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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Chemonics International is pleased to present this annual work plan for the MCC Indonesia Control of Corruption Project (MCC ICCP). The MCC ICCP program is a task order under the Building Recovery and Reform through Democratic Governance (BRDG) Indefinite Quantity Contract (IQC). This work plan covers the period May 2007 through April 2008. This work plan and the accompanying monitoring and evaluation plan will guide project implementation.

Chemonics International is the prime contractor for MCC ICCP. We will implement the project with the assistance of our BRDG consortium partners, Blue Law LLP, Partners for Democratic Change, Internews Network, and the Urban Institute. We will also work with several Indonesian organizations as subcontractors, initially these have been named as the Indonesian Society for Transparency (MTI), Hukum Online, Center for Indonesian Law and Policy Studies (PSHK), and Institute for an Independent Judiciary (LEIP). This list will grow over time as activities commence.

Program Description

MCC ICCP is a two-year contract in support of the MCC Threshold Country Program (TCP) for Indonesia. Awarded to Chemonics in April 2007, it will run from April 11, 2007 through April 10, 2009. The project team will work closely with several Indonesian government entities, including the Indonesian Supreme Court, the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK), the Financial Transaction Reports and Analysis Center (PPATK), and the Ministry for National Development Planning (Bappenas). Together, we will work to improve the integrity, competence, and productivity of court officials; enhance the investigative, communications, and outreach capacities of the KPK; promote collaboration between Non-Bank Financial Institutions (NBFIs) and the PPATK and improve PPATK’s reporting, communications, and analytical capacities; and improve the Indonesian government’s e-procurement system.

More specifically, our MCC ICCP team will provide assistance for the four MCC ICCP Tasks:

Task 1: This Task encompasses five related activities designed to improve Indonesian court administration through (i) institutionalizing systems for human resource, financial, asset and information management of court resources; (ii) training 2000 judges in the Judicial Code of Conduct and selected senior court personnel on wealth reporting; (iii) improving court personnel management and supervision systems; (vi) improving court budget preparation and monitoring of asset management, and, (v) installation of systems, procedures, and training to ensure public access to court information.

Task 2: The Indonesian Financial Intelligence Unit (PPATK) will adapt the “Know Your Customer” campaign to reach NBFIs, starting with moneychangers for the former and targeting the larger population of NBFIs for the latter. Additionally, the project will support PPATK’s efforts to upgrade its ability to monitor and analyze suspicious transition reports and cash transaction reports through the introduction of computer hardware and software enhancements and associated training. Finally, the ability of PPATK to communicate with law enforcement agencies will be enhanced.
through the installation of secure communication infrastructure. We will coordinate with International Criminal Investigative Training Assistance Program (ICITAP) of the U.S. Department of Justice, the implementing organization for this activity.

**Task 3:** The MCC ICCP team will enhance KPK’s ability to monitor anti-corruption trial proceedings. As well, the KPK needs to work with verifiable baseline data from a reliable source, such as Transparency International-Indonesia, to gauge the direction and level of changes in the perception of corruption. We will encourage peer-to-peer dialogue between KPK and TI-Indonesia that exchanges necessary and vital information without compromising either organizations required independence.

**Task 4:** Under Task 4, MCC ICCP will work alongside the Center for Public Procurement Policy at the Ministry for National Development Planning (Bappenas) to support the creation and implementation of five regional e-government procurement (e-GP) centers, the location of which will be selected by the GOI. Through these satellite e-GP centers, we will help realize a substantial reduction in the cost of government procurements by providing a system that increases transparency in the bidding process. Better data collection and monitoring of procurement processes will help track the overall process of government procurement reform. Public awareness activities of e-GP in each region will increase the number of Indonesian companies bidding on public tenders and the public’s knowledge of the public procurement process.

**Organizational Structure**

The MCC ICCP chief of party (COP), Mr. Jonathan Simon is responsible for the overall technical and administrative management of the project. The COP is supported by a team that includes long and short-term expatriate and Indonesian professional advisors, as well as program, managerial, and administrative support staff in Jakarta and the U.S. Dr. Sarah Tisch, Program Director, provides technical and administrative support. (See Exhibit 1 below).

**Results Framework**

Our approach to work planning and performance monitoring is based on a project results framework (Exhibit 2 below). The results framework shows the development hypotheses behind MCC ICCP project goals and objectives.

The overarching goal of the MCC ICCP project is to help Indonesia’s executive and judicial branches in their respective efforts to combat corruption. This goal falls under USAID/Indonesia’s Strategic Objective, *Effective Democratic and Decentralized Governance*, and more specifically under the Intermediate Result *Consolidating the Reform Agenda*.

We have identified four project intermediate results that correspond directly to the project’s four main tasks. Each Task is divided into specific key results so that we can better track our activities and performance.
SECTION I – WORKPLAN

Purpose

The MCC ICCP work plan is designed to be a flexible, organic document to guide implementation of project activities. It outlines the activities and expected results for each project component. It integrates performance monitoring and evaluation to encourage adaptation of activities to achieve the maximum possible impact. As USAID, the MCC ICCP team, and government counterparts monitor project performance and progress toward expected results in Indonesia’s dynamic environment, it is expected that the work plan will be periodically and appropriately modified to respond to opportunities and obstacles as they arise.

Linkages with Counterparts, Donors, and Other Projects

We recognize the need to build on previous and existing efforts to strengthen the Indonesian legal and judicial system. During project implementation we will seek cost-savings by avoiding duplication of effort and building on lessons learned from the efforts of our counterparts, other current USAID projects, and projects funded by other donors.

We believe that appropriate and effective implementation of MCC ICCP will require close coordination of project activities with our local counterparts and partners. This is the only means to ensure that MCC ICCP responds effectively to real needs. Of course, all of the MCC ICCP work will be undertaken with the advance collaboration and coordination of USAID in pursuit of both USAID and MCC TCP goals. As Indonesia is a busy development arena, we will communicate regularly with other programs pursuing similar, synergistic, or related endeavors, as appropriate, including AusAID, the EU, the World Bank, DfID, and other USAID contractors and grantees.

Led by the Chief of Party, the individual component leaders/advisors, specialists, and short-term experts of the MCC ICCP team, together with communications, monitoring and evaluation, and other experts, will collaborate with their appropriate counterparts. Accordingly, MCC ICCP will work closely with the Supreme Court, including the Supreme Court Reform Team, the Secretary General, and Registrar, to ensure that the goals of Task 1 are met fully. Some aspects of Task 1 may be coordinated with the KPK as well. While working closely with PPATK, we will also seek general synergies with the KPK, given its role in the bureaucratic reform effort of the GOI. The MCC ICCP team will work ‘hand in glove’ with the KPK on Task 3. Finally, the MCC ICCP team’s work on Task 4 will be coordinated with Bappenas and designated provincial governments to host e-GP satellite centers.
Exhibit 2. Results Framework

Project Objective
Strengthen the institutional capacity of the GOI to reduce corruption

Project Intermediate Result 1
Transparency and accountability within judiciary and court system improved and corruption reduced.

Key Result Areas
1.1: Judicial accountability mechanisms for ethical conduct strengthened.
1.2: Court’s ability to perform and monitor operations improved.
1.3: Public access to court information expanded.

Project Intermediate Result 2
Capacity of PPATK to track money laundering in banking and non-banking financial institutions enhanced.

Key Result Areas
2.1: Compliance of NBFIs with STR/CTR reporting requirements improved.
2.2: PPATK’s capacity for receiving STR’s/CTR’s increased.
2.3: Processes for effective electronic transmission of suspicious transactions strengthened.

Project Intermediate Result 3
Capability of the KPK to prevent, prosecute, and convict corrupt officials enhanced.

Key Result Areas
3.1: Monitoring framework for using communications, monitoring equipment developed
3.2: Capacity for monitoring and preventing corruption during legal proceedings strengthened.
3.3: Effectiveness of KPK corruption prevention strategy improved through expanded data analysis and collection.

Project Intermediate Result 4
Electronic Government Procurement (e-GP) System expanded to improve accountability and transparency in awarding public contracts at the provincial level.

Key Result Areas
4.1: Provincial e-GP processes and systems established.
4.2: Monitoring and analysis procedures for e-GP data institutionalized.
4.3: Public oversight of provincial procurement increased.
Technical Activities

Task 1: Judicial Reform

The primary goal of Task 1 is to assist in the on-going Supreme Court reforms that seek to produce a truly independent, competent, and impartial national justice system that is a resource for all Indonesians. The current prevalence and perceptions of, corruption within the judicial system undermines the effectiveness of the system, the existent reservoir of public trust in the judicial branch of government, and the confidence and pride of honest professionals now working within the system. Taking the opportunity to improve court management is provided by the Supreme Court’s 2003 ‘Blueprint for Reform’ and the one-roof system, the MCC ICCP Task 1 team will work to forge consensus and eliminate institutional bottlenecks constraining progress in the overall reform agenda with the Supreme Court.

Basic activities. Our team will improve existing and help create better judicial system and court administration management processes and accountability mechanisms. The team will also enhance the public visibility and understanding of the court system and its path towards and efforts thus far in self-improvement. Specifically, we will implement activities and design effective responses to opportunities that may arise in the following three main areas: court human resources management and training, court budget and existing asset management, and court system transparency and public outreach.

Resources. Under the supervision of COP Mr. Simon, the Task 1 Manager is Mr. Kenneth Barden, while Mr. Ralph Deloach is mentoring Indonesian technical staff on court reform. Mr. Barden and Mr. DeLoach work closely with Ms. Egi Suyatin, Ms. Judhi Kristantini, Dr. Laode Syarif, Mr. Saiful Doeana, Mr. Paul Dillon, Mr. Aries Nogroho, Mr. Budi Selawan, Ms. Irawady Soederham, Ms. Marina Margareta Djamilah and Ms. Florence Armein and Ms. Kathy Gaertner. This team will draw upon short-term expertise available through our partners, BlueLaw LLP, the Urban Institute, Internews Network Inc., Hukum Online, the Indonesian Society for Transparency, and the Indonesian Society for an Independent Judiciary.

Coordination. We will coordinate with donors and implementers working in functional areas at different court levels to ensure that activities are complementary and not duplicative. In addition, as the activities summarized above overlap and interconnect, we will integrate these tasks by involving all relevant Supreme Court divisions in the formation, planning, and implementation of individual activities and consulting with donors.

Anticipated Results: The overarching result sought by MCC ICCP activities is the strengthening of the Indonesian government and judiciary institutional structure’s resistance against and capacity to combat corruptive influences and practices. As a result of project activities, the efficiency, accountability, and transparency of the court system will be improved, which will have the derivative effect of reducing and forestalling corruptive influences and activities.
Task 1, Activity 1: Human Resources

Planned Activities, Resources, and Partners

There are five types of activities under Task 1, Human Resources. First, we will design and develop a comprehensive Code of Conduct course for judges with interactive case studies, role play, and other measures. We will deliver training of “judge trainers” (TOT) sessions for 250 judges in Jakarta. Subsequently, this Code of Conduct training course will be rolled out to the district courts to train at least 2,000 judges in the court system by the close of the project. We will work with the Supreme Court to build commitment to the new Code and incorporate accountability procedures into the Supreme Court’s human resource system.

Second, we will work with the KPK to include a wealth-reporting module in the Code of Conduct training described above. We will work with the KPK on a wealth training program – the TCP says that the training should focus on “how to fill out the form” for a group of upper echelon court personnel. Once this group is identified and designated by the Supreme Court we will provide training on submitting wealth reports. Finally, wealth-reporting monitoring will be integrated into the human resources database described below.

Third, we will conduct a human resources mapping exercise and through this develop standardized job descriptions, including responsibilities, supervision, promotion criteria, career development paths. We will survey court staff on skills, compensation, and workload. A remuneration strategy and plan will be developed for the Court to implement which will include merit-based performance indicators and overall staffing patterns. We will consider gender concerns, determining what, if any, formal and informal barriers prevent women from equal employment and promotion opportunities.

Fourth, we will conduct a court personnel staffing and judge distribution assessment and develop an implementation plan. We will conduct a statistical personnel and judge distribution assessment based on weighted caseloads. We will create a statistical formula for staffing and resource allocation across courts based on government data compiled and verified by local partners, and in focus groups and interviews with a sampling of judges and personnel. This activity will include a communications strategy as part of efforts to standardize positions and staffing in lower courts. We will establish Supreme Court oversight mechanisms to monitor and follow-up on the progress in the lower courts.

Fifth, we will integrate policies and procedures for standardized job descriptions, the personnel and judge distribution plan into an improved human resource database. We will conduct a gap analysis of the court’s human resources management system that will capture basic biographical data information, training, salary, performance history, and disciplinary actions for judges and court staff. We will train approximately 400 court staff from varying court levels on the new system as well as a cadre of Supreme Court trainers for rollout to additional courts. We will conduct training at the regional level through our Indonesian partners.

Assumptions. The activities for this Task as set forth below assume that the following circumstances exist or will exist during the period of this contract:

1. All required participants (judges and senior court personnel) can be identified.
2. Sufficient qualified trainers can be identified and recruited.

**Project Year 1, Quarter 1: April - June 2007**

These activities are anticipated during this quarter of the first project year.

- Hold preliminary meetings with counterparts and other donor-funded projects and partners.
- Number of judges already trained (by EU program) counted/identified.
- Identify available baseline data on wealth reporting, human resources.
- Identify and compile key legislation relating to Judicial Code of Conduct, wealth reporting, and human resources management in the courts.
- Identify potential participants and trainers for Judicial Code of Conduct.
- Identify potential partners, including universities and NGOs.
- Identify other partners (e.g., contact persons at each court, local organizers).
- Develop Judicial Code of Conduct training module.
- Review/establish baseline data for court human resources through (desk analysis).
- Create/modify template for job descriptions.
- Begin designing Judicial Code of Conduct training handbook and CDs.

**Milestones:**

1. Training module for Judicial Code of Conduct developed included the KPK wealth reporting training module.
2. Participants, local contact persons, potential stakeholders identified and contacted.
3. Draft job description template created.
4. Needs Assessment for Supreme Court training complete.
5. First draft of Judicial Code of Conduct training handbook completed.

**Project Year 1, Quarter 2: July-September 2007**

These activities are anticipated during this quarter of the first project year.

- Complete pilot workshops for judge trainers for Judicial Code of Conduct.
- Finalize training module for Judicial Code of Conduct based on feedback from first training of trainers.
- Incorporate KPK’s training module for Wealth Reporting into Code of Conduct curriculum.
- Identify critical court positions and descriptions and performance requirements.
- Begin identifying all positions at Supreme Court for job description formulation.
Six Month Deliverables and Outcomes

Deliverables:
- Judicial Code of Conduct training module developed.
- Critical Court positions identified.

Outcomes:
- Training of judge trainers on skills and knowledge necessary for training judges on new Judicial Code of Conduct begun.

Project Year 1, Quarter 3: October – December 2007

These activities are anticipated during this quarter of the first project year.

- Conduct Judicial Code of Conduct training of trainer sessions.
- Evaluate trainings held thus far; make necessary adjustments.
- Revise handbook/CDs on Judicial Code of Conduct.
- Modify wealth reporting training curriculum as needed to meet needs of trainees identified by the Court.
- Complete identification of job positions, descriptions and performance requirements.
- Begin quality assurance checking of completed job descriptions and associated performance requirements.
- Select subcontractor to provide staffing assessment.
- Initiate conduct of staffing assessment of courts.
- Review potential court human resources databases.

Milestones:

2. Draft design for staffing assessment.
3. 100 judges trained as Code of Conduct trainers.

Project Year 1, Quarter 4: January – March 2008

These activities are anticipated during this quarter of the first project year.

- Deliver regularly scheduled Code of Conduct workshops for judges.
- Evaluate trainings held thus far; make necessary adjustments.
- Conduct TOT for wealth reporting training.
- Deliver regularly scheduled wealth reporting training workshops for selected senior court personnel.
- Evaluate trainings held thus far; make necessary adjustments.
- Develop monitoring procedures for wealth reporting compliance.
- Integrate wealth reporting monitoring system and baseline data into HR database.
- Finalize job descriptions and performance requirements for all court personnel.
- Develop process and procedures for regular performance evaluation.
- Provide court with remuneration strategy and plan.
• Finalize recommendations and implementation plan based on staffing assessment results.
• Institutionalize standardized personnel policies and procedures for rolling out staffing plan, with mechanism for Supreme Court monitoring.
• Select human resource database, procure or develop.
• Identify courts to receive computers for human resource database.
• Procure 200 computers for human resource database.
• Train relevant staff on use of human resource database software.

### End of Year 1 Deliverables and Outcomes

**Deliverables:**
- Job descriptions and minimum position qualification requirements for court staff positions within the court system developed.
- Monitoring procedures for wealth reporting compliance developed.
- Minimum performance standards for each court position developed.
- Remuneration strategy and plan completed.
- Court staffing assessment conducted.
- Staffing plan and caseload-based judicial distribution plan developed.
- Computer human resources management database developed with wealth reporting compliance included.
- 200 computers procured to support HR database.

**Outcomes:**
- Staffing plan and caseload-based judicial distribution plan implemented.
- Training provided on new HR database.
- 100 judge trainers who can deliver the Judicial Code of Conduct workshop.
- 100 judge trainers who can deliver the wealth reporting component of the Code of Conduct training.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Y1, Q1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 1. Judicial Reforms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 1. Human Resources Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 1a. Judicial Code of Conduct</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop Judicial Code of Conduct training module, training handbook, and CDs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify partners, participants, trainers, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct TOT sessions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roll-out training program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 1b. Wealth Reporting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporate wealth reporting training module in Code of Conduct training</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify partners, participants, trainers, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct TOT sessions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roll-out training program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop monitoring procedures for wealth reporting compliance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrate monitoring system and baseline data into HR database</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 1c. Job Descriptions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify major positions at Supreme Court, along with descriptions and performance requirements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create template for job descriptions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify major positions in other courts, along with descriptions and performance requirements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop process and procedures for regular performance evaluation and merit promotion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete remuneration strategy and plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 1d. Staffing Assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design assessment methodology for court staffing and judge distribution assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct staffing and judicial distribution assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collect and analyze data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop recommendations and implementation plan based on assessment results</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create standardized policies and procedures for rolling out plan, with mechanism for SC monitoring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 1e. Human Resources Database</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct gap analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop or procure Human Resource database</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procure computers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Train court staffing in Human Resource database</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Task 1, Activity 2: Budget and Asset Management

Planned Activities, Resources, and Partners

For Task 2, we will work on two primary activities: reforming and improving the court systems budgeting processes and tracking and systematizing the court’s accounting of its existing physical assets. Our team includes short-term experts from Blue Law, Urban Institute, and LEIP. Additional local organizations will be identified through a competitive RFP process to undertake specific scopes of work. In addition, our team will coordinate with the AusAID LDF program. The goal of Activity 2 is to forecast expenses through asset management and develop annual budgets more effectively. A key benefit of the interventions outlined below will be the increased transparency regarding the appropriation and use of government funds and property. As part of this process, the courts will need to account for, track and manage its existing physical assets and asset needs more efficiently.

To ameliorate the court budgeting process, we will help improve the collection and verification of data on the needs of the courts and citizens, streamline the methods for aligning that data to established strategic goals for the court system, and open up to public scrutiny the process of determining allocations of court resources. To these ends, we will conduct a rapid assessment to determine existing budgetary tools and procedures and identify changes that will streamline the system, linkages to the court system’s strategic policies, and current availability of this information to the public. We will identify needs for software system enhancements to aid financial management and monitoring of the budget process and the training needs of existing court personnel.

We will train 1,600 court personnel in quantitative skills to enable them to prepare budgets as required by the Ministry of Finance of the Court. We will provide budget advocacy training to those senior staff with intra-governmental liaison responsibilities. We will develop budget-related performance indicators in consultation with the Supreme Court and establish a performance monitoring system that tracks indicators and results, all of which will be integrated into the budget information system. In cooperation with the Supreme Court Legal and Public Affairs Office, we will create procedures and formats for public release of court budget information.

We will help the Supreme Court control its expenses by enhancing its existing physical assets inventory. With an eye towards establishing an asset control system that prevents misuse and theft, we will assess records and inspect court facilities to survey, evaluate, and categorize the courts’ physical assets. Having identified the extent to which the courts’ actual assets correspond to its existing records, if any, our team will evaluate how to organize the inventorying process and improve recordkeeping, including improvement of the Supreme Court’s records needed for inventory tracking software purposes. We will provide training to those involved in asset management, including training in managing a random inspection process. After developing and testing the inventorying process and its administration in four court regions where no inventory records have been submitted by the courts, we will provide tools and a methodology for rolling out the process throughout the court system.

Assumptions. The activities set for below assume that the following circumstances exist or will exist during this contract:
1. Access to all courts property necessary for asset verification is readily available.

2. Access to all physical records on existing property is timely and readily available.

3. Court budgetary information is timely and readily available.

**Project Year 1, Quarter 1: April - June 2007**

These activities are anticipated during this quarter of the first project year.

- Hold preliminary meetings on budget and asset management with counterparts.
- Prepare a conceptual budgetary map of courts.
- Identify/modify methodology for budgeting needs assessment.
- Conduct budget needs assessment analysis.
- Collect data regarding existing budgeting system.
- Conduct initial interviews with counterpart experts in asset management.
- Prepare different scenarios for the Court regarding asset inventory and asset management.

**Milestones:**

1. Budget needs assessment completed.
2. Proposals for asset inventory provided to Court.

**Project Year 1, Quarter 2: July-September 2007**

These activities are anticipated during this quarter of the first project year.

- Collect budgetary procedure best practices.
- Initiate software gap analysis to determine any additional features needed.
- Identify computer installation plan and begin computer procurement.
- Prepare EOI for asset inventory firms.
- Develop and release RFP for asset inventory.
- Modify proposals to Court system for asset accountability.
- Review Court inventory records.
- Begin determination of asset needs of courts.

**Milestones:**

1. 100 computers for Supreme Court budget and finance officers procured.
2. 18 proposals in response to EOI for asset inventory firms received.
3. RFP distributed to qualifying firms for asset inventory.

**Project Year 1, Quarter 3: October – December 2007**

These activities are anticipated during this quarter of the first project year.

- Distribute computers and software to designated courts.
- Develop training program on budget system and procedures.
- Train court asset inventory takers.
- Begin court asset physical inventory taking in courts in four regions from which no records have been submitted.

**Milestones:**

1. 100 computers distributed to budget and finance officers.
2. Identification of budget software improvements continued.
3. Training program for court personnel on new budget procedures developed.
4. Training program for court asset inventory takers developed.

**Project Year 1, Quarter 4: January – March 2008**

These activities are anticipated during this quarter of the first project year.

- Training of court personnel on budget procedures.
- Training on strategic budget planning held for senior court staff.
- Procurement and distribution of the remaining 100 computers for budget and finance officers.
- Procure and provide improvements to budget information system to 200 lower courts.
- Develop and distribute procedures in alignment with the MoF processes for budget formulation and monitoring.
- Develop procedures and formats for public release of court budget.
- Identify and develop asset management database.
- Begin to create processes and procedures for regular updates and maintenance of asset information.
- Begin trainings on asset management for court personnel.
- Develop a financial spreadsheet model to help the Court forecast the annual cost, at the individual court level, for acquiring/replacing assets.

**Milestones:**

1. 100 computers distributed to budget and finance officers.
2. 135 senior court staff trained in strategic budget planning and change management.
3. 10 key verifiers for asset inventory trained.
4. Pilot asset inventory test completed.
5. Court asset verifiers trained.
6. Court asset inventory 60% complete in four regions.
7. 25% of court asset personnel trained on asset management.

**End of Year 1 Deliverables and Outcomes**

**Deliverables:**

- Needs assessment on budget items for court budget completed.
- Alignment of court budget formulation and monitoring procedures with those of the MoF.
- Procedure and format for public release of court budget information.
- Inventory completed in at least two regions without previous inventories.

**Outcomes:**

- Process for training Court personnel on new budget procedures implemented.
- Budget and finance officers equipped to provide MoF compliant budget information.
- Inventory records for two regional courts without previous asset inventories.
### Task 1, Activity 2 Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Y1, Q1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Task 1. Judicial Reforms</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activity 2. Budget/Asset Management</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activity 2a. Budget Management</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct budgeting needs assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collect data on existing budgeting system, including best practices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview counterparts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop and distribute procedures for budget formulation and monitoring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify computer installment plan and begin procurement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Install computers and software to designated courts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct TOT sessions (budget system and procedures) and roll out trainings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Align procedures for budget formulation and monitoring with MoF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formulate budget advocacy strategies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish procedures and format for public release of budget</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activity 2b. Asset Management</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design asset inventory methodology, provide proposals to Court</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review Court inventory records</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asset inventory training program developed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court asset inventory takers trained</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct inventory assessment and input baseline data into asset management database</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Task 1, Activity 3: Enhanced Court System Transparency**

**Planned Activities, Resources, and Partners**

For Activity 3 of Task 1, we will focus on four activities that will improve public access to information about the court system, mainstream the concept of the courts as a public service-oriented institution and build mechanisms for interaction via media such as radio, television, and print. Assisting our core team will be short-term experts from BlueLaw, Internews, Hukum Online, and LEIP, and other partners selected through RFPs or similar processes.

Improving public access to court decisions is a critical aspect of court transparency. To help the Indonesian courts advance towards improving coherent, predictable, and consistent application of law we will help increase the number of electronically published court decisions. We will work closely with the Supreme Court IT department and Supreme Court IT working group to determine requirements for a searchable Supreme Court decision database that is publicly available via the current Court Web site. After determining inadequacies, the team will recommend IT upgrades and enhancements, and once these are approved, implement them. Subcontractor Hukum Online will work on digitizing of the backlog of existing Supreme Court decisions through means that meet the Courts’ security concerns. We will coordinate with the AusAID LDF to ensure that any program overlap does not result in duplication.

We will work with the Supreme Court to create an independent and impartial verification process for public complaints, building on the Supreme Court’s existing public complaint tracking system. Subcontractor LEIP will review the current system and make recommendations for improvement, including a means to enable the public to check complaint status. We will also conduct a public awareness campaign about proper court personnel conduct and court procedures, including instructions on reporting Code of Conduct violations or complaints.

Corruption within the judiciary is rated as the number one priority among the business community in Transparency International-Indonesia (TI-I)’s 2004 Corruption Perception Index. To help change this perception, we will, in close coordination with other donor projects, assist the Supreme Court to develop and disseminate the “story” of its reform efforts. Our experts will help Court legal and public affairs staff inform the public about the Court’s concrete plans for achieving improved transparency and accountability, bolstering their skills regarding the public and the media. We will provide training and informal mentorship to these individuals to help build their skills. Likewise, we will provide training and skills workshops for Supreme Court public relations staff on communicating successes and institutional reforms that cover essential skills such as creating core messages, writing press releases, holding press conferences, and using appropriate communication mediums to maximize audience reach.

Our experts will develop a television series that looks at different aspects of Supreme Court activities, including the activities designed to improve transparency and accountability. Through this medium a large Indonesian public will be provided with a portrayal of a proactive Supreme Court.

Journalists will be trained in the workings and activities of the Supreme Court, so that they can offer informed coverage of cases and of the changes taking place there.
As noted above, all of the above initiatives will be aided and their effectiveness enhanced if working in the court system begins to carry a greater sense of public responsibility and, correspondingly, public access. To achieve greater public access, our team will work with the court, solicit input from civil society organizations and the public, and coordinate with other donor-funded programs to design appropriate initiatives. Such interventions could include small-, medium-, and high-cost initiatives such as posting daily dockets outside the courthouse, newsletters, information brochures, creating a public service counter in courthouses, an annual speech or press release on the state of the courts, and television dialogue programs. We will identify those that best fit the Indonesian context.

**Assumptions.** The activities for this Task as set forth below assume that the following circumstances exist or will exist during the period of this contract:

1. Judges and other senior court personnel with media or public responsibilities make themselves available for and participate in new skills training.
2. Supreme Court has designated with space and facilities for our team to work with the court backlogged decisions for online publication.
3. Supreme Court designates dedicated staff to work as information specialists.
4. Supreme Court is willing to address and improve the public complaint system.
5. Indonesian Television partner and program (new or existing) is willing to broadcast Supreme Court-dedicated programming at acceptable rates.

**Project Year 1, Quarter 1: April - June 2007**

These activities are anticipated during this quarter of the first project year.

- Hold preliminary meetings with relevant Supreme Court offices.
- Begin assessment of backlogged court decisions, including any existing/related projects with the Supreme Court.
- Develop an integrated Task 1 Communications Strategy Plan.
- Conduct Public Relations Training Needs Assessment with Legal and Public Affairs Office at the Supreme Court.

**Milestones:**

1. Assessment of ongoing on-line publication efforts compiled.
2. Communications Strategy Plan draft produced.
3. Assessment of Legal and Public Affairs training needs assessment completed.

**Project Year 1, Quarter 2: July-September 2007**

These activities are anticipated during this quarter of the first project year.

- Conduct assessment of Supreme Court staff capability and computer hardware/software requirements related to publication of decisions.
• Commence data collection concerning decisions for online publication.
• Prepare and analyze database and web application system requirements.
• Preliminary web application and database system design and development.
• Assess current Supreme Court complaint system.

**Project Year 1, Quarter 3: October – December 2007**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Six Month Deliverables and Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deliverables:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Supreme Court website upgraded to ensure initial capacity for online publication of decisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 40% of backlogged decisions in hand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Current Public Complaint system assessed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Outline for Public Affairs training program.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These activities are anticipated during this quarter of the first project year.

• Development of Supreme Court decision database, application, and website continues.
• Ongoing uploading of decisions onto website.
• Design and conduct trainings for public relations staff and senior personnel.
• Conduct second phase of public relations training needs assessment.

**Milestones:**

1. 10% of ‘backlogged’ cases in hand published online.
2. Testing and finalizing decisions database, application, and website enhancements.
3. First phase of public relations training for Supreme Court staff completed.

**Project Year 1, Quarter 4: January – March 2008**

These activities are anticipated during this quarter of the first project year.

• Continue scanning and uploading decisions on website.
• Create standard complaint submission forms.
• Develop public awareness campaign on public complaint system.
• Continued training of legal and public relations staff and senior court personnel.
• Enhance SC website to post information for the public.
• Design plan for PR materials, including brochures on court procedures, fees and activities, for hard copy and on line.
• Begin development of television discussion series on court activities, including identifying production facilities and negotiating timeslot, frequency of program play/broadcast schedule.

**Milestones**

1. 20% of in-hand decisions scanned and on-line.
2. Public complaint submission forms developed.
3. Public compliant public awareness materials developed.
4. Supreme Court website upgraded to ensure capacity for dissemination of other court information.
5. Brochure design and 50% of brochure, poster materials completed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>End of Year 1 Deliverables and Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deliverables:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Upgrade website capabilities to insure capacity for online decision publication and additional information about the court.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Procedures for on-line publication and procedures developed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Procedures and forms for public complaint system developed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Guidelines for release of Court disciplinary information completed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Brochures on court activities, procedures, and fees developed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 20% of backlogged in-hand Supreme Court decisions online publication complete.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Improvements to public complaint system adopted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Court budget made public.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Court brochures are available publicly hard copy and online.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Supreme Court Legal and Public Relations office trained in public relations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Task 1, Activity 3 Activities Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Y1, Q1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Task 1. Judicial Reforms</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activity 3. Court System Transparency</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activity 3a. Online Publication of SC Decisions</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supreme Court decision Web page design</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish process and procedures for posting final SC decisions into database</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop publication guidelines to ensure documents meet public requirements of transparency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance SC website to post decisions for the public</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publish decisions online</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activity 3b. Public Complaint System for Entire Court System</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design and conduct assessment of current public complaints system</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance SC capacity for receiving complaints via web, phone, or mail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activity 3c. SC Public Relations Training</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct PR training needs assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design and conduct trainings for PR staff and senior personnel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop television discussion series on court activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activity 3d. Public Access Program</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance SC website to post information for the public</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop format for the posting of court budget and financial information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop and publish court information brochures on court activities, procedures, and fees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Task 2: Enhancing the Capacity of the Indonesia Financial Intelligence Unit (PPATK).

In recent years, Indonesia has dramatically improved its efforts with anti-money laundering: the number of suspicious and cash transaction reports filed with the independent Indonesian Financial Intelligence Unit (PPATK) continues to increase. Yet challenges, including poor interagency coordination, *ad hoc* compliance with promulgated regulations, and the lack of a permanent staff, hamper PPATK potential. Task 2 aims to assist PPATK to perform its anti-money laundering tracking and enforcement duties more efficiently. The PPATK is tasked with identifying the proceeds of certain criminal activity, including corruption, and tracking suspicious transactions. The MCC ICCP will assist PPATK to extend its reach to non-bank financial institutions (NBFIs) through a Know Your Customer program. The project will also help PPATK to more effectively use technology in its recordkeeping, analytical, and enforcement roles.

**Basic activities.** We will work with the PPATK to extend the successful Bank Indonesia ‘Know Your Customer” program through a public awareness campaign aimed at NBFIs and the general public. This will help stimulate an increase in the number of suspicious transaction reports (STRs) provided by these NBFIs. We will also help PPATK improve its technology for receipt, tracking, and analysis of STRs and cash transaction reports (CTRs), which help PPATK track the financial dealings and proceeds of criminal and corrupt endeavors.

**Resources.** Under the supervision of COP Mr. Simon, Mr. Andrew Pentland will oversee implementation, working on a peer basis with PPATK staff and will have technical guidance from Mr. Kenneth Barden. The Task 2 team will also include Mr. Pentland, Mr. Budi Setiawan, Mr. Dillon, Mr. Nogroho, and Ms. Soedirham plus training coordinators Ms. Djamilah and Ms. Armein. Subcontractors Internews Network and Partners for Democratic Change will provide short-term technical assistance. Local media organizations will be subcontracted through RFPs.

**Coordination.** We will coordinate with donors and implementers working in functional areas with the PPATK on anti-money laundering at different levels to ensure that activities are complementary and not duplicative. In particular this is the USAID Financial Crimes Prevention Project and the AusAid TAMF project. In addition, as the activities summarized above overlap and interconnect, the MCC ICCP team will integrate these tasks by involving all relevant PPATK staff in the formation, planning, and implementation of individual activities and consulting with donors.

**Anticipated Results:** The overarching result sought by MCC ICCP activities is the strengthening of PPATK’s capacity as an independent agency to obtain records of, track, and analyze suspicious financial transactions, and thereby forestall and prosecute corruption.

MCC ICCP will enable PPATK to expand the overall number of transaction reports received by improving filing compliance by NBFIs, enhance its analytical capacity by improving its online receipt reporting technology. Inter-agency coordination will be improved through PPATK’s use of secure communications technology provided by ICITAP.
**Task 2, Activity 1: Education Campaign**

**Planned Activities, Resources, and Partners**

We have two primary initiatives under Activity 1, which encompasses the Know Your Customer (KYC) campaign. We will adapt the original anti-money laundering (AML) program developed by Bank Indonesia for banks to NBFIs. Using interactive training methodologies, we will present KYC/AML best practices, CTR/STR filing requirements, and share lessons learned from the existing compliance track record to NBFIs subject to PPATKs filing requirements.

In addition, drawing from the experiences of the Bank Indonesia KYC program, we will mount an extensive public awareness, with radio, newspaper, and television public service announcements, as well as posters and brochures. Assisted by media organizations, we will use a variety of media to widely disseminate information about the need for protecting Indonesia against money laundering through NBFI compliance.

We will work closely with the NBFI regulators: Bank Indonesia and Bapepam-LK in public awareness campaigns targeted to NBFI practitioners and the public as a whole. The public awareness campaign on money laundering and KYC will be conducted in three stages: where the general public education campaign will be the main activity in the first stage, followed by a specific regulatory “socialization” to NBFI practitioners in the second stage, and combining both segments as the main target of the public education campaign for stage three.

Up to December 2007 the training activities will concentrate on the NBFI money exchange sector in order to prevent duplication and overlap with the AusAid TAMF project, which will undertake general training of the NBFI community. During 2008 we will work closely with TAMF to target different sectors in a cooperative approach.

We will create one television talk program addressing the issues of protecting Indonesia against money laundering. Using this medium will ensure a large audience for the program, which will be well publicized through other media to maximize viewership.

Journalists will receive training and support to increase and improve media coverage of the Know Your Customer program.

**Assumptions.** The activities for this Task as set forth below assume that the following circumstances exist or will exist during the period of this contract:

1. The training sessions are directed to NBFIs and do not include other types of participants; moreover, it is assumed that six of the training sessions will be required for curriculum purposes and six of the training sessions will be for Training of Trainers (with the TOT focused on trainers from the industry such as compliance managers).

2. This work plan assumes that the PPATK will be short on staff available to carry out CTR/STR online reporting related activities.
Project Year 1, Quarter 1: April - June 2007

These activities are anticipated during this quarter of the first project year.

- Hold preliminary meetings with PPATK and related agencies.
- Identify the training needs of NBFI partners.
- Design education campaign (identify audience, message, and mediums).
- Discussion training needs with Bank Indonesia and Bapepam-LK.
- Identify NBFI partners.

Project Year 1, Quarter 2: July-September 2007

These activities are anticipated during this quarter of the first project year.

- Design and prepare Training of Trainer materials.
- Design and produce posters and leaflets.
- Commence discussions on television talk show

Project Year 1, Quarter 3: October – December 2007

These activities are anticipated during this quarter of the first project year.

- Commence education campaign: distribute posters, leaflets.
- Begin PSA program: create, place newspaper, radio and TV public service announcements.
- Hold TOT sessions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eight Month Deliverables and Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deliverables:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Produce and distribute 1,000 posters and 10,000 leaflets to be placed in NBFI partners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Training curriculum for NBFI partners developed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Public Education campaign begun.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• PSA program designed and begun.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Year 1, Quarter 4: January – March 2008

These activities are anticipated during this quarter of the first project year.

- Continue education campaign.
- Develop television talk show.
- Single television talk show goes to air, monitor and evaluate.
- Continue public service announcement programs.
- Hold final TOT sessions.
End of Year 1 Deliverables and Outcomes

Deliverables:
- Public service announcements developed.
- Posters and leaflets developed.
- Six training sessions for NPFI staff developed.

Outcomes:
- KYC Public service announcements on television, radio, and in newspapers.
- Single television talk show addressing KYC aired.
- Trainers trained and ready for six training sessions to be delivered to NBFIs.
### Task 2, Activity 1 Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Y1, Q1</td>
<td>Y1, Q2</td>
<td>Y1, Q3</td>
<td>Y1, Q4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 2. Enhancing Capacity of PPATK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 1. Education Campaign</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design education campaign (identify audience, message, and mediums)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create and place radio and TV public service announcements (PSAs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create and place newspaper PSAs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Produce and distribute posters and leaflets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop one television talk show</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop and conduct six training of trainer workshops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Task 2, Activity 2: Online Report Receipt Capacity

Planned Activities, Resources, and Partners

We will focus on technology improvements that will improve its online receipt reporting and tracking capabilities. As a relatively new organization, PPATK is still developing its capacity for its primary mission: the collection and analysis of financial reports in support of the enforcement of anticorruption and anti-money laundering laws and regulations. As such, PPATK’s online report receipt system for accepting and recording STRs and CTRs remains under construction. We will conduct an initial assessment status to determine requirements for increasing report receipt capacity and verify functionality. We will work with PPATK to accelerate the development of its system, including both hardware and software expansion. Recognizing that technology improvements only proceed as effectively and efficiently as staff can incorporate them into their work, we will also conduct an initial training needs assessment, and provide staff training as needed. We will assist PPATK in its capacity to gather, analyze, apply techniques for the production of relevant material for national police, KPK, and judicial case filing, and store these data.

Project Year 1, Quarter 1: April - June 2007

These activities are anticipated during this quarter of the first project year.

- Hold preliminary meetings.
- Conduct gap analysis on current online receipt system.
- Develop procurement plan for additional computer hardware.
- Identify improvements to online reporting capacity of PPATK.

Project Year 1, Quarter 2: July-September 2007

These activities are anticipated during this quarter of the first project year.

- Procurement plan for necessary software and hardware.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Six Month Deliverables and Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deliverables:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Gap assessment conducted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Recommendations for improvements made.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Additional computer hardware procurement process initiated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Project Year 1, Quarter 3: October – December 2007

These activities are anticipated during this quarter of the first project year.

- Suggest improvements to online receipt system.
- Deliver procured hardware and software.
- Begin review STR/CTR forms design and submission procedures.

Project Year 1, Quarter 4: January – March 2008

These activities are anticipated during this quarter of the first project year.

- Forms and procedures review completed.
- Monitoring and evaluation conducted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>End of Year 1 Deliverables and Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Hardware acquired and provided to PPATK.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Online receipt system review completed and recommendations submitted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Task 2, Activity 2 Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Y1, Q1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 2. Enhancing Capacity of PPATK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 2. Increasing Online Report Receipt Capabilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct gap analysis on current online receipt software</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide additional computer hardware</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommend system improvements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review forms and procedures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Task 2, Activity 3: Monitoring Progress and Use of Secure Communications

Planned Activities, Resources, and Partners

Poor communications infrastructure and insufficiently formalized policies and procedures for transferring financial analysis remain key obstacles to PPATK’s efforts to transfer its data collection into law enforcement action. Indeed, currently, all of PPATK’s information is transferred to appropriate law enforcement bodies in the form of hard paper copies. We will seek to ameliorate this deficiency through technical assistance as appropriate in connection to the procurement by ICITAP of secure communications equipment for PPATK. Noting that we will not be involved at all with the equipment procurement, we will work with PPATK to eliminate bottlenecks and more effectively track the status of cases. We will work with ICITAP and PPATK on monitoring installation and usage of the secure communications link, and ensure procedures are ready for equipment usage and tracking case status.

This activity assumes that the procurement of PPATK’s secure communications equipment proceeds apace and on a parallel schedule with MCC ICCP implementation. To this end, coordination and continual communications with ICITAP is a primary deliverable for this activity. It also assumes that PPATK will open its internal activities sufficiently to MCC ICCP Task 2 Team personnel to allow appropriate monitoring of the equipment’s use, once procured.

Project Year 1, Quarter 1: April - June 2007

These activities are anticipated during this quarter of the first project year.

- Hold preliminary meetings with PPATK and ICITAP.

Project Year 1, Quarter 2: July-September 2007

These activities are anticipated during this quarter of the first project year.

- Coordinate with ICITAP as per any equipment procurement for PPATK done through MCC ICCP.

Six Month Deliverables and Outcomes

Deliverables:

- Regular coordination meetings with ICITAP held.
Project Year 1, Quarter 3: October – December 2007

These activities are anticipated during this quarter of the first project year.

- Continue coordination with ICITAP

Project Year 1, Quarter 4: January – March 2008

These activities are anticipated during this quarter of the first project year.

- Work with PPATK staff to design monitoring mechanism and reporting schedule
- Conduct training needs assessment
- Training program complete
- Monitoring and evaluation commencing
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Y1, Q1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 2. Enhancing Capacity of PPATK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 3. Monitoring Progress and Use of Secure Communications Link</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinate with ICITAP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design monitoring system</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Train PPATK staff in monitoring system</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular monitoring of installation and use of secure communications link</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Task 3: Enhancing the Capacity of the Indonesia Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK)**

The KPK is Indonesia’s premier government agency for the investigation and prosecution of corruption and has prosecuted high-ranking officials for corruption. To continue to fulfill its mandate and deter public sector corruption with the threat of criminal sanctions, the KPK needs comprehensive monitoring system for government communications, expand and to improve its court monitoring capability. Also, the KPK intends to work with Transparency International-Indonesia (TI-I) to expand the data collected through TI-I’s Corruption Perception and Bribery Indices to produce information that will aid in the Indonesian government’s fight against corruption.

**Basic activities.** We will work with KPK and coordinate with ICITAP regarding monitoring the use of secure communications monitoring equipment. We will also work with the KPK to expand their courtroom monitoring program. We will procure this equipment as per KPK’s specifications. We will ensure that the KPK to ensure they have the training and capacity to use and maintain this equipment.

We will provide support to ensure policies for proper use are established and followed. We will work with equipment users to define accurate measurements for use of the communications monitoring equipment, examining options to allow for monitoring usage without breaching the confidential nature of private case information. We will meet regularly with the KPK regarding changes in usage assumptions that affect monitoring and reporting.

MCC ICCP will fund TI-I’s survey for the 2008 Corruption Perceptions Index (CPI) and Bribery Index, and an expanded analysis of the 2006 and 2008 CPI data. As we do so, we will work with TI-I and the KPK to build trust in the reliability of the survey process and data analysis. We will also co-fund work on an Integrity Index to be undertaken by the KPK alone.

**Resources.** Under the supervision of COP Mr. Simon, Mr. Andrew Pentland will oversee implementation with technical guidance from Mr. Ken Barden and Mr. Setiawan in providing technical assistance to the KPK on the use of anti-corruption data. Organization and Administration Specialist Mr. Doeana will manage the relationship with Transparency International-Indonesia, and liaise with the KPK. Ms. Endang Suyatin will supervise the TI-I grant deliverable and payment schedule.

**Coordination.** We will coordinate with ICITAP regarding the monitoring of communications equipment. We will coordinate with other donor funded project that are addressing court room monitoring and work closely with the KPK staff.

**Anticipated Results:** The overarching result sought by MCC ICCP activities is the strengthening of capacity of KPK to prevent, prosecute, and convict corrupt officials and use data from survey research to strength their analysis of anti-corruption efforts. We will help develop a monitoring framework for using KPK’s new communications monitoring equipment and improve KPK’s capacity to monitor and prevent corruption during legal proceedings. Finally, we will improve KPK’s corruption prevention strategy improved through expanded data analysis and collection.
Task 3, Activity 1: Monitor Installation, Use of Communications Monitoring Equipment

Planned Activities, Resources, and Partners

We will monitor the installation and use by KPK of secure communications equipment being provided through the ICITAP program. Our team will work on a peer-to-peer relationship with the KPK to monitor use of the communications monitoring equipment. We will provide support to ensure policies for proper use are established and followed. We will work with equipment users to define accurate measurements for use of the communications monitoring equipment, examining options to allow for monitoring usage without breaching the confidential nature of private case information. We will meet regularly with the KPK regarding changes in usage assumptions that affect monitoring and reporting.

This activity assumes that the procurement of KPK’s secure communications intercept equipment proceeds apace and on a parallel schedule with MCC ICCP. To this end, coordination and continual communications with ICITAP is a primary deliverable for this activity. It also assumes that KPK will open its internal activities sufficiently to our team to allow appropriate monitoring of the equipment’s use, once procured and installed.

Project Year 1, Quarter 1: April - June 2007

These activities are anticipated during this quarter of the first project year.

- Hold preliminary meetings.
- Coordinate with ICITAP.

Project Year 1, Quarter 2: July-September 2007

These activities are anticipated during this quarter of the first project year.

- Coordinate with ICITAP and KPK.

Six Month Deliverables and Outcomes

Deliverables:

- Regular coordination meetings with ICITAP.
Project Year 1, Quarter 3: October – December 2007

These activities are anticipated during this quarter of the first project year.

- Continue monitoring KPK use of intercept equipment.
- Suggest improvements as may be appropriate.

Project Year 1, Quarter 4: January – March 2008

These activities are anticipated during this quarter of the first project year.

- Begin monitoring and evaluation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>End of Year 1 Deliverables and Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Communications system monitoring program commenced.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Task 3, Activity 1 Timeline**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Y1, Q1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 3. Enhancing the Capability of the KPK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 1. Monitor the Installation and Use of Communications Monitoring Equipment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinate with ICITAP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design monitoring system</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular monitoring of installation and use of communications monitoring equipment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Task 3, Activity 2: Enhance KPK’s Court Monitoring Program

Planned Activities, Resources, and Partners

Under this activity, we will procure, install, and provide the KPK with technical assistance related to five new sets of court recording equipment to expand KPK’s courtroom monitoring activities. This activity assumes that KPK will have specifications for some idea of the equipment.

Project Year 1, Quarter 1: April - June 2007

These activities are anticipated during this quarter of the first project year.

- Hold preliminary meetings.
- Assess KPK’s current equipment uses to streamline use and planned procurement.

Project Year 1, Quarter 2: July-September 2007

These activities are anticipated during this quarter of the first project year.

- Develop procurement plan.
- Begin procurement of necessary hardware and any associated software.

Project Year 1, Quarter 3: October – December 2007

These activities are anticipated during this quarter of the first project year.

- Continue procurement process.
- Review any KPK training needs.

Project Year 1, Quarter 4: January – March 2008

These activities are anticipated during this quarter of the first project year.

- Equipment procurement, installation, and training complete.
- Conduct any necessary training of KPK staff.
- Monitoring and evaluation plan designed and initiated.

End of Year 1 Deliverables and Outcomes

Outcomes:

- Communications system monitoring program commenced.
### Task 3, Activity 2 Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Y1, Q1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Y1, Q2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Y1, Q3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Y1, Q4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Task 3. Enhancing the Capability of the KPK**

**Activity 2. Enhance the KPK’s court Monitoring Program**

- Identify and procure five sets of audio/video recording equipment: **[ ]**
- Training of KPK staff on equipment: **[ ]**
- Monitoring and evaluation commenced: **[ ]**
Task 3, Activity 3: Corruption Indices

Planned Activities, Resources, and Partners

We will provide a grant to Transparency International-Indonesia, so they can conduct the 2008 Corruption Perceptions Index (CPI) with a Bribery Index as a component (Bribe Takers Index) and do more in-depth analysis of the 2006 and 2008 CPI by working with focus group respondents.

With an eye towards expanding survey data collected and enhancing its usefulness to the KPK as a data resource, we will conduct initial meetings to define objectives and collection processes and review the detailed work plan for each activity, including: expanding the analysis and supplemental data collection for the 2006 and 2008 CPI; and incorporating a bribery index on the types, prevalence, and geographic locations of bribery in the 2008 CPI.

TI-I will hold public awareness activities on results of the 2006 expanded analysis and the 2008 CPI. The KPK will use the expanded analysis of the 2006 and the 2008 CPI (with the Bribery Index). CoP Mr. Simon will provide overall supervision whilst Mr. Pentland will provide oversee implementation overall supervision. Mr. Doeana will have the responsibility of communications with TI-I on progress and liaison with KPK on the Integrity Index. Mr. Dillon and Mr. Nogroho will provide assistance, if needed, regarding TI-I’s public awareness efforts. Mr. Dillon and Mr. Nogroho can advise on the proper media channels for reaching the optimum audience size for their public awareness efforts and advise on message style and content.

Assumptions

This activity assumes the on-going cooperation of TI-I in these efforts. As well, close cooperation with KPK is necessary regarding the relationship with TI-I but also for the Integrity Index, which KPK wants to handle and for which MCC ICCP will provide co-funding.

Project Year 1, Quarter 1: April - June 2007

These activities are anticipated during this quarter of the first project year.

- Hold preliminary meetings with KPK and TI-I.
- Build relationship with TI-I.
- Develop grant document.

Project Year 1, Quarter 2: July-September 2007

These activities are anticipated during this quarter of the first project year.

- Complete grant document and obtain USAID approvals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Six Month Deliverables and Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grant to TI-I signed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Project Year 1, Quarter 3: October – December 2007

These activities are anticipated during this quarter of the first project year.

- In-depth analysis of the 2006 CPI.
- Researchers for 2008 CPI recruited.
- Begin monitoring and evaluation of the TI-I grant.
- Work with KPK to improve and expand the 2007 KPK integrity survey during 2008.
- Develop the TOR which will be used for technical guidelines when for hiring survey firms.

Project Year 1, Quarter 4: January – March 2008

These activities are anticipated during this quarter of the first project year.

- Work begins on KPK Integrity survey.
- In depth analysis of 2006 CPI.
- Researchers for 2008 CPI hired.
- Continue monitoring and evaluation of TI-I grant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year One Deliverables and Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deliverables:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- TI-I grant signed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- In depth analysis of 2006 CPI data commenced.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Task 3, Activity 3 Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Y1, Q1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 3. Enhancing the Capability of the KPK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 3a-c. Corruption Indices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TI-I grant developed and signed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPK Integrity Index identified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct expanded analysis of data collected for 2006 CPI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve KPK Integrity Survey design, develop TOR for 2008 survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make arrangements with KPK regarding funding for 2008 Integrity survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Begin 2008 KPK Integrity survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Task 4: Electronic Government Procurement (E-GP)**

Increasing good governance, transparency and fairness in the government procurement processes is a major priority of Indonesia’s overarching anti-corruption strategy. During 2006, according to the KPK, more than $4.0 billion was lost through procurement-related corruption. To reduce these losses, Indonesia is endeavoring to create a national procurement center to standardize policies and practices and create the regulatory framework for establishment of a country-wide e-GP system. Pilot efforts, such as those conducted by the Ministry for National Development Planning (Bappenas), Ministry of Public Works, and the City of Surabaya, have demonstrated the advantages of e-GP: the costs of goods and services have been lowered alongside the procedural complexity of the process. Drawing from lessons learned from these pilot projects, Bappenas now has a software system that can support e-procurement at the initial stages.

**Basic activities.** We will work in three major activities. We will support the creation and implementation of five e-GP satellite regional centers for that will provide structure and accountability to local and/or provincial government procurement. We will expand on the data collected by e-GP monitoring to assist in more informed decision making as e-GP practice in Indonesia expands and evolves. Finally, we will conduct a broad public awareness campaign that engages a wide range of actors from civil society to small businesses to enhance the use, transparency, and accountability of burgeoning e-GP efforts, and public monitoring of regional governments procurement electronically undertaken.

**Resources.** Under the supervision of COP Mr. Simon, Mr. Miroslav Alilovic will work alongside Mr. Dondy Sentya, with assistance from Mr. Setiawan, Mr. Dillon, and Mr. Nogroho. They will call upon the short term expertise of Partners for Democratic Change and Internews Network for community level procurement monitoring, identification of NGOs for small grants, and design of the public awareness campaign. We will also seek to work with local media organizations selected through a competitive RFP process.

**Coordination.** We will coordinate with Bappenas Center for Development of Public Procurement Policy and designated regional governments to ensure a successful implementation of e-procurement system at respective regional e-GP satellite centers. To effectuate public awareness on the use of the e-procurement system and to encourage a public monitoring of e-procurement, we will liaise with the *Jaringan Pemantau Pengadaan Barang dan Jasa* (a network of local procurement watch organizations) which is coordinated through the Indonesia Procurement Watch. We will also communicate regularly with donors and implementers working to strengthen Indonesia’s public procurement policies, regulatory framework and institutions to ensure that activities are complementary and not duplicative.

**Anticipated Results:** The MCC ICCP will have expanded National Electronic Government Procurement (e-GP) System and improved its accountability and transparency in awarding public contracts at the regional level. These will be enhanced through the data monitoring and analysis featured in the electronic procurement system and through greater public awareness and monitoring of e-GP processes.
Task 4, Activity 1: E-GP Satellite Centers

Planned Activities, Resources, and Partners

The National Electronic Procurement Service (NEPS) developed by the Center for Development of Public Procurement Policy of Bappenas is software that can be used in the five satellite centers. We will work with regional and local government officials to establish five new e-GP satellite centers, creating entry points for public dialogue and feedback and establishing monitoring and accountability measures.

After conducting an initial assessment of existing leading e-GP systems and technologies we will work with Bappenas to identify five provincial governments willing to commit resources to sustaining the centers once the MCC ICCP is completed.

Drawing from lessons gained from existing pilot e-GP systems in Indonesia, we will work with regional governments to install the software, fill gaps in regulations, and formulate policies and procedures ensuring correct usage. With assistance of short-term expertise, the team will expand and deepen procurement data collection and monitoring mechanisms through NEPS.

Coordinating with our other public outreach efforts, we will work with stakeholders to create a public awareness strategy that empowers the public to monitor regional e-GP, ensuring goals and objectives are met. This work will begin with surveying to collect baseline information on public awareness of procurement issues. With stakeholder involvement, we will create a public awareness strategy and implement this using print and broadcast media to reach the general public. We will target potential vendors and private sector associations with messages on the new systems and how they can benefit from them.

We will hold meetings with local journalists in the five regions to explain the working of the e-Government Procurement centers and encourage accurate media coverage of the centers’ launch and continued operations.

Public surveys will be conducted after the public awareness campaigns have ended, to measure the increase in public knowledge of and confidence in the e-Government Procurement system.

Given the complexity of e-GP systems, we propose phased implementation for satellite centers following the piloting of NEPS, beginning with e-announcement. We will provide government staff and the public with training on the use of e-announcement. We will add a training function in each satellite center for government officials and suppliers. Each center will also be used to provide Internet access for bid submission for suppliers without computer access or Internet accounts, and access for public monitoring.

Assumptions. The activities for this Task as set forth below assume that the following circumstances exist or will exist during the period of this contract:

1. The five regional governments (provincial and/or municipality) have been designated based upon mutual understanding between Bappenas and regional governments.

2. The use of NEPS has been determined and agreed to by the five regional governments.
Project Year 1, Quarter 1: April - June 2007

These activities are anticipated during this quarter of the first project year.

- Hold preliminary meetings with all stakeholders, both from ICCP and GOI side.
- Review current public procurement legal framework that relate to the legal operation of e-GP satellite centers.

Project Year 1, Quarter 2: July-September 2007

These activities are anticipated during this quarter of the first project year.

- Conduct field work with Bappenas on candidate provincial governments regarding e-readiness and ability to host an e-GP satellite center.
- Prepare an analysis of the current e-GP system created by Bappenas and determine the basic software requirements for e-GP satellite centers.
- Contribute to development of MOUs for signature between Bappenas and the five provincial governments.

Six Month Deliverables and Outcomes

**Deliverables:**
- Review and analysis of reliability of NEPS software.
- Completed field work of e-readiness of candidate provincial governments.

**Outcome:**
- Signing of MOUs between Bappenas and provincial governments.

Project Year 1, Quarter 3: October – December 2007

These activities are anticipated during this quarter of the first project year.

- Prepare separate RFPs for equipment needed to establish each center.

Project Year 1, Quarter 4: January – March 2008

These activities are anticipated during this quarter of the first project year.

- Complete procurement hardware and associated software for the e-GP satellite centers
- Create training program for provincial government staff on e-GP policies and procedures.
## Year One Deliverables and Outcomes

**Deliverable:**
- Complete procurement of hardware and associate software for installation of e-GP system in designated satellite centers.
- Training program developed.

**Outcome:**
- Four e-GP centers are physically operational.
### Task 4, Activity 1 Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Y1, Q1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Year 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 4. Electronic Government Procurement (e-GP)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 1. e-GP Satellite Centers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct analysis and determine software system for e-GP centers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procure and install hardware and software in e-GP centers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide training on e-GP policies and procedures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Task 4, Activity 2: Data Collection/Monitoring Mechanism in Support of e-GP Satellite Centers

Planned Activities, Resources, and Partners

As part of an expanded e-GP system, data on procurements, tenders, offerors, and the like needs to be collected in detail within a reliable system. We will conduct an initial gap analysis of the NEPS system to ensure it meets all requirements for data monitoring. Given access, we will also assess current IT systems in provincial centers and availability of historical data that are necessary for preparation of monitoring reports, and enhance the software if necessary. We will work with each center to create internal procedures for regular monitoring and tracking of sole source procurements. This information will be made publicly available with a designated representative from each center to field questions and comments from the public.

As the data collection/procurement transactions-related monitoring system is embedded into the developed e-GP software system, details of the Activity 2 will follow the details in Activity 1.

Project Year 1, Quarter 1: April - June 2007

These activities are anticipated during this quarter of the first project year.

- Hold preliminary meetings.
- Define basic requirements concerning monitoring and data collection.

Project Year 1, Quarter 2: July-September 2007

These activities are anticipated during this quarter of the first project year.

- Assess the NEPS to ensure it meets all requirements for data monitoring.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Six Month Deliverables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deliverable:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Analysis of NEPS data monitoring capability.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Year 1, Quarter 3: October – December 2007

These activities are anticipated during this quarter of the first project year.

- Develop enhancements to NEPS as necessary for additional monitoring and data collection

Project Year 1, Quarter 4: January – March 2008

These activities are anticipated during this quarter of the first project year.
- Assess the accuracy of available procurement records in designated centers.
- Assess the actual record keeping and data collection system in designated centers.
- Continue software application improvement if needed.
- Devise training program for e-GP satellite centers.
- Procurement and installation complete of NEPS for each center.
### Task 4, Activity 2 Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Y1, Q1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 4. Electronic Government Procurement (e-GP)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 2. Data Collection/Monitoring Mechanism in Support of e-GP Satellite Center</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assess NEPS software for data monitoring capability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand NEPS software as necessary for additional monitoring and data collection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete assessment of the actual record keeping and data collection system in designated centers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create and implement oversight mechanism for the e-GP process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Train e-GP center staff in e-GP data monitoring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Task 4, Activity 3: Public Awareness Campaign in support of E-GP Satellite Centers

Planned Activities, Resources, and Partners

Government procurement is enhanced dramatically by public awareness and the scrutiny that comes with it. As the pool of people, businesses, and organizations aware of Indonesia’s expanded e-GP policies and procedures expands, the number of potential bidders should increase. In turn, a larger pool of potential bidders should drive down the costs to the government of procurement overall. We will promote constructive engagement and operational technical training of civil society to monitor and promote e-GP. Our team will create regional stakeholder working groups, with representatives from the government, civil society, the media, and the private sector to develop a core public awareness message and mechanisms to monitor e-GP implementation and impact. We will conduct an extensive public awareness campaign in each of the new e-GP centers. After appropriate consultation, we may award small grants for public awareness and procurement monitoring.

This work will begin with surveying to collect baseline information on public awareness of procurement issues. With stakeholder involvement, we will create a public awareness strategy designed to educate the public about the workings and their role in the centers. We will create a public education program using print and broadcast media. We will target potential vendors and private sector associations with messages on the new systems and how they can benefit from them.

We will conduct meetings and training if needed with local journalists in the five regions to explain the working of the e-Government Procurement centers and encourage accurate media coverage of the centers’ launch and continued operations.

Public surveys will be conducted after the public awareness campaigns have ended, to measure the increase in public knowledge of and confidence in the e-Government Procurement system.

Project Year 1, Quarter 1: April - June 2007

These activities are anticipated during this quarter of the first project year.

- Hold preliminary meetings.
- Develop public awareness plan with Bappenas.

Project Year 1, Quarter 2: July-September 2007

These activities are anticipated during this quarter of the first project year.

- Identify potential partners for public awareness campaign.
Project Year 1, Quarter 3: October – December 2007

These activities are anticipated during this quarter of the first project year.

- Survey stakeholders in each province
- Develop e-GP media campaign for journalists

Project Year 1, Quarter 4: January – March 2008

These activities are anticipated during this quarter of the first project year.

- Define method of publicizing small grants program with Bappenas and provincial governments.
- Develop education campaign for potential vendors and private sector associations.
- Develop public awareness campaign on e-government procurement centers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year One Deliverables and Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• E-GP public awareness/education campaign within the geographical areas covered by the five regional satellite centers developed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Task 4, Activity 3 Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Y1, Q1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Task 4. Electronic Government Procurement (e-GP)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activity 3. Public Awareness Campaign in Support of e-GP Satellite Centers</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outline public awareness campaign with Bappenas</td>
<td>❌</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify potential partners</td>
<td>❌</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop media training and campaign for education campaign for journalists</td>
<td>❌</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop education campaign for potential vendors and private sector associations</td>
<td>❌</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop public awareness campaign on e-government procurement centers</td>
<td>❌</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION II – PERFORMANCE MONITORING PLAN

In this section, we present our approach to performance monitoring, including how we select indicators, collect baseline data, set targets, and the roles of each team member in collecting, verifying, and analyzing data to inform management decisions and communicate results. Our approach to performance monitoring is based on a project results framework, reproduced below. The results framework shows the development hypotheses behind MCC ICCP goals and objectives.

The overarching goal of MCC ICCP is to help Indonesia’s executive and judicial branches in their respective efforts to combat corruption. This goal directly feeds into the overall MCC TCP objective to increase the GOI’s capacity to reduce corruption.

We have identified four project intermediate results that correspond directly to the project’s four main tasks. Each Task is divided into specific key results so that we can better track our activities and performance.

MCC ICCP Results Framework

**Project Objective**

Strengthen the institutional capacity of the GOI to reduce corruption

**Project Intermediate Result 1**

Transparency and accountability within judiciary and court system improved and corruption reduced.

**Key Result Areas**

1.1: Judicial accountability mechanisms for ethical conduct strengthened.
1.2: Court’s ability to perform and monitor operations improved.
1.3: Public access to court information expanded.

**Project Intermediate Result 2**

Capacity of PPATK to track money laundering in banking and non-banking financial institutions enhanced.

**Key Result Areas**

2.1: Compliance of NBFIs with STR/CTR reporting requirements improved.
2.2: PPATK’s capacity for receiving STR’s/CTR’s increased.
2.3: Processes for effective electronic transmission of suspicious transactions strengthened.

**Project Intermediate Result 3**

Capability of the KPK to prevent, prosecute, and convict corrupt officials enhanced.

**Key Result Areas**

3.1: Monitoring framework for using communications. monitoring equipment developed
3.2: Capacity for monitoring and preventing corruption during legal proceedings strengthened.
3.3: Effectiveness of KPK corruption prevention strategy improved through expanded data analysis and collection.

**Project Intermediate Result 4**

Electronic Government Procurement (e-GP) System expanded to improve accountability and transparency in awarding public contracts at the provincial level.

**Key Result Areas**

4.1: Provincial e-GP processes and systems established.
4.2: Monitoring and analysis procedures for e-GP data institutionalized.
4.3: Public oversight of provincial procurement increased.
Approach to Monitoring Evaluation, Analysis, and Communication

Monitoring progress and evaluating results are key management functions in any performance-based management plan. Performance monitoring is an on-going process that allows managers to determine whether or not an activity is making progress towards its intended results. Evaluation is the periodic assessment of a project’s relevance, performance, efficiency, and impact - both expected and unexpected - in relation to stated objectives. Performance information plays a key role in planning and managing decisions.

Analysis and communication are also important elements of performance monitoring. The project will collect performance and impact data and will add value to the raw data by performing appropriate analysis and providing context for data interpretation, thereby transforming raw data into useful information. This information will be conveyed to relevant internal and external parties through communications (i.e. knowledge sharing) and will achieve impact as knowledge is acted upon.

Monitoring and Evaluation System Design

We employ an integrated work plan/performance monitoring plan centered on the project results framework. The monitoring and evaluation (M&E) system tracks the delivery of outputs and quantitative and qualitative impacts at each results level. The system is based on an impact design linking activities to desired targets, indicators, and benchmarks. The MCC ICCP M&E system is designed to involve all technical team members as well as project counterparts. This design provides the following benefits:

Efficiency. Because technical team members and counterparts have first-hand knowledge of their activities and resulting impacts, they are best suited to efficiently collect and verify basic M&E data in their respective technical areas.

Ownership. By being involved in project M&E efforts, technical team members can ensure that the information generated is relevant and consistent with the interests of the project while our counterparts will see the demonstrated success of reforms.

Feedback. Having collected and analyzed M&E information, technical team members and counterparts will be aware of project progress and will be able to use M&E information to guide project implementation.

We will collect M&E data from various administrative and technical records of the projects, specially designed surveys, and focus groups. We will also consult records, statistics, surveys, and databases maintained by the GOI, USAID/Indonesia, other donors, and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) as additional sources of data.

Indicators

Using the contract requirements and MCC and USAID/Indonesia guidance, we have identified life-of-project indicators for activities. These indicators are designed to:

- capture and communicate major project achievements;
- track implementation progress against targets;
- supply information concerning major MCC ICCP activities; and
• contribute to USAID and MCC’s own performance management and reporting needs.

The M&E system will track performance indicators necessary for MCC ICCP progress review, troubleshooting, and other management tasks. Performance indicators track the immediate inputs and outputs of the project. They also provide feedback to managers on project performance and help identify areas where implementation strategies may need adjustment. Performance indicators closely reflect the work plan, capturing the main activities of the project.

**Baseline and Targets**

Upon finalization of the PMP, Mr. Aang Sutrisna, our M&E specialist, will organize project staff to collect baseline data for the specific indicators – that is, they will set the initial value of the indicator. We plan to focus the first few months of M&E activities on baseline data collection and verification. Counterpart collaboration will be essential at this stage. Once this is complete the MCC ICCP team will analyze the baseline information for the indicators and work with the counterparts to set aggressive but realistic life-of-project targets for each. We will review the targets during the first year of project operations to determine if they are realistic, and if not, propose adjustments accordingly. For many indicators, baseline data and targets are already available and/or passed down from the MCC Threshold Country Program. We have included these baselines and targets on the indicator reference sheets in Annex B.

During the first year of the project, substantial effort will be focused on building relationships with our counterparts and providing initial technical assistance and training. We expect the greatest impact of the project will begin in the second year of operations. Targets set for the indicators will reflect this trend.

*Baseline skills assessment.* In addition to collecting baseline for our PMP indicators, we will also collect baseline data for training interventions. Our training coordinator, Ms. Soedirham, will work closely with the technical team members to design a baseline skills assessment survey and methodology. In most cases, a simple survey will be developed and administered to a select group of targeted training participants possibly followed by a series of semi-structured interviews and focus groups. The skills assessment will inform curriculum development, highlighting areas that need the most emphasis during training sessions. During the training, a series of program exercises will be used to measure trainee’s acquisition of new skills and information. At the end of each training session, training participants will complete an evaluation form. This form asks them to provide information on their reactions and perceptions about the training. This information will be used to improve future training sessions and detect and correct any potential problems.

**Data Collection, Analysis, and Reporting**

*Roles and responsibilities.* Mr. Sutrisna is will be responsible for organizing the processes surrounding data collection. He will ensure project team members have the necessary tools to collect data and that they collect data consistently and at the appropriate frequency. He will verify data quality and analyze and report trends. Semi-annually, he will review the appropriateness of the PMP and make necessary additions or adjustments to the existing indicators. Mr. Simon, the COP will supervise the overall M&E system.
The task managers and training coordinator will be responsible for managing the process of primary data collection and entry in his task’s technical area. After analysis and quality control by the M&E specialist, the task teams – with the partners and COP – will use the information to make management decisions about implementation of activities and communicate progress to stakeholders to help them make decisions about necessary and priority reforms.

**Data elements and collection.** Some of the project’s proposed indicators are aggregate indicators, made up of various data elements. The M&E specialist will work with each task leader and counterpart to design database spreadsheets, forms, and surveys to capture and manage these data elements. It may be necessary to subcontract to a local research entity to conduct wide-scale surveys for this performance monitoring plan. Below is an illustrative list of surveys we plan to consult periodically and who will be conducting them – the project, a partner, or an external source. The data source for each indicator is specified in the indicator reference sheets, and more detailed data requirements by partner can be found in Annex E.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey/Index</th>
<th>Implementer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Post-Training Impact Assessments</td>
<td>MCC ICCP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transparency International Corruption Perception</td>
<td>Transparency International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Bank Control of Corruption Indicator</td>
<td>World Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom House Countries at the Crossroads Survey</td>
<td>Freedom House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Competitiveness Report</td>
<td>World Economic Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transparency International Global Corruption</td>
<td>Transparency International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barometer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Post-training intervention impact assessments.** We will collect impact data on our training interventions at Months 6, 12, and 18. Using simple survey tools, we will collect data from the participants on the perceived relevance of the training to their jobs, the actual usage of new skill sets gained from project trainings, and the levels of shared experience, knowledge, and skills gained through participation in project trainings. In addition to surveying training participants, we will also conduct a series of focus groups with participant supervisors to gain information on the productivity of training participants and usage of new skills in their current job. This information will provide insight into the overall impact of the MCC ICCP training skills at both the participant level as well as the institutional level.

**Performance feedback.** Using both formal and informal mechanisms, we will collect regular feedback on the relevance, impact, flexibility, responsiveness, and overall satisfaction with project results from USAID/Indonesia, MCC, counterparts, end-users, and implementing partners. Standard questionnaires will be distributed at Months 6, 12, and 18. In addition, the project will collect this information informally through targeted meetings, stakeholder roundtables, and project workshops. Using the project web site [www.iccp.or.id](http://www.iccp.or.id), USAID/Indonesia, MCC, and GOI partners will also be able to view project performance.

**Ensuring data quality.** Our technical team will provide initial quality control for the various M&E raw data elements. Each team member will examine the data to identify common errors including logical inconsistencies, out-of-range values, significant departures from trends, or other errors so that they can be immediately addressed.

Mr. Sutrisna, is responsible for data quality control after data entry. He will perform basic data analysis and tabulation to identify potential erroneous data. When errors are identified
early, Mr. Sutrisna can make appropriate corrections by coordinating and consulting with GOI counterparts as appropriate.

To further ensure M&E data is of the utmost quality, Mr. Sutrisna, in conjunction with the technical teams, will conduct an internal data quality assessment during the first three months of start-up. This internal assessment will examine the validity, integrity, precision, reliability, and timeliness of each indicator. (See Annex D for a sample data quality worksheet that will be completed for each project indicator). Mr. Sutrisna will also visit counterpart agencies to assess the data reporting process and specific data collection needs will be integrated into technical assistance. Subsequent data quality assessments will occur on an annual basis, with periodic spot checks for data coming from secondary sources.

**Reporting.** MCC ICCP will provide M&E updates with quarterly reports, including an evaluation of activity progress and impact within the context of the MCC indicators and sub-indicators. This regular reporting will also include a summary of activities implemented to control, verify, and validate the M&E data being reported, any anomalies discovered, and corrective measures taken to resolve them. Our reports will also provide contextual analysis when factors beyond the project’s control affect M&E information. In addition, we will report on selected indicators with targets outlined in the contract on a quarterly basis for the MCC (Annex C provides the template for MCC target reports).

MCC ICCP will also maintain PMP information on our project website [www.iccp.or.id](http://www.iccp.or.id). This information will be available to USAID, the MCC and GOI partners and will be updated quarterly.
SECTION 3 - INDICATORS

In this section, we present 21 indicators selected for primary monitoring under the MCC ICCP M&E system. These indicators were selected after discussions with USAID. The indicators below are intended to measure the results over the life of the project. Annually, MCC ICCP will review the PMP in coordination with USAID and modify indicators as necessary.

Assumptions

In designing the M&E system for MCC ICCP, we focused on indicators within the manageable interest of the activity. This approach allows the project to measure impacts that can be directly attributed to the project. The project’s ability to demonstrate improvement in these measures assumes the following basic assumptions:

- Absence of socio-political instabilities, including national and regional political and civil instabilities.
- Willingness on the part of the Supreme Court and court system, PPATK, KPK, the targeted provincial governments, and other counterparts to carefully consider project recommendations, implement reforms, and carry out training programs to meet the reform targets by April 2008.
- Access to available statistics and cooperation in conducting surveys and gathering data from counterpart institutions.

MCC ICCP Indicators

Cross-cutting Indicators

Indicator 1: Number of government officials receiving USG-supported anti-corruption training
Indicator 2: Number of USG-supported anti-corruption measures implemented
Indicator 3: Number of judges trained with USG assistance
Indicator 4: Number of justice sector personnel that received USG training

KRA 1.1 - Judicial accountability mechanisms for ethical conduct strengthened

Indicator 5: Number of judges trained on Judicial Code of Conduct
Indicator 6: Percentage of senior court officials submitting wealth reports

KRA 1.2 – Court’s ability to perform and monitor operations improved

Indicator 7: Number of court personnel trained on budget procedures
Indicator 8: Number of courts implementing performance based budgeting systems
Indicator 9: Percentage of courts with completed physical asset inventories

KRA 1.3 – Public access to court information expanded

Indicator 10: Percentage of courts implementing public compliant system
Indicator 11: Number of public and media inquires answered by Court public relations trainees per quarter
Indicator 12: Number of Supreme Court decisions accessible to the public via the Supreme Court website

**KRA 2.1 – Compliance of non-banking financial institutions (NBFIs) with STR/CTR reporting requirements improved**

Indicator: 13: Percentage of STR’s filed by non-banking institutions

**KRA 2.2 – PPATK’s capacity for receiving STR’s/CTR’s increased**

Indicator 14: Number of reports STR/CTR receipt system capable of receiving per day

**KRA 2.3 – Processes for effective electronic transmission of suspicious transactions strengthened**

Indicator 15: Number of PPATK cases transmitted for investigation

**PIR 3 – Capability of the KPK to prevent prosecute and convict corrupt officials enhanced**

Indicator 16: Number of KPK prosecutions of high ranking GOI officials

**KRA 3.2 – Capacity for monitoring and preventing corruption during legal proceedings strengthened**

Indicator 17: Number of trials monitored

**KRA 4.1 – Provincial e-GP processes and systems established**

Indicator 18: Percentage change in cost of a basket of selected goods and services procured in five procurement provinces

Indicator 19: Percentage of procurements undertaken by electronic means

**KRA 4.2 – Monitoring and analysis procedures for e-GP data institutionalized**

Indicator 20: Percentage of procurements awarded sole source

**KRA 4.3 – Public oversight of provincial procurement increased**

Indicator 21: Number of registered e-GP vendors

**Additional Monitoring Information**

In addition to the indicators described above, MCC ICCP will also monitor select third party surveys and indicators that will provide information about the context in which the project is operating. These indicators can be found in the MCC ICCP contract.

*Transparency International Corruption Perception Index.* MCC ICCP will track Indonesia’s movement on the Transparency International’s Corruption Perception Index. The index ranks more than 150 countries in terms of perceived levels of corruption as determined by expert assessments and opinion surveys. Indonesia’s baseline for 2005 was 2.2, which ranked it 140
out of 159 rankings. Monitoring Indonesia’s movement on this index will provide MCC ICCP with useful, objective, holistic information about the trends in government corruption.

*World Bank Institute Control of Corruption Indicator.* The World Bank Governance Indicators database provides six indicators measuring governance for 213 countries and territories. One of the six indicators, Control of Corruption, measures the extent of corruption, conventionally defined as the exercise of public power for private gain. It is based on scores of variables from polls of experts and surveys. Indonesia’s baseline for 2004 was - .90. Monitoring this indicator will provide insight into corruption trends in Indonesia over time.

*Freedom House Countries at the Crossroads Survey.* The Freedom House Countries at the Crossroads survey provides a comparative evaluation of government performance in four touchstone areas of democratic governance: Accountability and Public Voice, Civil Liberties, Rule of Law, and Anticorruption and Transparency. This survey examines these areas of performance in a set of 30 countries biannually that are at a critical crossroads in determining their political future. Using the Accountability and Transparency Indicator, MCC ICCP will be able to track Indonesia’s movement on this indicator during the project performance period. The Freedom House report shows Indonesia’s baseline for 2006 as 2.45. An increase in this value combined with the supplemental analysis will provide context into Indonesia’s efforts to combat corruption.

*World Economic Forum Global Competitiveness Report.* The Global Competitiveness Report measures select indicators that are critical to a country’s productivity and competitiveness. MCC ICCP will monitor a number of indicators related to Indonesia from this biannual report:

- Pervasiveness of money laundering through banks. 2005 Baseline: 3.6 out of 7.
- Pervasiveness of money laundering through non-bank channels. 2005 Baseline: 4.1 out of 7.
- Undocumented extra payments or bribes connected with the awarding of public contracts. 2005 Baseline: 3.4 out of 7.
- Extent of favoritism by government officials when deciding upon policies and contracts. 2005 Baseline: 4.2 out of 7.
- Undocumented extra payments or bribes connected with getting favorable judicial results. 2005 Baseline: 3.8 out of 7.

These selected indicators relate directly to the tasks of this project and will provide overall context to MCC ICCP’s progress in the targeted areas.

*Transparency International Global Corruption Barometer.* Transparency International’s Global Corruption Barometer is a survey of public opinions about corruption in 62 different countries. In addition to addressing petty corruption, the survey also measures public opinion related to corruption in the public sector and politics. Indonesia’s baseline for perceived corruption in the judiciary/legal system in 2005 was 3.8, but the score rose to 4.2 in 2006 out of a scale of 5, with 5 being extremely corrupt. The Global Corruption Barometer provides the public opinion context for MCC ICCP’s activities with the judiciary.
## ANNEX A – CONSOLIDATED INDICATOR LIST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Number</th>
<th>Project Result</th>
<th>Proposed MCC ICCP Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cross-cutting</td>
<td>Number of government officials receiving USG-supported anti-corruption training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Cross-cutting</td>
<td>Number of USG-supported anti-corruption measures implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Cross-cutting</td>
<td>Number of judges trained with USG assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Cross-cutting</td>
<td>Number of justice sector personnel that received USG training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>KRA 1.1</td>
<td>Number of judges trained on Judicial Code of Conduct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>KRA 1.1</td>
<td>Percentage of senior court officials submitting wealth reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>KRA 1.2</td>
<td>Number of court personnel trained on budget procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>KRA 1.2</td>
<td>Percentage of courts implementing performance-based budgeting systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>KRA 1.2</td>
<td>Percentage of courts with completed physical asset inventories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>KRA 1.3</td>
<td>Percentage of courts implementing public complaint system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>KRA 1.3</td>
<td>Number of public and media inquires answered by Court public relations trainees per quarter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>KRA 1.3</td>
<td>Number of Supreme Court decisions accessible to the public via the Supreme Court website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>KRA 2.1</td>
<td>Percentage of STR’s filed by non-banking institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>KRA 2.2</td>
<td>Number of reports PPATK STR/CTR receipt system capable of receiving per day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>KRA 2.3</td>
<td>Number of PPATK cases transmitted for investigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>PIR 3</td>
<td>Number of KPK prosecutions of high ranking GOI officials (includes cases filed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>KRA 3.2</td>
<td>Number of trials monitored</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>KRA 4.1</td>
<td>Percentage change in cost of a basket of selected goods and services procured in five procurement provinces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>KRA 4.1</td>
<td>Percentage of procurements undertaken by electronic means</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>KRA 4.2</td>
<td>Percentage of procurements awarded sole source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>KRA 4.3</td>
<td>Number of registered e-GP vendors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Key Result Area
Cross-cutting

### Indicator Number
1

### Name of Indicator
Number of government officials receiving USG-supported anti-corruption training

#### DESCRIPTION

**Precise Definition(s):** Persons must be from government. Training refers to all training or education events whether short-term or long-term, in-country or abroad.

**Unit of Measure:** Number of individuals

**Disaggregated by:** Gender, geographic location by district, government agency

**Justification & Management Utility:** Captures the work of a number of different anti-corruption interventions. More highly trained officials are essential to achieving the project goal of increased GOI capacity to reduce corruption.

#### PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION

**Data Collection Method:** MCC ICCP will collect data directly from the Counterpart agencies and verify with project training database.

**Method of Data Acquisition by the Project:** Reports

**Data Source(s):** Project records

**Frequency/Timing Of Data Acquisition:** Quarterly

**Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition:** Low

**Responsible Individual(s) at the Project:** Training Coordinator and M&E Specialist

#### DATA QUALITY ISSUES

**Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment:** N/A

**Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any):** Potential for double counting of individuals.

**Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:** Using a training database with trainees entered by name and agency should limit potential double counting.

**Date of Future Data Quality Assessments:** N/A

**Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments:** N/A

#### PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING

**Data Analysis:** Time trends

**Presentation of Data:** Tables, narratives

**Review of Data:** Quarterly

**Reporting of Data:** Quarterly

#### OTHER NOTES

**Notes on Baselines/Targets:** Baseline is zero.

#### PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>1,043</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of Project</td>
<td>5,756</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Result Area:</th>
<th>Cross-cutting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicator Number:</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Indicator:</td>
<td>Number of USG-supported anti-corruption measures implemented</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DESCRIPTION**

Precise Definition(s): Anti-corruption measures may include new laws, regulations, procedures, consultative mechanisms, oversight mechanisms, investigative/prosecutorial initiatives, public information initiatives, civil society initiatives and other measures taken (in any sector) with the objective of increasing transparency about public decision making, conflict of interest, resource allocation, etc.; decreasing impunity for corrupt acts; increasing demand for reform or awareness of the problem; increasing knowledge about corruption and its costs; and reducing opportunities for corruption. Implementation requires that the measure be adopted, that organizational arrangements are put in place, financial and human resources allocated, and that observable steps are taken to initiate implementation and repeated, continued, and/or expanded to demonstrate that implementation is continuing.

Unit of Measure: Number of anti-corruption measures implemented.

Disaggregated by: Geographic location by district, government agency

Justification & Management Utility: Captures progress on a broad range of program approaches to reducing corruption.

**PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION**

Data Collection Method: MCC ICCP will collect data directly from the Counterpart agencies and local civil society organizations.

Method of Data Acquisition by the Project: Reports

Data Source(s): Counterpart, CSO, and project records

Frequency/Timing Of Data Acquisition: Quarterly

Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition: Medium

Responsible Individual(s) at the Project: M&E Specialist in coordination with task leaders

**DATA QUALITY ISSUES**

Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: N/A

Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): Potential for counterpart organizations to exaggerate the level of progress on the implementation of the measures.

Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: All reported measures will be cross-checked against project records and the status of any measures that are not documented will be confirmed through site visits by the technical team members.

Date of Future Data Quality Assessments: N/A

Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: N/A

**PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING**

Data Analysis: Time trends

Presentation of Data: Tables, narratives

Review of Data: Quarterly

Reporting of Data: Quarterly

**OTHER NOTES**

Notes on Baselines/Targets: Baseline is zero.

**PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of Project</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Performance Indicator Reference Sheet**

**Key Result Area**: Cross-cutting  
**Indicator Number**: 3  
**Name of Indicator**: Number of judges trained with USG assistance

### DESCRIPTION

**Precise Definition(s)**: Number of judges who receive training on specific laws or topics related to fulfilling their professional roles and responsibilities. Training may be short-term or long-term, in-country or abroad.  
**Unit of Measure**: Number of judges  
**Disaggregated by**: Gender  
**Justification & Management Utility**: Training of judges improves their ability to more effectively carry out their duties that improves the capacity of the judiciary to act as a check on government power. Training may also instill a sense of the value of and necessity for judicial independence in a democratic society.

### PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION

**Data Collection Method**: MCC ICCP will collect data directly from the Supreme Court and verify with project training database.  
**Method of Data Acquisition by the Project**: Reports  
**Data Source(s)**: Supreme Court and project records  
**Frequency/Timing Of Data Acquisition**: Quarterly  
**Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition**: Low  
**Responsible Individual(s) at the Project**: Training Coordinator and M&E Specialist

### DATA QUALITY ISSUES

**Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment**: N/A  
**Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any)**: Potential for double counting of judges.  
**Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations**: Using a training database with trainees entered by name and agency should limit potential double counting.  
**Date of Future Data Quality Assessments**: N/A  
**Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments**: N/A

### PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING

**Data Analysis**: Time trends  
**Presentation of Data**: Tables, narratives  
**Review of Data**: Quarterly  
**Reporting of Data**: Quarterly

### OTHER NOTES

**Notes on Baselines/Targets**: Baseline is zero.

### PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of Project</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON DECEMBER 11, 2007**
**Key Result Area**: Cross-cutting  
**Indicator Number**: 4  
**Name of Indicator**: Number of justice sector personnel that received USG training

**DESCRIPTION**

**Precise Definition(s)**: Includes judges, magistrates, prosecutors, advocates, inspectors, and court staff. Training refers to all training or education events whether short-term or long-term, in-country or abroad.

**Unit of Measure**: Number of individuals

**Disaggregated by**: Gender, geographic location by district, position

**Justification & Management Utility**: Better-trained personnel are a pre-requisite for an improved legal system.

**PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION**

**Data Collection Method**: MCC ICCP will collect data directly from the Supreme Court and verify with project training database.

**Method of Data Acquisition by the Project**: Reports

**Data Source(s)**: Supreme Court and project records

**Frequency/Timing Of Data Acquisition**: Quarterly

**Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition**: Low

**Responsible Individual(s) at the Project**: Training Coordinator and M&E Specialist

**DATA QUALITY ISSUES**

**Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment**: N/A

**Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any)**: Potential for double counting of individuals.

**Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations**: Using a training database with trainees entered by name and agency should limit potential double counting.

**Date of Future Data Quality Assessments**: N/A

**Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments**: N/A

**PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING**

**Data Analysis**: Time trends

**Presentation of Data**: Tables, narratives

**Review of Data**: Quarterly

**Reporting of Data**: Quarterly

**OTHER NOTES**

**Notes on Baselines/Targets**: Baseline is zero.

**PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>803</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of Project</td>
<td>4,470</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON** December 11, 2007
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Indicator Reference Sheet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key Result Area:</strong> KRA 1.1 Judicial accountability mechanisms for ethical conduct strengthened</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator Number:</strong> 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name of Indicator:</strong> Number of judges trained on Judicial Code of Conduct</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DESCRIPTION

**Precise Definition(s):** The number of judges receiving training on the official Judicial Code of Conduct, whether through workshops, distance learning, or other means sponsored by either MCC ICCP or other donor-funded projects.

**Unit of Measure:** Based on numbers of individuals receiving Code of Conduct training

**Disaggregated by:** N/A

**Justification & Management Utility:** Training in the Indonesian standards for ethical conduct both raises awareness and improves judges’ knowledge and skills related to ethical conduct requirements and responsibilities.

### PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION

**Data Collection Method:** MCC ICCP will collect data directly from the Supreme Court and verify with project training database and records from other donor-funded projects.

**Method of Data Acquisition by the Project:** Reports

**Data Source(s):** Records from project, other donor-funded projects, and Supreme Court training center.

**Frequency/Timing Of Data Acquisition:** Quarterly

**Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition:** Low

**Responsible Individual(s) at the Project:** Training Coordinator and M&E Specialist

### DATA QUALITY ISSUES

**Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment:** N/A

**Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any):** Potential for double counting of individuals.

**Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:** Using a training database with trainees entered by name and agency should limit potential double counting.

**Date of Future Data Quality Assessments:** N/A

**Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments:** N/A

### PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING

**Data Analysis:** Time trends

**Presentation of Data:** Tables, narratives

**Review of Data:** Quarterly

**Reporting of Data:** Quarterly

### OTHER NOTES

**Notes on Baselines/Targets:** Baseline is TBD.

### PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of Project</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Target is per the contract.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON DECEMBER 11, 2007**
### Performance Indicator Reference Sheet

**Key Result Area:** KRA 1.1 Judicial accountability mechanisms for ethical conduct strengthened  
**Indicator Number:** 6  
**Name of Indicator:** Percentage of senior court officials submitting wealth reports

#### DESCRIPTION

**Precise Definition(s):** Senior court officials are defined as those officials within the court system required by law to submit wealth reports, including judges, court registrars, etc. To be considered submitted, wealth reports must contain all required information as determined by the KPK. The numerator is the total number of senior court officials submitting wealth reports. The denominator is the total number of senior court officials required to submit wealth reports.

**Unit of Measure:** Percentage based on number of individuals

**Disaggregated by:** N/A

**Justification & Management Utility:** This indicator demonstrates the effectiveness of wealth reporting training and judicial accountability measures related to controlling corruption within the court system.

#### PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION

**Data Collection Method:** MCC ICCP will collect data directly from the Supreme Court and the KPK.

**Method of Data Acquisition by the Project:** Reports

**Data Source(s):** Government counterpart records

**Frequency/Timing Of Data Acquisition:** Quarterly

**Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition:** Medium, if data is not currently being compiled in one location

**Responsible Individual(s) at the Project:** Court Administration Advisor

#### DATA QUALITY ISSUES

**Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment:** N/A

**Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any):** Quality of data depends on accuracy of Supreme Court and KPK records.

**Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:** Project technical team will work with Supreme Court to enhance the existing record keeping system and improve tracking specifically for non-judge senior court personnel.

**Date of Future Data Quality Assessments:** N/A

**Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments:** N/A

#### PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING

**Data Analysis:** Time trends

**Presentation of Data:** Tables, narratives

**Review of Data:** Quarterly

**Reporting of Data:** Quarterly

#### OTHER NOTES

**Notes on Baselines/Targets:** Baseline is TBD.

#### PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of Project</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Target per the contract.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON DECEMBER 11, 2007
### Key Result Area
KRA 1.2 Court's ability to perform and monitor operations improved

### Indicator Number
7

### Name of Indicator
Number of court personnel trained on budget procedures

#### DESCRIPTION

**Precise Definition(s):** The number of court personnel receiving training on performance-based budgeting procedures, whether through workshops, distance learning, or other means sponsored by MCC ICCP.

**Unit of Measure:** Numbers of individuals

**Disaggregated by:** N/A

**Justification & Management Utility:** Training in performance-based budgeting procedures will improve court staff knowledge and skills for effectively managing court operations.

#### PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Collection Method</th>
<th>MCC ICCP will collect data directly from the Supreme Court and verify with project training database.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Method of Data Acquisition by the Project</td>
<td>Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Source(s)</td>
<td>Records from project and Supreme Court training center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency/Timing Of Data Acquisition</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Individual(s) at the Project</td>
<td>Training Coordinator and M&amp;E Specialist</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### DATA QUALITY ISSUES

| Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment | N/A |
| Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any) | Potential for double counting of individuals. |
| Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations | Using a training database with trainees entered by name and agency should limit potential double counting. |
| Date of Future Data Quality Assessments | N/A |
| Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments | N/A |

#### PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING

| Data Analysis | Time trends |
| Presentation of Data | Tables, narratives |
| Review of Data | Quarterly |
| Reporting of Data | Quarterly |

#### OTHER NOTES

**Notes on Baselines/Targets:** Baseline is zero.

#### PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of Project</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Target is per the contract.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This sheet last updated on December 11, 2007
### Performance Indicator Reference Sheet

**Key Result Area:** KRA 1.2 Court’s ability to perform and monitor operations improved  
**Indicator Number:** 8  
**Name of Indicator:** Percentage of courts implementing performance-based budgeting systems

#### DESCRIPTION

**Precise Definition(s):** Courts is defined as all courts under the jurisdiction of the Indonesian Supreme Court. The implementation of performance-based budgeting systems will be determined based on standard criteria using a scorecard approach that will measure several key criteria such as… Numerator will be the number of courts that achieve a positive value on the scorecard indicating implementation of performance-based budgeting systems. Denominator will be the total number of courts.  
**Unit of Measure:** Percentage based on number of courts.  
**Disaggregated by:** N/A  
**Justification & Management Utility:** Measures the impact of project training and skills development for performance based budgeting within the court system. Demonstrates the practical application of skills and knowledge to improve court efficiency.

#### PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION

**Data Collection Method:** MCC ICCP will collect data this data directly from each court by implementing a pre-designed scorecard survey.  
**Method of Data Acquisition by the Project:** Review and analysis of scorecard results  
**Data Source(s):** Project scorecard survey results, conducted by project and implementing subcontractors.  
**Frequency/Timing Of Data Acquisition:** Annually  
**Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition:** Medium, cost will involve scorecard design and administration  
**Responsible Individual(s) at the Project:** Court Finance and Budget Expert and M&E Specialist

#### DATA QUALITY ISSUES

**Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment:** N/A  
**Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any):** Inconsistent application of scorecard measurements.  
**Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:** Using standard criteria and providing training to each evaluator should increase the consistency of the scorecard application.  
**Date of Future Data Quality Assessments:** N/A  
**Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments:** N/A

#### PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING

**Data Analysis:** Time trends  
**Presentation of Data:** Tables, narratives  
**Review of Data:** Annually  
**Reporting of Data:** Quarterly

#### OTHER NOTES

**Notes on Baselines/Targets:** Baseline is TBD.

#### PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of Project</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON DECEMBER 11, 2007**
| Key Result Area: | KRA 1.2 Court’s ability to perform and monitor operations improved |
| Indicator Number: | 9 |
| Name of Indicator: | Percentage of courts with completed physical asset inventories |

**DESCRIPTION**

**Precise Definition(s):** Completed asset inventories refers to the complete list of all assets belonging to a particular court (including moveable and immoveable property) as submitted to the Supreme Court and verified by MCC ICCP partners. Numerator is the number of courts that have submitted completed physical asset inventories. Denominator is the total number of courts under the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court.

**Unit of Measure:** Percentage based on number of courts

**Disaggregated by:** N/A

**Justification & Management Utility:** As more courts complete inventory assessment, the Supreme Court will have transparent information necessary for monitoring asset use and distribution throughout the court system, improving overall court operations and efficiency.

**PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION**

**Data Collection Method:** MCC ICCP will collect data directly from the Supreme Court and verify with onsite verification in courts.

**Method of Data Acquisition by the Project:** Existing reports; onsite verification

**Data Source(s):** Supreme Court and onsite verification

**Frequency/Timing Of Data Acquisition:** Ongoing

**Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition:** High

**Responsible Individual(s) at the Project:** Court Administration Advisor

**DATA QUALITY ISSUES**

**Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment:** N/A

**Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any):** Quality of data depends on accuracy of Supreme Court records.

**Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:** To address data limitations, project will verify information with project records and onsite verification visits to court, and will work with the Supreme Court to improve the quality and accuracy of its record keeping.

**Date of Future Data Quality Assessments:** N/A

**Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments:** N/A

**PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING**

**Data Analysis:** Time trends

**Presentation of Data:** Tables, narratives

**Review of Data:** Ongoing

**Reporting of Data:** Quarterly

**OTHER NOTES**

Notes on Baselines/Targets: Baseline is TBD.

**PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of Project</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Target is per the contract.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON DECEMBER 11, 2007
**Performance Indicator Reference Sheet**

**Key Result Area:** KRA 1.3 Public access to court information expanded  
**Indicator Number:** 10  
**Name of Indicator:** Percentage of courts implementing complaint procedures

### DESCRIPTION

**Precise Definition(s):** Courts under the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court that have developed clear procedures for receiving and processing complaints filed by the general public. Implementation requires that the measure be adopted, that organizational arrangements are put in place, financial and human resources allocated, and that observable steps are taken to initiate implementation and repeated, continued, and/or expanded to demonstrate that implementation is continuing. Denominator refers to the total number of courts under the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court. Numerator refers to the total number of courts that have implemented public complaint procedures.  
**Unit of Measure:** Percentage based on number of courts  
**Disaggregated by:** N/A  
**Justification & Management Utility:** As more courts complete implement responsive public complaint procedures, the public trust in the court system will increase. A public that trusts the court system is more willing to expend effort to hold the system accountable.

### PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION

**Data Collection Method:** MCC ICCP will collect data directly from the Supreme Court and verify with project records.  
**Method of Data Acquisition by the Project:** Reports  
**Data Source(s):** Supreme Court and project records  
**Frequency/Timing Of Data Acquisition:** Quarterly  
**Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition:** Low  
**Responsible Individual(s) at the Project:** Court Administration Advisor

### DATA QUALITY ISSUES

**Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment:** N/A  
**Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any):** Quality of data depends on accuracy of Supreme Court records.  
**Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:** To address data limitations, project will verify information with project records and work with the Supreme Court to improve the quality and accuracy of its record keeping.  
**Date of Future Data Quality Assessments:** N/A  
**Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments:** N/A

### PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING

**Data Analysis:** Time trends  
**Presentation of Data:** Tables, narratives  
**Review of Data:** Quarterly  
**Reporting of Data:** Quarterly

### OTHER NOTES

**Notes on Baselines/Targets:** Baseline is TBD.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of Project</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Target is per the contract.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES**

**THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON DECEMBER 11, 2007**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Result Area:</th>
<th>KRA 1.3 Public access to court information expanded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicator Number:</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Indicator:</td>
<td>Number of public and media inquires answered by Court public relations trainees per quarter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DESCRIPTION**

**Precise Definition(s):** Number of inquiries by media and general public including written, in-person, and telephone answered by MCC ICCP Supreme Court public relations trainees on a quarterly basis.

**Unit of Measure:** Number of inquiries answered

**Disaggregated by:** N/A

**Justification & Management Utility:** Captures the application of skills and knowledge by MCC ICCP media relation trainees. As Supreme Court staff increase the communication with the public and media and share information more freely, the Court will build trust and improve transparency with the public.

**PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION**

**Data Collection Method:** MCC ICCP will collect data by written surveys administered to media trainees.

**Method of Data Acquisition by the Project:** Written survey

**Data Source(s):** Supreme Court public relations trainee survey results

**Frequency/Timing Of Data Acquisition:** Quarterly

**Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition:** Medium

**Responsible Individual(s) at the Project:** Public Communications Advisor and M&E Specialist

**DATA QUALITY ISSUES**

**Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment:** N/A

**Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any):** Accuracy of data depends on truthfulness of survey respondents.

**Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:** To address data limitations, the trainers will explain purpose of the follow-up surveys and stress the need of accurate responses.

**Date of Future Data Quality Assessments:** N/A

**Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments:** N/A

**PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING**

**Data Analysis:** Time trends

**Presentation of Data:** Tables, narratives

**Review of Data:** Quarterly

**Reporting of Data:** Quarterly

**OTHER NOTES**

**Notes on Baselines/Targets:** Baseline is TBD.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Indicator Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of Project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Performance Indicator Reference Sheet

**Key Result Area:** KRA 1.3 Public access to court information expanded  
**Indicator Number:** 12  
**Name of Indicator:** Number of Supreme Court decisions accessible to the public via the Supreme Court website

#### DESCRIPTION

**Precise Definition(s):** Supreme Court decisions refer to the entire official decision document. For decisions to be considered accessible, the entire document must be posted on the Supreme Court website accessible to the general public.  
**Unit of Measure:** Number of Supreme Court decisions  
**Disaggregated by:** N/A  
**Justification & Management Utility:** At present, it is extremely difficult for the public to access Supreme Court decisions without special payments to the clerks maintaining the decisions. By increasing the number of Supreme Court decisions accessible to the public for free, the courts will eliminate the petty corruption associated with providing decisions to the public and increase transparency into the Supreme Court decision-making process. Ultimately the availability of Supreme Court decisions to the public will improve the overall quality and consistency of the decisions through public demand.

#### PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION

**Data Collection Method:** MCC ICCP will collect data directly by viewing the Supreme Court website.  
**Method of Data Acquisition by the Project:** Report  
**Data Source(s):** Supreme Court website  
**Frequency/Timing Of Data Acquisition:** Quarterly  
**Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition:** Low  
**Responsible Individual(s) at the Project:** M&E Specialist

#### DATA QUALITY ISSUES

**Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment:** N/A  
**Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any):** N/A  
**Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:** N/A  
**Date of Future Data Quality Assessments:** N/A  
**Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments:** N/A

#### PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING

**Data Analysis:** Time trends  
**Presentation of Data:** Tables, narratives  
**Review of Data:** Quarterly  
**Reporting of Data:** Quarterly

#### OTHER NOTES

**Notes on Baselines/Targets:** Baseline is TBD.

#### PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>2,292</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of Project</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON DECEMBER 11, 2007**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Indicator Reference Sheet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key Result Area</strong>: KRA 2.1 Compliance of non-banking financial institutions (NBFIs) with Suspicious Transaction Report (STR)/Cash Transaction Report (CTR) reporting requirements improved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator Number</strong>: 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name of Indicator</strong>: Percentage of STR’s filed by NBFIs on a quarterly basis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DESCRIPTION**

**Precise Definition(s)**: Numerator is the number of STR’s filed by non-banking financial institutions (NBFIs) received by PPATK. Denominator is the total number of STR’s received by PPATK from both banking and non-banking financial institutions.

**Unit of Measure**: Percentage based on number of STR’s.

**Disaggregated by**: N/A

**Justification & Management Utility**: An increase in the number of STR’s filed by non-banking financial institutions will demonstrate the effectiveness of the public awareness and NBFI training program carried out by MCC ICCP. However, it is possible that the public awareness campaign may also impact the submission of STR’s by banking institutions as well as NBFIs causing a smaller increase in the percentage of STR’s submitted by NBFIs.

**PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION**

**Data Collection Method**: MCC ICCP will collect data directly from the PPATK.

**Method of Data Acquisition by the Project**: Reports

**Data Source(s)**: PPATK records

**Frequency/Timing Of Data Acquisition**: Quarterly

**Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition**: Low

**Responsible Individual(s) at the Project**: Anti-Corruption Advisor

**DATA QUALITY ISSUES**

**Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment**: N/A

**Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any)**: Quality of data depends on accuracy of PPATK record keeping.

**Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations**: Technical Team will conduct periodic site visits to ensure that data is collected in a consistent, accurate, and timely fashion.

**Date of Future Data Quality Assessments**: N/A

**Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments**: N/A

**PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING**

**Data Analysis**: Time trends

**Presentation of Data**: Tables, narratives

**Review of Data**: Quarterly

**Reporting of Data**: Quarterly

**OTHER NOTES**

**Notes on Baselines/Targets**: Baseline is 3.2%.

**PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of Project</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Target per the contract.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Performance Indicator Reference Sheet**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Result Area:</th>
<th>KRA 2.2 PPATK’s capacity for receiving STR’s/CTR’s increased</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicator Number:</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Indicator:</td>
<td>Number of reports PPATK STR/CTR receipt system capable of receiving per day</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DESCRIPTION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Precise Definition(s):</th>
<th>Measure of PPATK hardware capacity related to STR/CTR receipt system based on the total number of STR/CTR reports the system can receive on any given day.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unit of Measure:</td>
<td>Number of reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disaggregated by:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justification &amp; Management Utility:</td>
<td>Measuring the increase in PPATK receipt system capacity is indicative of an overall increase in capacity to collect more data related to money laundering.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Collection Method:</th>
<th>MCC ICCP will collect data directly from PPATK by conducting joint tests of software and hardware capacity.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Method of Data Acquisition by the Project:</td>
<td>Review and analysis of software and hardware test results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Source(s):</td>
<td>Software/hardware tests conducted jointly by project staff and PPATK staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency/Timing Of Data Acquisition:</td>
<td>Annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition:</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Individual(s) at the Project:</td>
<td>Anti-Corruption IT Advisor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DATA QUALITY ISSUES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment:</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any):</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Future Data Quality Assessments:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Analysis:</th>
<th>Time trends</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presentation of Data:</td>
<td>Tables, narratives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of Data:</td>
<td>Annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting of Data:</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OTHER NOTES**

| Notes on Baselines/Targets: | Baseline is 100 STRs and 5,000 CTRs. |

**PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>15 STRs/1,795 CTRs</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of Project</td>
<td>300 STRs/ 10,000 CTRs</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Target per the contract.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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# Performance Indicator Reference Sheet

**Key Result Area:** KRA 2.3 Processes for effective electronic transmission of suspicious transactions strengthened  
**Indicator Number:** 15  
**Name of Indicator:** Number of PPATK cases transmitted for investigation per calendar year

## DESCRIPTION

**Precise Definition(s):** This indicator measures the number of financial analysis cases the PPATK submits to the Police and KPK for further investigation.  
**Unit of Measure:** Number of cases  
**Disaggregated by:** Submission medium (electronic/hard copy)  
**Justification & Management Utility:** An increase in the number of financial analysis cases transferred from PPATK to investigating authorities represents an expansion in the tracking and analysis of potential corruption and money laundering criminal acts.

## PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION

**Data Collection Method:** MCC ICCP will collect data directly from PPATK.  
**Method of Data Acquisition by the Project:** Reports  
**Data Source(s):** PPATK records  
**Frequency/Timing Of Data Acquisition:** Quarterly  
**Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition:** Low  
**Responsible Individual(s) at the Project:** Anti-Corruption Advisor

## DATA QUALITY ISSUES

**Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment:** N/A  
**Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any):** Quality of data depends on accuracy of PPATK record keeping.  
**Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:** Technical Team will conduct periodic site visits to ensure that data is collected in a consistent, accurate, and timely fashion.  
**Date of Future Data Quality Assessments:** N/A  
**Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments:** N/A

## PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING

**Data Analysis:** Time trends  
**Presentation of Data:** Tables, narratives  
**Review of Data:** Quarterly  
**Reporting of Data:** Quarterly

## OTHER NOTES

**Notes on Baselines/Targets:** Baseline is 40.

## PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of Project</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Target per the contract.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Performance Indicator Reference Sheet

**Key Result Area:** PIR 3 Capability of the KPK to prevent, prosecute, and convict corrupt officials enhanced  
**Indicator Number:** 16  
**Name of Indicator:** Number of KPK prosecutions of high ranking GOI officials related to corruption (includes cases filed)

#### DESCRIPTION

**Precise Definition(s):** The number of corruption cases filed by the KPK affecting Echelon I and II ranking officials in the Indonesian government.  
**Unit of Measure:** Number of court cases  
**Disaggregated by:** N/A  
**Justification & Management Utility:** Measures the improvement in the capacity to conduct corruption investigations and gather information necessary for prosecuting corrupt officials.

#### PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION

**Data Collection Method:** MCC ICCP will collect data directly from the KPK.  
**Method of Data Acquisition by the Project:** Reports  
**Data Source(s):** KPK records  
**Frequency/Timing Of Data Acquisition:** Quarterly  
**Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition:** Low  
**Responsible Individual(s) at the Project:** Anti-Corruption Advisor

#### DATA QUALITY ISSUES

**Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment:** N/A  
**Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any):** Quality of data depends on accuracy of KPK record keeping.  
**Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:** Technical Team will conduct periodic site visits to ensure that data is collected in a consistent, accurate, and timely fashion. The technical team will also verify data with secondary sources as the court.  
**Date of Future Data Quality Assessments:** N/A  
**Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments:** N/A

#### PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING

**Data Analysis:** Time trends  
**Presentation of Data:** Tables, narratives  
**Review of Data:** Quarterly  
**Reporting of Data:** Quarterly

#### OTHER NOTES

**Notes on Baselines/Targets:** Baseline is 2.

#### PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of Project</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Indicator Reference Sheet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key Result Area:</strong> KRA 3.2 Capacity for monitoring and preventing corruption during legal proceedings strengthened</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator Number:</strong> 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name of Indicator:</strong> Number of trials monitored</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DESCRIPTION

**Precise Definition(s):** Trials monitored refers to the number of court trials monitored by the KPK using video monitoring equipment.

**Unit of Measure:** Number of trials

**Disaggregated by:** Geographic location (inside Jakarta and outside Jakarta)

**Justification & Management Utility:** Captures the expansion of KPK capacity to monitor court trials, a process which serves as a deterrent for corruption to occur during the actual courtroom trial and also provides a detailed court record of high profile cases.

### PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION

**Data Collection Method:** MCC ICCP will collect data directly from the KPK.

**Method of Data Acquisition by the Project:** Reports

**Data Source(s):** KPK records

**Frequency/Timing Of Data Acquisition:** Quarterly

**Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition:** Low

**Responsible Individual(s) at the Project:** Anti-Corruption Advisor

### DATA QUALITY ISSUES

**Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment:** N/A

**Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any):** Quality of data depends on accuracy of KPK records.

**Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:** Project technical team will work with KPK to ensure that information recorded is consistent, accurate, and timely.

**Date of Future Data Quality Assessments:** N/A

**Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments:** N/A

### PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING

**Data Analysis:** Time trends, cross tabulation

**Presentation of Data:** Tables, narratives

**Review of Data:** Quarterly

**Reporting of Data:** Quarterly

### OTHER NOTES

**Notes on Baselines/Targets:** Baseline is 160.

### PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(170-Jakarta/230-outside Jakarta)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of Project</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Target per the contract.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(180-Jakarta/275-outside Jakarta)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Performance Indicator Reference Sheet

**Key Result Area:** KRA 4.1 Provincial e-GP processes and systems established  
**Indicator Number:** 18  
**Name of Indicator:** Percentage change in cost of a basket of selected goods and services procured through e-GP procurement system in five procurement provinces

#### DESCRIPTION

**Precise Definition(s):** Selected goods and services to be determined during baseline assessment based on accurate historical data maintained for the price per unit and common goods and services regularly procured by targeted provincial governments. This indicator will measure the average cost/unit of the basket of selected goods and services each year and then calculate the overall percentage change, minus inflation. Five procurement provinces refers to provinces served by MCC ICCP supported e-GP satellite centers. Denominator is the total costs per unit of the basket of goods in the baseline year. Numerator is the difference between the total costs per unit of the basket of goods in the baseline year and the total costs per unit of the basket of goods in the current year.

**Unit of Measure:** Percentage change in cost of selected goods and services  
**Disaggregated by:** Targeted procurement province  
**Justification & Management Utility:** Measures the overall impact of the e-GP satellite centers in providing a transparent and competitive process for government procurement. The increase in transparency provided by e-GP satellite centers should enhance competition for government procurements, decreasing corruption and improving price competition. The overall result should be a decrease in the cost of goods procured electronically.

#### PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION

**Data Collection Method:** MCC ICCP will collect data directly from the counterpart provincial governments.  
**Method of Data Acquisition by the Project:** Analysis of reports  
**Data Source(s):** Counterpart records  
**Frequency/Timing Of Data Acquisition:** Annually  
**Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition:** Medium to high, depending on state of existing record keeping.  
**Responsible Individual(s) at the Project:** e-GP Advisor

#### DATA QUALITY ISSUES

**Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment:** N/A  
**Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any):** Quality of data depends on accuracy procurement records.  
**Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:** In order to ensure reliable baseline for determination of the cost of basket of selected goods and services, the project technical team will work with targeted provinces to enhance the existing record keeping system and improve tracking related to per unit costs of procurements. The e-GP system developed for the satellite centers will capture this data directly, increasing the reliability of data for future collections.  
**Date of Future Data Quality Assessments:** N/A  
**Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments:** N/A

#### PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING

**Data Analysis:** Time trends  
**Presentation of Data:** Tables, narratives  
**Review of Data:** Annually  
**Reporting of Data:** Annually

#### OTHER NOTES

**Notes on Baselines/Targets:** Baseline is zero.

#### PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of Project</td>
<td>-10%</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Target per the contract.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON DECEMBER 11, 2007**
Performance Indicator Reference Sheet

**Key Result Area:** KRA 4.1 Provincial e-GP processes and systems established

**Indicator Number:** 19

**Name of Indicator:** Percentage of procurement processes undertaken by electronic means

**DESCRIPTION**

**Precise Definition(s):** Procurements undertaken by electronic means refers to all procurements processed through the MCC ICCP-supported e-GP satellite centers that entail at least one component of electronic procurement, including but not limited to electronic announcements and records of the public procurement procedures, e-tendering, e-offers, e-contracting, etc. Numerator refers to the number of procurements undertaken by electronic means in the provinces served by the e-GP satellite centers. Denominator refers to the total number of procurements processed in the provinces served by the e-GP centers.

**Unit of Measure:** Percentage related to the number of procurement processes

**Disaggregated by:** e-GP satellite center province

**Justification & Management Utility:** Measures the effectiveness and use of the e-GP satellite centers by province. As more procurement is conducted through the e-GP centers, overall government procurement at the provincial level becomes more transparent and provides opportunities for public oversight and accountability.

**PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION**

**Data Collection Method:** MCC ICCP will collect data directly from the counterpart provincial governments.

**Method of Data Acquisition by the Project:** Reports

**Data Source(s):** Counterpart records

**Frequency/Timing Of Data Acquisition:** Quarterly

**Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition:** Low

**Responsible Individual(s) at the Project:** e-GP Advisor

**DATA QUALITY ISSUES**

**Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment:** N/A

**Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any):** Quality of data depends on availability, completeness, and accuracy of government procurement records in the targeted provinces.

**Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:** Project technical team will work with targeted provinces to enhance the existing record keeping system and improve tracking related to procurements, including electronic procurements as well as procurements awarded sole source.

**Date of Future Data Quality Assessments:** N/A

**Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments:** N/A

**PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING**

**Data Analysis:** Time trends, cross tabulation.

**Presentation of Data:** Tables, narratives

**Review of Data:** Quarterly

**Reporting of Data:** Quarterly

**OTHER NOTES**

**Notes on Baselines/ Targets:** Baseline is zero.

**PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of Project</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Result Area</th>
<th>KRA 4.2 Monitoring and analysis procedures for e-GP data institutionalized</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicator Number</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Indicator</td>
<td>Percentage of public procurements awarded sole source in targeted provinces</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DESCRIPTION**

**Precise Definition(s):** Public procurement is the process by which government buy the inputs for providing vital public sector services. In procurement terms, those inputs are generally grouped into three categories: goods, services, and civil works. Sole source contracting is procurement through the solicitation from only one source which does not provide the benefits of competition in regard to quality and cost, lacks transparency in selection, and could encourage unacceptable practices. Denominator is the total number of procurements in the targeted province. Numerator is the total number of procurements awarded sole source.

**Unit of Measure:** Percentage based on number of procurements

**Disaggregated by:** Targeted province

**Justification & Management Utility:** Shows the prevalence of competitive government procurement. The assumption is that sole source awards are less transparent and require no competition between vendors so they result in a higher price per good or service.

**PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION**

**Data Collection Method:** MCC ICCP will collect data directly from the counterpart provincial governments.

**Method of Data Acquisition by the Project:** Reports

**Data Source(s):** Counterpart records

**Frequency/Timing Of Data Acquisition:** Quarterly

**Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition:** High, counterparts are not currently tracking this information

**Responsible Individual(s) at the Project:** e-GP Advisor

**DATA QUALITY ISSUES**

**Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment:** N/A

**Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any):** Accuracy is highly dependent upon counterpart record keeping. Since many sole source procurements are not in compliance with regulations, there are incentives for inaccurate data reporting.

**Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:** The technical team will work closely with counterpart provincial governments to improve their record-keeping and data collection system. They will also provide assistance for setting up additional institutional controls that ensure data records are accurate.

**Date of Future Data Quality Assessments:** N/A

**Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments:** N/A

**PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING**

**Data Analysis:** Time trends

**Presentation of Data:** Tables, narratives

**Review of Data:** Quarterly

**Reporting of Data:** Quarterly

**OTHER NOTES**

**Notes on Baselines/Targets:** Baseline is TBD.

**PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of Project</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Performance Indicator Reference Sheet

**Key Result Area:** KRA 4.3 Public oversight of provincial procurement increased

**Indicator Number:** 21

**Name of Indicator:** Number of registered e-GP vendors

#### DESCRIPTION

**Precise Definition(s):** Registered e-GP vendors refers to official businesses registered with the provincial e-government procurement satellite centers as e-GP vendors.

**Unit of Measure:** Number of vendors

**Disaggregated by:** N/A

**Justification & Management Utility:** Measures the impact of public awareness campaign and increased capacity for vendors to operate within the e-GP standards and processes. As the number of registered vendors increases, the more competitive and transparent the process becomes, with vendors serving an important oversight function in ensuring awards are made based on standard criteria rather than favoritism or corruption.

#### PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION

**Data Collection Method:** MCC ICCP will collect data directly from the counterpart provincial government agency’s records.

**Method of Data Acquisition by the Project:** Reports

**Data Source(s):** Counterpart records

**Frequency/Timing Of Data Acquisition:** Quarterly

**Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition:** Low

**Responsible Individual(s) at the Project:** e-GP Advisor

#### DATA QUALITY ISSUES

**Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment:** N/A

**Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any):** Quality of data depends on accuracy and timeliness of counterpart provincial government agency’s records record keeping.

**Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:** Technical Team will conduct periodic site visits to ensure that data is collected in a consistent, accurate, and timely fashion.

**Date of Future Data Quality Assessments:** N/A

**Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments:** N/A

#### PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING

**Data Analysis:** Time trends

**Presentation of Data:** Tables, narratives

**Review of Data:** Quarterly

**Reporting of Data:** Quarterly

#### OTHER NOTES

**Notes on Baselines/Targets:** Baseline is TBD.

#### PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of Project</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### ANNEX C – MCC REPORTING TEMPLATE

**INDONESIA THRESHOLD PROGRAM RESULTS REPORTING**

Note: The indicator numbers left of the indicator name below do not correspond with the Annex A Consolidated Indicator List. The indicators below have been renumbered as there are 10 selected indicators from the 21 described in Annex A.

| Indicator Name                                                                 | End Result | Baseline as of May 07 | FY Quarter | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Q1 | Q2-Q4 | Notes |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 Number of judges trained on Judicial Code of Conduct | 2,000 | 0 | Target | Actual |
| 2 Percentage of senior court officials wealth reports submitted | 100% (to be replaced by # if appropriate) | 44% | Target | Actual |
| 3 Percentage of Courts completing physical asset inventory | 100% (to be replaced by # if appropriate) | TBD | Target | Actual |
| 4 Percentage of Courts implementing complaint procedures | 100% (to be replaced by # if appropriate) | 0% | Target | Actual |
| 5 Number of court personnel trained on budget procedures | 1600 | 0 | Target | Actual |
| 6 Number of KPK prosecutions of high-ranking GOI officials | 8 | 2 | Target | Actual |
| 7 Number of trials monitored | 455 | 289 | Target | Actual |
| 8 Number of PPATK cases transmitted for investigation | 150 | 40 | Target | Actual |
| 9 Percentage of STR’s filed by non-bank financial institutions | 10% Total Filings | 3.20% | Target | Actual |
| 10 Percentage change in procurement costs in five (5) satellite center provinces | 10% Reduction in Cost of Procurement | TBD | Target | Actual |
ANNEX D – DATA QUALITY ASSESSMENT FORM

**Directions:** Use the following worksheet to complete an assessment of the indicator against the 5 data quality criteria outlined. Once the review is complete, ensure that any documentation related to data quality is maintained in the files for future reference.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Quality Assessment Worksheet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Result:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewer(s):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Reviewed:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the Indicator Reported?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Explanation and Actions Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Validity | Do the data clearly and adequately represent the intended result? Some issues to consider are:  
• Face Validity: Would an outsider or an expert in the field agree that the indicator is a valid and logical measure for the stated result?  
• Attribution: Does the indicator measure the contribution of the project?  
• Data Bias: Are there any measurement errors that could bias the data? Both sampling and non-sampling errors are areas where bias should be examined. | | |
| 2. Integrity | Do the data collected, analyzed, and reported have established mechanisms in place to reduce manipulation or simple errors in transcription? | | |
| 3. Precision | Are data sufficiently precise to present a fair picture of performance and enable management decision making at the appropriate levels? | | |
| 4. Reliability | Do data reflect stable and consistent data collection processes and analysis methods over time? | | |
| 5. Timeliness | Are data timely enough to influence management decision-making (i.e. in terms of frequency and currency)? | | |

General Notes or Comments:
ANNEX E – DATA REQUIREMENTS FROM COUNTERPARTS

A. Supreme Court

- Number of judges receiving USG training
- Number of justice sector personnel receiving USG training
- Number of judges trained on Judicial Code of Conduct
- Percentage of senior court officials submitting wealth reports
- Number of court personnel trained on budget procedures
- Percentage of courts with completed physical asset inventories
- Percentage of courts implementing complaint procedures
- Number of media inquires answered by Supreme Court public relations trainees

B. PPATK

- Percentage of STR’s filed by NBFIs on a quarterly basis
- Number of reports PPATK STR/CTR receipt system capable of receiving per day
- Number of PPATK cases transmitted for investigation per year

C. KPK

- Percentage of senior court officials submitting wealth reports
- Number of KPK prosecutions of high ranking GOI officials related to corruption
- Number of trials monitored

D. Bappenas and Counterpart Provincial Governments

- Percentage change in cost of a basket of selected goods and services procured through provincial e-GP procurement systems
- Percentage of procurement processes undertaken by electronic means
- Percentage of public procurements awarded sole source
- Number of registered e-GP vendor
- Number of sole source procurements