

**MID-TERM EVALUATION REPORT**

**IDN T80**

**SUPPORT TO IMPROVED SECURITY BY PROVISION OF CAPACITY BUILDING TO  
THE JAKARTA CENTRE FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT COOPERATION (JCLEC)**

**RULE OF LAW**

**Indonesia**

**Submitted by Sylvia Tiwon**

**UNITED NATIONS OFFICE ON DRUGS AND CRIME**

**Vienna**

**UNITED NATIONS OFFICE ON DRUGS AND CRIME**

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

Abbreviation and acronyms	p. 3
Summary matrix of findings, supporting evidence and recommendations	p. 4
Executive Summary	p. 7
<b>I. INTRODUCTION</b>	
A. Background and context	p. 13
B. Purpose and scope of the evaluation	p. 16
C. Executing modalities of the project	p. 17
D. Methodology	p. 22
E. Limitations to the evaluation	p. 23
<b>II. MAJOR FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS</b>	
A. Relevance of the project	p. 24
B. Attainment of project objectives	p. 28
C. Project outputs	p. 38
D. Institutional and management arrangements and Constraints	p. 49
<b>III. OUTCOMES, IMPACT AND SUSTAINABILITY</b>	
A. Outcomes	p. 51
B. Impact	p. 52
C. Sustainability	p. 54

#### IV. LESSONS LEARNED AND BEST PRACTICES

- A. Lessons learned p. 55
- B. Best practices p. 56

#### V. RECOMMENDATIONS

- A. Issues resolved during the evaluation p. 57
- B. Actions recommended p. 57

#### VI. OVERALL CONCLUSIONS p. 62

Annex 1. Terms of Reference p. 63

Annex 2. List of persons interviewed and field visit schedule p. 74

Annex 3. Questionnaire/Guidelines p. 76

#### Disclaimer

Independent Project Evaluations are scheduled and managed by the project managers and conducted by external independent evaluators. The role of the Independent Evaluation Unit (IEU) in relation to independent project evaluations is one of quality assurance and support throughout the evaluation process, but IEU does not directly participate in or undertake independent project evaluations. It is, however, the responsibility of IEU to respond to the commitment of the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) in professionalizing the evaluation function and promoting a culture of evaluation within UNODC for the purposes of accountability and continuous learning and improvement.

Due to the disbandment of the Independent Evaluation Unit (IEU) and the shortage of resources following its reinstatement, the IEU has been limited in its capacity to perform these functions for independent project evaluations to the degree anticipated. As a result, some independent evaluation reports posted may not be in full compliance with all IEU or UNEG guidelines. However, in order to support a transparent and learning environment, all evaluations received during this period have been posted and as an on-going process, IEU has begun re-implementing quality assurance processes and instituting guidelines for independent project evaluations as of January 2011.

## Abbreviations and Acronyms

AFP	Australian Federal Police
AGO	Attorney General's Office
AIT	Action Implementation Team
CID	Criminal Investigation Department
CSU	Charles Sturt University, Australia
CWG	Consortium Working Group
Densus 88	Special Detachment 88, Counter-terrorism squad
EC	European Commission
GB	Governing Board
INP	Indonesian National Police
JCLEC	Jakarta Centre for Law Enforcement Cooperation
KPK	Corruption Eradication Commission
LEMDIKLAT	Indonesian National Police Education and Training Institute
LEMDIKPOL	Indonesian National Police Institute for Police Education
NPIA	National Policing Improvement Agency, Bramshill, UK
Polda	Province level Police Command
Polres	District level Police Command (basic command unit)
Polsek	Sub-district level Police Command
PPATK	Financial Transaction Report and Analysis Centre
Pusdik	Education Centre
Pusdikjatrans	Education Centre for transnational crime
ROM	Result Oriented Monitoring
TNI	Indonesian Armed Forces
UNODC	United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime

## Summary matrix of findings, supporting evidence and recommendations

Findings: problems and issues identified	Supporting evidence	Recommendations
<p>1. Shortcoming in project design involving insufficient analysis of key stakeholders, including JCLEC, thus leading to some ambiguity as to project objectives and difficulties in defining impact and sustainability.</p>	<p>Document review: UNODC IDN T80 Project document, ROM report, INP Strategic Plan, JCLEC Protocol, MOU between AFP and INP; interviews with AIT, JCLEC, INP.</p>	<p>a. UNODC to play stronger leading role, especially at higher levels of national policy, including network building with high-level policy-makers.</p> <p>b. Organise strategic planning session including UNODC, AIT, JCLEC leadership, INP/CID/LEMDIKPOL and input from other law enforcement agencies to more fully articulate JCLEC strategic position, long-term sustainability, and extent to which Project interventions should extend directly to law-enforcement training/education centres and training at Poldas.</p>
<p>2. Position, role and future of national faculty as yet unclear leading to some tension and confusion as to responsibilities; sense of “dualism” between JCLEC and UNODC.</p>	<p>Interviews with national faculty; JCLEC leadership; AIT.</p>	<p>Needs of national faculty to be addressed in a timely manner; develop guidelines and policies; draw up agreements between Project/UNODC and JCLEC and INP. Create appropriate intellectual environment.</p>
<p>3. No clear direction for creation of pool of expert master trainers beyond the trainings.</p>	<p>Project documentation; interviews with alumni, national faculty.</p>	<p>Systematic activities to create and sustain pool of expert “master trainers.” This includes drawing up agreements, where possible, with their home agencies, to ensure they will be released when</p>

		needed.
4. Insufficient representation from Poldas in courses.	Project reports; INP Strategic Plan.	Increase number of participants from the Poldas. This should be done in close consultation with LEMDIKPOL and CID
5. Course evaluation system has not yet involved supervisors, especially at CID.	course evaluations; meeting at INP headquarters with, a.o.. Deputy Head of Criminal Investigations; CID report.	Continue refining evaluation methods, preferably to include interviews with supervisors to gauge improvement in actual performance, in cooperation with CID.
6. Case studies in courses do not sufficiently reflect the Indonesian legal context and situation.	Interviews with participants/alumni, national faculty.	Develop and maintain a bank of case-studies that fit the Indonesian legal context. This could also be made available to pool of master trainers.
7. Different terminologies used by trainers/courses from different countries, creating confusion in courses but also for implementation on the ground.	Interviews with participants/alumni, national faculty.	Develop uniform terminology for transnational crime for all courses in cooperation with academic specialists
8. Poor quality of some translators/interpreters	interviews with participants/alumni.	Improve quality of translators/interpreters for the courses. Selection should conform to criteria developed with input from academics and expert practitioners.
9. The language of the Computer-based training programmes and immersive installation is too Malaysian.	interviews with alumni.	Consult expert translation practitioner, preferably with strong academic background (e.g. from the Lembaga Bahasa Internasional, University of Indonesia).
10. There is a good informal interagency network of alumni but without efforts to develop	interviews with national faculty, alumni.	Devise and implement activities to strengthen the informal interagency alumni networks.

and strengthen this, sustainability is questionable.		
<p>11. Without accreditation/certification the courses are not attractive to participants because they do not count for much towards career/promotions. Accreditation will also facilitate possible continued graduate work in combating transnational crime in universities abroad.</p>	<p>Interviews with JCLEC leadership, alumni, national faculty; document review, JCLEC Protocol.</p>	<p>Study possibilities for accreditation/certification of courses, in cooperation with JCLEC and INP but consult experts.</p>

## **Executive Summary**

Project T80, strengthening the rule of law and security in Indonesia, is a complex, multi-dimensional project to enhance the investigative and management capacities of the Indonesian National Police and other law enforcement agencies in the area of transnational crime by strengthening the capacity of the Jakarta Centre for Law Enforcement Cooperation (JCLEC).

The overall design is workable and has incorporated mechanisms for sustainability beyond the life of the Project. However, there is a significant drawback because the position and role of the Project's main strategic target/beneficiary, i.e. JCLEC, have not been sufficiently analysed, making it difficult to assess the impact and longer-term sustainability of the Project's outputs. Because JCLEC is part of a set of bilateral agreements between the AFP and the INP, the Project has a deeper diplomatic dimension that requires closer attention by the UNODC Jakarta office and better coordination with high-level management at INP, possibly at other law enforcement agencies and parliamentary committees.

The Project's emphasis on training programmes in transnational crime is of high relevance in the increasingly globalized reach of organised crime and meets expressed needs of law enforcement agencies, in particular of the INP's Criminal Investigation Division. The activities aim to strengthen the various law enforcement education and training centres, with a focus on the INP. One important aspect of the trainings is the effort to create a platform to facilitate and strengthen inter-agency communication and cooperation, the lack of which has greatly hampered investigation and prosecution of transnational crime, including financial crime/corruption.

All stakeholders interviewed were agreed on the continuing need for the Project deliverables, in particular the set of courses on combating transnational crime and management of transnational crime investigation and the training tools and

facilities developed. Especially noted was the installation of the immersive training facility, the first of its kind in Indonesia, and computer-based trainings. Also considered useful is the emphasis on adult learning methods which are seen to counteract the militarised nature of education and training especially at the INP and AGO.

The Transnational Crime and Criminal Justice Trainer Development is aimed at improving the in-house training at the INP, KPK, PPATK and AGO by developing and delivering Trainer Development courses for experienced trainers using the cascade method (Training for Trainers). This set of courses is also intended to form a pool of expert trainers from which JCLEC will be able to draw in the future.

An important part of the Project's design for strengthening JCLEC is the creation of a National Faculty, a group of expert trainers who are undergoing specialised training in preparation for their eventual taking over from the international trainers. This emphasis on creating endogenous expertise is key to JCLEC sustainability.

Overall, the Project is on track for outputs involving developing and implementing the courses on transnational crime and the trainer development courses. The immersive training facility has been installed and used for training and computer-based training is Five of the six projected national faculty have been hired and are performing well. The Project is also to be commended for its flexibility, especially in responding to needs expressed by the INP, particularly the integrated management of corruption workshop. Inviting media coverage of this workshop is an encouraging sign of the gradual opening up of JCLEC, which hitherto has been seen as a somewhat closed entity.

The main challenges have to do with preparations for longer-term sustainability. This includes the formation of a task force for the development of a long-term curriculum, international, regional and national academic linkages, and prospects for accreditation/certification. Also in need of attention are maintenance of the

national faculty, the pool of expert trainers, and strengthening inter-agency cooperative networks developed as an outcome of the courses.

### **Lessons Learned**

1. Good project design is based on good analysis of key stakeholders and beneficiaries. It is not enough to compile a list of stakeholders and beneficiaries without clear explication of their relative positions vis-à-vis the action to be taken.

2. Good working networks create possibilities for sustainability and should be incorporated into the project design.

3. Multi-dimensional projects require better management at the UNODC country level. This is not to be construed simply as an implementation issue; rather, it has to do with maintaining and reinforcing the vision informing the whole Project, and with making sure that this vision is properly translated into the project's working parts. It also recognises that there are different levels of engagement with stakeholders/beneficiaries and achieving sustainability is unlikely to work without involving high-level policy and decision-makers.

### **Best Practices**

1. Involve media in coverage of key events. The way in which the media were invited to cover the Integrated Management of Corruption workshop is a good beginning and helps to raise public awareness of the issues.

2. Good evaluation methods are important tools for training programmes. The method developed (and still being refined) by the Project provides a fine example for law enforcement agencies.

3. Using the Training for Trainer method. This cascade method is a proven way to rapidly and efficiently transfer knowledge and skills to target agencies. However, without the backing of institutional policy, impacts upon the target training centres are likely to disappear.

4. Inter-agency participation in courses. This is a strong point in the design and implementation of the Project. However, to be sustainable, more needs to be done to encourage the political will necessary to formal interagency communication and cooperation.

## **Recommendations**

### I. Overall recommendations.

1. UNODC Country Office should play a stronger leading role for the Project, especially at the higher levels of national policy and decision-making required for sustainability.

2. UNODC Country Office should consider organising a brief but intensive higher level strategic planning session before the implementation of long-term planning, with participants from JCLEC leadership, INP/CID/LEMDIKPOL, and input from other law enforcement agencies.

### II. Particular recommendations.

1. National Faculty needs must be addressed in a timely manner. This means developing and implementing clear guidelines and policies. Specific agreements should be drawn up between the Project/UNODC and JCLEC/INP on the status of the National Faculty. Consistent efforts should be undertaken to create a sound intellectual and collegial environment.

2. There should be consistent and systematic activities to create and sustain the pool of expert “master trainers”. This includes drawing up agreements, where possible, with their home agencies, to ensure they will be released when needed.

3. Systematic efforts should be made to increase significantly the number of participants from the Poldas. This should be done in close consultation and cooperation with LEMDIKPOL and CID.

4. Work on refining the evaluation methods should continue. Where possible, the forms should be supplemented by interviews with supervisors to gauge improvement in actual performance. The CID specifically mentions evaluating post-training performance of CID participants, which presents an excellent opportunity to develop this part of the evaluations.

5. Courses should contain more cases that fit the Indonesian legal and security context without losing the transnational dimension nor universal principles of good policing. Courses should equip participants to tackle transnational crime without violating human rights or gender rights. It would be a good idea to develop and maintain a bank of case-studies that could also be made available to the pool of master trainers.

6. Develop a uniform terminology for transnational crime for all courses in cooperation with academic specialists.

7. Improve the quality of translators/interpreters for the courses.

8. Review and improve translations of the computer-based training programmes and of the Immersive installation into the Indonesian language. An expert translator, preferably with a university background should be consulted to ensure quality.

9. Devise and implement activities aimed at strengthening the informal inter-agency alumni networks.

10. Study possibilities for accreditation of courses in cooperation with JCLEC and INP. This should also involve experts in matters of certification and accreditation.

## **I. INTRODUCTION**

### **A. Background and context**

Project T80 is intended to strengthen the rule of law and security in Indonesia. It is funded by the EC and implemented by the UNODC as lead organisation in partnership with Kemitraan (Partnership for Governance Reform, Indonesia), the National Policing Improvement Agency NPIA, Bramshill, UK), and Charles Sturt University (Australia) as Associate. Together they make up a Consortium.

As described in the project documents (*Project Document* and *The Action*), the project is designed to support the improvement of the rule of law and security in Indonesia by strengthening the investigative and management capacities of the Indonesian National Police (INP) and other law enforcement agencies so that they are better able to detect, prevent and investigate serious transnational crime.

The specific objective is to supplement the capacity of JCLEC to train INP officers and other law enforcement personnel in the skills necessary for tackling transnational crime by establishing a comprehensive training and staff development programme.

The target groups are: the INP (main target group), the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK), the Attorney General's Office (AGO), the Financial Transaction Reports and Analysis Centre (PPATK) and the courts.

The final beneficiaries are the target groups, JCLEC, and the Indonesian public.

There have been some adaptive changes to the initial proposal document (UNODC Project document, IDN T80) to respond to recommendations presented in the November 2010 Monitoring Report (ROM), experience in actual implementation, and changes in and requests from the INP/JCLEC Governing Board.

While the concept as presented appears fairly straightforward, this is a project with many moving parts and, to some extent, shifting targets.<sup>1</sup> The complex nature of the project design is indirectly signalled in the ROM, which notes that there is a difference between the original project title and the title used in the project logo, i.e. “Transnational Crime and Criminal Justice Project” (ROM, IV. “Summary of conclusions”). The ROM describes the second title as being more appropriately reflective of the project and considers the first title somewhat inappropriate since strengthening of JCLEC is seen to make up only 10% of the Project activities.<sup>2</sup>

While the overall design as presented is workable, there is a significant shortcoming because the position and role of the Project’s main strategic target, i.e. JCLEC, are insufficiently conceptualized and articulated. This may account for the ambiguity about what the project is actually intended to achieve found in the ROM.<sup>3</sup> A similar confusion emerged in a meeting to introduce the project evaluators and the evaluation Terms of Reference<sup>4</sup> to the INP, in which the title of the project and what precisely was to be evaluated came under question.<sup>5</sup> The question came up fairly consistently in interviews with INP officials. Although JCLEC is positioned as a

---

<sup>1</sup> Most importantly in the changing elaboration of the logical hierarchy of Project objectives.

<sup>2</sup> This will be further commented on under II D (Institutional and management arrangements and constraints) below.

<sup>3</sup> In response to the ROM, a revised log-frame was produced which took the recommendations of the monitoring but lost the overall logics of the project itself.

<sup>4</sup> See Terms of Reference, Annex I. In Indonesian, “*Bantuan untuk meningkatkan keamanan melalui pengembangan kapasitas terhadap Jakarta Centre for Law Enforcement Cooperation (JCLEC)*”

<sup>5</sup> 28 July, 2011 at INP Headquarters, Jakarta. This meeting also included evaluators for two other UNODC projects, IDN T71 and IDN T81.

beneficiary (see *The Action* document, 1.4. Summary) in practice its position is more complex and its role much more active and determinant than would appear.

The Centre is a key strategic component of the design and, for this reason, the achievements of the Project, as well as the risks—in particular to sustainability—can be measured better by the extent to which its several components are incorporated into overall JCLEC activities and policies. Beyond this lies the question of the continued viability of the Centre and its vision and mission, which may be beyond the immediate scope of the Project, but impact upon its objectives nonetheless. More precise articulation of JCLEC vis-à-vis the Project will help to clarify the interface with the INP and plans for the eventual transfer of the Centre to the INP, a matter of some concern for many INP officials interviewed. The Centre's identity as part of a set of bilateral agreements between the AFP and the INP has also not been properly addressed in the design of the Project, which hides a deeper diplomatic dimension that requires closer attention by the UNODC Jakarta office and better coordination with high-level management at INP, possibly at other law enforcement agencies and parliamentary committees, in particular Committee III on Law, Human Rights and Security.

It is too late in the life of the project to reposition JCLEC—as partner, for instance—but more precise articulation of the Centre will enable better monitoring of outcomes and assessment of objectives achieved, and perhaps a more thorough strategic engagement (Project-JCLEC-INP, and other law enforcement agencies), while lesser complications that have arisen in the implementation of the project and in its day-to-day running may be rectified and/or avoided.<sup>6</sup>

Due to a delay of roughly 6 months in starting up the project, the existing deadline for the project (December 2012) may not provide sufficient time for the proper completion of all the components. Underspending has already been noted by the

---

<sup>6</sup> To be addressed below, in particular relating to the National Faculty and expectations from law enforcement practitioners outside INP.

ROM and is partly due to the late start of the project, partly to underestimation of the savings made possible by the arrangement with JCLEC. Plans for expenditure are already underway.

Reforming any law enforcement organisation with a strongly militarised past is a long process requiring the long-term commitment of many actors and agents. Reforming entrenched problems of inter-agency suspicions and rivalries, and general disinterest in cooperation enhances the possibilities for the reform of individual agencies (in this case, the INP) but also makes the task at hand more complex. Management of the project at JCLEC in Semarang needs serious backstopping from UNODC Jakarta to handle matters at higher levels of decision-making (including at the international level), establishing and/or reinforcing linkages with the broader law enforcement community, with parliamentary committees, and with academic institutions and civil society organisations.

## **B. Purpose and scope of the evaluation**

This is a mid-term evaluation intended to review the project to assist in making “any necessary adjustments to activities in order to achieve planned outcomes and results.”

This mid-term evaluation is intended to be conducted after 18 months of the starting of the project, thus covering the period November 2009-July 2011, but since the project only properly began in April 2010, it does not represent 18 months of actual project implementation.

A Results Oriented Monitoring (ROM) of the project was conducted in November 2010 and, to some extent, this evaluation draws on and addresses the findings of this monitoring activity. Because the ROM was largely conducted through document review, this evaluation attempted to emphasize interviews with key

actors, stakeholders and beneficiaries. It also attempted to highlight INP understanding and perception of the project, particularly in light of the changes at the INP since the project was conceptualized. Interviews were conducted in Jakarta and in Semarang.

While keeping to the Terms of Reference to focus on relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability, partnership and cooperation, the evaluation sought to emphasize sustainability as a key issue. In many ways, partnership and cooperation are key dimensions of sustainability. At mid-term, impact is difficult to measure but efforts were made to identify positive trends and activities.

### **C. Executing Modalities of the project**

There are three main components involved in the implementation of the project: The Action Implementation Team (AIT), the Consortium, and the supervisory entity (the Governing Board).

#### **i. The Action Implementation Team**

The project is implemented by an Action Implementation Team (AIT) headed by an international Project Manager.<sup>7</sup> Staffing is divided into two units:

- Technical Staff consisting of two international faculty and six national faculty (only five on board, the sixth still awaiting official INP permission).
- Administrative Staff, including the Finance Assistant hired in February 2011.

The Project Manager is tasked with the following:

---

<sup>7</sup> At times, e.g. in the Project Document, the AIT is also referred to as the Project Implementation Team, and the Project Manager as the Project Coordinator. While not conflicting, differences in nomenclature can be confusing.

- managing the day-to-day tasks of the Action according to the Action Proposal and Work Plan
- assisting in training course delivery
- ensuring all outcomes and financial management of the Action according to approved timelines
- consulting with the Consortium Working Group and the Governing Board on a regular basis
- regularly preparing and distributing reports on the progress of the Action to Partners, donors and JCLEC
- ensuring a smooth working relationship with JCLEC and effective coordination with donors
- any other duties necessary for the proper and timely implementation of the Action.<sup>8</sup>

The Project Manager reports to the UNODC Regional Centre, Bangkok, and backstopping is provided by relevant units of UNODC Headquarters, while UNODC Project Office Jakarta appoints a liaison assistant to facilitate requests from the Semarang Office.

The current Project Manager (Greg Linsdell) was hired full-time in September 2010 although he had been involved in activities on four shorter visits. To facilitate coordination of activities and communications with UNODC, he visits the Jakarta office at least once a month.

#### ii. Supervision of the Project.

The AIT is supervised by a Governing Board (GB) and a Consortium Working Group (CWG).

---

<sup>8</sup> From “The Action” p. 25.

Members of the CWG are: UNODC (1 person, Chair), Bramshill (1), Kemitraan (1), Charles Sturt University (1), Project Manager.

The Supervisory tasks of the CWG are:

- advises on broad policy matters that affect the conduct of the Action and relationships with Action stakeholders and other relevant agencies
- advise on the Consortium's budget and the financial allocation of the EC's contribution
- conduct annual validation of the realised expenditure in accordance with the budget
- approve changes to training syllabuses
- approve the appointment of the Project Manager and other international core faculty
- approve the appointment or removal of local staff upon the recommendation of the Project Manager.

The Governing Board is made up of 2 members from JCLEC, 2 from the EC, 2 from the INP, and the Project manager in a secretarial role and representing the CWG; it advises on:

- training syllabi and annual work plan of the Action
- the impact and evaluation of the Action
- relations with other training institutions worldwide
- coordination with the existing annual training plan of JCLEC
- coordination with existing INP training programmes
- any other matter on which the CWG seeks advice.

The Project Manager, however, does not have decision making powers on the GB.

iii. The Project Consortium

The Project Consortium is made up of UNODC as lead organisation, the Partners (NPIA/Bramshill and Kemitraan), and an Associate (Charles Sturt University). Apart from serving on the Consortium Working Group, the individual partners and Associate have discrete responsibilities:

UNODC (apart from its overall administrative role) is responsible for the following programs:

- Integrated Management of Corruption Workshop
- Specialised Management of Financial Crime Program

NPIA/Bramshill:

- Senior Management Investigation Program
- District Commander's Crime and Command Program
- Immersive Training Facilitators Program
- Executive Police Management Course
- Inclusion of applied technologies via NCALT, especially for the immersive training (KERIS in Indonesian).

Kemitraan:

- Criminal Justice Management Program
- Strategic Criminal Justice Improvement Program

CSU: Trainer Development Program

- Combating Transnational Organised Crime Program
- Advanced Trainer Development Program
- Specialist Methods Trainer Development Program

- Trainer Development Program: Australia Study Tour

In addition, CSU is also responsible for, among others:

- providing academic coordinator/teaching staff
- assisting with curriculum design and development
- providing scholarships for students to undertake higher education programs
- articulating programs offered through JCLEC into CSU award courses
- providing academic rigor and assessment criteria
- quality control of programs, including assessment and evaluation
- advice on academic collaboration with other training institutions.

The International Trainers on the AIT are assigned particular Partners to work with and/or facilitate:

Kemitraan - Mustafa Ünal Erten

UNODC – Greg Linsdell and Mustafa Unal Erten

CSU – Tracey Green

NPIA – Tracey Green and Greg Linsdell.

Each of the International trainers is teamed up with 2 (two) national faculty, in line with the contents and needs of the trainings.

In its implementation, the Action of the Project is divided up into four clusters: 1. Transnational Crime Training Courses; 2. Transnational Crime and Criminal Justice Trainer Development, including National Faculty development; .3. JCLEC Training and Education Plan (or Development of long-term training and education); 4.

Development of Academic Links and other regional/international law enforcement agencies.<sup>9</sup>

The terminology of the document titled “The Action” and the division into clusters provides a sense of the dynamic nature of the initial concept. Although the clusters are not fully sequential, the planning of clusters 3 and 4 are dependent upon the output of clusters 1 and 2. Clusters 3 and 4 focus on the longer-term development of the Centre itself and help to maximise the outcome of the training clusters. Without this dynamic framework, the outputs in a logframe intended for monitoring purposes lose some of their significance within the overall scheme.<sup>10</sup> Clusters do not appear to guide the division of tasks among the international trainers, and the running of the project appears to depend on considerable multi-tasking by members of the team.

#### **D. Methodology**

The evaluation was conducted in line with the broad Terms of Reference and attempts to focus especially on programmes/mechanisms to promote sustainability and related indicators. Positioning of the UNODC programme at JCLEC<sup>11</sup> was an important component, particularly within the context of education/training centres (“Pusdik” or “Pusdiklat”) at cooperating national agencies, including INP, Attorney General, as well as the agencies working on financial crime/transnational crime (KPK, PPATK, etc). The evaluation attempts to better delineate challenges/risks and available opportunities with possible impacts on sustainability.

---

<sup>9</sup> The names of the clusters are incorporated into briefing documents and into “The Action.” Titles are somewhat flexible and may have changed to better accord with the revised logical framework for the project (June 2011).

<sup>10</sup> At times some of the activities under the clusters can shift, as for example, should the immersive training be under Cluster 2? See the revised logframe of June 2011, which is probably a good idea for detailed executive monitoring but doesn’t provide a useful overall perspective to gauge impact.

<sup>11</sup> Which turned out to have to do with positioning of JCLEC vis-à-vis the project and the INP.

As far as possible the evaluation was open, employing the participatory approach to facilitate input from key stakeholders.

Data was obtained through desk review of key documents (Project documents, evaluations, assessments, training and education systems, INP and JCLEC documents). Interviews were conducted with key project personnel, including Consortium Partners and Associate, with EC representative, JCLEC program director and some key INP personnel.

Data was also obtained through an introductory meeting with INP leadership and an informal meeting with the Deputy Chief of the INP.

FGDs were conducted with alumni of the training courses, with trainers, and with National Faculty.

The evaluator was invited to observe a project staff meeting and the closing of the Integrated Management of Corruption Workshop. In addition, the evaluator had the opportunity to participate in and observe a session of the Directions in Management and Leadership Training, Smart Craftsmanship organized by the Netherlands.

## **E. Limitations to the Evaluation**

The evaluation was hampered to a considerable degree because the national evaluator as provided for in the TOR was not hired while the evaluation itself was designed to be handled by two people. Some FGDs and interviews with alumni could not be conducted, in particular with more alumni and participants, with INP (especially with the head of Lemdikpol), and NGOs. The timing of the evaluation was also somewhat unfortunate, coming at the height of summer vacation (for internationals at UNODC and the AIT) and the beginning of Ramadhan. This made

preparations for the evaluation more challenging than they should have been for the evaluator but also for the Project staff.

## **II. MAJOR FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS**

### **A. Relevance of the Project**

i. General. The project remains relevant and recent high-profile cases have trained public attention on the transnational dimensions of corruption and the need for better handling of transnational financial crime. The transnational nature of other serious crimes such as trafficking, maritime border disputes, and the like has also increasingly come to the forefront while a number of prominent cases have exposed weaknesses in the capacity of individual Indonesian law enforcement agencies and in inter-agency cooperation and communication.

ii. Training Component. All stakeholders interviewed were agreed on the continuing need for the project deliverables, in particular the trainings and the emphasis on inter-agency communication offered by the courses in which participants represented different law enforcement agencies.

Combating transnational crime, including terrorism and corruption, “without violating human rights,” is built into INP Strategic Plans and the 5 year budget,<sup>12</sup> as are management, education and training as components of INP’s institutional and organizational capacity building. These items in the INP’s plans and budget, however, tend to be listed as discrete elements and require further elaboration to

---

<sup>12</sup> Rencana Strategis Kepolisian Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 2010-2014 [Strategic Plan of the INP for 2010-2014], a document which derives its strategies from Indonesian Government National Priorities. The quote is from priority 11 on transnational crime and crimes against state assets. Planning documents from other law enforcement agencies were not readily available.

make the implementation relevant to the objective of combating serious transnational crime.

The emphasis on combating transnational crime, however, should not detract from appropriate incorporation of human rights and the gender dimensions. Good training in transnational crime linked to human rights and gender will provide a stronger basis for law enforcement agents and decision-makers and give them greater confidence in tackling transnational crime since this type of activity (especially of counter-terrorism) can frequently lead (or feed into) to the perception of human rights violations by law enforcers, leaving the results of their actions open to question.

INP officials involved in education and training note that reform of the INP educational system to reflect modern concepts of policing and democratic management systems, processes and accountability is a slow, long-term and multi-dimensional task. Some organisational changes have been introduced. The education and training coordinating body that used to be known as the LEMDIKLAT is now known as LEMDIKPOL and has authority over a broader range of police education and training programs/centres. However, both the current Head (Commissioner General, a three-star position) and the job are still fairly new. The current Head, Commissioner General Oegroseno is planning to develop a blueprint for police education and training to facilitate coordination among providers of training and education, including those offered through international agencies/donors, which are generally not considered an integral part of formally planned police activities, and therefore lack INP budgetary support and commitment.

Militarisation of the INP educational system, reinforced during Suharto's New Order regime, continues to be a problem. Militarization continues to be a serious problem also at the AGO Training Centre, a situation that may be ascribed to the fact that during the New Order, Attorney Generals were on the whole appointed from within

the ranks of the Indonesian Army (TNI).<sup>13</sup> The Project's emphasis on adult learning principles in the trainings and introduction of Training for Trainers are of particular relevance here.

Thus, the Project's training development (Clusters 1, 2) and curriculum development, quality control and evaluation methods (Cluster 3), and new teaching technologies (immersive training, Computer Based Teaching) are still of high relevance. The forging of regional and international linkages (Cluster 4) is integral to maintaining the transnational dimension and capabilities of the curricula, the trainers and national faculty, and the position of JCLEC itself.

iii. Support of JCLEC. INP officials cooperating most closely with the project (including JCLEC director Brig.Gen. Pol. Boy Salamuddin,<sup>14</sup> Brig. Gen. Lalu Suprpta Head of the Supervisory Directorate of Education and Training at LEMDIKPOL, the Deputy Head of the Criminal Investigations Body, and the Head of the Criminal Investigation School/Pusdik Reskrim) expressed their desire to see the Project continue, and felt that more time would be needed to strengthen both JCLEC and INP capacity to manage the Centre.

Strengthening the capacity of JCLEC was understood by most INP officials to be a strategic part of INP capacity building, especially as of January 2011, when JCLEC was moved out of the Personnel Development Bureau of the Deputy Chief for Human Resources (DeSDM)<sup>15</sup> and placed under the newly redesigned

---

<sup>13</sup> Interview with AGO Prosecutors who participated as trainers in two of the project courses.

<sup>14</sup> In the course of the evaluation, Brig. Gen Boy Salamuddin was promoted to Inspector General to head the International Relations Bureau at INP Headquarters in Jakarta. However, during the transition period of roughly 2 months, he will continue to be involved with JCLEC.

<sup>15</sup> Since recent changes at INP, all Deputies (Deputi Kapolri) are now designated as Asisten Kapolri (Assistants to the Chief of Police).

LEMDIKPOL.<sup>16</sup> By regulation No. 52, 2010 (*PP No. 52, 2010 tentang Susunan Organisasi dan Tata Kerja Polri*) on the organizational structure and work of the INP, JCLEC is now the Diklatsus Jatrans (Special education and training centre for transnational crime), and the JCLEC Director (Indonesia) is also Head of this new training centre (in a joint appointment with the representative from the Australian Federal Police as Director of Programs).

To non-police stakeholders, however, the concept of strengthening the capacity of JCLEC was not entirely clear and thus not necessarily seen to be of high relevance. The main problem here seems to be a difference in perception and understanding of the scope of the project as distinct from other UNODC projects on corruption and, in some cases, the provenance of JCLEC itself. Trainers from the AGO, for example (alumni of the trainings and instructors at the trainings) felt that to some extent the relevance of the trainings was limited by the strong emphasis on the police and police procedures. They pointed out that the highly compartmentalised system of crime detection and investigation, based on existing procedural law, meant that training material intended for the police was often of marginal use for AGO investigators. Kemitraan reported similar reservations about running inter-agency training programs/courses at an organisation under the police (often referred to as a “police asset” or *aset polisi*). For example, in response to invitations to participate in Kemitraan-run courses under the project, judges—who feel strongly about protecting the independence of the courts<sup>17</sup>—questioned why the police were inviting judges. Nevertheless, all were agreed that breaking down barriers to communication and cooperation among law enforcement agencies was highly relevant and rarely provided by other agencies and/or organisations, and that emphasis on continued training for mid-level and senior law enforcement managers was appropriate.

---

<sup>16</sup> Used to be the LEMDIKLAT.

<sup>17</sup> According to some people interviewed, the judges were the most difficult to include in integrated trainings because they thought that there might be a possibility that their independence might be compromised.

The EC/UNODC contributions make up more than 30% of the JCLEC program, the largest of all projects/contributions outside the Australian (36%).<sup>18</sup> Apart from simple percentages, the types of contributions and the sustainability measures built into the action that are to be handed over to JCLEC are designed for long-term applicability. Ironically, as noted in the project's revised logframe, the high level of relevance to JCLEC is also a source of concern over what will happen at the end of the project. This concern is shared by most INP officials interviewed, who expressed the desire to see the action continue beyond the project expiration date of December 2012.

JCLEC continues to be a strategic component in law enforcement capacity building, particularly for mid-level and senior management. INP repositioning of the Centre and the creation of the special transnational training centre post under LEMDIKPOL have served to enhance the relevance of the Project. In addition, the high visibility of some of the courses highlights what the INP may gain by using the Centre as a resource.<sup>19</sup> There has been a significant shift in Centre focus from counter-terrorism training to handling other transnational organised crimes. And the Centre is beginning to open up to links with the environment in which it is situated (including AKPOL, but also the local/provincial security, e.g. especially the Polda of Central Java, which is located in Semarang, the capital of Central Java; other law enforcement offices, administrative officials and civil society organisations in the capital/province).

---

<sup>18</sup> See JCLEC statistics, 2011. Updated July 2011. Mr. Ajit Roy, UNODC Country Manager estimates that if the long-term components of the project are counted (esp. the longer residence of the project's international experts), project contributions to JCLEC would be closer to 50%.

<sup>19</sup> Especially the integrated management of corruption workshop introduced at the request of the INP Chief. Unlike most other JCLEC courses, this included media coverage.

## **B. Attainment of project objectives**

i. Overview. The specific objective of the original documents (UNODC Project Document, for Project IDN T80, 2009; The Action, 2009) is “to supplement the capacity of the Jakarta Centre for Law Enforcement Cooperation (JCLEC) to train police officers and other law enforcement personnel in the skills necessary for tackling transnational crime by establishing a comprehensive training and staff development programme.” In response to the November 2010 ROM this was reworded to produce three specific objectives (revised logframe, June 2011): 1. Improving the managerial and operational capacity of the INP in general, and the CID in particular, both at Headquarters and at the regional (POLDA) level; 2. Improving the quality of in-house training at the INP, KPK, PPATK and AGO; 3. Strengthen JCLEC’s effectiveness and relevance as a training institute for the INP and other law enforcement agencies. While this may make for objectives that are more readily assessed using SMART guidelines, these new specific objectives (also referred to as “particular objectives” in the TOR for this evaluation) can only properly be assessed in a strategic manner when they are placed within the overarching Specific Objective of the original documents, i.e. strengthening the capacity of JCLEC. This is true as well for the project outputs since numbers of personnel trained, for example, are arbitrary unless placed within the broader policy and managerial context of the institution through which and/or into which they are fed.

Thinking strategically, thus, the questions to be posed are the following: is strengthening JCLEC a strategic action to improve the managerial and operational capacity of the INP/CID at headquarters and at the Polda? Does it support efforts to improve the quality of in-house training at the INP, KPK, PPATK and AGO?

Framed in this way, it becomes clearer that what is required is a better analysis of JCLEC background, institutional positioning, the assumptions and the risks entailed. A brief but intensive strategic planning session including all key actors

(UNODC/AIT, JCLEC leadership, INP leadership, with input from other law enforcement agencies) would be a useful activity.

The following overview of objectives will thus begin with the original Specific Objective and follow up with a discussion on Clusters 1-4.

ii. Specific Objective . Strengthen JCLEC’s effectiveness and relevance as a training institute for the INP and other law enforcement agencies.

There is a good fit between the activities of the Project grouped under Clusters 1 – 4 with the objectives of JCLEC,<sup>20</sup> its position vis-à-vis the INP,<sup>21</sup> and the projection of the life of the the Centre as a long term sustainable arrangement.<sup>22</sup> Beyond the question of sustainability, which will be addressed below, the activities do much to expand and promote the quality of JCLEC’s course offerings and its relevance as a training institute. The international staff/trainers allocated to JCLEC by the project are playing a vital role in the Centre. The Project Manager, for example, assumes secretarial tasks for the meetings of the Governing Board, on which both JCLEC directors (Indonesia and Australia) and INP representatives sit. The longer-term tenure of the international staff/trainers under the Project distinguishes it from most other international donors (outside Australia), whose trainers are mainly there for the short term. The Centre itself is geared towards providing tertiary level training and education for mid-level and higher law enforcement managers, but this has yet to be adequately articulated and planned. Key to this would be accreditation, which would enable recognition of credits towards undergraduate

---

<sup>20</sup> Protocol between the Indonesian National Police (INP) and the Australian Federal Police (AFP) to establish the Jakarta Centre for Law Enforcement Cooperation (JCLEC), p. 2: “The purpose of the Centre will be to assist the INP, and other international law enforcement communities, in developing capacity to manage counter-terrorist investigations and more broadly, other transnational crimes, through appropriate education and training for criminal investigations managers. “

<sup>21</sup> To assist the INP in capacity building, leading to increasing INP’s professionalism (Protocol, p. 3)

<sup>22</sup> i.e. beyond the five years of initial signing of the protocol on 29 April 2004.

and postgraduate law-enforcement studies.<sup>23</sup> Accreditation would also enhance the value of the courses for promotions, a point raised by several people interviewed (especially INP) as one reason why being assigned to courses at JCLEC was not as attractive as assignments to conventional INP training centres and schools.

Cluster 1, Transnational Crime and Criminal Justice Programmes addresses the particular objective of *improving the managerial and operational capacity of the INP in general, and the CID in particular, both at Headquarters and at the regional (POLDA) level* by strengthening JCLEC course offerings on transnational crime investigation and management. There was broad agreement among those interviewed that the transnational element of criminal investigation offered in the courses fulfil a critical need in light of the proliferation of transnational crime in today's globalized environment. At INP Headquarters there are working links to Interpol and other international law enforcement agencies, but the management skills necessary to make good use of these is lacking, especially at the level of the Polda/Polres. In addition, the CID School (Pudik Reskrim) lacks the resources needed to train more than 26% of the 43,000 INP criminal investigators/detectives. International training courses at the Pusdik are offered through international assistance but tend to focus on anti-terrorism.

The emphasis on developing managerial capacity in handling transnational crime of INP law enforcers is a key component to ensuring that the technical knowledge and skills of investigators is deployed efficiently and effectively. The evaluation method designed includes pre- and post-course tests and ensures systematic feed-back, gauges learning outcomes and relevance to job performance over a 3-6 month period after the end of training.

Cluster 2, Transnational Crime and Criminal Justice Trainer Development relates to the particular objective of *improving the in-house training at the INP, KPK, PPATK and AGO* by developing and delivering *Trainer Development* courses for experienced

---

<sup>23</sup> See Protocol, p. 4; also brought up in interview with Brian Thomson, the current JCLEC director of programmes.

trainers designed on the basis of Training for Trainers (TOT) courses and the principles of adult education. This cluster also includes *Immersive Learning*, *Computer Based Training*, and *Distance Learning*. Exposure to international law enforcement training methods through a *study tour* is part of this cluster and serves to reinforce the international nature of the trainings.

The cascade approach to training helps to ensure that the training courses offered can be quickly replicated within the various law enforcement training and education centres, thus maximizing the impact of the trainings. There are serious concerns attached to this, in particular because much depends on whether or not the in-house training centres are prepared and willing to accept the changes that invariably accompany the replacement of old educational models and philosophies for new ones. This aspect of the Project raises the question of the range and extent of Project interventions: should they be restricted to efforts to effect changes to the educational systems of law enforcement agencies through JCLEC, or should the interventions extend beyond the Centre into the various schools and training centres? If the latter, should this activity be better planned and incorporated into JCLEC's agenda?

This aspect of the Cluster is likely to be more workable through cooperation with the LEMDIKPOL where there is fairly good understanding of the need to incorporate teaching philosophies, methods and techniques appropriate to democratic policing practice and management and human rights training into its curricula to gradually dismantle the militarised nature of its educational system. Furthermore, since JCLEC is now responsible to the LEMDIKPOL, a window of opportunity is open. The CID school (Pusdik Reskrim) is already feeling the benefits of the trainings since a number of its trainers have attended the courses on transnational crime and the Trainer Development programme. During the interview with the Head, Deputy Head and two trainers, they displayed with considerable satisfaction a hefty volume of Indonesian case studies they had produced, modelled after the methods employed in the Trainer Development courses, to be used in the courses they teach

at the school. They were very much aware of the beneficial impact that the more democratic training methods can have on the militarised (command) training system. Resistance levels are low. Conversely, at the AGO, the militarised system is still very much in place and procedures for recruitment and promotion lack most vestiges of transparency<sup>24</sup>.

More appropriate to the longer-term needs of JCLEC trainings and fulfilment of the objective is the provision in this cluster for creating a *pool of expert trainers* from which JCLEC will be able draw. This is in line with JCLEC Protocol in which JCLEC is projected as a permanent institution.<sup>25</sup> While international sharing of information, knowledge and experience on transnational crime is integral to the Centre, forming an endogenous core of trainers is not only efficient but strategic to its permanence. Since the core team of expert Indonesian trainers is drawn from different law enforcement agencies, the aim of breaking down inter-agency communication and cooperation barriers is also supported. The challenges here will be to ensure that the agencies involved will be willing to release the trainers when needed, that the trainers will be able retain and build on the levels of expertise required and that they have access to material and systems necessary for continued development. How this is to be done is as yet not clear.

*National Faculty Development* is a vital part of this Cluster. Creating a core of highly trained, long-term and full-time faculty is key also to strengthening the Centre, which has been reliant on short-term instructors and trainers. The Cluster includes a Faculty Development programme with specialized trainings to enable them take on responsibilities for teaching the trainer development programmes, coordinating transnational crime courses, contributing to Immersive Training Scenario Development and Management, and to implement the evaluation system. Their preparatory programme also includes a short-term international placement programme (currently at NPIA, Bramshill, UK, and Europe).

---

<sup>24</sup> Interviews/FGDs with AGO trainer and prosecutors.

<sup>25</sup> Protocol, p. 3. AFP assistance appears to be dependent on extensions of the MOU.

Some of the problems with the training programmes identified during this evaluation were<sup>26</sup>:

- Quality and effectiveness of instructors, in particular, of some national expert speakers brought in for specific sessions in the trainings.
- Lack of cohesion within individual courses, especially those reliant on outside speakers.
- Some of the material presented in the courses were not appropriate in the context of the Indonesian legal system;
- Some of the material and techniques presented were not appropriate to the more general context of security needs and conditions in Indonesia;
- Different terminologies and systems introduced, especially by international trainers from different legal systems and law enforcement cultures were confusing;
- Translators did not have access to a standard vocabulary.

There are strong expectations expressed by the AIT, JCLEC leadership (Indonesian and Australian), and INP officials in education, that the National Faculty will be able to tackle these issues and thus to form a type of quality control/vetting body within JCLEC. Even the most critical interviewees for this evaluation expressed admiration for the ways in which the national faculty on several courses stepped in and took over for speakers who did not show up, and how their presence helped to bridge the different sections of the courses, thereby creating more cohesion. The position of the national faculty within JCLEC is strengthened by the fact that some of them have already been recruited to supplement trainings from other projects within JCLEC (e.g., in trainings conducted by Canada and the Netherlands). The INP is also expecting to be able to call upon their expert services for projects related to

---

<sup>26</sup> From interviews and FGDs with various stakeholders in the Project, but also from a few discussions with JCLEC stakeholders/participants not directly involved in the Project.

transnational crime training beyond the Project, and there have been external requests for them to speak on topics related to their expertise.

The national faculty as it exists to date is made up of experts from a variety of backgrounds; some are on secondment from the INP, which helps to cement relations between JCLEC and the INP,<sup>27</sup> It is clear at this early stage that the National Faculty are performing quite well and that their expertise is needed beyond the confines of the Project. However, since they are still properly identified with the Project (in management and budgetary terms), this has led to some tension as to the scope of their activities and responsibilities. To date there are no specific agreements between JCLEC and the Project, nor with the INP (beyond secondment of INP personnel) dealing specifically with the National Faculty. The National Faculty can also serve as a conduit for academic and other institutional and civil society linkages (see Cluster 3 below), but this needs to be better thought through and coordinated. Without a good overall educational strategy it will be difficult to formulate clear and workable guidelines and job descriptions for the National Faculty.

*Computer Based Training* supports the principles of adult education and self-paced learning and was highly regarded by participants for being an effective learning tool, especially at the CID school.

*Distance Learning* in theory serves to push further the multiplier effect of TOT. At first glance it could be a useful way of reaching criminal investigators at the Polda/Polres. However, it is not clear how this is to be done and whether it will be effective in the current law enforcement educational systems and at the level of the Polda/Polres. Distance learning lacks the face-to-face environment that enables quick responses to issues that may arise in the process and to trainee needs; it also poses the risk of fraud and lack of appropriate supervision. Much depends on sound

---

<sup>27</sup> This follows a model that worked well and efficiently for the IOM-Netherlands INP Capacity Building Project on Community Policing. One of the INP National Faculty gained extensive experience at IOM.

protocols and close supervision. It is not clear who will be providing these at the various training centres or at JCLEC now and once the Project ends.

Clusters 3., JCLEC Training and Education Plan and 4., University Links are geared more directly to the objective of strengthening JCLEC beyond the life of the Project.

Cluster 3 key activities aim to develop a long-term curriculum for the Centre, devising a continuity plan for national faculty, and mapping strategic direction for JCLEC. This involves the formation of a task force composed of representatives from JCLEC management, the INP Education Institute (LEMDIKPOL) and the CID. Activities under this cluster ensure that the long-term curriculum is developed using input from the broader law enforcement and academic communities through national seminars.

This cluster also provides for the delivery to JCLEC of training quality standards for trainer recruitment, course development and delivery, evaluation and business processes. The excellent evaluation process put in place for Project initiated courses will be of real value to the Centre, allowing it to establish a uniform system of vetting course offerings and evaluating results. This also has a strong potential to support JCLEC coordination (see Cluster 4 following below).

Cluster 4 activities emphasize development of national and transnational policing and academic linkages and is in line with JCLEC scope and function.<sup>28</sup> Through other programmes, including Kemitraan, JCLEC already has some academic links, e.g. to the University of Indonesia's Criminology Department of the Faculty of Law, and to civil society entities/ NGOs with appropriate knowledge and skills sets. As part of a joint cooperation agreement and international reach, JCLEC already attracts a range of international agencies working on various aspects of security and law enforcement. In a sense, the Centre's Protocol emphasis on sharing multi-

---

<sup>28</sup> Protocol, p. 4.

jurisdictional experiences enables it to act as a clearing house and host for international projects on SSR and transnational law enforcement. However, the approach can be somewhat scattered, lacking robust coordinating capacity, since the INP itself has no clear system in place to vet and approve educational and training assistance from the plethora of countries that have offered programmes under the recent emphasis on Security Sector Reform.<sup>29</sup> Cluster 4 activities seek to extend and reinforce transnational links through faculty exchange, especially for the National Faculty and for the pool of trainers. The multi-national composition of the Project Consortium incorporates academic and policing links to Australia (Charles Sturt University) and the UK (NPIA, Bramshill), and Indonesia (Kemitraan/ Security and Justice Governance Cluster). Transnational policing links are also provided by establishment of a regional transnational forum.

While these linking activities support JCLEC's core function and scope, the Cluster of activities by itself does not indicate how these will be coordinated to avoid some of the risks of fragmentation. These risks can range from, among others, confusion in implementation on the ground due to different terminologies and systems of law enforcement, to serious budgetary misallocations.<sup>30</sup> The new JCLEC director of programmes (Australia) has a background in education and is keenly aware of the need for better quality control and vetting systems; this opens a window of opportunity to be further explored and strategized with the INP. Whether the National Faculty as currently composed will be an appropriate entity to support such coordination is worth thinking through. AT INP there are discussions underway to systematize and coordinate the many international cooperation programmes which, currently, are linked to different offices within the INP.<sup>31</sup>

---

<sup>29</sup> Among them, interviews, INP officials at headquarters, including INP international cooperations, LEMDIKPOL, and JCLEC director. Also discussions with other international trainers outside the Project.

<sup>30</sup> INP interviews and observation of budgetary process for INP community policing.

<sup>31</sup> It must be noted, though, that the problem of lack of coordination over international programmes is a long-standing one and the rapid replacement of

The development and delivery to JCLEC of the immersive/simulation-based training facility by installing a simulation device for training in Investigation and Major Incident Response is part of Cluster 3 but is also an integral part of Cluster 2 as part of the training development programme for the national faculty and JCLEC staff, and supports Cluster 1. The immersive training suite and equipment which simulates live critical incidents is designed to enhance the decision-making capacity of crime investigation managers and will make JCLEC the first law enforcement centre to offer this effective and efficient training tool in Indonesia. The training method, as also the Computer Based Training method (see Cluster 2 above), gains high praise from INP and JCLEC management, though there was some criticism of the environments reproduced for not being immediately relevant to the Indonesian situation, and for the overly Malaysian-Malay language used.<sup>32</sup>

### **C. Project Outputs**

Overall, the Project is on track for outputs of Cluster 1 and Cluster 2. For Cluster 3 and 4, although there have been some outputs, especially under Cluster 4, the status of outputs is somewhat difficult to assess at this time because much depends on the results of further planning for the long-term and a more detailed phase-out strategy. In terms of the Specific Objective of strengthening JCLEC, the Centre has incorporated all the courses designed and delivered into its own roster of courses; it has made available facilities for the installation of the Immersive Training Facility; the new director of programs shares the views of the AIT that the National Faculty will be an important addition to JCLEC and encourages their teaching in courses outside the Project proper.

---

personnel through “*rotasi*” (rotation) or “*mutasi*” (reassignment) does not help the process.

<sup>32</sup> Though the language problem should be rectified, it must be noted, however, that at times some interviewees/FGD participants lost sight of the transnational emphasis of the courses.

Cluster 1 and 2:

i. *courses:*

The following courses on transnational crime have been designed and delivered:

1. Combating Transnational Organized Crime Course (CSU)
2. Senior Management Investigation Course (NPIA)
3. Strategic Criminal Justice Improvement Course (Kemitraan)
4. Specialized Management of Financial Crime Course (UNODC)
5. Special Management of Professional Standards, Accountability and Integrity Course (UNODC, later changed to Integrated Management of Corruption Workshop)
6. Criminal Justice Management Course (Kemitraan)
7. Executive Police Management Course (NPIA)
8. District Commander Crime and Command Program (NPIA)

For the Trainers Development Programme the following three modules have been designed and delivered:

1. Advanced Trainer
2. Law Enforcement Trainer
3. Advanced Training Methods, including Immersive Training, Computer Based Training, Distance Education.

The 2-4 weeks Study Tour in Australia is projected for the period between November 2011 and March 2012.

Most courses have been offered two times a year.

In response to a request from the INP Chief, a special workshop to address corruption and the lack of interagency communication was developed: the

Integrated Management of Corruption Workshop, conducted six times in 2011, with good representation from law-enforcement agencies (INP, AGO, KPK) and including the BPKP, Tax Department and PPATK. It was very well received by the INP and the broader law enforcement community. Each session closed with the signing of an integrity pact among participants and considerable media coverage.

ii. *numbers of Participants:*

Expected output by end of Project: 1800 participants trained (this number includes participants from Cluster 2 Trainer Development Programme)

Output achieved for Cluster 1 (to end of June 2011): 985 participants have been trained overall.<sup>33</sup>

Output achieved for Cluster 2: <sup>34</sup>

Module 1: 50 participants (INP: 36; KPK: 6; AGO: 6; PPATK: 2)

Module 2 & 3: 44 participants (INP:30; KPK: 6; AGO:6; PPATK:2)

Immersive Training Facilitators' Program: 28 (INP:20; JCLEC Staff: 8)

Although participants were predominantly INP/CID personnel, there has been proportionately good representation from other law enforcement agencies, with AGO/State level attorneys, the second largest law enforcement agency after the INP, sending the most participants after the INP (e.g. for the period January 2011- June 2011, INP: 359; AGO 60)<sup>35</sup>.

---

<sup>33</sup> Out of a total of 1011; this number has been disaggregated to distinguish specific objective 1 from specific objective 2. Source: *IDN T80 Semi Annual Progress report, 1 January 2011 – 31 June 2011*.

<sup>34</sup> It is assumed from interviews that most participants follow the full course from Module 2 through 3; however, this is not made clear in the numbers as they are reported.

<sup>35</sup> These numbers have not been disaggregated by specific objective. Some of the figures do not seem to tally with the numbers in the separate evaluation reports, e.g. 3 participants from KPK, although there were 12 KPK participants in the trainer development courses.

iii. *representation of law enforcement agencies in all programmes:*<sup>36</sup>

INP: 515

PPATK (23)

Attorney General's Office: 35

State Attorney: 31

Supreme Courts: 13

High Courts: 12

KPK: 49

NGOs:

ICW: 1

KP2KKN: 1

PUKAT: 1

LBH: 6

The average age of the alumni (39.5 years) reflects the seniority of participants, i.e. appropriate to the aim of training for mid- and high-level management.

The representation of participants from the different law enforcement (and related) agencies furthers the goal of enhancing inter-agency communication and cooperation. Most participants interviewed expressed high appreciation for the way in which the mix of participants in the trainings helped to break down what was called "sectoral ego" among trainees and alumni from different law enforcement agencies and encouraged the formation of informal networks, though they continued to emphasize that there were strong formal obstacles to inter-agency cooperation, and that there was a lack of participation from the courts

---

<sup>36</sup> May 2011 Project Overview, Powerpoint Presentation by AIT Project Manager, presented to evaluator 3 August 2011.

(attributed to the tendency of judges to protect their independence) although Kemitraan's Criminal Justice Management and Strategic Criminal Justice Improvement courses were attended by several representatives from the Supreme and High Courts. In his closing speech for the Integrated Management of Corruption Workshop (August 2011), the Deputy Chief of Police noted that defense lawyers had not been included in the workshop although they play an important role in the prosecution of corruption cases.

Although in terms of relative size representation of different law enforcement agencies is good, there was a perception among some alumni and trainers—mostly non INP—that INP representation was too dominant.<sup>37</sup> Others felt that JCLEC presented a good forum for building cooperation, that beginning with the same training at the very least begins to introduce change into the patterns of sectoral thinking.<sup>38</sup>

Conversely, Polda representation is not as high as it should be, since the majority of participants come from CID headquarters (Bareskrim - 441)<sup>39</sup> The 1/10/2010-31/3/2011 Progress Report<sup>40</sup> provides a useful distribution of INP participants which shows that 60% of participants at the time came from CID divisions within INP Headquarters, while only 16% came from INP Regions Criminal Units (DitReskrim — from all Polda except West Sulawesi), with the remaining 24% coming from other units such as Brimob and Sespim (the Police Command School).<sup>41</sup>

---

<sup>37</sup> For example, total number of prosecutors in Indonesia: 3721 (data from 2007 and 2008. <http://hukumonline.com/berita/baca/lt4d763a9d76c46/jumlah-hakim-dan-jaksa-berlebih>). INP investigators total more than 14,000 (source: CID school Head, in interview, August 2011).

<sup>38</sup> Senior prosecutors from the AGO who have been involved as speakers in some courses.

<sup>39</sup> Numbers in the 1/1/2011-31/6/2011 report do not appear to distinguish between Bareskrim/INP Headquarters and and DitReskrim Polda Metro Jaya (Greater Jakarta Metropolitan area).

<sup>40</sup> *Transnational Crime and Criminal Justice Project, Second Progress Report: 1 October 2010 to 31 March 2011.*

<sup>41</sup> Note: the pie chart seems to show the opposite proportions and needs to be corrected.

The Transnational Crime Centre, which is part of the same set of cooperation agreements between the INP and AFP as is JCLEC, is located in INP Headquarters in Jakarta, and this may be one reason for the overwhelming numbers of Bareskrim participants. However, the INP policy of decentralisation has placed greater emphasis on the Polres as Operating Core (KOD – Kesatuan Operasional Dasar)<sup>42</sup> and the low Polda participation rates in the courses do not reflect this important development in the direction of demilitarisation of the police. The gradual shift at JCLEC away from a somewhat single-minded focus on counter-terrorism training towards other transnational crime investigation, especially the emphasis on corruption and financial crime would benefit criminal investigators at the Polda/Polres levels. One of the unintended consequences of Indonesia's decentralisation has been the spread of corruption to the levels of province and regency, especially in resource-rich areas, where other crimes with strong transnational dimensions such as illegal logging and fishing, trafficking of women and children, and border-related incidents are rampant.

*iv. evaluation methods.*

The courses are reinforced by excellent evaluation methods. These include pre- and post-tests, using the four-level Kirkpatrick Evaluation Model; wisely, this essentially subjective model is now supplemented with objective testing, which, somewhat surprisingly, often show higher levels of learning than the subjective levels do.<sup>43</sup> The evaluation reports ask participants how often they use the knowledge/skills in their they have gained from the courses in their jobs and encourage them to write up concrete examples. Overall, levels of satisfaction are very high and participants felt that the learning outcomes were useful to them in their work. Gauging the impact of training and education on organisational performance is never a simple, causal process, and different types of evaluation strategies are sometimes employed concurrently or in stages.

---

<sup>42</sup> See, e.g. as outlined in INP Grand Strategy and Strategic plans to 2014.

<sup>43</sup> This is possibly related to the non-contextual nature of the Kirkpatrick model.

The evaluation has not yet been supplemented by interviews with supervisors to gauge improvements in actual performance. At the meeting with key INP officials in the office of the Deputy Chief of Police (July 25, 2011, INP HQ), the deputy head of the CID body gave a presentation showing activities related to UNODC projects, including JCLEC, which specifically mentions evaluating post-training on the job performance of CID participants at JCLEC /UNODC courses.<sup>44</sup> However, to what extent these internal INP evaluations have actually been carried out and what they measure is unclear, but it does offer a possibility for the Project/AIT to take this up further with the INP.<sup>45</sup>

Overall the courses are well received and fit the needs of the INP, especially the CID.<sup>46</sup> Discussion at the CID school (Pusdik Reskrim, in Megamendung, West Java) showed responses to the courses were good. <sup>47</sup> Participants in the discussion here, including the Head of the School, said that the emphasis on transnational crime investigation was very useful, although it was felt that there should be more cases that fit the Indonesian legal context and address how to conduct criminal investigation within the context of human rights and gender.<sup>48</sup>

The Trainer Development Programme and the educational tools introduced were also considered extremely useful, particularly in changing the entrenched military culture still prevailing in the INP educational system.

---

<sup>44</sup> *Bahan Presentasi Kabareskrim dalam Rangka Evaluasi Proyek UNODC*, Kepala Badan Reserse Kriminal Polri, 25 July 2011. Copy obtained from Ms. Monica Tanuhandaru, UNODC.

<sup>45</sup> Interviews with other INP officials and with the CID school seem to indicate that there are no appropriate evaluation tools to measure quality and job performance.

<sup>46</sup> CID/Bareskrim presentation for the evaluation, 26 July 2011.

<sup>47</sup> Because of the fasting month, there were no classes so most of the instructors were away; however, the Head and Deputy Head of the School were present for the interview as were two trainers who had participated in the transnational crime course.

<sup>48</sup> In line with INP policy, see INP Strategic Plan 2010-2014.

One issue raised has to do with certification of the courses. It was felt that without certification, the courses at JCLEC do not count for very much towards career development and that training at the CID School is weighted far more in career reviews. JCLEC itself also views certification as an important step in its capacity building.<sup>49</sup>

Among non-INP participants, there was some disagreement on the use of adult education methods to impart information. While agreeing with the principles, a few alumni felt that this was not the most efficient way to get across sufficient information in a limited period of time, especially when participants in the courses had little or no background in the field. Class size (on average 50) was considered to be too large for the effective use of the adult learning method, although the syndicates helped. Other participants, including one from KPK who had attended the Specialized Management of Financial Crime course felt that the adult education method employed was appropriate for the material.

The courses also meet the needs of the AGO/regional level prosecutors. According to a member of the Task Force for Special Crimes at the Attorney General's Office, training in management of corruption and financial crime and the like cover more recent developments in the area of financial crime that are not taught in the prosecutor education and training schools. Because the Indonesian legal system compartmentalizes criminal investigation, prosecutors are not familiar with the type of criminal investigation the police do. Since only 40% of the prosecutors have a *sarjana* degree<sup>50</sup> and it is difficult to gain access to outside training, most prosecutors are reliant on in-house training facilities, which continue to reflect the strongly militarised culture. Trainer Development courses are thus very useful for

---

<sup>49</sup> See JCLEC Protocol, p. 4. This was also mentioned by the Director of Programs.

<sup>50</sup> Tertiary level degree, generally equated with the Bachelor's degree, although the Sarjana Hukum is a professional degree which enables the holder to practice law. The rest of the prosecutors gain their education from in-house training, with a few having access to international education.

individual AGO trainers, though there is no guarantee that the changes will have much institutional impact.<sup>51</sup>

One area in which almost all participants were agreed was that the quality of translations/interpretation is not very good. Many of the translators were not familiar with the specialized terminology. They suggested that translators also be included in the evaluations.

v. *National Faculty*: to date, five of the six projected national faculty have been hired, although there was significant delay in the hirings because there was insufficient initial response to the job postings. Two National Faculty on secondment from INP were hired in January 2011, the three non-INP faculty were hired in May and June, 2011. One person hired from the INP, has yet to join the faculty, apparently because he has not yet been officially released from his current INP duties. One trainer from the INP, with a Densus 88 background has solid experience in transnational crime investigation and handling and is currently being prepared to take over the course on Combating Transnational Crime (NPIA) and is projected to be able to take over from the international trainers by early 2012.<sup>52</sup> The other INP trainer is from LEMDIKPOL, has a background as master trainer at IOM, experience with international standards, a strong human rights training background, and advanced degrees in law. The non-INP national faculty variously have academic backgrounds in corruption and finance, and one has a law degree (Sarjana Hukum)<sup>53</sup> as well as experience with other international law-enforcement capacity building programmes and knowledge of the workings of the INP down to the level of the sub-district command (Polsek). Since the hirings were done from a fairly small pool of applicants, it is not clear to what extent the selection process included criteria for specialisation.

---

<sup>51</sup> Interviews, FGDs with alumni from the AGO, but also with speakers from the AGO who have participated in some of the courses.

<sup>52</sup> Interview, Derek Ward, CSU, international trainer for the Combating Transnational Crime Course.

<sup>53</sup> The Sarjana Hukum is the degree required to practice law.

The INP faculty felt that being recruited for the Project opened up good opportunities for further development of skills and knowledge and appreciated the opportunity to view problems in transnational crime investigation and handling from the broader law enforcement perspective, nationally and internationally. They identified the still rigid adherence to rank within the INP educational system as a problem for courses at JCLEC, especially when trainers are of lower rank than those being trained. However, they felt that the atmosphere at JCLEC helps to dissolve this.<sup>54</sup>

The newly recruited national faculty (non INP) expressed some confusion as to their position and identified a kind of “dualism” between UNODC and JCLEC on work-related matters for which they had not been properly prepared. Having to participate in course closing ceremonies/dinners and early Friday morning physical exercises was not something that they had foreseen. All agreed that flexibility was built into the system but were unsure about how this worked. They did not have clear guidelines about their responsibilities to JCLEC management as separate from the UNODC Project or about responding to outside requests for their expertise.

There is also a degree of tension and confusion as to their relationship to the INP — this includes those on secondment from the INP. Many of the confusions can be attributed to the fact that the non-INP faculty have only been on the job a couple of months and need adjustment to the rhythms of the Project/JCLEC. However, there does not yet seem to be a clear-cut policy on the National Faculty (which may come out of the meetings scheduled for next year) and to date there are no specific agreements/MOUs with JCLEC on the National Faculty.

---

<sup>54</sup> The ranks of the two police trainers are Police Commissioner (Komisaris Polisi/Kompol) and Police Commissioner Adjutant (Ajun Komisaris Polisi/AKP). Mid-level managers are generally of higher rank.

Cluster 3 is yet to be implemented:

The Task Force is projected to be established in January 2012. Procedures and criteria for selection have yet to be worked out. This is a key component for long-term development and forming the task force should be planned out with care to make sure that the best possible individuals are selected.

Continuity Plan for National Faculty depends upon the exit strategy for the project and the strategic direction for JCLEC. However, two of the National Faculty have already taught sessions in non Project JCLEC courses (in INP management and human rights). This supports the plan for their absorption into JCLEC.

Strategic direction for JCLEC: to date there are as yet no specific activities to develop these.

Cluster 4: this cluster too remains to be fully implemented, and also depends on the results of planning and ideas about certification/having the courses accepted for credit in continuing graduate/post-graduate education/training with partner universities abroad, including especially Charles Sturt University, Australia.

Strategic academic partners have yet to be identified.

Regional workshops have been attended by Diponegoro University and Gajah Mada University.

One of the National Faculty is also a senior lecturer at Diponegoro University in Semarang.

Meetings have been held with University of Indonesia and Gajah Mada University and Discussions have been done with the University of British Columbia, Canada. Provisions for the National Faculty Exchange Program have been made and two national faculty have been sent on a Study Tour to NPIA/Bramshill, UK, and other police institutes in Europe.

A Regional Transnational Crime Training Forum was held in March 2011, with participants from Australia, Malaysia, Thailand, Pakistan, Hong Kong, Canada,

Germany, the United Kingdom, China, Turkey, Cambodia, the Philippines and Interpol.

Without a worked out plan for establishing linkages, this could be a hit or miss proposition.

A key objective of this cluster has been fulfilled, i.e. installation of the Immersive Training Facility, for which JCLEC has made available the space for the full suite, including a control room. The project has installed the hardware, including equipment for the control room, and the software has been purchased and customised to make it bilingual (English and Indonesian). A training course in the use of the equipment has been conducted (see Cluster 2 above), and the immersive training facility (called KERIS in Indonesian), has been used in the Senior Management of Investigation Course (March 2011).

Participants in FGDs/Interviews who have undergone the course all agreed it was excellent. The main requests was to improve the quality of the translation and make better adjustments to the Indonesian situation and human rights/gender needs.

#### **D. Institutional and management arrangements and constraints.**

The complexity of the project and the shortcoming in its conceptualization makes this a challenging project to manage/coordinate. UNODC as lead agency through its Jakarta office provides backstopping for the Action Implementation Team (AIT), located at JCLEC in Semarang. Procurement and hiring are done by UNDP, which introduces an extra layer of administration, which has been partly the cause of delays in hiring that have posed obstacles to the timely implementation of the Project. Monthly visits to Jakarta by the Project Manager and other staff help to sort out issues although who the lead person for the project is at the Jakarta office is not always clear. The ROM of 2010 has pointed out problems involved in the lack of a finance officer dedicated to the project. While the latter problem has been remedied by hiring a highly experienced finance officer for the Project in Semarang, the

absence of a lead person for the Project at the Jakarta office is cause for concern not only because coordination is difficult but also because it may signal the kind of conceptual gap between Jakarta and Semarang, as indicated in I.A. (project design) above.

Coordination with the Consortium members takes place through the Consortium Working Group. Coordination with key stakeholders to some extent is enabled through the Governing Board for the Project on which JCLEC, the INP (including representation from LEMDIKPOL) and the EC are represented. Through the Governing Board, course offerings are coordinated with existing JCLEC training plans and with INP training programmes. The Project Manager acts as secretary to the bi-annual meetings of the Governing Board. This arrangement enables the Project to be responsive to requests from the INP. Since the appointment January 2011 of the (Indonesia) Executive Director of JCLEC as head of transnational training (Pusdikjatrans) under LEMDIKPOL, coordination with the INP has been strengthened (compared to the situation when the ROM was conducted in 2010)<sup>55</sup>. However, there is a clear need to update agreements to reflect this and to address the matter of the position of the National Faculty vis-à-vis JCLEC and the INP, as described under II.C. v. above. The Executive Director/head of the INP's training centre for transnational crime felt that the Project was very responsive to the needs of the INP, particularly in the design of the curriculum and in management.

The Project generates a significant number of reports since it has to report to both UNODC and to the EC. A Results Oriented Monitoring (ROM) was conducted in 2010, not long after the formation of the full AIT. However, the ROM recommendations for revising the log-frame (and thus the logics) of the Project, while perhaps useful for minute monitoring purposes are not all that useful for understanding the logic and scope of the Project. This is addressed under II.B. above.

---

<sup>55</sup> Though this position is still temporarily held by Inspector General Boy Salamuddin, he is soon to be replaced.

Financial reporting is also a complex matter since the AIT must follow separate guidelines for UNODC and the EC. JCLEC also has different reporting formats. In addition, because of the transnational nature of the Consortium, financial reporting has to contend with different currencies and changing exchange rates.

### **III. OUTCOMES, IMPACT AND SUSTAINABILITY**

#### **A. Outcomes**

To date the main outcomes have been increased understanding of transnational crime at the INP/CID and INP's LEMDIKPOL, and to some extent at the Polda level. As evidenced from the 3 month post-course surveys, most alumni report that this knowledge has been useful to them.

The establishment of informal networks among alumni from different law enforcement agencies has increased informal cooperation among them and in some cases this has already led to improved handling of transnational crime.

The Integrated Management of Corruption Workshop has shown the responsiveness of the Project to the INP and the law enforcement environment in Indonesia. Media reports on this workshop are likely to increase public awareness of efforts by Indonesia's law enforcement agencies to combat corruption and address weaknesses in inter-agency communication. The media events coordinated by the AIT around the workshop create a good working model for working with the media and help to break down the barriers around JCLEC, which has generally been wary of media attention<sup>56</sup>.

---

<sup>56</sup> See Protocol on the fairly strict control over information about JCLEC programmes to the media.

JCLEC has access to a pool of expert trainers and the national faculty, and has increased its roster of course offerings, especially in combating transnational crime and management. Most significantly, the trainer development programme and the immersive training facility already installed have substantially improved its education and training capacity.

Better knowledge of and skills in employing adult education methods has begun to be incorporated into the CID School and also, to a much lesser extent, to the AGO education and training centre.

## **B. Impact**

As is the case with most work in education and training, the future impact of this fairly short-term project is difficult to assess at this moment. Critical mass, especially of trainers, and the introduction and long-term retention of solid management practices are required.

The cascade method of the TOTs and the pool of expert trainers, with good and appropriate management and close cooperation with LEMDIKPOL, has the potential for significant impact on the quality of investigators at the INP/CID, not only in tackling transnational crime but also on other crime investigations. The introduction of universal principles of good policing that accompanies the trainings can have a needed impact on the modernisation of police education as a whole. This is so especially because the material of the trainings focuses on what is generally recognised as core police work.

There is greater attention to JCLEC at the INP and better understanding of its potential as an advanced training centre for transnational crime that is at least partly to be attributed to the Project and the involvement of the INP in the Governing Board. Inclusion of other law enforcement agencies in the trainings (as participants and as speakers/trainers) has made individual trainers/alumni more

aware of JCLEC as a possible forum for continued exchanges. There is an enormous gap separating individual and institutional knowledge, however, and without critical mass and appropriate management, it is unlikely that there can be much of a longer term impact, especially on the AGO.

One perhaps less beneficial impact of the Project's inclusion of the broader law enforcement community has been the questions raised around the proper vision and mission of JCLEC and criticism of the dominance of the police-oriented material and methods in the trainings. This may be explained in part as caused by a lack of understanding of the historical background of the establishment of JCLEC among non-INP participants but may also highlight the lack of similar cooperative education and training facilities for the other agencies such as the AGO and the judiciary.

The success of informal cooperation networks among participants from different law enforcement agencies may lead to an awareness of the need to formalise such networks but this will take much more attention and management from the Project or from JCLEC.

The potential impact of the trainings in handling and management of transnational crime has yet to be realised through greater participation at the Polda level. There has been some talk (at Kemitraan, National Faculty) about the possibility of holding trainings at the Polda level. If this were to take place, the impact of the trainings would be greatly maximized.

There is a good potential for the Project trainings to have a beneficial impact on the CID School. Already the CID trainers and head of the school have produced course materials on the model of the trainer development courses, and have introduced the use of real case studies and inviting speakers with real experience in transnational crime cases to their own curricula.

JCLEC may be more amenable to media coverage of its activities and more open to involvement from non-police organisations and individuals, thus toning down the perception of it being exclusive and removed from interaction with the world outside its own confines.

### **C. Sustainability.**

The Project as designed is to be commended on having built in key components for sustainability beyond the life of the Project, although the task force and the five year plan have yet to be implemented. The national faculty are an important key to sustainability, as is the pool of expert trainers. As mentioned under II. B above, the number of trainees appears somewhat arbitrary, especially given the rapid staff rotation that marks INP (and AGO) personnel management. The emphasis on building managerial capacity in tackling transnational crime is an important component to sustainability but may well need reinforcement at the Polda level (possibly with trainings at selected Polda) and perhaps INP leadership endorsement through appropriate regulation. Developments at the LEMDIKPOL are promising and it would be appropriate to follow this up with closer coordination, using the access gained through the Governing Board. Sustainability of activities to strengthen in-house training for the INP depends on developing close working relations with LEMDIKPOL and incorporating the trainings into the curriculum, especially of the CID School and AKPOL, but also of the advanced schools, including SESPIM and the STIK, and making sure that some of the expert trainers are fed into those institutions.

The sustainability of the learning outcomes is enhanced by having them incorporated into the SOPs at the CID/Polda. Whether this is to be part of the plans for the task force to be formed is as yet unclear.

Sustainability of efforts at training/education centres at other law enforcement agencies, especially the AGO and the judiciary, is questionable without equal attention to cooperation with management at these agencies.

Building an integrated platform for the management of financial crime/corruption is a long-term activity, extending well beyond the remaining 12 months or so of the Project. How to maintain and build on the momentum achieved through the implementation of the integrated workshops is worth serious consideration by UNODC management.

Key to all this, however, is the sustainability of JCLEC, especially since the Project itself has such a short duration. While the Centre is envisioned as a permanent education and training facility, the founding documents and agreements do not provide clear guidelines for the transfer of the Centre to the INP. In the 2010-2014 INP Strategic Plan and Budget, JCLEC is entered only under “international cooperation for education”, and only its counter-terrorism (PLATINA) training is specified, with a target of producing 200 trainees over the five year period for a total cost of Rp. 31,743,971,000.<sup>57</sup> INP officials interviewed were quite emphatic in stating that INP management and knowledge capacities were as yet insufficient to take over the Centre.

#### **IV. LESSONS LEARNED AND BEST PRACTICES**

##### **A. Lessons learned**

Good project design is based on good analysis of key stakeholders and beneficiaries.

It is not enough to compile a list of stakeholders and beneficiaries without clear explication of their relative positions vis-à-vis the action to be taken.

---

<sup>57</sup> The revised Strategic Plan produced under the new INP Chief was not obtained for this evaluation.

Good working networks create possibilities for sustainability and should be incorporated into the project design.

Multi-dimensional projects require better management at the UNODC country level. This is not to be construed simply as an implementation issue; rather, it has to do with maintaining and reinforcing the vision informing the whole Project, and with making sure that this vision is properly translated into the project's working parts. It also recognises that there are different levels of engagement with stakeholders/beneficiaries and achieving sustainability is unlikely to work without involving high-level policy and decision-makers.

## **B. Best practices**

Involve media in coverage of key events. The way in which the media were invited to cover the Integrated Management of Corruption workshop is a good beginning and helps to raise public awareness of the issues.

Good evaluation methods are important tools for training programmes. The method developed (and still being refined) by the Project provides a fine example for law enforcement agencies.

Using the Training for Trainer method. This cascade method is a proven way to rapidly and efficiently transfer knowledge and skills to target agencies. However, without the backing of institutional policy, impacts upon the target training centres are likely to disappear.

Inter-agency participation in courses. This is a strong point in the design and implementation of the Project. However, to be sustainable, more needs to be done to encourage the political will necessary to formal interagency communication and cooperation.

## **V. RECOMMENDATIONS**

### **A. Issues resolved during the evaluation.**

There was not enough time to resolve issues that came up during the evaluation.

### **B. Actions recommended.**

i. Overall recommendations. Essentially two major actions are recommended to address shortcomings in the project design:

1. UNODC Country Office should play a stronger leading role for the Project, especially at the higher levels of national policy and decision-making required for sustainability. This does not mean interference in the direct implementation of the Project in Semarang, where the job is being adequately handled by the AIT. It does mean more serious attention to developing and/or maintaining good working relations with key decision-makers, including Parliamentarians, and with civil society organisations whose missions and activities are likely to bring them into confrontation with transnational crime. Raising the level of public awareness of the dimensions and impacts of this type of crime is an important element for sustainability; it means working with the media in a concerted and imaginative manner. Network building is seriously lacking in the design of the Project and would be a good way of allocating some of the underspent money from the Project.

2. The UNODC Country Office should consider organising a brief but intensive higher level strategic planning session before the implementation of long-term planning under Cluster 3 and part of Cluster 4. Participants should include, apart

from UNODC/AIT, JCLEC leadership, INP/CID/LEMDIKPOL, with input from other law enforcement agencies.

The strategic planning is best facilitated by an independent but knowledgeable team of persons and would undertake the following:

- Fully and more precisely articulate the strategic position and role of JCLEC in the Project. This includes explication of the Centre's vision and mission, its bilateral nature and its connection to the Transnational Crime Centre at CID/Headquarters.
- Update information on developments at the INP pertaining to transnational crime; perhaps rapid participatory assessment of INP needs, keeping in mind the strategic needs of the Poldas as well as Headquarters/CID/LEMDIKPOL.
- Update information on other key law enforcement agencies.
- Update current social, political and economic national and global conditions.
- On the basis of SWOT-type analysis of the above, identify possibilities for and challenges to the long-term sustainability of JCLEC (including eventual transfer to INP). Are there provisions for training of appropriate INP officials in the management of an institution such as the Centre?
- Against this overall analysis, review the range and extent of Project interventions and in particular Cluster 3 activities including composition of the Task Force. Some questions that might be raised are: Should interventions be restricted to working through JCLEC? Or should the Project undertake direct engagement with the various schools and training centres of different law enforcement agencies, especially at the INP and AGO? Should

Polda-level trainings be organised? If so, how will these be funded? How will Poldas be prioritised?

- Formulate the principles of a sound overall educational policy to serve as a basis for the guidelines for faculty and the pool of trainers (“master trainers”). This policy might include an overall description of the curriculum to serve as a guide for devising and implementing new courses; criteria for participant selection; methods for evaluation; criteria for the selection of speakers, trainers. Human rights should be incorporated into the educational policy, which should also reflect national targets for gender mainstreaming. The educational policy should reflect the needs of the Polda as well as that of the CID/Headquarters.
- Identify strategies to incorporate learning outcomes from the courses into the SOPs at the CID/Polda.

ii. Particular recommendations.

1. National Faculty needs must be addressed in a timely manner. This means clear guidelines and policies should be developed, preferably in a participatory manner. Specific agreements should also be drawn up between the Project/UNODC and JCLEC/INP on the status of the National Faculty. To date, JCLEC appears to have no funds specifically allocated to support the National Faculty at the end of the Project; however, there are provisions for research in the Protocol documents, that might be best used to support the National Faculty.

Faculty meetings should be held separately from administrative meetings.

There should be more consistent efforts at creating a sound intellectual and collegial environment. Some examples of activities:

- set up a library with online access to international digital holdings.
- organise regular faculty discussion sessions to take up different topics related but not restricted to transnational crime and law enforcement. Creativity should be encouraged. Sessions would include other trainers at JCLEC, scholars and practitioners from other educational institutions/civil society organisations in the area (including Salatiga), and would take advantage of visitors to the area to come in as speakers.
- encourage and support research activities.
- design and put into place a system for evaluating the performance of academic duties. This does not have to be very complicated but should be distinguished from the typical performance evaluations for administrative jobs.

2. There should be consistent and systematic activities to create and sustain the pool of expert “master trainers”. This includes drawing up agreements, where possible, with their home agencies, to ensure they will be released when needed.

3. Systematic efforts should be made to increase significantly the number of participants from the Poldas. This should be done in close consultation and cooperation with LEMDIKPOL and CID.

4. Work on refining the evaluation methods should continue. Where possible, the forms should be supplemented by interviews with supervisors to gauge improvement in actual performance. The CID specifically mentions evaluating post-training performance of CID participants, which presents an excellent opportunity to develop this part of the evaluations.

5. Courses should contain more cases that fit the Indonesian legal and security context without losing the transnational dimension nor universal principles of good policing. Courses should equip participants to tackle transnational crime without

violating human rights or gender rights. It would be a good idea to develop and maintain a bank of case-studies that could also be made available to the pool of master trainers.

6. Develop a uniform terminology for transnational crime for all courses in cooperation with academic specialists. One of the less beneficial outcomes of international cooperation has been the proliferation of new terms. This has caused confusion in the field as well as in trainings.<sup>i</sup> The National Faculty have also expressed the need for a standard terminology for transnational crime. However, in order to be effective beyond the trainings, there should be consistent steps taken in coordination with LEMDIKPOL (and other relevant training centres) to have the terminology officially adopted.

7. Improve the quality of translators/interpreters for the courses. A standard terminology will be a big help here but selection of translators/interpreters should conform to criteria developed specifically for JCLEC with input from academics and expert practitioners.

8. Translations of the computer-based programmes and of the Immersive installation into the Indonesian language should be reviewed and improved. An expert translator, preferably with a university background, should be consulted to ensure quality. Cooperation with the Lembaga Bahasa Internasional (International Language Institute) at the University of Indonesia will be useful.

9. Devise and implement activities aimed at strengthening the informal interagency alumni networks now in place.

10. Study possibilities for accreditation of courses. This should be done with JCLEC and INP, but should involve experts in matters of certification and accreditation.

## **VI. OVERALL CONCLUSIONS**

In its focus on combating transnational crime, the Project addresses a dimension of law enforcement that has only fairly recently gained attention of the broad law enforcement community and the public at large. The emphasis on training for managers and the cascade method for TOT are key elements for sustainability. The strategy of capacity building for the INP and other law-enforcement agencies through the JCLEC streamlines the process and is quite likely the most efficient way of fulfilling INP needs in this area for the medium-term.

## Annex 1

### ***TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR MID TERM EVALUATION OF UNODC PROJECT; “SUPPORT TO IMPROVED SECURITY BY PROVISION OF CAPACITY BUILDING TO THE JAKARTA CENTRE FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT COOPERATION (JCLEC).”***

#### **PROJECT NO: IDN T80**

#### **1. BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

“Support to improved security by provision of capacity building to the Jakarta Centre for Law Enforcement (JCLEC)” IDN T80 (the Transnational Crime and Criminal Justice Project) is a United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) project aimed at improving the rule of law and security in Indonesia by strengthening the investigative and management capacities of the Indonesian National Police (INP) and other law enforcement agencies so that they are better able to detect, prevent and investigate serious transnational crime. The project has the specific objective of supplementing the capacity of JCLEC to train INP officers and other law enforcement personnel in the skills necessary for tackling transnational crime by establishing a comprehensive training and staff development programme. The project commenced in November 2009 and is scheduled for completion in November 2012.

In this regard, the project aims to achieve the following particular objectives:

- to improve the ability of the INP and other law enforcement agencies to investigate transnational crime by imparting specialised skills and knowledge on priority crime areas to 1,470 INP officers (focusing particularly on the senior ranks of the Criminal Investigations Division – CID), and 300 staff members of the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK), the Financial Transaction Reports and Analysis Centre (PPATK), the Attorney-General's Office (AGO) and the courts. Training courses will focus on crimes like terrorism, money laundering, corruption, transnational organised crime and cross cutting issues like legislation, management of intelligence and forensics, investigation management, information sharing and international crime cooperation.
- to improve investigation management and information sharing amongst police managers, particularly regional managers of the CID (POLDA), through customised training modules.
- to improve training capacity in the INP and other law enforcement agencies through specialised, cumulative training to 40 internal trainers from INP training schools, which will also enhance the sustainability of the Action's training courses.
- to recruit and train local trainers to assist with the training courses and to facilitate

the inclusion of these trainers within JCLEC's permanent staff to enhance the projects sustainability and local ownership of the project.

- to develop a five year training and education plan for JCLEC, establish training quality standards guidelines for the Centre and conduct staff development workshops for JCLEC academic staff in order to strengthen JCLEC as a training institute.
- to forge institutional links between JCLEC and training institutions in European Union and ASEAN member countries in order to enhance JCLEC's academic excellence.
- Lay foundations of a long term real life simulation based training facility by installing a simulation based immersive training platform.

The UNODC is the leading agency of the implementation of the project and its partners in the development and the delivery of the project are the Partnership for Governance Reform (Kemitraan) Indonesia, National Policing Improvement Agency (International Academy Bramshill) UK, and the Associate partner is Charles Sturt University, Australia.

In addition, the training component of the project is also designed to facilitate inter-agency networking and cross-fertilisation of knowledge through integrated training programmes involving police, other investigators and analysts, judges and prosecutors.

The stakeholder groups impacted by the project outcomes are Indonesian National Police (INP), Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK), Attorney-General's Office (AGO), the Financial Transaction Reports and Analysis Centre (PPATK), JCLEC, the courts, TAX office (DJP) and the Financial and Development Supervision Agency (BPKP) and the general public of Indonesia.

The period of the project is 36 months. The project commenced in November 2009 and was engaged in preparative activities until training delivery commenced in April 2010. The project is located in Indonesia, specifically Semarang, Central Java. The project is using JCLEC facilities such as classrooms, hostel and other facility in JCLEC based on a signed MOU between the Project and JCLEC at the outset.

The Action Implementation Team (AIT) is headed by an International Coordinator who has a professional policing background in addition to project management experience. Technical staff consist of two experienced international faculty with law enforcement background. There are six positions for national faculty within the project. In addition to National Faculty staff a Finance and Administration Officer, also works as UNODC staff in the project. Three administrative staff and a driver are also attached to the project through the application of MOU with JCLEC.

The Action (the Project Document) stipulates that an external evaluation will be undertaken by an independent evaluator who will operate according to broad Terms of Reference developed by the Governing Board. The evaluator will conduct one mid-term and one terminal review of the Action, focusing on the effectiveness and impact of activities at both these stages of the Action. The results of the mid-term review will

assist the Action Implementation Team and the Governing Board in making any necessary adjustments to activities in order to achieve planned outcomes and results. This will help to keep the Action dynamic and responsive to changing needs during the course of the Action. The TOR of the Mid Term Evaluation has been approved by the Chair of the Governing Board, Mr. BG. Boy Salamuddin on 27<sup>th</sup> of June 2011.

## **2. PURPOSE OF THE EVALUATION**

This project requires an independent, external, mid-term evaluation. As stipulated on the original Project Document and document called the “Action” on item no 1.8.4 which covers the Procedures for follow-up and internal/external evaluation,

*“External evaluation will be undertaken by an independent evaluator who will operate according to broad Terms of Reference developed by the Governing Board. The evaluator will conduct one mid-term and one terminal review of the Action, focusing on the effectiveness and impact of activities at both these stages of the Action. The results of the mid-term review will assist the Action Implementation Team (AIT) and the Governing Board in making any necessary adjustments to activities in order to achieve planned outcomes and results. This will help to keep the Action dynamic and responsive to changing needs during the course of the Action.”*

The Action Implementation Team (AIT) of the Transnational Crime and Criminal Justice Project initiated the process on behalf of implementing agency of the project, namely United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC). Mid term evaluation is meant to be conducted after 18 months of the starting of the project. The evaluation is aimed at looking for the overall performance and achievements, of the project to date, in line with its objectives and project purposes. In particular the evaluation will consider the relevance, performance, and outputs of the project and provide recommendations for the remaining half of the project period. As stipulated in the Action main stakeholders of the project are Indonesian Law Enforcement Agencies, particularly INP, KPK, AGO. Thus they are the main stakeholders of the evaluation. The evaluation will be managed by the lead implementing agency, the UNODC Project Coordinator of Transnational Crime and Criminal Justice Project Mr. Greg Linsdell. Implementing partners or Consortium members of the project, Charles Sturt University of Australia, National Policing Improvement Agency of UK, and Kemitraan partnership of Indonesia are also among the main stakeholders of the evaluation. The evaluation intends to get the involvement of the main stakeholders by giving them the opportunity to reflect their inputs and satisfaction level towards the project. The stakeholders will be the Core Learning Partners. An evaluation team, which will comprise of one international and one national, will be set up.

The evaluation team will be tasked with conducting an evaluation of mid term of the above project that will address:

- Both the quantitative and qualitative elements of its actual delivery, activities and outputs as regards the intended and expected delivery, activities and outputs set out in

the original 'Project Document' and subsequent revised costed work-plans.

- The identification of any 'good practice' or areas for further development.
- Issues that are related to the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability
- Recommendations that will confirm, amend or add to the activities and outputs for remaining period of the project that were set out in the original 'project document'

The 'Evaluation Team' will be expected to report their findings and recommendations before the end of August 2011.

### 3. EVALUATION SCOPE

#### **General**

The project activities and objectives are detailed within the project document referred to as "The Action". The evaluation will cover the period November 2009 - July 2011.

The evaluation will focus on the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability; and evaluate the work of the project against the requirements of The Action and in particular the evaluation will report on the following key questions.

#### **Key evaluation questions that could be answered by the evaluation. (Questions provided below are only for reference. As such, the evaluator is not necessarily limited by the questions provided)**

**Relevance**, evaluate the pertinence of project objectives and purposes in relation to the project expected impact, target groups, direct and indirect beneficiaries.

- Does the project still respond to the needs of the target groups?
- Are there suitable and informative targets, e.g. are they Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic and Time-bound (SMART)?
- Are the activities, outputs and outcomes planned appropriate to achieve the project outcomes?
- Are the risks and assumptions holding true? Are risk management arrangements in place?
- Is the current design sufficiently supported by all stakeholders?
- Is the sustainability strategy (handing over strategy to partners) fully understood by the partners?
- Are the objectives clearly understood by the project partners?
- Is the timescale and/or range of activities realistic with regard to the stakeholders' capacities
- Is the current design sufficiently taking cross-cutting issues into account?

**Effectiveness**, evaluate project effectiveness “to what extent has the project produced its desired results”

- How well is the project achieving its planned results?
- Have the planned results to date been achieved?
- Are the targets for the project appropriate and are they being reported against?
- What is the quality of the results/services available?
- Have all planned target groups access to/ using project results available so far?
- Are there any factors which prevent target groups accessing the results/services?
- To what extent has the project adapted or is able to adapt to changing external conditions (risks and assumptions) in order to ensure benefits for the target groups?
- If any unplanned negative effects on target groups occurred, or are likely to occur through the project, to what extent did the project management take appropriate measures?
- To what extent are unplanned positive effects contributing to results produced/ services provided?

**Efficiency**, evaluate the project efficiency “to what degree have resources been optimized during the project implementation, and has the project achieved satisfactory level of cost effectiveness”

- How well is the availability/usage of means/inputs managed?
- To what degree are inputs provided/ available on time to implement activities from all parties involved?
- To what degree are inputs provided/ available at planned cost (or lower than planned), from all parties involved?
- Are inputs monitored regularly to encourage cost-effective implementation of activities? By whom are they monitored?
- Are project resources managed in a transparent and accountable manner?
- Are all contractual procedures clearly understood and do they facilitate the implementation of the project?
- How well is the implementation of activities managed?
- Is there a management tool used? If not, why not?
- Is an activity schedule (or work plan) and resource schedule available and used by the project management and other relevant parties?
- To what extent are activities implemented as scheduled? If there are delays how can they be rectified?
- Are funds committed and spent in line with the implementation timescale? If not, why not?
- How well activities are monitored by the project and are corrective measures taken if required?
- How well are outputs achieved?
- Have all planned outputs been delivered to date? And in a logic sequence?
- What is the quality of outputs to date?
- Are the outputs achieved likely to contribute to the intended results?
- Do the inter-institutional structures e.g. steering committees, monitoring systems, allow efficient project implementation?
- Have all partners been able to provide their financial and/or HR contributions?

**Sustainability**, evaluate the project sustainability “to what extent the outcomes will be followed after the life of the project” especially with regards to the retention of the service provided by the National Faculties by JCLEC.

- If the services/results have to be supported institutionally, are funds likely to be made available? If so, by whom?
- Are the services/results affordable for the target groups at the completion of project?
- Can the benefits be maintained if economic factors change (e.g. commodity prices, exchange rate)?
- Are the beneficiaries and/or relevant authorities/institutions able to afford maintenance or replacement of the technologies/services introduced by the project?
- Is there a financial/ economic phase-out strategy? If so, how likely is it to be implemented
- What is the level of ownership of the project by target groups and will it continue after the end of external support?
- To what extent are relevant target groups actively involved in decision-making concerning project orientation and implementation?
- What is the likelihood that target groups will continue to make use of relevant results?
- Do the target groups have any plans to continue delivering the stream of benefits and if so, are they likely to materialise?
- Is any public and private sector policy support likely to continue after the project has finished?
- How well is the project contributing to institutional and management capacity?
- How far is the project embedded in institutional structures that are likely to survive beyond the life of the project?
- Will adequate levels of suitable qualified human resource be available to continue to deliver the project’s stream of benefits?

**Impact**, evaluate the project impact and its contribution to the strengthening of the rule of law and better handling the transnational crime challenges What has the project achieved.

- What are the direct impact prospects of the project at Overall Objectives level?
- What, if any impacts are already apparent?
- What impacts appear likely?
- Are the current targets realistic and are they likely to be met?
- Are any external factors likely to jeopardise the project’s direct impact?
- To what extent does/will the project have any indirect positive and/or negative impacts? (i.e. environmental, social, cultural, gender and economic)
- Have there been/ will there be any unplanned positive impacts on the planned target groups or other non-targeted communities arising from the project? How did this affect the impact?
- Did the project take timely measures for mitigating the unplanned negative impacts? What was the result?
- Do donor coherence, complementarity and coordination exist and have any indirect impact on the project?

**Partnership and cooperation**, evaluate the partnership and cooperation level established by the project implementation so far.

- Are there good relations with new or existing institutions and are there plans to continue with some or all of the project's activities?
- Are project partners being properly developed (technically, financially and managerially) for continuing to deliver the project's benefits/services?
- How flexible is the project in adapting to changing needs?
- How does the project co-ordinate with other similar interventions to encourage synergy and avoid overlaps?

**Cross cutting issues**, evaluate the extent to which the project implementation is responding to in terms of some cross cutting issues, such as, gender, environment, Human Rights, the rule of law etc.

- To what extent has the project included *gender sensitivity* in the implementation of its interventions?
- To what extent has the project included *Human Rights* in the implementation of its interventions?
- To what extent has the project included *the rule of law* in the implementation of its interventions?
- To what extent has the project contributed directly or indirectly towards the development of gender sensitive approach in trainings?
- What is the percentage of women trained by the project?

**Lessons learned and best practices**, in addition, attention should be paid to the lessons learned and best practices applied in the project so far.

- What lessons can be learned from the project implementation in order to improve performance, results and effectiveness in the future?
- What best practices emerged from the project implementation?
- What lessons can be drawn from unintended results?
- Improvements that can be made to gender and cross cutting issues within the life of the project.

#### **4. EVALUATION METHODS**

The evaluation team will conduct a qualitative and quantitative assessment of the project progress. The evaluation should be conducted in a number of phases. These phases will include:

- The submission of an evaluation methodology and work plan. This should be submitted to IEU for review and approval before beginning the field research.
- A desk review of relevant reports and data that will mainly address quantitative issues;
- A field-research visit to Semarang, Indonesia where more qualitative issues can be addressed and finally
- The production of the report of evaluations team's findings and recommendations.

**Desk Review.** During the desk review, the written material that should be examined may include but may not be limited to:

- The original Project Document (The Action) and any subsequent costed work-plans;
- The main project reports (yearly, six-monthly progress reports, which will include key budgetary information);
- Minutes and conclusions of Governing Board and Consortium meetings;
- Details of course outlines and profiles;
- Progressive copies of Projects Calendar;
- Information on the pattern of student attendance at the courses;
- Summaries of the course evaluations;
- Information on the activities of project implementation team
- Any other material that would be relevant.

**Field-Research Visit.** This will involve a field visit to Semarang, Indonesia of approximately 4-5 days. Whilst it is anticipated that all the necessary research can be conducted within Semarang it may be necessary to conduct a short side-visit to Jakarta: The purpose of this field visit is to conduct;

- Face-to-face discussions with the UNODC staff including members of the project implementation team. The evaluation team should provide, some days in advance of their visit, a note summarising those issues that they would particularly look to explore further and a proposed schedule.
- A visual examination of the infrastructure and facilities existing at JCLEC.
- Observation of ‘Training in action’ in one of the training courses that may be ongoing during their visit. Timing is to coincide with delivery of a program.
- Discussions with target audience, beneficiaries and stakeholders (could be done via video conferencing)
- Discussions with past and present students and their line managers. (Ideally this would be conducted in Semarang but it may be necessary for an additional meeting in for example Jakarta).

**The preparation of a written report.** The evaluation team should submit a draft report to the project manager for review for factual errors or omissions and also to IEU for quality assurance and clearance. This should record the findings of the review, and any associated observations, recommendations, action plans, etc, which should be delivered to the UNODC and project implementation team in final form on a date to be agreed but in any case before the end of August 2011.

In conducting the evaluation, the evaluator needs to take account of relevant international standards, including the UNODC Independent Evaluation Unit (IEU) Evaluation Policy and Guidelines<sup>58</sup> and the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Norms and Standards.

## **5. EVALUATION TEAM COMPOSITION**

The evaluation team will comprise of one international and one national evaluator selected by UNODC, who preferably have experience in law enforcement and education. UNODC will facilitate the recruitment process and provide administrative and logistics support to the evaluation team. The international evaluation expert will have experience in monitoring and evaluation with law/sociology /education background and a good command of data collection and interviewing techniques. S/he will be familiar with project management or have experience in similar capacity building projects. S/he will be the team leader. S/he must have a good understanding of the Indonesian context of law enforcement and rule of law. An essential requirement will be a good knowledge and background on police/justice sector, human rights and gender issues. The evaluation experts are expected to have a good rapport with the Indonesian Law Enforcement. Evaluators will not act as representatives of any party and must remain independent and impartial. Both the international and national evaluators should have advanced university degree (master's degree or equivalent) in criminology, law, public administration or political science. They must have a minimum of 10 years of professional experience on work relating to monitoring and evaluation. Both the international and national evaluators must be fluent in English. National evaluator must be fluent in Bahasa Indonesia. Knowledge of Bahasa Indonesia for international evaluator is considered to be an asset.

The national evaluation expert should have proven skills in collecting data, interviewing skills, have a good understanding in the nature of the capacity building projects and s/he should act as the facilitator for the interviews as most of them could possibly be in Bahasa Indonesia. S/he should assist international expert in data collection and examination.

Both the international and national evaluators should be independent and not have any past or expected future associations with the project.

Costs associated with the transportation/accommodation cost for evaluators will be borne by the project.

## **6. PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS**

The evaluation team will be briefed on the project by the UNODC Project Coordinator on his/her arrival to the region. The essential project documents will be sent to the evaluator in advance to allow for preliminary familiarization with the project subject and preparation of the inception report.

UNODC Project Coordinator and the project staff in Semarang will provide necessary substantive and administrative support during the expert's field visits. Office space and required equipment will be provided by relevant UNODC Programme Office.

---

<sup>58</sup> <http://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/evaluation/about-projects-.html>

Although the expert should be free to discuss all matters relevant to his/her assignment with the authorities concerned, he/she is not authorized to make any commitment on behalf of UNODC or the Government.

The expert will submit the evaluation report (in English) to the UNODC Project Coordinator. The report will contain the findings, conclusions and recommendations of the evaluator as well as a recording of the lessons learned. Draft evaluation report should be shared with UNODC Indonesia, Chief of the Independent Evaluation Unit (IEU), and UNODC HQ, Vienna, Austria for their review, prior to its finalization. The evaluation experts, while considering the comments provided on the draft, would use their independent judgment in preparing the final report. IEU will serve to provide quality assurance throughout the process by providing comments on the evaluation tools, the draft report and will provide final clearance for the final evaluation report.

### **Timeframe for the evaluation process**

**Table - Matrix for calculating the number of days to be worked by consultants**

When (Tentative dates)	Consultant 1 (Who and for how many days)	Consultant 2 (Who and for how many days)	What tasks	Where (location)
25-27 July 2011	3	3	Desk review	Home
28 July 2011	1	1	Briefing of evaluators	Indonesia / Jakarta
29 July 2011	1	1	Field mission/visit	Indonesia / Jakarta
1-2 August 2011	2	2	Field mission/visit	Indonesia / Semarang
3 August 2011	1	1	Preliminary Debrief	Headquarters Jakarta
22 August 2011	2	1	Preparation of the draft report	Home
			Round of comments among relevant stakeholders	
26 August 2011	1	1	Finalization of the report	
<b>Total working days</b>	11	10		

### **Detailed budget**

#### **Budget Mid-term external evaluation- ICLEC**

Date: June - July

LINE ITEM	Unit	# of units	Unit Rate (USD)	Total Cost (USD)
<b>1. Consultant and Fees</b>				
Consultant 1 (Team Leader)		11	500.00	5,500.00
Consultant 2		10	150.00	1,500.00

<b>Sub-total Consultant Fees</b>				<b>7,000.00</b>
<b>2. Travel and DSA</b>				
<b>SF - Jakarta (returned airfare- business class)</b>		1		4,000.00
Jakarta - Semarang (returned airfare)		4	200.00	800.00
DSA Jakarta		4	180.00	720.00
DSA Semarang		4	120.00	480.00
<b>Sub-total Travel</b>				<b>6,000.00</b>
<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>				<b>13,000.00</b>

### **Expected deliverables**

The main deliverable will be a project evaluation report. This report will pull together the results of the evaluation team’s analysis, drawing on desk research, course observation, and the other group and individual discussions, which would inevitably have yielded outputs of variable quality. In addition to the above it is also expected that the evaluation team will make recommendations concerning:

1. Areas for further development or focus
2. Indication of best practise, best practices from outside projects can be presented as models for the project to follow.
3. Proposed activities and outputs for the remaining period of the project taking into consideration the activities and outcomes outlined in the original project document and their findings from their evaluation of mid term. [According to the project document Recommendations from the mid term evaluation should address the appropriateness/relevance of the current project (i.e. design, implementation strategy) to other countries, and potential risks in doing so, and means to mitigate such risks, etc.]

It is not envisaged that the report will be a very long document, and its main focus will be to pull together the analysis in a way that highlights key points, particularly issues to be taken into account in moving forward to the implementation and completion of the Project and future sustainability once the project has concluded. Evaluation team is also expected to give advice on cross cutting issues such as ways for implementation gender sensitive approach, respecting environmental needs and respect for diversity in the project, should be covered in the final evaluation report. The evaluation team should follow the “UNODC Standard Format and Guidelines for Project Evaluation Report”<sup>59</sup> which can be found as an attachment to this document.

## **7. PAYMENT**

Consultants will be issued consultancy contracts and paid in accordance with United Nations rules and procedures.

A lump-sum will be paid in three instalments:

---

<sup>59</sup> <http://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/evaluation/about-projects-.html>

- The first payment will be made upon signature of the contract and submission of proposed methodology of the evaluation (25 per cent of the consultancy fee and travel expenses plus 75 per cent of the daily subsistence allowance);
- The second payment (25 per cent of the consultancy fee and 25 per cent of the daily subsistence allowance) will be made upon receipt of the draft report by the relevant units and sections at headquarters or field offices and by the Independent Evaluation Unit;
- The third and final payment (50 per cent of the consultancy fee, i.e. the remainder of the fee) will be made only after completion of the respective tasks and receipt of the final report and its clearance by the Independent Evaluation Unit.

## Annex 2

### List of persons interviewed and field visit schedule

Date	Meeting/Interview
26 July 2011 Jakarta	Meeting, INP Headquarters: Komjen. Oegroseno, Head, LEMDIKPOL Irjen. Pujianto, Assistant to Chief of INP for Planning Irjen. Bekto Suprpto, Deputy Head, Criminal Investigations, Headquarters Brig. Jen. Boy Salamuddin JCLEC Executive Director Brig. Jen. Lalu Suprpto, Head, Bureau of Education and Training, LEMDIKPOL
27 July 2011 Jakarta	Meeting, Komjen. Nanan Soekarna, Deputy Chief, INP
3 August 2011 Jakarta	Briefing, Greg Linsdell, AIT Monica Tanuhandaru, UNODC
4 August 2011 Jakarta	National Faculty: Imam Subandi Gede Suardana  Kemitraan: M. Gaussyah, A. Qisai, Laoda Sharif.
5 August 2011 Jakarta	Interview, Irjen. Boy Salamuddin, International Relations Division, INP HQ;

	Brig.Jen. Dwi Priyanto, new JCLEC exec.director.
8 August 2011 Jakarta	Ajit Roy, UNODC  Narendra Jatna, Task Force for Special Crimes, AGO Reda Manthovani, Prosecutor, AGO
9 August 2011 Jakarta	Simona Palma, EC UNODC Brig.Jen. Lalu Suprpta (by Indria Fernida)
10 August 2011 Megamendung, West Java Jakarta	CID School, Megamendung, West Java  Kombes Drs. Wakin, M. Si, Head CID School AKBP Antonius Pujianto, SH, Deputy Head, CID School Kompol Sarjono, S.H., M. Hum. Instructor Jakarta Alumni: Ian Florindo, KPK Ferdinand Andi Lolo KPK investigator
11 August Semarang	Brian Thomson, JCLEC Meetings with AIT and staff  Greg Linsdell Tracey Green Mustafa Ünal Erten  National Faculty: Herbin Siahaan Budi Setyono Bernadeta Haryanti  Imam Subandi Gede Suardana  Skype call to UK: Derek Ward, CSU, Combating Transnational Organised Crime
12 August Semarang	Meeting on evaluation system, Mustafa Ünal Erten  Dadang Trisasongko, anti-corruption advisor, Kemitraan, facilitator,

	<p>Integrated Management of Corruption Workshop.</p> <p>Yulianti, PPATK Closing ceremonies, Integrated Management of Corruption Workshop.</p>
--	---

### **Annex 3.**

#### **Questionnaire/Guidelines:**

1. Introduction, including purpose of the evaluation.  
Esp: what is evaluated is the implementation of the project, not the INP performance or performance of other beneficiaries.
2. Introduction of the evaluation team, emphasis on independent nature, not UNODC.
3. Explain evaluation as mid-term evaluation
4. Explain: open process but protect identity when requested.
5. FGD participants introduce themselves, name, institution, which course participated. In what capacity.
6. What were the general impressions? (brief)
7. Were the courses useful:
  - was capacity increased? What types:  
(skills, technical skills, knowledge, conceptual skills)
  - provide examples.
  -
8. what was the most effective?
  - teaching material?
  - Method
  - Instructors
  - Interaction with other agencies
  - Place,
  - Time
  - Method of evaluation.
9. How were participants recruited?
10. Post-training use – personal skills — impact on organizational capacity : has this improved? Explain.

For supervisors/CID School :

To what extent were they familiar with UNODC? With JCLEC?

To what extent familiar with the trainings?

Able to benefit from the trainings?

Retention of trained personnel: what is the impact of the rotation system?

---

<sup>i</sup> One clear example was the proliferation of terms for community policing that originated from different countries of the world.