9 September 2011

MID TERM EVALUATION

IDN T81

Support to the fight against corruption in Indonesia

Rule of Law

Indonesia

Report of the evaluation team

Jacqueline Hicks

Aryo Bimmo

UNITED NATIONS OFFICE ON DRUGS AND CRIME

Vienna

CONTENTS

Abbreviations and Acronyms

ACF	Anti Corruption Forum
AGO	Attorney General Office (*Kejaksaan Agung RI*)
AusAid	Australian Government Overseas Aid Program
Bappenas	National Development Planning Agency (*Badan Perencanaan Pembangunan Nasional*)
Binus	Bina Nusantara University
BPK	*Badan Pemeriksa Keuangan* (State Audit Body)
C&S	Coordination and Supervision
CETRO	Center for Electoral Reform
CSO	Civil Society Organization
DEMOS	*Lembaga Kajian Demokrasi dan Hak Asasi* (Intitute for Democracy and Human Rights Study)
DPR	*Dewan Perwakilan Rakyat* (Indonesian Parliament)
EC	European Commission
ELSAM	*Lembaga Studi dan Advokasi Masyarakat* (Institute for Policy Research and Advocacy)
FH	*Fakultas Hukum* (Faculty of Law)
FITRA	*Forum Indonesia untuk Transparansi Anggaran* (Indonesian Forum for Budget Transparency)
FORMAPPI	*Forum Masyarakat Peduli Parlemen* (Forum of Citizens Concerned About the Indonesian Legislature)
GoI	Government of Indonesia
GTZ	Now GIZ - *Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit* (German International Cooperation Agency)
IBC	Indonesia Budget Center
IBL	Indonesia Business Links
ICEL	Indonesian Center for Environmental Law
ICW	Indonesian Corruption Watch
ID-SIRTII	Indonesia Security Incident Response Team on Internet Infrastructure
INFID	International NGO Forum on Indonesian Development
INP	Indonesian National Police (*Kepolisian Negara RI*)
Inpres	*Instruksi Presiden* (Presidential Instruction)
IPW	Indonesian Procurement Watch
JCLEC	Jakarta Center for Law Enforcement Cooperation
Kemitraan	Partnership for Governance Reform Indonesia
Komnas HAM	*Komisi Nasonal Hak Asasi Manusia* (National Commission on Human Rights)
Kormonev	*Koordinasi, Monitoring dan Evaluasi* (Coordination, Monitoring and Evaluation of Corruption Eradication Efforts)
KPK	*Komisi Pemberantasan Korupsi* (Anti Corruption Commission)
KPPOD	*Komite Pengawasan Pelaksanaan Otonomi Daerah* (Supervising Committee for the Implementation of Regional Autonomy)
KRHN	*Konsorsium Reformasi Hukum Nasional* (National Law Reform

	Consortium)
LBH	*Lembaga Bantuan Hukum* (Legal Aid Institution)
LP3ES	*Lembaga Penelitian, Pendidikan dan Penerangan Ekonomi dan Sosial* (institute for Economic and Social Research, Education and Information)
MenPan	*Kementerian Pendayagunaan Aparatur Negara dan Reformasi Birokrasi* (Ministry for State Apparatus Empowerment and Bureaucracy Reform)
MTI	*Masyarakat Transparansi Indonesia* (Indonesian Transparency Society)
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
PATTIRO	*Pusat Telaah dan Informasi Regional* (Center for Regional Information and Research)
PPATK	*Pusat Pelaporan dan Analisa Transaksi Keuangan* (Indonesian Financial Intelligence Unit)
PSHK	*Pusat Studi Hukum dan Kebijakan* (Center for Law and Policy Studies)
RAN-PK	*Rencana Aksi Nasional Pemberantasan Korupsi* (National Action Plan on Corruption Eradication) 2004-2009
SOP	Standard Operational Procedures
Stranas PK	*Strategi Nasional Pemberantasan Korupsi* (National Strategy on Corruption Eradication) 2010-2025
TII	Transparency International Indonesia
UI	*Universitas Indonesia* (University of Indonesia)
UKP4	*Unit Kerja Presiden Bidang Pengawasan dan Pengendalian Pembangunan* (Presidential Unit for the Monitoring and Evaluation of Development)
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNODC	United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime

Summary matrix of findings, supporting evidence and recommendations

Findings: problems and issues identified	Supporting evidence	Recommendations
1. Because of the dynamic environment surrounding this project, some of its approaches and related activities have become less relevant than when the project document was originally written in 2007. Component two has been subject to developments among the three government bodies whose coordination it aims to support. Similarly, the government's anti-corruption strategy which is at the centre of component three has changed substantially over the years.	Interviews with project staff, Bappenas, KPK. Project documents, minutes of meetings.	UNODC and the EC should ensure this project receives periodic adjustments to keep it relevant to changing government priorities and up to date.
2. The process of making amendments to the project is not working optimally. Currently amendments are agreed through a rather laborious procedure of letter writing between the EC and UNODC without the involvement of all stakeholders.	Interviews with project staff, EC, Bappenas, KPK, TII. Documentation of correspondence between UNODC and EC.	UNODC should prepare two or three options for a new more efficient mechanism to deal with project amendments. These options should be presented and decided upon at the next governing board meeting.
3. Sustainability of training has already been given much thought, but there are opportunities to strengthen it further. Component two needs a better developed plan for how to feed back participant evaluations into the materials to make them as relevant as possible when handed over to national agencies. Also it is unclear whether trainers will have the capacity to deliver the materials.	Interviews with project staff, INP, AGO, training participants. Review of project documents.	UNODC should hire a consultant at the end of the training component to make consultations in preparation for handing over course materials to the training centers of individual state agencies. The consultant could also help with a training or trainers activity, if needed, to ensure trainers are able and willing to deliver the new materials.

Findings: problems and issues identified	Supporting evidence	Recommendations
4. Some of the trainings were less relevant for some of the participants. Some participants went through a more rigorous selection process from their own agencies than others.	Interviews with staff of training centers for different agencies. Focus group discussion with training participants.	Project beneficiaries should ensure that those they send for trainings have the right background and knowledge to make the most of the classes. Where appropriate, UNODC should support project beneficiaries in this process.
5. Because corruption itself is such a complex and widespread phenomena, its eradication needs particularly strategic and focused interventions. Some meetings on the ACF and C&S are not as focused as they could be, and so can be less productive. It is not clear whether UNODC or TII has ultimate responsibility for the documentation and administration associated with ACF.	Interviews with TI, Bappenas, project staff, EC. Agendas and minutes or meetings.	All stakeholders should ensure that all meetings, but especially those associated with ACF, should have more tightly focused actionable agendas with a list of decisions that need to be made and, if appropriate, the allocation of tasks for the next meeting. Production of meeting minutes should also follow best practice and their distribution should be timely (see Annex One).
6. While having already made the decision to use the goCASE software after a long period of negotiation and trial, KPK wants to ensure that it is well adopted by obtaining UNODC support for it for as long as possible.	Interviews with KPK and UNODC staff.	UNODC and KPK should continue negotiations to find the best way to ensure the sustainability of goCASE. UNODC project staff say it may be possible for UNODC Vienna to provide IT support for two years if needed – this should be pursued.
7. Visibility is an important issue for the EC. Until now EC visibility has received less attention than	Interviews with EC and UNODC. Letters and	UNODC should continue to give the new visibility plan developed for the

Findings: problems and issues identified	Supporting evidence	Recommendations
is required according to the contractual agreement.	emails.	EC priority.
8. Many informants pointed to a real need to support the establishment of anti-corruption courts in the regions as a priority.	Interviews with KPK, AGO, ICW.	While not applicable to the time remaining for this project, any follow-up projects should consider supporting the anti-corruption courts (Tipikor) and CSOs in the regions.

Executive Summary

1. T81 has three components all related to the coordination of anti-corruption efforts. The first supports the development of the KPK's coordination and supervision (C&S) policy, the second gathers participants from different state agencies to attend specialized anti-corruption trainings together and the third supports a multi-stakeholder anti-corruption forum and some research on best practices.

2. The project document describes the three main outcomes thus:

1/ KPK's coordination and supervision function strengthened.	**2/** Anti-corruption agencies investigation and prosecution capacities built through specialised trainings.	**3/** Strengthened national anti-corruption strategy (RAN-PK and/or its successor) and its implementation through improved stakeholder involvement and coordination.

Summary of Findings

3. Overall this project is well conceived and implemented. It is working in a highly political and contested area and its achievements in bringing together so many different interests are to be commended.

4. Component one on the KPK's C&S policy has so far laid some of the ground work for the KPK's receptivity to future recommendations. With the research yet to be completed, it is not yet possible to tell how useful it will be in practice. It is important to remember that this is a very sensitive area for all the institutions involved, some of which do not accept any outside involvement.

5. In contrast, training activities such as those undertaken in component two are usually embraced by all parties and do not suffer the complications that support to policy formation or national strategies can. The training given in this project is based on many best practices, including an initial comprehensive needs assessment and plenty of consultation with participant organizations on the training contents. It is relevant and practical, but could do with some more fine tuning with regard to participant selection and the strategy for handing over the materials to state agencies' own training centers.

6. Judging by outputs alone, it is difficult to see what exactly the ACF from component three has achieved. However, taking the relationship building into account, the UNODC has been able to use its image as a neutral body to good effect under this part of the project, especially after the vice president used the second ACF in June to launch the president-backed anti-corruption strategy (Inpres 9). Since then, there has been a reinvigorated round of sub-meetings on finding ways to support CSO involvement in this strategy.

7. With so many moving parts, this is a difficult component to manage, but it needs continued strong guidance and vision to stop it from turning into rounds of general discussions on corruption.

8. Halfway through this project, its full potential is still to be realized. Relationship and consensus building has been achieved along with some knowledge generation through research activities. The next stage of the project will now have to use these assets to try to effect change.

9. Considering the sheer complexity of the project with so many different stakeholders, its management has been well executed. However, at the UNODC, there is a tendency for project staff to be pulled in many different directions to cover tasks outside their main responsibilities or temporary shortfalls on other projects. While in some ways it may be useful learning experience for people to work on other tasks, it is important for the success of the project that the core responsibilities of each staff member are prioritized.

10. Projects must be allowed to adjust over time to respond to a changing environment. If a project does not require any amendments during implementation, especially in a dynamic sector like anti-corruption, then there is something seriously wrong. This project has been able to make some changes while still keeping its original strategic focus, but the process through which the changes have been made is not optimal.

Lessons Learned
11. When funding a multi-stakeholder forum, it is important to clarify expectations about what can be supported. If a forum works well, then it should generate lots of new ideas for activities related to the project, but it may be that the project's budget cannot extend to supporting them.

12. There is a tendency to overestimate the results that can be achieved in governance projects. Project indicators should take into consideration the reform *process* as well as its "products." Even if a perfect MOU is produced from a project's activities in terms of international standards, if it was not forged through a consultative and voluntary process, it will stand little chance of implementation.

13. Research reports should always have a strategy about how they will be used when commissioned. This means that consideration should be given to how they will be used to cause change in terms of whose information gaps they fill and what process they can feed into at which institutions.

Best Practices
14. Taking a non-direct approach to project goals can sometimes be more fruitful than a direct approach. For example, bringing participants from different

agencies to sit together on trainings related to anti-corruption also supported the goal of C&S among different agencies.

15. This project understands the importance of authority when trying to effect reform. It sought the involvement of those with seniority or political weight to spur a deeper engagement from other participants.

16. UNODC added true value to the reform process by acting as an intermediary in bringing together different stakeholders through research, trainings or other meetings. TII and ICW noted that their access to state agencies such as the INP and the AGO was raised by the role UNODC staff played. Senior INP staff also said they were keen to work with UNODC in the long term, until 2025.

17. The comprehensive training needs assessment at the beginning of the project ensured that all agencies involved in the trainings generally found them both useful and relevant compared to trainings held by other state agencies and donors.

I. Introduction

A. Background and context of the project

18. T81 is an anti-corruption project funded by the EC and implemented by the UNODC in conjunction with two well known anti-corruption CSOs, ICW and TII. Its official government partner is the KPK, but it also works well with Bappenas. Several other state agencies have been involved in the project as training and research participants, including the INP, AGO, BPK, PPATK and MenPan.

19. EUR 2,395,093 has been requested from the EC by the UNODC for this project. It is 95% funded by the EC.

20. The project is well designed and based on a solid information gathering process.

21. The project document is very large and complex with a lot of information, but it does contain all the necessary components a project document should.

22. While the funding agreement between the EC and the UNODC was signed in November 2009, the project did not get underway until July 2010 due to a delay in ratification at the Indonesian Parliament. The delay attests to the sensitivity of the project as it supports anti-corruption efforts which may directly challenge the interests of some parliament members. In anti-corruption work such resistance effectively means that the project is well targeted.

23. The project also had to cope with several other complications as a result of external developments. In mid 2009, a serious conflict emerged among three of the project's most important partners, the KPK, the police and the AGO. After the KPK targeted some members of the police for corruption investigations, two senior KPK staff were counter accused of bribery and arrested. When wiretapped conversations involving AGO and INP staff emerged discussing a plot to bring the two KPK staff down, there was a public outcry and a strong show of support for the KPK. The episode eventually forced the deputy attorney general to step down and led to the removal of the National Police's chief of detectives from his post. Because of these developments, relations among these institutions were at an all time low at precisely the time the project was trying to improve their coordination.

24. A highly fluid policy environment punctuated by national elections and a change of cabinet after national elections also had an impact on component three. Since its aim is to engage with government policy on anti-corruption, there is a certain degree of fallout when those policies change. Nevertheless, the project found a way to navigate these challenges and stay on track.

B. Purpose and scope of the evaluation

25. This evaluation assesses the first 21 months of T81 from November 2009 until July 2011. The project is due to end in September 2012, lasting a total of 34 months.

26. The purpose of the evaluation is to (1) document the results of the project (2) identify good practices and lessons learned, and (3) provide recommendations for the project's remaining period.

27. The evaluation was undertaken by Jacqueline Hicks and Ariyo Bimmo over 21 days from July 5th 2011 to August 2nd 2011. It was managed by the UNODC Project Coordinator, Monica Tanuhandaru.

C. Executing modalities of the project

28. UNODC is the executing agency with responsibility for directly managing the project and UNDP is the associate executing agency dealing with some of the project's procurement. The implementing partners are ICW and TII. The project is guided by a Governing Board and a Consortium Working Group. The EC provides 95% of the funding and exercises its own monitoring of the project. See Section IID Institutional and Management Arrangements and Constraints for more on management.

D. Evaluation methodology

29. One of the main goals of this project is to encourage coordination between different stakeholders in the fight against corruption. The evaluation's methodology reflects this goal by using a participative approach. Rather than relying only on generalized indicators or the evaluators' ideas of what constitutes good results and best practices, it will also use the stakeholders' own assessments of what worked best *for them*. This approach aims to fulfill the information needs of the stakeholders, help them understand the other stakeholders' points of view and enhance teamwork and build shared commitment to act on evaluation recommendations.

30. The evaluation was based on a 1) review of documentation, including documents setting out the rationale and strategic orientation for activities, the project and related documents, progress reports, documents relating to project implementation and production of outputs, previous evaluation reports, minutes of meetings, and 2) interviews with UNODC project staff, EC project donors, TII and ICW as implementing partners, some individual participants in trainings and staff from a range of state agencies involved in the project.

E. Limitations to the evaluation

31. Two of the three project staff were away for the majority of the evaluation, only returning a few days before the report was due to be written. The interview schedule changed frequently and could have been better organised, although this was sometimes outside the control of the project staff. Some of

the interviews were arranged for the time set aside for report writing and some were with people who had little or no knowledge of the project. These limitations did not significantly impact the findings of the evaluation.

II. <u>Major findings and analysis</u>

A. Relevance of the Project

32. The majority of the stakeholders interviewed for this evaluation said the project maintained a high degree of relevance and were pleased to support it in the future. There was a good deal of consultation at the design phase with a range of CSO questionnaires and this is well reflected in the project document. However, in interviews, a group of senior members from the AGO said that they did not welcome the project's involvement in supporting its coordination with other institutions on anti-corruption. Instead they suggested several other areas they would like to work with the UNODC on, including the regional corruption courts.

33. There is no evidence of any cross-cutting issues such as gender or environment having been integrated into the design of the project. There are plans to disaggregate some of the data on training participants by gender, but its not clear what purpose this will serve.

34. The project fits well with the context of Indonesia's fight against corruption. All the different parts of the project feed off each other to some extent by a shared focus on coordination: component one deals with the KPK's coordination function, component two brings together different agencies into the same classroom and component three supports a forum for different elements of the anti-corruption community. This comes at a time when anti-corruption NGOs are moving towards engaging more with government in reform as oppose to an external advocacy role which means that coordination is a priority. Yet, at the same time many of the best NGOs have little capacity, or indeed desire, to engage with the requirements of big donors such as the EC and there is still a good degree of hostility between some state agencies and CSOs. Under these circumstances UNODC's intermediary role is extremely relevant.

35. The individual components also have a good degree of relevance. The KPK has only had a division dedicated to C&S since 2009 and it is fair to say the development of this function is still in its infancy. The KPK's C&S function is in the body's strategic plan and has recently attracted extra funding allocated to it from the state budget through the DPR. The training component was developed after a needs assessment, which, according to most stakeholders has resulted in relevant courses and there are currently no other anti-corruption forums such as the ACF of component three.

36. In such a dynamic environment as Indonesia's where opportunities for reform quickly open and close, the project must be able to maintain some degree of flexibility if it is to stay relevant. All stakeholders agreed that its general approach and beneficiaries are the right ones, but within that, changes to the project workplans must be allowed to occur with the agreement of all parties. By the same token, it is still crucial to maintain a project strategy and not change activities too reactively or the project could lose direction. Maintaining this balance will be critical to the project's future impact.

37. How well the project has been able to adapt to these changes is dealt with in Section II D Institutional and management arrangements and constraints.

38. Because the design pinpointed several areas of real need, the unavoidable delays in the start of project meant that some activities were implemented by beneficiaries themselves before the project began. Staff interviewed for this evaluation from the KPK said that some of the best practice studies in component three have already been done by the KPK and that the project's best practice studies which are still being worked on by TII risk duplication. They may however complement each other. In any case, the real issue here, as in other parts of the project, was the reluctance of staff and beneficiaries to enter into negotiations to make project amendments that can quickly and efficiently respond to such developments.

B. Attainment of the programme or project objectives

39. Objective One: Strengthen KPK's coordination and supervision (C&S) function: There are two ways in which the project outputs contribute towards achieving this objective. The first is with the production and eventual use of the research report which ICW has been contracted to research and write. In this regard, several documents have been produced already: one preliminary findings document, three reports by consultants contracted by ICW and some research by an international consultant contracted directly by UNODC on international best practices. These documents will be synthesized into one draft report by the ICW coordinator which is due at the end of August. How far this report can achieve the objective of strengthening the KPK's C&S function is ultimately dependent on its quality and the openness of the KPK to receiving input. To be a useful document, it should carry specific recommendations and action points for implementation rather than just be a discussion of the problems.

40. The second way in which the outputs can influence the achievement of the project's objectives is through the *process* of research for the report. In this regard the project has already had some positive achievements. The project's activities have supported and pushed the relationship-building that is needed for successful C&S in anti-corruption efforts among the INP, the AGO and the KPK at a time when the relationship among these institutions was at an all time low (see Section I: Background). By contracting an influential anti-

corruption watchdog such as ICW to undertake the research and discuss C&S issues with staff from all three institutions, the project has effectively enabled the inclusion of an external stimulus in the difficult negotiations among these institutions. It is a modest first step but, in the current political context, bringing together staff from ICW, the AGO, the INP and the KPK to share information on these issues is a useful and quite unique role for the project.

41. However, there is some lack of clarity about whether the purpose of this component is to support the KPK to produce C&S policy or whether it has the wider goal of aiding the building of C&S processes among the AGO, the INP and the KPK. This should be clarified in any future amendments.

42. The use of the UNODC's goCASE software should eventually aid the management of information in investigations if its adoption is well supported. How far it will contribute to improved C&S among the KPK, AGO and INP will not only depend on the KPK's adoption of it, but also how well the two other institutions understand how the system works.

43. <u>Objective Two: Build the investigation and prosecution capacities of anti-corruption agencies through specialized trainings:</u> All of those interviewed for this evaluation from the AGO, INP, KPK and BPK were positive about the trainings undertaken in this component and it is fair to say that they have contributed well to increasing the capacities of anti-corruption agency staff.

44. According to trainers in the AGO, BPK and KPK, and a focus group discussion with participants, the content of the trainings undertaken so far have been relevant to most of the participants' needs, although not all. A common remark was that the materials were refreshingly practical and advanced compared to the usual training they receive which is often general and theoretical. Achieving the right balance of generality and specificity is especially hard for these trainings given the variety of institutions from which the participants came and the project should be commended for it.

45. As well as imparting skills and knowledge, another training objective was to encourage mutual understanding among participants of each other's work. This also appears to have been a success, with both participants and training staff keen to highlight the importance and uniqueness of this aspect of the training. Staff from the AGO's training center said there were two trainings per year which involved attorneys, police and judges, but apart from those, there were no other courses which involved participants from a range of institutions. Similarly, the KPK has some *ad hoc* cross-institutional training on specific topics, but welcomed this approach by the UNODC.

46. Pre and post tests of the participants' knowledge were carried out in addition to satisfaction surveys. The data for these has yet to be fully analysed.

47. Objective Three: Strengthen the implementation of the government's anti-corruption strategy through improved stakeholder involvement: More than any other part of the project, this component has worked within a very fluid environment since its aim is to engage with government policy which is inevitably subject to changing political currents. When the project document was originally written, this component dealt with a government anti-corruption strategy called RAN-PK, but since then a new long term strategy has been written called STRANAS. Most recently, an annual action plan of the government's priorities in anti-corruption has been drawn from STRANAS called Inpres 9/ 2011. By signing the Inpres and not the STRANAS, the president has placed his political weight behind the Inpres as the government's anti-corruption strategy.

48. These changes have meant that the project has had to remain flexible concerning the vision for its engagement with the government's anti-corruption strategy as each different policy carries its own set of roles and responsibilities for different implementing partners.

49. The project did very well in hosting the vice president, seven ministers and the UKP4 – the body tasked with implementing the government's new anti-corruption strategy – to its second Anti-Corruption Forum (ACF).

50. After only two meetings it is premature to make any conclusions about how far the role of the ACF has been institutionalized. However, after the second meeting, it can be said that it is in a good position to build further and establish its role in strengthening the government's anti-corruption strategy. See Section IX B Impact for a further discussion of the ACF.

51. There were four research reports commissioned for this component – two on best practices in anti-corruption at local government level and two on best practices in corruption reform within two government directorates. While these are still underway, it is difficult to say how far they contribute towards the objective of supporting the government's anti-corruption strategy. It is, however, possible to say that their potential to do this suffers from a lack of strategy for how these research products will be used in the future. Apart from presenting the reports at the ACF, a more strategic consideration about whose information gaps they fill and what process they can feed into at which institutions is yet to be made.

52. It is also hard to assess whether the amount of time it is taking to complete them is reasonable before seeing the final products. But after one year, they should be quite substantial documents.

53. The Kormonev survey, to find the effectiveness of the government bodies assigned to monitor the implementation of the government's previous anti-corruption strategy has a clearer aim. It will be used to write guidelines for

MenPan to undertake its own surveys of Kormonev, of which there are 613 throughout Indonesia. The surveys contribute well to the objective of improving stakeholder involvement in government strategies by engaging with MenPan, one of the more difficult government departments to work with.

C. Achievement of the programme or project outputs

54. This section details only the status of the outputs delivered so far by the project. An analysis of the effectiveness of these outputs can be found throughout the other sections. In general, the outputs and activities have been in line with the original budget and there have been no major unforeseen costs. As of the end of June 2011, 52% of the first installment of the budget has been spent on target, while the project documents state that the expenditure target should be 70%. According to the finance officer, this is due to the delays in the uptake of goCASE as the KPK wished to have a trial period first and also because ICW has yet to request its second installment.

55. The overall level of achievement of activities is good, if patchy. The trainings have been most fully implemented, the research activities seem well advanced but have so far stopped short of producing an actual finished product, let alone using the research to bring about change. The achievement of holding two ACFs does not seem much, but should be viewed in the context of all the other meetings they have generated.

Outcome One: KPK's Coordination and Supervision		
Expected Outputs	**Key (see end of table)**	**Level of Achievement**
Evaluation of the KPK's current C&S function.	▢▢▮▮	ICW has been working on the evaluation since September 2010. In those ten months, ICW researchers have talked with KPK, AGO and police for information gathering and produced two documents: (1) a 10 page Preliminary Findings, and (2) a 20 page document from a researcher outside Jakarta. Two workshops to present the preliminary findings and obtain feedback were held on 24 -25 May 2011 with a wide range of stakeholders. The draft report complete with recommendations is due in mid August.
Development of an improved C&S strategic policy.	▢▮	The research helped lay some ground work for an improved C&S policy by socializing C&S ideas in the interview stage. The workshops in this project and in another project (JCLEC) also helped relationship building between the KPK, INP and AGO on the issue. However, the KPK has yet to revise its C&S policy.

Strengthened operational mechanism.	☐	As above, the research activities have supported the establishment of a operational mechanism, but as yet SOPs or any other mechanisms are still to be decided on by the KPK.
Supporting software developed and installed.	▣▣▣▣	The project has been in negotiations with KPK on UNODC's goCASE software since 2009. The software, to support information management in investigations, was trialed for the KPK in February 2011 by the UNODC's IT team from Vienna. Convinced of its relevance, the KPK is now in negotiations with UNODC Vienna to sign the agreement to receive it.
Training on revised KPK C&S strategic policy, standard operating procedures, and supporting database carried out.	_	With no policy or SoPs formalized, training is not yet needed.
Outcome Two: Specialised Trainings		
Expected Outputs		**Level of Achievement**
Asset Tracing and Recovery	▣▣▣▣	Two courses were held on 25-29 October 2010 and 1-5 November 2010. There was a total of 67 participants from AGO, KPK, BPK, Bank of Indonesia, INP, PPATK, Supreme Court, Ministry of Law and Human Rights and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. International trainers were used. Two more classes are planned for 2012.
Advanced Investigative interviewing	▣▣▣▣	Two courses were held on 17-21 January 2011, 24-28 January 2011. There was a total of 56 participants from AGO, BPK, INP, KPK and PPATK. International trainers were used.
Advanced Financial Investigations and Forensic Accounting	_	Four classes are planned for 2011-2012.
Advanced Fraud and Corruption Prevention techniques	▣▣▣▣	Two courses were held on 23-26 November 2010 and 29 November – 2 December 2010. There was a total of 61 participants from the AGO, INP, KPK, BPK, PPATK and the Supreme Court.
Mutual Legal Assistance	_	This was requested by stakeholders on the governing board to replace a course on Court Surveillance which was considered by stakeholders to be no longer relevant. Due to take place in October 2011.

Computer Forensic Investigations	▢▮▮▮	Four courses were held on 23 – 27 May 2011, 6 – 10 June 2011, 4 – 8 July 2011 and 11 – 15 July 2011. There was a total of 80 participants from AGO, BPK, INP, KPK and PPATK. Each course had 20 participants by request of the trainer. National trainers from the Digital Forensic Laboratory of INP and Id –SIRTII were used.
Anti-corruption training areas have up to date training materials on specialised technical areas	▢▮	The people interviewed for this evaluation from the KPK, the BPK and the AGO said they knew of plans to hand over the course materials after the trainings were finished and planned to use some or all of them in the institutions own training courses. However, this has not yet occurred as the trainings are ongoing. Each participant for all of the above trainings had (1) a pre and post course test (2) a post training evaluation and (3) a follow up questionnaire 6 months after the training to assess the use of the skills learnt in the workplace. All participants have completed the first two evaluations, and the third is still ongoing, although it has been difficult to get a good level of responses for the 6 month follow up. There is yet to be any detailed analysis of this data.
Outcome Three: Anti-Corruption Strategy		
Expected Outputs		**Level of Achievement**
Anti-Corruption forum (ACF) established and institutionalized by GoI	▢▮▮	The ACF met first on December 21 2010 with 61 representatives from a range of stakeholders from government bodies, private organizations, academia, media and NGO's including Bappenas, KPK, Komnas HAM, Menpan, MTI, LBH, Kemitraan, UI, Binus, FH Andalas, Media Indonesia, Jurnal Nasional, Rakyat Merdeka and GTZ. There was one subsequent meeting on 14-15 June 2011 with 42 attending, mostly from NGOs, including KPPOD, FITRA, IBC, DEMOS, ELSAM, PATTIRO, CETRO, FORMAPPI, ICEL, IBL, IPW, PSHK, KRHN. In terms of government involvement, the second forum could not have done better with the attendance of the vice

		president and 7 ministers to launch the latest government plan on anti-corruption (Inpres 9/2011). A series of 7 expert group meetings have also occurred with BAPPENAS, GTZ, TII, ICW, MenPan, KPK and some media to support the ACF by planning the agendas.
Studies on Government Anti-Corruption Reform including UNCAC implementation	☐▨▨	TII obtained the grant from UNODC in June 2010 to undertake a survey of the progress of Kormonev system in 5 locales around Indonesia. During the year since TII received the grant, its researchers have finalized the survey questions and obtained support from MenPan to undertake the research. The actual fieldwork was contracted by TII to LP3ES who are currently in the field undertaking the survey. The research on best practice of two local governments was contracted by TII to ICW and is due to be finished in September 2011. The research on the Customs and Tax Offices is in process and due to be completed at the end of July 2011. The draft of the tax office research at the time of the evaluation is a 6 page document. There has been no work done yet on a follow up to the 2006 UNCAC gap analysis.
Communication and public education strategy developed to publicise ACF findings.	_	No strategy to publicise ACF findings has been formulated. The first ACF was more of a general discussion on STRANAS, while the second one was used to introduce and discuss the Inpres 9/2011. There were in fact no real findings to be communicated to the public.
Additional activities not in original project document		The project also provided a small grant to TII to produce and distribute a number of anti-corruption brochures hats, t-shirts and banners as part of the very successful anti-corruption day held in December 2010, thereby increasing the project's general visibility.

Key: Level of output achievement: ☐▨▨▨■ = 5/5; ☐▨▨▨ = 4/5; ☐▨▨ = 3/5
☐▨ = 2/5; ☐ = 1/5; - = 0.

D. Institutional and management arrangements and constraints

56. UNODC is the executing agency with responsibility for directly managing the project including monitoring project progress, sub-contracting and managing project staff and funds. To manage the project there is one project coordinator, two project officers and one project associate who are supported by one finance assistant and one administration assistant.

57. Each project officer and the project associate are responsible for one of the project's components, but also have responsibilities in another complementary project (T71) funded by Norway. The finance and administration assistants work for both T71 and T81. It is UNODC's practice to build synergies between these two projects but also the other projects in the office on judicial reform and illegal logging where, for example, CSOs supported in these other projects are invited to attend the ACF.

58. Human resource management can sometimes be an issue in the UNODC office as staff are pulled in different directions to cover tasks outside their main responsibilities or temporary shortfalls on other projects. While this is a feature of most organizations working in this highly dynamic sector, care should be taken that staff are able to focus on their core responsibilities for projects. Adding extra tasks without reducing existing responsibilities can make for a stressful work environment.

59. The UNDP acts as an associated executing agency supporting procurement of equipment and services above US$2500 and the contracting of all staff including consultants. While this can cause delays of several months, especially when contracting new staff, it serves a useful function for the UNODC as it has no procurement department of its own.

60. The EC funds 95% of the project and, according to the grant agreement, can ask for information regarding the project at any time as well as the regular six monthly and annual reporting requirements.

61. UNODC in Bangkok receives and provides input into semi-annual and annual evaluation reports for the project. There is some *ad hoc* cooperation with UNODC Vienna on technical matters such as the goCASE software and training tools.

62. The project has a Governing Board and a Consortium Working Group. The Governing Board is expected to meet every six months and according to its ToR, its functions are to provide guidance to the project implementation, ensure its timely delivery to budget, review work plans and monitor project outputs. Its members include representatives from the KPK, AGO, INP, BPK, MenPAN, BAPPENAS, European Union and the Norwegian Embassy.

63. It has so far met twice, on the 8th and 26th of April 2011 to agree to its terms of reference and the project's work plan. None of the governing board members had any complaints about the meetings so far, but it is clear that it has not yet been able to serve the purpose for which it was created.

64. There is a perception among _all_ of the project stakeholders that the EC is not flexible enough in accepting changes to project activities. In fact, the EC _has_ accepted amendments – from the addition of extra staff for the project through to more minor changes such as the inclusion of training participants from additional institutions or the change in location for best practice research of local governments. The underlying problem is rather the process through which these amendments take place. Until now the method has been the exchange of long letters between the EC and the UNODC. While many of the issues discussed in these letters are valid, they can sometimes be buried amongst other much more trivial points.

65. Rather than such a time consuming exchange of letters, there should be a more efficient mechanism through which amendments are discussed and decided on by a range of the stakeholders, as was originally envisaged in the project design. As it stands, the governing board meetings are too infrequent and involve staff that are too senior to be functional for such minor changes to the project.

66. The Consortium Working Group is a smaller and less formal group which involves UNODC project staff and one member each from ICW and TII, the Basel Institute and GTZ. In practice it has been replaced by routine individual meetings between UNODC staff and ICW or UNODC staff and TII although GTZ has occasionally joined. Its meetings are yet to be regularized and are rather _ad hoc_ in nature.

67. ICW and TII each received a grant governed by formal grant agreements to implement components one and three of the project respectively. This means they are responsible for carrying out all of the component's activities, but in practice they have sub-contracted some of the activities to other CSOs.

68. Producing two different forms of financial reporting according to UNODC requirements and EC requirements has caused some difficulties. Yet, contrary to the recommendations of a previous evaluation, it is unrealistic to expect either organization to accept the format of the other. It should, however, be acknowledged that transferring a list of costs from one format into another will inevitably be a complicated process which needs time and effort. What happens when the budget line under which activities have been entered in the UNODC format does not exist in the EC format? Finance staff from both institutions are working together to try to resolve these complications. It is recommended to the UNODC that financial reports to the EC are made only once a year as requested in the grant agreement.

III. Outcomes, impact and sustainability.

A. Outcome

69. The project's overall outcome was to strengthen the rule of law and security in Indonesia. Judging from the activities already undertaken, the project has made a good contribution to this outcome, although it is not possible to measure its exact extent. The project's indicators range from a rise in the number of corruption cases to an increase in recovered assets, a reduction in corruption and the implementation of an anti-corruption strategy. While these are certainly worthwhile goals, none of these are indicators which can realistically be used by evaluators since they are all impossible to measure accurately and would take large amounts of resources to even try.

70. In general, for any type of governance projects it may be more useful to have an "indicative activities" column instead of "objectively verifiable indicators." This approach assumes that certain activities will produce the desired results. For example, one indicator for the "raised capacity of an anti-corruption commission" could be the "number of staff who receive training." Here, it would be assumed that the more the staff receive training, the stronger the capacity of the commission will be, rather than trying to determine the actual impact of the commission on incidences of corruption.

71. What can be said is that the project has engaged with the most important state and civil society actors in this process, sometimes playing a strong intermediary role between some of them. The short term effects of the project's outputs are to raise the level of knowledge among some staff from anti-corruption agencies, support the very complex C&S process and provide a forum for exchange between disparate elements of the anti-corruption movement. How far these short-term effects will become medium and long term effects is dealt with more substantially in the next section on impact.

B. Impact

72. Objective One: Strengthen KPK's coordination and supervision (C&S) function: The project aims to support the KPK's C&S capacities in relation to both its prevention and repression roles. C&S of corruption cases among the KPK, AGO and INP is an extremely sensitive topic since each institution's authority, and ultimately budget, is dependent on their roles relative to each other. There is some resentment from elements within the AGO and the INP of the budget and facilities that the KPK enjoys and there are also issues related to self-preservation as the KPK investigates and prosecutes cases involving staff from the AGO and the INP.

73. Under these circumstances, it is a very ambitious goal for an outside party such as UNODC or ICW to produce a revised KPK C&S policy or even to support the signing of an MOU among the institutions.

74. The three institutions have already been in negotiations for some time themselves over an MOU on mutual cooperation, including C&S of corruption cases and it has reached a draft stage, but it remains to be signed. It has taken intervention from the president himself to push this process, as it is now a required action under the presidentially-endorsed anti-corruption action plan, Inpres 9/ 2011.

75. The project's impact in relation to the C&S component has been relatively good within this context. ICW's research kept the MOU issue on the agenda before the Inpres was released, but in interviews for this evaluation, staff from the AGO at least made it very clear that the contents of the MOU would be decided among the organizations themselves without any outside input or support. In view of this, the expected results from the original project document to review the MOU and for the KPK to adopt an improved C&S policy is over-ambitious.

76. Nevertheless, according to the KPK Secretary General, the KPK commissioners who are in charge of refining C&S policy are interested in and open to ICW's recommendations. While it is unlikely that anything the project supports will be adopted wholesale, given the synergies created by staff from UNODC, ICW and KPK, there is a high probability that at least parts of the research will be taken into account in the policy revision process.

77. <u>Objective Two: Build the investigation and prosecution capacities of anti-corruption agencies through specialized trainings:</u> While the quality of the course material and trainers is an essential part of the success of any training, if the participants are not chosen well, the strategic impact of the training will be lost. This is especially the case in a country as large as Indonesia where there are literally tens of thousands of potential candidates for training from anti-corruption agencies.

78. There was a wide variety of practices within the different institutions for choosing the training participants involved in component two. BPK showed many best practices, first advertising the course on its intranet to ask for volunteers, then interviewing them according to UNODC's and their own criteria. The AGO and the police appointed participants after interviews, which is not ideal. The police in particular seem to have sent several people whose jobs were not relevant to the training.

79. Beneficiary institutions should be careful to ensure that participants are of high enough quality and that they are sufficiently engaged in the training. The national officer in charge of this component has had talks with the police and the attorney general on this issue and they have agreed to give UNODC a bigger supporting role in the participant selection process. But this has yet to be confirmed by the police and attorney general superiors.

80. As one of the objectives of the trainings was to build coalitions of reform among institutions, the project should also consider geographic spread. While anti-corruption agencies in the regions are in dire need of training support, rather than transporting one or two participants from each region to Jakarta for the training, it could be more strategic to hold a few trainings in some different locales. That way the policeman from, for example, Mataram will be training with the attorney, auditor and judge from Mataram and the potential for building a constituency of mutual understanding is higher than if participants were from a variety of regions.

81. However, if conducting training in the regions, special care has to be taken to ensure that participants will stay in their jobs since there is a high transfer rate of civil servants in the regions.

82. Immediately prior to undertaking the training courses, participants were given a test on the subject of the training and then given the same test immediately after the training had finished. The available data, which covers 9 classes over three courses, shows an average of 52% improvement in knowledge. Participants were also given satisfaction surveys. Of the five classes for which there is data currently available, 99% rated the overall course as good or excellent and 95% rated the course good or excellent in terms of its application to their work. As it stands, the data available from these tests and surveys is patchy and badly organised. If this data is to become a useful source of feedback on these courses, much work remains to be done on their analysis.

83. Objective Three: Strengthen the implementation of the government's anti-corruption strategy through improved stakeholder involvement: As discussed in Section IIB above, after the involvement of the government at a high level in the second Anti-Corruption Forum, it now has some potential to make a real impact. It is well known that reform strategies generally require political backing to work and this is particularly true of anti-corruption reform. In this evaluation, for example, several informants remarked how much more active training participants are when their seniors are involved in opening or closing ceremonies for the training. Similarly, the presence of the vice president in the last ACF seems to have motivated more interest by stakeholders in engaging with the ACF process.

84. This means that it is now a crucial time in the life of the ACF to maintain the momentum achieved by the June meeting. Until the end of July when this evaluation report was written, there have since been two additional meetings of sub-groups of ACF stakeholders. One was between TII, Bappenas, a team from the Vice President's Office, AusAid, UNODC and IFC on June 23, 2011 and the other between Bappenas, TII and UNODC on July 11, 2011.

85. The original project document envisaged an ACF focus on implementing, monitoring and evaluation of the government strategy, but it now seems to have evolved into a more general discussion forum on corruption issues. As well as a presentation of the STRANAS in the first meeting, there was also a presentation on corruption in the national budget. The second ACF had presentations not just on Inpres 9 but also by the police and Ministry of Home Affairs on their individual anti-corruption strategies. The post meetings of this second ACF planned future workshops to launch the STRANAS, meet with ministries to talk about strategies to reduce corruption, decide how to work on Inpres 9, socialize UNCAC to the regions and aid UNCAC reporting mechanisms.

86. To be sure, all of this is related to anti-corruption, but there is a danger that it is expanding too fast to cover so many different approaches. It is also effectively generating ideas for new activities for which there are no funds in the project's budget and so potentially raising expectations which cannot be financially supported by the project.

87. There is nothing intrinsically wrong with the ACF maintaining such a wide focus or having so many different purposes. Indeed, the whole point of the ACF is that it is a stakeholder-led process and this is what the stakeholders have chosen to do in the six steering group meetings, two ACF and multiple other sub-meetings.

88. However, in the context of this project it is important to spell everything out so that there are not any misunderstandings about the purpose and scope of the ACF. Such clarification could also have the benefit of enabling the steering committee to prioritise some of its purposes over others if they begin to prove too unwieldy.

89. From the experience so far of the ACF and associated meetings, it seems some of its purposes include, but are not limited to: (1) publicise the STRANAS to national ministries and local governments (2) present best practice studies from some ministries to others (3) generate seed ideas for donors (Ausaid and GTZ so far are involved) to develop and fund in the future (4) bring together anti-corruption CSOs from within and outside Jakarta to help consolidate the anti-corruption movement (5) engage with UKP4 to implement Inpres 9 (6) serve as a forum for government departments/bodies to present their anti-corruption strategies (7) provide input into the preparation of the 2012 anti-corruption strategy Inpres (8) assist Bappenas to make reports to UNCAC.

90. It should be noted that most of these purposes are in fact whole projects in themselves, each needing time and funds. Inevitably, where these are limited, priorities will have to be made and difficult questions will have to be answered. For example, it has been decided that a medium term STRANAS should be

developed for 2012-2014, but how will it fit with the Inpres which is already a comprehensive document carrying the president's signature and his political weight? It is crucial that a STRANAS does not confuse the focus of the Inpres, but rather reinforces it. Would it be better to build the STRANAS around the Inpres? These are exactly the sort of points stakeholders should be debating.

91. Whatever the ACF stakeholders ultimately decide in terms of strategy, some of the mechanisms of the decision-making process could be improved to ensure that every meeting does not turn into another general discussion with no ultimate impact.

92. Consensus building and information sharing are important functions of some meetings, but to move reform forward, individuals must take responsibility for developing materials outside the meeting. These materials can generate points that need decisions by participants during the meeting. Thus, agendas should detail not just general topics to discuss but also decisions that need to be made. Ideally, most meetings should end with tasks assigned to individual participants to carry forward into the next meeting as too often, meetings end by only recommending more meetings (see Annex One). It is also important to find ways to support the participants to fulfill these tasks outside the meetings.

93. This is all part of the life cycle of establishing a multi-stakeholder forum. Its purposes and scope could be directed from outside, probably resulting in a project component that was easier to understand and to evaluate, but then it wouldn't be a true multi-stakeholder forum. As it is, the ACF has some way to go before it registers any real impact. In addition to the much larger ACF, there have also been seven smaller "expert group meetings" which typically meet with around ten people from UNODC, Bappenas, KPK and some CSOs. These meetings have generated good working relationships on anti-corruption and most recently have become a hub of activity related to the development of the medium term STRANAS. In sum, the process of the ACF's establishment has begun well and there are no other forums like it, so it does fill a very important gap.

C. Sustainability
94. There are clear examples from the project design that sustainability has been considered. There are plans in the training component to collect materials used during the trainings and hand them over to the dedicated training arms of each of the institutions. Interviewees from the BPK, the AGO and the KPK all said that they were looking forward to receiving the materials and that some, if not all, of the courses would be repeatedly taught using their own trainers and facilities. Staff from the AGO training center said that the more involved their own staff were in writing the materials at the beginning of the course, the more likely the course would be adopted wholesale. To ensure that materials were well adopted it may be an idea to finish the component with a training of trainers activity for the staff of all the institutions' training centers.

95. It is also important to consider the purpose of the participant evaluations. Ideally, the results of such evaluations are coupled with focus group discussions and fed back into a process of curriculum development to ensure that the materials are as relevant as possible to the needs of all the participants. This will be especially important for this project since there was such a wide variety of participants on each course. An end of project activity to ensure the materials that are handed over to each institution are as relevant as possible should also be considered. The post training analysis to find how far the skills from the course are being used by participants six months after the course have yet to be undertaken. Again, these evaluations have the potential to be fed back into the curriculums before they are handed over to the training centers.

96. In interviews, KPK staff expressed some concern that the organization would be liable to pay annual license costs associated with the goCASE software before its value was fully proven. Donors often favour including some form of software in projects because as an output it is easily measured and its potential use can be high. However, the practice of using the software into the future is often not given enough consideration and it is not long before it is dropped. This project is arranging to pay for the first year of support for the software, but in order to ensure that the adoption is firmly embedded, it may be worthwhile to extend the support to two years.

97. During the evaluation, staff from Bappenas said that there is a good likelihood that Bappenas could assume some of the costs and responsibilities for arranging Anti-Corruption Forums into the future if their use was adequately proven during the lifetime of the project.

98. In general, any project that works with and supports CSOs in the fight against corruption has an inbuilt sustainability. Indonesia's future development relies on its own civil society capacities and until the populace has both the means and the will to financially support anti-corruption NGOs, donors can play a crucial role in filling that gap.

99. From interviews with CSOs involved in the project for this evaluation, it seems clear that they will continue working in and around the same issues and people as this project deals with, but will not themselves fund an equivalent anti-corruption forum.

IV. Lessons learned and best practices

A. Lessons learned
100. Donor projects often fund multi-stakeholder forums or series of meetings to come up with plans or strategies for dealing with particular issues. Stakeholders can sometimes quite naturally believe that any ideas for future

activities that are generated from these forums will be funded from the same donor. If this is not the case, it is important to clarify that the donor is only supporting the decision-making process, not the future plans.

101.   There is a tendency for donors to overestimate the results that can be achieved or measured, especially in projects relating to governance. The result oriented approach that expects MOUs or whole intact policies to be produced from project activities can often lead to frustration. Project indicators should take into consideration the importance of the reform *process* as well as its "products." Even if a perfect MOU is produced from a project's activities in terms of international standards, if it was not forged through a consultative and voluntary process, it will stand little chance of implementation.

102.   Corruption reform is the most highly political type of reform there is, dealing with a myriad different entrenched interests. It is important to be realistic about the role an outside agency like UNODC or EC can play in this process – e.g. in the C&S activities of this project. In this regard, working with and through domestic CSOs is crucial.

103.   There should always be an effort to situate research reports into a particular process of reform. While the pursuit of knowledge is a worthy cause under many circumstances, reform aims to cause changes. This means that consideration should be given to how any knowledge product will be used to cause changes in terms of whose information gaps they fill and what process they can feed into at which institutions.

B. Best practices
104. Taking a non-direct approach to project goals can sometimes be more fruitful than a direct approach. In order to fulfill the goal of encouraging C&S among different anti-corruption agencies, this project brought participants from different agencies to sit together on courses. While the material taught was not directly about C&S, by bringing people together the classes still supported the goal of strengthening C&S.

105. Wherever possible, this project sought the involvement of those with seniority or political weight to spur a deeper engagement from other participants. In some trainings, participants' seniors opened or closed trainings and the vice president attended the last ACF.

106. UNODC added true value to the reform process by acting as an intermediary in bringing together different stakeholders through research, trainings or other meetings. TII and ICW noted that their access to state agencies such as the INP and the AGO was raised by the role UNODC staff played. Another donor active in this area, Ausaid, also noted how crucial UNODC's role in bringing together different groups is to current anti-corruption reform efforts.

107. The comprehensive training needs assessment at the beginning of the project ensured that all agencies involved in the trainings generally found them both useful and relevant compared to trainings held by other state agencies and donors.

V. Recommendations

A. Issues resolved during the evaluation

108. Potential duplication of research on best practices was raised by the KPK and communicated by evaluators to TII for further discussion in the next governing board meeting.

109. Some KPK personnel were under the mistaken impression that they would have to pay a license fee every year for the use of goCASE. This point is clarified that the only future cost they may incur is for IT support and this evaluation recommends that is extended for one more year, making two free years of IT support for the KPK.

110. As the proper place to discuss project amendments, a governing board meeting will take place to present the findings of this evaluation and make decisions about the direction of the second half of the project.

B. Actions recommended

111. As detailed in the previous sections, Component one on C&S and component three on anti-corruption strategy are operating in relatively fluid contexts. In the years since the project document was written there have been major developments in both government policy and implementation in these sectors. It is therefore recommended that the project receives periodic reviews and amendments to stay relevant.

112. Accepting that the project needs periodic amendments, the process through which these amendments take place should be fine-tuned. Governing board meetings are too infrequent and involve stakeholders who are too senior to decide on the relatively minor changes that are needed. On the other hand, the current practice of exchanging long and detailed letters between the EC and the UNODC seems laborious and excludes other stakeholders. It is recommended that alternative options are discussed at the upcoming governing board meeting.

113. It is recommended that UNODC hire a consultant at the end of the training component to prepare for the handing over of course materials to the training centers of individual state agencies. Participant evaluations and the opinions of training center staff can be fed back into the materials, ensuring they are as useful as possible to the needs of future participants. A training of trainers activity would help ensure that the materials could be optimally used.

114. In order to ensure participants for the trainings are of high enough quality and that they are sufficiently engaged, project beneficiaries should follow best practices in choosing participants for the trainings. If possible, this includes potential participants volunteering for the course and careful selection according to UNODC criteria in subsequent interviews. Where appropriate UNODC can support beneficiaries more closely in the selection process.

115. Meetings are a key mechanism for making change happen and it is essential that they are managed and administered well. All meetings, but especially those associated with ACF, should have tightly focused actionable agendas with a list of decisions that need to be made, and end with the allocation of tasks for the next meeting if appropriate (see Annex One). Responsibility for such meeting administration needs to be clarified.

116. In order to ensure that the goCASE software has the best chance of being fully adopted, UNODC should consider covering the costs of the first two years of IT support from UNODC Vienna for goCASE to the KPK. UNODC project staff have made it clear that there are several different possibilities for IT support from UNODC Vienna for the future which can be tailored to meet KPK's specific needs.

117. Having contributed 95% of the budget for this project, visibility is a major issue for the EC. UNODC has developed a new EC visibility plan for this project and it is recommended that this continues to receive serious attention.

118. Asked where they think donors can help most in anti-corruption, the answer from a range of different informants was astonishingly similar. People from the AGO, ICW, TII and KPK all said much more effort needs to go into the regions outside of Jakarta. Both the AGO and ICW agreed that the new anti-corruption courts that are just beginning to be established in a handful of regions this year need support, as do the CSOs which will engage with them. While it is not possible for this project to turn to this issue midway through its lifetime, it is recommended that any follow-up projects consider the regional anti-corruption courts as a focus.

VI. Conclusions

119. This project is a thoughtfully conceived, well implemented effort in anti-corruption. It is ambitious in its scope, with so many different stakeholders, and occasionally suffers from some of the same problems that many anti-corruption projects do in terms of focus. Corruption is such a multi-dimensional phenomena that efforts towards its eradication are often overwhelmed by it sheer pervasiveness. Maintaining a balance between a focused strategy and ability to respond to an ever changing context is key,

and this project has so far achieved that with the help of an incredibly dedicated team of staff.

<u>**Annex One:**</u> <u>**Best Practice in Holding Meetings**</u>

<u>**Clarifying Aims and Purposes**</u>
A meeting's aims or purposes should be at the top of every agenda. These are the key decisions that must be made or actions that must occur at the meeting. **If you aren't clear on aims and purposes, don't meet.**

Everything else on the agenda-topics, times, presenters, are the activities that, taken together, will accomplish the aims.

<u>**How to clarify your meeting's purpose**</u>
One way to clarify aims is to ask oneself, "Imagine the meeting is over. What do I hope will have happened?" When the agenda activities and time allocations have been decided, ask "If we complete these agenda activities, will we have accomplished our overall aims? Additions or adjustments in the agenda may be required.

<u>**Creating an Actionable Agenda**</u>
The agenda is the framework that supports the meeting. Agendas have been compared to road maps, blueprints, flight plans, recipes and musical scores. These all suggest that the agenda helps a group achieve a desired outcome.

To help ensure that all important issues are addressed, the agenda should be created with input of members. Some groups ask a sub-committee of 2 or 3 people to help the chair plan agendas. Some groups spend time at the end of a meeting planning the next agenda. Some groups send a call for agenda items via mail or E-mail from the chair. It is generally not advisable for a chair to create agendas in isolation.

Writing agenda items
Each item on the agenda should begin with an **action word** (verb). These items should frame the expectations of attendees.

Common action words	Example agenda items
Decide	*Decide* best methodology for student follow-up survey (phone, web, E-mail, etc.)
Discuss	*Discuss* after-hours building security
Review	*Review* recommendations from accreditation report
Select	*Select* speakers for symposium
finish	*Finish* reviewing graduate applications

The table below illustrates some well and poorly written agenda items.

Poor	Better
Teacher Assignment	Decide on Teacher Assignments for spring
Workshop	Decide on agenda and activities for workshop.

Allotting Time for Topics
The meeting agenda should allot specific amounts of time for each item. If no times are specified, then everything on the agenda appears to be of equal importance. An unfortunate consequence is that too much time will be spent on the least important items.

Assigning Key Meeting Roles
Most meetings need people playing **four roles**:

1-Leader convenes the meeting
2-Facilitator keeps discussion and decision-making process moving along
3-Recorder takes notes on paper, laptop or on flip charts
4-Timekeeper reminds leader when time almost up for a given item.

Make sure these roles are assigned prior to a meeting

Leader role
The leader convenes the meeting and takes responsibility for communication before and after. The leader may lead discussion on all items or may ask others, including a facilitator, to lead all or parts of the meeting. This enables the leader to be a full participant in discussions.

Facilitator role
The facilitator keeps the discussion and decision-making process moving along. The facilitator takes responsibility for the process, but should not be involved in the content of the meeting. A facilitator is especially useful if the leader holds a very strong opinion on an agenda item. Having a facilitator enables the leader to be a full participant.

Recorder role
The recorder takes notes on paper, laptop or on flip charts. Meeting notes should be distributed as soon after the meeting as possible. The longer the lag, the less confidence the members have that their investment will result in action. For groups that meet regularly, the recorder is responsible for keeping previous meeting notes and agendas in one place where they can be referenced later, such as through a shared network drive or a notebook, etc.

Timekeeper
The timekeeper reminds leader when time almost up for a given item. A stop watch or small clock is invaluable.

Agree on action plan
An action plan outlines the specifics that must be done before the next meeting. Not every goal needs an action plan, but for goals that involve more than one person, it's usually helpful to be specific about who will do what by when.

Every goal should have a point person-an individual charged with ensuring that the goal is moving forward. The point person is not expected to complete the goal personally but to connect the people involved, make progress reports, and seek assistance or resources needed to keep the goal moving forward.

The effectiveness of a meeting can be measured in terms of its outcomes. If people don't follow-through on action plans, tasks and decisions after the meeting ends, then one needs to question the value of having a meeting in the first place.

Distribute minutes
Ensure that minutes are produced and promptly distributed to all attendees including guests. Meeting minutes don't need to include everything everyone said. They do need to include following:

- Date, time location
- Attendees
- Key points raised and decisions made
- Motions and voting results if votes taken
- Who is responsible for what follow-up action and by when
- Name of the Recorder

https://www.ohrd.wisc.edu/home/HideATab/FullyPreparedtoManage/HowtoLead EffectiveMeetings/tabid/161/Default.aspx

Annex Two: List of Persons Interviewed and Field Visit Schedule

Date	Respondent	Job and Relationship to Project
6 July	Ajit Joy	UNODC, Country Manager; Oversees project.
Multiple	Monica Tanuhandaru	UNODC, National Project Coordinator, Anti-Corruption; Project Coordinator.
8 July	Rizky Indrawansyah	UNODC, Project Associate, Anti-Corruption; Project Officer for Component one.
8 July	Focus group discussion with 5 training participants from AGO, PPATK, INP, BPK.	Training participants
8 July	Muhammad Nuh Al-Azhar	Police, Forensics Officer; Trainer for Computer Forensics (refused to speak to evaluation team).
11 July	Bambang Sapto Pratomosunu	KPK Secretary General; Member of governing board.
11 July	Hotman Tambunan	Donor Coordination of KPK; knowledge of the project and other donor projects.
11 July	Emerson Yuntho	ICW Deputy Coordinator; Research coordinator for C&S research, component one.
11 July	Donal Fariz	ICW Law Researcher; Researcher for C&S research, component one.
11 July	Febri Diansyah	ICW Coordinator for Law and Court Monitoring Division; Researcher for C&S research, component one.
12 July	Vidya Dyasanti	Public Finance Manager TII Indonesia; Research Coordinator for best practice studies, component three.
12 July	Raghavan	UNODC, International Consultant on Anti-corruption; Reviewed and given recommendations on the project.
13 July	Prahesti Pandanwangi	Deputy Director of Human Rights, Bappenas; Project focal point in Bappenas.
13 July	Rois Solihin	Menpan, Head of Anti-Corruption Programmes; Member of the governing board, focal person for Kormonev survey.
14 July	Andreas Röttger	EC, Head of Economic & Regional Cooperation/ Good Governance; Head of section which oversees the project for the

		EC.
14 July	Vaida Kudabiene	EC, Finance and Contracts Section; Deals with UNODC financial reports to EC.
14 July	Novianty E. Manurung	EC, Project Officer Good Governance; Oversees the project for the EC.
14 July	Yuyun	UNODC, Finance Officer; Collates and Submits financial reports for the project.
14 July	Yogi Sasmito Nugroho	BPK, Head of Multilateral Cooperation; Member of Governing Board.
14 July	Sulung Setyo Amboro	BPK, Human Resources; Selected participants for component two training.
14 July	Audy	BPK, Public Relations; No direct involvement in project.
15 July	Darmono	AGO, Vice Attorney General; No direct involvement in project.
15 July	Feri Wibisono	AGO, Head of Planning Review; Had one meeting with ICW as an informant for component one research.
15 July	Hani Hasim	AGO, Assistance Team RB; No direct involvement in project.
15 July	Indra Sugianti	AGO Coordination Team; No direct involvement in project.
15 July	Idem	AGO Head of TU; No direct involvement in project.
15 July	Mahfud Mannan, SH	AGO, Head of National Training Center; No direct relation to project, center was used to host some trainings from component two.
15 July	Neva Sari Susanti	AGO, Head of Programme and Planning Division; involved in selection of AGO participants to attend trainings in component two.
18 July	Diani Sadiawati	Bappenas, Director of Law and Human Rights; member of the governing board.
21 July	Iwan Misthohizzaman	UNODC, National Officer, Training Coordination and Capacity Building; Project Officer for component two.
21 July	Damaris Monteiro Tnunay	National Project Associate, Anti-Corruption and Interim Project Coordinator, Illegal Logging; Project officer for component three.
27 July	Oegroseno	INP, Head of Education Institute; No direct involvement in project.

27 July	Hasyim Irianto	INP, Inspectorate of General Supervision; No direct involvement in project.
27 July	Pujianto	INP, Assistant for Planning and Budgeting; No direct involvement in project.
27 July	Syukri	INP, Inspectorate; No direct involvement in project.
27 July	Lalu Suprapta	INP, Education Institute; No direct involvement in project.

Annex Three: Terms of Reference

TERMS OF REFERENCE
Mid-term Evaluation[1]
UNODC Project
Support Indonesia's in the Fight Against Corruption
July – August 2011

PROJECT NO: IDN T81

1.   BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The objective of the action is to strengthen the rule of law and security in Indonesia by strengthening the capacity of the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK), providing specialised anti-corruption trainings and by strengthening the implementation of the National Anti-Corruption Strategy (RAN-PK/STRANAS and/or its successor) .Through improved governance, the Indonesian public's renewed trust in government and a more secure economic and social environment is sought to be the end result. This in turn will contribute to the overarching objective of improving the rule of law and security in Indonesia.

In strengthening the capacity of the KPK, there is a need to enhance the effectiveness of KPK's coordination and supervision function on both the repression and prevention side. Thus, the project provides for the strengthening of KPK's capacity which will be carried out by evaluating existing C&S processes, and providing technical assistance in developing a more robust C&S strategy and policy. The project also provides for building the investigation and prosecution capacities of anti-corruption agencies through delivery of specialised trainings. KPK, AGO, INP, the Indonesian FIU (PPATK), the State Audit Board (BPK) and the Anti-Corruption Court have expressed need for specialised training courses in advanced anti-corruption investigative and coordination techniques. In line with the above mentioned, there is a need to increase the quality of coordination between government, NGOs, media, private sector, and academia involved in the fight against corruption as well. The project therefore will also attempt to strengthen the monitoring and evaluation of the National Anti-Corruption Strategy and its implementation through improved stakeholder involvement and coordination. The goal is to evaluate the successes of the existing RAN - PK and actively assist the new government in the formation a new anti-corruption strategy

UNODC IDN T81 Project is one of the EU support to government of Indonesia under support to the Rule of Law, with the grant agreement amounted EUR 2,395,093. UNODC is the project implementing agency for this project, with its implementing partners, Transparency International Indonesia (TII) , Indonesian Corruption Watch (ICW) , and project associate Basel Institute and GTZ . The duration of the project is 34 months, with the grant agreement signed in October 2009, and only signed off by the government of Indonesia and commenced in November 2009 and is scheduled for completion in September 2012The project complements another UNODC Norway

---

[1] http://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/evaluation/about-projects-.html.

funded project, namely 'Strengthening the Capacity of Anti-corruption Institutions in Indonesia' (IDN T71). Both projects share a joint governing board.

The Project Objectives

The overall objective of the project is to support Indonesia's fight against corruption. More specifically this project supports Indonesia's anti-corruption efforts by strengthening the capacity of a key anti-corruption institution, the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK). The project will seek to specifically strengthen the KPK's co-ordination and supervision function in relation to other institutions authorized to eradicate corruption (objective 1). The project will also provide specialized anti-corruption training to improve the operational, technical and coordination capabilities of key institutions mandated to investigate and prosecute corruption cases. These include the KPK, National Police, AGO, Audit Board and the Anti-Corruption Court (objective 2). The project will support Indonesia in strengthening the implementation and monitoring and evaluation of the National Anti-Corruption Strategy (RAN-PK/STRANAS and/or its successor) through the creation of a stakeholder forum, strengthening corruption monitoring and evaluation mechanisms and reviewing progress made against UNCAC (objective 3)

• **KPK's coordination and supervision (C&S) function strengthened**
This will be carried out by evaluating existing C&S processes and providing technical assistance in developing a more robust C&S strategy and policy. A corresponding operational mechanism to implement the new C&S policy will be developed along with complimentary case management software. Trainings will be delivered for familiarisation of the new system within KPK and understanding and compliance of the same by the Attorney General's Office (AGO), National Police (INP) and other government stakeholders. In total, 230 KPK, AGO and INP officers will be trained on KPK's new C&S function. This is in line with KPK's Strategic Plan 2008-2011 objectives to increase the integrity of law enforcement, strengthen KPK's oversight apparatus as well as to undertake a series of effective corruption prevention measures.

• **Anti-corruption agencies' investigation and prosecution capacities built through specialised trainings**
A training needs assessment of the KPK, AGO, INP, the Indonesian FIU (PPATK), the State Audit Board (BPK) and the Anti-Corruption Court conducted by Basel Institute on Governance revealed a need for specialised training in advanced anti-corruption investigative and coordination techniques. In total, 420 senior personnel from these agencies will be trained. The project will expand the operational and technical knowledge available to investigators, prosecutors and judicial officers of these agencies through high quality training workshops on: investigative interviewing, forensic accounting, asset tracing and recovery, fraud and corruption prevention techniques, and computer forensic investigations. Improving the coordination mechanisms and operational cooperation between these agencies will be another area of focus.

• **Effective implementation and monitoring and evaluation of National Anti-Corruption Strategy (STRANAS) 2010-2025**
The project will: (i) bring government and non-government entities together through an Anti-Corruption Forum for improving STRANAS implementation; (ii) conduct 4 analyses of reforms already undertaken by selected field offices of the Directorate of Tax, Directorate of Customs, and two local government offices to identify good practices and

lessons learned in Anti-Corruption (AC) reform; (iii) carry out 1 follow-up study on the UN Convention Against Corruption (UNCAC) Gap Analysis of 2006 to map Indonesian AC response and recommend future direction; and (iv) MenPAN, Transparency International Indonesia (TII) and Indonesia Corruption Watch (ICW) will carry out 1 survey on The Ministry of State Administrative Reform's (MenPAN) Coordination, Monitoring, and Evaluation (Kormonev) system with the help of a wide NGO network in 10 regional locations.

The Project is linked to the UNODC Indonesia Country Program Framework (CPF) particularly on Sub-Program 2, Anti-Corruption;
Outcome 2.1- Improved Law Enforcement Response
Outcome 2.2- Civil Society and the Media

The key-stakeholder and partners of the project are Indonesian National Police (INP), Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK), Attorney General's Office (AGO), the Financial Transaction Reports and Analysis Centre (PPATK), and Civil Society Organizations (CSOs).

The Project Implementation Team (PIT) is headed by a National Coordinator who has experience and knowledge of working on police reform and capacity building programmes, in addition to project management experience. The National Project Coordinator is assisted by one international consultant experienced in law enforcement and project management, and with a team of four staffs.

2.   PURPOSE OF THE EVALUATION

This project requires an independent, external, mid-term evaluation, as stipulated in the Annex I of the financing agreement:

"Periodic reporting combined with an independent mid-term and end-term evaluation represents the foundation of the action's evaluation. The Programme Logistical Framework incorporates a set of indicators and means of verification for each outcome and output, which shall provide the basis for programme performance monitoring."

"External Evaluation: External evaluation will be undertaken by an independent evaluator who will operate according to broad Terms of Reference approved 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 the action's outcomes, outputs and supporting activities at both of these stages. The results of the mid-term review will assist the AIT in making any necessary adjustments to activities in order to achieve planned outcomes, outputs and expected results. This will help to keep the action dynamic and responsive to any changing needs that may arise during the course of the action."

This external evaluation initiated by the UNODC is a part of the project evaluation as mandated by the UNODC Guidelines on evaluation. The purpose of this evaluation is to assess the progress and measure the achievements and present recommendations on the way forward. A final evaluation will take place upon completion of the project".

 http://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/evaluation/about-projects-.html

The independent mid-term external evaluation will be conducted by a team of evaluation experts. The evaluation will assess the relevance, efficiency, and effectiveness comprising of one International Consultant and one National Consultant.

The evaluation is aimed at looking for the overall performance and achievements, of the project to date and provide recommendations regarding the remaining duration of the project. As stipulated in the project document the main stakeholders, partners, and associates of the project are Indonesian Law Enforcement Agencies, particularly INP, KPK, AGO, PPATK, BPK, Basel Institute on Governance, GTZand, as well as implementing partners ICW and TII are also among the main stakeholders of the evaluation. The project also involves the media ,NGOs, CSOs and universities. These agencies / organisations will therefore be the key learning partners in this evaluation.

The Project Coordinator will be the evaluation manager The evaluator is expected to report their findings and recommendations before the 7th of August 2011.

3.   EVALUATION SCOPE

General

The Mid-term review will assess the performance of the project T81 in two areas:

1. ***Progress of the portfolio*** towards achieving the objective of the project and the status of the portfolio in terms of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, impact, lessons learned and best practices.

2. ***Operational performance*** in terms of relevance and effectiveness of the project governance, management mechanisms and also level of compliance with rules and regulations of the partner agencies.

The performance of the portfolio should be assessed against the project result framework, both to show progress towards achieving the objective of the project, as well as to review the current validity of the result framework as a reporting tools. The final report will represent both project findings as well as the programmatic assessment. Recommendations will largely be focused at program level.

Both above mentioned areas should be thoroughly reviewed, but stronger focus should lie on assessing the progress and the quality of project portfolio with the intention to promote capturing of lessons learned and especially recommendation for moving forward.

The project activities and objectives are detailed within the project document. The evaluation will cover the period November 2009 - July 2011, with the coverage at the national level and studies at selected regions and targeted government institutions

 The final report will be prepared in English and in Bahasa Indonesia.

Key evaluation questions to be answered by the evaluation.

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

Effectiveness, evaluate project effectiveness "to what extent has the project produced its desired objectives

Efficiency, evaluate the project efficiency "to what degree have resources been optimally used during project implementation, and has the project achieved satisfactory level of cost effectiveness"

Sustainability, evaluate the project's likely contribution to sustainability of benefit streams, e.g. "to what extent benefits will continue after the life of the project.

Impact, evaluate the project impact and its contribution to the Indonesia's fight against corruption and what has the project achieved.

Recommendations, lessons learned and best practices, finally the evaluation will look at recommendations; lessons learned and best practices of the project.

4.   EVALUATION PROCESS AND FOLLOW UP ACTION

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:

1. A desk review of relevant reports and data that will mainly address quantitative issues;
2. Submission of proposed methodology to be cleared by UNODC Independent Evaluation Unit;
3. Field-research and visit to partners and grantees, where more qualitative issues can be addressed, and finally;
4. The preparation of the report which include findings and recommendations. And review findings with stakeholders/partners and preparing follow-up action plan to implement accepted recommendations
5. Project Strategic Programming & Project Proposal Amendments and Refinements

1. 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 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 meetings, Anti-corruption forums, expert working groups
- Relevant documents Grants for Civil Society TII and ICW
- 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.

2. Submission of Evaluation Methodology

The evaluator will submit proposed methodology to the evaluation manager and IEU for review and approval.

3. Field Assessments

Field research, interviews and FGDs may include but may not be limited to:

- 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.
- Observation of 'Training in action' in one of the training courses that may be on-going during their visit. Timing is to coincide with delivery of a program.
- Discussions with target audience, beneficiaries and stakeholders.
- Discussions with past and present students and their line managers (with available ongoing course). This will involve a field visit to ICW and TII as the project implementing
- Other thematic support in anti-corruption, such as national, international bilateral and multilateral cooperation.

4. Presentation of Results, Review Findings, Reporting and Final Submission

The output of the evaluation will be a comprehensive draft report outlining the methodology pursued and main findings of the evaluation, including lessons learned and recommendations for the remaining half project period. The findings of the evaluation will be presented the evaluator to the members of the Governing Board and with the draft report and Aide Memoir for their review and input. The Governing Board members will provide their feedback and the evaluator integrate inputs to the report and submit the final evaluation report. The final report, which include recommendations, action plan should be submitted to UNODC on the date to be agreed in any case before endthe 1st of August.

5. Strategic Programming & Project Proposal Amendments and Refinements

Subsequent to the result of the evaluation, is to generate a Strategic Programming (SP) based on mid-term evaluation findings and recommendations with the involvement of stake-holder, partners, and beneficiaries, it is also primarily to secure consensus of the Governing Board members. The output will be refinements/amendments of the project proposal, logical framework, workplan, and budget.

5. EVALUATION TEAM COMPOSITION

The evaluation team will comprise of one international experts selected by UNODC, who preferably have the working experience in the rule of law, justice sector, capacity building and civil society strengthening. UNODC will facilitate the recruitment process and provide administrative and logistics support to the evaluation team, and the IEU will provide further guidance and support in regards to accordance to evaluation policy and procedures.

The international evaluation expert must have a minimum of master's degree majoring in law/ sociology/ education, with 15 years of working experience in the work of development, a vast experience in monitoring and evaluation of international projects, required 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 national evaluation expert must have an excellent understanding of the Indonesian context of law enforcement and rule of law, anti-corruption national and international instruments, and required to have a good knowledge of the Indonesian justice sectors in particular in relation to anti-corruption effort. must have an excellent background of the Indonesian and International law related to anti-corruption, with 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.

The evaluation experts are expected to have a good rapport with the Government of Indonesia and in particular with the Indonesian Law Enforcement. Evaluators will not act as representatives of any party and must remain independent and impartial.

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

6. PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

The TOR and the proposed methodology of the Mid-term evaluation will be shared and consulted with the Governing Board members and UNODC IEU. The evaluator(s) 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 and submission.

UNODC Project Coordinator and the project staff 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.

Although the experts 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 Country Manager and 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 tUNODC Indonesia, The Governing Board of the Project, Chief of the Independent Evaluation Unit, UNODC Regional Centre, and UNODC HQ, Vienna, Austria for their review, prior to its finalization. The evaluation expert, 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.

Subsequent to the submission of the final report, a strategic programming sessions is to be organized by UNODC and participated by members of the Governing Board, partners and beneficiaries(selected). The mid-term evaluation will be presented ,and with the consequence to provide inputs to the planning of the project remaining period, outputs will be refinements/amendments of the project proposal, logical framework, workplan, and budget. The strategic programming sessions will take place in a form of a two day workshop and to be facilitated by an independent programming facilitator.

Time Table

Week	Date	Activities
1	July	
	5	Review project documents. Write methodology.
	6	**Submit draft methodology**. Review project documents. Meeting at UNODC with project staff to plan schedule and get feedback on methodology.
	7	Review project documents and generate questions. UNODC arrange appointments for the rest of the evaluation. **Re-submit methodology**.
	8	Interviews with previous and current project staff. Interviews with participants of training/ trainers and KPK donor coordination staff.
2	11 – 18	Interview EU, Indonesian National Police, KPK, BAPPENAS, BPK, PPATK, Men-PAN, AGO, MoFA, Min Law and Human Rights and other stakeholders.
		Meet other stakeholders including members of the governing board, people involved in trainings, CSOs in Jakarta. FGDs with training participants and trainers

3	20	Draft initial report, more interviews as appropriate.
4	25	**Submit draft** of key findings and recommendations to UNODC, IEU, KPK and EU.
	26	…………………………………………………………...
	27	Presentation of key findings and recommendations to UNODC, KPK and EU.
	28-29	Incorporate feedback from IEU and presentation into draft report. **Submit final report.**
5	**August**	
	1	Present key findings and recommendations to governing board and wider stakeholders.
	2	Workshop with UNODC to incorporate findings into project re-design.

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. Examples of best practise

3. Issues about longer-term sustainability. Whilst it will probably be difficult to get a comprehensive view of this, discussions at senior levels with past and prospective donors, stakeholders and customers would give at least an indication of how far there was commitment to integrating the benefits of the project into long-term planning.

4. A proposed strategic programming session, which the mid-term evaluation will be presented , to provide inputs to the planning of the project remaining period, the outputs will be refinements/amendments of the project proposal, logical framework, workplan, and budget. With taking into consideration the activities and outcomes outlined in the original project document and t findings from their evaluation of mid-term. In terms of written deliverables, the evaluation team should provide to the PIT and UNODC an "issues list" in advance of starting the fieldwork in the Indonesia, and would be expected to brief the Project Implementing Team (PIT) and UNODC

Country Manager informally during the fieldwork as to emerging findings and any issues that require further investigation.

It is not envisaged that the report will be a very long document (main report maximum of 30 pages), 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"[2] 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:

- 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.

8.   REPORT STRUCTURE (25-30 pages)

CONTENTS

Abbreviations and acronyms

Summary matrix of findings, supporting evidences and recommendations

Executive summary

VII. Introduction

A. Background and context of the programme or project

---

[2] http://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/evaluation/about-projects-.html

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

C. **Executing modalities of the programme or project**

D. **Evaluation methodology**

E. **Limitations to the evaluation**

VIII. **Major findings and analysis**

A. **Relevance of the programme or project**

B. **Attainment of the programme or project objectives**

C. **Achievement of the programme or project outputs**

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

IX. **Outcomes, impact and sustainability.**

A. **Outcomes**

B. **Impact**

C. **Sustainability**

X. **Lessons learned and best practices**

A. **Lessons learned**

B. **Best practices**

XI. **Recommendations**

A. **Issues resolved during the evaluation**

B. **Actions recommended**

XII. **Conclusions**

  Annexes, including at least

- **Terms of reference of the evaluation**

- **List of persons interviewed and field visit schedule**

- **Evaluation assessment questionnaire**

Annex Four: Evaluation Assessment Questionnaire

Project/programme title: **Support to the fight against corruption in Indonesia**

Project/programme number: **IDN T81**

The evaluators are required to rate each of the items shown below on a scale of 1 to 5 (1 being the lowest and 5 being the highest), as follows:

    5 = Excellent   (90-100 per cent)

    4 = Very good   (75-89 per cent)

    3 = Good   (61-74 per cent)

    2 = Fair   (50-60 per cent)

    1 = Unsatisfactory   (0-49 per cent)

These ratings are based on the findings of the evaluation and thus are a translation of the evaluation results. Please note that these findings must be supported in the text of the evaluation. This means that the numeric system here is a reflection of the analysis carried out by the evaluators. This table is not included in the evaluation report itself, but will be used as input into the Annual Evaluation Report.

A. Planning	Rating					
	N/A	1	2	3	4	5
1. Quality of context analysis during the project planning phase (socio-economic context and demographic, economic, legal, institutional, cultural, religious, and attitudinal factors, including gender dimensions)					X	
2. Good practices review (lessons learned from projects in the same context)	X					

#	Criteria	N/A	1	2	3	4	5
3.	Consultation of stakeholders (beneficiaries, authorities, partners)					X	
4.	Identification of risks and mitigation measures				X		
5.	Existence of baseline data (baseline data collection and utilisation)			X			
6.	Project design (clarity, logic, coherence, reasonable assumptions)			X			
7.	Appropriateness of project design (realistic purpose compared to beneficiaries context and needs)				X		
8.	Appropriateness of inputs (human and financial resources) to achieve planned objectives				X		
9.	Appropriateness of objectives and outcomes (realistic and measurable objectives and outcomes; existence of realistic and measurable indicators – benchmarks and targets)			X			
10.	Appropriateness of overall strategy (the project strategy feeds into UNODC strategy and takes into consideration national priorities)					X	
11.	Fulfilment of prerequisites by Government				X		
12.	Participation of stakeholders				X		
13.	Adherence to project duration				X		
14.	Adherence to budget						X
15.	Consideration of gender dimensions in the planning assumptions and project design		X				

B.	Implementation	Rating					
		N/A	1	2	3	4	5
16.	Quality and timeliness of UNODC inputs				X		
17.	Quality and timeliness of government inputs				X		
18.	Quality and timeliness of third-party (please specify:_____) inputs	X					

No.		N/A	1	2	3	4	5
19.	UNODC headquarters support (administration, management, backstopping)				X		
20.	UNODC field office support (administration, management, backstopping)				X		
21.	Executing agency support				X		
22.	Responsiveness of the monitoring system (changes in needs and context feed back into the project strategy)		X				
23.	Partnerships (successful establishment, maintenance, and utilization)					X	
24.	Consideration of gender dimensions (data collection, establishment of relevant partnerships, and monitoring of gender perspectives)		X				

C.	Results	Rating					
		N/A	1	2	3	4	5
25.	Attainment and timeliness of outputs				X		
26.	Quality of outputs				X		
27.	Achievement and timeliness of outcomes				X		
28.	Quality of outcomes				X		
29.	Partnerships (successful achievements)						X
30.	Programme/project impact				X		
31.	Achievement of gender equality related results (outcomes and objectives)		X				
32.	Sustainability of results/benefits				X		

D.	Recommendations *The evaluator should choose ONE of the four options below.*	
	Continue/extend without modifications	
	Continue with modifications	X
	Revise project completely	

	End project	

E.	Comments **Provide relevant explanations and comment on issues such as clarification, replicability, best practices or any other comment.** To fulfill its potential this project should ensure (1) it maintains strong guidance to keep the anti-corruption forum focused (2) extra activities are added to ensure sustainability of trainings (3) a renewed mechanism for project amendments.