

**Republic of Indonesia**  
**Country Programme Evaluation**

**Approach Paper**



**April, 2012**

**Independent Office of Evaluation  
International Fund for Agricultural Development**



**Republic of Indonesia**  
**Country Programme Evaluation**

**Approach Paper**

**Table of Contents**

<b>Abbreviations and acronyms</b>	<b>ii</b>
<b>I. Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>II. Country Background</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>III. Overview of IFAD Operations and Evolution of the Country Strategy</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>IV. Evaluation Objectives, Methodology and Process</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>V. Core Learning Partnership</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>VI. Agreement at Completion Point</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>VII. Evaluation Team</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>VIII. Communication and Dissemination</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>IX. Evaluation Roadmap</b>	<b>13</b>

**Appendices**

<b>1. Indonesia CPE Framework</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>2. Bibliography and References</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>3. List of IFAD Loans to Indonesia, 1980 – 2012</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>4. List of Projects to Be Evaluated Under the Indonesia CPE</b>	<b>24</b>

## Abbreviations and acronyms

ACP	Agreement at Completion Point
ADB	Asian Development Bank
AP	Approach Paper
APEC	Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation
APR	Asia and the Pacific Division
ASEAN	Association of South-east Asian Nations
CI	Cooperating Institution
CLP	Core Learning Partnership
COSOP	Country Strategic Opportunities Paper/Programme
CPE	Country Programme Evaluation
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
GOI	Government of Indonesia
NGO	Non-governmental organization
IOE	Independent Office of Evaluation of IFAD
TAG	Technical Assistance Grant
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNOPS	United Nations Office for Project Services
WFP	World Food Programme
WB	World Bank

## I. Introduction

1. As decided by the Executive Board, the Independent Office of Evaluation of IFAD (IOE) will undertake a Country Programme Evaluation (CPE) of the IFAD-Government of Indonesia co-operation in 2012. This is the second CPE undertaken by IOE in Indonesia since the inception of the Fund's operations in 1978, following the CPE in 2003/4. The current CPE will cover IFAD activities in the country during the period from 2004 to the present. CPEs are normally conducted prior to the preparation of a new IFAD-Government co-operation strategy for the concerned country.<sup>1</sup>

2. The Indonesia CPE will be conducted within the overall provisions contained in the IFAD Evaluation Policy<sup>2</sup> and follow IOE's methodology and processes for CPEs as contained in the IOE Evaluation Manual.<sup>3</sup> The previous IOE evaluations of IFAD operations in Indonesia - as shown in Table 1 - will provide valuable evaluative evidence for the planned CPE.

**Table 1. Previous IOE Evaluations Relating to IFAD Operations in Indonesia**

Evaluation Type	Evaluations
Project evaluations	Project Completion Report Validation of the Post-Crisis Programme for Participatory Integrated Development in Rainfed Areas (2011)
Country Programme Evaluation	Indonesia (2003/4)
Corporate level evaluations including Indonesia	Direct Supervision Pilot Programme (2004/5) IFAD's Regional strategy in Asia and the Pacific (EVEREST, 2005/6)

## II. Country Background

3. Located in South East Asia, Indonesia has more than 80 per cent of its territory covered with water, a land area of 1,904,443 square kilometres, and a population of approximately 238 million (as of 2010). The large number of islands and their dispersion over a wide area have given rise to a diverse culture and hundreds of ethnic groups, each with its own language, although Bahasa is the national language of Indonesia. The average annual population growth rate is around 1 per cent. About 44.3 per cent of the population live in the urban areas<sup>4</sup>.

4. **The Economy.** Prudent economic management has enabled Indonesia to record consistently high rates of economic growth, well in excess of the expansion in population, for more than two decades. This growth, which averaged more than 6 per cent per year between 1970 and 1996, was achieved despite a number of external shocks, including sharp movements in oil prices and in international exchange rates, which affected the terms of trade and the value of the country's external debt. From a low income country in the mid-1960s, Indonesia transformed itself into a middle income country, with GDP per capita of almost US\$1,250 in 1996. As a result of the 1997-1998 financial crisis, GDP growth first slowed to 4.7 per cent in 1997 and then contracted by 13.1 per cent in 1998, the worst performance since records began. Recovery from the crisis began in 2000, fuelled by strong household and government consumption, and GDP growth exceeded 6 per cent in 2007 for the first time since the 1997-1998 crisis. Average annual growth in 2003-2007 was 5.4 per cent and GDP per head recovered to an estimated US\$1,840 in 2007<sup>5</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> That is, the results-based Country Strategic Opportunities Programme (COSOP).

<sup>2</sup> Approved by the Fund's Executive Board in May 2011; see document EB2011/102/R.7/Rev. 1. Also available from the IFAD internet site: <http://www.ifad.org/pub/policy/oe.pdf>.

<sup>3</sup> Available from the IFAD Internet site: [http://www.ifad.org/evaluation/process\\_methodology/doc/manual.pdf](http://www.ifad.org/evaluation/process_methodology/doc/manual.pdf).

<sup>4</sup> UNDP Human Development Report 2010.

<sup>5</sup> Economic Intelligence Unit Indonesia Country Profile 2008.

**Table 2. Indonesia 2004-2011: Key Macroeconomic Indicators and Projections**

	ACTUAL					PROJECTED		
	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Real GDP growth (%)	5.0	5.7	5.5	6.3	6.0	6.4	6.7	6.7
GDP per capita (US\$) <sup>a</sup>	-	3207	3449	3727	3987	4155	-	-
Value added in agriculture; hunting and forestry; fishing (%) <sup>a</sup>	14.3	13.1	12.9	13.7	14.5	15.3	15.3	-
Exports (GNFS) (billion US\$)	84.2	99.8	115.0	130.4	152.6	164.1	180.0	200.2
Imports (GNFS) (billion US\$)	71.3	91.3	95.5	108.5	117.9	123.2	132.6	143.0
Current account balance (billion US\$)	3.3	0.3	9.9	11.0	8.5	4.9	1.6	-1.3
Budget deficit (% of GDP)	-1.0	-0.5	-0.9	-1.3	-1.8	-1.6	-1.3	-1.0
Consumer price index (% change)	6.2	10.5	13.1	6.5	12.5	8.0	6.0	6.5
Growth of Money Supply M2 (%)	8.1	16.4	14.9	18.9	11.4	14.4	13.1	12.6
Total outstanding government debt to GDP (%)	59.7	47.1	38.5	34.5	31.3	29.6	27.7	26.3
<sup>a</sup> Data extracted from OECD- Country Statistical Profiles- the data in the table are not projected								

Source: World Bank

5. **Human Development.** The Human Development Index (HDI) of Indonesia ranks 108 out of 169 countries which places Indonesia in the medium human development category. Indonesia is one of the most populated countries in the world. The total fertility rate is on a decreasing trend from 2.9 (1990-1995) to 2.0 (2010-2015) births per woman. The life expectancy is 71.5 years. The adult literacy rate is 92 per cent (2005-2008) for the population aged 15 and older. The labour force participation rate for men is 86.2 per cent (2008) while that of women is 53.3 per cent. The total number of unemployed and underemployed people in Indonesia now stands at 41.6 million or 40.4 per cent of the labour force (with an official unemployment rate of 9.5 per cent). Unemployment has been rising since 1997 in particular due to the fall in formal sector employment, especially affecting young, low-skilled and poorer workers<sup>6</sup>.

6. In 2007, Indonesia's value on the Gender Development Index was 0.721, and it ranked 94<sup>th</sup> out of 157 countries. Poor women are often physically overworked, having to collect water, in addition to working in the fields, and looking after their household and small livestock management tasks. Poor woman-headed households have a higher risk of being affected by shocks than other types of households. Despite the importance of women in agricultural production, most of the government extension workers are men

7. Decision-making processes within families and communities often exclude women. Women are under-represented in elected leadership positions, and in management positions in public services. In addition, they lack economic opportunities and access to credit and other productive resources, creating a wage gap<sup>7</sup>, both in the informal and formal sectors.

8. **Poverty.** Indonesia has shown solid progress in poverty reduction since the Asian crisis and has demonstrated sustained resilience and robustness during the recent global economic downturn. Steady economic growth has led to a gradual reduction in overall poverty in the country, which has fallen from 17 per cent in 2004 to 13 per cent in early 2010.

9. Poverty in Indonesia has three salient features. First, a large number of Indonesians are vulnerable to poverty. The national poverty rate masks the large number of people who live just above the national poverty line. These "near-poor" households are vulnerable to shocks such as food price increases and ill health, which can easily drive them into poverty. Analysis indicates that there is little that distinguishes the poor from the near-poor, suggesting that poverty reduction strategies should focus on improving the welfare of the lowest two quintile groups.

<sup>6</sup> European Community Strategy Paper, 2007-2013.

<sup>7</sup> Australia Indonesia Partnership Country Strategy, 2008-2013.

10. Second, non-income poverty is a more serious problem than income poverty. When one acknowledges all dimensions of human well-being: adequate consumption, reduced vulnerability, education, health and access to basic infrastructure, then almost half of the Indonesians would be considered to have experienced at least one type of poverty.

11. Third, regional disparities in poverty are considerable. Wide regional differences characterize Indonesia, some of which are reflected in disparities between rural and urban areas. Rural households account for about 57 per cent of the poor in Indonesia and also frequently lack access to basic infrastructure services: only about 50 per cent of rural poor have access to an improved source of water, compared with 80 per cent for the urban poor. But more importantly, across the vast Indonesia archipelago, it is also reflected in broad swathes of regional poverty, in addition to smaller pockets of poverty within regions.

12. **Government's Poverty Reduction Strategy.** Poverty reduction has received consistent attention in all of the Government's five-year development plans. The national Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP) (2003) recognizes poverty as a multidimensional phenomenon and the diagnosis acknowledges regional and urban/rural disparities and gender concerns. The PRSP aims to address issues not only for those who are already poor, but also for those who are vulnerable and at risk of becoming poor. The PRSP is mainstreamed into the Medium-Term Development Plan (2004-2009) which identified the key requirements for reducing the incidence of rural poverty as follows: (i) accelerated rural development and improved management of natural resources with a focus on providing productive and durable employment; (ii) improved rural infrastructure; (iii) increased participation of the poor in development and improved quality of life for women; (iv) greater opportunities for poor communities living in areas that have been left behind because of their remote location; and (v) provision of the appropriate social security systems to offer short-term assistance in times of adversity.

13. In the 1990s, the Government launched, with the support of the World Bank, its highly successful Kecamatan Development Programme that emphasized decentralization and community empowerment. Building on the successful experience of this programme, in August 2006, the Government launched its flagship community-based poverty reduction programme, the National Programme for Community Empowerment or Program Nasional Pemberdayaan Masyarakat (NCEP/PNPM). PNPM is the Government's operational umbrella for all poverty programmes which use a community empowerment approach. IFAD is also part of this programme. The objective of PNPM is to ensure that the poor benefit from improved socioeconomic and governance conditions. The programme aims to consolidate community-based programmes of various ministries and institutionalizes Indonesia's experience in bottom-up planning and decision-making into a single community-based poverty reduction programme, in both rural and urban areas. PNPM had a massive scaling up in 2009. Today it is one of the large poverty reduction programmes in the world, with a documented record of community engagement, participation and service delivery. It has nationwide coverage in all rural villages and urban wards in Indonesia.

14. **Agriculture.** Agriculture plays an important role in Indonesia's economy, providing employment to over 40 per cent of the workforce and income to two-thirds of the country's poor. Increases in agricultural productivity are credited with reducing poverty in Indonesia during the 1970s and 1980s, and even now agriculture continues to be the key livelihood for many and a key source of poverty reduction.

15. Agriculture was de-emphasized after the 1980s as Indonesia reached substantial self-sufficiency in the production of food. However, the Government once again began to give greater priority to agriculture. For example, during 2001-2008, national spending on agriculture<sup>8</sup> increased from Rp 11

---

<sup>8</sup> Figures for national agriculture expenditure cited here include expenditure by the Ministry of Agriculture, sub-national government spending on agriculture and irrigation, expenditure under the Ministry of Public Works and

trillion to Rp 53 trillion, an average of 11 per cent per year in real terms. Agriculture's share of total government spending doubled from 3 per cent in 2001 to 6 per cent by 2008, reaching 1 per cent of GDP because of increasing spending on agriculture subsidies. The Ministry of Agriculture allocates a large and increasing share of resources to input subsidies in an effort to increase the production of food crops. Agriculture subsidies account for 60 per cent of all agriculture spending in Indonesia (2008). Fertilizer subsidies are about 50 per cent of all subsidy spending (US\$1.6 billion) at 0.3 per cent of GDP.

16. However, increased public expenditures have failed to increase agricultural productivity, an aspect that has plagued the sector for many years. Over the past three decades, Indonesia significantly boosted its capacity in agricultural R&D, but public spending on R&D was only 0.22 per cent of the agriculture output in 2003. By 2007, spending on R&D was still only half of that on seed subsidy. After adding in private sector agricultural R&D investments, the intensity with which Indonesia invested in agricultural research, at 0.27 per cent, was at the level of Lao PDR (0.24 per cent) and much lower than Malaysia (1.92 per cent) or the Philippines (0.46 per cent).

17. The public research and extension systems are facing several challenges to remain viable under pressure from staff and budget decentralization, demands for greater client orientation, and increasing need to accommodate commercial pressures. High quality agricultural research and extension systems will be critical to getting productivity onto a higher growth path. There is an urgent need for greater investment in agricultural research and technology dissemination – but this should take a demand driven approach and seek greater involvement of the private sector rather than relying on the old supply driven model.

18. **Institutional Context of the Agricultural Sector.** The responsible ministries for agriculture sector development in Indonesia include the Ministry of Agriculture (MOA), the Ministry of Forestry (MOF), and the Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries (MMAF) while the National Development Planning Agency (BAPPENAS) provides planning, programming and budgeting along with coordination with the relevant agencies. The State Ministry for Research and Technology coordinates research and development policy. The largest government research agency in Indonesia, with more than 3,000 scientists in 2003, is the Indonesian Agency for Agricultural Research and Development (IAARD) of the Ministry of Agriculture<sup>9</sup>.

19. **Agricultural Policies and Strategies.** One of the important national policies is the Long Term National Development Planning for the period 2005-2020, based on which the strategy is specified in five year stages into the National Medium-Term Development Plans (NMTDP). The NMTDP has prioritized reducing absolute poverty and improving income distribution through social protection that is based on the family, community empowerment and expansion of economic opportunities of the low income population. The priorities also aim to increase food security and continuation of the revitalization of agriculture for realizing self-reliance in food, increasing the competitiveness of agricultural products, increasing the income level of farmers, and conserving the environment and natural resources. The plan also targeted the objective of increasing the growth rate of the agricultural sector in the GDP to 3.7 per cent in 2014.

20. The vision of the Indonesian Agricultural and Rural Development of 2020 is to ensure a progressive rural community in the agribusiness activities in such a way that they will be able to create and fill productive job opportunities and be able to jack up their income growth at the regional and national level. Six priority strategies have been formulated as follows: (i) acceleration of human resources and entrepreneurship empowerment; (ii) empowerment of social investment by strengthening decentralization, community self-help, and empowering social institutions; (iii) revitalization of broad spectrum agricultural productivity increase through agricultural research and development, and

---

central government subsidies closely related to agriculture (e.g., fertilizers), but excludes expenditure on fisheries and forestry and rural roads.

<sup>9</sup> ADB. Strategic Vision for Agriculture and Rural Development.

diversification; (iv) support for competitive and efficient agribusiness and developing related and profitable industrial zones; (v) empowerment and strengthening the growth and productivity of rural non-agricultural sector; and (vi) strengthening sustainable natural resource management.

21. The Indonesian President in July 2005 decreed the Revitalization of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry as a policy priority. The specific policy goals of the Agricultural Revitalization initiative are: (i) realization of a competitive industrialized agriculture; (ii) solidity and self-reliance of food security; (iii) full employment opportunities for farmers; and (iv) poverty eradication in the agricultural sector with a farmer income level of US\$2,500/year.

22. **Regional Cooperation.** The 2008 global food price crisis led regional institutions like the Association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN) and Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC), of which Indonesia is a member state, to address global food security issues in the Asia and the Pacific region. Integrated Food Security Framework and Strategic Plan of Action on ASEAN Food Security for 2009-2013 have been adopted to ensure long term food security and improve the livelihoods of farmers in the ASEAN region. APEC's recent Strategic Framework for Food Security has prioritized the promotion of food security through increasing access to food, availability of food and reliability of supply, enhancement of food safety and dietary health; and strengthening environmental security and sustainability<sup>10</sup>.

23. **Official Development Assistance (ODA).** During the period from 2001-2009, the biggest single donor of ODA to Indonesia was Japan, followed by Australia, France, and the United States. The main multilateral agencies providing ODA are the World Bank, the Asian Development Bank and the EU. The following tables provide further information on ODA to Indonesia.

**Table 3. Top Ten Donors of Gross ODA (2008-2009 average) (US\$ million)**

Donors	Amount (US\$ million)
Japan	1,370
IDA	369
Australia	334
France	263
United States	256
Germany	198
Netherlands	165
Asian Development Fund	120
United Kingdom	86
EU institutions	84

Source: OECD, World Bank

24. In 2005, Indonesia's GNI per capital passed the OECD threshold for being classified as a lower middle income country. As a result, the development banks practically ceased to give new soft loans and grants to Indonesia as of mid-2008. Several smaller bilateral donors are preparing to reduce or even terminate their programmes including the UN organizations. IFAD's lending terms to Indonesia is currently intermediate, but is likely to become ordinary as GDP/capita of the country continues to increase. The Indonesia NMTDP 2010-2014 will therefore enjoy less ODA support than those of the past decade. However, even at the peak of aid flows in this period, ODA rarely exceeded 0.5 per cent of gross national income and 5 per cent of the government budget.

<sup>10</sup> IFATPC. Strategic Framework for Food Security in APEC.

**Table 4. Overall ODA to Indonesia**

<b>Receipts</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>
Net ODA (US\$ million)	896	1,225	1,050
Bilateral share (gross ODA)	81%	80%	79%
Net ODA/GNI	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%
Net Private flows (US\$ million)	2,069	2,745	3,472

*Source: OECD, World Bank*

25. Concerning ODA on agriculture and rural development, IFAD, AsDB, and the World Bank are the main multilateral donors, whereas Japan, Australia, France, Netherlands, and Germany are the main bilateral donors. In 2008, ODA provided by Japan for agriculture and rural development was around US\$213 million, making it the biggest bilateral donor, followed by Australia (US\$36 million). Also in 2008, ODA for agriculture and rural development by AsDB was US\$49 million and the World Bank was US\$38 million, while ODA by IFAD in the same year was US\$68.5 million.

### **III. Overview of IFAD's Operations and Evolution of the Country Strategy**

26. **IFAD-funded operations in Indonesia** include both loans for projects and programmes, and non-lending activities including knowledge management, policy dialogue and partnership strengthening, which are often funded through grants. Overall, since 1980, IFAD has financed 15 projects and programmes in Indonesia, approving loans for a total of approximately US\$403.6 million out of the total costs of US\$8.08 billion of IFAD-supported portfolio. This includes US\$5.67 billion of Government counterpart funding and US\$1.62 billion of co-financing from the World Bank for the National Programme for Community Empowerment in Rural Areas. A sixteenth project is currently being appraised, and is expected to be presented for approval to the Board in April 2012. Of the 15 projects that were approved, 10 are closed, one completed, one cancelled and three are ongoing.

27. IFAD financed approximately 49.8 per cent of total project costs, excluding the counterpart funding of US\$5.67 billion and co-financing of US\$1.62 billion for the National Programme for Community Empowerment in Rural Areas. IFAD's contribution falls to 5 per cent of the total costs of the IFAD-supported portfolio, if the Government counterpart and co-financing for aforementioned National Programme are also included. Table 4 provides a snapshot of key data related to IFAD operations in the country, whereas Appendix 3 includes a more comprehensive list of the projects and programmes funded, together with the financial breakdowns by co-financiers and Government counterpart funding.

**Table 5. A Snapshot of IFAD Operations in Indonesia**

First IFAD loan-funded project:	<b>1980</b>
Total loans-funded projects approved:	<b>15</b>
Total amount of IFAD funding:	<b>US\$403.6 million</b>
Lending terms:	<b>HC, I (current lending terms is I)</b>
Counterpart funding (contribution from Government and beneficiaries):	<b>US\$214.7 million<sup>11</sup> (26.5 per cent of the total costs)</b>
Co-financing amount:	<b>US\$192.3 million<sup>12</sup> (23.7 per cent of total costs)</b>
Total portfolio cost:	<b>US\$810.6 million</b>
Focus of operations:	<b>Community empowerment, micro-finance, institution building and livelihoods.</b>
Co-financiers:	<b>Asian Development Bank, Islamic Development Bank, The Netherlands, New Zealand, UNDP, WFP, and World Bank</b>
Number of on-going projects:	<b>3</b>
Total grant amount:	<b>[To be added]</b>
Past cooperating institutions:	<b>Asian Development Bank, World Bank and UNOPS</b>
Country office in Jakarta:	<b>There is currently a Country Presence Officer and the CPM is expected to be out-posted in 2012 Asia and the Pacific Region</b>
Responsible IFAD division for operations:	<b>M. Galletti, R. Bartoloni, Y. Wang, R. Hartman (current CPM)</b>
Country programme managers (CPMs) since 2004:	<b>Responsible since 2011</b>
Current CPM:	<b>Ministry of Finance, Ministry of Planning, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Ministry of Agriculture</b>
Main government partners	

28. **Evolution of the Country Strategy.** The Country Opportunities Strategic Programme (COSOP) that is the subject of the current CPE was prepared in 2008 following the 2003/4 CPE. The 2003/4 CPE, being the first ever evaluation of the Indonesia programme by IOE, covered IFAD operations since their inception in early 1980s. However, its principal thrust was on operations in the period 1988-2003 covered by two formal strategies, the first one prepared in 1988 and the second in 1998. The 1988 country strategy was a 400-page document described by the CPE as “heavily descriptive, resource endowment driven and not sufficiently analytical”. The CPE assessed the COSOP as not having given adequate attention to an analysis of the government policy within which the IFAD programme was proposed. The CPE considered the main feature of the strategy as being “on the cutting edge in its powerful and straightforward arguments in favour of helping rural poor women.”

29. The next COSOP was prepared in 1998, about one year in advance of the original plans to respond to the 1997 crisis by most donors. Besides updating the previous strategy that was by now 10 years old, it intended to take particular account of the impact of the crisis on the poor. Like the previous strategy, it did not present an analysis of the government’s agriculture policy, but it did restate IFAD’s traditional concern with rural poverty and proposed tightening of its targeting so that it helped the poorest of the poor in the most resource poor areas. It defined poorest for the first time to include indigenous, voiceless communities, rural young people and the marginalized poor. Community

<sup>11</sup> US\$5.88 billion if the counterpart funding provided to the National Programme for Community Empowerment in Rural Areas is included. The percentage then increases to 72.7 per cent.

<sup>12</sup> US\$1.81 billion if the co-financing amount provided by the World Bank to the National Programme for Community Empowerment in Rural Areas is included. The percentage then is 22.3 per cent.

mobilization and empowerment became a strong focus of the COSOP, something that was criticized by the CPE 2003/4 as not in itself sufficient to achieve the main COSOP objective of raising rural farm and non-farm incomes. The CPE recommended that IFAD: (i) adjust its country strategy to better balance the current focus on empowering the poor with efforts to raise farm and non-farm productivity; and (ii) increase its staff and other inputs devoted to knowledge generation, partnership building and policy dialogue.

30. The most recent COSOP – approved by the IFAD Board in December 2008, was prepared in close consultation with the Government, including the organization of a stakeholder consultation workshop in Jakarta and a detailed review process by the Government. The Government also demonstrated its ownership by preparing part of the country strategy, including, inter alia, (i) an analysis of the government’s policies and priorities for rural poverty reduction, agriculture and rural development; (ii) proposed priority sectors/sub-sectors for IFAD support in rural poverty reduction, agriculture and rural development; (iii) An assessment of IFAD’s value added in rural poverty reduction, agriculture and rural development; and (iv) preparation of project proposals for possible IFAD financing during 2009-2013.

31. The COSOP sets out three strategic objectives for the period 2009-2013: (i) increase the access of rural poor people to productive assets, appropriate technology and production support services to boost on- and off-farm productivity; (ii) enhance the access of rural poor people to infrastructure, input and output markets, and financial services; and (iii) build the capacity of the rural poor people to engage in local policy and programming processes. The COSOP defined its institutional objective as “strengthening capacity of central and local governments for evidence-based policymaking in favour of the rural poor” and “in collaboration with development agencies, promote policy and institutional changes that will benefit the poor.”

32. The COSOP 2008 proposed a far-reaching agenda for policy dialogue on climate change, response to rising food and commodity prices both in the short-term and long-term, and the need to increase biofuels. It proposed a number of partnerships with community-based organizations, NGOs, the private sector, civil society organizations, Rome-based UN organizations (WFP and FAO), and other UN organizations within the UNDAF framework. Finally, it proposed a systematic effort for knowledge management and communication through various annual reviews, meetings and assessments.

33. The COSOP envisaged an indicative allocation of US\$100 million in new lending over 2009-2013 (after deducting US\$68.53 million of IFAD financing approved in September 2008 for the National Programme for Community Empowerment) to be provided through 2-3 projects. The COSOP included an illustrative concept note for the projects with a potential list of 14 options for the components. It appears that the concept note was not based on an assessment of the feasibility but rather a long list of ideas that may or may not be relevant. The COSOP did not specify grant resources that may be provided or administrative budget requirements. There were no implementation details provided for the proposed policy dialogue and institutional development agenda.

34. The COSOP includes a result management framework (RMF) for each of the three COSOP strategic objectives, separately for projects and institutional/policy objectives. The indicators for projects are divided into “milestones for progress” and “outcomes which COSOP seeks to influence”. The RMF framework, if accompanied by M&E and progress assessment indicated in the COSOP, should provide a useful basis for this CPE. However, the RMF also indicates that “the targets and indicators should be refined when the pipeline of projects are designed”, raising questions about the usefulness of the RMF in the COSOP.

#### **IV. Evaluation Objectives, Methodology and Process**

35. **Objectives.** The CPE will have two main objectives: (i) assess the performance and impact of IFAD operations; and (ii) generate a series of findings and recommendations that will serve as building

blocks for the formulation of the forthcoming COSOP by IFAD and the Government. The new Indonesia COSOP will be prepared following the completion of the CPE.

36. **Methodology.** The objectives of the CPE will be achieved by analysing three mutually reinforcing pillars in the IFAD-Government partnership. These include assessing the performance of the: (i) project portfolio; (ii) non-lending activities (knowledge management, policy dialogue and partnership building); and (iii) COSOP itself in terms of its relevance and effectiveness.

37. The performance in each of these areas will be rated on a scale of 1 to 6 (with 1 being the lowest score, and 6 the highest). While these will be viewed individually, the synergies between the components will also be looked at, for example, to what extent IFAD's knowledge management activities supported its project activities and whether taken together these reflected the approach outlined in the COSOP. Based on this assessment and the aforementioned three ratings, the CPE will generate an *overall achievement* rating for the IFAD-government partnership. The sections below provide further details of how each of the assessments will be conducted by the CPE.

38. The proposed evaluation framework is contained in Appendix 1. The evaluation framework describes the main questions the CPE will answer, including the sources of data and information that will be tapped to generate the required responses.

39. With regard to assessing the performance of the project portfolio, IOE will apply its standard evaluation methodology for each project included as part of the CPE cohort. This includes using the internationally-recognised evaluation criteria of: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, sustainability, innovation and scaling up, gender equality and women's empowerment and performance of partners (IFAD and Government). The role grants have played in strengthening the country programme will be evaluated, including the synergies between grant funded and loan-financed activities.

40. Ratings will be provided for individual projects/programmes, and on that basis, a rating for the performance of the overall project portfolio will be derived. The performance of the portfolio will be benchmarked with the performance of IFAD operations in Asia and the Pacific region and globally, as well as with the results of other donors working in agriculture and rural development in Indonesia (subject to availability of comparable data).

41. Considering that this is the second time a CPE is undertaken in Indonesia, it is proposed that the current CPE include only the projects that were under implementation, or were designed after the completion of the previous CPE in 2003/4. There are a total of seven projects which will be therefore assessed by this CPE. The paragraph below provides an indication of how the seven selected projects will be treated by the CPE:

- (a) The two projects (Income Generating Project for Marginal Farmers and Landless Phase III and Post-Crisis Programme for Participatory Integrated Development in Rainfed Areas) previously included in the 2003/4 CPE will be rated by this 2012 CPE across all evaluation criteria used by IOE. These projects closed, respectively in 2006 and 2009. This CPE will now be able to fully and independently assess their performance, especially in terms of impact and sustainability.
- (b) The East Kalimantan Local Communities Empowerment Programme was approved in December 2002, but was cancelled in 2005, well ahead of its expected closing date as originally approved by the Board. The CPE will assess this project in terms of relevance of design and implementation performance until its closure. The CPE will, among other issues, assess the merits of cancelling this project from the Indonesia portfolio.
- (c) The two projects (Rural Empowerment and Agricultural Development Programme in Central Sulawesi and the National Programme for Community Empowerment in Rural Areas) are on-

going, and have been under implementation for about three years. The CPE will assess these two projects across all evaluation criteria, except impact and sustainability.

- (d) The Smallholder Livelihood Development in Eastern Indonesia was approved in May 2011 and became effective in July last year. It will be assessed in terms of relevance and innovativeness of design.
- (e) The Coastal Community Development Project is now being appraised and will be presented to the IFAD Board for approval in April 2012. It will also be assessed in terms of relevance and innovativeness of design.

42. Given that the 2003/4 CPE already had quite a comprehensive assessment of the project portfolio, the current CPE, while still including the section on project portfolio performance as described above, will focus much more on strategic issues at the country level, in particular non-lending activities and COSOP performance.

43. Assessment of non-lending activities will specifically entail an assessment of IFAD and Government's combined efforts in promoting policy dialogue, strengthening partnerships (e.g., with Government, UN agencies, IFIs, private sector, NGOs, and civil society organisations) and knowledge management. The CPE will review the synergies between lending and non-lending activities. For example, it will assess knowledge management activities promoted, and whether they have provided the required basis to inform policy dialogue with the Government and others on specific operational issues and served to strengthen community participation in projects and programmes.

44. IFAD's contribution to policy dialogue is an important issue to be looked at by the evaluation. The previous CPE 2003/4 identified IFAD's limited contribution to policy dialogue in Indonesia on agriculture and rural development. It also recommended that IFAD increase its staff and other inputs to knowledge generation, partnership building and policy dialogue. The 2008 COSOP outlined an ambitious agenda for policy dialogue including: (i) strengthening the capacity of local institutions to engage in evidence-based policy making; (ii) advocating for more resources for agriculture and rural development; and (iii) working with the government and other development agencies to develop feasible interventions to strengthen areas identified as weak by the sector policy and institutional assessment. Specific areas identified for policy dialogue on agriculture and rural development included access to land, water for agriculture, agriculture research and extension services, and agriculture inputs and product markets.

45. In addition, IFAD expected to focus on issues of accountability, transparency and corruption in rural areas. However, the COSOP 2008 did not provide any specifics or implementation details, or how IFAD would actually do this within its operating model. The CPE therefore will assess the appropriateness of the areas identified for policy dialogue, how far these intentions were implemented in practice and the extent to which they were or are likely to be effective. The evaluation will in particular focus on how realistic it is to aim at the wide impact foreseen by the COSOP and whether the level of ambition should or should not have been scaled down to match what is possible, especially within the level of resources (staff and administrative budgets, etc) available. It will look at not only what has been achieved but also opportunities missed.

46. The assessment of the performance of the COSOP is central to the CPE. This will include assessing the COSOP across the relevance and effectiveness criteria in seven specific areas: (i) strategic objectives, (ii) geographic priority, (iii) sub-sector focus, (iv) main partner institutions, (v) targeting approach used, including emphasis on selected social groups, (vi) mix of instruments in the country programme (loans, grants and non-lending activities), and (vii) the provisions for country programme and COSOP management.

47. The strategic positioning of IFAD is an important evaluation issue. The CPE will assess how the IFAD programme fits with the Government's overall programme of rural poverty reduction, how it

complements support from the World Bank, AsDB and other players such as the private sector and civil society partners, and the role IFAD has played. It will assess how flexibly the COSOP was implemented as conditions on the ground evolved. This would include the treatment of risks and their mitigation in the COSOP. COSOP timeline will also be looked at, as the 2008 COSOP was prepared 10 years after the previous COSOP (in 2008 compared with the original plan of 2004), and therefore the reasons for delay and its implications (if any) need to be understood. The CPE will also review the results framework both at project and country programme level to assess if these were realistic and lent themselves to effective M&E. The role of the COSOP in framing IFAD-supported activities will also be reviewed. An overall rating for the performance of the COSOP will be provided by the CPE, taking into account the assessments of relevance and effectiveness.

48. A key element of the evaluation will be to assess the how actual performance and results of the COSOP measure up to the strategic objectives of IFAD's engagement. There is a broad consensus, confirmed during the CPE preparation mission, that IFAD should address the following goals in Indonesia :

- a. help reduce rural poverty through agricultural and rural sector interventions;
- b. focus on less developed parts of the country;
- c. place poor farmers and their communities at the centre of this effort;
- d. build on the success of the national farmer group empowerment programmes to help communities and individual members to gain better access to technology, inputs (land, fertilizer, seeds water and credit), marketing opportunities and knowledge;
- e. energize the role of the National and Provincial authorities and particularly the District government in supporting such access to the opportunities available in the government, private and civil society sectors;
- f. design and implement projects with these goals in mind and support policy dialogue, knowledge and studies that solve problems encountered in such IFAD activities;
- g. design the IFAD program to deliver on these goals, mindful of the small size of IFAD operations, both in terms of financial transfers and administrative budget, and the importance of finding a *niche* for IFAD in the context of large government programs and the better resourced activities of other donors; and
- h. measure IFAD's success by results in scaling up project design models and knowledge generated to impact visibly and substantively on the national programs for agriculture and rural poverty.

49. These goals will be constantly reviewed by the CPE evaluation mission and tested against conditions on the ground, the views of the Government and development partners and the experiences gained by IFAD and other donors and presented as validated and modified by the mission in the CPE document. In particular, the evaluation mission will assess the COSOP lending and non-lending operations and its implementation against these evolving goals during the mission. The mission will examine how far the COSOP 2008 document meets these goals, what else could it have covered without the hindsight that informs these goals today, and what were opportunities presented and taken or missed during COSOP 2008 implementation so far. It will look at each of the projects and non-lending activities, through these lenses. Based on such analyses, the CPE will assess the performance of COSOP 2008 and its implementation so far, through lending and non-lending operations and identify gaps, successes and failures from which can be drawn the building blocks for the next COSOP.

50. While evaluating the performance of IFAD's non-lending and lending programs, the CPE will examine the coherence and synergy between the IFAD programs on one hand, and the Government's strategy and operational framework for food security, climate change, decentralization, community empowerment and human resource development, on the other. It will also examine the results of the farmer and community empowerment programs on the demand side and access to land, water, technology, credit, inputs and markets on the supply side. The relationships between community groups, the decentralized government entities, the national government, the private sector and civil

society will also be looked into in IFAD program areas. Similarly, partnerships with other donors will also be assessed.

51. The CPE will also evaluate the performance of IFAD management in respect of its program in Indonesia during the COSOP 2008 program. Elements that would be reviewed would include the nature and success of strategic engagement with the Government and its various ministries and agencies, the recognition of regional and global dimensions in designing programs, the impact of frontline staff and the quality assurance support and coaching given to such staff by the management; the effectiveness in managing scarce IFAD staff and consultant resources, the efficiency of teams and the location of staff and the synergy developed between IFAD projects and non-lending services in the pursuance of IFAD goals.

52. In order to further underpin the analytical foundations of the CPE, immediately after the main mission, which would have available to it completed desk reviews of lending and non-lending operations, desk reviews will be carried out to further strengthen the analysis on the main recommendations. This may include but would not be limited to (i) land issues at the national level and their manifestation and mitigation in the IFAD program areas: (ii) the emerging role of the District government, in the decentralization context, in the supply of inputs and management of land and water and its role of intermediation with the national level:(iii) the emerging nexus among the farmers at the community level, the local governments, the private sector, civil society and the national research organizations in regard to technology and two-way knowledge transmission and the evolving role and potential for information technology applications that has or could be supported by IFAD programs. In brief, therefore, the CPE mission would be focused on how IFAD (and the COSOP) has actually performed and what it could have done instead. Opportunities taken and opportunities missed will both be covered.

53. In suggesting building blocks for the next COSOP, the evaluation will draw on the lessons learned from the review of the COSOP (2008) and its implementation and will look at both what was implemented in the event as well as opportunities missed. It will *inter alia* examine the question of creating synergy between lending and non-lending operations, the effective use of the potential to build constructive partnerships, management and mitigation of country and project risks besides reputational risks to IFAD and the articulation, monitoring and management of results.

54. **Process.** The CPE entails five phases. These include the: (i) preparatory phase; (ii) desk review phase; (iii) country work phase; (iv) report writing; and (v) communication and dissemination.

55. The preparatory phase includes the development of the draft approach paper, which will be reviewed by APR and thereafter by the Government of Indonesia. It will entail the fielding of a one week preparatory mission to Indonesia, in order to discuss the draft approach paper with the Government and other partners, as well as to capture their priorities for the CPE. In the preparatory phase, IOE will also search for consultants, who will be hired to conduct the CPE under the overall responsibility of the division. Finally, the preparatory mission will be used to develop the programme of work of the main CPE mission.

56. The desk review phase includes the preparation of short desk review notes on the projects included in the CPE. Each desk review note will follow a standard format developed by IOE. In addition, a separate desk review note will be prepared on non-lending activities. All desk review notes will be used to prepare a consolidated CPE desk review report, to be shared for comments first with APR and thereafter with the Government. This process will be completed before launching of the main CPE mission.

57. In addition to the above, IOE also plans to prepare few thematic working papers on topics of importance to the Indonesia country programme. The aim of these thematic papers is to strengthen the analytic underpinning for the main CPE report. Topics suggested include: (i) the evolution of the agriculture and rural development context in Indonesia; (ii) rural finance; and (iii) institutional

architecture and decentralisation in the agriculture and rural sectors. These will be done through a desk review of documents.

58. In addition, during the desk work phase, APR and the Government will be asked to prepare their respective self-assessments. The self-assessment would cover the questions contained in the CPE framework shown in Appendix 1. A discussion on the APR self-assessment would be held at headquarters before the CPE mission. Among other issues, the preparatory mission will provide IOE with the opportunity to brief the Government on the overall objectives and approach to the self-assessment. A half day workshop will be organized at the outset of the mission in Jakarta to discuss the government's self-assessment.

59. The country work phase entails primarily the fielding of a multidisciplinary mission to Indonesia. The main mission will spend three weeks in the country. It will hold discussions in Jakarta with the government and other development partners, travel to various provinces for consultation with key stakeholders, and visit selected IFAD-supported projects and programmes to see activities on the ground and hold discussions with beneficiaries. At the end of the main CPE mission, the evaluation team will organize a wrap up meeting to present emerging findings to the Government, IFAD APR and other development partners. The CPM for Indonesia will take part in this meeting in person.

60. The CPE report writing phase will follow the country work phase. During this phase, the CPE team will prepare their independent evaluation report, based on the data and information collected and analysed throughout the evaluation process. The report will be exposed to a rigorous internal peer review within IOE<sup>13</sup>. Thereafter, it will be shared with APR for comments. Following the incorporation of APR's comments, the report will be sent to the Government for their feedback before being finalized.

61. The final phase of the evaluation, communication and dissemination, will entail a range of activities to ensure timely and effective outreach of the findings, lessons learned and recommendations from the CPE – see section VIII for more details.

## **V. The Core Learning Partnership**

62. The core learning partnership (CLP) consists of the main users of the evaluation, and as per the Evaluation Policy, it is mandated to provide guidance to IOE at critical stages in the evaluation process. The CLP will be involved, in particular, in:

- (a) reviewing and commenting on the draft Approach Paper;
- (b) reviewing and commenting on the draft CPE report;
- (c) reviewing and commenting on the draft Issues Paper to be discussed at the Indonesia CPE National Round Table Workshop (see section VIII); and
- (d) participating in the above-mentioned workshop, which will provide an opportunity to discuss the main findings, conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation.

63. The following persons are proposed as part of the CLP for the Indonesia CPE. The composition of the CLP will be finalised following the CPE preparatory mission in February 2012.

---

<sup>13</sup> This will include the Director of IOE and the senior evaluation officers.

- (a) Representative from the State Ministry for National Development Planning (BAPPENAS)
- (b) Representative from the Ministry of Finance
- (c) Representative from the Ministry of Agriculture  
Representative from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs
- (d) Representative from the Embassy of Indonesia in Italy
- (e) Mr Luciano Lavizzari, Director IOE
- (f) Mr Ashwani Muthoo, Deputy Director IOE and Lead Evaluator of the Indonesia CPE
- (g) Director of APR
- (h) Mr Ronald Hartman, CPM Indonesia
- (i) Directors of all IFAD-funded ongoing projects
- (j) Representatives of other development partners including the Asian Development Bank and World Bank

## **VI. The Agreement at Completion Point**

64. As per the IFAD Evaluation Policy, each IOE evaluation is concluded with an Agreement at Completion Point (ACP). The latter is a short document which captures the main findings and recommendations contained in the CPE report that IFAD and the Government agree to adopt and implement within specific timeframes. The ACP will be prepared at the end of the CPE process, and benefit from the comments of the participants of the CPE national roundtable workshop (see section VIII). Once finalised, the ACP will be signed by the Government of Indonesia and the IFAD management (represented by the Associate Vice President, Programmes). The role of IOE is to facilitate the preparation of the ACP, and the ACP will be included as an integral part of the final published version of the CPE report.

## **VII. Evaluation Team**

65. The Director of IOE (Mr Luciano Lavizzari) will have the overall responsibility for the Indonesia CPE. He has designated Mr Ashwani Muthoo, Deputy Director IOE as the lead evaluator for the purpose. Mr Muthoo will be supported by other IOE staff, including Ms Oanh Nguyen, Evaluation Research Analyst, and Ms Kendra White, Assistant to the Deputy Director. The CPE consultants' team will be led by Mr Jayasankar Shivakumar. He will be supported by specialists in the following fields: (i) agriculture; (ii) non-lending activities (policy dialogue, partnership building and knowledge management); (iii) portfolio assessment; (iv) community development, gender and social issues; and (v) project management including the M&E system. IOE will hire a Senior Independent Adviser (Mr Basil Kavalsky, Economist), who will review the evaluation approach paper and draft final report. He will prepare an independent report (2-3 pages) on the quality of the evaluation process and the contents contained in the final CPE report.

## **VIII. Communication and dissemination**

66. A CPE national roundtable workshop will be organised in Jakarta by IOE in close collaboration with the Government of Indonesia and APR towards the end of the evaluation process. This workshop, which will focus on learning, will allow multiple stakeholders to exchange views on key evaluation issues and lessons. The Associate Vice President, Programmes, Directors IOE and APR, and other IFAD staff are expected to take part in the workshop.

67. The published final CPE report will thereafter be widely distributed in hard copies and posted on IFAD's website. An evaluation Profile and Insight<sup>14</sup> will be prepared on the Indonesia CPE, and distributed together with the final evaluation report. The CPE report, Profile and Insight will also be disseminated through selected electronic networks such as the United Nations Evaluation Network (UNEVVAL). The main text of the CPE report should not exceed 50 pages, written in English.

68. It is important to note that written comments of the Government and APR on key CPE deliverables will be treated with utmost consideration by IOE, in line with the provisions contained in the IFAD Evaluation Policy. This requires IOE to: (i) rectify any factual inaccuracies that may be present in the CPE report; and (ii) carefully assess the comments of partners on substantive issues, and decide whether or not they should be included in the report. Comments of a substantive nature that, according to IOE, would not lead to changes in the evaluation's overall findings may be flagged in the main CPE report as dissenting views in the form of footnote(s), clearly indicating the issue at hand and source of comment. Finally, IOE will prepare and share an "audit trail" of how it has treated the comments of the Government and APR in finalising the CPE report.

---

<sup>14</sup> The Profile is a 800 word brochure capturing the main findings and recommendations from the CPE. The Insight will focus on one key learning issue emerging from the CPE, with the intention of raising further attention and debate around the topic among development practitioners.

## IX. Evaluation Roadmap

69. The provisional timetable for the CPE is given below. It is of utmost importance that the APR and the Government carefully review the various activities and proposed timeframes, given that their inputs and participation will be essential at key steps to ensure the success of the CPE.

Date	Activity
6 Feb	Share draft Approach Paper with APR
13 Feb	Comments from APR on draft Approach Paper
20 Feb	Share draft Approach Paper with Government of Indonesia
5 Mar	Written comments of the Government on the draft Approach Paper
2 Jan -30 Mar	CPE desk review phase, including preparation of desk review notes and consolidated CPE desk review report
27 Feb – 2 Mar	Preparatory CPE mission to Indonesia
16 Mar	Finalize Approach Paper
20 Apr	Self-assessments by APR and GOI
29 April – 20 May	CPE main mission
18 May	CPE wrap-up meeting with IOE and APR to discuss Aide Memoire with Government and other partners in Jakarta
2 Jul	Draft CPE report to IOE
3 Jul-14 Sep	IOE internal peer review process
17 Sep	Draft report to APR
8 Oct	APR comments to IOE on draft CPE
29 Oct	IOE to share revised draft report with Government for comments, with copy to APR (together with Audit Trail to APR)
19 Nov	Government to provide comments to IOE
26 Nov	Finalise evaluation report and share with all partners (prepare and share with Government Audit Trail on their comments)
Week of 3 Dec	CPE National Roundtable Workshop
Dec	Finalise CPE Agreement at Completion Point, publish report, Profile and Insight

## Indonesia CPE (Evaluation) Framework<sup>15</sup>

	<b>Key Questions</b>	<b>Main sources of data and information</b>
<b>Portfolio Performance</b>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>Project Relevance</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are project objectives realistic and consistent with Indonesia’s national agriculture, rural development and rural poverty reduction strategies and policies, the COSOP and relevant IFAD sector and sub sector policies, as well as the needs of the rural poor? Were opportunities missed in project design to support better the COSOP objectives?</li> <li>• Was the project design (including synergies among activities and services, financial allocations, project management and execution, supervision and implementation support, and monitoring and evaluation arrangements) appropriate for achieving the project’s core objectives?</li> <li>• How coherent was the project in terms of its fit with the policies, programmes and projects undertaken by the Government and other development partners in Indonesia?</li> <li>• Was the project design participatory in the sense that it took into consideration the inputs and needs of key stakeholders, including the Government, executing agencies, co-financiers and the expected beneficiaries and their grassroots organizations?</li> <li>• Did the project benefit from available knowledge (for example, the experience of other similar projects in the area or in the country) during its design and implementation? Were lessons learnt from the previous CPE Indonesia in 2004 reflected in the design of the new projects?</li> <li>• Did project objectives remain relevant over the period of time required for implementation? In the event of significant changes in the project context or in IFAD policies, has design been retrofitted?</li> <li>• What are the main factors that contributed to a positive or less positive assessment of relevance?</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>Project Effectiveness</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To what extent have the objectives of the project and its components been attained both in quantitative and qualitative terms?</li> <li>• If the project is not yet complete, is it likely that unattained objectives may be accomplished in full/in part before its closure?</li> <li>• What factors in project design and implementation account for the estimated results in terms of effectiveness?</li> <li>• Were project risks and their mitigation adequately handled in project design?</li> <li>• Was the results framework useful in monitoring the project towards achievement of project objectives?</li> <li>• In particular, what changes in the overall context (e.g., policy framework, political situation, institutional set-up, economic shocks, civil unrest, etc.) have affected or are likely to affect project implementation and overall results?</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>Project Efficiency</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What are the costs of investments to develop specific project outputs (e.g., what is the cost of constructing one kilometre of rural road)? The quality of works/supplies needs to be fully (and explicitly) recognized for such input/output comparisons.</li> <li>• Is the cost ratio of inputs to outputs comparable to local, national or regional benchmarks?</li> </ul>	<p>Government of Indonesia’s related policies and strategies; IFAD policy statements and Indonesia COSOPS. Interviews with IFAD managers, GOI and project officials.</p> <p>CPE Indonesia 2004, Evaluations of completed projects, PCRs, Mid-term reviews and supervision reports. Surveys of project beneficiaries.</p> <p>CPE 2004, Evaluations of completed projects, PCRs, Mid-term reviews and</p>

<sup>15</sup> The questions in the Appendix are essentially a generic list developed for all IFAD CPEs. While they are not all equally relevant in the Indonesia case they provide a useful ex ante check-list and have therefore been included. In addition a number of specific issues that are of concern in the Indonesia context have been added to the framework.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What are the loan costs per beneficiary (both at the time of appraisal and at the time of evaluation) and how do they compare to other IFAD-funded operations (or those of other donors) in the same country and/or other countries?</li> <li>• How does the economic rate of return at evaluation compare with project design?</li> <li>• What are the administrative costs per beneficiary and how do they compare to other IFAD-funded operations (or those of other donors) in Indonesia or other countries, especially in South East Asian Countries?</li> <li>• A number of IFAD projects have had substantial delays in effectiveness? What has been the cause of these delays and how costly have these delays been?</li> <li>• By how much was the original closing date extended, and what were the additional administrative costs that were incurred during the extension period?</li> <li>• What factors helped account for project efficiency performance?</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>Rural Poverty Impact</u></b></p> <p><b>I. Household income and assets</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Did the composition and level of household incomes change (more income sources, more diversification, higher income)?</li> <li>• What changes are apparent in intra-household incomes and assets?</li> <li>• Did farm households' physical assets change (farmland, water, livestock, trees, equipment, etc.)? Did other household assets change (houses, bicycles, radios, television sets, telephones, etc.)?</li> <li>• Did households' financial assets change (savings, debt, borrowing, insurance)?</li> <li>• Were the rural poor able to access financial markets more easily?</li> <li>• Did the rural poor have better access to input and output markets?</li> <li>• Do the better health and education promoted by the programme allow the rural poor to obtain higher incomes and more assets?</li> </ul> <p><b>II. Human and social capital and empowerment</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Did rural people's organizations and grassroots institutions (such as SHGs, village associations) benefit from the project?</li> <li>• Were the community groups and SHGs established under the project effective in empowering women in the community and promoting gender equity? Are changes in the social cohesion and local self-help capacities of rural communities evident?</li> <li>• To what extent did the project empower the rural poor vis-à-vis development actors and local and national public authorities? Do they play more effective roles in decision-making? Was the decentralization process facilitated by the project?</li> <li>• Were the rural poor empowered to gain better access to the information and knowledge needed to improve incomes and the quality of their lives?</li> <li>• Did the rural poor gain access to better health and education facilities?</li> </ul> <p><b>III. Food security and agricultural productivity</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Did cropping intensity change? Was there an improvement in land productivity and, if so, to what extent? Did the returns to labour change?</li> <li>• Did children's nutritional status change (e.g. stunting, wasting, underweight)?</li> <li>• Did household food security change?</li> <li>• To what extent did the rural poor improve their access to input and output markets that could help them enhance their productivity and access to food?</li> </ul>	<p>supervision reports. Surveys of project beneficiaries. Interviews with project managers.</p> <p>CPE 2004, Evaluations of completed projects, PCRs, Mid-term reviews and supervision reports. Surveys of project beneficiaries. Interviews with beneficiaries and project managers.</p>
---	---

**IV. Natural resources and the environment (including climate change)**

- Did the status of the natural resources base change (land, water, forest, pasture, fish stocks, etc.)?
- Did local communities' access to natural resources change (in general and specifically for the poor)?
- Has the degree of environmental vulnerability changed (e.g., exposure to pollutants, climate change effects, volatility in resources, potential natural disasters)?
- Have the projects facilitated the implementation of policies and legislation such as those relating to the access of the poor to natural resources, adaptation to climate change, and the protection of biodiversity?

**V. Institutions and policies**

- Were there any changes in rural financial institutions (e.g., in facilitating access for the rural poor)?
- How did public institutions and service delivery for the rural poor change?
- What improvements were discernable in local governance, including the capacity and role of government departments, NGOs, and elected bodies and officials?
- Were linkages between rural communities and the private sector enhanced by the project?
- Were there any changes in national/sectoral policies affecting the rural poor?
- Did the regulatory framework change insofar as its impact on the rural poor?
- Did market structures and other institutional factors affecting poor producers' access to markets change?

*Note: For each domain, the evaluation should describe the impact achieved and also the underlying reasons (i.e., the "why" factor) behind the observed or expected changes.*

**Project Sustainability**

- Was a specific *exit strategy* or approach prepared and agreed upon by key partners to ensure post project sustainability?
- What are the chances that benefits generated by the project will continue after project closure, and what factors militate in favour of or against maintaining benefits? What is the likely resilience of economic activities to shocks or progressive exposure to competition and reduction of subsidies?
- How robust are the institutions that have been established under IFAD projects, and are they likely to be able to ensure the continuation of benefits to the rural poor?
- Is there a clear indication of government commitment after the loan closing date, for example, in terms of provision of funds for selected activities, human resources availability, continuity of pro-poor policies and participatory development approaches, and institutional support? Did the IFAD project design anticipate that such support would be needed after loan closure?
- Do project activities benefit from the engagement, participation and ownership of local communities, grassroots organizations, and the rural poor?
- Did the NGOs involved continue their support to village organizations after project closure?
- Are adopted approaches technically viable? Do project users have access to adequate training for maintenance and to spare parts and repairs?
- Are the ecosystem and environmental resources (e.g. fresh water availability, soil fertility, vegetative cover) likely to contribute to project benefits or is there a depletion process taking place?

**Innovations and Scaling up**

- What are the characteristics of innovation(s) promoted by the project or programme? Are the innovations consistent with the

Visits to sites of completed projects and interviews with beneficiaries and project managers. In selected cases consideration will be given to commissioning new surveys.

Interviews with GOI and other

<p>IFAD definition of this concept?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How did the innovation originate (e.g., through the beneficiaries, Government of Indonesia, IFAD, NGOs, research institution, etc.) and was it adapted in any particular way during project/programme design?</li> <li>• Are the actions in question truly innovative or are they well-established elsewhere but new to the country or project area?</li> <li>• Were successfully promoted innovations documented and shared? Were other specific activities (e.g., workshops, exchange visits, etc.) undertaken to disseminate the innovative experiences?</li> <li>• Have these innovations been scaled up and, if so, by whom? If not, what are the realistic prospects that they can and will be scaled up by the Government, other donors and/or the private sector?</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>Performance of Partners</u></b></p> <p><b>IFAD</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Did IFAD mobilize adequate technical expertise in the project design?</li> <li>• Was the design process participatory (with national and local agencies, grassroots organizations) and did it promote ownership by the borrower?</li> <li>• Were specific efforts made to incorporate the lessons and recommendations from previous independent evaluations in project design and implementation?</li> <li>• Did IFAD adequately integrate comments made by its quality enhancement and quality assurance processes?</li> <li>• Did IFAD (and the Government) take the initiative to suitably modify project design (if required) during implementation in response to any major changes in the context, especially during the MTR?</li> <li>• What was the performance of IFAD in projects that are under direct supervision and implementation support? In the case of the supervision of a cooperating institution, how effective was IFAD in working with the institution to carry out the mandated task? In both cases, has IFAD exercised its developmental and fiduciary responsibilities, including compliance with loan and grant agreements?</li> <li>• Was prompt action taken to ensure the timely implementation of recommendations stemming from the supervision and implementation support missions, including the MTR?</li> <li>• Did IFAD undertake the necessary follow-up to resolve any implementation bottlenecks?</li> <li>• Where applicable, what is the role and performance of IFAD's country presence team in Indonesia? Did IFAD headquarters provide the necessary support to its country presence team, for example, in terms of resources, follow-up and guidance, adequate delegation of authority, and so on?</li> <li>• Has IFAD made proactive efforts to be engaged in policy dialogue activities at different levels in order to ensure, inter alia, the scaling up of pro-poor innovations?</li> <li>• Has IFAD been active in creating an effective partnership and maintaining coordination among key partners to ensure the achievement of project objectives, including the scaling up of pro-poor innovations?</li> <li>• Has IFAD, together with the Government, contributed to planning an exit strategy?</li> </ul> <p><b>Government of Indonesia</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has the Government assumed ownership and responsibility for the project? Judging by its actions and policies, has the Government been fully supportive of project goals?</li> <li>• Has adequate staffing and project management been assured? Have appropriate levels of counterpart funding been provided on time?</li> </ul>	<p>partners. In depth reviews of project documents. Discussions with IFAD managers.</p> <p>Interviews with partner agencies, NGOs and IFAD managers.</p> <p>Interviews with GOI officials and IFAD managers.</p>
---	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has project management discharged its functions adequately, and has the Government provided policy guidance to project management staff when required?</li> <li>• Did the Government ensure suitable coordination of the various departments involved in execution?</li> <li>• Has auditing been undertaken in a timely manner and have reports been submitted as required?</li> <li>• Did the Government (and IFAD) take the initiative to suitably modify the project design (if required) during implementation in response to any major changes in the context?</li> <li>• Was prompt action taken to ensure the timely implementation of recommendations from supervision and implementation support missions, including the MTR?</li> <li>• Has an effective M&amp;E system been put in place and does it generate information on performance and impact which is useful for project managers when they are called upon to take critical decisions?</li> <li>• Has the Government (and IFAD) contributed to planning an exit strategy and/or making arrangements for continued funding of certain activities?</li> <li>• Have loan covenants and the spirit of the loan agreement been observed?</li> <li>• Has the Government facilitated the participation of NGOs and civil society where appropriate?</li> <li>• Have the flow of funds and procurement procedures been suitable for ensuring timely implementation?</li> <li>• Has the Government engaged in a policy dialogue with IFAD concerning the promotion of pro-poor innovations?</li> </ul> <p><b>Cooperating Institution</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should there have been greater involvement of partners such as the UN agencies and other development agencies in the design, financing and implementation of the programme?</li> <li>• Has the supervision and implementation support programme been properly managed (frequency, composition, continuity)?</li> <li>• Has the cooperating institution complied with loan covenants?</li> <li>• Has the cooperating institution been effective in financial management?</li> <li>• Has the cooperating institution sought to monitor project impacts and IFAD concerns (e.g., targeting, participation, empowerment of the poor and gender aspects)?</li> <li>• Have implementation problems been highlighted and appropriate remedies suggested? Have the suggestions and related actions been followed in the next supervisions?</li> <li>• Were there any missed opportunities to secure partners who could have enhanced outcomes of the project?</li> <li>• Has the supervision process enhanced implementation and poverty impacts?</li> <li>• Has the cooperating institution been responsive to requests and advice from IFAD when carrying out its supervision and project implementation responsibilities?</li> </ul>	<p>Interviews with representatives of cooperating institutions. PCRs, Mid-term Reviews and evaluations of completed projects.</p>
<p><b>Non-lending activities</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Relevance</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are policy dialogue, partnership-building, and knowledge management objectives clearly outlined in the COSOP? Are they in line with the needs of the rural poor and are they consistent with the strategic objectives of the COSOP and lending operations, as well as with the Government's priorities?</li> <li>• Do the selected non-lending activities provide sufficient support for country programme objectives as per COSOP, as well as the loan portfolio in the country?</li> <li>• Were resources earmarked for non-lending activities and explicitly outlined in the COSOP (e.g., in the form of grants and/or the IFAD administrative budget)?</li> <li>• Was the selected mix of policy dialogue, partnership-building and knowledge management appropriate and relevant?</li> </ul>	<p>Review of IFAD documentation on non-lending activities. Discussions with counterparts responsible for implementing these activities.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Were the advisory services delivered by other partners taken into account in selecting the focus of non-lending work?</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>Effectiveness</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Describe the extent to which non-lending activities achieved their objectives if they were explicitly articulated. Did the non-lending program and the lending program mutually reinforce IFAD’s strategic goals for the country or was there divergence? Were opportunities missed to define and target more effectively the outcome of non-lending activities to the resolution of priority issues emerging from the portfolio?</li> <li>• How did non-lending activities contribute to the replication and scaling up of innovation promoted by IFAD?</li> <li>• Has IFAD systematically engaged in and contributed to the deliberations of donor working groups related to agriculture, food issues and rural development?</li> <li>• How much progress has been made as a result of non-lending activities in furthering the application of the provisions contained in the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness in terms of ownership, alignment, donor coordination and harmonization, managing for results and mutual accountability?</li> <li>• With regard to knowledge management, was the COSOP’s strategic objectives and project design and implementation properly informed by IFAD experiences in Indonesia and elsewhere?</li> <li>• Were the most appropriate approaches deployed to achieve the desired results?</li> <li>• What have been the roles of the IFAD country representative, where applicable, and of the main government institutions in making non-lending services effective?</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>Efficiency</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Could alternative instruments and activities be implemented to increase the cost-effectiveness of non-lending activities?</li> <li>• What were the costs of the different types of non-lending activities and how do they compare to IFAD benchmarks (where available)?</li> <li>• Was the administrative burden on country officials minimized?</li> </ul>	
<p><b>COSOP Performance</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Relevance</b></p> <p><b>Assessment of the alignment of strategic objectives</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Were the objectives set out in the COSOP consistent with the overarching objectives of the prevailing IFAD strategic framework and relevant corporate policies?</li> <li>• Were the strategic objectives identified in the COSOP consistent with the Government’s strategies and policies for agriculture and rural development, alleviation of rural poverty and decentralization as well as the economic and social development framework more broadly and clearly defined for achieving sustainable rural poverty reduction?</li> <li>• Were the strategic objectives flexible enough to be adjusted during implementation to reflect realities on the ground? Was the basic approach adopted by IFAD, focused on support for women and socially excluded groups, too narrowly defined in terms of a broad strategy for rural poverty reduction? Should there have been an attempt to encompass issues such as youth, migration and addressing conflict in the rural areas? Should there have been a more cohesive approach to balancing empowerment of rural communities with improving access to agricultural technology and related services, provision of social services and credit, private sector opportunities, marketing and market services?</li> <li>• Did the poverty analysis (economic and sector work) provide an adequate basis for the development of overall strategy, including the selection of the main elements of the COSOP (refer to Evaluation Manual)?</li> <li>• Are the strategic objectives aligned with the priorities of other bilateral and multilateral donors working in agriculture and</li> </ul>	<p>Review of COSOP. Interviews with GOI and IFAD managers.</p>

rural development in the same country? If other donors pursued other priorities, should they have been convinced to align with IFAD?

- Were the risks involved in pursuing the strategic objectives properly identified and the objectives aligned to mitigate risks?

**Evaluating the coherence of the main elements of the COSOP**

- Did the strategy succinctly articulate IFAD's comparative advantage and competencies in the country (i.e., country positioning)? Did the COSOP position IFAD optimally in this regard?
- Were the target groups clearly identified in terms of the nature of the assistance that IFAD would provide?
- Did IFAD select the most appropriate subsectors for investments?
- Were the geographic priorities defined in the strategy consistent with the definition of the target groups?
- Were the main partner institutions (e.g., for project execution, supervision and implementation support, community mobilization, co-financing) the correct ones for meeting the country strategy objectives?
- Were specific objectives defined and resources allocated for non-lending activities, including policy dialogue, partnership-building and knowledge management?
- Were appropriate synergies foreseen within and among investment activities and between lending and non-lending activities? That is, did IFAD's overall assistance constitute a coherent country programme? For example, in terms of supervision and implementation support, the roles of the country programme management team and country presence arrangements. Country positioning is a measure of how well the organization responded to (or even anticipated) the evolving development challenges and priorities of the Government, built on the organization's comparative advantages, and designed its country strategies and programmes in a manner that took into consideration the support available from other development partners.
- Did interventions proposed and developed on: (a) agriculture technology transfer to rural communities; (b) improving access to agricultural markets; (c) improving agriculture input services and making subsidies smarter and cost-effective for such communities; (d) nutrition interventions; (e) health services; and (f) education opportunities reflect selectivity, doability and steps towards achievement of the COSOP strategic goals?
- Did interventions proposed and developed on (a) capacity building for rural communities; (b) internet and IT connectivity and access to knowledge; (c) special attention to women and backward regions; (d) capacity building for local, district and provincial governments for services and infrastructure provided to rural communities; (e) development of mechanisms to strengthen the interface between communities and local governments and (f) support to introduction of e-government to facilitate interactions between governments and rural communities reflect selectivity, doability and steps towards achievement of the COSOP's strategic objectives?
- Were appropriate interventions proposed and developed on : (a) finding niches for IFAD where a chain of interventions from grass-roots upward would significantly strengthen the ongoing nationwide empowerment programs; (b) targeting expansion of the coverage of the ongoing program with women, children and backward regions in view; (c) capacity building for empowering and providing information and knowledge to the rural community groups to engage in the local policy and programming process and (d) tapping better the potential of IT to strengthen the interface between these groups and the supply side players
- How could the strategic objectives have been translated into a viable and doable program, through selectivity, sharpening of program and project objectives, promoting coherence between non-lending work and projects, retrofitting where possible the existing portfolio and non-lending work, building greater synergy with other donors and establishing better rapport as well as operational cooperation with counterparts in government, inter alia by focussing on a few counterpart agencies. Were any

important opportunities missed in this regard?

- Did IFAD assess the extent to which the global policy environment (trade, migration, etc.) and exogenous factors (e.g., climate change, exposure to natural disasters) should guide the choice of lending and non-lending instruments and the priorities for IFAD engagement through lending and non-lending services?

#### **Country programme management and COSOP management**

- Did the Fund and Government of Indonesia select appropriate supervision and implementation support arrangements?
- How did country presence support the COSOP strategic objectives? Was the most suitable country presence arrangement established in the country?
- Were lessons learned and recommendations set forth in independent evaluations properly reflected in the country strategy?
- Were sufficient administrative and human resources made available for the implementation of the country strategy by both IFAD and the Government?
- Did the CPM and country presence officer have appropriate skills and competencies to promote the policy dialogue and partnership-building objectives identified in the COSOP?
- What is the quality of the COSOP results management framework, project status reports, and aggregated RIMS reports and country programme sheets? Were Management actions in connection with this information system appropriate?
- Was the COSOP monitoring and evaluation performed properly? Were annual country programme reviews undertaken in a timely manner and were the corresponding recommendations implemented within the required time frames?
- As the COSOP is dynamic, was it modified to reflect changes at the country level?
- Did the CPMT concept function appropriately and make the required contribution to country programme management?

#### **Effectiveness**

- To what extent were the main strategic objectives included in the COSOP achieved?
- Is it likely that so far unattained objectives may be achieved in full or in part?
- What changes in the context have influenced or are likely to influence the fulfilment of the strategic objectives? Was the COSOP properly adapted mid-course to reflect changes in the context?
- How could the positioning been better, given the advantage of hindsight? Did the positioning deprive IFAD of opportunities as they arose or were the objectives continuously adjusted to match emerging ground realities?
- Were the risks involved in pursuing the strategic objectives properly identified and the objectives aligned to mitigate risks?
- Did the Fund devote sufficient attention and resources to promoting effectiveness?

## Bibliography and References

### **Government of Indonesia policies and strategies**

Interim Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper, 2003  
 National Medium-Term Development Plan 2010-2014, Book 1: National Priorities, Indonesia, 2010  
 Strategic Plan 2005-2009, Ministry of Agriculture, 2005

### **IFAD Strategy/Policy**

Strategic Framework, 2007-2010  
 Strategic Framework, 2011-2015  
 Evaluation policy - 2011  
 Innovation strategy – 2007  
 Knowledge management strategy - 2007  
 Rural finance policy – 2000 and 2009 update  
 COSOP Indonesia – 2008  
 Anti-corruption policy - 2005  
 Rural enterprise policy - 2004

### **Evaluations**

IFAD's Regional Strategy for Asia and the Pacific - 2006.  
 Direct Supervision Pilot Programme – 2005  
 Country Programme Evaluation Indonesia – 2004  
 Project Completion Report Validation of the Post-Crisis Programme for Participatory Integrated Development in Rainfed Areas - 2011

### **Project documentation**

A comprehensive list of project documents for the CPE team to review will be developed by IOE.

### **Documents of other institutions**

The Economist Intelligence Unit, Indonesia, Country Profile 2008, London.  
 Asian Development Bank (2006), Strategic Vision for Agriculture and Rural Development, Indonesia  
 Food and Agriculture Organization (2009), National Medium-Term Priority Framework 2010-2014 for Indonesia's External Assistance in the Agriculture Sector (including Forestry and Fisheries), Indonesia.  
 European Community Strategy Paper 2007-2013  
 IFATPC. Strategic Framework for Food Security in APEC. *Edt.*: Johnson, R.; Anderson, K.; Josling, T.; Montemayor, R.; Shiraiwa, H.; and Sumner, D.  
 The SMERU Research Institute (2010), Review of Government's Poverty Reduction Strategies, Policies and Programmes in Indonesia. *Edt.*: Suryahadi, A.; Yumna, A.; Raya, U.R.; and Marbun, D, Indonesia.  
 UNDP, 2010. Human Development Report 2010. The Real Wealth of Nations: Pathways to Human Development. USA  
 UNDP, 2010. Assessment of Development Results. Evaluation of UNDP Contributions. Evaluation Office.  
 USAID, 2009. USAID Indonesia Strategy 2009-2014.  
 WHO, 2008. Country Cooperation Strategy. 2007-2011. Country Office for Indonesia, Indonesia  
 World Bank, 2008. Country Partnership Strategy FY 09-12. Indonesia Country Team, Indonesia.

<b>List of IFAD Loans to Indonesia, 1980 – 2012</b>											
<b>Project Name</b>	<b>Project Type</b>	<b>Total Project Cost US\$ million</b>	<b>IFAD Approved Financing US\$ million*</b>	<b>Cofinancier Amount US\$ million</b>	<b>Counterpart Amount and Beneficiary Contribution US\$ million</b>	<b>Board Approval</b>	<b>Loan Effectiveness</b>	<b>Project Completion Date</b>	<b>Cooperating Institution</b>	<b>Project Status</b>	
1. Smallholder Cattle Development Project	LIVST	40	26		14	06 May 80	01 Oct 80	31 Aug 86	World Bank	Closed	
2. Sulawesi Paddy Land Development Project	IRRIG	52.8	34		18.8	08 Sep 81	29 Sep 82	30 Jun 90	AsDB	Closed	
3. Seventeenth Irrigation (East Java Province) Project	IRRIG	142.6	25	72.6 (WB)	45	31 Mar 82	15 Dec 82	30 Sep 88	World Bank	Closed	
4. Second Smallholder Cattle Development Project	LIVST	66.4	12	32 (WB)	22.4	05 Sep 85	15 Apr 86	30 Sep 93	World Bank	Closed	
5. Income Generating Project for Marginal Farmers and Landless	CREDI	28.1	14	2 (Netherlands) 1.4 (UNDP)	10.7	03 Dec 87	18 Jun 88	31 Dec 97	UNOPS	Closed	
6. East Java Rainfed Agriculture Project	RURAL	35.6	20	2.9 (WFP) 3.5 (Netherlands)	9.2	19 Apr 90	09 Oct 90	31 Dec 98	AsDB	Closed	
7. South Sumatera Smallholder Tree Crops Development Project	AGRIC	28.1	19.9		8.1	14 Apr 92	29 Sep 92	15 Mar 99	AsDB	Closed	
8. Eastern Islands Smallholder Cashew Development Project	AGRIC	43.2	26	1 (UNDP)	16.2	19 Apr 94	29 Jul 94	30 Jun 02	UNOPS	Closed	
9. Eastern Islands Smallholder Farming Systems and Livestock Development Project	LIVST	39.3	18	6.7 (IsDB) 1.4 (New Zealand)	13.2	06 Dec 95	22 Mar 96	31 Mar 03	UNOPS	Closed	
10. Income Generating Project for Marginal Farmers and Landless Phase III	CREDI	118.9	24.9	60.5 (AsDB) 8.3 (Dom. fin. Inst.)	25.2	04 Dec 97	09 Jul 98	31 Dec 06	AsDB	Closed	
11. Post-Crisis Programme for Participatory Integrated Development in Rainfed Areas	RURAL	27.4	23.5		3.9	04 May 00	31 Jan 01	31 Mar 09	IFAD	Completed	
12. East Kalimantan Local Communities Empowerment Programme	RURAL	26.5	20.0		6.5	11 Dec 02			UNOPS	Cancelled	
13. Rural Empowerment and Agricultural Development Programme in Central Sulawesi	RURAL	28.3	21.6		6.7	02 Dec 04	18 Nov 08	31 Dec 14	IFAD	Ongoing	
14. National Programme for Community Empowerment in Rural Areas Project	RURAL	68.5	68.5	1,620 (WB)	5,667	11 Sep 08	17 Mar 09	31 Mar 16	World Bank	Ongoing	
15. Smallholder Livelihood Development Project in Eastern Indonesia	RURAL	65	50.2		14.8	11 May 11	05 Jul 11	31 Jan 19	IFAD	Ongoing	
16. Coastal Community Development Project										Under design	

**List of Projects to Be Evaluated Under Indonesia CPE**

- 1) Income Generating Project for Marginal Farmers and Landless Phase III
- 2) Post Crisis Programme for Participatory Integrated Development in Rainfed Areas
- 3) East Kalimantan Local Communities Empowerment Programme
- 4) Rural Empowerment and Agricultural Development Programme in Central Sulawesi
- 5) National Programme for Community Empowerment in Rural Areas Project
- 6) Smallholder Livelihood Development Project in Eastern Indonesia
- 7) Coastal Communities Development