

## Country Case Study Indonesia

External End Evaluation  
Partners for Resilience  
2016–2020 programme

**17 April 2020**

**Final DRAFT**

Tony Land & Ruth Alicia Suciadi

---

## Table of Contents

1.Introduction .....	4
1.1. Purpose.....	4
1.2. Approach and Methodology .....	4
1.3. The Indonesia Country Programme.....	5
2.Observations and Emerging Conclusions.....	58
3.Annexes .....	60
Annex 1: Matrix of Outcomes, their Significance and the Contribution of PfR II .....	60
Annex 2: Challenges of Working with Government .....	77
Annex 3: List of persons interviewed .....	79
Annex 4 - Schedule of Meetings .....	82
Annex 5 – List of Documents Consulted.....	86

## List of Boxes

Box 1: An example of PFR Alliance Collaboration at the Sub-National Level .....	14
Box 2: Empowering the participation of women in Village Planning – experience of Oekiu Village .....	16
Box 3: Eco-system protection as a pathway to improving livelihoods .....	17
Box 4: Significance of PFR II for the Alliance Members .....	29
Box 5: Using Village fund to finance IRM Activities .....	48
Box 6: Example of PFR Lobby and Advocacy Approach.....	51
Box 7: Feedback from stakeholders .....	52

## List of Tables

Table 1: The Five Trajectories .....	6
Table 2: Applying IRM principles to various Disaster Management policy processes .....	12
Table 3: Promoting Coordination .....	23
Table 4: Examples of collaboration with non-PFR actors .....	27
Table 5: Examples of Capacity Strengthening Interventions .....	34
Table 6: Contribution to Partner Capacity Strengthening .....	38
Table 7: CSO Contributions To Outcomes .....	39
Table 8: National Level Outcomes.....	43
Table 9: Sub-National Level Outcomes .....	45
Table 10: Village Level Outcomes .....	46
Table 11: How PFR has Contributed to Outcomes.....	49

## List of Acronyms

APB	Revenue and Expenditure Budget (Anggaran Pendapatan dan Belanja)
APBdes	Village Revenue and Expenditure Budget (Anggaran Pendapatan dan Belanja desa)
API	Climate Change Adaptation (Adaptasi Perubahan Iklim)
ASEAN	Association of South East Asian Nations
BAPPEDA	Development Planning Agency at Sub-National Level (Badan Perencanaan Pembangunan Daerah)
BAPPENAS	National Development Planning Agency (Badan Perencanaan Pembangunan Nasional)
BMKG	Indonesian Meteorological, Climatological and Geophysical Agency (Badan Meteorologi Klimatologi dan Geofisika)
BNPB	National Agency for Disaster Management (Badan Nasional Penanggulangan Bencana)
BPBD	Regional/District Agency for Disaster Management (Badan Penanggulangan Bencana Daerah)
BPN	National Land Office (Badan Pertanahan Nasional)
CBO	Community Based Organization
CCA	Climate Change Adaptation
CII	CARE International Indonesia
COP	Conference of the Contracting Parties
CSO	Civil Society Organization
DM	Disaster Management
DPRD	District Representative (Dewan Perwakilan Rakyat Daerah)
DRR	Disaster Risk Reduction
EMR	Ecosystem Management and Restoration
IEC	Information, Education & Communication
IFRC	International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies
IRM	Integrated Risk Management
KARINA KWI	Karitas in Indonesia
KEMENDAGRI	Ministry of Home Affairs (Kementrian Dalam Negeri)
KemenDesPDTT	Ministry of State for the Development of Disadvantaged Regions
KEMENKEU	Ministry of Finance (Kementrian Keuangan)
KEMEN KP	Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fishery (Kementrian Kelautan dan Perikanan)
KEMENLU	Ministry of Foreign Affairs (Kementrian Luar Negeri)
KEMEN PK	Ministry of Education and Culture (Kementrian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan)
KEMEN PUPR	Ministry of Public Works and Public Housing (Kementrian Pekerjaan Umum dan Perumahan Rakyat)
KEMENSOS	Social Ministry (Kementrian Sosial)
KEMENTAN	Ministry of Agriculture (Kementrian Pertanian)
KLHK	Ministry of Environment and Forestry (Kementrian Lingkungan Hidup dan Kehutanan)
KLHS	Strategic Environmental Assessment (Kajian Lingkungan Hidup Strategis)
L&A	Lobby and Advocacy
NGO	Non-Government Organization
NTT	Nusa Tenggara Timur
NWPI	Netherlands Water Partnership Indonesia
PERKA BNPB	Regulations Head of BNPB (Peraturan Kepala BNPB)
PMI	The Indonesian Red Cross (Palang Merah Indonesia)
RAN API	National Action Plan for Climate Change Adaptation (Rencana Aksi Nasional - Adaptasi

	Perubahan Iklim)
RAN GRK	National Action Plan for Greenhouse Gas (Rencana Aksi Nasional – Gas Rumah Kaca)
RAN PRB	National Action Plan for Disaster Risk Reduction (Rencana Aksi Nasional – Pengurangan Risiko Bencana)
RCCC	Red Cross/Red Crescent Climate Centre
RPJM Menengah)	Medium - Long Term Development Plan (Rencana Jangka Panjang Menengah)
RPJMdes	Medium - Long Term Development Plan at Village level (Rencana Jangka Panjang Menengah Desa)
RPJMN	Medium - Long Term National Development Plan (Rencana Jangka Panjang Menengah Nasional)
RKPdes	Village Government Work Plan (Rencana Kerja Pemerintah desa)
SDG	Sustainable Development Goals
SF-DRR	Sendai Framework – Disaster Risk Reduction
SKPD	Local Government Unit (Satuan Kerja Pemerintah Daerah)
ToT	Training of Trainers
UNFCCC	United Nation Framework Convention in Climate Change
WII	Wetlands International Indonesia

# 1. Introduction

## 1.1. Purpose

This is a report of the findings of the Indonesia Country study which is one of three country studies being prepared as an input to Evaluation of the PFR II programme. For ease of comparison and to facilitate the preparation of the overall report, this country report is structured according to the seven generic Evaluation Questions (and associated Judgement criteria and indicators) that inform this evaluation.

## 1.2. Approach and Methodology

This country report is based on a data collection exercise that comprised three phases: i) a desk review of key documentation pertaining to the Indonesia PFR programme (see annex 5 for list of documents consulted), ii) a set of interviews conducted with key informants at the country level; iii) a participatory review process of emerging findings carried out with PFR programme alliance members. The country study was carried out by a two-person team comprising an international and national consultant and was greatly facilitated by the Indonesia country programme coordinator and leads of the five alliance partners.

Country level interviews included both one-on-one meetings as well as focus group discussions. Interviewees included PFR programme staff from across the five alliance members, representatives of the Government of Indonesia at national, provincial, district and village levels, representatives of contracted and non-contracted partners, and community representatives. A full list of persons interviewed as well as a schedule of meetings held is available in Annex 3. Interviews were based on a set of semi-structured guideline questions linked to the seven evaluation questions and associated judgement criteria and indicators.

In view of the COVID 19 pandemic, the international consultant was unable to travel to Indonesia. Therefore, an adjusted data collection methodology was adopted whereby the international consultant conducted interviews by video conferencing and email/ WhatsApp exchange whilst the national consultant carried out the envisaged face to face interviews with key informants at the national and sub-national levels. The consultant team held daily e-meetings to review progress, discuss emerging findings and issues and plan the way forward.

Due to COVID 19, it was also necessary to adjust the format of the envisaged end of mission learning working. Instead of a face to face event, a two-step virtual review process was adopted. The first step involved the on-line review of an outcome harvesting matrix, using google docs, that had been prepared by the consultants and which was validated by the PFR Indonesia team. The second step involved a 2-hour e-workshop which brought together the evaluation team and PFR Indonesia programme team. The e-workshop, facilitated by the international consultant, discussed four core cross-cutting topics emerging from the findings.

### 1.3. The Indonesia Country Programme

In line with PFR 2 programme design, the overall objective of the Indonesia programme is to localise global agendas and commitments aimed at disaster management, climate change adaptation and working with an eco-system approach. It is recognised that each country faces unique challenges, has different institutional, capacity and resource opportunities/ limitations and have prioritised their responses to these global agenda and commitments in different ways. In this respect, contextualisation to local needs and circumstances is critical.

IRM offers a unique framework for responding to global agendas and commitments in an integrated and complementary way. The concept is however new to most stakeholders and needs to be promoted in ways that make sense in the local context. For Indonesia the main (but by no means unique) entry point for discussion on IRM is through the perspective of Disaster Management (DM). It is through this window that topics of climate change adaptation (CCA), eco-system approach, landscape and watershed approaches can be introduced, as well as more specific challenges such as sustainable peatland and mangrove swamp management.

In Indonesia, there are multiple actors and stakeholders involved in DM both as duty bearers and rights holders. The Government of Indonesia plays a leadership role in this regard with responsibilities for policy setting, coordination, regulation and programme delivery. The government of Indonesia is however decentralised with significant powers, authority and budgets devolved to provincial, district and village tiers of government. Therefore, to address DM and to promote IRM, it is necessary to engage all levels of government, more especially as the sub-national levels have an implementation role whereas the national level has more of a coordination and policy setting role. Indonesia also recognises that a multi-stakeholder approach to DM is necessary and therefore the complementary roles of civil society and the private sector have been recognised. These also exist at national, sub-national and village levels and participate in multi-actor forums such as for DRR and Watershed management. Various development partners are also engaged in supporting DM, CCA and resilience in Indonesia and include UN agencies, specialised technical agencies, multi-lateral and bilateral development cooperation agencies and international development NGOs.

As an expansive archipelago and with a population of above 270 million, Indonesia faces both common and unique disaster risks. There is for sure no one-size-fits-all solution and responses need to be adapted to the particularities of specific localities, districts and provinces. This is further reason why working across the different tiers of government is required. At the same time, it is recognised that administrative jurisdictions share common problems that require common approaches that transcend administrative boundaries, and which demand trans-boundary responses.

PFR 2 builds on the experience of PFR1 and is also shaped by the institutional mandates and working approaches of each of the PFR alliance members. In this respect, the programme is not fully demand driven but is guided by past interventions, lessons of experience and interests/ mandate of the partners. Collectively, the 5 partners offer a broad depth of expertise and experience that enables the partnership to tackle most but not all aspects of DM/ IRM and the localisation and implementation of global commitments. Specifically:

- Each partner brings to the table the legacy of PFR 1 including lessons of good practice, established relationships, and investments in certain localities across the country at all levels;
- Each partner brings its own modus operandi, which influences to some extent the way they participate in and engage with government led policy processes;
- Each partner has certain areas of expertise and interest, for example Karina's interests in Urban Farming/ Resilience and in Watershed Management; Wetlands interest in Peatland and mangrove swamp management, Care's interest in sustainable livelihoods, gender empowerment and resilience, IFRC interest in disaster risk reduction, through prevention, preparedness and response, and Red Cross Climate Centre (RCCC) interest in climate change adaptation.

Against this background, the PFR programme in Indonesia conceived a programme structured around 5 trajectories. Each trajectory is led by a PFR alliance partner and engages government across different levels to address particular aspects of the broader agenda. The implementation of the trajectories offers opportunity for and in fact demands joint action across the trajectories in certain instances.

There is however no overarching master plan for localising global commitments. This is neither the case for the Government nor for external actors seeking to influence/ support the Government. The DM sector is complex and highly inter-connected, but it moves at different speeds, is significantly compartmentalised by administrative/institutional jurisdictions and mandates and is driven by competing political imperatives and contextual drivers. This therefore requires that the programme adopt a multi-pronged approach working on different issues both in parallel and in sequence. Table 1 provides an overview of the 5 trajectories:

Table 1: The Five Trajectories

<b>Trajectory</b>	<b>Title/ Goal</b>	<b>Lead</b>
<b>1</b>	Disaster Management (DM) law and select related DRR policies and regulations comply with IRM standards, are harmonized with each other, and align with relevant sectoral policies. Primary focus is on Policy.	<b>IFRC</b>
<b>2</b>	Global agreements (like SFDRR, SDGs, Paris Climate Agreement, including their respective regional roadmaps that highlight the importance of IRM), are taken into consideration in national and local policies and vice versa. Primary focus is on Policy but with some input on investment and practice.	<b>Red Cross Climate Centre</b>
<b>3</b>	Gender-sensitive community-based development plans incorporate and fund IRM initiatives, leverage maximum funding allocated through Village Law, and align with and inform national IRM policy frameworks. Primary focus is on policy translation at sub-national levels, on investment and practice.	<b>Care Indonesia</b>
<b>4</b>	Finding provisions for lowland development planning complies with IRM criteria, promoting investment in sustainable economies and livelihoods for lowland communities. Focus is on policy and practice.	<b>Wetlands Indonesia</b>
<b>5</b>	Watershed Management Approach and accompanying regulatory frameworks incorporated into Village and District Development Plans in Sikka district in NTT and (to a lesser degree Jakarta (Banten Bay), in a manner that can inform future mainstreaming at national level. Focus straddles the three dimensions of policy, investment and practice.	<b>Karina (Cordaid)</b>

The main tools for engagement by PFR alliance members and their partners (contracted and non-contracted) have included: Lobbying and Advocacy; capacity strengthening, knowledge management and facilitation of vertical and horizontal linkages. Drawing on these tools, the PFR programme has set itself the following objectives:

- To target relevant government institutions at national, sub-national and village level with mandated responsibilities for DM (broadly defined), to promote the IRM approach<sup>1</sup>;
- To identify windows of opportunity and accompany policy processes driven largely by government departments, where there is a political interest for change or innovation;
- To join with or facilitate establishment of multi-stakeholder platforms to engage government at all levels;
- To build the capacity of NGOs and CBOs active in the field of DM to effectively engage with and support government institutions and community groups;
- To use evidence-based advocacy as a tool for engaging government in policy related discussions including collation and dissemination of good practices (including drawing on experiences of PFR 1);
- To provide technical expertise and advisory services to government to develop / revise policy, regulatory and planning documents;
- To assist government to conduct consultative processes with stakeholders through the organisation and financing of meetings, workshops and related events;
- To assist government agencies to link up to relevant networks of expertise and influence.

---

<sup>1</sup> In the Indonesia context, a decision was taken not to push the IRM terminology as such but rather to promote linking disaster management with climate change adaptation and eco-system management approaches.



**EQ 1 – On relevance and coherence: To what extent was the PfR II programme relevant and coherent for the promotion of IRM?**

**Summary**

The Indonesia programme is well adapted to the local context and has demonstrated responsiveness to the policy, institutional and geographic characteristics of the country. It has recognised the importance of working through government structures and processes at national, sub-national and village levels where it has sought opportunities to influence the design and implementation of policies, laws, regulations, technical guidelines, plans and budgets.

The key global agreements/ frameworks have provided the reference points for articulating the country programme, whilst IRM provided a conceptual framework for doing so, especially with respect to bringing together disaster risk management, climate change adaptation and eco-system approaches. However, the IRM concept itself has not been pushed too hard, with focus rather on promoting the ideas and principles enshrined within it.

The five PFR alliance partners have worked closely together to design and implement the programme. PFR II demanded a more collaborative way of working, the benefits of which have been appreciated by alliance partners with the passage of time. Whilst each partner retains its area of specific expertise and interest and bilateral working relationships, which have at times reinforced a silo approach, considerable efforts have been made to collaborate on planning, budgeting and reporting, joint training events and lesson learning, and joint interventions. One of the five trajectories has also served as an advisory service desk for the other trajectories. For regional level engagements, inputs from across the five trajectories have been channelled through the PFR coordinator who also serves as the regional level focal point.

Gender has not been systematically mainstreamed in the design, implementation and reporting of the Indonesia programme, although there is provision for reporting on gender in the bi-annual reports, and one of the five trajectories has purposefully addressed gender issues. The programme recently conducted a self-assessment of each partner's readiness to engage on gender issues, revealing in most cases, the need for considerable work to be done to ensure each partner is able to promote gender adequately. With respect to vulnerable and marginalised groups, it is noted that the entire work of PFR II, aims at improving the resilience of vulnerable and marginalised communities against the threat of disaster, by shaping and informing government policies and practices that impact on their lives. The selection of localities for three trajectories that engage at community level, was moreover determined by consideration of disaster risk and socio-economic profile. In this respect, there has been positive bias towards supporting communities that have a higher proportion of vulnerable and marginalised groups.

***JC 1.1: The PfR II programme was adapted to local context and has shown responsiveness and adaptiveness to the priorities and needs of their implementing partners and communities in terms of their capacity strengthening and to communities in terms of tackling IRM challenges***

**The Indonesia programme is well adapted to the local context and has demonstrated responsiveness to the policy, institutional and geographic characteristics of the country. It has recognised the importance of working through government structures and processes at national, sub-national and village levels where it has sought opportunities to influence the design and implementation of policies, laws, regulations, technical guidelines, plans and budgets.**

PFR II builds on experiences of PFR I. The design of this second phase was facilitated by a consultant who prepared an initial set of proposals which were subsequently tested and refined through a consultative process involving various stakeholder groups.

The selection of programme focal areas and priorities has been based on an assessment of the status of relevant government policies, regulations, guidelines and planning/ budgeting frameworks as well as to the identification of windows of opportunity for influencing these. The government of Indonesia at all levels including village government may be regarded as the principal target group for the programme's lobby and advocacy work<sup>2</sup>.

The programme has not started from zero but rather builds on the experiences of and connections built during PFR 1. This includes working relationships established with a number of CSO/ civil society implementing partners as well as with specific community groups. These have offered solid entry points for some of the work carried out under PFR 2.

Overall, over the life of PFR II, the programme has engaged with approximately eight national level government agencies, four provincial governments, eight district governments and thirty village governments. Whilst impressive it is important to recognise the size of Indonesia with 37 provinces, 7000 districts and a reported 75,000 gazetted rural villages.

Agenda setting for the programme has been informed by the following approaches:

- Identification of windows of opportunity to influence the eight national government departments with mandated responsibilities for the development, review, and monitoring of DM-related policy portfolios;
- In the 4 provinces and 8 districts, engagement of relevant offices responsible for the translation of national policy and for the implementation of plans, budgets and programmes that are amendable to IRM approaches – typically planning (BAPPEDA), community and village empowerment (PMD), environmental services, and disaster management (BPBD). The programme has also taken account of the specific socio-economic, and spatial characteristics of as well as vulnerabilities/ risks pertaining to each province and district;
- In the 30 villages, engagement with village government administrations and associated community-based structures. These villages are generally those that the programme worked with during PFR1 and were selected also because of their poverty profile and vulnerability indices.
- As a general working modality, PFR has facilitated multi-stakeholder dialogues including various civil society organisations, platforms/ forums and community groups. From the perspective of national and sub-national Government, one of the strengths of the alliance is its capacity to engage different stakeholder groups and its ability to forge linkages with the community level.
- Trajectory 3 (Care) has, moreover, paid significant attention to issues of gender and has purposefully promoted women's participation in village government decision-making structures.

---

<sup>2</sup> And as discussed later, capacity strengthening work too.

The alliance's implementing partners (contracted CSOs and multi-stakeholder forums) have been party to these agenda setting approaches - in this regard the implementing partners role has been primarily as executor of the delivery of trajectory objectives on behalf of the trajectory leads. Their implication in the programme has been most obvious in trajectories 3-5, which have active engagement at the community levels but also at district and to lesser extent provincial levels. To enable implementing partners to play their roles effectively, they have received capacity strengthening support from the alliance partners, where needs have been identified through the administration of a capacity self-assessment tool (DCF). Capacity strengthening is further discussed under EQ 4 and 5 below.

The programme's approach of engaging government institutions at all levels, is based on an intimate understanding of how public policy is made and executed in the Indonesia context and on the workings of Indonesia's public administration. In this regard, key considerations have included:

- Understanding the mandated responsibilities of different national government agencies that address DM related issues, and the relationships and working modalities that exist between them;
- Understanding Indonesia's specific model of decentralisation and the respective assignment of roles and responsibilities to sub-national tiers of government;
- The implications of the 2015 Village Law which has established the village government as a distinct tier of government with law making, regulatory and planning and budgeting responsibilities, and which has bestowed on village governments a significant annual budget/fund;
- Identifying opportunities for reform and readiness for change that emerge in different parts of government at all levels and opportunities for building synergies and collaborations, linked in particular to election cycles at different levels of government;
- An appreciation of the various steps involved in translating policy commitments into action on the ground including the idiosyncrasies of legislative, regulatory and planning requirements to operationalise and fund policy directions and the technical pre-requisites to accompany such processes (guidelines and related technical documents etc);

The programme's logic of intervention at the sub-national level is also informed by the specific socio-economic and environmental/ disaster contexts that pertain at provincial, district and village levels, where the programme's partners work. Opportunities to promote IRM take account and responds to the specific challenges confronted at these different levels and builds on experiences gained during the course of PFR I. In this respect the broader policy frameworks outlined in national legislation are translated into local laws, guidelines, plans and budgets that take account of these local contexts. The political priorities of elected leaders (provincial governor and district regent) also have an influence on what gets done.

Alliance partners and their contracted CSO partners have identified provinces, districts and villages where they believe they have a relevant role to play. Thus, for example, Wetlands is typically active in lowland areas where issues of peatland degradation and mangrove swamp destruction is prevalent. Karina on the other hand works in areas where watershed management is a critical factor in averting natural disasters such as floods. Care has focused especially on communities where the poverty index and exposure to risk is high.

Trajectories have not necessarily conducted an explicit political economy or stakeholder analysis, in advance of their interventions. However, they are sensitive and understand the functioning of government and current political priorities in the domains they work in, most having established long standing formal and informal relationships with government counterparts at all levels. Based on their reading/ scanning they have identified suitable entry points and explored avenues for strengthening/ broadening relationships.

Alliance partners underscore the dynamic nature of the policy making process which has required them at times to be nimble footed and to adapt their strategies according to windows of opportunity that either open up or close down. Several examples were cited where it proved necessary to change course in order to remain relevant. This has also meant on occasions responding to requests which were not initially foreseen, or which do not feature in the respective trajectory ToC, but which are important to pursue from the perspective of building strong working relationships. An example of this is the decision of trajectory 3 to take up the NTT province's Governor's request to explore ways of integrating IRM into the eco-tourism sub-sector. In other instances, reform processes or policy adoption processes are slow burning and require remaining engaged over the long term, an example of this being the programme's engagement on the revision of the national Disaster Management Law.

Overall it can be said that the programme has applied a mix of demand driven, demand inducing and more supply driven approaches:

- Demand driven typically involves responding to a concrete request from a government agency for support or input. This can be likened more to playing a service delivery role.
- Demand inducing is where PFR has identified opportunities to engage the government and to advocate for an approach and in the process to convince the government to take up the idea/ concept through provision of knowledge, technical advice, and process facilitation.
- Supply driven might be where the programme has actively pursued a particular agenda, which was not necessarily on the agenda of the government but which through lobby and advocacy work has gained the attention of the government.

A selection of PFR achievements are listed below in table 2 below to illustrate how the broader IRM concept and underlying principles have been applied to respond to national policy reforms related to disaster management and resilience building.

Table 2: Applying IRM principles to various Disaster Management policy processes

Trajectory	Reform/ Change Process	Application of IRM
1	Revision of National Disaster Management Law (Policy focus)	Opportunity to lobby for integration of climate change adaptation and eco-system approach into the overall disaster management policy framework for Indonesia. These are regarded as the cornerstones of the IRM approach.
2	Authorisation of Use of Village Fund by Village Governments for financing Emergency Responses (Policy and investment focus)	Opportunity to advocate for Village authorities to be allowed to use their village budget to finance and implement emergency responses that address village-specific disasters that are not necessarily covered by district level response. Here the emphasis is on empowerment of communities to take responsibility for disaster management from an IRM perspective
3	Incorporation of IRM principles into strategic environmental assessment (KLHS) documents, in two districts and one municipality and which inform the direction of mid-term development plan (RPJMD) of each district/ municipality (Policy focus)	Environmental assessment reports are mandatory accompanying documents for the mid-term development plan, which in turn provides the main reference for planning and budgeting of programmes/ services. Opportunity was used to integrate IRM principles of eco-system approach and climate change adaptation in the environmental assessment report thereby ensuring that these influence plans and budgets
4	Adoption of Village Regulations on fire prevention in peatland area in 4 villages across 4 districts (Policy, investment and practice focus)	Opportunity for PFR to work with communities to adopt legislation informed by an eco-system approach to manage and safeguard damaged peatland areas.
5	National planning agency BAPPENAS has adopted SDG indicators on Resilient Cities, and agreed to develop a set of SDG indicators that take account of watershed management, DRR, and CCA (Policy focus)	PFR identified an opportunity to engage the national planning agency to consider adoption of IRM principles of climate change adaptation and eco-system approach in the development of SDG indicators on Resilient Cities.

***JC 1.2: The PfR alliance programme has been aligned with the regionally and globally agreed priorities on IRM***

The key global agreements/ frameworks have provided the reference points for articulating the country programme, whilst IRM provided a conceptual framework for doing so, especially with respect to bringing together disaster risk management, climate change adaptation and eco-system approaches. However, the IRM concept itself has not been pushed too hard, with focus rather on promoting the ideas and principles enshrined within it.

The key global agreements/ frameworks (Sendai, Paris, New Urban Agenda etc.) have provided the reference points for articulating the country programme. IRM provided a conceptual framework for doing so, more especially with respect to bringing together disaster risk management, climate change adaptation and eco-system approaches, in the programme's engagements with government stakeholders. However, in the Indonesia context, it was agreed amongst the alliance partners not to

push the IRM concept too hard, but rather to advocate the ideas and principles enshrined within it. The main entry points for the programme have been Indonesia's own policy frameworks and efforts to "localise" the global agreements and frameworks and it has been essentially the domestic policy framework, such as review of the national disaster management law, which has guided programme interventions. That said, the objective of trajectory 2, which works across all the other trajectories, is to ensure that the global agreements are taken into consideration in national and local policies and vice versa. In practical terms, this has meant engaging various government institutions on adapting disaster management-related policy frameworks to accommodate relevant aspects of IRM.

---

### ***JC 1.3: The five PfR alliance partners share and align their approach regarding IRM***

**The five PFR alliance partners have worked closely together to design and implement the programme. PFR II demanded a more collaborative way of working, the benefits of which have been appreciated by alliance partners with the passage of time. Whilst each partner retains its area of specific expertise and interest and bilateral working relationships, which have at times reinforced a silo approach, considerable efforts have been made to collaborate on planning, budgeting and reporting, joint training events and lesson learning, and join interventions. One of the five trajectories has also served as an advisory service desk for the other trajectories. For regional level engagements, inputs from across the five trajectories have been channelled through the PFR coordinator who also serves as the regional level focal point.**

**Country Level Engagement** - The design of the country programme for PFR II was reported as being participatory and took account of the interests, views and comparative strengths of the different alliance partners.

The programme eventually agreed upon, built on a combination of the key global agreements/ policy frameworks, the experiences of PFR I, the institutional mandates and areas of expertise of the alliance partners at country level and an analysis of the Indonesia country context and potential opportunities for engagement.

PFR II represented a new way of working requiring the individual alliance partners to work much more closely with one another than had been the case in PFR I. This collaborative way of working was a learning process, the benefits of which have been recognised and appreciated over time. This working together is reflected in the following ways:

- Participation in joint reporting and planning activities, including review of the programme-wide theory of change and mapping of inter-linkages between the individual trajectories;
- Identification of opportunities for working together in joint activities or events, whether in terms of advocacy and lobbying, capacity strengthening, and knowledge management/ technical expertise;
- Periodic lesson learning events where experiences from the field are shared and discussed, and common approaches/ actions identified;
- Growing recognition of the benefits of presenting a common front/ image of the PFR alliance towards stakeholders, rather than profiling a particular alliance member<sup>3</sup>.

---

<sup>3</sup> However, in practice, most relationships remain bilateral. Many of the interviews with key partners and beneficiaries suggests that they seldom recognize PFR. What they do recognize is the individual organization partner that they are working with.

This collaborative way of working has helped contribute to building coherence across the programme. It is noteworthy that on various occasions, the alliance members have worked jointly in their engagement with government. Examples where two or more alliance members have worked together include:

- Engagement with the National Disaster Management Agency (BNPB) on the development of a Master Plan on Disaster Management (RIPB);
- Engagement with the Ministry of Home Affairs (MOHA) on the drafting of Minimum Service Standards for Disaster Management for Local Governments;
- Engagement with the National Planning Agency (BAPPENAS) on the inclusion of IRM into Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) indicators;
- Engagement with the Coordinating Ministry of Maritime Affairs and Investment on the development of a national roadmap on Land Subsidence Mitigation and Adaptation;
- Engagement with the City of Kupang on integration of IRM principles and practices (See box 1).

**Box 1: An example of PFR Alliance Collaboration at the Sub-National Level**

KARINA and CIS have been supporting one another in policy advocacy work in Kupang city. For example, both KARINA and CIS are members of the watershed Forum in NTT Province and they both engage the forum in the consultation process of regulation drafting and in policy advocacy. KARINA also involved CIS in their initiative related to new urban agenda indicator whilst CIS supported KARINA by linking them with the Kupang city government.

*Source: Interviews with CIS and Karina representatives in Kupang City.*

Moreover, in the area of capacity strengthening (see EQ 4 below), the alliance has used common tools/ knowledge products for disseminating information on IRM and for training purposes where they have promoted common tools for conducting lobbying and advocacy work, such as the IRM policy “check-list”. Thus, beyond sharing a common understanding of the “universe” of IRM content-wise, the alliance has also sought to work towards a common approach on how to conduct lobbying and advocacy work. In this respect, an approach of “constructive engagement” has been agreed upon as the *modus operandi* across the alliance members. This has been a delicate balancing act that required taking account of the differing institutional mandates, profiles, interests and capacities of each of the alliance members<sup>4</sup>.

At the same time, each partner retains its area of specific expertise and interest and bilateral working relationships with relevant counterpart organisations/ physical jurisdictions. The assignment of a specific trajectory to a specific alliance member has tended to reinforce a “silo” approach, which alliance partners are aware of and have sought to overcome. The “silo” approach is also manifested in the highly compartmentalised structure of government with clearly demarcated mandates, plans and budgets. Opportunities for working across institutional mandates are comparatively few and have proven to be challenging. There have, however, been some notable achievements, for example the establishment of an MOU between the Ministries of Environment and Forestry and the Ministry of Spatial planning, where both T2 and T5 were actively involved in promoting.

It is important to point out the special character of trajectory 2 which is led by the RCCC. The trajectory is less programmatic in character and functions more as an advisory service desk for the other trajectories. Whilst it has pursued a number of self-standing activities, some of its most significant achievements has been where it has provided advisory support to the work of other trajectories. For example, it collaborated with trajectory 3 in assisting the Ministry of Home Affairs to

<sup>4</sup> For example, the Red Cross (PMI) which is an auxiliary institution of the Government has to tread carefully when it involves itself in advocacy work.

confirm the availability of the Village fund for village-level emergency situation and authority of Village Administrative to declare emergency situation.

**Regional and Global Engagement** - For Indonesia, there is no joint regional programme. Each alliance partner has its own internal processes and information channels between country office and the respective regional and headquarter offices and focus on the specific agreements most relevant to their respective mandates. Care has, however, been appointed as the regional focal point for the five alliance members to pursue common agendas. In practice this has meant:

- Acting as the focal point for interacting with relevant government departments/ teams mandated to engage/ interact with official regional policy processes and forums that relate to the main IRM agendas (eg: Disaster Management Agency participation in DRR Asia-Pacific Ministerial Conference);
- Receiving requests from government for technical inputs into official government documents for submission to regional events/ processes, and mobilising inputs from across the alliance members. On occasions, the government has also invited alliance members to participate in official delegations as expert or to make presentations on behalf of the country delegation;
- Facilitating the collection and dissemination of good practice experiences from the work of alliance members for dissemination at regional and global events.

---

***JC 1.4: Gender considerations and inputs from vulnerable and marginalised groups have been included, represented, addressed and mainstreamed in design, implementation and M&E***

Gender has not been systematically mainstreamed in the design, implementation and reporting of the Indonesia programme, although there is provision for reporting on gender in the bi-annual reports, and one of the five trajectories has purposefully addressed gender issues. The programme recently conducted a self-assessment of each partner's readiness to engage on gender issues, revealing in most cases, the need for considerable work to be done to ensure each partner is able to promote gender adequately. With respect to vulnerable and marginalised groups, it is noted that the entire work of PFR II, aims at improving the resilience of vulnerable and marginalised communities against the threat of disaster, by shaping and informing government policies and practices that impact on the lives of the vulnerable. The selection of localities for three trajectories that engage at community level, was determined by consideration of disaster risk and socio-economic profile. In this respect, there has been positive bias towards supporting communities that have a higher proportion of vulnerable and marginalised groups.

**Gender** - Gender considerations have not been systematically mainstreamed in the design, implementation and reporting of the Indonesia programme, although there is provision for reporting on gender in the bi-annual reports. A number of specific trajectory activities have however purposefully addressed gender issues (see further below).

Alliance members attribute the lack of systematic treatment of gender to the absence of any kind of gender strategy and associated objectives in the overall design of PFR II, although reference to gender is made in the country design document. The need to pay greater attention to gender has however been emphasised during the latter part of the programme, and therefore an effort is now ongoing to see how best to accommodate gender across the trajectories. Care's own tool for assessing the readiness of organisations to address gender in a systematic way (Gender marker tool)<sup>5</sup> was

---

<sup>5</sup> See Care Gender Marker tool in the Indonesia Annual Report 2019.



therefore used to assess how well-prepared alliance members are to accommodate gender. With the exception of Care, the four other partners scored poorly indicating the need for substantial internal work to be done in order to be able to tackle gender in a more proactive and systematic way. Caution was however expressed at mainstreaming gender as a default across all areas of work without first assessing its relevance in the different policy domains where the programme is engaged.

Trajectory 3 (Care) is the one trajectory that has purposefully adopted a gender mainstreaming approach in its core work on IRM integration into village budgets and in its engagement with stakeholders at all levels. In this regard the work of Trajectory 3 has included:

- Collaboration with the training unit of the Ministry of Villages (MOVID) to develop training modules on gender sensitive IRM for the training of community empowerment officers as well as for community members;
- Facilitation of women's participation in the formulation of village development plans including training of Village leaders on the role of women in community development and IRM. Box 2 below highlights the impact this work has had on women's empowerment in the planning process:

Box 2: Empowering the participation of women in Village Planning – experience of Oekiu Village

Usually the planners (team) in the village are dominated by men, but now women have started to participate as members of the planner team. In Oekiu Village, for example, out of 11 people in the planner team, there are now 6 women (previously only 1 woman). In village meetings, CIS observed that the village chief has started to provide opportunity and invite women to speak out and to present their comments and concerns.

To support this process, Care-CIS held a planning forum specifically for women, which is held ahead of the Musrenbang (village consultative planning meeting). This forum was held to accommodate women's voices since not all women are confident enough to express their opinion in the public forum. Concerns raised were then carried forward to the main village consultative meeting. The planning forum for women is now a part of the whole village development planning process that is organized before the main consultative meeting. Care-CIS also provided training to women on advocacy. Women in general now have more confidence and willingness to be involved. However, women noted that there is still a challenge since even though they are present at the meeting and probably voice their opinion, they are still not involved in the (final) decision-making.

Source: Discussions with key informants in NTT province.

Given that three of the five trajectories are actively engaged at the field level in order to influence the behaviour and actions of village and district governments, and that two trajectories (T3 and T5) operate within the same province (NTT), one might have expected greater effort to come up with a common approach on gender mainstreaming.

**Vulnerable and Marginalised Groups** – Indirectly, the entire work of PFR II, aims at improving the resilience of vulnerable and marginalised communities against the threat of disaster, by shaping and informing government policies and practices that enable communities to better prepare, mitigate and respond. Moreover, the mandates of the CSOs contracted by the alliance partners to implement the programme are aimed primarily at empowering communities and promoting sustainable livelihoods.

The selection of localities where trajectories 3,4, and 5 are active, was determined by consideration of disaster risk and socio-economic status. In this respect, there has been positive bias towards supporting communities that have a higher proportion of vulnerable and marginalised groups, however, the evaluation has not obtained statistical data to confirm validate the extent to which this is so. Besides positive attention towards empowering women, it was not established how far other

vulnerable and marginalised sections of the community have been deliberately targeted. In this regard, the programme has worked through Village government structures, regulations and procedures for determining how financial and technical resources are distributed across communities, and on how community members are involved in decision-making processes.

A positive benefit brought about by the programme is the additional funding that has been mobilised through the village fund to support IRM related activities. This has enabled replication of technologies and initiatives - initially developed during PFR I on a pilot basis - to a larger number of community members. The adoption of specific village regulations - such as on protection of peatlands and mangrove swamps - is also expected to have community-wide benefits, especially for those whose livelihoods depend on the preservation of these eco-systems.

In Serang for example where Trajectory 4 has promoted the adoption of Paludiculture, community members particularly appreciate the income generating opportunities that access to peatland concessions has offered them (see box 3 below), whilst the adoption of local regulations in 4 villages in Demak District, Central Java to protect mangrove swamps is helping to protect the livelihoods of the community at large. The programme also contributed to an in-principle government decision to rezone an industrial development area so that it becomes a protected mangrove eco-system. This is expected to have a positive impact on local livelihoods<sup>6</sup>.

**Box 3: Eco-system protection as a pathway to improving livelihoods**

- Communities in Serang City, Banten Province, involved in mangrove conservation, mentioned that they now could manage their aquaculture ponds more effectively, harvesting shrimps (every day) and milkfish (every month). Previously, they could only harvest 1.2 kg of shrimps but now with the mangrove and good water quality, they could harvest up to 5.7 kg.
- At the same time, communities have started to feel the environmental impact of mangrove preservation/rehabilitation for their area with a reduction of intrusion of seawater and coastal abrasion.
- Based on these achievements, communities feel empowered to be involved in the advocacy process to protect their environment. For example, they have been active in advocating for revision of the RTRW because the spatial plan designates their area as area for industry and warehouse development.

*Source: Interviews with community members in Serang City, Banten Province.*

---

<sup>6</sup> However, to date it has not been possible to obtain a copy of the revised policy document to verify that changes have indeed been instituted.

**EQ 2 – On efficiency and coordination: To what extent were the internal governance mechanisms, management approaches and working processes of the PfR alliance efficient and well-coordinated?**

### **Summary**

The programme in Indonesia has recorded significant achievements across all trajectories. However, the character of the programme is such that it does not have complete control over timelines and results. With respect to lobbying and advocacy work, the policy processes it has supported have evolved at different speeds, required different approaches and techniques for influencing and were driven by different political imperatives. With respect to capacity strengthening work and knowledge management, alliance members note that whilst much has been done, it was carried out in a manner that has been more ad hoc than systematic. There is now in the last year of the programme an effort to push outstanding capacity strengthening and knowledge management activities. In terms of geographical spread, a certain logic prevails that has enabled linking of interventions at national, sub-national and village levels. National level engagement has ensured maximum impact as the policies influenced guide what should happen at the sub-national level. The attention to the district and village level makes sense as these two tiers of government are the most important from the perspective of Indonesia's decentralisation.

Alliance members consider the institutional set-up for coordination and management as overall appropriate. This has been provided through a part-time coordinator who is also the lead for trajectory 3. This part-time arrangement is however not considered adequate and alliance partners see the need for a Secretariat type structure to oversee the programme going forward. In 2019, a full-time knowledge management expert was recruited to support the entire programme, and a cross-alliance KM working group was set up. All trajectories note the generally flexible approach to planning and budgeting that the programme encourages and that enables adjustment of each TOC and accommodation of emergent needs. Alliance members meet routinely to plan, budget and report as well as draw lessons of experience and identify opportunities for collaboration. Linkages to the regional level are directed through a regional focal point who is the programme coordinator. Alliance partners consider the transaction costs associated with working in partnership as being outweighed by the benefits accruing.

The programme has put in place a standard reporting template for use by all country programmes that is completed twice annually and aligned with bi-annual PMEL meetings. Alliance partners in the Indonesia programme have reported to the best of their ability but are universally critical of the reporting framework describing it as time consuming to complete and confusing. The principal stumbling block seemed to be the correct understanding of "outcomes". Although now resolved, this apparent confusion is unfortunate as the underlying reporting framework is considered relevant building on the three core Outcome Harvesting evaluation questions. With respect to knowledge management, its strategic role as enabler of evidence-based lobbying and advocacy work and as an integral part of capacity strengthening, has been increasingly recognised by alliance members. A KM strategy/ framework that will now be rolled out for use across the alliance. With respect to communications and visibility, the value of presenting the alliance as a community of practice working on complementary aspects of IRM is recognised and

partners support the idea of strengthening the PFR brand. At the same time, encouraging visibility needs to be handled carefully, especially where a behind the scenes role for the alliance is more appropriate.

*JC 2.1: The PfR programme has been delivered in a timely manner, against reasonable overhead costs and, given the resources available, been spread appropriately across regions and countries (incl. the focus on facilitating Southern ownership and South-South cooperation, and linking/ creating synergy of our work at the different levels, i.e. local to regional to global)*

The programme in Indonesia has recorded significant achievements across all the trajectories. However, the character of the programme is such that it does not have complete control over timelines and attainment of results. With respect to *lobbying and advocacy work*, the programme has worked on many fronts and scored many achievements. However, the policy processes the programme supported have evolved at different speeds, required different approaches and techniques for influencing and were driven by different political imperatives. With respect to *capacity strengthening work and knowledge management*, alliance members note that considerable work has been undertaken, however this has been carried in a manner that has been more ad hoc than systematic. There is now in the last year of the programme an effort to push outstanding capacity strengthening and knowledge management activities. In terms of the geographical spread of the programme, a certain logic prevails that has enabled linking of interventions at national, sub-national and village levels. The programme's engagement at national level ensures maximum impact as the policies that have been influenced guide what should happen at the sub-national level. The attention to the district and village level makes sense as these two tiers of government are the most important from the perspective of Indonesia's decentralisation.

The programme in Indonesia has recorded significant achievements across all the trajectories. However, the character of the programme is such that it does not have complete control over timelines and attainment of results. This is because PFR II is not a conventional implementation programme but an advocacy and lobbying programme where the primary objective is to influence the behaviour and actions of key stakeholder groups over which the programme itself has only so much sway.

Overall it is important to acknowledge that the approach adopted under PFR II was a novel one departing considerably from the modus operandi of PFR I which could be described as a more conventional implementation programme. Alliance members acknowledge that it took some time, and indeed the best part of the first year to fully adapt to the new way of working. This included the formulation of theories of change within which key outcomes were identified and influencing strategies devised.

With respect to *lobbying and advocacy work*, it is clear that the programme has worked on many fronts and scored many achievements as reported later on in this report. But it is important to underscore that the key determinant of outcomes has been a combination of the characteristics of the policy issue in question, the policy processes that needed to be observed and the incentives and commitment of the institutional actors involved – both technical and political. In practice, this meant that the policy processes the programme supported evolved at different speeds, required different approaches and techniques for influencing and were driven by different political imperatives. For illustration purposes, two examples are provided:

- The revision of the Disaster Management Law, which the programme has contributed to amongst other actors, has now been handed over to legislators by the government for parliamentary scrutiny and approval. This stage of the policy process has its own logic and timeframe over which external parties have no influence;
- Adoption of specific technical documents and plans by district and provincial administrations must be ultimately approved by the political head/ leadership. There are instances where technocrats are over-ruled by political decisions/ considerations. For example, in the Province of Banten, efforts to establish a strategy on mangrove eco-system management and protection have been put on hold because the Governor does not see the value of having such a strategy.

Annex 2 provides further insights on the challenge of working with government as identified by the PFR team.

With respect to *capacity strengthening work and knowledge management*, alliance members note that considerable work has also been undertaken, however this has been carried in a manner that has been more ad hoc than systematic – see further EQ4. They point to the fact that guidance from headquarters on how to accommodate capacity strengthening and knowledge management came late even though some tools were provided including the DCF tool. A full-time knowledge management expert was only recruited in the second half of 2019 after which a knowledge management framework and data base for the entire programme was formulated. There is now in the last year of the programme an effort to push outstanding capacity strengthening and knowledge management activities, which could conceivably have been carried out at an earlier stage. It is, however, also important to note that these areas of work are closely linked to the L&A workstream and it was not necessarily possible to fully plan upfront the type and volume of capacity strengthening and knowledge management activities required. The process has been somewhat emergent with needs identified during the course of implementation. At the same time, it is recognised if a more strategic approach had been adopted from the outset, this could have enabled a more robust approach to rolling out capacity strengthening and knowledge management activities.

In terms of the geographical spread of the programme, a certain logic prevails that has enabled linking of interventions at national, sub-national and village levels. As earlier noted, the size of the country, both geographically and demographically, presents an inevitable challenge with respect to making trade-offs between spreading widely or working intensively in specific localities. The programme's engagement at national level ensures in some respects maximum impact as the policies that have been influenced guide what should happen at the sub-national level. The selection of the four provinces to work in was in large part inherited from PFR I but the criteria used to select those provinces and indeed the districts and villages within them are considered robust. Whilst only working in four of Indonesia's 37 provinces, the programme has managed to work in 8 districts and 30 villages within those provinces. The attention to the district and village level makes sense as these two tiers of government are the most important from the perspective of Indonesia's decentralisation. Villages enjoy considerable autonomy and avail of an important budget that allows them some discretion over how they direct their local development. At the same time, they rely heavily on the district level for technical services and for ensuring compliance and alignment with particular process and policy frameworks. Working at the village in isolation of the district level and/ or vice-versa would be therefore be counter-productive in an Indonesian context as in fact they are inter-dependent. And by working at the district level, ensures that lessons learned from one cluster of villages should be transferrable to another part of the district.

**JC 2.2: The PfR programme has been operationally coordinated across the five PfR alliance partners at global, regional as well as national levels**

Alliance members consider the institutional set-up for coordinating and managing the programme at country level as overall appropriate. Programme coherence and overall management is provided through a part-time coordinator who is also the lead for trajectory 3. This part-time arrangement is not considered adequate for a programme of such complexity and diversity and alliance partners see the need for a Secretariat type structure to oversee the programme going forward. In August 2019, a full-time knowledge management expert was recruited to support the entire programme, and a cross-alliance KM working group set up. Trajectories otherwise operate under their own steam but interact on a monthly or as needs basis.

All trajectories note the generally flexible approach to planning and budgeting that the programme encourages and that enables adjustment of each TOC and accommodation of emergent needs. Alliance partners did not express strong views with respect to the transaction costs associated with working in partnership but consider that costs incurred are outweighed by the benefits accruing.

Alliance members consider the institutional set-up for coordinating and managing the programme at country level as overall appropriate for the type of initiatives they have been trying to support. Each trajectory is led by an alliance member with an appointed full-time lead and mobilisation of additional support staff.

Programme coherence and overall management is provided through a part-time coordinator who is also the lead for trajectory 3. Quite recently, in August 2019, a full-time knowledge management expert was recruited by Care to support the entire programme, working with a KM working group consisting of alliance members. This will help reinforce a PFR-wide standard and approach for knowledge management informed by general guidance provided from the Hague. Care has also mobilised its Gender specialist to support the programme in mainstreaming gender. As earlier noted, cross trajectory engagement around providing inputs to *regional events/ processes* are provided through the country programme coordinator who acts as regional focal point.

Trajectories otherwise operate under their own steam but interact on a monthly basis or on an as needs basis. As reported already under EQ 1, opportunities for joint work and sharing of information and resources have been increasingly identified, and trajectory 2 in particular has worked closely with other trajectories. Bi-annual PMEL meetings have been used to further strategize on opportunities for joint action and working strategically across trajectories. Overall it can be concluded that alliance members are now working closely and intensively to plan, implement and report on their annual plan of activities.

- At the *national level*, each trajectory lead tends to work bilaterally with its government counterparts even if they present themselves as being part of a broader alliance. Therefore, the relationships forged have tended to be bilateral rather than multilateral. There are, however, increasing attempts to present a common/ united front and to explore opportunities for working together. This has included discussions about branding.
- At *community and district level*, the extent of collaboration across trajectories is limited as trajectories work in different physical localities and administrative jurisdictions. The exception is NTT province, where T3 and T5 are active. However, they work in different districts and villages, although opportunities for joint action have been realised.

All trajectories note the generally flexible approach to planning and budgeting that the programme allows and that enables adjustment of each TOC. Budget lines are considered to be sufficiently flexible to allow adjustment in programme activities according to emerging realities and demands<sup>7</sup>. However, the planning and budgeting processes are not pooled and remain tied to each alliance member. Therefore, there is some variation with the respect to the extent of adjustment permitted.

Alliance partners did not express strong views with respect to the transaction costs associated with working in partnership. The general view was that any costs incurred, whether in terms of time (*“it requires longer time and more energy to build and work in partnership”*) or resources have been outweighed by the benefits accruing. In other words, there is a recognised return on investment. Such benefits include:

- *Gaining more knowledge from each other.* Alliance members remarked that IRM is complex and that they have been able to learn from each other on different dimensions of IRM. For example, Wetlands used to work traditionally on environmental issues, but has started to learn about humanitarian approach which it is now incorporating in its approach;
- *Expanding of networks.* Alliance members appreciate how they can tap into their partners' resource/networks to support advocacy work, such as obtaining contacts in other parts of government or access to relevant documentation/ data.
- *Working with a unified voice.* Overall, alliance members recognise the value of working collectively, thereby strengthening their influencing capabilities.

This appreciation of partnership was less evident at the start of PFR 2, where the level of coordination was reportedly much less developed, but the partnership spirit has certainly grown over life of PFR 2.

That said the country programme coordinator has expressed concern that the coordination function on top of leading one of the trajectories has been demanding and the split allocation of time has at times impacted negatively on managing tasks optimally. As overall coordinator this has meant not always being able to allocate sufficient time to strategic reflection - particularly in areas related to capacity strengthening and KM<sup>8</sup>.

The Coordinator has suggested that the function should be a full-time responsibility to accommodate the complexity and breadth of the programme, rather than part-time as is currently the case. The suggestion was also made by trajectory leads that the possible way forward would be to establish a Secretariat to handle all programme wide/ cross cutting issues including strategic direction<sup>9</sup>. Such a structure would also handle issues related to PFR communications and visibility.

---

<sup>7</sup> Some activities have been included that not fully in line with the TOC but have been deemed worth investing into from perspective of relationship building with partners and potential to influence broader agenda indirectly. Difficult to judge scientifically the rate of return on this “bets”.

<sup>8</sup> The appointment of a full time KM officer has addressed part of this concern.

<sup>9</sup> There was no suggestion however that such a Secretariat would handle financial management aspects.

Table 3: Promoting Coordination

Enablers	Challenges
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Overall Programme design and use of IRM as rallying point</li> <li>Use of TOC methodology and common planning and reporting frameworks</li> <li>Growing commitment of alliance members to build synergies across trajectories</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Institutional mandates of alliance members and pre-existing relationships and networks</li> <li>Absence of a full-time programme coordinator</li> <li>Lack of clear guidance on some cross-cutting themes that could have helped develop common approaches</li> </ul>

***JC 2.3: The PfR support has been monitored for accountability and learning on a regular basis to identify and report on results and blockages/problems at the three intervention levels (national, regional, global) and notably at South-South cooperation level***

The programme has put in place a standard reporting template for use by all country programmes that is completed twice annually and aligned with bi-annual PMEL meetings. Alliance partners in the Indonesia programme have complied to the best of their ability with the reporting requirements. However, alliance members were universally critical of the reporting framework describing it as time consuming to complete and confusing. The principal stumbling block seemed to be the correct understanding of “outcomes”, which created difficulty for participants to know how to document results, a problem that was only satisfactorily resolved last year. This apparent confusion is unfortunate as the underlying reporting framework is considered relevant for a lobbying and advocacy programme, building on the three core Outcome Harvesting evaluation questions. With respect to knowledge management, its strategic role as enabler of evidence-based lobbying and advocacy work and as an integral part of capacity strengthening, has been increasingly recognised by alliance members. The appointment of a programme-wide KM officer has facilitated the preparation of a KM strategy/ framework that will now be rolled out for use across the alliance. There is also greater appreciation of the resources and diverse capacities required to adequately support an effective cross-programme KM function. With respect to communications and visibility, the value of presenting the alliance as a community of practice working on complementary aspects of IRM is recognised and partners support the idea of strengthening the PFR brand. At the same time, encouraging visibility needs to be handled carefully and in some circumstances might be counterproductive, where a behind the scenes role for the alliance is more appropriate.

**Monitoring and Reporting** - The programme has put in place a standard reporting template for use by all country programmes that is completed twice annually and aligned with bi-annual PMEL meetings. The reporting template is inspired by the Outcome Harvesting methodology which requires information on outcomes achieved, their significance for the policy process concerned and the plausible contribution of the PFR alliance to the reported outcomes. The reporting template is quite elaborate and requires completion of a number of matrices as well as narrative texts. Information is also required on other aspects of planning, budgeting and reporting including progress on capacity strengthening and knowledge management, interlinkages and adjustments to the theory of change.

Alliance partners in the Indonesia programme have complied to the best of their ability with the reporting requirements as set out in the PMEL template and guidance. Yet, whilst comprehensive, alliance members were universally critical of the reporting framework describing it as time consuming



to complete and confusing<sup>10</sup>. It was felt that guidance received from headquarters was not always clear or consistent – at times requesting more detailed information, at other times demanding more summarised information. The principal stumbling block seemed to be the correct understanding of “outcomes”, which created difficulty for participants to know how to document results. The evaluation team was informed that it was only in 2019 that agreement was reached on a common understanding of outcomes.

This apparent confusion is unfortunate as the underlying reporting framework should be straight forward to use and relevant to a lobbying and advocacy programme, building on the three core outcome harvesting (OH) evaluation questions. It is possible that insufficient time and effort was invested in ensuring that the conceptual underpinnings of the OH methodology was adequately communicated to and internalised by country level actors.

From the point of view of the evaluators, it proved as a result challenging to grasp the essence of the programme’s activities contained in the semi-annual reports, despite the volume of data/ information contained<sup>11</sup>. Direct engagement and interrogation of the trajectory leads, partners and stakeholders as was afforded during the evaluation exercise however offered a real opportunity to get “under the skin” of the programme and better understand the functioning, experiences and achievements of the programme’s trajectories. For this reason, a complementary re-engineered results matrix was prepared as part of the evaluation exercise that seeks to capture the entirety of programme achievements using the three OH questions<sup>12</sup> (see annex).

**Adjustment of ToC** - During the course of the programme, trajectories have reviewed their respective ToCs. Taking on board lessons learnt during the course of implementation as well as the need to adjust priorities according to emergent needs, adjustments to the ToCs have been made. Examples include adjustment of the name of trajectory 1, adjustment of result areas of trajectory 3 and trajectory 4.

**Knowledge Management** - As reported elsewhere, the strategic role of KM as an enabler of evidence-based lobbying and advocacy work and as an integral part of capacity strengthening, has been increasingly recognised among the alliance, over the life of the programme but this has only come to be fully operationalised in 2018. In 2019 the appointment of a programme-wide KM officer has facilitated the preparation of a KM strategy/ framework and data base which will now be rolled out<sup>13</sup>. There is moreover greater appreciation of the resources and diverse capacities (staff, system, processes, ICT etc) that are required to adequately support an effective cross-programme KM function. This will mean being realistic about what can be achieved given resource availability to support knowledge generation and packing across the different trajectories. Overall, alliance members appreciate the need to:

---

<sup>10</sup> The interpretation of how to complete the templates and how to present the TOC also varied across the trajectories making also difficult to compare results and processes across the different parts of the programme.

<sup>11</sup> Sometimes exceeding 100 pages.

<sup>12</sup> This matrix was presented to and validated by country alliance members.

<sup>13</sup> Elements of KM have already happening beforehand but on a more piece-meal basis and under the initiative of individual trajectories. Thus, for example, Karina, as lead of trajectory 5 produced a considerable volume of documents during the course of the programme. Wetlands, which has its own communications and knowledge management officer, has for example established FODERIA together with the Ministry of Environment as a knowledge platform for promoting the use of paludiculture.

- better document the PFR “story” so that it can be more easily communicated to different stakeholders/ audiences – in this regard, trajectory leads have been asked to submit their top three stories/ products for profiling on the soon to be launched website;
- more systematically draw lessons of experiences and good practices that can support advocacy especially at national levels;
- broaden the evidence base so that it does not rely uniquely on their field experiences which may be considered context specific and therefore not necessarily valid for national replication, (based on experience of their engagement with BAPPENAS and MOHA);
- use a diverse portfolio of knowledge collection and distribution modalities that include the use of social media, production of technical documents and policy briefs, to the facilitation of communities of practice/ networks.

**On Communications** - Alliance members have also been reflecting on the way in which the PFR brands itself. The value from a visibility and messaging point of view of presenting the alliance as a community of practice working on complementary aspects of IRM is recognised. And as earlier reported, from the perspective of promoting coordination, coherence and synergy it would be beneficial to present a unified front under the PFR banner. A prime example is the alliance’s participation in the annual “DRR day” where alliance members come together to formulate common messages and identity. It is also important from the point of view of informing government partners so that they appreciate that the alliance member they work with is part of something bigger. This was the case with the Ministry of Villages which only knew Care. However, after being advised of the wider alliance, the Ministry expressed interest in the broader scope of work the alliance was involved in.

At the same time, encouraging visibility needs to be handled carefully and in some circumstances might be counterproductive. Thus, for example, it was cautioned that in engaging around national policy processes, a too prominent visibility might distract national stakeholders from focusing on content issues and raise concerns about the legitimacy and possible perception of undue foreign influence in domestic policy processes.

Provisions for a communications and visibility function were put in place at the start of the programme, however, the position has remained vacant for a number of years. The general view was that the position is needed as part of the proposed secretariat to help develop and implement a common communications strategy.

---

***JC 2.4: The PfR alliance was governed and managed appropriately and ongoing and past lessons related to governance and management were identified and taken up***

**Overall the PFR alliance has been governed and managed appropriately in the Indonesia context. However, the workload placed on the part-time coordinator is considered excessive, impacting on the level of attention paid to cross-cutting issues. Recent recruitment of a KM specialist and mobilisation of a gender expert has addressed this concern in part. Alliance members meet routinely to plan, budget and report as well as draw lessons of experience and identify opportunities for collaboration. Linkages to the regional level are directed through a regional focal point who is the programme coordinator.**

In Indonesia, the programme coordination function has been part time. This has proven inadequate particularly with respect to backstopping alliance members in core areas related to lobby and advocacy, capacity strengthening and knowledge management. The part-time coordinator is also lead

for trajectory 3 and is also the focal person for engagement at the regional level. The appointment in 2019 of a knowledge management and reporting specialist is considered an important step in ensuring a cross-programme approach to knowledge management and in so doing, relieving some of the pressure on the coordinator. Care has also made its gender specialist available to support alliance members in addressing the need to mainstream gender more substantively across the programme.

Alliance members believe that a secretariat-type structure that sits over the alliance and is fully responsible for management, coordination and technical backstopping would provide a better way to manage the alliance.

Within the existing arrangements, alliance members plan, budget and report collectively and hold monthly management/ progress meetings. These meetings are also used to draw lessons of experience and to identify opportunities for collaboration. Budgeting and financial management otherwise remains the responsibility of individual alliance members with each retaining their own budget and internal financial management and procurement rules and procedures. A number of jointly funded activities such as training on lobbying and advocacy have taken place.

As previously noted, the programme coordinator also serves as the regional focal point. Requests for inputs from Government are channelled to the focal point and in turn inputs are solicited from alliance partners. Each partner is responsible for following up and monitoring specific regional priorities based on global agreements, however, the level of engagement in regional processes are not been substantial.

**EQ 3 – On value added and complementarity: To what extent has the PfR’s support been of added value and complementary to what non-PfR programme actors have been doing in support of IRM and have the efforts of the PfR alliance and the NL MFA been complementary to each other and of added value to both?**

#### **Summary**

**The Indonesia programme does not have a systematic or explicit approach to collaboration with non-PfR supported actors. However, alliance members and contracted partners have collaborated with other actors and stakeholders on a case by case/ as-needs basis in the execution of their trajectory activities.**

**The Indonesia programme has operated with only minimal contact and interaction with the Netherlands Embassy and other resilience-related programmes funded by the Dutch government. For each of the Alliance partners, the PfR programme forms part of their wider country programme portfolios. Overall, the PfR programme is considered a significant part of their respective portfolios, content-wise though this varies from partner to partner.**

***JC 3.1: The PfR support has been complementary and of added value to efforts of non-PfR supported actors for IRM at local, national, regional and global levels***

**The Indonesia programme does not have a systematic or explicit approach to collaboration with non-PfR supported actors. However, alliance members and contracted partners have collaborated with other actors and stakeholders on a case by case/ as-needs basis in the execution of their trajectory activities.**

The Indonesia programme does not have a systematic or explicit approach to collaboration with non-PFR supported actors<sup>14</sup>. However, alliance members and contracted partners have collaborated with other actors and stakeholders on a case by case/ as-needs basis in the execution of their trajectory activities. This has resulted in instances of complementarity of effort and value-added in terms of joint analytical work, adopting common positions, co-funding of activities and broadening of networks.

Examples include working with other donor-funded programmes to promote a common objective at national level, collaborating with other community development programmes to achieve a common result at community level, lobbying alongside other CSOs on a common platform to influence policy review, building on lessons learned of initiatives financed by other funders to go to scale, and building alliances with religious institutions to promote the dissemination of IRM practices. Examples from across the five trajectories are captured in the table below:

**Table 4: Examples of collaboration with non-PFR actors**

Trajectory	Intervention	Collaboration
1	Review of Disaster Management Law	IFRC/PMI worked with the CSO platform (AMPU-PB) to advocate for review of the law and has since participated alongside other CSOs in the consultative process established by the government.
2	Engaging Ministry of Spatial Planning to prepare guidelines for the inclusion of climate risk management and climate change in spatial planning.	RCCC and the USAID APIK programme recognised their common interest in integrating climate change adaptation and resilience into DRR discussions. USAID APIK and RCCC were the key CSO players together with IAP (Association of Planners in Indonesia) to engage the Ministry to develop the guidelines. As part of the process they lobbied the Association of municipalities in Indonesia to promote this agenda among their members and prepared a joint policy paper.
3	Engagement with the Church network (GMIT Synod) to adopt IRM components into their church programmes and declaring November as the month of the environment.	Care-CIS recognised the potential role the GMIT Synod in NTT province could play in disseminating knowledge on IRM principles through its network of sub Synods. Care-CIS provided technical assistance and capacity strengthening support to the GMIT Synod.
4	Adoption of regulations on coastal mangrove eco-system management in 4 villages in Demak District	Wetlands partnered with another programme “Building with Nature Project” ( <a href="http://www.indonesia.buildingwithnature.nl/">http://www.indonesia.buildingwithnature.nl/</a> ) that focuses on integrated coastal management. Working together leverage the experiences gained with working with specific communities, Wetlands was to advocate the adoption of this regulation by the respective village governments.
5	Launch of a Grand Design on Urban Farming, based on Watershed and IRM principles by City of Jakarta.	Karina was able to use its resources to upscale a pilot experience on Urban farming, which had been funded by the Ford Foundation and Cordaid in one locality of Jakarta. This provided an interesting example of leveraging and complementarity, whereby funding from Ford foundation could not be used for lobbying and advocacy work, whereas that of PFR could not be used for implementation.

<sup>14</sup> The team was informed that a mapping of potential partners active in the field of IRM was however carried out at the start of PFR II.

The evaluation team did not have an opportunity to hold discussions with other donor agencies and other actors active in the field with the exception of the USAID Apik programme, which expressed appreciation for the analytic work and readiness of trajectory 2 to join forces and work on common agendas in their engagement with government agencies.

---

***JC 3.2: The PFR programme and the resilience-related efforts of NL MFA were complementary to each other and of added value to both the PFR alliance and NL MFA.***

**The Indonesia programme has operated with only minimal contact and interaction with the Netherlands Embassy and other resilience-related programmes funded by the Dutch government. For each of the Alliance partners, the PFR programme forms part of their wider country programme portfolios. Overall, the PFR programme is considered a significant part of their respective portfolios, content-wise though this varies from partner to partner.**

The Indonesia programme has operated with only minimal contact and interaction with the Netherlands Embassy and other resilience-related programmes funded by the Dutch government. It was not therefore possible to establish the extent of relationship of and complementarities between the PFR programme and other DGIS-funded programmes in Indonesia. The 2019 annual report for Indonesia notes the participation of a PRF alliance KM specialist in a workshop on media training hosted by the Netherlands Embassy, as well as participation by the alliance coordinator in a routine strategic review meeting with the Embassy to track progress and discuss the future funding possibilities for the programme.

For each of the Alliance partners, the PFR programme forms part of their wider country programme portfolios. Overall, the PFR programme is considered a significant part of their respective portfolios, content-wise though this varies from partner to partner<sup>15</sup>. Whilst a detailed analysis of this significance from the point of view of finances/ resource allocations, was not made, insights and anecdotes obtained in discussion with the trajectory leads from each alliance confirms the importance attached to the PFR programme, but also some of the challenges involved (see box 4 below):

---

<sup>15</sup> The evaluation was not able to examine the programme budgets of the alliance partners, so it is not possible to calculate the relative significance of the PFR programme from a financial perspective.

#### Box 4: Significance of PFR II for the Alliance Members

**IFRC** - For IFRC, the lobby and advocacy approach of PFR II does not sit so naturally within the mandate of the organisation, which is more focused on disaster preparedness and response, but the linkage is there with respect to its broader resilience building mandate. IFRC however does not have an implementation role at country level unless there is a call from the government for international assistance. Therefore, implementation is carried out through the Indonesian Red Cross organisation, PMI. The role of the trajectory lead is therefore to provide technical guidance and support to PMI in its implementation of trajectory 1 activities and in using its extensive networks to support the work of PMI. In this regard, the lobby and advocacy focus need to take account of the status of the Red Cross as an auxiliary institution of the Indonesian government.

**RCCC** - The situation for the RCCC is somewhat different in that its presence in the programme is in the form of a single individual offering a service desk to other trajectories. Organisationally, RCCC is accommodated by PMI as part of the Red Cross Family. Its involvement in PFR II has worked well in large part influenced by the personal relationships that have been forged between the leads of the alliance. The participation of the Climate Centre is influenced in part by the strategic vision of the PMI, as its host, and in particular the extent to which PMI is willing to continue investing in this kind of lobby and advocacy work.

**Care** - For Care Indonesia, PFR is their second largest programme after their Central Sulawesi disaster response. PFR falls under their Disaster Management programme cluster, which also includes the response in Sulawesi as well as a USAID-funded disaster preparedness project. Their second cluster focuses on women and youth. PFR is regarded as fitting very well within the overall DRM cycle approach (mitigation, preparedness, mitigation, response, recovery) that informs the Disaster Management Cluster. PFR experience offers insights and lessons on how to go about lobbying and advocacy which Care wants to introduce to some of its other programmes. The experience of working with the Ministry of Villages to develop a training module is one that Care would also like to replicate in other thematic/ topic areas.

**Wetlands** - For Wetlands, engagement in lobby and advocacy is a departure from their core way of working which is more field based and implementation focused. However, the benefits of engagement in lobby and advocacy work are appreciated and regarded as complementary to their traditional areas of work. They have a strong communications and KM function which recognises opportunities for linking to evidence-based advocacy work. Wetlands note the benefits accruing from partnership with other alliance members in terms of approaches to L&A, as well as opportunities for opening doors to other partners and sections of government. For instance, Wetlands is now recognised by the national disaster management agency (BNPD) which was not the case before.

**Cordaid/ Karina** - Cordaid's main areas of engagement in Indonesia are around Urban farming and climate smart agriculture. It does not have an office in Indonesia and therefore is represented by Karina as its implementation partner. For PFR, a specific PFR unit was established with its own staff within Karina. From Cordaid's perspective, PFR offers opportunities to scale up and give visibility to its field/ community level engagements, which are financed from other donor sources. The example already referenced of using the experience of a Ford Foundation funded urban farming to influence the development of a Grand Design on Urban Farming for Jakarta is a case in point.

**EQ 4 – Effectiveness of engagement (from inputs to results/ capacity strengthening support): To what extent has the PfR alliance been effective in applying good practices in the design, delivery and monitoring of capacity strengthening support for IRM to PfR contracted and non-contracted partners working at national and sub-national levels?**

### **Summary**

The Indonesia programme has worked with 19 implementing partners. Their selection was based on pre-existing relationships established during PFR 1 as well as an assessment of their relevance and potential to support programme objectives under PFR 2. The global DCF capacity assessment tool has been used by the Indonesia programme in combination with the Capacity 2020 planning framework to guide capacity strengthening work across the programme. The tool has been applied in a participatory manner. The general view is that the DCF tool whilst useful in pin-pointing areas of need, is quite complex to apply and is time-demanding. Its value for assessing the capacity of forums and networks, which are looser institutional set-ups has also been questioned. The Capacity 2020 planning framework fell into disuse and was only re-activated in 2019. To bring it up to date, a “minor assessment” exercise was administered rather than running through the full DCF. From this assessment, it was agreed to focus on three core capabilities: negotiation, advocacy and knowledge management.

Annual activity plans have been used to programme capacity strengthening activities. These are done for each trajectory and subsequently reported on. Such plans do not constitute a capacity strengthening strategy per se. Alliance members believe that a stronger communication from headquarters on the strategic role of capacity strengthening in the programme would have helped earlier on. This would have situated capacity strengthening within the theory of change and would have enabled a discussion of its validity in the Indonesia context. Alliance partners recognise that a country level capacity strengthening strategy could also have been developed to address local contextual realities and to guide capacity strengthening approaches. Thus, in the Indonesia context a substantial portion of capacity strengthening efforts have been directed towards government entities at all levels. Formally speaking these do not constitute part of the capacity strengthening agenda, which according to the global design, targets intermediary partners only. Various tools and approaches have been used for capacity strengthening of partners. Training has constituted a major component, but this has often been accompanied by technical advisory and coaching support. Financial support has also been used to kick-start the functioning of networks and forums. Increasingly, knowledge products have been used to reinforce training and technical advisory inputs.

The DCF by design provides a mechanism for tracking changes in capacity over time of targeted entities. Its effectiveness, however, depends on a systematic and routine re-application of the self-assessment tool. The capacity 2020 planning framework offers a planning and results framework for capacity strengthening that draws upon the findings of the DCF. However, these latest plans were not based on the full application of the DCF tool but on a minor assessment exercise. Alliance members are also expected to report on capacity strengthening as part of the bi-annual PMEL process. The reporting templates include a specific section pertaining to capacity strengthening results and updating of the DCF progress markers. Reading through the 2019 report confirms the abundance of

information that is submitted; however, it is not easy to capture emerging issues and trends, nor to judge the evidence base upon which determinations of progress have been made.

*JC 4.1: The PfR has designed capacity strengthening interventions at country level on the basis of a structured and participatory capacity diagnostic exercise that has examined different dimensions of capacity and engaged local stakeholders in the diagnostic process, including taking account of local contextual/ political dynamics.*

The Indonesia programme has worked with 19 implementing partners. Their selection was based on pre-existing relationships established during PFR 1 as well as an assessment of their relevance and potential to support programme objectives under PFR 2. The global DCF capacity assessment tool has been used by the Indonesia programme in combination with the Capacity 2020 planning framework to guide capacity strengthening work across the programme. The tool has been applied in a participatory manner. The general view is that the DCF tool whilst useful in pin-pointing areas of need, is quite complex to apply and is time-demanding. Its value for assessing the capacity of forums and networks, which are looser institutional set-ups has also been questioned. The Capacity 2020 planning framework fell into disuse and was only re-activated in 2019. To bring it up to date, a “minor assessment” exercise was administered rather than running through the full DCF. From this assessment, it was agreed to focus on three core capabilities: negotiation, advocacy and knowledge management.

**Stakeholder Mapping and Partner Selection** – The Indonesia programme has worked with 19 identified implementing partners across the five trajectories. In only one or two cases has more than one trajectory worked with the same intermediary partner. A considerable number of partners are in fact forums that have been established by law at the sub-national level and which serve as multi-stakeholder consultative mechanisms on issues related to disaster management and watershed management.

The selection of implementation partners is based on pre-existing relationships established during PFR 1 as well as an assessment of their relevance and potential to support programme objectives under PFR 2. There is no evidence that a systematic stakeholder analysis was carried out and repeated over time. However, it is clear that alliance members understand the policy contexts within which they work and have been strategic in the selection of partners and stakeholders to engage with in one manner or another.

The experience of implementing the programme has revealed lessons on who and how to engage with to advocate for change. Alliance members for instance highlighted the need to fully understand the mandates, structures and working approaches of implementing partners, both contracted and non-contracted. These vary considerably from those with experience only in implementing activities at the community level to others which have traditionally played a more confrontational advocacy role. Whilst some are organisations with legal identity, others such as non-contracted partners eg DRR and Wetland forums, are looser associations of interest groups sharing a common agenda. Approaches towards capacity strengthening have therefore to be adjusted to the character and needs of different intermediaries.

**Capacity Diagnostics** - The global DCF capacity assessment tool has been used by the Indonesia programme in combination with the Capacity 2020 planning framework to guide capacity strengthening work across the programme.



The DCF tool provides a framework and reference for diagnosing the capacity needs of partner CSOs and networks in relation to what are understood to be lobby and advocacy-related capacities. The tool has been applied in a participatory manner involving partner CSOs and networks. The general view is that the DCF tool whilst useful in pin-pointing areas of need, and validating what partners already identify intuitively, is quite complex to apply and is time-demanding. As a self-assessment tool, it has proven difficult for targeted entities to repeat its application on a regular basis without external facilitation. This is especially the case for the non-contracted partners, namely forums. Its value for assessing the capacity of forums and networks, which are looser institutional set-ups has also been questioned. It is also felt that additional technical guidance and support on how to use the DCF tool could have been provided from the headquarters level, a concern that has been apparently tabled and discussed in annual headquarter meetings.

In the Indonesia context, the Capacity 2020 planning framework fell into disuse and was only re-activated in 2019. To bring it up to date and following a global review of progress on capacity strengthening that was carried out in 2019, it was decided to apply a “minor assessment” rather than running through the entirety of the DCF. Based on this minor assessment it was collectively agreed to focus on three core capabilities that have emerged as a priority across most intermediary organisations. These are negotiation, advocacy and knowledge management capabilities. As a result, each trajectory has produced a capacity strengthening plan for 2020 that aims to bridge gaps between existing capabilities in these three identified areas and the goals set in the 2020 planning framework.

---

***JC 4.2: The PfR has developed a capacity strengthening change strategy/ capacity strengthening plan at country level that reflects the findings of the capacity diagnostic process and which applies a range of complementary capacity strengthening tools/ instruments appropriate to addressing the identified capacity needs***

Annual activity plans have been used to programme capacity strengthening activities. These are done for each trajectory and subsequently reported on. Such plans do not constitute a capacity strengthening strategy per se. Alliance members believe that a stronger communication from headquarters on the strategic role of capacity strengthening in the programme would have helped earlier on. This would have helped to situate capacity strengthening within the theory of change and would have enabled a discussion of its validity in the Indonesia context. Alliance partners recognise that a country level capacity strengthening strategy could also have been developed to address local contextual realities and to guide capacity strengthening approaches. Thus, in the Indonesia context a substantial portion of capacity strengthening efforts have been directed towards government entities at all levels. Formally speaking these do not constitute part of the capacity strengthening agenda, which according to the global design, targets intermediary partners only. Various tools and approaches have been used for capacity strengthening of partners. Training has constituted a major component, but this has often been accompanied by technical advisory and coaching support. Financial support has also been used to kick-start the functioning of networks and forums. Increasingly, knowledge products has been used to reinforce training and technical advisory inputs.

**Strategic Approach to Capacity Strengthening** - Annual activity plans have been developed to programme capacity strengthening activities. These are done for each trajectory and subsequently reported on. According to respondents, the Capacity 2020 plan has been a helpful planning document but as reported above, fell into dis-use for 3 years.

However, the preparation of such plans does not constitute a capacity strengthening strategy per se. It was acknowledged that it took time for PFR II alliance members to fully recognise the strategic role capacity strengthening is expected to play in the overall PFR delivery and that more could have been done to think this through at a strategic level. As a result, attention to capacity strengthening only really picked up in the latter part of the programme<sup>16</sup>.

Alliance members believe that a stronger messaging/ communication from headquarters on the strategic role of capacity strengthening in the programme would have helped earlier on and should have accompanied the technical guidance provided on the use of the diagnostic tools. In this respect, it is understood that a discussion and exchange was required not so much directed to the “what and how” of capacity strengthening, which was adequately catered for, but more on the “why” of capacity strengthening. This would have helped to better situate capacity strengthening within the theory of change and would have enabled a discussion of its validity in the Indonesia context. It is also noted that partner alliance leads are first and foremost subject matter experts and may not necessarily have a conceptual and technical grounding in the practice of capacity development.

In this regard, it was noted during discussions that a country level capacity strengthening strategy could have been developed to take account of local contextual realities and guide the manner in which capacity strengthening was approached. Alliance members point to the fact that working systematically through a process of first building capacity and then engaging in lobby and advocacy work is not always possible. In many instances, alliance members have had to engage directly in the L&A process or have had to draw upon existing networks and communities of practice. In other cases, it has required providing more on-the-job capacity support to implementation partners as they engage.

Another anomaly in the Indonesia context is that a substantial portion of capacity strengthening efforts have been directed towards government entities at national, sub-national and village levels. Formally speaking these do not constitute part of the capacity strengthening agenda of the programme, which according to the global programme design, is supposed to target intermediary partners only. However, in the Indonesia context, government entities have been a key target of support and capacity strengthening has been an integral part of the alliance member’s engagement and influencing strategies, whether at national, sub-national or village levels.

In fact, 5 distinct target groups for capacity strengthening can be identified:

- Government officials at all levels targeted for capacity strengthening as part of a wider influencing/ engagement strategy;
- Community-based organisations such as farmers/ gender groups and various planning/ village government committee members, trained and sensitised to adopt IRM practices/ ways of working;
- Intermediaries CSOs (the focus of PFR 2) and also multi-stakeholder forums at sub-national level supported to empower them to take forward the L&A mandate through training and coaching;

---

<sup>16</sup> However, it was noted that most of the partners are actually already quite strong and only need capacities sharpened in selected areas. Therefore, the delays in implementing capacity strengthening activities are not considered as having delayed achievement of the programme’s wider L&A objectives.

- Alliance members, themselves including in case of IFRC, the national chapter of the Red Cross (PMI) and in case of Cordaid, its implementing partner Karina, to ensure they are able to lead work on PFR 2 and conduct lobbying and advocacy work;
- Civil society - more generally defined - including universities/academics and other communities of practice active in the field, supported through training, workshops and dissemination of knowledge to broaden the IRM message and build a wider community of practice.

With the more recent focus on addressing the three core capabilities of negotiation, advocacy and knowledge management, the alliance has identified opportunities for conducting joint capacity strengthening activities. Also noteworthy are several initiatives to deliver training for the benefit of alliance members themselves. As an example, Karina offered a training to all alliance members on advocacy shortly after the launch of PFR 2. The recent attention given to knowledge management and the appointment of a full-time KM manager for the programme has also allowed for a better appreciation of the role of KM in supporting capacity strengthening work.

**The Capacity Strengthening Toolbox** – Various tools and approaches have been used towards strengthening the capacity of targeted implementing partners. Training has constituted a major component of support provided, but this has often been accompanied by technical advisory and coaching support. Financial support has also been used as a way to kick-start the functioning of networks and forums that have fallen moribund. Increasingly, the production of knowledge products has been used to reinforce training and technical advisory inputs. The table below highlights a selection of some of the capacity strengthening activities carried out by the PFR alliance. At the same time, alliance members are aware that capacity strengthening is a process rather than an event and that specific interventions such as those listed below need to be seen as part of a broader process of accompaniment and engagement.

**Table 5: Examples of Capacity Strengthening Interventions**

Trajectory	Target Group	Nature of Capacity Strengthening Support
1	PMI and various other stakeholders (university, government officials)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• On-line and Face-to-face Delivery of Humanitarian Diplomacy Course aimed at building skills in policy dialogue and negotiation</li> </ul>
2	PMI	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Training on applying a new approach to Maritime Weather Forecasting</li> </ul>
3	Village Government/ Community members/ Womens' groups  DRR Forum  T4 (Wetlands)  CIS/ Forums	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Training on procedure for preparing village plan and budget</li> <li>• Training on Gender Sensitive IRM (delivered by Community Empowerment officers)</li> <li>• Training on climate sensitive agricultural techniques, water supply/conservation technologies/ techniques, and value addition to agricultural products</li> <li>• Financing of meeting, mobilisation of members, support in developing strategic plan, awareness raising on IRM, training on policy advocacy</li> <li>• Training on functioning of Village Government, plan and budget</li> <li>• Care has set up a programme called 'IRM class' for capacity building and learning for the CIS team to support their work as well as their partners such as forums. It has been used to learn</li> </ul>

		about the village law & village administrations, internalisation of SDGs as well as to refresh us about gender mainstreaming.
4	Wahli, Purun, and Petak Danum	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Technical assistance on basic organisation and financial management</li> <li>• Training on IRM principles</li> <li>• Guidance on how to support a policy process</li> <li>• Guidance on use of social media as tool for advocacy and lobbying work</li> </ul>
5	DRR and Watershed Forums  Caritas Sikka	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provision of coaching and technical backstopping support in implementation of activities. Main approach is therefore empowerment, giving Forums a role to play and through this promoting a learning by doing approach (tacit learning).</li> <li>• Training on i) Advocacy; ii) writing policy briefs; iii) local government planning and budgeting, followed by coaching and backstopping</li> </ul>
Joint	Alliance members	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Training on Advocacy and preparation of policy briefs including use of L&amp;A policy check-list</li> <li>• Training on Village Government Planning and Budgeting</li> </ul>

***JC 4.3: The PfR has developed a results framework and arrangements for progress monitoring (dialogue) that facilitate the tracking of changes in capacity over time, adjusting the sequencing and prioritisation of interventions (flexibility and responsiveness), and for reviewing the quality of the partnership (mutual accountability for results)***

The DCF by design provides a mechanism for tracking changes in capacity over time of targeted entities. Its effectiveness, however, depends on a systematic and routine re-application of the self-assessment tool on at least an annual basis. The capacity 2020 planning framework offers a planning and results framework for capacity strengthening that draws upon the findings of the DCF. However, these latest plans were not based on the full application of the DCF tool but on a minor assessment exercise. Alliance members are also expected to report on progress with capacity strengthening as part of the bi-annual PMEL process. The reporting templates include a specific section pertaining to capacity strengthening results and updating of the DCF progress markers. Reading through the 2019 report confirms the abundance of information that is submitted; however, it is still not easy to capture emerging issues and trends, nor to judge the evidence base upon which determinations of progress are made.

The DCF by design provides a mechanism for tracking changes in capacity over time of targeted entities. The colour code used to rank capacity status offers a visual means to monitor improvements or otherwise in the capacity in question. Its effectiveness as a monitoring tool and offering a results framework for monitoring change in capacity over time, however, depends on a systematic and routine re-application of the self-assessment tool on at least an annual basis.

The capacity 2020 planning framework offers a planning and results framework for capacity strengthening (that draws upon the findings of the DCF) and against which recording of capacity activities implemented, remaining gaps to address and improvements in capacity takes place. Alliance members provided the evaluation team with such a results framework developed for each trajectory. However, as earlier noted, these latest plans were not based on the full application of the DCF tool but on a small assessment based on the three selected core areas of attention; advocacy, negotiation and knowledge management.

Alliance members interact regularly with their implementation partners and have a good feel and intuitive sense of the capabilities and performance of each partner. A more systematic monitoring and self-assessment review process would indeed be desirable but would require commitment of additional resources and support to ensure that such a process is used routinely and recognised as a helpful tool for continuous capacity improvement for each entity concerned.

The evaluation team was also not able to establish whether a routine mutual assessment and review process takes place between alliance members and their implementation partners to ascertain how well they are working together, the relevance of the support provided by alliance members to the implementation partner and the performance of the implementation partner.

Meanwhile, alliance members are expected to report on progress with capacity strengthening as part of the bi-annual PMEL process. The reporting templates include a specific section pertaining to capacity strengthening results and updating of the DCF progress markers. Reading through the 2019 report confirms the abundance of information that is submitted; however, it is still not easy to capture emerging issues and trends, nor to judge the evidence base upon which determinations of progress in capacity strengthening are made.

**EQ 5 – Effectiveness and direct outcomes (capacity strengthening results & processes): To what extent have PfR implementing partners and communities built internal capacities and reached out, including with support of the five PfR partners, to advocate and lobby for IRM at local, national, regional and global levels?**

#### **Summary**

**PFR capacity strengthening support has been mainly directed towards enhancing capabilities of partners to engage in lobbying and advocacy work for IRM. This has involved both process and content aspects. However, it is not clear how far these efforts have contributed to real changes in the capacities of targeted entities. Most evidence seems to be anecdotal or based on general observation. The fact that supported partners have been able to achieve results in their engagement with stakeholders has also been used as a proxy to conclude that capacities have been strengthened.**

**For most trajectories, intermediary CSOs and networks/ platforms have played a critical role in programme delivery. This has been the case especially for trajectories 3 – 5 where the focus of their work has been on the promotion of IRM at district and village levels. Most of the results recorded at the sub-national level can therefore be attributed to the direct engagement of contracted (CSOs) and non-contracted partners (forums).**

**CSOs and forums with which the programme has worked, have had a sub-national focus and do not have a presence or mandate to engage at the national or regional/ global levels. PFR**

alliance members have incorporated learnings and insights obtained from the global level and regional levels into the training events and knowledge products they have organised for their stakeholders and intermediaries.

The evaluation team was not able to identify a significant set of either positive or negative unintended effects.

***JC 5.1: The PfR support contributed to strengthening capacity of PfR contracted partners and other CSOs for IRM at local, national, regional and global levels***

PfR capacity strengthening support has been mainly directed towards enhancing capabilities of partners to engage in lobbying and advocacy work for IRM. This has involved both process and content aspects. However, it is not clear how far these efforts have contributed to real changes in the capacities of targeted entities. Most evidence seems to be anecdotal or based on general observation. The fact that supported partners have been able to achieve results in their engagement with stakeholders has also been used as a proxy to conclude that capacities have been strengthened.

PfR capacity strengthening support - as already highlighted under EQ 4 - has been mainly directed towards enhancing capabilities of partners to engage in lobbying and advocacy work for IRM. This has involved both process and content aspects. By comparison, relatively little attention has been given towards strengthening enabling and alliance building capabilities, because these generally did not emerge as being in need of attention during the DCF diagnostic exercise<sup>17</sup>.

Whilst the DCF tool and capacity 2020 planning framework helped to diagnose capacity strengthening needs, it is not clear whether the DCF was used to re-assess the extent to which capacity strengthening interventions have contributed to real changes in the capacities of targeted entities<sup>18</sup>. This is not an easy thing to do and requires quite deliberate and detailed observation and measurement of indicators of capacity change. Most evidence seems to be anecdotal or based on general observation. The fact that supported partners have been able to achieve results in their engagement with has also been used as a proxy to conclude that capacities have been strengthened. However, without the benefit of a more thorough assessment of the capacities of individual entities, it is not possible to confirm categorically how far and to what extent PfR contracted partners and other CSOs have strengthened their capacities.

The following table draws conclusions on the overall contribution of the programme towards three categories of capacity: enabling, support base and coalition building, and advocacy and lobbying:

<sup>17</sup> Overall, most entities scored quite highly on the DCF rating, falling mainly in the yellow and green categories, suggesting an overall high aggregate level of capacity. It was only CBOs such as gender groups that recorded a greater number red or orange scores, though a couple of the alliance members did also have a couple of capabilities that were in need of attention.

<sup>18</sup> Whilst there are a few instances where a shift from a lower to a higher level of capacity can be noted in the scoring, there are many areas where the baseline was already green and therefore there was no apparent scope for improvement. There are other instances where there are gaps in the reporting, so it is difficult to tell if there has been any improvement or not.

Table 6: Contribution to Partner Capacity Strengthening

Area of Capacity	Contribution
Enabling Capacities	In the Indonesia context, comparatively limited attention was given to strengthening the enabling capacities of implementing partners, with more attention given to addressing the technical capabilities required to conduct lobbying and advocacy in the specific area of IRM.
Support Base and Coalition Building Capabilities	With respect to strengthening the capacity of PFR implementing partners to widen their support base/ advocacy coalitions for IRM, the evidence base is limited. However, alliance partners noted several examples of ways in which CSOs working with the alliance have been able to broaden their support base and engage with different networks.
Advocacy and Lobbying Capacity	The main focus of capacity strengthening support as noted already in EQ 4 has been on strengthening the advocacy and lobbying capacities of PFR partners. This has mainly taken the form of training courses on lobby and advocacy working including on how to draft policy notes. There have also been various technical trainings focusing on specific elements of IRM, but also on understanding the functioning of planning and budgeting processes within government structures. CSOs and forums have valued this exposure. The Humanitarian Diplomacy course offered by trajectory 1 to other alliance members, and later to universities and local government officials has also been appreciated

***JC 5.2: The PfR supported PfR contracted partners and other CSOs strategically engaged with IRM stakeholders in their environment at local, national, regional and global levels to promote IRM in policies, influence investment mechanisms in support of IRM and influence practice that takes of IRM.***

**For most trajectories, intermediary CSOs and networks/ platforms have played a critical role in programme delivery. This has been the case especially for trajectories 3 – 5 where the focus of their work has been on the promotion of IRM at district and village levels. Most of the results recorded at the sub-national level can therefore be attributed to the direct engagement of contracted (CSOs) and non-contracted partners (forums)**

For most trajectories, intermediary CSOs and networks/ platforms have played a critical role in programme delivery. This has been the case especially for trajectories 3 – 5 where the focus of their work has been on the promotion of IRM at district and village levels. Therefore, most of the results recorded at the sub-national level can be attributed to the direct engagement of contracted (CSOs) and non-contracted partners (forums)<sup>19</sup>, with the relevant alliance member providing support from behind the scenes, and periodic direct engagement with government authorities when required. Illustrations are provided in the table below. The programme's intermediary organisations have not, however, been involved in activities or processes at the regional and global levels.

<sup>19</sup> The general strategy of PfR Alliance members and its contracted partners has been to either establish or re-activate multi-stakeholder forums or working group in order to support further advocacy or actions.

Table 7: CSO Contributions To Outcomes

Trajectory	Intermediary Organisation	Contribution to Results
3	CIS is the main intermediary CSO that Care has worked with and has led work on integrating IRM into the Village fund in NTT province. It has also engaged with the District governments to promote IRM in drafting of the district medium term development plans. CIS has also led the work on women empowerment.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assisted villages to assign budgets for DRM related activities which take account of gender sensitive IRM principles. This has been done by i) sharing knowledge on tested technologies such as drip irrigation and injection wells; ii) training and coaching village formulation teams and village administrators;</li> <li>CIS also advocated the village plan to the district government, to ensure that the plan is accepted, and village fund could be used to fund the activities in accordance with the prevailing regulations.</li> </ul>
4	Wetlands has worked with three main intermediary organisations (in different localities aimed at promoting protection and management of lowland eco-systems.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PFR intermediaries led the work on raising awareness and building the capacity of village authority and villagers through participatory risk assessment and a series of trainings.</li> <li>Intermediaries also facilitated the meetings in drafting the village regulation and further facilitated the meetings between village representatives and the local authority, such as legal bureau, to ensure that the village regulation is aligned with the criteria and could be acknowledged as a Village Regulation by the local government.</li> </ul>
5	Karina has worked through Caritas in Sikka district to promote the integration of watershed management approach into the district mid-term development plan.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Caritas facilitated multi-stakeholder meetings in order to discuss and determine the priority actions from watershed management and disaster management to be included in the mid-term development plan.</li> </ul>

Further examples of the significant contribution of intermediaries to the outcomes of especially trajectories 3-5, can be obtained from the outcome matrix in Annex 1.

***JC 5.3: The five PFR alliance partners assisted and facilitated lobbying and advocacy for IRM beyond national borders with a view to influence decisions at regional and global levels***

**CSOs and forums with which the programme has worked, have had a sub-national focus and do not have a presence or mandate to engage at the national or regional/ global levels. PFR alliance members have incorporated learnings and insights obtained from the global level and regional levels into the training events and knowledge products they have organised for their stakeholders and intermediaries.**

There is little evidence to comment on this judgement criteria. From what is understood, the CSOs and forums with which the programme has worked, have had a sub-national focus and do not have a presence or mandate to engage at the national or regional/ global levels. The exception would be Walhi which is networked with Friends of the Earth and is active in broader environmental lobbying work. However, its linkages with global and regional processes are independent of its association with the PFR.



PFR alliance members have incorporated learnings and insights obtained from the global level and regional levels into the training events and knowledge products they have organised for their stakeholders and intermediaries. This includes the Humanitarian Diplomacy Course and guidance note/ check list on lobbying and advocacy. An important role for the alliance partners is to serve as a conduit of knowledge and information that can help shape country responses to global and regional frameworks. It is not clear the extent to which the PFR Global policy group has supported the country programme in identifying relevant global messages and insights for translation and onward communication at the country level.

---

***JC 5.4: Potentially unintended positive and negative effects of PfR support have (not) been identified and addressed by the PfR alliance and its contracted partners and other CSOs***

**The evaluation team was not able to identify a significant set of either positive or negative unintended effects**

The evaluation team was not able to identify a significant set of either positive or negative unintended effects. However, there are two examples that are worth citing:

An example of a potentially negative unforeseen result related to the early stages of engagement on the revision of the disaster management law where the national disaster management agency interpreted the actions of the CSO lobby, which included PFR members, as undermining its authority and intent on disbanding the agency. This required some careful behind-closed doors discussions to clarify the position of CSOs, including PFR representatives to allay concerns of the agency. Subsequently, the agency BNPD has evolved to be the main interlocutor of the PFR alliance members with whom significant joint work has been carried out.

An example of a positive unforeseen result relates to the work of Wetlands with the Serang City mangrove rehabilitation community group. Due to their reported achievements, the community group is now often contacted and engages in various programmes run by other stakeholders. For example, the community was invited to participate in the Pro-Climate Village where they received tools to help them for cultivation. They were also involved in a simulation activity conducted by the DRR Forum of Serang City. The local disaster management agency and Palang Merah Indonesia also invited them to their trainings, whilst a number of NGOs conducting research have also collaborated with the community group. The group is now also registered as recipient for seedlings assistance by Banten Province/ Serang City government. Several comparative studies have also been done and the community group has even been interviewed by CNN and BBC to share their success story.

**EQ 6 – Longer-term outcomes and impact (change): To what extent has the enhanced advocacy and lobbying capacity (and activities) among PfR contracted partners and other non-contracted CSOs led to enhanced policies, better investment mechanisms and improved practices for IRM at national, regional and global levels and to more resilience of vulnerable communities at national level?**

### **Summary**

A main focus of the Indonesia PFR 2 programme has been on engaging political leaders and decision makers across different tiers of government on the value of incorporating IRM into disaster management policies, investments and practices. Primary interlocutors for the programme have been technical and planning departments of the Indonesian government. This has included various sector ministries and specialist agencies at the national level and their counterparts at provincial and district government levels. Through such technical level engagements, the programme has been able to have audiences with the political leadership, who in some instances have demonstrated commitment to taking on board elements of the IRM approach. The programme engaged with 8 national level ministries/ agencies, engaged with 4 provincial governments and 8 district/ municipality governments and engaged with 30 village government structures. At the national level, the programme has contributed to the shaping and promulgation of approximately 24 separate government decisions/ actions that take on board IRM concepts and principles. At the provincial level, the programme succeeded in influencing 8 actions (across 4 provinces), whilst at the district level, the programme contributed to approximately 19 actions (across 8 districts). At the village level, the focus of programme activities has been on mobilising interest and resources to implement IRM activities that can impact on community resilience and livelihoods. This has included i) facilitating inclusion of IRM practices into the Village medium term and annual plans and budgets; ii) supporting villages to put in place required legal provisions to empower village authorities to apply IRM practices into their budgets and iii) promoting technologies and know-how that enable communities to increase their resilience.

Government stakeholders at all levels, who have interacted with alliance members and their implementation partners acknowledge the significant contribution the programme has made to the reported changes in IRM policy, investment and practice. Officials have appreciated the technical knowledge and expertise the PFR was able to bring to bear. It also remarked on the significant networks that PFR partners were linked to that could support government efforts and appreciated their skills in community mobilisation activities. The direct engagement of PFR alliance members with government stakeholders has been considerable and did not necessarily rely on the participation of intermediary organisations. Conversely, intermediary organisations were more directly involved in work at the district and community level, where these CSOs are actually based and where their sphere of operations are. The programme worked also with formally established networks and platforms at all levels. Examples include the DRR and watershed platforms.

***JC 6.1: Over the course of the past 5 years, IRM policies have been enhanced, IRM investment mechanisms improved, and IRM practices changed for the better at national, regional and global levels and resulted in more resilience of vulnerable communities at national level***

A main focus of the Indonesia PFR 2 programme has been on engaging political leaders and decision makers across different tiers of government on the value of incorporating IRM into disaster management policies, investments and practices. Primary interlocuters for the programme have been technical and planning departments of the Indonesian government. This has included various sector ministries and specialist agencies at the national level and their counterparts at provincial and district government levels. Through such technical level engagements, the programme has been able to have audiences with the political leadership, who in some instances have demonstrated commitment to taking on board elements of the IRM approach. The programme engaged with 8 national level ministries/ agencies, engaged with 4 provincial governments and 8 district/ municipality governments and engaged with 30 village government structures. At the national level, the programme has contributed to the shaping and promulgation of approximately 24 separate government decisions/ actions that take on board IRM concepts and principles. At the provincial level, the programme succeeded in influencing 8 actions (across 4 provinces), whilst at the district level, the programme contributed to approximately 19 actions (across 8 districts). At the village level, the focus of programme activities has been on mobilising interest and resources to implement IRM activities that can impact on community resilience and livelihoods. This has included i) facilitating inclusion of IRM practices into the Village medium term and annual plans and budgets; ii) supporting villages to put in place required legal provisions to empower village authorities to apply IRM practices into their budgets and iii) promoting technologies and know-how that enable communities to increase their resilience.

A major focus of the Indonesia PFR 2 programme has been on engaging political leaders and decision makers across different tiers of government on the value of incorporating IRM into disaster management policies, investments and practices. There is considerable evidence of the programme's achievements in this regard.

However, as earlier noted, the programme deliberately avoided pushing "IRM" as a new term but rather promoted its substance and underlying principles through its engagement with various stakeholders working on different policy portfolios such as the review of the national disaster management law, drafting of master plans (grand designs) on resilient cities, and on land subsidence, and the establishment of minimum service standards for disaster management for sub-national governments, to name a few. Through its engagement on these policy processes, the programme has been able to advocate for integration of climate change adaptation and eco-systems approaches including watershed management.

In the Indonesian context, the primary interlocuters for the programme have been technical and planning departments of the Indonesian government. This has included various sector ministries and specialist agencies at the national level and their counterparts at provincial and district government levels. It has also included engagement with the village government administrative structures. Through such technical level engagements, the programme has been able to have audiences with the political leadership, who in some instances have demonstrated commitment to taking on board elements of the IRM approach. For example, the political head of NTT province (Governor) invited the programme to explore ways of integrating IRM into the eco-tourism sub-sector. Meanwhile, at the national level, law makers are currently reviewing proposals to amend the national disaster

management law, which includes IRM provisions advocated by the PFR programme during the review process. There are of course instances where the political leadership has gone against technical proposals submitted or adjusted proposals to accommodate their own interests or perspectives.

Overall, it is noteworthy that the programme engaged with 8 national level ministries/ agencies, engaged with 4 provincial governments and 8 district/ municipality governments and engaged with 30 village government structures. In this way, the programme has supported the Government of Indonesia to “localise” international/ global conventions and frameworks, using IRM principles as the entry point for doing so.

Through these engagements, the lobby and advocacy “footprint” of the programme across the five trajectories has been impressive, as illustrated in the tables below.

At the **national level**, the programme has contributed to the shaping and promulgation of approximately 24 separate government decisions/ actions that take on board IRM concepts and principles. These comprise revisions to laws, regulations and policies, development of master plans and technical guidance documents, mobilisation of budgets for programmes and activities, development of results/ monitoring frameworks and establishment of working groups and cross-ministry collaborations (see table 8 for further details).

**Table 8: National Level Outcomes**

Lead Institution	Issue/ Topic/ Policy Area	Trajectory
1. BNPB – The National Disaster Management Agency	Revision of the National Disaster Management law	T1
	Establishment of a National Disaster Insurance Programme	T2
	Establishment of a working group with BAPPENAS, Min Environment and CSOs on integration of DRR, CCA and environmental management and resilience framework	T2
	Incorporation of watershed and IRM principles in the revision of the Disaster Management Planning regulation 4/2008	T5
	Incorporation of watershed and IRM principles into the revision of BNPB regulation on Resilient Cities (3/2012).	T5
	Drafting of Forecast-based Early Action on Flood (FbA) and Updating InaSafe (red-cross movement collaboration)	T2
	Development of the Master Plan on Disaster Management (RIPB)	T1,T2,T3,T4,T5
2. MOHA – The Ministry of Home Affairs	Development of Minimum Service Standards for Disaster Management for Local Governments	T1 and T5
	Confirmation and dissemination on availability of Village fund for village-level emergency situation and authority of Village Administrative to declare emergency situation.	T2/ T3
3. BAPPENAS – The National Planning Agency	Drafting of Resilience Framework and strategy on national adaptation plan on climate change (NAP)	T2
	Adoption of SDG indicators on Resilient Cities and integration of watershed management into spatial plan	T5
	Inclusion of IRM into Sustainable Development Goal (SDG)	T2, T3, T4,T5
	Adoption of best practices on IRM (the catalogue) into village development plan and action and by private sector	T1,T2,T3,T4,T5

4. Ministry of Villages	Development of a training module on gender sensitive DRM/ IRM for its Community Empowerment Officers, Training of Trainers (ToT) on IRM Module for Community Engagement Officer	T3
5. The Ministry of Environment and Forestry	Establishment and operationalisation of a National Multi-stakeholder Forum on Paludiculture (PaludiFOR)	T4
	Establishment of national regulation (Permenko 4/2017) on policy, strategy, program and performance indicator of mangrove ecosystem management, to accelerate the implementation of the National Strategy on Mangrove Management	T4
	Adoption of the watershed management approach into Spatial Planning through MoU between Ministry of the Environment and Ministry of Agrarian and Spatial Planning and has included an SDG indicator to monitor progress	T5
	Establishment of a working group with BAPPENAS, Min Environment and CSOs on Integration of DRR, CCA and environmental management	T2
6. Coordinating Ministry of Maritime Affairs and Investment	Establishment of national working group on Land subsidence mitigation and adaptation (legalize by enactment of CMM deputy decree no.5/DII/2019)	T2 and T4
	Development of a national roadmap on Land Subsidence Mitigation and Adaptation	T2 and T4
7. Ministry of Spatial Planning	Development of guidelines for the inclusion of climate change in sub-national spatial planning	T2
	Ministry of the Environment and Ministry of Agrarian and Spatial Planning have established an MOU to facilitate integration of watershed management into spatial planning	T5
8. Meteorology, Climatology, and Geophysical Agency	Redesign of programme on communicating climate forecast information to coastal/fishing community.	T2
	Forecast-based Early Action on Flood (FbA) and Updating InaSafe (red-cross movement collaboration, multi-programs collaboration)	T2

An underlying aim of the Indonesia programme is to mobilise public resources to implement IRM complaint programmes and activities that can impact directly at the community level. This has been the focus of the programme's work at the **sub-national level** where national policy frameworks are translated into operational programmes. In the Indonesia context, the medium-term development plans (RPJMB) of provincial, district and village governments hold the key to resource mobilisation and allocation for development activities. To ensure that programmes abide to set norms and standards, technical guidance documents play an important role in accompanying the planning documents. Equally important is ensuring that local legislation in the form of a hierarchy of regulations, authorise provincial, district (and village) governments to take action:

- At the **provincial level**, the programme succeeded in influencing 8 actions (across 4 provinces). These included ensuring incorporation of indicators on watershed management and disaster management into the provincial midterm development plan, drafting of regulations on mangrove management strategy and a regulation on peat eco-system management.
- At the **district level**, the programme contributed to approximately 19 actions (across 8 districts). Examples include incorporation of the watershed management approach into the district RPJMD, incorporation of IRM principles into strategic environmental assessment (KLHS) documents, and the establishment of DRR Forums such as in Serang City.

A summary of outcomes achieved at the sub-national level are listed in the table below:

**Table 9: Sub-National Level Outcomes**

Provincial Level	District/ Kota Level	Issue/ Topic/ Policy Area	Trajectory
NTT		Incorporation of IRM principles within Provincial Eco-tourism strategy/ pilot program	T3
		Adoption of some action plans from DM Plan and watershed management into program indicators of the Provincial Mid-Term Development Plan 2018-2023	T5
		Development of Disaster management plan 2018-2023 Development of the document of Environmental Carrying Capacity at Provincial level	T5
Central Java		Establishment of a Provincial regulation concerning mangrove management strategy (Governor Regulation No. 24/2019) as a legal umbrella for the provincial mangrove management programme	T4
Banten		Drafting of a provincial regulation concerning mangrove management strategy as a legal umbrella for the provincial mangrove management programme	T4
		Reactivation of mangrove management WG in Banten Province (Legalized by the enactment of governor decree No.522/2019)	T4
South Sumatra		Establishment of a Provincial regulation concerning peat ecosystem management and protection (Provincial Regulation No. 1/2018) as a legal umbrella for the provincial peat ecosystem protection and management programme	T4
	Sikka	Incorporation of the watershed management approach into the Sikka RPJMD (2018-2023)	T5
		Drafting of a Disaster Management Plan that incorporate watershed management and IRM principles	T5
	TTS	Incorporation of IRM principles into strategic environmental assessment (KLHS) documents, which inform the mid-term development plan (RPJMD)	T3
		Drafting of a Disaster Management Plans that incorporate watershed management and IRM principles	T5
		Adoption of a Head of Regency regulation on the use of village fund for emergency response	T3
	Kupang	Incorporation of IRM principles into strategic environmental assessment (KLHS) documents, which inform the mid-term development plan (RPJMD)	T3
		Incorporation of IRM and gender issue into their new KRB (disaster risk assessment) document	T3
		Establishment of an Integrated Farm Demonstration Plot covering an area of 10ha by adopting good practice PER 1 CARE developed with UNDANA	T3
	Demak	Budget allocation for IRM practices for wetlands management within the 2020 annual development planning document (RKP 2020).	T4
		Establishment of Demak District's DRR Forum (legalized by	T4

		enactment of regent Decree no.360/286/2019)	
	<b>Kota Kupang</b>	Incorporation of IRM principles into strategic environmental assessment (KLHS) documents, which inform the mid-term development plan (RPJMD) Development of Disaster Contingency Plan for the City of Kupang	T3
	<b>Kota Serang</b>	Revision of its spatial plan (RTRW) to accommodate mangrove ecosystem protection and has developed a DRR plan that adopts IRM measures in relation to mangrove management	T4
		Adoption of IRM measures for mangrove rehabilitation incorporated into the Kota Serang DRR Plan.	T4
		Establishment of SerangCity DRR Forum (legalized by enactment of major decree No. 360/2018)	T4
	<b>Jakarta</b>	Development of a Grand Design on community-based DRM (CB-DRM) for the city.	T1
		Development of a Grand Design on Urban Farming based on Watershed and IRM principles and inclusion of Urban Farming in its RPJMD (2018-2022).	T5
		BPBD Jakarta Province received PMI's study on forecasted time travelling of water from upstream to downstream of Ciliwung for flood early warning in Jakarta (technical assistance to PMI Jakarta Province and American Red-Cross)	T2
		Introduction affordable flood alarm to community in North of Jakarta and Bogor District	T2
	<b>Ogan Komering Ilir</b>	Release of instruction/circular letter to strengthen the district level industrial program by using Paludiculture/Peat native- Species	T4
		Revision of its spatial plan (RTRW) to accommodate a native peat species ecosystem (purun) protection	T4

At the **village level**, the focus of programme activities has been on mobilising interest and resources to implement IRM activities that can have a direct impact on community resilience and livelihoods. This has meant i) facilitating the inclusion of IRM practices into the Village medium term and annual plans and budgets; ii) supporting villages to put in place required legal provisions to empower village authorities to apply IRM practices into their budgets and iii) promoting technologies and know-how that enable communities to increase their resilience.

The programme has therefore worked intensively with 30 village authorities through trajectories 3, 4 and 5. As elaborated in the table below, as a result of programme engagements, 8 villages have allocated resources for IRM related activities that include sustainable agriculture practices, various measures and techniques to protect water sources and the mitigation of relevant hazards, 14 villages have integrated watershed management activities into their village development plans whilst 8 villages have established local regulations to manage peatlands and mangrove eco-systems.

Much of the work at the village level has built on the legacies of PFR1. Evidence of strengthened community capacities to manage disasters and build resilience is reflected in a number of ways; i) adoption of new technologies and practices such as water-wise irrigation and water harvesting techniques; ii) knowledge and awareness of IRM informing formulation of village level plans and budgets; iii) establishment of networks and platforms for advocacy and promotion. Details are included in the table below:

**Table 10: Village Level Outcomes**

Province	Districts	No of Villages	Action	Trajectory
NTT	TTS, Kupang	8	Allocation of an increasing percentage of village funds to IRM related activities such as: sustainable agriculture practices & various measures and techniques to protect water sources and mitigate relevant hazards	T3
South Sumatra, Riau, Central Kalimantan, central Java	OKI, MUBA, Kep.Meranti, Pulang Pisau	4	Village Regulations established on fire prevention in peatland area	T4
	Demak	4	Regulations established on coastal mangrove eco-system management	T4
NTT	Sikka	14	Integration of watershed management approach into Village Development Plans	T5

The box below provides further insight on how the mobilisation of resources at village level to implement IRM related activities has impacted on communities:



#### Box 5: Using Village fund to finance IRM Activities

Sikka district's community empowerment services noted that CKMs advocacy work has begun to influence the awareness and understanding of communities towards disaster watershed management issues. 14 villages located in the watershed of Dagesime-Magepanda and Riawajo, Sikka District, NTT have already integrated prioritized activities listed in the watershed management plan and disaster management plan into their 2019 annual village development plans and budget. As a result, they have been able to implement a number of activities such as village regulation making, planting trees in degraded land and around water spring, building barriers to prevent landslide and flood, planting mangrove, water conservation, etc. In total, the villages have allocated an estimated USD 500,000 on watershed management related activities. One of the important innovations noted by community members has been the construction of "green wells" to replace deep wells that had been depleting water availability for the village. One community noted the availability of water during summer months, something that had not happened for many years.

In Kolisia village, Sikka district, at least 6 actions have taken place since the village received guidance and support from CKM to develop their village level mid-term development plan and annual plan. These include:

- Mangrove planting and construction of retaining wall to reduce erosion
- Replanting of water source areas to reduce water loss
- Construction of 20 green wells
- Training & capacity building on horticulture techniques (organic fertilizer production, pest control, good planting practices)
- The use of simple tools to measure rainfall
- Strengthening early warning system through procurement of mobile phone,

Through the advocacy and support in the beneficiary villages, the villagers, particularly village administrations now are increasingly aware of the importance of implementing disaster risk reduction and management in their village. Further, the village administration has also understood how to incorporate these measures into their village development plan and work plan.

Meanwhile, eight Villages in Kupang and TTS districts, NTT province, used their 2019 village budget to finance activities which incorporate IRM gender responsive principles. These include drip irrigation system, and the use of organic and eco-friendly fertilizer and pesticides. The budget allocation for such activities ranged from 9% in Oelatimu village to 53% in Tolnaku village.

Source: 2019 Annual Report, and key informant interviews

As earlier reported under EQ1, trajectory 3 has also promoted the voice of women in the village development planning process.

---

***JC 6.2: The enhanced capacity among PfR implementing partners and their networks and communities has contributed to the mainstreaming of IRM in sector policies, improved IRM investment mechanisms, changed IRM practices for the better at national, regional and global levels and resulted in more resilience of vulnerable communities at national level***

Government stakeholders at all levels, who have interacted with alliance members and their implementation partners acknowledge the significant contribution the programme has made to the reported changes in IRM policy, investment and practice. Officials have appreciated the technical knowledge and expertise the PFR was able to bring to bear. It also remarked on the significant networks that PFR partners were linked to that could support government efforts and appreciated their skills in community mobilisation activities. The direct engagement of

PFR alliance members with government stakeholders has been considerable and did not necessarily rely on the participation of intermediary organisations. Conversely, intermediary organisations were more directly involved in work at the district and community level, where these CSOs are actually based and where their sphere of operations are. The programme worked also with formally established networks and platforms at all levels. Examples include the DRR and watershed platforms.

Government stakeholders at all levels, who have interacted with alliance members and their implementation partners acknowledge the significant contribution the programme has made to the reported changes in IRM policy, investment and practice. The various ways in which the programme has contributed to the outcomes realised are listed in the master outcome matrix which is available as an annex 1. Various illustrations of the programmes' specific contributions to outcomes are highlighted in the table below:

**Table 11: How PFR has Contributed to Outcomes**

Trajectory	Outcome	PFR Contribution
1	Review of Disaster Management Law	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PFR has worked with the CSO platform (AMPU-PB) to advocate for review of the law and has since participated in the review consultative process established by the government.</li> <li>PFR has also facilitated two public consultations to further discuss the proposed revisions in which it invited representatives of GOI (BNPB and MoSA) to present government positions.</li> <li>T5, through its relationship with the Min of Environment (which sits on Review Task Force), provided technical guidance and lobbied for adoption of the Landscape approach to spatial planning within the revised law.</li> </ul>
2	MOHA and MOVID confirmed availability of Village fund for village-level emergency situation, including early action and authority of Village Administrative to declare emergency situation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PFR provided technical inputs on how village fund can be used for emergency situation (early action and emergency response).</li> <li>PFR engaged with MOHA and Ministry of Village Development to discuss implications and process for dissemination of guidelines.</li> <li>PFR is supporting MoHA (in a written or video documented statement) to inform district governments and village administration.</li> </ul>
3	Selected villages have allocated an increasing percentage of their village fund to IRM related activities such as: sustainable agriculture practices & various measures and techniques to protect water sources and mitigate relevant hazards.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PFR has assisted villages to assign budgets for DRM related activities which take account of gender sensitive IRM principles. This has been done by i) sharing knowledge on tested technologies such as drip irrigation and injection wells; ii) training and coaching village formulation teams and village administrators; iii) training Min of Village Community Empowerment Officers.</li> <li>PFR also took a strategic approach in increasing awareness on gender equality by providing a platform and space for women to be able to participate and voice out their inputs in the village planning decision-making process.</li> <li>PFR also advocated village plan proposals to the district government, to ensure that the plan will be accepted, and village fund could be used to fund the activities in accordance to the prevailing regulations.</li> </ul>
4	Provincial Government	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PFR approached the provincial authority and advocated for the</li> </ul>

	of Central Java has issued a regulation concerning mangrove management strategy (Governor Regulation No. 24/2019) as a legal umbrella for the provincial mangrove management programme	<p>development of a provincial strategy for mangrove management.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PFR provided their technical expertise, lessons learned from their field project, and IRM principles into the draft. Furthermore, PFR as a member of the Provincial KKMD (Working Group for Mangrove) used this vehicle to promote, monitor and strengthen the mangrove management programme in Central Java.</li> </ul>
5	Ministry of the Environment & Forestry adopted the watershed management approach into Spatial Planning (through MoU between MoEF and MoASP) and has included an SDG indicator to monitor progress in this area	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PFR conducted discussions with MoEF, MoASP, and BAPPENAS on integration of watershed management into spatial plan</li> <li>PFR was invited to discussion on national SDGs indicator with BAPPENAS</li> <li>PFR proposed 2 indicators, namely integration of watershed management into spatial plan, and resilient city</li> <li>PFR reviewed MoASP regulation number 1/2018 on spatial planning, and made policy brief on inputs for integrating watershed management into spatial plan</li> <li>PFR did presentation in front of MoEF and MoASP on proposal to integrate watershed management into spatial plan</li> </ul>

The following general observations are made:

- The direct engagement of PFR alliance members with government stakeholders has been considerable and did not necessarily rely on the participation of intermediary organisations. Direct engagement was most pronounced in Trajectory 1 and Trajectory 2 and in general at the national level across all trajectories;
- Conversely, intermediary organisations were more directly involved in work at the district and community level, where these CSOs are actually based and where their sphere of operations are;
- The programme worked also with formally established networks and platforms at all levels. Examples include the DRR and watershed platforms which exist at provincial, district and village levels. At the national level, the programme participated in formally designated CSO platforms to engage government on the review of the disaster management law;
- The scope of PFR lobby and advocacy engagement was considerable. The overall approach, whether by alliance members themselves or by contracted partners, was to pursue constructive engagement through delivery of technical inputs and facilitation of policy processes. Typically, that might include preparation of technical guidance, review and commenting on technical documents, drafting and delivery of training materials, organisation of workshops to promote certain approaches and ideas and presentation of good practices. It could also include facilitation of workshops and related events where the programme would take a lead in mobilising stakeholders, as well as designing and financing events (see further Box 6 below for further insight);
- Government officials have appreciated the technical knowledge and expertise the PFR was able to bring to bear. It also remarked on the significant networks that PFR partners were linked to that could support government efforts and appreciated their skills in community mobilisation activities, thereby helping to promote vertical linkages and to roll-out national policies and programmes (see further box 7 below for further examples of feedback from PFR stakeholders);

- In some instances, PFR alliance members have established MOUs with specific government departments, whilst in other cases, the relationship is more ad hoc. More informal “backdoor” methods of engagement have also been used, especially to obtain the attention of senior officials and elected leaders.

#### **Box 6: Example of PFR Lobby and Advocacy Approach**

PFR partners are engaged in Lobby and Advocacy work in different and strategic ways as illustrated below:

At national level, various opportunities have been afforded to ensure that existing policies and strategies are made operational and that a framework is in place to monitor implementation. In the case of Mangrove ecosystem management and protection, there was already a national strategy policy document in place, which had been developed by the Ministry of Environment and Forestry (MOEF), but it was not followed up on. Wetlands approached and collaborated with the Coordinating Ministry of Maritime Affairs, whose main task is to coordinate several ministries, including the MoEF, in formulating and issuing the subsequent implementing regulation. This initiative open doors for further engagement, and the opportunity was used to advocate on the need to have a policy document that addresses the problem of land subsidence in lowland and coastal areas.

A different approach was to establish a community of practice - Wetlands worked with the Ministry of Environment to establish the PaludiFOR platform to learn, exchange knowledge and experiment to promote paludiculture and in so doing to contribute to peatland restoration. This is a multi-stakeholder initiative and platform with a focus on learning and information sharing with respect to paludiculture practices. Concrete activities include: meetings, workshop, presentation on paludiculture, book writing and participation in international events (presentation on paludiculture practice for sago for hydro mitigation and food security). The platform has learnt that to mainstream this practice and overcome scepticism especially from private sector requires building evidence-based arguments as well as building demo plot/ site in companies to show what is possible. Going forward, there is need to further strengthen the communications capacity of the forum and further engage with the private sector.

At sub-national level, one approach is to work directly with district governments to shape and inform their policies and technical guidance. In Kupang district for example, CIS supported the District government to formulate its Strategic Environmental Assessment (KLHS) as mandatory input to the preparation of mid-term development plan. The plan had been rejected by the national government because the KLHS had not been prepared. Through CIS support (facilitating meetings with stakeholders, collecting data etc.) the local government was able to undertake the process and analysis required in developing a proper KLHS document while CIS ensured the integration of IRM principles in the process and policy document. The district government said they appreciated the PFR approach because it did not come offering a new programme but instead discussed together with the regional government its priorities and challenges and identified where they could support the programme in line with their mission.

Another approach is to encourage DRR forums to broaden their perspective by accommodating IRM approaches. The programme has worked with a number of DRR forums in NTT province encouraging them to take a broader view of DRR by embracing the IRM approach. As a result, a number of forums have changed their name to DRR-CCA forum in recognition of the importance of climate change adaptation. Through their association with the Kupang City DRR, university representatives have said they want to direct their students to think about final projects that directly address the environmental and disaster risk issues facing the District, such as water conservation, and the construction of water trap, etc. PFR has also encouraged the participation of media in the forums with the result that they are now more informed and sensitive in their treatment of disaster events.

Some lessons:

Understanding incentives – The main concern of technical departments of government is to fulfil tasks assigned by the political leadership and ensure that targets set in the mid-term development plan are achieved. If this can be done by mobilising technical or financial resources from CSOs, then government officials are willing to engage with programmes such as PFR. For CSOs it means identifying those areas where there is clear incentive to engage and use this as an entry point for furthering goals.

Timing is all-important. In Sikka district, the issue of timing of engagement was critical for CKM. New Village Chiefs had just been appointed at that time and the villages did not yet have their village mid-term development plan (RPJMDes) and work plan (RKPDDes). These had to be submitted as soon as possible to be able to access their village funds. CKM supported the process of developing the plans and through the process helped to build the capacity of BMD (village council as village representatives). Within 3 months, RPJMDes and RKPDDes had been submitted and in the process of developing village plan, CKM introduced and raised the awareness of village administration on multiple issues such as education, health, environment and particularly disaster risk reductions.

Lastly, the box below provides a set of testimonies obtained from government officials and community members on the perceived contributions the programme has made.

**Box 7: Feedback from stakeholders<sup>20</sup>**

*Yuli Utami (Head of Sub-directorate for Watershed Management Institutionalization, MoEF)*

*“KARINA’s work in NTT (Province, Sikka District to target villages) is seen as the form of ‘internalisation’ of watershed management reaching out the grassroots level that the Directorate is aiming for”*

*Ir. Oswar M. Mungkasa, MURP*

*(Former Deputy Governor of Environment and Spatial, DKI Jakarta)*

*“KARINA help us and bring the experience of working with community in developing community level disaster risk management”.*

*Nurcholis (The Head of Sub-directorate for Cooperation – Puslatmas/ Training Center of Ministry of Village)*

*“Our role is to empower village communities. CARE’s proposal is related to disaster management issue and they have beneficiary villages in NTT that are located in disaster-prone areas. Ministry of Village also have a list of priority villages for empowerment, including in NTT where CARE works. And we see the importance of this, since we have not been able to reach these disaster-prone areas because we do not have the capacity to train our officers on disaster issues. Hence, we are very enthusiastic when the proposal came in to develop disaster management modules together.”*

*Maxi (Bappeda – Kupang District Development Planning Agency)*

*“Kupang District government appreciates CARE-CIS’ approach: CARE-CIS did not come offering new program but instead discuss together with the government on what is the government’s program and priority and where they could support the program that is in line with their mission.”*

*Environmental Service of Serang City: Indah (Provincial Environmental Service) and Pingkat (Municipal Environmental Service)*

*The focus of Wetland’s intervention has been on environmental damage in coastal areas, especially through mangrove rehabilitation. Environmental protection is certainly a mandate for environmental service, however,*

<sup>20</sup> Note these quotations are reconstituted from meeting notes and are not verbatim.

*both environmental service in the province and in the city level have a very limited budget to implement any program. The budget that could be used is at the hand of the relevant government agencies or task force like KKMD. By developing a regional strategy on mangrove management, we direct the government agencies to integrate the mangrove management aspect to their program, facilitate coordination and program cohesion among different agencies. First, Wetland provides support in terms of co-financing and technical assistance in the development of the draft of regional strategy on mangrove. Second, through this collaboration, we learn about the modality of community empowerment as practiced by Wetland and hence, open up ideas to involve private sectors in applying similar schemes.*

**EQ 7 – Sustainability: To what extent has the PFR support contributed to a structurally strengthened and sustainable engagements of its implementing partners to promote IRM at national, regional and global levels?**

### **Summary**

Overall, implementing partners have embraced the PFR 2 approach and have recognised the role and potentials of working in the domain of lobbying and advocacy for IRM. CSOs have adjusted to this new way of working at different speeds and with different levels of capability and interest. Most operate sub-nationally and are not expected to engage at the national level. The various DRR and watershed multi-stakeholder forums which the PFR has worked with, have as part of their mandate, a lobbying and advocacy role. What has been new is the IRM lens. In some instances, the programme has helped establish new communities of practices. A number of CSOs have indicated interest to apply lobbying and advocacy work to non-IRM aspects of their work.

In the Indonesia context, ownership among Government stakeholders at all levels for IRM is also important to acknowledge from the perspective of sustainability. By virtue of its engagements and contributions to policy reforms and innovation, it is clear that IRM principles and approaches are now established in important pieces of law, policy, regulatory frameworks and technical guidance notes. Moreover, in a selection of districts and villages, budgets have been allocated specifically to finance IRM related activities. However, Indonesia is a huge country and the programme's reach at the sub-national level has been limited to a cluster of provinces, districts and villages.

Partner alliance members note that the sustainability of interest in lobbying for IRM does not only reside in formal entities. Influencing as large a cohort of individuals as possible who can carry forward the work irrespective of where they currently are working is equally important.

It is not possible to state categorically if the PFR implementation partners are now able to lobby and advocate for IRM on their own independently of the PFR programme. Overall, there is more knowledge on IRM, skills have been developed in the area of lobbying and advocacy, and some attention has been paid to strengthening organisational capacities. But this does not assure an ability to go it alone. With respect to the DRR and watershed forums, these vary tremendously in terms of the capacity of members, their standing/ reputation in the wider community and their access to predictable funding. Their capacity to act and to engage is likely to vary over time, but as mandated entities to promote DM, they are well positioned to exercise a leadership role in advocating for IRM. With respect to CSOs, there is



a clear interest to engage on IRM but there are elements of advocacy, negotiation and knowledge management capabilities that remain to be strengthened, which cannot be resolved in the short term. The fragile funding base of CSOs also means that what gets done is heavily influenced by the priorities and interests of funders which may not necessarily be for IRM.

***JC 7.1: The effects of the PfR support are owned by the PfR implementing partners***

Overall, implementing partners have embraced the PFR 2 approach and have recognised the role and potentials of working in the domain of lobbying and advocacy for IRM. CSOs have adjusted to this new way of working at different speeds and with different levels of capability and interest. Most operate sub-nationally and are not expected to engage at the national level. The various DRR and watershed multi-stakeholder forums which the PFR has worked with, have as part of their mandate, a lobbying and advocacy role. What has been new is the IRM lens. In some instances, the programme has helped establish new communities of practices. A number of CSOs have indicated interest to apply lobbying and advocacy work to non-IRM aspects of their work.

In the Indonesia context, ownership among Government stakeholders at all levels for IRM is also important to acknowledge from the perspective of sustainability. By virtue of its engagements and contributions to policy reforms and innovation, it is clear that IRM principles and approaches are now established in important pieces of law, policy, regulatory frameworks and technical guidance notes. Moreover, in a selection of districts and villages, budgets have been allocated specifically to finance IRM related activities. However, Indonesia is a huge country and the programme's reach at the sub-national level has been limited to a cluster of provinces, districts and villages.

Partner alliance members note that the sustainability of interest in lobbying for IRM does not only reside in formal entities. Influencing as large a cohort of individuals as possible who can carry forward the work irrespective of where they currently are working is equally important.

Overall, implementing partners have embraced the PFR 2 approach and have recognised the role and potentials of working in the domain of lobbying and advocacy for IRM. For most of the CSOs, which had participated in PFR1, this working approach was nevertheless a challenge to take up and it has taken time to recognise the advantages accruing and to accommodate this way of working. However, that said, a number of remarks are in order:

- CSOs have adjusted to this new way of working at different speeds and with different levels of capability and interest<sup>21</sup>. This reflects the very different character of the entities the alliance members have worked with, and their scope of operations. Several CSOs work with and for other funding agencies which may have other priorities other than those promoted by the PFR;
- Most CSOs are based at the sub-national level and are not expected to engage in national level engagement processes, as this is not their domain. Here the alliance members have a comparative advantage of engaging directly with government stakeholders and/ or working in tandem with relevant nationally focused networks and forums on an as-needs basis;

---

<sup>21</sup> In one instance, the implementation partner has traditionally played a more adversarial role and was less convinced of the programme's constructive engagement approach. Over time a meeting of minds emerged, however the experience highlighted the need for the programme to fully understand the interests and mandates of their intermediaries. It cannot be taken for granted that there is a natural fit.

- The various DRR and watershed multi-stakeholder forums which the PFR has worked with, have as part of their mandate, a lobbying and advocacy role. What has been new is the IRM lens, which in general has been well received and accommodated within their scope of work;
- In some instances, the programme has helped establish new communities of practices such as PaludiFOR which is mandated to promote knowledge and awareness on paludiculture. This is a very focused aspect of IRM and such an entity would not necessarily be expected to engage on broader aspects of IRM promotion;
- A number of CSOs have indicated their interest to apply lobbying and advocacy work to non-IRM aspects of their work.

In the Indonesia context, ownership among Government stakeholders at all levels for IRM is also important to acknowledge from the perspective of sustainability. By virtue of its engagements and contributions to policy reforms and innovation, as documented in previous chapters, it is clear that IRM principles and approaches are now established in important pieces of law, policy, regulatory frameworks and technical guidance notes. Moreover, in a selection of districts and villages, budgets have been allocated specifically to finance IRM related activities. The attention given to influencing national policy in this regard has been important in terms of the overall influence/ guidance this can have on shaping actions at lower levels of government.

However, as already remarked, Indonesia is a huge country and the programme's reach at the sub-national level has been limited to a cluster of provinces, districts and villages. The vast majority of provincial, district and village governments have not been sensitised to IRM approaches and it is evident that the level of engagement enjoyed by the partners of the PFR programme could not be easily replicated across the entire country.

Broadening of ownership will therefore remain a challenge, particularly in ensuring that a greater number of sub-national governments and villages get exposed to and adopt IRM approaches. A strong national policy, legal and regulatory framework as has been developed with the support of PFR is essential, but longer-term success will depend on identifying and supporting policy champions within government structures at different levels. The role of intermediary CSOs, networks and platforms will be critical in facilitating such processes.

Partner alliance members also noted that the sustainability of interest in lobbying for IRM does not necessarily reside in formal entities per se but in individuals. They argue that the key is to influence as large a cohort of individuals as possible who can carry forward the work irrespective of where they currently are working. Invariably they will not stay in a single organisation but will rather shift, crossing paths with others in various forums, networks and communities of practice. Thus, even if the impact on creating sustainable institutions to advance the work has only been partially effective, the contribution to broadening awareness among a larger cohort of individuals across different levels of Indonesian society should not be underestimated.

---



***JC 7.2: PfR partners are able to lobby and advocate for IRM on their own and without the support of the PfR***

**It is not possible to state categorically if the PFR implementation partners are now able to lobby and advocate for IRM on their own independently of the PFR programme. Overall, there is more knowledge on IRM, skills have been developed in the area of lobbying and advocacy, and some attention has been paid to strengthening organisational capacities. But this does not assure an ability to go it alone. With respect to the DRR and watershed forums, these vary tremendously in terms of the capacity of members, their standing/ reputation in the wider community and their access to predictable funding. Their capacity to act and to engage is likely to vary over time, but as mandated entities to promote DM, they are well positioned to exercise a leadership role in advocating for IRM. With respect to CSOs, there is a clear interest to engage on IRM but there are elements of advocacy, negotiation and knowledge management capabilities that remain to be strengthened, which cannot be resolved in the short term. The fragile funding base of CSOs also means that what gets done is heavily influenced by the priorities and interests of funders which may not necessarily be for IRM.**

It is not possible to state categorically if the PFR implementation partners are now able to lobby and advocate for IRM on their own independently of the PFR programme. It was not possible to conduct a comprehensive assessment of the readiness of all partners to work on their own. More systematic use of the DCF might have allowed a better assessment of how readiness to go it alone has evolved but even here, there are a range of other factors that could impact on the ability to continue alone.

Earlier chapters have documented the capacity strengthening support that has been offered to various partners and there is also clear evidence of the contribution that intermediaries have made to realising programme outcomes. This would hint at an ability to go it alone, but does not ensure that this capability is fully in place. Overall, there is more knowledge on IRM, skills have been developed in the area of lobbying and advocacy, and some attention has been paid to strengthening organisational capacities related to planning, budgeting, MEL, finance and leadership. However, overall less attention has been paid by the programme on enhancing these enabling capabilities, as these were identified in the DCF as areas that were already quite strong.

With respect to the DRR and watershed forums, that have been established across the country, these vary tremendously in terms of the capacity of members, the standing/ reputation of the forums within the wider community/ political leadership and their access to predictable sources of funding to enable them to function. Their capacity to act and to engage is likely to vary over time, but as mandated entities to promote DM, they are well positioned to exercise a leadership role in advocating for IRM. One might expect on-going needs for capacity support as their interactions in the field of IRM evolve. Other types of platforms have already been established including those focusing on single issues such as paludiculture. According to Wetlands, it is confident the work of the platform will continue irrespective of whether or not PFR continues.

With respect to intermediary CSOs, a number have embraced the lobbying and advocacy function and have indicated an interest to integrate this as their modus operandi whether in the realm of IRM or not. CKM for example stated that:

*“CKM have started to shift to policy advocacy work after learning from the PfR experience: Three other CKM programmes now also incorporate policy advocacy measures particularly through the village planning process. CKM believe that with the current opportunity presented by the village law and funds, advocacy to the village planning process would bring more real impact and ensure more sustainability.”*

IRM has also been recognised as a strategic way to address DM issues in a holistic manner in the Indonesia context. However, as the programme has noted, capacity gaps related to advocacy, negotiation and knowledge management remain and are not resolved in the short term. These are likely to remain areas demanding attention and support at least over the medium term. It is also important to acknowledge that for most CSOs their financial base can be fragile meaning that what gets done is heavily influenced by where funding can be obtained and by the interest of their funders. If funding to IRM is reduced, the very CSOs the alliance has worked with may move on to a new agenda, depending on the interests and priorities of those who are willing to finance them. This can of course work in a different way, as hinted by some partners, who indicated that their exposure to IRM and lobbying and advocacy has enabled them to tap into new sources of funding and related support. Another critical factor here is the stability of the workforce of CSOs and the quality and interest of their leadership in sustaining interest in the IRM field and applying their new knowledge, skills and insights in whatever future programmes they end up working in. Those with more established funding streams and stronger track record in implementation/ delivery might be expected to pursue the agenda going forward.

## 2. Observations and Emerging Conclusions

The Indonesia PFR II programme is a robust programme and has recorded many successes. Much has also been learnt along the way which has led to a number of adjustments in the way the programme has been executed. Overall, the programme scores positively in terms of relevance, coherence, efficiency and effectiveness. This has translated into realising a considerable number of policy influencing outcomes that have resulted in IRM being established in the policy, laws, regulations, technical guidance, plans and budgets of the Government of Indonesia at national, provincial, district and village levels. These can be said to have contributed towards establishing an enabling environment for a more holistic approach to disaster management. In turn this has offered selected communities the opportunity to access technologies and know-how, apply good practices individually and collectively that contribute to preventing, mitigating and responding to disaster.

Looking to the future, 6 aspects of the programme are identified where there is potential room for improvement. The points raised reflect the views of the consultants but are in part inspired by suggestions raised by Alliance members during the course of the evaluation and during the end of evaluation e-workshop. These are looked at in turn:

The five *trajectories* have served as the backbone of the programme providing a way to operationalise the country level theory of change and to distinguish the different focal areas of the programme. The definition of each trajectory has also taken account of the interests and professional expertise of the alliance partners. Whilst this has worked well in many respects, including accommodating aspects of policy, investment and practice, to the extent relevant, and whilst growing efforts have been made to collaborate across trajectories, the approach does create silos. Based on experiences gained to date and the interest of and opportunities for partners to collaborate more closely, consideration should be given to structuring trajectories in a way that allows more than one alliance member to participate on a systematic basis. Doing so would however raise a number of organisational, planning, budgeting and reporting challenges, but could create opportunities for pooling technical and financial resources.

*Capacity Strengthening* is an important part of PFR II. Its strategic role could however have been given further attention despite it already featuring prominently in the underlying programme theory of change. Guidance on why capacity strengthening is important to the programme, and how the concept of capacity strengthening is understood and applied, including options for operationalising it at country level would have been helpful, and would have complemented the tools and reporting frameworks provided. In the Indonesia context, capacity strengthening went beyond a focus on intermediary CSOs revealing the importance of targeting a broader set of stakeholders including government institutions. It also identified negotiation, advocacy and knowledge management as core capabilities to focus on.

Arrangements for *Country programme management* have generally worked well but alliance members underscore the need for the coordination function to be full-time. Moreover, the suggestion has been made to establish a secretariat type structure that sits above the alliance members. Such a secretariat could provide both management and technical support to the alliance. In this regard, it could house expertise covering the three core functional areas of lobbying and advocacy, capacity strengthening and knowledge management that underpin the programme's logic of intervention and that could link to their counterparts at headquarter level. Such an arrangement would inevitably raise additional operating costs but would help ensure stronger collaboration among partners and a more robust approach to core areas of work.

The programme's approach to *working across different tiers of government* has much to commend itself and seems very appropriate in the Indonesia context. Whilst many results have been achieved at the national level, maintaining relationships and supporting national government initiatives will remain important. The real challenge is to decide what to do at the sub-national level, whether to continue to work in the same provinces, districts and villages or to move on? Focusing on a set of provinces, and within these, on selected districts and villages seems to make most sense, offering the best opportunities for replication and bedding in of processes and practices. One option could be to remain in the same provinces but to expand/ move to different or additional districts and villages. Another option could be to start working in additional provinces. Such decisions should not be based merely on the need to cover more localities but should reflect needs and interests. As such a demand driven approach would be most desirable whereby provinces and districts approach the programme for assistance. In this way, the programme could function more as a facility providing services in response to requests received.

*Intermediary CSOs* have played an important role in programme delivery especially for the three trajectories that operate at the sub-national and village levels. The experience of the past five years has however demonstrated that in some instances, alliance members are best placed to work directly with government stakeholders, or in others to work with other structures such as communities of practices, working groups, alliance and platforms. It is important therefore that this broader multi-stakeholder approach to engagement is recognised in the programme's theory of change/ intervention logic such that capacity strengthening, and knowledge management resources target the different stakeholder groups as necessary. This is also important in terms of sustainability as the experience of Indonesia would suggest that a narrower focus on empowering intermediary CSOs only is insufficient.

The *PMEL framework and associated processes* are well thought out and in principle are appropriate for the nature of the PFR programme. They offer plenty of opportunity for reporting and learning in a participatory way and for tracking results using the Outcome Harvesting evaluation approach. In practice, it has become burdensome, and has generated an overload of information that has not necessarily benefitted country level participants. Distilling the big picture remains challenging. To ensure the utility-focus of the framework, efforts should be made to simplify them and as necessary to allow adaptation to country level circumstances (without losing the potential for cross-country learning and comparison). A short training and/ or guidance on the use of the Outcome Harvesting methodology would also be useful so that country level participants are able to report on emerging results in a consistent and learning-focused way.

### 3. Annexes

#### Annex 1: Matrix of Outcomes, their Significance and the Contribution of PfR II<sup>22</sup>

Outcome	Outcome Significance	PfR Contribution	Trajectory
<b>NATIONAL LEVEL</b>			
<b>Government of Indonesia</b> is proposing a revision of the national Disaster Management law	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The current law is outdated and needs to include provisions that enable it to respond to current and future challenges. These provisions include adoption of IRM principles including the eco-system approach and attention to the entire disaster risk management cycle especially disaster risk reduction, mitigation and preparedness.</li> <li>The DM law is a key enabler for effective disaster management in Indonesia providing a framework and guidance for stakeholders at national, sub-national and community levels.</li> <li>The revised law would also elevate the status and authority of BNPD so that it has greater executive and coordinating powers.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PfR has worked with CSO platform (AMPU-PB) to advocate for review of the law and has since participated in the review consultative process established by the government (under MoSA).</li> <li>PfR has also facilitated two public consultations to further discuss the proposed revisions in which it invited representatives of GOI (BNPB and MoSA) to present government positions.</li> <li>T5, through its relationship with the Min of Environment (which sits on Review Task Force), provided technical guidance and lobbied for adoption of the Landscape approach spatial planning within the revised law.</li> <li>T2 participated in consultative process advocating especially inclusion of climate change considerations. This included preparing a policy brief in 2017</li> </ul>	T1, T2 and T5
<b>National Disaster Management Agency (BNPB) and Ministry of Finance</b> have established a national disaster insurance programme and a government unit to manage collected funds (from state budget, donor, and private) to cover the insurance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assets of vulnerable groups living in high risk areas will be protected with the insurance scheme funded by Government. It will potentially reduce the risk and impact of disaster to the vulnerable groups.</li> <li>Government assets and housing of the most vulnerable people would be the priority to be covered by the insurance and expand to vital infrastructure afterward.</li> <li>Establishment Badan Layanan Umum (or similar to Trust Fund) is innovative way beyond conventional state annual budget to manage fund from state budget</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PfR Climate Centre with two university experts (UGM and ITB University) were requested by BNPB at the end of 2017 to produce a paper that analyse relevant policy and practice on disaster insurance in Indonesia.</li> <li>A meeting with two directors of BNPB, university experts from ITB and UGM University was organized on October-20, 2017.</li> <li>The paper was submitted to BNPB on October 31, 2017. Climate Centre writing on existing disaster risk transfer, especially disaster micro-insurance products and pooled fund, challenge and learning in promoting</li> </ul>	T2

<sup>22</sup> This master matrix of outcomes was compiled during the course of the evaluation exercise. It combines material obtained from the annual reports, more especially the finalised 2019 Annual report together with insights obtained from interviews in the field. Trajectory leads also participated in an on-line review process of the draft document and edited it as required. Although still long, the matrix offers a simplified overview of the programme achievements over the life of PFR2 and across all 5 trajectories.

premium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>and private to pay insurance premium.</li> <li>Trust fund would remove barriers in managing contribution of non-government entity in supporting the insurance program as well receiving fund from the insurance claim. Trust fund would also allow to receive loan quickly from multinational-development bank (ADB, World Bank), which will be returned soon after the claimed to insurance company received.</li> </ul>	<p>disaster micro-insurance and pooled fund, and policy analysis to establish government-funded disaster insurance. The provided conclusion, among others, that existing policy and regulation allows BNPB or other government agency to fund disaster insurance program from national and regional state budget.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Revision of DM Law is not needed for establishment of government-funded insurance. Instead communication to Ministry of Finance and parliament is needed. The paper also mentioning the role of trust fund or Badan Layanan Umum (BLU) to manage multi-source fund to cover insurance premium.</li> <li>In development of National Roadmap on Disaster Management for 2020-2024, in December 2017 to April 2018, PfR provided feedback. T-2 , among others, recommended development of disaster insurance and a trust fund to manage the insurance program.</li> <li>BNPB built communication to Ministry of Finance for development of disaster insurance in Indonesia.</li> <li>BNPB and Ministry of Finance built dialogue on establishment of disaster insurance for disaster vulnerable groups.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>National Disaster Management Agency (BNPB)</b></p> <p>has established a working group with BAPPENAS, Min Environment and CSOs on Integration of DRR, CCA and environmental management in spatial planning.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The working group on DRR-CAA will discuss issues and provide recommendation for integration of DRR-CCA and environment management into policy and practice at national and local level. It will bring together all relevant stakeholders, especially BNPB, MoEF, BAPPENAS and Min. of Spatial Planning.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Within 2017-2018, discussion have been made several times by RCCC and USAID APIK with MoEF and USAID APIK on integration of DRR-CCA, especially on methodology of disaster risk assessment and on climate vulnerability assessment. Two FGD was jointly organized by RCCC and USAID APIK (27 Feb, July 27, and 22 May 2017) specifically on the risk assessment. The integration topic was raised several times also during relevant event , such dialog on NAP and development of MoEF guideline on methodology of climate risk assessment (dec5, 2017, and April 2018).</li> <li>On March 9, 2018, PfR Alliance met Director of DRR of BNPB to present report of IFRC study on “integration of DRR and CCA into spatial planning and development” and to submit PfR recommendations to draft RIPB (master plan on disaster management). It was later followed with discussion involving staff of USAID APIK Program to discuss integration of DRR-</li> </ul>	T1, T2 and T5

		<p>CCA. The discussion agreed to have a platform to discuss regularly integration of DRR-CCA involving relevant CSOs and government agencies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>On Sept 17, 2018 USAID APIK and PFR-RCCC met and discussed with Director of DRR of BNPB on integration of DRR and CCA into spatial planning and to follow up earlier conversation regarding working group on DRR-CCA.</li> <li>On October 5, 2018, BNPB organized a brainstorming meeting on resilience indicators. PFR RCCC and KARINA shared on existing initiative to develop resilience framework and indicators for City Resilience and climate resilience for NAP, both organized by BAPPENAS. PFR encouraged BNPB to initiated working group with relevant ministries, especially, MoEF and BAPPENAS, and CSOs to discuss the resilience framework and other relevant topics.</li> <li>On October 5, 2018, PFR RCCC facilitated meeting with KARINA, IFRC and USAID APIK program to gain input on integration of DRR-CCA into spatial planning and to respond meeting point previously organized by BNPB that day (morning)</li> </ul>	
<p><b>National Disaster Management Agency (BNPB)</b> has incorporated watershed management and resilient city for the revision of Disaster Management Planning regulation 4/2008</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The DM Plan is now a mandatory for local governments, so that the guideline/regulation from BNPB will be referred by all local governments</li> <li>Ensuring the integration of watershed management into DM Plan will help local governments to consider risk not only based on administrative boundary, but also on ecological or landscape based.</li> <li>Once BNPB officially revises its regulation on DM Plan, it is expected in 2020, it will be the main reference for local governments, and it includes watershed management issue.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PFR has been able to lobby for revision of the DM planning regulations by drawing on their experience of working with district governments.</li> <li>BNPB showed interest in the approach used by PFR and adopted these in the revision process.</li> <li>PFR provided example of DM Plan from local government facilitated by PFR that has been legalized by Governor Regulation in NTT.</li> <li>PFR provided its consultant to work with BNPB on developing the guideline on DM Plan</li> </ul>	T5
<p><b>National Disaster Management Agency (BNPB)</b> has incorporated watershed and resilient city indicators for the</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The BNPB regulation is one of main references for local governments for building resilient cities. The draft indicators have been accommodated watershed management issue. Therefore, once it is legalized, expected in 2020, it will be used as main reference for</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PFR identified window of opportunity to engage BNPB as the current indicators were soon to expire</li> <li>Internally, PFR discussed and identified a set of indicators which were presented to stakeholders in a workshop and in a follow up with individual line</li> </ul>	T5

revision of BNPB regulation on Resilient Cities (3/2012).	local governments.	Ministries <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PFR facilitated workshops with various stakeholders on developing the resilient city indicators</li> <li>PFR facilitated testing the draft of indicators at 2 local governments</li> <li>PFR wrote policy brief on the resilient city indicators</li> <li>BNPB took over the process and invited NGOs including PFR to test the indicators</li> </ul>	
<b>BAPPENAS (National Planning Agency)</b> has adopted SDG indicators on Resilient City, and agreed to develop indicators that take account of watershed management, DRR, and CCA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GOI recognises resilient cities as a key development priority, so that it will be used as performance measurement for local governments</li> <li>The set of resilient city indicators has accommodated watershed, DRR, and CCA measures, hence once it is applied by local governments it will ensure risk reduction at local level</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PFR proposed indicator of resilient city as part of national SDGs indicators for Goal 11</li> <li>PFR audienced with BAPPENAS to propose inclusion of resilient city as a SDG indicator. PFR also proposed to develop a set of the resilient city indicators, that also accomodate issues of watershed, DRR, and CCA</li> </ul>	T5
<b>Ministry of Home Affairs (MOHA)</b> is reviewing the Minimum Service Standards for the Delivery of Disaster Management services at the Local Government level.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MoHA uses Minimum service standards (MSS) as a way to monitor and performance manage service delivery at the district/city level of government.</li> <li>Before 2018, there was no the MSS for disaster management. Therefore, as mandated by National Law 23/2014, it requires drafting to ensure that local government can adequately implement provisions of the DM MSS.</li> <li>The responsible office for implementing the MSS for DM is BPBD, which is the Disaster Management Office at the district/city level.</li> <li>In Indonesia's decentralised context, BNPB has no administrative authority over BPBD, therefore, the role of MoHA in standards setting is critical in ensuring effective implementation of the DM law at the sub-national level.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PFR audienced with MoHA on the progress of MSS development</li> <li>PFR conducted workshop with MoHA involving BPBD from DKI Jakarta Province, NTT Provinsi, Sikka District, and TTS District to provide technical input to the development of the MSS.</li> <li>PFR wrote policy briefs on inputs for the MSS</li> <li>PFR audienced with MoHA and BNPB to deliver the policy briefs</li> <li>PFR monitored the process of MSS development through MoHA's staff</li> </ul>	T1, T3 and T5
<b>Ministry of Villages (MOVID)</b> has developed a training module on gender sensitive DRM/ IRM for its	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Community Empowerment Officer (CEO) is supposed to play a key role in supporting Villages to draft their respective Village development plans as</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PFR lobbied Ministry of Villages on the idea of developing such a training module and was successful in persuading the Ministry to adopt the idea.</li> </ul>	T3



Community Empowerment Officers and have organised peer to peer learning between villages.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>well as to support them in implementation of activities.</li> <li>Having knowledge base on gender- sensitive DRM will enable them to act as change agents at district and Village government level with respect to integration of IRM into Village plans and budgets. There role is therefore important from point of view of institutionalising knowledge in this area.</li> <li>Due to staff shortages and budget limitations, CEOs are however unable to reach most villages.</li> <li>Therefore, their inputs need to be reinforced by support provided by NGOS/ CSOs that work directly at village level.</li> <li>Village Ministry is also encouraging peer to peer learning at village level as a way to share knowledge, taking account of the limited capacity of CEOs.</li> <li>Training on gender-based IRM is delivered through the Ministry of Village training centre (Puslatmas).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PFR worked with the Ministry to design the module and thereafter to test it in selected localities.</li> <li>PFR has also worked together with the Ministry to facilitate peer to peer learning between the Ministry's "Model" villages and the villages where PFR (Care) has been active in promoting gender-sensitive DRM at village level.</li> </ul>	
<b>Ministry of Home Affairs and Ministry of Villages</b> have confirmed the availability of Village fund for village-level emergency situations, including early action and authority of Village Administrative to declare emergency situation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Villages are at forefront of emergency response but have not had mechanism to mobilise resources from village fund.</li> <li>Have relied on district declaring an emergency, however, this usually applies when emergency is district-wide rather than village specific and does not empower them to use own resources.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provided technical inputs on how village fund can be used for emergency situation (early action and emergency respond).</li> <li>Engaged with MOHA and Ministry of Village Development to discuss implications and process for dissemination of guidelines</li> <li>Dissemination on confirmation from MoHA (in a written or video documented statement) to district governments and village administration is pursued.</li> </ul>	T2 and T3
<b>Coordinating Ministry of Maritime Affairs and Investment</b> has produced a national roadmap on Land Subsidence Mitigation and Adaptation (in coastal areas)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This is the first national road map that addresses the problem of land subsidence particularly in coastal areas of Indonesia. By having this road map, i) it draws the attention of stakeholders to the serious threat of land subsidence as a form of slow on-set disaster and ii) it provides reference for stakeholders to develop a comprehensive mitigation and adaptation strategy.</li> <li>Up until this time, there has been no specific agency assigned responsibility to address land subsidence, nor has there been a legal/ regulatory framework.</li> <li>The Ministry has also established a working group on</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It has used evidence-based advocacy to raise the critical issue of land subsidence in lowland areas.</li> <li>Through its advocacy, PFR has been able to draw the attention of government stakeholders, especially the Coordinating Ministry of Maritime Affairs to the problem of land subsidence by linking it to the national government's development target in 2015-2019 in recovering coastal areas.</li> <li>PFR provided policy analysis input on relationship between climate change and environment</li> <li>PFR was invited to review documentation and draft</li> </ul>	T2 and T4

	land subsidence mitigation and adaptation as per degree no 5/DII/Maritim/11/2019	section of roadmap	
<b>Ministry of Spatial Planning</b> has developed guidelines for the inclusion of climate risk management and climate change in spatial planning and set up an Expert meeting to obtain submissions and feedback.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The specific feedbacks will potentially improve the Guideline on integration of Climate Change into Spatial Planning and furthermore harmonization with other prepared guidelines (on disaster risk and on strategic environmental study into spatial planning) and ensure that key climate-hazard are included into analysis on development of spatial analysis.</li> <li>Feedback also to suggest harmonization of the two separate guideline on integration of climate change and on integration of disaster risk into spatial planning.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Integration of DRR-CCA was discussed with partners and member of drafting team of Ministry Decree for development of Guideline on Integration of CCA into Spatial Planning in FGD organized jointly with USAID APIK on Oct 10 and on Oct 17, 2018. Brief conclusion on report of IFRC study on “Integration of DRR-CCA into Spatial Planning and Development Plan” was shared.</li> <li>Climate Centre and PfR-IFRC invited into Expert Meeting Oct 29 and Nov 27, 2018, organized by Ministry of Spatial Planning, to collect input from relevant experts to the drafted guideline. PfR Karina involved also in Expert Meeting on Nov 27, 2018,</li> <li>Climate Centre/IFRC shared the IFRC report on “Coordination and Integration of DRR-CCA Into Spatial and Development Planning” to the drafting team of the Guideline.</li> <li>On October 5, 2018, PFR RCCC facilitated meeting with KARINA, IFRC and USAID APIK program to gain input on integration of DRR-CCA into spatial planning, result from IFRC Study, and on plan of each organizations on this topic.</li> </ul>	T2
<b>Ministry of Environment and Forestry</b> has issued a regulation concerning Policy, Strategy, Performance Indicators on National Mangrove Management to accelerate the implementation of the National Strategy on Mangrove Management in Indonesia (Permenko No.4 Year 2017)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>While the national strategy had been in place since 2012, there was no framework for monitoring implementation of the strategy.</li> <li>Issuing this ministerial regulation provides a stronger political and legal signal to encourage acceleration of implementation by relevant ministry/government agency.</li> <li>They are now required to report on progress to the coordinating ministry every six months.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PFR has facilitated multi-stakeholder meetings to update and revise the 2012 national strategy document.</li> <li>It used this opportunity to advocate for issuing a (ministerial) regulation under the coordinating ministry to facilitate monitoring and reporting of progress.</li> <li>Through the process, PFR also ensured the integration of disaster management perspectives into the policy document.</li> <li>It also advocated for inclusion of BNPB within the reporting framework as the authorised national agency for disaster management.</li> </ul>	T4

<p><b>Ministry of Environment and Forestry, under its Forest Research centre (FOERDIA)</b></p> <p>has established a National Multi-stakeholder Forum on Paludiculture (PaludiFor)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PaludiffOR is a multi-stakeholder initiative with the goal to proliferate paludiculture practices to restore and/ preserve peat land area.</li> <li>• It serves as a learning platform that draws practices and evidence from paludiculture demo plots across Indonesia to support the application of good paludiculture practices.</li> <li>• Members of the forum from private sector (WSL and MTI) have started to apply paludiculture in the industrial plantation forest area where they operate and conclude that the practice could benefit the local communities as a source of livelihood and at the same time it optimally supports the conservation function.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PFR Initiated the establishment of the forum by organizing a series of multi-stakeholder meetings to build and secure commitment.</li> <li>• PFR provides support to strengthen the forum via legal status and work plan formulation.</li> <li>• PFR continues to facilitate learning exchange and outreach activities of the forum.</li> <li>• PFR support builds on a longstanding relationship between Wetlands International and the Ministry which has been formalised in an MOU.</li> </ul>	T4
<p><b>Ministry of the Environment &amp; Forestry</b></p> <p>has adopted the watershed management approach into Spatial Planning (through MoU between MoEF and MoASP) and has included an SDG indicator to monitor progress in this area.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The MoU between Ministry of Environment and Forestry (MoEF) and Ministry of Agrarian and Spatial Planning (MoASP) will ensure that all local spatial plans consulted with MoASP will also include consideration of watershed condition and watershed management plan into land use planning in the spatial plan.</li> <li>• Once the spatial plan has included watershed management, its implementation by local governments will be able to reduce risk of flood, landslide, drought, and extreme weather.</li> <li>• Inclusion of Integration of watershed management into spatial plan as an indicator of national SDGs implementation, will ensure that it is monitored by BAPPENAS for measuring achievement of SDGs. Consequently, both national and local governments will pay attention to implement it.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PFR conducted discussion with MoEF, MoASP, and BAPPENAS on integration of watershed management into spatial plan</li> <li>• PFR was invited to discussion on national SDGs indicator with BAPPENAS</li> <li>• PFR proposed 2 indicators, namely integration of watershed management into spatial plan, and resilient city</li> <li>• PFR reviewed MoASP regulation number 1/2018 on spatial planning, and made policy brief on inputs for integrating watershed management into spatial plan</li> <li>• PFR did presentation in front of MoEF and MoASP on proposal to integrate watershed management into spatial plan</li> <li>• PFR audienced with MoEF to propose of having MoU with MoASP</li> <li>• PFR provided inputs on MoU between MoEF and MoASP</li> </ul>	T5
<p><b>Meteorological Agency</b></p> <p>has redesigned its programme on communicating climate forecast information to coastal/fishing communities.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The modules and approach on accessing and disseminating maritime weather forecast for coastal community and fishermen are continuously recognized and disseminated by others (USAID APIK , BMKG) and at least by one local government (Sampang District).</li> </ul>	ND	T2

Provincial Level			
<b>NTT provincial government</b> plans to incorporate IRM principles within its promotion of Eco-tourism	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Governor of NTT identified eco-tourism as a suitable sub-sector for integrating IRM principles. This idea built on the province's earlier exposure to IRM through PFR lobby and advocacy work.</li> <li>The plan is to pilot the approach in one district, and if successful, replicated. However, work has not yet begun. Yet the work at the district level has started to ensure the '<i>Fatuleu</i>' is incorporated in the Grand Design of Tourism of District of Kupang.</li> <li>The initiative provides an example of how the provincial government and governor are taking ownership of the IRM concept and have identified further opportunity to operationalise it in specific sub-sectors such as eco-tourism.</li> <li>Eco-tourism is an identified priority area with the current NTT mid-term development plan.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PFR (Care) has been asked to provide technical input and support to the design of the pilot.</li> <li>This is not fully within the scope of the original ToC but is regarded as an opportunity to reinforce the relationship with the Province and to test out IRM in a specific sub-sector.</li> <li>The program has conducted different activities with the community on revitalizing the community forum on tourism, conduct public campaign on waste management and lobby and advocacy to District Level and managed</li> </ul>	T3
<b>NTT Provincial government</b> incorporated some actions drawn from DM Plan and watershed management plan into the Provincial Mid-Term Development Plan 2018-2023	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It secures financing of activities related to watershed &amp; disaster management from the provincial budget. The total budget allocated based on the plan is around 0.04% of the total budget of NTT Province.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PFR facilitated workshops to develop DM Plan for NTT Province</li> <li>PFR reviewed and provide inputs for the DM Plan</li> <li>PFR facilitated meetings with various stakeholders in order to determine prioritized actions for watershed management and DRR and the adoption of those actions into NTT's mid term development plan 2018-2023</li> </ul>	T5
<b>Central Java Provincial Government</b> has issued a regulation concerning mangrove management strategy (Governor Regulation No. 24/2019) as a legal umbrella for the provincial mangrove management programme	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The provincial strategy for mangrove management require the local government to implement and monitor progress of the mangrove management, rehabilitation and restoration programme.</li> <li>This regulation provides a space in the provincial development budget to fund the mangrove management programme as well as open up the opportunity for external funding, such as from private sector and blended funding to support programme implementation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PFR approached the provincial authority and advocated for the development of a provincial strategy for mangrove management.</li> <li>PFR provided their technical expertise, lessons learned from their field project, and IRM principles into the draft. Furthermore, PFR as a member of the Provincial KKMD (Working Group for Mangrove) used this vehicle to promote, monitor and strengthen the mangrove management program in Central Java.</li> </ul>	T4
<b>Banten Provincial Government</b> has drafted a regulation concerning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A provincial strategy is needed to put in place mangrove ecosystem management actions that is</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Using evidence collected from mangrove ecosystem management practices, PFR advocated for the</li> </ul>	T4

<p>mangrove management strategy) as a legal umbrella for the provincial mangrove management programme</p>	<p>adapted to the local context. Hence, the strategy would support the achievement of development targets of Banten Province in improving the tree (mangrove) coverage in coastal areas as indicated in its mid-term development plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Since mangrove ecosystem management is cross-sectoral in nature, the strategy would serve as guidance for each sector in integrating mangrove ecosystem management to their programs.</li> <li>• As part of the process, the Governor also issued a decree (SK. Gubernur NO. 522.75.051Kep.8 1-Huk/20t9) to formalized the establishment of Provincial Mangrove Working Group/ KKMD (Kelompok Kerja Mangrove Daerah).</li> <li>• However, the draft has not been officially launched by the provincial government because the regional secretary has not given his approval, preferring direct implementation rather than having another policy document.</li> </ul>	<p>formulation of the regional strategy and facilitated multi-stakeholder meetings in formulating the strategy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PFR worked closely with the province and district environmental service, CBO, and also Provincial KKMD (Working Group for Mangrove) in preparing the draft of regional strategy.</li> <li>• Given the regional secretaries reluctance to approve the draft, PFR is continuing to advocate for the strategy while ensuring that important activities to protect mangrove ecosystem are implemented.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>South Sumatra Provincial Government</b> establishes a Provincial regulation concerning peat ecosystem management and protection (Provincial Regulation No. 1/2018) as a legal umbrella for the provincial peat ecosystem protection and management programme</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The provincial regulation on peat ecosystem management and protection regulate on how local government implement and monitor progress of the peat management, rehabilitation and restoration programme including planning, utilizing, controlling, maintaining and hydrological management. It also consist of several obligation, prohibition and sanction for stakeholder related to peat protection and management</li> <li>• This regulation provides a space in the provincial development budget to fund the peat management programme as well as open up the opportunity for external funding, such as from private sector and blended funding to support programme implementation.</li> <li>• However, the implementation of provincial level peat management planning still pending (except for prohibition clauses) since the national government postpone the releases of Nationa Peat management and protection plan, that should become the reference of the provincial regulation.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PFR Using evidence collected from peat ecosystem management practices,</li> <li>• PFR advocated for the formulation of the provincial strategy to be synergize with the national regulation on peat management (PP No.71/2014 and PP.57/2016).</li> <li>• PFR worked closely with the Watershed forum and peat restoration team in South Sumatera in providing technical input related to peat restoration program in South Sumatera, that also becom reference in the development of this regulation</li> <li>• Given the implementation of this regulation still very limited, PFR is continuing to advocate for the implementation of this strategy in the lower level (at district and village level) while ensuring that important activities to protect peat ecosystem are implemented</li> </ul>	<p>T4</p>

District/ Municipality Level			
<b>City of Jakarta (Resilience Secretariat)</b> is developing a Grand Design on community-based DRM (CB-DRM) for the city.	<p>Jakarta is highly vulnerable to disaster risk including flooding, fire and pollution.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Current provisions for disaster management within Jakarta rely on a government-led response with limited participation and role for the community. This impacts negatively on the effectiveness and timeliness of disaster prevention, monitoring and response.</li> <li>• Institutions at community level that could participate already exist but lack the knowledge and authority to intervene.</li> <li>• Development of a Grand Design on CB-DRM by the city is a first step towards mobilising resources for implementation. The next step is incorporation of CBDRM grand design principles within the next mid-term development plan (RPJMD) for Jakarta.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PFR was invited by the city (Chief Resilience Officer) to assist them in drafting the CBDRM grand design. This included provision of technical knowledge as well as the facilitation of the consultation and drafting process.</li> </ul>	T1, T4 and T5
<b>City of Jakarta</b> has officially launched a Grand Design on Urban Farming, based on Watershed and IRM principles. It has also issued a Governor instruction letter on implementation of the Grand Design and has included Urban Farming in its RPJMD (2018-2022).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Within the urban farming grand design, there is actions plan on water conservation, disaster risk reduction (DRR) and climate change adaptation (CCA). As the design has been adopted by the Province government through the instruction letter, so that the related government offices will implement it</li> <li>• The water conservation, DRR, and CCA in the urban farming grand design will contribute to improve Jakarta resilience toward flood and food insecurity risks</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PFR was able to use its resources to upscale a pilot experience on Urban farming which had been funded by the Ford Foundation and Cordaid in one locality of Jakarta.</li> <li>• Building on that experience, PFR was able to propose good practices and guidelines to influence the design of the Grand Design</li> <li>• Through working collaboratively with the Province government, PFR facilitated discussions and workshops on the development of the grand design</li> <li>• PFR also assigned a consultant to work with the government on writing the document of grand design</li> </ul>	T5
<b>Governments of TTS District, Kupang District &amp; Kupang City in NTT province</b> have incorporated IRM principles into their respective strategic environmental assessment (KLHS)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• KLHS is a mandatory assessment that serves as the basis for any region's spatial plan and mid-term development plan, which are the main planning document of a region.</li> <li>• The RPJMD is the main planning document used by district government to finance development activities for the period of five years. If it is not reflected in the plan, it cannot be funded</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PFR has provided technical input and facilitation support (multi-stakeholder consultations) to the two districts and one city to integrate DRM/ IRM into the KLHS documents.</li> <li>• PFR has worked primarily with BAPPEDA, BNPD, department responsible for agriculture and PND.</li> </ul>	T3

documents, which inform the mid-term development plan (RPJMD) of their respective region.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Integration of DRM/ IRM into the RPJMD therefore ensures/ increases likelihood that DRM related interventions including both those falling under the responsibility of BPPD and those mainstreamed into sectors are adequately funded and prioritised. This includes ensuring allocations for district level emergency response, as well as for prevention, mitigation and preparedness actions.</li> <li>The extent to which DRM/ IRM has been fully mainstreamed across NTT sectors is however not clear.</li> </ul>		
<b>BPBD (Disaster Management Agency) of Kupang district, NTT province,</b> Has incorporated IRM and gender issue into their new KRB (disaster risk assessment) document In October 2018	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Law No. 24 of 2007 on Disaster Management and Regulation of the Head of the National Agency for Management Disaster No. 13 of 2014 concerning Gender Mainstreaming in the Field Disaster management. However, the implementation is still not optimal since the intensity of disasters in Indonesia is very high, where women and vulnerable groups are the most vulnerable therefore it is important gender issues to be incorporated in the KRB document</li> <li>Disaster risk assessment document will be a reference for local government in determining development planning</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PfR has provided technical input into new KRB (disaster risk assessment) document</li> <li>PfR has worked very closely with the DRR, and so far PfR has facilitated capacity strengthening for the DRR forum as well so that the forum can also directly provide input in the KRB document</li> </ul>	T3
<b>BAPPEDA (planning agency) of Kupang district, NTT province</b> Has invested in making an Integrated Farm Demonstration Plot covering an area of 10ha by adopting good practice PER 1 CARE developed with UNDANA In July 2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There was a policy or program from Bupati they called "Taman Eden" the government made a demonstration plot for the pilot, and taman eden were required in all villages to be replicated, but the local government didn't understand the concept as to what it should be.</li> <li>Undana is a university that has a large budget for agriculture but has never been used for dry land management. PfR has facilitated a meeting between Undana and Unkris where Unkris has a lecturer and often works as a consultant who understands dryland agriculture. Through the meeting they have developed dryland laboratory and designed agricultural development by involving students.</li> <li>The results of the concept developed by Undana and Unkris are in line with Bupati's mission regarding taman eden, then this concept is left to Bupati or local</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PfR has lobbied Undana and Unkris to share their resources, and has facilitated meetings to discuss the concept of dryland agriculture</li> <li>PfR has provided technical assistance to government and shared knowledge on IRM principles</li> <li>PfR has built an advocacy dialogue actively with the government on policies and programs that they plan to integrate IRM principles</li> </ul>	T3

	<p>government to be implemented.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The demonstration plot has introduced to heads of village and heads of subdistrict so that they have knowledge and can practice it (from the point of view of this plant it can improve food security, as well as save water, and disaster risk reduction)</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Sikka district in NTT province</b> has incorporated the watershed management approach into the Sikka RPJMD (2018-2023)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>66% of activities identified in the watershed management plan are now included in the RPJMD</li> <li>Sikka District Government shall now have to assign budget to enable it to implement these action activities and associated targets.</li> <li>In the annual plan for 2020 itself, around 4.7% of the annual budget plan is allocated for watershed management and DRR actions.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PFR facilitated the development of watershed management plan, together with watershed forum. It includes risk assessment, stakeholder analysis, and developing action plan for watershed management</li> <li>PFR facilitated the development of DM Plan, together with DRR Forum. It includes risk analysis, capacity assessment, and developing action plan for reducing the risk</li> <li>PFR did lobbies to Head of District, BAPPEDA, and BPBD</li> <li>PFR facilitated multi-stakeholder meetings in order to discuss and determine the priority actions from watershed management and disaster management to be included in the mid-term development plan</li> <li>PFR participated in the development planning meeting organized by BAPPEDA, and proposing the watershed management and DM Plans</li> </ul>	T5
<p><b>Sikka and TTS Districts in NTT province</b> have produced Disaster Management Plans that incorporate watershed management and IRM principles</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The disaster management plans serve as one of the main references for district governments on planning programs prioritized in the mid-term development plan</li> <li>The disaster management plan has been legalized through Head of District Regulation number 24/2019, so that it will be referred by all actors working on disaster management in the district (not only government offices)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PFR audienced with BPBD (local disaster management agency) on assessing the local capacity to deal with disaster</li> <li>PFR facilitated workshops with relate stakeholders on capacity assessment and development of DM Plan</li> <li>PFR assigned a consultant to work with BPBD and DRR Forum to formulate the DM Plan</li> <li>PFR worked with BPBD and DRR Forum on proposing the DM Plan to be legalized by the Head of District</li> </ul>	T5
<p><b>Church network (GMIT Synod) in NTT province</b> adopted IRM components into their church programs by establishing</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GMIT Synod is one CSO targets, GMIT plays a very important role to disseminate / promote IRM principles to sub Synod( where 1 sub synod has 35 church members)</li> <li>GMIT Synod has also developed its field of work on</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PFR has provided technical assistance for GMIT Synod</li> <li>PFR has facilitated capacity strengthening for the GMIT Synod</li> </ul>	T3



“water planting” in all their programs, declaring November as the month of the environment where the congregation was encouraged to make water planting holes	the issue of disaster management, therefore integrating IRM through disaster risk reduction practices such establishing “water planting” becomes important because it will support the mission of GMIT		
<b>Serang City in Banten Province</b> has revised its spatial plan (RTRW) to accommodate mangrove ecosystem protection and has developed a DRR plan that adopts IRM measures in relation to mangrove management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The previous RTRW assigned Sawah Luhur and Banten area as zones for industry and warehousing. It did not consider the effect on the mangrove ecosystem that has an important role for local livelihood and in disaster risk reduction.</li> <li>However, it is noted that up until now, the revised spatial plan has not been published, thus there is uncertainty how far reaching/ comprehensive the revisions are.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PFR conducted study to determine minimum width of coastal set back line considering risk of coastal erosion in Serang coastal areas</li> <li>PFR advocated for the revision of the spatial plan with its partners: CBO (KPAPPD), environment Service in Province &amp; District level, and the local disaster management agency.</li> <li>Bappeda claims that the petition for revision has been accommodated, however, the revised RTRW itself has not been published hence the stakeholders have not been able to verify whether the revised RTRW truly accommodates their input.</li> </ul>	T4
<b>Serang City in Banten Province</b> establishes a DRR Forum (legalized by enactment of major decree No. 360/2018 )	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This regulation become the legal standing of the DRR forum in serang as multistakeholder forum that concern in further mainstreaming IRM in to development agenda. DRR forum became a multi-stakeholder platform that enabled the learning exchange, promoted initiatives and act as media of policy intervention in DRR issue including capacity strengthening in DRR for community, private sector and Civil Society Organisations(CSO).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PfR in collaboration with DRR agency of Kota Serang has facilitated the establishment of the Forum since 2018 by providing budget for series of meeting and workshop as well as provided technical input in developing and directing this new organisation. The activity are including: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Initial Workshop /Awareness raising</li> <li>2. Establishment of DRR Forum</li> <li>3. Series of Coordination meeting</li> <li>4. Capacity building</li> <li>5. Regular coordination and assistance from PfR</li> </ol> </li> </ul>	T4
<b>Serang City in Banten Province</b> has adopted IRM measures for mangrove rehabilitation incorporated into its Disaster management Plan. (This includes use	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The disaster management plans serve as one of the main references for the city governments on planning programs prioritized in the mid-term development plan</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PFR conducting participatory risk assessment for coastal areas in Kota Serang , that audienced with DRR agency of Kota Serang</li> <li>Pfr Conducted and facilitated capacity strengthening workshop in preparation of DM plan development workshop</li> </ul>	T4

of green infrastructure in addressing coastal erosion, and mangrove based livelihood and ecotourism).		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PFR participated and presented the result in as series of DM plan workshops</li> </ul>	
<b>BAPPEDA (Planning Agency) of Demak District in Central Java Province</b> has allocated budget for IRM practices for wetlands management within the 2020 annual development planning document (RKP 2020).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This budget will enable the replication of IRM practices for wetland management in Demak District. This will primarily increase the capacity of local communities and enable them to adopt and maintain green infrastructures to reduce coastal risk erosion in Demak.</li> <li>Specifically, within the 2020 annual development planning document (RKP 2020), Demak allocated IDR 1,275 Billion (EUR 81.000) from Public fund (APBD) for Destana (village resilience program) at Tambak bulusan (one of WII's target area), coastal field school and HE/ Hybrid engineering maintenance.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Building on the previous policy engagement in Demak District, as well as evidence &amp; learning from on-site activities with communities in Demak, PFR has continued to advocate for IRM-based coastal management and its integration into the district's development plan.</li> </ul>	T4
<b>Demak District in Central Java Province</b> has established its District DRR Forum (legalized by enactment of regent Decree no.360/286/2019)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This regulation become the legal standing of the DRR forum in Demak district as multistakeholder forum that concern in further mainstreaming IRM in to development agenda in Demak.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PfR in collaboration with DRR agency Demak has facilitated the establishment of the Forum since 2018 by providing budget for series of meeting and workshop as well as provided technical input in developing and directing this new organisation. The activity are including: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Initial Workshop /Awareness raising</li> <li>Establishment of DRR Forum</li> <li>Series of Coordination meeting</li> <li>Capacity building</li> <li>Regular coordination and assistance from</li> </ol> </li> </ul>	T4
<b>OKI District in South Sumatra Province,</b> Released an instruction/circular letter to strengthen the district level industrial program by using Paludiculture/Peat native- Species	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Massive peat conversion resulted to purun (native peat species) areas left under threats. The local policy on purun protection is very important to ensure the areas well protected and sustainably managed. At the moment, the process of legalisation of local policy on peat species conservation and sustainable management through development of purun management plan is is still on going. As an another policy windows outcome, the government has released thi circular letter to also support and provided market</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PfR have conducted several meeting for IRM capacity building with Purun Institute, a local NGO working for purun conservation. This bring in to joint action that agreed on February 2019 to propose the development of management system for Purun ecosystem to the district authority. WII then financial and technically support Purun Institute to do Participatory mapping with the community and do the public consultation to develop community based group that will be arranged for Purun Ecosystem Management. The draft is</li> </ul>	T4

	for Purun product, in other to promote a sustainable management of Purun and peat area	currently in the process of discussion with district authority . While waiting for the finalisation, the organisation push government also to promote the marketing side of Purun products that will provide incentives to the community to sustainably managed Purun and Peat ecosystem in their areas	
<b>OKI District in South Sumatra Province</b> drafted a revision of its spatial plan (RTRW) to accommodate a native peat species ecosystem (purun) protection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The incorporation into spatial planning as strategic areas means that the spatial planning process should consider for this areas in order to be conserved and protected, to prevent extension of peat fire impacted areas in OKI's district</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PfR financially and technically support Purun Institute to do Participatory mapping with the community and do the public consultation to develop community based group that will be arranged for Purun Ecosystem Management. The draft is currently in the process of discussion with district authority . While waiting for the finalisation, the organisation push government also to protect the location by putting the status as strategic areas in its spatial planning plan</li> </ul>	T4
<b>Village Level</b>			
<b>Selected villages in TTS and Kupang districts, in NTT province</b> have allocated an increasing percentage of their village fund to IRM related activities such as: sustainable agriculture practices & various measures and techniques to protect water sources and mitigate relevant hazards.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In the context of decentralisation in Indonesia, the Village Law allocates substantial funding to each of Indonesia's village governments to promote local level development.</li> <li>This creates an opportunity to allocate resources to finance DRM/ IRM related activities. However, until now, there has been no framework nor guidance for doing so.</li> <li>Selected villages with support from PFR have now assigned significant levels of funding to activities that promote DRM broadly defined and which align with gender-sensitive IRM.</li> <li>The village fund is also the main instrument available at community level to replicate good practices and to promote DRM-IRM on a sustainable basis.</li> <li>Community members are now increasingly aware of the importance of taking measures to protect their environment, especially water sources and to reduce disaster risk, and are able to incorporate these activities into their village development plan</li> <li>Women are increasingly involved in consultative processes and decision-making substantively in the</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assisting villages to assign budgets for DRM related activities which take account of gender-sensitive IRM principles. This has been done by i) sharing knowledge on tested technologies such as drip irrigation and injection wells; ii) training and coaching village formulation teams and village administrators; iii) training Min of Village Community Empowerment Officers.</li> <li>PFR also took a strategic approach in increasing awareness on gender equality by providing a platform &amp; space for women to be able to participate and voice out their inputs in decision-making process.</li> <li>PFR also advocate the village plan to the district government, to ensure that the plan will be accepted, and village fund could be used to fund the activities in accordance to the prevailing regulations.</li> </ul>	T3

	target villages.		
<b>4 Villages (respectively in OKI &amp; MUBA Districts in South Sumatera Province, kepulauan Meranti District in Riau Province and Pulang Pisau District, in Central Kalimantan Province)</b> have passed regulations on fire prevention in peatland area	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• These actions are taking place within framework of the workplan of the Peatland Restoration Agency of 2016, and represent among the first actions to implement the workplan at local level.</li> <li>• the regulation provides a strong mandate to implement ecosystem management measures, including the necessary budget to support and ensure peat fire prevention in each village.</li> <li>• Simultaneously, it builds the awareness of the relevant village on the risks of peat fire and any activities that could cause such hazard.</li> <li>• Rambai Village Authority, for example, has even rejected the operation of PT. BHP for palm oil plantation that is located next to the village, knowing the impact of the plantation to the peat area and to their village.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PFR has worked to raise awareness and build capacity of village authority and villagers through participatory risk assessment and series of trainings.</li> <li>• PFR facilitated the meetings in drafting the village regulation and further facilitated the meetings between village representatives to local authority, such as legal bureau, to ensure that the village regulation is aligned with the criteria and could be acknowledged as a Village Regulation by the local government.</li> </ul>	T4
<b>4 Villages in Demak District, Central Java Province</b> have passed regulations on coastal mangrove eco-system management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regulations are being enforced and communities mobilised to take actions to protect mangrove eco-systems.</li> <li>• Community members found cutting mangrove have been reported and sanctioned by village government</li> <li>• Community members are active in maintaining and planting mangrove to protect coastal eco-systems.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PFR has partnered with another programme "Building with Nature Project" that focuses on integrated coastal management</li> <li>• District regulations in Sikka on coastal management were already enacted in NTT province under PFR 1. Therefore, this represents a continuation of the process.</li> </ul>	T4
<b>14 Villages in Sikka district, NTT province,</b> have integrated the watershed management approach into their Village Development Plans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• By adopting priority action plans on watershed management into village development plan, the community will be able to directly implement measures using their village fund.</li> <li>• The advocacy and facilitation process to the villages raise the awareness of village authorities on the importance of IRM for the benefit of their village. For example, i) the construction of green wells has helped some villagers to continue to have water supply during dry season; ii) The construction of retention basins in order to provide water supply for paddy field as opposed to the old practice of using water pump that drains more water particularly in dry season.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PFR organized a workshop in 2019 with all of the target villages to assist them in developing priority actions for watershed management.</li> <li>• Aside from support at the village level, PFR also collaborated with the district government to promote watershed management approach.</li> <li>• Using windows of opportunity, such as the MoHA regulation on the management of village fund for 2020, that includes watershed management as one of the items of activity to promote, and by connecting the village authority with district government &amp; parliaments, PFR partners helped to ensure that the village's development plan could be approved by the</li> </ul>	T5

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In 2019, the villages allocated between 10-40% of their village fund budget to watershed management activities such as land rehabilitation, planting trees, livelihood strengthening, water restoration, disaster risk reduction.</li> </ul>	district government.	
--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------	--

## Annex 2: Challenges of Working with Government

Recording results in terms of influencing government decisions whether at national, sub-national or village level is not without its challenges:

### **Planning and Budgeting**

*Approval of Village development plan and Budget* – although in principle, villages have been granted significant autonomy to develop their village development plans and budgets, they require approval by the district government, which will check that proposals are in line with their own development plans. If they are not, proposals can be rejected. Villages, and PFR have learned the importance of engaging the district authorities in good time to ensure there is alignment and to avoid disappointment.

*Approval of District/ Provincial development plan and Budget* – Proposals developed at a technical level with relevant technical agencies are ultimately submitted to the district/ provincial legislature for consideration and approval. Political considerations can result in overriding or adjustment of technical proposals and negation of the work jointly developed between the PFR and technocrats. For example, political leaders might change the beneficiary villages of a certain intervention to another village of their choosing because that is their constituent base

*Bias towards Infrastructure* – Directives on the use of the village fund give priority to infrastructure projects (70-80%) because: (i) they are fast disbursing and help reach spending targets and (ii) direction from the central government is to focus on basic infrastructure building: road, water and now housing. This means that villages will under-invest on capacity strengthening and community development and will look to development NGOs to finance the funding gap. This also applies to district and provincial levels of government.

*Funding Constraints* - Identification of proposals within the development plan does not guarantee follow-up implementation. Often, budgetary allocations to technical departments fall short of what has been requested meaning that activities are suspended or deferred. In Kupang district for example, there were inadequate funds to support the district DRR forum whereas in neighbouring Kupang city, adequate funds could be mobilised. In Serang City, the environmental service did not receive any budget allocation for mangrove rehabilitation in 2018-2019, even though one of the indicators for quality of the environment in the district development plan and annual workplan is tree and mangrove coverage in coastal areas.

### **Bureaucracy**

*Silo approach* - As elsewhere in the world, the Indonesian bureaucracy is highly segmented and compartmentalised. A silo mentality tends to prevail, with each department/ unit guided by legally defined mandates, regulations, plans and budgets. This makes the task of promoting horizontal and mainstreaming modalities, such as developing integrated policies and regulations, as promoted by PFR challenging to implement. It can also create duplications of efforts. For example, the activities related to 'New Urban Agenda' indicators and 'Resilient City' indicators overlap. When asked about the difference between these two initiatives, there is no clear answer. However, these initiatives are led by two different agencies: New Urban Agenda is initiated by Ministry of Public Works while 'Resilient City' is an initiative of BNPB (National disaster management agency). To address this challenge, the programme has supported the establishment of joint platforms or "sekber" and working groups (pokja) to encourage openness and collaboration. However often the incentive for units/ departments to collaborate with one another is when they have a budget deficit and need to mobilise funds from another source, including from CSOs.

*Staff turn-over and limited institutional memory* – There is considerable staff turnover within the public service at all levels and also frequent changes of structures. This can negate the achievements of relationship building and awareness raising and require starting again. It can also mean that the new incumbents are not even aware of the decisions and regulations that have been made by predecessors. The problem is exacerbated because of a lack of teamwork and knowledge sharing resulting in limited institutional memory. So part of the work of CSOs is to conduct the induction and orientation of new personnel of government, when this is not forthcoming.

*Elections* - Local election (leadership change in district/city and village level) offers a very crucial momentum for policy advocacy. Change of leadership usually means a change of policy since it will be dictated by the vision and mission of the newly elected leader. This could be a window to advocate for certain policy, to be engaged in the development planning process, but also could be a challenge in trying to ensure that the previous work and good policy will be continued in the next leadership period.

### Annex 3: List of persons interviewed

No.	Name	Designation	Organisation	Location
1.	Yuli Utami	Head of Sub-directorate for Watershed Management Institutionalization	Ministry of Environment and Forestry	Jakarta
2.	Hari	Head of Section for Information System, Sub-directorate of Internalization of Watershed Management		
3.	Mahendra	Directorate of Planning and Evaluation on the watershed control and Forest Protection		
4.	Dr. Ir. Oswar M. Mungkasa, MURP	Former Deputy Governor of Environment and Spatial of DKI Jakarta	Formerly: DKI Jakarta Provincial Government  Currently stationed in BAPPENAS (National Development Planning Agency)	Jakarta
5.	Dr. Raditya Jati	Director for Disaster management Strategy Development	Badan Nasional Penanggulangan Bencana/ BNPB (National Disaster Management Agency)	Jakarta
6.	Cahyo Nugroho	Head of Sub-director for Governance		
7.	Wicaksono Agung	Staff – Disaster Analyst		
8.	Ari Mochammad	Climate Change Adaptation Governance Advisor	USAID APIK	Jakarta
9.	Putra Dwitama	Former Head of RAN API Secretariat	RAN API Secretariat (National Secretariat for National Action Plan for Climate Change Adaptation), Bappenas	
10.	Nurcholis	The Head of Sub-directorate for Cooperation – Puslatmas/ Training Center of Ministry of Village	Puslatmas, Ministry of Village	Jakarta
11.	Roswitha	Coordinator PfR	CiS Timor	Kupang City
12.	Haris Oeamata	Coordinator	CiS Timor	
13.	Willy	Knowledge Management	CiS Timor	
14.	Atawuwur	District Officer	CiS Timor	
15.	Elfred	District Officer	CiS Timor	
16.	Purwono Yunianto	Advocacy Officer	KARINA	
17..	Azer Naben & Villagers (more and less 20 people)  Women: - Ersi - Wita - Helmi - Yusmina	Azer Naben as Village Chief	Oelbiteno Village	Kupang District



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Delfi</li> <li>- Marteda</li> <li>- Beryana</li> <li>- Rachel</li> <li>- Kori</li> <li>- Selvina</li> <li>- Petronela</li> </ul>			
10.	Maxi Ndolu Eoh	Head of Economic Affairs	BP4D (District Development Planning & Research Agency)	Kupang District
11.	Samuel	Secretary of BPBD	BPBD (District Disaster Management Agency)	
12.	Partenus Vinci	Head of Environmental Service	Environmental Service (Dinas Lingkungan Hidup & Kebersihan)	
13.	Marcus	Head of Sub-division of Village Community Empowerment	Village Community Empowerment Division (PMD)	
14.	Silvester	Head of DRR Forum of Kupang City	DRR Forum Kupang City	Kupang City
15.	Buce Gah	Head of DRR Forum of NTT Province	DRR Forum NTT Province	Kupang City
16.	Yuven Wangge	Project Coordinator for PfR	CKM & Secretary of DRR Forum	Maumere City
17.	Win Keupung	DRR Forum of Sikka District	Wahana Tani Mandiri (CSO)	
18.	Donatus Salfaritus	Head of Water Resources Management Division	Bapelitbang (Research & Development Planning Agency of Sikka District)	
19.	Bakri Kari	Head of Emergency Unit	BPBD (Sikka District Disaster Management Agency)	
20.	Selastina Sanggo	Head of Service Division	Magenpanda Village Administration	
21.	Yossi	Village governance unit	Koalisi B Village Administration	Magepanda Sub-district, Sikka
22.	Alvridus Nong Nita	Head of Planning		
23.	Antonius Mbomba	Head of BPD & Head of Watershed Forum of Magepanda Sub-district	BPD (Village Empowerment Agency)	Magepanda Sub-district, Sikka District
24.	Urip	Community Facilitator – Serang City	Wetland	Serang City
25.	Kasrudin	Head of KPAPPD	KPAPPD/ Kelompok Peduli Pelestarian Alam Pulau Dua (community-based organization for nature & environmental preservation of Pulau Dua)	Serang City
26.	Babay	Secretary of KPAPPD		
27.	Yadi	Treasurer of KPAPPD		
28.	Indah Damayanti	Head of Section for Environmental	Dinas LH Provinsi	Serang City

		Preservation	(Provincial Environmental Service)	
29.	Pingkan Intan Miranda	Head of Section of Environmental Damage	Dinas LH Kota Serang (Municipal Environmental Service)	
30.	Eva Hasanah	Head of Section for Emergency & Logistics (Previously Head of Section for Prevention & Emergency in 2015-2019)	BPBD Serang City (Serang City Disaster Management Agency)	Serang City
31.	Sahat M. Panggabean	Assistant Deputy for Disaster and Environment	Coordinating Ministry of Maritime and Investment	Jakarta
32.	Setio Yuwono	Head of Sub-directorate of Reforestation	Ministry of Environment & Forestry	Jakarta
33.	Bagus Dwi Rahmanto	Sub-directorate of Reforestation for Mangrove	Ministry of Environment & Forestry	
34.	Agus Tampubolon	Head of FOERDIA, Puslihut/ Center of Training of Forestry Department	FOERDIA – Forestry and Environmental Research Development and Innovation Agency - Bogot	Jakarta
35.	Annisa Srikandini	PFR Coordinator and Trajectory 3 Lead	Care, Indonesia	
36.	Robert Sulisty	Trajectory 1 Lead	IFRC	
37.	Raja Siregar	Trajectory 2 Lead	RCCC	
38.	Susan Lusiana	Trajectory 4 Lead	Wetlands Indonesia	
39.	Johan Santosa	Trajectory 5, Lead	Karina	
40.	Chasan Ascholani	Trajectory 5, Consultant	Karina	
41.	Rezky S. Yusuf	KM and Reporting Specialist, PFR	Care	
42.	Teguh Wibowo		PMI	
43.	Arifin Hadi	Head of Disaster Management	PMI	

## Annex 4 - Schedule of Meetings

Date	Time	Organisation	Name	Designation	Meeting venue
9 March 2020	09.00 – 12.00	PfR Alliance	1) Annisa Srikandini	CARE	Wisma PMI, Jakarta
			2) Rezky S. Yusuf	CARE	
			3) Chasan A.	KARINA	
			4) Johan R.S.	KARINA	
			5) Robert Sulistyono	IFRC	
			6) Raja Siregar	RCCC	
			7) Teguh Wibowo	PMI	
9 March 2020	13.00 – 14.00	Ministry of Environment and Forestry	8) Susan Lusiana	WII	Office of Ministry of Environment & Forestry, Jakarta
			9) Hery F.	PMI	
			Yuli Utami	Head of Sub-directorate for Watershed Management Institutionalization	
			Hari	Head of Section for Information System, Sub-directorate of Internalization of Watershed Management	
			Mahendra	Directorate of Planning and Evaluation on the watershed control and Forest Protection	
			Dr. Ir. Oswar M. Mungkasa, MURP	Former Deputy Governor of Environment and Spatial of DKI Jakarta	
10 March 2020	09.00 – 10.00	Currently stationed in BAPPENAS (National Development Planning Agency)			Office of Bappenas, Jakarta
			Dr. Raditya Jati	Director for Disaster management Strategy Development	
			Cahyo Nugroho	Head of Sub-director for Governance	
			Wicaksono Agung	Staff – Disaster Analyst	
			Ari Mochammad	Climate Change Adaptation Governance Advisor	
			Putra Dwitama	Former Head of RAN API Secretariat	
10 March 2020	11.00 – 12.00	USAID APIK Project			Setiabudi One, Jakarta
		RAN API Secretariat (National Secretariat for National Action)			

Date	Time	Organisation	Name	Designation	Meeting venue
11 March 2020		Plan for Climate Change Adaptation), Bappenas			
	13.30 – 14.30	Puslatmas/ Center for Training for Community, Ministry of Village	Nurcholis	The Head of Sub-directorate for Cooperation – Puslatmas/ Training Center of Ministry of Village	Office of Ministry of Village, Jakarta
	17:00 – 18:15	Karina	Chasan Ascholani	Consultant, Trajectory 5	Skype Call
	14.00 – 17.00	CiS Timor	Roswitha	Coordinator PfR	CiS Timor Office, Kupang City
		CiS Timor	Haris Oeamata	Coordinator	
		CiS Timor	Willy	Knowledge Management	
		CiS Timor	Atawuwur	District Officer	
		CiS Timor	Elfred	District Officer	
		KARINA	Purwono Yuniato	Advocacy Officer	
	14:00-15:00	Care	Anissa Srikandini	Lead, Trajectory 3 and PFR Coordinator	Skype Call
12 March 2020	10.00-11.00	Oelbiteno Village	Azer Naben & villagers (more and less 20 people)	Village Chief	Oelbiteno village office, Kupang District
			Women: - Ersi - Wita - Helmi - Yusmina - Delfi - Marteda - Beryana - Rachel - Kori - Selvina - Petronela	Women (farmers) group	
12 March 2020	16.00 – 17.00 (note: the meeting was scheduled at	BP4D (District Development Planning & Research Agency)	Maxi Ndolu Eoh	Head of Economic Affairs	Office of Kupang District Government, Kupang District
		BPBD (District Disaster Management Agency)	Samuel	Secretary of BPBD	

Date	Time	Organisation	Name	Designation	Meeting venue
	<i>13.00, but delayed and we had to wait for the Vice Governor to officially start the meeting)</i>	Environmental Service (Dinas Lingkungan Hidup & Kebersihan)	Partenus Vinci	Head of Environmental Service	
		Village Community Empowerment Division (PMD)	Marcus	Head of Sub-division of Village Community Empowerment	
	17.00 – 18.00	DRR Forum Kupang City	Silvester	Head of DRR Forum of Kupang City	During car trip from Kupang District to Kupang City
	19.30 – 20.30	DRR Forum NTT Province	Buce Gah	Head of DRR Forum of NTT Province	Neo Eltari's restaurant, Kupang City
13 March 2020	10.00 – 12.00	CKM & Secretary of DRR Forum	Yuven Wangge	Project Coordinator for PfR	Office of CKM, Maumere City
		Wahana Tani Mandiri (CSO)	Win Keupung	DRR Forum of Sikka District	
		Bapelitbang (Research & Development Planning Agency of Sikka District)	Donatus Salfaritus	Head of Water Resources Management Division	
		BPBD (Sikka District Disaster Management Agency)	Bakri Kari	Head of Emergency Unit	
		Magenpanda Village Administration	Selastina Sanggo	Head of Service Division	
13 March 2020	14.00 – 14.30	Koalisia B Village Administration	Yossi	Village governance unit	Magepanda Sub-district, Sikka
			Alvridus Nong Nita	Head of Planning	
	15.00 – 15.30	BPD (Village Empowerment Agency)	Antonius Mbomba	Head of BPD & Head of Watershed Forum of Magepanda Sub-district	Antonius Mbomba's house, Magepanda Sub-district, Sikka District
	13:00-14:00	Wetlands International	Susan Lusiana	Lead, Trajectory 4	Skype Call
	15:00-16:00	IFRC	Robert Sulisty	Lead, Trajectory 1	Skype Call
	16:00-17:00	Red Cross Climate Centre	Raja Siregar	Lead, Trajectory 2	Skype Call

Date	Time	Organisation	Name	Designation	Meeting venue
15 March 2020	09.00 – 10.00	Wetland	Urip	Community Facilitator – Serang City	Restaurant, Serang City
		KPAPPD/ Kelompok Peduli	Kasrudin	Head of KPAPPD	
		Pelestarian Alam Pulau Dua	Babay	Secretary of KPAPPD	
		(community-based organization for nature & environmental preservation of Pulau Dua)	Yadi	Treasurer of KPAPPD	
	10.15 – 11.00	Dinas LH Provinsi (Provincial Environmental Service)	Indah Damayanti	Head of Section for Environmental Preservation	Via phone call, Serang City (due to Covid, civil servants in Banten Province are instructed to avoid meeting/gathering)
		Dinas LH Kota Serang (Municipal Environmental Service)	Pingkan Intan Miranda	Head of Section of Environmental Damage	
	11.00 – 12.00	BPBD Serang City (Serang City Disaster Management Agency)	Eva Hasanah	Head of Section for Emergency & Logistics (Previously Head of Section for Prevention & Emergency in 2015-2019)	Restaurant, Serang City
16 March 2020	09.00 – 10.00	Coordinating Ministry of Maritime and Investment	Sahat M. Panggabean	Assistant Deputy for Disaster and Environment	Office of Coordinating Ministry of Maritime and Investment, Jakarta
16 March 2020	10.30 – 11.15	Ministry of Environment & Forestry	Setio Yuwono	Head of Sub-directorate of Reforestation	Jakarta
		Ministry of Environment & Forestry	Bagus Dwi Rahmanto	Sub-directorate of Reforestation for Mangrove	
	'13.00 – 13.30	FOERDIA – Forestry and Environmental Research Development and Innovation Agency - Bogor	Agus Tampubolon	Head of FOERDIA, Puslihut/ Center of Training of Forestry Department	Via phone call, Jakarta
18 March 2020	14:00-15:00	Care Indonesia	Rezky Yusuf	Knowledge Management & Data Reporting Specialist, PFR II	Skype Call

## Annex 5 – List of Documents Consulted

- Program Proposal for PFR II Indonesia 2016-2020
- Indonesia PMEL bi-annual and annual Reports; 2017, 2018, 2019
- Indonesia DCF Excel Spreadsheet
- Assessment on Progress of Progress of Capacity Strengthening Goal 20202 for IFRC, RCCC, Care, Wetlands and Karina
- Capacity Strengthening Goals updates for IFRC, RCCC, Care, Wetlands and Karina
- Indonesia PME Capacity Strengthening Powerpoint Overview Presentation (2020)
- PFR Integrated Risk Management Law and Policy Check List Document
- PFR Indonesia Knowledge Management Framework and Data Base (2020)
- PFR programme Budget spreadsheets for IFRC, RCCC, Care and Karina
- Sample of knowledge Products from Karina