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1. Background

Previous studies have shown that many SKPDs (local government technical agencies) remain resistant to community proposals developed through Musrenbang (Development Planning Meetings). Many factors have prevented community priorities from connecting to district-level budgeting, including poorly formulated village proposals that are sometimes too small to attract attention or provide incentives for local government agencies to respond positively to community proposals. To address these factors, P2SPP (Program Pembangunan Sistem Perencanaan Partisipatif or the Participatory System Development Program, was designed in 2006 to supplement the village planning under PNPM Rural). P2SPP (named PNPM Integrasi in 2011) aims to integrate PNPM’s participatory development planning into regular development planning and align political technocratic planning with participatory planning. P2SPP provides block grant at the district level for kecamatan-level projects generated through the PNPM Rural and Musrenbang participatory planning process.

The initial selection P2SPP pilot locations were based upon the following criteria: districts considered successful in implementing the participatory planning system, the commitment to integrate participatory planning into regular system, and the will to improve the capacity of community and village government actors. P2SPP was first piloted in four districts in May 2006. By 2011 it was implemented in 38 districts in 29 provinces. Implementation was divided into two components: First, integration activities covering village development planning, village government management improvement, planning alignment, and improved support from local government and DPRD; Second, capacity building activities covering: support for various village and subdistrict institutions such as KPMD, LPMD, BKAD, and UPK, training of village officials and the village council (BPD), and training of subdistrict and district cadres of Setrawan.

2. Objective and Methodology

The objective of this study is to better understand interactions between the participatory processes at the PNPM community level and regular local government development planning processes (Musrenbang). Further, this study seeks to understand whether the interactions have resulted in program priorities and budget allocations more favorable to village community development priorities. The study uses a qualitative evaluation/research method in the following steps:

1. Observe the process of integration of PNPM planning with regular planning at Musrenbang meetings;
2. Interview key actors of P2SPP and planning integration;
3. Hold focus group discussions at the village and subdistrict levels with local NGOs and at district level;
4. Analyze secondary P2SPP data.

Research was conducted over the period February–May 2011 in six P2SPP districts: Boyolali, Batanghari, Ngada, Tapin, Sumedang and Gunung Kidul. The six districts were selected because they are seen as successful in implementing P2SPP, according to an assessment by the Ministry of Home Affairs.

3. Lessons Learned from the Field

From the six districts studied, it can be concluded that the integration of PNPM planning with village Medium-Term Development Planning (RPJM-Desa) is beginning to take place. Musrenbang meetings held in P2SPP locations also include proposals for PNPM Mandiri and P2SPP. However, the Village RPJM-Desa are still ‘inward looking’ which at times make them difficult to access for district agencies. There are two reasons for this. First, the drafting of RPJM-Desa lacks the support of available planning documents (RPJMD and Renstra SKPD) at the district and subdistrict levels as reference for villages in preparing their planning documents. Secondly, the subdistricts themselves do not have subdistrict development plans containing clear development programs to guide village planning (the subdistrict plans only cover subdistrict administration, not development targets). These findings imply that planning has become fragmented horizontally (between villages) and vertically (village versus district planning).

The resistance of district SKPD to village proposals from subdistrict Musrenbang is caused by a number of factors. First, proposals are perceived as lacking standardization and consistency with district planning. Second, village proposals are relatively small scale and difficult to adopt by district agencies. Third, SKPDs have limited discretionary funds available which requires them to focus more on compulsory type of programs/activities whose targets have been established in the legally binding RPJMD.

With the limited adoption of community priorities in the local budget, P2SPP’s impact on public services has been driven by the participation of APBD and SKPD program in the PNPM block grant (BLM) allocations. For instance, SKPDs have picked up P2SPP proposals for early childhood education (PAUD) buildings, inter-village/subdistrict bridges and inter-village/subdistrict roads, meaning they do not need to allocated funds for these in their regular budget. There is less evidence that district planning in itself is becoming more responsive to community needs. For example, in the Early Childhood Development (PAUD) facility development. P2SPP stakeholders held discussions with the Education Technical Agency (Dinas Pendidikan) about division of funding, rather than directly funding the entire project (Dinas’ financial support for learning operations). In addition, the maintenance costs for infrastructure built using block grant were an issue in all the districts studied. There is thus a concern about the long-term sustainability of P2SPP – at the moment, it is with a few notable exceptions (see below) more of an additional funding source than influencing the planning system.

As part of program facilitation, district Setrawan (government officials supported by P2SPP to promote community empowerment) have not always successfully bridged the
gap between community priorities and the SKPD program. This is because their position as PMD staff is temporary and relatively weak within the SKPD’s organizational structure. The study also found that P2SPP-facilitated dialog between the community and DPRD (Local Legislative Council) have not been very successful. In general, however, this is not related to the DPRD’s commitment to budget allocations that meet community aspirations but rather because DPRD members prefer to use their own mechanism for identifying such aspirations by means of their recess, work visits and dialog with commissions/factions. Despite its minor impact on budget allocations, the dialog between DPRD and the community has paved the way for further communication in the initiation of broader policy advocacy by the community.

4. Good Practices and Innovations

P2SPP-promoted good practices that should be strengthened include:

- The study found that through intense facilitation, P2SPP has made significant contributions to village institution development. These include: i.) P2SPP has successfully promoted cooperation between stakeholders in PNPM-MP, LPMD and Village Governments in drawing up RPJM-Desa and implementing program proposals at the village and subdistrict levels; ii.) P2SPP has created skilled local facilitators (KPMD and subdistrict Setrawan) to support participatory planning method in regular planning; and iii.) the slogan of ‘one village, one plan’ has become well-known and practiced in almost all P2SPP-supported villages and beyond, and is being scaled-up to all PNPM jurisdictions in 2012.

- The use of clear budget allocation known to all in the subdistrict in both PNPM and P2SPP brings clarity to the planning process. This is something that the regular Musrenbang process could learn from PNPM.

- Social networks have been created among stakeholders beyond the village level such as cross-SKPD Forum, BKAD Information Café (Warung informasi), and BKAD Coordination Forum (Boyolali) have the potential to promote and guide community priorities on the district scale. Policy advocacy provided by P2SPP stakeholders through ‘multi-stakeholder dialogues’ has promoted better commitment of local governments to make and implement innovations.

- P2SPP has in some of the better jurisdictions promoted communication and cooperation between the local branch of PMD and Bappeda. This serves as an ‘entry point’ to address fragmentation of planning at the district level.

These innovations and good practices at the local level seem heavily dependent on the local context, including leadership and capacity of Bappeda, the role of Local Government Budgetary Team (TAPD), local politicians, and existence of local NGOs focusing on budgeting and public services and public participation culture.

5. Policy and Program Recommendations

a. Village Level Integration (Horizontal Integration)
Financial sources for village development programs should be increased and consolidated into village budgets (APB-Desa). Villages should also adopt the institutional function of PNPM/P2SPP, which as shown to be good for village government processes—for example, the Verification Team, TPK, Accountability Forums and presence of a Facilitator Team. With the ‘one village, one plan’ policy in operation, the next target is to achieve ‘one village, one budget,’ which envisions a single village budget (that is drafted participatory and published transparently) with different sources of funding (own-source, district, province, national).

b. Musrenbang Integration (Vertical Integration)

As in PNPM and P2SPP, subdistrict indicative allocations (Pagu Indikatif Kecamatan or PIK) and subdistrict development plans should be published before village and subdistrict Musrenbang takes place. If the PIK is used, program proposals will not be fragmented at the village level, and will not exceed the existing financial capacity. In addition, it is also necessary to strengthen community control over the level up to the APBD allocation decision maker. Therefore, the presence of community representatives (Forum Delegasi Musrenbang) in RKPD and APBD forums becomes important.

In order to develop training programs and strengthen the capacity of planning and budgeting facilitators in a sustainable way to improve the quality of Musrenbang outputs, the function of subdistrict Setrawan should be embedded in the district PMD Section Head and the function of district Setrawan should be embedded in the SKPD-Planning Section Head.

To support village-level planning it is necessary to create subdistrict task forces with the function to provide supporting documents (RPJMD and SKPD Work Plans) and assistance to villages in accessing and analyzing these plans. This could be done by encouraging the type of multi-stakeholder dialogues supported by P2SPP.

c. Encouraging the Support of Community Priorities by Local Governments

The Dinas’ frontline service agencies (UPTD) should consult with communities to form the basis for developing Strategic Plans (Renstra), SKPD Work Plan and service standards pursuant to Government Regulation 8/2008. This process should begin without waiting for the official Musrenbang schedule. The communication process may be facilitated or represented by BKAD (inter-village coordination board). Thus, BKAD may serve as: 1) dialog mediator between SKPD and communities as well as rural functional groups, and 2) a center to monitor the SKPD service units (public accountability at the grass-root level).

The model of villagers’ representatives as delegates in Musrenbang forums (Forum Delegasi Musrenbang) to monitor and attend budgetary discussions within DPRD has proven effective in several jurisdictions to accommodate community program priorities in the local budget. Therefore, districts may adopt this model according to local conditions. Dialog between communities, BKAD and DPRD should be conducted in an
institutional scheme and according to the DPRD’s schedule by adopting the mechanisms of recess, work visits and hearings.

d. Promoting Responsiveness and Accountability of Local Governments

There is a need to develop a mechanism for increasing the roles of BKAD, Community Learning Forums (Ruang Belajar Masyarakat or RBM), community organizations and local NGOs to improve local governments’ responsiveness and accountability particularly for public service delivery. One potential model is to promote existing well-functioning BKAD into ‘community service centers’ at the subdistrict level, developing community monitoring and citizen charter through service units. This would build on models developed with some success by ACCESS and PEKKA in Eastern Indonesia at the village level, and link to NGO networks and one-stop service shops at the district level. These ‘community service centers’ would consist of BKAD, RBM, community representatives such as the Forum Delegasi Musrenbang and NGOs at the district and subdistrict level to develop monitoring networks and improve pro-poor policies, budget allocations and service delivery.

Through the mechanism outlined above, the community involvement would not be limited to drawing up proposals but also improving accountability for the implementation of development programs and public service delivery by the government as mandated by Law 28/1999 and Government Regulation 6/2008. Therefore, there should be activities to build BKAD’s skills in policy advocacy based on data, local budget analysis and tracking, and monitoring of public service delivery by communities at the district level, such as citizen report cards.

e. Strengthening Policy and Institutional Support for PNPM-Integrasi at the National Level

P2SPP provides valuable lessons that programs of ‘project nature’ outside of the regular system (such as P2SPP and PNPM) will not effectively transform government institutions. Moreover, it is difficult to promote reform if local governments and civil servants do not receive benefits from the reform. Nevertheless, the study shows that such transformation may happen if the following conditions are achieved: 1) there are networks and champions to promote institutional transformation, 2) BKAD (inter-village collaboration) is strengthened, 3) Setrawan structure and powers are improved, 4) there is political support for institutional reform, 5) information transparency and public control are improved.

Finally, it is necessary to clarify the relationship between village and district planning regulations. In this case, it is necessary to clarify the relationship between Government Regulation 72/2005 on Villages and Government Regulation 8/2008 on local planning. More operationally, it is necessary to clarify the relationship between MOHA Regulation 66/2007 on Village Planning and MOHA Regulation 54/2010 that governs the implementation of Government Regulation 8/2008. This could be done through a review and revision of these legal instruments.
National-level institutional cooperation should also be strengthened, particularly among PMD, Bangda, Bappenas, and TNP2K because the scope of PNPM-P2SPP is wider than that of PNPM-MP. At the district level, increased cooperation should seek to involve BPMPD, Bappeda, and technical agencies (Dinas). The institutional strengthening at the national level may take the form of developing and monitoring programs in cooperation with PNPM-P2SPP.