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Executive Summary

1. Introduction

Indonesia’s Kecamatan Development Project (KDP) began in 1998 and is implemented through the Ministry of Home Affairs, Community Development Office (PMD). KDP aims to alleviate poverty and improve local governance. The Project provides block grants of approximately USD56,000 to USD111,000 to subdistricts (kecamatan). Villagers engage in a participatory planning and decision-making process to allocate those resources for their self-defined development needs and priorities. KDP is one of the largest community development projects in Indonesia, implemented in 29 of Indonesia’s 32 provinces.

Field reports state that local governments in several parts of the country have initiated KDP replication or “spin off” projects funded through their own budgets. These projects purport to replicate KDP to varying degrees.

The main goal of this study is to examine in greater depth ten KDP replication schemes and to assess the extent to which they adopt certain principles and programmatic features of KDP. This study is important as an initial step to gain insight into how KDP’s principles and procedures may be influencing other government development projects especially in the areas of improved governance, community capacity building, and service delivery.

2. Methodology

The research team chose these ten cases based upon the recommendations of KDP regional field consultants. The research team solicited this information through an initial questionnaire and follow-up telephone discussions. This study was originally intended to conduct a more complete inventory of the total number of KDP replication schemes existing, but due to miscommunications regarding the purpose of the field questionnaire, this study eventually limited itself to only probing the ten cases recommended by KDP field consultants. According to field consultants, these ten projects contained sufficient elements of KDP to warrant further investigation. It should be emphasized that this study does not cover all local government projects claiming KDP replication features, merely a select number of examples.

After identifying the replication projects, the research team conducted in-depth field visits using a checklist of KDP key principle and design variables. During these field visits, the team conducted semi-structured interviews with government officials at the district and subdistrict levels and villagers to understand their attitudes and opinions towards these replication schemes.
The research team visited 25 villages across seven provinces and conducted informal interviews with over 450 villagers. Forty-five percent of the respondents were women.

3. KDP Replication Schemes

The projects identified as KDP replicas were:

- Project Pemberdayaan Masyarakat Desa (PPMD) in Bangkalan East Java
- Bantuan Pembangunan Desa (Bandes) in Lamongan District, East Java
- Gerakan Terpadu Pengentasan Kemiskinan (Gerdu Taskin) in Lamongan and Bangkalan Districts, East Java
- Project Peningkatan Sarana Prasarana Pelayanan Publik Pola Partisipatif (P2SP5) in West Sumatra
- Danau Allokasi Umum (DAU) in Tapanuli Utara, North Sumatra. This is a generic name for central government transfers but it is also the name used in Tapanuli for this project and this report uses this name.
- Project Pemberdayaan Ekonomi Kerakyatan Kampung Tua (PPEK-KT) in Lampung
- Project Pembangunan Pengembangan Desa Mandiri (P3DM) in South Kalimantan
- Gerakan Membangun Desa (Gerbangdes) in South Kalimantan
- Gerakan Masyarakat Aceh Darussalam (Gema Assalam) in Aceh
- Project Pemberdayaan Masyarakat Desa (PPM) in Kupang

4. Local Government Replication of KDP Principles and Operating Procedures

PMD, the lead institution in nine of the ten projects, reports that KDP’s principles and design features have strongly influenced these projects. For example, the head of PMD in Bangkalan commented: “Since 2001, there is a significant change in development style … now villagers are given funds, and we let them plan and implement all that they need on their own”.

Each of the ten projects has adopted to varying degrees some of the central principles of KDP. Specifically the study found the following with respect to KDP core principles and procedures:

a. Poverty Alleviation and Targeting Marginalized Groups

The main goal of KDP is the alleviation of poverty and improved local governance. Three of the ten replication projects have an explicit focus on poverty alleviation and they target villages based on poverty criteria. These projects are Gerdu Taskin in East Java, PPEK-KT in Lampung, and Gema Assalam in Aceh. Gerdu Taskin and Gema Assalam use data from BPS (National Statistics Office) and BKKBN (family planning) to select villages. PPEK-KT uses the Lampung poverty index to help select poor kemukiman
(groups of villages). Only the Gerdu Taskin project engages in poverty targeting at the village level for micro-credit and a small scholarship scheme.

While the goal of poverty alleviation is not explicitly stated, all ten projects provide support to improve village infrastructure and support small-scale economic activities. These projects try to improve villagers’ incomes through providing employment opportunities and in all cases, the projects aim to improve village living conditions.

None of the projects target specifically the poor or women’s groups. In the case of women, the project does not target them specifically for support and women are very much underrepresented in the projects. The projects generally do not encourage participation of women and village heads rarely invite them to village proposal meetings. Only one project requires that PKK (village women’s organization) should be represented. An examination of the attendance records for all project meetings indicates that less than one percent of those attending were women.

The poor are equally under-represented and are not targeted per se. As one poor villager in Desa Sungai Kupang in South Kalimantan commented, “We are orang kampong, they seldom invites us, only civil servants are invited”. This was a general concern heard in most villages.

b. Village Proposal Meetings

All projects in the study follow the central principle of KDP: villagers make their own project proposals at a series of open village meetings.

In general, projects have two village meetings to discuss and finalize proposal selection. However, the openness of these project meetings is questionable, as in practice participation in meetings is usually based upon a written invitation from the village head and not widely publicized. On average, the attendance rate varies from 30 to 40 people. Where attendance rates are high, it is due to higher attendance on the part of local village organizations’ representatives as opposed to ordinary villagers.

The exceptions were villages in the DAU and Gema Assalam projects where project officials made a point of ensuring wider publicity by announcing the meetings publicly in churches (DAU) and in mosques (Gema Assalam).

c. Open Menu Policy

All ten projects in the study have an “open menu” policy but are not quite as open as KDP in so far as some of the replication projects specify the activity type and others specify the mix of activity types. For example, projects such as PPMD and P2SP5 stipulate that activities have to be infrastructure only. Other projects such as DAU and P3DM require that projects be mainly infrastructure but allow a limited amount of funding for micro-credit activities.
KDP is more open although it also has a negative list.

d. Project Socialization and Facilitators

KDP places very strong emphasis on project socialization especially at the village level and especially prior to village proposal meetings. It uses facilitators to assist the process in order to broaden community participation, socialize the project to a wider audience, and ensure better quality participation.

The ten local government projects also contain socialization efforts or phases but in most cases these efforts are superficial. The socialization projects do not make use of facilitators to ensure deeper and wider participation of women and the poor. Consequently, ordinary villagers are left with a less clear idea of their rights and the rules and regulations of the project as compared to their counterparts in KDP. The study team found this to be a widely held perception in villages that have knowledge of KDP and are in a position to make comparisons.

For example, in seven of the ten projects, socialization took place only once and then only briefly. This was during the first village project meeting, whose main purpose was the election of project teams and the discussion of initial project proposals. These meetings were on average only three hours long. Given the heavy agenda at these meetings, it is clear that inadequate time was invested in proper socialization.

Facilitators are rarely used in these government replication projects - only three projects had facilitators at the village level. These projects are PPEK-KT, P3DM, and Gema Assalam.

e. Village Contributions as an Indicator of Community Participation

Village contribution or swadaya is regarded as a good indicator of community participation and all projects with the exception of PPEK-KT (a micro-credit only project) have village contributions as a component of their projects. The level of contribution is generally very high and varies from 10 percent to a high of almost 60 percent.

f. Community Control and Ownership of the Projects

Six of the ten projects devolve project selection to the village level within their respective funding ceilings. In the Gema Assalam and PPEK-KT projects, decisions on project approval and funding are made at the provincial level and in the P2SP5 project, the decision on the level of funding is at the district level.

A key indicator of community control is the election of project management teams by the villagers. In eight of the ten projects, villagers elect project implementation teams charged with the management of the project at the village level.
Only four of the ten projects have separate financial management teams (PPMD, Gerdu Taskin, PPEK-KT, and Gema Assalam) and with the exception of the PPEK-KT, all are elected. Thus, for the majority of the projects, communities have formal control of project management at the village level.

All projects in the study devolve control of project funds to the village management teams in a series of two or three tranches, similar to KDP’s arrangements.

Villagers reported that the projects with control devolved to the village level were better and less prone to “leakage” than projects with control at the district or provincial level.

g. Inter-Village Competition

The local government projects in the study for the most part do not make use of inter-village competition as an operating principle and most government local officials view this central KDP principle negatively.

Only two projects, Gema Assalam and PPM, have adopted a policy of prioritization of proposals and competition at the inter-village level. However, this is more at the rhetorical than at the practical level. The Gema Assalam project mechanisms do not support the stated policy of inter-village competition as all village proposals are merely added to the kemukiman (local structure comprising of several villages) proposals and forwarded to the provincial selection team for selection and funding decisions. This process renders useless any true inter-village competition, as decisions are not made at the inter-village level.

The other eight projects do not use inter-village competition.

Many local government officials hold the view that inter-village competition is socially divisive and a possible cause of social unrest and conflict.

h. Transparency

All ten projects have been less successful than KDP in adopting effective monitoring and transparency measures despite the fact that all have handbooks and proclaim a commitment to transparency. All of the projects have serious financial transparency issues such as the lack of clear financial documentation, the absence of effective financial safeguards, and the absence of public accountability meetings.

Financial controls are generally poor and only four projects have separate finance teams. Only four of ten projects specify a requirement to have public accountability meetings but the study team found no evidence of these meetings actually occurring.

Only one project, PPEK-KT, has a formal complaints mechanism but as this specifies
that complaints should be made to the project manager at the village level, this grievance mechanism is unlikely to be effective.

Only three projects have a sanctions system. The Bandes project guidelines state that villages may apply local sanctions in the event of misuse of funds and villages may impose fines or undertake legal action. P3DM has similar guidelines and further states that all funds must be returned. Neither project has a project-specific complaints system that would support their sanctions systems. Gerbangdes has a rewards and sanctions system whereby project funds will be reduced by Rps 15 million in the event of poor performance and those villages that perform well may have their funds increased. Project officials declined to cite specific incidences where this has happened but state that there have been cases.

Though transparency and information dissemination, especially regarding finances, is not very good, several projects stated that they are putting in place systems and there may be opportunities to help these projects improve transparency and complaints handling.

i. Sustainability of the Projects

All of the replication projects helped to build community self-reliance and develop village management skills by devolving project implementation to the village level and by insisting on village contributions as a condition of project funding.

However none of the projects appear to recognize the importance of developing maintenance and operations planning skills at the village level. None of the projects in the study have maintenance plans as a condition for receiving project funds. Only one village had a maintenance plan in operation. At the time of this study, most of the infrastructure projects were still functioning, but it is very questionable as to how long infrastructure projects will last in the absence of any maintenance funds. Part of the problem lies in the fact that most of these projects are of one-year duration and monies cannot be retained from one year to the next. This time limitation makes it impossible to set aside funds for future maintenance.

j. Project Simplicity

Most of the projects have clear simple guidelines, straightforward strategies, and operating methods. The exceptions are the four projects that retain control and decision-making at the district and provincial levels. These projects lack clarity and transparency, with reported cases of confusion and possible corruption. None of the projects have a coherent anti-corruption strategy and mainly rely on reporting to the very same village level institutions most likely to engage in these activities.
k. Community Awareness of the Projects

The study found that most villagers had only superficial knowledge of the local government projects. Only a small number of women had any knowledge of the projects and even fewer women attended project meetings.

The study also found that in ex-KDP villages, villagers had in-depth knowledge of the KDP project, and attendance and participation rates in KDP activities were significantly higher. Meeting records also showed that women had attended more KDP meetings than attended the meetings for the local government projects.

Overall, villagers were satisfied with the improvements in infrastructure and agreed that it improved the quality of their lives. However, there is considerable disquiet and unhappiness with both of the major micro-credit projects.

l. Types of the Project Activities

The study team visited twenty-five villages during the study and the majority of the funded activities were small-scale infrastructure works. The infrastructure projects were: rock paving and asphaltling of roads and footpaths (13 villages); irrigation and drainage (6 villages); public washing and hygiene facilities (3 villages); wells and clean water (2 villages); bridge repairs (1 village); building of village halls and offices (2 villages). Some villages have more than one project.

The study found that the infrastructure projects generally used local labor and materials. Contractors were only used when necessary, such as for asphaltling roads.

The study also found that technical teams at the kecamatan and kabupaten levels, which included Ministry of Public Works’ representatives, were used to monitor the technical quality of the infrastructure and to verify project costs. The technical teams used Public Works standards to assess projects. The study found evidence that the technical teams took their remit seriously and reduced project payments when they judged that the projects were too costly. For example, under the P2SP5 project in South Kalimantan, villagers in Koto Baru paved 400 meters of road, which the implementation team estimated as costing Rps 20 million. The technical team at the kabupaten level disagreed with the costing and authorized only Rps 10 million in payment. However, the actual number of villages reporting visits by technical teams and the incidence of cost reductions being made was very small.

KDP local technical consultants, where possible, were asked to comment on the quality and the costs of the infrastructure improvements. Without exception, their comments were that the infrastructure improvements were on par with KDP projects in terms of quality and were either at the same cost (materials and labor) or cheaper. For example, the KDP technical consultant in Bangkalan, East Java appraised the 500 meters of paved road in Tagungguh village (PPMD Project) of good quality and a reasonable cost. While it was beyond the scope of this study to provide a detailed cost benefit and quality
analysis of these infrastructure projects, the general impression gained was that infrastructure improvements are generally of reasonable quality, met villagers’ needs, and that wastage was not a significant issue.

The study also found that village contributions were a condition of funding in all projects and this village contribution, mainly in the form of voluntary labor and materials, impacted positively to lower infrastructure costs.

The study found that micro-credit projects tended towards small scale projects mainly in the form of grants averaging Rps 2 million to the local village women’s organization (PKK) and that projects did not require any accounting for the use of these funds. Generally, the projects provided grants without the need to account for the funds and in most cases, villagers interviewed had no knowledge of what these funds were used for and who benefited from them. In PKK, wives of village heads lead these projects and the projects appear to be run for the benefit of a small number of wives of the village elite.

Only two projects, Gema Assalam and PPEK-KT, were major micro-credit projects and the study could only access implementation information in PPEK-KT. The study found that in both villages visited under the PPEK-KT project, there was controversy over the interest rates charged and possible misuse of funds.

All projects are funded by the district APBD budget with the exceptions of Gerdu Taskin, PPEK-KT, and Gema Assalam, which have cost sharing between the provincial and district APBD budgets.

5. Possible Implications for the KDP project

The infrastructure projects in this study appear to be cost effective and of reasonable quality without hiring expensive facilitators. If this is true, it would suggest that KDP should review its reliance on technical facilitators and instead use the services of local government technical teams. However, more analysis is required before such a conclusion could be safely made.

Current costs for these local government projects do not take into account the costs of the local government technical teams at the kabupaten and kecamatan levels. An accurate costing of these infrastructure projects would require incorporating these costs before a valid cost comparison could be made between local government projects and KDP projects.

As regards the quality of the projects, once again further study is needed before any conclusions can be drawn. First, most of the observations were made by our study team and this team did not have a technical background. Secondly, where these observations were supported by KDP technical people, their cost assessments did not include the costs of technical assistance from the district and provincial levels or a more detailed cost analysis. Thirdly, the sample of actual projects with good cost and technically informed assessments is too small and a larger sample is needed before effective conclusions can
be drawn with respect to implications for KDP. Finally, the lack of transparency referred to earlier makes it difficult to establish real costing.

What is clear is that these findings certainly warrant further study by KDP and that KDP should do this as a matter of expediency.

A significant goal of KDP is to empower the rural poor through encouraging more democratic and participatory forms of local governance. This study shows that the ten projects studied are generally very weak in this area and that community participation is limited to representatives of village institutions and the elite. The study also demonstrates that women and the poor are underrepresented at village meetings and in decision-making. One underlying factor for this is the absence of social facilitators in most of the projects who help to guarantee that ordinary villagers are involved. KDP could provide training to local government project teams on how to increase participation of the poor and women.

All the projects in the study have serious transparency issues centering on the lack of accurate financial documentation and the lack of public accountability and transparency measures in their projects. It is not clear if these transparency issues are the result of inadequate knowledge of good accounting practices or the lack of will to enforce them. What is clear is that the local government projects are not as transparent as KDP and this view is widely shared by villagers even though they appreciate the benefits of having the projects. KDP could support these and other local government projects by providing training.

There is a clear aversion to the KDP principle of inter-village competition, even though it is just a prioritization mechanism for projects due to limits in available funding. KDP needs to do more to address and combat the widespread perception that inter-village competition can cause inter-village conflict. It also needs to address the perception that inter-hamlet competition is just as effective as inter-village and less socially divisive.

Many officials appear to dislike the KDP matching grants project because it does not coincide with the district financial year and disrupts the normal reporting cycle. This perhaps needs to be addressed more in designing the next matching grants project. These issues are dealt with in a separate study.
6. Specific Recommendations for KDP

The study team recommends the following actions:

1. Conduct a follow-on survey to develop a more comprehensive inventory of KDP spin-offs, and based upon the survey findings, decide if a more complete in-depth study is necessary.

2. Offer to provide facilitator training in socialization and participation techniques for the three projects that have facilitators, whether at the kecamatan or village level.

3. Offer to provide training in bookkeeping, effective financial controls and accountability measures for projects that have finance teams and provide training materials for kecamatan and kabupaten oversight teams, as needed.

4. Offer to support a workshop / conference for the projects with the aim of reviewing good and bad practices in the projects and promoting “horizontal learning” and help local governments document the successes of these projects.

5. Address concerns that local governments have regarding the timing of the matching grant allocations and their inconsistencies with local government fiscal years.

6. Consider ways to address the negative perceptions that local government have concerning the prioritization of projects and inter-village competition.

7. Investigate further the costs and technical quality of the local government replication projects. Consider running a trial KDP pilot using only social facilitators and local government technical teams to monitor projects for technical quality and costs, and compare the results to KDP.
1. Terms of Reference

1.1 Background

The Kecamatan Development Program (KDP) is one of the largest community-driven development (CDD) programs in the world. Under the auspices of the Ministry of Home Affairs and with funding assistance from the World Bank, KDP is currently being implemented in all but three of Indonesia’s 32 provinces.

Anecdotal evidence suggests that a number of KDP “spin off” initiatives have been initiated in various parts of the country, in many cases with funding from various levels of local government. What remains to be seen, however, is whether these so-called spin-off projects replicate the spirit and practices of KDP or whether they merely attempt to build on KDP’s reputation for their own purposes.

1.2 Purpose of the Study

The overall goal of this study was to determine the number of projects currently being undertaken by government (and, possibly non-government) agencies that claim to replicate the KDP project and to assess the extent to which they do. An initial survey was conducted by a questionnaire prepared by the national management consultant and telephone interviews. The questionnaire was sent to all NMC field consultants and this was followed up by a telephone check on the returns. This study is based on NMC responses. It and does not claim to be an exhaustive list of local government replication.

Specific Issues

The study examined four key areas using both quantitative and qualitative techniques:

- The development of an inventory of KDP spin-offs
- The actual design, processes, and operating procedures used in the spin-offs.
- The funding source and mechanisms of the spin-offs
- The effectiveness of the spin-offs in terms of how closely do they represent a continuation of the Community Development Design approach and process pioneered by KDP
2. Methodology

Research was conducted using three main instruments:

- A survey of field-based NMC consultants to develop baseline data of KDP spin-offs
- A desk study, supplemented by telephone interviews, to gather data and analyse KDP spin-offs
- In-depth field visits were conducted using a checklist of KDP process indicators to evaluate KDP spin-offs. Semi-structured interviews were conducted with key personnel at the kabupaten and kecamatan levels and face to face meetings with villagers to explore their perceptions of the ‘openness’ and participatory effectiveness of the identified programs.

To analyze the relative effectiveness of these initiatives in terms of their ‘openness’, the level of accountability and transparency, and the level of villagers’ participation and control, the following variables were examined:

- Operations manual (and level of adaptation of KDP manual or key principles/procedures)
- Facilitation (planned and actual)
- Degree of “open menu” and project decision-making mechanism
- Supervision and monitoring (external and internal)
- Fund disbursement system and management mechanisms
- Gender mainstreaming/affirmative action
- Project operations and maintenance strategy
- Anti-corruption strategy
- Complaints resolution system and deployment of sanctions

The team comprised of two NMC staff (one a special studies specialist and the other a monitoring and evaluation consultant), a locally hired freelance researcher and an international consultant. Each program was visited by two team members with the exceptions of the Gema Assalam program in Aceh, PPEK-KT in Lampung and PPM in Kupang where for work scheduling reasons only one team member visited each of these programs.

3. Programs Covered by this Report

This report covers ten programs that were identified by the National Management Consultant survey as being KDP “Spin-offs” directed towards rural communities. The programs are as follows:

1. Program Pemberdayaan Masyarakat Desa (PPMD) in Bangkalan East Java
2. Bantuan Pembangunan Desa (Bandes) in Lamongan District, East Java
3. Gerakan Terpadu Pengentasan Kemiskinan (Gerdu Taskin) in Lamongan and Bangkalan Districts, East Java
4. Program Peningkatan Sarana Prasarana Pelayanan Publik Pola Partisipatif (P2SP5) in West Sumatra
5. Danau Allocasi Umum (DAU) in Tapanuli Utara, North-Sumatra.
6. Program Pemberdayaan Ekonomi Kerakyatan Kampung Tua (PPEK-KT) in Lampung
7. Program Pembangunan Pengembangan Desa Mandiri (P3DM) in South Kalimantan
8. Gerakan Membangun Desa (Gerbangdes) in South Kalimantan
9. Gerakan Masyarakat Aceh Darussalam (Gema Assalam) in Aceh
10. Program Pemberdayaan Masyarakat Desa (PPM) in Kupang
4. Main Issues and Findings

This report makes overall conclusions concerning the extent to which these ten programs replicate KDP’s operating principles and procedures; indicates ways in which they might be improve; and reviews their quality and cost effectiveness as a whole as well as focusing on possible implications for the KDP program itself.

4.1 Programs Replication of KDP Operating Principles and Procedures

This section assesses the extent to which the spin-off programs target the poor and replicate KDP operating principles and procedures. A matrix based on these key principles was developed to facilitate this discussion. (See appendix ). These key operating principles are those identified in the report “Kecamatan Development Program: 1998-220, Final Report” June 1992 pg. 17 and are as follows:

- “Community participation and empowerment of poor rural communities – Communities take ownership of all aspects of the project, from planning and decision making to implementation. Community participation is emphasized, especially amongst the poor and women. Participation should be broad based, not just of the village elite, but through local decision making by all villagers.”

- “Transparency – KDP emphasizes transparency and information sharing throughout the project cycle. Decision-making, procedures, and financial management should be open and shared with the entire community. Everyone should have access to key program information.”

- “Sustainability - Activities should be sustainable, building on community self reliance and village management of all activities. Each activity should be easily managed and maintained by the community.”

- “Simplicity - KDP strives to keep projects simple. There should be no complex rules or procedures; only simple strategies and methods should be used.”

- “Competition for funds- There should be open, healthy competition between villages for KDP funds. The program encourages villagers to select projects from an open menu based on their individual merits. But with the understanding that funds are limited and not all proposals can be funded at any one time.”

4.1.1 Poverty Alleviation and Poverty Targeting

One of the main goals of KDP is the alleviation of poverty by raising rural incomes. Poverty targeting and poverty alleviation are not the stated focus of the majority of the local government programs. Of the ten programs, only three have a specific poverty alleviation focus as a main aim and target villages based on poverty.
These programs are Gerdu Taskin, PPEK-KT, and Gema Assalam. Gerdu Taskin and PPEK-KT use BPS (the national office of statistics) and BKKN (family planning) ratings to select villages and Gema Assalam uses the Lampung poverty index to help them to select poor kemukiman (groups of villages). Only the Gerdu Taskin program engages in poverty targeting at the village level for micro-credit and a small scholarship program.

The other seven programs do not have a specific poverty alleviation focus and are mainly infrastructure programs with small micro-credit components. The micro-credit programs are usually a component aimed at the village women’s group (PKK) and programs generally do not offer guidelines for these or require any form of accounting or reporting. All of these programs have an economic and community development focus but not specifically aimed at poverty alleviation per se. All programs are funded by the district APBD budget with the exceptions of Gerdu Taskin, PPEK-KT, and Gema Assalam, which have cost sharing between the Provincial and District APBD budgets.

Nevertheless, the programs impact on local poverty by providing the means to improve village infrastructure and providing funding for small-scale economic activity. These projects in some cases directly improve villagers’ incomes through their employment opportunities and in all cases improve village living conditions. For example, in Tlemang village, under the auspices of the Gerdu Taskin program, 1,200 meters of asphalt road was constructed which helps villagers to transport their goods to markets more easily. Under the same program, nine cows were provided to poor villagers for breeding purposes. When these cows have calved, they are then rotated to another group of poor villagers. As one villager noted “I am a poor women and I could never afford to buy a cow. Now I have one thanks to the government.” Under the Bandes program 500 meters of a very steep hilly road was rock paved and this has had a significant impact on the lives of villagers. A villager commented, “I am happy with the road because we not only get paid but we benefit from it. Nowadays people have easier transportation, especially for sick people and pregnant women and for selling cows.” The road connects to a main transportation route.

4.1.2 Targeting Marginalized Groups

None of the programs in the study targets marginalized groups per se. Women are only targeted in so far as most programs provide funding for the Program Kesejahteraan Kelwarga (PKK), which is generally regarded as a women’s organization at the village level. The PKK is normally under the leadership of the wife of the village head and, from reports in the villages visited, its activities predominantly benefit village elites and few ordinary villagers are invited to its meetings or benefit from its activities. None of the programs studied require accountability or reporting on the use of the funds allocated to PKK.

A singular exception was the case of Salimuran village in South Kalimantan where under the P3DM program, Rps five million was given to the PKK and these funds were used to set up rotating chicken breeding groups. The wife of the village head had good documentation on the current groups and a list of the next groups to benefit. This was a
small tight knit community and here the PKK appears to be responsive to ordinary villagers’ needs.

The absence of targeting marginalized groups is in strong contrast to KDP, which specifically targets the and women. It is interesting to speculate how different the project choices in most projects would have been if women had been encouraged to participate. For example, in Simason village in North Sumatra where the DAU program is operating, villagers (all men) chose to make a cement road up a hill to the local primary school and to provide a cement road running through the main village to the mosque. Whilst both these projects do improve the living conditions of the villagers, they do not impact significantly on the lives of women in the village. This particular village has no running water and the main source of available clean water is over a kilometer a way. Women indicated very strongly that this was a major problem for them, as they have to fetch water twice a day for household needs.

4.1.3 Community Participation and Empowerment of Poor Rural Communities

A significant impact of KDP on the programs in the study is the emphasis that these programs now give to community participation and empowerment. PMD is the lead institution in nine of the ten programs and PMD officials report that their programs have been strongly influenced by the KDP program and its principles. For example, the head of PMD in Bangkalan commented, “Since 2001, there is a significant change in development style, in the middle of KDP implementation, and now villagers are given funds, and we let them plan and implement what they need on their own.” In fact, PMD officials in all program locations appear to have an in-depth knowledge of the KDP program, and in many locations, PMD officials have official responsibilities in both programs.

KDP uses a variety of principles and operating procedures to attempt to ensure broad based community participation and empowerment. A central KDP principle is that villagers are invited to a series of open village meetings and make their own proposals from an open menu (with a small negative list) for funding from the KDP kecamatan allocation. The meetings should be widely advertised through a variety of means such as announcements in mosques and churches, at village events, traditional groups meetings such as arisan (saving self-support groups) and public notice boards.

Village Proposal Meetings

All programs in the study follow the central principle of villagers making their own project proposals at a series of open villages meetings. In general, programs have two village meetings to discuss and finalize proposal(s) selection. However, the openness of these program meetings is questionable as in practice attendance at meetings is usually by a written invitation of the village head and not widely publicized. The exceptions to this were villages in the DAU and Gema Assalam programs where program officials made a point of ensuring wider publicity by having the meetings publicly announced in churches (DAU) and in mosques (Gema Assalam). Attendance at village meetings in DAU were
average but attendance in two villages under the Gema Assalam program were very high with the highest meeting attendance recorded as 127 people.

The attendance figures (where lists were available) for village meetings varied from village to village but for most programs ranged from 25 to 40 people and the attendance lists indicated that the majority of the people attending were representative of various village organizations and traditional village elite with few ordinary villagers attending. The poor rarely are invited. As one poor villager in Desa Sungai Kupang in South Kalimantan commented, “We are orang kampong, they seldom invites us, only civil servants”. This was a general refrain heard in most villages.

Women are very much under represented at these village proposal meetings. The programs generally do not encourage women and village heads rarely invite them. Only one program insists that PKK (village women’s organization) should be represented. A study of the attendance records of all programs indicate that less than one percent of those attending are women.

As noted, the participation at village meetings for most of the programs visited tended to be representatives of village organizations and not ordinary villagers and so this is an issue for these programs. In representational democracy, elected officials take on the role of representing citizens in governing and running their public affairs. All of the programs specify that village and hamlet heads and the major village institutions such as the Badan Perwakilan Desa (village representative council) and the Lembaga Pemberdayaan Masyarakat (village legislative body) have to participate in the programs. These bodies are elected by villagers. Village heads and neighborhood heads are also elected by villagers, and therefore it can be argued that the village community is therefore involved through the representation of their elected officials. At issue is the degree of openness and legitimacy of these election processes. An assessment of this is beyond the scope of this study and so the only comment that can be made is that the elected village representatives were present at village meetings for all of the programs and were there in reasonable numbers.

The programs as a whole follow the KDP principle of village proposal meetings and achieve a good level of representational participation but not the broad based community participation that the KDP program seeks to achieve.

Another reason for limited participation in the programs is the lack of facilitators trained to be proactive in seeking wider community participation. Programs that do not have facilitators would be well advised to consider using them and those that have facilitators need training in being proactive in seeking the participation of women and the poor.

Open Menu

All programs in the study have an “open menu’ policy but are not quite as open as KDP as these programs usually have activity type limitations. For example, some programs, such as PPMD and P2SP5, stipulate that project activities have to be infrastructure
Other programs, such as DAU and P3DM, stipulate that projects should be mainly infrastructure and provide limited funding for micro-credit activities. Gema Assalam in Aceh stipulates specific percentages for three project activity types: infrastructure (60%), Micro-credit (30%), and adat (traditional institutions) strengthening activities (10%).

Most programs do not operate a negative list. The exceptions are PPEK-KT, Gerbangdes, and Gema Assalam and these almost replicate the KDP negative list. PMD officials for most programs stated that they operate an unofficial list and this appears to be largely the case.

Program Socialization

KDP places very strong emphasis on program socialization especially at the village level, prior to village proposal meetings and uses facilitators to enable this process in order to broaden the base of community participation. All but one (P2SP5) of the programs studied have program socialization in their guidelines. However, in seven of the ten programs in the study, village level socialization took place at the first village meeting where project teams were elected and initial proposal discussion took place. These meetings were on average three hours long with lengthy agendas. This left inadequate time for proper socialization.

Only three programs had separate village socialization meetings prior to village proposal and team election meetings and these were: Gerdu Taskin, PPEK-KT, and Gema Assalam. Four of the programs, PDM, Gerbangdes, Gema Assalam and PPM, had hamlet meetings to further discuss village proposals prior to the final proposals selection meeting and these meetings are de facto additional socialization with a broader participation base.

Only three of the programs have facilitators at the village level: PPEK-KT, P3DM and Gema Assalam, and their effectiveness in ensuring broad based program socialization can be judged by the fact that only the Gema Assalam program showed considerably higher levels of attendance than average at village meetings. As noted earlier, the average village meeting attendance figures ranged from 25 to 40 people and the Gema Assalam program achieved a figure of 127 people at one meeting, which could be attributed in part to its use of facilitators.

What would be useful to identify in a further study is the precise terms of reference for facilitators in all of these three programs and the type of training they are given and what they actually do on a daily basis that might cause these differences or lack thereof. The evidence would suggest that they are generally not trained in programs socialization techniques and make little effort to achieve broad based socialization.

It would appear, therefore, that local governments, despite their rhetoric on community participation, do not really make strong efforts to achieve broad based participation as evidenced by their lack of commitment to effective program socialization.
Village Contributions as an Indictor of Community

Village contribution or swadaya is regarded as a good indicator of community participation and all programs with the exception of PPEK-KT (micro-credit only program) have village contribution as part of their programs.

Village contributions vary from programs to program and village-to-village but in most cases appear to be very high. A few examples are sufficient to illustrate this. In the DAU program in North Sumatra, village contribution was estimated to be approximately 10% of the cost allocated for infrastructure. In Lumbang Garaga village contribution was estimated as Rps 2 million (unpaid labor) representing 10% of the DAU infrastructure allocation and in Hutapaung village contribution was estimated at Rps 2.5 million, which is a little over 10%. These contributions are very significant as both villages are extremely poor.

In Batu Licin Irigasi in South Kalimantan, the P3DM program implementation team estimated that the village contribution in the form of labor and materials was 60% of the total cost of the infrastructure project. Under the same program in Manunggal village, the implementation team estimated that the infrastructure project (village community hall) will cost almost Rps 88 million against the program allocation of Rps 27 million and that villagers will contribute the difference in labor, materials and monies. Both of these villages are very poor and their contribution represents a great deal of community commitment.

In Tlemang village, the Gerdu Taskin implementation team estimated village contribution as being over Rps 43 million that was approximately 50% of the infrastructure cost. In Tlemang household were asked to contribute 4 workdays and the equivalent of a truckload of rocks. Villagers confirmed this and were very positive about their contribution and proud of their achievement. One villager commented “The road is good and we are glad that we helped to build it” and another stated “I don’t know about the cost of the road. We were not told but we all had to help and we are proud of our road.”

The study shows that village contribution is quite significant for all programs and if village contribution is taken as an indicator of community involvement, the programs can be stated to very successful in achieving community participation. A caveat is that in some cases, village heads exerted social pressure on villagers to contribute but interviews with villagers (for all of the nine programs that had community contribution) suggest that contribution was generally voluntary, and that villagers were proud of their contributions.

4.1.4 Community Control and Ownership of the Programs

All programs in the study have village proposal discussion and selection meetings and the average number of these meetings is two.

In most programs, the first meeting is for the initial discussion of proposals and the second meeting is where the final decision on project selection takes place.
programs report a verbal voting mechanism for project selection and this appears to be mainly true with only a small number of villages reporting that they were told by the village head what the project was going to be.

As only two programs (Gema Assalam and PPM) have inter village competition, for most programs the decision on the actual project lies with the village within the respective program funding ceiling and program guidelines on activity type. There are four notable exceptions to this. P2SP5, where the decision on the level of funding is at the district level, PPEK-KT, where the level of funding decision lies at the provincial level, Gema Assalam where decisions on projects and the level of funding is decided by the provincial team, and PPM where in 2003 there was a compulsory infrastructure component.

A key indicator of community control is the election of project management teams by the villagers. In eight of the ten programs, villagers elect project implementation teams charged with the management of the program at the village level. The exceptions are Bandes where the Lembaga Pemberdayaan Desa (an elected village organization) is charged with the management of the program and the PPEK-KT program where a traditional adat institution is given overall management of the program at the village level.

Only four of the ten programs have separate finance management teams (PPMD, Gerdu Taskin, PPEK-KT, and Gema Assalam) and, with the exception of the PPEK-KT, all are elected. Thus for the majority of the programs studied village communities have formal control of project management at the village level.

All programs in the study devolve project funds to the village management teams in a series of two or three tranches. The specific fund disbursement mechanism for each program varies slightly and these are described in the individual program description in the appendices section of this report. All programs require implementation teams to submit program progress reports usually with photographic evidence and a financial report prior to the disbursement of the second and, where applicable the third tranche.

It is clear from the above that the programs are quite successful in devolving control and ownership of the programs to the village level. This control, however, is limited to official village representatives and is not in the hands of ordinary villagers, the poor, or women. For the programs to achieve wider community participation, they need to employ facilitators trained in socialization techniques or to ensure that kecamatan staff are given such training.

4.1.5 Transparency Issues

“Transparency – KDP emphasizes transparency and information sharing throughout the project cycle and shared with the entire community. Everyone should have access to key program information.”

Handbooks
All programs have handbooks but circulation (access) of these is limited to village heads and implementation teams. All programs report that these handbook were revised as a direct result of exposure to the KDP program. All include key KDP principles such as community participation, KDP type funding mechanism, transparency, preference for local materials and skills and village contributions and eight to the ten include village election of project management teams.

Monitoring and Evaluation

Monitoring and evaluation are key tools in ensuring transparency and accountability, especially when such monitoring is conducted by external bodies to the program. Only Gema Assalam in Aceh has an independent monitoring team, which is a self-funded NGO forum, and it publishes its reports in local newspapers. The program also hires two NGOs (Yayasan Aceh Bersama and Forkesli) to conduct monitoring and, in addition to their own monitoring activities, these NGOs train villagers to conduct village level monitoring. All other programs have their own monitoring teams at the kabupaten and kecamatan levels. How often these teams monitor and how effective they are is highly speculative. Most villages visited during the study reported that monitoring teams rarely visited.

Financial Controls

As noted earlier, only four programs have separate finance teams to provide financial management oversight and to safeguard program funds. Many of the programs have only one account signatory and financial documentation is generally poor for all programs. Most villages visited had not retained financial reports and such reports were difficult to gain access to at the kecamatan and kabupaten levels. The few financial reports observed were mainly notable for their lack of original receipts. This does not necessarily imply that original receipts do not exist or that there was misuse use of funds. It appears to reflect the widespread tendency at kecamatan and kabupaten levels to make reports neat and tidy by typing up all receipts afresh to make the report neater.

All programs require some form of written progress and financial accountability reports to the kecamatan and kabupaten program or provincial level management teams for fund disbursements (usually in two to three tranches) but only five programs (PPMD, Gerdu Taskin, PPEK-KT, Gema Assalam and Gerbangdes) specify in their guidelines the requirement to hold public accountability meetings for their programs. Study visits, however, found no evidence of these occurring in any of the villages visited.

KDP uses public notice boards to both publicize meetings and to display key project information as part on its transparency measures. Only three programs had a requirement to use public notice boards, Bandes, PPEK-KT, and Gema Assalam, and there notice board did not display key project and so are not effective as a transparency measure.
Given all of the above, it is very likely there might be some misuse of funds in some if not all of the programs. The only program where villagers really commented on this was in PPEK-KT villages. This program is a micro-credit program where the selection of groups funded and the level of funds allocated are decided at the provincial level. There is a total lack of transparency on how these decisions are made and this has produced tensions at the village level. Claims have been made that in some cases the funds received do not match those approved and disbursed from the provincial level. Claims have also been made that the interest rates charged do not match those stated by the implementation teams.

The low level of comment on misuse of funds is not surprising given the lack of transparency of financial documentation and the lack of public accountability mechanisms.

Complaints Mechanisms

Another factor that impedes effective program transparency in the programs studied is the absence of project specific complaints mechanisms. Only one program, PPEK-KT, actually specifies in its guidelines a complaints mechanism. Unfortunately, their complaints mechanism is very weak as it states that complaints should be made to the village project leader (not very useful if the person you are complaining against is the project leader) or to the program secretariat at the provincial level. There is no provision for anonymity and the system is unlikely to be in any way effective.

The absence of independent effective complaints in KDP spin offs marks a significant departure from the original model of KDP. Given that KDP has a well developed complaints mechanisms, this might be an area that KDP can advise local government programs to emulate.

Sanctions and Rewards Policies

Only three programs have a sanctions system. The Bandes program guidelines state that villages may apply local sanctions in the event of misuse of funds and fines may be imposed and legal action taken. P3DM has similar guidelines and further state that all funds must be returned. Neither program has a project specific complaints system that would support their sanctions systems. Gerbangdes has a rewards and sanctions system that states that project funds will be reduced by Rps 15 million in the event of poor performance and that those villages that perform well may have their funds increased. Program officials declined to cite incidences where this has happened but state that there have been cases. They did cite an example of a village that was awarded a motorbike for good performance. It is noted that Gerbangdes does not have a project specific complaints system.

What is very clear from the above is that all the programs have very serious transparency issues caused by poor financial controls, the lack of proper documentation, the absence of public accountability mechanisms, the lack of sanctions and rewards policies, and the
absence of effective complaints mechanisms. The programs have not taken on board
KDP procedures designed to ensure program transparency and public accountability.
Some officials admitted these weaknesses but there appears to be a lack of will to engage
with these problems.

4.1.6 Program Sustainability

“Sustainability - Activities should be sustainable, building on community self reliance
and village management of all activities.”

All of the programs studied help to build community reliance and to develop village
management skills by devolving project implementation control to the village level and
by insisting on village contributions as a condition of program funding. Sadly, without
exception, they do not appear to recognize the importance of developing maintenance
planning skills at the village level. None of the programs in the study required t
maintenance plans for receiving program funds: Only one village visited had a
maintenance plan in operation. This was Tlemang village in East Java, where villagers
are operating a tollgate scheme to fund maintenance of their newly asphalted road built
with Gerdu Taskin funds.

PMD officials are aware of this weakness in their programs and many state that they
informally push villages to maintain infrastructure built under their programs. A few
officials have stated that they plan to revise their program guidelines. A possible reason
for the lack of insistence on maintenance planning is that all the programs have a one
year funding period and funds have to be spent in that fiscal year. This does not allow
funds to be carried forward to future years as a maintenance budget.

4.1.7 Program Simplicity

“Simplicity - KDP strives to keep projects simple. There should be no complex rules or
procedures; only simple strategies and methods should be used.”

Most of the programs have clear simple guidelines and operate simple strategies and
methods. Four programs that retain control and decision making beyond the village level
and these programs lack clarity and transparency. These are P2SPR where the decision on
the level of funding is at the district level, PPEK-KT where the level of funding decision
lies at the provincial level, Gema Assalam where decisions on project to be financed and
the level of funding is decided by the provincial team, and PPM where in 2003 there was
a compulsory infrastructure component.

4.1.8 Competition for funds

Only two programs (Gema Assalam and PPM) in theory have adopted a policy of
competition at the inter-village level. The Gema Assalam program mechanism do not
support their stated policy of inter-village competition as all village proposals are merely
added into the kemukiman ( adat structure comprising of several villages) proposals
and forwarded to the provincial selection team for selection and funding decisions. This process renders useless any true inter-village competition as decisions are not made at the inter village level. In the PPM program all villages actually receive funding under the program and decisions on the level of village funding rests with the district not at the inter village level, effectively negating the stated policy of inter-village competition.

Interviews with program officials indicated a strong aversion to the concept of inter-village competition. The absence of inter-village competition in KDP spin offs is a deliberate policy rather than oversight. Many commented that the KDP inter-village competition principle is divisive and that they view it as a potential source of social conflict between villages and a source of discontent in villages that lose out in competition. Their viewpoint is not against the concept of competition for funding and resources per se but the point at which such competition takes place. Their preference is for competition at the inter-hamlet level and not at the inter village. This is a widely shared view and is a view that that has to be addressed.

4.2 Community awareness of the ten Programs and KDP

General Findings

- Most villagers interviewed had only superficial knowledge of the programs operating in their villages.
- Villagers in ex KDP villages generally knew much more about the KDP program than about the local government program.
- Women had better knowledge of the KDP program than the local government program.
- Few ordinary villagers reported attending village program meetings.
- Villagers overall are very happy with the infrastructural improvements supported by the programs and felt they improved the quality of their lives.
- There is considerable disquiet and unhappiness with both micro-credit programs (PPM and PPEK-KT).

PPMD

Two villages were visited: Tagunghuh and Petaonan. Projects in both villages were rock road paving projects.

Villagers in both villages visited did not know the name of the program or any details of the programs mechanisms. However, when asked about the infrastructure they indicated a high level of satisfaction with the infrastructure improvements (roads in both cases) and commented very favorably on the benefits. In Tagunghuh, a villager commented that
transportation was now easier, and this was particularly important when people were ill or pregnant and needed to travel to the nearest medical facility. In Petaonan, a villager commented ‘we feel that the road belongs to us as we participated in its construction’.

Bandes

Two villages were visited during the study: Tlemang and Karang Tinggil. The main project in Tlemang was to repair an asphalt road and in Karang Tinggil; the project was to build the village office.

Villagers in both villages visited did not know the name of the program, any details of the programs mechanisms and none met with had attended the Bandes village project meeting. Villagers indicated that they were happy with the repairs to the asphalt road and the building of the village office.

Gerdu Taskin

Three villages were visited during the study: Tlemang, Tagungguh, and Karang Tinggil. The Gerdu Taskin program in Tlemang supported two main programs: the asphalting of 1200 meters of road, and a cow husbandry program. The program in Tagungguh supported several small projects: a 3,000-meter road rock-paving project, a goat husbandry program, a small batik project, and a small scholarship program for poor primary school students. The program in Karang Tinggil was the asphalting of 600 meters of road and the purchase of two field tractors for rental to village farmers at lower rates than they would be charged by hiring them from outside the village.

Villagers in all three villages were very aware of the Taskin Gerdu program, knew of the various program activities, but were unaware of the funding details or mechanisms. In Tlemang and Tagungguh, villagers expressed a high degree of satisfaction with the program and were appreciative of the benefits. In Tlemang a villager commented, “We all had to work on the project for some days and we gave rocks”. Another villager commented, “The road is good and we are glad that we helped to build it”. In Tagungguh, similar sentiments were expressed. In Karang Tinggil, villagers generally did not know about the program and the few that did expressed negative comment. From there comments it was clear that that the rental charge for the tractors were no lower than the commercial rates and that there is an issue of over the use of the funds generated by the project.

P2SP5

Two villages were visited: Taruang-Taruang and Koto Baru.

The project in Taruang-Taruang (ex KDP) was a 420-meter rock road-paving program. Thirty-two villagers (7 women and 25 men) were interviewed and these interviews highlight the contrasting levels of community awareness and participation between the KDP program and the P2SP5 program.
All of the 32 villagers interviewed were aware of the KDP project activity but only six villagers knew about the P2SP5 program. None of the people interviewed had attended a P2SP5 meeting or had any knowledge of the P2SP5 funding level or fund mechanisms. In contrast, 13 villagers had attended KDP meetings, villagers, and a higher number knew quite a lot of detail about project funds, the funding mechanism, and even details of labor salaries. As one villager commented, “We know almost everything about KDP such as the value of the funds, the funds disbursements and the meetings but we know very little about the other program.” and another stated, “I like KDP better because it is very transparent in almost all aspects.” Nevertheless, they were happy with the P2SPR road improvement.

In Koto Baru (a non-KDP Village), the project was a 400 meter road rock paving program. Only 12 off the 21 villagers interviewed knew a little about the project activity and only five men had attended the village meeting. The villagers were, however, pleased with the actual road improvement.

DAU

Three villages were visited during the study: Simason, Hutapaung, and Lumbang Garga.

Interviews with villagers in the Simason and Hutapaung (both ex-KDP villages) highlight the contrasting levels of community awareness and participation between the KDP program and the DAU program.

The DAU program in Simason was road rock paving program (150 meters) and road repairs to 100 meters of road. Thirty villagers were interviewed (12 women and 18 men), and the interviews indicate that 13 villagers had attended KDP meetings and that none had attended DAU and had little knowledge of the program. A farmer in Simason stated, “KDP is better because there are meetings with all hamlets and in DAU there is only one village meeting” and a nurse in the same village made the point that KDP “is better because we get training and learn how to make plans.”

The DAU program in Hutapaung was a small irrigation and drainage project. Thirty-eight villagers (22 women and 16 men) were interviewed, and all of the men and 19 of the women had knowledge of the KDP project versus 11 men and 2 women with knowledge of the DAU program. Two of the women made the comment, “We women are not considered as important in DAU thought we know a lot about irrigation as we have rice fields”.

The village head in Hutapaung (ex-KDP) commented that DAU allows insufficient time for villagers to develop ideas as there is only one village meeting unlike KDP and the village head in Simason (also ex-KDP) made the same point by commenting that KDP socialization was broad and that DAU was limited.
The interviews clearly indicate that in both Simason and Hutapaung the level of community knowledge and participation in KDP was considerably higher than for the DAU program suggesting that KDP socialization was more effective.

In Lumbang Garaga (unsuccessful in KDP competition), the DAU program was a rehabilitation of public washing facilities (6 units). Twenty-one villagers were interviewed (2 women and 19 men) showing that 13 men and 2 women knew of the DAU program and 12 men actually had attended the meeting. Only two villagers knew any details of the program mechanisms. These villagers commented positively on KDP, which they viewed as more transparent and hope to get involved with KDP in the future.

Villagers comment positively on the improvements to the washing facilities.

**PPEK-KT**

Two villages were visited during the study: Mulang Maya and Tanjung Raja.

Interviews with villagers in Mulang Maya and Tanjung Raja (both ex KDP villages) indicated similar levels of community awareness and participation between the KDP program and the PPEK-KT program.

The program in Mulang Maya is a micro-credit program supporting three fish breeding groups and one cassava-planting group. Eighteen villagers (11 women and 7 men) were interviewed, and the interviews showed a great knowledge of the KDP program and higher attendance at KDP meetings.

Feelings were very mixed about the PPEK-KT program. There is controversy over the level of interest charged to the groups and the amount of funds received. Some beneficiaries claimed they were charged 18% interest and the implementation team insists that the interest charged was only 3%. A beneficiary complained, “We only get 52% of our rights….we made a good proposal and passed the verification, but we don’t receive the full amount. Was it corrupted by the committee?” Other villagers felt that the program was good and that it developed traditional institutions.

The program in Tanjung Raya is also a micro-credit program supporting cow and goat husbandry groups and fish breeding groups. Fourteen villagers (3 women and 11 men) were interviewed, and the interviews showed equal knowledge and participation in both programs.

As in the case of Mulang Maya, feelings are very mixed about the program. Once again, there was controversy over the interest rate charged (10%) which some beneficiary groups claim is too high and that they were not involved in the decision to charge this amount.
P3DM

Four villages were visited during the study: Manunggal, Segumbang, Batu Licin, and Salimuran. The program is in the first year of operation.

The P3DM Program in Manunggal (ex KDP) is to build a village hall but this is still only in the planning stage. Interviews conducted with 21 villagers indicate a low level of awareness and participation in the P3DM program and only slightly better result for the KDP program.

The P3DM program in Segumbang (ex KDP) is an irrigation program to prevent flooding in the village. Twenty-six villagers were interviewed and once again the interviews showed higher levels of participation and program awareness for KDP but still low for both programs. In Segumbang, many of the villagers commented that they are ordinary people and “we don’t hear about these things”. However, they commented positively on the benefits of the irrigation project, which has stopped their homes from being flooded.

In Batu Licin Irigasi, the P3DM project consisted of several small projects relating to drainage, rock paving of a small road, repairs to the village hall, and three wells. In Salimuran, a river village, the infrastructure project was repairs to a bridge connecting villagers on either side of the river.

Interviews with 25 villagers in Batu Licin Irigasi, an ex KDP village, and with 14 villagers in Salimuran revealed quite low levels of participation in and awareness of the P3DM program. Those that knew about the projects commented positively.

Gerbangdes

Three villages were visited during the study: Sungai Nipah, Sangking Baru, and Sungai Kupang.

The Gerbangdes project in Sungai Nipah (Ex KDP) in 2003 was a clean water project. Interviews were conducted with 25 village women who were having an ‘arisan’ meeting. The consensus seemed to be that women do not attend meetings and that meetings are only for the men. Practically all reported that men did not discuss with their wives any meetings they attended. One woman had heard about KDP but that was all.

The Gerbangdes project in Sangking Baru (ex KDP) is still at the planning stage for 2004 and the project in 2003 was rock paving of 1.800 meters of road. Interviews indicated a very high participation rate and knowledge level with 11 of the 14 interviewed having attended program meetings. All were positive about the 2003 project. However, one of the women commented that in “Gerbangdes males dominate the meeting but in KDP women could participate and could even contribute suggestions in the meetings. These women are women with no education as well.” Knowledge of the KDP program was low but not surprising as the KDP program finished two years ago.
As with Sangking Baru, the Gerbangdes program in Sungai Kupang is still at the planning stage and in 2003, the project was also a rock paving road program. Forty-six villagers were interviewed (29 men and 17 women). Sixteen of the men and three of the women knew quite a lot about Gerbangdes but only three men had attended the meetings. Villagers appeared happy with the infrastructure improvements.

Gema Assalam

Four villages were visited during the study: Deah Ray, Alue Naga, Layeun, and Pulot.

The project activity for Deah Raya and Alue Naga is not yet decided as the program is still at the discussion stage in both villages. In Layeun, the program supports three small projects: a drainage outlet to the sea, improvements to the washing facilities in the mosque and rehabilitation of the village women’s group office. In Pulot, the program supports the building of a public toilet, a water channel, and a washing place at the mosque.

As a checklist was not used in discussion with villagers, there is no interview data to sample and assess the extent of community participation and awareness. It was also difficult to meet people and people were reluctant to make comments. However, records of village attendance meetings in Deah Raya showed very high attendance rates, 147 at the first village meeting and 52 at the second. In Alue Naga records show high attendance at hamlet meetings (average 49) and 12 at the first village meeting and 73 at the second, suggesting that participation was very high. No records were available for the other two villages.

In Pulot and Layeun, villagers made very positive comment about the infrastructure improvements. A villager in Layeun commented, “Before we this washing facility at the mosque, we had to wash at a villagers’ house. We are thankful to have this facility as we now don’t have to wait in long queues before Friday prayers”. In the same village another villager commented, “All of us worked on this drainage. It used to be very dangerous for children as the road was very slippery and it smelt bad. Now dirty water and garbage goes directly to the sea”.

PPM

Four villages in three Kecamatans were visited, Oenesu (KDP) and Kuan Heun (KDP) in Kecamatan Kupang Barat, Noelmina (KDP) in Kecamatan Takari and Oesena (KDP phase out) in Kecamatan Amarasi.

Three of the villages are still at the planning stage and have not yet decided on their project proposals. Noelmina has been give seeds for a small peanut plantation. In 2003 Oenesu, and Oesena were also given seeds for a peanut plantation and Kuan Heun built 1.5 kilometers of road.
Twenty-three villagers (11 men and 12 women) were interviewed in Oenesu; 25 villagers (20 women and 5 men) in Kuan Heun; 6 villagers (5 women and 1 man) in Noelmina, and 18 villagers (16 men and 2 women) in Oesena.

Interviews with villagers in Oenesu and Kuan showed a considerable higher participation and program awareness rates of the KDP program than for the PPM Program and that women’s participation in the KDP program was slightly higher that in PPM. However, participation and program awareness was very low for both programs. In Oesena, participation and program awareness was also considerably higher for KDP. Participation and program awareness rates were low in all the villages for the PPM program. The interviews suggest that PPM program socialization is very weak and comments by villagers reflect this. In Oesena a recipient of the PPM program reported, “PPM never has meetings. They [the district] just give us some seeds to plant and we never know where the money comes from or even who organized PPM in the District. We just follow orders”. This comment ties in with the general impression gained that the program only gives lip service to community participation and that the program activities are dictated by district sectoral priorities and not necessarily village aspirations.

4.3 Range of Project Activities, Costs, and Quality

Infrastructure

Twenty-five villages were visited during the study program and the majority of the projects funded by the programs are small-scale infrastructure projects. The infrastructure programs chosen ranged from rock paving and asphalting of roads and footpaths (13 villages), irrigation and drainage (6 villages), public washing and hygiene facilities (3 villages), wells and clean water (2 villages), bridge repairs (1 village) to the building of village halls and offices (2 villages). Some villages have more than one project. Though the focus of study was on the extent to which these programs replicated KDP principles, it is possible to make some statements regarding the quality of the infrastructure improvements.

Firstly, it is worth noting that these small-scale projects were built mainly by local labor and contractors were used only when necessary, such as for the asphalting of roads. In all other cases, programs used local labor and skills to achieve the infrastructure improvements. This had several benefits. It was a considerable cost saving as much of the labor was provided either free as part of the village contribution or at below market rates. In the cases where labor was paid for, it provided temporary employment for village artisans and unskilled laborers. Above all, it gave village communities a sense of ownership and commitment to these projects.

Secondly, it is also worth noting here that in most of the programs technical teams (included Public Works) at the kabupaten and kecamatan levels were used to review the technical quality of the projects. The use of these technical teams appears to have been effective in both reducing costs and ensuring better technical quality.
KDP local technical consultants, where possible, were asked to comment on the quality and the costs of the infrastructure improvements. Without exception, their comments were that the infrastructure improvements were on par with KDP projects in terms of quality and were either at the same cost (materials and labor) or even cheaper. For example, the KDP technical consultant in Bangkalan, East Java appraised the 500 meters of rock paved road built in Tagungguh village (PPMD Program) at a cost of Rps 23.75 million as of good quality and at a reasonable cost. Petaonan villagers, also in Bangkalan, built the same type of road and achieved 800 meters of road for the same cost. The difference in the costings can be explained by the difference in village contributions. Under the DAU program in North Sumatra, villagers in Simason built one cement footpath of 150 meters and repaired another 100 meters of cement road at a cost of Rps 20 million. The village implementation team estimated the village contribution of labor and sand as Rps 2.5 million that clearly had a significant cost reduction impact.

Under the Gerdu Taskin program in Bangkalan and Lamongan, the village project in Tlemang achieved the asphaltlining of 1,200 meters of road at a cost of Rps 43.65 m and the project in Tagungguh village (a recipient the PPMR program) achieved a rock paving of 3,000 meters of road at a cost of Rps 30 m. The implementation team estimates that village contribution was the equivalent of 50% of the infrastructure cost. In sharp contrast, Karangtinggil village in the same program only achieved the asphaltlining of 600 meters of road at a cost of 43.65 million. This appears to be expensive, and, as will be noted later under the discussion of micro-credit components, the implementation team appears to be misusing funds.

It is interesting to note that some technical teams at the kabupaten level took very seriously their remit to review the technical quality and costs of the project under their program. For example, under the P2SP5 program in South Kalimantan, villagers in Koto Baru rocked paved 400 meters of road, which the implementation team estimated as costing Rps 20 m but the technical team at the kabupaten level (which included Public Works members) disagreed with the costing and authorized only Rps 10 m in payment. This same technical team reviewed a village project in Taruang-Taruang to build 420 meters of road and only authorized a payment of Rps 8 million. It would appear from these examples that the use of local government technical teams to monitor and evaluate but not to manage projects can be effective in achieving lower costs and ensuring reasonable quality. This may have implications for KDP, which perhaps should trial the use of local government technical teams instead of KDP hired facilitators.

It is also worth commenting that majority of programs applied funding ceilings and that funds were generally allocated based on these ceilings and not through the KDP inter-village competition mechanism. In theory, the KDP inter-village competition mechanism ensures the most economical and beneficial use of funds as villages chose projects based on technical merit, cost effectiveness and need. The expectation, therefore, would be that the infrastructure projects in these programs would be characterized by inefficiency, poor quality, and fund wastage. It is beyond the scope of this study to provide a detailed cost benefit and quality analysis of these infrastructure projects, but the general impression
gained is that infrastructure improvements are generally of reasonably quality, meet villagers needs, and that wastage is not a significant issue. There might be something to say for providing a small grant and then letting villagers do as much as possible with the grant, providing technical backstopping and supervision throughout the process. The risk would be lack of transparency and capture with a little being done with a little money and due to lack of trust and ownership little swadaya being generated.

Micro-credit

The micro-credit components in the programs in this study are more problematic and more difficult to assess. Most of the programs had only small micro-credit components and these were mainly in the form of small grants averaging Rps 2 million per village that are given to the village Program Kesejahteraan Kelwarga (PKK) programs. PKK is a women’s organization at the village level. Generally, these grants were provided without the need to account for the funds and in most cases villagers interviewed had no knowledge of what these funds were used for and who benefited from them. In PKK, wives of village heads lead these programs and the programs appear to be run for the benefit of a small number of wives of the village elite at best and at worst simply reward the elite village women for being better off and more powerful.

The Gerdu Taskin program has a more significant micro-credit program and a little more information is available. In Tlemang village, the micro-credit program is a cow husbandry program. Nine cows were bought at cost of Rps 27 m and a group of nine poor villagers was given the cows to care for until they calve. The beneficiary keeps the calf and the cow is passed on to the new group. The village had a list identifying the next group. Interviews with the recipients and other villagers confirm that the recipients are some of the poorest villagers and the recipients themselves acknowledge that this program will provide them with economic benefits. Tagungguh village runs a similar scheme with goats and similar observations are made for this program.

In Karangtinggil, the village opted to use the micro-credit component to purchase two tractors to rent out to villagers at a lower than the commercial rate charged by neighboring villages who own their own tractors. Interviews with villagers suggest that they are still paying the same commercial rates and members of the implementation team could not give any satisfactory explanation as to the use of the funds accrued from rental charges. The person given the responsibility to maintain and look after the tractors appeared to be quite affluent and a villager indicated that he was a relative of the village head. This project appears to be benefiting the village elite and not providing benefits to ordinary villagers.

Another program that has a significant micro-credit component is the Gema Assalam program in Aceh, which allocates 60% of programs funds to micro-credit activities. This program operates at two levels: the kemukiman level, which is a traditional grouping of villages, and the individual village level. In theory, this program uses the KDP principle of inter-village competition for project funding but in reality, all decisions on projects and project funding are actually made by a provincial level selection team. Two of the four villages visited had not yet started the program in 2004 and the other two villages had
only infrastructure programs so no information was gained on the micro-credit activities of this program.

The only other program that has a significant micro-credit component is PPEK-KT in Lampung province, which is a micro-credit only program that started in 2003. This provincial funded program has poverty alleviation and the strengthening of local traditional institutions as the main aims. The program has facilitators at village and provincial levels. This yearly program focuses on poor villages with a high percentage of indigenous people. The program funds small-scale economic activities. In the first year of the program, each village received Rps 100 million and in 2004, each village receives Rps 90 million. Decisions on economic groups to be supported are made at the provincial level. The guidelines state that decisions on revolving fund mechanism, repayments and interests rates should be determined at a village program meeting.

Funds are distributed in two tranches and the second tranche is released when the provincial implementation team is satisfied that there had been full disbursement of the first tranche. For more details, see the individual program description in the appendices.

This study visited two villages: Tanjung Raya and Mulang Maya.

Tanjung Raya submitted 13 proposals but only three economic programs were funded. These included a cow husbandry program to the value of Rps 44,147,500, a goat husbandry program to the value of Rps 23,157,00, and a fish breeding group (3 three ponds) to the value of Rps 22,67,500. The groups are generally very unhappy with the program as they received their funding with 10% deducted as interest. Villagers from the groups state that the decision to deduct interest prior to receiving funding was not made at the village meeting and that the interest was distributed to members of the programs implementation teams. Villagers are waiting for the provincial monitoring team to visit to complain about this. Villagers also reported that 85% of the recipients of the cow husbandry program actually pay poorer villagers to look after the cows. It would appear that the beneficiaries of the program are not the poor and that there is considerable misuse of funds and deviation from program guidelines.

In Mulang Maya, only two activities are funded. A cassava farming group to the value of Rps 44 million and three fish breeding groups to the value of Rps 46 million. Village groups here only received the first tranche (70%) and say that they were never given any reason for not receiving the second tranche. PMD officials claim that this was because of poor performance. Once again, there is controversy over the way interest rates were decided and the level of interest rates implemented. Beneficiaries claim that 18% was deducted in advance by the implementation team but this team claims that only three percent was deducted.

Overall, it would appear that medium micro-credit programs not under the control of the village women associations but under the control of elected project teams appear to work
reasonably well and have a positive impact. This is not true for the larger micro-credit programs, which appear to have targeting problems and suffer from misuse of funds.

4.4 Possible Implications of this study for the KDP program

As discussed in the previous section, the infrastructure programs in this study appear to be cost effective and of reasonable quality without the use of hiring expensive facilitators. If this is true, it would suggest that KDP should review its reliance on facilitators and possibly dispense with their services. However, a lot more study is required before such a conclusion could be safely made.

Current costings for these local government projects do not take into account the costs of the local government technical teams at the kabupaten and kecamatan levels. An accurate costing of these infrastructure projects would require incorporating these costs before a valid cost comparison could be made between local government and KDP projects.

As regards to the quality of the projects, once again caution and more study is needed. Firstly, most of the observations were made by the study team and this team did not have a technical background. Secondly, where KDP technical people supported these observations, their cost assessments did not include the costs of technical assistance from the district and provincial levels. Thirdly, the sample of actual projects with good cost and technically informed assessments is too small and a larger sample is needed before effective conclusions can be drawn with respect to implications for KDP. Finally, the lack of transparency referred to earlier makes it difficult to establish real costing.

What is clear is that these findings certainly warrant further study by KDP and that KDP should do this as a matter of expediency.

Even if the local government infrastructure programs were cheaper and of comparable quality, it would still not necessarily make sense to dispense with facilitators altogether. A significant goal of KDP is to empower the rural poor through encouraging more democratic and participatory forms of local governance. This study shows that the local government programs studied are generally very weak in this area and that community participation is limited to representatives of village institutions. The study also demonstrates that women and the poor are under represented at village program meetings. One underlying factor for this is the absence of facilitators in most of the programs. KDP achieves a greater degree of broad based community participation, especially with respect to women and the poor because it has facilitators trained to be proactive in seeking such participation.

What the study does highlights is the need for socialization facilitators and more effective facilitator training and KDP could offer to help those programs that have facilitators by providing additional facilitator training for them. It also could provide similar training
and training materials to kecamatan and kabupaten staff responsible for project socialization where there are no social facilitators.

It would also be advisable for KDP to trial in a number of kecamatan programs with a mix of local government teams for technical backstopping and the use of social facilitators for project socialization. These could be used for a comparative study on costs, quality, and levels of participation.

All the programs in the study have serious transparency issues centering on the lack of accurate financial documentation and the lack of public accountability measures in their programs. It is not clear if these transparency issues are the result of inadequate knowledge of good accounting practices or the lack of will to enforce them. If the former is the case then this is clearly an area where KDP could very positively support local government ‘spin off’ programs by providing village program finance teams (where they exist) with training in financial record keeping and in the importance of these for both audit and public accountability reasons. KDP could also help the programs to discuss transparency and other issues by supporting a workshop or conference that would bring these programs together with the purpose of identifying good and bad practices in their programs.

There is a clear aversion to the KDP principle of inter-village competition and, if KDP wishes to influence local government programs to adopt this principle, it needs to do more to address and combat the widespread perception that inter village competition can cause inter village conflict. It also needs to address the perception that inter hamlet competition is just as effective as inter village and less socially divisive.

Comments from quite a few local government officials perceive the KDP matching grants program as being expensive because of the high cost of facilitators reflecting their understanding that the districts would have to pay for the facilitators. This misunderstanding needs to be negated. Many officials appear to dislike the KDP matching grants program because it over runs the district financial year and disrupts the normal reporting cycle. This perhaps needs to be addressed more in designing the next matching grants program.

4.6 Specific Recommendations for KDP

1. Conduct a further survey to develop a comprehensive inventory of KDP spin-offs, and based on the findings decide if a more complete in-depth study is necessary.

2. Offer to provide facilitator training in socialization and participation techniques for the programs that have facilitators, whether at the kecamatan or village level. Also, offer to provide the same training to relevant kecamatan staff if individual facilitators are not utilized.

3. Offer to provide training in bookkeeping and effective financial controls and
accountability measures for programs that have finance teams and provide training materials in the same area for kecamatan and kabupaten oversight teams, as needed.

4. Offer to support a workshop / conference for the programs with the expressed aim of reviewing good and bad practice in the programs and promoting “horizontal learning” and help local governments document the successes of these programs

5. Address concerns that local governments have regarding the lack of fit that matching grant allocations have with local government financial years (implementation running over fiscal year end).

6. Consider ways to negate the negative perceptions that local government have concerning the prioritization of projects and inter-village competition. Provide districts with training in monitoring and evaluating their programs.

7. Investigate further the costs and quality of the local government programs using consultants with the relevant technical skills and use the results to explore the implications for KDP.

8. Consider running a trial KDP program in a number of kecamatans that uses only social facilitators and uses local government technical teams to monitor projects for technical matters and costs and compare the results with those of similar KDP programs.
Appendices

Appendix 2: Individual Program Descriptions and Analysis of the Extent that they Replicate KDP Operating Principles

1. Individual Program Descriptions and Analysis of Replication of KDP Operating Principles

This section of the report reviews each of the ten programs and the extent that they adopt key KDP operating principles. These key operating principles are those identified in the report “Kecamatan Development Program: 1998-220, Final Report” June 1992 pg. 17 and are as follows:

- “Community participation and empowerment of poor rural communities – Communities should have control over decisions and resources that affect them. Communities take ownership of all aspects of projects, from planning to implementation. Participation should be broad based and include poor people and other marginalized groups.”

- “Transparency – KDP emphasizes transparency and information sharing throughout the project cycle and shared with the entire community. Everyone should have access to key program information.”

- “Sustainability - Activities should be sustainable, building on community self-reliance and village management of all activities.”

- “Simplicity - KDP strives to keep projects simple. There should be no complex rules or procedures; only simple strategies and methods should be used.”

- “Competition for funds - There should be open, healthy competition between villages for KDP funds. KDP encourages villagers to select projects based on their individual merits.”
2.1. Program Pemberdayaan Masyarakat Desa (PPMD) in Bangkalan East Java

This program operates in Bangkalan district in Madura and is under the auspices of Pembangunan Masyarakat Desa (PMD), the Community Development Agency. This agency is under the Ministry of Home Affairs and is the government-implementing agency for the KDP program.

Rationale for the Program

Bangkalan district (Kabupaten) has 18 sub-districts (kecamatan) of which 10 are full KDP participating kecamatans and 2 participate in the matching grants program. Six kecamatans do not participate in either program. PMD reports that the PPMD was initiated because not all kecamatans were in receipt of KDP type of support and that it is committed to providing such support using the principles underlying KDP. The program was funded from the 20003 APBD (District Budget).

Aim of the Program

The program had a specific poverty alleviating aim and in theory is directed at the poorest villages.

Village Selection Criteria:

PPMD had only very limited funds (Rp50,000,000 million Rps left in the 2003 budget), so it decided it could only provide meaningful support to two Kecamatan and two villages in the selected Kecamatans.

PPMD claimed to use the following criteria to select the kecamatans and villages:

1. The kecamatan was not currently a KDP or KDP matching grant recipient
2. The kecamatan had not either previously received fund assistance or had not done so for a considerable period.
3. The kecamatan was recognized as one of the poorest kecamatans according to the National Statistics Office (BPS) and Family Planning Statistics (BKKN) ratings.
4. The village selected was one of the poorest villages in the kecamatan according to the National Statistics Office (BPS) and Family Planning Statistics (BKKN) ratings.

PMD reports that it intends to operate the program again in 2004 but the district budget has not yet been disbursed.

Villages covered by the Program

This program covered Petaonan village in Socah kecamatan and Tagungguh village in Tanjung Bumi kecamatan and these villages were appointed by PMD reportedly using the above criteria.
PPMD Program Characteristics that Replicate KDP Principles:

PPMD in theory operates on some of the key KDP principles. The Head of PMD, the lead institution in charge of the program, reports, “Even though this program does not adopt all KDP principles but we at least try to adopt the basic principles of development (bottom up planning and decentralization).” The following is a description of the extent that this program adopts KDP Principles:

Community participation and empowerment of poor rural communities:

“Community participation and empowerment of poor rural communities – Communities should have control over decisions and resources that affect them. Communities take ownership of all aspects of projects, from planning to implementation. Participation should broad based and include poor people and other marginalized groups.”

Community Participation

The program does offer community participation with its *open-menu* procedure and its provision for village decision-making meetings. Villagers are in theory free to choose their own program within the limitations of it being an infrastructure program and the funding ceiling of Rps 25 million. The program guidelines stipulate that there should be village meetings in which villagers decide on and select the infrastructure program within the funding limitations.

The extent of villager participation is somewhat questionable. Thirty people attended the village meeting in Tagungguh and a similar figure in Petaonan though the village head actually invited 60 people. Attendance records for both villages indicate that the majority of people attending were from traditional village elite groupings such as Hamlet heads, Neighbor Heads (RTs) and sub-neighborhood (RWs) representatives but there were ordinary villagers present as identified by the term ‘masyarakat’ against their names on the signed attendance list. None of the ordinary villagers met with during the study visit had actually attended the meetings.

Women were not present at the meetings in both villages, the program does not in any way specifically encourage the participation of women, and thus they remain marginalized.

The issue of broad based participation is a problematic issue. In representational democracy, elected officials take on the role of representing citizens in governing and running their public affairs. Village heads and neighborhood heads are elected by villagers and it therefore could be argued that the village community is therefore involved through the representation of their elected officials. In this case, what then becomes crucial is the legitimacy of the election process and degree of openness and transparency. An assessment of this is beyond the scope of this study and so the only comment that can
Another indicator that can be used to gauge ordinary villager participation is swadaya or villager contribution to the program. Swadaya was significant in both village programs. The infrastructure program in Tagungguh Village was a road stone paving program with the goal of achieving 400 meters with the available funding. This was the figure assessed as realistic by the Kecamatan Technical Team. The actual achievement was 500 meters, which was an additional 100 meters or 25% more than the program target. This was the result of villager contribution in the form of unpaid voluntary labor and villager contributions of rocks and sand. In Petaonan Village, the contribution was even more impressive as the planned infrastructure was 400 meters and the achieved figure was 800 meters, which was twice the anticipated result. PPMD guidelines encourage villager contributions and in this case, it certainly is working. It could therefore be argued that participation is broad based under this program as evidenced by the significant village contributions. However, there is a caveat in that for such an argument to be valid, contributions would have to be voluntary and not the result of pressure by the village elite or leaders. In Tagungguh Village, the village head appears to have quite an intimidating presence and a strong hold on the villagers. How much ‘social’ pressure was brought to bear is highly speculative and the only comment that can be made is that of a caveat. In Petaonan Village, the village head appears to be well liked and respected and villagers appeared to have given their time and labor freely and with a strong sense of ownership. A very poor villager in Petaonan reports “We feel the road belongs to us since we participated during the construction’. Another poor villager in Petaonan reports “It is good to have the road construction by the villagers because hopefully easier to get funds from the local government to asphalt it.”

It therefore can be argued, at least in the case of Petaonan Village, that swadaya is a good indicator of broad based community participation.

Community Control and Ownership of the Program

The program emphasizes community control and ownership. Program guidelines insist on the election of a project Village Implementation Team (Unit Pengelola Program – UPP) and a project Management and Finance Team (Kelompok Proyek –KPP) at the village meeting, the former in charge of actual infrastructure design and implementation, and the latter in charge of managing finances and purchasing materials. Both teams parallel KDP project implementation bodies at the village level. Some posts, however, are not open for election. The village head is the nominal person in charge (Penanggungjawab) and the Head of the UPP (implementation team) has to be the head of the Lembaga Pemberdayaan Masyarakat – LPM that is a formally elected village governance institution. As both posts are elected by villagers, they still can be said to be under villagers’ control.

The program guidelines stipulate that villagers propose and decide on the actual infrastructure project. In Tagungguh, villagers did not actually discuss a variety of
proposals and select the actual infrastructure project. According to the village head, the village meeting had only one proposal. In Petaonan village, the village head reports a similar situation but according to him, villagers had previously requested the project on many ‘informal occasions’ such as at wedding parties and other village events. This raises into question the actual openness of the meetings and the degree of pressure brought to bear by village heads in these village meetings.

**Community Control over Program Resources**

The Head of PMD states, “Since 2001, there is a significant change of development style. For some years, the people do not have much opportunity to take part on the development and only followed what government commanded and gave them, but then in 2001 (particularly at the middle of KDP implementation), the people were involved in the development in planning and implementation, as well as in maintenance. Now, villagers (communities) are given funds, and let them plan and implement all what they need by their own.” This philosophy inspired by KDP is reflected in the program guidelines, which require that the control over program funds is devolved to the project implementation and finance teams at the village level. The program funds are disbursed directly from the Kas Daerah to the village project bank account. This account has to be in the village project name and is held at the kabupaten government bank and requires two project signatories. The funds are disbursed in two tranches (60% and 40%) and the guidelines stipulate that a progress report form the teams stamped by the village head and approved by the Kecamatan office prior to release of the second tranche. Both villages reported that the funds are indeed under village project control and none reported any ‘slippage’.

**Program Transparency Issues**

Transparency is an important principle in KDP and PPMD guidelines incorporates some important indicators of transparency.

The program guidelines are in the form of a handbook which PMD reports as a simplified version of the KDP handbook. The handbook is made available to all village heads and kecamatan staff.

PMD conducted a half-day initial socialization of the project goals, procedures, and documentation with village heads and kecamatan staff. It should be noted that this initial socialization did not include training on participatory techniques or methods for increasing community participation. This is also true for all of the programs in the study and it is one of the weak areas in common to all of these programs. This could well be an area for KDP supportive interventions.

Project socialization at the village level was held at the first village meetings in both villages. However, both of these meetings were only three hours long and included the election of project teams and proposal selections, thus leaving very little time for project socialization, which is a key factor in information sharing and developing community
participation and commitment. As will be discussed later, many of the programs studied pay too little attention to this vital area and the lack of attention to this is a significant weakness in many of these community empowerment programs. This is yet another area for KFP support and intervention.

Facilitators in the KDP program play an important role in ensuring effective and widespread project socialization but this program does not have any facilitators for cost reasons.

Effective record keeping, in particular financial record keeping, and open access to these records are important criteria for transparency. PPMD guidelines require such records are maintained and require that there is an accountability meeting back to the community. The guidelines do not, however, require public display of such records. During the study visit, unsuccessful attempts were made to gain access to these records at the kabupaten, kecamatan, and village levels. It was constantly reported that the records were elsewhere and none were available at any of these levels. The village heads also reported that they do not keep copies once the program tranche has been approved or the program has finished. In addition, there was no evidence of a real accountability meeting being held at either village. In fact, one village head reported that it was not a real accountability meeting but more of a “thank you party”. Laxity in the area of financial record keeping and public accountability in actual administration is very evident. A fact that the Head of PMD is very well aware of when he states “I admit that this project still has many weaknesses, especially for the administrative and financial records. I will try to improve it for the next project in a different village.”

As will be discussed elsewhere in this report, the lack of accurate financial records with original receipts and the lack of public availability of such records is a serious impediment to the public accountability of the programs studied. This is clearly an area where KDP could very positively support local government ‘spin off’ programs by providing training at kecamatan and village levels in financial record keeping and in the importance of these for both audit and public accountability reasons. The need for such training is very much in evidence at the village level.

Notable features in KDP’s efforts to ensure public accountability and scrutiny are the use of public notice boards to display project information and finances and the use of a complaints system. Both features are absent in the PPMD program guidelines and were not initiated by the villages concerned. That is reflected in the lack of awareness by villagers of any knowledge of the projects’ finances.

**Program Sustainability**

PPMD guidelines in some respects promote community self-reliance by encouraging village management of their projects, by actively encouraging villager contributions and by indicating a preference for local artisans and materials. However, the guidelines are remiss in so far as they do not stipulate a village maintenance plan for infrastructure proposals as a condition of receiving program funds. This is a missed opportunity as
frequently projects fail because of the lack of such planning. PMD is aware of this and has stated that project villages are informally encouraged to maintain their infrastructure projects and villager heads also made comments to this effect.

**Program Simplicity**

PPMD is clearly a simple project and the project guidelines are certainly simple. The goals are straightforward and the procedures are easy to follow. However, they do not have sufficient checks against the possibility of misuse of program funds and resources and lay themselves open to such possibilities and to such accusations by not doing so. The program is perhaps too simple.

**Competition for funds**

This program does not operate an inter village competition. One reason for this is the program has very limited funds. In addition, the specific rationale for the existence of the program is that it was conceived as a means to provide villages that lost out in KDP inter-village competition with some development assistance. PMD staff, clearly, have a lot of respect for KDP and state that this program design was inspired by and based on KDP principles. However, they are emphatically not in sympathy with the inter village competition principle of KDP which they see as divisive and as a potential source of social conflict between villages and a source of discontent in villages that lose out in competition. This view is widely shared by all of the programs visited in this study and is a view that should be taken seriously. Their viewpoint is not against the concept of competition for funding and resources per se but the point at which such competition takes place. Their preference is for competition at the inter-hamlet level and not at the inter village. This viewpoint has many merits as it retains the concept of competition for resources as a mechanism for better utilization of such resources but it locates the competition within the village where possible discontent can be better managed and dealt with. In a society where there are many ethnic groups, the effective management of discontent is a serious and an important issue.

**Summary**

In summary, this program was inspired by KDP principles and does replicate many of those principles. It does as noted above have some significant weaknesses especially in the matter of financial record keeping and public accountability.
2.2 Bantuan Pembangunan Desa Program (Bandes) in Lamongan District in East Java Province

Bantuan Pembangunan Desa Program or Bandes is a program in Lamongan District in East Java Province. This program is under PMD (also known as BAPEMAS - Badan Pemberdayaan Masyarakat).

Under this program, funds are directly allocated to village governance institutions with the purpose of strengthening village institutions, stimulating economy empowerment and village infrastructure development to support village economic activities.

**Aim of the Program**

This program does not have a poverty alleviating aim. It has four specific goals:

1. To expand community ability at the village level to develop and to maintain supporting infrastructure
2. To increase village economic productive groups
3. To enhance human resource capacity at the village level, through information dissemination and family welfare program training
4. To increase the function and role of community institutions and government at the village level in enhancing community participation and empowerment

**Village Selection Criteria**

All villages in Lamongan receive this program so there is no selection process.

**Bandes Program Characteristics that Replicate KDP Principles**

The Bandes Program operates on some of the KDP principles and PMD emphasizes that it was very influenced by KDP in designing its program. The following is a description of the extent that this program adopts KDP Principles:

**Community Participation**

The program does offer community participation with its open-menu procedure and its provision for village decision-making meetings. Villagers are in theory free to choose their own program within the limitations of it being an infrastructure and a micro-credit program and the funding ceiling of Rps 52 million. The program guidelines stipulate that there should be village meetings in which villagers decide on and select the infrastructure program within the funding limitations.
The extent of villager participation is very unclear. In the two villages visited (Tlemang in Kecamatan Ngimbang and Karang Tinggil in Kecamatan Pucuk) there were no attendance lists available but the village head in Tlemang (a woman which is unusual) reported that there were meetings at the hamlet level as well as two village meetings with all formal village institutions represented. In Karang Tinggil the village head reported there was only one village meeting but that there were hamlet meetings as well.

Another indicator that can be used to gauge ordinary villager’ participation is swadaya or villager contribution to the program. Swadaya was significant in Tlemang village only. The infrastructure program in Tlemang was a repair to an asphalt road and the villager contribution was estimated as the equivalent of Rps 15 million, which represents 37.5% of the PMD available funding. This contribution was in the form of labor and rocks and sand. In Karang Tinggil, the infrastructure project was building a village office, a project that was reported to have been decided upon by the village head and secretary prior to the only village meeting and would suggest that villagers had little say in the program. Village contribution was reported to have been in the form of labor to prepare the site but no villagers confirmed this.

It therefore can be argued; at least in the case of Tlemang Village, that swadaya is a good indicator of broad based community participation.

**Community Control and Ownership of the Program**

The program emphasizes developing community institutions but not necessarily community ownership. Program guidelines dictate that the Lembaga Pemberdayaan Masyarakat (LPM) is the implementation team at the village level. The LPM is a formally elected village governance institution and as such can be said to be under villagers’ control. However, by not allowing for any direct elections to the project implementation team, the program does not strengthen or extend villager ownership.

The program guidelines stipulate that villagers propose and decide on the actual infrastructure and micro-credit programs. Alternative proposals and a proposal selection mechanism would be strong indicators of community control and ownership but neither village reported alternative proposals being discussed. In the case of Karang Tinggil, it was clear that the actual decision to build an office was decided upon by the village head and secretary prior to and outside the village forum.

Sanction and rewards are key instruments in both community control and in maintaining transparency. The program guidelines suggest the use of the Badan Perwakilan Desa (village representative body) as a complaints mechanism and indicate that fines and litigation are possible sanctions but does not suggest any rewards. This is in line with the program aim of strengthening village institutions but it does not allow an independent body to provide an oversight function.
Community Control over Program Resources

A good indicator of community control over program resources is the devolution of program finances to the village level by the program agency.

Bandes does provide for this and guidelines stipulate that funds are devolved to the village implementation team in two tranches. A bank account is opened by the Pjak (who is the project administrator at the village level in this program) and the initial tranche is released upon submission of the project proposal in the format proscribed in the handbook (know as a DRUK). The second trance is released upon submission of a progress report. For information, that is more detailed see the respective program matrix in the appendixes.

Program Transparency Issues

The program guidelines are in the form of a handbook which PMD reports as a simplified version of the KDP handbook. The handbook is made available to all village heads and kecamatan staff.

PMD conducted an initial socialization of the project goals, procedures, and documentation with kecamatan heads. Then the kecamatan heads conducted a half-day socialization briefing with the village heads and the heads of the respective LPM. Additional training was given to individual project administrators and project managers by PMD and by the district finance body (Badan Keuangan dan Barang Daerah – BKBD). The program guidelines also stress socialization at the village level but in the case of Karang Tinggil, socialization and project selection took place in the one meeting, not allowing for sufficient time for reflection and debate.

As previously noted effective record keeping, in particular financial record keeping, and open access to these records are important aspects of transparency. Bandes program guidelines require such records are maintained but do not require public reporting accountability meetings or public display of such records. A particular weakness of the Bandes program is that it requires only one signatory for the project bank account and this leaves the program seriously open to the possibility of misuse of project funds.

Program Sustainability

Bandes does encourage community self-reliance by encouraging village management of their projects, by actively encouraging villager contributions and by indicating a preference for local artisans and materials. However, the guidelines are remiss in so far as they do not stipulate a village maintenance plan for infrastructure proposals as a condition of receiving program funds. Nevertheless, Tlemang villagers are encouraged to maintain their roads and the village has in place a portal levy scheme to raise funds for maintenance purposes.
Program Simplicity

The Bandes program guidelines are straightforward and program procedures are clear and simple. However, like the Pemberdayaan Masyarakat Desa program in Bangkalan, there are insufficient checks against the possibility of misuse of program funds and resources.

Competition for funds

This program does not have inter-village competition and, as with many other programs in this study, this is a deliberate policy. Preference is for competition at the inter hamlet level.

Summary

In summary, this program follows some of the KDP principles but in common with the PPMD program, it has insufficient checks and balances on project finances and insufficient stress on wider community participation and ownership.
2. 3 Gerakan Terpadu Pengentasan Kemiskinan Program (Gerdu Taskin) in Lamongan and Bangkalan in East Java

Gerdu Taskin is a BAPPEDA provincial program to alleviate poverty, particularly in rural communities and covers all districts in East Java. This program started in 2003 and is claimed as KDP adoption. Local government has stated that this program is inspired by some KDP principles such as participation, transparency, and bottom up mechanism.

This program uses a cost sharing system between provincial and district funds. For example, Gerdu Taskin in Bangkalan covers 20 villages in 4 sub-districts (Kokob, Tragah, Konang, and Tanjung Bumi). Funding from the district APBD is Rps 980 million for 5 villages and funding from the provincial APBD (Rps 1,160 billion) for 15 villages. Gerdu Taskin in Lamongan covers 10 villages from district funds and 13 villages from provincial funds.

This year, each village received Rps 72,750,000 to fund three types of activities: infrastructure human resource development and micro-credit with an additional RPS 2,500,000 for administrative expenses.

In Lamongan, the funding ceiling is for not only type of activities but also the percentage designated for each activity type. Thus, 60% of the funding is allocated to infrastructure and the remaining 40% is divided between micro-credit activities and associated human resources training. The program has a consultant at the provincial level but villages report that the involvement of this person was minimal.

Funds are allocated directly to the villages. Villages visited during the study were Tagungguh in Kecamatan Tanjung Bumi in Bangkalan, and Tlemang in Kecamatan Ngimbang and Karangtinggil in Kecamatan Pucuk in Lamongan. For detailed information on the program and the villages visited, see the relevant appendices.

Aim of the Program

This yearly program has a specific poverty alleviating aim directed at rural communities. The program has three components: infrastructure human resource development and micro-credit.

Village Selection Criteria:

Villages are selected on the basis of poverty. Villages are chosen at the provincial level in conjunction with district recommendation. Villages have to be designated as “Desa Merah” or priority poorest villages as identified by the National Statistics office (BPS) and by Family Planning Statistics (BKKN).
Gerdu Taskin Program Characteristics that Replicate KDP Principles

The Gerdu Taskin Program operates on some of the KDP principles and BAPPEDA emphasizes that it was very influenced by KDP in designing its program. The following is a description of the extent that this program adopts KDP Principles:

Community Participation

The program does offer community participation with its open-menu procedure and its provision for village decision-making meetings. Villagers are in theory free to choose their own program within the limitations of it being an infrastructure, micro-credit and associated human resource training program and within the overall funding ceiling of Rps 72, 5000,000 and 2,500,000 for administrative purposes. The program guidelines stipulate that there should be village meetings in which villagers decide on and select the infrastructure program within the funding limitations. In addition, the program guidelines prohibit the election of village staff or village officials to the project management committees, which enhances community participation. The program, however, does not actively encourage the involvement of women or other marginalized groups.

Initial program socialization was conducted at the kecamatan level for village and hamlet heads and village secretaries. Information was given on program principles, guidelines, funding, program management teams and the level and type of village contribution expected.

Villager participation varied across the villages visited. In Tlemang, an initial socialization meeting was conducted for village bodies such as the LPM (village council) and BPD (village legislative council) hamlet heads and village leaders. This was followed up by three village meetings with participation rates of 25, 69, and 41 respectively. The majority of the participants at these meetings were representatives of village organizations but also included ‘ordinary villagers’. The first village meeting (25 participants) was a socialization meeting attended mainly by representatives of village organizations and it was at this meeting that a proposal to build an asphalt road of 1200 meters was made. Also proposed at this meeting was that the micro-credit program of animal husbandry (9 cows for breeding with the offspring being donated to poor villagers) and an animal husbandry training program for participants was made. This proposal was ratified at the second village meeting (69 participants) which was more widely attended. Tagungguh village also had three project meetings with attendance rates of 50, 50, and 90. The initial meeting was a socialization meeting, the second meeting elected project teams (implementation and financial) and developed proposal. The third meeting the final proposal was decided upon which was a road improvement project of 750 meters and two micro-credit programs (a goat-breeding program for poor villagers and a small batik cottage industry with eight groups). The human resources program chosen was a small school scholarship program aimed at very poor students with participants decided upon by the village head and the school principal. A small amount of money was also used to help repair the floor of a needy villager. The list of beneficiaries for the scholarship program was announced at a village meeting. Both of these villages...
maintained attendance records and both appeared keen to have as broad based participation as possible. Karang Tinggil had only one village meeting an attendance figure of 31. This meeting was to elect project management units (financial and implementation) and to decide on the project proposal. The project proposal selected was to asphalt 600 meters of road and a micro-credit project, which was the purchase of two tractors and training in the use of the tractors. There was a second meeting but this was held at the kabupaten level to deal with administrative matters. Impressions gained were that in this village officials are a close-knit group who run the program for their own benefit and are not interested in broad based participation or in the actual aims of the Gerdu Taskin program. The rational for the purchase of the tractors were that villagers could rent them at a cheaper rate than hiring them from other villages, as previously was the case. However, several villagers reported that the charges for renting the tractors were Rps 45,000 per session, which is the same rate as that charged previously. Two villagers reported that they thought the tractors were the personal property of the village head and knew nothing about the program - “we know nothing about Gerdu Taskin…we just know from you that the village get funds to buy tractor. Do the tractors belong to the village? We thought they are owned by the village head.”

Gerdu Taskin guidelines stipulates that participating villages provide swadaya or village contribution as a condition of participation in the program. Swadaya can be seen as an indicator of broad based participation. Swadaya figures for the participating villages studied were recorded as 20 million Rps for Karangtinggil, no figure was monetized for Tagungguh, but villagers confirmed they provided a significant amount of free labor and in Tlemang, village contribution was estimated as over Rps 43 million or approximately 50% of the infrastructure cost. In Tlemang household were asked to contribute 4 workdays and the equivalent of a truckload of rocks. This was confirmed by many of the villagers and most were very positive about their contribution and proud of their achievement. One villager commented “The road is good and we are glad that we helped to build it” and another stated “I don’t know about the cost of the road. We were not told but we all had to help and we are proud of our road.”

Community Control and Ownership of the Program

The program guidelines stipulate that villagers propose and decide on the actual infrastructure and micro-credit programs. Alternative proposals and a proposal selection mechanism would be strong indicators of community control and ownership and it is clear that village meetings in Tlemang and Tagungguh were well attended and alternative proposal were considered. One suspects that this was not true in the case of Karangtinggil, which had only one meeting and villagers met with indicated that the village head only invites selected people to meetings.

Sanction and rewards are key instruments in both community control and in maintaining transparency. The program guidelines suggest the use of the Badan Pengaduan Masyarakat (community complaints unit) but this is not effective as it is a part of the village apparatus. The program offers neither sanctions nor rewards.
Community Control over Program Resources

A good indicator of community control over program resources is the devolution of program finances to the village level by the program agency.

Gerdu Taskin does provide for this and guidelines stipulate that funds are devolved to the village financial team (UPK) in three tranches. The initial disbursement is made by BAPPEDA after the UPK submits details of the selected project, the project teams, and a photo of the infrastructure site at project start. BAPPEDA checks these with the kabupaten prior to disbursing the funds. The second tranche is released upon submission of a progress report with photo of the work done. The final tranche is released upon the submission of an accountability report. In practice, the number of tranches varied from village to village and in no case were copies of such reports available for inspection. The study team did not obtain details of account signatories but were informed that the accounts were held by the respective finance teams in accounts in the village project name.

Program Transparency Issues

The program guidelines are in the form of a handbook which BAPPEDA reports as being based on the KDP handbook. The handbook is made available to all village heads and kecamatan staff.

BAPPEDA conducted an initial half-day socialization of the project goals, procedures and documentation with kecamatan heads at the district level followed by one-day socialization meetings at the kecamatan level. The program guidelines also stress initial socialization meetings at the village level but in the case of Karang Tinggil, socialization and project selection took place in the one meeting, not allowing for sufficient time for reflection and debate.

Effective record keeping, in particular financial record keeping, and open access to these records are important aspects of transparency. Gerdu Taskin program guidelines require such records are maintained and require accountability meetings but do not require public display of such records. During the study visit, no financial records were available and villagers met with knew little or nothing about the sums of money involved in the program reflecting the lack of accountability meetings and public display of project finances.

Program Sustainability

Gerdu Taskin does encourage community self-reliance by encouraging village management of their projects, by actively encouraging villager contributions and by indicating a preference for local artisans and materials. However, the guidelines are remiss in so far as they do not stipulate a village maintenance plan for infrastructure proposals as a condition of receiving program funds. Nevertheless, Tlemang villagers are
encouraged to maintain their roads and the village has in place a portal levy scheme to raise funds for maintenance purposes.

**Program Simplicity**

The Gerdu Taskin program guidelines are straightforward and program procedures are clear and simple. However, in common with the previous programs discussed, there are insufficient checks and balances against the possibility of misuse of program funds and resources.

**Competition for funds**

This program does not have inter-village competition and, as with many other programs in this study, this appears to be a deliberate policy. Preference is for competition at the inter hamlet level.

**Summary**

The Gerdu Taskin program has a definite poverty alleviation aim and it theoretically targeting the poorest villages in East Java. However, only Tlemang really appeared to be a very poor village and the other two villages visited appeared to be relatively affluent as indicated by the quality of housing in these villages and this would, therefore, hold into question the effectiveness of the its program poverty targeting procedures. The programs guidelines correspond in many respects with the KDP program but its lack of sufficient checks and balances on project finances and its lack of public open accountability are serious issues for its effectiveness.
2.4. Program Peningkatan Sarana Prasarana Pelayanan Publik Pola Partisipatif (P2SP5) in South Sumatra

This infrastructure only program operates in the Solok District in Sumatra Barat with PMD as the institution in charge.

Aim of the Program

The principal objective of this program is to empower villagers with participatory bottom-up village development planning. As the program operates at the village level (not at the sub-district) the program funds go directly to program structures at the village level.

Village Selection Criteria

Each year the local government budgets around 700-900 million Rps from the APBD for the program and all villages (76) have access to this budget. Villages receive a maximum of Rps 20 million per project but the decision on the actual budget allocation is made at the district level in contrast to the previous programs discussed.

The program has been implemented since 1997. In 2003, PMD revised the program, which claims to adopt some KDP principles such as participation, transparency, village contribution and a preference for local skills and materials. It does not, however, have a poverty alleviation goal.

Two villages were visited during the study, Taruang-Taruang (ex KDP Village) in Kecamatan Koto Sungai Lasi and Koto Baru (non-KDP) village in Kecamatan Kubung. A checklist indicating levels of knowledge and participation in the programs was used for interview purposes. 32 villagers (25 men and 7 women) were interviewed in Taruang-Taruang and 21 villagers 17 men and 4 women) in Koto Baru. Villagers were chosen for interview on the basis of availability.

P2SP5 Program Characteristics that Replicate KDP Principles:

The following is a description of the extent that the P2SP5 program adopts KDP Principles:

Community Participation

Villagers are in theory free to choose their own program within the limitations of it being an infrastructure program and the funding ceiling of Rps 20 million. The program guidelines stipulate that there should be village meetings in which villagers decide on and select the infrastructure program within the funding limitations and subject to verification of the proposal by PMD at the district level. The verification team consists of representatives of BAPPEDA, PMD, and PU (Public Works). PU standards are used to verify the proposed project costings.
A potential impediment to community participation is the very questionable assumption made by PMD is that as the program has been running for several years that socialization is no longer required. This assumption is highly questionable and contrasts strongly with KDP, which places very heavy emphasis on project socialization meetings at sub-district and village levels as a prerequisite for broad based community participation. Whilst there is debate over the amount of socialization required for effective community participation, there can be no debate that some socialization is required if effective community participation is to take place.

Interviews with villagers in Taruang-Taruang, an ex KDP village which participates in this program, highlights the contrasting levels of community awareness and participation between the KDP program and the P2SP5 program. 32 villagers, 7 women and 25 men, were interviewed. All of the 32 villagers were aware of the KDP project activity whilst only 4 of the men and 2 of the women knew about the P2SP5 program. 20 men and 5 women knew the precise funding level of the KDP project contrasting sharply with zero knowledge of the funding of the P2SP5 project. 20 men and 3 women had knowledge of the KDP fund disbursement tranches but no one had any knowledge of the P2SP5 funding mechanism. Ten men and three women had actually attended KDP meetings and none had attended or even had knowledge of the P2SP5 project meetings. Fifteen men and tow women had knowledge of the KDP laborers selection process, laborer salaries and had actually been employed on the KDP project whilst none had knowledge of the P2SP5 labor selection process and salaries and none were employed on the P2SP5 project. One villager commented, “We know almost everything about KDP such as the value of the funds, the funds disbursements and the meetings but we know very little about the other program.” and another stated, “I like KDP better because it is very transparent in almost all aspects.”

There was only one P2SP5 project village meeting and the village head and his staff decided on the proposal, which was a stone paving project for 420 meters of road. No attendance figures were available but village staff indicated that the participation was limited to village organizations’ representatives.

Likewise, in Koto Baru (a non KDP Village), there was only one project meeting at the village level but villagers had better knowledge of the P2SPR project than in Taruang-Taruang. The village head indicated that between 30-50 villagers had attended the meeting but there was no attendance list to verify this. The project in this case was also a 400-meter road stone paving project. Of the 21 informants, 10 men and 2 women knew about the project activity but only 5 men had knowledge of the project funding and no one knew about the funds disbursement process. 4 men and 1 woman had actually attended the village project meeting. 10 men and 2 women knew about the labor selection process and 8 men had actually worked on the project as unpaid laborers as part of the village contribution. All labor on this project was voluntary unpaid labor.

Village contribution or swadaya is thought of as indicative of community participation and in the two villages visited in the study of the P2SP5 program swadaya was very significant. In Taruang-Taruang, village contribution was estimated as Rps 6,500,000
(labor and materials) representing over 81% of the actual P2SP5 program allocation of only Rps 8,000,000. In Koto Baru, the estimated contribution was Rps 2,500,000, which was 25% of the program allocation of 10,000,000, a figure that is not as impressive as Taruang-Taruang but is significant. The contributions gain even more significance when noted against the fact that there are only 170 households in Taruang-Taruang and 200 in Koto Baru. Using swadaya as an indicator would suggest that community participation is high under this program.

It is interesting to note here that programs funds only become available for disbursement very late in the year and that villages have only 2-3 months to initiate and complete their projects. This is because of the slow process involved in the APBD budgeting process and the subsequent late disbursement of funds. This is true for all the programs in this study and reduces the time available for lengthier program socialization.

**Community Control and Ownership of the Program**

The program emphasizes community control and ownership in so far as program guidelines insist on the election of a project Village Implementation Team (Unit Pengelola Program – UPP).

**Community Control over Program Resources**

The program funds are devolved to the village implementation team and funds are released in two tranches in the form of a cash cheque to the implementation team from Kas Daerah (Finance office). In previous years, the funds were actually delivered in cash!

There is no provision for a separate financial team to monitor and safeguard program funds expenditure and no requirement for a project bank account with specified signatories.

**Program Transparency Issues**

Transparency is an important principle in KDP and the P2SP5 does have a program handbook that is available to kecamatan Heads and to village heads. The guidelines are reported to be influenced by KDP principles such as participation, transparency, preference for local materials and skills and village contributions. However, these guidelines are inadequate with respect to details on how to achieve these. In particular, the guidelines do not adequately safeguard project funds and do not insist on public display of project activities or public accountability meetings.

Monitoring and evaluation are key tools in ensuring transparency and accountability, especially when such monitoring is conducted by external bodies to the program. The program does have a monitoring team at the district level, which includes representatives from BAPPEDA, PMD, and a financial person from the Bupati’s office. In theory, this team is required to conduct a monitoring visit prior to the release of the second tranche of project funds.
Program Sustainability

The P2SP5 program does encourage community self-reliance, in particular, by insisting on village contributions and the use of a village implementation team to manage and implement the program but the guidelines do not insist on a maintenance plan, which is essential to the sustainability of any project.

Program Simplicity

P2SP5 program has simple guidelines and a simple strategy of supporting bottom-up initiatives but the program does not have sufficient checks against the possibility of misuse of program funds and resources and leave themselves open to such possibilities and to such accusations by not doing so.

Competition for funds

This program does not have inter-village competition as all villages receive funding. Inter-hamlet competition is not encouraged, as there is funding ceiling to encourage such competition.

Summary

The P2SP5 program replicates some of the principles of the KDP program in so far as villages make proposals and funds are devolved to the village level. However, the decision on the actual project funds available to the villages is retained at the district level, which does not really give full control to the villages concerned. Key KDP features such as extensive socialization, procedures and processes safeguarding project funds, public display of information on project activity and use of funds and maintenance plans are all absent.
2.5 Danau Allocasi Umum (DAU) in Tapanuli Utara in North Sumatra

This program operates in the Tapanuli Utara District in North Sumatra with PMD as the institution in charge.

**Aim of the program**

The principal objective of this program is to improve village infrastructure and the program developed from another program. There is no specific poverty alleviation aim or poverty targeting but PMD expressed the hope that the infrastructure improvements will develop the village economies. PMD officials are very aware of the KDP program and claim to have made changes to the DAU program based on KDP principles. They cite community participation, devolution of funding, financial planning and budgeting and the village contributions as changes influenced by the KDP program.

**Village Selection Criteria**

The program covers all 18 villages in the district and each village receives an allocation of Rps 26 Million. Rps. 20 million of this is for the project itself, Rps 1 million for the project management teams, Rps 1 million for the village women’s group (Program Kesejahteraan Kelurga) and Rps 4 million for village administration.

Three villages were visited during the study: Hutapaung Village in Kecamatan Pollung, and Simason and Lumbang Garaga villages in Kecamatan Pahae Julu. Hutapaung and Simason are ex KDP villages and Lumbang Garaga was unsuccessful in the competition for KDP funding. A checklist indicating levels of knowledge and participation in the programs was used for interview purposes. 38 villagers (6 men and 22 women) were interviewed in Huatpaung, 30 villagers (12 women and 18 men) in Simason and 21 villagers (19 men and 2 women) in Lumbang Garga.

Villagers were chosen for interview on the basis of their availability.

**DAU Program Characteristics that Replicate KDP Principles**

The following is a description of the extent that the DAU adopts KDP Principles:

**Community Participation**

Villagers are in theory free to choose their own program within the limitations of it being mainly an infrastructure program and the funding ceiling of Rps 20 million for the project itself and provided the project proposed does not contradict the negative list. The project guidelines negative list is similar to the KDP negative list. It includes items for consumption (e.g. the hiring of cars), the rehabilitation of mosques or churches, the purchases of sports equipment and tools (e.g. tractors), the use of contractors, payment of tools, paying for fertilizers and pesticides and prohibits the election of village officials to the implementation team (with the exception of the village treasurer).
The DAU program insists on the election by voting at an open village meeting of an implementation team consisting of a project head, a secretary, and a treasurer but it does not make provision for a separate financial team.

The program encourages villagers to make alternative proposals and to rank them verbally prior to proposal selection by voting at a village meeting. DAU guidelines insist that the implementation team must subsequently produce the selected proposal in written form according to a prescribed format that includes a detailed budget for the project. This has to be reviewed at the kecamatan level prior to submission to PMD at the district level.

Project socialization is a key to community participation and the DAU program guidelines stipulate program socialization at district level for kecamatan and PMD staff and at kecamatan level representatives of village organizations such as the LPM, PKK, and BPD. Unlike the programs previously discussed DAU insists that the representatives of the village women’ group (PKK) must be included. DAU also stipulates that socialization should take place at the village level by kecamatan staff as facilitators but this is conducted in the same meeting as the election of the project implementation team, which is a limitation on effective community socialization. Program guidelines instruct that hamlet heads and 2 representatives from each hamlet should be invited to the village meetings. Village heads and villagers in all three villages criticized the DAU program for the lack of time accorded by the program to community socialization and compared it negatively to the KDP program. The village head in Hutapaung (ex KDP) commented that DAU allows insufficient time for villagers to develop ideas as there is only one village meeting unlike KDP and the village head in Simason (also ex KDP) made the same point by commenting that KDP socialization was broad and that DAU was limited. A farmer in Simason stated that “KDP is better because there are meetings with all hamlets and in DAU there is only one village meeting” and a nurse in the same village made the point that KDP “… is better because we get training and learn how to make plans”.

Interviews with villagers in the Simason and Hutapaung (both ex KDP villages) highlight the contrasting levels of community awareness and participation between the KDP program and the DAU program. In Simason where 30 villagers were interviewed (12 women and 18 men), only 10 men knew about the DAU program compared to 15 men and 2 women with knowledge of the KDP program. 11 of the men knew about KDP meetings and 2 had actual attended these but none knew of the DAU meeting and none attended. 11 (men) knew about the KDP project team election process versus 0 for DAU. 8 men and 2 women knew about the KDP funding mechanisms versus 7 men and 0 women having similar knowledge for DAU.

In Hutapaung where 38 villagers (22 women and 16 males) were interviewed, all 16 men and 19 of the women had knowledge of the KDP project versus 11 men and 2 women with knowledge of the DAU program. Two men had attended the KDP meetings and
only one man had attended the DAU meeting. Thirteen men and two women knew about the KDP project team election process whilst only eight (men) knew about the DAU election process. Eleven men and two women knew about the KDP funding mechanisms versus none for DAU.

The interviews clearly indicate that in both Simason and Hutapaung villages the level of community knowledge and participation in KDP was considerably higher than that for DAU suggesting that KDP socialization was more effective than the DAP program.

In Lumbang Garaga (unsuccessful in KDP competition), 21 villagers were interviewed of which 2 were women and 19 were men. 13 women and the 2 women know of the DAU program and 12 of the men actually attended the meeting but only 2 men knew of the election of implementation team process and the same was true for the funding mechanism suggesting that that socialization in the meeting was poor and events were conducted hurriedly.

Village contribution or swadaya is thought of as indicative of community participation and the DAU program strongly encourages this. In Lumbang Garaga village contribution was estimated as Rps 2 million (unpaid labor) representing 10% of the DAU infrastructure allocation and in Hutapaung this was estimated at Rps 2.5 million, a little over 10%. No figures were provided for Simason. Whilst none of these figures are particularly high compared to other programs discussed, they can, nevertheless, be considered as very significant community contribution as all three villages are extremely poor and are by far the poorest villages in the whole study.

**Community Control and Ownership of the Program**

The program emphasizes community control and ownership in so far as program guidelines insist on the election by voting of a project village implementation team (Tim Pelaksanaan Kegiatian – TPK) and that project selection is by proposals and voting on them at a village meeting.

**Community Control over Program Resources**

The program funds are devolved to the village implementation team and funds are released in two tranches (50% and 50%). The first tranche requires a written proposal with a detailed budget and photo evidence of site conditions at the start of the project and a report on the village meeting. The second tranche requires a written report on work progress and expenditure details with receipts. The account is held in the village name at the Bank Pembangunan Daerah Sumatra Utara and two signatories are required (Implementation Team Head and Treasurer with a stamp by the village head.

**Program Transparency Issues**

Transparency is an important principle in KDP and the DAU has a program handbook that is available to kecamatan and village heads and the project implementation teams
are required to read it. PMD reports that the guidelines are influenced by KDP principles such as participation, funding mechanism, transparency, preference for local materials and skills and village contributions.

Monitoring and evaluation are key tools in ensuring transparency and accountability, especially when such monitoring is conducted by external bodies to the program. The program does have a monitoring team at the district level, which includes representatives from BAPPEDA, PMD, and a financial person from the Bupati’s office. In theory, this team is required to conduct a monitoring visit prior to the release of the second tranche of project funds.

However, the program does not require public accountability meetings or the public display of program activities and funding expenditures nor does it have a complaints system. PMD officials admit that these are weaknesses and state they are constantly trying to improve the program.

**Program Sustainability**

The DAU program encourages community self-reliance, in particular, by insisting on village contributions and the use of a village implementation team to manage and implement the program but the guidelines do not insist on a maintenance plan, which is essential to the sustainability of any project.

**Program Simplicity**

The DAU program has simple guidelines and a simple strategy of supporting bottom-up initiatives.

**Competition for funds**

This program does not have inter-village competition as all villages receive funding but PMD states that they encourage inter-hamlet competition by insisting in the guidelines that hamlet heads and two representatives per hamlet should attend the village project meeting. The program would be more effective in this respect if the guidelines insisted on hamlet meetings to develop proposals prior to the village meeting.

**Summary**

The DAU program has adopted some of the principles of the KDP program in so far as villages make proposals and funds are devolved to the village level. However, key KDP features such as extensive socialization, the separation of implementation and financial teams to safeguard project funds, the public display of information on project activity and use of funds and the insistence on maintenance plans are all absent.
2.6. Program Pemberdayaan Ekonomi Kerakyatan Kampung Tua (PPEK-KT)

PPEK-KT is a micro-credit program in Lampung Province, which started in 2003 and is now in its second year of operation.

Aim of the Program

This program is aimed at alleviating poverty focusing on Kampung Tua community. Kampung tua refers to villages in Lampung, which are inhabited by adat community or indigenous people mainly from two clans (Pepadun and Sebatin clans). The main goals are to:

1. Revitalize adat (traditional) institutions to become more active in the development process
2. Empower kampung tua (adat) institution to develop economic activities
3. Create new local economic activities
4. Strengthen existing local economic activities
5. Introduce marketing and banking to these communities as a part of economic development
6. Set up economic cooperative institutions at the Kampung Tua level

Village Selection Criteria:

Of the 2,105 villages in Lampung, 755 villages (36.67%) are categorized as poor villages with kampung tua villages being in the majority according to PMD Lampung poverty list. The program was set by the local government of Lampung to achieve equality and reduce development gaps between kampung tua and other villages.

In year 1 (2003) each kecamatan selected one kampong tua (village) but in year 2 (2004) each kecamatan could select 2 or 3 villages.

Criteria:

1. Considered as ‘kampong tua’ (old village)
2. Made up by adat communities majority
3. Poor and underdeveloped
4. Has natural and human resources capable of being developed
5. High unemployment
6. Easy access to transportation

Two villages were visited during the study: Kampung Tua Mulang Maya in kecamatan Kotabumi Selatan and Kampung Tua Tanjung Raja in kecamatan Tanjung Raja, both ex KDP villages. A checklist indicating levels of knowledge and participation in the programs was used for interview purposes. Eighteen villagers (9 women and 9 men) were interviewed in Mulang Maya, and 14 villagers (3 women and 11 men) in Tanjung Raja.

Villagers were chosen for interview on the basis of their availability.
PPEK-KT Program Characteristics that Replicate KDP Principles

The following is a description of the extent that PPEK-KT adopts KDP Principles:

**Community Participation**

Villagers are in theory free to propose their own micro program subject provided it does not contradict a negative list and subject to verification by the UNILA implementation team and PMD at the provincial level. For example, Mulang Maya proposed 10 micro-credit activities but only two were successful; a Cassava group with a proposed revolving fund of Rps 44 million and a fish breeding activity (3 groups) with a proposed revolving fund of Rps 46 million. Tanjung Raja submitted 13 proposals and only 3 were funded. These were a cow husbandry scheme (914 cows) costing Rps 44,147,500, a goat husbandry scheme (25 goats) costing Rps 23,157,000, and 3 fish breeding ponds costing Rps 22,677,500. Thus, the main controlling agency of the program funds and decision on village micro-credit proposal rests with UNILA and PMD at the provincial level and not with the village management teams. This is a severe impediment to community control and ownership.

Project socialization is a key to community participation and the PPEK-KT program guidelines stipulate program socialization by PMD and UNILA at provincial district level for province DPRD, NGO, University and community organizations to seek inputs on the program, and at Kabupaten for district DPRD representatives, Head of Kecamatan and Kampung Tua representatives. Program socialization at the village level was facilitated by Kampung Tua program facilitators or FKs (FKs responsible for 2-3 villages) and was conducted over two village meetings for adat institution representatives, the village LPM, BPD, and village staff. At the initial meeting, the Lembaga Masyarakat Adat (LMA) as a representative body of the adat communities with overall responsibility for the PPEK-KT program was appointed in accordance with adat principles. In this meeting two other program bodies are set up the Unit Pengelola Keuangan Kampung Tua or UPK-KT (Kampung Tua Finance Team) and the Unit Kelompok Usaha Masyarakat Adat Kampung Tua or KUM-KT (the Kampung Tua micro-credit implementation team). Both are supposed to be elected but in some instances are appointed. KDP principles would tend to emphasize election through voting over appointment of community representatives but this can conflict with adat or traditional ways of providing community representation. The PPEK-KT program with its aim of revitalizing adat institutions brings into focus the issue of community representation and the conflict between adat and KDP principles over the selection of community representation and community control.

Training is an important component in socialization and villagers in both villages have commented on the lack of training by the program. In Tanjung Raja one villager commented, “Honestly, I think this program will useless, because there is no training or even monitoring to us. It is just like Santa Claus giving children a present, only charity.”
It’s difficult to hope that this would empower people here. I wish government would pay attention to this by giving us guidance and training.”

Interviews with villagers in Mulang Maya and Tanjung Raja (both ex KDP villages) indicated similar levels of community awareness and participation between the KDP program and the PPEK-KT program.

In Mulang Maya where 18 villagers (11 women and 7 men) were interviewed, 8 men and 1 woman knew about the PPEK-KT program compared to only 5 men and 2 women with knowledge of the KDP program. However, more villagers (10) had better knowledge of the KFP meetings (3 men and 7 women) compared to 8 villagers (women) for PPEK-KT with the same figures for actual attendance. Similar figures were true for knowledge of the different project teams’ selection processes but significantly, more villagers (8 versus 3) were aware of KDP accountability meetings compared to PPEK-KT. Equal numbers were recorded for knowledge of both projects’ funding mechanisms.

In Tanjung Raya where 14 villagers (3 women and 11 men) were interviewed, 9 men and 3 of the women had knowledge of the KDP project versus 9 men and 1 woman with knowledge of the PPEK-KT program. 5 men and 3 women had attended the KDP meetings and slightly better attendance (9 men but no women) was noted for the PPEK-KT meetings. Knowledge of both programs team elections processes were similar but villagers had better knowledge of KDP accountability meetings (6 for KDP versus 1 only 1 for PPEK-K). Knowledge of the funding mechanisms was equal for both programs.

The interviews would suggest similar levels of community participation in both programs but better knowledge of KDP accountability meetings

**Community Control and Ownership of the Program**

The program emphasizes community control and ownership insofar as the program allows for voting by election of the program village implementation and financial teams and adat institutions in the villages appoint the village program oversight team. It also allows villages to make their own micro-credit proposals but it effectively negates community ownership and control by retaining full control of project funding decisions at the provincial level.

**Community Control over Program Resources**

In theory once the proposals are decided upon at the provincial level, the program funds are devolved in two tranches (1st tranche of 70% and the 2nd tranche of 30 %) to the program finance team (UPK-KT) at the village level. The second tranche requires a written progress report on the economic groups’ activities and verification of the full disbursement of the first tranche by a visit of the provincial team (PMD and UNILA). Release of the second tranche relies on full disbursement of the first tranche of fund. The UPK-KT then releases the funds to the beneficiaries groups in two tranches of 70% and 30%. Interest is payable in advance by deduction and the level of interest is supposed
to be decided at the village meeting with the beneficiaries. The interest then becomes part of the revolving fund for the next year.

In the case of Mulang Maya only the first tranche was devolved to the UPK-KT and villager program teams report that they do not understand why this was the case. PMD and UNILA have reported this was because of poor performance in fund disbursement. It may well be related to the fact that there is controversy over how the funds were released to beneficiaries by the UPK-KT. According to villagers beneficiary groups received the micro-credit with 18% interest deducted upfront but according to UPK-KT and the other program village institutions the interest deducted was 3%.

In the case of Tanjung Raja all funds were released by the provincial team but there is also controversy over the interest deducted by the UPK-KT. Villagers claim that it was 10% and that there had been no discussion or agreement on the interest rate at the village meeting. The UPK-KT claims that there had been a discussion and the interest deducted was 9% not 10%.

As noted earlier, the community does not have control over the proposal funding decisions but once funds are released, there is community control over these funds subject to verification by the provincial team. However, there was community conflict over the application of this control in both villages visited.

Program Transparency Issues

Transparency is an important principle in KDP and the PPEK-KT has a program handbook that is available to program management teams at the village level. It is claimed that this handbook was influenced by KDP principles such as participation, transparency, accountability, and sustainability.

Both villages visited during this study do not understand why some of their proposals for funding were rejected at the provincial level and feel that the decision over proposal funding is not transparent. In Mulang Maya one villager commented, “We only get 52% of our rights. I can’t understand what the program wants. We made a good proposal and passed the verification but we didn’t receive the entire amount asked for in the proposal. Was it corrupted by the committee?”

Transparency over fund allocations at the village level is also an issue as evidenced by the controversy over interest rates particularly in Tanjung Raja but also in Mulang Maya. In Tanjung Raja one villager commented, “The team never asked us about interest rates. They decided themselves. Yeah maybe right that they discussed about it but only among themselves without inviting us.” And a villager in Mulang Maya commented, “In our proposal which has been verified, we proposed three units of fish ponds for all members of the fish group. But, we only got two units. UPK-KT said that the fund for us was switched to other group. At our proposal it noted that our allocation was Rps 46 million, but we only receive RPS 17 million.”
Monitoring and evaluation are key tools in ensuring transparency and accountability, especially when such monitoring is conducted by external bodies to the program. The program does have PMD and UNILA monitoring teams at the provincial level. UNILA has also hired an independent monitoring team but at the time of the study visit, this team had not yet reported. In theory, these teams are required to conduct a monitoring visit prior to the release of the second tranche of project funds. Villagers in Tanjung Raja say that visits by these teams are rare and are hoping they will be visited soon so they can ask questions about the interest rate. In the case of Mulang Raya, two monitoring visits were made.

The program guidelines stipulate public accountability meetings but villagers in both villages visited commented negatively on this. There is no public display of program activities and funding expenditures nor does it have a complaints system.

Program Sustainability

The PPEK-KT program guideline encourages community self-reliance but do not insist on maintenance plans.

Program Simplicity

The PPEK-KT program in theory has simple guidelines but there is confusion over how interest rates are decided and this process needs to be clarified and widely publicized.

Competition for funds

This program does not have inter-village competition.

Summary

The PPEK-KT program has adopted some of the principles of the KDP program in so far as villages make proposals and funds once devolved are managed at the village level. But decisions on the funding of village proposals are taken at the provincial level and there are serious transparency issues especially over the interest rates and how proposals are managed at the village level.
2.7 Program Pembangunan Pengembangan Desa Mandiri (P3DM) in Tanah Bumbu South Kalimantan.

This annual program started in 2004 in the new district of Tanah Bumbu, which was formerly a part of the district of Kota Baru in South Kalimantan. The program evolved from a Kota Baru program entitled Gerbangdes but unlike the Gerbangdes program, it has a small micro-credit component. The program is funded by district funds and the Bupati’s is very involved in this program. The program was initiated by the Head of BAPPEDA who hired a consultant from the University of Lambung Mangkurat to design the program. PMD under BAPPEDA is the agency in charge of the program. The program has facilitators (termed motivators) at the village level and they are theoretically recruited from the program village. PMD claims that P3DM is inspired and modeled on KDP though they stressed that they also wanted a project that was independent of KDP.

The kecamatans in this new kabupaten are:

Kecamatan Batulicin : 27 villages [ex gerbangdes]
Kecamatan Kusan Hilir : 35 villages [ex gerbangdes]
Kecamatan Kusan Hulu : 22 villages
Kecamatan Sungai Loban : 14 villages
Kecamatan Satui : 19 villages

Aim of the Program

The program does not have a specific poverty alleviation aim nor does it engage in poverty targeting. The program is a village community development program aimed mainly at the development of village infrastructure.

Village Selection Criteria:

None as all 117 villages plus one urban village in these five kecamatans are funded through this program. Each village receives Rps 50 million broken down into; Rps 12 million for transport (motorbike), Rps 2 million for communications (VHF FM Transceiver), Rps 27 million for infrastructure, Rps 5 million for village women’s group (PKK) and Rps 4 million for operational costs. The motor bikes and transceivers are purchased centrally by PMD and provided to participating villages in this first year of the project. PMD states the infrastructure component funding will be increased by Rps 14 million next year, the cost of the motorbike and receiver provided in this the first year of the project.

Unlike most of the programs in the study, P3DM has facilitators at the village level. The guidelines state that facilitators (termed motivators) are responsible to work with all community development projects at the village level and not just the P3DM program. Motivators are supposed to be proposed by the village apparatus, reviewed by the Bupati’s office, and approved by PMD. 5 of the 27 motivators in Batu Licin are women. The recruitment criteria for motivators are:
• Have a bachelor level degree
• Candidates should be proposed by village apparatus
• Candidates should where possible be recruited from the village and live in it.

Motivators are paid 500,000 Rps a month (from the district budget) for a ten-month year and report to PMD at the district level.

Motivators are given training by PMD and PT Alkon (a consulting firm from Surabaya) who produced a one-week training program with an additional 3 days for physical training designed to increase their strength for working in the field!

In practice, the recruitment procedures are frequently not adhered to and in many cases; the motivators are proposed and chosen by the Bupati’s office. The existing Bupati is an acting Bupati and at the time of the study was up for election. Comments have been made that the motivators are appointed by the acting Bupati to serve as his ‘ear’ at the village level. Irregularities in the recruitment of motivators are a serious source of contention in many villages and have created poor working relationships in some instances. Another source of contention is that motivators’ salaries are high relative to village official salaries and this has resulted in tensions between some village officials and motivators, which impeded their effectiveness. In Manunggal village, officials report that the motivator was appointed with their involvement and from outside the village, despite the fact that the village has 56 graduates. In Segumbang village, officials report that the motivator was appointed by the Bupati’s office without their knowledge and that relationships with the motivator are very poor and they claim the motivator is ineffective. In Segumbang, village officials are very unhappy over the high salary paid to the motivator.

The criterion that candidates for motivator positions must have a degree is problematic as it rules out possibly good candidates who lack this qualification. It also rules out poor villagers who do not have the means to continue their education to this level and almost by definition, therefore, selects from traditional village elites. PMD indicated that one of the concerns behind the criterion is to provide employment for graduates. The post does not really require such a high level of education and changing the qualification to a high school graduate would open the recruitment pool considerably and potentially result in better recruitment results.

Four villages in Kecamatan Batulicin were visited during the study: Desa Manunggal (ex KDP), Desa Segumbang (ex KDP), Desa Batu Licin Irigasi (lost out in competition for KDP funding), and Salimuran.

A checklist indicating levels of knowledge and participation in the programs was used for interview purposes. Twenty-one villagers (12 men and 9 women) were interviewed in Manunggal; 26 villagers (11 women and 15 men) in Segumbang, 25 villagers (14 men
Villagers were chosen for interview on the basis of their availability.

**P3DM Program Characteristics that Replicate KDP Principles**

The following is a description of the extent that the P3DM adopts KDP Principles:

**Community Participation**

Villagers are in theory free to choose their own program within the limitations of it being mainly an infrastructure program and the funding ceilings of Rps 27 million for infrastructure and Rps 5 million for micro-credit for the village women’s group (PKK). The is no official negative list but PMD discourages funds being used for the building of mosques, the building of schools and the rehabilitation of existing villages over a ceiling of Rps 5 million.

The P3DM program insists on the election by voting at an open village meeting of an implementation team consisting of a project head, a secretary, treasurer and one technical person but the program does not make provision for a separate financial team. All positions have to be elected but there is no prohibition on village officials being elected to these posts with the exception of the village head.

The program encourages villagers to make alternative proposals at an initial village meeting and then to further discuss these at the hamlet level prior to verbally ranking and selection by voting at a second village meeting. The formal guidelines do not state the number of meetings required but PMD strongly suggests at least two village meetings.

Project socialization is a key to community participation and the P3DM program guidelines stipulate program socialization at district level (half day) for kecamatan and program facilitators. P3DM also stipulates that socialization should take place at the village level by the motivators but as this is conducted in the same meeting as the election of the project implementation team (TPKPK) and the discussion of initial project proposal, the time available for effective socialization is limited. Program guidelines instruct that hamlet heads and neighborhood representatives should be invited to the village meetings.

Interviews with villagers in the Manunggal and Segumbang (both ex KDP villages) indicate higher levels of participation and program awareness for KDP but the level of awareness of both programs was quite low. Informants from Batu Lcin Irigasi and Salimuran revealed quite low levels of participation in and awareness of the P3DM program.

Village contribution or swadaya is thought of as indicative of community participation and the P3DM program encourages this. In Batu Lcin Irigasi, the program implementation team estimated that village contribution in the form of labor and
materials was 60% of the total cost of the infrastructure project. No figure was given for Salimuran but villagers contributed unpaid labor. In Manunggal, the implementation team estimates that the infrastructure project (village community hall) will cost almost Rps 88 million against the program allocation of Rps 27 million and villagers will contribute the difference in labor, materials, and monies. In Segumbang, no figure was given but the implementation team reports that villagers are accepting lower working salaries as their contribution. Thus using village contribution as an indicator of participation would suggest quite high levels of participation under this program.

**Community Control and Ownership of the Program**

The program emphasizes community control and ownership in so far as program guidelines insist on the election by voting of a project village implementation team (Tim Pelaksanaan Kegiatian – TPK) and that project selection is by proposals and voting on them at a village meeting.

**Community Control over Program Resources**

The program funds are devolved to the village project implementation team and funds are released in three tranches (40%, 40%, and 20%). The first tranche requires a written proposal with a detailed budget and photo evidence of site conditions at the start of the project and a report of the village meeting 1 and 2. This report should be sent to the kecamatan first for approval and then forwarded to a technical team at the district level (Tim Teknis Kabupaten). The person responsible at the district level is the Head of the district BAPPEDA office. The BAPPEDA financial office (Pemegang Kas Kantor) actually releases the funds.

The second tranche requires a written report on work progress and expenditure details (including labor salaries) with receipts. The third tranche follows a similar format.

The guidelines state that the account is held in the program name with the treasurer as the official signatory. The number of signatories varies in practice according to the particular local bank’s terms and conditions.

The program has no separate finance team to safeguard program funds, which leaves the program, open to the potential misuse of funds.

**Program Transparency Issues**

Transparency is an important principle in KDP and the P3DM has a program handbook that is available to kecamatan and village heads. PMD reports that the guidelines are influenced by KDP principles such as participation, funding mechanism, transparency, preference for local materials and skills and village contributions.

Monitoring and evaluation are key tools in ensuring transparency and accountability, especially when such monitoring is conducted by external bodies to the program. The
program does not have an external independent monitoring but there are monitoring teams at the kabupaten and kecamatan levels. Monitoring at the kecamatan level is conducted by a kecamatan technical team (Tin Teknis Kecamatan) whose duties are to look at administration and building progress and to attend were possible all program meetings. The head of this team is the section head of PMD. The monitoring team at the district level is the district technical team (Tim Teknis Kabupaten) consisting of representatives from the Bupati’s office, BAPPEDA, PMD and PU.

However, the program does not require specific public accountability meetings or the public display of program activities and funding expenditures nor does it have an official complaints system. Program guidelines state that in the event of misuse of program funds village meetings can decide on local sanctions and legal sanctions can be employed if this does not solve the problem. The guidelines also state that all misused funds must be returned.

**Program Sustainability**

The P3DM program encourages community self-reliance, in particular, by insisting on village contributions and the use of a village implementation team to manage and implement the program but the guidelines do not insist on a maintenance place, which is essential to the sustainability of any project. PMD officials state that they informally encourage villagers to maintain their projects.

**Program Simplicity**

The P3DM program has simple clear guidelines and a simple strategy of supporting bottom-up initiatives through project village project proposals with funding devolved to the village.

**Competition for funds**

This program does not have inter-village competition as all villages receive funding but PMD states that they encourage inter-hamlet competition by insisting in the guidelines that hamlet heads and neighborhood representatives should attend the first village project meeting and further discuss proposals at subsequent hamlet meetings prior to the final proposal selection at the second village meeting.

**Summary**

The P3DM program has adopted some of the principles of the KDP program in so far as villages make proposals and funds are devolved to the village level. However key KDP features such as extensive socialization, the separation of implementation and financial teams to safeguard project funds, the public display of information on project activity and use of funds and the insistence on maintenance plans are all absent.
2.8 Program Gerakan Membangun Desa (Gerbangdes) in Kota Baru, South Kalimantan

This annual program started in 2001 in the district of Kota Baru in South Kalimantan, a year after KDP started its program. The lead institution since 2004 is PMD and the coordination team has a very positive attitude towards community empowerment.

Aims of the Program

The specific aims of the program are to develop village autonomy, to strengthen village governance institutions and to maximize villagers’ participation. The program emphasizes community contribution and the use of village meetings (Musbangdes) to develop program activities. The main program activity is developing village infrastructure.

Village Selection Criteria

Initially, the program was aimed at non-KDP sub-districts but it has now spread to all districts and so there is overlap. It appears that Kota Baru is not interested in the matching grants program because it is viewed as expensive (especially with respect to facilitator costs) and because it runs over financial years, which is seen as problematic in terms of reporting to the DPRD.

Each village receives Rps 50 million broken down as follows: Rps 5 million for operational costs of the Implementation Team and Rps 45 million for the infrastructure project.

A noticeable feature of the program is that it has a reward and sanctions mechanism. Villages performing well are given an incentive and villages performing poorly have their funding reduced. The Bupati’s office decides which villages should be rewarded and which should be penalized based on reports by the team technical (Tim Teknis) in each Kecamatan. Last year Desa Karang Payau in Kecamatan Kelumpang Hulu was rewarded with a motorbike. Officials were reluctant to identify an example of a village being penalized but stated that it did happen.

Three villages in Kota Baru were visited during the study: Desa Sungai Nipah (lost out in KDP competition), Desa Sungai Kupang, and Desa Sangking Baru (Ex KDP in 2002).

A checklist indicating levels of knowledge and participation in the programs was used for interview purposes. 25 villagers (all women) were interviewed in Desa Sungai Nipah, 46 villagers (17 women and 29 men) in Desa Sungai Kupang and 14 villagers (11 men and 3 women) in Desa Sangking Baru.

Villagers were chosen for interview on the basis of their availability.
Gerbangdes Program Characteristics that Replicate KDP Principles
The following is a description of the extent that the Gerbangdes adopts KDP principles:

Community Participation

Villagers are in theory free to choose their own program within the limitations of it being mainly an infrastructure program and the funding ceilings of Rp 47 million for infrastructure and Rp 5 million for operational costs of the village implementation team. The programs has a negative list, which replicates the KDP negative list.

The Gerbangdes program insists on the election by voting at an open village meeting of an implementation team consisting of a project head, a secretary, treasurer and one technical person but the program does not make provision for a separate financial team. All positions have to be elected but there is no prohibition on village officials being elected to these posts with the exception of the village head.

The program encourages villagers to make alternative proposals at an initial village meeting and then to further discuss these at the hamlet level and to produce written proposals prior to verbally ranking and selection by voting at a second village meeting. The formal guidelines do not state the number of meetings required but PMD strongly suggests at least two village meetings and stresses that proposals not accepted in one year should be included for acceptance in following years. Unlike many of the other programs, Gerbangdes provides training in proposal writing for all hamlet and neighborhood heads in the form of a one-day workshop.

Project socialization is a key to community participation and the Gerbangdes program guidelines stipulate program socialization at district level (half day) for kecamatan heads and the kecamatan program technical team. Gerbangdes also stipulates that socialization should take place at the kecamatan level for village heads, village council heads, village legislature heads, and the heads of village women groups.

Socialization is also conducted at the village level for hamlet and neighborhood heads and representative form the village council and legislature and other village official and leaders. But as this is conducted in the same meeting as the election of the project implementation team (TPKPK) and the discussion of initial project proposals, the time available for effective socialization is limited. Nevertheless, Gerbangdes does make stronger socialization efforts than most of the other programs.

Interviews with 14 villagers (11 men and 3 women) in Desa Sangking Baru showed a very high Gerbangdes participation rate and knowledge level for the men, with all 11 interviewed having attended. Only one woman had knowledge of Gerbangdes program but had not attended any meetings. One of the women commented that in “Gerbangdes males dominate the meeting but in KDP women could participate and could even contribute suggestions in the meetings. These women are women with no education as well.” Knowledge of the KDP program was low but not surprising as the KDP program finished two years ago.
In Sungai Nipah interview was conducted with 25 villager women who were having an ‘arisan’ meeting. The consensus seemed to be that women do not attend meetings and that meetings are only for the men. Practically all reported that men did not discuss with their wives any meetings they attended. One woman heard about KDP and knew very little. Most of the women knew nothing about either Gerbangdes or KDP except that there was a water pump from the project right outside the house where the arisan meeting was taking place) and none of the women knew about either project or had attended any meetings. This was a highly conservative village.

In Sungai Kupang 46 villagers were interviewed 29 men and 17 women) 16 of the men and 3 of the women knew quite a lot about Gerbangdes but only 3 (men) of the villages had attended the meetings.

Village contribution or swadaya is thought of as indicative of community participation and the Gerbangdes program encourages this. No figures were available but village heads in all three villages reported that was quite high and was in the form of labor and materials.

**Community Control and Ownership of the Program**

Gerbangdes emphasizes community control and ownership in so far as program guidelines insist on the election by voting of a project village implementation team (Tim Pelaksanaan Kegiatan – TPK) and that project selection is by proposals and voting on them at a village meeting. The program also provides proposal-writing training and this enables villagers to have a greater sense of ownership and control.

**Community Control over Program Resources**

Gerbangdes program funds are devolved to the village project implementation team and funds are released in two tranches (50% and 50%). The first tranche requires a written proposal with a detailed budget and photo evidence of site conditions at the start of the project and a report of the village meeting 1 and 2. This report should be sent to the kecamatan for approval.

The second tranche requires a written report on work progress after 50% of the infrastructure has been completed and the report has to be submitted by the village head and approved by the kecamatan. The program guidelines state that there should be a village accountability meeting at this stage.

The guidelines state that the account is held in the program name but does not stipulate the number of signatories required or where the account is held. The program has no separate finance team at the village level to safeguard program funds, which leaves the program, open to the potential misuse of funds.
Program Transparency Issues

Transparency is an important principle in KDP and the Gerbangdes has a program handbook that is available to kecamatan and village heads. PMD reports that the guidelines are influenced by KDP principles such as participation, funding mechanism, transparency, preference for local materials and skills and village contributions.

Monitoring and evaluation are key tools in ensuring transparency and accountability, especially when such monitoring is conducted by external bodies to the program. The program does not have an external independent monitoring but there are monitoring teams at team at the district level and sub-district levels. Monitoring at the sub-district level is conducted by a kecamatan technical team (Tim Teknis Kecamatan) whose duties are to look at administration and building progress and to attend were possible all program meetings. The head of this team is the section head of PMD. The monitoring team at the district level is the district technical team (Tim Teknis Kabupaten) consisting of representatives from the Bupati’s office, BAPPEDA, PMD and PU.

Program guidelines specify that public accountability meetings should be held after 50% of project infrastructure completion and after 100%.

The program operates a reward and sanction policy. Program guidelines state that in the event of misuse use of program funds village meetings can decide on local sanctions and legal sanctions can be employed if this does not solve the problem. The guidelines also state that all misused funds must be returned. They also state that funds will be reduced by Rps 15 million for poor performance. Village performing well may be given extra funding through the Bupati’s office or through the savings accrued from sanction. This is only program of the 10 programs studied that has such a policy.

The program does not have program complaints mechanism.

Program Sustainability

The Gerbangdes program encourages community self-reliance, in particular, by insisting on village contributions and the use of a village implementation team to manage and implement the program but the guidelines do not insist on a maintenance place, which is essential to the sustainability of any project. PMD officials state that they informally encourage villagers to maintain their projects.

Program Simplicity

The Gerbangdes program has simple clear guidelines and a simple strategy of supporting bottom-up initiatives through project village project proposals with funding devolved to the village program implementation team.
Competition for funds

This program does not have inter village competition as all villages receive funding but PMD states that they encourage inter-hamlet competition by insisting in the guidelines that hamlet heads and neighborhood representatives should attend the first village project meeting and further discuss proposals at subsequent hamlet meetings prior to the final proposal selection a second village meeting.

Summary

The Gerbangdes program has adopted many of the principles of the KDP program. The program has a handbook on KDP lines and operates many of the mechanisms including a rewards and sanctions policy. However, key KDP features such as extensive socialization, the separation of implementation and financial teams to safeguard project funds and the insistence on maintenance plans as part of project proposals are absent.
2.9 Gerakan Masyarakat Aceh Darussalam (Gema Assalam) in Aceh.

This is a three-year program operating in Nangroe Aceh Darussalam province and started in 2002. This program is a continuance program from an earlier program entitled Program Pembangunan Gampong (Village Development program which started in 2002), an effort which focuses on community empowerment and poverty alleviation. The program is funded through cost sharing between provincial and district APBD budgets.

In Aceh, the program operates through traditional (adat) structures such as the kemukiman or mukim, which is a grouping of several villages and is structurally under the kecamatan level. A kecamatan may have more than one kemukiman. A village in Aceh is known as a ‘gampong’.

The program operates in some KDP kecamatans, and so, in some cases, there is overlap. There are cases where one village will have both programs, thus placing a heavy burden on villagers’ time commitments if they wish to participate in both programs. 52 kemukiman with 497 villages have participated in the program to-date. In 2004, PMD is the executing agency in this program.

There are several notable features to this program. The first is that this program operates at two levels of proposals. Those at the village level for village activities (proposed by the villagers) and those at the kemukiman level proposed by the kemukiman head and the kemukiman facilitators for such sectoral level facilities such as Telecommunications Offices (Wartel), Markets and kemukiman offices). Approximately 50% of the total program fund is allocated to kemukiman level activity. All proposals are decided upon by the Provincial Selection Team. The total value of the program in 2004 is Rps 19,713,085,000. Villages are encouraged to make proposals that are 60% micro-credit, 30% infrastructure and 10% for kemukiman strengthening activities.

Another noticeable feature is that the program has facilitators at the provincial and kemukiman levels. All facilitators are recruited at the provincial level. At the provincial level, there is a regional coordinator (Korwil) with two assistants. The recruitment criteria for these provincial level facilitators are:

- S1 graduate
- 5 years experience in community development
- Pass a provincial level selection process.

There are 3 facilitators per kemukiman for first year locations and 1 facilitator per kemukiman for second and third year locations. Facilitators are paid a monthly salary of Rps 1.200,000. The recruitment criteria for the kemukiman level facilitators are:

- S1 graduate
- 2 years experience in community development
- Pass the provincial level selection process

Facilitators are known as Facilitator Kemukiman (FK or FM) and are sometimes referred to as Facilitator Gampong (FG) in this program.
Another notable feature is that the provincial government has hired through PMD two NGOs to provide provincial level monitoring Yayasan Aceh Bersama or Yasma and Forkesli. Both are supervised and report to PMD. Copies of their reports were not available. In addition, there is independent monitoring by Forum LSM Aceh, which is self-funding and makes their reports available to a wider audience including the Press. “

**Aim of the Program**

The main goals are:

- To speed up development through infrastructure activities aimed at developing community assets for the gampong
- To increase community “gotong royong” (self help mutual support groups) through active participation in many activities
- To strengthen the management of local government at the kemukiman and Gampong levels (Adat institutions)
- To speed up the poverty alleviation effort, through the economy-productive work and also to open working opportunities using the micro-credit activities of this program

**Village Selection Criteria**

Selection takes place at the kemukiman level not at the village level.

The program operates in selected kemukimans based on the following criteria:

- Kemukiman with many remote villages and a high incidence of poor people as based on the BPM poverty index.
- Kemukiman that have very basic facilities (health and education)
- Kemukiman with very low economy infrastructure facilities
- Kemukiman with appropriate security and governance and adat institutions that are working well

All villages in a selected kemukiman participate in the program.

Two kemukiman and four villages were visited during the study: Pulot and Leupung in kemukiman Leupung Deah Raya and Alue Naga in kemukiman Syech Abdurauf. In Syech Abdurauf, the program is still at the planning stages and neither village had decided on proposals at the time of the study.

Meeting and talking to villagers was difficult and for sensitivity reasons a formal checklist was not used. 13 villagers (5 men and 8 women) were interviewed in Deah Raya Nipah; 6 villagers (4 men and 2 women) in Alue Naga; 9 villagers (5 men and 4 women) in Pulot and an unspecified number in Layeun.
Villagers were chosen for interview on the basis of their availability.

**Gema Assalam Program Characteristics that Replicate KDP Principles**

The following is a description of the extent that the Gema Assalam adopts KDP Principles:

**Community Participation**

The program operates at two levels, the kemukiman level, and the village level. The kemukiman level has its own meetings (2). The first kemukiman meeting attended by village heads, BPD staff, LKMD staff, adat leaders and heads of women’s groups (PKK). The initial meeting is for program socialization, the election of a kemukiman level financial team (Unit Pengelolaan Keuangan) and the election of the Facilitator Gampong for each village. The latter process is unclear but presumably, this really involves delegating a facilitator to each village from a list of facilitators appointed to the kemukiman by PMD. Proposals are not produced by this meeting but are decided upon by the Kemukiman Head and the kemukiman facilitator. The second kemukiman level is to announce the projects chosen to be funded by the provincial selection team. It appears, therefore, that whilst there is community participation in the form of representation by a mix of elected village representative and traditional adat leaders, real control, and decision-making is at the provincial level.

At the village level, villagers are in theory free to choose their own program within the limitations that the proposals are 60% micro-credit activities, 30% infrastructure and 10% directed towards strengthening kemukiman institutions. There is no negative list but facilitators advise against the building of new buildings such as mosques, schools etc…

The Gema Assalam program insists on at least two village program meetings and open invitation to these meetings. All villagers are invited and invitation is through word of mouth and mosques announcements. The program stresses that all villagers have the right to make proposals and those proposals should first be developed at hamlet meetings prior to villages meetings. These meetings are facilitated by village level facilitators and the village head. The initial village meeting elects the implementation team (TPK) and a proposal writing team (TIM Penulis Usulan or TPU) and proposals are forwarded from the hamlet meetings and new proposal ideas are discussed at this meeting. All TPK and TPU members are elected positions but there is no prohibition on village officials being elected to the post. The second meeting finalizes and selects proposals through discussion for forwarding to the kemukiman level. In theory, the TPU then writes up the proposal but in practice, the facilitator actually does it.

As noted the selected proposal are forwarded to the kemukiman level and are collated into the kemukiman proposal. All kemukiman level proposals are decided upon at the provincial level by a provincial level selection team. Thus, effective control over program selection and funding rests with the provincial level and not at the village level.
As a checklist was not used in discussion with villagers, there is no interview data to sample and assess the extent of community participation and awareness. However, records of village attendance meetings in Deah Raya showed very high attendance rates (147 at the first meeting and 52 at the second, and in Alue Naga records show high attendance at hamlet meetings (average 49), 12 at the first village meeting and 73 at the second, suggesting that participation in kemukiman Syech Abdurauf was very high.

Project socialization is a key to community participation and the Gema Assalam program guidelines stipulate program socialization at provincial level for provincial government staff, DPRD representatives, PMD, heads of provincial agencies such as health and education, NGO representatives and the Press. There was no socialization at the district level though guidelines state there should be. There was half-day socialization at the kemukiman level for village heads, representatives from all village organizations, hamlet heads, and Kemukiman Facilitators.

Socialization is also conducted at the village level for hamlet and neighborhood heads and representative form the village council and legislature and other village official and leaders. But as this is conducted in the same meeting as the election of the project teams (TPK and TPU) and the discussion of initial project proposals, the time available for effective socialization is limited. Nevertheless, Gema Assalam does make stronger socialization efforts than most of the other programs.

Village contribution or swadaya is thought of as indicative of community participation and the Gema Assalam program insists that there should be village contribution as a condition for receiving program funds. The program has not got underway in Kemukiman Syech Abdurauf but villages visited in Kemukiman Leupung stated that contribution was high and in the form of voluntary and materials.

**Community Control and Ownership of the Program**

Gema Assalam emphasizes community control and ownership in so far as program guidelines insist on the election by voting on project teams (implementation team and a writing proposal team) and proposals are voted on at village meetings but the final decision on proposals rest with the provincial selection team and so real community ownership and control is negated.

**Community Control over Program Resources**

The UPK (financial team at the kemukiman level) prepares technical and administration documents, including the detailed Budget Plans / Rencana Anggaran Biaya [RAB] using the services of the planning and monitoring provincial consultant according to the program guidelines. Funds are initially developed to the kemukiman level and then to the village UPK in cash payments. There is no bank account at the village level. Funds are released to village implementation teams in 3 tranches.
1st First Tranche -60% for Micro-credit

Funds are disbursed when the Kemukiman has prepared a budget plan proposal for the micro-credit groups. This program has to be approved by the Tim Koordinasi Gema Assalam at the provincial level and by the Tim Koordinasi at the District level because of cost sharing between the district and provincial APBDs

2nd Tranche- 30% for Infrastructure

This is then divided into 3 tranches. The first at project start and the last two after 60% of the actual work completed. There is no written accountability report just a supervisory inspection by the kemukiman financial team (UPK) and the kemukiman head. If UPK and kemukiman head agree then the next tranche is released. No other details are available.

3rd Tranche

10% for strengthening kemukiman institution.

Kas Daerah transfers funds direct to the UPK program account in Bank Aceh in kemukiman and funds are then released in cash payments.

Signatories:

There are two signatories: Imam Kemukiman (Head) and UPK head. Imam is a courtesy title and does not necessarily refer to a religious

There is no separate program finance team at the village level to safeguard program funds, which coupled with the cash payment system leaves, the program very open to potential abuse.

Program Transparency Issues

Transparency is an important principle in KDP and the Gema Assalam has a program handbook that is available to Kemukiman heads, village heads and programs teams. PMD reports that the guidelines are influenced by KDP principles such as participation, funding mechanism, transparency, preference for local materials and skills and village contributions.

Monitoring and evaluation are key tools in ensuring transparency and accountability, especially when such monitoring is conducted by external bodies to the program. The program makes use of two NGOs hired at the provincial level to conduct internal monitoring but we were unable access any such reports. The technical at the provincial level and a provincial monitoring team from PMD are charged with conducting at least three monitoring visits a year. In addition, independent monitoring is conducted by a self-
funding NGO (LSM Forum Aceh) who makes their reports available to newspapers for publication. This is the only program that has totally independent monitoring.

The program does not operate a reward and sanctions nor does it have an official complaints mechanism but complaints can be made to the NGO monitoring organizations previously mentioned and the two of the villages visited have reported that complaints were made to NGOs and these were published. However, no information was available on any follow up action to these complaints.

The guidelines state there should be project public notice boards at the Kemukiman level but makes no mention of the same at the village level.

**Program Sustainability**

The Gema Assalam program encourages community self-reliance, in particular, by insisting on village contributions and the use of a village implementation team to manage and implement the program but the guidelines do not insist on a maintenance plan (as part of proposals) which is essential to the sustainability of any project. PMD officials state that they informally encourage villagers to maintain their projects.

**Program Simplicity**

The Gema Assalam program has simple clear guidelines and a simple strategy of supporting bottom-up initiatives through project village project proposals with funding devolved to the kemukiman and village program teams but the strategy of decision making on kemukiman and village proposals at the provincial level undermines community control. ..

**Competition for funds**

This program guidelines state that there is competition at inter village but the mechanisms do not support this as village proposals are merely added into the kemukiman proposals and forwarded to the provincial selection team rendering useless any true inter-village competition. The head of the Leupung kemukiman reports, “To avoid conflict among villages and groups I decided to submit all proposals to the province. Let the province choose which are select and pass verification. So villagers do not blame me if their proposals are not successful.”

**Summary**

Gema Assalam has adopted many of the principles of the KDP program. The program has a handbook on KDP lines and operates many of the mechanisms. Unlike other programs in the study, Gema Assalam does make use of NGOs for internal and independent monitoring. However, key KDP features such as real control by villages and kemukiman over proposal selection and funding is retained at the provincial level. Also, the cash payment system, the lack of village level financial teams and the non-
insistence on maintenance plans as a condition of proposal funding are inconsistent with KDP operating principles.
2.10 Program Pemberdayaan Masyarakat (PPM) in Kabupaten Kupang, NTT

This annual program started in 2002 in the district of Kupang in Nose Tangga Timor; two years after KDP started its program. The main program activity is infrastructure development at kecamatan and infrastructure and micro-credit activities at village levels. Since 2005, the lead institution is PMD but previously was the Bupati’s Office supported by the Badan Pemberdayaan Masarayakat Desa (PMD) and representatives from relevant district institutions forming an inter-sectoral team for the program. The program is funded by the district APBD budget. In 2004, the program at the time of the study was only at the initial planning stages at the village level.

Initially, the program was aimed at non-KDP villages but it has now spread to all districts and so there is overlap. It appears that Kupang government is not interested in the matching grants program because it is viewed as complicated and costly (especially with respect to facilitator costs) and because they have their own program already.

The Total PPM budget in 2002 was Rps 56 Billion, in 2003, Rps 70 billion and for 2004, it is estimated as approximately Rps 100 billion in total. Each village receives a different amount depending on the activities approved.

The PPM design was influenced by observations of other empowerment program, such as IDT, PDM-DKE, Padat Karya, P3DT, NTAADP, and KDP.

The oversight team identified the follow operating principles (quoted in the program handbook) as follows.

- Community participation: community plans, implements, evaluates, monitors, and sustains their project
- Implementation based on giving freedom and authority for the community to organize and uses their fund to meet community needs and solve community real problems as agreed upon in the village forum
- Involvement of traditional institutions (adat and religious forums)
- Healthy competition among villager groups in proposal generation
- Sustainability: - villagers should manage a sustainable progress on the activities, infrastructure and capital revolving fund
- Activities will not overlap with other similar empowerment projects (but it does with KDP!)
- Government involvement only as coordination and facilitators and not as the command line
- Transparency: activities conducted by the implementation team should be socialized to the wider community through the use of a public information boards
Aim of the Program

The main goals of PPM:
- Increasing community empowerment to be able to compete in the third millennium
- Increasing community income and community institutional ability through community empowerment funds in the form of capital for economy productivity activities and infrastructure
- Improving and shaping transparency and public accountability to develop synergy and interaction between DPRD, the community, District Kabupaten Government to synchronize community-based planning mechanism

Targets:
- Community groups with low income
- Small scale micro-credit groups
- Location: villages within Kabupaten Kupang [District Kupang]

There are several notable features in this program. The first is that the program has in theory inter-village competition. There are inter-village meetings and proposals from villages are ranked at these meetings but the actual decision as to which village proposals are accepted is made by the Bupati’s Office. There is confusion as to whether some villages lose out in the competition process. PMD states that all villages receive the program but at different levels of funding. Other officials have stated that some village do actual lose out in competition. It is more likely the former.

The second notable feature is that the program in 2003 involved compulsory infrastructure development at the kecamatan level but managed at village level (closest village to the project activity) by the village implementation team. These actives were:

- The building of a Kantor Cabang Dinas Bersama or the Kecamatan Dinas Branch Unit Office
- The rehabilitation of the kecamatan office
- The asphalting of roads to the kecamatan office

Specific funding was provided for this and was not a part of the village proposal mechanism.

Another notable feature is the provision of funding for long-term loans for plantation type of activities for village economic cooperative in addition to the small term usual micro-credit activities.

Four villages in three Kecamatans were visited: Oenesu (KDP) and Kuan Heun (KDP) in Kecamatan Kupang Barat, Noelmina (KDP) in Kecamatan Takari and Oesena (KDP phase out) in Kecamatan Amarasi.
A checklist indicating levels of knowledge and participation in the programs was used for interview purposes. 23 villagers (11 men and 12 women) were interviewed in Oenesu; 25 villagers (20 women and 5 men) in Kuan Heun; 6 villagers (five women and 1 man) in Noelmina, and 18 villagers (16 men and 2 women) in Oesena.

PPM Program Characteristics that Replicate KDP Principles

The following is a description of the extent that the PPM adopts KDP Principles:

Community Participation

Villagers are in theory free to propose their own program with respect to village infrastructure, longer-term economic loan activities (e.g. plantation type activities), and the usual small-scale micro-credit activities. And these proposals are forwarded to the inter-village meeting where proposals are ranked in a priority order through a discussion process but the actual decision on acceptance of proposals lies with the technical selection team at the kabupaten office team. The criterion for selection is not publicized but it appears to include district sectoral priorities.

The PPM program insists on the election by voting at an open village meeting of an implementation team (TPK) consisting of a project head, a secretary, treasurer and a technical person (craftsman) is appointed by the village head. The program does not make provision for a separate financial team. All positions have to be elected (technical person excepted) and there is a prohibition on officials being elected to these posts.

The program encourages villagers to make alternative proposals at an initial village meeting and then to further discuss these at the hamlet level and to produce written proposals prior to verbally ranking and selection by voting at a second village meeting. The formal guidelines do not state the number of meetings required but PMD strongly suggests at least two village meetings. These proposals are forwarded to the inter village meetings.

Project socialization is a key to community participation and the PPM program guidelines stipulate program socialization at district level (half day) for kecamatan heads and relevant kecamatan staff. PPM also stipulates that socialization should take place at the kecamatan level for village heads, village council heads, village legislature heads and the heads of village women groups and representatives from Dinas Kimprasiswili, Dinas Pertanian, and Dinas Perkebunan (district sectoral offices).

Socialization is also conducted at the inter village level (1st inter-village meeting) for village Heads, BPD, community leaders and village technical people (appointed by village head). At the village level it is conducted in the same meeting as the election of the project implementation team (TPK) and the discussion of initial project proposals, the time available for effective socialization at the village level is limited.
Interviews with villagers in Oenesu and Kuan showed a considerable higher participation and program awareness rates of the KDP program than for the PPM Program and that women’s participation in the KDP program was slight higher that the men. Participation and program awareness was very low for both programs. In Oesena, participation and program awareness was also considerably higher for KDP but only 2 women compared to 2 men were interviewed so it is difficult to comment on participation and program awareness rates for women. Participation and program awareness rates were low in all villages for the PPM program. The interviews suggest that PPM program socialization is very weak and comments by villagers reflect that this is so. In Oesena a recipient of the PPM program reported, “PPM never has meetings. They [the district] just give us some seeds to plant and we never know where the money comes from or even who organized PPM in the District. We just follow orders.” This comment ties in with the general impression gained that the program only gives lip service to community participation and that the program activities are dictated by district sectoral priorities and not necessarily village aspirations.

Village contribution or swadaya is thought of as indicative of community participation and the PPM program encourages this. No figures were available and though villagers in 2003 contributed labor days at reduced payments, this was not seen to be significant or it counted for little in the eyes of program officials.

**Community Control and Ownership of the Program**

PPM emphasizes community control and ownership in so far as program guidelines insist on the election by voting of a project village implementation team (Tim Pelaksanaan Kegiatan – TPK) and that project selection is by proposals and voting on them at a village meeting prior to submission to the inter-village meetings. Inter-village meetings then rank the proposal in a priority order and forward them to the proposal selection team at the district where the decisions are made. Effective control and ownership is at the district level and not at the village level.

**Community Control over Program Resources**

PPM program funds are devolved to the village project implementation team and each community group in three tranches but the percentage for each tranches varies from kecamatan to kecamatan. The general mechanism is a follows:

1. Send out of budget request from village implementation team (TPK) and community groups (Pokmas) to Dinas Teknis, verified by the Kepala Cabang Dinas/ and the Pjok
2. Dinas Teknis send an SPP (request letter) to the Pemegang Kas Dinas (treasury at the Dinas)
3. Pemegang Kas Dinas Teknis/Badan [the District office] will sign the transfer transaction once approved by the Head of the Office. This should be done only if the administration complete
4. Funds are directly transferred direct to the account of the TPK or the Community group (Pokmas) held in Bank NTT [the official government Bank].

1<sup>st</sup> Tranche

The amount for infrastructure or empowerment will be transferred at project start once the proposal has been approved by the Dinas Teknis at the district levels.

2<sup>nd</sup> Tranche

The second tranche can be disbursed after TPK sends a progress report with a request for disbursement to the district signed and approved by village and kecamatan heads. The criterion for the second tranche is:

- A progress report from TPK and the same for the community groups (Pokmas)
- Proof of the first disbursement
- Recommendation from the Verification Team in Kecamatan [KCD/PTO/UPT and PJOK]

Bank accounts are held in the name of the village program implementation team (TPK) and the name of the particular community. Each community groups has its own name and account. The guidelines do not stipulate the number of signatories required or the location of the account.

Program Transparency Issues

Transparency is an important principle in KDP and the PPM has a program handbook that is available to kecamatan and village heads. PMD reports that the guidelines are influenced by KDP principles such as participation, funding mechanism, transparency, preference for local materials and skills and village contributions. However, decision making over program activities is with the Kabupaten level proposal selection team and the criteria for decisions in not made available so the program if fundamentally not transparent.

Monitoring and evaluation are key tools in ensuring transparency and accountability, especially when such monitoring is conducted by external bodies to the program. The program does not have an external independent monitoring but there are monitoring teams at team at the district level (Tim Koordinasi Kabupaten) and sub-district levels ((Tim Teknis Kecamatan). The monitoring team at the district level consists of members from the Bupati’s Office, PMD, BAPPEDA, and the district finance office. The kecamatan monitoring team has relevant kecamatan staff and is lead by the section head of PMD know as Pjok. It is very unclear how often they are supposed to monitor.

The program guidelines do not specify any public accountability meetings at the village level.
The program does not operate a rewards and sanctions policy and there is no formal complaints mechanism.

The program does not have a separate finance team at the village level to safeguard village funds.

The program has serious transparency issues.

**Program Sustainability**

The PPM program encourages community self-reliance, in particular, by insisting on village contributions and the use of a village implementation team to manage and implement the program but the guidelines do not insist on a maintenance plan that is essential to the sustainability of any project. PMD officials state that they informally encourage villagers to maintain their projects. But removing real decision making from villagers it takes away any sense of real ownership and this impedes sustainability.

**Program Simplicity**

The PPM program is not simple and the guidelines are not sufficiently detailed. It pays lips service to bottom up planning and its strategy of retaining decision making to the district level lead to confusion and lack of clarity.

**Competition for funds**

Formally the program has inter-village competition but as decision making lies at the district level and PMD officials state that all villages receive funding (different amounts), there is only the semblance of competition and not the substance.

**Summary**

The PPM program claims to have adopted some of KDP operating principles and procedures of the KDP program such as a program handbook, village proposals, monitoring teams (not independent), and the devolution of funds to village groups. However key KDP features such as extensive program socialization, control of proposal and funding decisions at inter-village level, the separation of implementation and financial teams to safeguard project funds, a complaints system a rewards and sanctions policy and the insistence on maintenance plans as part of project proposals acceptance are all absent.
Appendix 3 The NMC Survey Result.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province/District</th>
<th>Program Name/Title</th>
<th>Type of Activities</th>
<th>Adopting KDP</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jawa Barat</td>
<td>• Reksa Desa</td>
<td>• Open Menu</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Insufficient Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• CNA (Community Need Assessment)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aceh</td>
<td>• All District</td>
<td>• Gema Assalam</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>In general, this program had adopted most of KDP mechanism. Similar to KDP, this program also have facilitators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jawa Tengah</td>
<td>• Wonogiri</td>
<td>• DAD (Dana Alokasi Desa)</td>
<td>No No</td>
<td>A program design almost similar to KDP, but did not adopt some of the KDP basic principle, such decision making process at village meetings.. Village elite still dominated the decision making process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Wonosobo</td>
<td>• PPPD (Proyek Perimbangan Pembangunan Desa)</td>
<td>No No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jawa Timur</td>
<td>Bangkalan</td>
<td>Tuban</td>
<td>NTT/Kupang</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lamongan</td>
<td>• Bangdes</td>
<td>• PBPM (Program Bantuan Pemberdayaan Masyarakat)</td>
<td>• PPM (Program Pemberdayaan Masyarakat)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Bangkalan</td>
<td>• Open Menu</td>
<td>• Open Menu</td>
<td>• Open Menu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Tuban</td>
<td>• Kegiatan Pemberdayaan Desa/Kelurahan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Yes (adopted some part)</td>
<td>• Yes (adopted in part)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Local government admitted that this adopted KDP program, esp. the decision making process. However, there is strong official’s domination, esp. the head of advisor and implementation in sub-district headed by camat. They disbursed the funding directly to the village with fixed allocation, Rp. 52,500,000 per village.

This program adopted 2 programs, KDP and Gerdu Taskin but not comprehensive. Some of KDP basic principle applied were participation, for example in decision-making stages (through village meetings). The APBD fund is disbursed directly to villages (each Rp. 25 million). The difference is this program does not have consultants and there is no special treatment for women. They could spend the money freely according to their allocation. Because the amount is small, it’s only for simple infrastructure, such as the smoothing of roads.

This program adopted P3MD.

This program adopted some of KDP mechanism, including the process mechanism or stages and some of principles. Moreover, government apparatus involvement still strong (camat is responsible of all activities). The participants attending the meetings are elites or local leaders, meanwhile community could only represent their voice through them. Fund allocation from ABPD. Technical Support is implemented by Branch Office from the Dinas/UPT acting as FK and field agriculture officer/operational officer or Village Technical Officer act as FD (fasilitator desa).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sulawesi Selatan</th>
<th>PDPP (Program Dasar Pembangunan Partisipatif)</th>
<th>Open Menu</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Community empowerment program (focus in villages) which is considered similar to KDP but there’s no KDP model adoption.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maros</td>
<td>PSK (Program Stimulan Keswadayaan)</td>
<td>Open Menu</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wajo</td>
<td>PDPP (Program Dasar Pembangunan Partisipatif)</td>
<td>Open Menu</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toraja</td>
<td>PDPP (Program Dasar Pembangunan Partisipatif)</td>
<td>Infrastruct</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kalsel</th>
<th>Gerbangdes</th>
<th>Infrastruct</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>This program adopted many of the principle and mechanism in KDP but the activities is not open menu (limited to infrastructure activities to support the local investment, education, and health, to increase community welfare. They also apply KDP negative list. Difference with KDP, the money is directly disbursed to village with fixed amount of Rp. 45 million per village and TPK operational Rp. 5 million. They have several tranches for the disbursement. Next disbursement could only be transfer after the accountability report.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kota Baru</td>
<td>P3DM (Program Pengembangan Pembangunan Desa Mandiri)</td>
<td>Infrastruct</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanah Bumbu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kalsel</th>
<th>DAU desa/kelurahan</th>
<th>Infrastruct</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>This program 4 years ago, but along with KDP excellent implementation in Tapanuli, government adopted some of principles and KDP mechanism in this program. Moreover, there’s a big different with KDP, especially on amount of budget allocation per village (equal distribution), so that there’s no inter-village competition. Beside that, transparency principle still weak. This program doesn’t have facilitators. In the village, head of village act as facilitator.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tapanuli Utara</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sumbar</th>
<th>PPSP4 (Program Peningkatan Sarana Prasarana Pelayanan Publik Pola Partisipatif)</th>
<th>Infrastruct</th>
<th>No</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Solok</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sumut</th>
<th>DAU desa/kelurahan</th>
<th>Infrastruct</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>This program 4 years ago, but along with KDP excellent implementation in Tapanuli, government adopted some of principles and KDP mechanism in this program. Moreover, there’s a big different with KDP, especially on amount of budget allocation per village (equal distribution), so that there’s no inter-village competition. Beside that, transparency principle still weak. This program doesn’t have facilitators. In the village, head of village act as facilitator.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tapanuli Utara</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Maluku Utara
- Bacan
  - PPER (Program Pemberdayaan Ekonomi Masyarakat)
  - Ekonomi
  - Not clear
  - -

### Riau
- Kampar
  - PPEK (Program Pengembangan Ekonomi Kerakyatan)
  - Ekonomi
  - Insufficient information

### Lampung
- PPEKKT (Program Pemberdayaan Ekonomi Kerakyatan Kampung Tua)
  - Ekonomi
  - Yes
  - Local government admitted that they adopted KDP pattern but there are certain adjustments according to local context. The village accepting fund will be chosen mostly from traditional villages. They have similar decision-making process through meeting (musyawarah masyarakat adat) but the traditional elites will be the decision makers. But there’s still lack of community participation. District coordinator and Fasilitator kampung tua (village facilitator) is openly recruited and funded by APBD budget. Type of activities: non-open menu for economy only.

### Gorontalo
- Boalemo
  - PPM (Program Pemberdayaan Masyarakat Miskin)
  - Open Menu?
  - No
  - The program was designed using a bottom up planning approach, but did not adopted most KDP principles.

### Papua
- Jayapura/Manokwari/Merauke/Nabire/Fakfak
  - PDPP (Program Dasar Pembangunan Partisipatif) (2002 - ?)
  - Open Menu
  - Capacities Building
  - No
  - Not clear
  - This community empowerment program is not inspired by and did not adopted KDP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maluku Utara</th>
<th>PPER (Program Pemberdayaan Ekonomi Masyarakat)</th>
<th>Ekonom</th>
<th>Not clear</th>
<th>-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Riau</td>
<td>PPEK (Program Pengembangan Ekonomi Kerakyatan)</td>
<td>Ekonomi</td>
<td>Insufficient information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lampung</td>
<td>PPEKKT (Program Pemberdayaan Ekonomi Kerakyatan Kampung Tua)</td>
<td>Ekonomi</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Local government admitted that they adopted KDP pattern but there are certain adjustments according to local context. The village accepting fund will be chosen mostly from traditional villages. They have similar decision-making process through meeting (musyawarah masyarakat adat) but the traditional elites will be the decision makers. But there’s still lack of community participation. District coordinator and Fasilitator kampung tua (village facilitator) is openly recruited and funded by APBD budget. Type of activities: non-open menu for economy only.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gorontalo</td>
<td>PPM (Program Pemberdayaan Masyarakat Miskin)</td>
<td>Open Menu?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The program was designed using a bottom up planning approach, but did not adopted most KDP principles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papua</td>
<td>PDPP (Program Dasar Pembangunan Partisipatif) (2002 - ?)</td>
<td>Open Menu</td>
<td>Capacities Building</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**
Most of the information (preliminary data) which had been entered by the NMC stated that they have a KDP adopted project, but when studied and crosschecked with consultants proved to not to be the case.

Most of the community empowerment programs from APBD, which claimed to be similar to KDP- especially on, bottom up planning-but did not adopt KDP principles and mechanism.

1. Some programs claimed that they have been inspired and adopted KDP principles, but when we look at their guidelines or handbooks, the implementation is quite different or maybe even against the KDP principles. Example, communities are not involved in the decision making process and most are manage by the traditional village apparatus.
2. Criteria for selection was:
   - The government claimed that they adopted KDP with adjustment
   - The community decision making is a bottom up process.
   - There are village meeting process similar to KDP
   - There is an activity fund accountability report on the activities before the next disbursement
   - They formed some kind of implementation team in the kecamatan and in the village.

3. Some of the programs that were confirmed as adopting KDP mechanism (not all mechanism) were:
   - Dana Alokasi Umum (DAU) Desa/Kelurahan: Tapanuli Utara (Sumatera Utara), North Sumatera
   - Program Bantuan Pemberdayaan Masyarakat (PBPM): Bangkalan (Jawa Timur), East Java
   - Program Pembangunan Desa (Bangdes): Lamongan (Jawa Timur), East Java,
   - Program Pemberdayaan Masyarakat (PPM): Kupang (Nusa Tenggara Timur), East Nusa Tenggara
   - Gerakan Membangun Desa (Gerbangdes): Kota Baru (Kalimantan Selatan), South Kalimantan
   - Program Pengembangan Pembangunan Desa Mandiri (P3DM): Tanah Bumbu (Kalimantan Selatan), South Kalimantan
   - Program Pemberdayaan Ekonomi Kerakyatan Kampung Tua (PPEKKT): seluruh kabupaten (Lampung) Lampung in Sumatra island
Appendix 4 Matrices of Individual Programs

4.1 Matrix: Program Pemberdayaan Masyarakat Desa (PPMD) in Bangkalan East Java

This program operates in Bangkalan East Java. The program was initiated by PMD to provide community development funding for villages not in receipt of either full KDP funding or of the matching grants program, which effectively was six kecamatans, would have been targeted. However, because of funding limitations PMD decided that it could only afford to cover two kecamatans and only one village in each of those kecamatan. The recipients are Kecamatan Socah, the village of Petaonan, Kecamatan Tanjung Bumi, and the village of Tagungguh. This is an infrastructure only program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Bangkalan – East Java</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Program Pemberdayaan Masyarakat Desa (Community Empowerment Program). Program funded through APBD (district funds )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Program</td>
<td>Annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No of Villages participating in program</td>
<td>2 villages from 2 kecamatans.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Selection Criteria| Selection by PMD office. Criteria for selections as follows:
  1. Not KDP recipient
  2. Not in receipt of funding assistance for many years.
  3. Determined as a poor kecamatan, and a poor village in the kecamatan according to National Statistics Office (BPS) and Family Planning Statistics (BKKN) ratings |
| Value of Project  | Each village receives Rp 25,000,000
  - 5 % for general administration,
  - 95% for the construction |
| Handbook          | Yes A very basic handbook that adopts open menu and bottom up planning mechanism. Available to village head and kecamatan staff |
| Initial Dissemination | Initial Dissemination restricted to pre-selected villages only. PMD concerned that ‘social jealousy and conflict’ would be triggered if other villages were informed of the program. This suggests that the “objective” criteria of poverty targeting using BPS and BKKN statistics might not have been strictly followed.

Kabupaten for:

Kecamatan Staff
BPD staff at Kecamatan level

Kecamatan level for:
  - Village Head
  - BPD Head
  - LKMD Head
  - Community leaders

Training on:
1. Brief information of the program
2. Fund allocation
3. Manual (regulation, mechanism, fund flow, principle, goal etc)
4. Participation

| Open Menu and proposals | In theory yes.

  - The Kabupaten offered an open menu but in practice village head has a large say. Also program is limited to infrastructure
  - No negative list but third party contracts are prohibited and the program has to be managed by villagers.

PMD states they informally apply a negative list based on the KDP negative list

| Competition | None

| Village Contribution | Yes strongly encouraged

| 1st meeting (Village) | Project Socialization for:

  - Village Head
  - LKMD Reps |
- Head of BPD
- Village officials
- Villager Elders

Elections of Project Teams:

- Village Implementation Team (Unit Pengelola Program - UPP)
- Project Management and Finance Unit (Kelompok Pengelola Proyek - KPP). In charge of managing finances and buying materials (no separation of financial and purchasing controls)

The UPP consists of:
- Village head as the nominal person in charge (Penanggungjawab Utama).
- Head of LPM as the head of UPP
- Secretary: elected
- Treasure selected

The KPP consists of:
- Head
- Secretary:
- Treasure:

“PMD let villagers decided how to select the KPP team, appointed or selected” No guidelines on how these posts should be selected

Decision on Proposals

- Proposals offered
- Village meeting ranks proposals
- Voting on proposal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2nd Meeting (Project Teams)</th>
<th>• Planning Preparation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3rd meeting (Village)</td>
<td>Accountability Report at project end</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitator / Consultant</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Team</td>
<td>Public Works (PU) at Kecamatan Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring Team</td>
<td>The PMD Kabupaten team monitors directly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Funds Disbursement | • Two Tranches (60% and 40%). In theory UPP has to provide a progress report prior to disbursement of 2\textsuperscript{nd} tranche  
• Account in village name held at government bank at Kabupaten level  
• 2 signatories |
|-------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|
| Maintenance       | No Formal Team  
Villagers encourage to maintain themselves |
| Complaints and Sanctions Mechanisms | None specific to project |
| Advertising /Announcement/ Notice Board | No Notice Board or advertising  Village Head invites through a letter |
4.2. Matrix of Bantuan Pembangunan Desa (Bandes) in Lamongan District, East Java

Gerdu Taskin is provincial program to alleviate poverty, particularly in rural communities. This program uses cost sharing system between provincial and district funds. For example, Gerdu Taskin in Bangkalan covers 20 villages in 4 sub-districts which (Kokob, Tragah, Konang, and Tanjung Bumi). Funding from the district APBD is Rps 980 million for 5 villages and funding from the provincial APBD (Rps 1,160 billion) for 15 villages.

This program covers all districts in East Java, but the number of locations in each sub-district varies. This program started in 2003, and is claimed as a KDP adoption, inspired by such KDP principles such as participation, transparency, and bottom up mechanisms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Lamongan and Bangkalan Districts - East Java</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Gerakan Terpadu Pengentasan Kemiskinan (Gerdu Taskin)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Program funded either through district funds or from provincial level funds. In Lamongan they are only from district funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Program</td>
<td>Annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No of Villages participating in program</td>
<td>10 villages from district funds under BAPPEDA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection Criteria</td>
<td>Poorest Villages (know as Desa Merah) chosen by Province based on National Statistics Office (BPS) and Family Planning Statistics (BKKN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value of Project</td>
<td>Each village receives Rp 72.5 M and 2.5 M for admin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handbook</td>
<td>Yes, limited edition so restricted circulation but available to village head and Kecamatan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Dissemination</td>
<td>District Level (half day) for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Village Heads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Sub-district Heads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At Sub-district (one day) for:</td>
<td>Training on:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Overview of program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Funds available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Information on components</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Standard forms and documentation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Open Menu and proposals</th>
<th>All proposals must have the following 3 components:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Human Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Micro-credit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and there is an open menu within this framework and within the funding ceilings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Competition | None One village per Kecamatan (poorest village) but there can be inter-hamlet competition for the project |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Village Meeting</th>
<th>Project Socialization for:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One Day</td>
<td>• Village Head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• RT and RW heads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• LPM Reps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• BPD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Village officials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Villager Elders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elections of Project Team:</td>
<td>Implementation Team (UPP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Finance Team (UPK)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facilitator</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Technical Team | Theoretically there is a Technical Support Team at Kecamatan level but it is really PU (Public Works) |
| **Funds Disbursement** | In 2004 will be 2 Tranches 50% 50% but was 3 tranches in 2003.  

1st Tranche 50% of the total amount, will be transferred after filling all documents/administration, SPK with a letter of acknowledgement (SPK) saying there’ll be community contribution for this project  

2nd Tranche  

. After the infrastructure reach 60%, they will disburse the money, and will hold a Serah Terima Pekerjaan Tingkat I [STT-1] or First Stage Handing Over and Berita Acara [meeting resume] to describe the 60% work that had been done so far.  

3rd Tranche  

10% of total, Rp 4.365.000. After the final 100% progress, they will disbursed the money, and will hold a Serah Terima Pekerjaan Tingkat II [STT-II] and Berita Acara, to describe the project progress. |
| **Maintenance** | No Formal Team  

Villagers encourage to maintain themselves |
| **Complaints Mechanism** | None specific to project  

But Unit Pengaduan Masyarakat (community complaints unit) not effective as part of village structure and not anonymous |
| **Advertising /Announcement/ Notice Board** | None Village Head invites through a letter |
4.3. Gerakan Terpadu Pengentasan Kemiskinan (Gerdu Taskin) in Lamongan and Bangkalan Districts, East Java

Gerdu Taskin is provincial program to alleviate poverty, particularly in rural communities. This program uses cost sharing system between provincial and district funds. For example, Gerdu Taskin in Bangkalan covers 20 villages in 4 sub-districts which (Kokob, Tragah, Konang, and Tanjung Bumi). Funding from the district APBD is Rps 980 million for 5 villages and funding from the provincial APBD (Rps 1,160 billion) for 15 villages.

This program covers all districts in East Java, but the number of locations in each sub-district varies. This program started in 2003 and is claimed as a KDP adoption, inspired by such KDP principles such as participation, transparency, and bottom up mechanisms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Lamongan and Bangkalan Districts - East Java</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Gerakan Terpadu Pengentasan Kemiskinan (Gerdu Taskin) Holistic Movement for Alleviating Poverty. Program funded either through district funds or from provincial level funds. In Lamongan they are only from district funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Program</td>
<td>Annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No of Villages participating in program</td>
<td>10 villages from district funds under BAPPEDA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection Criteria</td>
<td>Poorest Villages (know as Desa Merah) chosen by Province based on National Statistics Office (BPS) and Family Planning Statistics (BKKN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value of Project</td>
<td>Each village receives Rp 72.5 M and 2.5 M for admin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handbook</td>
<td>Yes, limited edition so restricted circulation but available to village head and Kecamatan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Dissemination</td>
<td><strong>District Level (half day) for</strong>&lt;br&gt;• Village Heads&lt;br&gt;• Sub-district Heads&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;<strong>At Sub-district (one day) for:</strong>&lt;br&gt;Training on:&lt;br&gt;• Overview of program&lt;br&gt;• Funds available&lt;br&gt;• Information on components&lt;br&gt;• Standard forms and documentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Menu and proposals</td>
<td><strong>All proposals must have the following 3 components:</strong>&lt;br&gt;4. Infrastructure&lt;br&gt;5. Human Resources&lt;br&gt;6. Micro-credit&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;and there is an open menu within this framework and within the funding ceilings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competition</td>
<td><strong>None</strong> One village per Kecamatan (poorest village) but there can be inter-hamlet competition for the project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Village Meeting</td>
<td><strong>Project Socialization for:</strong>&lt;br&gt;• Village Head&lt;br&gt;• RT and RW heads&lt;br&gt;• LPM Reps&lt;br&gt;• BPD&lt;br&gt;• Village officials&lt;br&gt;• Villager Elders&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;Elections of Project Team:&lt;br&gt;• Implementation Team (UPP)&lt;br&gt;• Finance Team (UPK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Team</td>
<td>Theoretically there is a Technical Support Team at Kecamatan level but it is really PU (Public Works)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Funds Disbursement** | In 2004 will be 2 Tranches 50% 50% but was 3 tranches in 2003.  
1<sup>st</sup> Tranche 50% of the total amount, will be transferred after filling all documents/administration, SPK with a letter of acknowledgement (SPK) saying there’ll be community contribution for this project  
2<sup>nd</sup> Tranche  . After the infrastructure reach 60%, they will disburse the money, and will hold a Serah Terima Pekerjaan Tingkat I [STT-1] or First Stage Handing Over and Berita Acara [meeting resume] to describe the 60% work that had been done so far.  
3<sup>rd</sup> Tranche 10% of total, Rp 4.365.000. After the final 100% progress, they will disbursed the money, and will hold a Serah Terima Pekerjaan Tingkat II [STT-II] and Berita Acara, to describe the project progress. |
| **Maintenance** | No Formal Team  
Villagers encourage to maintain themselves |
| **Complaints Mechanism** | None specific to project  
But Unit Pengaduan Masyarakat (community complaints unit) not effective as part of village structure and not anonymous |
| **Advertising /Announcement/ Notice Board** | None  
Village Head invites through a letter |
4.4. Program Peningkatan Sarana Prasarana Pelayanan Publik Pola Partisipatif (P2SP5) in West Sumatra

This infrastructure only program operates in the Solok District in Sumatra Barat. The principal objective of this program is to empower villagers with participatory bottom-up village development planning. As the program operates at the village level (and not at the sub-district), the funds go directly to project structures at the village level.

Each year the local government budgets around 700-900 million rupiah from the APBD for the program and all villages (76) have access to this budget.

The program has been implemented since 1997. In 2003, PMD revised the program to adopt KDP principles such as, the funding mechanism, transparency, allocation budget planning (RAB)/design and monitoring.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Name</th>
<th>Program Peningkatan Sarana Prasarana Pelayanan Publik Pola Partisipatif (P2SP5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>List of informants:</td>
<td>PMD Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Visit 8-12 July 2004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution in Charge</td>
<td>PMD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No of Villages</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection Criteria</td>
<td>None. All villages receive the program No Poverty Targeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value of Project</td>
<td>Rps 20 millions maximum No separate administrative funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Program</td>
<td>Annually. However, the infrastructure should be completed within 2 months after the 1st tranche.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Open Menu | Infrastructure only.  
Proposals submitted by villages, and PMD staff does the selection based on the result of a verification team at the district level. The verification team consists of members from several institutions such as Bappeda, PMD, and PU. They use PU standards to calculate the budget needed for each village. |
| Competition | None |
| Consultants / Facilitators | Kabupaten (the technical team) play this role. |
| Maintenance Team | No Formal Team  
Encouraged to maintain |
| Handbook | There is a 2003 handbook. In addition, it has been distributed to Sub-district Head and all villages.  
Some similar principles to KDP:  
- Participation  
- Transparency  
- Village contribution  
- Improve community standards  
- Preference for local skills and materials.  
But no emphasis on poverty targeting |
| Initial Dissemination | There is no particular socialization for this program at the district or sub-district levels as it is assumed that villagers know of the program because it has been running for several years.  
Therefore, despite changes to the handbook and the so-called adoption of KDP principles there is no follow through socialization. |
<p>| Village Meeting | There was only one meeting for this program. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reports</th>
<th>Only once at project end</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funds Flow Disbursement</td>
<td>2 Tranches (50% 50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st tranche requires:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• written proposal, design and photo evidence</td>
<td>2nd Tranche requires:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Tranche requires:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Check on Work Progress by Technical team from kabupaten</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• written report with expenditure and receipts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• photos of work to date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash Daerah produce the 1st tranches in cash cheque. Delivered it to PMD staff. Then PMD staff bring it and give to a person in villager who in charge for the implementation. No specific person is named in guidelines</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The same thing happened for the 2nd tranche.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Team</td>
<td>From kabupaten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring and Evaluation</td>
<td>Monitoring by district team who check the work before releasing the 2nd Tranche (PU, PMD, Bappeda, and financial person from Bupati office).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bupati responsible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMD 2 people</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bappeda 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Monitoring by Bupati Office 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bawasda for finance only 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complaints</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Announcement/ Notice Board</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 4.5 Danau Allocasi Umum (DAU) in Tapanuli Utara, North Sumatra

This program operates in the Tapanuli District in North Sumatra

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Name</th>
<th>Danau Allocasi Umum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>List of informants:</td>
<td>Bappeda, PMD and Pjok Informants: Pak Bultom Purba, PMD Pak Hotin Manulong, Bappeda Pak Hizer Siregar, Pjok FKS Pak Situmorang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visited 23 June 2004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution in Charge</th>
<th>PMD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No of Villages</th>
<th>18 villages 1 Urban Village (kelurahan)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selection Criteria</th>
<th>None. All villages receive the program No Poverty Targeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value of Project</th>
<th>Rp 26 Million per village</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Details:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

  - 4 million for Village Administration,
  - 1 million for Implementation Teams
  - 1 million for Program Kesejahteraan Kelurga (PKK -women’s group)
  - 20 Million for Project (Mainly infrastructure)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of Program</th>
<th>Effectively 2-3 Months because of delays in APBD disbursement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open Menu</td>
<td>Yes band negative list:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• For consumption e.g. hiring cars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Rehabilitation or hiring offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Building Mosques or Churches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Purchasing tools, tractors, sports equipments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Paying labor supplier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Paying for fertilizer and pesticides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Salaries or wages higher than the cost of the infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Rent or hire of contractors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Overlapping with other projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Implementation Team cannot be Government village officials with the exception of the village treasurer who can be elected as treasurer of the Implementation Team</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village Contribution</th>
<th>Program strongly encourages this</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competition</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>But can be at Inter hamlet level with competing proposals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consultants / Facilitators</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sub-district Team acts as facilitators</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maintenance Team</th>
<th>No Formal Team</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Encouraged to maintain</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Handbook</th>
<th>Yes similar principles:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Transparency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Maintenance team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Village contribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Improve community standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Preference for local skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>But no emphasis on the poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Dissemination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Brief overview of program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Funds available</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Standard forms and documentation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At District (Kabupaten) Level for</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sub-district Level Staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Pemberdayaan Masyarakat Desa (PMD)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At Sub-district Level for:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Village heads,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Village Council Head (LPM)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Head of Badan Perwakilan Desa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Head of Women’s’ group and PKK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village Meeting (One Only)</th>
<th>For Project Socialization:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One Day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Village Head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Hamlet Heads and 2 other people for each hamlet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>And Project Team Elections</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Implementation Team (Team Pelaksanaan Kegiatan )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• No separate financial team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Numbers: 3 Head, Treasurer and Secretary</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>And Verbal Selection of Proposal</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ranking of verbal Proposals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• selection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation Team Proposal Writing</th>
<th>1 day by TPK to Kecamatan for revision and comment and then sent to Kabupaten</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(two weeks later)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verification: None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funds Flow Disbursement</td>
<td>2 Tranches (50% 50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1st tranche requires:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• written proposal, design and photo evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• report on first meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2nd Tranche requires:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• written report with expenditure and receipts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• photos of work to date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Account: Village Name held at Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pembangunan Daerah Sumatra Utara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Account Signatories:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Head of Implementation Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Treasurer of Implementation Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Stamp by Village Head</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technical Team</th>
<th>Sub-district Public Works (PUK)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monitoring and Evaluation</th>
<th>Monitoring by Kabupaten Bupati responsible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PMD 5 people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bappeda 3-4 People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Financial Monitoring by Bupati Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Buwasda for finance only</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complaints</th>
<th>None specific to project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>But can complain to Bupati</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Announcement/ Notice Board</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
4.6 Program Pemberdayaan Ekonomi Kerakyatan Kampung Tua (PPEK-KT) in Lampung

This is a program in Lampung Province, which started in 2003 and is now in its second year of operation. This program is aimed to alleviate poverty focused on Kampung tua community. Kampung tua here is refer to village in Lampung, which is inhibited by adat community or indigenous people (usually two main clans in Lampung: “Pepadun” and “Sebatin”).

From 2,105 villages in Lampung, 755 villages (36, 67%) are categorized as poor village which majority are Kampung tua (based on PMD Lampung poverty list). To reach equality and reduce development gap between Kampung Tua and other villages, Government of Lampung set up this program.

The main goals are:
7. Revitalize of adat institution to be more active in development process
8. Empower Kampung Tua (adat) institution to develop economic activities
9. Create new local economic activities
10. Strengthen local economic activities which have existed
11. Introduce market and bank to communities as a part of economic institution
12. Set up economic institutions in Kampung Tua level through economic enterprise (cooperatives)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Program</th>
<th>Program Pemberdayaan Ekonomi Kerakyatan Kampung Tua (PPEK-KT) in Lampung Province</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source of funds</td>
<td>Provincial APBD province trough PMD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Team at Province level | - Secretariat program :PMD province  
|                        | - Implementation team : LPM (Community Empowerment Institution) of Lampung University (UNILA) |
| Number of Villages | Total 164 villages (2 years)  
|                    | Year 1: 65 (planned 66, but one failed) 2003  
<p>|                    | Year 2: 99 (planned 100, but one failed) 2004 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selection Criteria</th>
<th>In year 1 (2003) each kecamatan selected one kampong tua (village) but in year 2 (2004) each kecamatan could select 2 or 3 villages.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Criteria:           | 7. Considered as ‘kampong tua’ (old village)  
|                     | 8. Made up by adat communities majority  
|                     | 9. Poor and undeveloped  
|                     | 10. Has natural and human resources capable of being developed  
|                     | 11. High unemployment  
|                     | 12. Easy access for transportation |
| Value of Project    | Year 1: each kampong tua received Rp. 100 million  
|                     | Year 2: each kampong tua received Rp. 90 million |
| Length of Program   | Each kampong tua receives a one-year fund, but the revolving fund should be used continuously. The program was planned as a three-year program (including maintenance), but PMD decided to suspend after 2 years. |
| Open Menu           | Only for micro-credit economic empowerment with negative list as follows:  
|                     | 1. The purchase of trawlers or motor ships for passengers  
|                     | 2. Long-term harvest plantations, such as coffee, coconut, rubber, etc  
|                     | 3. Rice or coffee huller  
|                     | 4. Transportation (car, motorcycle etc.)  
|                     | 5. Electricity  
|                     | 6. Buy or provide insecticide, cyanide, asbestos, explosive material, weapons, army needs, and other materials which bring danger to environment, and all activities which employ or exploit children. |
| Handbook            | Yes, similar principles to KDP  
|                     | - Participation  
|                     | - Transparency  
|                     | - Accountability  
|                     | - Sustainability  
|                     | - facilitators |
| Initial Dissemination | 1. At province: conducted by PMD province and UNILA (as project implementation team). This dissemination invited DPRD province, NGO, university, community organizations to disseminate the program and to seek inputs from all participants. Participants discussed about the definition, perception, goal, mechanism, and criteria of “kampong tua”.  
<p>|                     | 2. At Kabupaten: invited government official at kabupaten level, DPRD, camat, representatives of Kampung Tua. This meeting held a couple weeks after dissemination at province. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village Meeting</th>
<th>Kampung Tua (Village) level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Half day meeting at MMA (Musyawarah masyarakat Adat or village meeting)</td>
<td>These meeting divided into 4-6 meetings and some were facilitated by FKTs (Kampung Tua facilitators). This meeting invited adat leaders, adat institution, and LPM, BPD, and village staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| MMA 1 | - Brief overview of the program  
- Set up Lembaga Masyarakat Adat (LMA: Adat community Institution), which is representative of adat communities. LMA role is as advisor and supervisor of PPEK-KT program  
- Set up UPK-KT (Kampung Tua Financial Team) elected or appointed in some instances.  
- Set up KUM-KT (Kampung Tua, Implementation Team) elected.  
Attended by approx 35 people (no participant list) |
| MMA 2 | - Facilitated by FKT, coordinated with LMA, UPK-KT and KUM-KT  
- Socialization of economic activity planning and proposing mechanism  
- Preparing proposal  
- Set up repayment mechanism of revolving fund from KUM-KT to UPK-KT (including interest, revolving requirement, next target group of revolving fund, etc)  
Attended by approx 25 people |
| MMA 3 | - Inform list of proposals which are successful (meet the criteria from verification team: UNILA and PMD secretariat team)  
- Attended by approx 40 people (including members of economic group). This agenda should be written and signed by FKT, LMA, and UPK-KT. |
| MMA 4 | - UPK-KT distributes revolving fund to beneficiaries or to head of economic group witnessed by MMA 4 participants.  
- Set up action plan for next disbursement and distribution |
| MMA 5 | - Accountability report of UPK-KT  
- Accountability report of KUM-KT  
- Planning next revolving  
- Set up annual report to Governor (via team leader PPEK-KT and Bappeda) |
| MMA 6 | - Preparation of next revolving fund  
- (In case of force mayor) discussing the problems  
- Handling complaint and resolution |
### Program Teams at Village Level

1. **LMA (Lembaga Masyarakat Adat: Adat Community Institution).** Some LMA has been established long before, but others are new (just created during MMA 1). LMA is representative of adat communities, must be appointed (not elected) based on their adat tradition. LMA is responsible for overall program implementations.

2. **UPK-KT (Unit Pengelola Keuangan Kampung Tua: village financial team).** This team elected during MMA 1 (but in some cases, it is also pointed by adat leader).
   
   UPK-KT Team tasks are:
   - Propose releasing fund to Pimpro (project team leader)
   - Distribute fund to beneficiaries or head of economic group
   - Make financial report

3. **KUM-KT (Kelompok Usaha Masyarakat Adat Kampung Tua: Kampung Tua Micro-credit Economic Group).** KUM-KT made up of 3 persons, elected during MMA 1. Team tasks:
   - Manage revolving fund and responsible to all economic groups
   - Manage repayment from groups to UPK-KT
   - Report financial record to UPK-KT every month

### Announcement/ Notice Board

None

### Maintenance

None

### Funds Flow

**Disbursement**

From province to UPK-KT (village finance team) disbursed in two tranches: 1<sup>st</sup>: 70% and 2<sup>nd</sup>: 30%.

1<sup>st</sup> Tranche

- To obtain first tranche the UPK-KT should make request with an attached action plan of proposed activities.

2<sup>nd</sup> Tranche

- To obtain the second tranche the UPL-KT should provide a progress report on the initial action plan. Before the tranche is disbursed, PMD (province) and UNILA team visit villages to ensure that all of the first tranche was distributed to all beneficiaries. If not, the second tranche is delayed.

From UPK-KT to beneficiaries or head group, the funds are also released in two tranches. Each beneficiary gets 70% in the first tranche and 30% in the second tranche.

### Competition

Fund to kampong tua is a fixed-allocation from province (verification team UNILA-PMD). No competition at village level.
| Consultant / Facilitator | Yes.  
| - Province level: UNILA Team (project implementation team)  
| - Kabupaten level: Kabupaten coordinator (called Korkab)  
| - Kampung Tua (village) level: Kampung Tua Facilitator (called FKT). One FKT is responsible for 3-4 villages (kampong tua) |  
| Technical Team | Yes, from UNILA and kabupaten team |  
| Complaints | Yes. Complaints should be submitted to team leader or PPEK-KT secretariat at PMD province. |  
| Length of Program | Each kampong tua get one-year fund, but the revolving fund should be used continuously. The program was planned as a three-year program (including for maintenance), but PMD decided to suspend after 2 years. |  
| Monitoring and Evaluation | Yes, by PMD team and UNILA team. UNILA hired an independent team to monitor and evaluate the program. However, this is still at the implementation stage and has not yet reported. |  
| Report | LMA- UPK-KT and KUM-KT should report to secretariat of PPEK-KT (both UNILA and PMD) and go trough Governor. |
4.7 Program Pembangunan Pengembangan Desa Mandiri (P3DM) in South Kalimantan.

This program started in 2004 in the new district of Tanah Bumbu, which was formerly a part of the district of Kota Baru in South Kalimantan. The program evolved from a Kota Baru program entitled Gerbangdes but unlike the Gerbangdes program, it has a micro-credit component. The Bupati is very involved in the program. The program was initiated by the Kepala Bappeda who hired a consultant from the University of Lambung Mangkurat to design the program.

The program has a facilitator (termed motivators) at the village level and is theoretically recruited from the village. PMD claims that P3DM is inspired and modeled on KDP though they stressed that they also wanted a project that was independent of KDP. The program is a village community development program.

The kecamatan in this new Kabupaten are:
Kecamatan Batulicin : 27 villages [ex gerbangdes]
Kecamatan Kusan Hilir : 35 villages [ex gerbangdes]
Kecamatan Kusan Hulu : 22 villages
Kecamatan Sungai Loban : 14 villages
Kecamatan Satui : 19 villages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Tanah Bumbu District – South Kalimantan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Program Pembangunan Pengembangan Desa Mandiri (P3DM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Program funded through district funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Program</td>
<td>Annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No of Villages participating in program</td>
<td>117 villages plus 1 kelurahan in 5 sub-districts from district funds under Bappeda with PMD as the operating agency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection Criteria</td>
<td>All villages receive so there is no selection process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value of Project</td>
<td>Each village receives Rp 50,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breakdown as follows:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Million for transport (motorbike provided)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Million For communications (VHF FM Transceiver. The motor bike and the VHF receivers are for 2004 only as this is the first year of the project. The motorbikes and receivers are supplied by the Bupati office and not bought by project villages)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Million For Infrastructure. This will increase in subsequent years by the amount of money spent on motorbikes and receivers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Million for Micro-credit to Women’s Group (PKK)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Million for Operational Costs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Handbook | Yes available to village head and sub-district staff |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Dissemination</th>
<th>District Level (half day) for</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Village Heads</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-district Heads</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarjana Motivator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At Sub-district (one day) for:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training on:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overview of program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funds available</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information on components</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard forms and documentation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Open Menu and proposals</th>
<th>Yes but within the limits of having two components with funding ceilings for 2004:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. Infrastructure 27 Million</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Micro-credit 5 Million (through PKK)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no official negative list in the guidelines but PMD discourages the following:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• No building of Mosques</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• No building of schools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Rehabilitation of existing buildings beyond a ceiling of 5M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Competition | None but there can be inter-hamlet competition |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village Contribution</th>
<th>Encouraged</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1st Village Meeting</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musbangdes 1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(no time period specified)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Socialization for:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village Head</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward (RT) and Sub-Ward (RW) Heads</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPM Reps</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of BPD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village officials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villager Elders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elections of Project Team:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village Implementation Team (TPK)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The TPK consist of Head, Secretary, Treasurer, and 1 technical Person. All are elected positions but there is no restriction on village officials being elected with the exception of the Village Head</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no separate Finance team for financial oversight</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Initial Discussion of Proposal Ideas</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>These are then further discussed at the ward and sub-ward levels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2nd Village Meeting</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musbangdes 2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final agreement on proposal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB the guidelines do not specify the number of Village Meetings but a meeting with PMD emphasized there should at least 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Facilitator / Consultant  | Yes - termed motivators  
These motivators work at the village level for community development programs, and not Just as facilitators for the P3DM program. They are organized by district government (Bupati office).

Motivators are paid Rp 500,000 a month, which is a source of conflict with Village Heads and other village officials who are paid considerably less. The motivators are paid for 10 months not 12 and are paid for the PAD (District Budget)

The candidate recruitment criteria are:
- Candidates should be from the village
- Have a bachelor level degree
- Candidate should be proposed by village apparatus

The proposed candidate details are submitted to the Bupati’s Office and should be approved by BPD

Motivator has to report to the District Office and is supervised from there.

5 of 27 motivators in the kecamatan Batu Licin are women.

Motivators are given training by PMD and PT ALkon (a consulting firm from Surabaya) who produced a one-week training program with an additional 3 days for physical training designed to increase their strength for working in the field!

| Monitoring Team | Kecamatan Technical Team (Tim Teknis Kecamatan) duties:  
- To look at administration and building progress  
- To monitor and follow all process (meetings]) if accessible. Many not be possible in remote areas  
- The Tim Teknis Kecamatan will be lead by Section Head of PMD in kecamatan  

The District Technical Team (Tim Teknis Kabupaten) will be lead by Bappeda office, which monitors the program at the sub-district level. The Tim Teknis Kabupaten consists of members from Bupati Office, Bappeda, PMD and also other related institution such as PU (Public Works)  
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funds Disbursement</th>
<th>3 Tranches 40% 40% and 20%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st Tranche</td>
<td>40% of the total amount for infrastructure will be transferred at project start. According to admin procedure, the Tim Pelaksana should submit a Berita Acara of Musbangdes I and II with proposals approved by the Kecamatan and send to Tim Teknis Kabupaten. The person responsible for this is the Pimpro in the District Bappeda office. The money will be approved for disbursement by the Pemegang Kas Kantor Bappeda.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB</td>
<td>In one village First tranche was disbursed in cash directly by Bupati (May 2004). The Bupati gave Village Head, Tim Pelaksana, and Village Treasurer the money symbolically to one village. The Bupati is in an acting position only and is coming up for election!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Tranche</td>
<td>40% of the total amount After the infrastructure has been 40% completed and a report submitted by the Village Head and approve by the Head of the Kecamatan. The Implementation Team has to submit a progress report on the activities, including photos of the work to date and details of laborers’ salaries. They also have to submit original receipts, and attach the account number of each village. The account opened by each village has to be a P3DM account with treasurer as the signatory. The Bappeda office will not disburse the funds if admin procedure not yet completed. The form of the progress report is very simple.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Tranche</td>
<td>20% of total infrastructure cost disbursed after 80% of the work is completed with progress reports etc as per tranche.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank Account:</td>
<td>In the name of the Implementation Team. Not clear whether individual name or project Signatories:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety of signature at village level depending on the particular Bank’s terms and conditions. There are villages’ accounts with treasurer only signing the account. Others have signatures of treasurers and Ketua Tim Pelaksana P3DM, or P3DM treasurer and Kepala Desa. In Sungai Loban Kecamatan, no transactions allowed from the account without Kepala Desa signature.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>No Formal Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villagers encourage to maintain themselves</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complaints and Sanctions Mechanisms</td>
<td>No project specific complaints structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local sanctions decided by a meeting of the villagers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal sanctions may be imposed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funds must be returned if misused</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising /Announcement/ Notice Board</td>
<td>None Village Head invites through a letter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.8 Gerakan Membangun Desa (Gerbangdes) in South Kalimantan.

This program started in 2001 in the district of Kota Baru in South Kalimantan, a year after KDP started its program. The specific aims of the program are to develop village autonomy, to strengthen village governance institutions and to maximize villagers’ participation. The program emphasizes community contribution and the use of village meetings (Musbangdes) to develop program activities. The main program activity is developing village infrastructure. The lead institution since 2004 is PMD and the co-ordination team has a very positive attitude towards community empowerment.

Initially, the program was aimed at non-KDP sub-districts but it has now spread to all districts and so there is overlap. It appears that Kota Baru is not interested in the matching grants program because it is viewed as expensive (especially with respect to facilitator costs) and because it runs over financial years, which is seen as problematic in terms of reporting to the DPRD.

A noticeable feature of the program it at that it has a reward and sanctions mechanism. Villages performing well are given an incentive and villages performing poorly have their funding reduced. The Bupati’s office decides which villages should be rewarded and which should be penalized based on reports by the Team Teknis in each Kecamatan. Last year Desa Karang Payau in Kecamatan Kelumpang Hulu was rewarded with a motorbike. Officials were reluctant to identify an example of a village being penalized but stated that it did happen.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Kota Baru– South Kalimantan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Program Gerakan Membangun Desa [Gerbangdes]. A Village Development Action Program Program funded through district funds (APBD).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Intuition</td>
<td>Originally BAPPEDA but handed over to PMD in 2004. The central policy is that all community development programs for villages are now handled by PMD The LPM is the main facilitator at the village level with BPD having a supervisory function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Program</td>
<td>One Year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **No of Villages participating in program** | Originally, for Non KDP Sub-districts (kecamatan) but now extended to all.  
185 Villages |
| **Selection Criteria** | All villages not currently in receipt of KDP funding or are a KDP phase-out village. |
| **Value of Project** | Each village receives Rp 50,000,000  
Breakdown as follows:  
5 Million for Operational Costs of the Implementation Team  
45 Million for the Infrastructure Project |
| **Village Contribution** | Villagers are expected to contribute in cash or in kind (labor, materials etc) |
| **Handbook** | Yes available to all village Heads and sub-district staff. Adopts many of the KDP principles |
| **Initial Dissemination** | District Level (half day) for  
Sub-district Head and his staff (Tim Teknis Kecamatan)  
At Sub-district (one day) for:  
Village heads, Village Council Head (LPM)  
- Head of Badan Perwakilan Desa  
- Head of Women’s’ group (PKK)  
Training on:  
- Overview of program  
- Funds available  
- Information on components  
- Standard forms and documentation |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Open Menu and proposals</th>
<th>Yes but within the limits of it being an Infrastructure Project with a ceiling of 45 Million and administration costs of 5 Million )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative list:</td>
<td>• For consumption e.g. hiring cars • Rehabilitation or hiring offices • Building Mosques or Churches • Purchasing tools, tractors, sports equipments • Paying labor supplier • Paying for fertilizer and pesticides • Salaries or wages higher than the cost of the infrastructure • Rent or hire of contractors • Overlapping with other projects • Implementation Team cannot be Government village officials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competition</td>
<td>None but there is inter-hamlet competition for the project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Village Meeting Musbangdes 1)</td>
<td>Project Socialization for:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(no time period specified)</td>
<td>Village Head Ward (RT) and Sub-Ward (RW) Heads LPM Reps Head of BPD Village officials Villager Elders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elections of Project Team:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Village Implementation Team (Tim Pelaksanaan Kegiatian -TPK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The TPK consist of Head, Secretary, Treasurer, and 2 other persons. One should be a person with a technical background (Tin Teknis Desa) e.g. an artisan. All positions are elected and village officials are prohibited from being elected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There is no separate Finance team for financial oversight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Initial Discussion of Proposal Ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>These are then further discussed at the RTs ad RWs for further discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal Writing Workshop</td>
<td>This is given by the Village Implementation team and is a one day workshop for all Hamlet and RT (village Wards) Heads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **2nd Village Meeting (Musbangdes 2)** | **Final agreement on proposal**  
| | • Ranking of written proposals according to villages priorities  
| | • Selection by voting  
| | PMD stresses that proposals not accepted in one year should be included for acceptance in the following years |
| **3rd Village Meeting (Musbangdes 3)** | PMD stress that there should be accountability meetings held on work completed to date prior to the next trance. These meetings are known as Musdes Pertanggunjawaban or village accountability meetings. |
| **Facilitator / Consultant** | None but sub-district staff has a facilitating role. Also at the village level one member of the Village Implementation Teams should be a technical person (craftsman) |
| **Monitoring Team** | Sub-district Technical Team (Tim Teknis Kecamatan) duties:  
| | • To look at administration and building progress  
| | • To monitor and follow all process (meetings) if accessible. Many not be possible in remote areas  
| | • The Tim Teknis Kecamatan will be lead by Section Head of PMD in kecamatan  
<p>| | The District Technical Team (Tim Teknis Kabupaten) will be lead by Bappeda office, which monitors the program at the sub-district level. The Tim Teknis Kabupaten consists of members from Bupati Office, Bappeda, PMD and also other related institution such as PU (Public Works) |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Funds Disbursement</strong></th>
<th>2 Tranches 50% 50%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1st Tranche</strong></td>
<td>50% of the total amount for infrastructure will be transferred at project start once the proposal has been approved at village and sub-district levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2nd Tranche</strong></td>
<td>50% of the total amount After the infrastructure has been 50% completed and a report submitted by the Village Head and approved by the Head of the Kecamatan. Should hold a village accountability meeting at this stage and at the program end.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bank Account:</strong></td>
<td>In the name of the Implementation Team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Signatories:</strong></td>
<td>The guidelines do not stipulate the number of signatories required or the location of the account but it would appear to be at the village level.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Maintenance**        | No Formal Team Villagers encourage to maintain themselves |

| **Complaints / Sanctions and Rewards Mechanisms** | • No project specific complaints structure  
• Funds will be reduced by 15m for poor performance or misuse of funds  
• Villages performing well may be given extra funding from the Bupati’s office or through the savings made from the imposed sanctions  
• Legal sanctions may be imposed  
• Funds must be returned if misused |

| **Advertising /Announcement/ Notice Board** | None Village Head invites through a letter |
4.9 Gerakan Masyarakat Aceh Darussalam (Gema Assalam) in Aceh

This annual program operates in Nangroe Aceh Darussalam province. This program is a continuance program (from an earlier program entitled Program Pembangunan Gampong), an effort which focuses on community empowerment and poverty alleviation. Villages in Aceh are known as ‘gampong’. The program operates in some KDP Kecamatan, and so, in some cases, there is overlap with KDP locations. There are cases where one village will have both programs, thus placing a heavy burden on villagers’ time commitments if they wish to participate in both programs.

A noticeable feature of this program is that there are two levels of proposals. Those at the village level for village activities (proposed by the villagers and those at the Kemukiman level proposed by the Kemukiman Head and the Kemukiman Facilitators for such facilities as Telecommunications Office – Wartel, Markets, and Mukim Offices). Approximately 50% of the total program fund is allocated to Kemukiman level activity. All proposals are decided upon by the Provincial Selection Team

Aim of the Program

The main goals are:

- To speed up development through infrastructure activities aimed at developing community assets for the gampong.
- To increase community “gotong royong” (self help mutual support groups) through active participation in many activities.
- To strengthen the management of local government at the Kemukiman and Gampong levels (Adat institutions).
- To speed up the poverty alleviation effort, through the economy-productive work and also to open working opportunities using the micro-credit activities of this program

Village Selection Criteria

In Aceh, the program operates through traditional (adat) structures such as the Kemukiman or ‘Mukim’, which is a grouping of several villages and is structurally under the Kecamatan level. A sub-district may have more than one ‘Kemukiman’. A village in Aceh is known as a ‘gampong’

The program operates in selected Kemukimans based on the following criteria:

- Kemukiman with many remote villages and a high incidence of poor people as based on the BPM poverty index.
- Kemukiman that have very basic facilities (health and education)
- Kemukiman with very low economy infrastructure facilities
- Kemukiman with appropriate security and governance and adat institutions that
are working well.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Nangroe Aceh Darussalam (NAD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Gerakan Masyarakat Aceh Darussalam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Intuition</td>
<td>BPM (another name for PMD )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Program</td>
<td>Annual program for 3 years (2002-2004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No of Villages</td>
<td>Total 52 Kemukiman, Number of villages 497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>participating in</td>
<td>2002 : 15 Kemukiman at 136 villages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>program</td>
<td>2003 : 16 Kemukiman at 197 villages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2004: 21 Kemukiman at 164 villages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection Criteria</td>
<td>The main target for Gemas Assalam is poor Kemukimans that fit the following criteria:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kemukiman with many remote gampong and poor people, highest poverty index based on the BPM list</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kemukiman that have very basic facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kemukiman with very low health and education service index quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kemukiman with very low economy infrastructure facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kemukiman with appropriate security and governance, and adat institutions that are working well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value of Project</td>
<td>Total amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2002 : Rps 50.158.430.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2003 : Rps 18.125.323.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2004 : Rps 19.713.085.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village Contribution</td>
<td>Village contribution (labor, material, etc) is a condition of receiving fund of the program. No fixed amount of contribution so according to village capability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handbook</td>
<td>Yes, similar principle to KDP participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>transparency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>open menu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Dissemination</td>
<td>Province Level  (half day)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attended by provincial government staff such as governor, BPM representatives, Heads of provincial agencies such as health and education, Bupatis, district heads, DPRD representatives, NGO representatives, religious leaders, police, and press.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>At District Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(According to manual, but does not happen in practice)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kemukiman Heads, Head of Kabupaten agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>At Kemukiman (half day)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Village heads, Village Council Head (LPM) Head of Badan Perwakilan Desa Hamlet heads Facilitator Mukim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training on: Overview of program Funds available Information on components Standard forms and documentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Menu and proposals</td>
<td>Handbook states funds completely open menu, however, Gampongs are encouraged to propose these main activities: Micro credit 60% Infrastructure 30% Strengthening Kemukiman institution 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Menu and proposals</td>
<td>No negative list, but in practice facilitators advice against new building such as mosques, school etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competition</td>
<td>The manual states there is competition among Gampongs but in reality, proposals are complied into Mukim proposals and are decided upon at provincial level.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Kemukiman Meetings | Prior to village meeting, hamlets have their own meeting to develop proposal ideas
| 1st Musyawarah Mukim (Mukim Meeting) | Program Socialization (brief overview of program, fund allocation etc)
| Election of Financial Team (Unit Pengelolaan Keuangan) | Election of Gampong Facilitator (FG) NB FGs are responsible for 2-3 villagers
| Meeting attended by village heads, BPD staff, LKMD Heads, village leaders, heads of women’s groups. (PKK) | 2nd Musyawarah Mukim
<p>| Announces list of Mukim activities agreed be funded by Provincial team and preparations for project implementation. | Attended by village heads, and representatives of villagers (5 persons each village) |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village meeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Village Meeting (Musyawarah Gampong -MG) conducted twice. Villagers invited openly (mosque announcements mouth-to-mouth etc). All villagers are encouraged to attend to the meeting. Here, villagers facilitated by the FG elect the Tim Penulis Usulan - (TPU (proposal writing team) and Village Implementation Team (TPK), prepare proposals for forwarding to the Kemukiman level where they are compiled into a Mukim proposal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All villagers invited (very open)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Election of TPU and TPK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection of ideas and preparation of proposals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All villagers invited (once again very open)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final discussion of proposals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NB Prior to village meeting, hamlets have their own meeting to develop

Note:
Gampong Facilitator together with Keuchik (Village Head) holds a meeting for proposal idea generation. All participants have a right to propose. The mechanism is as follow:
FG and Keuchik (Village Head) holds a village meeting to discuss proposals. Proposals from villagers compiled as a “proposal list” and carried through to the Mukim meeting.
Proposals are then verified by Facilitator Mukim and Mukim Head and compiled into a “Mukim proposal”.
FM writes up a formal written proposal for each activity.
Micro credit proposals are divided into several group of activity type, such as goat, chicken, sewing, agriculture, small trader, snack trader etc.
All proposals from Mukim submitted to provincial team to be approved. From hundreds of Mukim proposals the Provincial Team (Regional Co-coordinator with 2 assistants and BPM Staff.) selects around 20 proposals to for funding.
In each village, they have a proposal writer team, but in practice, proposals are actually written up by the FM.
FM and Imam Mukim prepare Mukim level proposals, which are sectoral level activities and for which 50% of total program fund is allocated.
| Facilitator / Consultant | Provincial level: Korwil (Regional Coordinator) and two assistants recruited by Badan Pemberdayaan Masyarakat.  
Recruitment Criteria: S1 graduate, have at least 5-year experience in community development, have good facilitation skill and passed provincial selection process.  
None at District level  
Kemukiman level:  
3 facilitators (FM) in first year location.  
1 FM in second and third year locations.  
FM role support villagers in the planning and implementation of the program.  
FM$s are recruited through an application process by the provincial team  
Criteria for FM$s: S1 graduate, have at least 2-year experience in community development, have good facilitation skill and passed provincial selection. Each FM got salary: IRD 1,2 million Encouraged to be from the particular Kemukiman  
Gampong level: one facilitator for 2 or more villages. Facilitator Gampong (FGs per month 200,000) are elected at the Kemukiman meeting (MM 1) |
| Monitoring | Monitoring Focus:  
Community participation at every stage of the program  
Transparency of every process  
The implementation of program procedures and principals  
Facilitator quality  
Program Quality  
Implementation Problems  
Monitoring team:  
Technical Consultant (provincial level) and provincial team (BPM) at least three times a year. (Usually 2-3 persons).  
NGO’s contracted by government  
Yayasan Aceh Bersama (Yasma)  
Forkesli  
(These NGO chosen by BPM. No clear criteria and how were they selected. No report evidence) Supervised by and Report to BPM  
Independent monitoring by Forum LSM Aceh (NGO Forum) made up by:  
UKM-BSPD Syah Kuala University for district Aceh Besar  
Yayasan Peduli Kawasan (Yapeka) for district West Aceh  
Lembaga Pembinaan Pengembangan Sumber Daya Manusia (LP2SM) covers Aceh Singkil  
Satya Pila/Remaja Melati Tunas Marhamah (RMTM) covers district South east Aceh  
Yayasan Simalue Lestari covers district Simalue  
Contracted NGO and Independent NGO have different reporting systems  
The contracted NGO is formally contract to the BPM, is paid by it, and reports to it.  
The Independent NGO is not formally related to the BPM and is self-funding through a variety of sources and its monitoring is completely independent. There reports are made to the Forum SLM Aceh and are published in newspapers. |
| Funds Disbursement | The UPK (financial team at the Kemukiman level) prepares technical and administration documents, including the detailed Budget Plans / Rencana Anggaran Biaya [RAB] using the planning and monitoring consultant service according to the regulations/guidelines. There are 3 tranches.  
1st First Tranche  
60% for micro credit. Disbursement for micro credit: will be transferred if the Mukim has already prepared a budget plan proposal for the economy groups. This program has to be approved by the Tim Koordinasi Gema Assalam at the provincial level and by the Tim Koordinasi at the District level because of cost sharing between the district and provincial APBDs.  
2nd Tranche  
30% for infrastructure. This is then divided into 3 tranches, The first at project start and the last two after 60% of the actual work completed. There is no written accountability report actually just a supervisory inspection by the Mukim UPK and the Mukim Head. If UPK and Mukim Head agree then the next tranche is released. No other details available.  
3rd Tranche  
10% for strengthening Mukim institution.  
Kas Daerah transfers funds direct to UPK account in Bank Aceh in Kemukiman. Then released in cash payments.  
Signatories: Imam Mukim and UPK head  
NB Imam a courtesy title and does not necessarily refer to a religious leader. |
| Maintenance | No formal system, but encouraged to maintain, managed by village head. |
| Complaints / Sanctions and Rewards Mechanisms | No formal system, but usually villagers can complain through the NGOs |
| Advertising /Announcement/ Notice Board | Guidelines state that there should be a project notice board at the Kemukiman level but does not specify the same for the village level |
4.10 Program Pemberdayaan Masyarakat Desa (PPM) in Kupang, NTT.

This annual program started in 2002 in the district of Kupang in Nose Tangga Timor; two years after KDP started its program. The main program activity is infrastructure development at kecamatan and infrastructure and micro-credit activities at village levels. Since 2005, the lead institution is PMD but previously was the Bupati’s Office supported by the Badan Pemberdayaan Masarayakat Desa (PMD) and representatives from relevant district institutions forming an inter-sectoral team for the program. The program is funded by the district APBD budget.

Initially, the program was aimed at non-KDP villages but it has now spread to all districts and so there is overlap. It appears that Kupang government is not interested in the matching grants program because it is viewed as complicated and costly (especially with respect to facilitator costs) and because they have their own program already.

The PPM design was influenced by observations of other empowerment program, such as IDT, PDM-DKE, Padat Karya, P3DT, NTAADP, and KDP.

The oversight team identified the follow operating principles (quoted in the program handbook) as follows.

- Community participation: - the community plans, implements, evaluates, monitors, and sustains their project.
- Implementation based on giving freedom and authority for the community to organize and uses their fund to meet community needs and solve community real problems as agreed upon in the village forum.
- Involving the traditional institutions [adat and religious forum] to bridge program mechanism with the local context.
- Healthy competition among villager groups in proposal generation and selection, fair process and maintaining community harmony
- Sustainability: - villagers should manage a sustainable progress on the activities, infrastructure and capital revolving fund
- Activities will not overlap with other similar empowerment projects (but it does with KDP!)
- Government involvement, only as coordination and facilitators not as the command line.
- Transparency: activities conducted by the implementation team should be socialized to the wider community through the use of a public information boards

The program has several notable features. The first is that the program involves compulsory infrastructure development at the kecamatan level.
Aim of the Program

The main goals of PPM are:

- Increasing community empowerment to be able to compete in the third millennium
- Pacing up the community income and community institution ability through community empowerment funds, in a form of capital for economy productivity activities and infrastructure buildings, which support sectoral activity
- Improving and shaping transparency and public accountability to develop synergy and interaction between DPRD, the community, District Kabupaten Government to synchronize community-based planning mechanism

Targets
- Community groups with low income
- Small scale micro-credit groups
- Location: villages within Kabupaten Kupang [District Kupang]

Activities:
- Infrastructure
- UEP or economy productivity unit [micro credit]
- Health pharmacies equipment, food, cattle breeder, fish breed, and plants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Kupang-NTT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Program Pemberdayaan Masyarakat [PPM]. A Village Development Action Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Program funded through district funds (APBD).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Intuition</td>
<td>2003 Bagian Penyusunan Program [Program Design Division], Sekda Office [Bupati office] act as the secretariat of the program at n District level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2004 PMD (not yet reached village only at socializations stage)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Program</td>
<td>Annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No of Villages participating in program</td>
<td>Originally, for Non-KDP Sub-districts (kecamatan) but 2003 extended to all.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>186 Villages [from. 22 kecamatan]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Selection Criteria** | All Kecamatan receive  
At the Inter-Village Level Forum, proposals are ranked but criteria for ranking not given in the guidelines. Only that it must be a group decision  
The Bupati (Setda) office actually decides which village proposals are accepted |
| **Value of Project** | 2 types of activities:  
Fixed Infrastructure Activities (2003)  
Each kecamatan receives 225,000,00 for building a Kantor Cabang Dinas Bersama [the Joint Office Branch Building for inter sector meetings] and the actual cost for Rehabilitation for the Kecamatan Office so amounts vary  
Activities for Proposals: upgrade roads or asphalt  
groups economy for buying cattle, buying seeds for plantation, fishery etc  
Not all of the villages received the same infrastructure or economy loan.  
Example: Breakdown as follows in Kecamatan Amarasi in 2003 project:  
225 Million for Building of Kantor Cabang Dinas Bersama  
60,827,000 for Kantor Kecamatan Rehab  
60 million for upgrading road in one village  
70,650,000 for asphalt roads  
86 million for upgrading road |
| **Village Contribution** | Villagers are expected to contribute in cash or in kind (labor, materials etc) |
| **Handbook** | Yes available to all TPK and sub-district staff.  
Adopts many of the KDP principles. |
| Initial Dissemination                                                                 | District Level (2-4 hours) for Sub-district Head and his staff (Tim Teknis Kecamatan)  
<p>| At Sub-district (one day) for: Village heads, Village Council Head (LPM) Head of Badan Perwakilan Desa Head of Women’s’ group (PKK) UPT or Petugas Teknis Operasional (PTO)technical person in the kecamatan level [UPT from the Dinas Kimpraswil (ex-PU) and PTO usually from the Dinas Perkebunan/Pertanian] |
| Open Menu and proposals                                                                 | Yes but within the limits of Infrastructure and Micro-credit Project for the development of the Kecamatan infrastructure. In Year 2003, they will prioritize for all the kecamatan to have a building of Kantor Cabang Dinas Bersama and rehab for the Kecamatan office building. But the building of this main PPM infrastructure will be conducted by the village or kelurahan wherever the centre of kecamatan located. Apart for these 2 building, they will have open menu for other project including: Infrastructure Economy-productive activities such as planting a long term plan, for investment. Or buying cattle, or motor-unit for boats etc Empowerment fund, micro credit loan activities, for small groups No negative list. |
| Competition                                                                           | Yes, there is a form of inter-village competition with inter village meetings and ranking of proposals. The TPK with approval of the Desa and Kecamatan will send proposals to Kabupaten. But the final selection will be decided by the Dinas Teknis in District level. The intervention of the government in district still quite dominant. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FAD I [Forum Antar Desa I] Inter Village Meetings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The first inter-village meeting will talk on the project socialization. This will be facilitated by the Kasi pemberdayaan (kecamatan) or the PJOK, but the forum will be lead by the Kecamatan Head. In attendance all village heads, all BPD, community leaders, religious leaders, academic, or PPL and Tenaga Teknis Desa.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st Village Meeting Musbangdes I) (2 hours to 4 hours)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facilitator: Penyuluh Pertanian Lapangan - PPL [Field Agriculture Officer] or Tenaga Teknis Desa TTD (Technical Person)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Socialization for:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Heads (RTs and RWs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPM Reps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village officials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villager Elders/Religious leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elections of Project Team:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village Implementation Team (Tim Pelaksanaan Kegiatan -TPK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The TPK consist of Head, Secretary, Treasurer, and 2 other persons. All positions are elected positions and village officials are prohibited from being elected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The village head already appointed the TTD before this meeting. The TTD is a person with a technical background e.g. an artisan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Discussion of Proposal Ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>These are then further discussed at hamlet level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Musbandus Meeting (Hamlet Meeting)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The head of hamlet will socialize to the villagers. They should start a list of ideas or needs of the villagers. They will also agree on the hamlet for the 2nd Village Meeting (Musbangdes II)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2nd Village Meeting (Musbangdes 2)

The Village head will lead the meeting, but meeting will be facilitated by the PPL (Agriculture Officer).

Final agreement on proposal

To agree on proposals from sub-village and Pokmas (community Group) according to villages priorities

Selection of representative to go to the Forum Antar Desa II

Decision on selection of the Tim Penulis Usulan or the writing team, from the Villagers, Tenaga Teknis Desa/PPL

### Proposal Writing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal Writing</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Forum Antar Desa II [FAD II] Second Inter Village Meeting.

Facilitated by: PJOK and Cabang Dinas/UPT

Lead by : Camat

Attended by:

- Village Head
- Head of BPD
- Village representative [5 people chosen]
- PJOK
- Dinas Teknis/UPT/PTO

Forum will:

- Select the proposal from the village [infrastructure or the Pokmas activities]
- The activities recapitulation in Kecamatan to be delivered to the Bupati with a cc to Dinas office to allocate the budget as the procedure
| Facilitator / Consultant | None. But sub-district staff has a facilitating role. PJOK is the same person of PJOK in KDP program. This will be add with the PPL or field agriculture officer from the Dinas Perkebunan or Dinas Pertanian who work for several villages and divide time to facilitate on farming.  
Kepala Cabang Dinas [KCD] from Kabupaten will work as the organizing coordinator of several kecamatan on the Technical Office. He will lead UPT (technical Team at Kecamatan) and PTO and report to the Dinas Teknis in Kabupaten.  
UPT or Unit Pelaksana Teknis usually from the Kimpraswil [infrastructure or housing office the new name for Dinas PU]. Will be place in Kecamatan for all coordination with this program  
PTO or Petugas Teknis Operasional usually from Dinas Perkebunan dan Pertanian will work on every program in Kecamatan about the farming, cattle, or agriculture. |
| Monitoring Team | Sub-district Technical Team (Tim Teknis Kecamatan) duties:  
To look at and verify the proposal, administration and building progress  
To monitor and follow all process (meetings) if accessible. Many not be possible in remote areas  
The Tim Teknis Kecamatan will be lead by Section Head of PMD in kecamatan and usually called PJOK.  
The District Coordination Team (Tim Koordinasi Tingkat Kabupaten) will be lead by Asisten Administrasi Pembangunan [Setda Office or the Bupati Office], which monitors the program at the sub-district level. The Tim Teknis Kabupaten consists of members from Bupati Office, Bappeda, Banwas, PMD, Keuangan (Financial).  
The Dinas Teknis [Technical Office] Will inform and socialize program through Camat and the KCD or PTO and UPT as a big team for the PPM program.  
Dinas Teknis is included:  
Dinas Kimpraswil  
Dinas Pertanian  
Dinas Perkebunan  
Dinas Koperasi  
Etc |
Funds Disbursement

Does not say specifically in the handbook. Mostly from answers in the interview 3 tranches

35:25: 40%
or
40:40:20

Mechanism:
Send out of budget request from TPK and Pokmas to Dinas Teknis, verify by the Kepala Cabang Dinas/PTO, UPT related and the Kasie Koordinasi Program [at the Kecamatan office] as the PJOK.
Dinas Teknis will send to the Pemegang Kas Dinas [treasurer/financial at the Dinas] the SPP [a request letter for budget transfer]
Pemegang Kas Dinas Teknis/Badan [the District office] will sign the transfer transaction, approved by the Head of the Office. This should be done only if the administration complete Transfer direct to the TPK or Pokmas Account in the Bank from Bank NTT [the official government Bank].

1st Tranche

The amount for infrastructure or empowerment will be transferred at project start once the proposal has been approved by the Dinas Teknis at the district levels.

2nd Tranche

TPK sends progress report to District approved by Desa and Kecamatan heads and request second disbursement. There is no village accountability meeting. Criteria to get second tranche is:
Attach progress report, physic or infrastructure progress report by TPK and progress report of the groups from the head of the Pokmas
Proof of the first disbursement
Recommendation from the Verification Team in Kecamatan [KCD/PTO/UPT and PJOK]

Bank Account:
In the name of the Implementation Team TPK.

Signatories:
The guidelines do not stipulate the number of signatories required or the location of the account but it would appear to be TPK responsible for that.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maintenance</th>
<th>No Formal Team</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Villagers encourage to maintain themselves</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reporting</th>
<th>Multi layered reporting system.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Kepala Desa/Pokmas will send out the formats [already have formats] monthly to the kecamatan cc to Bupati. Camat will make a summary on the overall villages report for the District level monthly. Kepala Cabang Dinas/Pelaksana Teknis Operasional [in District level] will report to their office and cc the report to the Bupati monthly. Kepala Dinas/Head of Office will report to Bupati.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complaints / Sanctions and Rewards Mechanisms</th>
<th>No project specific complaints structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social sanctions may be imposed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Advertising /Announcement/ Notice Board                                   | None announcements. Village Head only invites through a letter |