



Evaluation Summaries

Papua Indigenous Peoples Empowerment (PIPE) Project: Reducing Poverty and Strengthening Peace and Development Mechanisms involving Indigenous Peoples in Papua and West Papua - Indonesia

Quick Facts

Countries: Indonesia

Final Evaluation: December 2008

Mode of Evaluation: Independent final

Technical Area: Standards

Evaluation Management: ILO-Jakarta (Taufik Muhamad)

Evaluation Team: Robert Hewat **Project Start:** January 2006

Project End: December 2008

Project Code: INS/04/01/HSF

Donor: UNHSF (US \$ 1,537,965)

Key Words: Indigenous people, local economic development, gender mainstreaming

Background & Context

Summary of the project purpose, logic and structure

The PIPE Program was a pilot project implemented by the ILO in collaboration with the Government of Indonesia. The project aimed to promote the institutionalization of the rights of indigenous people, reduce poverty, mainstream gender issues and promote sustainable peace through a rights-based approach to local development called Community Driven Participatory Development (CDPD). The evaluation key findings and recommendations are summarised as follows.

Purpose, scope and objectives of the evaluation

An independent final evaluation was aimed at reviewing the project's strategic relevance, design

and implementation, and evaluating the probable short- and medium-term outcomes. The final evaluation also assessed the implementation of the recommendations of the independent mid-term evaluation and provided recommendations regarding necessary follow-up actions to ensure sustainability of outcomes, build upon progress made to date and to ensure that the most important lessons to be learned from the project are captured and analysed.

Methodology of evaluation

The evaluation methodologies include:

- a survey and assessment of partners' perceptions of and experiences in implementing interventions introduced and supported by PIPE
- focus groups discussions with PIPE project beneficiaries
- consultation with development agencies and govt. offices in Papua that are the key stakeholders of PIPE
- desk review of project reports and reports by project partners
- critical assessment of strategic fit between PIPE interventions and experiences with the emerging development initiatives and on-going ILO activities in Papua

Main Findings & Conclusions

Overall Relevance & Strategic Fit - The evaluation concluded that whilst PIPE appears quite unconventional compared to other programs being implemented by the ILO in Indonesia, it remained consistent with and supportive of the goals of the Indonesia Decent Work Country Program and the advancement of the international agenda of establishing indigenous people's rights through the

adoption and enactment of ILO Convention No. 169 and the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous People. Moreover, PIPE was highly relevant to the emerging national and provincial development agendas as they related to the rights of indigenous Papuans, and very timely, as it emerged at a time when the processes of democratization, decentralization and rapid acceleration of development and resource exploitation created political space to address such issues whilst heightening the level of threat of indigenous marginalization and potential for inter-ethnic conflict.

Validity of Program Design – The underlying project logic, focusing on conflict mitigation through increased community participation in development processes, poverty alleviation and gender mainstreaming, was highly sound and entirely appropriate. Weaknesses lay, however, in a lack of adaptation of the project's design to local needs and conditions. The policy of deferring engagement with most local stakeholders until Phase II undermined the effectiveness of project implementation. It created a situation whereby the project remained poorly informed regarding their working context, and lessons learned from similar interventions in the past, and also compromised capacity for subsequent engagement with many of these organizations. Most notably, failure to effectively engage with the newly formed Papuan Representative Council (MRP) represents a lost opportunity to develop the relevance and capacity of this vital indigenous representative body from its infancy.

M&E / performance indicators – PIPE's M&E system was in many respects deficient. A major problem stemmed from the lack of a quality baseline study, which was compounded by the low quality of several subsequent studies on gender and peace building mechanisms. Furthermore, M&E tools lacked transparency, many of the selected indicators were ambiguous and most of the claimed achievements of the PIPE Program could not be substantiated. It is difficult to determine which changes occurred as a result of the ILO-PIPE's interventions, and what social, political and economic changes were occurring in communities regardless of PIPE. Given that PIPE was a demonstrative pilot program, a much greater effort should have been invested in planning, developing and documenting innovative approaches to M&E.

Implementation – Challenges, Progress and Effectiveness – PIPE faced numerous and complex socio-cultural, political and economic challenges. The most evident included the paucity of interest from local government partners, lack of suitable indigenous people's organizations (IPOs) with which to partner, and attempts by a group of indigenous

elites to position themselves as intermediaries between PIPE and the participating communities. Less apparent, yet arguably more obdurate challenges included extremely low education levels, deeply entrenched hand-out mentality and attitudes towards gender, as well as high levels of intra-communal competition and conflict.

At the conclusion of the project, PIPE could demonstrate a reasonable level of progress in terms of establishing new IPOs, encouraging self-reliance, supporting technical and entrepreneurial skills training and improved livelihoods, and addressing gender issues in at least 3 of the 4 target areas. However, most achievements remained fragile and conditional upon continued facilitative support for at least another 2-3 years.

PIPE also achieved limited success in terms of generating support for the adoption of CDPD by local government. Specifically, the head of the Village Empowerment Body (BPMD) had shown strong interest in adopting elements of the CDPD approach and GET Ahead entrepreneurship training tools into their programs. However, this support base remained quite narrow.

It was also concluded that effective implementation was undermined by a combination of under-resourcing and overly rapid implementation during the first 12 months, resulting in poor communication of the projects intentions and modality to partners and participants. Towards the end of the project there was also a spike in material assistance from the project, which, in at least some cases, caused tensions within the communities and arguably undermined gains made in terms of promoting self-reliance.

This implies that the community-driven approach espoused by PIPE was often compromised or subjugated to managerial imperatives such as the need to meet pre-planned schedules and the pursuit of outputs. Project implementation would have flowed better, miscommunication could have been minimised, the cognitive transition for program participants from a hand-out to a self-help attitude could have been strengthened, and a similar or even greater number of outputs which would lead to a more sustainable outcome could have been achieved if a greater amount of time and resources had been invested into establishing strong foundations for action at the outset.

Application of mid-term evaluation results – Following the mid-term evaluation a range of actions were taken in response to some of the findings and recommendation of the mid-term evaluation. Most notably, PIPE was able to strengthen their core team sufficiently to facilitate much more effective communications and capacity building support.

However, other recommendations were either disregarded or were only partially applied. For example there was no improvement in the quality of the baseline survey documents or subsequent reports, there was little improvement in M&E processes, and most significantly, the recommendations relating to the need to build strategic networks were not internalized by PIPE's management.

Resourcing & Management – The mode of implementation - whereby the PIPE team was directly responsible for project implementation at the grass roots level, whilst sub-contracting specific short term elements to local consultants - was considered less than optimal. Instead, the establishment of long-term sub-granting arrangements with several credible local organizations, is not only likely to have proved a more cost effective approach, but would also have increased the project's capacity for adaptation and innovation, whilst also supporting improvement in capacity of local organizations and building a support base for the promotion of the CDPD approach, gender mainstreaming, indigenous rights and peace. This situation was exacerbated by under resourcing, primarily insufficient allocation of human resources and funding to support effective field facilitation particularly in West Papua. During 2008 there was marked improvement in the level of supervision of field activities as a result of the recruitment of additional human resources and increased allocation of funds for travel to the field.

The selection, supervision and quality control functions in relation to short-term consultant inputs was also generally poor, as evidenced by the low quality and extremely low utility of major study reports.

Exit strategy - PIPE's exit strategy was formulated in the last six months of the program, as it became apparent that a smooth progression to the planned Phase II would not be achievable. The mainstay of PIPE's exit strategy was the provision of US\$110,000 block grant to two micro-finance institutions in Jayapura and Manokwari to support micro-lending for livelihood activities, as well as training and supervisory services to the IPOs for a period of approximately six months. This was a highly positive step, but they should have been involved in the process much earlier, and there should have been a smoother progression from GET Ahead Training, via micro-savings activities before making micro-loans available. Ultimately it seems unlikely that an additional 6 months of access to micro-credit and facilitative support services from these micro-finance institutions (MFIs) will prove sufficient to ensure sustainability of the IPOs and livelihoods outcomes.

Sustainability & Scaling-up – The sustainability of project outcomes remains highly questionable. In the face of future government hand-outs, it is doubtful that project recipients will be motivated to take on the principles of participatory development and CDPD. As such it is crucial that PIPE build the sustainability of what it has already achieved, prior to any major scaling-up. The project needs to be willing to change the implementation modality and develop an approach involving a far broader range of stakeholders in program design, implementation and evaluation.

Recommendations & Lessons Learned

ILO should make a long term commitment to continued pursuit of the vision and goals of PIPE in Papua, and even expand their role to enable them to influence broader changes relating to the human resources crisis, market access constraints, land and resource rights, socio-political change, and the impacts of resource exploitation, REDD programs and corporate social responsibility issues. To achieve this, it is necessary to modify the existing approach in a number of ways. First and foremost, the ILO should conduct a Participatory Program Review Workshop and Strategy Planning Process prior to embarking upon Phase II.

The ILO also needs to focus upon applying its key areas of expertise by seeking ways to employ ILOs comparative advantage in facilitating multi-sectoral social dialogue, capacity building, legal drafting, education / training methodologies and microfinance and SME development. All of these will maximise the chances of supporting the development of sustainable democratic institutions which respect indigenous rights. A range of other recommendations are also provided relating to issues including:

A range of other recommendations are also provided relating to issues including:

- Enhancing M&E and project documentation processes to make them more participatory, transparent, relevant and include gender disaggregated data;
- Developing, pilot-testing and promoting participatory technical skills training methodologies including adaptation of the GET Ahead materials, farmer field schools and participatory action research approaches;
- Strengthening the focus on gender mainstreaming by taking affirmative action to increase women's participation;
- Facilitating greater opportunities for technology transfer through generating opportunities for

cross visits between pilot program and Papuan communities where valuable lessons could be learned;

- Reviewing staffing arrangements, including effort to recruit a greater number of indigenous Papuans, particularly in managerial roles;
- Upwards revision of the budgetary and resource allocations to better reflect the true cost of project implementation for PIPE Phase II;
- Ensuring that they are maintaining high HSE standards by clearly establishing HSE standards and instituting HSE compliance reviews as part of the village development planning process.