



Evaluation Summaries

Evaluation: 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
Mid-Term Evaluation: July 2007
Mode of Evaluation: Independent
Technical Area: Employment
Evaluation Management: Asia
Evaluation Team: Lucy Mitchell, John Rahail
Project Start: November 2005
Project End: October 2008
Project Code: INS/04/O1/HSF
Donor: United Nations Trust for Human Security US\$ 1,537,965
Keywords: Indigenous people, Participatory development, Poverty reduction, Empowerment

Background & Context

The Papua Indigenous Peoples' Empowerment programme (PIPE) has as its long-term development goal to contribute to the improvement of the human security situation of indigenous peoples in Papua. This is aimed at reducing poverty; eliminating discrimination in employment; promoting gender equality; and facilitating a favourable social, economic and political environment. To attain the programme objectives, PIPE uses as an overarching tool which is a community-driven participatory development (CDPD) approach. CDPD is a reversal of traditional, top-down and "one size fits all" approaches to development. Capitalizing on

indigenous knowledge, initiatives and resources, the CDPD systematically provides communities at the village level the opportunity to take greater responsibility for, and leadership in, their own development, in conjunction with concerned local and national government agencies. As such, the members of the target groups (partner communities), through their own community organizations, are considered the lead implementers of the project activities undertaken at the village level. For other activities, ILO takes the lead and involves government counterparts as appropriate.

It is important to note that in the project document(s), PIPE was designed as a five (5) year undertaking, with Phase I (the current three (3) year programme) focusing on piloting the CDPD approach and Phase II (a further two (2) years in the original design) focusing more on building government capacities related to mainstreaming a Papuan version of the CDPD approach. In practical terms, the pro started in early 2006. When the Chief Technical Advisor took up his post in July 2007, a mid-term evaluation was commissioned by ILO in order to gain an independent perspective on PIPE implementation to date and for input to support and improve the programme's contribution toward the long-term development goal for the remaining period to December 2008.

The PIPE mid-term evaluation was approached as a collaborative exercise focused on effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability. In evaluating the project's overall performance, the main categories of analysis related to: Relevance and strategic fit, Validity of design, Progress and effectiveness, Efficiency of resource use, Effectiveness of

management arrangements, and Sustainability. Sources of information included project documentation, other UN and government reports, interviews, focus groups and observation.

Limitations of the evaluation include that the field component of the PIPE evaluation was conducted over a period of nine (9) days, and across a large geographical area, such that much of the time was sent in travel. At the community level, more time was generally allowed for discussion with community development facilitators (CDF) and members of the indigenous peoples' organizations (IPOs) than for villagers that are *not* involved in these groups. The consultation with government agencies was limited to field level workers involved in PIPE, whereas the civil servants working in policy and bureaucratic functions that were consulted had little real involvement in the programme.

Main Findings & Conclusions

The evaluation concluded that PIPE is extremely relevant to the development needs and opportunities in Papua at this point in time. The original project document set an overly ambitious agenda for ILO to accomplish in the space of 3 years, however the revised outputs and activities are focused and achievable. The PIPE design is centred on the CDPD method, with community-level activities being piloted in Phase 1 of PIPE (2006-2008), and the more focused effort on government capacity building and replication tabled for Phase 2 (a further 2 years). This is considered a minimal necessary timeframe to genuinely achieve the changes that PIPE aims for, or for them to be achieved in a sustainable manner.

Overall it is considered reasonable for PIPE to have progressed through the noted activities in an 18 month timeframe. The response from the Community Development Facilitators (CDF), Indigenous Peoples Organisations and community members to the tangible activities so far has been overwhelmingly positive; in many cases these are the first 'real' forms of assistance that the people have ever received or been a part of. PIPE has nevertheless encountered a number of challenges that the CTA and team must quickly learn from, in order to ensure the pilots proceed effectively and that relevant lessons are indeed learned from this process. These relate to the baseline of community-level information, human resourcing of the ILO team and forms of capacity-building support provided. The other main finding from the

evaluation is that it is appropriate for PIPE to be more engaged in the bigger picture related to indigenous community development (including gender equality and peace building), both at the provincial level and nationally. Related to this, there are aspects of mainstreaming the CDPD approach that was envisaged as activities for PIPE's 'Phase 2' that should rather be carried out in parallel with the pilots at the community level. Opportunities exist for ILO to expand its technical assistance related to

CDPD to support the Papua provincial government in its 'RESPEK' programme and the national government in the 'PKNP' programme, which are both focused on village empowerment generally.

Recommendations & Lessons Learned

The most critical issues identified for greater attention in PIPE implementation are:

- The baseline and processes actively facilitated reflection and self-analysis with the partner communities. These should be re-visited to more firmly establish the basis for learning from the activities that PIPE supports, including in relation to gender empowerment activities that are planned;
- the programme's human resources, in particular increasing the use of established local expertise and improving communications with partner communities; and
- The types of capacity building provided to all partners, from CDFs to local consultants and partner agencies. To date, PIPE has somewhat underestimated the need for certain types of capacity building and should intensify efforts in order to achieve programme objectives overall.

In terms of impact and sustainability, it is recommended that PIPE maximize the documentation of the process of implementing CDPD in Papua and make greater effort to capture lessons from the pilot activities in the second half of the programme period. It is also recommended that ILO increase efforts for quality monitoring of PIPE implementation.

Finally, given the programme's objectives and achievements to date, the evaluation team recommended that ILO consider seeking continued funding for PIPE or PIPE-related activities beyond the present project period.