



Papua Indigenous Peoples Empowerment Program (PIPE)

Mid-term Evaluation Report

Draft for comment – July 2007



INTERNATIONAL LABOUR ORGANIZATION

MULTI-BILATERAL PROGRAMME OF TECHNICAL COOPERATION

INDONESIA

Prepared by: Lucy Mitchell (consultant)



Project data

Project Location:	Papua and West Papua Provinces, Indonesia
Project Title:	Papua Indigenous Peoples Empowerment (PIPE) Project: Reducing Poverty and Strengthening Peace and Development Mechanisms involving Indigenous Peoples in Papua and West Papua – Indonesia
Project Code:	INS/04/M01/HSF
Original Starting Date:	November 2005
Original Completion Date:	October 2008
Evaluation Period:	January 2006 – May 2007
Executing Agency:	International Labour Organization
Implementing Partners:	National Level: Ministry of Manpower and Transmigration, Ministry of Social Affairs, Ministry for Underdeveloped Regions Provincial Level: Relevant partner agencies in local government and Community Organizations (<i>Reba A'ling</i> ; <i>Forum Dumtru</i> ; <i>Win Hamo</i> and <i>Ventori</i>)
Project Cost:	USD 1,537,965
Type of Evaluation:	Independent Mid-Term Evaluation

Note: Through this report, the words Papua and Papua region refer to generally to the entire Indonesian area on the western half of the island of New Guinea. Although the program is implemented in the two (2) provinces that make up this area, they are only referred to specifically when it is pertinent to distinguish between them (see map in Annex 1).



Contents

	Project data	1
	Table of contents, acknowledgements and glossary.....	2
1	Abstract	3
2	Brief background on the project and its logic.....	5
3	Purpose, scope and clients of the evaluation	6
4	Approach and methods.....	6
5	Review of implementation	8
6	Mid-term evaluation findings	9
6.1	Relevance and strategic fit.....	9
6.2	Validity of design	10
6.3	Progress and effectiveness.....	11
6.4	Efficiency of resource use and effectiveness of management arrangements	16
6.5	Sustainability and lessons learned.....	18
7	Conclusions	19
8	Recommendations.....	20
	Annex 1. Map of Papua region (Papua and West Irian Jaya provinces)	1
	Annex 2. Table of revised PIPE outputs, activities and indicators.....	1
	Annex 3. Terms of reference for the PIPE mid-term evaluation	1

Acknowledgements

This mid-term evaluation was significantly aided by the supportive cooperation and participation of many people, including the PIPE team (especially Mr. Doming Narahayan and Suzan Brudam), former PIPE project staff in Jayapura, community development facilitators (CDF) and community members from Muari Tami, Kemtuk Gresi, Tanah Rubuh and Kebar districts. The evaluation team also benefited significantly by inputs from staff of selected civil society organizations, UN agencies and local government, who shared their insights related to the communities involved in PIPE, as well as regarding the project itself. The evaluation team gratefully acknowledges each for their enthusiastic support and commitment to the development of indigenous communities in the Papua region.

The image used on the cover and throughout this report is from the author's photograph of artwork by a community member in Tanah Rubuh District area, Manokwari, Irian Jaya.

Glossary of abbreviations used frequently in this report

(others used only occasionally are spelled out in situ)

CDF	Community development facilitator
CDPD	Community-driven participatory development
CSO	Civil society organization
GOI	Government of Indonesia
IPO	Indigenous peoples' organization
PIPE	Papuan Indigenous Peoples Empowerment (Program)



1 Abstract

An independent mid-term evaluation was conducted in July 2007, reviewing the design and implementation of the Government of Indonesia and ILO's Papua Indigenous Peoples Empowerment (PIPE) program. The evaluation focused primarily on progress and effectiveness of the key activities implemented to date, including:

- Setting up the institutional framework with government and universities;
- Establishing PIPE with target communities, including the selection of pilot areas, the selection of community development facilitators (CDFs) and formation of indigenous peoples' organizations (IPOs);
- Conducting training for CDFs;
- Conducting community baseline surveys and preparing community action plans; and
- Implementation of activities based on community action plans.

Overall, the evaluation concluded that PIPE is extremely relevant to the development needs and opportunities in Papua at this point in time. The links between social and economic security and peace are well substantiated, and facilitation of self-reliance amongst disadvantaged and minority groups is a critical initiative that is known to contribute to improved human security. With its principle focus on methods for empowering indigenous citizens to play a greater role in their own future, through improved social and economic development employment for men and women, as well as with strengthened mechanisms for constructive engagement in society generally, PIPE is an appropriate initiative. At the national level, there are also a number of changes underway related to indigenous peoples' development interests which, along with developments in Papua, mean that PIPE and the ILO more generally have the opportunity and challenge of becoming more involved in the wider development programme in the region.

Although the original project document sets an overly ambitious agenda for ILO to accomplish in the space of 3 years, the outputs and activities in the revised document 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 CDFs, IPO 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.

The evaluation report provides a comprehensive set of forward-oriented recommendations to support the PIPE team addressing the challenges encountered to date, and to help ILO gain maximum impact from the PIPE program. Enhanced monitoring effort is recommended, including a further independent review of the response to key recommendations in this report.



The most critical issues that have been identified through the evaluation which PIPE should address are:

- the baseline and processes of actively-facilitated reflection and self-analysis with the partner communities, to more firmly establish the basis for learning from the activities that PIPE supports;
- the program's human resources, in particular the use of established local expertise and the improvement of 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 program objectives overall.

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' program and the national government in the 'PKNP' program, which are both focused on village empowerment generally.

Taking 'strategic others' along on the journey of learning how CDPD works – for better or for worse – in Papua, will be an important contribution to as many relevant partners as ILO chooses to engage. There is clear need for and interest in this type of work in Papua, and with the right efforts, PIPE should be rising to the occasion and finding itself and the CDPD lessons positioned as an integral part of Papua's sustainable development future.



2 Brief background on the project and its logic

The Papua Indigenous Peoples' Empowerment Program (PIPE) has as its long-term development goal to "contribute to the improvement of the human security situation of indigenous peoples in Papua by reducing poverty, eliminating discrimination in employment, promoting gender equality and facilitating a favourable social, economic and political environment" (Project Document, 2005).

In the title, the word 'project' was replaced with 'program' once ILO learned the negative associations that many people in Papua have when considering development through the context of 'a project'. PIPE's immediate objectives were also reworded in 2006 in order to deflect Indonesian government concerns about terms such as 'conflict', and the outputs and indicators were also revised (see Annex 2). The objectives have since been adjusted again (ref. PIPE Mid-Term 2007 Progress Report), and are as follows:

1. Reducing poverty by testing and disseminating new approaches in providing support to community initiatives for income and employment generation;
2. Promoting gender equality by improving capacities for mainstreaming gender issues in the development process; and
3. Strengthening the capacity of stakeholders to sustain existing peace and development mechanisms involving indigenous peoples.

To attain these objectives, PIPE uses as an overarching tool a community-driven participatory development (CDPD) approach, which is a reversal of the traditional top-down or "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. Relative to PIPE, this means that 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 undertaken to achieve PIPE objectives, ILO takes the lead and involves government counterparts as appropriate. Assessment of progress toward the PIPE outputs is provided 'collectively' under the heading 'Progress and Effectiveness' in Section 6.3 of this report.

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 program) 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.

The ILO-INDISCO program sought to start PIPE with a "detailed exploratory phase in which the dynamics linking poverty, discrimination and human security would be addressed and form the basis of a specific development response will be tailored in cooperation with the local stakeholders". Specific pilot work areas and groups would then be defined and activities implemented to strengthen village institutions and alleviate poverty through community-driven initiatives of sustainable livelihoods. According to the original project document, PIPE would also work with relevant government and other institutions to strengthen their capacity to promote human security, peace and development, as well as gender equality. The bulk of this work would take place in the second phase of PIPE, for which specific approaches, activities and outputs would be designed toward the end of Phase I, i.e. in 2008.



3 Purpose, scope and clients of the evaluation

In general the purpose the evaluation is to increase the shared accountability for achieving the ILO's strategic objectives. Evaluation focuses on the extent to which ILO performance is on track, where potential for improvement exists, and actions to be taken. Insights and lessons learned are fed back into the process of organizational learning and the planning and programming of future activities (ILO Evaluation Guidance, 2005).

For the Papuan Indigenous Peoples Empowerment (PIPE) program, the mid-term evaluation terms of reference specify that:

“On the basis of the project document, the evaluation will identify the project’s overall progress, focusing on achievements and strengths, challenges and shortcomings. This will be based on a critical assessment of the original logical framework, the situation on the ground and the actions undertaken by the project....The mid-term evaluation will examine the progress, achievements, good practices, and lessons learned from the implementation of project in selected communities in both provinces in order to give early feedback on the approach being followed, the methodology being applied and the validity of the design in terms of providing a basis for scaling up and replication”. The full TOR for the evaluation is provided as Annex 3.

Prior to commencing the evaluation, the consultants and agreed that the reporting should emphasis findings relevant to the future or remaining implementation period, with special attention paid to providing detailed recommendations.

The principle audiences for this evaluation are the PIPE team in Papua, ILO Jakarta with the responsibility for backstopping the PIPE program and ensuring overall relevance and alignment with the Decent Work Country Program, as well as government partners responsible for overseeing the program’s direction. Other important clients of the evaluation include the staff and donors of the United Nations Trust Fund for Human Security, in particular the Government of Japan, and the ILO’s INDISCO team in Geneva. Local government, UN and civil society development partners in Papua also have an interest in the progress of PIPE’s work, particularly in terms of the pilot activities with indigenous communities. For the latter audience, a Bahasa Indonesia summary in presentation form has been prepared (see Annex 4 – to be completed once report content finalised).

4 Approach and methods

The PIPE mid-term evaluation was approached as a collaborative exercise focused on effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability. While not carried out as a thoroughly participatory evaluation, the approach was consultative and inclusive, with efforts to facilitate learning made where possible. For example, questions were asked in ways that encourage reflection and analysis of individuals’ role in particular successes or problems encountered, and results of the evaluation are to be fed-back to most participants, as well as followed-up with specific activities.

In evaluating the project’s overall performance, the main categories of analysis related to:



- Relevance and strategic fit
- Progress and effectiveness
- Effectiveness of management arrangements
- Validity of design
- Efficiency of resource use
- Sustainability

The evaluation terms of reference provided a plethora of suggested research questions, however to focus the work and simplify the reporting of findings, key questions for each of the categories above were identified. To avoid repetition, the questions are indicated directly in the report section 6 on findings.

Methods used to gather and verify data for the evaluation were:

- Review of secondary data (project document, training materials, community/IPO proposals, monitoring reports, etc);
- Visits to field locations and community meetings in three (3) of the four (4) districts where PIPE's pilot activities are being implemented (Muara Tami, Kemtuk Gresi, Tanah Rubuh), and a meeting with representatives from the fourth district, Kebar, in Manokwari;
- Interviews with identified key persons in government, civil society and communities;
- Semi-structured interviews and informal dialogues with community members, selected at random ; and
- Integrative analyses and focus group discussions for verification and reflection.

Constraints

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 spent 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 program.

While the evaluation team endeavoured to be as balanced and thorough as possible, it is the nature of such work that discussions are focused but brief. On certain issues therefore, the evaluation team could develop impressions only.

Evaluation team

The evaluation team was carried out by a team of one (1) national and one (1) international consultant, Mr. John Rahail and Dr. Lucy Mitchell. Mr. Rahail was raised in Papua and has over 20 years of professional experience spanning several disciplines that range from indigenous community health to youth education. He heads a local CSO in Jayapura and has an extensive network and knowledge of development programs and issues in the Papuan context. Dr. Mitchell is an anthropologist specialising in community development and capacity building. She has extensive experience working with indigenous communities, CSOs and government in many parts of Asia and the Pacific/Melanesia, and has supported ILO and other United Nations (UN) agencies in a range of programme planning and review functions.



5 Review of implementation

In practical terms, the program commenced in early 2006 when the Chief Technical Advisor (CTA), Mr. Domingo Nayahangan, 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 program's contribution toward the long-term development goal for the remaining period to December 2008.

Particular highlights and challenges are discussed under 'progress and effectiveness' in Section 6 of this report, however the following are noted as the key activities and milestones in the first eighteen (18) months of PIPE:

- Setting up the institutional framework with government and universities; staff recruitment;
- Establishing PIPE with target communities, including the appointment of pilot areas, the selection of community development facilitators (CDFs) and formation of indigenous peoples' organizations (IPOs);
- Conducting initial basic training for CDFs;
- Conducting community baseline surveys and preparing community action plans; and
- Implementation of activities based on action plans, in particular livelihoods-related training.

The IPOs working with ILO to implement PIPE are Reba A'ling (Muara Tami district), Forum Dumtru (Kemtuk Gresi district), Win Hamo (Tanah Rubuh district) and Ventori (Kebur district). The first two of these are located in Papua Province, and the latter two are located in West Irian Jaya Province.

Periodic internal monitoring by the CTA has taken place timed around key activities, namely the conduct of community baselines and the implementation of livelihood-related activities. On-going implementation of activities by the CDFs and ILO program staff does involve continuous review and reflection (aspects of monitoring), however there has been minimal documentation *per the specific outputs and indicators*. The timing of the independent mid-term evaluation is appropriate as there has been sufficient foundational work undertaken for review and comment, and leading into the second half of PIPE (Phase 1), adjustments can be made based on consideration of recommendations.

The timing of the evaluation is also opportune given a number of other developments relating to PIPE objectives of indigenous empowerment and poverty alleviation more generally, namely:

- The momentum of Special Autonomy in Papua and West Irian Jaya, and the current Governor of Papua's flagship people-centred development program called 'RESPEK';
- The initiation and revision of both new and on-going activities related to poverty reduction and village empowerment in other agencies, for example PDP of GOI/UNDP, PPK (now called PNPM) of GOI/WB, and Jayapura regency's pilot partnership with APF3 to engage local villagers;
- The establishment of a 'Multi-Stakeholder Advisory Board' overseeing diverse donors and development partners in an effort to better coordinate assistance to Papua;
- An increased momentum on the indigenous peoples interests at the national level, including initiatives to promote national discussion on ILO Convention No. 169 on Indigenous Peoples;
- The intention of the UN agencies to develop a joint work in Papua, and in particular ILO's collaboration with UNDP in Papua; and
- ILO's future works in Papua i.e. through the proposed EAST project and other initiatives.



6 Mid-term evaluation findings

The principle findings from the evaluation presented here represent the professional opinion of the evaluation team, based on information reviewed and observations and communications throughout the evaluation period, all set within a long-term, comprehensive understanding of development challenges in the Papua region. This consideration of the bigger picture relating to indigenous community empowerment and sustainable, peaceful development in Papua generally is important context for the analysis of findings about PIPE; if one were to look at PIPE without this perspective, a different set of findings - somewhat less complimentary - may emerge.

6.1 Relevance and strategic fit

How well does the project link up to a broader emerging national interest to address the rights and welfare of indigenous people in Indonesia, or per the provision of the ILO Convention 169 on the right of indigenous peoples? Does the project's planned strategy correspond to the overall development agenda of the two provinces as defined by national and provincial governments?

The overall development objectives and principle methodology used in PIPE are extremely relevant to the contemporary needs and opportunities in Papua. Basic development indicators related to education, health and employment all show the indigenous population consistently amongst the most disadvantaged in the whole of Indonesia, and the tensions between certain tribes and with migrants continue. The Government of Indonesia's commitment to address these issues is manifest in the Special Autonomy law of 2001, which provides the legal framework for better addressing the needs of marginalized indigenous populations. The real implementation of Special Autonomy has been slow starting, however with there is growing recognition of the opportunity that it provides for significant improvements in social and economic development for the people of Papua. There is also growing commitment amongst local government and elected representatives, most recently expressed through the Papuan governor's village-based development focus that has been coined 'RESPEK'. The ILO's PIPE program is entirely aligned with the spirit of Special Autonomy. With its principle focus on methods for empowering indigenous citizens to play a greater role in their own future, through improved social and economic development employment for men and women, as well as with strengthened mechanisms for constructive engagement in society generally, PIPE is an appropriate initiative.

The activities undertaken as part of PIPE to date are not new or original, however the explicit targeting of indigenous people and their institutions, and working with indigenous peoples' organizations (IPOs) as program implementing partners is unique in Papua. The PIPE rationale of piloting the community-driven participatory development (CDPD) method in Papua, to determine how well it works and what implementation adjustments are needed specifically for the Papuan context, can foreseeably result in ILO making an important contribution to the target communities, but also to government and other development actors who, to date, have little in the way of real tools or proven approaches to this kind of work. Through the implementation of PIPE, to date and for the remainder of Phase 1, i.e. until the end of 2008, there is a valid learning process for the communities, and is a necessary period for ILO to establish credibility in the local development scene, particularly amongst the stakeholders most likely to adopt and take forward the CDPD approach in the future.



At the national level, there are also a number of changes underway related to indigenous peoples development interests, including the creation of new networks, a national Secretariat, and working groups on key issues. These developments provide opportunities for Papuans to integrate further within the Republic of Indonesia, if their participation is facilitated. PIPE has recently been engaged in discussions at the national level, where Bappenas (National Development Planning Agency) has acknowledged the PIPE's CDPD methods as relevant and potentially appropriate for use in the National Program for Community Empowerment (Program Nasional Pemberdayaan Masyarakat - PNPM), which will be implemented throughout Indonesia, and in Papua will align with the local government flagship program, 'RESPEK'. The discussions for using CPDP as an approach in these provincial and national contexts are still underway. This represents an important opportunity to provide ILO experience and expertise in CDPD for another audience and with wider potential impact. This also means that PIPE and the ILO more generally have the opportunity and challenge of becoming more involved in the wider development programme in the region and the country.

6.2 Validity of design

Are the project's planned objectives and outcomes relevant and realistic to the situation on the ground? Is the design and approach appropriate given the project goal and expected outcomes? How does the project target involvement of its stakeholders at various levels (national, provincial and community) which may already have expertise and activities in indigenous and community development issues?

As explained above (Section 6.1), PIPE is an extremely relevant project for Papua at this point in time. The links between social and economic security and peace are well substantiated, and facilitation of self-reliance amongst disadvantaged and minority groups is a critical initiative that is known to contribute to improved human security. Similarly, the inclusion of gender equality objectives as an integral part of the program indicates ILO's recognition that addressing gender issues at the community level is central to addressing the broader issues of poverty.

Although the original project document sets an overly ambitious agenda for ILO to accomplish in the space of 3 years, the outputs and activities in the revised document are focused and achievable. As explained in the original and revised project documents, 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.

PIPE offers a different approach to the same problems that many donor and civil society projects, and the government more generally, are trying to address. The CPDP approach has had proven results with marginalized communities in other parts of the world. It addresses fundamental issues that are common to the indigenous people of Papua, and with its central principles, it is valid to implement in Papua. The CDPD method is 'generic' enough to be applied or implemented as a learning exercise, and can be expected to produce tangible results in the target communities, as well as lessons about the necessary adaptations and changes for implementation on a broader scale (i.e. replication and scaling-up).

The greatest weakness of the PIPE design is that people from certain disciplines and backgrounds, including within ILO, may not easily understand the high importance of process in implementing CDPD. The challenge for the team implementing PIPE is to balance the technical adherence to the CDPD method, ensuring due process, but also 'packaging' and communicating results along the



way, thus building others' comprehension of how CDPD works. When there is a lack of appreciation of the nature of marginalization and disempowerment amongst the poor, particularly indigenous people, it is easy to overlook the value of process and to underestimate the timeframe required for genuine changes to occur. PIPE is also likely to be criticized or deemed to have only modest results when compared to projects that involve more 'hardware' or are implemented on a bigger scale, for example.

To ensure the PIPE design remains valid however, the PIPE team must be careful to be as flexible and responsive to the broader environment and stakeholders in indigenous people as they are with the IPOs and communities. The dynamics around Special Autonomy and the new RESPEK program are such that there are important opportunities to promote CDPD and build an important political support base for taking the approach further, beyond PIPE Phase 1 and into other communities. Although the principle focus remains on the pilots with IPOs in Phase 1, following a linear course of steps vis government and other stakeholders could be detrimental in the longer term. In other words, it is not valid for PIPE to wait until Phase 2 before engaging seriously with provincial and national agencies that have interest and influence in terms of empowering marginalized groups in Papua.

6.3 Progress and effectiveness

To what extent have the project activities been implemented, and has the means of implementation been appropriate and had expected results? What problems have been encountered and why? What are the necessary adjustment to be made with regards to implementation approach, targets and indicators? How does the project contribute to gender equality? Has the project adjusted its implementation strategy to the evolving situation in Papua? Is the adjustment responsive to national and local needs, or to those of any particular government agency?

The main activities undertaken thus far by the PIPE program are noted below, with findings regarding their progress and effectiveness. Overall it is considered reasonable to have progressed through these particular activities in an 18 month timeframe. This recognizes that development is not 'quick' - indeed, doing certain things too quickly can compromise on quality and be ultimately ineffective, especially if that entails errors that need to be made up for, or tasks that need to be repeated. Working too quickly with local communities is a key factor in the 'unsustainability' of many development projects, so finding a pace that is acceptable both to community partners and to funding institutions is a challenge.

- Setting up the institutional framework with government and universities

The institutional framework related to PIPE includes the national advisory committee and a provincial steering committee, with the Labour agency (Disnaker) and Social Welfare Department (Depsos) represented at both levels, as well as the BPMK ('village empowerment and development agency') included in Papua. PIPE has positioned the indigenous peoples' organisations' (IPOs) as lead implementers, which is a reversal of the usual approach and means that at this stage of the program government is less engaged than would be the case in other ILO projects. A small number of government actors are involved in implementing activities as service providers to communities are, however their understanding of the overall PIPE objectives and approach is minimal. The PIPE team too, appears to consider that in the program (Phase 1) "the role of concerned government agencies and other assisting institutions is to provide demand-driven facilitative support services". This is a somewhat limiting view and is likely part of the reason that relevant agencies' personnel (not involved in field activities), as contacted during the course of the evaluation, also reflected



minimal understanding of overall project objectives and potential contribution to sustainable development in Papua.

Apart from addressing these issues, there is also scope for increasing engagement of government partners, as well as for working more specifically with other institutions such as UNCEN and UNIPA (universities), the local parliaments (DPD / DPRD), Papuan People's Assembly (MRP) and Dewan Adat, and with other government agencies such as the Regional Development Planning Agency (Bappeda) and the Governor's staff. By mid 2007, PIPE was starting to recognize that establishing and deepening relationships with these institutions will expand PIPE's impact by fostering understanding of indigenous empowerment methods and the links to peace and prosperity in Papua. This will in turn become the basis for government and others' support to continue empowering IPOs as vehicles of community development in the future. In coming months, a new Advisory Board will replace the existing provincial steering committee and should provide opportunity to connect and communicate more on PIPE substance with a wider audience.

- Establishing PIPE with target communities, including the selection of pilot areas, the selection of community development facilitators (CDFs) and formation of indigenous peoples' organizations (IPOs)

The areas where PIPE is piloting the CDPD method have been agreed with government and the local indigenous communities, and members of those ethnic groups have been appointed by the communities as community development facilitators (CDFs). In parallel with this, the different groups have each formed an organization which is functioning as the 'official partner' with ILO on the PIPE program. Each of the IPOs appears to have formed for the purposes of PIPE: apparently there were no pre-existing formal organizations that the project could have partnered with, although 'LMA's (also IPOs) are said to exist in the baseline studies. The challenge in terms of sustainability is thus for ILO to facilitate with the IPOs sufficient organizational development and understanding of their potential beyond dealing with ILO. This is part of the empowerment process that CDPD is designed to bring about, however this issue should be specifically recognized.

The CDFs, other IPO members and communities approve of PIPE's general approach and are, for the first time, being given the opportunity to lead and be responsible for a set of activities and interface with an external (international) organization (ILO). There are no current or previous programs that afford IPOs this role; it is thus new and a steep learning experience for them. Approximately 20% (1 in 5) of the CDFs are women.

In each of the pilot areas, the CDFs, who are members of the IPO but are primarily seen (by themselves and the communities) as the liaison or link to ILO, come from diverse backgrounds and hold a range of positions in the communities. While some CDFs are clearly local clan heads or position holders in the traditional social structure, others have been selected based more on their level of education and perceived ability to deal effectively with outsiders. Some have worked in government; others live in town rather than in the villages. As well as a small stipend, there is status associated with their role, although by this stage in the program the CDFs are realizing that there are also challenges and responsibilities that they must reckon with. This awareness is bringing into question the commitment of some CDFs to their role, and therefore to PIPE, both by community members and PIPE staff. In the second half of the program, the CDFs that continue in their role need to develop a deeper recognition that they are not intended primarily as a link to, or extension of, ILO but rather as facilitators of learning and development opportunities, dialogue, and social change more generally, and that they are accountable to their own people.



If the CDFs were all the actual indigenous leaders or position-holders in their traditional governance structures, this would be less of an issue. Since the PIPE partner communities did not select such people to serve as the CDFs, it adds another 'layer' of interface between activities supported by PIPE and the average indigenous person in the villages and tribe. As such, it will remain to be seen what impact this has in terms of achieving objectives (related to improved livelihoods, increased gender awareness and clear mechanisms for responding to tensions). This will be one significant aspect to focus on as a lesson learned *vis a vis* the adaptation of the CDPD method for Papua.

In the Win Hamo IPO (Tanah Rubuh district), the situation is more complicated because of a government initiative to sponsor additional CDFs. This meant a greater number of candidates, increasing the intensity of the issues outlined above. Further still, the government was then significantly delayed in paying the additional CDFs, thus adding to problems of CDF effort, commitment etc. These issues appear to be gradually being resolved, however they have taken some focus away from the more constructive opportunities for empowerment that PIPE offers.

- Conducting training for CDFs

An initial training course focused on CDPD was conducted by PIPE's CTA and attended by the CDFs, some university staff who were going to work as PIPE consultants, and some local government personnel. The five (5) day course provided an introduction to the issues that PIPE is designed to address, the roles of the CDFs and the types of skills necessary to facilitate community development in general. For CDF participants the material and methods used in delivering the course were new and "very good". They explained to the evaluation team that the course offered "different ways of learning" and described interactive approaches that are good practice but unfortunately not common in Papua.

The immediate follow up to this course was working on developing community baselines and action plans (see below). Since then, training has been in many forms: meetings, consultations, workshops, FGDs, informal one-on-one talks, phone conversations, etc. While the PIPE team, including CTA, program officers and skills development consultant approach all such interactions with the CDFs and community members as part of capacity-building, and this is apparently reinforced to them at every occasion, there remains an expectation and perceived need amongst the CDFs for further training of a more formal nature, such as was provided at PIPE's outset. Discussions with the CDFs in the course of the evaluation, and a review of the timing and focus of meetings between PIPE team and CDFs, indicate a need to provide more specific training to improve CDF's fundamental understanding of CPDP and to equip them with more advanced facilitation skills. It appears at mid-point in the project, several CDFs are unable to articulate a basic understanding of CPDP or a solid appreciation of the PIPE objectives. The PIPE team has been trying to address these issues, and is starting to recognize the need for more intense efforts to strengthen general facilitation capacities in the CDFS.

One important development related to training and capacity building has been the Reba A'ling IPO's decision to adopt a 'resident trainer' specifically on farming-related issues. The Ventori IPO has similarly recognized the skills of a local co-operative manager and invited him to support them on activities in that area. These developments are important as they reflect the CDFs role in action, as well as ILO/PIPE's responsiveness to community initiatives, in line with the CDPD approach. Where ILO/PIPE needs to be careful, however, is to support such informal trainers, as well as formal trainers (from government, university, consultants) with better pedagogical methods and



approaches. This means recognizing that such people typically have no prior exposure to modern and more effective adult education approaches; they usually work in the ways they always have, although they could benefit greatly from some other examples such as the CTA provided in running the initial course for CDFs. For their local expertise to be more meaningfully imparted, PIPE must recognize this capacity issue and intervene to support local trainers and staff in the ways they work with the CDFs, IPOs and communities generally.

One further area where additional, specific training effort appears necessary is to support the development of the IPO capacity, i.e. organizational development capacity. While they have meetings and spend time with 'skills development consultants' as mentors, so far PIPE has not had the targeted approach to building the organisation's functional or operating competencies that would likely help the IPOs grapple with internal and external issues better over time. The issue of staffing for these functions within PIPE is addressed in Section 6.4.

- Conducting community baseline surveys and preparing community action plans

Community baseline surveys were conducted over a period of three (3) months, lead by the CDFs and supported by consultants from local universities. According to the revised project document, the objectives and outputs of the baseline work was: 1) analysis of the socio-economic and cultural conditions of indigenous communities in the pilot project sites; and 2) analysis of the existing potentials for reducing poverty and promoting peace and development. The baseline surveys are set out as foundational to the PIPE program, as they provide the first comprehensive context analysis for planning activities to achieve the program objectives (reducing poverty and strengthening self-reliance, promoting gender equality, and strengthening mechanisms for peace and development).

Discussions during the evaluation field period confirmed the CDFs involvement in the survey activities, but suggested that there was a focus on data collection rather than analysis. A review of the four (4) baseline reports confirms this and furthermore shows that the most relevant types of data, considering the purpose of the exercise, were not included. In particular, the baseline reports have essentially no information on incomes, gender or conflict-resolution mechanisms in the local cultural traditions. There is minimal ethnographic data, describing structures of indigenous governance, local concepts of time, development or otherwise. Similarly, the baselines have not addressed past development experiences. What the reports do present is a generic format community profile of 'run-of-the-mill' quality, by local standards. They cannot be used for monitoring purposes, and clearly were not used as a tool in a process of collective learning, with discussion, analysis and reflection, resulting in some enhanced understanding of the communities' development predicament and opportunities for stronger futures. Although the PIPE's CDPD approach is itself a strategy for ensuring that the programme is implemented in keeping with existing indigenous knowledge systems and practices (IKSPs) and is culture sensitive, having no documentation or program-oriented analysis of these aspects of local cultures means that PIPE is overly reliant on assumptions about local IKSP and trusts too much that people recognize when and where 'traditional' and non-traditional processes are, or should be used in relation to program activities.

The key problem in this matter appears to have been the quality of supervision provided by ILO's team, in particular the technical guidance for the university consultants. The emphasis on process and the fundamental importance of using this activity to facilitate self-learning by the communities has not come through. This represents a serious missed opportunity for the partners, (IPOs) and ILO, and an issue which must be addressed as a priority (see recommendations in Section 8). The



main lesson learned is not to assume local consultants understanding of the process and outcomes is inline with PIPE, and indeed to assume that close technical supervision of any activity using local experts is necessary.

The preparation of community action plans took place in the same time period as the baseline surveys (i.e. as interrelated activities). It appears that PIPE team supervised this process more closely, as the plans went through a series of revisions to bring out a more focused list of priorities.

The plans themselves show community priorities in the areas of livelihoods (training, equipment etc) and can be considered a solid basis for implementing specific activities with the communities. This is because the priorities are deemed a reflection of the real situation; they are consistent with results of needs assessments conducted amongst indigenous communities in numerous locations around Papua, for example by BP (2003), UNDP (2005) and Mercy Corp (2007). As there was no specific focus on gender or conflict issues in the PIPE baseline work, it flows naturally that these are not featured in the action plans either. It is worth noting, however, that in other community action plans prepared around Papua, these issues are not generally raised as priorities either. This does not mean there is no opportunity for activities related to these PIPE objectives, but means that they will be best addressed later in the program, as indeed the CTA has planned. Addressing both gender equality and peace mechanisms in the local cultures requires careful analysis of the issues and sensitive planning, including in relation to timing. At present, PIPE does not have an adequate baseline on these issues, but does have an established system within which to address them.

- Implementation of activities based on community action plans

In response to the community action plans, the CDFs facilitated the development of proposals and based on these, a number of activities have been implemented. The theme of all activities is livelihoods and economic self-reliance, and to this end, there has been 'hands-on', 'field schools' types of specific related training activities directly with community members. With Reba A'ling the activities have been focused on agriculture, developing garden beds etc. With Forum Dumtru the focus has been cacao production and drying methods. With Ventori the focus is on developing cooperatives for trading agricultural produce and essential items. With Win Hamo, there has been some problems with the activities related to agriculture (discussed below), and there has also been some training related to coconut oil production.

Training providers have been local government field workers from departments of industry, agriculture, plantation, livestock and co-operatives. As well covering the expenses related to the training (transport, photocopying), PIPE has also been paying supplementary fee for their service, which the evaluation team suggests should not be done, as it is not sustainable and also sends the 'wrong message' to both communities and the government. To support the practical use of lessons from the field training, PIPE has also provided funds for related materials such as seed/seedlings, farming equipment and processing equipment, differing from group to group. The communities have been busy with other related activities too, such as land preparation and building basic infrastructure for kiosks. The response from the CDFs, IPO 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.

The main challenge that PIPE (ILO and IPOs) is encountering is reaching agreement on what activities to fund, as the proposals prepared by the CDFs and communities generally are unrealistic in their scope and budgets. This issue has lead to some delays in implementing activities and



caused considerable discontent in some areas (Win Hamo, in particular and Kemtuk Gresi and Ventori to a lesser extent). While the particular dynamics of each location/group are different, there appears to be a general issue in the ways that ILO has communicated and assisted the development of these proposals. These are, to some extent, part of the learning process for the communities involved, and hopefully also for the PIPE team. While it has been a deliberate choice by the PIPE team not to convey indicative budgets to the communities, to avoid an over-focus on money, there does not appear to have been a deliberate effort to plan separate budgets for each area/IPO based on the different geographic and logistical realities. In West Papua province at least, this has added to the difficulties for the program officer in explaining or justifying to the CDFs the criteria upon which proposals may be approved. It appears that the three 3 IPOs (excluding Reba A'ling) are all eager for a wider range of activities to be undertaken as soon as possible, and that if there are considerable further delays in implementing more activities at the community level, it may result in less enthusiastic participation from the people that originally proposed them.

Another aspect of the implementation challenges is the mindset of the local people, who have for many decades been passive recipients of 'development' assistance (mostly from government programs). This approach to development has severely disempowered people throughout Papua and indeed throughout Indonesia, deeply engraining a 'waiting' attitude rather than a 'doing' attitude. In some areas, this is compounded by a local cultural character that tends not to be proactive in seeking or addressing change. The PIPE team recognizes this dynamic and expects it can be turned around, with time, through the CDPD approach. At the same time, however, the PIPE team must be alert to when there are delays or obstacles in implementation because of capacity issues *that PIPE/ILO can help address*. This does not mean 'spoon-feeding' the CDFs or the community, but more realistically appraising their current capacities and acting to support them appropriately.

In other words, there are some capacities that will develop gradually over time from being involved as the implementing partner in the PIPE program generally, but there are other specific capacity-building needs that PIPE can help address more proactively, to facilitate smoother and more effective processes at the community level. The program is, in many ways, an opportunity for communities to develop their inherent capacities, and although there is a tendency for communities to focus on what funds are available to help them, PIPE can support them by to get the most out of the available funds by providing good quality technical assistance and facilitation. Part of their empowerment may involve awareness as to the costs of training and other assistance, for example. Examples of actions to this end are included in the recommendations under Section 8.

6.4 Efficiency of resource use and effectiveness of management arrangements

Are the project's internal management arrangements, roles and responsibilities appropriate and clear to all parties involved? Does the project have sufficient resources to achieve the designed outcomes, and are they being used strategically and effectively? Does the project receive sufficient management support from the ILO backstopping units?

The current implementation modality whereby ILO is directly executing the PIPE program is a choice that has already been made and should be maintained for the remainder of PIPE Phase 1. When meaningful lessons have been learned and experiences captured from PIPE, these can be used as a knowledge base upon which ILO can convincingly draw upon to promote the CDPD approach for strengthening local communities in terms of peace and development. In future scaling-up activities, it would make sense to consider other implementation modalities: for example there are foreseeable advantages to providing selected technical and methodological assistance, along



with funds, to local CSOs and/or relevant units of local universities to work in partnership with IPOs. One such advantage would be the building of a wider, stronger, more sustainable CDPD capacity base to work across Papua in the future.

In terms of program staffing, there have been some challenges in recruiting and retaining personnel, and this naturally impacts on progress and effectiveness of program activities. The change-over in personnel has been relatively high over the short period of time the program has been implemented, and every effort should be made to ensure greater continuity for the remainder of time to come. The issue of PIPE/ILO credibility amongst the development community in Papua more generally is also affected by current staffing, particularly in Jayapura where the program officer post has been vacant and so the finance/administrative person has been trying to fulfill program officer functions. While this may work at some level, it is not an appropriate strategy and certainly reflects / has the potential to reflect weakly on PIPE in the eyes of local CSOs, government and other development partners. In terms of the baseline survey work done in the first year of PIPE, this issue of program officer competence is also reflected (see section 6.3 above). As a general rule, it is prudent to separate the financial and technical (community development) functions/responsibilities between different personnel, as it can be difficult for the communities to differentiate, respect and accept authority for both aspects resting in the same individuals. It can also make for more difficult work for the person involved, as they effectively 'wear two hats' and are rarely seen as impartial.

During the evaluation field period, communities reported, and there was ample evidence, of communication problems arising as a result (in part) of the current arrangements. As the CTA cannot function fluently in the native language, then the program officer serves as a default representative on many occasions, and should therefore have a strong community development practitioner background, with networks and technical credibility amongst a broad range of stakeholders. In West Papua province, the program officer is engaged only half time due to her having other professional commitments. While this time commitment is inadequate and needs to be addressed, it has nevertheless been of benefit to the PIPE program that the incumbent has clearly relevant prior professional experience and is also known amongst stakeholders to be associated with a respected local CSO.

The program's strategy of using local consultants on an 'as needed' basis is sound in principle. In real terms however, there is an ongoing need and so having committed personnel (rather than shorter-term appointees) may be a more suitable strategy. At the same time, PIPE should endeavour to make greater use of local knowledge and expertise so as to avoid 'learning from scratch' on matters that are well-known community development phenomena in Papua. As a project focused on indigenous empowerment, and addressing issues that are fundamentally shaped by cultural values and the external forces specific to Papuan communities, it would appear essential to have some Papuan anthropological expertise in, or available to, the PIPE team. As noted in relation to the supervision of CDFs, training providers and local consultants (for example for the baseline survey), the CTA and program officers must be realistic about local capacities and provide close assistance to ensure their work approaches are in line with, and reinforcing of, the project objectives, including CDPD. Specific recommendations for addressing this are provided in Section 8.

Budget and backstopping are two aspects of project management that have been reviewed more briefly as compared to the substantive (content) aspects of program implementation. Comments made in previous sections about budget structure for the community-level activities and about financial transparency with the communities (or at least the CDFs and IPOs) relate to this section.



During the evaluation field period there were questions raised about the allocation of funding per area, as well as the overall percentages of funding dedicated to community activities. There is an expectation that the majority of funds will be used for community-level activities, stemming from communication from ILO (Jakarta or Geneva) to communities at the start of PIPE that “this is YOUR program”. As such, some of the IPOs are keenly concerned about the use of budget for non-community level activities. The recommendations section addresses some of these issues, including communication generally, and allocations of budget for community level and program human resources generally. When the budget is revised for the remainder of the program, it is suggested that if there is a need for additional funds, i.e. because the evaluation is recommending commencement of additional activities (outside the community level), then a separate budget be established for that purpose.

The nature of backstopping from Jakarta to date has been mostly administrative and financial, partly due to the need for support in these areas, but also because the technical capacity specific to CDPD is far stronger in the CTA than in Jakarta-based personnel. At the same time, the project officer in Jakarta has extensive experience in Papua, as well as being physically located closer to the national partners, has recently been called upon to facilitate more engagement by PIPE in national-level activities, for example related to the ratification of ILO Convention 169. The Jakarta team should be able to offer more substantive backstopping for additional activities that are recommended to ensure PIPE remains relevant in the changing Papuan context, and to build a support base for CDPD through strategic engagements (see section 6.1). Examples of activities that Jakarta could backstop more technically in the remainder of the project include the involvement of Papuan leaders in training and other opportunities through ILO, INDISCO and other UN family projects (see point 6.1). As the program proceeds, greater involvement with national level government agencies will also be required, for example with a field visit and also efforts to engage in a new national program for community empowerment (Program Nasional Pemberdayaan Masyarakat - PNPM). For this, the CTA may need to provide closer technical supervision to assist Jakarta personnel to represent the CDPD approach with relevant national partners, or consultants may be engaged. Finally, the need for improved monitoring, or reporting of monitoring in PIPE, could be addressed by making better use of the backstopping personnel in Jakarta.

6.5 Sustainability and lessons learned

What are the realistic long-term effects of the project on sustainable development in Papua? Can the project be scaled up and what are the necessary adjustments and conditions to be met? Will local and/or national government offices be likely to adopt and pursue the approach promoted by the project after project completion? Are there any “best practices” and “lessons learned” to be derived from the project that can be applied to ILO development with indigenous peoples elsewhere?

As noted in Section 6.1 and 6.2, the PIPE program has the potential to bring about important changes in the indigenous communities it is partnering with, as well as contributing significant knowledge and new tools for meaningful grassroots empowerment in Papua. This assumes that the PIPE team addresses the most critical of issues identified through the mid-term evaluation (notably the baseline, IPO/CDF capacity building and PIPE human resources), and also that the political climate in Papua at least remains focused on people-centred development.

As noted in Section 6.4, there is potential for PIPE to be scaled up, however it is necessary to undergo the full process of implementation as planned for PIPE as a Phase 1 (including with efforts



to address issues raised in this evaluation), and to ensure that the Phase 2 is also supported (with design adjustments). The building up of a support base of organizations/agencies and persons familiar with PIPE and knowledgeable in CDPD is an important condition for any future scaling up, and for this reason, should be addressed more actively in the current PIPE timeframe (Phase 1, to December 2008).

Following the mid-term evaluation recommendations, for example related to maximizing the use of local knowledge and expertise, will also contribute to sustainability by helping generate or capture more specific and useful lessons from PIPE's implementation of CDPD approach in Papua. More concerted effort to document lessons learned is considered necessary, as to date the lessons noted (for example in the 2006 Annual Report) are generic to the CDPD approach and do not reflect specific learnings from the Papuan experience. As the baseline and gender analysis are addressed in coming months, using good quality processes, there will foreseeably be many lessons learned which will be very important for a range of development stakeholders in Papua and nationally.

7 Conclusions

Papua is a place where it is notoriously difficult to make development gains, for a range of reasons. While this may be true, many lessons about 'doing development' have not been seriously taken on board by organizations with programmes in the region. One such lesson relates to the pace and timeframe for implementing development projects, where organizations typically do not allow sufficient time for sustainable changes to take place. Another is trying to do too much in too many places.

PIPE's design, with two (2) phases totaling five (5) years and focusing on piloting the CDPD approach to community empowerment in different cultural and geographical environments within Papua, is considered a realistic undertaking. The PIPE program has made reasonable progress in the first 18 months of implementation, and should continue to implement the planned activities, with several adjustments as recommended based on the mid-term evaluation.

The most critical issues for PIPE to address are: the baseline and the processes of actively-facilitated reflection and self-analysis with the partner communities, to more firmly establish the basis for learning from the activities that PIPE supports; the program's human resources, in particular the use of established local expertise and the improvement of communications and monitoring with partner communities; and the types of capacity building provided to all partners, from CDFs to local consultants. To date, PIPE has somewhat underestimated the need for certain types of capacity building and tended to trust more in peoples' abilities, but this has led to less-than-top results in some areas. In many ways however, the project is certainly providing unique development opportunities for marginalized populations of indigenous Papuans, and is seeing some results on a small scale.

It is premature to look at replicating or scaling-up PIPE activities, as there is a need to follow through on more community level activities at this stage, as well as continuing to diversify and engage with stakeholders in the bigger picture of indigenous development in Papua. To this end, the PIPE team should be very focused in the coming three (3) months to maintain momentum in the pilot areas, and in the latter part of this year (2007), become more engaged with strategic local organizations and agencies, and be open to sharing what PIPE is doing, confident about the approach and willing to discuss the challenges that are being encountered.



To date, PIPE as focused on the implementing the pilots, and is just starting to tune in to the broader development context that it should be contributing to. Taking others along on the journey of learning how CDPD works – for better or for worse – in Papua, will be an important contribution to as many relevant partners as ILO chooses to engage. There is clear need for and interest in this type of work in Papua, and with the right efforts, PIPE should be rising to the occasion and find itself and the CDPD lessons positioned (by others) as an integral part of Papua’s sustainable development future.

8 Recommendations

Based on the findings discussed in Section 6 of this report, the evaluation team offers a comprehensive set of recommendations. A detailed discussion and suggestions to support the implementation of the recommendations is provided in Annex 5, along with an “action list” specifying recommending priorities, timeframe and responsibilities for follow up.

These recommendations necessarily focus on areas where improvements can be made so as to better ensure the achievement of PIPE objectives. While it is important that the PIPE team continue to ensure that the CDPD method is followed sincerely, there are certain aspects of the project where better results are likely if the PIPE team is more proactive. However, in responding to these recommendations, the ILO needs to recognize the centrality of ‘process’ in PIPE and remember that too many, or certain types of activities initiated by the PIPE team could compromise the communities’ own learning. ILO must ensure that actions initiated by ILO complement or add value to the initiatives coming from the indigenous communities and/or facilitators. At the same time, the PIPE team should recognize where recommendations can be taken up and enhance the overall outcomes of the project. Where additional budget may be required, this is noted in Annex 5.

Some of the recommendations reinforce initiatives that are already planned by the PIPE project staff for implementation. For example, use of posters as another means to communicate with communities and increased effort to capture lessons. They are included here (under the detailed discussion in Annex 5) in order emphasise their importance and provide suggestion for *the way* that these tasks can be accomplished effectively.

Importantly, it is recommended that the response to priority items related to ‘progress and effectiveness’ and ‘efficiency of resource use and effectiveness of management arrangements’ be assessed through independent monitoring at the end of 2007. At such a time, progress regarding current implementation issues can be validated and all resources for the final year of PIPE can be reviewed.

8.1 *Relevance and Strategic Fit*

Recommendations here relate to the noted need to build stronger, strategic networks and expand some program activities to engage more on the broader indigenous empowerment agenda and opportunities in Papua and nationally. (Each point is discussed further in Annex 5).

- a. It is recommended that PIPE’s CTA, with the support of a resource person (see point 8.3 e below), actively seek audiences to make focused presentations to key personnel in the relevant institutional structures that have been established to address indigenous rights issues and capacities in Papua.



- b. It is recommended that ILO (in Jakarta) collaborate with UNDP and UNESCO to develop a list /set of relevant Indonesian language resources available, either through these organizations or others such as the National Human Rights Commission (Komnasham) and AMAN (Indonesian Indigenous People's Alliance). The point of this activity is to have a resource base upon which the PIPE team can draw to support and strengthen relevant parties in Papua.
- c. The PIPE team should consider arranging small seminars and media launches, with ILO (PIPE CTA, Jakarta, Geneva) personnel or others (including consultants) as guest speakers when materials or specific information are distributed, doing so in a way that builds the capacity and profile of the Papuan organizations/institutions.
- d. It is recommended that PIPE's CTA continue to convene regular meetings to bring together people from different government agencies with a portfolio related to indigenous empowerment.
- e. It is recommended that the PIPE team proactively approach APF3 (the Association of Development Planning Facilitators) to share information, in particular training materials for village-level (mostly indigenous) facilitators.
- f. It is recommended that the PIPE team develop stronger networks with local universities, in order to draw on knowledge and experience there, as well as to create opportunities for sharing and strengthening capacities related to work in indigenous communities and contexts.

8.2 Progress and effectiveness

Recommendations here relate to the noted need for improved ongoing analysis, capacity building and monitoring approaches. (Each point is discussed further in Annex 5).

- a. It is recommended that PIPE facilitate an internal, 'mid-term review' or assessment of CDF roles and responsibilities for all 4 pilot groups.
- b. It is recommended that PIPE facilitate intensive 'proposal review committees' for 3 pilot groups (Forum Dumtru, Win Hamo and Ventori) and respond quickly with funds dispersal once the committees' task is completed.
- c. It is recommended that PIPE support additional, focused cultural analyses with IPOs, integrating gender assessment work in this activity.
- d. It is recommended that ILO increase capacity-building support to CDFs.
- e. It is recommended that PIPE facilitate additional organizational development support to IPOs.
- f. It is recommended that PIPE provide standardized formats for financial recording / reporting.
- g. It is recommended that PIPE increase transparency of PIPE finances to communities.



- h. It is recommended that PIPE diversify the forms of communication with partner communities.

8.3 Efficiency of resource use and effectiveness of management arrangements

Recommendations here related to the noted need to address in-house capacity, making use of local knowledge, addressing specific issues in pilots and ensuring clear communication with community and other partners. (Each point is discussed further in Annex 5).

- a. It is recommended that ILO revise the remaining PIPE budget.
- b. It is recommended that ILO retain current CTA/Team Leader for PIPE.
- c. It is recommended that ILO review the current PIPE programme staff positions.
- d. It is recommended that PIPE increase use of local (Papuan) technical resources, particularly related to indigenous cultures and community development.
- e. It is recommended that ILO engage local resource person or persons on a retainer to provide overall specialist cultural expertise to support the PIPE team and partner communities.

8.4 Impact and sustainability

Recommendations here related to the noted issues of realistic timing when working with marginalized groups and aiming for tangible results and sustained outcomes, the need to capturing more specific lessons in order to make better long-term contribution, and for improved checks/safeguards in place for the remaining project period. (Each point is discussed further in Annex 5).

- a. It is recommended that early in 2008, ILO internally prepare to consider seeking continued funding for PIPE or PIPE-related activities.
- b. 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.
- c. It is recommended that ILO increase efforts for quality monitoring of PIPE implementation.

Annex 1. Map of Papua region (Papua and West Irian Jaya provinces)



Annex 2. Table of revised PIPE outputs, activities and indicators

Preliminary survey (PRA) on the socio-economic and cultural condition of Indigenous and Tribal Peoples in Papua/West Papua

Outputs	Activities
1. Analysis (PRA) of the socio-economic and cultural conditions of indigenous communities in the pilot project sites.	1.1 Recruit and train community development facilitators (CDFs) in each of the four pilot project sites (20) 1.2 Prepare and execute a participatory rapid socio-economic and cultural assessment (baseline survey) of the partner communities in the pilot project sites. 1.3 Analyze the data collected and prepare report of findings.
2. Analysis of the existing potentials for reducing poverty and promoting peace and development.	2.1 Considering the generated information, prepare and execute a participatory rapid appraisal. 2.2 Analyze the collected information and prepare report of findings.

Immediate objective 1: Reducing Poverty and strengthening self-reliance

At the end of the project, the indigenous communities will be capable of generating sustainable income and engaging in decent employment opportunities through their own institutions and self-help mechanisms/organizations.

Outputs	Activities	Indicators
2.1 Improved livelihood skills and functional literacy acquired by a number of indigenous Papuans and non-Papuans with whom they live in the pilot project sites.	2.1.1 Identify priority livelihood skills training needs through community-driven participatory processes. 2.1.2 Organize livelihood skills training in appropriate locations. 2.1.3 Conduct village level functional literacy training.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least 15 per cent increase in literacy rate in targeted communities. Indigenous women and girls make up at least 50 per cent of newly literate community members.
2.2 Established micro and small enterprises by women and men in the pilot project sites.	2.2.1 Conduct entrepreneurship training using GET AHEAD and other related tools. 2.2.2 Facilitate community credit facilities in strategic areas using site-specific mechanisms. 2.2.3 Identify, train and mobilize community entrepreneurship consultants.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improved livelihood skills in relation to farming, horticulture, animal husbandry, fishing, etc. At least 1,500 men and women are engaged in sustainable livelihoods through viable micro and small enterprises by the end of the project. At least 1,000 jobs and self-employment opportunities are created by the end of the project.
2.3 Established cooperatives and other self-help organizations in the pilot project sites.	2.3.1 Conduct cooperative pre-membership education training. 2.3.2 Facilitate organization of cooperatives by	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sustainable culturally-anchored community credit and savings facilities in target areas. At least 200 women and men have become active members

	indigenous peoples. 2.3.3 Conduct cooperative management training. 2.3.4 Conduct cooperative entrepreneurship training. 2.3.5 Identify, train and mobilize community cooperative development facilitators.	established cooperatives or self-help groups.. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least 25 per cent increase in income of direct beneficiaries. Alternative employment and income generation opportunities exist in project areas.
2.4 Improved management of education and health care facilities in pilot project sites.	2.4.1 Assess the management existing education and health care facilities and services in pilot project sites and identify corresponding gaps. 2.4.2 Draw up and implement improvements in the management of education and health care facilities involving the indigenous peoples and in partnership with the local government. 2.4.3 Facilitate indigenous peoples participation in existing community health insurance scheme.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community-based education and health care facilities are effectively managed with indigenous community participation. Local government and indigenous communities are jointly engaged in the elaboration of education and health care plans and programmes.

Immediate objective 2: Promoting gender equality

At the end of the project, the indigenous communities will have developed their own mechanisms for mainstreaming gender equality issues in the development process with more attention to the development needs of indigenous women and girls.

Outputs	Activities	Indicators
3.1 Gender equality issues are analysed and corresponding gender awareness training activities are implemented.	3.1.1 Analyse the gender equality issues in the pilot project sites. 3.1.2 Facilitate formulation of site-specific gender awareness and equality training designs. 3.1.3 Conduct gender awareness and equality training in strategic areas.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least 200 indigenous women are actively involved in village development processes.
3.2 Gender equality concerns mainstreamed in village development plans and programmes.	3.2.1 Identify training needs in relation to mainstreaming gender equality concerns in village development plans and programmes. 3.2.2 Conduct training on mainstreaming gender issues in village development processes. 3.2.3 Facilitate pilot processes in the formulation of community mechanisms for mainstreaming of gender equality concerns in village development processes.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community mechanisms for mainstreaming gender equality issues in the village development processes are existing and in use. Local government officials are supportive of community mechanisms for mainstreaming gender equality issues in the village development processes.
3.3 Gender-related discrimination is diminished.	3.3.1 Facilitate participatory identification of manifestations of gender related discrimination.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community mechanisms for addressing gender-related discrimination exist and used by community organizations

	<p>3.3.2 Formulate community mechanisms for addressing gender-related discrimination.</p> <p>3.3.3 Test community mechanisms for addressing gender-related discrimination in strategic areas.</p>	<p>and local government units.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Women groups are capable of effectively advocating the elimination of gender-based discrimination at the village level.
--	---	--

Immediate objective 3: Strengthening mechanisms for peace and development

At the end of the project, the capacity of indigenous communities to strengthen and sustain their own mechanisms for peace and development will have been enhanced and corresponding local government support in terms of favourable policies and programs will have been ensured.

Outputs	Activities	Indicators
1.1 Existing peace and development mechanisms at the village level are analysed.	<p>1.1.1 Conduct a rapid assessment of existing peace and development mechanisms in the pilot project sites.</p> <p>1.1.2 Validate the findings of the assessment of peace and development mechanisms through multi-sector consultations.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local government officials are capable of identifying and addressing local governance issues that concern mitigation of conflict among the migrant communities and indigenous Papuans.
1.2 Community measures for strengthening peace and development mechanisms at the village level are established.	<p>1.2.1 Conduct multi-sector workshops on community measures for strengthen peace and development mechanisms in the village level.</p> <p>1.2.2 Test identified community measures for strengthening peace and development mechanisms in strategic areas.</p> <p>1.2.3 Formulate corresponding training materials and conduct training on strengthening community peace and development mechanisms at the village level.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local government officials and representative organizations of indigenous Papuans and migrant communities are effectively making use of conflict prevention training materials and tools. • Increased awareness among local officials and migrants of the social, economic and cultural needs and rights of indigenous Papuans. • Improved dialogue among indigenous Papuans, migrant communities and government officials.
1.3 Socio-cultural practices and rights of indigenous Papuans are respected and promoted by local authorities and other sectors of society	<p>1.4.1 Identify and document important socio-cultural practices and rights of indigenous Papuans at the village level.</p> <p>1.4.2 Conduct multi-sector workshops on measures to promote respect for the socio-cultural practices and rights of the indigenous peoples.</p> <p>1.4.3 Conduct training on measures to promote respect for the socio-cultural practices and rights of the indigenous peoples.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A documentation of the socio-cultural practices and rights of indigenous Papuans in the pilot project sites exist and use. • A documentation of measures to promote recognition and respect for the socio-cultural practices and rights of the indigenous peoples exist and in use.. • At least 200 community leaders and local government officials are trained on the promotion of the socio-cultural practices and rights of indigenous peoples at the village level. • <i>Adat</i> community organizations are actively participating in village development processes.

Annex 3. Terms of reference for the PIPE mid-term evaluation



INTERNATIONAL LABOUR ORGANIZATION

MULTI-BILATERAL PROGRAMME OF TECHNICAL COOPERATION

TERMS OF REFERENCE
MID TERM EVALUATION, MAY 2007

Papua Indigenous Peoples Empowerment (PIPE) Project

Project Location:	Papua and West Papua Provinces, Indonesia
Project Title:	Papua Indigenous Peoples Empowerment (PIPE) Project: Reducing Poverty and Strengthening Peace and Development Mechanisms involving Indigenous Peoples in Papua and West Papua – Indonesia
Project Code:	INS/04/M01/HSF
Original Starting Date:	November 2005
Original Completion Date:	October 2008
Evaluation Period:	January 2006 – May 2007
Executing Agency:	International Labour Organization
Implementing Partners:	National Level: Ministry of Manpower and Transmigration, Ministry of Social Affairs, Ministry for Underdeveloped Regions Provincial Level: Relevant partner agencies in local government and Community Organizations (<i>Reba A'ling</i> ; <i>Forum Dumtru</i> ; <i>Win Hamo</i> and <i>Ventori</i>)
Project Cost:	USD 1,537,965
Type of Evaluation:	Independent Mid-Term Evaluation

1 Project Summary (from 2006 Progress Report)

1. The Project has been conceived as a response to the development needs of the indigenous peoples that face increasing poverty and challenges to human security. Its immediate objectives constitute: a) strengthening existing peace and development mechanism involving indigenous peoples; b) Reducing poverty and strengthening self-reliance; and c) Promoting gender equality.

2. To attain these objectives, the Project uses as an overarching tool a community-driven participatory development (CDPD) approach, which is a reversal of the traditional top-down or “blueprint” methodologies. Capitalizing on indigenous knowledge, initiatives and resources, the CDPD systematically provides communities at the village level ample opportunity to pro-actively take greater responsibility for and leadership in the pursuit of their own development, side by side with concerned local and national government agencies. Relative to the Project, this means that the members of the target groups (partner communities), through their own community organizations, are given the privilege to serve as lead implementers of project activities especially at the village level. The CDPD approach gives equal importance to both the process and the results.

3.

4. Moreover, under the CDPD, the suitability of all forms of support services to the prevailing socio-economic and cultural environment in the community is paramount. Thus, the element of flexibility is among the most important considerations in the CDPD process. It is for this reason that immediate appropriate action had to be taken when, under this Project, the changing socio-economic, cultural and political conditions in the province necessitated certain adjustments in the project document. These adjustments however have been made without any diminution of or deviation from the core objectives and essential elements of the Project. The “human security” phrase in the project title, for example, became prone to misinterpretation and therefore replaced with the phrase “peace and development” without losing its essence in terms of meaning and intent. This adjustment in the title is also reflected in the rewording of the first immediate objective/component of the project. An internal re-phasing of the project budget had to be done too for the purpose of moving resources along the same budget lines to 2007 in view of the expected surge of project activities following completion of the preparatory and start up phase in 2006.

Progress and achievements made to date generally indicate that the Project is on track towards the attainment of its objectives. Among the milestones are the establishment of the legal and policy framework, the setting up of the institutional framework, the selection of partner communities and the identification of their traditional organizations, the selection and training of community development facilitators (CDFs), the conduct of community baseline surveys and the preparation of community action plans for poverty reduction and village development.

5. The project implementation phase was ushered in with the start of actual community-driven participatory poverty reduction and village development activities. In the process, key project implementation milestones were likewise achieved, including the strengthening of the partner community organizations (PCOs), the enhancement of the facilitative skills of the CDFs, the reorientation of linkages with partner agencies (PAs) and institutions, the community establishment of priority poverty reduction and village development activities, the conduct of basic socio-economic skills development training (of which more than 900 partner community members have already participated), and the linking of initial project experience to the New Papua Development Strategy (NPDS).

Ground level observations generally indicate that the outputs so far achieved have made initial impact among stakeholders. At the local government level, there is a recognition that the project could contribute significantly to the realization of the objectives of the Papua Special Autonomy Law (OTSUS). The OTSUS emphasizes development from the village and the participation of traditional institutions (*Adat*) in the local development process. At the community level, the initial impact of

project outputs includes recognition by the partner communities on the importance of their own culture, their indigenous knowledge systems and practices in the process of their own development. They also realized the potentials of their own traditional institutions and the value of their indigenous systems of governance. Above all, the partner communities are slowly discovering their natural capacity to initiate solutions to their own development problems, including poverty reduction and the need to revive and sustain the foundations of peace and development in their villages.

To date, project implementation process has generated some first clear lessons: a) a truly grounded CDPD approach could be a potent alternative to the often counter-productive top-down and prescriptive approaches; b) the tapping of traditional community organizations, indigenous knowledge systems and practices and local human resources has tremendous implications to project sustainability; c) people in the villages are actually well endowed with potential for individual and collective self-improvement and only need skills and opportunities to realize their development aspirations; and, d) the most sustainable village development activities are those which the people themselves have initiated using mainly their traditional knowledge and the resources around them.

The initial achievements notwithstanding, a number of challenges have yet to be overcome. These challenges include the slow pace in gaining serious advocates of the CDPD approach due to long standing generally top-down and prescriptive service delivery mindsets; the budgetary constraints caused mainly by the spontaneous enlargement of the pilot project areas; the complex socio-cultural and economic environment in area which continuing adaptation of processes; and the difficulty of promoting entrepreneurial concepts due to prolonged adherence to the subsistence economy. Slowly but surely, however, these challenges are being hurdled as the project implementation process continues.

The Project Document and Progress Report are attached as Annexes 1 and 2 to this Terms of Reference, respectively.

2 Scope and Purpose of Mid-Term Evaluation

The mid-term evaluation of a project is a requirement of the ILO as per its guidelines for technical cooperation. It has been foreseen in the project document and is in line with the requirements for monitoring and evaluation of the United Nations Trust Fund for Human Security, the sole donor of the project.

The project was formally commenced in January 2006 thus in May 2007 it comes to a half way. With the progress report of 2006 and work plan for 2007 available, there is a good basis for a mid-term evaluation to take place. The members of both National Advisory Committee (NAC) and Project Steering Committee (PSC) at the provincial level will be closely associated with this exercise.

The proposed timing of the evaluation is opportune given a number of overall developments:

- The plans of the Papuan Governor to roll out the RESPEK (Rencana Strategis Pembangunan Kampung) programme, providing opportunities and challenges for the Project to be involved more in the development programme of the region;
- The need for the PIPE project to engage actively in the developments of Indigenous People at the national level with regards to ILO's initiatives to promote national discussion on Convention No. 169 on Indigenous Peoples;
- ILO's future works in Papua i.e. through the proposed EAST project and other initiatives;
- The intention of the UN agencies to develop a joint work in Papua and in particular ILO's collaboration with UNDP in Papua;
- The intention of the 'Multi Stakeholders' group of donors and development partners to coordinate their assistance to Papua;

- The initiation and revision of both new and on-going activities of other agencies i.e. PDP of UNDP, PPK or WB, etc.

The mid-term evaluation will examine the progress, achievements, good practices, and lessons learned from the implementation of project in selected communities in both provinces in order to give early feedback on the approach being followed, the methodology being applied and the validity of the design in terms of providing a basis for scaling up and replication. The evaluation shall include all activities undertaken by the ILO and the project team from November 2005 until May 2007.

On the basis of the project document, the evaluation will identify the project's overall progress, focusing on achievements and strengths, challenges and shortcomings. This will be based on a critical assessment of the original logical framework, the situation on the ground and the actions undertaken by the project.

The Evaluation Report should set out concrete and detailed recommendations to be considered by the ILO in the second phase of the project, possibly broken down at different levels (policy/operational, short-term/medium term). The evaluation should also include dialogue, feedback and inputs from Project's key stakeholders at all levels in particular the tripartite constituents.

Overall, the proposed evaluation is intended to assist the ILO to further refine its implementation approach in this technical field of indigenous peoples and to contribute to the ILO's knowledge building. The final report should highlight lessons learned and good practices identified.

The evaluation shall address the overall ILO evaluation concerns such as relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability. Specific aspects for the examination are: project design; relevance of strategy; implementation process; performance and achievements; replicability; sustainability; and partnerships. It will be carried out in line with the guidelines for project evaluation as defined by the ILO, which are based on the OECD/DAC and UN standards (see website www.ilo.org/eval).

3 Outputs and methodology

The evaluation and its outputs aim to address the interest of the project's key stakeholders. Primarily, the evaluation is to facilitate a process for the project team and the ILO Jakarta office to learn about the success and the gaps in project approach and to draw inputs from project strategic partners' namely national and local government, project implementing partners and other organizations addressing similar causes (PPK, Respek, PDP, etc). At a broader level, the evaluation will take stock of lessons learned and good practices in empowerment of the indigenous populations for the ILO's knowledge base.

The output will be the Evaluation Summary using ILO's template (see annex 3) and an Evaluation Report (20-30 pages) that contains: 1) evaluation process; 2) background and context; 3) main findings and conclusions; 4) recommendations and lessons learned for immediate application by the ILO Jakarta Office and the Project Team, and recommendations for ILO's future engagement in the region and in relation to IP matters throughout the country. The recommendations will relate to project's implementation approach and revision of project's targets and indicators as appropriate. The recommendation should clearly indicate the responsibility of each project personnel as well as relevant officers at ILO Jakarta office in order to ensure that the outputs of project will be achieved. The Evaluation Report should be concise and suitable for public dissemination.

The Evaluation Report shall be presented in accordance with the ILO's Standard Evaluation and shall consist of an Evaluation Summary and a detailed report.

The evaluation will be conducted by a team consist of:

- A team leader with a deep knowledge on both the region and the subject. He/she has to: 1) have a strong background in community development and indigenous peoples' issues; 2) have an excellent understanding on local culture and situation in Papua and/or West Papua; 3) not been involved in project design and/or implementation; 4) be familiar with the working methods of both central and local government as well as the United Nations; 5) have an excellent analytical skills; 6) understand bahasa Indonesia and have a great writing skill.
- A national consultant, preferably from or live in Papua. He/she has to: 1) have a strong background in community development and indigenous peoples' issues; 2) have an excellent understanding on local culture and situation in Papua and/or West Papua; 3) not been involved in project design and/or implementation; 4) be familiar with the working methods of both central and local government as well as the United Nations; and 5) have an excellent English skill both in writing and speaking.

The Team Leader will be responsible for finalizing the overall process of the evaluation including analytical framework, evaluation questions and the Evaluation Report. S/he will determine and manage inputs from the members of the Evaluation Team. The final evaluation's analytical framework and questions will be discussed with the ILO's Evaluation Manager.

ILO Jakarta will serve as the secretariat to the Evaluation Team. The International Programme Officer in the ILO Jakarta Office will act as the Evaluation Manager. Her responsibilities will be primarily to ensure the evaluation is carried out as per an agreed framework and to facilitate the interaction between the Evaluation Team and the key project stakeholders including partner communities and their own traditional organizations.

The Evaluation Manager with the support from the Project Team will organize a stakeholders' workshop involving representatives of National Advisory Committee members and Project Steering Committee members whereby the initial findings and recommendations can be discussed and verified. Upon completion of the evaluation exercise, the Evaluation Manager shall coordinate inputs from all relevant parties and submit it to the Evaluation Team as a basic for the development of final Evaluation Report, thus disseminate the final Evaluation Report to respected parties.

The Methodology

To facilitate a learning process as well as ownership in evaluation findings and applicability of recommendation, this independent evaluation will engage project stakeholders to the extend feasible. To gather required information, the Evaluation Team may use a combination of the following methods: field visits, interviews with project beneficiaries, implementing partners and other strategic partners, focus group discussion, desk studies, consultation workshop to verify preliminary findings and recommendations, etc. The Evaluation Team should try as much as possible to specify sex-disaggregated of the data gathered.

Relevant documents to consider in the evaluation process are:

- project document
- Indonesia Decent Work Country Programme
- ILS C169 and relevant Recommendations
- CPDP methodological guide
- 2006 annual report
- 2007 work plan
- community baseline surveys and community action plans
- mission reports from ILO Jakarta staff and consultants relevant to the project

- minutes of steering committee meetings (both in national and provincial level)
- general reports on Papua Development initiative by other Development Partners
- RESPEK document and other strategic planning document of the Provincial Government (both provinces) and Renstrada of relevant dinas (Disnaker, Dinas Sosial, etc)
- other relevant document

Proposed questions to be addressed by the Mid-Term Evaluation Team:

Design:

- In what way was the project design and implementation contributes to the realization of Indonesia's Decent Work Country Programme, particularly Priorities 2: Employment Creation for Poverty Reduction and livelihood Recovery?
- How well does the project link up to a broader emerging national interest to address the rights and welfare of indigenous people in Indonesia as per the provision of the ILS Convention 169 on the right of indigenous peoples?
- Does the project's planned strategy correspond to the overall development agenda of the two provinces as defined by national and provincial governments?
- Are the project's planned objectives and outcomes relevant and realistic to the situation on the ground? Do they need to be adapted to the changing project environment e.g. formal division of the province, implementation of OTSUS, RESPEK, etc. After considering such adaptation, what should be the relevant and realistic project deliverables?
- Does the project have clear targets and indicators against which impact at the community and individual levels can be assessed?
- Has the project developed clear quality control (M&E) and impact assessment systems that will allow to assess how the project has contributed to reducing poverty and developing local economies (as stated in its immediate objectives)?
- How does the Project target involvement of its stakeholders at various levels (national, provincial and community) which may already have expertise and activities in IP and community development issues?

Effectiveness:

- To what extent has the Project adjusted its implementation strategy to the evolving situation in Papua? Is the adjustment responsive to national and local needs? If yes, which particular government agency that the project is responsive to and how is the process that the project undertook in adjusting its implementation strategy?
- Has the project developed clear quality control (M&E) and impact assessment system/mechanism that will allow the assessment of project contribution to poverty reduction and the development of local economies (as stated in its immediate objectives)?
- What is the progress made by the project with regards to its 3 immediate objectives (policy, institutional capacity building and direct services)?
- Will the project be likely to achieve all planned outputs upon completion? Have the quantity and quality of the outputs produced so far been satisfactory? What are the necessary adjustment to be made with regards to implementation approach, targets and indicators?
- To what extent the project encourage local government and community participation in project planning and implementation? What are the challenges and good practices in the involvement of local government and community in project activities? How to best address the challenges?
- How does the project contribute to gender equality? At which levels (policy, institutional, community and individual) that the contribution has been made?
- What are the strengths and gaps in the current Project's interventions and how to realistically close the management and implementation gaps?

- Has the project approach produced demonstrated successes? What are the greatest achievements of the projects? Why is this and what are the contributing factors? How to build on and expand these achievements?
- In which areas has the project produced the least achievements? What accounts for the difficulties? How can they be overcome?

Efficiency:

- Does the project have sufficient resources to achieve the designed outcomes? Are existing resources used strategically and effectively? Do the results achieved justify the costs?
- Have the project funds and activities been delivered in a timely manner? If not what are the inhibiting factors? How to overcome these challenges?
- Are the project's internal management arrangements, roles and responsibilities clear to all parties involved? Does the project receive sufficient management support from the ILO backstopping units?
- Do the project's implementation partners and key stakeholders have a good understanding of the project strategy, progress and challenges so that they could contribute to the success of the project?

Sustainability:

- To what extent the Project's interventions can be sustained/continued to ensure genuine capacity is created at community level? Is the project management steering implementation approach towards impact?
- What are the realistic long-term effects of the project on sustainable development in Papua? Can the project be scaled up and what are the necessary adjustments and conditions to be met?
- To what extent the project has contributed to enabling policy environment for long-term realization of IP's economic empowerment?
- Is the project being geared towards full national ownership of both national and local governments? Will local and/or national government offices be likely to adopt and pursue the approach promoted by the project after project completion? If not, what are the specific reasons for such reluctance and what are the realistic course of action to undertake by the projects in order to ensure the adoption of project approach by national and local government?
- Are the local government and social partners actively involved in project implementation? To what extent is their involvement i.e. in the development of project work plan, TOT, M/E, etc?
- Are there any "best practices" and "lessons learned" to be derived from the project that can be applied to ILO development with indigenous peoples elsewhere?

4 Timeframe and Budget

The evaluation shall take place from 23 June to 20 July 2007. The Evaluation Team shall work in Jakarta, Papua and West Papua with the proposed arrangement:

- 7 days field visit
- 7 days of desk review and writing of 1st draft Evaluation Report
- 4 days of writing final report (after discussion with the ILO)

The field visits should include the 2 provinces under project coverage namely Papua and West Papua. A first draft Evaluation Report shall be available and discussed within 7 working days after completion of field assessment for review and comments by the ILO. The final Evaluation Report shall be submitted to the ILO within 4 working days after submission of ILO's comments.

A tentative timetable will be developed jointly by the Evaluation Manager, the project team and the evaluation consultant prior to the work being undertaken.

The evaluation will be financed by the project budget. Its use will be in accordance with ILO's financial rules and regulations. The consultants will be provided with 'external collaborator' contracts and travel arrangements will be handled by the ILO Jakarta.

* * * *