Indonesia - Green Prosperity - Participatory Land Use Planning

Report generated on: December 21, 2017

Visit our data catalog at: https://data.mcc.gov/evaluations/index.php

Overview

Identification

COUNTRY
Indonesia

EVALUATION TITLE
Green Prosperity - Participatory Land Use Planning

EVALUATION TYPE
Independent Performance Evaluation

ID NUMBER
DDI-MCC-IDN-PLUP-2016-v01

Overview

ABSTRACT
The primary purpose of this qualitative pre/post performance evaluation (PE) is to identify progress (in phase 1) and achievement (in phase 2) of short-term and long-term outcomes of PLUP, focusing on PMAP 1. A secondary purpose is to assess the implementation performance of PLUP in order to inform future PMAP roll-out in other areas. Phase 1 data collection occurred from August - October 2016, and Phase 2 will be conducted in 2018 to serve as an endline for PMAP 1 outcomes. The phasing of data collection activities is intended to both identify immediate lessons learned in PMAP 1 implementation as well as capture changes in PMAP 1 outcomes over an extended period of time, accounting for long-term effects not readily materialized by the time project activities have concluded.

The report addresses five key evaluation questions, as listed below. In particular, the report focuses heavily on presenting information to address Evaluation Question 1, as it relates to both project outputs and nine project outcomes (or progress against targeted project achievements).

1. How has PLUP progressed in the achievement of short-term outcomes, and how is it likely to progress in the achievement of long-term outcomes?

2. Were achievements toward identified PLUP outcomes varied by geography, community type, or gender and vulnerable/marginalized groups?

3. What were the main challenges in managing PLUP?

4. What were unintended results (positive or negative) achieved on PLUP?

5. Through what pathways, if any, is increased spatial certainty likely to increase household incomes? What evidence does the evaluation find for this?

In relation to Evaluation Question 1, while many PMAP 1 activities have been completed, key outputs - particularly village maps and the district Information Management System (IMS) - have yet to be delivered to actual users in partner areas. Specifically regarding Task 1 maps, there are indications of proposed use of maps at the village level, but the extent of the resource mapping and use of these maps for spatial planning varied across sampled villages. The focus of PMAP 1, Task 1 at the village level is largely geared towards establishing agreement of village boundaries. Task 1 is also especially relevant in terms of conflict. There is evidence that the project helped address administrative disputes through their use of a participatory and technology-based approach to VBS/RM, and made important contributions in setting up dispute resolution mechanisms in high conflict-prone areas. In some instances, however, the project re-opened existing disagreements that had been ignored or were dormant. Each sub-district the ET visited had one (or more) disputes remaining after the completion of the VBS/RM process.

Turning to Task 2 - 4 progress at the time of the evaluation, some geospatial and licensing data had been compiled; Geographic Information System (GIS) and IMS trainings had been completed in all districts; and a geographically specific IMS had been developed. Additional outputs including the complete database, and those related to the IMS had not been realized (including installation of the IMS, hardware, and internet connection). Users of the IMS were enthusiastic about the tools; however, there remain significant threats to use after delivery of this output. When the ET was conducting fieldwork, there

was no plan for i) coordination of spatial planning; ii) installation and establishment of the IMS; and iii) management and maintenance of the IMS. The lack of an exit strategy for PMAP 1 also raised questions about sustainability and continued use of all task outputs that had clearly generated much interest among local stakeholders.

In terms of the nine PLUP outcomes, the most measurable change for short-term outcomes (Outcomes 1 - 6) was identified at the village level. For example, Outcome 1 is increased public perception of spatial certainty. The evaluation found evidence of this in sampled PMAP 1 villages from pre-PMAP 1 activities, as measured through awareness and understanding of village boundaries. Progress at the district and national level across short-term outcomes, however, was less prominent.

While some progress was identified in long-term outcomes (Outcomes 7 - 9), the majority of information presented in the report for these outcomes is baseline information to be used as a point of comparison in Phase 2 of the PE.

Evaluation Question 2 presents data that explains how project progress against outputs did not, in general, vary by characteristics including geography, implementer, phase of implementation, gender, or marginalized/vulnerable groups. Outcomes baselines, however, do vary substantially by district; each district has a unique context that will be important to re-evaluate in 2018 in terms of confidence in administration, capacity, and licensing and permitting. Furthermore, in Evaluation Question 4, the ET identified unintended results of PMAP 1. Respondents noted more positive than negative unintended results, with one important positive result being indications of replication of the VBS/RM process in Mamasa and Mamuju districts, in West Sulawesi Province.

Within this context of project progress, in Evaluation Question 3, the ET explores the management structure and challenges faced during PMAP 1 implementation. The most commonly mentioned barriers had to do with PMAP 1 resources and unclear expectations. The contractor was found to be resourceful in addressing these barriers; however, MCA-I and MCC were critical of the performance of the implementer, and reported that the implementer under-delivered on some basic output requirements like the delivery of the VBS/RM process as specified in the Contract.

Lastly, in regards to Evaluation Question 5, though GP has missed an opportunity to demonstrate that increased spatial certainty leads to greener investments in partner districts because of the adjusted sequencing of PLUP and the GP Facility Investments, the evaluation found plausible pathways through which spatial certainty as advocated for through PLUP can contribute to GP's goals. Findings indicate that the objectives that PMAP 1 is seeking to achieve remain relevant, particularly in the context of governance, development planning, and safeguards in Indonesia. It is not surprising that implementation has drawn interest from international institutions like the World Bank, and from key government reform projects like the Peat Restoration Agency (BRG).

EVALUATION METHODOLOGY
Pre-Post

UNITS OF ANALYSIS
For Task 1 VBS/RM related outcomes, the unit of analysis is citizens or villagers.

For other outcomes in Tasks 2-4, the unit of analysis is is institutional stakeholders (primarily at the district level, but also at the provincial and national levels, to a lesser extent)

KIND OF DATA
Other

TOPICS

Topic	Vocabulary	URI
Participatory Mapping		
Participatory Land Use Planning		
Village Boundary Setting		

KEYWORDS
Indonesia, Land, Participatory, Mapping, Planning, Jambi, West Sulawesi, Muaro Jambi, Merangin, Mamasa, Mamuju, Boundary Setting

Coverage

GEOGRAPHIC COVERAGE
Data were sampled purposively, and thus cannot be considered representative at any level. The results will not be generalizable to the PMAP 2 – 8 districts. This is due to the sampling of districts for this evaluation, and to the fact that most of the PMAP contracts do not implement Task 1 - 4 as PMAP 1 does. However, data were collected from the four districts covered under PMAP 1 (from six of the eight sub-districts) as well as from provincial and national stakeholders. These four districts are Merangin and Muaro Jambi in Jambi province and Mamasa and Mamuju in West Sulawesi Province.

UNIVERSE
The study population includes all participants and implementers of PMAP 1.

Producers and Sponsors

PRIMARY INVESTIGATOR(S)

Name	Affiliation
Social Impact	

FUNDING

Name	Abbreviation	Role
Millennium Challenge Corporation	MCC	

Metadata Production

METADATA PRODUCED BY

Name	Abbreviation	Affiliation	Role
Millennium Challenge Corporation	MCC		Review of Metadata

DATE OF METADATA PRODUCTION
2016-10-06

DDI DOCUMENT VERSION
Version 1 (2016-10-6): This is the first metadata entry for the PLUP evaluation. It has been developed on the basis of the Evaluation Design Report.

DDI DOCUMENT ID
DDI-MCC-IDN-PLUP-2016-v01

MCC Compact and Program

COMPACT OR THRESHOLD
Indonesia Compact

PROGRAM
The Indonesian government has prioritized key reforms in natural resource conservation and economic development. The MCC Green Prosperity Project (GP) is strategically placed to provide the foundational elements to support a reorientation of investments towards more sustainable land uses that also increase economic growth. The Participatory Land Use Planning (PLUP) activity, as the lead initiative of MCC GP, supports a process whereby communities, private sector, and government at multiple levels can engage on key accountability mechanisms setting the stage for wider GP implementation. These include issues that range from village boundary setting and resource mapping (VBS/RM), hardware interventions to support improved spatial planning with key institutions, engagement on licensing and permitting systems, and working with a broad set of stakeholders to engage in participatory development planning that supports economic growth and emissions reductions. The $43 million activity consists of four discrete activities or tasks: -Task 1: Participatory Determination, Geo-Location and Physical Demarcation of Village Boundaries, the Mapping of Natural and Cultural Resource Areas within the Villages, and the Creation of Geospatial Databases of the Information Collected (referred to as Village Boundary Setting/Resource Management, or VBS/RM); -Task 2: Acquisition of Geospatial Data and Preparation of Geographic Information System (GIS) Databases of Land Use/Land Cover; -Task 3: Compilation and Geo-Referencing of Existing and Pending Licenses and Permits for Land and Natural Resource Use; and, -Task 4: Enhancement of District Spatial Plans Through Capacity Building in Spatial Planning, Enforcement and Management of Land Use Information in Spatially Enabled

Databases.

MCC SECTOR
Land (Land)

PROGRAM LOGIC
The Green Prosperity (GP) Project will promote environmentally sustainable, low carbon economic growth as set forth in the Government's medium- to long-term development plans (RPJP and RPJM), the National Greenhouse Gas Emission Reduction Action Plan (RAN-GRK), and Regional Spatial Plans (RTRW). The GP Project will provide a combination of technical and financial assistance to support rural economic development that raises real incomes of Indonesians in a manner that reduces reliance on fossil fuels, improves land management practices, protects natural capital, and complements efforts to reduce emissions from deforestation and environmental degradation. The GP Project will involve local communities and governments in activities to improve the clarity and implementation of government policies and regulations that support low carbon development, as well as build capacity of local communities in natural resource and environmental management, and will be guided by an integrated river basin management approach. The purpose of the Participatory Land Use Planning (PLUP) Activity is to ensure that projects funded by the GP Facility are designed on the basis of accurate and appropriate spatial and land use data and adhere to and reinforce existing national laws, regulations and plans. The PLUP Activity also will help strengthen the capacity of local communities and district level institutions to manage their own land and resources and encourage investment. It will consist of investment in administrative boundary setting and resource mapping at the village level, updating and integration of land use inventories, and enhancing spatial plans at the district and provincial levels. The specific outcomes targeted by the PLUP activity are elaborated below: Short-term: -Increased public perception of land tenure security within the PLUP villages -Decreased conflict between villages (or groups of villagers from adjacent villages) over land use rights in "border"/outlying areas between villages -Improved confidence in land governance administration -Increased capacity to manage land and external (natural) resources -Improved land use planning, including use of degraded land -Increased conformance of land use (particularly as measured by new project or uses) to the (new/improved) land use plans Long-term: -Accurate and locally accepted spatial and land use data -Shared understanding of boundaries and various land uses -Greater efficiency in land permitting/licensing processes (licensing transaction costs, license utilization, and license conflicts)

PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS
Given the nature of the project to provide strengthening in technical information and practices in spatial planning and governance capacity strengthening, the stakeholders range across national, provincial, district, sub-district and village levels. Participants differ in their proximity and relationship to the project. These details are included below, by level. National: National level stakeholders are largely partners, including BAPPENAS and the Ministry of Home Affairs. They did not receive direct training from the project, though representatives from Badan Informasi Geospatial (BIG) did receive project outputs (related to Task 4). Provincial: Provincial level government offices were not targeted by the program, though they are indirectly related to the work of the project. In particular, these stakeholders include BAPPEDA and the Regional Investment and Coordinating Board (BKMPD/A). District: At this level, the project did have direct program participants. Depending on the district, members of district government offices were invited to participate in IMS and GIS trainings. Participants were selected by the government offices themselves after training invitations were sent by the project, including from BAPPEDA, Sekretariat Daerah including Asisten Daerah, Forestry Office, Cash-Crops Office, One-Stop Permitting Office (Perijinan Terpadu Satu Pintu), Land Office (Kantor Pertanahan), and Mines and Energy Office (among others). Other district level participants in the project included TPPBD members, selected/appointed by the initial steps of the VBS/RM process (Task 1). These government staff were from the office of Assisten 1 or other agencies. Sub-District: The sub-district head (Camat) was a participant in the settling of village boundary disputes and in the VBS/RM process. Village: Village participants were selected through the VPT selection process, as stipulated by MCAI. There were five members of each VPT in 114 villages across the project. In all but two cases, the VPT had one woman member. These villagers were appointed to the VPT role. The village head (Kepala Desa) also participated in the VBS/RM process through dispute resolution and review of outputs.

Sampling

Study Population

The study population includes all participants and implementers of PMAP 1.

Sampling Procedure

The study sample includes 64 KIIs and 24 FGDs (total of 244 respondents) that were sampled purposively to include a diverse set of program stakeholders. This sample is not meant to be representative, and no power calculations were conducted since the data are mostly qualitative.

Deviations from Sample Design

The original plan was to conduct 110 KIIs and 8 FGDs. When the team was in the districts, however, there was excitement and high levels of engagement from related government offices. This resulted in more FGDs and fewer KIIs.

Response Rate

Not applicable.

Weighting

Not applicable.

Questionnaires

Overview

All questionnaires were written in English and then translated into Bahasa Indonesia. The 12 utilized questionnaires are detailed briefly below:

1. KII-Village Member: A VPT member or Dispute Forum member (if not village officials), or another community leader/figure. This guide may be used for individual interviews or group interviews (with two to three individuals that have similar roles in the village such as small scale farmers or members of women's groups or PKK).

2. KII-Village Official: A village official/leader (who can also be a VPT or dispute forum member).

3. KII-District Level: Separate guides used for: (i) BAPPEDA staff members identified by PMAP 1, and when possible staff members that directly participated in PMAP 1 activities for Tasks 2 – 4; (ii) OSS staff members identified by PMAP 1, and when possible staff members that directly participated in PMAP 1 activities for Tasks 2 – 4; or (iii) The Camat (Sub-district head).

4. KII-Provincial Officials: Officials from provincial BAPPEDA, BPN, etc.

5. KII-National Officials: Bappenas, BIG, BRG, and MOHA

6. KII-MCC and MCA-I Staff: Respondents to include GP Management (Jakarta), PLUP MCA-I Management Team (Jakarta), MCAI M&E Team (Jakarta), MCC PLUP Advisors (Jakarta and USA), MCAI Window Program Managers, MCAI Communications Team, MCAI Economics team, and PLUP-related consultants (when available, Jakarta).

7. KII-PMAP 1 Implementers: Respondents to include PMAP 1 COP, PMAP 1 Jakarta staff (including Task Coordinators 1 – 4), District Team Leaders, CLCS, and SCF (when and where available). Respondents will also include Warsi and Puter staff where they fill the positions mentioned previously. Respondents will also include Trimble staff that are visiting Indonesia during the time of the evaluation.

8. KII-NGO/CSO/Research Institutions

9. KII-Concessionaire/Land Claimant: Concessionaires/Land Claimants (at the national, provincial and district level, as available).

10. FGD-Village Level Community Members: A VPT or Dispute Forum of five to six individuals, or a group of community members if the VPT or Dispute Forum does not exist or is not available.

11. FGD-Land Claimants/Concessionaires/Businesses: Concessionaires/Land Claimants (at the national, provincial and district level in groups of five or six (as available).

12. FGD-Training Beneficiaries: Participants of either the IMS or GIS training conducted by PMAP 1. Trainees are typically from BAPPEDA and the OSS in the districts.

Data Collection

Data Collection Dates

Start	End	Cycle
2016-08-29	2016-09-30	N/A

Data Collection Notes

Each interview team consisted of two or more interviewers, with a female interviewer present whenever a female respondent was present. The team was supported by local drivers and local implementing staff in each district. A total of five interviewers were used for data collection. Data collection took place from August 29 - September 30, 2016. Two weeks were spent in Jakarta and the remaining weeks were spent across two provinces (two districts and six sub-districts). Interviewing took place every day of the week. Interviews averaged 1 hour for all questionnaires - most all respondents were willing and available to talk for over an hour. Interviews were all conducted in Bahasa Indonesia except with select individuals at the national level.

Questionnaires

All questionnaires were written in English and then translated into Bahasa Indonesia. The 12 utilized questionnaires are detailed briefly below:
1. KII-Village Member: A VPT member or Dispute Forum member (if not village officials), or another community leader/figure. This guide may be used for individual interviews or group interviews (with two to three individuals that have similar roles in the village such as small scale farmers or members of women's groups or PKK).
2. KII-Village Official: A village official/leader (who can also be a VPT or dispute forum member).
3. KII-District Level: Separate guides used for: (i) BAPPEDA staff members identified by PMAP 1, and when possible staff members that directly participated in PMAP 1 activities for Tasks 2 – 4; (ii) OSS staff members identified by PMAP 1, and when possible staff members that directly participated in PMAP 1 activities for Tasks 2 – 4; or (iii) The Camat (Sub-district head).
4. KII-Provincial Officials: Officials from provincial BAPPEDA, BPN, etc.
5. KII-National Officials: Bappenas, BIG, BRG, and MOHA
6. KII-MCC and MCA-I Staff: Respondents to include GP Management (Jakarta), PLUP MCA-I Management Team (Jakarta), MCAI M&E Team (Jakarta), MCC PLUP Advisors (Jakarta and USA), MCAI Window Program Managers, MCAI Communications Team, MCAI Economics team, and PLUP-related consultants (when available, Jakarta).
7. KII-PMAP 1 Implementers: Respondents to include PMAP 1 COP, PMAP 1 Jakarta staff (including Task Coordinators 1 – 4), District Team Leaders, CLCS, and SCF (when and where available). Respondents will also include Warsi and Puter staff where they fill the positions mentioned previously. Respondents will also include Trimble staff that are visiting Indonesia during the time of the evaluation.
8. KII-NGO/CSO/Research Institutions
9. KII-Concessionaire/Land Claimant: Concessionaires/Land Claimants (at the national, provincial and district level, as available).
10. FGD-Village Level Community Members: A VPT or Dispute Forum of five to six individuals, or a group of community members if the VPT or Dispute Forum does not exist or is not available.
11. FGD-Land Claimants/Concessionaires/Businesses: Concessionaires/Land Claimants (at the national, provincial and district level in groups of five or six (as available).
12. FGD-Training Beneficiaries: Participants of either the IMS or GIS training conducted by PMAP 1. Trainees are typically from BAPPEDA and the OSS in the districts.

Supervision

The data collection team included four team members in Jambi, with a fifth team member joining in West Sulawesi who was fluent in the local language. The team travelled and conducted data collection together, switching responsibilities between asking questions and taking notes. All team members shared responsibility for transcribing and note taking post-interview. The evaluation specialist was responsible for checking accuracy of information and applying the coding scheme.

Data Processing

Data Editing

Interview notes were cleaned at the end of each day of data collection, and aggregated at the end of each week in the evaluation team's data management system. In the event that the quantity of notes to clean compromised the team's ability to do so meticulously, the evaluation team hired a transcriber to keep up and ensure high quality data. All data editing was conducted manually based on end of day discussions between team members to clarify inconsistencies between notes. The team conducted team analysis sessions two-three times per week to help identify emerging themes, trends, and/or findings. After the team completed data collection, cleaned interview notes were printed for team analysis. In addition, the evaluation specialist applied a total of 28 codes to the interviews, FGDs, and observations to better organize and document themes related to evaluation questions.

Other Processing

All data was noted manually in a notebook during data collection. Interviews were also recorded. During note taking, interviewers would review notes and the recordings to ensure accuracy. Computer typed notes were then shared with other interviewers, reviewed, and saved on the team's data management system. The evaluation specialist then used these notes to enter into the coding software used. A total of five team members typed notes, reviewed notes, and coded notes.

Data Appraisal

Estimates of Sampling Error

Not applicable.