



Evaluation of the NIMD-Supported Country Program of KID in Indonesia

Final Report

August-September 2009

Submitted to:

The Netherlands Institute for Multiparty Democracy

Prepared by:

**Eric Bjornlund
Democracy International, Inc.
Bethesda, Maryland USA**

**Sugeng Bahagijo
Prakarsa
Jakarta, Indonesia**

Contents

Executive Summary	1
Overview	3
A. Context	3
State of Democracy in Indonesia	3
Political Parties	5
Education.....	6
NIMD and KID	7
B. Evaluation Methodology	8
Approach and Methodology of Evaluation	8
Evaluation Team	8
C. Overview of Evaluation.....	9
Programs	10
A. Sekolah Demokrasi.....	10
Background	10
Relevance and Achievements	12
Issues and Concerns	15
B. Political Party Consultations	22
Relevance	22
Achievements.....	23
Issues and Concerns	23
Recommendations	24
Institutional Issues.....	26
A. Institutionalization of KID	26
Recommendations	27
B. Relationship between KID and NIMD	29
Recommendations to KID and NIMD	30
C. Future Scenarios for KID	30
D. Concluding Observations	32
Core Objectives.....	32
Summary of Recommendations	33
APPENDIX A: COMMENTS ON PREVIOUS EVALUATION	36
APPENDIX B: LIST OF INTERVIEWS	39
APPENDIX C: BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION ON EVALUATORS	41

Executive Summary

The Netherlands Institute for Multiparty Democracy (NIMD) commissioned this new evaluation as second look at its programs working with the Indonesian Community for Democracy (KID) in Indonesia. The team for this evaluation included Eric Bjorn-lund of Democracy International, a democracy and governance analytical firm in the U.S., and Sugeng Bahagijo of Prakarsa, an Indonesian NGO and policy research organization. In May 2009, the team reviewed documents from NIMD and KID and conducted in-depth interviews of key stakeholders and others in The Hague and in Jakarta and other locations in Indonesia.

Sekolah Demokrasi

The team's overall impression is that the Sekolah Demokrasi program is generally relevant to the political context and democratization challenges in Indonesia. It has, for example, successfully shared knowledge, values and skills of democracy in the locations in which schools are operating; received positive endorsements from students and alumni; developed and applied innovative adult education methods, including a focus on out-of-class projects; designed and developed a curriculum and comprehensive materials; attracted an increasing number of applicants locally; used a merit-based, open tender process to identify qualified local partners; provided information, training and encouragement for local young political activists; and attracted interest in replication and expansion. The program has benefitted from the commitment, skill and social capital of strong local partners; a careful, considered process for recruiting and selecting students; and competent and reputable national and local facilitators and resource persons.

Despite the program's notable accomplishments, however, the evaluation team believes that the Sekolah Demokrasi approach suffers from some weaknesses and confronts a number of challenges. The team has concerns both about the program's internal operations and about the challenges of expanding its impact, locally and nationally. Regarding internal issues, we recommend that KID and its partners improve the accessibility of materials and provide supplemental materials, continue emphasis on practical skills and out-of-class projects, consider additional prerequisites for admission to the program, consider focusing the target audience for some classes, emphasize evaluation, and conduct evaluation surveys. Regarding alumni, we recommend that KID continue to encourage local political engagement, involve alumni more in the democracy schools themselves, encourage alumni to spread the Sekolah Demokrasi concept, maintain links with alumni, and develop a strategy and policy paper. To potentially broaden the program's impact beyond its current local focus, we urge concern about costs and cost-effectiveness and development of a strategy for scaling up and mainstreaming. We recommend that KID consider collaboration with educational, governmental, civil society and political institutions. We further recommend that KID develop a policy for unsolicited requests for new democracy schools and consider "open source" options, sharing its curriculum, and on-line options.

Political Party Consultations

Based on its review of documents and interviews, the team believes that the Political Party Consultations (PPC) program addresses an important challenge to the consolidation of democracy in Indonesia, namely, improving the multiparty system and strengthening the capacity of political parties. Program achievements date include establishing a forum for

dialogue, building trust and establishing the impartiality of NIMD and KID, supporting a common agenda for reform, playing a needed role in addressing political parties, and using a demand-driven approach. We recommend a comprehensive needs assessment, building a shared agenda with the parties, developing a comprehensive program strategy, working with individual party reformers rather than formally with the parties themselves, hiring a senior liaison to the parties, and drawing on NIMD's network.

Institutional Development of KID

We recommend greater attention to the institutional development of KID itself. We encourage KID to develop a long-term vision, conduct comparative research, publish an annual report, focus on monitoring and evaluation, establish benchmarks for organizational goals, give weight to the ownership interests of Implementing Agencies, and seek to diversify its funding. We recommend that KID explicitly consider whether its long-term vision is to be a democracy education organization, a policy research and advocacy organization (think-tank), a national membership-based advocacy coalition, or some combination of these alternatives.

Relationship between NIMD and KID

NIMD has actively encouraged and assisted KID to better institutionalize itself and become a more professional organization. NIMD has also demonstrated genuine commitment to local ownership of the Sekolah Demokrasi, PPC and other programs in Indonesia.

Although relations between NIMD and KID seem to have encountered difficulties at times, to the credit of both organizations, KID and NIMD have made serious efforts to address how to improve their communication and relationship. We note the challenges of implementing an effective partnership, regarding (a) strategic issues related to financing, communication, finances and reporting, and (b) practical issues such as communication, finances and reporting. We encourage consideration of the length of NIMD's funding commitment and periodic review of the commitments the two organizations made in their February 2009 meeting in Malang.

Overview

A. Context

State of Democracy in Indonesia

In general, the institutional structure of democracy is now in place in Indonesia. Since its democratic transition began in 1998, Indonesia has adopted fundamental institutional reforms. The constitution has been amended to shift from a problematic mixed system that reflected a lack of consensus on the basic rules of the game to a more internally consistent presidential system that enjoys the support of all major political actors. The constitutional amendments also established a weak upper house of the national legislature to represent regional interests at the center, adopted protections for human rights, and created a Constitutional Court. Indonesia successfully held national, provincial and district legislative elections in 1999, 2004 and 2009 as well as direct presidential elections for the first time in 2004. New presidential elections are scheduled for July 2009, with a run-off, if necessary, in September.

Beginning with new laws enacted in 1999, public service delivery and budget planning have been decentralized to the approximately 450 municipalities and districts, and the country began holding direct elections for provincial governors and district chief executives for the first time in 2005. Dozens of new political parties and politically active civil society organizations have emerged since the beginning of the transition in 1998. These and other changes in the last 11 years represent truly fundamental reform.

The following paragraphs address the status of democracy in Indonesia in the context of five key elements of democracy: consensus, inclusion, competition, rule of law and good governance. These describe the background to the democracy programs of NIMD and KID and suggest some challenges these programs are intended to address.

Consensus

There is reasonable consensus among most citizens and parts of Indonesia about the nature of the state and the legitimacy of the country's statehood, borders and constitution, including the prevailing national ideology of Pancasila.¹ There is reasonable consensus on broad national goals and rules of the game. There are some exceptions; some citizens in certain parts of the country question their place in Indonesia, and fringe groups do not favor the pluralistic Pancasila state.

With the exception of fringe religious groups, all significant political actors and social groups appear to agree on the importance of democracy.² Although there is some nostalgia for the levels of economic growth and stability achieved during Suharto's authoritarian New Order, no significant group argues for a government dominated by the military or the benefits of authoritarian rule. Moreover, Indonesians understand democracy to involve such basic ideas as open competition, protection of civil liberties, the rule of law,

¹ Pancasila is the five-point state ideology originally developed by Sukarno that is included in the preamble to the 1945 constitution. It consists of belief in God, humanitarianism, national unity, consultative/representative democracy and social justice.

² E.g., Democracy International, *Indonesia Public Opinion Surveys: 2007 Report* (USAID/Indonesia, February 2008), p. 11.

and respect for pluralism and minority rights. As part of this consensus on democracy, Indonesian actors agree on the importance of genuinely democratic elections and accept the premise that elections are the only legitimate way to change governments. However, disputes about election implementation and debates over the election system continue.

Inclusion

In general, inclusion is not a significant problem in Indonesia. The country's laws, rules and practices do not exclude any segment of the population from participation in government, the political process or public life. Although ethnicity and religion are salient sources of political and social identity and organization, neither ethnic nor sectarian divisions significantly threaten Indonesian national unity. Advocates of an Islamic state, for instance, remain a small minority of the population.

Despite a largely inclusive political system, however, two significant issues of inclusion remain to be resolved.

First, concerns about the relationship between political parties/political elites and the general public continue to trouble Indonesia's democracy. Many observers see a gulf between political elites, who are able to operate in the current system to serve their narrow interests, and the public. Many suggest that the system has yet to provide sufficiently strong links between elected representatives and ordinary citizens, although a decision of the constitutional court before the 2009 parliamentary elections created a new open party-list system that is intended to increase accountability to the public.

Despite a political system that does not always foster accountability, however, various types of civil society organizations have emerged since the Suharto era as significant actors in the public debate. The large number of television stations, newspapers and other media outlets provides unprecedented opportunities for opposition parties and independent civil society organizations to take part in the public discourse. The national legislature, despite shortcomings, operates largely in the open and increasingly seeks public input through commission hearings and other means.

Second, there remain questions about the relationship of both Aceh and Papua to the Indonesian state. Both provinces have seen strong separatist sentiments and continue to harbor suspicions about the central government, although in Aceh, while tensions remain, the peace accords in 2005 and local elections in 2006 have ushered in a period of relative calm.

Competition

Vigorous competition exists in Indonesian political and public life. Elections and political parties are competitive at national and local levels. Although elite-based and centrally controlled, parties compete forcefully, and the results and fairness of elections are generally accepted. Indonesia held national parliamentary elections in April 2009 and the first round of a direct presidential election is scheduled for July. The country has held competitive elections for provincial governors, district executives (*bupati*) and mayors (*walikota*) throughout the country since 2005.

Despite its remarkable transition over the past decade, Indonesia continues to confront serious problems with the justice sector, including with the judiciary, prosecutors, police

and lawyers. Corruption within the legal system is endemic. Impunity remains a significant problem.

Human rights in Indonesia are respected in principle and—since the post-Suharto amendments—are protected by the Constitution. But accountability for past human rights abuses remains a major concern. The threat of religious and other extremism has receded. Although there remain some reasons for concern, basic “law and order” issues are not paramount.

Governance

Though improvements have been made, effective governance at national and local levels often remains elusive in Indonesia; there are weaknesses in performance and responsiveness. Governments at national and local levels often fail to provide services that they are supposed to provide, especially services to the poor or services targeted at poverty reduction. Governments at all levels are also relatively closed to demands from the public. Corruption, by consensus a huge problem in many realms, is in many ways a symptom of these failures of governance.

Political Parties

Political parties in Indonesia receive widespread criticism as wholly self-interested and a threat to the consolidation of genuine democracy. Many observers see a crisis of representation. Political parties draw their leaders and activists almost entirely from the elite, and there is little ideological competition. Many analysts fault political parties for behaving undemocratically, concerning themselves solely about political power, and failing to encourage political education and public participation. Although there were changes before the recent elections, in general the electoral and party system has not encouraged a focus on democratic representation or strong ties to constituencies, which has hurt accountability.

Because there were nine factions in the previous DPR, no party could dictate policy. Thus, parties have worked on sharing the advantages of political power rather than really competing. Similarly, the “rainbow cabinet” reflects the primacy of patronage. There is often ambiguity about whether particular parties are in government or opposition, which also makes it harder to determine whom to hold accountable.

Although Indonesia has a very large number of parties, the number of truly influential parties is far fewer. These include the Democrat Party (Partai Demokrat), the party of President Yudhoyono, which won the most votes and seats in the recent legislative elections; Golkar (Partai Golongan Karya or Party of Functional Groups), the ruling party of Suharto and the New Order; the PDIP (Partai Demokrasi Indonesia-Perjuangan or Indonesia Democracy Party-Struggle) of former President and current presidential candidate Megawati; PKS (Partai Keadilan Sejahtera, Prosperous Justice Party), PAN (Partai Amanat Nasional, National Mandate Party) and PPP (Partai Persatuan Pembangunan, Development Unity Party).

President Yudhoyono is running for re-election in 2009. Two other presidential tickets, headed by former President Megawati of the PDIP and Vice President Jusuf Kalla of Golkar, are challenging President Yudhoyono largely on a platform of economic nationalism. Political opposition to the government has tended to oppose market-oriented economic policies and to favor commodity subsidies, government controls and protec-

tionism. This means they also tend to favor the economic interests of current elites. Recent election results, polling data and expert analysis suggest the influence of Islamic-oriented parties is waning.

Political Party Deficits in Internal Democracy and Capacity

Many local analysts and activists lament a lack of internal democracy and accountability within parties, and corruption plagues internal party processes. Within the parties there are increasing demands for decentralization of internal party decision making where appropriate to the regions. Both local party leaders and civil society leaders complain about the centralization of the parties (e.g., Megawati's control over PDIP, the control of "oligarchs" over Golkar, Amien Rais's personal control of PAN, Abdurrahman Wahid's domination of PKB, and Yudhoyono's control over Partai Demokrat). In general there is a sense that the local governments are decentralized, but the parties are not, which makes for awkward and undemocratic situations in which central party leaderships control what should be local decisions. In many parties, the candidate who can contribute the most to party coffers receives the nomination.

Nevertheless, local party bosses have become increasingly important. Pilkada candidates apply to parties for nominations, and thus the parties act, in effect, as job brokers. This has contributed to the fragmentation of parties, and central party leaders are no longer entirely in control. The PDI-P leadership, for example, is trying to constrain and reform party branches in regions.

There are some signs that parties are beginning to become sensitive to popular needs and demands both on a national and local scale, because that is where the votes are. Losing or faring poorly in elections is a powerful incentive to rethink party organization and campaign strategy.

There are also problems with internal party capacity. Party leaders could better define the issues and the stance their parties will take regarding issues. As it is now, parties are not much differentiated from each other, and party leaders and legislative representatives have not cared too much, because they were sure they would get reelected. But this may be changing. So there is a growing awareness that they need to learn more about issues. Some argue that regional politicians, as party leaders and members of the DPRD, are trying to be more responsive to the demands of particular civil society groups like feminist and legal rights groups.

Despite their shortcomings, political parties remain relevant local actors that will continue to play an important role. But for democracy to thrive in Indonesia, political parties must be able to bridge the gap between the public and the decision-making process to a greater extent than other organizations, such as labor unions, religious organizations, nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) or other social movements.

Education

Indonesia is hamstrung by the absence of an organized approach to human capacity development, training and education. The education system is poor. Analytical skills are not well taught.

Together with health, most economists consider education to be one of the two basic building blocks of a developing economy and also one of the two sectors in which gov-

ernment investment can have the most positive results. By most accounts, the quality of the education system in Indonesia, from primary through tertiary levels, is extremely poor. In the mid-1990s, after considerable school expansion and before the 1997-1998 economic crisis, Gavin Jones, a highly respected demographer, cited “the high proportion of inadequately trained teachers, the very basic school buildings, the lack of teaching aids, the high level of absenteeism . . . and the high dropout rate” in the primary schools. Using World Bank data, Jones also cited the low proportion of eligible young people who enter tertiary education compared to other countries in ASEAN and in Northeast Asia. A 2007 study by the World Bank concludes that education performance outcomes in Indonesia are among the lowest in the world.³

Nevertheless, there is now a village school within walking distance of three-quarters or more of all Indonesians, and there are many more junior and senior high schools, universities and other tertiary institutions than at the beginning of Suharto’s New Order. The main challenge now is quality, not quantity.

NIMD and KID

NIMD seeks to support democratization by strengthening political parties to help create a functioning, sustainable, pluralistic political system. NIMD focuses on three interrelated core objectives: (1) reinforcing a multiparty political system; (2) strengthening the institutionalization of political parties; and (3) enhancing the relationship between political and civil society. NIMD facilitates locally developed reform agendas that reflect the need for ownership of the process by political stakeholders. In Indonesia, beginning with assessment missions in 2002, NIMD consulted with a wide spectrum of organizations, diagnosed challenges to democratization, and began developing an idea for an “academy of democracy.” NIMD contracted with the Yogya-based NGO INSIST for a feasibility study regarding the idea, but INSIST failed to complete an acceptable study, in part because it sought to appropriate for itself the opportunity to be NIMD’s partner and program implementer.

Komunitas Indonesia untuk Demokrasi (Indonesian Community for Democracy, KID) is a nongovernmental organization formed by several prominent Indonesian academics and intellectuals in 2004. After NIMD determined that INSIST had failed to follow the terms of reference for its engagement and was not an appropriate partner for the Sekolah Demokrasi program, KID was formed to fill the void and become a local partner for NIMD. Established as an association (*perkumpulan*) and managed by a National Steering Committee (NSC), KID took ownership of the Sekolah Demokrasi program in 2004. KID developed the curriculum and materials and initiated a tendering process for so-called Implementing Agencies in three districts. The first three democracy schools were opened in 2005 and two more began operations in 2007. As discussed below, KID, working with NIMD, initiated a Political Party Consultations program in 2007 and has also organized public affairs events on “cross-cutting” issues of public concern. Over its five-year history, KID has evolved from being essentially the local implementing partner of NIMD to being an autonomous Indonesia NGO, but the two organizations continue to work very closely together.

³ Gavin Jones, “Labour Force and Education,” in Hal Hill, ed., *Indonesia’s New Order: The Dynamics of Socio-Economic Transformation* (Sidney: Allen and Unwin, 1994), pp. 145-178; World Bank, *Spending for Development: Making the Most of Indonesia’s New Opportunities*, (Jakarta: World Bank, 2007).

B. Evaluation Methodology

Approach and Methodology of Evaluation

In 2008 NIMD commissioned an evaluation of KID projects in Indonesia. A three-person team conducted fieldwork for the evaluation and presented preliminary results to KID in August 2008. The team subsequently provided a draft evaluation report and later a revised report to NIMD. Members of the National Steering Committee and representatives of NIMD were disappointed with the evaluation because it failed to provide recommendations about how KID could ensure its sustainability in the coming years and they did not feel it met the requirements of its terms of reference. Accordingly, NIMD and KID agreed to ask a new team of evaluators to conduct a second evaluation. In the terms of reference for the new evaluation, NIMD emphasized the importance of conducting interviews with NIMD staff members and of presenting practical, constructive recommendations to KID and NIMD.

Thus, NIMD has commissioned this new evaluation as second look at its programs in Indonesia. The terms of reference call for the evaluators to consider three broad questions: (1) the relevance of the program within the broader social and political context of Indonesia; (2) the efficiency and effectiveness of the program; and (3) the efficiency and effectiveness of the relationship between KID and NIMD. The terms of reference list a number of specific questions, which this evaluation report attempts to address below. When preparing the initial draft of this report, the current evaluators had not seen the previous evaluation report. However, they have since carefully reviewed previous evaluation, as discussed in Appendix A.

The team conducted this evaluation principally through in-depth interviews of key stakeholders and others in The Hague, The Netherlands and in Indonesia in Jakarta; Malang and Batu, East Java Province; Tangerang, Banten Province; and Palembang and Banyuwasin, South Sumatra Province. The team interviewed representatives and members of the KID Executive Board, KID Advisory Board, KID staff, Implementing Agencies, Community Committees (KKs), political parties, international donor organizations, democracy assistance organizations, the Netherlands Embassy, and NIMD board and staff, as well as other stakeholders and observers. (A list of interviews is attached as Appendix B.) Sometimes together and sometimes separately, the evaluators met with both individuals and groups for semi-structured and informal interviews. Most interviews lasted 60 to 90 minutes or more, with group discussions in Indonesia often lasting even longer. The team also reviewed a number of relevant documents. The team found the programs to be extremely well documented and commends the NIMD's documentation practices.

Evaluation Team

The team for this evaluation included Eric Bjornlund, an expert on democracy assistance and Indonesia and President of Democracy International, a U.S.-based firm that provides analytical services and support for democracy and governance programs around the world; and Sugeng Bahagijo, Deputy Director of Prakarsa, an Indonesian NGO and policy research organization. Biographical information for each is attached as Appendix C.

C. Overview of Evaluation

In seeking to address the questions posed by the terms of reference and subsequent discussions with NIMD and KID, we have organized this evaluation report in two main sections. In the first broad section, we address issues related to programs, specifically including consideration of the Sekolah Demokrasi and Political Party Consultations programs. For each of these two main programs, we address (a) the program's relevance and achievements; (b) issues and concerns; and (c) recommendations. In the second broad section, we consider institutional issues, including issues related to the institutionalization of KID and the relationship between KID and NIMD. In these discussions we have tried to address the questions raised by the terms of reference.

Because KID is the principal "owner" of and stakeholder in the relevant programs, most program recommendations are addressed to KID, although many are simultaneously recommendations to NIMD about what programs to assist and fund and what programmatic changes to support. In contrast, we address many of our institutional recommendations specifically to KID or NIMD or both.

Programs

A. Sekolah Demokrasi

Background

The flagship program of NIMD and KID in Indonesia has been the Sekolah Demokrasi or “democracy schools” in several locations around the country. The Sekolah Demokrasi program is designed to develop and spread knowledge, skills and values of democracy. Participants of this program are young people (between 21 and 40 years old) who come from four different social groups: political parties, civil society organizations, the business community and the government/bureaucracy.

The schools use a considered adult education methodology, and KID has developed a well-thought-out curriculum and comprehensive materials. NSC members (now called board members), including one with expertise in adult education, developed the pedagogy and materials. The curriculum involves work inside and outside the classroom. Each school provides from 300 to 500 hours of class meetings and 50 to 200 hours of out-of-class activities.

Modules prepared by KID provide the structure and content for the curriculum. The curriculum includes modules on (1) societal analysis, (2) development of democratic thought and practice, (3) political and governance systems, (4) concepts of democracy, (5) business and politics, (6) social movements, (7) public policy, (8) democracy and human rights, and (9) democracy and law. These are reference modules for the Implementing Agencies, and KID strongly recommends that the Implementing Agencies work closely with the facilitators to tailor the modules to the needs of local participants. The out-of-class assignments include having students organize seminars, public dialogues, talk shows and case studies. Participants select themes that are relevant to the local context.

Participants in the Sekolah Demokrasi meet two to four times a month on Saturdays and Sundays. In addition to attending classes, students are responsible for participating in out-of-class projects. Students pay no fee for participating in the program.

Each of the schools serves about 30 people a year. Students must have education through at least senior high school and reside or work in the community where the school is located. For their applications, they must obtain references from local individuals or institutions. For the existing schools, the number of applicants has increased substantially over the several years the program has been running.

To select students, the implementing agencies obtain recommendations from candidates’ institutions and assess the interest and academic capacity of candidates through written test and interviews. In addition to finding representatives of each of the “four pillars,” the Sekolah Demokrasi seek to identify individuals who are committed to public service after completing the program.

The exact composition of participants varies. In Tangerang, for example, participants come from more diverse backgrounds and are more senior and more knowledgeable about politics than, for example, participants in Palembang. In Tangerang, the group includes journalists, members of social organizations such as Fatayat NU and representa-

tives of church organizations. In Palembang, there are more women activists and students from civil society organizations such as the environmental group WALHI.

During the course of the program, each student must undertake a certain number of external projects. Specifically, they must either publish five articles in local newspapers or organize talk shows on local radio/TV, hearings at DPRD or other public events. They must also plan and execute at least one community development activity. At the end of the year participants take an exam that involves essays which is graded by KID. Passing standards are based not only on knowledge, but also on out-of-class assignments and participation.

Implementing Agencies and Locations

KID has contracted with local NGOs as Implementing Agencies to organize and run the schools. Sekolah Demokrasi began operating in 2005 in three districts: Lembata island in East Nusa Tenggara (NTT), Jenepono in South Sulawesi, and Malang in East Java. Two schools were added in 2007: Tangerang in Banten Province and Banyuasin, near Palembang in South Sumatra. The school in Malang was moved to nearby Batu in 2008.

KID has used an open, competitive tendering process to select Implementing Agencies for each of the schools. KID NSC members (now Board members) have actively guided, monitored and participated in the activities of the Implementing Agencies. The Implementing Agencies use the modules developed by KID and also are expected to develop their own locally rooted modules.

It takes up to a year to complete the Sekolah Demokrasi curriculum. Each school selects its students and begins its program early in the year, and then the program runs throughout the rest of the year. (Most of the schools operate on a calendar-year basis, but the schools in South Sumatra and Banten, at least previously, were operating on a 12-month calendar from mid-year to mid-year). KID insists that each school must meet KID's high standards and attempts to ensure the quality of the program. Among other things, as discussed above, KID chooses the Implementing Agencies, provides much of the educational materials, sends its own board members as presenters, sets minimum standards for classroom hours and requires students to complete a specified number of out-of-classroom activities in order to complete the course.

Community Committees

Komite Komunitas or Community Committees (KKs) are loose groups of Sekolah Demokrasi alumni that come together to maintain their relationships and pursue a common political agenda to bridge the gap between civil society and political society at the local level. In Malang and Lembata, for example, KID reports that KKs have played a mediating role in local conflicts. KID has emphasized the distinction between Sekolah Demokrasi and Komite Komunitas: a Sekolah Demokrasi is a nonpartisan educational institution that is not involved in political activities while a KK is an independent alumni forum for direct political engagement in local issues. But while the Komite Komunitas is not considered a KID program, KID has provided support and seed funds to KK activities.

KID and NIMD representatives admit to some ambivalence about the role they see for Komite Komunitas. They do not want to control KKs, nor do they want to be the principal source of funding for them. But KID and NIMD do see the KKs as potentially playing a constructive role in local politics as well as being a means for sustaining alumni

enthusiasm for the Sekolah Demokrasi experience and maintaining their ties to both KID and to their fellow alumni. As KID and NIMD fully recognize, this presents something of a dilemma, which they will seek to address in the coming months.

Costs

The overall cost of the Sekolah Demokrasi program is considerable. There are program, monitoring, administrative and overhead costs for the schools, the Implementing Agencies and KID as well as applicable costs incurred directly by NIMD. In 2007, KID reports it spent a total €439,826 on the Sekolah Demokrasi program.⁴ This represents approximately €2,500 per student for the 175 students who participated in the five Democracy Schools during that year. NIMD reported that costs for each school run about €75,000, which based on an assumption of 30 students suggests about the same per student cost. These numbers do not include operational expenses for the KID Secretariat or KID Institutional Program Support costs, which in 2007 were €147,371 and €11,866, respectively.⁵ Even though the secretariat and institutional support costs also supported other programs, Sekolah Demokrasi was and remains KID's largest program.

The 2009 KID Workplan provides €270,753 for the Sekolah Demokrasi program in the five current locations and €272,341 for KID management (including €7,152 from the Dutch Embassy). It provides €172,685 for the development of three new democracy schools, €167,183 of which would come from Partnership and additional fundraising. The total budget for the 2009 program is €822,838, of which €570,387 is from NIMD, €71,432 is from the Netherlands Embassy, and €181,019 is to be raised from other sources.⁶

A comparison of actual 2007 expenditures with budgeted 2009 expenditures for the existing five schools suggests a considerable reduction in operating costs. But the costs for institutional support of KID appear to have increased. It is difficult to draw conclusions, as there may be problems in comparability of these numbers.

Relevance and Achievements

The team's overall impression is that Sekolah Demokrasi program is generally relevant to the political context and democratization challenges in Indonesia. For one thing, political parties in Indonesia pay little attention to training their activists on democracy issues. For another, formal education in universities in Indonesia tends to depend too much on in-class methodology and on individual academic disciplines, but a problem-based adult learning methodology has the potential to more effectively develop skills need to better address complex social problems. To build public trust in political parties and to build political parties as political institutions, a new paradigm is needed. That new paradigm should stress politics as a way to develop and improve people's lives, including improving public services and ensuring citizens' rights. This requires a long-term approach and a long-term investment.

⁴ Fund Accountability Statement for the Period from January 1, 2007 to December 31, 2007, A Project Administered by Perkumpulan Komunitas Indonesia Untuk Demokrasi (KID) and the Netherlands Institute for Multiparty Democracy (NIMD), Project No. ID-07-KID-01.

⁵ *Ibid.*

⁶ KID, Narrative Workplan 2009, p. 6.

The alumni of Sekolah Demokrasi are a tangible output of the program and an increasingly large and potentially valuable resource in their communities. According to data provided by KID, Sekolah Demokrasi now has 586 alumni and students, more than 100 in each of the five districts. More than half (321) are designated as coming from civil society, and about one-third (200) are women.

The Sekolah Demokrasi program can count a number of achievements to date.

- ***Sharing Knowledge, Values and Skills of Democracy.*** The Sekolah Demokrasi program has contributed to the spread of knowledge, values and skills of democracy in the locations in which it has operated. To date, the Sekolah Demokrasi have graduated 435 people, and another 151 are currently students in the program. In the places in which it has operated, the program has clearly made a significant contribution to the sharing of practical skills and knowledge about democracy. Given the absence of education on democracy by political parties and established mass organizations, the Sekolah Demokrasi initiative seems to be widely and immediately accepted, and it seems to have changed the local conversation about democracy in the locations in which the schools operate.
- ***Strong, Positive Endorsements from Students and Alumni.*** In interviews with team members, Sekolah Demokrasi students and alumni uniformly suggest that the program has provided them with new knowledge and information as well as new experiences and the strong motivation to improve the socio-economic conditions in their local communities.
- ***Adult Education Methods.*** For the Sekolah Demokrasi project, KID has developed and applied innovative adult education methods. The focus on out-of-class education and the development of an intensive one-year educational program are at least unusual if not innovative in Indonesia. Students and alumni credit in particular the out-of-class programs such as seminars, talk shows, discussions of local issues, and public policy advocacy efforts for building their knowledge and skills.
- ***Curriculum and Materials.*** In designing and implementing the Sekolah Demokrasi project, KID has also developed a curriculum and comprehensive, extremely valuable resource/reading materials focused on democracy. This multidisciplinary curriculum and materials—which cover such issues as concepts of democracy, gender, public policy and human rights—represent a different approach in Indonesia. Formal education in the country typically focuses on a single discipline, and thus, for example, those who are knowledgeable on economics do not understand politics and those who study politics do not understand economics.
- ***Increasing Number of Applicants.*** In locations in which democracy schools have run for several years, the number of applicants has increased as the opportunity has presumably become more well known. This demand is a good indication that individuals see some real personal benefit from involvement in the program.
- ***Selection of Implementing Agencies.*** KID has used a careful, merit-based, open tender process to identify qualified local partners to serve as Implementing Agencies. This is at least unusual and sets a good example for the Indonesian NGO sector.

- ***Strengthening Local Institutions and Activists.*** The program has helped strengthen political parties at the local level in the applicable locations by providing information, training and encouragement for some young party activists.
- ***Interest in Replication and Expansion.*** The Sekolah Demokrasi program has generated interest from other parties, including local governments, political parties, social organizations and donor organizations. A number of such organizations are interested in implementing similar programs. In Malang, Tangerang and Palembang, for example, political parties have shown interest in replicating or expanding democracy schools. In Palembang the local government has shown similar interest.

There have been some significant indicators of the impact that Sekolah Demokrasi have had at the local level. In the 9 April 2009 national legislative elections, for example, a substantial number of Sekolah Demokrasi alumni were candidates for local assemblies. Eight Sekolah Demokrasi alumni were elected to kabupaten/kota-level local assemblies (DPRDs), and one was elected to a provincial DPRD (a representative from Partai Demokrat in South Sumatra). Another alumnus of the Sekolah Demokrasi in Malang is currently serving as the chair of the provincial election commission (KPUD) for East Java. In Lembata, seven graduates have been elected by their communities as village heads. At least one current student is a teacher in an Islamic boarding school. In Tangerang, a midwife who is an alumna of the school is now actively engaged in local community efforts to improve local better health service. Also, in Tangerang, a former Jawa (a kind of local gangster) who participated in the program reversed his previous opposition to Christmas celebrations to become a leader in efforts to protect the Christmas celebration, which has important symbolism regarding tolerance for the rights of minorities.

The evaluators were not in a position to assess the extent to which participation in the Sekolah Demokrasi program contributed to the electoral success of some alumni; such success may suggest as much that the program has attracted the right kind of students—including upwardly mobile, politically active young leaders—as that the program has helped particular individuals to get elected. But participation in local elective office at least gives an opportunity for alumni to build on and share the values and skills they have learned. Moreover, anecdotes like the one about the individual in Tangerang who became an advocate for tolerance suggest that in least some circumstances the program has directly affected local political action.

A number of factors have contributed to the relative success of Sekolah Demokrasi. First, the program has benefitted from strong and experienced local partners. The commitment, skill and social capital of Sekolah Demokrasi organizers in each region has been exemplary. In Malang, local partner Averroes reported that its leaders and staff spend most of their time and energy on managing the local Sekolah Demokrasi. Second, the program has benefitted from a careful, considered process for recruiting and selecting students. Organizers have made sure to recruit students from four separate sectors of society, which ensures diversity, and have established application procedures that ensure that students are serious about the process, and representatives of local Implementing Agencies review and consider each of the applications. Third, anecdotal evidence suggests that the national and local facilitators and resource persons have been competent, reputable and credible. In short, the people involved in Sekolah Demokrasi program are almost uniformly complimentary, and the programs appear to be well considered and well implemented.

Issues and Concerns

Notwithstanding the project's clear achievements and successes and the seemingly positive feelings of all involved, the team has some issues and concerns about the Sekolah Demokrasi project. In this section, we first address concerns about the schools themselves, including concerns about the curriculum and materials. Then we address the challenges of ensuring the program has broader impact, both in the locations in which has operated and nationally.

Internal Issues and Concerns

Despite the program's notable accomplishments, the evaluation team believes that the Sekolah Demokrasi approach suffers from some weaknesses and problems.

- ***Difficulty of Materials/Modules.*** According to many students, alumni and facilitators we spoke with, the modules and reading materials are still too difficult for some participants. Many suggested the materials would benefit from more summaries and similar techniques to simplify, summarize/reinforce, and help students to better understand the basic points.
- ***Complexity of Measuring Improvements in Knowledge, Skills and Values.*** It is difficult to determine or measure the extent to which the program has improved the understanding and level of knowledge of participants, even after a year of participation in the program. Facilitators and organizers of Sekolah Demokrasi acknowledge that measuring such changes remains a challenge for them. Students and alumni typically are more articulate in presenting and discussing their ideas verbally than in writing. Our sense is that participants do not generally come to the program with anything more than average writing skills, which have not greatly improved by the time they graduate from the program.
- ***Need for Additional Reference Materials.*** Some stakeholders suggest there is a lack of additional, easily understood reference materials for students and facilitators, such as on best practices in other countries. Facilitators, participants and alumni suggest that these types of materials can help them understand various concepts and explanations in the modules. One Sekolah Demokrasi participant, for example, called for reading materials on "practices and democratization experiences in other countries" and "best practices on public policy and public services. Another called for materials on best practices on good governance, budgeting and gender policies.
- ***Community Committees.*** As discussed above, Community Committees (KK) are expected to function as loose coalitions of alumni that can mediate local disputes and advocate better public policies. KID has supported KK by channeling seed funds to provide a place and an opportunity for alumni to get together to organize activities. KID has also supported KK with training on various issues, such as appraising project proposals. The KK, however, is still a floating organization that lacks a clear and distinct direction.

Broadening Impact

There are also challenges of expanding the impact of the Sekolah Demokrasi project. These include the challenge of expanding the schools to other locations ("scaling up") as well as the problem of whether and how to get educational, social and other organiza-

tions to adapt and use the Sekolah Demokrasi materials and approach (“mainstreaming”). Scaling up and/or mainstreaming will be necessary to expand the impact of the program on strengthening democratization and the local multiparty system in the country more broadly.

- **Limited Reach.** Even given all of its creativity and innovations, the Sekolah Demokrasi directly benefits a tiny number of citizens and indirectly benefits only a very few communities. Each school educates only about 30 students a year. A number of other applicants are turned away.
- **Considerable Cost.** The intensive Sekolah Demokrasi approach is expensive, particularly on a per-student basis. While it might be argued that the costs were understandable during the project’s start-up, pilot phase, there is a need to consider how to make the program more efficient and cost-effective.
- **Lack of Policy on Responding to Inquiries about Expansion or Replication.** The increased visibility for the benefits, quality and innovation of Sekolah Demokrasi in a number of regions has led to interest from political parties, local governments and social organizations in adopting and expanding the program, based on their own needs and perspectives. Unfortunately, KID does not have a policy or guidelines on how to respond to these requests.

Recommendations

Based on these findings, the team offers a number of recommendations for consideration regarding the Sekolah Demokrasi project. These include recommendations regarding (1) the project and internal operations of the schools themselves; (2) the alumni; and (3) means of broadening impact.

Internal Issues

- **Improve Accessibility of Materials.** KID should undertake efforts to improve the accessibility of modules, for example, by adding summaries, developing shortened and simplified supplementary materials, and providing more visual aids. Such efforts would help some readers to better understand key concepts.
- **Provide Supplemental Materials.** KID should try to identify and make available additional tools and reference materials, including materials addressing or illustrating best practices and experiences from other countries.
- **Continue Emphasis on Practical Skills and Out-of-Class Projects.** The Sekolah Demokrasi program should continue its emphasis on practical skills and out-of-class projects as effective means of adult education.
- **Consider Additional Prerequisites for Admission to Program.** KID and other Sekolah Demokrasi stakeholders should consider adopting prerequisites regarding level of education and writing/reading skills that students must meet in order to be admitted to the program. This would ensure that program resources were being directed at individuals most able to benefit from the opportunity and most able to build on the experience to improve their local communities.
- **Consider Focusing Target Audience for Some Classes.** KID should reconsider its emphasis on having representatives of all “four pillars” of society (government, business, political parties and civil society) represented in each Sekolah

Demokrasi class. While the idea of having representatives of different parts of society talking to each other is appealing, the small numbers involved in any given class make this essentially symbolic. And this otherwise commendable emphasis on diversity may come at the expense of a more focused mission and increased efficiency of the education program. It is possible that the program could have greater local impact if it were focused on educating a subset of young people, such as those active in political parties or politically active civic organizations, or young government officials. NIMD's 2007 Annual Plan, for example, states that the Sekolah Demokrasi program has "two main aims: to train young regional politicians and activists on democratic values and practices, and to create a new generation of democratic politicians in Indonesia." This makes a lot of sense but seems to state a more focused mandate and target population than has actually been the case. The Sekolah Demokrasi may suffer from trying to be "all things to all people" rather than focusing its mission to educate young political activists. Rather than insisting on diversity in each class, it might make sense to conduct the program for selected groups.

- ***Emphasize Evaluation.*** KID and its Implementing Agencies should focus more on evaluation of the Sekolah Demokrasi program and should work to ensure feedback from students, resource persons and Implementing Agencies. This includes taking steps to ensure that students, facilitators, resource persons, and other stakeholders complete and return evaluation forms. KID currently monitors both the financial aspects and program implementation of the Sekolah Demokrasi through (1) visits of KID staff and board members at least once a year; (2) questionnaires; (3) routine communication and contacts between KID representatives and Sekolah Demokrasi/Implementing Agencies; and (4) annual partners meetings where partners report and analyse progress, challenges and weaknesses. These efforts need to be continued and made more systematic.
- ***Conduct Surveys for Evaluation Purposes.*** KID should consider conducting surveys for evaluation purposes. First, KID should conduct baseline surveys of students before they begin the course and subsequent surveys at the end of the course to enable comparisons of knowledge about relevant course topics. This would have no significant cost implications. Second, KID should conduct a satisfaction survey of alumni and students; rather than testing respondents' knowledge of relevant democracy concepts, such a survey would ask them directly about their opinions about and recommendations for the program. This also need not be expensive. Implementing Agencies could administer essentially the same survey to graduating students upon the completion of the course. Third, KID and/or NIMD should consider designing and implementing some kind of more rigorous "impact evaluation," which would involve baseline and subsequent surveys of (a) communities with Sekolah Demokrasi programs and (b) other, similar communities to serve as controls. This would enable stronger inferences about the program's real impact on local communities. Unlike surveys of students and alumni, this would require careful design and additional resources.

Alumni

- ***Continue to Encourage Local Political Engagement.*** KID (and NIMD) should continue to encourage local political engagement of Sekolah Demokrasi alumni, through the Community Committees (KK) and in other ways. KID and Implementing Agencies should seek to mobilize alumni and/or Community Commit-

tees to create spinoff activities in the community. One activity, for example, might be to track local budget expenditures. Or a KK could become a citizen forum or citizen committee partnering with the local assembly by providing public forums to address important public policy questions, such as health or education. The objective is to create a multiplier effect and to seek students and alumni of the program as not only individuals who have benefitted from, but are also promoters of, the democracy schools. KID could at least consider helping make the KK a local advocacy NGO and program of KID, although KID is rightly concerned about the problem of costs for the KK. Beyond involvement in KKs, alumni should be encouraged to participate in local politics through political parties and civic organizations and as individual activists. The focus should be on encouraging local political engagement and activism rather than on the institutionalization or capacity building of the KKs.

- ***Involve Alumni in Democracy Schools.*** Beyond the KKs, KID should encourage alumni to stay involved with activities of the schools themselves. This could include both serving as resource persons for Sekolah Demokrasi classes and organizing out-of-class activities for students, such as meetings at the local DPRD. Alumni are well positioned to serve as mentors to existing students.
- ***Encourage Alumni to Spread Sekolah Demokrasi Concept.*** KID should also encourage alumni to help expand and adapt the Sekolah Demokrasi approach to other venues, such as local high schools (see recommendations on “broadening impact” below), and to serve as resource persons for such efforts. In addition to local political participation through KKs or otherwise, this kind of involvement in civic education could be a means for alumni to share knowledge and values of democracy in an educational setting.
- ***Maintain Links with Alumni.*** KID should make efforts to maintain links with Sekolah Demokrasi alumni. This will require additional attention over time, as the number of alumni grows and as the time since graduation of the early classes increases. Thus, we recommend that KID establish and maintain a database and mailing list of all Sekolah Demokrasi alumni; establish a national alumni organization (which, unlike KKs, would be directly tied to KID); convene periodic meetings of alumni, perhaps including an annual national meeting (although likely without paying transportation, lodging and most other costs for such a meeting) or annual local meetings; and consider soliciting financial contributions from the alumni for the alumni association.
- ***Develop a Policy Paper.*** In consultation with its local Implementing Agencies and other Sekolah Demokrasi stakeholders, KID should develop a policy paper on the role of Community Committees. KID should seek means to support the role of alumni in expanding democracy in their regions.

Broadening Impact and Considering Alternatives to Current Approach

- ***Increase Concern about Costs, Cost-Effectiveness and Sustainability.*** The Sekolah Demokrasi project is expensive, particularly when considered on a per student basis, and KID and NIMD should be more concerned about costs and cost-effectiveness. There are considerable program, monitoring, administrative and overhead costs for the schools, the Implementing Agencies, KID, and even NIMD and other funders. Sponsors of the program should be concerned about the

sustainability of the overall level of costs and about the cost-effectiveness of the locally focused, intensive Sekolah Demokrasi approach. In part because of their costs, the existing schools are more pilot projects than actual models that can be scaled up by simply replicating existing schools. With the addition of up to 10 additional schools, there are likely to be economies of scale in central administration from KID, but it seems reasonable to expect that new local Implementing Agencies and schools will have similar costs to those in other locations; thus, significant economies of scale will be hard to achieve using the current model. Nevertheless, KID and NIMD should aim to increase cost-effectiveness and bring down the cost per student in the coming years.

- ***Sustainability and Expansion.*** Consideration should be given to providing less intensive opportunities to more students and to how to reduce costs, such as by modifying the curriculum, to increase the chances of expanding the project to significantly more locations with additional funds. This might mean, for example, organizing new, abbreviated democracy education programs that run for much shorter periods than the year and 300-plus classroom hours that the current course runs. Existing schools might also admit a larger number of students, perhaps 40 rather than the current 30 (although there are limits to this kind of expansion and this certainly will affect the experience of each of the students). Schools could also consider charging a very modest tuition as a way of ensuring student commitment to the program as well as offsetting some small amount of program costs. In the absence of some kind of significant changes, perhaps along the lines suggested here, the overall project will remain dependent on donors and is simply not sustainable on a larger scale.
- ***Develop Strategy for Scaling Up and Mainstreaming.*** The evaluation team commends the plan to expand from the current five to 15 schools in the next few years. But it will become prohibitively expensive to continue to expand by simply replicating the current approach in an ever greater number of locations. Thus, KID, perhaps with assistance from NIMD, should develop a strategy for expanding the program in different ways, both within existing regions and across the country. In existing locations, KID or local Implementing Agencies could establish partnerships or other relationships with other local institutions committed to democratization and democracy education (see recommendation below). KID and its local partners might also consider increasing the number of students educated, perhaps by increasing the average class size, reducing the length of the program in order to be able to educate more students, and/or developing some kind of short version of the curriculum.
- ***Consider Collaboration.*** KID should consider collaboration with other institutions with an interest or a potential interest in democracy and political education. Potential partners or users of the educational approach, curriculum and materials include:
 - Universities
 - Government (national or regional), including perhaps the Ministry of Education for integration into the high school curriculum and government training institutes at the national or local level
 - Local government associations
 - Other educational institutions, such as Islamic or Catholic schools
 - Civil society networks

- DPRD II
- Political parties
- Other democracy/political education efforts

Working with any of these kinds of organizations would certainly have challenges, including yielding at least some control of the product and necessarily changing the nature of the course to some degree, but partnerships of some kind are essential if one goal is to expand the significance and impact of the program.

- ***Investigate Possible Cooperation with the Institute for Peace and Democracy at Udayana University in Bali.*** In December of last year, President Yudhoyono and the Government of Indonesia hosted the Bali Democracy Forum, which was attended by representatives of more than 30 countries. The President said, “We can share our best experiences and learn from the practices of others.” With backing from the President and Foreign Minister Hasan Wirajuda, Udayana University in Bali has established the Institute for Peace and Democracy. Because of this strong backing from the government, KID could explore possible avenues of cooperation with this new institute. Working with a government-backed initiative might provide an opportunity for KID to spread its values and educational approach to a broader audience or to attract government resources for the expansion of the Sekolah Demokrasi concept.
- ***Develop a Policy for Unsolicited Requests for New Democracy Schools.*** KID should develop a policy and guidelines to respond to interest and enthusiasm from other stakeholders (such as local governments, political parties and donors) for adopting and scaling up the program.
- ***Consider “Open Source” Options, Sharing of Curriculum, Encouraging Other Political Education Efforts.*** Beyond actual partnerships with governmental, educational or other institutions, KID should consider making its pedagogy, curriculum and materials available to other institutions, and it should look for other means of encouraging other institutions to establish their own versions of “democracy schools.” This could be a kind of “franchising” model, in which KID would provide materials, set standards and certify other providers, or it could be looser, with KID simply making its curriculum and materials available. KID might explore the possibility of charging a license for use of its curriculum and materials. At the same time, KID does understandably have a strong interest in trying to maintain standards and quality, in ensuring commitment to democratic principles, and in receiving all due credit for its curriculum and materials.
- ***Consider On-Line Options.*** As an alternative or in addition to other strategies for expanding the reach of the Sekolah Demokrasi concept, consideration could be given to making the course, or some version of the course, available on-line. Although internet access and band-width would likely be issues, internet usage is widespread enough among young, relatively educated Indonesians across the country to suggest this could be a possibility. On-line assignments might be combined with periodic in-person meetings of students. An on-line course could potentially be an inexpensive way to reach much larger numbers of students. The evaluation team did not have an opportunity to investigate the market for or cost of such courses; we simply suggest consideration of whether this would be a feasible, cost-effective way of making the Sekolah Demokrasi course more widely available.

Some of these recommendations are merely ideas to consider or explore. Some may be mutually inconsistent. KID and NIMD may well disregard some of them for legitimate reasons. Nevertheless, all of these recommendations are offered in the spirit of helping to reinforce and expand the impact of the Sekolah Demokrasi program on local communities and on the overall consolidation of democracy in Indonesia.

B. Political Party Consultations

At the invitation of NIMD, representatives of Indonesia's seven largest political parties, in terms of representation in Indonesia's parliament, the DPR (Dewan Perwakilan Rakyat or People's Representative Council), visited the Netherlands in April 2007. These parties were Golkar, PDIP, PAN, PKS, PKB, PPP and Partai Demokrat. The Indonesian party representatives met with counterparts from the seven major Dutch political parties that are represented on the board of NIMD. The parties agreed to establish a forum for political discussions, the Komunitas Dialog Partai Politik (The Community for Political Party Dialogue or KDPP), which would be facilitated by KID. This became KID's Political Party Consultations (PPC) program.

While the Sekolah Demokrasi program seeks to promote reform "from below," the PPC is meant to promote reform "from above," specifically to strengthen the multiparty system. The PPC program would provide a forum for multiple political parties to discuss long-term issues that are not typically discussed in the parliament.

As part of the PPC program, KID has hosted private, off-the-record discussions on selected topics for political party representatives as well as public seminars open to participants from civil society organizations, universities, the media and the public. In consultation with the participating party representatives, KID has set agenda for and facilitated these private discussions and public seminars. They have been held at KID's premises and at other facilities in Jakarta, as well as at several locations around the country.

During the first phase of this program, beginning in 2007, the topics of these forums were (i) independent candidates for mayors, governors, district heads; (ii) local parties, (iii) financing and financial accountability of political parties; and (iv) local election and direct democracy. The program became less active as national elections in April 2009 approached.

The methodology for the PPC program has involved a formal approach to each political party. NIMD initially directed invitations for participation in the trip to The Hague to party leaders, who then identified party representatives to be involved in the program's activities. KID then informally probed for advice on issues and approach. The party representatives are the ones who have decided what should be discussed. Throughout the program, NIMD and KID have maintained their neutrality and impartiality.

Relevance

Based on its review of documents and interviews, the team believes that the PPC program addresses an important challenge to the consolidation of democracy in Indonesia, namely, the improving the multiparty system and strengthening the capacity of political parties. Party leaders and stakeholders suggested two principal deficiencies of the political parties. First, Indonesian political parties in general do not have platforms, ideological identities or policies that distinguish them from one another, which does not augur well for the success of the multiparty political party system. Second, Indonesian political parties are too focused on political transactions, such as gaining government posts, and resources; they are less interested in developing or producing competing public policies on such important issues as education, agriculture and health. For the party system to function properly and democratically, each party should be better able to identify its constituencies and policy positions.

Achievements

With support from NIMD, KID has accomplished a great deal to date in the Political Party Consultations (PPC) program, which provides a solid foundation for future efforts to engage the parties. Achievements to date include the following:

- ***Establishing Forum for Dialogue.*** The program has led to agreement among the political parties to establish a forum for dialogue facilitated by KID, and KID has successfully convened and facilitated interparty dialogue on various issues and topics of public concern.
- ***Building Trust and Establishing Impartiality.*** KID has built substantial trust with Indonesia's most significant political parties, as demonstrated by the participation of party leaders in KID programs and in interviews with party leaders and outside observers. KID has demonstrated its impartiality and neutrality as well as its understanding of and commitment to the role of political parties in a democracy. KID has worked with care and tact and in accordance with the desires of the parties.
- ***Supporting Common Agenda for Reform.*** The program has enabled political party representatives to work together to develop a broad, common agenda for democratic reform, and it has focused attention on the role and concerns of parties.
- ***Playing a Needed Role in Addressing Political Parties.*** Despite the important and necessary role of political parties in a democracy, the PPC program is one of a very few externally supported programs in Indonesia that has directly engaged political parties. It is one of even fewer programs that have facilitated multiparty dialogue in an effort to strengthen the multiparty system.
- ***Using Demand-Driven Approach.*** The PPC process has been participatory and demand-driven, that is, driven by the parties' own concerns. KID has adroitly involved the participants in designing the forums and prioritizing the topics. It has approached the project with appropriate caution and has proceeded with the agreement of the parties. This has helped KID to build trust with the parties as a neutral and impartial institution.

Issues and Concerns

From the interviews and the document review, the evaluation team identified some issues of concern. We believe it is important to address these issues to ensure the success and sustainability of the program.

- ***Next Steps Unclear.*** KID has stated its goal for the PPC to become a second forum for domestic political discussions among political parties outside parliament. Such a forum would take up issues that the DPR may be struggling to resolve as well as more long-term, fundamental political issues. Internationally, building on the return visits between Indonesia and Dutch political parties and parliamentarians in 2007 and 2008, KID wants to develop the PPC as a forum for transnational, interparty collaboration; this would provide a third type of international collaboration in addition to government-to-government and party-to-party collaboration. Nevertheless, judging from the team's interviews and document review, the next steps for the PPC program are not yet clear. The program became less

active as the 2009 elections approached, and the agenda and rationale for a renewed, active program remain vague. If the PPC program is going to resume and to contribute in a serious way, KID, NIMD and interested party representatives will have to focus attention on developing a new strategy to enable the program to move forward.

- **Consistency and Level of Participation.** It seems that some political parties have participated in the PPC dialogue sessions more consistently and regularly than others, and some parties have been represented by more senior, experienced and/or reform-minded party representatives. It would help the PPC considerably to have consistent participation from the same core group of party representatives, for each party to be consistently represented, and for each participant to be someone with a position of leadership or influence within his or her party.
- **Need for Additional Structure.** Although KID has been smart to defer to the concerns and priorities of the parties, this means that the program lacks a clear agenda and structure. There is a danger that the PPC will become nothing more than, as at least one person put it, a “coffee club.” Even though the PPC is a forum established by Indonesian political parties rather than by KID, it is nevertheless a KID program and it provides an opportunity for KID to take the initiative with parties to encourage reform. It is important to find a balance between party interests and needs on the one hand and KID’s agenda and mandate to strengthen multiparty system on the other.
- **Strengthening Relationship with Parties.** KID still lacks the necessary human resources and strategy to manage the program and relationships with the political parties. KID needs to continue to develop and manage an effective, ongoing relationship with each of the major political parties. KID lacks the experienced staff needed to network with and understand the needs and interests of the parties.

Going forward, the PPC program can focus on any of three different types of issues. First, it may be worthwhile for the parties to address institutional, constitutional or systemic reforms necessary for the consolidation of democracy in Indonesia (“institutional reforms”). These include such issues as proposals on the draft bill on the role and function of legislative bodies and proposals to regulate political and campaign finance, strengthen the party system, restructure the civil service, and reform the judiciary. Second, the PPC could focus specifically on issues related to party strengthening and capacity-building, including fostering inclusiveness, encouraging internal democracy, recruiting candidates, developing policy positions, raising funds, managing campaigns, etc (“internal party building”). Third, the parties could use the program’s dialogues as an opportunity to address detailed public policy issues, such as education, agriculture, health, welfare or economic policy (“policy issues”).

Recommendations

In light of the foregoing analysis, the team offers the following recommendations:

- **Needs Assessment.** NIMD and KID should conduct a comprehensive needs assessment to determine the views of political party leaders and reformers about the experience of and possibilities for the PPC program and for KID’s role as a facilitator of party dialogue. Among other things, it is important to determine whether parties continue to have an interest in this kind of multiparty dialogue or other engagement with KID and NIMD. Senior representatives of KID, and possibly of

NIMD as well, should engage directly with relevant party officials to solicit their views and determine their needs.

- ***Building Shared Agenda between Parties and KID.*** KID should seek to build a shared agenda with the political parties for the PPC. Such an agenda should take account of the political interests of parties and should further the goals of KID (and NIMD and other potential funders or partners) to strengthen the multiparty system in Indonesia.
- ***Program Strategy.*** Based on the findings of the needs assessment, KID should develop a comprehensive, new PPC strategy. This strategy should address how KID can build a shared agenda with the parties and should consider whether the project would be most likely to contribute by primarily addressing (a) institutional reforms, (b) internal party building, or (c) policy issues.
- ***Working with Individual Party Reformers.*** Rather than primarily dealing formally with parties, the team recommends that KID try to identify and collaborate with individual party activists or office-holders who have influence within those parties and are committed to individual party and party system reform. Even while trying to maintain needed support from parties themselves, KID should try to involve individual reformers who are likely to make a long-term commitment to be actively involved in the PPC program. It is important for KID to try to understand the internal dynamics of the political parties.
- ***Senior Staff.*** KID should have an experienced, senior professional staff member who has experience and networks with political parties. This staff member should regularly and intensively network and communicate with the parties and should become the main liaison between KID and the parties.
- ***Drawing on NIMD's Network.*** KID and NIMD should consider whether there are opportunities to draw on NIMD's network of politicians and political party professionals in the Netherlands and perhaps elsewhere that can participate in or serve as resource persons for party dialogues. If conducted with the appropriate tact and sensitivity, involvement of Dutch professionals and experts and consideration of experiences in the Netherlands and elsewhere may provide valuable models for consideration and may spur new, more effective kinds of dialogue.

Institutional Issues

A. Institutionalization of KID

Since its founding in 2003, KID has grown from an organization established in effect to manage NIMD's Sekolah Demokrasi program in Indonesia to a genuinely Indonesian, locally owned, well-established institution that manages multiple programs to support democracy in Indonesia. KID has its own office and program staff, has increased its autonomy over program and funding decisions, and has begun to diversify its sources of funding.

For much of its institutional life, KID has been managed by its founders, consisting of a National Steering Committee, supported by a small technical/professional and administrative staff. The NSC acted as program executors, managers and supervisors. NSC members designed the programs, developed the curriculum and materials for the Sekolah Demokrasi, chose implementing agencies in the regions to manage the schools, served as resource persons for the Sekolah Demokrasi classes, oversaw all aspects of the schools including the quality of instruction, and managed financial matters for KID and the programs.

KID confronted the daunting, multifaceted challenges of simultaneously establishing itself as a new organization, initiating a complex new program, and creating a new educational approach, methodology and materials more or less from scratch. KID took on these challenges and its programs sought to address the substance of Indonesian democratization in the midst of the country's complex, sometimes ambiguous transition. These were inherently difficult challenges, complicated by an inherently difficult political environment and complex, changing subject matter. After the initial stage of institutional development, KID has taken steps to ensure further professionalization of its organization. KID has experienced growing pains and is still developing as an organization.

During much of the time it has worked in Indonesia, NIMD has relied on a local consultant to develop and oversee its program in Indonesia and liaise with KID, political parties and other stakeholders. The consultant supported NIMD by maintaining NIMD's relationships with its Indonesian partners, and he worked with KID on the KID-NIMD programs. As KID has become increasingly institutionalized and has taken ownership of the programs, the role of the consultant has diminished.

As many respondents acknowledge, until recently KID has put a priority on developing and managing its programs rather than developing itself as an institution. Members of the NSC have simultaneously managed and supervised programs. For much of its institutional history, KID has not had an Executive Director. Some respondents have pointed out that this has meant there has been a relative absence of effective organizational controls or "checks and balances." As KID is no longer in a start-up phase, it is essential for it to ensure that these checks and balances have been institutionalized.

In addition to overlap between the roles of supervision and implementation, this has led to a lack of transparency in decision-making on financial issues, including honoraria and performance-based fees for NSC members. Moreover, members of the NSC/Board of Directors responsible for developing program and institutional strategy and for serving as lecturers or resource persons in Sekolah Demokrasi or other KID programs have had to

function simultaneously as program executors and program managers. From its interviews and document reviews, the team noted that there have been complaints about these issues. We do not question, however, the legitimacy of KID providing reasonable compensation to any individuals, including board members, for providing professional services.

In recent months, KID has made substantial improvements in its management and procedures. It has separated the functions of supervision and implementation by reconstituting the board of directors (Pengurus), establishing a supervisory board (Pengawas), and creating the position of executive director, as well as by adopting new institutional statutes and bylaws. The board of directors is responsible for setting policy and ensuring accountability within the organization, while the executive director is responsible for program execution, day-to-day operations and regular communications with partners and funders, including NIMD. KID appointed an interim executive director and, in February 2009, recruited and hired a permanent executive director. The executive director supervises a small group of managers.

In addition, the organization has adopted new standard operating procedures for financial matters. NIMD reports no major issues with KID's program or financial reporting, although an independent auditor report on compliance for 2007 found some ineligible expenses and material instances of noncompliance, which NIMD and KID both appear to have since addressed.

KID and NIMD could have and should have moved sooner to ensure better corporate governance and internal procedures. NIMD did try over several years to get KID to focus on the institutionalization of KID as an organization but apparently without much success. Indeed, this became a source of some tension between the two organizations. Nevertheless, KID now appears to be on course for substantially improved internal governance.

KID has begun to diversify its funding sources and external strategic network beyond NIMD. Since 2007, for example, KID has received funding directly from the Netherlands embassy for additional democracy schools. KID and NIMD are also negotiating with the trust fund Kemitraan (Partnership) to fund additional schools. KID has also applied for some funds from the United Nations Democracy Fund (UNDEF) and the European Union.

Recommendations

The team offers the following recommendations regarding the institutionalization of KID:

- ***Institutional Development.*** KID should pay greater attention to institutional development. It should build on its recent positive steps in this area, including the adoption of new statutes and bylaws, the recruitment of an executive director, and the implementation of a number of new SOPs. KID should continue this momentum toward institutional development. KID should maintain the distinction and separation of authority between the board of directors and the executive director. It should institutionalize semiannual meetings between the board and the executive director/staff as a routine mechanism for monitoring and accountability.

- NIMD should continue to encourage these efforts toward institutionalization and improved corporate governance.
- **Long-Term Vision.** KID's board and stakeholders should consider what their long-term (five-to-ten-year) vision for the organization is. They may want to consider whether KID should be, for example, an educational center focused on democracy policy or some kind of policy advocacy organization.
 - **Public Profile and Visibility.** Although some KID leaders have suggested it was wise for the organization to maintain a low profile during its early years, in order to avoid undue questions or interference from the Ministry of Education, for example, we believe KID should now increase its public profile and visibility, through public events, publications and media alerts. This will contribute to increasing the impact of its programs. KID should consider developing some kind of media strategy.
 - **Comparative Research.** KID should consider comparative research on selected research NGOs in other countries, such as IDASA in South Africa.
 - **Annual Report.** To provide accountability and transparency, KID should publish an annual report available to the public. This report would not only increase KID's visibility but would also enhance the transparency and public accountability of KID's operations.
 - **Monitoring and Evaluation.** KID needs to be a learning organization. For this purpose, KID needs (a) to implement internal monitoring and evaluation practices; (b) to have good documentation including a database of information about Sekolah Demokrasi alumni; and (c) to solicit and collect input from alumni or Sekolah Demokrasi participants on the benefit and impact of the program.
 - **Benchmarks.** KID should develop benchmarks on institutional development, role and financing. These benchmarks would enable KID to evaluate itself and prepare itself for the future.
 - **Relationship with Implementing Agencies.** KID has been wise to closely manage Implementing Agencies, but it should increasingly consider the interests of such local organizations in ownership of the program. Implementing Agencies have their own interests and views about how to make the local schools effective and meaningful. In planning and implementing the program, KID (and NIMD) should take account of these views.
 - **Diversification of Funding.** KID needs to diversify its sources of funding and strategic partners to ensure the sustainability and scaling up its programs. The Sekolah Demokrasi program in particular requires additional funders, partners and implementers in order to have broad, significant impact across the country.

B. Relationship between KID and NIMD

NIMD developed its intervention strategy in Indonesia on the basis of broad, careful consultations over a period of time. Although sustainability and impact continue to be challenges, there is considerable support from stakeholders and others for the Sekolah Demokrasi concept. Moreover, through their efforts working on the Sekolah Demokrasi project, NIMD and KID built up the platform and trust necessary for the subsequent launch of the Political Party Consultations project. The development of the Sekolah Demokrasi project and the establishment of KID have provided a strong basis for the implementation of the NIMD mandate.

Moreover, NIMD has demonstrated genuine and appropriate commitment to local (Indonesian) ownership of the Sekolah Demokrasi, PPC and other programs in Indonesia. Even though KID was created at the behest of NIMD, judging from our interviews and review of documents, NIMD seems to fully support KID's independence and autonomy.

Starting a new organization, rather than working with an existing one, has presented difficulties and disadvantages. It might have been preferable if NIMD could have identified and recruited an existing organization with existing capabilities and an established governing structure to develop these new approaches and innovative programs. But, despite intensive efforts over many months, NIMD was not able to identify such an organization and thus understandably decided to sponsor the creation of a new organization.

NIMD has actively encouraged and assisted KID to better institutionalize itself and become a more professional organization. NIMD and KID have engaged in active dialogue about these issues since at least early 2007. Most recently, top representatives of both organizations met in December 2008 and February 2009 to discuss the institutionalization of KID, the principles and values governing the NIMD-KID relationship, and mechanisms and procedures to maintain and improve this relationship.

Relations between NIMD and KID seem to have encountered difficulties at times. KID has complained about NIMD's inability to make a long-term funding commitment to KID. KID has also complained about some delays in the transfer of funds, which have disrupted KID's cash flow, and about the schedule for transferring funds going forward. KID has also criticized NIMD's alleged lack of timely notice of a planned visit to Indonesia, which KID officials felt distracted from other priorities. In addition, KID complained about the format and frequency of program and financial reports to NIMD. Likewise, NIMD certainly has had concerns about KID's internal organization, financial and program reporting, and similar matters.

To the credit of both organizations, KID and NIMD sat down together in Malang in February 2009 to discuss how to improve their communication and relationship. The leaders of both organizations attended the meeting, and they agreed on a number of important principles and a way to move forward together. They agreed, for example, that the relationship between KID and NIMD is a partnership between autonomous organizations based on mutual respect and common interests and in which both parties have rights and obligations. They agreed further to respect each other's organizational arrangements and to pursue a joint agenda to promote democracy in Indonesia. At a more practical level, NIMD and KID agreed on the simplification of reporting from KID to NIMD and that NIMD would send a quarterly report to KID on issues related to its program in Indonesia.

Recommendations to KID and NIMD

The team offers the following recommendations with respect to the relationship between KID and NIMD:

- ***Implementing an Effective Partnership.*** It is critically important for KID and NIMD to maintain their commitment to a genuine partnership based on mutual respect and a common agenda. The challenge will be how to implement this partnership in two main arenas: (a) strategic issues related to financing, sustainability and scaling up the program; and (b) practical issues such as communication, finances and reporting. We recommend that the two organizations institutionalize the agreements they made at their February 2007 meeting in Malang, including a schedule for consultations and procedures for communications, strategy development, program planning, reporting, monitoring and evaluation, and finances.
- ***NIMD Commitment to Indonesia.*** NIMD has invested significant effort to understanding, and has demonstrated admirable commitment to, Indonesia. Building on this investment, the Institute should maintain its commitment to programs in the country.
- ***Length of NIMD's Funding Commitment.*** NIMD should seek to find a way to extend the length of its commitment to KID. NIMD should inform KID about strategic issues in the Netherlands that may affect the program in Indonesia.
- ***Review of Malang Agreement.*** The Malang meeting was important both as a matter of process (the two organizations sat down and forthrightly addressed their concerns and how to improve their collaboration) and as a matter of substance (the two organizations made a number of specific commitments to improve their communication and collaboration). Before the end of the year, NIMD and KID should review together whether their partnership has operated in a manner consistent with the understandings reached at their joint meeting in Malang. They should consider which operating procedures and mechanisms have worked and which have not.

C. Future Scenarios for KID

There are several possible alternative scenarios for the evolution, institutional development and focus of KID over the next five to ten years, each of which has implications for the sustainability of current programs and of KID as an organization. These scenarios include the following:

- ***KID as Democracy Education Organization.*** In the first scenario, KID maintains and builds on its current programming and strategy. In other words, KID functions as a political educational institution and develops and expands its existing Sekolah Demokrasi and PPC programs but does not become a policy advocacy or research institution. KID's focus will be on improving and expanding these existing programs. KID already has a plan to establish three new schools, including in West Papua and Aceh in the near term and several additional schools in the following years. This would be a reasonable contribution to the consolidation of democracy in Indonesia. Some stakeholders have suggested that KID should expect a backlash sooner or later from the government of Indonesia in which the

government will eventually move to stop or interfere with the Sekolah Demokrasi program. We do not share this concern, but, in this view, KID should simply expand its education programs as fast as possible because it may become much more difficult if not impossible to conduct these kinds of democracy education programs in the future.

- ***KID as Think-Tank.*** In another scenario, KID could become a policy research and advocacy organization (“think-tank”) that supports political parties, legislators and/or the government in an impartial, multiparty manner with evidence-based methods and policy research to help develop and promote public policies. In other, postauthoritarian countries, think-tanks have emerged and contributed to democratization by helping the new, democratic government and political parties. This would help political parties in Indonesia to address their weaknesses in developing and advocating specific public policies, as in agriculture, health and education. KID would draw on the independent, creative intellectuals and academics who comprise its board and membership and would build on its access to political leaders and government officials. KID could become a policy research organization while maintaining its role as an educational institution.
- ***KID as Membership-Based Advocacy Coalition.*** Drawing on its local partner organizations and alumni, including the Community Committees, KID could become a nationwide network of local advocacy NGOs. In this scenario, KID would develop a mass base of members and supporters.

We understand that KID is currently working under the first scenario. Accordingly, we recommend that, at a minimum, KID should focus on the improving and expanding existing programs in accordance with the recommendations above. But even as KID focuses on these programmatic challenges, we also urge the organization to work simultaneously on its own institutionalization in accordance with our specific institutional development recommendations.

KID’s involvement with political parties through the PPC program may lead to opportunities to provide advice or research support on institutional reform, internal party building and policy issues. A program to assist the political parties will have to explain how it can help them to respond to pressure for accountability and constituent services from citizens and the public at large.

D. Concluding Observations

This document has attempted to address above the questions posed in the “Terms of Reference for a peer review of the 2008 Evaluation of the NIMD-supported Country Programme of KID in Indonesia” (January 2009). Here we offer some concluding observations in response to some of the key questions in the Terms of Reference.

Core Objectives

As noted above, the NIMD program focuses on three core objectives: (1) reinforcing a multiparty political system; (2) strengthening the institutionalization of political parties; and (3) enhancing the relationship between political and civil society.

Initially, NIMD’s program in Indonesia, which created democracy schools, focused primarily on the third of these objectives, enhancing the relationship between political and civil society. As discussed above, the project has enhanced that relationship directly and meaningfully in the places it has operated. It has trained and shared values with young people from civil society organizations who have become more politically active in those organizations or have become more directly involved in politics. It has introduced young people to the ways and means of political parties and government and has built bridges among the individuals representing diverse sectors of society. It has resulted in alumni who are a tangible output of the program and an increasingly large and potentially valuable resource in their communities. For the individuals and local civic organizations involved in the program, it has helped to establish a new democratic paradigm that sees politics as a way to develop and improve people’s lives, including improving public services and ensuring citizens’ rights.

The Sekolah Demokrasi program has also contributed in a similar way and to a similar extent to the objective of reinforcing a multiparty political system by educating students about the values of multiparty democracy and preparing them in some way for more effective participation in multiparty politics. It has contributed to strengthening political parties by training individuals prepared to participate directly in party activities.

Because of its local nature, however, the Sekolah Demokrasi program cannot claim to have enhanced the relationship between political and civil society or to have reinforced multiparty politics or the institutionalization of political parties at a macro or national level. The evaluation team has expressed concerns about the challenges of expanding the project’s impact. Accordingly, we have urged greater focus on cost-effectiveness and development of a strategy for scaling up and mainstreaming. We recommend that KID consider collaboration with educational, governmental, civil society and political institutions. We further recommend that KID develop a policy for unsolicited requests for new democracy schools and consider “open source” options, sharing its curriculum, and on-line options. Such efforts would have the potential to increase the macro-level impact on strengthening relations between political and civil society.

By its initial choice not to engage with political parties, NIMD chose not to directly address the goals relating to the multiparty system and the institutionalization of parties until sometime after it had begun working in Indonesia. Subsequently, through the Political Party Consultation program and other activities, NIMD and KID have taken some significant steps toward reinforcing the multiparty system, both by engaging the parties directly and by addressing important questions of public policy and institutional reform. The

PPC program has done less to strengthen parties themselves, mostly because it has not made this a focus and has not engaged the parties on issues of internal reform or institutional strengthening, but the program provides a platform for doing so. Because and to the extent the program engages party leaders at a national level, there are real opportunities for macro-level impact. The extent of that impact to date is debatable, but there have been important steps in the right direction, and NIMD and KID now have an unusual opportunity to build on their past efforts in a way that will contribute meaningfully not only to discussions that reinforce multiparty democracy but that also engage parties on issues of internal party strengthening and reform. That effort itself will also reinforce multiparty democracy and the link between citizens and the parties and elected officials who represent them or, in other words, between civil and political society.

Summary of Recommendations

This report makes a number of recommendations. This section briefly repeats and summarizes some of these recommendations, organized according to some key questions in the evaluation's terms of reference.

Ownership

The report makes several recommendations that go to the question of program ownership. We commend NIMD for actively encouraging and assisting KID to better institutionalize itself and become a more professional organization. NIMD has also demonstrated genuine commitment to local ownership of the programs in Indonesia.

As we note, it is critically important for KID and NIMD to maintain their commitment to a genuine partnership based on mutual respect and a common agenda. The challenge will be how to implement this partnership regarding both strategic issues related to financing, sustainability and scaling up the program and practical issues such as communication, finances and reporting. We recommend that the two organizations institutionalize the agreements they made at their February 2007 meeting in Malang, including a schedule for consultations and procedures for communications, strategy development, program planning, reporting, monitoring and evaluation, and finances. We further recommend that NIMD and KID should review together whether their partnership has operated in a manner consistent with the understandings they reached in Malang and should look again at operating procedures and mechanisms.

We also recommend that KID should pay greater attention to the interests of local Implementing Agency organizations in ownership of the program. Much as NIMD should encourage its Indonesian partner to drive the program, the Jakarta-based KID should continue to work to take account of the interests and views of its local partners.

Institutional Capacity of KID

In the body of the report above, we make a number of recommendations regarding the possibilities for the development of the institutional capacity of KID in relation to the future expansion of the KID program. We encourage KID to pay greater attention to institutional development by building on its recent positive steps in this area, including the adoption of new statutes and bylaws, the recruitment of an executive director, and the implementation of a number of new operating procedures. We encourage KID's board and stakeholders to consider their long-term vision for the organization, as this will largely drive the nature of future expansion. We also encourage KID to increase its pub-

lic profile and visibility, through public events, publications and media alerts. And we encourage KID to continue to diversify its sources of funding and strategic partners to ensure the sustainability and scaling up its programs.

Indicators to Measure Impact

We also recommend that KID strengthen its internal monitoring and evaluation practices, build its database of information about Sekolah Demokrasi alumni, and more systematically collect input from program participants and alumni. We recommend that KID consider conducting surveys for evaluation purposes, including baseline surveys and post-course surveys to enable comparisons of knowledge about relevant course topics. We also suggest a satisfaction survey of alumni and students that asks directly about opinions about and recommendations for the program. These two types of surveys will provide program-level indicators to measure impact.

We also suggest that KID and/or NIMD consider designing and implementing some kind of more rigorous “impact evaluation,” which would involve baseline and subsequent surveys of (a) communities with Sekolah Demokrasi programs and (b) other, similar communities to serve as controls. This would potentially enable stronger inferences about the program’s real impact on local communities. Impact evaluations, including evaluations using randomized, quasi-experimental and similar designs, have the potential to allow donors and implementers to better assess the effects of particular programs by controlling for factors in the external environment that might affect the results of a program. By identifying control groups, taking measurements on important indicators for the control and participant groups both before and after the program, and using randomization or other statistical techniques to minimize unintentional bias in the results, donors and implementers can learn much more about what impact their programs have had, whether those programs are worth continuing, and how they can be improved. The development of meaningful indicators for this kind of study would be a considerable challenge, but they would undoubtedly include comparisons of awareness of democratic concepts, measures of local activism, and evaluation of the extent of constructive engagement between local political and civil society.

With regard to indicators of KID’s institutional development, we suggest the development of benchmarks on institutional development, role and financing. This includes, for example, the extent of external financing and the number of Indonesian partners, in both the civic education and party consultation programs.

Macro-level indicators for democracy programs are even more difficult, not least because of the tremendous problem of attribution of cause and effect. Nevertheless, over time the effect of the NIMD/KID civic education programs can be measured in part by following the accomplishments and public-spirited engagements of graduates; assessing the impact on local communities as suggested above; seeing the extent of buy-in and interest from Indonesian educational, political, governmental and other institutions; and, ultimately at least at the local level where programs have operated, measuring public attitudes toward political parties and democracy. For programs engaging political parties and political elites, indicators will include the extent to which parties commit to institutional and party reforms and that party leaders involved pursue constructive, policy-based politics.

Some of these indicators of impact can and should be quantitative in nature, but many will not be. It is equally important to make well-informed qualitative judgments about program impact.

Cost-Effectiveness and Absorption Capacity

We make recommendations above about increasing the effectiveness of the allocation of the budget. We note our view that significant economies of scale will be hard to achieve using the current model, and thus we suggest consideration for providing less intensive opportunities to a greater number of students and to how to reduce costs, such as by modifying the curriculum, to increase the chances of expanding the project to significantly more locations with additional funds. We also encourage KID and NIMD to develop a strategy for expanding the program. KID or local Implementing Agencies could establish partnerships or other relationships with other local institutions committed to democratization and democracy education. KID and its local partners might also consider increasing the number of students educated, perhaps by increasing the average class size, reducing the length of the program in order to be able to educate more students, and/or developing some kind of short version of the curriculum. We also encourage KID to consider collaboration with other institutions with an interest or a potential interest in democracy and political education. Working with other organizations would certainly present new challenges, including requiring KID to yield at least some control of the product and necessarily changing the nature of the course to some degree, but partnerships of some kind are essential to expanding the significance and impact of the program.

Moreover, there are indeed limits on the capacity of KID to absorb funds and dramatically scale up its activities. KID continues to rely on the efforts and active engagement of a relatively small number of individuals from its board, and it has had difficulty recruiting and retaining an executive director. Above, we recommend continued attention to these issues of internal governance and to modestly expanding the professional staff, in particular for the PPC program. Regardless of these steps, because of limits on its absorptive capacity, it will be necessary for KID to expand its partnerships with national and local-level Indonesian organizations in order to expand the reach and the impact of the programs.

NIMD's Capacity to Manage the Relationship with KID

NIMD seems to have the capacity to effectively manage the relationship with KID. Having a program officer who speaks Bahasa Indonesia and a larger team that is familiar with the country and the program, as NIMD does, goes a long way. There is no obvious need to expand or change the nature of this team; indeed, greater local ownership over time should reduce the need for so much direct involvement from The Hague. At the same time, it is important for NIMD to have the back office staff and systems necessary to provide effective administrative and financial support to the project. And NIMD must have the necessary support for the program from its own authorizing environment in The Netherlands.

APPENDIX A:

COMMENTS ON PREVIOUS EVALUATION

After completing its field work and the first draft of this current evaluation, the team reviewed the Final Draft Report of the *Evaluation of the NIMD-Supported Country Program of KID in Indonesia*, dated August-September 2008 (the “previous evaluation”). We understand that there were one or more earlier drafts of this previous evaluation, but our comments only address the Final Draft Report.

The previous evaluation includes much valuable analysis and reflects considerable knowledge of Indonesia, the project and development issues. Moreover, many of the findings of the previous evaluation are consistent with our subsequent findings. At the same time, the previous evaluation seems overly critical of KID’s board, management and institutional development and often less-than-constructive in its tone. We make some specific comments about the previous evaluation in the following paragraphs.

Section 1. The Indonesian Democratization Process. After concluding in its review of Indonesia’s experience with reform over the past decade that that the “party system is closed” and that there is a “need for social movements and popular and civic organizations to form ‘democratic political blocks’,” the previous evaluation complains that this need is “only marginally reflected in the strategic objectives” of the NIMD-KID program (p.6). Unless one wholly and unequivocally accepts the previous evaluation’s arguably idiosyncratic analysis, this does not seem to be a fair criticism. Likewise, the “key evaluation finding” that “NIMD is not intimately familiar with contemporary analyses of the position of political parties in Indonesia” (p. 8) is gratuitous and not supported by any prior statements or findings.

In the subsection on “Strategic Program Objectives,” the previous evaluation questions the Sekolah Demokrasi program’s focus on skills development, rather than encouraging political activism. While this is a useful observation, we did not find that “Students are discouraged to engage in political or ‘activist’ activities as the schools are thought to remain ‘neutral’ and cannot afford to be associated with such activities” (p. 9). Rather, we found real interest in encouraging meaningful local political engagement of both individuals and community committees, even if there was some ambivalence about the appropriate relationship of KID to the latter. In its discussion in this section of party strengthening, the previous evaluation makes a useful suggestion about trying to identify “younger, mid-level party leaders” to work with (p. 10). Without getting into the nuances of the “political block strategy” being advocated, this is not too dissimilar to our recommendation to look for individual party reformers to involve in party consultations. At the same time, the previous evaluation also asserts that this is not really appropriate for KID, absent major changes in KID’s approach, but we do not agree; as we have discussed, we can certainly envision KID engaging more directly with parties and on party strengthening activities.

Importantly, although we might share some reservations about the academic approach of the schools, as indicated by our own analysis above, we have more confidence in the program’s potential to build bridges between civil and political society, at least at the local level.

Section 2.2. The Democracy School Program. The previous evaluation's suggestion to consider the "possibility of moving towards a school franchise system" (p.17) is consistent with the thrust of our suggestions about how to potentially increase impact. We also made a suggestion similar to the previous evaluation's finding that "KID may want to revisit its policy to create balanced representation from the four pillars" (p. 17), although our reasoning was less a criticism and more a suggestion about how potentially to increase focus and impact. We do not share formalistic concerns about "applying standard practices from the formal educational sector in a non-formal institutional environment" or that "KID issues education certificates without being registered or licensed . . ." (p. 17). This seems like a relatively trivial concern. We have recommended, however, that KID consider whether the democracy school concept would fit within existing formal educational structures. We also do not understand the recommendation for KID to "reconsider its selection criteria . . . to create more cohesiveness in outreach" (p. 17); whatever criticism this is intended to imply, it does not seem supported by any analysis in the previous evaluation, and we did not find any notable problems with the process of selecting students.

Section 2.3. The Community Committees Program. The previous evaluation notes, as did we, KID's ambivalence about the community committees. Indeed, NIMD and KID itself fully acknowledge this ambivalence. We agree that community committees may not be effective as civil society organizations, and we have suggested greater emphasis on activities to support the democracy schools. But despite the skepticism of the previous evaluation (p. 18), it seems based on our interviews that such committees have in fact found opportunities to serve as local mediating institutions. We agree that it might make sense to expand the membership of KID to include community committees and/or democracy school alumni.

Section 2.4. The Cross-Cutting Program. Although we did not focus a lot of attention on the cross-cutting program *per se*, we agree with the previous evaluation that such efforts "perform satisfactorily" to enhance KID's visibility as well as that KID should consider greater cooperation with other organizations (p. 20). Indeed, we have encouraged more efforts to increase KID's profile.

Section 2.5. The Political Party Consultation Program. We share the previous evaluation's finding that the political parties "do not appear to be very enthusiastic" about the PPC program and that they have not been able to "insert any sense of vision or direction" (p. 20). But we did not understand KID to be uncomfortable with its facilitating role in party consultations as "increasing[ly] incompatible with its evolved identity as an education institution" (p. 20), and we disagree with the recommendation of the previous evaluation to phase out the PPC program (p. 21). Rather, we have urged additional attention to this program. Indeed, because we agree with the previous evaluation's observation that ". . . the idea to work with parties in order to strengthen their capacities and foster interparty cooperation remains an interesting yet challenging strategic option" (p. 21), we have recommended consideration of moving the program in this direction.

Section 2.6. Program Sustainability. As our findings indicate, we agree with some of the previous evaluation's observations about program sustainability, including the importance of cost-effectiveness (value-for-money) and the likely limitations on additional funding. We also agree with the suggestion that KID has been too cautious in responding to demand for democracy education services and in interacting with political parties and

CSOs (p. 24). Without implying any criticism, we agree with the suggestions of increasing diversity on the KID board, expanding KID's association membership, and hiring (and retaining) a strong executive director.

Sections 3.1 and 3.2. *The Evolution of KID and The Evolution of the KID-NIMD Partnership.* It was beyond our terms of reference to rehash the circumstances that led to the separation with INSIST and the establishment of KID, but we can say that many of the people we talked to disagree with the version of this history as laid out in the previous evaluation. Thus, we do not agree that the cause of the problem was simply that INSIST had "little experience and affinity with" a second model of development partnership in which donors play an active role in program planning and often in program management and supervision (p. 28). Nor, for that matter, do we accept that there are only two basic models of development partnership, which seems overly pedantic, or that confusion over which model applied explains alleged difficulties with program ownership. Likewise, we do not share the view that, by accepting recommendations and involvement from NIMD, KID was somehow waiving or confusing its ownership rights in the program. We do agree, as we have said above in different words, that KID should apply the "same partnership concept to its own implementing agencies" (p. 30). NIMD and KID have already effectively addressed the nature of their partnership going forward.

Section 3.3. *KID's Institutional Performance.* As our evaluation makes clear, we agree about the importance of institutional accountability and transparency, although we are less inclined to attribute or imply improper motives. We agree that KID needs to address institutional governance issues and that NIMD should continue to insist on such reforms.

Section 3.4. *Cost-Effectiveness.* We share concerns about cost-effectiveness, although we do not feel we have enough information to be as critical or definitive as is the previous evaluation.

Section 4. *Conclusions and Lessons Learned.* In our report, we have attempted to provide constructive and, to the extent possible, specific recommendations.

The previous evaluation provides much interesting, trenchant analysis and many useful observations. At least in its final version, its findings are often consistent with those of the current team. The previous team, however, derives some of its more important conclusions from formalistic models of development and a particular, reasonably pessimistic, arguably idiosyncratic analysis of Indonesia's democratic transition, much of which we do not agree with. In its criticism of KID, the previous evaluation implies without apparent foundation improper motives. While we share a number of findings, we have a much more benign view of the difficulties to date and are more optimistic about the potential for the project to contribute to democratic development in Indonesia going forward.

APPENDIX B: LIST OF INTERVIEWS

Netherlands Institute for Multiparty Democracy

Roel van Meijenfeldt
Pepijn Gerrits
Will Derks
Annie van de Pas
Jos van Gennip, Board Member
Benny Subianto, Consultant, Jakarta

Indonesian Community for Democracy (KID)

Ignas Kleden, Chairman
Ratih Hardjono, Secretary General
Rustam Ibrahim, Treasurer
Asmara Nababan, Board Member and former acting Executive Director
Riza Primahendra, Executive Director
Henny Soelistyowati, Program Manager
Muh. Fajar, Program Officer, PPC
Josephine Shanti, Office Manager
Reza Simamora, Finance Officer
Anita Lie, Board Member
Kresnayana Yahya, Board Member
Ruhani Dzuriatun, Board Member
Thamrin Tomagola, Former NSC Member

International Community

Robin Bush, The Asia Foundation
Rainer Heufers, Friedrich Naumann Foundation
Muhamad Husain, UNDP
Kevin O'Rourke, Reformasi Information Services
Paul Rowland, National Democratic Institute
Adam Schmidt, International Foundation for Election Systems (IFES)
Barbara Smith, U.S. Agency for International Development
Kate Somvongsiri, U.S. Agency for International Development
David Timberman, Management Systems International
Florian Witt, European Union
Paul Ymkers, Embassy of the Netherlands

Political Parties (Jakarta)

Marzuki Darusman, Golkar
Budiman Sudjatmiko, PDIP
Laoly Yasson, PDIP

Tangerang Sekolah Demokrasi

Arie Sujito, IRE (implementing agency)
Sigit (organizer)
Choirul Huda (alumnus)

Malang/Batu Sekolah Demokrasi

Heri Setiono (organizer)
Bangun Setiyawan Nugroho, Malang State University (participant)
Darmawan (participant)
Habib Maulana Ayik Hidayatullah (participant)
Happy Budi Febriasih, Averroes Community
Sutomo, Averroes Community
Khoirul Anwar

Banyuasin/Palembang Sekolah Demokrasi

Tarech Rasyid (organizer)
Rina Bakri, Executive director, Yayasan Puspa (organizer)
Defry (participant)
Prana (young journalist and alumna)

APPENDIX C:

BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION ON EVALUATORS

ERIC BJORNRLUND

Eric Bjornlund is co-founder and president of Democracy International, a U.S.-based consulting firm specializing in international democracy and governance assistance. A lawyer and development professional with two decades of international experience, Mr. Bjornlund has designed and managed democratic development programs in 35 countries in Africa, Asia, Europe and Eurasia, and the Middle East. From 1989 to 2000, Mr. Bjornlund worked for the National Democratic Institute for International Affairs (NDI) in various senior positions, including as Senior Associate and Asia Director.

Mr. Bjornlund began working on domestic election monitoring, civil-military and civic education programs in Indonesia in the mid-1990s. From 1999 to 2000, he served as NDI Country Director in Indonesia and oversaw a comprehensive program in support of Indonesia's transition to democracy, including domestic and international election monitoring, constitutional and law reform, anticorruption, political party development, legislative process, decentralization and regional autonomy, civil-military relations, and civil society advocacy. In 2004, as Field Office Director for The Carter Center in Indonesia, he designed and directed comprehensive election monitoring program for Indonesia's first direct presidential elections. In recent years, in addition to the recent evaluation for NIMD, Mr. Bjornlund has also conducted a series of assessments and evaluations in Indonesia for USAID, including a political party assessment, (2002), a local government program evaluation (2006), an assessment of local elections, including elections in Aceh (2005), an assessment of election administration and election dispute resolution mechanisms (2007), and a broad democracy and governance assessment and strategy (2008). He has served as a technical expert and senior advisor for Democracy International's three multiyear programs in Indonesia: the Democratic Reform Support Program, the Local Government Support Program (including support for local elections in Aceh and other provinces), and Annual National Opinion Polling for USAID.

Mr. Bjornlund has written and spoken extensively about transitional and postconflict elections, democratization, legal reform and international democracy promotion. He is author of *Beyond Free and Fair: Monitoring Elections and Building Democracy* (Wilson Center Press and Johns Hopkins University Press, 2004) as well as numerous book chapters, articles, essays and reports. Mr. Bjornlund has testified on many occasions before the U.S. Congress as well as before the United Nations. He has spoken at conferences and universities throughout the world and has appeared often on television and radio programs as an expert commentator.

For four years earlier in his career, Mr. Bjornlund practiced corporate and international law at Ropes & Gray in Boston, Massachusetts, one of the largest law firms in the United States. He holds a Juris Doctor from Columbia University in New York, New York; a Master in Public Administration from John F. Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University in Cambridge, Massachusetts; and a Bachelor of Arts *magna cum laude* from Williams College in Williamstown, Massachusetts.

SUGENG BAHAGIJO

Sugeng Bahagijo is associate director of Prakarsa, a policy research NGO based in Jakarta, where he manages a multiyear research and training program supported by the Ford Foundation (role of the state, public service and welfare), Novib (the governance of globalization) and EED (pro poor budget and the legislative role). From 2006 to 2007 Mr. Bahagijo served as Policy Advisor to the Coordinating Ministry for Social Welfare of Indonesia on mainstreaming poverty reduction strategy and human development, and from 2004 to 2005 he was Technical Advisor to the State Minister for National Development Planning (Bappenas) (Deputy Minister for Regional Autonomy and Regional Cooperation). He was a Visiting Fellow at the Institute of Development Studies (IDS), The University of Sussex, Brighton, UK in 2004 and a Research Intern at Human Rights Watch/Asia in New York, USA in 1996-97.

Mr. Bahagijo has been working on issues such as human rights, debt issues, and international financial institutions. He has written articles and op-eds on pro-poor budget and social policies. He is co-author of *Mimpi Negara Kesejahteraan: Telaah Dinamika Peran Negara dalam Produksi dan Alokasi Kesejahteraan* (The Dynamics of the Welfare State, and its Relevant for Indonesia) (Jakarta: LP3ES, 2006), a book on the dynamics of social policy and the welfare state. He also edited *Globalisasi Menghempas Indonesia* (The Governance of globalization and the place of Indonesia) (Jakarta: LP3ES, 2006), a book on governance of globalization and the position of Indonesia. Mr. Bahagijo studied philosophy, human rights and international policy at Gadjah Mada University, Yogyakarta.