



Graduate School of Development Studies

**An analysis of Program IKUTT:  
(Its design, implementation and proposing evaluation  
method)**

A Research Paper presented by:

***Yecin Apriana***  
(Indonesia)

In partial fulfillment of the requirements for obtaining the degree of  
MASTERS OF ARTS IN DEVELOPMENT STUDIES

Specialization:  
**[Public Policy and Management]  
(PPM)**

Members of the examining committee:

Dr. Ria Brouwers [Supervisor]  
Dr. Barbara Lehmbruch [Reader]

The Hague, The Netherlands  
November, 2011

***Disclaimer:***

This document represents part of the author's study programme while at the Institute of Social Studies. The views stated therein are those of the author and not necessarily those of the Institute.

Research papers are not made available for circulation outside of the Institute.

***Inquiries:***

Postal address:           Institute of Social Studies  
                                  P.O. Box 29776  
                                  2502 LT The Hague  
                                  The Netherlands

Location:                 Kortenaerkade 12  
                                  2518 AX The Hague  
                                  The Netherlands

Telephone:               +31 70 426 0460

Fax:                       +31 70 426 0799

## Acknowledgement

When I am writing this part, such mixed feelings come along from the nervousness, exhausted, sadness and relieved. This is almost the end of my MA journey in which I have learnt a lot. I would like to acknowledge supports that I have received during this precious time of my live.

This research is impossible without the supports from my interviewees: the beneficiaries of program IKUTT, field assistants, vets, program leaders, head of departments, sub-districts head and government officers at Bappeda office. Their willingness to share their thoughts and time is really appreciated. This research is also indebt to my friend Tri Afriliani (ayuk Ani) at 'dinas peternakan and perikanan' who accompanied me to the fields with her motorbike even to the village which was difficult to access by, also the one who helped me to access the documents and information at department of animal husbandry and fishery. I thank to my friends at Bappeda office for their moral supports. This work owes my friend in Canada for giving assistance as proof reader.

Moreover, this research is hardly to accomplish without supervising from my supervisor Ria Brouwers and feedback from my second reader Barbara Lehmbuch. I still remember the moral support that my supervisor gave me when I thought that my work is hard to be done. "Put in your mind that you can do it and it is doable", I will always remember this sentence as it is a motivation for me to accomplish this work.

I would not come to this stage without being insane if there was no support from my Indonesian friends and other colleagues at ISS. Kak Anna Ningsih and family in Belgium, I owe you many thanks for giving me a place at your home and cooking me banana pancake whenever I stress out with my work.

Last but not least and most importantly, I dedicate this work to my beloved Mama and Papa who always support me and spell my name anytime in their prayers for my best wishes. I will always remember the support that my mom gave at my most weak moment "diploma is not the most important thing, it is the knowledge and learning processes matter. Just do your best and don't give up". This is the best motivation I ever got and finally I am on my way to finish this study but not for the learning processes as it will keep continuing as long as I still want to learn.

I hope this work will be useful for the policy practises especially for the local government in Indonesia to take a look at its program design, implementation and monitoring and evaluation method, and learn from it in order to do improvement in the future.

# Contents

Acknowledgement	iii
List of Tables	vi
List of Acronyms	vii
Abstract	viii
<b>Chapter 1 Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Background	1
1.2 Relevance and justification	3
1.3 Research objectives and questions	3
1.4 Methodology	4
Study on documents and literature	4
Methods of data collection and research scope	4
1.5 Research challenges	6
1.6 Structure of the paper	6
<b>Chapter 2 Conceptual Framework</b>	<b>7</b>
2.1 Public policy	7
2.2 Logical framework approach (LFA)	8
2.3 Monitoring and evaluation (M&E)	12
Theory based-evaluation (TBE)	14
2.4 Lesson learn	15
<b>Chapter 3 Program IKUTT's Design Analysis</b>	<b>16</b>
3.1 Program ikutt in brief	16
Its description	16
Its interrelated to higher governments	18
3.2 Its program matrix	19
Analysis of program ikutt's matrix in RPJMD	19
Analysis of program matrix for dairy cattle sub-program and its coherence to RPJMD.	20
Analysis of program matrix for cocoa plantation sub-program and its coherence to RPJMD.	21
3.3 The nature of the program	22
<b>Chapter 4 Program IKUTT Implementation</b>	<b>28</b>
4.1 The implementers and beneficiaries' perception of the program	28
For dairy cattle sub-program	28
For cocoa sub-program	29
4.2 The unintended outcomes	30
4.3 The implementation process	31

4.4	Monitoring and evaluation (M&E) activities	35
<b>Chapter 5</b>	<b>Lesson learn, recommendation and proposing different evaluation method</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>Chapter 6</b>	<b>Conclusion</b>	<b>39</b>
Appendices		41
	Appendix I Program Planning Design of Dairy Cattle agribusiness Development program 2007 (Operational guidance Version)	41
	Appendix II Program Planning Matrix of “Dairy Cattle Agribusiness Development Program 2007” (Head of the Department and Program Leader’s Perspective)	43
	Appendix III Program Planning Matrix Of “Dairy Cattle Agribusiness Development Program 2007” (Beneficiaries’ Perspective)	45
	Appendix IV Program Planning Design Of Cocoa Plantation sub-Program 2006 (Operational Guidance Version)	47
	Appendix V program Planning Matrix Of Plantation (Cocoa) Program 2006 (Head of plantation department’s and program leader’s perspective)	49
	Appendix VI Program Planning Matrix Of Cocoa Plantation sub-Program 2006 (Beneficiaries’ perspective)	51
	Appendix VII Source of information	53
References		54

## List of Tables

Table 1: Logframe/program matrix	10
Table 2: Criteria for both sub-programs	23

## List of Acronyms

Bappeda	: Badan perencanaan pembangunan daerah (local development Planning board)
Juklak	: Petunjuk Pelaksanaan (operational guidance)
Juknis	: Petunjuk Teknis (technical guidance)
SMART	: Specific, measurable, attainable, reliable and time-bound
BPS	: Badan Pusat Statistik (statistic bureau) at local government
PAD	: Pendapatan asli daerah (local genuine income)
APBD	: Anggaran pendapatan dan belanja daerah (local income and Spending budget document) for yearly use.
UU	: Undang-undang (Indonesian law)
PP	: Peraturan Pemerintah (government regulation)

## **Abstract**

This study analyzes the design of program ikutt specifically for its two sub-programs: dairy cattle and cocoa plantation, its implementation, monitoring and evaluation method. In term of design, it analyzes whether the various official designs were complement or contradicts each other, were the designs well formulated by using logframe/program matrix and SMART indicators as analysis means and what the nature of the program/its context is.

Furthermore, in term of implementation, it will analyze the implementers and beneficiaries' perception of the program, the program's implementation (the stages and breaking down points) and the unintended outcomes. Lastly it analyzes the monitoring and evaluation method in term of how the program was monitored and evaluated. At the end this study will describe the lesson learns and the recommendation also propose a different evaluation method from what local government used to.

The findings confirm that the designs are poorly and incomplete formulated although on the other hand they are complement each other. The implementers and beneficiaries perceived the program almost in line with the official design and complement each other as well. Furthermore, few stages were taken to implement the program and few breaking down points were occurred. The program, beside its official objectives also generates unintended outcomes which were revealed by the beneficiaries and the field assistants. The monitoring and evaluation concepts were miss-perceived by the policy formulator and evaluators and it was conducted in traditional/implementation method. Therefore, there were lessons learn and recommendations for further improvement also propose a different method for evaluation than the local government used to.

## **Relevance to Development Studies**

The study contributes to the policy more in term of practical atmosphere. It analyzes the program almost at all its stages from design although without seeing its decision making process, its implementation, monitoring and evaluation stages by using some concepts which at the end will contribute to the improvement of the policy in practical atmosphere. Analyzing the practical might contribute for more in-depth policy discussion as a science, in which a concept might be improved based on the findings at the practical atmosphere.

## **Keywords**

Program IKUTT, LFA, Program Planning Matrix/Logframe, dairy cattle sub-program, cocoa sub-program, official design, narrative summary, SMART analysis, mean of verification, risks/assumptions, implementation, breaking down points, lesson learned, recommendation, monitoring and evaluation.





# Chapter 1

## Introduction

### 1.1 Background

Poverty is one of a big issue faced by developing countries like Indonesia. There were many policies, programs or interventions have been formulated, implemented and evaluated to address the issue. It is stipulated in Indonesia development notion that the highest objective of development conducted is to increase the people's welfare.

In order to achieve this objective, Indonesia formulated its development plan into three terms: the longest term formulated for twenty years plan which then elaborated into a mid-term plan for five years and lastly it will be elaborated into a yearly plan. These terms apply to all levels of governments either at the central/national, provincial or at the local.

The local government nowadays has a wide authority and being autonomous to define their development programs, policies or strategies without any interference from central or provincial government especially after the reformation movement in 1999. There was a significant change for the development system at that time from a centralized to decentralized system, from top-down to mixed between top-down and bottom-up approaches. It is a right for local to define their developments without being steered by central government as they know what best and needed by the people. Although the local governments are autonomous, they still get financial support from central government to finance their development and their development plan must be coherence to the national plan.

Kepahiang district autonomously formulated various policies and programs to increase the welfare of its people and one of them was a policy called 'program ikutt'. The program encompassed four core programs: fishery, agriculture and horticulture, plantation and animal husbandry in five years from 2006 to 2010. The government envisaged the living condition of its people which vulnerable to poverty as majority of them are coffee farmers and having a fluctuated live. Hence, this condition needs to be changed and one of the ways was by conducting program ikutt, and it became a core program for the last five years. Changing the farmers' living condition was one of the reasons why the program was conducted.

Program ikutt was formulated by a new established district which faces many constraints especially in formulating, implementing and evaluating a program. The government conducting it as a 'learning by doing' process therefore there must be weaknesses of the design it self, the implementation process and also the monitoring and evaluation method.

The program has a noble aim to increase the people's welfare by increasing their domestic income. However, the aim is not the focus of this paper. Weather or not the aim or purpose of the program was attained is not assessed in this research. Moreover, the formulation process in term of how the program was formulated, who were the stakeholders involved and what

their interests are not assessed either. This paper focus on something that more interesting than just assessing the result of the program. It sees the matters/concerns that play an important role and contribute in attaining the program's objectives which is the design, the implementation process and the monitoring and evaluation. The research will focus analyzing two of its sub-programs: dairy cattle and cocoa plantation.

Europe Aid (2001:10) mentions that there were few factors influence the objectives attainment such as a good or careful planned program, interests are represented fairly through participation, efficient project management, competent and motivated project team, institution capacity, fair allocation of cost and benefit between women and men, clear defined beneficiaries, committed involved people and lastly the project/program addresses real problem concerned by the targeted people.

In the same line, Ortengren (2004:7) also argues slightly similar in which he mentioned those factors are such as the commitment from involved parties, clear roles for involved parties, objectives are realistic, specific and clear objective hierarchy, management team has capacity to conduct the program and deal with risks, flexible to adjust and beneficiaries willing to participate.

Based on the factors mentioned above, it can be said that a clear/well written design and implementation influence the attainment of program. The objectives of any program will be hardly attained if the design is not clear or vaguely formulated, if there were many challenges occurred in the implementation process and also if the monitoring and evaluation are miss-perceived and less useful.

Inline with this understanding, therefore, it is interesting to find out about program ikutt design, how well formulated it is, do the various documents that it has complement or maybe even conflicted each other and lastly what the context of the program is. It is also interesting to find out about its implementation such as how the implementers and beneficiaries perceived the program as different perception about the program may derive them from attaining the official objectives, also what stages it has been through as a mean to attain the objectives, what were the breaking down points and as the program was formulated in a sense to focus on written objectives therefore, the unintended outcomes were missing and it is interesting also to know what the unintended outcomes were. Moreover, how the program was monitored and evaluated is also interested to know.

In order to get the answer for the concerns above, the logical framework analysis (LFA) specifically its program matrix will be used to analyze the program matrix of program ikut official designs. It will assess its narrative summary, its indicators, means of verification and the assumption. The SMART analysis will also be used to analyze the design.

The implementation will be analyzed by finding out what actually happened in the field through interviews and observations. The monitoring and evaluation will be analyzed from the design and also from the practices in the field.

The findings confirm that the official designs are still need to improve, the implementation also has few breaking down points, the monitoring and

evaluation concepts are even miss-perceived. All of these findings will be discussed in-depth in further chapters. The findings at the end can become lessons learn and therefore some recommendations are also suggested for further improvement as similar program may be conducted in the future.

## **1.2 Relevance and justification**

This research analyzes the design of the program, its implementation and monitoring and evaluation (M&E) method. It will capture the weaknesses of the design, the actors' perception of the program, the breaking down points in implementations, the unintended outcomes, and the monitoring and evaluation method which these are concerned in policy study especially in term of policy cycle. Therefore, analyzing these concerns will give a picture about the program at all stages which the weaknesses and breaking downs of the program will be revealed such as what works and what does not work, also what should be done. The finding about these concerns will become as lessons learn and will be very useful in formulating, implementing, monitoring and evaluating a better program in the future.

Personally speaking, this research is very important for me as a person who works in an institution which responsible in formulating, monitoring and evaluating programs conducted in a district level of government. This research is also important to my colleagues who work in the same field as me at different offices. We all, formulated, implemented, monitored and evaluated our programs at the first year of the five-year development term by 'learning by doing'. And hence, as the first five-year development is finished in 2010, an evaluation is needed to take a look at the program that has been done. Unfortunately, an in-depth and academic sound evaluation has not been done yet, therefore, the question 'what happen to the beneficiaries after the program is completed' or 'how the (similar) program can be improved for its design, formulation, monitoring and evaluation' are remained unanswered. Although this research is not intended to assess the objectives attainment nor the decision making process, there will be, still, something that we can learn from our program for improvement in the future. With the political will and official willingness to learn for improvement, therefore, this research is also important for the practical atmosphere beside its academic uses.

## **1.3 Research objectives and questions**

The objectives of this research are to know the official design of program ikutt in term of its program matrix, the nature of the program, the complement/contradiction between the official designs. Moreover, it also intended to know the perception of implementers and beneficiaries about its program's matrix, the program's implementation in term of its stages and breaking downs also the unintended outcome. This research is intended to get a picture about the monitoring and evaluation method conducted for the program. Lastly, the objective is also to know the lessons learn, recommendation and proposes different method of evaluation as well.

In relation to the research objectives, there are few main questions in this research:

1. What is written in its program matrix and how well formulated is it?
2. Were the official designs complement or contradict each other?
3. What is the nature of the program/its context?
4. Were the implementers and beneficiaries having the same perception of the program's matrix as formulated in the official design?
5. How was the program implemented, what were the breaking down points and what were the unintended outcomes?
6. How was the program monitored and evaluated and what different evaluation method can be proposed?

## **1.4 Methodology**

### ***Study on documents and literature***

For the purpose of this research, few documents and literature were studied. I looked through the official documents related to the topic and also few regulations on Indonesia development system to support and understand the system works in Indonesia. The regulations are UU number 25 year 2004 about national development planning system, UU number 32 year 2004 about local government and PP number 8 year 2008 about stages, mechanisms, control and evaluation local development planning, while the documents are the local development planning documents: RPJMD a-five-year development plan, Juklak and juknis of both sub-programs, program report (annexes) and APBD. Some of them especially the official policy documents were treated as the primary data while others were used as secondary data.

Moreover, the literature about concepts used in this research is also studied especially the literature on LFA approach, program/logframe matrix, policy analysis, monitoring and evaluation method and theory-based evaluation, lastly the study will see the pros and contras/critics using the concepts. Literature study was also used to gather data about similar topic from different research and the data will be used as secondary data.

### ***Methods of data collection and research scope***

In collecting data, the fieldwork was the main method beside documents studies. It was conducted for one month in July 2011 at Kepahiang district to two sub-programs out of four sub-programs in program ikutt: the dairy cattle and cocoa plantation sub-program.

The interview was conducted to the interviewees as follow: two head of departments: first, department of animal husbandry and fishery and second is department of forestry and plantation, two head of sub-district during the implementation phase: Kepahiang sub-district and Tebat Karai sub-district. One staff at Seberang Musi sub-district, one officer at Bappeda office, two program leaders: dairy cattle and cocoa plantation sub-program, one head of field assistant institution, one field assistant coordinator, two field assistants,

one vet, the beneficiaries (three group leaders and its members for dairy cattle sub-program and four for cocoa sub-program)<sup>1</sup>.

The interviewees chosen based on few considerations. For the head of department, was a person who involved more than two years to the program as the head of department. The program leader was a person who ever led the program for more then one year in between 2006 to 2010. The sub-district head was the person who heads the sub-district during the intervention time not the present sub-district head and also can be accessed by interviewer regarding to the transportation and safety issue. The staff is the one who involved much into the program intervention at the sub-district, he was chosen as the head of sub-district was inaccessible.

The officer at Bappeda office is the one who involved in formulation, monitoring and evaluation the program. The field assistant institution head and the coordinator are also chosen based on their involvement to the program at intervention time. Field assistant is an assistant who assists the beneficiaries more then two years from the beginning of the program. During the field work, I just can access two of them as they were less accessible because they were assisting the beneficiaries in the field, also most of them were in a recess time before extending their contract, hence, more information about their roles are gathered from their coordinator. For vet, as there are only two vets and have the same roles, hence, whomever had time for interviewed will be chosen.

The beneficiaries for dairy cattle were selected based on the number of input they received which the more beneficiaries received the more preferable they are and the input availability physically for cross checking. Moreover, the field accessibility by transportation and safety issue for interviewer to come were also taken into account. For the cocoa beneficiaries, as the intervention was implemented in all sub-districts then, the interviewees were selected randomly.

In term of sub-program selection, dairy cattle and cocoa plantation sub-program were selected because they have the official designs needed in this research and accessible, their program leaders are accessible and willing to be interviewed and both have supporting data recorded in their document. Lastly, their outputs are still available to observe which are important for cross checking unlike the other sub-programs (fishery and agriculture and horticulture).

The fieldwork was also conducted by observation to the field to cross check the program for the reality at the field. It was conducted right after the interviews taken place. The field observation was conducted to cross check the inputs and interventions given to the beneficiaries, also to observe the inputs condition after the intervention. Therefore, I went to the cocoa field and to the cattle shelter. I also went to the vet's office to observe about the medical equipment and treatment availability.

---

<sup>1</sup> See appendix vii.

## **1.5 Research challenges**

There were few challenges occurred when I conducted this research. It was hard to find all hard copy documents that I need for my research. They were less accessible because the current official does not have all of them, they were kept by the former program leaders who I hardly could access or the documents were missing as the office was moving few times, and even some of the soft copy was also inaccessible as the data was missing. Hence I just got some of them in full documents and some were just the annexes. To gather the data which was missed from the (incomplete) documents, I therefore conducted in-depth interviews with the interviewees who much involved in the program and much information was gathered from them as they were willing to share.

It was also a bit challenging to find the interviewees during the day as most of them were working at their field till the evening, but I was lucky at that time because some of them were going back home for lunch.

## **1.6 Structure of the paper**

This paper is organized in 6 chapters. Chapter one, introduction, explain the background, program ikutt brief description, the relevance and justification of this research, statement of problem, research objectives and questions, methodology, scope and limitation and the structure of the paper it self.

Chapter two, theoretical framework, explains the theory on public policy, LFA and evaluation methodologies.

Chapter three explains program ikutt design analysis, its matrix, and its context.

Chapter four, program ikutt implementation, explains the perception of implementers and beneficiaries upon the program, the unintended outcomes and the implementation process.

Chapter five consists of lesson learn, recommendation and proposing different evaluation method.

Lastly, chapter six encompasses the conclusion.

## Chapter 2

# Conceptual Framework

This chapter will discuss the concepts used in this paper in analyzing the data. The concepts encompass the explanation about public policy, logical framework approach, monitoring, evaluation and theory-based evaluation.

### 2.1 Public policy

It is necessary to know what (public) policy is before analyzing a program/policy in-depth as program itself is a policy taken by a local government to solve a problem through its interventions. It is also necessary because by understanding what public policy is, what it encompasses, what does it use for or how to take a right decision then policy formulator and implementer can use a right method or strategy in analyzing or implementing policy.

Policy can be perceived differently by different people as they see it from different perspectives. It can be seen as a mean of control from higher power authorities over the lower ones or as a mean to impose a right to participate. It can also be seen as 'adjectival policy' when it focuses on the subject concerned and how the structure of public authority deals with (Colebatch 2002:2-4).

From the approach in writing policy, it has two mainstreams: the stage or policy cycle and policy analysis (ibid:5). Parson, Bridgman and Davis in Colebatch (ibid:5) divide the former as a logical succession of steps, from problem defining, finding alternatives, evaluation of options, decision, implementation and evaluation. While the later, Jenkins-Smith in Colebatch (ibid:5) argues that it concerned with the development of a methodology to determine outcome and comparison between policies' alternative upon the outcome.

Moreover, Colebatch mentioned that policy has two dimensions: vertical and horizontal (ibid:23). Vertical dimension sees policy as rule concerned to the transmission of authorized decision downwards while horizontal sees it from the structure of action concerned to the relationship among policy participants in different institution (ibid:23).

From the perspective of aim, policy can be seen as the pursuit of goals (ibid: 49) which inline with De Leon and Vogenbeck in Fisher et al who see policy framed as problem-oriented addressing public issue and solution for it (Fischer and Miller 2007: 4). Quite similar interpretation also given by Jann and Wegrich in Fisher et al who see policy in term of policy-making which recognize the problem and contribute to the problem solving (ibid:45, 53). Spicker also argues that policy analysis begin with issues or problems and apply insight from different source to the issue or problem (Spicker 2006: 3), moreover, Knoepfel et al argue that policy is intended to solve a public problem defined by the government on its agenda (Knoepfel 2007:21).

Policy also can be seen as a course of action (Anderson cited in Colebatch 2002:49, Spicker:15), as projected program of goals, values and practices



(Laswell and Kaplan cited in Colebatch *ibid*:49, see also Spicker *ibid*:61 and (Yanow 2000:14). Moreover, policy also as course of action by government designed to achieve certain results (Bridgman and Davis in Colebatch *ibid*:49). Nagel in Dunn see it more in term of policy analysis to determine which alternative policy can achieve goals (Dunn 1986:247). Policy as argued by Friedrich in Colebatch equates goal, objective or purpose (Colebatch 2002:49). Furthermore, policies are choices made by decision-makers clearly set out in order public know (Colebatch 2002: 15).

Public policy as a term is used to refer to the substance of what government does and pattern of resources to response public problems as argued by Dearlove in Colebatch (*ibid*:16). From the definition about (public) policy above, it can be understood that policy is a decision taken by authority for public to solve problem encompasses course of actions and objectives to achieve.

In line with the understanding policy as a problem solving then it is important to find a method in policy formulation which can address this concern, a method which can define a problem concerned by public and analyze it properly with the involvement of stakeholders, an approach which can give a 'best' solution of the problem also describes what strategies or activities need to be taken to attain the objectives. Various methods can be used but, these concerns are likely can be addressed by using a logical framework approach as it encompasses all the concerns above through the stages it has. The following sub-chapter will elaborate the logical framework approach.

## **2.2 Logical framework approach (LFA)**

LFA and logframe/program matrix were used widely by donor agencies and imposed it to the recipient countries. It is an objective-oriented approach (Ortengren 2004:3, Norad 1999:4) and a useful approach for design, implementation and evaluation (Jackson 1997:3, SIDA 1996:2, ADB 1998:1, Ortengren 2004:3). It clarifies the program objectives through logical linkage between hierarchical set of its narrative summary (Cusworth and Franks 1993:15).

Moreover, Europe Aid (2001:9) elaborates LFA as a method which provides the result of systematic and logical analysis for program's objectives, as a mean to check the objectives' fulfillment and also provides the assumptions. In conducting this approach, there were nine steps taken: it starts from analysis of the project's context, followed by stakeholder analysis, problem/situation analysis, objective analysis, then plan of activities, planning the resources, set-up indicators/measurements of objectives, analysis and management of risk, lastly analysis the assumption (Ortengren 2004:7).

On the other hand, the LFA has two phases: the analysis and planning phases. The former consists of the analysis of problems, objectives and strategies while the later consists of logframe matrix, activity schedule, input and cost schedule (Jackson 1997:3, Europe Aid 2001:10-11).

The first phase of LFA is very useful for policy formulator when formulating or planning a policy. In this formulation stage, the context of a

policy, its objectives and means to achieve the objectives will be analyzed. The basic idea about using LFA in formulation/planning stage is there is a condition or situation concerned by stakeholders which can be defined as a problem which needs to be changed for better condition. This situation will be defined and analyzed by using a '*problem tree*' model and afterward there will be solution to overcome the situation also the objectives to be achieved. The objectives are analyzed by using '*objective tree*' model as the positive reverse image of '*problem tree*' model and the objective hierarchy from activities, input, output, purpose and aim will be defined (Jackson 1997:6-8, Europe Aid 2001:10-11, Ortengren 2004:8-11). There is a possibility that the problem or solutions are not perceived similarly therefore a participatory approach to planning which involves stakeholders is important. LFA is better conducted in a workshop which may give a chance to stakeholders to address their interests and come up with a consensus on what the problem they constitute important to solve, what solution or intervention can be done afterward and finally what the objectives are. The decision made might not be the best decision but at least it is a decision which can satisfy most of the stakeholders.

After defining the problem, its solution and objectives, activities will be set-up as a mean to achieve the objectives and these activities will guide the implementers in implementing the program afterward. Resources are also needed to take into account as they make the implementation become real. The resources can be as the expertise, equipments, premises, fund and time (Ortengren 2004:15).

The formulation stage is continued by identifying the indicators to measure the achievement of the program and they must be objectively verifiable (ibid:16). The risk will also be identified and the risk management needs to be set up to avoid the risk or to overcome it and this stage will be completed by analyzing the assumption (ibid).

The result of these steps is equated into 16 boxes with four rows and columns acknowledged as 'logframe matrix or program/project matrix' which summarize the projects, record the assumptions and outlines how it will be monitored (Wiggins and Shields 1995:3, Europe Aid 2004:9, Saldanha and Whittle 1998:28).

The first column is narrative summary records the hierarchy of objectives. The top is the goal followed by purpose, output and input which posit the means-ends causal link (Wiggins and Shields 1995:3, Saldanha and Whittle 1998:30-31). The narrative summary also as if-then process refers to if input then output, if output then purpose, if purpose then goal. This causal link is important for the implementation process as the objectives are explained and the ways/activities how to obtain them are also explained.

The objectives and outputs shall be formulated and fulfilling SMART notion (specific, measurable, approved, realistic and time-bound) as required in logframe matrix which acknowledged as SMART objectives (Ortengren 2004:13-14). Jackson and Europe Aid on the other hand argue that SMART notion is also used in choosing indicators acknowledged as SMART indicator. They describe it as: specific refers to measure what it is supposed to measure, while measurable refers to indicators which should be able to measure quantitatively or qualitatively. It is available at an acceptance cost or feasible in

term of financial, equipment, skill and time. Furthermore, it should be relevant to the objective and time-bound which provide information in timely term (Jackson 1997:13 and Europe aid 2001:28).

Two following columns, objectively verifiable indicator and means of verification are important for monitoring and evaluation. The former is used to measure the achievement of objectives at each level of hierarchy while the later records the information sources and method of data collection and analysis to check the achievement of the former (Wiggins and Shields 1995:3, Jackson 1997:13-14, Saldanha and Whittle 1998:29). The last column is assumption explained how actors beyond the control of project managers or owner are expected to behave and also the risk which may distract the program (Wiggins and Shields 1995:3, Saldanha and Whittle 1998:30). The matrix is seen as follow:

**Table 1:  
Logframe/program matrix**

Narrative summary	Objectively verifiable indicator (OVI)	Means of verification (OVI)	Important assumptions
Goal	Measure the goal achievement	Sources of information used	Assumptions affecting purpose-goal linkage
Purpose	Ends of project status	Sources of information used	Assumptions affecting output-purposes linkage
Outputs	Magnitude of outputs planned completion date	Sources of information used	Assumptions affecting inputs-outputs linkage
Inputs	Nature and level of resources necessary cost planed starting data	Sources of information used	Initial assumptions about the project

(Source: Coleman in Wiggins and Shields 1995:3)

The matrix has a vertical and horizontal logic (Bakewell and Garbutt 2005:3, Europe aid 2002:17, Gasper 2000:18) and Gasper explains them furthermore that vertical logic described the connection and coherence of the objectives' level and assumptions while the horizontal logic describes the connection and coherence of each level of objectives and the indicators (Gasper 2000:18).

However, it is important to distinguish between LFA as an approach and logframe matrix. Dale in Bakewell and Garbutt distinguish LFA as an

approach is the whole processes conducted from problem defining till risk/assumption analysis which these will be put in the matrix, while logframe matrix is the result/summaries of the processes (Bakewell and Garbutt 2005:2-3). This approach is likely a 'right' choice in analyzing policy as it can be used in all phases of policy from formulating, implementing and evaluating, also as it is derived from problem analysis which inline to the policy definition as problem solving.

Using LFA as an approach gives some advantages, SIDA (1996:7) argues the advantages are such as: it gives an opportunity for a dialogue between the implementing and the financing agency, it offers an analysis instrument to identify problems, needs, interest parties, opportunities and risks. It helps to set-up the activities, defines the objectives and clarifies the linkage between objectives and the means-ends process, it also creates a common approach to the project, also it facilitates follow-up, reporting and evaluation.

However, the uses of this approach were criticized by Jackson, Woodhill, Gasper, Mac Arthur and Norad as they reveal the weaknesses of the approach. Jackson (1997:4) furthermore mentions the weaknesses of LFA are: it often produces poor results and limited vision for potential solution as it is derived from problem-focused. It often used rigidly and developed after the project has been designed rather than used as a basis for design, lastly the unintended consequences are unable to be monitored.

Inline with this critics, Woodhill (2000:25) adding that LFA over focusing on problems rather than opportunities and vision, used rigidly, problem-focused, tendency to poorly thought through activities and objectives by equating it in a matrix which the significant elements of analytical process have been skipped. Lastly he argued the simple logic of LFA is often inappropriate to program level planning especially when dealing with parallel or cross cutting logic.

Moreover, Mac Arthur in Saldanha and Whittle (1998:56) criticized Logical framework system as inflexibility design, lack in addressing all stakeholders view, treating assumptions too superficially and lastly its objectives may be filled too much in detail. Norad (1999:5) criticizes LFA is rigidity used and applied as general analytical tool.

Logframe is also criticized by Gasper for its simplification, rigidity, less helpful for monitoring and evaluation especially in term of unintended effects. It faces difficulties when there are persistent differences in priorities among stakeholders. He, furthermore, criticized it as 'logic-less frames' refers to a delusion of logic provided in the matrix, as 'lack-frames' where overcrowding too much into a diagram and leave out the significant aspects of a project. Lastly, as 'lock-frame' refers to the impeding for program learning and adaptation (Gasper 2000:17-18,21). Gasper also argues that the worthy of LFA is turning down when using it for post-implementation evaluation (Gasper 2000:19).

Although LFA is being criticized so much, I argue that LFA is still a useful approach especially for goal-focused implementer and evaluators. In term of planning, LFA offers a problem solving as it starts from problem identification and continued with analyzing the best possibility to solve the problem. Moreover, it has a logical linkage between the objectives and activities as a

means-end causal to attain the objectives which is important for the implementer. In term of evaluation, it may help the evaluator in evaluating the program by using the matrix as a guideline.

I also agree to Backwell and Garbutt who argue that LFA is still the best choice among the bad options for planning and monitoring the development work, although it has weaknesses it still being used widely (Backwell and Garbutt 2005:1). LFA (ibid: 12-13) is an approach which can encourage a clear, linear and systematic thinking how to attain the goals by conducting activities which will deliver output and outcome. It provides a simple summary of key development's element consistently and coherently which enable understanding 'what is trying to do and how'. It also reaches a consensus on overall project and lastly LFA encompasses the theory of change through its narrative summary (ibid).

Concerning all the weakness and advantages that it has, LFA should not be treated rigidly but flexible for any changes during program implementation as a program it self develops (Europe Aid 2001:10, Ortengren 2004:6).

### **2.3 Monitoring and evaluation (M&E)**

M&E are two processes in policy cycle which inter-related each other as the former might complement the later. Valadez and Bamberger in Khan describe monitoring as a continuing internal management activity to ensure that the program activities conducted within a prescribed timeframe and budget to achieve the objectives, and it provides feedback for implementation's progress and the pitfalls occurred in the implementation stage (Khan 1998:311).

They explain evaluation is an internal or external management activity to assess the appropriateness of a program's design and implementation methods in achieving objectives and to assess the program's results both intended and unintended ones, also to assess the factors affecting the level and distribution of benefits produced (ibid:311).

UNDP (2002:6) is inline with this description which it defines monitoring as continuing function which presents an enduring intervention and early indication of improvement or challenges in the attainment of results. It defines Evaluation as a selective work to systematically and objectively assess improvement toward and attaining of outcome. Moreover, OECD defines evaluation as "a systematic and objective assessment of ongoing or completed project, program or policy, its design, implementation and results" (Molund and Schill 2004:9). It defines monitoring as continuous activity which reveals the ongoing intervention with the indication of improvement and attainment of objectives, and progress in used of fund (Kusek and Rist 2004:12).

Inline with OECD, SIDA also defines evaluation is a careful and systematic retrospective assessment of the design, implementation, and results of development activities (Molund and Schill 2004:9). However, in general evaluation can be seen as a process to resolve the merit, worth or value of something (ibid:9, Patton 1997:65).

Moreover, M&E should be distinguished although monitoring is sometimes acknowledged as kind or element of evaluation (Molund and Schill 2004:10) or evaluation as complement to monitoring when monitoring can not

cope with problem sufficiently (SIDA quoted by Molund and Schill *ibid*:11), and monitoring has important role to make evaluation more feasible (Molund and Schill *ibid*:11).

Monitoring, argued Molund and Schill, can be interpreted as nothing than just a simple recording of activities and results against plans and budget (*ibid*:10). They argue that monitoring can not answer why a particular problem occurs or why an outcome may be gain or failed. It is evaluation that can answer it (*ibid*:10).

They furthermore differentiate monitoring and evaluation which the former is described as continuous activity, program objectives used as given, pre-determined indicators of improvement assumed to be suitable, track improvement is aligned with pre-determined indicators, intended result-focus, use quantitative method, collecting data routinely, causal question is unanswered and use for internal management (*ibid*:11).

Evaluation is described as episodic/ad hoc, program objectives assessed against higher-rank goals, pre-determined indicators are open to query, address various concerns, intended and unintended focus, use qualitative and quantitative data, numerous data resource, causal question is answered, frequently conducted by external evaluator (*ibid*:11).

Evaluation, based on its purpose, is divided into two types: accountability and learning (*ibid*:12-13) which the former acknowledged as summative evaluation and the later as formative one (Edward 2000:54). Evaluation for accountability used to find out whether the intervention attained the intended result or expected to achieve (Molund and Schill 2004:12), meanwhile, evaluation for learning is used to generate substantive thoughts to improve the reviewed or similar activity (*ibid*:13).

From the uses of findings, evaluation is distinguished to three purposes: rendering judgments, facilitating improvement, and/or generating knowledge (Patton 1997:65). He defines judgment-oriented evaluation aimed at determining the whole merit, worth or value of something. While improvement-oriented evaluation is used to improve a program and knowledge-oriented one used to contribute to knowledge such as clarifying program model, testing theory, distinguishing types of intervention and so forth (*ibid*:65,68,70-71).

Traditionally, M&E was conducted to focus on assessing inputs and implementation process (UNDP 2002:5) which is inline with Kusek and Rist who elaborate it as a design which answer question 'did they do it' question. It focuses assessing how well a program is being conducted but it does not give an understanding of a success or failure of a program/policy to the stakeholders (Kusek and Rist 2004:15). This approach furthermore, does not assess the goal or objectives of the program and hence, a-goal (result) focused method is introduced to address this issue.

Using a result-based approach in evaluating provides the real objectives (outcome and goal) of government intervention and able to answer 'so what' question (*ibid*:15). It becomes a universal interest nowadays as stakeholders found the increased accountability, transparency and result by using the approach (*ibid*:162).

However, applying result-oriented evaluation method is challenging in developing countries especially when demand and sense of ownership of it as the basic requirement for the evaluation is less (Kusek and Rist 2004:32). Therefore, few conditions are needed to apply this evaluation such as: developing countries first must establish a basic foundation—a traditional implementation-focused M&E system which provides basic statistical system and data. Furthermore, building capacity for officials, they also need to establish a political and administrative environment characterized by accountability and transparency. Lastly, create a more mature M&E system which multi-governmental institutions are interdependent, align and coordinate (ibid 2004:33-34).

I will argue that in Indonesia specifically for program ikutt, the first thing that should be done is establishing a political and administrative environment characterized by accountability and transparency as this is the most significant factor which will affecting the M&E practices.

Using (result) goal-focused method was criticized as focusing on goal brings weaknesses. The goal it self is often formulated vaguely and general, the definite processes/ways to address the goal is not specified and the realization of a goal is impractical which is uncertain if it can be attained through the existing resources (Deutscher in Chen 1990:169). Concerning about this method's weaknesses, a goal-free method introduced furthermore as an alternative, but this method is also being criticized. Chen argues that this approach might ignore a program's intention which might be important for policy makers as it favor to assess the actual effect/impact of the program disregard the written/official ones, it also generates an administrative resistance as it weakness (Chen 1990:172). Chen and Rossi (ibid:172) also question the quality of information given by this approach.

Focusing on goal also criticized by Perrow who argues that the program effectiveness is better understood by assessing its operative goals which the objectives are sought from the actual operating policies, from what institution doing despite what the official design formulated (Perrow in Chen 1990: 174).

A goal-free and operative-goal approaches favor the actual goals and less taken into account the official goals. In my perspective, it is useful to use an approach which can assess the written/official goals and also the actual goals as well. Theory-driven model can be used to address both concerns as it takes into account the importance of (written) goals and also the impact other than goals (Chen 1990:190).

### ***Theory based-evaluation (TBE)***

Theory based-evaluation is an approach used in evaluating policy, it can explain how the objectives of program are achieved through the changes made by the intervention as causal effect sequence. This approach will also be used in analyzing the implementation of program ikutt in chapter 4. Although this paper is not intended to see whether or not the program ikutt's objectives are achieved but, it is necessary to see how the program was implemented and its breaking down points by using this approach.

The basic notion about TBE is the assumption underlying the intervention taken in term of phased sequence as causes and effects linkage such as program theory (Weiss 1997:501,Carvalho and White 2004:143). This evaluation approach will see how every phases of the sequence are implemented. It describes not only how much the changes are but also how it changes and the breaking down points (Weiss 1997:501-502, Carvalho and White 2004:143).

Weiss furthermore explain that the theory is "...the set of beliefs and assumptions that undergird program activities"(Weiss 1997:503) and program is built based on theory how intended changes can be attained by the activities, and these are hypothesis which people construct their program plan and action. It sees whether the events are occurred and intended outcome achieved (ibid:503). Inline with this explanation, Pawson argues that theory-driven evaluation finds out whether or not program works, it perceives program as a theory it self and the evaluation therefore is a theory testing (Pawson 2003:472).

When assessing a program using this approach, it will begin by testing the causal process and define whether to accept or refuse that the intervention resulting to the observed effects (ibid:506). The basic assumption of this method can be described in 'if-then linkage' which means if input is conducted in circumstances then it will generate output, furthermore, if output is also based on circumstances then it will generate outcome and lastly if outcome on the circumstances then it will generate goal. If the output, outcome and goal are not attained then there must be breaking down points which can be assessed.

## **2.4 Lesson learn**

Lessons learn can be generally understood that it is about a lesson that can be learn from the experience for further improvement. Bateson cited by Browne and Wildavsky develop a theoretical ladder of learning based on the change occurred and learned from (Pressman and Wildavsky 1984:238). He argues that there are three rungs of lesson learn: first is 'receipt of a signal' as the lowest rung which also acknowledged as 'learning-zero' refers to the condition where evaluation in not taken into account which also means that the similar errors are repeated. The second rung is 'learning one' or 'simple learning' which incorporates feedback from the actual event into the organization's memory (ibid). Lastly is 'learning-to-learn' or 'deutero-learning' which described as the 'learning to learn to receive signals'. This is a 'double-loop' process constitute the one-to-one correlation between a stimulus and a change in behavior, and the evaluative learning generates a context for organizational change and continuous change through learning (ibid:238-239).

The lesson learn proposed in further chapter is at the level of 'learning one' which the breaking points are assessed and the solutions or recommendation are given with the intention for further improvement and similar breaking down points will not be repeated.



## Chapter 3

# Program IKUTT's Design Analysis

This chapter will encompass the description of program ikutt briefly, the analysis of the program designs by using logframe matrix as a mean in analyzing in which the narrative summary of the program, its indicators, means of verification and assumption also SMART analysis will be described. It also describes the contestation and coherence between the official designs. Moreover, the context of the program will also analyze.

### 3.1 Program ikutt in brief

#### *Its description*

Program IKUTT was first proposed by the elected mayor in 2005 and being implemented by a local government at Kepahiang district for five years from 2006 to 2010. It was derived from the political and economic aspects which has implications to the socio-cultural as well.

From the political aspect, the program was conducted to address the program initiated by the mayor which he proposed during the mayoral election, and hence, it is a political will of the mayor to fulfill what he had promised to the people disregard whether or not they vote for the mayor.

Economically, the program was intended to change the coffee farmers live for better of. The government envisaged the problem faced by the people specifically coffee farmers who live in a condition vulnerable to poverty. Most of the inhabitants live as coffee plantation farmers which 24,928.75 hectares or about 37,5% of its land is used for coffee plantation beside being used for rice field and other type of plantations (BPS 2007: xvii).

The farmers are vulnerable to poverty because coffee plantation can only be harvested once a year and the people's live is depend on it as the main source for their domestic income, hence, it makes their live fluctuated which refers to the condition farmers own money if their coffee is harvested and have no money when their coffee is not harvested yet or have less amount of money when their coffee is harvested in low amount of production with low price.

The program, economically, was also intended to attain a *pendapatan asli daerah*/PAD (resource for local genuine income) for local government especially after being autonomous<sup>2</sup>. Local government should be able to attain PAD to finance its development program by taxing, levying or charging people/beneficiaries or stake holders and being independent from central government's financial support. If a local government failed to attain PAD then it might be merged to other local government<sup>3</sup>. Other economic intention was to generate job availability.

---

<sup>2</sup> Autonomous government means that after being established a new government has authority to decide their development plan and to use/attain financial resources.

<sup>3</sup> Indonesian law number 32 year 2004.

The political and economic aspects generated the socio-cultural aspects such as encourage people to work on different livelihood specially on cocoa, animal husbandry, fishery or other agricultural plantations despite being a coffee plantation farmer only and also reduced malnutrition<sup>4</sup>. However, encouraging people to work on different livelihood was the most socio-cultural aspect concerned by the government and the later are the effect of the former.

Program ikutt encompassed four core programs: fishery, agriculture and horticulture, plantation and animal husbandry which each of them also divided into few sub-programs and three local government institutions were in charged in formulating and implementing them. Fishery program was divided into fishery sub-program while animal husbandry was divided into dairy cattle, beef cattle, goat, duck and chicken sub programs<sup>5</sup>. Plantation program was divided into cocoa and coffee sub-programs<sup>6</sup> and lastly the agriculture and horticulture program was divided into agriculture plants sub-programs<sup>7</sup>.

Department of fishery and animal husbandry was in charged to manage the fishery and animal husbandry programs while department of forestry and plantation was in charge for plantation program, lastly department of agriculture was in charge for agriculture and horticulture program. Program ikutt was a core program of the development planning from 2006 to 2010 but it does not mean that other programs were neglected. It was just the program which the government wanted to focus on more.

Although the program was initiated by the mayor, public was still consulted through a yearly public consultation with government called '*musrenbang*'. For the first year, program was conducted directly based on the government's initiative because *musrenbang* was conducted to gather the information from public as a process to prepare intervention/program which the program will be implemented at the coming years<sup>8</sup>. Hence, public was consulted at the first year but the result will be implemented at the years after.

The government afterward will analyze the program proposed by public at *musrenbang* internally and there was no public space given in this process, hence, I would like to criticize this process by wondering how transparent the process is and how public can appeal for the decision made if it is not open for them. This process makes the public in a position as a doer and not as a decision maker, and their participation is at the level of 'tokenism' where public just being informed and consulted and does not have a power to influence in decision making (Amsfein 1969:217).

According to Indonesian development system, the development plan in district level is divided into three terms based on the year they serve: a-long term plan for twenty years which the document called RPJPD, a-mid term plan for five years and the document called RPJMD, lastly a-yearly plan which

---

<sup>4</sup> Based on interview with official from Bappeda in July 2011.

<sup>5</sup> Based on interview with head of animal husbandry and fishery department also with program leader in July 2011, APBD 2006-2010, program report's annexes.

<sup>6</sup> Based on interview with head of forestry and plantation department also with program leader in July 2011, APBD 2006-2010.

<sup>7</sup> Based on APBD 2006-2010.

<sup>8</sup> Interview with official at Bappeda office in July 2011.

document called RKPD<sup>9</sup>. These documents are supported with, *juklak* for the operational document and *juknis* for the technical document for each program.

In order to be financed, program ikutt should be approved by the local parliament and formulated afterward in RPJPD, RPJMD and RKPD. RPJPD consists of vision, mission and local development's drift. It is a general description of the development and will be elaborated in RPJMD. RPJMD encompasses vision, mission and program of the Head of government (mayor). It also consists of locals' budgeting policy drift, local development strategies, general policies, local departments' working plans, cross departments work and working plans formulated in term of regulation and indicative budgeting framework<sup>10</sup>. RPJMD is a compilation document of programs consists of *Renstra* (strategic planning) proposed by all departments at the district.

RPJMD will further elaborated into RKPD consists of local economic plan framework, local development priorities, working plan, program budget and the program/policy which could be conducted directly by the government or by encouraging people's participation<sup>11</sup>. RKPD is also a compilation document of program consists of *Renja* (action planning).

The approval process start from the government proposes a development plan to the parliament and they will discuss and analyze it afterward. Both of them at the end will decide whether or not to approve or change the program. After approval, the government will formulate the program into RPJPD, RPJMD and RKPD and the specific budget for each program will be formulated into 'APBD' for yearly used.

### ***Its interrelated to higher governments***

Program IKUTT was a policy taken by the local government autonomously which means the idea came from the local's authorities, designed and conducted by them and there was no interference from provincial or central government to the program or decision making. The central government role is providing the financial support through '*dana alokasi umum/DAU*' (general allocation budget) which will be given to every local government to finance their programs or development planning. The other role that central or provincial government can play is providing consultation and expertise whenever asked by local governments.

Additional budget can be attained beside DAU which is usually used to financing physical project from the ministerial office and local government should write a proposal to the ministry for approval. In this case, local government is the doer as the design, role of the game, procedure and other regulation has been stipulated by the ministry. Program ikutt was mostly financed by DAU and additional budget was also used to support its physical project uses<sup>12</sup>.

---

<sup>9</sup> UU number 25 year 2004.

<sup>10</sup> Ibid.

<sup>11</sup> Ibid.

<sup>12</sup> Based on interview with head of the departments and program leaders in July 2011 also APBD 2006-2010.

Although local government is autonomous, it should formulate its development program in line and referred to the national and provincial plan. To ensure this concern, local RPJPD and RPJMD should be consulted to central government before approved by local parliament<sup>13</sup> and in practical both documents are also consulted to the provincial government.

Using various documents and systems for clearances as practiced in Indonesia is criticized by Mathur which he argues that governments are trapped to use various clearances to assess, analyze and approve proposed policy (*Public Administration Policy and Planning: Edited by Prasant K. Mathur. 1996:6*).

## 3.2 Its program matrix

### *Analysis of program ikutt's matrix in RPJMD*

Program matrix is a mean which can describes about the program in term of its objectives and activities to attain them, indicators, verification and assumptions. As mentioned in the previous chapter, Indonesia has various policy documents encompass all programs/policy taken, therefore, program ikutt must also be formulated in RPJPD, RPJMD, Renstra, RKPD, Renja, and supported by juklak and juknis. But in term of budget it is written in APBD.

These various documents will be analyze to get a picture whether they are coherence or conflict each other, the program design will also be analyzed whether it has clear narrative summary, indicators, verification and the assumption. Moreover, the SMART analysis is also used to examine the design. Due to the constrain of the availability of the documents as confirmed by the department officials, RPJPD, Renstra and RKPD will not be analyzed, hence, only RPJMD and juklak/operational guidance will be analyzed with the exception for juknis/technical guidance which will be used only to analyze the inputs criteria.

RPJMD as the higher policy document and a guideline for renstra, RKPD, juklak and juknis should be formulated well and able to describe the program in term of the reason behind establishing a program, its objectives, targets, indicators, beneficiaries, general activities and provision for monitoring and evaluation. But, it is unlikely for the RPJMD 2006-2010 of Kepahiang district as it does not describe the concerns above explicitly and comprehensively in the documents.

In term of program ikutt, RPJMD formulated it as a program to exploit and manage the natural resources optimally and sustainably which elaborated further to increase the agriculture, plantation, forestry and fishery production. There is no further description about how this concern will be implemented, for how long and for whom explicitly. Hence, analyzing the program using logframe matrix can be described that it has narrative summary which only equated the objectives without the activities, input and output. Although the objectives are sound realistic and attainable but how to attain them are not

---

<sup>13</sup> PP number 8 year 2008.

described. Moreover, it does not have indicators to measure, neither the means of verification nor the assumption which are required in program matrix.

As RPJMD cannot be used as a guideline, consequently, it might cause further policy formulator and implementer interpret the program differently from RPJMD which it is avoided in Indonesia (district) development system as the notion practiced is the official design and actors' perception should be in the same line. It is assumed by having the implementers who are in line with the official designs then the (written) objectives are easier to achieve as they know what the program wants to achieve and how to attain and can keep them focused.

Furthermore, the program's effectiveness will be defined by the achievement of its official objectives against its indicators, this practice is likely a goal-focused approach which the unintended outcome and 'operative objectives' in Perrow's term is left out (Perrow in Chen 1990:174). And hence, it will be difficult for evaluator to define the effectiveness of the program formulated in RPJMD from the (result) goal-focused approach as it does not have indicators as a mean to measure nor the means of verification. If the program is intended to be evaluated by conducting a result-based evaluation approach then focusing on the official objectives attempts to assess the desirable dimension of objectives generated by the program and miss to assess the plausible dimension ones (Chen 1990:167).

The following sub-chapters will not analyze in-depth about the RPJMD, it will analyze the further specific official design of the program ikutt acknowledged as 'operational guidance/juklak' which should gives more description about the program in term of its narrative summary, indicators, rules of the games, implementation stages and so forth.

### ***Analysis of program matrix for dairy cattle sub-program and its coherence to RPJMD.***

Analyzing dairy cattle sub-program design by using program matrix can be described that it has a narrative summary in its design but it does not have the indicators, means of verification and assumption as required in program matrix (see appendix I).

Its narrative summary only consist the program's activities, targets, purposes and aims and it does not encompass the inputs and output explicitly which are crucial for a program. Narrative summary is a logical story/thinking of a program and a transformation or linkage from activities and inputs into outputs and into outcome as argued by theory-based school of thought and LFA theorist. Therefore, if there is a stage missing in its narrative summary, then, the logical thinking is not complete and the transformation or linkage will unclear.

The activities in its design are formulated in general term although there are specific activities followed but they are poorly formulated. For example, one of its activities is providing dairy cattle health service, but, what exactly it provides whether vets, medicine, place, when and for how long are not clear.

Moreover, the design misconceived the notion of purpose and target. They are written in separate column but encompass similar notion, hence, the difference between the targets and purposes are not clear.

In term of SMART indicators analysis, the indicator itself can not be analyzed as the program does not have indicators and hence, it will be hard to measure the objectives fulfillment of the program from the (result) goal-oriented approach. Wholey et al in Chen argued that a social program should not be evaluated if its goals are immeasurable (Chen 1990:170). Furthermore, the aim is sound realistic except 'to compete in a domestic or international market' as it is over ambitious for a new-established local government which faces many challenges for its resources. Hence, this over ambitious aim shows that the aim is also consists of desirability dimension despite the plausibility one as it reflects the desired aims generated by the program and less concerns to the realistic potential impacts of the program (Chen and Rossi cited by Chen 1990:167). Having over ambiguous and unrealistic expectation may distract the program attaining its objective (Chowdhury and Kirkpatrick 1994:3).

From the analysis above can be concluded that the design in term of program matrix is poorly and vaguely formulated although it is tolerable in a sense to attain political support for program's approval (Nakamura and Smallwood in Chen 1990:176). But, this matter does not apply for program ikutt as the field work confirmed that the vaguely design was not intended to gain political approve but more because the formulator faced challenging in formulating policy. They formulated it by 'learning by doing' as it was the first program conducted by new established local government. Formulated a clearly planning is challenging for developing countries (Kusek and Rist 2004:320) and program's objectives are numerous, contradict and fuzzy, unconvincing and inappropriate (Spicker 2006:63).

The contestation between the juklak and RPJMD is the former can give a better picture/description about the program compared the later especially in term of narrative summary although the juklak is still poorly written. From the perspective of Indonesian development perspective, both official designs should be able to describe clearly the program such as its narrative summary to avoid miss or various interpretation afterward as having a clear objective hierarchy is essential for a good program design also for monitoring and evaluation (Woodhill 2000:12), and this concern is likely absence for both designs.

However, juklak is inline with RPJMD although they formulated the narrative summary especially the objectives differently but it can be interpret that they complement each other. Both designs concern on the issue to increase the welfare of people in which the former encompassed the (general) activities to attain program ikutt's objective formulated in RPJMD.

### ***Analysis of program matrix for cocoa plantation sub-program and its coherence to RPJMD.***

Analyzing cocoa plantation sub-program using program matrix can be described that it has a narrative summary in its design, but its design does not

encompass means of verification and assumption as required in program matrix (see appendix IV). Compared to the previous sub-program and RPJMD designs, it can be defined that this sub-program is formulated better. It has more clearly narrative summary with more specific activities formulated as required in Indonesian development perspective and program matrix, it also has inputs, output, purpose and aims. Indicators are formulated although for some uses only. However, the program's designs of both sub-programs do not encompass the means of verification and assumption.

In term of SMART analysis, the indicators are formulated well enough although just able to indicate the output and targets and absence for the purpose and aim. The aim and purposes are possible attained and realistic except to decrease the influence of price fluctuation on plantation commodity which is likely hard to attain as the price is not defined by the farmer but by the market and other force/power which none of the implementer, beneficiaries or local power can play a significant role to change. Moreover, the design does not have time bound to determine the specific time for the program. Based on these matters, the design is slightly useful to get a picture of the program but, it is still difficult to measure its success from the practices of (written) goal-focused school of thought. Lastly, in term of its coherence to RPJMD, the design is definitely coherence as it formulated the aim similarly to RPJMD and it describes the plan more clearly how to achieve the objectives.

Having a more clearly formulated design is important in one hand as implementers and beneficiaries will be in the same line with the official design specifically they will be aware to what objective it wants to achieve and how to achieve. Well formulated design is also useful for the evaluator to measure the program's effectiveness in term of the effectiveness refers to the achievement of official objectives as argued by goal-focused school of thought (Deutscher in Chen, 1990:167). However, on other hand, focusing on official goals seems neglecting the unintended outcome and makes the program as a 'goal-seeking machine' (Chen 1990:169).

### **3.3 The nature of the program**

In this sub chapter, the context of the program beside its program matrix will be analyzed, and hence it will encompass the analysis of program ikutt's design in term of its focus and scope such as its beneficiaries, places where the program has been conducted, how the program related to the peoples' current livelihood, how it can improve the people's live, assumptions behind the program, the implementation structure and lastly the provision for monitoring and evaluation.

Program ikutt as mentioned in previous chapter is aimed to increase the people's welfare which changes from fluctuated live cycle to be better, explicitly from a living condition vulnerable to poverty to be better by providing the inputs and supporting interventions. Specifically, cocoa program was intended to benefit the coffee farmer while a dairy cattle opens to the coffee farmer and to others as well as long as they meet the criteria.

Both sub-programs have different criteria for their beneficiaries which divided into few different categories: criteria for beneficiaries, beneficiaries'

group, location and also for its inputs. Dairy cattle sub-program formulated the criteria into its juklak and juknis documents which complement each other while the cocoa sub-program formulate it in juklak only. The criteria are as shown in the table below:

**Table 2:  
Criteria for both sub-programs**

Dairy cattle sub-program		Cocoa plantation sub-program
Technical version (juknis)	Operational version (juklak)	Operational version (juklak)
<p>Breeder candidate:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Candidate should have cage for live stock and field which belong to the breeder's private property of ownership.</li> <li>2. Candidate has field for live stock's food resource which is adequate for given live stock.</li> <li>3. Candidate is member/register ed in breeder group at the village.</li> <li>4. Candidate is not in process of achieving live stock from similar program.</li> <li>5. Candidate's main occupation is farmer or breeder.</li> </ol> <p><i>Group candidate.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Group consists of 25-30 members.</li> </ol>	<p>Breeder candidate:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Candidate lives permanently in the location where live stock will be distributed and must be declared by official letter from the village chief.</li> <li>2. Candidate is married.</li> <li>3. Candidate is not or not yet breeding live stock given by government.</li> <li>4. Willing to be a member of breeder/farmer group.</li> <li>5. Breeder has experience, skill or ability in breeding&amp;managin g live stock.</li> <li>6. Able to provide food for the live stocks and able to breed them too.</li> <li>7. Agree to follow technical guidance from animal husbandry&amp;fishery</li> </ol>	<p>Farmer candidate:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Farmer has coffee field in Kepahiang district which will be plant cocoa with diversification or monoculture system.</li> <li>2. Farmer is a member of farmer's group or willing to be the member.</li> <li>3. Farmer wants/willing to follow the regulation/guidance, assistance from the officials.</li> <li>4. Farmer agrees to sign the statement letter for planting&amp;managing plants professionally.</li> </ol> <p><i>Location.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Location is in kepahiang.</li> <li>2. Not inside the conservation forest, people's forest or tourism forest.</li> <li>3. Width minimum 0,5 hectares, maximum 2 hectares.</li> <li>4. Maximum 800m from sea above.</li> </ol> <p><i>Cocoa:</i></p>



<p>2. Group leader is not a civil servant, army or policeman.</p> <p>3. The group has never achieved any live stock before.</p> <p>4. Group has experience in breeding live stock.</p> <p>5. Group is living in the same village.</p> <p>6. The group is active and the members are active.</p> <p>7. Group agrees to be assisted by the officials or by related institution.</p> <p>8. The group agrees to share live stock to other group assigned according to institution's policy.</p>	<p>department.</p> <p><i>Dairy cattle</i></p> <p>1. Cow is 3-7 month of pregnancy.</p> <p>2. Has no 'brucellosis disease'.</p> <p>3. In good health, not handicap.</p> <p>4. Its height minimum 115-120 cm.</p> <p>5. Female cow at 1,2-2 years of age.</p>	<p>Qualified cocoa approved by the certificate from cocoa research centre in Jember.</p>
<p><i>Location:</i></p> <p>1. Location is in central area for animal husbandry development.</p> <p>2. Adequate field for live stock resource.</p> <p>3. Location is not an endemic of diseases.</p> <p>4. Candidate of location must be in kepahiang</p>		

district.		
-----------	--	--

(Source: own construction based on juklak and juknis of dairy cattle sub-program, juklak for cocoa plantation sub-program)

Both sub-programs in my perspective are just benefitted to the people who vulnerable to poverty and not benefitted to the real poor. Although it was intended to help the vulnerable ones but, it can be modify to benefit the real poor. For the cocoa program it can be focused to benefit the vulnerable as it intended to, but for the dairy cattle, it is better to benefit the real poor. One of the criteria in its technical document for breeder which the breeder should have a field as their private property is bias for the real poor as they may not have it. Therefore, it should be change to ‘the breeder are able to feed the live stock’, although this criterion has been already accommodated in operational document but it contradicts to the former criterion. This criterion should be clear formulated and not contradicts to other criteria on other documents in order to give a chance for the real poor to be benefitted from the program.

In relation to the people’s current livelihood, the program was intended to encourage people to work on different modalities despite just being coffee farmers as the major livelihood in the district. The government assumed that by being live stock breeder or farmer for different plantation such as cocoa and supported by high quality standard of inputs then beneficiaries can have more income (weekly) which can increase their welfare afterward despite having a yearly income from coffee harvest as the price is higher than coffee<sup>14</sup>. Moreover, they can have different skills, more stable living condition and can afford their needs. Breeding the dairy cattle is also profitable for them which there will be frequent dairy production that can be sold to the (traditional) market and the number of cattle population will also increase by the time which definitely can increase their income if they sell the calf or cattle. But, the government likely missed to assess/consider that changing people’s livelihood is not easy as they may not fully interested or believed to the new program, also changing their working time and behavior are challenging.

In order to be able to implement the program well, the implementation procedure and stages must be set-up properly in the design. The stage was starting by informing people about the program especially about roles of the program. Those who are interested and meet the criteria should make a farmer/breeder group and write a proposal to the head of department signed by group’s leader, approved by the field assistant and acknowledged by the village chief. The head of department afterward will establish a team to assess the location and beneficiaries according to the criteria. This team will select the prospected beneficiaries and propose it to the head of department who will propose it afterward to the mayor for approval. The mayor’s approval will be informed to the beneficiaries, sub-district head and village head<sup>15</sup>.

<sup>14</sup> Cocoa price at average was Rp.10,000 while coffee was Rp.4,000 (BPS 2006:131-133).

<sup>15</sup> Juklak from both sub-programs.

Afterward, a purchasing and checking team will be established to ensure the quality and quantity of the inputs purchased by third party. The inputs will be delivered to the beneficiaries witnessed by the head of sub-district, village head and field assistant. Any complain on the inputs can be addressed directly to the third party. The next stage was planting and managing the cocoa and cattle. Any concerns/problems found during the managing time will be consulted to the field assistants<sup>16</sup>.

The last stage was a program completion which there will be interest share of the result of the program between government and beneficiaries. For example, government will attain one calf over three born calves, and this concern is stipulated clearly in the juklak design for both sub-programs.

The implementer teams are divided into two categories: firstly is a-core consists of members who leading and managing the program administratively. It has program leader, treasury and administration officers. Secondly is a-supporting team consists of a team needed to support the implementation of the program. Both sub-programs have different supporting team<sup>17</sup>. The dairy cattle has an assessing team, purchasing and checking team, field assistant and vets. While cocoa sub-program added more teams: a team at district level which members are higher bureaucrats, a team at sub-district level consist of head of sub-district, field assistant coordinator and other three members. Lastly a team at village level consists of village head, beneficiaries and field assistant.

In term of monitoring and evaluation (M&E), both sub-programs mentioned in the design but, it is written very simple for the dairy cattle sub-program unlike the cocoa sub-program which defined it more precise. Dairy cattle sub-program formulated the monitoring and type of report without formulating the evaluation (its method, focus and scopes). The monitoring is conducted based on the regulation and reports will be written in three times: monthly, once in three months and yearly report. It will be written by the program leader addressed to the head of department and the mayor with also copied to the related institution<sup>18</sup>.

The time to submit the report is based on the regulation. This monitoring provision is meagerly and vaguely designed which there is no adequate or precise guidance on how and what to conduct it. Also the term that monitoring will be conducted based on the regulation is not clear either in term which regulation that it refers to. Moreover, as the provision for evaluation is not formulated, therefore, which evaluation method is going to used and what the purpose is undefined.

On the other hand, cocoa sub-program formulated M&E provision more precise and supported with specific formats. In general M&E should report about the program progress, problem and its solving, the group's endeavor progress, physical and financial realization beside the specific format mentioned earlier. The village team should report to the head of forestry and plantation, copied to mayor, head of field assistant institution and to sub-

---

<sup>16</sup> Ibid.

<sup>17</sup> Ibid.

<sup>18</sup> Based on Juklak of dairy cattle sub-program.

district head. It should be written once in 15 days in seven formats. A sub-district team should write report according to specific format monthly to the head of the department and head of field assistant institution. Lastly, the district team should report once in three months according to specific format to the head of the department with copied to mayor and head of the field assistant institution<sup>19</sup>. The formats, in my perspective address the output notion and left out the outcome ones.

The weakness of the design for M&E of cocoa sub-programs is it combined the evaluation and auditing notion which it is likely miss perceived the financial realization determined as evaluation. It should be perceived as an auditing and not as an evaluation. Moreover, if we refer to the definition of M&E in chapter 2, the design also miss-conceived the M&E concepts as it combined these notions by conducting it in the same way. What has been formulated in the design is more in term of monitoring and not in term of evaluation as it focused on the progress, problems and problems solving, and did not formulate to assess the result/outcome of the program, how the objectives were (not) achieved and what recommendation or lesson-learned are.

Although the M&E is mixed formulated, the evaluation method is implicitly formulated in the design which focused to the output, and hence the evaluation method practiced is a traditional approach which does not tell much how benefitted the beneficiaries from the intervention/program and the outcome, unintended outcomes or the actual/operative objectives are left out. Further critics on this approach are mentioned in chapter 2.

---

<sup>19</sup> Juklak of coca sub-program.

## Chapter 4

# Program IKUTT Implementation

This chapter is intended to describe how the program was implemented. It will explain what actually happened after the program was formulated. Specifically it will encompass how the implementers (head of departments and program leader) and beneficiaries perceived the program (the narrative summary), what the unintended outcomes are and the stages that the program has been through. The breaking down points will also be assessed by using theory-based approach, and lastly, the monitoring and evaluation activities will be analyzed as well.

### 4.1 The implementers and beneficiaries' perception of the program

#### *For dairy cattle sub-program*

As it is mentioned in the previous chapter that the program design (juklak) is vaguely and incomplete formulated which may cause different perceptions of the program from the implementers and beneficiaries (complete description is in appendix II and III).

Analyzing the perception of the program from the implementer and beneficiary's perspective can be described that both of them perceived the aim of the program similarly to increase the welfare of people. This perception is different from the official one literally which is "to operate the infrastructure development and dairy cattle agribusiness endeavor, which drifted all agribusiness subsystem can productively and efficiently produce various agriculture products which have value added and high competition ability, in a domestic or international market". However, the official one is complement to the aim perceived by implementers and beneficiaries.

Implementers perceived the purposes are to increase the people's income, encourage people to make fishery and animal husbandry endeavor as a core domestic income source not as an additional income source afterward and lastly to self-provided for meat. Beneficiaries perceived it to increase beneficiaries' domestic income only. Hence, both of them perceived the purposes slightly different although they agreed in one purpose to increase people's income. On the other hand, the purposes in official design are to increase productivity, fulfill the need of milk and meat, develop the processing sub-system and develop the marketing sub system. These purposes are inline with the implementers' perception literally only to fulfill (self provided) for meat, but, these purposes could be complement to the implementers and beneficiaries' purposes.

In term of targets, implementers refer these to the official one as to increase the income and help the people's economical resource, develop the agribusiness entrepreneurship, fulfill the need of protein from meat and

increase the production of animal husbandry. These are very different from beneficiaries as they did not have any target.

Implementers perceived the outputs are: live stocks, cages, field for food resource, health's equipment, trainings, technology transfer and human resources which are perceived similarly by beneficiaries. On the other hand, outputs are not mentioned in the official design.

Furthermore, in term of activities, implementers and beneficiaries perceived these by providing the live stocks and cages, providing the food resource for the live stocks, providing the health's equipments for the live stocks, providing trainings for beneficiaries and the field assistant and technology transfer to the beneficiaries. However, the official design formulated activities to conduct acceptor intensification, breeding the live stock by injection/artificial insemination, fattening the live stock, services on breeding injection/artificial insemination, services on fertilizer and live stock's food, services on live stock's health. These can be seen that the official ones formulated activities more general compared to the implementers and beneficiaries.

Lastly, official design did not formulate its inputs while the implementer perceived it as number of live stocks stated in the APBD and the cages, food resource for the live stocks as stated in the APBD, providing the health's equipments for the live stocks as stated in the APBD, training few times as stated in the APBD for the beneficiaries and field assistants, technology transfer through trainings, and human resources. These are in line with beneficiaries' perception.

Based on the analysis above, the implementers and beneficiaries have quite similar perception of the program, and there is differences from official one but it might serve as complement to what perceived by implementers and beneficiaries.

However, beneficiaries are not able to verify or cross check the number of inputs they received to official document as they have less access to it and were just informed by officials. Hence, it is important for the government to share the information about the program to public widely and accessibly in order they can have equal chances to participate. It is also important for transparency which programs should be transparent to public as it is funded by 'public money', and it will eliminate the public suspicion about the program especially for their queries how a particular person/group is defined as beneficiary, how much budget spent and so forth.

### ***For cocoa sub-program***

For cocoa sub-program, the implementers and beneficiaries perceptions contested with official one are as follow: in term of goal, both of them perceived similarly to increase people' welfare and it is also in line to the official design (see appendix V and VI).

The purposes were perceived by beneficiaries as to provide a weekly domestic income for the beneficiaries while implementers perceived as to provide a weekly domestic income for the beneficiaries, to decrease a global warming, to function as a guardian for Musi river, provide jobs for people,

contribute to local government through local genuine income and to increase the ability of people in to afford their need. There are different perceptions between them and only similar in providing weekly income. On the other hand, official document/juklak formulated purposes to increase the farmer's income, to increase the productivity of farmland especially for coffee which can increase farmer's income, to increase the production of plantation commodity, to decrease the influence of price fluctuation on plantation commodity, to increase local genuine income and to support local economics mainstay and environment sustainability. These are quite similar to implementers' perception and they complement each other.

In term of targets, implementer, beneficiaries and official are in line as it targeted to the coffee farmland or other farmlands, or nominee of farmland in kepahiang district which the owners/farmers are interested to plant cocoa plantation.

Moreover, they all are also in line for the outputs which is cocoa seed plantation, fertilizer, management and teams, and training and technical transfer.

For activities, official design mentioned to provide cocoa plantation, provide fertilizer and project management procedure and team, lastly training and technical transfer field assistant and beneficiaries. These are perceived similarly by the implementers and beneficiaries.

Lastly, they are all also perceived inputs similarly: cocoa seed plantation up to 4,5 millions, fertilizer up to 10kgs per hectare for diversification pattern and 20kgs per hectare for monoculture pattern, project management procedure and teams from district, sub district and village (human resources) and lastly training and technical transfer for field assistant and beneficiaries.

It is likely that for cocoa sub-program that the implementers, beneficiaries and official design were mostly in line. The design was formulated better compared to dairy cattle program. It is supported with specific number of inputs which is absence for cattle sub-program. The similarity for both sub-programs is both beneficiaries have less access to the official design.

## **4.2 The unintended outcomes**

As mentioned in chapter three the unintended outcomes are left out to take into account as it is not formulated in the official design, hence it is interesting to know the unintended outcomes of program ikutt and it will be assessed from the perspective of beneficiaries and field assistants as they played major and significant role in the program.

The field work confirms that the beneficiaries and field assistants attained various skills which are not mentioned in the design as its objectives/outcomes.

Both of them confirmed in the interview that they attained soft and hard skill by participating in the program. Beneficiaries mentioned that they learn how to plan an activities although it is a very simple plan, they learn how to organize and set up program/plan, how to encourage people and working together as a group, being more aware and responsible to the given inputs, they now know how to write a better proposal to the department to get the inputs,

how to coordinate with others and they also increase their communication skill. Moreover, for the hard skill, they mentioned that beneficiaries are able to define which live stocks/cocoa plants are better than others, they also able to detect the disease that occur to the inputs and what treatment can be done to cure naturally and unnaturally. They also mentioned that breeders now are able to build a cage based on the required standard by using the existed resources (naturally and cheaply) and they know how to manage the dairy's processes based on the ISO standard. Lastly, beneficiaries have a new skill in marketing their product such as selling the dairy, calf and cocoa with a better skill in bargaining.

From the field assistants' point of view, they learn likely similar soft skill as beneficiaries are with addition that they learnt how to lead a group consisted of many people with various thoughts. They also learn how to communicate well with higher and powerful bureaucrats such as the departments' head and program leader, and also have no fear to address their thoughts to the decision maker for program improvements. Moreover, they attained a very important hard skill through the program which is attaining a new knowledge and skill different from their formal education background. For example, the field assistant who has diploma in forestry attained a new knowledge in plantation and animal husbandry. Although it was hard at first to assist the beneficiaries as their questions about managing the input were unanswered right away, but with the meeting for knowledge-shared and training conducted for field assistants frequently they afterward were able to explain/answer the questions and assist beneficiaries.

### **4.3 The implementation process**

This sub-chapter will describe how the program was implemented, specifically what processes/stages that it has been through, whether or not they were conducted accordingly to the official design. Moreover, this process will be analyzed by using theory-based approach with an example of program logic to know the program transformation and its breaking down points from input and activities to output and finally to outcome.

The fieldwork confirmed that the program was implemented to the beneficiaries, place and inputs based on the criteria set up in the official design and the implementers were strict about defining them in order to achieve the stated program objectives (the criteria refers to chapter three). Moreover, fieldwork also confirmed that the program was implemented through few stages/processes as mentioned in the official design. It was started by informing people about the program followed by selection process, distributing the inputs, managing the inputs, monitoring and evaluation and lastly followed by the completion stage.

I will start analyzing the implementation process by using general program logic that by providing the intervention such as qualified/standardized inputs, communicate with beneficiaries, adequate training for beneficiaries and field assistants, supported by vets, have good management system and team, conducting it well through the stages mentioned above, then it will transform into outputs which the cattle can produce dairy frequently and calf, also the



cocoa can be harvested every week. Afterward, the outputs will transform into outcomes which is increasing of people's welfare as they have more domestic income generated from selling, dairy products, calves and cocoa.

However, these outcomes can be attained if everything is running well and it is important to notice that there might be some points where program was breaking down during the process which can influence the objectives/outcomes achievement and this is likely happened to program ikutt.

I will use a specific logic as an example to analyze these transformations and the breaking down points. The specific logic is if the sharing information/communicating stage convinced the beneficiaries then they will plant the cocoa or breed the cattle and manage it well (will acknowledged it later as first transformation), and then they will have the cocoa and cattle which can harvest/produce (second transformation/output), which at the end it will increase their income and also increase their welfare generated from selling the output (last transformation/outcome).

For the first transformation, fieldwork confirmed that the sharing information/communicating stage was not enough to convince people about the successfulness of the program, therefore there were cocoa not being planted and cattles not being managed well.

This stage was used to inform, convince and encourage people to participate, but it was just conducted few times which was not enough to convince them as argued by beneficiaries and field assistants. Many of beneficiaries hesitate to conduct the new program because it was not proven yet for its successfulness, though there were other beneficiaries still interested to try. They also hesitated because participating to the program means they have to change their livelihood which is a big deal for them as they depend much their live on the existed livelihood as coffee farmer.

The hesitation occurred not because the implementers failed to convince beneficiaries but more because the story of the program it self was not enough convincing. This stage should no be conducted only to inform people but more importantly to assess what people perceive/believe about the program. Building up a good example and successful trajectory for similar program is needed to convince them to change. Inline with this, Eyben et al argue that localized success generates conviction to beneficiaries to follow the trajectory (2008:203). It is also important to convince beneficiaries that their live cycle can change if they believe that they have capacity and willingness to change individually or collectively as Eyben et all say that change is a result of purposive individual and collective action (ibid:205).

Moreover, this stage failed to assess the issue spread out among the cocoa beneficiaries which influence them to participate. Beneficiaries, field assistant, and sub-district team mentioned that there was an issue for those who willing to plant cocoa will accept amount of money which was not true. And hence, according to them, there were many people willing to participate in order to get the 'fake money' not because they really want to participate. Although beneficiaries were selected strictly according to the criteria mentioned in chapter three by a 'selection team' who were free from any power interference but this team still missed to assess the beneficiaries whose intention just to get the 'fake money'. The field assistant and program leader confirmed that there

were farmers who did not plant the cocoa and I believe the reason was because they did not get the ‘fake money’.

This issue did not occur among the dairy cattle’s beneficiaries, but some breeders were still less incorporated to manage the cattle because they were less convinced by the program. So, the logic of the program was breaking down at the very beginning stage of the program.

However, cocoa sub-program was implemented in all Kepahiang sub-districts<sup>20</sup> specifically in 84 villages out of 91 villages it has, using 8393.35 hectares of its land, involved 6,968 farmers and 4,500,000 cocoa trees<sup>21</sup> and 20 grams fertilizer per tree<sup>22</sup>. Meanwhile, the dairy cattle sub-program distributed number of cattles, medicine/health services, cages and supporting infrastructure<sup>23</sup>.

The second transformation can be defined that not all beneficiaries could harvest their cocoa and dairy cattle as few breaking downs occurred. Although given inputs fulfilled high quality standard as mentioned in the design, purchased and checked carefully by a team before distributing it, supported with trainings for beneficiaries and field assistants, supervised by field assistants and vets and also supported by committed officials but still, it did not guarantee that it could generate good output. Most of the breaking down points occurred at the managing stage for this transformation.

During the managing stage, farmer or breeder were assisted by field assistant. Any queries about the inputs can be asked to them for the answer. Field assistants were placed in all targeted villages which one field assistant for each village with exception for some field assistants who assisted more than one village due to the lack number of them, and they should also do the knowledge transfer to the beneficiaries. Field assistants were categorized into two: civil servant and contracted assistant whom the latter divided into central government and local government contracted<sup>24</sup>. The managing stage involved vets since 2009 by having one civil servant and one contractual vet who serve all the sub-districts.

The biggest challenging which influences much the program was changing the beneficiaries’ habit from coffee farmers to cocoa farmer and breeder. Being coffee farmers mean they do not need a lot of effort to manage which refers to the condition once they plant it then they can leave it without having frequent checking of the plants, while planting cocoa need frequent checking as it vulnerable to insects and diseases. Once it infected then an immediate treatment is needed otherwise it can not be harvested at all or harvested with low quality. Frequent checking make beneficiaries have to change their working habit and not all of them were ready and willing to change<sup>25</sup>. This is likely what argued by Mazmanian and Sabatier that the fundamental problem

---

<sup>20</sup> It has 8 sub-districts.

<sup>21</sup> Based on mayor’s decree.

<sup>22</sup> Based on juklak cocoa sub-program.

<sup>23</sup> Based on dairy cattle report document and APBD 2006-2010.

<sup>24</sup> Based on interview with field assistant coordinator in July 2011.

<sup>25</sup> Based on interview with program leader, head of forestry and plantation department, sub-district head, field assistant and beneficiaries in July 2011.

faced by proponents is to change their behavior which might be decrease overtime (Mazmanian and Sabatier 1983:32). Hence, this is another breaking down point occurred.

The insect and disease on cocoa made beneficiaries frustrated and cut them off, moreover, cocoa also need to deal with pig, squirrel and mouse as the other distractions. Many beneficiaries failed to harvest cocoa because of these distractions. Moreover, some beneficiaries thought that field assistants were less helpful as they were new and less experience. Lastly, the safety issue occurred as their inputs were taken by unknown people<sup>26</sup> and these matters also the breaking down point which affected the amount of cocoa production afterward.

The breaking down points also happened to dairy cattle which there were breeders who less incorporated in managing the live stocks especially when they take turn to feed/bathing the cattle. Some beneficiaries were not experiences enough in managing dairy cattle. Few catties were dead when they had disease prior 2009 as there were no vets to ask for help although there was a vet assistant to help but still could not did much.

Beneficiaries also found difficulty in marketing the dairy until they cooperate with school to sell it to students which this was not thought by the formulators when they formulate the policy. Beneficiaries also noted that at the beginning they did not know how to process the dairy using higher technology as they used to do it naturally until they suggested the management team to provide them trainings.

Furthermore, number of vets was not adequate, hence, they could not monitor or treat all live stocks at all sub-districts adequately. They did not supported by vehicle or budget for gasoline, therefore, treatment for infected/ill cattle sometime was too late. Moreover, interviewing with vets confirmed that the medicine stocks are sometime less affordable to cure many live stock's diseases. Some medicines should be afforded by vets own resource and beneficiaries will pay for vets' treatment which not all of beneficiaries can afford. Paying for treatment was free if the cattle still under the program supervision which is usually only for the first year<sup>27</sup> and afterward beneficiaries have to pay. Also, new kind of disease occurred which vets did not know how to overcome. Safety issue also occurred where beneficiaries lost their live stocks taken by unidentified person.

From the field assistant for cocoa sub-program's perspective is informed that they have done their best to assist beneficiaries, however, they also have impediments in assisting beneficiaries. Firstly, local contracted assistant did not have vehicle to access the field which some were inaccessible by public transport, neither budget for gasoline was given unlike central government contracted assistants who got budget for field visits, hence some beneficiaries were assisted inadequately.

Furthermore, they found difficult to encourage beneficiaries to gather in a place for information/knowledge transfer or training. Farmers tend to attend the meeting if there is money given in term of transportation cost or others.

---

<sup>26</sup> Ibid and interview with beneficiaries.

<sup>27</sup> Based on interview with dairy cattle program leader.

Concerning about their capacity based on their formal education, most of the field assistants have bachelor degree and diploma and only few of them were high school graduated<sup>28</sup>. This education levels supported enough for the program although some of them were less experienced. However, assistant who less experienced will be trained once in two weeks given by their colleagues or trained to a specific training in other province.

Another breaking down point was the program did not stipulate a notion of giving fine or sanction to those beneficiaries who failed to incorporate or failed to manage the inputs well. The field work confirmed that there was a contract between the program leader and beneficiaries but it was written very simply which just stipulated obligations and rights of both parties without stipulated any sanction if beneficiaries failed to cooperated and manage their input well. Having no sanction stipulated may cause the beneficiaries have less sense of responsibility to the program and could not avoid the beneficiaries who just pretended to participate to the program to get 'fake money'.

All of these matters and breaking down points influence the output transformation as less amount of cocoa can be harvested and less number of cattle can produce dairy or calf, hence, the output transformation will effect the outcome transformation which not all beneficiaries can increase their income as their cocoa can not be harvested (being cut-off or stolen), or the breeders lost their cattle as well. The outcome transformation is also affected when the beneficiaries attained less income than expected generated from the outputs because of the low quality of the products or low amount of production.

#### **4.4 Monitoring and evaluation (M&E) activities**

The monitoring and evaluation conducted differently by both sub-program. Dairy cattle program monitored the program at least once a month and its report must be written monthly, quarterly and yearly and sent to head of department and mayor also copied it to related officials. Cocoa program monitored it every half-month by field assistant, monthly by sub-district supervising team and quarterly by district supervising team. The reports sent to the head of departments, mayor and head of field assistant institution. Monitoring conducted to know the progress of the program, impediments and solutions also groups enhancement while evaluation conducted once after completion of the program to evaluate whole program processes.

In term of evaluation, it will be conducted by the program management official as internal evaluator and also by Bappeda as semi external evaluator. The former will write a final report based on evaluation consists of the program description: the background and objectives. It also consists of implementation processes: the activities, inputs, pitfalls, solutions and intervention taken to solve the problems, the output and program's achievement. Lastly, it consists of budget spent.

The M&E for both sub-programs in term the method, formats, timeline or the evaluator conducted similarly to what has been stipulated in the official

---

<sup>28</sup> Data taken from interview with the field assistant' coordinator in July 2011.

design. The description and critic of the M&E is as explained in chapter two and three.

## Chapter 5

### Lesson learn, recommendation and proposing different evaluation method

This chapter will encompass the lesson that can be learnt from the program official design, the processes, evaluation method and also proposing different evaluation method from what the government used to.

As mentioned in the previous chapter, the official designs were poorly formulated refers to the vaguely description of the program. Analyzing the official design by using logframe matrix gives a sight that it has weaknesses in some aspects. Firstly, the RPJMD as a higher policy document which become guidance for further policy was poorly formulated. It just formulated the aim and purpose of program ikutt and left out the activities, input, output, indicators, means of verification and assumptions. Hence, it cannot describe the program well enough in term of it has the objectives but how to achieve the objectives are not formulated. Evaluating the program from the goal-focused approach will also be challenging as it did not formulate the indicators, and means of verification to define the achievement of the program.

The further design (juklak) for dairy cattle sub-program formulated the activities, targets, purpose and aims in its narrative summary and left out the input and output which are essential for the design. Moreover, it did not encompass the indicators, means of verification and assumption as required in the matrix. Meanwhile, the cocoa sub-program formulated its narrative summary well enough as it has all items needed in narrative summary, but the indicators are only applied for the output and target and left out the purpose and aims. Lastly, one of the objectives is formulated over ambitious for the new established local government which faces few constraints.

Based on the weaknesses above and from the traditional (goal-focused) school of thought, program ikutt official designs can be classified as incomplete and vague, therefore, these weaknesses should become as lesson learns. To fulfill the concerns above, it is recommended to formulate the design more clearly and realistically also addressing the concerns in logframe matrix. For example the purpose to increase people's domestic income should be added by how many percent and by what year. In addition to this thought, the indicators, means of verification and assumption are advised to formulate in the design as it will be a guideline for implementer and evaluator afterward.

The other lesson learns are from the implementation stages. As there were breaking down points occurred in the stages, then it is recommended to conduct a communicating process more frequent and able to encourage and convince people to participate by formulating a strong story, good examples/experiences and trajectory on the successfulness of the program. Moreover, it should also be able to assess the beneficiaries' motive and issues around them. Lastly, it is very useful to take into account the clause of sanction in the contract between beneficiaries and government as it is the best way to

avoid the 'pretended beneficiaries' also to make them more responsible to the program.

The field assistants and vets should be supported by vehicle or transportation budget to access beneficiaries and the number of them is advisable to add. The medicine for live stock should be available and if possible subsidized by the government.

Lastly, intense approaches to beneficiaries are needed to change their work habit as it is very challenging in this program and it played a big role in implementation stage. It can be done informally by the field assistants or program leader by motivating and encouraging beneficiaries continuously or by bringing other beneficiaries who succeed managing the similar program and share their experience with. In term of safety issue, it is also important to cooperate with people and police in dealing with this issue.

The last lessons learn is from the evaluation activities. Firstly, as the design and implementation miss perceived the concepts of evaluation, monitoring and auditing, hence, it is recommended to distinguish the different function, uses and method of them. Secondly, as the program was formulated in a sense it can be evaluated based on traditional/implementation evaluation approach which focused to evaluate more in term of its outputs, it is therefore recommended and proposed to assess the program from its outcomes/objectives fulfillment as this approach can tells more how the beneficiaries are benefitted from the program. For example, it is important to check how many live stocks given and managed by beneficiaries but it is necessary to know are they really benefitting by managing the live stock or maybe in other hand it makes them one step closer to poverty line.

Furthermore, the evaluation is better intended to assess not only its official objectives but also the unintended outcomes and the operative objectives. Therefore, I recommend to the local government or evaluator to use a theory-driven evaluation method when assessing the program in which the official objectives, unintended outcomes and the actual/operative objectives are assessed.

## Chapter 6

### Conclusion

This paper analyzed Program IKUTT as a policy taken by a local government in term of its official designs, implementation and evaluation method which at the end there will be lessons learn, recommendation and proposing different evaluation method.

It analyzes two out of its four sub-programs which are dairy cattle and cocoa sub-programs. The purpose of the paper is to know what is written in program ikutt's official designs, how well formulated they are using logframe matrix and SMART analysis mean. Moreover, it also to know the program implementation in term of the implementers and beneficiaries perception of the program, the unintended outcome, stages it has gone through and the breaking down points. Lastly it describes the lesson learns and recommendation also proposes a new method for evaluating the program despite the evaluation method that the local government used to.

Analyzing the program designs using logframe matrix and SMART analysis can be concluded that the official designs were vaguely and incomplete formulated and less fulfilling SMART notion, hence, it less describes the program and it might cause difficulties for implementers and evaluator especially for the goal-focused evaluator although on the other hand, they are complement each other.

In term of implementation, the implementers and beneficiaries perceived the program almost in line with the official design although there are few differences, but it can be interpret that they are complement each other. The implementation was conducted into few stages: started by informing people about the program followed by selection process, distributing the inputs, managing the inputs, monitoring and evaluation and lastly followed by the completion stage.

There were breaking down points occurred for its transformation. First transformation was broken down by less convincing information shared/communicating which made the beneficiaries hesitate to involve. It was also unable to assess the 'fake-money minded' beneficiaries. Second transformation was broken down caused by some beneficiaries were unwilling to change their work habit, safety issue occurred and constraints faced by the field assistants and vets also unstipulated clause of sanction for incorporated beneficiaries. These matters affected the last transformation which not all the beneficiaries can increase their welfare as their domestic income less/not increased by the intervention.

For the evaluation method, it miss perceived the concepts of monitoring, evaluation and auditing. The evaluation was formulated and conducted more focused to the output and left out the intended and unintended outcomes.

From the weaknesses that the designs have, the breaking down points occurred in the implementation and the evaluation method used, there are few lessons can be learnt from and recommendations suggested which these will be



very useful for future improvement as the similar program might be still conducted.

## Appendices

### *Appendix I Program Planning Design of Dairy Cattle agribusiness Development program 2007 (Operational guidance Version)*

Narrative Summary	Objectively Verifiable of Indicators	Means of Verification	Risk/Assumptions
<p>Aims :</p> <p>To operate the infrastructure development and dairy cattle agribusiness endeavor, which drifted all agribusiness subsystem can productively and efficiently produce various agriculture products which have value added and high competition ability, in a domestic or international market</p>	<p>All indicators of Aims are not mentioned in the document.</p>	<p>It is not mentioned what sort of means of verification that should be used to verify the aims explicitly in the operational guidance.</p> <p>Aim is just written shortly as stated at previous column.</p>	<p>-</p>
<p>Purposes :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. To increase productivity.</li> <li>2. To fulfill the need of milk and meat.</li> <li>3. To develop the processing sub-system.</li> <li>4. To develop the marketing sub system</li> </ol>	<p>All indicators of purposes are not mentioned in the document.</p>	<p>It is not mentioned what sort of means of verification that should be used to verify the purposes explicitly in the operational guidance.</p> <p>Purposes are just written shortly as stated at previous column.</p>	<p>Risk or assumptions are not mentioned explicitly in the document.</p>
<p>Targets :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. To increase the income and help the people's economical resource.</li> <li>2. To develop the agribusiness entrepreneurship.</li> <li>3. To fulfill the need of protein from meat.</li> </ol>	<p>All indicators of targets are not mentioned in the document.</p>	<p>It is not mentioned what sort of means of verification that should be used to verify the targets explicitly in the operational guidance. Targets are just written</p>	<p>Risk or assumptions are not mentioned explicitly in the document.</p>

4. To increase the production of animal husbandry		shortly as stated at previous column.	
Outputs are not mentioned explicitly in the document.	Indicators for output are not mentioned in the document.	It is not mentioned what sort of means of verification that should be used to verify the outputs explicitly in the operational guidance.	Risk or assumptions are not mentioned explicitly in the document.
<p>Activities :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Acceptor intensification.</li> <li>2. Breeding the live stock by injection/artificial insemination.</li> <li>3. Fattening the live stock.</li> <li>4. Services on breeding injection/artificial insemination.</li> <li>5. Services on fertilizer and live stock's food.</li> <li>6. Services on live stock's health.</li> </ol>	Inputs are not mentioned specifically in the document.		Risk or assumptions are not mentioned explicitly.

(Source: own construction based on dairy cattle operational guidance 2007).

**Appendix II Program Planning Matrix of “Dairy Cattle  
Agribusiness Development Program 2007” (Head of the  
Department and Program Leader’s Perspective)**

Narrative Summary	Objectively Verifiable of Indicators	Means of Verification	Risk/Assumptions
<p>Goal :</p> <p>To increase the welfare of the people.</p>	<p>Not defined explicitly but can be assumed from people are able to provide their needs, not being poor, amount of money spent.</p>	<p>Policy documents/planning M&amp;E report, economic growth, statistic report, project implementation report.</p>	<p>-</p>
<p>Purposes :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. To increase the people’s income.</li> <li>2. To encourage people to make fishery and animal husbandry endeavor as a main domestic income source not as an additional income source afterward.</li> <li>3. Self-provided for meat.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. People [beneficiaries] increase their domestic income.</li> <li>2. Numbers of people make fishery and animal husbandry endeavor as main domestic income source.</li> </ol>	<p>Policy documents/planning M&amp;E report, project implementation report, economic growth, statistic report.</p>	<p>It is assumed that people [beneficiaries] are incorporated well, willing to work and change their main domestic income resource, stakeholders are incorporated. Safety issue is also managed which at the end achieving the purposes will lead to the achieving its goal.</p>
<p>Targets :</p> <p>Targets are as stated in the planning or policy documents such as in operational and technical guidance.</p>	<p>The indicator as stated in the policy documents.</p>	<p>Policy documents/planning M&amp;E report, project implementation report, beneficiaries’ proposal and survey.</p>	<p>Targets are defined well and achievable.</p>
<p>Outputs :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Live stocks &amp; cages.</li> <li>2. Field for food resource.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. 1– 6 as stated in APBD/policy documents.</li> <li>2. For human resources it</li> </ol>	<p>Policy documents/planning , project implementation report, M&amp;E report, observation/survey,</p>	<p>Outputs are also assumed adequately achieved as much as given inputs.</p>

3. Health's equipment. 4. Trainings. 5. Technology transfer. 6. Human resources.	involved stakeholders (beneficiaries, expert, field assistants, vets, management teams).		
Activities : 1. Providing the live stocks and their cages. 2. Providing the field food resource for the live stocks. 3. Providing the health's equipments for the live stocks. 4. Providing trainings for beneficiaries and the field assistant. 5. Technology transfer to the beneficiaries.	Inputs : 1. Providing live stocks at the number stated in the APBD and their cages. 2. Providing the field food resource for the live stocks as much as stated in the APBD. 3. Providing the health's equipments for the live stocks such as vaccines at number stated in the APBD. 4. Providing trainings few times as stated in the APBD needed by the beneficiaries and field assistants. 5. Technology transfer through trainings. 6. Human resources.	It is assumed that the program/project can provide all the inputs adequately as required, on time.	

(Source: own construction based on interview in July 2011).

**Appendix III Program Planning Matrix of “Dairy Cattle  
Agribusiness Development Program 2007” (Beneficiaries’  
Perspective)**

Narrative Summary	Objectively Verifiable of Indicators	Means of Verification	Risk/Assumptions
Goal : To increase the welfare of the beneficiaries.	More money that beneficiaries have to afford their needs.	Individual income and amount of need that they can afford. No specific document mentioned.	-
Purposes : To increase beneficiaries’ domestic income.	Beneficiaries increase their domestic income compared to amount of previous income.	Amount of money beneficiaries have from their live stock endeavor.	Some beneficiaries assumed that by working hard breeding the live stock then it can increase their domestic income and finally they can increase their welfare as well while some other beneficiaries were not.
Targets : Beneficiaries tend to not having targets for their live stock’s production/growth.	There is no indicator mentioned explicitly except beneficiaries assumed indicators by still having the live stock alive as an indicator.	Number of live stock that is still alive.	Beneficiaries tend to do their best in animal husbandry endeavor first without having (any/much) target.
Outputs : 1. Live stocks. 2. Cages. 3. Trainings including technology transfer. 4. Field for live stocks’ food available. 5. Healthy live stocks.	1-5 are as given or informed by project leader. 6: active participation.	1, 2, 4, 5: Physically evidence. 3: number of trainings & topics that beneficiaries trained. 6: number of meeting, training, etc related to the project participated.	Outputs are the same as provided by inputs.

6. Participations.			
<p>Activities :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Providing the live stocks and their cage.</li> <li>2. Providing the field food resource for the live stocks.</li> <li>3. Providing the health's equipments for the live stocks.</li> <li>4. Providing trainings for beneficiaries and the field assistant.</li> <li>5. Technology transfer to the beneficiaries.</li> </ol>	<p>Inputs :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Beneficiaries got the live stocks at amount and qualification as recommended by the project leader.</li> <li>2. Some projects provide cages as well but some did not.</li> <li>3. Trainings for beneficiaries including technology transfer.</li> <li>4. Beneficiaries should provide field for live stock's food resource.</li> <li>5. Beneficiaries can go to vet if there is live stock got disease.</li> <li>6. Beneficiaries and other stake holders' participation.</li> </ol>	<p>Beneficiaries assumed that inputs are given as being told by the project leader (quantity and quality, time delivery), the environment is safe to breed live stocks, beneficiaries know where to distribute their live stock afterward, they have good/enough experience and skill in breeding.</p>	

(Source: own construction based on interview in July 2011).

**Appendix IV Program Planning Design of Cocoa Plantation sub-  
Program 2006 (Operational Guidance Version)**

Narrative Summary	Objectively Verifiable of Indicators	Means of Verification	Risk/Assumptions
<p>Goal :</p> <p>To increase the welfare of the people</p>	<p>Indicators are not mentioned explicitly</p>	<p>It is not mentioned what sort of means of verification that should be used to verify the aims explicitly in the operational guidance. Aims are just written shortly as stated at previous column.</p>	<p>-</p>
<p>Purposes :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. To increase the farmer's income.</li> <li>2. To increase the productivity of farmland especially for coffee which can increase farmer's income</li> <li>3. To increase the production of plantation commodity.</li> <li>4. To decrease the influence of price fluctuation on plantation commodity.</li> <li>5. To increase local genuine income.</li> <li>6. To support local economics mainstay and</li> </ol>	<p>Indicators are not mentioned explicitly</p>	<p>It is not mentioned what sort of means of verification that should be used to verify the purposes explicitly in the operational guidance. Purposes are just written shortly as stated at previous column.</p>	<p>Risk or assumptions are not mentioned explicitly in the document.</p>



environment sustainability.			
<p>Targets :</p> <p>The coffee farmland or other farmlands, or nominee of farmland in kepahiang district which the owners [farmers] are interest to plant cocoa plantation.</p>	<p>Coffee farmland/other, owners are interest to plant cocoa which is about 9,000 hectares with diversification pattern or 4,500 hectares with monoculture pattern.</p>	<p>It is not mentioned what sort of means of verification that should be used to verify the targets explicitly in the operational guidance either. Targets are just written shortly as stated at previous column but the beneficiaries are well defined.</p>	<p>Risk or assumptions are not mentioned explicitly in the document.</p>
<p>Outputs are implicitly mentioned as:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Cocoa seed plantation.</li> <li>2. Fertilizer.</li> <li>3. Management and teams</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. 4,5 millions.</li> <li>2. 10kgs per hectare for diversification pattern and 20kgs per hectare for monoculture pattern.</li> <li>3. Project management procedure and working teams at district, sub district and village level.</li> </ol>	<p>It is not mentioned what sort of means of verification that should be used to verify the outputs explicitly in the operational guidance but the operational guidance is well informed enough about the outputs.</p>	<p>Risk or assumptions are not mentioned explicitly in the document.</p>
<p>Activities are mentioned implicitly as to :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Provide cocoa plantation.</li> <li>2. Provide fertilizer.</li> <li>3. Project management procedure and team.</li> </ol>	<p>Inputs are implicitly mentioned as:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Provide cocoa seed plantation up to 4,5 millions.</li> <li>2. Provide fertilizer up To 10kgs per hectare for diversification pattern and 20kgs per hectare for monoculture pattern.</li> <li>3. Project management procedure and teams (human resources).</li> <li>4. Training and technical transfer for field assistant and beneficiaries.</li> </ol>		<p>Risk or assumptions are not mentioned explicitly in the document but implicitly can be assumed that inputs will be given according the requirements, on time and supervised tightly.</p>

(Source: own construction based on cocoa plantation operational guidance).

**Appendix V program Planning Matrix Of Plantation (Cocoa) Program  
2006 (Head of plantation department's and program leader's  
perspective)**

Narrative Summary	Objectively Verifiable of Indicators	Means of Verification	Risk/Assumptions
<p>Goal :</p> <p>To increase the welfare of the people</p>	<p>Faster economic growth (more money is spent in kepahiang district), ability to afford people needs.</p>	<p>Statistic report, economic growth, M&amp;E evaluation, project/policy documents.</p>	<p>-</p>
<p>Purposes :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. To provide a weekly domestic income for the people [beneficiaries].</li> <li>2. To decrease a global warming.</li> <li>3. To function as a guardian for Musi river.</li> <li>4. Provide jobs for people.</li> <li>5. As a contribution to local government through local genuine income.</li> <li>6. To increase the ability of people in buying-selling products/stuffs [afford their need].</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Beneficiaries have a weekly income source.</li> <li>2. Beneficiaries plan through monoculture pattern which will turn into people forest afterward.</li> <li>3. Amount of water flow at the river is stable</li> <li>4. More people involved as cocoa farmer.</li> <li>5. There will be amount of local genuine income to government through this program.</li> <li>6. More amount of money that people [beneficiaries] have.</li> </ol>	<p>Statistic report, economic growth, M&amp;E evaluation, project/policy documents.</p>	<p>By managing cocoa plantation consistently the purposes will be achieved</p>
<p>Targets :</p>	<p>Coffee farmland/other, owners are interest to plant</p>	<p>M&amp;E evaluation, project/policy</p>	<p>Targeted farmer are willing to</p>

<p>The coffee farmland or other farmlands, or nominee of farmland in kepahiang district which the owners [farmers] are interest to plant cocoa plantation.</p>	<p>cocoa which in total is about 9,000 hectares with diversification pattern or 4,500 hectares with monoculture pattern.</p>	<p>documents, project implementation report, survey, observation.</p>	<p>cooperate into the program</p>
<p>Outputs :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Cocoa seed plantation.</li> <li>2. Fertilizer.</li> <li>3. Management and teams</li> <li>4. Training &amp; technical transfer.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. 4,5 millions.</li> <li>2. 10kgs per hectare for diversification pattern and 20kgs per hectare for monoculture pattern.</li> <li>3. Project management procedure and teams from district, sub district and village (human resources).</li> <li>4. Training and technical transfer [field assistant and beneficiaries] conducted few times.</li> </ol>	<p>M&amp;E evaluation, project/policy documents, project implementation report, observation.</p>	<p>Outputs are achieved as much as at given inputs</p>
<p>Activities :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Provide cocoa plantation.</li> <li>2. Provide fertilizer.</li> <li>3. Project management procedure and teams.</li> <li>4. Training and technical transfer [field assistant and beneficiaries].</li> </ol>	<p>Inputs :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Provide cocoa seed plantation up to 4,5 millions.</li> <li>2. Provide fertilizer up To 10kgs per hectare for diversification pattern and 20kgs per hectare for monoculture pattern.</li> <li>3. Project management procedure and teams from district, sub district to village (human resources).</li> <li>4. Training and technical transfer [field assistant and beneficiaries].</li> </ol>		<p>Inputs are given based on high requirements and supervised tightly.</p>

(Source: own construction based on interview in July 2011)

**Appendix VI Program Planning Matrix Of Cocoa Plantation sub-  
Program 2006 (Beneficiaries' perspective)**

Narrative Summary	Objectively Verifiable of Indicators	Means of Verification	Risk/Assumptions
Goal : To increase the welfare of the people	Beneficiaries have more money to afford their needs.	Amount of money beneficiaries have	-
Purposes : To provide a weekly domestic income for the people [beneficiaries].	Beneficiaries have income [weekly ] from cocoa endeavor	Amount of money beneficiaries have per weekly	Beneficiaries manage professionally the plantation.
Targets : The coffee farmland or other farmlands, or nominee of farmland in kepahiang district which the owners [farmers] are interest to plant cocoa plantation.	Farmers who have coffee farmland or those who willing to plant cocoa.	Ask [interview] people.	People are willing to incorporate into the program
Outputs : 1. Cocoa seed plantation 2. Fertilizer. 3. Management and teams. 4. Training & technical transfer.	1. 4,5 millions. 2. 10kgs per hectare for diversification pattern and 20kgs per hectare for monoculture pattern. 3. Project management procedure and teams (human resources). 4. Training and technical transfer [field assistant and beneficiaries] conducted few times.	1-2: Observe the physical outputs. 3: program procedures/management, and teams from district, sub district and village. 4: number of training & technology transfer participated.	Outputs are as much as given inputs.
Activities : 1. Provide cocoa	Inputs : 1. Provide cocoa seed plantation up to 4,5		Inputs are given according to the

plantation.	millions.	procedure, on time with high quality and sufficient quantity.
2. Provide fertilizer.	2. Provide fertilizer up To 10kgs per hectare for diversification pattern and 20kgs per hectare for monoculture pattern.	
3. Project management procedure and teams.	3. Project management procedure and teams from district, sub district and village (human resources).	
4. Training and technical transfer [field assistant and beneficiaries.	4. Training and technical transfer [field assistant and beneficiaries].	

(Source: own construction based on interview in July 2011)

*Appendix VII Source of information*

Sub-program	Source of information
Dairy cattle	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Head of Animal Husbandry and Fishery Department</li><li>2. Head of sub-districts: Kepahiang, Tebat Karai.</li><li>3. Bappeda official</li><li>4. Program leader</li><li>5. Head of field assistant institution</li><li>6. Field assistant coordinator</li><li>7. Field assistant.</li><li>8. Vet.</li><li>9. Beneficiaries: 1 group leader and 1 group member for each sub district:Kepahiang, Ujan Mas and Kabaweten.</li></ol>
Cocoa plantation	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Head of Forestry and Plantation Department.</li><li>2. Head of sub-districts: Kepahiang, Tebat Karai and Seberang Musi.</li><li>3. Bappeda official</li><li>4. Program leader</li><li>5. Head of field assistant institution</li><li>6. Field assistant coordinator</li><li>7. Field assistant.</li><li>8. Beneficiaries: one beneficiary for each sub-district:Kepahiang, Ujan Mas, Tebat Karai and Kabaweten.</li></ol>

## References

- Amsfein, S.R. (1969) 'A Ladder of Citizen Participation'.
- Badan Pusat Statistik (2007) 'Kepahiang Dalam Angka 2006', Kepahiang. BPS Kabupaten Rejang Lebong.
- Bagian Keuangan Kabupaten Kepahiang (2006) 'Penjabaran Anggaran Pendapatan dan Belanja Daerah (APBD) Kabupaten Kepahiang Tahun Anggaran 2006'. Kepahiang. Unpublished.
- Bagian Keuangan Kabupaten Kepahiang (2007) 'Penjabaran Anggaran Pendapatan dan Belanja Daerah (APBD) Kabupaten Kepahiang Tahun Anggaran 2007'. Kepahiang. Unpublished.
- Bagian Keuangan Kabupaten Kepahiang (2008) 'Penjabaran Anggaran Pendapatan dan Belanja Daerah (APBD) Kabupaten Kepahiang Tahun Anggaran 2008'. Kepahiang. Unpublished.
- Bagian Keuangan Kabupaten Kepahiang (2009) 'Penjabaran Anggaran Pendapatan dan Belanja Daerah (APBD) Kabupaten Kepahiang Tahun Anggaran 2009'. Kepahiang. Unpublished.
- Bagian Keuangan Kabupaten Kepahiang (2010) 'Penjabaran Anggaran Pendapatan dan Belanja Daerah (APBD) Kabupaten Kepahiang Tahun Anggaran 2010'. Kepahiang. Unpublished.
- Bappeda Kabupaten Kepahiang (no year) 'Rencana Pembangunan Jangka Menengah Daerah (RPJMD) Kabupaten Kepahiang 2006-2010', Kepahiang. Unpublished.
- Blackwell, O. and Anne Garbutt (2005) 'The Use and Abuse of the Logical Framework Approach'. No place: Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency.
- Carvalho, S. and Howard White (2004) 'Theory-based Evaluation: the Case of Social Funds', *American Journal of Evaluation* 25(2): 141-160. Sage.
- Chen, H. (1990) *Theory-Driven Evaluations: Huey-Tsyb Chen*. Newbury Park, CA [etc.]: Sage.
- Chowdhury, A. and C.H. Kirkpatrick (1994) *Development Policy and Planning: An Introduction to Models and Techniques / Anis Chowdhury and Colin Kirkpatrick*. London [etc.]: Routledge.
- Colebatch, H.K. (2002) *Policy: H.K. Colebatch*. Buckingham [etc.]: Open University Press.
- Cracknell, Basil Edward (2000) 'a Basic Issue: Why Evaluate? For accountability or for Lesson-Learning?', *Evaluating Development Aid, Issues, Problems and Solutions*, Sage publications, pp 54-66.
- Cusworth, J.W. and T.R. Franks (1993) *Managing Projects in Developing Countries: Edited by J.W. Cusworth and T.R. Franks*. New York: Wiley.
- Dinas Kehutanan dan Perkebunan Kabupaten Kepahiang (2006) 'Petunjuk Pelaksanaan (Juklak) Kegiatan Pengembangan Tanaman Perkebunan Kakao Tahun Anggaran 2006. Kepahiang. Unpublished.
- Dinas Peternakan dan Perikanan Kabupaten Kepahiang (2007) 'Petunjuk Pelaksanaan (Juklak) Penyebaran dan Pengembangan Ternak Sapi Perah', Kepahiang. Unpublished.
- Dinas Peternakan dan Perikanan Kabupaten Kepahiang (2007) 'Petunjuk Teknis (Juknis) Penyebaran dan Pengembangan Ternak Sapi Perah', Kepahiang. Unpublished.

- Dunn, W.N. (1986) *Policy Analysis: Perspectives, Concepts, and Methods* / Ed. by William N. Dunn. Greenwich, CT [etc.]: Jai Press.
- Europe Aid (2001) Manual Project Cycle Management. Brussels:European Commission. Accessed 11 November 2011  
[http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/where/latin-america/regional-cooperation/urbal/documents/publications/pcm\\_handbook\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/where/latin-america/regional-cooperation/urbal/documents/publications/pcm_handbook_en.pdf)
- Fischer, F. and G.J. Miller (2007) *Handbook of Public Policy Analysis: Theory, Politics, and Methods* / Ed. by Frank Fischer, Gerald J. Miller [and] Mara S. Sidney. Vol. 125. Boca Raton, FL [etc.]: CRC Press.
- Gasper, D. (2000) 'Evaluating the 'logical Framework Approach' Towards learning-oriented Development Evaluation', *Public Administration and Development* 20(1): 17-28.
- Jackson, B. (1997) 'Designing Projects and Project Evaluations Using the Logical Framework Approach'. Switzerland: International Union for the conservation of Nature and Natural Resources (IUCN).
- Khan, M.A. (1998) 'Evaluation Capacity Building', *Evaluation* 4(3): 310.
- Knoepfel, P. (2007) *Public Policy Analysis: Peter Knoepfel ... [Et Al.]*. Bristol: Policy Press.
- Kusek, J.Z. and R.C. Rist (2004) *Ten Steps to a Results-Based Monitoring and Evaluation System: A Handbook for Development Practitioners*. Vol. 289. World Bank Publications.
- Mazmanian, D.A. and P.A. Sabatier (1983) *Implementation and Public Policy: Daniel A. Mazmanian, Paul A. Sabatier*. Glenview, IL [etc.]: Scott, Foresman.
- Molund, S. and Goran Schill (2004) 'Looking Back, Moving Forward' SIDA Evaluation Manual. Stockholm :Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency.
- Norad (1999) *the Logical Framework Approach (LFA): Handbook for Objectives-oriented Planning*, 4<sup>th</sup> edition. Oslo: Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation. Accessed 11 November 2011  
<http://www.ccop.or.th/ppm/document/home/LFA%20by%20NORAD%20Handbook.pdf>
- Ortengren, K. (2004) 'the Logical Framework Approach: a Summary of the Theory Behind the LFA Method'. No place. Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA). Accessed 11 November 2011  
[http://www.google.com/#pq=sida&hl=en&sugexp=ppwl&cp=35&gs\\_id=dk&xhr=t&q=sida,+ortengren,+logical+framework&pf=p&scient=psy-ab&biw=958&bih=495&source=hp&pbx=1&oq=sida,+ortengren,+logical+framework&aq=f&aqi=&aql=&gs\\_sm=&gs\\_upl=&bav=on.2,or.r\\_gc.r\\_pw.,cf.osb&fp=d013020512624b3e](http://www.google.com/#pq=sida&hl=en&sugexp=ppwl&cp=35&gs_id=dk&xhr=t&q=sida,+ortengren,+logical+framework&pf=p&scient=psy-ab&biw=958&bih=495&source=hp&pbx=1&oq=sida,+ortengren,+logical+framework&aq=f&aqi=&aql=&gs_sm=&gs_upl=&bav=on.2,or.r_gc.r_pw.,cf.osb&fp=d013020512624b3e)
- Patton, M.Q. (1997) 'Intended Uses of Findings' *Utilization-focused Evaluation: The New Century Text*, 3rd edition (4):63-79. London: Sage.
- Pawson, R. (2003) 'nothing as Practical as a Good Theory', *Evaluation* 9(4):471-490. Sage.
- Pemerintah Republik Indonesia (no year) 'Peraturan Pemerintah Republik Indonesia Nomor 8 Tahun 2008 tentang Tahapan, Tata Cara Penyusunan, Pengendalian dan Evaluasi Pelaksanaan Rencana Pembangunan Daerah' (development planning system). Accessed 11 November 2011  
[http://hukum.unsrat.ac.id/pp/pp\\_8\\_2008.pdf](http://hukum.unsrat.ac.id/pp/pp_8_2008.pdf)
- Pemerintah Republik Indonesia (no year) 'Undang-undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 25 Tahun 2004 tentang Sistem Perencanaan Pembangunan Nasional' (development planning system). Accessed 11 November 2011  
<http://www.bappenas.go.id/node/26/18/>



- Pemerintah Republik Indonesia (no year) 'Undang-undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 32 Tahun 2004 tentang Pemerintahan Daerah' (local government). Accessed 11 November 2011  
[http://www.kpu.go.id/dmdocuments/UU\\_32\\_2004\\_Pemerintahan%20Daerah.pdf](http://www.kpu.go.id/dmdocuments/UU_32_2004_Pemerintahan%20Daerah.pdf)
- Pressman, J.L. and A.B. Wildavsky (1984) *Implementation: How Great Expectations in Washington are Dashed in Oakland : Or, Why it's Amazing that Federal Programs Work at all, this being a Saga of the Economic Development Administration as Told by Two Sympathetic Observers Who Seek to Build Morals on a Foundation of Ruined Hopes / Jeffrey L. Pressman and Aaron Wildavsky*. Berkeley, Calif., [etc.]: University of California press.
- Public Administration Policy and Planning: Edited by Prasant K. Mathur*. (1996) New Delhi: Kanishka.
- Saldanha, C.D. and J.F. Whittle (1998) 'Using the Logical Framework for Sector Analysis and Project Design'. Manila: Asian Development Bank. Accessed 11 November 2011  
[http://www.adb.org/Documents/Guidelines/Logical\\_Framework/logical.pdf](http://www.adb.org/Documents/Guidelines/Logical_Framework/logical.pdf)
- SIDA (1996) Guideline for the Application of LFA in Project Cycle Management. Stockholm: Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency.
- Spicker, P. (2006) *Policy Analysis for Practice: Applying Social Policy / Paul Spicker*. Bristol: Policy.
- UNDP (2002) Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluating for Results. New York: United Nations Development Program. Accessed 11 November 2011  
<http://www.undp.org/evaluation/documents/HandBook/ME-HandBook.pdf>
- Weiss, C.H. (1997) 'How Can Theory-Based Evaluation Make Greater Headway?', *Evaluation Review* 21(4): 501-524. Sage.
- Wiggins, S. and D. Shields (1995) 'Clarifying the "logical Framework" as a Tool for Planning and Managing Development Project', *Project Appraisal*, Vol.1, No.1 : 2-12.
- Woodhil, J. (2000) 'Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating Programmes and Projects; Introduction to Key Concepts, Approaches and Terms', IUCN Working Draft Version 1- March 2000. No place. International Union for the conservation of Nature and Natural Resources (IUCN). Accessed 11 November 2011  
[http://cmsdata.iucn.org/downloads/pme\\_concepts\\_terms\\_00.pdf](http://cmsdata.iucn.org/downloads/pme_concepts_terms_00.pdf)
- Yanow, D. (2000) *Conducting Interpretive Policy Analysis: Dvora Yanow*. Vol. 47. Thousand Oaks, Calif., [etc.]: Sage.