



A Baseline Study of Decentralization/ Regional Autonomy

A Survey of Processes and Performance Indicators Across Twelve Kabupaten/kota

The findings, views, and interpretations in this report are those of the authors and should not be attributed to any of the agencies providing financial support to SMERU activities and reports (including The World Bank Group). For further information, please contact SMERU, Phone: 62-21-336336, Fax: 62-21-330850, web: www.smeru.or.id, e-mail: smeru@smeru.or.id

Syaikhu Usman

M. Sulton Mawardi

Nina Toyamah

Vita Febriany

Sudarno Sumarto

John Strain

A Research Proposal from the Social Monitoring & Early Response Unit (SMERU), a unit with support from the World Bank, AusAID, the ASEM Trust Fund, and USAID.

Revised Version

May 1, 2000

Table of Contents

Summary.....	iii
1. Background	1
2. About SMERU	2
3. Research Objectives	2
4. Relationship to Other Studies.....	3
5. Areas of Investigation	4
5.1. Processes	4
Regional government tasks and structures	4
Personnel transfer.....	5
Managing regional government budget.....	5
Creating and directing regional public policies.....	5
Capability and accountability of local assembly.....	6
5.2. Performance Measures.	6
Health.....	7
Education	7
Agriculture	7
5.3. Conclusion	7
6. Methodology.....	8
6.1. Justification of Sampling	8
6.2. Selection of Kabupaten/kota	8

Summary

The central government of Indonesia is trying to accommodate demands for greater autonomy from the regions. As a result, provincial and kabupaten/kota level governments will soon have to cope with political, fiscal and administrative decentralization. Article 8 of Law 22/1999 states that decentralization must be accompanied with the hand-over and transfer of financing, facilities and infrastructure as well as resources in accordance with the authority delegated to a region. SMERU has outlined a four to five year study to monitor the process of decentralization and to test the impact of decentralization on the structure of the government and on the government's ability to deliver services in 12 kabupaten/kota.

From April 2000 to April 2001 SMERU proposes to monitor preparations and expectations in provincial, kabupaten/kota, kecamatan and village level administrations as well as prepare a survey instrument for evaluating decentralization in the future. The study will investigate how the sub-national governments are coping with the *processes* related to their new functions.

In the second year of the study, starting may 2001, the affect of decentralization on the *performance* of kabupaten/kota governments in service delivery will be measured. In this study a different methodology will be needed to test performance because it will involve a broad household survey, a census of service delivery points and expert interviews at the local level. As previously stated, SMERU plans to develop the survey instruments for this 2001 study using input and key indicators generated from this year's study.

Twelve kabupaten/kota will be surveyed with two villages covered in each kabupaten. Government, universities, NGOs, print media and village level representatives will be surveyed. Reports will be produced on one kabupaten/kota per month for 12 months with working papers comparing results across kabupaten/kota being published in November 2000 and again in May 2001.

Scope and Schedule of Long-Term Activities of Regional Autonomy Study Team

No	Activity	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
1.	Study design preparation					
2.	Describing regional autonomy preparations and expectations in selected regions					
3.	Develop survey instruments to measure impact of regional autonomy on sub-national government service delivery to the people					
4.	Monitoring autonomy implementation of regional autonomy in selected regions					
5.	Measuring impact of autonomy implementation in selected regions					
6.	Compilation of report on overall autonomy process in selected regions					

1. Background

Indonesia is about to undertake a major decentralization¹. The current plan will see most government responsibilities shift from the central government, to the 341 district level (kabupaten/kota²) governments (thereby largely bypassing the provincial governments). The new powers, responsibilities and structures of kabupaten/kota government are outlined in Law 22/1999 which was prepared by the Ministry of Home Affairs. The allocation of finance to the kabupaten/kota is outlined in law 25/1999 and this law was prepared by the Ministry of Finance. These laws will be implemented at the start of Indonesia's financial year in January 2001.

Decentralization will include the election of sub-national officials (by provincial and kabupaten/kota parliaments) which is major shift from the past when accountability of regional officials was (at least on paper) bottom up and appointment of officials was top down.

This dramatic change in government administration faces challenges in the form of the poor synchronizing of the two main decentralization laws (22/1999 and 25/1999) and the lack of supporting/clarifying regulations (peraturan pemerintah). The speed with which decentralization is expected to be implemented, starting in April 2000, is also a challenge for the public service. A public service work culture that has developed over 30 years will be turned on its head. Changes ranging from greatly increased responsibilities in managing finances, transferring personnel and service delivery while accountability shifts from the previous top-down style to the new bottom up approach.

Although previous attempts at decentralization in Indonesia were never fully implemented (law 5/1974) there is little doubt of the political will at the highest levels of government for the proposed decentralization policy. There is also pressure for decentralization coming from the regions and civil society.

Stated government aims of decentralization amount to a few sentences at the beginning of the two laws. Law 22 mentions "empowering the public, cultivating initiative and creativity and intensifying public participation".

Since President Suharto stepped down in May 1998. Indonesia has experienced dramatic democratization. Characterized by a free election in 1999, freedom of the press and national calls for '*reformasi*' this democratization of society has allowed for a flood of regional demands and grievances directed towards the central government. The aims of decentralization are to pacify regions by providing a fairer redistribution of revenue and allowing for better service delivery and local level accountability. It is hoped that this will quell the demands some regions have for succeeding from Indonesia. SMERU has developed the following proposal with these issues of national importance in mind.

¹ Decentralization in the Indonesian context refers to the devolution by statutory transfer of authority, responsibility and accountability of most government functions from central government to kabupaten/kota. This is accompanied with the decentralization of expenditure responsibilities, assets and personnel from the center to kabupaten/kota.

² A kabupaten and kota are the district level administrations for rural and urban areas respectively. Below these are kecamatan. The lowest administrative level is at the village level. In rural (kabupaten) administrations villages are called 'desa' and in urban (kota) administrations the village level administration is known as kelurahan.

2. About SMERU

SMERU (Social Monitoring & Early Response Unit) grew out of a deep concern expressed at the July 1998 Consultative Group for Indonesia (CGI) meetings that there was little independent, reliable, real time, monitoring of the social impact of the crisis unfolding in Indonesia. Responding to this concern, a multi-donor initiative led to the creation of SMERU with funding for its activities obtained from several donor agencies, in particular AusAID, ASEM, and USAID, and with logistical and administrative support from the World Bank.

SMERU has carried out this mandate with studies of the impact of the crisis on poverty, labor markets, health, education, gender, and crime, and of the performance and impact of reform efforts with studies of crisis programs in rice (OPK and OPSM) and other emergency Social Safety Net programs such as PDM-DKE, health, and education. It has also conducted an extensive monitoring of the regional trade deregulation efforts. SMERU studies have applied both qualitative and quantitative techniques, using both teams of researchers addressing specific topics or programs through field visits across the country and a data analysis unit to report quantitatively on these same issues.

In 18 months SMERU has produced 9 special reports, 12 working papers, 30 field reports on a variety of topics and 14 reports on decentralization. SMERU's output and further information about SMERU is available on the SMERU web-site at www.smeru.or.id.

SMERU consists of four units: the Crisis Impact Monitoring Unit, the Data Analysis Unit, the NGO Liaison Unit and the Decentralization and Regional Autonomy Unit. In 1999 the Decentralization and Regional Autonomy Unit studied regional trade deregulation and this year the team will focus entirely on decentralization. The decentralization team is headed by Dr Syaikh Usman.

3. Research Objectives

Short term – 2000/2001 research objective:

Document the changes regional governments make to cope with new responsibilities and new bottom up accountability.

Document how these changes *are likely* to affect service delivery to people in the regions.³

Develop survey instruments that will be used to measure local government performance in service delivery.

Long term research objective:

To describe how regional governments manage the process of decentralization and how this affects service delivery in the regions.

³ Full expenditure decentralization is not planned to be in place until 4/2001 therefore in 2000 SMERU will not document the impact of decentralization.

4. Relationship to Other Studies

The research aims to be a reference point for measuring how regional governments are managing the complex process of decentralization and how this is affecting service delivery in the regions.

SMERU will aid the decentralization process through giving central government policymakers feedback on the progress of decentralization in a limited number of kabupaten/kota. This will allow for policy adjustments based on accurate field data generated in a relatively short time.

A further aim of the research is to contribute to the discourse on decentralization in Indonesia by disseminating results not only to government but to the donor community, universities, print media and relevant NGOs.

The aim 'to increase people participation in the local decision making process' is beyond the scope of this study. This research however will investigate the efforts being made to bring local community voice and participation into planning, decision-making and service provision. In 2001 a household survey will test satisfaction with service delivery, transparency and accountability. SMERU feels that this contributes in some way to aid the channel for people's aspirations to reach kabupaten/kota level government and possibly become closer to being a basis for future local level decision making.

Much of the research to date on decentralization in Indonesia has focussed on the fiscal aspects of decentralization or the anomalies in the laws No. 22,1999 and No. 25, 1999. Studies focusing on the fiscal aspects of decentralization include:

Ahmad, E. et. al. (1999). *Indonesia: Decentralization – Managing the Risks*. Fiscal Affairs Department, International Monetary Fund.

Buentjen, C. (1999). *Fiscal Decentralization Reform in Indonesia: A Critical Assessment of Law No. 25, 1999 on the Fiscal Balance between the Central and the Regional Government*. GTZ – Support for Decentralization Measures.

Mahi, R. (2000). *Intergovernmental Fiscal Transfer in Indonesia*. Lembaga Penyelidikan Ekonomi dan Masyarakat (LPEM) Fakultas Ekonomi Universitas Indonesia.

Research that has provided an overview of Indonesia's decentralization strategy through a critique of laws 22, 1999 and 25, 1999 includes:

Alm, J. & Bahl, R. (1999). *Decentralization in Indonesia: Prospects and Problems*. Supporting Documentation for UEM Strategy and Program Development.

Islam, I. (1999). *Making Decentralization Work: Reaping the Rewards and Managing the Risks*. Jakarta: United Nations Support Facility for Indonesian Recovery.

The above research is focussed on the national level and based on secondary material. SMERU proposes to base its reports on primary material gathered through face to face interviews from the provincial to the village level. Our 'hands on' study will provide feedback from those expected to implement decentralization and those affected by decentralization. In this way our research is closer to the study conducted by Suharyo, Widjajanti (2000). *Voices From the Regions: A Participatory Assessment of the New Decentralization Laws in Indonesia*. United Nations Support Facility for Indonesian Recovery. Two rounds of interviews and discussions with stakeholders at central and regional levels were conducted and the second phase of the

research covered 10 provinces. This study provided important feedback on how regions feel about decentralization and it looked broadly at what preparations regions were undertaking. This year SMERU plans to probe deeper into exactly how kabupaten/kota administrations are planning to cope with decentralization through an investigation of five processes outlined in the following chapter. It is through this 'hands on' assessment that SMERU will provide feedback on how various kabupaten/kota are coping with decentralization and where potential problem areas lie.

Indonesia was one of three countries in a World Bank comparative study of local level institutions (LLI) carried out from 1996 to 1998. The purpose of this study was to explore the role and capacity of local institutions and social capacity in household welfare and service delivery. SMERU's study is also interested in local government service delivery and investigating the extent that decentralization is making local government more responsive to demands from civil society. Currently there is a second LLI study being undertaken to provide data on how local institutions change over time. SMERU will be particularly interested in the role that social capital plays in how households cope with the monetary crisis and the type of new local institutions that are emerging as political transformation progresses.

The World Bank's Kecamatan Development Project (KDP) is being implemented in 700 kecamatan across 19 provinces. While this is a project (as opposed to a study) the focus on the increase of functions and responsibilities of kecamatan governments and their relationship with kabupaten governments has similarities with this research proposal. SMERU will be particularly interested in findings from KDP monitoring studies on structural changes within governments and how service delivery performance is affecting local constituencies.

5. Areas of Investigation

The two main areas of investigation are:

1. The **processes** provincial and kabupaten/kota level governments undertake internally to cope with their new functions and responsibilities.
2. The **performance** of provincial and kabupaten/kota level governments with respect to their service delivery to local populations⁴.

5.1. Processes

To test how regional governments cope with these new responsibilities and functions, five **processes** will be investigated. These five processes have been selected on the basis that they are the most critical to the success or failure of the implementation of regional autonomy.

Regional government tasks and structures

Law No 22, 1999 devolved eleven services to kabupaten/kota government. Sweeping national policies under the New Order government's central administration led to inefficiencies in the structure of kabupaten/kota level government. *Dinas kehutanan* offices exist in areas without

⁴ Most service delivery functions rest with kabupaten/kota level governments with provinces playing a coordinating role.

forests and mountain areas support fishery departments. It is expected that kabupaten/kota level government will bring their departments in line with the needs of their region.

Further, the internal structure of these departments needs to change to accommodate the increase in responsibilities and independence from the central government. This indicator is related to how well departments cope with personnel reform, funding and equipment decentralization and is therefore linked to other processes under investigation by SMERU. See page 10 for a full list of government offices to be surveyed.

Personnel transfer

The central government proposes to send central government employees to the regions to strengthen the capacity of regional governments. The successful movement of skilled personnel to the regions and their seamless assimilation in their new offices is a crucial factor determining how effectively kabupaten/kota governments will operate. The issues relating to decentralizing personnel include the steps the central government has taken to prepare staff, timing, 'fit' (skills matching local needs) and several personal factors. The issues of pensions and seniority are two examples of potential dispute as *Dinas* and *Kanwil* offices are merged. These personal factors include a reluctance of personnel to leave Jakarta because of family, status or unwillingness to work and live in a different environment. Personal factors also include the potential for kabupaten/kota to be unwilling to accept personnel from the central government. We will investigate this process in all the government offices in the survey (see p. 10).

Managing regional government budget

Provincial and kabupaten/kota governments have new responsibilities and greater flexibility in budget expenditure management. Failure of kabupaten/kota governments to manage budgets will mean the failure of decentralization in that region (and the provincial government will take over the administration of the kabupaten/kota).

There are concerns that responsibilities set out in law 22, 1999 are not matched by adequate financing in law 25, 1999 and criticisms that both laws lack supporting legislation. There are also concerns that a lack of experience in budget management and the temptation for 'leakage' will stifle efforts to balance budgets.

SMERU will investigate the process by which budgets are managed. Theoretically, although not always in practice, input from RAKORBANG should allow for a more bottom up approach to budget formulation. There is the hypothesis that greater autonomy in budget expenditure allocation should lead to a more efficient and effective usage of funds because kabupaten/kota governments know what their districts need better than central government planners. SMERU will investigate budget allocation, accountability and transparency.

Creating and directing regional public policies

Using the same hypothesis as process above (i.e. sub-national governments know their districts better than the central government) one would expect kabupaten/kota to create more suitable public policies for their districts. Local legislation (*peraturan daerah*) and local decrees (*keputusan daerah*) under the new order government were sometimes an instrument for those in power to secure local level monopolies at the expense of the people. SMERU is interested in the types of policies that will be created with decentralization and will be testing whether these policies reflect the spirit of transparency, good governance and democracy.

Capability and accountability of local assembly

The capability of local assemblies (DPRD at provincial and kabupaten/kota levels) is presently weak. It is possible that some functions will be opened to professionals/consultants in order to provide advice and expertise to individual members and boost the capacity of local assemblies to control the executive government.

Trends in the makeup of the local assembly will be monitored. It is expected that changes at the village level will be the election of members (previously appointed) and that local *adat* will be better accommodated. This should bring village assemblies closer in line with the aspirations of the people. Previously there was often a division between the 'government leaders' and the 'traditional or community leaders' of a village. It is hoped decentralization will lessen this division with the community leaders assuming roles in village assemblies.

Efforts by local assemblies to be accountable to their constituencies can be documented. The publishing of decisions and budget figures in the spirit of transparency would be a positive result of decentralization. Efforts by electorates to make sure that local assemblies are accountable can also be documented. Demonstrations over a lack of accountability are one such indicator.

The influence of political parties and party affiliations will soon expand at the sub-national levels of government. SMERU will try to report on developments in this area as they appear.

5.2. Performance Measures

One of the rationales of decentralization is that it will lead to better service delivery by sub-national governments to the people. As such, how services are being delivered needs to be investigated.

The current plan is for decentralization to begin in April 2001. Although many regulations will be implemented according to the government's schedule, the overall impact of decentralization on sub-national governments performance delivery will take years (in most cases) to measure.

SMERU therefore plans to look at performance measures in the first year of the study only from the perspective of preparations, expectations and documenting current levels of service delivery. In the second year of the study, the affect of decentralization on the service delivery will be studied. In 2001 and beyond different methodology will be needed to test performance and it will probably involve a broad household survey, a census of service delivery points and expert interviews at the local level. As previously stated, SMERU plans to develop the survey instruments for this 2001 study using input from this year's study.

In-depth interviews with government offices and at the service delivery points are necessary to understand how service delivery is functioning. Welfare indicators provided by BPS, while helpful, ignore factors outside the control of a sub-nation administration. For example a poor harvest could affect the number of farmer's children in school or forest fires could affect the health of communities despite the satisfactory delivery of health and education services.

Eleven service sectors have been decentralized to kabupaten/kota level governments. SMERU will investigate three of these sectors. Two areas will be investigated across all provinces i.e. health and education. The third sector will be a kabupaten/kota -specific performance measure depending on the needs of the kabupaten/kota (e.g. agriculture, tourism, and environment).

Health and education have been chosen for investigation because they are thought to be critical to people's welfare. Further, if governments performed badly in the delivery of these services the consequences would be felt sharply.

Health

Health offices at the provincial, kabupaten/kota and kecamatan levels will be surveyed. The point of delivery will also be surveyed and the head of the *puskesmas* will be asked about their present levels of service delivery and expectations of decentralization. *Puskesmas pembantu* (village level community health clinics) will be included if they are found in any of the villages we survey.

Education

Education will be investigated using the same methodology as health. Semi structured in-depth interviews with provincial, kabupaten/kota and kecamatan levels of the education department (e.g. *Dinas Pendidikan Nasional*) and interviews at the point of service delivery in the villages. Headmasters and teachers of primary school will be interviewed with regards to creating a baseline of present service delivery levels and measuring expectations for decentralization.

Agriculture

The agricultural sector produces staple foods and creates employment. More Indonesians are employed in agriculture than any other sector making management of agriculture critical to the welfare of millions of farmers. Agricultural offices at the provincial, kabupaten/kota and kecamatan levels will be surveyed. At the village level, farmers' representatives will be surveyed to generate data on present satisfaction with government service delivery and expectations of decentralization on service delivery in the agricultural sector.

SMERU is mindful of its agenda to help bring local community voice and participation into planning, decision-making and service provision. In all three above sectors therefore, SMERU will endeavor to draw out the expectations and satisfaction end users feel with government services. These opinions may come from several sources including informal local representatives and households.

5.3. Conclusion

The test of the success or failure of decentralization is how well decentralized kabupaten/kota governments provide services to their constituencies. The first round of research will document how decentralization is affecting processes within sub-national level governments as they prepare to cope with their new functions. This study will also allow for the development of an instrument, to be used in the second round, to test the performance of kabupaten/kota governments in service delivery.

The second round of research will measure how well kabupaten/kota are performing their service delivery functions. The focus of the second round of the research will therefore shift from the impact of decentralization on sub-national governments' themselves to the impact of decentralization on service delivery performance. The focus therefore shifts from the government to the people and how decentralization is impacting on the type of services the people receive from the government.

6. Methodology

6.1. Justification of Sampling

SMERU has an experienced research team capable of investigating issues across the four levels of sub-national administration. The control gained by the same research team conducting semi-structured interviews with high, medium and low levels of government and members of civil society will allow for issues to be probed from several angles with consistency. Early warning can be given to government about potential problems (albeit on kabupaten/kota by kabupaten/kota basis).

The level of discourse on these issues among the donor community, universities and in the press can be raised. Comparisons might be drawn from concurrent research. What is gained in the trade off by not being able to extrapolate results across Indonesia is the accuracy and control of data and ability to test issues (both expected issues and issues that arise in field) across a broad spectrum of administration and society.

The semi-structured nature of our survey instrument and the high qualifications of the survey team will allow for a high value added qualitative component to the study. For example it is possible that issues relating to personnel reform will only be uncovered in field. The issues are likely to be as complex/difficult as human nature itself. Many of the concerns district level governments have about receiving personnel (e.g. status, office harmony, insecurity) are better explored qualitatively.

Further, reports will come out monthly allowing for indications of how individual kabupaten/kota are progressing in their preparations for decentralization. A working paper reporting on one province per month will be produced. In November 2000 a comparison will be drawn between the first six working papers and this will be repeated in May 2001 with a report tying the results of the 12 kabupaten/kota together.

Some issues investigated at the kabupaten/kota level will be the same for other kabupaten/kota in that province. Our analysis of one kabupaten/kota may well help other kabupaten/kota by providing early warning of challenges ahead. This is true of both processes and performance measures. An example (for processes) is the issue of transfer of personnel to islands outside Java and the handling of new budgetary functions. An example for performance issues would be the handling of land clearing and forest fires in Kalimantan, agricultural issues in Central Java and health in NTB/NTT. SMERU might therefore be able to assist, in a modest fashion, a broader reach of kabupaten/kota than the 12 we survey.

In 2001 SMERU will measure the performance of local government in the delivery of services to the people. A household survey will be conducted as well as expert interviews at service delivery points. Input will also be generated from interviews with local level community leaders and relevant government offices. The methodology in 2001 therefore will be more quantitative than the present methodology.

6.2. Selection of Kabupaten/Kota

There are 26 provinces and 341 kabupaten/kota in Indonesia. SMERU will cover 12 provinces at the rate of one province per month. Within each province, the four levels of sub-national administration will be surveyed and each kabupaten survey will include two villages. Sub-

national levels of administration are known as provincial, kabupaten/kota, kecamatan and desa/kelurahan.

Provinces have been chosen to allow for a geographic spread across Indonesia. Indonesia's population is 61% rural and 39% urban. Our sampling of 9:3 for kabupaten: kota partly reflects this distribution but has is weighted towards rural areas because the Decentralization and Regional Autonomy Team at SMERU is most concerned with the affects of regional autonomy in the rural areas. It is in the rural areas that people are poorest and most dependent on the continuation of government services.

The nine kabupaten have also been selected on the basis of whether they are rich, average or poor. This scale was based on PDRB per capita. There are three kabupaten from each of the wealth categories. The three kota were chosen on the same basis of geographical distribution and wealth.

Papua has been included for the specific purpose of testing the GOI assumption that regional autonomy will be a panacea for disintegration demands coming from provinces.

The order in which kabupaten/kota will be surveyed is not random. While reports will come out monthly a summary report will be produced at the end of November 2000. The timing has allowed for a mixture of five kabupaten and two kota to be in sample for the November summary report. Further, a geographical spread will be represented in the November sample with two surveys from kabupaten/kota west of Java, two from Java and three from Eastern Indonesia. Papua will be interviewed in the dry season when villages are more accessible.

Number and Type of Respondent

Administrative Levels	Respondent Categories	Respondents	Seniority of Respondent	N=
Propinsi	Legislatif	Ketua/Wakil ketua Dewan	-	1
	Eksekutif/Pemda	BAPPEDA	Kepala atau wakil kepala	1
		Gubernur/ Sekwilda	-	1
		Kanwil-Kanwil sesuai fokus permasalahan (e.g. Menteri Tani –Dinas Pendidikan Nasional, Dinas Kesehatan)	Kepala atau wakil kepala	3
	Masyarakat	Universitas/lembaga penelitian	Senior Lecturers from the economics/politics/law faculties of the largest private (n=1) and largest public (n=1) university	2
		LSM	Political/social NGOs – depends on regional issues (e.g.Kal. enviro)	2
Surat kabar lokal		Editorial board, senior pol/eco journo.	2	
Kabupaten/ Kota	Legislatif	Komisi A, Bidang Pemerintahan	Kepala atau wakil kepala	1
		Komisi B, Bidang Perekonomian	Kepala atau wakil kepala	1
		Komisi C, Bidang Keuangan	Kepala atau wakil kepala	1
		Komisi E, Bidang Kesra	Kepala atau wakil kepala	1
	Eksekutif/Pemda	Bupati/Walikota/Sekwilda	-	1
		Bappeda	Kepala atau wakil kepala	1
		Bagian Keuangan	Kepala atau wakil kepala	1
		Bagian Organisasi (Subag Tatalaksana)	Kepala atau wakil kepala	1
		Bagian Kepegawaian	Kepala atau wakil kepala	1
		Bagian Hukum	Kepala atau wakil kepala	1
		Bagian Ekonomi	Kepala atau wakil kepala	1
		Dispenda	Kepala atau wakil kepala	1
		Dinas-Dinas sesuai fokus Permasalahan(e.g. Menteri Tani –Dinas Pendidikan Nasional, Dinas Kesehatan)	Kepala	3
		Itwilkab/kota	Kepala	1
		BKPMMD	Kepala	1
		BPS	Kepala	1
		BUMD	Kepala	2
	Masyarakat	Mantan birokrat	Mantan Kepala	2
		Ketua partai	Kepala	2
		Puskesmas	kepala	2
Asosiasi pengusaha		Kepala	2	
Tokoh masyarakat		-	1	
LSM		Kepala LSM	1	
Kecamatan	Legislatif	UDKP	-	1
	Pem. Kecamatan	Camat/Sekwilcam	-	1
		Cabang Dinas Terkait sesuai fokus permasalahan (e.g. Menteri Tani –Dinas Pendidikan Nasional, Dinas Kesehatan)	Kepala	3
Desa/ Kelurahan (2 desa)	Legislatif	LMD	-	2x1=2
	Pem. Desa	Kepala Desa/Sekdes	-	2x1=2
		Puskesmas Pembantu	-	2x2=4
		Kepala dusun	-	2x1=2
		LKMD	Kepala	2x1=2
	Masyarakat	Tokoh masyarakat/adat	-	2x2=4
		Sekolah	Kepala and senior teachers	2x2=4
		Kelompok Tani	Kepala	2x1=2
		FMOG	Teacher (n=1) and Parent (n=1) rep.	2x1=2
Kelompok pemuda/tokoh pemuda		Kepala (n=1) tokoh (n=1)	2x1=2	

Topics Covered by Respondent and Administrative Level - Sample Sizes are for one Province

Respondent	N=	General Issues	PROCESSES					PERFORMANCE MEASURES		
			Tasks and org. structures	Personnel transfer	Managing regional dev. budget	Creating and directing regional public policies	Local assembly – capability and accountability	Education	Health	Agriculture
Propinsi										
Ketua/Wakil Ketua Dewan	1	✓	✓	✓				✓		
BAPPEDA	1	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓			
Gubernur/ Sekwilda	1	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓			
Kanwil-Kanwil sesuai fokus permasalahan	3	✓	✓	✓			✓			
Universitas/lembaga penelitian	2	✓					✓	✓		
LSM	2	✓					✓			
Surat kabar lokal	2	✓					✓			
Kabupaten/Kota										
Komisi A, Bidang Pemerintahan	1	✓	✓	✓			✓	✓		
Komisi B, Bidang Perekonomian	1	✓	✓	✓			✓	✓		
Komisi C, Bidang Keuangan	1	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		
Komisi E, Bidang Kesra	1	✓	✓	✓			✓	✓		
Bupati/Walikota/Sekwilda	1	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Bappeda	1	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Bagian Keuangan	1	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		
Bagian Organisasi	1	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		

Respondent	N=	General Issues	PROCESSES					PERFORMANCE MEASURES		
			Tasks and org. structures	Personnel transfer	Managing regional dev. budget	Creating and directing regional public policies	Local assembly – capability and accountability	Education	Health	Agriculture
(Subag Tatalaksana)										
Bagian Kepegawaian	1	✓	✓	✓			✓			
Bagian Hukum	1	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓			
Bagian Ekonomi	1	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓			
Dispenda	1	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓			
Dinas-Dinas sesuai fokus Permasalahan	3	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Itwilkab/kota	1	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓			
BKPM	1	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓			
BPS	1	✓	✓	✓			✓			
BUMD	2	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓			
Mantan birokrat	2	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓			
Ketua partai	2	✓	✓	✓			✓			
Puskesmas	2								✓	
Asosiasi pengusaha	2	✓					✓			
Tokoh masyarakat	1	✓					✓	✓		✓
LSM	1	✓					✓			
Kecamatan										
UDKP	1	✓	✓	✓			✓			
Camat/Sekwilcam	1	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓			
Cabang Dinas Terkait sesuai fokus permasalahan	3	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Desa/Kelurahan										
LMD	2	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓			
Kepala Desa/Sekdes	2	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Kepala dusun	2	✓	✓	✓			✓			
LKMD	2	✓					✓			
Tokoh masyarakat/adat	2	✓					✓	✓		

Respondent	N=	General Issues	PROCESSES					PERFORMANCE MEASURES		
			Tasks and org. structures	Personnel transfer	Managing regional dev. budget	Creating and directing regional public policies	Local assembly – capability and accountability	Education	Health	Agriculture
Sekolah	4	✓					✓	✓		
FMOG	4	✓				✓	✓	✓		
Kelompok Tani	2									✓
Kelompok pemuda/tokoh pemuda	4	✓				✓	✓			
TOTAL	71									

Schedule of short-term activities of Regional Autonomy Study Team (February 2000-May 2001)

o.	Activity	March 2000		April 2000		May 2000		June 2000		July 2000		Aug. 2000		Sept. 2000		Oct. 2000		Nov. 2000		Dec. 2000		Jan. 2001		Feb. 2001		March 2001		April 2001		May 2001	
		1 & 2	3 & 4	1 & 2	3 & 4	1 & 2	3 & 4	1 & 2	3 & 4	1 & 2	3 & 4	1 & 2	3 & 4	1 & 2	3 & 4	1 & 2	3 & 4	1 & 2	3 & 4	1 & 2	3 & 4	1 & 2	3 & 4	1 & 2	3 & 4	1 & 2	3 & 4	1 & 2	3 & 4		
A	General Guideline Formulation	P U	P U	P U																											
B	Field Survey																														
	1. Kota. Sukabumi - W. Java (pilot)			S																											
	2. Kab. Solok – W. Sum.					S																									
	3. Kab. Sanggau W. Kal.							S																							
	4. Kab. Magetan E. Java									S																					
	5. Kab. Lombar NTB											S																			
	6. Kab. Jayawijaya – Papua												S																		
	7. Kota. Binjai – N. Sum														S																
	8. Kab. Minahasa – N. Sul																														
	9. Kota. Banjarmasin – S. K.																S														
	10. Kab. Ngada – NTT																					S									
	11. Kab. Kudus – Cent. Java																						S								
	12. Kab. Donggala – Cent Sul																								S						
C	Report Compilation/Regency																											S			
	1. Kota. Sukabumi - W. Java (pilot)					L K																									
	2. Kab. Solok – W. Sum.							L K																							
	3. Kab. Sanggau W. Kal.									L K																					
	4. Kab. Magetan E. Java											L K																			
	5. Kab. Lombar NTB												L K																		
	6. Kab. Jayawijaya – Papua													L K																	
	7. Kota. Binjai – N. Sum														L K																
	8. Kab. Minahasa – N. Sul																					L K									
	9. Kota. Banjarmasin – S. K.																								L K						

SMERU –Regional Autonomy Study of 12 Kabupaten/kota

o.	Activity	March 2000	April 2000	May 2000	June 2000	July 2000	Aug. 2000	Sept. 2000	Oct. 2000	Nov. 2000	Dec. 2000	Jan. 2001	Feb. 2001	March 2001	April 2001	May 2001			
	10. Kab. Ngada – NTT															L K			
	11. Kab. Kudus – Cent. Java																L K		
	12. Kab. Donggala – Cent Sul																		L A
D	Report combination																		W S
E	Workshop																		L A
F	Phase II study design detailing																		

Note: - PU = General guidelines
 - S = Field survey

- LK = Regency/City Report
 - LA = Final report

- W= Workshop