

FROM THE NATIONAL COMMUNITY EMPOWERMENT PROGRAM (PNPM) TO THE VILLAGE LAW: TRANSITION, CHANGE, AND CONTINUITY

IRFANI DARMA

LEIDEN 19/05/16

INTRODUCTION

- The national program: poverty reduction, community-driven development, 15 years, nationwide coverage
 - Control by communities
 - Block grant
 - Participation, transparency, accountability
 - Operations manuals – system, procedure
 - Institution
 - Technical assistance through facilitators
 - Strong structured management from central gov't
- Institutionalization in the village law
 - Other countries may follow same path: Timor Leste, Myanmar, Philippine
- Transition to village law implementation
 - Program closure in conjunction with start of VL implementation
 - Use of program's resources in preparing VL implementation

Study background info

- ADB study: Toward Mainstreaming and Sustaining Community-Driven Development in Indonesia – Understanding Local Initiatives and the Transition from the National Program to the Village Law
- Late 2014 – early 2015 in four provinces: East Java, Bali, NTB, South Sulawesi
- Objective and question around:
 - Types of local initiative
 - Extent of sustainability under village law implementation
 - Lessons and good practices including for other countries
- Limitation

Replication and proliferation of assistance and possible implications under VL

- Various assistance from central, province, and district governments using similar approach – block grant through community groups or via village government, own manuals and facilitator, sector focus
- Co-existence, poor coordination – fragmentation – not necessarily an issue from villagers' perspective
- With village law:
 - Termination of national programs
 - Effect of transfer to villages from district budget (10%) – re-alignment of programs
 - Delineation of responsibilities between district and village
 - Discussion on subsequent effects on services
 - Fear: district government disown their responsibilities to villages

Integration of participatory planning into district planning mechanism

- Response to criticism and an approach to sustain
- Village medium-term development planning
- One village one plan
- Adopted through district regulatory framework
- Participation at sub-district and district level planning process
- Improved participation do not correspond with improved results in terms of allocation – anecdote: *mustahil, mustajab*
- Participatory planning cannot affect “supply side” – classic commonsense – unless linked with budget allocation decision e.g. sub-district earmarking for inter-village to decide

Inter-village cooperation and network of actors

- Significance of sub-district locus and inter-village arrangements in PNPM
 - Inter-village deliberations for collective decisions
 - Regular meeting, training of village representatives
 - Set-up of activity and financial management unit
 - Set-up of inter-village cooperation
 - Base of facilitators
- Long-term engagement → capacity development
- Sign of self-sustained
- Gaining recognition
- Elected actors often among youth and better educated –mostly university graduates
- Contrary to traditional perception – no sign of deficit of human resources

Village head perspective on village law – experience from first year

- Ambiguity – between hope and accountability concern
- VHs have ultimate responsibility – change in power relations with facilitator
- VHs' anxiety - fear of doing things wrong → concern rather than opportunity
- Lack of clarity, different interpretations, complex regulations
- Reduction: more directives and compliance focused vs long-term vision of devolution and transformation
- Play safe – focus on infrastructure to spend budget
- More responsibility – complexity – with little incentive → demotivated to run?
- More upward than downward accountability – concern
- BPD members are confused on new roles – little attention

Reflection

- Early stages – testing, reflection, refinement of implementing regulations – some have experienced revisions
- Dominant narrative → administrative/technical, procedural
- Big picture remains:
 - Administrative/technical focus, less political
 - Rules-and-prescriptive-guidelines based
 - “One size fits all”
 - Centralized, Jakarta project