Indonesia: Special Accountability Report

Action Plan 2014-2015

The 2013 Indonesia Open Government Partnership (OGP) action plan is notable for its commitments related to improving budgetary transparency in the management of natural resources and that have a strong emphasis on transparency in public service delivery. The first IRM report found a large number of ambitious commitments that saw some progress. During the second round, commitments were less ambitious, with few completed or carried over into the next action plan.

I. Overview

The Open Government Partnership (OGP) is a voluntary international initiative that aims to secure commitments from governments to their citizenry to promote transparency, empower citizens, fight corruption, and harness new technologies to strengthen governance. The Independent Reporting Mechanism (IRM) carries out a biannual review of the activities of each OGP participating country.

The Special Accountability Report

As one of the founding members of OGP, the Indonesian government submitted its first OGP action plan in 2011 with commitments for 2011-2013. The IRM progress report of the first action plan was published in January 2014. The second OGP action plan was released in 2013, with commitments for 2013-2015. In September 2014, the Indonesian government released a third action plan one year ahead of schedule.

Led by an advisory body called the International Expert Panel (IEP), and after consulting the Indonesian government, and civil society, the IRM opted to release a Special Accountability Report to evaluate progress made on the second action plan. Due to the early release of the third action plan and a change in administration during the period of evaluation, the time frame covered by this report and the evaluation period were shorter than for a typical IRM progress report. This special accountability report has been condensed to fit the shortened time frame for release. With fewer research questions, this report will inform implementation of Indonesia's 2014-2015 action plan, as envisioned by government and civil society.

Institutional Context and Consultation

In Indonesia, OGP programs and action plans are coordinated by the Open Government Indonesia (OGI) "Core Team." Since 2013, seven government ministries and seven nongovernmental organisations (CSOs) led by the Presidential Delivery Unit for Development Monitoring and Oversight (UKP-PPP or UKP4) comprise the Core Team.[1]

Prior to consultation with broader civil society, draft commitments were discussed within the Core Team.[2] The stakeholder consultation was organised on 13 February 2013. The aim of the consultation was to provide opportunities for the public to participate in the drafting of the OGP action plan. The event was divided into two sessions, one with CSOs and academics, and the other with the private sector, including state owned enterprises.[3]

The consultation process did not conform to OGP guidelines. Neither the timeline nor the schedules of the consultation were available to the public prior to the stakeholder consultation event. A call for public input on the draft action plan was announced 12 days after the stakeholder event and the comment period was only six days long.[4] Calls for public input were conducted using social media – Facebook and Twitter – but the number of responses was very low.[5] An announcement regarding the 13 February 2013 stakeholder event was posted on the OGP Indonesia website. However, neither a report on individual submissions nor a summary of submissions made at the event was included in the announcement.[6]

After the stakeholder consultation event, the government conducted a workshop with agencies tasked with executing the draft action plan.[7] If the agencies objected to draft commitments during the workshops, the commitment target was either lowered or had its timeframe extended. However, this was not public consultation because all workshops were internal to government agencies. No additional consultations took place during the implementation stage.

This report was prepared by Mohamad Mova Al'Afghani, Director of the Center for Regulation, Policy and Governance (CRPG), in an independent capacity.

The government released a [mid-term] self-assessment report on 4 August 2013, and reported an 11-day time frame for comments.[8]

The Indonesian government's second action plan includes commitments on transparency of Hajj costs and procedures, land, investment, in addition to a pilot project of OGP implementation in three selected regions. Similar sectors were also targeted in the previous action plan, such as in school budgets, natural resources, and land services. Although the two action plans targeted the same sectors for more transparency, the second action plan focused on a different set of issues in each sector. This points to a continuation of the open government agenda in those sectors.

The action plan did not fully meet civil society demands. One stakeholder considered the process of drafting the action plans to be UKP4-driven – although civil society are given the room to participate on the draft that has been previously prepared.[9] CSO core team members meet, often only when facilitated by UKP4. This reflects that resources and institutional buy-ins within CSO still need to be improved.

CSO stakeholders criticised the consultation process for only including CSOs from Java at the stakeholder consultation event.[10] Another stakeholder pointed out the lack of utilisation of IT infrastructure, although it could have been used to reach CSOs outside of Java.[11] Several stakeholders commented that the final draft of the action plan was different from what was originally discussed with CSOs.[12]

However, there are also opinion suggesting that in overall, as opposed to the previous years, in 2013 the CSOs are much better shaped, in terms of the division of roles and bargaining power with the government – especially as there are CSO representative sitting in the OGP Steering Committee.[13] One stakeholder commented that almost all suggestions from their part was included in the final version of the action plan – and this was probably due to their active participation during the drafting process and in communicating ideas to UKP4.[14]

On 20 October 2014, President Joko Widodo was inaugurated and UKP4 was dissolved at the end of the 2014. The new administration will restructure the agency governing the OGP process. When this report was written, there is still no definitive lead agency for Indonesian OGP initiative. The transition process does somewhat impede government's responsiveness in the IRM process. However, the National Planning Agency (Badan Perencanaan Pembangunan Nasional or Bappenas) was quick to respond and take-over the role of UKP4 during the transition period. There are plans that a joint secretariat comprising of Bappenas, the Executive Office of the President and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs will be formed. Since the role of lead agency is crucial, the IRM expects that the government will soon materialize this plan. .

Dates of Coverage

This action plan covers 1 January 2013 through 31 December 2013.

For a fuller description of progress on the first OGP action plan, please see the first IRM progress report covering 2011 through 2012.

---

[1] Government of Indonesia, Presidential Working Unit for Supervision and Management of Development (UKP4), *Laporan Implementasi Gerakan OGI 2013 (Government Self-Assessment Report; GSAR)*, (Report, Indonesia, August 2014), [Bahasa Indonesia] http://bit.ly/14D1E1r; Nanda Sihombing, "Background to the Open Government Partnership in Indonesia: The CSO Core Team," Blog, Open Government Partnership (OGP), 7 July 2014, http://bit.ly/1yGcmNZ

[2] Fajar Muhammad Subchan, "Routine Meeting of Indonesia OGP Core Team" (minutes written in Bahasa Indonesia for a meeting, Indonesia, 2013).

[3] UKP4, "Konsultasi Publik Renaksi OGI 2013: Menyerap Masukan Masyarakat," (Report, 2013), http://bit.ly/1FoGB0k

[4] Sekretariat Open Government Indonesia, "Mari Berpartisipasi dalam Konsultasi Publik Rencana Aksi OGI 2013," (Report, 2013), http://bit.ly/1B9rgO9

[5] Government official, UKP4, interview with the IRM researcher, 10 September 2014.

[6] Sekretariat Open Government Indonesia

[7] Deputi Bidang Pendanaan Pembangunan BAPPENAS, Memorandum No.72/Dt.8.2/05/2013, May 23, 2013.

[8] UKP4, "Laporan Implementasi Gerakan Open Government Indonesia 2013: Masa Penerimaan Masukan Publik," 2014, http://bit.ly/1wqUib2

[9] Sad Dian Utomo, Pattiro, interview with the IRM Researcher, 19 Novermber, 2014

---

[10] Iskandar Saharudin, Program Officer at PATTIRO, interveiw with the IRM researcher, 2 September 2014; Government official from UKP4, interview, September 2014.

[11] Muhammad Maulana, FITRA, interview with the IRM researcher, 2 September 2014.

[12] Danardono Siradjudin, IPC, interview with the IRM researcher, 2 September 2014; Hendrik Rosdinar, YAPPIKA, interview with the IRM researcher, 4 September 2014.

[13] Maryati, Publish What You Pay, interview with the IRM researcher, 31 October, 2014

[14] Maryati, Publish What You Pay, interview with the IRM researcher, 31 October, 2014

II. Commitment Implementation

As part of OGP, countries make commitments in a two-year action plan. Table 1 summarises each commitment, including level of completion, ambition, whether it falls within Indonesia's planned schedule, and the key next steps in future OGP action plans.

All OGP participating governments develop OGP country action plans that elaborate concrete commitments over an initial two-year period. Governments begin their OGP country action plans by sharing existing efforts related to their chosen grand challenge(s), including specific open government strategies and on going programs. Action plans then set out governments' OGP commitments, which stretch government practice beyond its current baseline with respect to the relevant policy area. These commitments may build on existing efforts, identify new steps to complete on-going reforms, or initiate action in an entirely new area.

While the nature of concrete commitments under any grand challenge area should be flexible and allow for each country's unique circumstances, OGP commitments should be relevant to OGP values laid out in the OGP Articles of Governance and Open Government Declaration signed by all OGP participating countries. The IRM uses the following guidance to evaluate relevance to core open government values:

- **Access to information** — These commitments:
    - pertain to government-held information;
    - are not restricted to data but pertain to all information;
    - may cover proactive or reactive releases of information;
    - may pertain to strengthen the right to information; and,
    - must provide open access to information (it should not be privileged or internal only to government).
- **Citizen participation** — Governments seek to mobilize citizens to engage in public debate, provide input, and make contributions that lead to more responsive, innovative, and effective governance. Commitments around access to information:
    - open decision making to all interested members of the public; such forums are usually "top-down" in that they are created by government (or actors empowered by government) to inform decision making;
    - often include elements of access to information to ensure meaningful input of interested members of the public into decisions;
    - often include enhancing citizens' right to be heard, but do not necessarily include the right to be heeded.
- **Public accountability —** Rules, regulations, and mechanisms in place call upon government actors to justify their actions, act upon criticisms or requirements made of them, and accept responsibility for failure to perform with respect to laws or commitments. As part of open government, such commitments have an "open" element, meaning that they are not purely internal systems of accountability without a public face.
- **Technology and innovation for transparency and accountability** — Commitments for technology and innovation promote new technologies, offer opportunities for information sharing, public participation, and collaboration. Technology and innovation commitments:
    - should make more information public in ways that enable people both to understand what their governments do and to influence decisions;
    - may commit to supporting the ability of governments and citizens to use technology for openness and accountability;
    - may support the use of technology by government employees and citizens alike;
    - may focus on the national, local and/or subnational level—wherever the government believes their open government efforts will have the greatest impact.

Recognizing that achieving open government commitments often involves a multiyear process, governments should attach time frames and benchmarks to their commitments that indicate what is to be accomplished each year, whenever possible.

This section details each of the commitments the country included in its initial action plan.

While most indicators used to evaluate each commitment are self-explanatory, a number deserve further explanation.
1. Relevance: The IRM researcher evaluated each commitment for its relevance to OGP values and OGP grand challenges.
    - OGP values: To identify OGP commitments with unclear relationships to OGP values, the IRM researcher made a judgment from a close reading of the commitment's text. This judgment reveals commitments that can better articulate a clear link to fundamental issues of openness.
    - Grand challenges: While some commitments may be relevant to more than one grand challenge, the reviewer only marked those challenges that had been identified by government.

2. Ambition: The IRM researcher evaluated each commitment for how ambitious commitments were with respect to new or pre-existing activities that stretch government practice beyond an existing baseline.
   ○ Potential impact: To contribute to a broad definition of ambition, the IRM researcher judged how potentially transformative each commitment might be in the policy area. This is based on the IRM researcher's findings and experience as a public policy expert. In order to assess potential impact, the IRM researcher identifies the policy problem, establishes a baseline performance level at the outset of the action plan and assesses the degree to which the commitment, if implemented, would impact performance and tackle the policy problem.
   ○ New or pre-existing: The IRM researcher also records whether each commitment was first published in the OGP action plan (or the specificity of the action has been improved) or if the commitment has been carried over from other public documents.
3. Timing: The IRM researcher evaluated each commitment's timing, even when clear deliverables and suggested annual milestones were not provided.
   ○ Projected completion: In cases where this information was not available, the IRM researcher made a best judgment based on the evidence of how far the commitment could possibly be at the end of the period assessed.

Table 1: At a Glance	
Number of commitments:	15
Number of milestones:	33
Level of Completion by Commitment	
Completed:	2 (13%)
Substantial:	5 (33%)
Limited:	8 (53%)
Not started:	0
Number of Commitments with:	
Clear relevance to an OGP value:	14 (93%)
Moderate or transformative potential impact:	8 (53%)
Substantial or complete implementation:	7 (46%)
All three (✪)	3 (20%)

Table: Summary of Commitments

	OGP value relevance				Potential impact				Completion				Specificity			
	Access to information	Civic participation	Public accountability	Technology and innovation for transparency and accountability	None	Minor	Moderate	Transformative	Not started	Limited	Substantial	Complete	None	Low	Medium	High
1.1 Motor Vehicle Services	✔		✔			✔				✔						✔
1.2 Public School Funding	✔			✔			✔			✔						✔
1.3 Hajj Services: Ministry of Religious Affairs	✔			✔			✔			✔						✔
1.4 Marriage Services: Office of Religious Affairs	✔		✔				✔				✔					✔
1.5 Toll Roads	✔					✔				✔					✔	
2.1 Land Affairs Transparency	✔	✔					✔			✔						✔
2.2 Forest Management			✔				✔			✔						✔
2.3 Natural Resources Management Activity			✔			✔					✔				✔	
2.4 Oil, Gas, and Mining Revenue Transparency			✔			✔						✔			✔	
3.1 Information Management Officials			✔				✔			✔						✔
✪ 3.2 Business/Investment Licensing Services [1]	✔			✔				✔			✔					✔
✪ 3.3 Local Information Management Officials[2]			✔				✔			✔						✔
4.1 Subnational Open Government Pilot Project	Unclear				✔					✔				✔		
4.2 Integration of Performance-Based Budgeting	✔			✔		✔				✔					✔	
✪ 4.3 Ensuring the Publication of Budget Plan[3]			✔				✔			✔					✔	

[1] Starred commitments are considered exemplary OGP commitments. In order to receive a star, a commitment must meet several criteria. (1) It must be specific enough that a judgment can be made about its potential impact. Starred commitments will have "medium" or "high" specificity. (2) Commitment language should make clear its relevance to opening government. Specifically, it must relate to at least one of the OGP values of Access to Information, Civic Participation, or Public Accountability. (3) The commitment must have a "moderate" or "transformative" potential impact, should it be implemented. (4) Finally, the commitment must see significant progress during the action plan implementation period (receiving a ranking "significant" or "complete" progress).

[2] Exemplary commitments receive a star. For an explanation of the starred commitment formula, see Footnote 1, page 6.

[3] Exemplary commitments receive a star. For an explanation of the starred commitment formula, see Footnote 1, page 6.

Cluster 1. Basic Services

1.1. Motor Vehicle Services[1]

1.1.1. Completion of the poster design for public services publication. Publication of services-related information, including the types of services, the mechanism/procedure, the cost and time period, through posters in Sumatera, Java, and Bali Provinces

1.2.1. Completion of the draft mechanism for the reporting/complaining system in Driving License (SIM), Vehicle Registration Certificate (STNK) Vehicle Ownership Certificate (BPKB) services, in Motor Vehicle Registration (SAMSAT) offices in Sumatera, Java, and Bali. Publication of information on police services related to SIM, STNK, and BPKB through posters and other public media, including the mechanism of reporting/complaining system in the whole region of Sumatera, Java, and Bali Provinces

1.3.1 Completion of the draft/guideline/manual for the socialisation on how to drive safely and a radio and television socialisation/campaign about driving safely.

	OGP value relevance				Potential impact				Completion				Specificity			
	Access to information	Civic participation	Public accountability	Technology and innovation for transparency and accountability	None	Minor	Moderate	Transformative	Not started	Limited	Substantial	Complete	None	Low	Medium	High
1.1 Overall	✔		✔			✔				✔						✔
1.1.1. Service-related information	✔					✔				Unclear						✔
1.1.2. Complaint mechanism			✔				✔			✔						✔
1.1.3. Road safety education program	✔					✔					✔					✔

This commitment aimed to establish clear procedures and fees for obtaining a driving license and vehicle registration certificates. No single information source stipulated both the cost and the procedure for such services. Driving licenses often could be obtained through intermediaries who offered expedited services and guarantee of success for higher fees.[2] In some cases, actual fees were unknown, and (corrupt) officials imposed higher fees on applicants.[3] The prerequisites and procedures for applying for a driving license were formulated in regulation issued by the police chief in 2012, and the costs were stipulated in 2010.[4] However, the regulations were written in a technical language not easily understood by non-specialists.[5] Service related information and road safety education programs have "minor" potential impact since similar programs predated the action plan. The complaint mechanism, by contrast, is rated as "moderate". This set of commitments could potentially be "transformative" if the complaint mechanism is embodied in a regulatory framework. Without clear legal basis, complaint mechanisms are often not as effective.

In order to address this shortcoming, the government put forward three "achievement criteria."

1. The publication of service-related information, including cost, time period, and procedures related to obtaining a driving license, vehicle ownership book, police record and vehicle registration number
2. Design, publication, and operationalisation of the complaint mechanism
3. Design and publication of safety driving materials

Both the Government's self-assessment report and an official letter from the National Police Headquarters to the IRM researcher reported the target as completed.[6] According to the national police, milestone 1.1.1 and 1.1.3 were 100% implemented, whereas milestone 1.1.2 was 90% implemented. However, due to a lack of information, the IRM researcher was unable to verify if posters (for milestone 1.1.1) were placed throughout relevant police stations in three provinces: Sumatra, Java, and Bali, as originally intended by the action plan.

The IRM researcher was unable to confirm if the complaint mechanism is in place and if road safety education programs have been implemented. The national police or regional police offices carried out road safety programs on television and media frequently throughout the year. However, these programs could not be clearly linked to the OGP action plan.[7] The official letter that the IRM received from the national police also did not contain evidence that the programs were implemented as a result of the action plan.

The self-assessment reported the publication of a website (http://bit.ly/1nxzug8), which contains all the necessary information required by the action plan. The articles on the website were written in 2012, before the 2013 action plan was developed. Moreover, the site is hosted using a "blogger" web address and not the official police web address. This does not reduce the relevance and usefulness of the information contained on the site, but it makes the information more difficult to locate and brings into question how official the information may be.

1.2. Public School Funding[8]

1.2.1. Design of data publication of the allocation and utilisation of BOS fund for schools in 33 Provinces on the website of the Ministry of Education and Culture and subsequently its publication on the website of Ministry of Education and Culture (12-month).

1.2.2. Design for publication of the allocation and utilisation of BOS fund on announcement boards of all recipient schools in Java and Bali and subsequently its implementation (12-month).

	OGP value relevance				Potential impact				Completion				Specificity			
	Access to information	Civic participation	Public accountability	Technology and innovation for transparency and accountability	None	Minor	Moderate	Transformative	Not started	Limited	Substantial	Complete	None	Low	Medium	High
1.2 Overall	✔			✔			✔			✔						✔
1.2.1. BOS fund - 33 provinces	✔			✔			✔				✔					✔
1.2.2. BOS fund – all schools	✔						✔			**Unclear**						✔

The School Operational Assistance (BOS) Fund allocates national funds to schools. The World Bank considers transparency of budget allocation as important for improving the quality of spending.[9] Due to a lack of transparency in how the budget is allocated and spent, the BOS has been prone to allegations of corruption. The funds were often disbursed too late, impeding schools' operation and activities.[10] The majority of parents and students are never presented with reports from schools as to how the funds are allocated and utilised.[11] If the grant data were published on the Internet, education and anti-corruption activists would be able to obtain information easily for analysis and benchmarking of expenditures.

The first (2012) OGP action plan also included BOS fund transparency as one of its targets. The difference between the 2012 and the 2013 commitments is that in 2012 the action plan aimed at publication of subsidy data at every elementary school and junior high school in 411 regional governments (district level), whereas the 2013 action plan aims at publication of data on the Ministry of Education's website and in "all recipient schools" (thus, not only elementary and junior high) in Java and Bali.[12] According to the previous IRM report, only the publication at announcement boards was conducted at around one percent (1%) of elementary and junior high schools.[13]

The 2013 commitment targets two kinds of publication: publication on a website and publication on a notice board in schools.

BOS disbursement and allocation data can be accessed at the ministry website at http://bos.kemdikbud.go.id/. On the website, users can access data on how the BOS funds are being spent by each school every trimester. The data are disaggregated into 13 budget categories. The website does not provide a breakdown for each budget category. Around 60% of schools have yet to report their data and thus are not represented on the website. Interviews with government and civil society revealed that one obstacle to uploading data to the website is that teachers and principals are not familiar with the Internet and may not have Internet access.[14]

In December 2012, the Ministry of Education issued technical guidance to schools on the utilisation and accountability of the BOS fund for the 2013 financial year.[15] The guidance requires the publication of both the budget plan and its utilisation

report[16] on schools' announcement boards. For the budget plan, the announcement must contain the total amount of the available financial resources in the budget and the amount allocated for each budget post. For the utilisation report, schools must report the type of expenditures, dates, amount, and the suppliers.

The national government monitors compliance by conducting direct evaluation of the schools by sampling two regencies in each province and two schools in each regency.[17] Monitoring is also conducted through reports from regency/city and provincial education offices to the Ministry of Education.

The IRM researcher found that the system for BOS fund accountability is in place: the website is operational, if not yet fully complete, the technical regulation for data publication is available and the government has implemented compliance mechanisms. Data gathering for the website faces obstacles due to school administrators' lack of familiarity with Internet tools. However, this accountability website has been in place since 2012, before the 2013 action plan was drafted. Thus, if compared to the previous condition, the 2013 action plan contributes to several developments in terms of quantity of the data published on the Ministry's website and the availability of technical regulation for data publication.

There may be an increase in the numbers of schools complying with this publication requirement. However, The IRM researcher was unable to validate or measure the completion of the second milestone – publication of the allocation and utilisation of BOS funds on notice boards of all recipient schools in Java and Bali. If this commitment were implemented, parents and students would have immediate access to BOS funds utilisation report directly in schools without the need for Internet access. This would enable them to request clarification directly from the school in case of unclear information or discrepancies, which would improve and simplify citizen monitoring of education budgets.

1.3. Hajj Services: Ministry of Religious Affairs[18]

1.3.1. Service and publication designs related to the total Hajj departures, the List of Travelling Plans, the service of Hajj queuing status, and Hajj deposit fund management or BPIH (6-month).

1.3.2. Publication of Hajj services on the website of the Ministry of Religious Affairs (12-month), including the details of Hajj cost, the total number of Hajj departures based on Regency/City, the List of Travel Plan based on Groups and Embarkation, the services of Hajj queuing status, and BPIH deposit management-related information.

	OGP value relevance				Potential impact				Completion				Specificity			
	Access to information	Civic participation	Public accountability	Technology and innovation for transparency and accountability	None	Minor	Moderate	Transformative	Not started	Limited	Substantial	Complete	None	Low	Medium	High
1.3 Overall	✔			✔			✔			✔						✔
1.3.1 Hajj-related services information	✔					✔				✔						✔
1.3.2 Web publication of Hajj-related services	✔						✔			✔						✔

The Ministry of Religious Affairs oversees and organises the Hajj pilgrimage to Mecca for Indonesian citizens. Because the demand for Hajj is extremely high, a quota system was implemented. As of 2013, approximately 2.2 million people were still on the government waiting list.[19] To be added on the waiting list, a fee of up to USD$2,000 must be paid. The waiting period can take up to 12 years, and citizens often claim that they do not know their place on the list. This commitment aims to correct this by making Hajj-related information publicly available. Due to the current lack of transparency in the Hajj system, there have been allegations of misuse of Hajj funds by the Ministry's highest officials. Several officials have been arrested by the Commission on the Eradication of Corruption (KPK) for alleged misuse of funds and prevented from undertaking overseas travel. At the time of writing, the investigators were in the process of compiling a legal case for trial at the corruption court in Jakarta.[20]

The precursor to the present day Hajj Integrated Information and Computerised System (SISKOHAT) was established in the 1990s.[21] A snapshot from the "Internet Wayback Machine" (http://archive.org/web/), which allows users to see how a

specific website appeared on a specified date, shows that a system for checking queue status has been in place since 31 December 2011.[22] The system allowed Hajj candidates to check their status in the waiting list. As the system has been in place since 2011, this milestone is not new or specific to the OGP action plan. Consequently, the action's potential impact is "minor" rather than "moderate."

The Hajj costs are officially determined through presidential decree and the costs differ based on the departure location. The presidential decree and several news items related to it are published on the Ministry of Religious Affairs' website.[23] Although a presidential decree on Hajj cost usually is issued each year, these documents do not contain a detailed breakdown of the amounts that should be paid. The IRM researcher was unable to locate a detailed breakdown of such costs on the Ministry's website.

As for the total number of Hajj departures based on Regency/City, interviews with government sources suggest that this information was published at this address: http://bit.ly/1tDXakY. However, as of 21 October 2014, the website did not contain any information.[24] The List of Travel Plan by departure location is published on the Ministry's website.[25] Information on Hajj queue status also is available on the Ministry's website.[26] However, this system has been available since 2011, before the action plan.

Finally, the publication of information related to the Hajj Cost Initial Deposit (BPIH) management was not met. This was confirmed in an interview with the relevant official.[27] The website contains a report on the total balance of the Hajj funds each month, including the total balance of initial Hajj deposits.[28] However, there is no information as to how funds are managed.

1.4. Marriage Services: Office of Religious Affairs (KUA)[29]

1.4.1. AB06 and B12: Poster design and publication for marriage information services and publication of marriage services information through posters, covering: the mechanism/procedure, cost and time period of service. Reporting/complaining system in the Office of Religious Affairs in every Regency/Municipality of Java, Sumatera, and Bali Provinces.

1.4.2. Design for reporting/complaint system in the Office of Religious Affairs in every Regency/Municipality of Java, Sumatera, and Bali Provinces. A well-operated reporting/complaint system in the Office of Religious Affairs in every Regency/Municipality of Java, Sumatera, and Bali Provinces.

	OGP value relevance				Potential impact				Completion				Specificity			
	Access to information	Civic participation	Public accountability	Technology and innovation for transparency and accountability	None	Minor	Moderate	Transformative	Not started	Limited	Substantial	Complete	None	Low	Medium	High
1.4 Overall	✔		✔				✔				✔					✔
1.4.1. Marriage services information	✔						✔				✔					✔
1.4.2. Office of Religious Affairs complain mechanism			✔				✔			✔						✔

The Office of Religious Affairs (KUA), which has civil registration authority over marriage and divorce, does not provide clear and easily accessible information on the fees and procedures associated with marriage registration. There are also no complaint procedures available. KUA district offices are located in every district (kecamatan) level.

Regulation concerning marriage registration was enacted in 2007[30] and a more detailed technical regulation was published by the Ministry of Religious Affairs and made available in 2013.[31] As a part of the Ministry, the KUA is compelled to abide by these regulations, which contain prerequisites and procedures for marriage registration. However, they are written in a technical language, which is not easily understood by non-specialists.

At the time of writing (Late 2014), the government issued Government Regulation 48 for 2014, which stipulates that marriage registration conducted at KUA is free of charge. However, when conducted outside KUA, registrants will incur a fee of approximately USD$60.[32] The decision to institute a fee received significant media coverage.

Although the public already is aware of the formal costs of marriage registration due to media coverage of the new regulation, important information regarding procedures, period of service, and complaint mechanisms remains difficult to locate. According to an interview conducted with a government official, information is distributed through posters available at every KUA including the websites of the Ministry's working groups.[33] According to the government source, all KUAs (5382 offices throughout Indonesia) have received such posters.[34] The posters were created by the Directorate General of Bima Islam and then distributed to all religious offices.

Complaints can be made through complaint boxes, written letters, or electronic mail.[35] One of the impediments faced by the Ministry was related to the procurement of complaint boxes for all offices throughout Sumatera, Java, and Bali provinces. In the end, the boxes were procured independently by each KUA. A government source informed the IRM researchers that the Government has not provided training for those who will be in charge of handling the complaint system. The complaint procedure is available and published, but its efficacy is unclear, as citizens do not have assurance of completion. The IRM researcher could not verify the exact number of KUAs with complaint boxes in place. There does not seem to be a legally mandated sectoral or religious regulation for a complaint mechanism. However, a redress mechanism is available under general public service law.[36]

1.5. Toll roads[37]

1.5 Toll roads; Publication of the toll road information on the Minimum Service Standard for toll roads.

	OGP value relevance				Potential impact				Completion				Specificity			
	Access to information	Civic participation	Public accountability	Technology and innovation for transparency and accountability	None	Minor	Moderate	Transformative	Not started	Limited	Substantial	Complete	None	Low	Medium	High
1.5 Overall	✔					✔								✔		

Highway users often do not know their rights and what service standard is available to them. The Minimum Service Standard for toll roads has been available since 2005 through a ministerial regulation and this was reformed in 2014.[38] However, this ministerial regulation does not contain any obligation for toll road operators to publish such a standard. In 2006, the toll road regulator Badan Pengatur Jalan Tol (BPJT) enacted an internal monitoring procedure for the enforcement of such a standard. But, according to internal procedure, no policy requires the publication of such standards or monitoring of results.[39] This commitment received a potential impact of "minor" since publication of service standards may not, in itself, change the status quo. Service standards are often meaningless unless accompanied by procedures on how citizens can obtain redress for violations of those standards.

The Government's self-assessment reported that such a standard was published on the toll road operator website: http://bit.ly/1FAjZKx. However, the website merely copied Article 3 of the 2005 regulation, which contains only the framework for measuring the minimum standard for toll road service.[40] The detailed minimum parameters of the standard actually are found in a 2006 decree of the toll road regulator, BPJT and the 2014 Ministerial Regulation. Not only does the BPJT decree regulate the minimum parameters to be fulfilled, it also sets the monitoring and enforcement procedures of such a standard.

BPJT published the minimum service standard in its page http://x.crpg.info/1EV1ksT . The website contain detailed parameters of minimum service standard that must be fulfilled by toll roads. With such publication this commitment is considered completed. BPJT's page on minimum service standard can actually be further improved in order to display the compliance of each toll roads against minimum standard.

Another potential improvement is to integrate minimum services standard to complaint and enforcement mechanism. In its official letter to the IRM, BPJT clarified that the authority for consumer complaint lies in the hand of the Ministry of Public Works and not BPJT.[41] The IRM recommends that minimum service standard, complaint mechanism, compliance report and its monitoring and evaluation be integrated and made accountable. This measure would bring greater impact to user and the public in general.

[1] For easier reading, the IRM researcher clustered commitments, shortened the original text, and changed commitment numbering from the original government action plan. For each commitment, the original commitment number is noted for ease of reference. Original commitment: OGI1P1A1

[2] Indonesia Corruption Watch, http://bit.ly/1m4Kx08

[3] Eka Setiawan, "Bikin SIM di Semarang Rp400 Ribu," Sindonews.com, 9 January 2013, http://bit.ly/1m4KEsv

[4] Peraturan Pemerintah Republik Indonesia, Nomor 50 Tahun 2010, Tentang Penerimaan Negara Bukan Pajak yang berlaku pada Kepolisian Negara.

[5] Peraturan Kapolri, No. 9 Tahun 2012, Tentang Surat Izin Mengemudi.

[6] UKP4, "Laporan Implementasi Gerakan Open Government Indonesia 2013: Masa Penerimaan Masukan Publik" <http://bit.ly/1wqUib2> accessed October 3, 2014; Naufal Yahya, *Penyampaian Aksi OGI Polri Tahun 2013, Letter dated 24 September 2014* (Indonesian National Police Headquarters 2014)

[7] Universitas Diponegoro, *Pengaruh Intensitas Kampanye Cara Berkendara Dengan Selamat (Safety Riding) dan Tingkat Kemampuan Kognitif Terhadap Tingkat Perilaku Berkendara Dengan Selamat di Kalangan Pelajar SMA Setyabudhi Semarang* by Eko Feriyanto (Master Thesis, 2011); Yulian Warman, "Indonesia, Ayo Aman Berlalu Lintas," News article, Satu Indonesia, 15 April 2014, http://bit.ly/1BPBT8c

[8] Original commitment: OGI1P1A2

[9] The World Bank Office Jakarta, *Spending More or Spending Better: Improving Education Financing in Indonesia East Asia and Pacific Region*, by The World Bank (Report No 73050-ID, Jakarta, March 2013), http://bit.ly/1Iz3L2S

[10] Iskandar Saharudin and Lukman, "Peta Masalah Program BOS: Konsistensi Mandat, Keberlanjutan, dan Akuntabilitas," Pusat Telaah dan Informasi Regional, 2011.

[11] Latief, "Transparansi Dana BOS Rendah," News, Kompas, 11 August 2010, http://bit.ly/10tVEpR

[12] Open Government Partnership (OGP), *Independent Reporting Mechanism: Indonesia Progress Report 2011-2013* by Chitra Retna Septiandrica (First Progress Report, Washington, DC, 2013), http://bit.ly/14DJ5KL

[13] OGP, *Independent Reporting Mechanism: Indonesia Progress Report 2011-2013* by Chitra Retna Septiandrica (First Progress Report, Washington, DC, 2013), http://bit.ly/14DJ5KL

[14] Marcella Wijayanti, Ministry of Education, interview with Pius Widiyatmoko, 15 October 2014.

[15] Ministry of Education, *Petunjuk Teknis Penggunaan dan Pertanggungjawaban Keuangan Dana Bantuan Operasional Sekolah (BOS) Tahun Anggaran 2013* (2012).

[16] This feature was added in 2013, following the technical guidance of Widiyatmoko.

[17] This feature was added in 2013, following the technical guidance of Widiyatmoko.

[18] Original commitment: OGI1P1A3

[19] Kemenag, "Pendaftar Capai 40 Ribu Jamaah per Bulan, Antrian Calon Jamaah Haji Indonesia Mencapai 2,2 Juta," Ministry of Religious Affairs of the Republic of Indonesia, 18 December 2013 http://bit.ly/1wsiytk

[20] Haeril Halim, "More Allegations Entangle Ex-minister Suryadharma," National News, The Jakarta Post, 2 October 2014, http://bit.ly/14b8zxU

[21] *Kerangka Acuan Kerja (KAK) Pengadaan Perangkat Siskohat Online Pada 85 Kandepag Kab/Kota Tahun 2008* (Direktorat Jenderal Penyelenggaraan Haji dan Umrah Departemen Agama, 2009).

[22] Internet Archive Wayback Machine, http://bit.ly/1wsnBKg

[23] Tomo85, "Terbitnya Peraturan Presiden Tentang Biaya Haji," Kementrian Agama R.I, 5 June 2014, http://bit.ly/1wsns9y

[24] Government Official in Jakarta, interview with Pius Widiyatmoko, 4 October 2014.

[25] Ministry of Religious Affairs, Travel Plans, http://bit.ly/1tDWQCG

[26] Ministry of Religious Affairs, http://bit.ly/1tDX9gV

[27] Government Official in Jakarta, interview, October 2014.

[28] Rabu, "JUA Yang Lakukan Pungli Akan Ditindak," News/Regional, Kompas.com, 25 December 2013, http://bit.ly/1q2PAsC; "KUA Kramat Jati Tak Transparan Soal Biaya Nikah," Crime, Metro, 10 December 2012, http://bit.ly/1q2PEsl; Nograhany Widhi K, "Kisah Ninit Meminta Transparansi Mahalnya Biaya Nikah di KUA," detikNews, 28 December 2012, http://bit.ly/1q2PHoc; Ministry of Religious Affairs, Financial Statements, http://bit.ly/1wsp8Qp

[29] Original commitment: OGI1P1A3

[30] Peraturan Menteri Agama Republik Indonesia, Nomor 11 Tahun 2007, Tentang Pencatatan Nikah.

[31] Keputusan Menteri Agama, No. 99 Tahun 2013, Tentang Penetapan Blangko Daftar Pemeriksaan Nikah, Akta Nikah, Buku Nikah, Duplikat Buku Nikah, Buku Pencatatan Rujuk, dan Kutipan Buku Pencatatan Rujuk.

[32] Peraturan Pemerintah Republik Indonesia, Nomor 48 Tahun 2014, Tentang Perubahan Atas peraturan Pemerintah, Nomor 47 Tahun 2004, Tentang Tarif Atas Jenis Penerimaan Negara Bukan Pajak Yang Perlaku Pada Departemen Agama.

[33] Dr. Thobib Al-Asyhar, M.Si, interview with Pius Widiyatmoko, 17 September 2014.

[34] Al-Asyhar, interview, September 2014.

[35] Al-Asyhar, interview, September 2014.

[36] Undang Undang, No. 25 Tahun 2009, Tentang Pelayanan Publik.

[37] Original commitment: OGI1P1A4

[38] Peraturan Menteri Pekerjaan Umum, No. 392/PRT/M/2005, Tentang Standar Pelayanan Minimal Jalan Tol; also Peraturan Menteri Pekerjaan Umum No. 16/PRT/M/2014 Tentang Standar Pelayanan Minimal Jalan Tol

[39] Keputusan Kepala BPJT, Nomor 03 Tahun 2006, Tentang Pedoman Pemantauan dan Penilaian Pemenuhan Standar Pelayanan Minimal Jalan Tol.

[40] PT Jasa Marga Indonesia Highway Corp., "Layanan Jalan Tol," http://bit.ly/1FAjZKx

[41] Witjaksono A, Letter Number PR.02.02.Pt/419 to Kepala Biro Perencanaan dan KLN dated 15th of December 2014

Cluster 2. Services in Business and Investment[1]

2.1. Land Affairs Transparency[2]
2.1.1. Public consultation regarding draft book/document.

2.1.2. Publication of a book/document/file integrating the regulations for the ownership and the use of land.

2.1.3. Publication on BPN website

	OGP value relevance				Potential impact				Completion				Specificity			
	Access to information	Civic participation	Public accountability	Technology and innovation for transparency and accountability	None	Minor	Moderate	Transformative	Not started	Limited	Substantial	Complete	None	Low	Medium	High
2.1 Overall	✔	✔					✔			✔						✔
2.1.1. Public consultation		✔				✔			Unclear							✔
2.1.2. Land use/ownership regulations	✔						✔		Unclear							✔
2.1.3. Publication on BPN Website	✔						✔				✔					✔

Rules and regulations pertaining to land affairs are available in various pieces of legislations and policies and are published on the land agency's website.[3] But, they are not easily accessible to a non-specialist. The cost of land title registration services is not directly transparent for the average user, although it would be possible to obtain such information through legal analysis of regulation. There is no single unified compendium for information regarding land registration services, procedures, and costs. If the commitment to publish relevant materials in the website is carried out, users would be able to obtain information about cost, time frame, and the documents required for the registration of land related titles.

The IRM researcher was unable to verify if the public consultation and actual book publication occurred. However, the website contains significant information on land-related services. The website (http://bit.ly/1x7IEQr) groups the government's land-related services. For each type of group, the portal lists the prerequisites and the documents required, as well as the time frame from start to completion. There is also a flowchart explaining every bureaucratic stage. In addition, the portal provides a tool to estimate the cost of the service, customised based on the user's situation. By inserting price calculation and other tools, the website went beyond the target initially intended by the commitment. Applicants are now able to estimate the cost of service, the documents required for such services, and the estimated time for completion. The clarity of fees and bureaucratic procedure potentially could reduce corruption and increase efficiency. However, the IRM researcher recommends that a complaint mechanism be added to this transparency effort.

2.2. Forest Management[4]

2.2.1. Publication of the Ministry of Forestry Regulation regarding the obligation of reporting data on the production and circulation of the forest products and Forest Product Royalty (PSDH & DR).

2.2.2. Publication of data and information regarding forest management through Ministry of Forestry website, including the production and circulation data of the forest products and Forest Product Royalty (PSDH & DR).

2.2.3. Improvement of the Ministry of Forestry website to be more user-friendly and to have better navigation.

2.2.4. Issuance of standard operating procedures (SOP) and completion of a report, following up public complaints through website.

	OGP value relevance				Potential impact				Completion				Specificity			
	Access to information	Civic participation	Public accountability	Technology and innovation for transparency and accountability	None	Minor	Moderate	Transformative	Not started	Limited	Substantial	Complete	None	Low	Medium	High
2.2 Overall			✔				✔			✔						✔
2.2.1. Reporting data on forest products			✔				✔					✔				✔
2.2.2. Reporting forest management data on website			✔				✔					✔				✔
2.1.3. Ministry of Forestry website accessibility			✔				✔			✔					✔	
2.1.4. Publication on BPN Website			✔				✔			**Unclear**						✔

As of 2009, the forest coverage in Indonesia amounts to 46% of overall land.[5] Meanwhile, Indonesia's deforestation rate is almost two million hectares of land per year, making Indonesia the third greatest contributor of greenhouse emissions in the world.[6] Deforestation is also linked to corruption, in the form of granting forest licenses and concessions as well as colluding with local authorities.[7] Production data and the amount of royalties paid to the government are therefore essential to forest governance in Indonesia. Budgetary transparency of forest management has the potential to reduce the circulation of illegal timber, minimise corruption, and provide legal legitimacy to the logging industry.

This commitment aims to decrease misuse of funds and corruption in forest management by making data on the logging industry publicly available.

Online publication of royalty payments and a timber tracing system were implemented in 2009 through a Ministerial Regulation on Timber Administration.[8] The regulation does not require publishing such data for the public, but since 2010, the Ministry has published information on royalty payments on their website.[9] In 2014, the government enacted a Ministerial Regulation on Timber Administration revoking the 2009 regulation. The 2014 regulation is more detailed with respect to regulating the Timber Administration Information System, but still does not require publication.

The timber tracking system, available since 2009, is accessible to the public at a government website http://bit.ly/1xbfujr. The timber tracking website provides data on forest licenses, the volume of log production, and state revenue from logging activities. The most recent (2014) version of the timber tracking system contains more data than the 2010 version. The recent version contains data on licenses, whereas the former version contained only state revenue and production data.

However, the government website has yet to offer a mechanism for complaints as intended by the action plan. The IRM researcher was unable to verify if the Standard Operating Procedure as required by the action plan is available. The Government's self-assessment report makes no mention of the existing Procedure.

Overall, the commitment is not new and is based on an existing infrastructure. Nevertheless, there are some improvements in terms of the amount of data made newly available.

2.3. Transparency and Accountability in Natural Resources Management Activity[10]

2.3.1. Publication of data and information regarding the oil and gas and mining activities on the Ministry of Energy and Natural Resources website, including information about oil, gas, and mining production; income; and the list of Clean and Clear (CnC) mining business license holders.

2.3.2. Design and launch of Freedom of Information (FoI) website: www.kip.esdm.go.id.

	OGP value relevance				Potential impact				Completion				Specificity			
	Access to information	Civic participation	Public accountability	Technology and innovation for transparency and accountability	None	Minor	Moderate	Transformative	Not started	Limited	Substantial	Complete	None	Low	Medium	High
2.3 Overall			✔			✔					✔				✔	
2.3.1. Publicize oil, gas, and mining information on Ministry website			✔			✔				✔					✔	
2.3.2. Launch Freedom of Information (FOI) website			✔			✔						✔			✔	

The publication of oil and gas state revenues as well as production capacity already forms a part of Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative target deliverable (see Commitment 9 in the action plan). The publication of the Clean and Clear (CnC) list of mining licenses per province started in 2011.[11] New companies are regularly added to the list each year as they fulfil compliance requirements. Meanwhile, the setup of FoI desks in government ministries, as well as the announcement of public interest information through its website, have been a part of various FoI programs. This commitment aims to increase public access and usability of budgetary and procedural information related to the extractives industry. Data published in this initiative will be useful for the public to trace state income from the extractive sector. This action plan is categorized as minor since CnC publication is already a part of an existing practice and inclusion of this practice into OGP action plan does not stretch beyond existing practices.

The Government's self-assessment report pointed to a website (http://kip.esdm.go.id/) for the publication and the CnC, but the IRM researcher was unable to find that information. A government source interviewed suggested that the CnC data should be available in the "statistic" menu in the government main page but the IRM researcher was unable to find such information or the revenue data.[12]

The Ministry publishes CnC lists on several homepages (http://bit.ly/1tZesFE and http://bit.ly/1tZetJG). The CnC list can be published on the FoI website to enhance user friendliness. The IRM Researcher recommends annual updates to reflect new companies and improve coverage.

The FoI website (http://kip.esdm.go.id) and the Internet archive shows that the site has been available since March 2013, after the action plan was created. The IRM researcher considers that this target has been met, notwithstanding the urgent need to compile CnC list in a single website.

2.4. Oil, Gas, and Mining Revenue Transparency[13]

2.4.1. The availability of Indonesia EITI reconciliation data.

2.4.2. Publication of the State's income report year 2010-2011.

	OGP value relevance				Potential impact				Completion				Specificity			
	Access to information	Civic participation	Public accountability	Technology and innovation for transparency and accountability	None	Minor	Moderate	Transformative	Not started	Limited	Substantial	Complete	None	Low	Medium	High
2.4 Overall			✔			✔						✔			✔	
2.4.1. The availability of Indonesian EITI reconciliation data			✔				✔					✔		✔		
2.4.2. Publication of State's income report (2010-11)			✔			✔						✔			✔	

As reported in the first IRM progress report, Indonesia published state income information (central and region) from extractive industries as a part of the first (2011) action plan. For the second (2013) action plan, the Government of Indonesia aimed at publishing reconciliation data and state income report for 2010-2011. The Extractive Industry Transparency Initiative (EITI) reconciliation report gathers data from both the government (in terms of state income from extractive industries) and from the private sector (in terms of what they pay to the government). In theory, this would enable the public to see any mismatch between what the extractive industries pay to the government and what the government receives. It would also enable stakeholders to identify information per sector (oil, gas, and mining) as well as per company.

Availability of EITI reconciliation data would have a moderate impact on budget transparency and efforts to eradicate corruption. Any mismatch uncovered through analysis could be used as preliminary data for state audit agencies and relevant parties to commence an investigation. However, this would depend on the detail and volume of the data presented.[14]

After clarifying with relevant government officials, the IRM researcher determined that the reconciliation data under the first milestone of this commitment was intended for the 2009 EITI report (at the time, the report was released without reconciliation data).[15] This was also mentioned in the first IRM report.[16] The 2009 EITI reconciliation report was issued as a part of the EITI annual report in April 2013 and was done by an independent accountant and published on the Ministry's website.[17] The report notes that there is a 1.5% difference between the income reported by the government and payments made to the government by the private sector. The report suggests that this discrepancy is due to several mining companies not reporting payment to the government in their report. The report suggests that the reconciliation data shows that everything appears to be in order.

The IRM researcher considers this commitment complete. However, the original action plan contains an "achievement measure" which targets the publication of 2010-2011 data, but the target deliverables (Milestone 2.4.1.) do not specify a time for completion. Data on state income 2010-2011 were published in December 2013.[18] Previously, the target was to publish the 2010-2011 reconciliation data by the end of 2013.[19] The reconciliation data – for the oil, gas, and mining sectors – was, however, finally published in April 2014 and June 2014.[20]

---

[1] Original commitment OGI2P1A1

[2] Original commitment OGI2P1A1

[3] National Land Agency (Kementerian Agraria Dan Tata Ruang), Rules and Regulations, http://bit.ly/1w7Bz5B

[4] Original commitment: OGI2P1A2

[5] Forest Watch Indonesia, *Potret Keadaan Hutan Indonesia: Periode Tahun 2000-2009* by Wirendro Sumargo et al. (Report, Indonesia, 2011), http://bit.ly/14DPtBG

[6] Forest Watch Indonesia, *Potret Keadaan Hutan Indonesia: Periode Tahun 2000-2009* by Wirendro Sumargo et al. (Report, Indonesia, 2011), http://bit.ly/14DPtBG

[7] Joyotee Smith et al., "Illegal Logging, Collusive Corruption and Fragmented Governments in Kalimantan, Indonesia," *International Forestry Review* 293 (2003): 5.

[8] Peraturan Menteri Kehutanan Republik Indonesia, Nomor P.8/Menhut-II/2009, Tentang Perubahan Kedua Atas; Peraturan Menteri Kehutanan, Nomor P.55/Menhut-II/2006, Tentang Penatausahaan Hasil Hutan yang Berasal dari Hutan Negara.

[9] Internet Archive Wayback Machine, http://bit.ly/1uDbHLE

[10] Original commitment: OGI2P1A3

[11] Ministry of Energy and Mineral Resources, Penjelasan Tambahan Terhadap Pengumuman Rekonsiliasi IUP, 30 June 2011, http://bit.ly/1tZesFE; Ministry of Energy and Mineral Resources, Index, http://bit.ly/1tZetJG

[12] Government Official from the Ministry of Energy and Mineral Resources (Kementerian Energi Dan Sumber Daya Mineral; ESDM), interview with Pius Widiyatmoko, 17 September 2014.

[13] Original commitment: OGI2P1A4

[14] Susan Ariel Aaronson, "Limited Partnership: Business, Government, Civil Society, and the Public in the Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative (EITI)," *Public Administration and Development* 31 (2011): 31.

[15] Ambarsari from the Co-ordinating Ministry for Economic Affairs, interview with Pius Widiyatmoko, 17 September 2014.

[16] Septiandrica, CR, Independent Reporting Mechanism: Indonesia Progress Report 2011-2013 (First Progress Report, 2013)

[17] EITI Indonesia, *Laporan Rekonsiliator EITI Indonesia Tahun 2009* by KAP Gideon Ikhwan Sofwan (Final report, 22 April 2013), http://bit.ly/1A2NI8Y

[18] Coordinating Ministry for Economic Affairs Republic of Indonesia, *Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative EITI Indonesia Annual Report 2013* prepared by Secretariat of Extractive Industry Transparency Team Deputy of Energy and Mineral Resources (Report, December 2013), http://bit.ly/1shIcSj

[19] Ambarsari from the Coordinating Ministry for Economic Affairs, interview, September 2014.

[20] EITI Indonesia, Download, Reports of EITI Indonesia Year 2010-2011, Oil and Gas Sector, http://bit.ly/1nIZOUP; EITI Indonesia, Download, Reports of EITI Indonesia Year 2010-2011, Mining Sector, http://bit.ly/1nIZQff

Cluster 3. The Infrastructure of Open Government Indonesia Implementation

3.1. Appointments of Information and Documentation Management Officials (PPID) in National Agencies and Enactments of their Standard Operating Procedure[1]

3.1.1. Establishment of 50 PPID.

3.1.2. Establishment of 70 PPID.

	OGP value relevance				Potential impact				Completion				Specificity			
	Access to information	Civic participation	Public accountability	Technology and innovation for transparency and accountability	None	Minor	Moderate	Transformative	Not started	Limited	Substantial	Complete	None	Low	Medium	High
3.1 Overall			✔				✔			✔						✔
3.1.1. Establishment of 50 PPID			✔				✔			**Unclear**						✔
3.1.2. Establishment of 70 PPID			✔				✔			✔						✔

The Indonesian Freedom of Information (FoI) law requires public bodies to appoint Information and Documentation Management Officials tasked with, among other things, responding to FoI requests and publishing a register of information assets. Since FoI came into effect in 2010, the implementation level of such requirements by public bodies has remained low. This commitment aims to increase the number of Information and Documentation Officials (PPIDs) desks in national agencies and establish standard operating procedures.

The Government's self-assessment report stated that only 37 out of 70 national agencies have appointed a PPID. A government official from the Ministry of Communication and Information confirmed that about 38 agencies have appointed a PPID.[2] However, only two (out of 38) PPIDs were formed after February 2013, following the OGP action plan. The new PPIDs are in the cabinet secretariat (established its PPID in 1 March 2013) and the National Library (12 November 12 2013). The rest of the agencies already had a PPID in the period 2010-2012. The Ministry of Information and Communication does not have the authority to compel national agencies to appoint a PPID; they can only make recommendations and provide some guidelines.

Due to the decentralised structure of the Indonesian government, there are different methods among government institutions for determining which institutions should have their own PPID. According to a government source, the target number of 70 PPIDs was calculated based on the number of agencies that are independent in terms of budgeting by the decree which established them.[3] The IRM notes that the formation of PPID would depend on how an entity defines itself as a "public body." The IRM agrees with the view that the degree of autonomy of an entity, as reflected through budget and decree of establishment is an appropriate method in defining public bodies.

The commitment's "achievement measure" also targets standard operating procedures (SOP), but the Ministry did not evaluate this.[4] Because only two PPIDs were established within the action plan time period, and the government's self-assessment report notes that only 37 national agencies have appointed PPIDs, the IRM researcher considers this commitment mainly incomplete.

✪ 3.2. Formulation of a Working Plan and a Well-operated Tracking System for Business/Investment Licensing Services in 10 Provinces and 10 Regencies/Cities[5 6]

	OGP value relevance				Potential impact				Completion				Specificity			
	Access to information	Civic participation	Public accountability	Technology and innovation for transparency and accountability	None	Minor	Moderate	Transformative	Not started	Limited	Substantial	Complete	None	Low	Medium	High
3.2 Overall	✔			✔				✔				✔				✔

While the integrated investment licensing system Sistem Pelayanan Informasi dan Perizinan Investasi Secara Elektronik (SPIPISE) processes all applications online, the tracking system enables applicants to obtain the status of their application and the estimated time until approval.[7] According to a document obtained from a government source, trainings to implement both SPIPISE and the tracking system were held between June and August 2013.[8] Regions that have implemented SPIPISE were selected as candidates for the tracking system. This commitment is rated as having "transformative" potential impact since it has real use for the business community by increasing the ease of doing business in Indonesia.

According to an official from the investment agency Badan Koordinasi Penanaman Modal (BKPM) the system has been successfully implemented in 10 provinces and 10 regencies/cities.[9] The provinces include Aceh, Sumatera Utara, Sumatera Barat, Riau, Jambi, Lampung, Jawa Tengah, Jawa Timur, Kalimantan Barat, and Papua. Meanwhile, regencies that have implemented this are Sragen, Kab, Pinrang, Kubu Raya, Demak, Sidoarjo, Sukabumi, and Gresik, as well as the cities of Pekalongan, Serang, and Tarakan. Applicants can use the system by inputting their application number on the BKPM website.[10]

The commitment has been completed. The IRM researcher recommends the expansion of the system to other provinces, regencies, and cities in the next action plan.

✪ 3.3. Encouraging the Acceleration of the Operational Formation for Information Services in Local Government through the Formation of Local Government's PPID and its Tools[11] [12]

3.3.1. The Minister of Home Affairs' radiogram and/ or circular are delivered to (i) encourage the acceleration of local government's PPID formation and (ii) subsequently evaluate such formation.

3.3.2. Completion of a local PPID formation strategy and working plan. Completion of implementation report on the assistance and supervision of a local PPID formation.

3.3.3. Government-issued decree for an assistance and supervision team to help local government PPID formation and to evaluate the progress of such team in a report.

3.3.4. Overall evaluation on the formation of local government PPID.

3.3.5. Execution of National Coordination Meeting of local PPID.

	OGP value relevance				Potential impact				Completion				Specificity			
	Access to information	Civic participation	Public accountability	Technology and innovation for transparency and accountability	None	Minor	Moderate	Transformative	Not started	Limited	Substantial	Complete	None	Low	Medium	High
3.3 Overall			✔				✔				✔					✔
3.3.1 Effectiveness of Minister of Home Affairs' radiogram			✔				✔					✔				✔
3.3.2. Local PPID formation strategy and implementation			✔				✔					✔				✔
3.3.3. Local PPID formation assistance and evaluation team			✔				✔					✔				✔
3.3.4. Overall local PPID formation evaluation			✔				✔			✔						✔
3.3.5. Local PPID National Coordination Meeting			✔				✔					✔				✔

Similarly to commitment 3.1 (above), public bodies in the regions are required by the Indonesian Freedom of Information (FoI) law to appoint Information and Documentation Management Officials. Since the FoI law is relatively new, there is still confusion about its implementation in the regions.

The Ministry of Home Affairs (MOHA) issued radiograms in April and October 2013.[13] A guideline book on the formation of PPIDs was issued in June through a circular.[14] In addition, a decree for assistance and the establishment of a supervision team to help local government PPIDs was issued in June 2013.[15] A national coordination meeting was held on 21-23 October 2013 in Jakarta and was attended by representatives of local PPIDs from throughout Indonesia.[16] MOHA issued a list of all PPIDs in Indonesia, including in local government, on its website: http://bit.ly/1so39nI. Based on the review conducted in 2013, 24 (out of 33) provinces, 99 (out of 408) regencies, and 38 (out of 92) cities have formed PPIDs.

According to one interviewed government official, the problems with the formation of PPIDs are due to seven factors:

1. Policy: some regional governments await formal guidance from the central government (and thus the commitment sought to issue such guidance);
2. Institutions: there are doubts among regional governments whether the PPID should be a part of the Office of the Ministry of Communication and Information (Dinas Kominfo) or the Public Relations Bureau (as stated in the guide book);
3. Lack of knowledge and information: several radiograms, guidelines, and the national coordination meetings aimed to provide information on PPID formation;
4. Lack of response from regional bureaucrats and worries about increasing workload;
5. The mind-set of "exclusiveness" and concern over openness, as well as lack of technical information in collecting information;
6. Lack of local demand for PPIDs; and,
7. Budgetary concerns over costs associated with establishing a PPID.

These concerns have been addressed partially through the guidelines and formal letters issued by the MOHA.

The IRM researcher also obtained data from the Ministry of Communication and Information on the review of PPIDs. As of 1 July 2014, there are 224 local government PPIDs across regencies and cities. The total number of regencies/cities keeps changing because of administrative fragmentation and creation of new regions (pemekaran). The latest national bureau of statistics survey carried out in 2013 stated that there were 503 regencies/cities; however, other informal sources mentioned that the number was 514.[17]

According to an evaluation conducted by the Ministry of Home Affairs in February 2013 (when the action plan started), only 22% of regional governments had a PPID. By November 2013, the percentage increased to 43%.[18] The IRM researcher considers the 21% increase significant.

It is also worth noting that this commitment was implemented with strong CSO input and collaboration from donor organisations such as GIZ/Decentralisation for Good Governance (DecGG), AusAid (AIPD), PATTIRO, and ICEL. Collaboration between CSOs, government, and donor organisations increases the quality of the commitment's deliverables. At the same time, CSOs monitor implementation. In this respect CSOs monitor and provide technical assistance and expertise to the Ministry, while the Ministry provides access to their bureaucracy for monitoring purposes and incorporates CSOs inputs into their policies.

Theoretically, with PPID, citizens would have more access to government agencies and the government would be more responsive on FoI issues. Nevertheless, formation of a PPID does not guarantee its effective operation. The IRM researcher recommends that the government continue to encourage the formation of PPIDs and monitor the process. Evaluate performances in regions where PPIDs are already in place. Budgetary consequences of the PPID also should be evaluated and, when possible, benchmarked to provide value-for-money service.

---

[1] Original commitment: OGI3P1A1

[2] Government Official from Kominfo, interview with Pius Widiyatmoko, 16 October 2014. The IRM notes that there are data differences between ministries about the actual amount of PPID that has been established. The difference is due to interpretation of what constitutes a non-ministerial public body.

[3] Government Official from Kominfo, interview, October 2014.

[4] Government Official from Kominfo, interview, October 2014.

[5] Exemplary commitments receive a star. For an explanation of the starred commitment formula, see Footnote 1, page 6.

[6] Original commitment: OGI3P1A2

[7] Indonesia Investment Coordinating Board (BKPM), "Tracking System English," (Podcast, 23 October 2012), http://bit.ly/1tzaFRW

[8] BKPM, *Rencana Kerja Implementasi Tracking System Daerah*, 2013.

[9] Ade Maulana, Indonesia Investment Coordinating Board (BKPM), interview with Pius Widiyatmoko, 14 October 2014.

[10] Indonesia Investment Coordinating Board (BKPM), http://www.bkpm.go.id

[11] Exemplary commitments receive a star. For an explanation of the starred commitment formula, see Footnote 1, page 6.

[12] Original commitment: OGI3P1A3

[13] Diah Anggraeni, *Radiogram Menteri Dalam Negeri Nomor 188.2/1987A/SJ*, 22 April 2013; Diah Anggraeni, *Radiogram Mendagri Nomor 188.2/7266/SJ*, 3 October 2013.

[14] Diah Anggraeni, *Surat Edaran Sekjen Kemendagri 061-3253-SJ*, 21 June 2013; also see Pusat Penerangan Sekretariat Jenderal Kementerian Dalam Negeri Republik Indonesia, *Panduan Pembentukan dan Operasional Pejabat Pengelola Informasi dan Dokumentasi: Pemerintah Provinsi dan Kabupaten/Kota* by Andi Kriarmoni et al. (Guide, Jakarta, 19 June 2013), http://bit.ly/1w7ngsz

[15] Keputusan Menteri Dalam Negeri Republik Indonesia, Kepmendagri Nomor 480.05 – 4579 Tahun 2013 Tentang Tim Asistensi Pejabat Pengelola Informasi dan Dokumentasi Pemerintah Daerah, 19 June 2013, http://bit.ly/1w7ngsz

[16] Andri Irawan, Ministry of Home Affairs, interview with Pius Widiyatmoko, 2 November 2014.

[17] National Bureau of Statistics (Badan Pusat Statistik), *Trends of Selected Socio-Economic Indicators of Indonesia* (Jakarta: Badan Pusat Statistik, 2014), http://bit.ly/17tyiUm

[18] Diah Anggraeni, *Surat Edaran Menteri Dalam Negeri 135-8565-SJ*, 3 Desember 2013.

Cluster 4. Transparency and Accountability in Budget

4.1. Encouraging Comprehensive Implementation of Open Government in Pilot Province/Regency/City[1]

4.1.1. Formulation of planning and strategy for the implementation of Pilot Project in One Province/Regency/City.

4.1.2. Implementation of Open Government Pilot Project in One Province/Regency/City.

	OGP value relevance				Potential impact				Completion				Specificity			
	Access to information	Civic participation	Public accountability	Technology and innovation for transparency and accountability	None	Minor	Moderate	Transformative	Not started	Limited	Substantial	Complete	None	Low	Medium	High
4.1 Overall	Unclear				✔						✔			✔		
4.1.1. Formulate one Open Government Pilot Project	Unclear				✔						✔			✔		
4.1.2. Implement one Open Government Pilot Project	Unclear				✔							✔		✔		

This commitment targets OGP implementation in the regions. It is not clear which OGP relevant values (transparency, participation, or accountability) and challenges the commitment addresses. The purpose of the commitment is to promote open government in the regions, but the commitment is ambiguously worded, without clear deliverables or measurable benchmarks.

Prior to implementation, UKP4 [See Section 1: Overview] selected candidate regions for pilot projects based on several indicators: ease of investment, FoI commission rating, anti-corruption commission integrity rating, and the characteristics of regional leadership.[2] The results were then discussed within the OGP Core Team. The UKP4 must also obtain approval from the regional head and enter into a Memorandum of Understanding. In the end, three regions were selected for the pilot project: the Province of Central Kalimantan, the City of Ambon, and the Indragiri Hulu Regency. The project has three facets: appointment of PPIDs, open budget, and an Open School program.[3] However, none of these details were stated in the original action plan.

The Government's self-assessment report indicated the PPIDs were formed in all three regions.[4] However, according to the Ministry of Home Affairs' data, Ambon's PPID has been working since 7 January 2013, Central Kalimantan was formed 15 March 2013, and Indragiri Hulu's was established 20 August 2011.[5] Thus, two of the three PPIDs were established before the action plan.

All three regions are notable for their informative websites. The government commended Ambon's PPID, and its website is informative.[6] Indragiri Hulu's PPID also has an informative website.[7] The IRM researcher is unable to trace the website of Central Kalimantan's PPID. Ambon's Open Budget website contains downloadable information on development plans, performance accountability reports, and procurement plans, among others.[8]

The Open School program uses the "SIAP" platform from PT Telkom (State Telecom company), which is available to schools in Indonesia for a fee.[9] One of the program's features is managing online applications and acceptance announcements for new students every year. As reported in the government's self-assessment, the OGP Open School program uses this platform.[10] While all the regencies in this program used the "SIAP" platform, Ambon also has an additional website dedicated to a school database for registration of new entrants.[11]

Despite the unspecific and immeasurable language of the commitment, the deliverables that were later stipulated in this program (the open schools, formation of PPID and open budget websites) are relevant to OGP. Local governments have become more receptive to the value of open government and OGP. In terms of planning and execution (if not in terms of specificity and measurability), this commitment can become a model of collaboration between government and civil societies.[12]

4.2. Integration of Performance-Based Budgeting[13]

4.2.1. Information system design for an integrated working plan application.

4.2.2. Publication of "Ministerial/Government Agency's Work Plans and Work and Budget Plans" (Renja K/L RKA/KL) information.

	OGP value relevance				Potential impact				Completion				Specificity			
	Access to information	Civic participation	Public accountability	Technology and innovation for transparency and accountability	None	Minor	Moderate	Transformative	Not started	Limited	Substantial	Complete	None	Low	Medium	High
4.2 Overall	✔			✔		✔					✔				✔	
4.2.1. Integrated working plan application				✔		✔						✔				✔
4.2.2. Publication of Ministerial, Government Agency's Work and Budget Plans	✔						✔				✔				✔	

This commitment aims to implement performance-based budgeting in a publicly accessible system at the national level. According to interviews with a government source, the commitment aims to increase the transparency of budget planning, so that the public can have access to information on how each government agency plans to spend the state budget.[14]

Performance-based budgeting has been in place since 2004-2005, as a result of the enactment of the state budget law.[15] While every state apparatus implements performance-based budgeting, there was no unified software application at the national level. The FoI law specifically mandates the publication of public agencies' performance and financial reports, as further elaborated in government regulation.[16] In addition, the FoI Commission issued a circular in 2011 stipulating that public bodies should publish all of the details pertaining to budget planning regularly.[17]

The application was developed using Microsoft Access, and the Microsoft Data Base (MDB) file template is downloadable from the National Planning Agency (Bappenas) website.[18] Bappenas also issued a technical guideline for using the template. The process still requires users to send both hard and electronic copies of files. According to a government source, the template was developed in 2005 and has been continuously worked on since.[19]

Information on Work Plan for 2014 is posted on the Bappenas website. Data is available for every ministry/agency at the national level on the website (http://bappenas.go.id/files/6513/8839/5260/Data Renja per KL Tahun 2014.zip?&kid=1417146187). Data is segregated into code, program/activities and funding sources. However, the data on programs/activities is formulated very broadly. Thus, there are no specific performance or target deliverables that can be discerned from the information published.

The Budget and Work Program (RKA/KL) data are not published on the Bappenas website because this task is seen as the responsibility of the Ministry of Finance. The 2014 Work Plan data will enable the public to understand the planned budget allocation of each ministry/institution and thus obtain information about institutional priorities for that financial year. Combined with the Budget and Work Program data provided by the Ministry of Finance (see 4.3.), the public can see if the budgeting process has been consistent.

Bappenas sent a letter to the UKP4 clarifying that it is not within their responsibility to ensure the publication of Budget and Work Program.[20] They clarified that the commitment contains two deliverables: the design system of work plan application

and the publication of information on each ministry/government institution. In its evaluation, the UKP4 appears to agree with this interpretation.[21]

✪ 4.3. Ensuring the Publication of Budget Plan (RKA/DIPA)[22][23]

4.3.1. Monitoring report and monitoring follow-up on the information availability of RKA KL, DIPA, 3-month budget realisation and Budget Realisation Report on the websites of each Ministry/Institution.

4.3.2. Publication of RKA/KL, DIPA, 3-month Budget Realisation and Budget Realisation Report on the websites of all Ministries/Institution.

	OGP value relevance				Potential impact				Completion				Specificity			
	Access to information	Civic participation	Public [...]	Technology and innovation for transparency and accountability	None	Minor	Moderate	Transformative	Not started	Limited	Substantial	Complete	None	Low	Medium	High
4.3 Overall			✔				✔			✔					✔	
4.3.1. Monitor availability of budget information on websites			✔				✔				Unclear					✔
4.3.2. Web publication of budget reports			✔				✔			✔					✔	

As indicated in the analysis of Commitment 4.2, a number of legal and policy instruments mandate the publication of budget planning and implementation documents. However, compliance has been quite low, and a number of cases were brought before the FoI Commissions.[24] This commitment aims to establish a monitoring program to evaluate the publication of agency budgets.

If this commitment were implemented in combination with the data on the 2014 Work Plan (see 4.2), the public would be able to assess the consistency of the budgeting process. This commitment – as well as the publication of the work plan data in 4.2 above – is significant because there have been cases when budgets were allocated for potentially unnecessary expenses such as travel under the guise of "socialisation." With pressure from CSOs, it is expected that public institutions will allocate budgets more efficiently. The relationship between publications of budget data, behavioural changes in budget allocation, and the overall efficiency requires further research.

Government officials clarified that there are different interpretations as to the intention of the commitment, namely whether data should be published only from the Ministry of Finance (MoF) or from all ministries. According to an interviewee, it was later agreed that the commitment seeks to publish budget information from all ministries but only on the MoF website.[25] The IRM researcher is unable to verify if this interpretation has been agreed on by the UKP4. Furthermore, there are no changes on the wording of this commitment in the Government's self-assessment report.

Data of all RKA/KL (Work Budget) and DIPA (budget implementation guidance) is posted on the MoF website (http://bit.ly/1DT71Wr).[26] However, the IRM researcher was unable to find information on the 3-month budget realisation. Only some of the commitments, namely the publication of RKA/KL and DIPA, have been completed.

---

[1] Original commitment: OGI4P1A1

[2] Government official from UKP4, interview, September 2014.

[3] UKP4, *GSAR* (Report, Indonesia, August 2014), [Bahasa Indonesia] http://bit.ly/14D1E1r

[4] UKP4, *GSAR* (Report, Indonesia, August 2014), [Bahasa Indonesia] http://bit.ly/14D1E1r

5 Center for Regulation, Policy and Governance, *Rekapitulasi SK PPID Provinsi, Kabupaten & Kota Se Indonesia Pusat Penerangan Sekretariat Jenderal Kementerian Dalam Negeri Tahun 2013*, (Report, December 2013), http://bit.ly/1yPmS8Q

6 ANT, "PPID Ambon Jadi Model Nasional," Hukumonline, 28 June 2013, http://bit.ly/ZSGdGy; Pemerintah Daerah Kota Ambon, http://ambon.sip-ppid.net/

7 Pejabat Pengelola Informasi Dan Dokumentasi (PPID) Kabupaten Indragiri Hulu, http://ppid.inhukab.go.id/

8 Pemerintah Kota Ambon, Transparansi Pengelolaan Anggaran Daerah, http://bit.ly/ZSGVn4

9 Sistem Informasi Aplikasi Pendidikan, Perbandingan Biaya, http://produk.siap-online.com/biaya-layanan/

10 Penerimaan Peserta Didik Baru Online (PPDB), Kota Palangkaraya [The Open School for Central Kalimantan], http://bit.ly/1DS8MTE; PPDB, Kabupaten Indragiri Hulu, http://bit.ly/1DS8Ra2; PPDB, KotaAmbon, http://bit.ly/1DS8UT3

11 Pemerintah Kota Ambon, Open School, http://www.ambon.go.id/open-school/

12 Karina Kusumawardani, "Risalah Rapat KP Kalteng" *(*meeting note, Jakarta, 1 February 2013); Margaretha Quina, Indonesian Center for Environemntal Law, email correspondence with Pius Widiyatmoko, 30 October 2014.

13 Original commitment: OGI4P1A2

14 Angga Ekananta, Ministry of National Development Planning (Kementerian Perencanaan Pembangunan Nasional/Badan Perencanaan Pembangunan Nasional; Bappenas), interview with Pius Widiyatmoko, 27 October 2014.

15 Undang Undang 17 Tahun 2003 Tentang Keuangan Negara; Articles 4 and 15 of Peraturan Pemerintah Republik Indonesia Nomor 21 Tahun 2004 tentang Penyusunan Rencana Kerja dan Anggaran Kementerian Negara/Lembaga; Jón R. Blöndal, Ian Hawkesworth, and Hyun-Deok Choi, "Budgeting in Indonesia," *OECD Journal on Budgeting* 2 (2009).

16 Undang Undang No.14 Tahun 2008 Tentang Keterbukaan Informasi Publik; Articles 9.2 and 11.1; Peraturan Komisi Informasi Nomor 1 Tahun 2010 Tentang Standar Layanan Informasi Publik Article 11 (1).b.5.

17 Surat Edaran Komisi Informasi Pusat, Nomor 1 Tahun 2011 Tentang Rencana Kerja dan Anggaran Kementerian/Lembaga (RKA/L) Serta Daftar Isian Pelaksanaan Anggaran (DIPA) Sebagai Informasi Publik yang wajib disediakan dan diumumkan secara berkala oleh Badan Publik.

18 Kementerian PPN/Bappenas, "Renja K/L Tahun 2014," 9 April 2013, http://bit.ly/1tAtrZh

19 Ekananta, interview, October 2014.

20 Deputi Bidang Pendanaan Pembangunan BAPPENAS Memorandum No.72/Dt.8.2/05/2013, May 23, 2013 (2013).

21 Kuntoro Mangkusubroto, written correspondence to the Minister of National Development Planning/Bappenas Concerning Evaluation Result of OGI 2013, 31 July 2013.

22 Exemplary commitments receive a star. For an explanation of the starred commitment formula, see Footnote 1, page 6.

23 Original commitment: OGI4P1A3

24 For example KIP, 'BIN Mempunyai Kewajiban Menjalankan Pelayanan Informasi Publik.' (2013) <http://www.komisiinformasi.go.id/news/view/bin-mempunyai-kewajiban-menjalankan-pelayanan-informasi-publik> accessed January 21, 2015; also KIP, 'Tangani Delapan Perkara, KIP Gelar Sidang hingga Pukul 19.30 WIB' (2014) <http://www.komisiinformasi.go.id/news/view/tangani-delapan-perkara-kip-gelar-sidang-hingga-pukul-19-30-wib> accessed January 21, 2015

25 Government Official from the Ministry of Finance, interview with Pius Widiyatmoko, 7 October 2014.

26 Ministry of Finance Data Catalogue http://www.kemenkeu.go.id/katalogdata

III. Recommendations

Some of the commitments evaluated in this report contain target deliverables to set up and operationalise complaint mechanisms in several government services. The IRM researcher recommends that these commitments be accompanied by a binding internal policy or formal decree.

The IRM researcher highlights that three commitments were well coordinated between the government and civil society actors, namely section 2.4 on gas and mining revenue transparency, 3.1 on appointments of information and documentation management officials (PPID) in National Agencies and enactments of their standard operating procedure, and section 4.1 on OGP pilot projects in the regions. However, for the rest of the commitments, most civil society does not have any access to executing agencies. Such access is required for monitoring, evaluation, and advocacy purposes. The IRM researcher notes that efforts are underway to foster more collaboration between CSOs and the government in the planning and execution of OGP action plans. At present, the CSO coalition on Open Government formed six working groups on several sectors to plan, monitor, and safeguard OGP action plans in the coming years.

A gradual change of approach, in which governmental agencies themselves produces the initiatives for the action plan and the government lead agency conducts supervision and monitoring of such action plans should be envisaged in order to improve the OGP ownership within governmental bodies.

The IRM researcher recommends that all processes leading to the adoption of the action plans, especially individual submissions from CSOs and the proceedings of stakeholder events are documented and published on the OGP Indonesia website with an adequate time frame for stakeholders to express their opinions.

Due to several staff changes within agencies and organisational restructuring, some of the government points of contact were no longer available for interviews. The IRM researcher recommends that future OGP action plans be coordinated with the Information and Documentation Management Officials (PPIDs), who should be in charge of OGP implementation in each public agency. PPIDs are permanent government institutions and would be able to preserve the "institutional memory" for OGP activities.

Finally, it is urgent for the government to decide on the lead agency for OGP initiatives in Indonesia. As regime transitions have been known to impede OGP processes, the IRM recommends that in addition to a lead agency – the execution of OGP should involve non ad-hoc governmental bodies which are not affected by transitions. This would help to ensure that OGP commitments will not become too influenced by political transitions.

Methodology Note

Commitments are clustered based on the original OGP action plan 2013. There is no need for re-clustering as the commitments in the original action plan have been grouped based on specific themes. This report started with a desk review and analysis of all of the commitments. Interviews were conducted in person, by phone, and via email. Interview results were triangulated and crosschecked with available documents.

Dr. Mohamad Mova Al'Afghani is a researcher and an open government expert, leading the Center for Regulation, Policy and Governance (CRPG), a research institution based in Universitas Ibn Khaldun, Bogor. He conducted research in collaboration with various organisations on the issue of transparency, environmental information, freedom of information, utilities regulation, and water services. The author would like to thank Mr. Pius Widiyatmoko for his assistance in writing this report.

The Open Government Partnership (OGP) aims to secure concrete commitments from governments to promote transparency, empower citizens, fight corruption, and harness new technologies to strengthen governance. OGP's Independent Reporting Mechanism (IRM) assesses development and implementation of national action plans to foster dialogue among stakeholders and improve accountability.