INDEPENDENT REPORTING MECHANISM:

INDONESIA PROGRESS REPORT 2011–2013

Chitra Retna S.
Article 33 Indonesia
First Progress Report
Bahasa Indonesia Summary Inside

Open
Government
Partnership
INDEPENDENT
REPORTING MECHANISM

ARTICLE 33
INDONESIA

Public comment version

INDEPENDENT REPORTING MECHANISM:

INDONESIA
PROGRESS REPORT 2011–13

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

INDEPENDENT REPORTING MECHANISM (IRM):
INDONESIA
PROGRESS REPORT 2011-2013

Indonesia's action plan contained ambitious commitments in many key sectors. Though only five commitments were completed, all commitments saw at least substantial or limited progress. Considering the ambition of the action plan, this was a promising start for the Open Government Partnership in Indonesia.

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 each OGP participating country's activities.

One of the eight founding countries of the OGP, Indonesia began formal participation in September 2011.

Indonesia created Open Government Indonesia (OGI) as the national coalition to coordinate OGP. OGI's Core Team comprised representatives of five governmental bodies lead by the Presidential Working Unit for Supervision and Management of Development (UKP-PPP or UKP4), and four civil society organisations, selected by the government.

OGP PROCESS

Countries participating in OGP follow a consultation process during development and implementation of their OGP action plan.

The consultation process for developing the action plan was posted online prior to the consultation, and even though some stakeholders did not receive forewarning, they reported that the announcement was widely circulated compared with past government projects. Most participants were civil society organisation (CSO) staff or university-based researchers from Jakarta or nearby, although most had national networks as well.

During the implementation phase, the government held six multi-stakeholder consultations that usually took the form of half-day or one-day meetings. Core Team and sectoral ministries participated, alongside civil society representatives who were mostly from Jakarta-based CSOs. The forum met in Jakarta at least every two months.

Informally, CSO representatives routinely held meetings with other CSOs not directly involved in OGI to report on progress and provide input for improving implementation of the action plan.

This report was prepared by Chitra Retna S. of Article 33 Indonesia.

AT A GLANCE

MEMBER SINCE: **2011**
NUMBER OF COMMITMENTS: **12**

LEVEL OF COMPLETION

COMPLETED:	5 out of 12
IN PROGRESS:	7 out of 12
NOT STARTED:	0 out of 12
UNCLEAR:	0 out of 12
WITHDRAWN:	0 out of 12

TIMING

ON SCHEDULE:	6 out of 12

COMMITMENT EMPHASIS

ACCESS TO INFORMATION:	11 out of 12
CIVIC PARTICIPATION:	4 out of 12
ACCOUNTABILITY:	3 out of 12
TECH & INNOVATION FOR TRANSPARENCY & ACCOUNTABILITY:	6 out of 12

GRAND CHALLENGES

PUBLIC SERVICES:	6 out of 12
PUBLIC INTEGRITY:	12 out of 12
PUBLIC RESOURCES:	11 out of 12
SAFE COMMUNITIES:	1 out of 12
CORPORATE RESPONSIBILITY:	2 out of 12

COMMITMENT IMPLEMENTATION

Table 1 summarises Indonesia's 12 commitments and gives the IRM researcher's assessment of each commitment's level of completion, whether each is on schedule, and key next steps. Where no timelines were given in the action plan, commitment timing is judged based on the expertise of the independent researcher. The Indonesian plan focussed on online service delivery and access to information.

Table 2 summarises the IRM researcher's assessment of progress on each commitment.

Table 1 | Assessment of Progress by Commitment

COMMITMENT SHORT TITLE AND SYNOPSIS	LEVEL OF COMPLETION				TIMING	NEXT STEPS
	NOT STARTED	LIMITED	SUBSTANTIAL	COMPLETE	Ahead of schedule, behind schedule, or on schedule?	
1. Improving Public Services: **Poverty Reduction.** Publish budget allocation information and implementation plan and results on website, and develop a participation mechanism.	■	■	■		Behind schedule	Extension building on existing implementation
2. Improving Public Services: **Education Subsidies.** Publish budget allocation, disbursement, and expenditure data.	■	■	■		Behind schedule	Continued work on basic implementation
3. Improving Public Services: **Health Subsidies.** Publish budget allocation, expenditure data, the list of recipients of health insurance, and the process to obtain it.	■	■	■		Behind schedule	Continued work on basic implementation
4. Increasing Public Integrity: **Police**. Publish institution and officer profiles, costs and time for services, case status, and an annual report.	■	■			Behind schedule	Continued work on basic implementation
5. Increasing Public Integrity: **High Corruption Risk.** Publish in higher-risk agencies like Tax Court, and Immigration, and Customs offices, institution and officer profiles, costs and time for services, case status, and an annual report.	■	■	■	■	On schedule	Maintenance and monitoring
6. Increasing Public Integrity: **Civil Service Recruitment.** Publish openings, requirements, recruitment process, selection criteria, test results, and announcement of hires. Also publish citizen complaints and resolutions.	■	■			Behind schedule	Continued work on basic implementation
7. Increasing Public Integrity: **Land Administration.** Publish types of services, processes, costs and time required, and status of service requests.	■	■	■		On schedule	Extension building on existing implementation

COMMITMENT SHORT TITLE AND SYNOPSIS	LEVEL OF COMPLETION				TIMING	NEXT STEPS
	NOT STARTED	LIMITED	SUBSTANTIAL	COMPLETE	Ahead of schedule, behind schedule, or on schedule?	
8. More Effectively Managing Public Resources: **National Budget Information.** Publish national budget (proposed and enacted), project and budget list, disbursements, annual report, audited report, and a citizens' budget.				●	On schedule	Extension building on existing implementation
9. More Effectively Managing Public Resources: **District Budget Information.** Publish regional budgets (proposed and enacted), subdistrict project and budgets, and disbursements.			●		Behind schedule	Extension building on existing implementation
10. More Effectively Managing Public Resources: **E-Procurement**. Install and operate software at 56 central government institutions.				●	On schedule	Extension building on existing implementation
11. More Effectively Managing Public Resources: **OneMap Portal.** Digitalize data on primary and secondary forests in single portal, to promote efficient forestry management.				●	On schedule	Significant revision of the commitment
12. More Effectively Managing Public Resources: **Environmental Openness.** Publish extractive industry revenue information for the central and regional government, establish a multi-stakeholder forum for spatial plan development, and publish the spatial plan.				●	On schedule	Extension building on existing implementation

Table 2 | Summary of Progress by Commitment

COMMITMENT	SUMMARY OF FINDINGS
1. Poverty Reduction	Led by the National Team on Fostering Poverty Alleviation (TNP2K), the Indonesian government built a unified database of the 40 percent lowest-income households to facilitate coordination of poverty alleviation programs. There are two main challenges. First, it is important for TNP2K to expand the type and amount of data provided in the Unified Database. Second, UKP4 can use its authority within OGI to de-bottleneck implementation by recommending a presidential regulation, as suggested in the commitment.
2. Education Subsidies	The central government has started to publish the data on the School Operational Fund (*Bantuan Operasional Sekolah; BOS*). According to its self-assessment, the government had committed to this plan long before the OGI action plan as a response to public demand. However, inclusion in the OGI action plan allows progress to be tracked. Moving forward, data should be provided as disaggregated as possible, and the web-based transparency and complaint mechanism should be linked with both the subject of the complaint as well as the relevant institution in charge of responding.
3. Health Subsidies	The central government has started to publish the Health Operational Budget (*Bantuan Operasional Kesehatan; BOK*) data as listed in this commitment through the Ministry of Health website. Like the previous commitment, this initiative existed prior to Indonesia's involvement in the OGP. However, inclusion in the OGI action plan made it easier to track, even though it did not radically move government practice forward. Providing less aggregated, more specific data on actual spending patterns would help strengthen community participation. Also, the government needs to standardize presentation of the data across all localities. Inconsistent categories complicate cross-district analysis and accountability.
4. Police	As of August 2013, the Indonesian Police Office website provided limited evidence that this commitment had been implemented. An organisational map and listing of every regional headquarters is now accessible, including the names and addresses of the police chiefs. While this does represent progress, the three other aspects of the commitment have been more challenging. Occasional updates and information appeared through the home page, but were limited and difficult to find.
5. High Corruption Risk	The websites of the Directorate General (DG) of Tax, the Immigration Office, and the Customs Office provide and regularly update almost all the information listed in the commitment. In addition to overcoming the remaining technical challenges to the website, another key next step would be to link the complaint and whistleblower mechanisms to both an internal authority and an external authority especially tasked with corruption prevention, such as the Corruption Eradication Commission or Supreme Audit.
6. Civil Service Recruitment	The government planned to promote transparency on civil service recruitment. However, the moratorium on hiring new civil servants that began in September 2011 has frozen this commitment. This moratorium aimed at stemming the ballooning cost of the bureaucracy by restructuring it, redistributing civil servants between offices/agencies, recruiting with more transparency, and improving civil servant professionalism. The moratorium was a good step to reforming the system, and the government should continue working to implement this commitment.

COMMITMENT	SUMMARY OF FINDINGS
7. Land Administration	The National Land Administration Office (BPN) has provided almost all of the information required by the commitment. However, it has not yet provided online services or the next level of complaint handling, namely showing responses and progress made on the complaints. A key next step is to improve the complaint mechanism and link it to a specific authority in the internal monitoring system, in addition to an external authority charged with corruption prevention, such as the Corruption Eradication Commission or Supreme Audit. Another important step is to provide interactive online services.
8. National Budget Information	The DG Budget website is known as one of the government's most advanced websites. However, it suffers from lag time and delays. A second problem is that the budget only breaks down data by sectoral ministry, whereas the public demands budget data for each project in every ministry and department.
9. District Budget Information	Overall the website on District Budgets provides significant information to the public. Despite advances, the website does not yet provide detailed regional budgets (proposed and enacted), detailed project and budget lists, or budget disbursement. The challenge lies in the coordination with local government (34 provinces and 409 districts) to provide detailed data in a form that is easily uploaded to a website in a timely manner. The central government should provide guidance on standardizing the information provided by local government websites, since many publish their budgets in different formats. Central government also needs to clarify the rules for publication of detailed local budgets as a mandatory requirement in the annual fiscal approval process. Finally, the website itself needs significant technical revision.
10. E-Procurement	Led by the Indonesia Goods and Services Procurement Policy Institution (LKPP), government boosted the use of the Electronic Procurement Service (LPSE) as part of reforms to establish a more effective and efficient procurement system. LPSE is currently used in 546 units in ministries and government bodies. While the number of transactions conducted electronically has been increasing, they still account for only a small portion of Indonesia's overall public procurement. Moving forward, e-procurement should be standardized, institutionalized into a law, promoted to the private sector, and incorporated into government officials' standard training.
11. OneMap Portal	OneMap is a program to synchronize government geospatial information and create one all-purpose base map for use by all sectoral ministries dealing with land tenure, land concessions, and land-use licensing. Relevant sectoral ministries have agreed and collaboratively established the OneMap. There is urgent need to encourage the use of this map, and integrate it with problematic areas, such as overlapping licensing, land conflicts, tenure conflict resolution, and spatial planning. Piloting the map in several regions and line ministries will help foster the process and ground-truth the map as a problem-solving instrument.
12. Environmental Openness	The Indonesian government released its first Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative (EITI) report in early 2013. This report published revenues paid to the government, using 2009 data, by nearly all oil, gas, mineral, and coal companies operating in the country. The government needs to complement the publication of EITI report with clear guidance on how to read the data to encourage public engagement. The EITI website needs to link with sectoral ministries' websites that contain more detailed information. Contract-by-contract information would be even more useful to stakeholders. This level of information broken down by company is consistent with the recommendation for data disaggregation made in many of the preceding commitments.

RECOMMENDATIONS

OGI was able to open space for public participation, but only five commitments were completed with progress made on several others. On technically difficult commitments, the government focussed on constructing a basic framework, or providing limited updates to tools that existed prior to OGP without significantly improving government practice. Consultations and focus group discussions with stakeholders highlighted at least five recommendations for government to improve in its next action plan.

1. **Improve OGI as an instrument of the strong transparency framework that Indonesia has instituted with its Freedom of Information (FOI) Law.** This law provides a strong foundation for transparency but since its enactment in 2008, it has faced stumbling blocks. OGI should boost FOI Law implementation, taking advantage of the OGP's momentum to unblock its challenges.

2. **Select a strategic, but ambitious, scope for the next action plan.** Building on current initiatives enabled the government to establish a realistic foundation for the system. This targeted approach should continue, but, based on the first action plan's successes, Indonesia should develop a more ambitious concept of fostering open government beyond current initiatives.

3. **Deepen system transparency by strengthening structural incentives and disincentives, rather than by only highlighting best practices.** It is time for OGI to move beyond areas in which government has performed well through systemwide changes to encourage behavioural adjustments in line with the FOI Law. Further, since almost all OGI commitments to date have focussed on providing information only via the Internet, government needs to explore alternate channels.

4. **Strengthen the lead institution to enforce OGP implementation.** Many ministries' transparency plans have been blocked by systemic bottlenecks. Those agencies need a lead institution like OGI's Core Team to address those challenges. The central government needs to confirm permanent institutional arrangements for OGI, rather than allowing OGI to continue to be tied to the President's UKP4, which is dependent on the outcome of the next election.

5. **Improve governance of the Core Team as a leading institution of OGI.** Many stakeholders highlighted the need to improve the regulation governing the OGI Core Team, its governing arrangement, and its authority to take decisions. The Core Team should include representation from more ministries and CSOs. Further discussion is needed as to how civil society representatives are chosen, how Core Team members can encourage meaningful participation from other members of civil society, and how decision making should happen within the Core Team to give equal weight to the voices of civil society and government.

ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS: 2011

To participate in OGP, governments must demonstrate commitment to open government by meeting minimum criteria on key dimensions of open government. Third–party indicators are used to determine country progress on each of the dimensions. For more information, visit: http://www.opengovpartnership.org/how-it-works/how-join

BUDGET TRANSPARENCY:
4 OUT OF 4

ACCESS TO INFORMATION:
LAW ENACTED

ASSET DISCLOSURE:
4 OUT OF 4

CIVIC PARTICIPATION:
9.12 OUT OF 10

ARTICLE 33
INDONESIA

Article 33 Indonesia is a research-based advocacy institution founded in 2009, previously called PATTIRO Institute. Its mission is to promote good governance and public finance management related to basic services, extractive resources, and adaptation and mitigation of climate change in Indonesia.

Open Government Partnership
INDEPENDENT REPORTING MECHANISM

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 assesses development and implementation of national action plans in order to foster dialogue among stakeholders and improve accountability.

MEKANISME PELAPORAN INDEPENDEN:
INDONESIA
LAPORAN KEMAJUAN 2011-2013

Rencana aksi Indonesia berisi 12 komitmen ambisius dalam banyak sektor penting. Walaupun hanya lima komitmen yang termasuk kategori selesai, lima komitmen lainnya menunjukkan kemajuan berarti, dan hanya dua komitmen dengan kemajuan terbatas. Mengingat tingkat ambisius dari keseluruhan komitmen tersebut, hasil ini menunjukkan sebuah kemajuan awal yang sangat penting bagi Open Government Partnership di Indonesia.

Open Government Partnership/Kemitraan Pemerintah Terbuka (OGP) adalah sebuah prakarsa internasional sukarela yang bertujuan untuk menjamin komitmen dari pemerintah kepada masyarakat, untuk meningkatkan transparansi, memberdayakan warga negara, memberantas korupsi, dan memanfatkan teknologi baru dalam kerangka memperkokoh tata kelola pemerintahan. Mekanisme Pelaporan Independen (IRM) melakukan peninjauan dua kali setahun atas kegiatan-kegiatan setiap negara peserta OGP.

Sebagai salah satu dari delapan negara pendiri OGP, Indonesia mulai ikut serta dalam OGP secara resmi pada bulan September 2011.

Indonesia membentuk 'Pemerintah Terbuka Indonesia' (OGI) sebagai koalisi nasional untuk mengkoordinasikan OGP. Tim Inti OGI terdiri atas lima badan pemerintah yang dipimpin oleh Unit Kerja Presiden Bidang Pengawasan dan Pengendalian Pembangunan (UKP-PPP or UKP4), dan empat organisasi masyarakat madani (LSM), yang dipilih oleh pemerintah.

PROSES OGP
Negara-negara yang ikut serta dalam OGP melakukan proses konsultasi (musyawarah dengan masyarakat) selama penyusunan dan pelaksanaan rencana aksi OGP mereka.

Selama tahap penyusunan rencana aksi Open Government Indonesia, proses konsultasi dengan masyarakat dilakukan melalui rangkaian diskusi intensif maupun secara online. Walaupun sebagian pemangku kepentingan tidak menerima pemberitahuan sebelumnya, mereka secara umum melaporkan bahwa pengumuman tentang konsultasi diedarkan secara luas, lebih dibandingkan dengan proyek-proyek pemerintah pada masa lalu. Kebanyakan peserta konsultasi adalah staf LSM atau peneliti dari perguruan tinggi di Jakarta (dan sekitarnya), dimana sebagian peserta ini juga memiliki jaring kerja ke daerah.

Selama tahap pelaksanaan pada tahun 2012, pemerintah menyelenggarakan sedikitnya enam pertemuan Tim Inti, yang biasanya berupa pertemuan-pertemuan setengah hari atau satu hari, dihadiri oleh Tim Inti dan kementerian sektoral yang terkait dengan rencana aksi. Forum tersebut bertemu di Jakarta setidaknya setiap dua bulan.

Secara tidak resmi, perwakilan-perwakilan LSM dalam Tim Inti secara rutin menyelenggarakan pertemuan dengan LSM yang lebih luas , untuk melaporkan kemajuan dan mencari masukan guna perbaikan pelaksanaan rencana aksi.

SEKILAS
ANGGOTA SEJAK: **2011**
JUMLAH KOMITMENT: **12**

PENYELESAIAN

SELESAI:	5 dari 12
SEDANG BERJALAN:	7 dari 12
BELUM DIMULAI:	0 dari 12
TIDAK JELAS:	0 dari 12
TIDAK JELAS	0 dari 12

KETEPATAN WAKTU

LEBIH CEPAT DARI/SESUAI DENGAN JADWAL	6 dari 12

PERHATIAN KOMITMEN

AKSES PD. INFORMASI:	11 dari 12
KEIKUTSERTAAN MASY.:	4 dari 12
PERTANGGUNGJAWABAN:	3 dari 12
TEK. & INOVASI UTK. TRANSPARANSI & PERTANGGUNGJAWABAN:	6 dari 12

TANTANGAN BESAR

MASYARAKAT YG. AMAN: TANGGUNG JAWAB	1 dari 12
PERUSAHAAN:	2 dari 12
LAYANAN MASY.:	6 dari 12
SUMBERDAYA MASY.:	11 dari 12
INTEGRITAS MASY.:	12 dari 12

Laporan ini ditulis oleh Chitra Retna S dari Article 33 Indonesia.

PELAKSANAAN KOMITMEN

Tabel 1 meringkas dua belas komitmen yang dibuat oleh Indonesia dan menyajikan penilaian dari peneliti IRM mengenai tahap penyelesaian setiap komitmen, apakah masing-masing sesuai dengan jadwal waktu, dan langkah-langkah penting berikutnya. Apabila tidak tersedia catatan waktu dalam rencana aksi, ketepatan waktu komitmen dinilai berdasarkan keahlian peneliti independen tersebut. Rencana Indonesia menitikberatkan terutama pada pemberian layanan dan akses informasi secara online.

Tabel 2 meringkas penilaian peneliti IRM mengenai kemajuan setiap komitmen.

Tabel 1 | Penilaian Kemajuan menurut Komitmen

JUDUL SINGKAT DAN IKHTISAR KOMITMEN	TAHAP PENYELESAIAN				KETEPATAN WAKTU	LANGKAH-LANGKAH BERIKUTNYA
	BELUM DIMULAI	SEDIKIT	BANYAK	SELESAI	Lebih cepat dari jadwal, terlambat dari jadwal, atau sesuai dengan jadwal?	
1. Perbaikan Layanan Masyarakat: **Pengurangan Kemiskinan**. Menerbitkan informasi alokasi anggaran, dan rencana dan hasil pelaksanaan pada situs web maupun mekanisme keikutsertaan.	■	■			Terlambat dari jadwal	Memantapkan sosialisasi atas apa yang dilaksanakan
2. Perbaikan Layanan Masyarakat: **Subsidi Pendidikan**. Menerbitkan data alokasi, penyerapan, dan penggunaan anggaran.	■	■			Terlambat dari jadwal	Melanjutkan kegiatan yang sudah dilaksanakan
3. Perbaikan Layanan Masyarakat: **Subsidi Kesehatan**. Menerbitkan data alokasi dan penggunaan anggaran, dan daftar penerima jaminan kesehatan dan proses memperolehnya.	■	■			Terlambat dari jadwal	Melanjutkan kegiatan yang sudah dilaksanakan
4. Peningkatan Integritas Masyarakat: **Kepolisian**. Menerbitkan profil lembaga dan petugas, biaya dan waktu pelayanan, status kasus, dan sebuah laporan tahunan.	■	■			Terlambat dari jadwal	Melanjutkan kegiatan yang sudah dilaksanakan
5. Peningkatan Integritas Masyarakat: **Tingginya Risiko Korupsi di Kantor Pajak, Imigrasi, dan Bea dan Cukai**. Menerbitkan profil lembaga dan petugas, biaya dan waktu pelayanan, status kasus, dan sebuah laporan tahunan.	■	■	■	■	Sesuai dengan jadwal	Mempertahankan dan memantau
6. Peningkatan Integritas Masyarakat: **Penerimaan Pegawai Negeri Sipil**. Menerbitkan pembukaan, persyaratan, proses penerimaan, kriteria seleksi, hasil ujian, dan pengumuman pegawai baru. Juga mengumumkan pengaduan masyarakat dan cara mengatasinya.	■	■			Terlambat dari jadwal	Melanjutkan kegiatan yang sudah dilaksanakan
7. Peningkatan Integritas Masyarakat: **Pertanahan**. Menerbitkan jenis layanan, proses, biaya dan waktu yang dibutuhkan, dan status permintaan layanan.	■	■	■		Sesuai dengan jadwal	Memantapkan penyuluhan atas apa yang dilaksanakan

JUDUL SINGKAT DAN IKHTISAR KOMITMEN	TAHAP PENYELESAIAN				KETEPATAN WAKTU	LANGKAH-LANGKAH BERIKUTNYA
	BELUM DIMULAI	SEDIKIT	BANYAK	SELESAI	Lebih cepat dari jadwal, terlambat dari jadwal, atau sesuai dengan jadwal?	
8. Pengelolaan Sumberdaya Masyarakat secara Lebih Efektif: **Informasi mengenai APBN**. Menerbitkan APBN (usulan dan yang diundangkan), daftar proyek dan anggaran, penyerapan, laporan tahunan, laporan teraudit, dan penyebarluasan informasi anggaran kepada masyarakat.					Sesuai dengan jadwal	Memantapkan sosialisasi atas apa yang dilaksanakan
9. Pengelolaan Sumberdaya Masyarakat secara Lebih Efektif: **Informasi mengenai APBD Kabupaten**. Menerbitkan APBD (usulan dan yang diundangkan), daftar proyek dan anggaran per kecamatan, dan penyerapan.					Terlambat dari jadwal	Memantapkan sosialisasi atas apa yang dilaksanakan
10. Pengelolaan Sumberdaya Masyarakat secara Lebih Efektif: **Pengadaan secara Elektronik**. Memasang dan menjalankan perangkat lunak di 56 lembaga pemerintah pusat.					Sesuai dengan jadwal	Memantapkan sosialisasi atas apa yang dilaksanakan
11. Pengelolaan Sumberdaya Masyarakat secara Lebih Efektif: **Portal** untuk meningkatkan pengelolaan kehutanan secara efisien. Mendigitalisasi data mengenai hutan primer dan sekunder pada portal tunggal.					Sesuai dengan jadwal	Banyak memperbaiki komitmen
12. Pengelolaan Sumberdaya Masyarakat secara Lebih Efektif: **Keterbukaan mengenai Lingkungan**. Menerbitkan informasi mengenai pendapatan pemerintah pusat dan pemerintah daerah dari industri ekstraktif, membentuk sebuah forum multipihak untuk penyusunan rencana tata ruang, dan menerbitkan rencana tata ruang tersebut.					Sesuai dengan jadwal	Memantapkan sosialisasi atas apa yang dilaksanakan

RINGKASAN EKSEKUTIF

Tabel 2 | Ringkasan Kemajuan menurut Komitmen

KOMITMEN	RINGKASAN TEMUAN
1. Pengurangan Kemiskinan	Dengan dipelopori oleh Tim Nasional Percepatan Penanggulangan Kemiskinan (TNP2K), pemerintah Indonesia membangun 'Basis Data Terpadu' mengenai 40% keluarga dengan taraf kesejahteraan terendah, untuk memudahkan koordinasi program-program penanggulangan kemiskinan. Ada dua tantangan utama. Pertama, penting bagi TNP2K untuk memperluas jenis dan jumlah data yang disediakan pada Basis Data Terpadu. Kedua, UKP4 dapat menggunakan kewenangannya dalam OGI untuk mendorong pelaksanaan inisiatif ini dengan merekomendasikan diterbitkannya peraturan presiden, sebagai bagian terakhir dari komitmen yang disarankan.
2. Subsidi Pendidikan	Pemerintah telah mulai menerbitkan data tentang Bantuan Operasional Sekolah (BOS). Menurut penilaian oleh Kementerian terkait, pemerintah telah melaksanakan inisiatif ini sebelum ada Rencana Aksi OGI, sebagai tanggapan atas permintaan masyarakat. Akan tetapi, penyertaannya ke dalam Rencana Aksi OGI membuat inisiatif ini dapat dilacak secara rutin. Untuk perbaikan depan, data yang disediakan perlu lebih detil (disagregat, misalnya data pengeluaran di tingkat sekolah secara detil), dengan transparansi dan mekanisme pengaduan melalui situs web perlu ditautkan dengan perihal pengaduan maupun lembaga terkait yang akan menanggapinya.
3. Subsidi Kesehatan	Pemerintah telah mulai menerbitkan data Bantuan Operasional Kesehatan (BOK) sebagaimana terdaftar dalam komitmennya melalui situs web Kementerian Kesehatan. Serupa dengan komitmen no.2, prakarsa ini sudah ada sebelum keterlibatan Indonesia dalam OGP. Akan tetapi, penyertaannya ke dalam Rencana Aksi OGI memungkinkan kemajuan inisiatif ini dapat dilacak secara rutin walaupun tidak secara luar biasa membuat maju pelaksanaan oleh pemerintah. Penyediaan data yang lebih detil dan lebih spesifik dalam pola pembelanjaan BOK diharapkan akan membantu memperbesar keikutsertaan masyarakat ntuk memantau. Demikian juga, pemerintah perlu membakukan penyajian data tersebut di semua daerah. Penyajian yang tidak seragam dapat memperumit penelaahan antar kabupaten dan pertanggungjawabannya.
4. Kepolisian	Sampai dengan Agustus 2013, situs web Kepolisian RI menyediakan sedikit kemajuan ntentang pelaksanaan komitmen ini. Bagan organisasi dan daftar setiap Kepolisian Daerah sekarang dapat diperoleh, termasuk nama dan alamat para Kepala Kepolisian. Walaupun ini benar-benar menunjukkan kemajuan, tiga aspek lain dalam komitmen tersebut menghadapi lebih banyak kendala dalam pelaksanaannya. Pembaruan sekali-kali dan informasi tampak pada laman 'Beranda', tetapi sangat terbatas.
5. Tingginya Risiko Korupsi	Situs web Ditjen Pajak, Kantor Imigrasi, dan Kantor Bea dan Cukai sudah menyediakan dan memperbarui secara rutin hampir semua informasi yang terdaftar dalam komitmen tersebut. Disamping mengatasi tantangan teknis yang tersisa pada situs web tersebut, sebuah langkah penting berikutnya ialah menautkan mekanisme pengaduan dan pengadu, baik untuk pihak berwenang internal maupun eksternal, terutama yang bertugas dalam pencegahan korupsi seperti Komisi Pemberantasan Korupsi atau Badan Pengawas Keuangan.

KOMITMEN	RINGKASAN TEMUAN
6. Penerimaan Pegawai Negeri Sipil (PNS)	Pemerintah merencanakan meningkatkan transparansi dalam penerimaan PNS. Akan tetapi, penundaan penerimaan PNS baru (moratorium) sejak September 2011 telah menghentikan untuk sementara pelaksanaan komitmen ini. Tindakan ini bertujuan baik, yaitu untuk mencegah menggelembungnya biaya pegawai, penataan kembali, peninjauan kembali penempatan PNS, penerimaan secara transparan, dan meningkatkan keprofesionalan PNS. Penundaan tersebut merupakan langkah bagus untuk mereformasi sistem, dan pemerintah ke depan hanya perlu melanjutkan komitmen ini saat moratorium telah dicabut.
7. Pertanahan	Badan Pertanahan Nasional (BPN) sudah menyediakan hampir semua informasi yang terdaftar dalam komitmen di atas. Instrumen ini belum menyediakan layanan online beserta status/kemajuannya, ataupun belum dapat menyediakan tindak lanjut penanganan pengaduan, yaitu menunjukkan status serta tanggapan atas pengaduan. Sebuah langkah penting berikutnya ialah memperbaiki mekanisme pengaduan dan menautkannya dengan pihak berwenang tertentu dalam sistem pemantauan internal, disamping dengan pihak berwenang eksternal yang bertugas dalam pencegahan korupsi seperti Komisi Pemberantasan Korupsi atau Badan Pemeriksa Keuangan. Sebuah langkah penting lain ialah menyediakan jalur birokrasi yang lebih pendek dengan menyediakan layanan online.
8. Informasi mengenai APBN	Situs web Ditjen Anggaran telah dikenal cukup lama sebagai salah satu dari situs web pemerintah yang paling maju. Masih ada sedikit masalah yang berkaitan dengan kelambatan pembaharuan (update) pada situs web tersebut. Masalah lain terkait dengan penerbitan penggunaan anggaran karena terkait besarnya data dari kementerian-kementerian sektoral yang harus diunggah, sementara masyarakat di sisi lainmenuntut untuk memperoleh data yang yang sangat terperinci, yaitu besaran anggaran per proyek di setiap kementerian.
9. Informasi mengenai APBD Kabupaten	Secara keseluruhan, situs web mengenai APBD kabupaten menyediakan banyak informasi untuk masyarakat. Walaupun ada kemajuan, situs web tersebut belum menyediakan APBD terperinci (usulan & yang diusulkan), daftar proyek dan anggaran terperinci, dan penyerapan anggaran. Tantangannya terletak pada koordinasi dengan pemerintah daerah (34 provinsi dan 409 kabupaten), untuk menyediakan data terperinci dalam bentuk yang mudah diunggah ke situs web secara tepat waktu. Untuk mengatasi tantangan ini, pemerintah dapat menyediakan panduan pembakuan informasi yang disediakan oleh situs web pemerintah daerah karena banyak pemerintah daerah telah mulai menerbitkan anggaran mereka dalam bentuk file lunak (soft-file/online), tetapi mungkin dalam format berbeda-beda. Pemerintah pusat juga perlu memperjelas aturan untuk menenerbitkan APBD terperinci sebagai syarat wajib dalam proses persetujuan keuangan setiap tahun. Pada akhirnya, situs webnya sendiri perlu banyak perbaikan teknis.
10. Pengadaan secara Elektronik	Dengan dipelopori oleh Lembaga Kebijakan Pengadaan Barang/Jasa Pemerintah (LKPP), pemerintah Indonesia mendorong penggunaan Layanan Pengadaan secara Elektronik (LPSE) sebagai bagian dari reformasi untuk membentuk sistem pengadaan yang lebih efektif dan efisien. LPSE pada saat ini telah digunakan di 546 unit kerja dalam kementerian dan badan pemerintah. Jumlah transaksi yang dilakukan secara elektronik semakin meningkat walaupun masih merupakan sebagian kecil dari keseluruhan pengadaan oleh negara Indonesia. Untuk arah ke depan, pengadaan secara elektronik perlu dibakukan, dilembagakan ke dalam sebuah undang-undang secara jelas, dipromosikan kepada swasta, dan merupakan bagian dari pelatihan baku bagi para pejabat pemerintah.

KOMITMEN	RINGKASAN TEMUAN
11. Portal One-Map	One-Map (Satu Peta) ialah sebuah program untuk memadu-serasikan informasi geospasial pemerintah dan membuat sebuah peta dasar serbaguna untuk digunakan oleh semua kementerian sektoral yang mengurusi penguasaan lahan, hak guna lahan, dan perizinan penggunaan lahan. Kementerian-kementerian sektoral terkait telah bersepakat dan secara bersama-sama membuat One-Map (Satu Peta) atas lahan. Ada kebutuhan mendesak untuk mendorong penggunaan peta ini, dan memadukannya dengan bidang-bidang lain yang bermasalah atau yang terdapat dalam rencana aksi, misalnya kasus perizinan yang tumpang-tindih, sengketa lahan, penyelesaian sengketa penguasaan lahan, dan perencanaan tata ruang. Perintisan peta tersebut di beberapa daerah dan kementerian teknis akan membantu mempercepat proses tersebut dan pengumpulan data di lapangan untuk peta tersebut sebagai sebuah instrument untuk mengatasi masalah.
12. Keterbukaan mengenai Lingkungan	Pemerintah Indonesia menerbitkan laporan EITI pertamanya pada awal 2013. Laporan ini menyajikan pendapatan pemerintah dari setiap perusahaan, dengan menggunakan data tahun 2009, yang dibayarkan oleh sebagian besar perusahaan minyak, gas, bahan galian, dan batu bara yang beroperasi di negara ini. Pemerintah perlu melengkapi penerbitan laporan EITI tersebut dengan panduan yang jelas mengenai cara membaca datanya, agar lebih memahami temuan-temuan sehingga menyebabkan semakin terlibatnya masyarakat dalam perbaikan yang dibutuhkan oleh sistem tersebut. Situs web EITI perlu ditautkan dengan situs web/data kementerian-kementerian sektoral dan menyoroti informasi lebih terperinci yang disediakan oleh kementerian-kementerian sektoral. Informasi detil untuk setiap kontrak juga akan lebih bermanfaat bagi para pemangku kepentingan. Hal ini sesuai dengan rekomendasi mengenai penyediaan data secara detil (disagregat) untuk sebagian besar komitmen Open Government Indonesia.

REKOMENDASI

OGI telah berhasil memberi ruang bagi keikutsertaan masyarakat, tetapi pada tahap awal ini belum cukup optimal. Dalam hal komitmen yang secara teknis sulit, pemerintah menitikberatkan pada pembentukan kerangka dasar, atau menyediakan tambahan bantuan berupa monitoring rutin terhadap inisiatif yang telah ada sebelum OGP, tetapi sayangnya kurang banyak membantu menangani masalah-masalah struktural terkati pelaksanaan oleh Kementerian/Lembaga. Berbagai musyawarah dan diskusi kelompok terarah dengan para pemangku kepentingan menyoroti sedikit-dikitnya lima rekomendasi bagi pemerintah untuk menyempurnakan rencana aksi OGI berikutnya.

1. **Menyempurnakan OGI sebagai sebuah instrumen untuk dijalankan dalam kerangka implementasi Undang-**
   undang Keterbukaan Informasi, sebagai landasan yang lebih kokoh bagi Indonesia.

   Undang-Undang Keterbukaan Informasi ini telah memberi landasan kuat bagi transparansi di Indonesia, tetapi sayangnya sejak diundangkan pada tahun 2008, implementasi UU ini menghadapi banyak sekali batu sandungan.

   Dengan demikian, OGI perlu mengambil peran untuk mendorong percepatan dan mengantasi tantangan-tantangan dalam pelaksanaan UU KIP, dengan memanfaatkan OGP sebagai sebuah instrumen internasional yang penting.

2. **Memilih cakupan yang lebih strategis, tetapi sistemik, dalam rencana aksi berikutnya.** Penyusunan strategi pada rencana aksi saat ini (Rencana Aksi 2012) memang merupakan tahap pembangunan landasan yang penting, sehingga dapat dipahami jika pemerintah memilih cakupan yang realistis.

   Ke depan, beerdasarkan keberhasilan dalam rencana aksi pertama, Indonesia perlu menyusun rencana aksi yang lebih ambisius dalam arti lebih strategis dan sistemik, untuk mempercepat tercapainya kondisi 'pemerintah terbuka', melampaui inisiatif-inisiatif di Kementrian/Lembaga yang sudah ada (business as usual) sebelum adanya prakarsa Open Government Indonesia.

3. **Memperdalam transparansi sistem dengan memperkuat struktur insentif, dibandingkan sekadar menyoroti praktik-praktik teladan**. Rencana aksi berikutnya adalah saat dimana OGI harus bergerak lebih maju dari bentuk-bentuk/inisiatif yang telah dilaksanakan dengan baik oleh Kementerian/Lembaga sebelumnya (business as usual), dengan mendorong perubahan sistem insentif di seluruh sistem untuk mendorong perubahan perilaku yang sejalan dengan UU KIP. Lagi pula, karena hampir semua komitmen OGI sampai sekarang lebih menitikberatkan pada penyediaan informasi melalui Internet, pemerintah perlu menjajaki saluran-saluran transparansi lainnya, untuk menjangkau khalayak yang lebih luas.

4. **Memperdalam peran dan dorongan OGP dalam implementasi transparansi di Indonesia**. Banyak rencana transparansi kementerian-kementerian pada saat ini mengalami hambatan sistemik, seperti: konflik atas batasan informasi yang dibuka atau dikecualikan. Instansi-instansi tersebut memerlukan sebuah lembaga dengan kemampuan koordiasi kuat seperti Tim Inti OGI, untuk membantu mengurai hambatan sistemik tersebut. Selain itu pemerintah juga perlu memastikan pengaturan kelembagaan yang memastikan pelaksanaakn OGI ke depan, agar tidak tergantung pada situasi politik seperti misalnya hasil pemilihan umum mendatang.

5. **Memperbaiki tata kelola Tim Inti sebagai sebuah lembaga penting di OGI**. Banyak pemangku kepentingan menyoroti perlunya memperbaiki tata cara aturan dalam OGI/Tim Inti, seperti tata cara pembuatan keputusan misalnya. Tim Inti perlu mencakup keterwakilan dari lebih banyak kementerian dan memberi lebih banyak ruang bagi CSO dalam pembuatan keputusan. Pembahasan lebih lanjut dibutuhkan misalnya mengenai bagaimana cara memilih perwakilan-perwakilan masyarakat madani, mendorong keikutsertaan yang lebih intensif dan luas dari masyarakat madani lainnya, dan cara Tim Inti membuat serta melaporkan keputusan, sedemikian rupa sehingga memberi posisi yang setara antara masyarakat madani dan pemerintah.

PERSYARATAN KELAYAKAN: 2011

Untuk ikut serta dalam OGP, pemerintah harus menunjukkan komitmen terhadap 'pemerintah terbuka' dengan memenuhi kriteria minimum dalam bidang-bidang pokok 'pemerintah terbuka'. Indikator pihak ketiga digunakan untuk menentukan kemajuan negara atas setiap bidang tersebut. Untuk informasi lebih lanjut, kunjungi:
http://www.opengovpartnership.org/how-it-works/how-join

TRANSPARANSI ANGGARAN:
4 dari 4

AKSES PD. INFORMASI:
UU Diundangkan

PENGUNGKAPAN KEKAYAAN:
4 dari 4

KEIKUTSERTAAN MASY:
9 dari 12

Article 33 Indonesia adalah sebuah lembaga advokasi berdasarkan riset yang didirikan pada tahun 2009. Misinya ialah untuk meningkatkan tata kelola dan pengelolaan keuangan negara yang baik dalam kaitannya dengan layanan dasar, sumberdaya ekstraktif, dan adaptasi dan mitigasi perubahan iklim di Indonesia.

Open Government Partnership INDEPENDENT REPORTING MECHANISM

OGP bertujuan untuk memastikan komitmen nyata pemerintah untuk meningkatkan transparansi, memberdayakan masyarakat, memberantas korupsi, dan memanfaatkan teknologi baru untuk memperkuat tata kelola. Mekanisme Pelaporan Independen OGP menilai penyusunan dan pelaksanaan rencana aksi nasional guna mempercepat musyawarah di kalangan para pemangku kepentingan dan memperbaiki pertanggungjawaban.

TOC

I | BACKGROUND

The Open Government Partnership (OGP) is a voluntary, multi-stakeholder international initiative that aims to secure concrete commitments from governments to their citizenry to promote transparency, empower citizens, fight corruption, and harness new technologies to strengthen governance. In pursuit of these goals, OGP provides an international forum for dialogue and sharing among governments, civil society organisations, and the private sector, all of which contribute to a common pursuit of open government. OGP stakeholders include participating governments as well as civil society and private sector entities that support the principles and mission of OGP.

Indonesia, one of the eight founding countries of the Open Government Partnership, began its formal participation in September 2011, when President Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono formally launched the initiative along with other heads of state and ministers in New York.

To participate in OGP, governments must exhibit a demonstrated commitment to open government by meeting a set of (minimum) performance criteria on key dimensions of open government that are particularly consequential for increasing government responsiveness, strengthening citizen engagement, and fighting corruption. Indicators produced by organisations other than OGP are used to determine the extent of country progress on each of the dimensions, with points awarded as described below. Indonesia entered into the partnership exceeding the minimum requirements for eligibility with a high score in each of the criteria. At the time of joining, the country had the highest possible ranking for the categories of "open budgets" (2 out of a possible 2),[1] an access to information law,[2] and a high score for "asset disclosure for senior officials" (2 out of a possible 2).[3] Indonesia also had a score of 7.06 out of a possible 10 on the Economist Intelligence Unit's Democracy Index Civil Liberties subscore[4]

All OGP participating governments must develop OGP country action plans that elaborate concrete commitments over an initial two-year period. Governments should begin their action plans by sharing existing efforts related to a set of five "grand challenges," including specific open government strategies and ongoing programs. [See Section IV for a complete listing of grand challenges]. Action

plans should then set out each government's OGP commitments, which stretch government practice beyond its current baseline with respect to the relevant grand challenge. These commitments may build on existing efforts, identify new steps to complete ongoing reforms, or initiate action in an entirely new area.

Along with the other founding members of OGP, Indonesia developed its national action plan from June through September 2011. The effective start date for the action plan submitted in September was officially 1 January with implementation running through 31 December 2012. The government published its self-assessment in April of 2013. At the time of writing (July–August 2013), officials and civil society members had published the second national action plan.

Pursuant to OGP requirements, the Independent Reporting Mechanism (IRM) of OGP has partnered with a respected, independent national researcher, Chitra Retna S. from Article 33. She carried out an evaluation of the development and implementation of Indonesia's first action plan, forming the basis for this report. It is the aim of the IRM to inform ongoing dialogue around development and implementation of future commitments in each OGP participating country.

INSTITUTIONAL CONTEXT

On 20 September 2011, Indonesia created Open Government Indonesia (OGI) as the national coalition responsible for representing and implementing OGP in the country. Several organisations comprise OGI. Governmental bodies include the Presidential Working Unit for Supervision and Management of Development

(UKP-PPP or UKP4), the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Ministry of Communication and Information Technology, the National Development Agency, the Indonesian Central Commission, the Ministry of Internal Affairs, and the Ministry of Administrative Reform and Bureaucratic Reform. From civil society, the National Secretariat of Indonesian Forum for Budget Transparency (Seknas FITRA), the Centre for Regional Information and Studies (PATTIRO), the Indonesian Centre for Environmental Law (ICEL), and Transparency International Indonesia (TII) are members.

UKP4 led the implementation of Indonesia's action plan. Created by President Yudhoyono in December 2009, UKP4 has strong powers of coordination within the top level of the government. Its five principal responsibilities are:

1. Supervision and facilitation of intersectoral programs.

2. De-bottlenecking implementation of initiatives through analysis and coordination.

3. Monitoring of strategic matters with potentially positive or negative effects on governance, to propose rapid responses to the President or Vice-President.

4. Operation of the *Bina Graha* (executive building) control room to support strategic decision making.

5. Special assignments by the President or Vice-President.[5]

In the context of OGP, UKP4 faced several formal and informal challenges. Legally, despite its wide mandate, the institution was created via "presidential regulation," which is the second to lowest type of law in terms of the hierarchy of authority.[6] This regulation endowed UKP4 with some power, which it used to coordinate OGP implementation primarily through monitoring and scoring each agency's plan. Based on these evaluations, it then made special recommendations to the agencies or to the executive. But UKP4 sometimes faced difficulties coordinating OGP implementation due to the large number of

ministries and departments involved in the action plan.

In July 2011, with stringent timelines for developing the first OGP national action plan, UKP4 made the decision to select a handful of civil society organisations to join government representatives in the Core Team, within OGI, responsible for the planning, program management, monitoring and evaluation of the open government initiative. Four CSOs (FITRA, PATTIRO, ICEL, and TII) and five government departments (UKP4, National Planning Agency, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Ministry of Communication and Information, and National Information Committee) were invited to form the Core Team.[7]

[1] Open Budget Partnership, "Open Budgets Change Lives," Open Budget Partnership, Washington, DC, 2012. http://bit.ly/V5dcPl
[2] Republic of Indonesia, *Public Information Disclosure Act*, 30 April 2008. http://bit.ly/1erXtVl
[3] Simeon Djankov, Rafael La Porta, Florencio Lopez-de-Silanes, and Andrei Shleifer. "Disclosure by Politicians," Tuck School of Business Working Paper 2009-60 (2009): http://bit.ly/19nDEfK; Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), "Types of Information Decision Makers Are Required to Formally Disclose, and Level of Transparency," in *Government at a Glance* 2009, p. 32, Paris: OECD, 2009. http://bit.ly/13vGtqS; Ricard Messick, "Income and Asset Disclosure by World Bank Client Countries," World Bank, Washington, DC, 2009. http://bit.ly/1cIokyf
[4] Economist Intelligence Unit, "Democracy Index 2010: Democracy in Retreat," Economist, London, 2010. http://bit.ly/eLC1rE
[5] UKP4, "Overview." http://www.ukp.go.id/profil
[6] Republic of Indonesia, Law 10/2004, "The Formation of Legislation," 2004. http://bit.ly/160B6iR
[7] Tara Hidayat, cited in Dolar Vasani, "Indonesia: Time for More Proactive Engagement and Better Access to Information," Open Government Indonesia Blog, 1 July 2013. http://bit.ly/16ZZOEB

II | PROCESS: DEVELOPMENT OF ACTION PLAN

Countries participating in OGP are required to follow a process for consultation during development of their OGP action plan.

OGP GUIDELINES

Countries must:

- Make the details of their public consultation process and timeline available (online at minimum) prior to the consultation

- Consult widely with the national community, including civil society and the private sector; seek out a diverse range of views; and make a summary of the public consultation and all individual written comment submissions available online

- Undertake OGP awareness-raising activities to enhance public participation in the consultation

- Consult the population with sufficient forewarning and through a variety of mechanisms—including online and in-person meetings—to ensure the accessibility of opportunities for citizens to engage.

A fifth requirement, during consultation, is set out by the OGP Articles of Governance and covered in Section III: Consultation during Implementation:

- Countries must identify a forum to enable regular multi-stakeholder consultation on OGP implementation—this can be an existing entity or a new one.

Generally stakeholders accept that the current action plan functioned as a first stage of OGI, in which government focussed on building the process and the institution.

The process for public consultation, including a timeline, was available online prior to beginning consultations.1 Even though not all the stakeholders interviewed received forewarning, they generally reported that the consultation announcement was widely circulated, at least compared with past government projects. The forewarning reached the main CSOs in Jakarta, and the number of workshops and focus group discussions conducted during this consultation (more than 30) was proof of a sufficient forewarning that gave civil society time to prepare.

For the most part, only CSOs based in Jakarta were contacted or encouraged to participate, but some based in districts surrounding Jakarta participated, and many had countrywide networks as well. Supported by several funding agencies, civil society held workshops to evaluate the action plan and gathered their comments and input as recommendations to the Core Team through their CSO representatives.

Civil society raised concerns that "the process wasn't participative…government just appointed them."[2] Government responded by explaining that the first OGP process in Indonesia was based on the idea of "let's make a start and see how it goes." Tara Hidayat of the PDU explained, "There are hundreds of CSOs in Indonesia. We wanted organisations with a proven track record, experience and relevance in the field but no affiliation to any political party. We now know it should be done differently."[3]

Most of the participants in the consultations were NGO staff and university-based researchers, with limited participation from line ministries and other levels of government. The discussion usually followed the focus group method and focussed on specific topics. Minutes of discussions were circulated for review.

In the opinion of the IRM researcher, considering Indonesia's diversity, it would be difficult to reach out to all relevant stakeholders. In general, participation in the consultation represented a diverse set of stakeholders, especially across sectors and issues. Even though some underrepresentation was observed for the private sector and the subnational level, the consultation was meaningful in the sense that

TOC

government opened a wide space for stakeholders to make recommendations for the government's action plan. Through this process, stakeholders largely perceived that their input was accommodated fairly and included in the action plan. On one hand, this process showed how the government responded to stakeholder concerns; on the other hand, the strategy of accommodating all stakeholders' interests led the plan to cover a larger, more detailed agenda, and opened it to criticism on this front.

[1] Ridaya Laodengkowe, Prorep staff, phone interview with author, 28 May 2013; FGD with stakeholders on 3 June 2013.
[2] Tanti Suryani, cited in Dolar Vasani, "Indonesia."
[3] Tara Hidayat, cited in Dolar Vasani, "Indonesia."

III | PROCESS: CONSULTATION DURING IMPLEMENTATION

During the implementation phase, the government held six multi-stakeholder consultations that usually took the form of half-day or one-day meetings. The Core Team and sectoral ministries participated, alongside civil society representatives that were mostly Jakarta-based CSOs. The forum met in Jakarta at least every two months.

Informally, CSO representatives routinely held meetings with a broader set of CSOs not directly involved in OGI to report on progress and provide input for improving implementation of the action plan. Several commitments overlapped with other, related initiatives that Indonesia was undertaking in parallel to OGP. For example, the NGO Publish What You Pay Indonesia met with ministries and companies regarding Indonesia's participation in the (Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative (EITI), which is a thematic overlap between OGP and REDD+ (a partnership for developing countries to reduce emissions from deforestation and forest degradation).

Several ways to improve representativeness and participation in consultations are addressed in Section VI: Moving Forward.

TOC

IV | IMPLEMENTATION OF COMMITMENTS

At the heart of OGP are the commitments in countries' national action plans. This section outlines the requirements of Indonesia's commitments before presenting a report on each.

OGP commitments must be structured around a set of five "grand challenges" that governments face. OGP recognizes that all countries are starting from different baselines. Countries are charged with selecting the grand challenges and related concrete commitments that most relate to their unique country contexts. No action plan, standard, or specific commitments are forced on any country.

The five OGP grand challenges are:

1. **Improving Public Services**—measures that address the full spectrum of citizen services including health, education, criminal justice, water, electricity, telecommunications, and any other relevant service areas by fostering public service improvement or private sector innovation.

2. **Increasing Public Integrity**—measures that address corruption and public ethics, access to information, campaign finance reform, and media and civil society freedom.

3. **More Effectively Managing Public Resources**—measures that address budgets, procurement, natural resources, and foreign assistance.

4. **Creating Safer Communities**—measures that address public safety, the security sector, disaster and crisis response, and environmental threats.

5. **Increasing Corporate Accountability**—measures that address corporate responsibility on issues such as the environment, anti-corruption, consumer protection, and community engagement.

While the nature of concrete commitments under any grand challenge area should be flexible and allow for each country's unique circumstances, all OGP commitments should reflect four core open government principles:

- **Transparency**—information on government activities and decisions is open, comprehensive, timely, freely available to the public, and meet basic open data standards (e.g. raw data, machine readability).

- **Citizen Participation**—governments seek to mobilise citizens to engage in public debate, provide input, and make contributions that lead to more responsive, innovative and effective governance.

- **Accountability**—there are rules, regulations, and mechanisms in place that 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.

- **Technology and Innovation**—governments embrace the importance of providing citizens with open access to technology, the role of new technologies in driving innovation, and the importance of increasing the capacity of citizens to use technology.

Countries may focus their commitments at the national, local and/or subnational level—wherever they believe their open government efforts are to have the greatest impact.

Recognizing that achieving open government commitments often involves a multi-year process, governments should attach timeframes and benchmarks to their commitments that indicate what is to be accomplished each year, wherever possible.

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

TOC

1 | Improving Public Services: Poverty Reduction

COMMITMENT SUMMARY

LEAD INSTITUTION	National Team on Fostering Poverty Alleviation (*Tim Nasional Percepatan Penanggulangan Kemiskinan*; TNP2K Indonesia)
SUPPORTING INSTITUTIONS	None
POINT OF CONTACT SPECIFIED?	No
OGP VALUES	Access to information, Participation, Accountability, Technology and innovation
OGP GRAND CHALLENGES	Increasing public integrity, More effectively managing public resources
SPECIFICITY OF GOAL	Medium
ACTION OR PLAN	Carry out action

LEVEL OF COMPLETION	NOT STARTED — LIMITED — **(CURRENT)** — SUBSTANTIAL ▼ — COMPLETE ⚠ **(PROJECTED)**
NEXT STEPS	Extension building on existing implementation

Full text of the commitments

Promoting transparency, accountability, and public participation in government's poverty reduction programs. This commitment includes providing information on the budget allocation for the poverty reduction program and placing the implementation plan and its results on the website. A public participation mechanism throughout the cycle of the program must be enforced through regulations. (Track I,[1] by December 2012).

What happened?

Led by TNP2K and the National Team on Fostering Poverty Alleviation, the Indonesian government has built a system called the "unified database" to facilitate coordination of poverty alleviation programs. TNP2K is a government institution, directed by the Vice-President and reporting to the President, whose main role is to improve the implementation of targeted poverty alleviation programs by introducing better systems, promoting program coordination and integration, and effectively monitoring and evaluating results.

One of TNP2K's main priorities was the unification of the National Targeting System into a single database,

to be used by various poverty reduction initiatives. This priority represented a "lesson learned" from previous experiences, in which social assistance programs relied on different databases and approaches to target poor households, inefficiently duplicating efforts.

The new, unified database includes the lowest 40 percent of households (according to socioeconomic status) in Indonesia. Most of the data was provided by the Social Assistance Database Program (Pendataan Program Perlindungan Sosial; PPLS), a survey of 26 million households conducted by the Badan Pusat Statistik (BPS) in July 2011. A goal of the unified database system was to facilitate the coordination and use of a primary data source of poor households by social protection program stakeholders.

Currently there are three levels of data accessibility in the database:

1. Through the website, one can access extensive data about the distribution of poor households across province and district.

2. Through direct inquiry, one can request more detailed data on poor households.

TOC

3. Through direct inquiry, government administrations, like subnational governments or other relevant institutions that need more detailed data, can request raw data like name and address.[2]

While there has been wide acknowledgement on the importance of this project, disputes have been raised on the transparency of the data, as discussed below.

Even according to the government self-assessment, this plan had been initiated long before the OGI action plan was created. Still, the database can be categorized as an advance on the general government's pre-existing institutional transparency plan. OGI exposes this commitment to scrutiny and enables progress to be tracked on a regular basis.

Did it matter?
According to interviewees, those who requested data found differing levels of accessibility. They reported overly complicated requirements for citizen data requests, and suspected that only certain well-known or governmental institutions could easily access the data.

Some CSOs and research institutions demanded access to governmental information that included raw data by name by address. The government insisted that this data, gathered legally on the basis of government's need, is protected under the "exception" category of the Indonesian Freedom of Information Law (14/2008) to respect the privacy of individual citizens. A case was filed by a civil society initiative for adjudication through the National Information Committee,[3] with the decision recognizing individual personal data as "exception information."[4] Thus government agencies access a version of the data disaggregated to the individual level, while the public version is aggregated and does not include personal identifying information.

Other stakeholders complained of the absence of certain data, especially the disclosure of the level of progress on implementing a variety of poverty programs. Such information could be used to improve government accountability and safeguard against overlapping initiatives.

According to the government self-assessment, it might have to revise this target, since TNP2K is not an executing agency, but is instead a policy broker or intermediary for several executing agencies. As a result, TNP2K does not have the authority to compel the executing agencies to disclose their data, to determine which data the public has a right to access, or to deal with copyright issues involving reports produced by institutions using the data.

Since the TNP2K database is the only formal source of data that should be used in government poverty alleviation programs, public access to it online or by direct inquiry is a significant achievement. Some CSOs and subnational government stakeholders have begun to use the database. Despite calls for accessibility to more data, many stakeholders acknowledged the current disclosure on distribution and poverty measurement is useful and an important first step. Still, no public participation mechanism was created, so the IRM researcher considered implementation to be 'substantial.'

Moving forward
Two main challenges remain for this commitment's full implementation. First, it is important for TNP2K to create a public participation mechanism, and expand the type and amount of data provided in the unified database. It should include pooling data from other line ministries that are deemed critical for poverty analysis. The data made available to government agencies through this commitment should be made available, in a way that respects privacy and the "exception information," to citizens so they can hold government-targeted poverty reduction plans accountable.

Second, OGI is in a good position to facilitate the resolution of bottlenecks (problems of coordination with other line ministries or agencies, disputes about the status of the data that can be published, or conflicting requirements about who can access the data). Specifically, UKP4 can use its authority within OGI to resolve these conflicts perhaps through recommending presidential regulation as the last part of the commitment suggested.

---

[1] OGI classified its action plan commitments into three different deadline tracks, called the "3-Track Strategy."
[2] More information can be found at http://bit.ly/1fDr0Pi
[3] National Information Commission, "Perkumpulan Inisiatif Minta Data TNP2K Untuk Social Audit," 19 January 2013. http://bit.ly/15YcD4V
[4] National Information Commission, "Tak Penuhi Syarat Mitigasi, Majelis Komisioner Kalahkan Pemohon Soal Data Penerima Jamkesmas," 18 May 2013. http://bit.ly/19PGTfP

TOC

2 | Improving Public Services: Education Subsidies

COMMITMENT SUMMARY	
LEAD INSTITUTION	Ministry of Education
SUPPORTING INSTITUTIONS	None
POINT OF CONTACT SPECIFIED?	No
OGP VALUES	Access to information, Participation
OGP GRAND CHALLENGES	Increasing public integrity, More effectively managing public resources
SPECIFICITY OF GOAL	High
ACTION OR PLAN	Carry out action

LEVEL OF COMPLETION

NOT STARTED — LIMITED — **(CURRENT)** — SUBSTANTIAL ▼ — COMPLETE ⚠

(PROJECTED)

NEXT STEPS	Continued work on basic implementation

Full text of the commitments

Promoting transparency, accountability, and public participation in the area of government subsidies for education in elementary and junior high schools. The data and information to be published are: budget allocation, disbursement, and expenditure data. The publication of information should be conducted at every elementary school and junior high school in 411 regional governments (district level). (Track I, by December 2012).

What happened?

The government has started to publish the data on the School Operational Fund (*Bantuan Operasional Sekolah;* BOS) both on the Ministry of Education website as well as at the schools. Four components have been listed as commitments: BOS allocation, BOS disbursement, BOS expenditure, and a complaint mechanism. Implementation of those commitment parts varies in terms of detail and completeness.

- The BOS allocation has been published on the website with the highest possible level of detail: every BOS allocation to every school has been provided to the public.

- The BOS disbursement has been published at a general level: that is, the amount being disbursed or the province that has received the funds.

- Publication of the BOS expenditures, the most critical data required by public, has been initiated for a number of sample schools (roughly 1 percent of elementary schools).

- The complaint mechanism involves complaints directed at BOS, not about all transparency issues. The website provides complaint statistics, details of the complaints, and the progress in responding to them.[1]

Did it matter?

According to its self-assessment, the government had committed to this plan in response to public demand long before the OGI action plan was created. However, inclusion in the OGI action plan allowed civil society to track progress, even though some of its aspects did not radically move government practice forward.

Stakeholders greatly appreciated the detailed disclosure of BOS allocations at the school level, since the public has demanded it for a long time. Schools (school staff, parents, or school committees) can now

TOC

easily access this data for planning or monitoring. CSOs focussed on education are actively using these data for accountability and monitoring.

The statistics on complaints demonstrate the extensive and regular use of the online complaint mechanism It represents a significant achievement under this commitment.

Nevertheless, several challenges remain to this commitment's implementation:

- Much of the data is provided at an aggregated level, while the demand is for a disaggregated level.

- Exported spreadsheets are often many layers "deep," meaning they include multiple values per row or column or multiple sheets in a workbook, which complicates analysis and is not an open data format.

- The accuracy of the data remains doubtful.

- Providing data on expenditures in over 10,000 schools is a huge undertaking, and data are now available on less than one percent of elementary schools.

- The web often slows down when the flow of data peaks.

- Physically maintaining such large files online is a challenge given current limited resources and skills.

- Although it appears to be well used thus far, there is no guarantee of enforcement or responsiveness to the online complaint mechanism. Many questions received responses of "We will forward that inquiry" or "Please address your complaint to the local school or provincial authority."

- There is no mechanism yet to monitor and enforce the transparency and publication of data at the school level outside of the 1 percent of sample schools.

- There is some dispute over the status of the under-lying information sources, for example whether or not payment receipts are subject to public access.

Moving forward

Two key next steps are important in implementing this commitment.

First, data should be provided to the public as disaggregated and as user-oriented as possible to allow for comparison of different schools and their progress. Data like a school's allocation compared with the amount to which it was entitled, or data on student enrollment compared with school fund allocation would enable easy and accurate analysis. In general, spreadsheet-based data should be "flat" to make analysis as easy and error-free as possible.

Second, a simple but effective improvement to the web-based transparency and complaint mechanism would be to link it with both the office subject to the complaint and to that office's oversight institution. For example, linking complaints about a specific central, provincial, district, or school office both to that office and to the central authority that would enforce addressing the complaint would better promote accountability.

---

[1] More information can be found in http://bos.kemdiknas.go.id/home/berita/48 and http://bos.kemdiknas.go.id/pengaduan/

TOC

3 | Improving Public Services: Health Subsidies

COMMITMENT SUMMARY	
LEAD INSTITUTION	Ministry of Health
SUPPORTING INSTITUTIONS	None
POINT OF CONTACT SPECIFIED?	No
OGP VALUES	Access to information, Participation
OGP GRAND CHALLENGES	Increasing public integrity, More effectively managing public resources
SPECIFICITY OF GOAL	High
ACTION OR PLAN	Carry out action

LEVEL OF COMPLETION

NOT STARTED — LIMITED — (CURRENT) — SUBSTANTIAL ▼ — COMPLETE

(PROJECTED)

NEXT STEPS	Continued work on basic implementation

Full text of the commitments

Promoting transparency, accountability, and public participation in the area of government subsidies in the health sector. The data and information to be published are: budget allocation and expenditure data, list of the recipients of health insurance, and the process to obtain health insurance services. The publication is conducted at every community hospital (subdistrict level) in 497 regional governments (district level). (Track I, by December 2012).

What happened?

As with the education community, the three biggest questions of the health community are: How much is the budget allocation? Does it reach the service provider? Was it used as it should have been used?

In response, the government started to publish the data required by this commitment on the Ministry of Health website, including the Health Operational Budget (Bantuan Operasional Kesehatan; BOK) allocation and realisation, the procedure to access health insurance services, and other relevant health information.

The Ministry of Health launched BOK to support the activities of Community Health Centres (Puskesmas).

In 2013 this fund was distributed to 9,419 Health Centres throughout Indonesia's 26 provinces. The data on BOK allocations were posted on the web as aggregate amounts for each district for each month, including the progress on their use. The website also displayed the technical instructions for appropriate use of BOK funds, and how each Health Centre used its BOK allocation.

Government still faces problems related to the transparency of expenditures, particularly in the level of aggregation, which is at the district level rather than the Health Centre level. Additionally, the Ministry of Health's website relies on each local government's website to support these data, which encourages local government to play a role, but also diffuses responsibility.[1]

Like commitment two, this initiative existed prior to Indonesia's involvement in the OGP. However, inclusion in the OGI action plan enabled its progress to be tracked, even though it did not radically move government practice forward.

Did it matter?

Although there is no evidence on how much stakeholders have used the data provided by this commitment, the amount of data published and the

wide applications for them will empower civil society. Users from clinic staff to the public at large can use data for studies and assessments or monitoring and advocacy.

Stakeholders identified two main challenges: the level of data aggregation and data updating. First, the data on expenditure is still provided at an aggregate level, while the demand is for disaggregation. Second, the data are not updated regularly. As previously mentioned, the Ministry of Health relies on local governments' websites for expenditure data. Ensuring that more than 400 districts provide this information at a decent pace poses a significant challenge.

A final challenge was that, as of August 2013, the data was not easy to access, analyse, or compare. Aside from difficulties navigating the website, data for different provinces was presented in different formats, over different periods of time, and using different indicators.

One interesting aspect of the public release of this data was the space for public participation. Some province websites provided a tool to submit commentary on documents and other information. Although it is not clear whether these comments will influence policy, the effort is laudable and in the spirit of OGP.

Moving forward
Providing less aggregated, more specific data on actual spending patterns would help strengthen community participation. More detailed BOK disbursements, such as showing how districts and Health Centres spent their budgets, for example, would help strengthen community monitoring. In terms of organisation, Government needs to make efforts to standardise the presentation of the data across all localities. Inconsistent categories complicate cross-district analysis and accountability.

TOC

4 | Increasing Public Integrity: Police

COMMITMENT SUMMARY	
LEAD INSTITUTION	Indonesia National Policy
SUPPORTING INSTITUTIONS	None
POINT OF CONTACT SPECIFIED?	No
OGP VALUES	Access to information, Technology and innovation
OGP GRAND CHALLENGES	Increasing public integrity, Creating safer communities, Improving public services
SPECIFICITY OF GOAL	High
ACTION OR PLAN	Carry out action

LEVEL OF COMPLETION	NOT STARTED — LIMITED **(CURRENT)** ▼ — SUBSTANTIAL — COMPLETE △ **(PROJECTED)**

NEXT STEPS	Continued work on basic implementation

Full text of the commitments

Promoting transparency, accountability and public participation for police and public prosecution services. The data and information to be published include: institution and officer profiles, type and service mechanism, time and cost required, case status/ progress and annual report. The data and information are required to be published on the institutions' website. (Track I, by December 2011).

What happened?

This commitment involved four types of information. As of August 2013, the Indonesian Police Office website provided limited evidence that this commitment had been implemented.

An organisational map and listing of every regional headquarters is now accessible, including the names and addresses of the police chiefs. While this does represent progress, the three other aspects of the commitment have had a more challenged implementation. The "Provisions and Services" section of the website lists many files for download, but when the IRM researcher tested these links they were either broken or downloaded blank files. A few cases could be

accessed, but they provided little information and had not been updated since 2010. The last annual summary available also dates from that year, but it contains no information—every category lists zero as its value.

Occasional updates and information appeared on the home page, but were limited and difficult to find. For example, a post about a new traffic enforcement initiative included some data about number of arrests and incidents, but not in a way that could be used for analysis or comparison for accountability.[1] Another post on licensing services included information on where mobile licensing registration would be occurring, but did not include time or cost as the commitment outlined.[2]

Together, these results suggest that little has changed since before the design and implementation of the Indonesia action plan.[3]

Did it matter?

While stakeholders reported making use of the descriptions of police procedures and services, such as the procedure for drivers' license applications, the IRM was not able to download or access any of the files that the site lists as available.

TOC

While the website now shows the names and addresses of police chiefs, this information is not especially useful for public accountability as the public can file complaints without it.

Users complained of the nonfunctional online complaint mechanism, because it is difficult to keep track of the authorities' responses to the complaints. The lack of response has discouraged citizens from filing reports.

Thus, the only part of this commitment implemented was to publish "institution and office profile" information. Given the large potential effects of the other aspects of this commitment, the IRM researcher considers this implementation and its significance to be limited.

Moving forward

While stakeholders reported significant improvements in information about the type of police services and mechanisms, they also remarked that corruption is still quite common. Focussed efforts usually improve the system for a while, but then cases resurge. An important key step forward, therefore, is for government to improve the complaint tracking system so that the public can see how its complaints are being handled.

TOC

5 | Increasing Public Integrity: High Corruption Risk

COMMITMENT SUMMARY	
LEAD INSTITUTION	Directorate General of Tax, Immigration Office, and Customs Office
SUPPORTING INSTITUTIONS	None
POINT OF CONTACT SPECIFIED?	No
OGP VALUES	Access to information, Technology and innovation
OGP GRAND CHALLENGES	Increasing public integrity, More effectively managing public resources, Improving public services
SPECIFICITY OF GOAL	High
ACTION OR PLAN	Carry out action

LEVEL OF COMPLETION

NOT STARTED		LIMITED	**(CURRENT)**		SUBSTANTIAL		COMPLETE

(PROJECTED)

NEXT STEPS	Maintenance and monitoring

Full text of the commitments

Promoting transparency, accountability, and public participation in the public area services that indicated high risk of corruption such as the Tax Court Office, Immigration Office, and Custom Office. The data and information to be published include: institution and officer profiles, type and service mechanism, time and cost required, case status and progress, and annual report. The data and information are required to be published at institutional websites. (Track I, by December 2011).

What happened?

The websites of the Directorate General (DG) of Tax, the Immigration Office, and the Customs Office provide almost all the information listed in this commitment, namely: institutional profile, officer profile, type of services offered and how to access them, time and cost required, case status and progress, and annual report. They were all regularly updated and maintained.

The DG of Tax website is functional and all relevant information is easily accessed. The home page

features a simple icon that leads to pages explaining how to register, how to report, how to pay, and how to get a tax refund. This website also shows a variety of e-government functions, including electronic forms, online reporting, online billing, and retrieval of taxpayer numbers.[1]

The commitment to update the Immigration Office website was also fully implemented. The site describes the roles and responsibilities of the office, and lists relevant addresses, including immigration lawyers and detention centres. On the e-government side, one can easily access simple information on applying for visas and passports, and there is also an online application that enables residents to get a visa and passport in one day.[2]

The Custom Office website provides fairly complete information on e-government procedures like import, export, and excise duty. A functional complaint submission button is clearly located on the home page, with detailed instructions for how to submit and follow-up on a complaint. Complaints are not publically viewable, so information was not available

TOC

on how well this accountability mechanism functioned in practice.[3]

Did it matter?

Stakeholders reported wide use of the e-government sections of the websites. Still, they complained of many problems related to difficulties with the online application, such as uploading the relevant documents, as well as difficulty understanding the instructions.

A common challenge across the three commitments was that transparency alone does not translate automatically into accountability. While stakeholders considered the information provided on the website as adequate to improve service access, transparency alone cannot curtail the corruption that occurs.

Moving forward

These three offices are designated by the action plan as having especially large risks of corruption, thus they should make special efforts to ensure that complaints are easily made, received, addressed, tracked, and resolved. In addition to overcoming the remaining technical challenges to the websites, a key next step is to link the complaint and whistleblower mechanisms not only to the specific authority in the internal monitoring system, but also to an external authority especially tasked with corruption prevention, such as the Corruption Eradication Commission or Supreme Audit.

TOC

6 | Increasing Public Integrity: Civil Service Recruitment

COMMITMENT SUMMARY

LEAD INSTITUTION	Ministry of the State Apparatus (*Menteri Pendayagunaan Aparatur Negara*)
SUPPORTING INSTITUTIONS	None
POINT OF CONTACT SPECIFIED?	No
OGP VALUES	Access to information, Accountability
OGP GRAND CHALLENGES	Improving public services, Increasing public integrity, More effectively managing public resources
SPECIFICITY OF GOAL	High
ACTION OR PLAN	Carry out action

LEVEL OF COMPLETION

NOT STARTED — LIMITED **(CURRENT)** — SUBSTANTIAL **(PROJECTED)** — COMPLETE

NEXT STEPS	Continued work on basic implementation

Full text of the commitments

Promoting transparency on civil services recruitment by the central and regional government. The data and information to be published include: position openings and requirements, recruitment process, selection criteria, test results, and announcement of final candidates to be employed. Citizen complaints on the civil service recruitment process and the corresponding resolutions are also to be made public. (Track II, by December 2013).

What happened?

To support civil service reform in Indonesia, government planned to promote transparency on civil service recruitment. However, the moratorium on hiring new civil servants that began in September 2011 has frozen this commitment. This moratorium was aimed at stemming the ballooning cost of running the bureaucracy, organisational restructuring and rightsising, civil servant redistribution, transparent recruitment, and improving civil servant professionalism.

The new employee hiring system will have several requirements. Ministries and other government institutions will be required to have a five-year human resource plan, backed by position and workload analysis, that is in line with the civil servant redistribution plan. Government offices will also have to conduct an open, fair, efficient, and accountable recruitment process. Only government offices that spend less than 50 percent of their total budgets for employees will be allowed to hire, and even then, recruitment will only be allowed after approval from the National Committee for Bureaucracy Reform.[1]

The new approach to recruitment did not begin during the OGP implementation period, so the Ministry of State has disclosed only limited information. The website provides an explanation of the new civil servants' hiring system, position analysis, and workload analysis for every ministry and bureau in the central government, as well as for every province and district in Indonesia. The website also announces a budget analysis showing how much each district spends on employees and whether or not it is eligible to hire new civil servants.[2]

TOC

Did it matter?

Past efforts to reform the corrupt system have been difficult. Major issues in transparency and accountability, like bribery and patronage, have plagued civil servant recruitment in Indonesia.[3] This history has created the impression that civil servant recruitment is about money rather than competency, which in the long run may contribute to the acceptance or rationalisation of unlawful conduct.

Since the implementation of this commitment is still very limited, not much can be said about the utilisation of its information. However, the available information should help civil society monitor the hiring system as the new approach is implemented.

Moving forward

The moratorium on hiring new civil servants is a good step to reform the system. Poor distribution of civil servants stems from issues with decentralisation. Revenue sharing from the central government depends in part on the number of local civil servants, which incentivises local governments to spend much of their budgets on employees.

In the view of the IRM researcher, this commitment is achievable. Therefore, the government should continue working to implement all of its aspects. For example, one key step is to open the results of qualification tests to the public, especially if government has implemented the computerised assistance test (CAT) for the civil servants' recruitment system as planned. This information would help enable citizens to hold the process accountable.

[1] "Indonesia Lifts Moratorium on Hiring Civil Servants," *Jakarta Globe*, 21 January 2013. http://www.thejakartaglobe.com/archive/indonesia-lifts-moratorium-on-hiring-civil-servants/
[2] More information can be found at: http://www.menpan.go.id/
[3] Peter Blunt, Mark Turner, and Henrik Lindroth, "Patronage, Service Delivery, and Social Justice in Indonesia," International Journal of Public Administration 35, Iss. 2 (2012): 214–20.

TOC

7 | Increasing Public Integrity: Land Administration

COMMITMENT SUMMARY

LEAD INSTITUTION	National Land Administration Office (BPN)
SUPPORTING INSTITUTIONS	None
POINT OF CONTACT SPECIFIED?	No
OGP VALUES	Access to information, Technology and innovation
OGP GRAND CHALLENGES	Improving public services, Increasing public integrity, More effectively managing public resources
SPECIFICITY OF GOAL	High
ACTION OR PLAN	Carry out action

LEVEL OF COMPLETION

NOT STARTED — LIMITED — **(CURRENT)** — SUBSTANTIAL — COMPLETE
(PROJECTED)

NEXT STEPS	Extension building on existing implementation

Full text of the commitments

Promoting transparency and accountability of public services at the Land Administration Office. The data and information to be published include: types of services, processes required for service provisions, estimated time to complete a service, costs for service provision, and status of and progress on service request. The data and information are required to be published at the institutional website. (Track II, by December 2011).

What happened?

The National Land Administration Office (BPN) has provided almost all the information listed in this commitment, namely: types of services, processes required for service provisions, estimated time to complete a service, costs for service provision, and status of and progress on each service request. The procedures include: service of first time land registration, maintenance of land registration data, recording system and land information, land plots measurement, management of land use, and a complaint mechanism. The explanations of the procedures are detailed and include process simulations and cost estimations. However, this website

does not yet contain applications for requesting services online, nor the status/progress of service requests.[1]

At this early stage, the lead institution has only provided mechanisms and procedures, such as the complaint mechanism, in its first stage of pooling complaints. It has not yet managed to provide the rest of the commitments on the list, namely online services and their status/progress, nor is it yet able to provide the next level of complaint handling, namely showing responses and updates and progress of the complaints.

Did it matter?

Stakeholders, especially activists involved in corruption and agrarian issues, considered this commitment critical. The services provided by this website have been widely used by citizens who have downloaded the service procedures prior to accessing the services in the field (BPN office). Having access to the procedures was helpful to citizens, especially in preparing the requirements and estimating cost and time. However the usefulness of this information is still limited because of the complicated and lengthy bureaucracy of service in the BPN office.

TOC

Moving forward

Land administration services are widely known as a complex and lengthy bureaucracy that is prone to corruption, especially with the complex issue of overlapping land certificates. The government needs to further the type of transparency urgently needed for corruption prevention, as well as to improve the speed of the system.

One key next step is to improve the complaint mechanism and link it to a specific authority in the internal monitoring system, as well as to an external authority charged with corruption prevention tasks, such as the Corruption Eradication Commission or Supreme Audit.

Another important step is to shorten the bureaucratic process by providing online services, which could reduce the current delays and costs that prevent citizens from efficiently engaging with the Land Administration. Unfortunately, many citizens without access to or familiarity with the Internet will have difficulty accessing these services. Future OGP commitments should take this into account.

TOC

[1] More information can be found at: http://www.bpn.go.id/home.aspx

8 | More Effectively Managing Public Resources: National Budget Information

COMMITMENT SUMMARY	
LEAD INSTITUTION	Ministry of Finance, Directorate General Budget
SUPPORTING INSTITUTIONS	None
POINT OF CONTACT SPECIFIED?	No
OGP VALUES	Access to information
OGP GRAND CHALLENGES	Increasing public integrity, More effectively managing public resources
SPECIFICITY OF GOAL	High
ACTION OR PLAN	Carry out action
LEVEL OF COMPLETION	NOT STARTED — LIMITED — **(CURRENT)** — SUBSTANTIAL — COMPLETE / **(PROJECTED)**
NEXT STEPS	Extension building on existing implementation

Full text of the commitments

Promoting transparency and accountability on budget information at the national level. The data and information to be published include: national budget (proposed and enacted), project and budget list, periodic budget disbursement, annual budget report, audited budget report, and citizen budget. (Track II, by July 2012).

What happened?

The DG Budget website is well known as one of the government's most advanced websites. It provides information consisting of: the Financial Note and Indonesia Fiscal Budget for the current year, data on the current national budget, and the proposed budget revision for the current year. The website also provides a project and budget list, with the user required to install an application to read the data.

The website also provides services like a software application to help government bodies to formulate their work and budget plans and targets for nontax revenue, record realisation of nontax revenue, and formulate special standard costs (special unit costs for Ministerial and departmental expenses as regulated by law). The budget disbursement is reported in the quarterly report, but only at the aggregate level. Annual budgets and audited budget reports are provided, but not citizen budgets (i.e. simplified presentations of budgets that are accessible to citizens with no technical knowledge).

A copy of the budget allocation that has been approved through the budgeting process is relatively easy to access, even though there remains a problem associated with the lag-time and delays on the website. A problem is that in the budget expenditure, data are aggregated by sectoral ministries, whereas the public demands data on a disaggregated, detailed level, showing expenditures for each project in every Ministry and department.

Did it matter?

Many stakeholders reported benefitting from the publication of national budget information on a regular basis, especially for use in research or projects that employ budget analysis methods, such as the Public Expenditure Review or Public Expenditure Tracking methods. Hits on the site increased during the latest

TOC

year, evidence that these data are useful to the public.[1] Still, detailed information, such as the budget plans of sectoral ministries (Agency Work Plan and Budget, RKAKL) and the targets for and realisation of nontax revenue in every sectoral ministry is not accessible to the public.

Moving forward

Budget accountability has been one of the biggest public demands. Two big questions regarding budgeting are: Was the allocation made efficiently and rationally? Was the allocated budget used for its purpose without corruption? To enforce these two objectives, the government needs to encourage deeper transparency.

Three next steps are recommended:

- Deepen transparency by providing more detailed, disaggregated data on budget allocation and complement this with budget analysis, such as: motivation for the allocation, cost, comparison with previous budget, key target indicator, etc. This information will enable the public to engage with the monitoring and budget analysis.

- Improve transparency of the budgeting process in the parliamentary phase, since this is one of the processes prone to corruption. If possible, record the process and publish the minutes of parliamentary meetings on the website.[2]

- Extend transparency of budget expenditures linking to sectoral ministries' websites, with the necessary disaggregated data to allow the public to engage with monitoring.

TOC

---

[1] It is possible that government agencies are responsible for the large number of hits, but considering the common practice of agencies' requesting data directly from other agencies, one can fairly assume that most of the hits are from the public.

[2] According to the parliamentary law on the Code of Conduct (*Tata Tertib*), the discussions in a commission are closed to the public when detailed budgets are discussed. Plenary sessions are open to the public, but they approve overall government budgets.

9 | More Effectively Managing Public Resources: District Budget Information

COMMITMENT SUMMARY

LEAD INSTITUTION	Ministry of Home Affairs and Directors General of Local Finance
SUPPORTING INSTITUTIONS	None
POINT OF CONTACT SPECIFIED?	No
OGP VALUES	Access to information
OGP GRAND CHALLENGES	Increasing public integrity, More effectively managing public resources
SPECIFICITY OF GOAL	High
ACTION OR PLAN	Carry out action

LEVEL OF COMPLETION

NOT STARTED — LIMITED — **(CURRENT)** — SUBSTANTIAL — COMPLETE

(PROJECTED)

NEXT STEPS	Extension building on existing implementation

Full text of the commitments

Promoting transparency and accountability on budget information (activity based) at the district level. The data and information to be published include: regional budgets (proposed and enacted), project (subdistrict level) and budget lists, and budget disbursements. (Track II, by December 2012).

What happened?

Overall the Ministry of Home Affairs DG Local Budget website provides significant information to the public.[1] First, it displays, in a fairly clear manner, an analysis and profile of each local budget. Each profile consists of several critical, commonly used indicators, such as general information, revenue trends, expenditure trends, government borrowing, and ratio of direct to program-based expenditures. Second, the website analyses the progress of local budget management transparency initiatives, for each province and each district in Indonesia. This analysis consists of 12 aspects, derived from the criteria used in the Open Budget Index, including a summary of the local budget, local budget regulations, general and contact information of the district budget office, realisation of the local budget, composition of loans and investments, and the result of the local financial audit. Third, this website explains the standard procedure for important financial allocations like a Special Allocation Grant (DAK). Fourth, it provides the SIPKD application, an information system on local financial management, to help local governments manage their finances according to the public finance management (PFM) standard.

Despite these advances, the website has not yet met another part of the commitment: providing detailed regional budgets (proposed and enacted), detailed project and budget lists, and budget disbursements. The challenge lies in the coordination with local government (34 provinces and 409 districts) to provide detailed data in a form that is easily uploaded to a website in timely manner.

Did it matter?

The high number of visitors to this website shows that these data are very important to many parties. Most people use the data for research and analysis, especially the profiles of local budgets, which are well

displayed and help many, including relevant policy makers, to deeply and systematically understand the local budget.

The SIPKD application is quite complicated to install, but it is targeted primarily at local government. The data are poorly organised, which complicates locating the analyses and information. While much of this commitment did not change government practice, publishing data reports by government entities is an important step forward, since this kind of work was until recently carried out by international NGOs or World Bank analysts instead of Indonesian stakeholders.

Moving forward

The most important part missing from this commitment is the disclosure of detailed local budgets.

To overcome this challenge, the government can provide guidance on standardising the information provided by local government websites, since many local governments have begun to publish their budget but in differing formats. Central government needs to clarify the rules for publication of detailed local budgets as a mandatory requirement in the annual fiscal approval process. This standardisation will ensure that all provinces and districts provide the data on their websites, or on the Ministry of Home Affairs DG Local Budget website, in a timely manner.

Finally, the website itself needs significant technical revision. The quality of the information cannot have its full impact if the information is difficult to locate.

---

[1] More information can be found at: http://djkd.kemendagri.go.id/?#

10 | More Effectively Managing Public Resources: E-Procurement

COMMITMENT SUMMARY	
LEAD INSTITUTION	Indonesia Goods and Services Procurement Policy Institution (LKPP)
SUPPORTING INSTITUTIONS	None
POINT OF CONTACT SPECIFIED?	No
OGP VALUES	Accountability, Technology and innovation
OGP GRAND CHALLENGES	Improving public services, Increasing public integrity, More effectively managing public resources
SPECIFICITY OF GOAL	High
ACTION OR PLAN	Carry out action

LEVEL OF COMPLETION	NOT STARTED — LIMITED — (CURRENT) — SUBSTANTIAL — COMPLETE (PROJECTED)

NEXT STEPS	Extension building on existing implementation

Full text of the commitments

Promoting transparency and accountability in procurement activities of government institutions. E-procurement software will be installed and operated at 56 central government institutions. (Track II, December 2012).

What happened?

Led by the Indonesia's Goods and Services Procurement Policy Institution (LKPP), government boosted the use of the Electronic Procurement Service (LPSE) as part of reforms to establish a more effective and efficient procurement system.[1] The LPSE is a decentralised system, so each government entity (national ministries, provinces, cities, districts, public universities, stated-owned companies) has its own LPSE installations. This simplification of the procurement procedures is stipulated by a presidential regulation of 2010.[2] As part of that regulation's changes, specific procurement service units (ULPs) established in each ministry handle their department's purchases.

The Electronic Procurement Service is currently used in 546 units in ministries and government bodies. While the number of transactions conducted electronically has been increasing, they still account for only a small portion of Indonesia's overall public procurement.

Several challenges affected the installation of e-procurement.

- The top-down approach of central government instructing local governments to adopt the same e-procurement system overestimates the readiness of local governments in terms of facilities or skills needed.

- Decentralisation has led to different procurement regulations at different government levels. Many local officials are not sufficiently familiar with LPSE's provisions to implement them, and generally avoid attempting enforcement.

Additionally, several issues emerged during the commitment's implementation.

- Even when in place, some e-procurement systems are underutilised. Uptake by end-users (e.g., the procuring government entity) and participation by contractors and suppliers have been lower than expected.

- The ability of bidders to comment on a transaction depends on the identity of the procuring entity. Similarly, information is available on procurement but only if a bidder knows where to look or has special access to procurement officials. That is, the structure of bids frequently undermines fair competition.

- Sometimes deadlines and rules are changed in the middle of the procurement process.

- "Ghost costs," the pressure to bribe or pay public officials, still exists.

- Winners are publicly announced, but it is rare that procurement officials provide technical or financial reasons for the choice, and no dispute-resolution mechanism exists.

Did it matter?
The LPSE's e-tendering and e-purchasing enable procurement processes to be faster, cheaper, more transparent, and freer from brokerage. However slow, the system has been on a positive track. PERTAMINA, the state oil company, has become a best-practices champion of government procurement through the introduction of greater transparency and integrity into its procurement system.[3]

Still, problems remain. E-procurement alone cannot prevent corruption, and arranged bidding still occurs whereby a firm pays its competitors to overbid and thereby wins the contract itself. Stakeholders reported low expectations of the overall effect of this commitment, citing still-missing critical information such as how winners are chosen.

Moving forward
The following recommendations would improve this commitment:

- Strengthen the national procurement law by giving it clear legal superiority over other laws. The absence of a national law that clearly supersedes provincial and local laws results in a lack of consistency in procurement rules throughout Indonesia.

- Systematically train provincial and local government officials to facilitate consistent application of the new procurement rules.

- Educate the private sector about how to participate in procurement and empower civil society to participate as independent monitors of public procurements.

- Create standard procedures for the technical implementation of e-procurement, such as the preparation of goods and services requirements, terms of reference for open bidding, public tenders, direct awards, prequalification requirements, time frames and scheduling, audits, and dispute settlement.

TOC

[1] More information can be found at: http://www.lkpp.go.id/v3/
[2] President of the Republic of Indonesia. "Pengadaan Barang / Jasa Pemerintah" (Procurement of Goods / Services of the Government)," Presidential Decree 54 (2010). http://bit.ly/1gOjBvm
[3] APEC Procurement Transparency Standards in Indonesia, TII-CIPE, 2011.

11 | More Effectively Managing Public Resources: OneMap Portal

COMMITMENT SUMMARY	
LEAD INSTITUTION	Geospatial Information Body (*Badan Informasi Geospasial*; BIG) and Presidential Delivery Unit (UKP4)
SUPPORTING INSTITUTIONS	All relevant sectoral Ministries
POINT OF CONTACT SPECIFIED?	No
OGP VALUES	Access to information, Technology and innovation
OGP GRAND CHALLENGES	Improving public services, Increasing public integrity, More effectively managing public resources, Increasing corporate accountability
SPECIFICITY OF GOAL	High
ACTION OR PLAN	Carry out action

LEVEL OF COMPLETION	NOT STARTED — LIMITED — **(CURRENT)** — SUBSTANTIAL — COMPLETE **(PROJECTED)**

NEXT STEPS	Significant revision of the commitment

Full text of the commitments

Develop the OneMap Portal to promote efficiency on forestry management. The initiative will digitalize the data and information related to primary and secondary forests (including peat lands) on a single portal. Those data and information will be synchronized with license data attached to the land area. (Track II, by December 2013).

What happened?

OneMap is a program to synchronise government geospatial information and create one all-purpose base map for the use of all sectoral ministries dealing with land tenure, land concessions, land-use licensing, and the like. Previous mistakes, where varied definitions and methodologies caused differences across Ministries' maps, led to many problems such as overlapping licensing. This project aimed not merely at creating a product, but moving towards cross-sectoral and central-regional collaboration to build trust and lay a foundation towards better natural resources governance and bureaucratic reform.

Did it matter?

Relevant sectoral ministries have agreed and collaboratively established the OneMap. Some ministries have started to establish their own thematic maps developed from this basic map. The public participated to some degree, as community-based organisations gave inputs to revise the original map. The preliminary form of this map has been used in several pilot licensing projects to prevent overlap.

This map built on existing initiatives, namely the National Spatial Data Network, and will be used as the only reference of basic geospatial information. This map will also serve as one standard for thematic mapping, whereby sectors may produce thematic maps to serve their purposes by using mapping standards approved by BIG so they can be integrated with other themes to create a national thematic map.[1]

The challenge was to coordinate with all relevant sectoral ministries, which required time and energy, as well as to support the technical assistance and tools needed to establish the OneMap.

TOC

Moving forward

There is urgent need to encourage the use of this map, and integrate it with other problematic or action plan areas, such as the overlapping licensing, land conflicts, tenure conflict resolution, and spatial planning. Piloting the map in several regions and line ministries will help to foster the process and ground-truth the map as a problem-solving instrument.

Importantly, Indonesia should consider publicising this map so that civil society can access the same information as government and its private sector partners. The commitment as designed encourages a more efficient government and has resulted in greater accountability and transparency although it could be greater as some ministries and departments have not yet added their information. There is still some resistance within government agencies to consolidating their information. Ministries and departments also need to clarify which information will and will not be made available in terms of the Freedom of Information Law so as to allow the public to question cases in which information is made available and then subsequently access is denied.[2]

[1] More information can be found at: http://www.satgasreddplus.org/
[2] "Indonesian Minister Denies Access to Concession Maps," Freedominfo.org, 19 July 2013. http://bit.ly/123W6KF Note: Some international CSOs adapted the information from the map before it was removed, and used it to create other thematic maps. See for example: http://bit.ly/19owvLT

TOC

12 | More Effectively Managing Public Resources: Environmental Openness

COMMITMENT SUMMARY	
LEAD INSTITUTION	EITI Secretariat, Ministry of Economic Coordination
SUPPORTING INSTITUTIONS	None
POINT OF CONTACT SPECIFIED?	No
OGP VALUES	Access to information, Participation
OGP GRAND CHALLENGES	Increasing public integrity, More effectively managing public resources, Increasing corporate accountability
SPECIFICITY OF GOAL	Medium
ACTION OR PLAN	Carry out action

	NOT STARTED LIMITED **(CURRENT)** SUBSTANTIAL COMPLETE
LEVEL OF COMPLETION	**(PROJECTED)**

NEXT STEPS	Extension building on existing implementation

Full text of the commitments

Promoting transparency, accountability, and public participation in the area of environment, natural resources, and spatial data management. The key actions include:

- *Publication of revenue information of the government (central and region) from the extractive industries (oil and gas, coal). (Track III, by October 2012).*

- *Establishment of a multi-stakeholders' forum for a spatial plan development. (Track III, by July 2012)*

- *Publication of spatial plan document. (Track III, by December 2012)*

What happened?

The Indonesian government released its first Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative (EITI) report in early 2013.[1] This report published the revenues paid to the government, using 2009 data,[2] by nearly all oil, gas, mineral and coal companies operating in the country. Although the overall contribution of the oil and gas sector to public revenues has long been public information, the EITI report shows the exact contribution of each oil and gas company, and for each large- and medium-sized mining company, including those that are locally licensed. The report provided what may be the first figure on the overall income tax and royalty contribution of the mineral and coal sectors, whereas before the implementation of EITI, the only public number was a single figure for all royalties paid by mining firms.[3]

Because this report was produced through a multi-stakeholder approach, which involved government, private sector actors, and civil society, the process was long. Administrative issues caused many delays, and it was difficult to coordinate the many sectoral ministries to gather the data, as well as to collect the data from more than 200 companies.

Did it matter?

Even though the report was released only in early 2013, the EITI process has lent substantial weight to enforce the transparency of the extractive industry sector. The establishment of a multi-stakeholder group to assist the EITI process has been significant in opening up the discussion among stakeholders, building trust, and initiating deeper understanding among civil

TOC

society, thus strengthening their role of oversight. OGI provided a monitoring mechanism over the preparation of the EITI report, with the added ability to liaison with higher authorities (like the Ministry of Economic Coordination).

Due to the complexity of technical issues in these sectors, many ordinary people do not easily comprehend the report, which discourages public engagement. Media digestion of the report and its coverage has been scanty, and several CSOs are now taking on dissemination of the information to their stakeholders.

Moving forward

There are several next steps for the implementation of this commitment:

- The government needs to complement the publication of the EITI report with clear guidance on how to read the data to give a better understanding of the findings and thus lead to better public engagement.

- The EITI website needs to link with sectoral Ministries' websites that highlight more detailed information provided by these Ministries.

- Contract-by-contract information would be even more useful to stakeholders. Providing it is consistent with the recommendation of further data disaggregation made by many of the preceding commitments.

[1] KAP Gideon Ikhwan Sofwan, *Indonesia 1st EITI Reconciler's Report 2009*, 22 April 2013. http://bit.ly/19PdNKV
[2] There have been criticisms of using data from 2009, but the multi-stakeholder group is already preparing to release updated reports from 2010 and 2011. See Sam Bartlett, "Towards Real-Time EITI Data," EITI Blog, 5 July, 2013. http://bit.ly/1a5DuKd
[3] More information can be found at: http://eiti.ekon.go.id/eng_index.php

TOC

V | SELF-ASSESSMENT CHECKLIST

This section summarises the process by which Indonesia created and published its self-assessment.

Overall, the process was successful, since the Core Team encouraged public comment by circulating the draft through their networks. Still, stakeholders noted the limited amount of information included on each commitment's progress.

Was annual progress report published?	☒ Yes ☐ No April, 2013
Was it done according to schedule?	☒ Yes ☐ No
Is the report available in the local language(s)? According to stakeholders, was this adequate?	☒ Yes ☐ No
Is the report available in English?	☒ Yes ☐ No
Did the government provide a two-week public comment period on draft self-assessment reports?	☒ Yes ☐ No
Were any public comments received?	☒ Yes ☐ No
Is the report deposited in the OGP portal?	☒ Yes ☐ No
Did the self-assessment report include review of consultation efforts?	☒ Yes ☐ No
Did the report cover all of the commitments?	☒ Yes ☐ No
Did it assess completion according to schedule?	☐ Yes ☒ No
Does the report reaffirm responsibility for openness?	☒ Yes ☐ No
Does the report describe the relationship of the action plan with grand challenges?	☒ Yes ☐ No

TOC

VI | MOVING FORWARD

GENERAL ANALYSIS OF INDONESIA'S FIRST ACTION PLAN

The Indonesian government extended the original 12 commitments it submitted as part of its OGP action plan into an extended 38 action plans, with tangible and specific targets to strictly monitor the progress of achievements. These 38 action plans were classified into three tracks, called the "3-Track Strategy," to strengthen and accelerate activities that encourage and catalyse openness, develop portals containing essential information that directly corresponds to public needs, and spur a new initiative of openness. These extended action plans were enacted as a regulation through 'Inpres 14/2011' to bind their implementation. While this expansion of the original OGP commitments is laudable, only the original 12 OGP commitments are addressed in this IRM report.

The level of transparency demonstrated by OGI, despite its preliminary stage, has opened the space for deepening public participation in at least three ways.

1. Disclosure of information regarding public service gave society better access to services.

2. Disclosure of information enabled society to engage in monitoring services more closely.

3. Space for collecting inputs and complaints from society enabled society to better engage, scrutinise, and participate in decision making.

However, this phase has not yet achieved the next stage as expected. Government officials have not been incentivised to make ambitious improvements and solve problems. Accountability, as differentiated from transparency, and mechanisms to ensure government officials take actions based on public inputs are still missing. Though the OGP has been successful in spurring the relevant ministries and offices to disclose information online, this success faces challenges. The websites require improvement and regular updates. Stakeholders questioned the ways in which information reaches the Indonesian people, and the level of data being disclosed. The heavy use of websites was perceived as a bias for urban dwellers with better access to the Internet, and against rural and remote areas, which lack access.

Finally, two serious action plan design challenges emerged during the IRM analysis.

First, on *technically* difficult commitments, the government focussed on constructing a basic framework, or providing limited updates to a website or tool that existed prior to OGP without significantly improving government practice. While this framework represented progress, aspects of the commitments that were technically challenging went under-addressed, and the government did not acknowledge them, instead opting to focus in its self-assessment only on limited successes. This strategy can reduce credibility among stakeholders on commitments where Indonesia did have real, significant, successful implementation, and can distract from the most effective next steps that could be designed to address limited progress. Examples were commitments 7 (Land Administration), 9 (District Budgets), and especially commitments 3 and 4 (Health Subsidies and Police).

Second, *politically* difficult commitments did not see the level of progress for which stakeholders hoped. The most serious example was commitment 11 (OneMap Portal), where long-run political economic issues related to forest resource management complicated the commitment.[1] While Indonesia successfully created the tool for better practice *within* government, stakeholders requested that it be used to improve accountability between government and *citizens*. Therefore, this and other politically sensitive issues will need to be addressed in future OGP activities in Indonesia.

Generally, stakeholders accepted that the current OGP action plan functioned as a first stage of OGI, where government focussed on building the process and institutional frameworks. Therefore, the main general recommendation for government's next action plan is to strengthen those basic frameworks that were not successfully implemented, and build upon those frameworks that were.[2]

TOC

During interviews and the stakeholder meeting, no specific commitment was identified as the most important. Instead, stakeholders recommended that the next action plan include efforts to follow the mandate of the Freedom of Information Law. These efforts would include, in particular, establishment and effective functioning of an Office for Management of Information and Documentation *(Pejabat Pengelola Informasi dan Dokumentasi; PPID)* in every ministerial and departmental unit and at every level of government. This recommendation is addressed below.

GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS

The various consultations and focus group discussions with stakeholders highlighted at least five recommendations for government to improve the next action plan of OGI.

First, improve OGI as an instrument of the strong transparency framework that Indonesia has instituted with its FOI Law.

This law's many aspects provide a strong foundation for the implementation of transparency efforts across sectors. However, since its enactment in 2008, the FOI Law has faced stumbling blocks that hamper its implementation. One of these is the bureaucracy's entrenched mindset for secrecy that encourages officials to search for ways to use the law's provision for exemptions to defeat its objectives. A second stumbling block is the absence in many public bodies of a mechanism to handle requests. A third is the absence of a sanctions mechanism to enforce the rulings of the Central Information Commission.

OGI should, therefore, take on the role of boosting FOI Law implementation, taking advantage of the OGP movement's momentum to "unblock" its challenges. UKP4 should use its powers to promote FOI Law compliance by government agencies.

Second, select a strategic, but ambitious scope for the next action plan for further improvement in sectors already covered.

Building on state ministries' and agencies' current initiatives was an understandable first stage of OGI. Reaping this "low-hanging fruit" enabled the government to build a strong and realistic foundation

for the system. This targeted approach should be continued. However, Indonesia should develop, based on the first OGP action plan's successes, a more ambitious concept of fostering open government within each of the target sectors that goes beyond initiatives already in place when the first action plan was formulated.

Third, deepen system transparency by strengthening the structural incentives and disincentives in the system, rather than only highlighting best practices.

As mentioned above, it is now time for OGI to move beyond the areas in which government has already performed relatively well. This movement will require systemwide changes that encourage behavioural change in line with the FOI. Further, almost all OGI commitments to date have focussed on providing information to people who have access to the internet. Going forward, the government needs to explore more energetically ways of providing access to those who do not have easy access to the internet.

Fourth, strengthen the lead institution to enforce OGP implementation.

Many current ministries' transparency plans have been blocked or halted by systemic bottlenecks, such as lack of coordination between government institutions or legal disputes. Agencies need a lead institution with enough power to de-bottleneck those challenges. Stakeholders thought OGI and the Core Team have the right momentum and status to adopt this facilitating or enabler role. The central government needs to confirm permanent institutional arrangements for OGI going forward, rather than having OGI's progress depend on the future of UKP4, whose status is dependent on the outcome of the next election.

Fifth, improve the governance system of the Core Team as a leading institution of OGI.

Many stakeholders highlighted the need to improve the regulation and "rules of the game" governing the OGI Core Team to improve its governing arrangement, improve its authority to take decisions, and give more space to civil society. The Core Team should include representation from more sectoral ministries and more CSOs. Further discussion is needed as to how the representatives of civil society

are chosen rather than leaving this in the hands of government. Current CSO members of the Core Team as well as other CSOs emphasised the need for a mechanism through which Core Team members can get mandates from and report back to other members of civil society. Clarification is also needed as to how decision making should happen within the Core Team so as to give equal weight to the voices of civil society and government.

[1] Maharani Hapsari, "The Political Economy of Forest Governance in Post-Suharto Indonesia," in Hirotsune Kimura, Suharko, Javier Aser, and Ake Tangsupvattana (eds.), *Limits of Good Governance in Developing Countries*, Gadjah Mada University Press, 2011.
[2] This is especially important for access to information with regard to implementation of the Freedom of Information Law in the Indonesian context.

TOC

ANNEX: METHODOLOGY

As a complement to the government self-assessment, an independent assessment report is written by well-respected governance researchers, preferably from each OGP participating country.

These experts use a common OGP independent report questionnaire and guidelines, based on a combination of interviews with local OGP stakeholders as well as a desk-based analysis. This report is shared with a small International Expert Panel (appointed by the OGP Steering Committee) for peer review to ensure that the highest standards of research and due diligence have been applied.

Analysis of progress on OGP action plans is based on a combination of interviews, desk research, and feedback from nongovernmental stakeholder meetings. The IRM report builds on the findings of the government's own self-assessment report and any other assessments of progress put out by civil society, the private sector, or international organisations.

Each local IRM researcher carries out stakeholder meetings to ensure an accurate portrayal of events. Given budgetary and calendar constraints, the IRM cannot consult all interested or affected parties. Consequently, the IRM strives for methodological transparency, and therefore where possible, makes public the process of stakeholder engagement in research (as detailed later in this section). In national contexts where anonymity of informants—governmental or nongovernmental—is required, the IRM reserves the ability to protect the anonymity of informants. Additionally, because of the necessary limitations of the method, the IRM strongly encourages commentary on public drafts of each national document.

Focus Group Design
A meeting, held in two sessions on 3 June 2013, brought together about 25 stakeholders. Representatives from civil society, the government, and the private sector were invited. A list of attendees follows the Meeting Synopsis.

- **Civil Society:** Efforts were made to include partici-pants outside of the "usual suspects," but most of those who attended were from the usual organisa-tions because they were most aware of OGI. These organisations included Transparency International Indonesia (TII), the Indonesia Forum for Budget Transparency (FITRA), and PATTIRO Centre for Regional Information and Studies.

- **Government:** The participants represented ministries most relevant to OGI. They included the Coordinat-ing Ministry for Economic Affairs, which is tasked with EITI implementation, and the Ministries of Health, Education, and the National Archives under the Ministry of Communication and Informatics. UKP4 did not attend, citing the fear that it would sidetrack or influence the discussion.

- **Private Sector:** Though invited, no representatives from the private sector attended.

Meeting Synopsis
The national IRM researcher began the meeting by briefly introducing OGI, before narrowing in on the IRM structure and process. She then presented her preliminary findings. She touched on specific commitments as well as the general process of multi-stakeholder interviews.

Then the researcher began a moderated discussion. She asked the participants a series of questions.

1. For the group as a whole, "How do you feel about the current action plan, and what progress have you seen on implementation?"

2. For the four CSO representatives, "What do you think about the commitment that is most relevant to your organisation's work?

3. For the group as a whole, "How do we move forward?"

TOC

THE LIST OF PARTICIPANTS: FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSIONS 3 JUNE 2013

First Focus Group, 10 a.m. – 1 p. m.

NO	NAME	INSTITUTION
1	Andi Kasman	National Archive Indonesia (Arsip Nasional; ANRI)
2	Merelyn R.A	National Archive Indonesia (ANRI)
3	Jumono	Education Parent Nework (Aliansi Orangtua Peduli Pendidikan; APPI)
4	Basuki Triono	Article 33 Indonesia
5	Cici Yusella	Article 33 Indonesia
6	Ronald Tambunan	Extractive Industries and Transparency Initiative (EITI)
7	Dody Priambodo	Hivos
8	Morentalisa	Institute for Essential Services Reform (IESR)
9	Abdul Waidl	Indonesia Budget Committee (KAI)
10	Febri Hendri	Indonesia Corruption Watch (ICW)
11	Prawito	Ministry of Health Indonesia (Pusat Komunikasi Kemenkes)
12	Fadhlina	Ministry of Health Indonesia (Set BOK Ditjen GIKIA Kemenkes)
13	Ahmad Rofik	PATTIRO
14	Walota	Persatuan Guru Republik Indonesia (PGRI)
15	Ilham Cendekia	Pusat Telaah dan Informasi Regional (PATTIRO)

Second Focus Group, 2–5 p.m.

NO	NAME	INSTITUTION
1	Basuki Triono	Article 33 Indonesia
2	Cici Yusella	Article 33 Indonesia
3	Darmaningtyas	Education Forum
4	Alex Irwan	Ford Foundation
5	Sulastio	Indonesia Parliamentary Centre (IPC)
6	Marcella	Ministry of Education Indonesia (Kementrian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan)
7	Lukman Hakim	National Secretary for Budget Transparency (Seknas FITRA)
8	Maryati Abdullah	Publish What You Pay Indonesia (PWYP)
9	Ilham Saerong	Transparency International Indonesia (TII)
10	Danar	USAID Prorep (Program Representasi)

LIST OF INTERVIEWEES

The IRM researcher also interviewed, in one-on-one meetings or phone calls, a number of Indonesian stakeholders. They are listed below.

NO	NAME	INSTITUTION
1	Andi Kasman	ANRI
2	Nurul Widyaningrum	AKATIGA Bandung
3	Jumono	Education Network
4	Suparman	FGII (Federasi Guru Independen Indonesia)
5	Shita Laksmi	Hivos
6	Wasingatu Dzakiah	IDEA Jogjakarta
7	Fabby Tumiwa	Institute for Essential Services Reform
8	Sulastio	Indonesia Parliamentary Centre (IPC)
9	Alamsyah	National Commission of Information
10	Yuna Farhan	National Secretary for Budget Transparency (Seknas FITRA)
11	Maryati Abdullah	PATTIRO
12	Ilham Cendekia	PATTIRO
13	Ahmad Rofik	PATTIRO
14	Danar	Program Representasi USAID
15	Widjajanti Isdijoso	SMERU Research Institute
16	Widjajanti Isdijoso	SMERU Research Institute
17	Tanti	Tifa Foundation
18	Suahasil Nazara	National Team for Poverty Eradication (TNP2K)
19	Ridaya Lon	U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID)
20	Adipradana	UKP4 (OneMap)
21	Dedi Cahyanto	UKP4 OGI
22	Bachtiar K	United nations Development Programme (UNDP)
23	Wiske Rotinsulu	Universitas Sam Ratulangi
24	Hendrik	YAPPIKA

ABOUT THE INDEPENDENT REPORTING MECHANISM

The IRM is a key means by which government, civil society, and the private sector can track government development and implementation of OGP action plans on a bi-annual basis. The design of research and quality control of such reports is carried out by the International Experts' Panel, comprised of experts in transparency, participation, accountability, and social science research methods.

The current membership of the International Experts' Panel is:

• Yamini Ayar

• Debbie Budlender

• Jonathan Fox

• Rosemary McGee

• Gerardo Munck

A small staff based in Washington, DC shepherds reports through the IRM process in close coordination with the researcher. Questions and comments about this report can be directed to the staff at irm@opengovpartnership.org

TOC

Open
Government
Partnership

INDEPENDENT
REPORTING MECHANISM