



*Empowered lives.  
Resilient nations.*

**Third Consolidated Annual Progress Report on  
Activities  
Implemented under the UN Window of the  
Indonesia Multi-Donor Fund Facility for Disaster  
Recovery  
(IMDFF-DR)**

**Multi-Partner Trust Fund Office**

**Bureau of Management**

**United Nations Development Programme**

**<http://mptf.undp.org>**

**31 May 2014**

## PARTICIPATING ORGANIZATIONS

---



**Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO)**



**International Labour Organization (ILO)**



**International Organization for Migration (IOM)**

IOM • OIM



**United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)**

**CONTRIBUTING DONORS**

---



**New Zealand**

## ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

ATS	After Training Support
BPBD	Badan Penanggulangan Bencana Daerah (Regional Disaster Management Body)
B POM MUI	Food and Drug Administration *MUI (Indonesian Ulema Council responsible for providing halal certificate to food and drug products)
CBDMG	Community-Based Disaster Management Group
DIY	Daerah Istimewa Yogyakarta (Yogyakarta Special Administrative Region)
DRR	Disaster Risk Reduction
FAO	United Nations Food and Agriculture Organisation
IDR	Indonesian Rupiah
ILO	International Labour Organisation
IMDFF-DR	Indonesia Multi Donor Fund Facility for Disaster Recovery
IOM	International Organization for Migration
LoA	Letter of Agreement
MFI	Micro Finance Institution
MIS	Management Information System
MonEv	Monitoring and Evaluation
MoU	Memorandum of Understanding
PDNA	Post Disaster Needs Assessment
PJOK	Penanggungjawab operasional Kegiatan (Responsible person for RR activities)
PPKK	Pusat Penelitian Kopi dan Koko (Indonesian Coffee and Cocoa Research Institute)
PUPUK	Perkumpulan Untuk Peningkatan Usaha Kecil (Association for the Advancement of Small Business)
REKOMPAK	Public Work's Community Settlement, Reconstruction and Rehabilitation Project
RENAKSI	Government of Indonesia's Rehabilitation and Reconstruction Action Plans
RPJMN	Indonesia's National Medium Term Development Plan
RR	Rehabilitation and reconstruction
SKPD	Satuan Kerja Perangkat Daerah (Government offices)
SME	Small and Medium Enterprises
ToT	Training of Trainers
TPT	Technical Support Team
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNPDF	United Nations Partnership for Development Framework
VCA	Value chain assessment
VDRRT	Village Disaster Risk Reduction Team
VDRRF	Village Disaster Risk Reduction Forum
VPT	Village Promotion Teams

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY..... vi**

**1. INTRODUCTION.....8**

**2. PROGRAMME RESULTS.....8**

**2.1 Mentawai Islands Livelihoods Recovery Programme.....8**

**2.2 Merapi Islands Livelihoods Recovery Programme.....22**

**3. UNJP PROGRAMME EXTENSION.....33**

**4. CONSOLIDATED ANNUAL FINANCIAL REPORT OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE AGENT..... 34**

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The Government of Indonesia (GoI) and its development partners signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) on 30 December 2009 agreeing to establish the Indonesian Multi-Donor Fund Facility for Disaster Recovery (IMDFF-DR) as a standing disaster response Facility. The Facility has two separate and clearly defined funding windows: one supported by the United Nations (UN) and the other with the World Bank (WB). The UN window is administered by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) through its Multi-Partner Trust Fund Office (MPTF Office) acting as the Administrative Agent (AA) on behalf of the Participating Organisations while the WB is the trustee for the WB window.

The IMDFF-DR was established as a standing mechanism to help fund implementation of the Government of Indonesia's (GoI) Rehabilitation and Reconstruction Action Plans (RENAKSI) that are formulated based on the GoI led Post-Disaster Needs Assessments (PDNA). The National Disaster Management Agency (BNPB) is the lead GoI Agency responsible for the management of natural disasters. In December 2013, the Steering Committee agreed to expand the scope of the IMDFF-DR to make more effective use of UN's capacity in the area of disaster recovery by allowing programming through the UN window before the Government's Rehabilitation and Reconstruction Plan is established by supporting disaster preparedness work to take place before the next disaster. To enable this shift, the Terms of Reference (ToR) of the Facility shall be revised and the name of the Facility changed to the Indonesia Disaster Fund (IDF). The changes will be implemented early in 2014.

The IMDFF-DR Steering Committee approved two joint programmes for \$1,000,000 each for a total of \$2,000,000 on 8 February 2012, namely the Mt. Mentawai Livelihood Recovery Programme and the Mt. Merapi Volcanic Eruption Livelihood Recovery Programme. Subsequently, in December 2013 the Steering Committee approved additional funding and a timeline extension for both joint programmes. An additional \$533,512 for Mt. Merapi and \$692,713 for Mentawai were approved and the funds were transferred in January 2014.

### **Summary of Programme Achievements**

The UN Joint Programme (UNJP) for Mentawai started its activities during the first quarter of 2012, with a total duration of 12 months. However, before the end of the joint project, UNJP obtained an extension up to May 2013.

By December 2013, the UNJP achieved 95% of its planned activities through the implementation of six different types of field trainings in the agriculture and fishery sector, five different types of trainings in the vocational and business sector, and series of coordination meetings, workshops and trainings facilitated for local government staffs in monitoring PDNA and the RENAKSI progress.

In total, more than 600 direct beneficiaries, comprising of 550 impacted community members, 28 local government staff, and 115 members of the recovery community working groups with a gender balance of 53% male and 47% female.

The Government's RENAKSI faced numerous delays due to the long process needed for requesting land permit and clearing from the Ministry of Forestry. Because of this delay, the approved RENAKSI budget had to be returned to the Ministry of Finance, thus creating a certain amount of discontent and frustration amongst the affected communities that are still living in temporary shelters prohibiting them from investing in a stable livelihood and income generating activities. These temporary shelters are far away from the permanent resettlement sites thus representing a major obstacle for the communities to resume their normal agricultural activities.

Recent developments, however, indicate that most of the outstanding issues are being resolved. As the RENAKSI will start and with the approved cost-extension up to June 2014, the presence of the UN Joint Programme will be ensured in the intervention area and will allow the UNJP to play the catalytic and synergic role for which it was designed to the benefit of the affected communities. The implementation of the RENAKSI will also facilitate the sustainability of the project results and represent an important component for the project exit strategy.

The UNJP for Mt. Merapi Livelihood Recovery has continued providing technical assistance in supporting the recovery initiatives in Merapi throughout 2013. By mid-2013, some achievement included building the capacity of communities to develop and manage communal cages that are used for cows and managed by a group of households in the local community. It was culminated by the symbolic transfer of ownership of the communal cages to the local district governments of Sleman and Magelang. The UNJP also promoted greater access to the market for organic salak by engaging the prominent private sector player in organic food industry, i.e. Biofach-Nuremberg Germany, who usually organizes the biggest annual organic exhibition in the world. The UNJP also supported the Mt. Merapi Resilience Consortium comprised of private sector, civil society organizations, and the local governments, as a platform for cooperation in sustaining various initiatives related to post-disaster recovery and resilience initiatives within the areas associated with permanent hazard of Mt. Merapi.

The implementation of RENAKSI in 2012 was reviewed to assist local governments in planning the recovery projects for the 2013 RENAKSI programme and budget. Furthermore, the coverage of the village information systems (VIS) was expanded and the integration of data systems in Yogyakarta Special Administrative Region (DIY) and Central Java provinces into a single coordinated mechanism between different levels of Regional Disaster Management Body (BPBDs) was initiated.

The programme managed to implement the livelihood activities targeting business groups and refinement of the DRR initiatives as a part of the enhancement of the community resilience in the targeted villages (Wukirsari, Umbulharjo, Kepuharjo, Argomulyo and Jumoyo). The programme, through its innovative approach of setting-up Village Promotion Teams, also contributed to building higher level of confidence among beneficiary business groups resulting in a demonstrated recovery of affected communities' livelihood.

Similarly, the DRR initiatives has equipped the target communities with the necessary knowledge and awareness that enabled them to better analyze and understand their own environment, develop tailored tools specific to their local realities and needs (i.e. maps, contingency plans, early warning system (EWS) etc.) and organize themselves into village disaster reduction teams ( VDRRTs) with clear response mechanism responsibilities.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

This Annual Progress Report provides information and financial data on activities and progress within the UN Window of the IMDFF-DR for the reporting period from 1 January 2013 to 31 December 2013. During the reporting period, an internal review process of the IMDFF-DR was undertaken to identify lessons learned and opportunities to strengthen the process of developing joint UN disaster recovery programmes through the Facility.



In 2012, discussions within the Technical Committee and Steering Committee were held to consider expanding the scope and changing the name of the Facility. It aimed to make more effective use of UN's capacity in the area of disaster recovery by allowing programming through the UN window before the Government's Rehabilitation and Reconstruction Plan is established by supporting disaster preparedness work to take place before the next disaster. The last Steering Committee approved change of scope and the facility was renamed into Indonesia Disaster Fund (IDF) to reflect this expansion effective January 2014.

## 2. PROGRAMME RESULTS

The UNJPs contributes to the following United Nations Programme Development Framework (UNPDF) outcomes including: Outcome 2: "The socio-economic status of vulnerable groups and their access to decent work and productive sustainable livelihood opportunities are improved within a coherent policy framework of reduction of regional disparities" and Outcome 4: "Increased national resilience to disasters, crisis and external shocks by 2015".

These UNPDF outcomes are relevant to national priorities as stipulated in the National Medium Term Development Plan (RPJMN). The UNPDF Outcome 2 is linked with the national priorities on Reducing Poverty and Food Security. UNPDF Outcome 4 is linked to national priorities on Reducing Poverty and on Environment and Management of Natural Disasters. Further, the UNJPs also contribute to the GoI's RENAKSI in Mentawai and Merapi.



## **2.1 Mentawai Islands Livelihoods Recovery Programme**

The outcome of the Mentawai Islands Livelihoods Recovery Programme is to improve sustainable livelihoods and strengthen institutional capacity in disaster recovery in area affected by the 2010 Mentawai earthquake and tsunami.

### ***2.1.1 Output 1: Agricultural livelihoods restored, improved and diversified, incorporating the value chain approach***

A value chain assessment conducted at the initial stage of the programme in 2012 provided the basis in identifying priority activities to ensure food security, the establishment and development of agricultural and home-based industries, access to quality inputs and penetrating outside markets as a means to restore, improve and diversify household income.

Based on the value chain assessment, the programme promoted better practices in the cultivation of identified agricultural crops and livestock and in parallel introduced diversification of produce through the integrated farming approach which seeks to combine a variety of different crops and livestock in a plot of land. Series of on-field trainings, coupled with provision of essential inputs, have been given on high-valued crops; cocoa, patchouli oil, and vegetable (chilly and tomatoes), as well as introduced cattle rearing, fishpond management, and the overall concept of integrated farming.

Post training supervision and monitoring were also conducted by field staff to ensure adoption of acquired farming practices. In each of the location more than 200 beneficiaries have received one or more of the aforementioned trainings, and each are listed as members of specific productive groups.

In initiating the livelihoods recovery, the programme established demonstration plots in the three different locations, respectively kilometer (KM) 10 of North Pagai, and KM 27 and 37 of South Pagai. These demo plots were established in 2012 and continued throughout 2013. These became the training sites for farmers in enhancing farming skills and agricultural know how. This approach was applied considering affected farmers are expected to each receive a plot of land approximately 2 hectare (Ha) from the government to be used as permanent relocation site and farming land.

In addition, the programme selected 20 community members to participate in a Training of Trainers 'entrepreneurship' programme with the aim of replicate training they received to 200 Mentawai women in 10 sub villages in the 3 relocation sites of KM 10 North Pagai, KM 27 and 37 South Pagai. The programme also sent 30 youths (9 women) to Padang for 2 weeks to receive vocational training in the areas of meal preparation, furniture making and motorbike repairing. Following the training the participants returned back to their communities and some started their own business after receiving working tools and direct business assistance through the programme. Another good result was the success of a women's group from KM 37 South Paga who have been successful at selling their light meals product to Padang market on a regular basis.

The programme has made important progress towards the achievement of the output by strengthening the capacities of the local communities and including district extension workers in the process as a mean towards sustainability.

### ***2.1.2 Output 2: Institutional capacity of local government strengthened to promote livelihoods recovery efforts and encourage provision of basic social and public services***

One of the key findings from the capacity assessment indicated the need for capacity development of the local government related to the West Sumatra and Mentawai BPBDs' existing database and management information system (MIS) particularly related to Mentawai rehabilitation and reconstruction. The assessment results suggested that both institutions were in need of basic information technology equipment and skilled, dedicated staff. Therefore, the programme worked closely with the BPBD to develop a data management and information system for supporting Mentawai rehabilitation and reconstruction. To further promote this effort, a coaching module and training materials for data management and information system were delivered.

By the end of 2013, necessary technical support has been provided to strengthened capacity of local government through monthly and quarterly coordination meetings while advocating for a strengthened coordination mechanism to oversee the implementation of Mentawai Rehabilitation and Reconstruction. Technical support on MIS has been provided through developing MIS system (i.e. software& hardware) on <http://www.rrbpbdsumbar.info> and coaching the administrator, which aims to manage realible Mentawai Rehabilitation and Reconstruction implementation. To date, the MIS system for Mentawai Rehabilitation and Reconstruction implementation has been launched and handed over to Provincial BPBD of west Sumatera. In addition, the MIS system for Mentawai Rehabilitation and Reconstruction implementation has been disseminated to six districts in BPBD of West Sumatera.

With reference to clean water management, the key achievements made to date include the establishment of 17 community groups for clean water management (KP2AB), covering 14 sub-villages, and involving heads of villages, local leaders and representative of the affected communities. In addition, these community groups have also put in place long-term plans for managing the access to clean water by all impacted households.

#### *Programme challenges & lessons learned*

Various challenges have arisen during the course of the programme:

- The coordination with provincial and district government has been a challenge due to the poor mobile communication.
- The difficult access to Mentawai to supervision capacity of activities by project staff.
- The scarce weekly transportation between Padang and Mentawai.
- Changes in key staff of local government have adversely affected program coordination, implementation, and monitoring.
- Sudden changes in Government schedules that make appropriate planning of activities somewhat problematic.
- The delayed approval of RENAKSI funding has brought about the delayed construction of community permanent house by government, which further delayed the implementation of various activities, mainly the furniture and motorbike repairing business plan, as well as the clean water infrastructure. The 2,000 construction of permanent houses was believed to bring much positive impact to furniture and motorbike repairing business as well as light meals business. The delayed

implementation of the clean water infrastructure has consequently put on hold the long term plan formulated by the local community groups for the management of clean water distribution.

- Institutional strengthening of Gakup (farmer groups) is quite difficult because the organization is new, intensive and continual assistance and support is being provided by programme's field personnel.
- Beneficiaries are new to the concept of business modeling and therefore is not easily accepted and adopted.
- Geographical constraint with limited mode of transportation and communication.
- Time and budget demanding for project supervision.
- Coordination between province and district government is lacking and miss coordination almost impacted the work of PUNOs.

While numerous challenges remain due to the lack of alternative solutions, many other challenges have been successfully addressed. For example, several approaches have been used in order to ensure proper supervision of activities in the intervention area, including the recruitment of additional staff. As far as the changes in government schedules are concerned, communication between the project staff members and the government has been increased. To reduce the impact of the geographical constraint a tight work plan has been developed and UNDSS (United Nations Department for Safety and Security) conducted an assessment on transportation options to and from Mentawai.

### *Qualitative assessment*

The programme has been carried out in a very challenging environment due to inaccessibility of target communities, access to reliable, regular transportation to and within the islands, and living conditions of project beneficiaries. Nonetheless, the project activities have effectively supported livelihood recovery in the intervention areas, in terms of increased capacities in a number of areas including entrepreneurship, vocational training, agricultural skills, etc., access to markets and strengthened capacities for DRR. The UNJP has succeeded at playing a catalytic role and implementing the activities as outlined in the RENAKSI, Government counterparts have further expressed interest in taking over the project activities beyond the project's duration to ensure their sustainability.

### 2.1.3 Indicator Based Performance Assessment

	<u>Achieved</u> Indicator Targets	Reasons for Variance with Planned Target (if any)	Source of Verification
<b>Outcome: to improve sustainable livelihoods and strengthen institutional capacity in disaster recovery in area affected by the 2010 Mentawai earthquake and tsunami.</b>			
<b>Output 1: Agricultural livelihoods restored, improved and diversified, incorporating the value chain approach</b>			
<b>Activity 1.1</b>  <b>Indicator 1.1.1</b>  <b>Baseline:</b> Non-existing value-chain assessment for the Pagai Utara and Pagai Selatan area  <b>Planned Target:</b> One value assessment produced	<p>A value chain assessment has been completed and disseminated through a workshop in Tua Pejat, capital of the Mentawai District.</p> <p>The assessment is instrumental in identifying areas of work and initiating a model of intervention for the livelihoods recovery programme.</p>		Draft VCA report Consultant report to respective agency (LoA reports)
<b>Indicator 1.1.2</b>  <b>Baseline:</b> Dissemination of findings is required for further refining  <b>Planned Target:</b> One workshop conducted	Workshop has been implemented and the report has been amended according to the discussions held		Workshop report Revised/finalized value chain assessment report
<b>Indicator 1.1.3</b>  <b>Baseline:</b> Non-existing value chain document  <b>Planned Target:</b> 500 copies of the VCA booklet to be distributed to government offices as well as other relevant stakeholders	Assessment document drafted but requires further refining before being published	N/A	Delivery report from logistics team/admin support staff

<p><b>Activity 1.2</b></p> <p><b>Indicator 1.2.1</b></p> <p><b>Baseline:</b> Post disaster assessment exists but requires updating</p> <p><b>Planned Target:</b> One updated comprehensive assessment produced</p>	<p>Assessment has been conducted producing detailed data on targeted beneficiaries and effected communities</p>	N/A	<p>Assessment report</p> <p>Baseline data report</p>
<p><b>Indicator 1.2.2</b></p> <p><b>Baseline:</b> No adequate demonstration plots available to function as site for the farmer field schools</p> <p><b>Planned Target:</b> Establish three demonstration plots within the intervention site by Sept 2012</p>	<p>3 demonstration plots established respectively in KM10, KM 27, and KM 37</p>	N/A	<p>Report, MonEv report from monitoring by FAO staff, local NGOs, and extension worker (each party has their own report)</p>
<p><b>Indicator 1.2.3</b></p> <p><b>Baseline:</b> Limited on-farm trainings have been provided to farmers in intervention site</p> <p><b>Planned Target:</b> At least 100 farmers adopt intercropping techniques by the end of the project; Production of selected crops increased; Quality of selected crops increased and up to standard for marketability</p>	<p>177 farmers received training on cocoa cultivation, 5 champion farmers identified in each area</p> <p>238 farmers received training on vegetable cultivation (tomatoes and chilly)</p> <p>60 farmers received training on introduction to cattle rearing and fish pond management</p> <p>60 farmers received training on patchouli cultivation and production</p>	N/A	<p>Training report</p> <p>Attendance list</p> <p>Post activity assessment report</p> <p>MonEv report</p> <p>Consultant report</p>

<p><b>Indicator 1.2.4</b></p> <p><b>Baseline:</b> Farmers have limited knowledge on up-to-date farming knowhow and market access</p> <p><b>Planned Target:</b> Establish partnerships with at least two national research institutes and organizations experienced in delivering farmer trainings and conducting assessment on market access</p>	<p>As above</p>		
<p><b>Indicator 1.2.5</b></p> <p><b>Baseline:</b> Farmers have limited up-to-date information on successful farming cultivations achieved elsewhere</p> <p><b>Planned Target:</b> At least 1 comparative field study facilitated for at least 15 farmers and local government field officers; Participating farmers adopt knowledge gained during field visit and share experience with their community/groups</p>	<p>As above</p>	<p>target reached</p>	
<p><b>Indicator 1.2.6</b></p> <p><b>Baseline:</b> Local food products have not been indorsed by BPOM MUI</p> <p><b>Planned Target:</b> "Halal" certification are issued for certain food products in order to better attract market</p>			

<p><b>Activity 1.3</b></p> <p><b>Indicator 1.3.1</b></p> <p><b>Baseline:</b> Limited proper farming equipment made available in the intervention site</p> <p><b>Planned Target:</b> Provide locally available and low maintenance farming equipment to selected farmer groups</p>	<p>Procured para-para and fermented box for cocoa harvesting</p>	<p>Procurement partially on-hold pending results of fish harvest</p>	<p>Report (include documentation report of all tools/inputs)</p>
<p><b>Indicator 1.3.2</b></p> <p><b>Baseline:</b> Farmers have limited information on use of newly introduced equipment</p> <p><b>Planned Target:</b> Provide training support on the proper use of procured farming equipment</p>	<p>Trainings on the proper use of para-para and fermented box delivered to approximately 75 cocoa farmers; Training on the proper use of distillation units have been delivered to approximately 60 patchouli farmers</p>		<p>Training report and post activity evaluation report</p>
<p><b>Output 1.4</b></p> <p><b>Indicator 1.4.1</b></p> <p><b>Baseline:</b> Limited number and knowledge on quality seeds available in the intervention site</p> <p><b>Planned Target:</b> Procure quality seedlings and provide training for multiplication through cloning</p>	<p>Cocoa seedlings have been grafted with clones, and patchouli seedlings have been prepared and are ready to be planted in the demonstration plots</p>		<p>Report from FAO, local NGO (implementer) and extension worker</p>
<p><b>Output 1.5</b></p> <p><b>Indicator 1.5.1</b></p> <p><b>Baseline:</b> Limited quantity as well as information sharing on quality seedlings</p> <p><b>Planned Target:</b> Conduct a one-day farmers</p>	<p>Facilitated farmers joining the National Cacao Symposium in Padang to meet with potential traders</p>	<p>on target</p>	<p>Report, MoU (agreement) between farmers or farmer groups or GAKUP with market or company</p>

market in the intervention site			
<b>Output 1.6</b>	Currently undergoing compilation of materials to be suit local needs		Training report and post activity evaluation report
<b>Indicator 1.6.1</b>			Training report M&E report Attendance list Participant post training assessment/test
<b>Baseline:</b> Modules on famer field schools are non-existent			
<b>Planned Target:</b> Produce training modules that can be used by the local agriculture service			
<b>Indicator 1.6.2</b>			
<b>Baseline:</b> Limited trainings provided for extension workers in better engaging farmers			
<b>Planned Target:</b> Facilitate at least one training to agriculture extension workers and/or agricultural field officers.			
<b>Output 1.7</b>	15 GET AHEAD trainers (4 of them are women) have been certified to conduct training of entrepreneurs		Training report MonEv report Attendance list Participant post training assessment/test
<b>Indicator 1.7.1</b>			Training report MonEv report Attendance list Participant post training assessment/test
<b>Baseline:</b> No local trainers with GET AHEAD module certificate			
<b>Planned Target:</b> At least 9 trainers are certified after training of entrepreneurs, 4 of which are women	Training provider assessment has been completed and vocational training providers have been selected		



<p><b>Indicator 1.7.2</b></p> <p><b>Baseline:</b> No local NGO/trainers with 4 in 1 method certificate</p> <p><b>Planned Target:</b> At least 9 trainers submit training proposal in line with market demand, 4 of which are women</p>			
<p><b>Output 1.8</b></p> <p><b>Indicator 1.8.1</b></p> <p><b>Baseline:</b> No community members especially women received vocational training on light meals before</p> <p><b>Planned Target:</b> At least 170 trainees successfully complete the training, out of which at least 40% are women, 30% youth, 5% person with disabilities. At least 100 trainees are employed or start a business</p> <p><b>Indicator 1.8.2</b></p> <p><b>Baseline:</b> No community members especially women received GET AHEAD training before</p> <p><b>Planned Target:</b> At least 102 trainees successfully complete the training, out of which at least 40% are women, 30% youth, 5% person with disabilities. At least 60 trainees are employed or start a business</p>	<p>200 Mentawai women who have been trained already produced the three types of light meals, i.e. banana chips, taro crispy and fish snack. ILO provided packaging and market linkage</p>	<p>After market assessment, the light meals business focus on 1 type only i.e. Taro crispy.</p>	<p>Training report MonEv report Attendance list Participant post training assessment/test</p>
	<p>Get Ahead training to 10 sub villages at relocation site of KM 27 South Pagai, KM 37 South Pagai and KM 10 North Pagai, which consisted in 200 Mentawai women, already completed.</p>		<p>Training report MonEv report Attendance list Participant post training assessment/test</p>

<p><b>Output 1.9</b></p> <p><b>Indicator 1.9.1</b></p> <p><b>Baseline:</b> No one of trainees has complete working tools</p> <p><b>Planned Target:</b> At least 15 trainees, or 50% of the total trainees, are employed or start a business</p>	<p>Provided working tools to 200 Mentawai women in 3 relocation sites. Production house of light meals in KM 27 already established. Furniture working tools provided to 10 youths and motorbike repairing tools provided to 10 youth in 3 relocation sites</p>		<p>Training report MonEv report Attendance list</p>
	<p>Market linkage of light meals established with Padang</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>Training report MonEv report Attendance list</p>
<p><b>Indicator 1.9.2</b></p> <p><b>Baseline:</b> No one of trainees have market linkages</p> <p><b>Planned Target:</b> market linkages established</p> <p><b>Indicator 1.9.3</b></p> <p><b>Baseline:</b> No one trainees have access to small loans</p> <p><b>Planned Target:</b> At least 15 participants take part in a study visit to Jember; 50% of community members have good knowledge of MFI establishment and operation</p>	<p>1 women light meals group from KM 37 South Pagai has market linkages with local market in Sikakap and Tua Pejat as well as Padang market.</p> <p>Several individual women in KM 27 and 37 South Pagai has sold their product to their neighbourhood shops.</p> <p>1 furniture making group in KM 37 South Pagai has received ordered to build tables, chairs etc.</p> <p>2 motorbike repairing group in KM 37 and 27 South Pagai has routine customers.</p> <p>1 MFI survey/mapping has been completed</p>	<p>Indicator 1.9.3. has changed due to unavailability of existing MFI to provide loans to remote areas in KM 27 and 37 South Pagai. The proposed indicator for next phase is 50% of beneficiaries receive Financial Education.</p>	<p>Study visit report Training report and post activity evaluation report Participant post training assessment/test</p>

<p><b>Output 2<sup>1</sup>: Institutional capacity of local government strengthened to promote livelihoods recovery efforts and encourage provision of basic social and public services</b></p>			
<p><b>Activity 2.1</b></p> <p><b>Indicator 2.1.1</b></p> <p><b>Baseline:</b> 0</p> <p><b>Planned Target:</b> 6 coordination meetings attended by 15 participants each</p>	<p>2 coordination meetings attended by 15 participants each. Support has been provided for BPBD Mentawai to conduct coordination meeting in Tuapejat regarding the implementation of the RR process mainly at PJOK from all related SKPD</p>		<p>Minute of Meeting</p>
<p><b>Indicator 2.1.2</b></p> <p><b>Baseline:</b> 0</p>	<p>Completed in 2012: Workshop conducted with 40 participants on the monitoring and evaluation covering overview of the PDNA and RENAKSI conducted on 9 - 11 October 2012</p>		<p>Workshop report</p>
<p><b>Planned Target:</b> One time training attended by 40 participants</p> <p><b>Indicator 2.1.3</b></p> <p><b>Baseline:</b> 0</p> <p><b>Planned Target:</b> 2 times monitoring</p>	<p>2 quarterly monitoring supports have been conducted at provincial level and district level, participated by relevant institutions involved in Mentawai recovery. These meetings were conducted in Mentawai Island (i.e. Tua Pejat) on 20-21 March 2013 and in Padang on 21-22 May 2013.</p>		<p>Monitoring report</p>
	<p>Two induction training sessions for BPPD staff on data management and information system (MIS) were conducted on 25-27 February 2013 and 3-5 December 2013, attended by 27 participants</p>		<p>Training report</p>

<sup>1</sup> Note: Outcomes, outputs, indicators and targets should be **as outlined in the Project Document** so that you report on your **actual achievements against planned targets**. Add rows as required for Outcome 2, 3 etc.

<p><b>Indicator 2.1.4</b></p> <p><b>Baseline:</b> 0</p> <p><b>Planned Target:</b> One training attended by 5 participants</p>	<p>Two coaching sessions on data collection, verification and analysis were conducted on 29 March 2013 and also on 5 April and 27 April 2013. Both sessions were attended by five participants.</p>		<p>Mentawai recovery data systems</p>
<p><b>Indicator 2.1.5</b></p> <p><b>Baseline:</b> 0</p> <p><b>Planned Target:</b> 5 participants</p> <p><b>Indicator 2.1.6</b></p> <p><b>Baseline:</b> 0</p> <p><b>Planned Target:</b> 50 participants</p>	<p>MIS system for Mentawai Rehabilitation and Reconstruction implementation has been launched and handed over to Provincial BPBD of West Sumatera on 23 May 2013. The launching session was attended by 50 participants. The MIS system was disseminated to 6 district/municipality BPBDs of West Sumatera on 3-5 December 2013.</p>	<p>None</p>	<p>Event report</p>
<p><b>Output 2.2</b></p> <p><b>Indicator 2.2.1</b></p> <p><b>Baseline:</b> 0</p> <p><b>Planned Target:</b> 1 assessment report completed</p> <p><b>Indicator 2.2.2</b></p> <p><b>Baseline:</b> 0</p> <p><b>Planned Target:</b> Produce 4 community map on the respective 4 relocation sites</p>	<p>Completed</p>	<p>None</p>	<p>Assessment report</p>
	<p>Completed</p>		<p>Community report</p>
	<p>Two technical support sessions were conducted to discuss communication strategy on sustainable access to clean water. The sessions were conducted on 25-26 September 2013 and also on 24-25 October, benefiting 17 community groups (i.e. KP2AB) at four relocation sites, who now have long-term plan on</p>	<p>None</p>	<p>Partner report</p>

<p><b>Indicator 2.2.3</b></p> <p><b>Baseline:</b> 0</p> <p><b>Planned Target:</b> Produce a strategy for the provision of clean water and sanitation at 4 relocation sites</p>	<p>water management.</p>		
<p><b>Indicator 2.2.4</b></p> <p><b>Baseline:</b> 0</p> <p><b>Planned Target:</b> Conduct a 2-day focus group discussion</p>	<p>Focus group discussion conducted on 24-25 Oct 2013 for 17 community groups with the total number of participants 46 people.</p>	<p>None</p>	<p>Discussion report</p>

## 2.2 Merapi Livelihoods Recovery Programme

The outcome of the Merapi Livelihoods Recovery Programme is improved sustainable livelihoods recovery and enhanced community resilience in areas affected by the 2010 Mt. Merapi eruption. The main outcome level achievements during the reporting period are outlined in the following paragraphs.

The income of beneficiaries of organic *salak* certification and market access project has increased. The increase of income is attributed to producing organic agriculture *salak* which sells for 10-30 percent more compared to conventional *salak* price. The communal cage project's beneficiaries also saw an increase in value of their livestock. The presence of Merapi Resilience Consortium including civil society, and government effectively facilitated dialogues and coordination among various agencies and was seen as critically important to ensuring the sustainability of the project benefits.

The activities focus on economic recovery helped to strengthen home-based-industries of the selected beneficiary business groups. Through the establishment of Village Promotion Team's (VPT) beneficiaries were able to enhance their business development and promotional activities. While, the core home-based businesses still require additional investment to be sustainable, the creation of VPT has increased awareness and capacity to develop strategies to expand market access, including the diversification of products and packages that match with market requirements.

There was a significant increase in GOI's RENAKSI delivery during 2012-2013 compared to the targets. The coordination forums established to facilitate coordination among recovery actors, including different levels of government institutions as well as CSOs, were a significant contribution to clarifying the roles and responsibilities of these actors in the implementation of the RENAKSI programs. In addition, the feedback mechanism put in place helped to ensure effectiveness, accuracy and accountability of Rehabilitation and Reconstruction (RR) programmes. Similarly the Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) perspective was integrated in RR programmes through development of DRR policies.

With reference to community resilience, the affected communities demonstrated enhanced capacities as 'Resilient Villages' as evidenced in their development of their own community-based response approach to disaster risks and impacts. The communities were able not only to develop tailored tools such as maps, contingency plans, and EWS, but were able to organize themselves into structured groups with clear response mechanisms. These tools and group response mechanism are essential to manage disaster risks and allow the communities to respond effectively to any future disasters.

### **2.2.1 Output 1: Agricultural livelihoods restored, improved and diversified, incorporating the value chain approach**

A total of 87 participants attended the business development training including 15 women. In Kuwang, 54 cattle have been handed over to the 82 households ( 54 male and 28 female headed household) and in Blongkeng, 190 goat/sheep was handed over to 35 household ( 27 male and 8 female household).

FAO trained 482 individuals from 120 households. Participants were allowed to participate in more-than-one training. Some 31% of these participants were women, higher than the targeted percentage of 20%. Three livelihood fora were conducted including a buyer forum, investor forum, and multi-stakeholder forum. The buyer forum was attended by 15 traders of organic agriculture products from Jakarta, Yogyakarta, Surabaya, Malaysia,

and Thailand. The buyers met with the organic salac association. The buyer forum resulted in some business transaction between organic salac farmers association with organic traders. The Merapi Resiliency Consortium (MRC) consisting of corporations, civil society organizations, and government was established to hand over project components to beneficiaries and local actors, including local government and civil society organization.

A total of 642 individuals from the selected home-based-industries sectors received livelihood recovery assistance from IOM and its partner LPTP, representing 107% of the initial target number (i.e. 600), 73.9% of which were women (target was initially 30%). IOM reached out to a bigger number of female than male beneficiaries as the assessed home-based industries were mostly run by women in the target villages.

Livelihood recovery assistance consisted of different forms of support including business development trainings (BDT), facilitation of business plans, thematic technical trainings, market access and business networking activities. The number of beneficiaries for each of these initiatives is summarized as follows:

- Up to the end of the reporting period, 430 of the 642 beneficiaries participated in the BDT and received follow-up assistance from IOM's local partner for the development of 37 business development plans. The BDT aimed at introducing participants to the basics of business development – i.e. market identification, business planning, group-based financial management, accounting, production management and human resource management. IOM provided complementary technical or thematic-based trainings tailored to the needs of each specific business sector.
- In total, 236 of the 642 beneficiaries received such complementary trainings, including: batik-making training, Service of Excellence Training for volcano tour at Umbulharjo Village, English Class for Volcano Tour, Marketing, Promotion and Innovation Training, Packaging Training and Media training. The business groups were also facilitated to show their products at a number of exhibitions at national and sub-national level, and were linked to strategic partners with access to market, for example: Bakpia Djogja (traditional cake store in Yogyakarta), Mirota Batik (popular souvenir and gift shop in Yogyakarta), and ASITA (Association of the Indonesian Tours and Travel Agencies). Lastly, the project helped to establish VPTs which consist of representatives of the IOM-assisted business groups. These VPTs joined market access related workshops, business networking events, exhibitions and fairs, and developed marketing branding. The set-up of VPTs has played a critical role in expanding beneficiary groups' business performance, marking one of the best practices of the programme for potential replication.

Lastly, to further strengthen resilience of assisted business groups in a context of high disaster risks, the VPTs and the business groups were also introduced to the development of DRR Village contingency plans and received DRR-related information and materials through different activities (Output 3) – e.g. trainings on first aid kits, safety at work, and the insertion of DRR measurement through the development of business planning. IOM also facilitated a Disaster Risk Financing and Insurance (DRFI) Workshop for the beneficiary business groups. The purpose of this workshop was two-fold: (i) to increase community awareness on risk-transferring scheme; and (ii) to identify type of risk-transferring options (register their business group to the micro insurance provider, group-savings, contingency budget, etc.). As follow-up actions, plans were prepared on how to improve the DRFI socialization into the community. The DRFI facilitators were trained on 'how to prepare the good DRFI scheme for the community based on community needs,' and 'how to facilitate DRFI policy making at national level'. IOM also provided an insurance package of one-year validity from *Jasaraharja Putera* for all of the training participants. A total of 167 packages were provided. Based on follow-up discussions with some of beneficiaries, some business groups confirmed their intention to continue to cover

the insurance with their own resources. IOM's stimulant for one year was useful for them as it facilitated the administration process and familiarized the beneficiaries with micro-insurance procedures.

The number of commodities developed into value-chain based marketing strategies target was reached (125% of the target number for IOM, 100% for FAO and 100% for UNDP).

### ***2.2.2 Output 2: Strengthened capacity of local government to manage and coordinate DRR-based recovery programmes and mainstream DRR with involvement of all stakeholders***

The village information system is designed to support the RENAKSI implementation and the broader disaster management in the affected areas through early warning system, data preparedness, feed-back mechanism and participatory monitoring exercise. Much of these features utilize on-line network with interconnection to the existing information systems BPBD, BNPB, BPPTK and other relevant actors, i.e. national and local information commissioners, local and national ombudsman and local governments. By the end of May 2013, the functional data management systems (Indicator 2.1) were built in the 6 local BPBDs planned, in the 9 villages (100% of target) and they reached 1,324 people instead of 1,000 (132%). Specifically in Magelang district, the village information system is designed to support sister villages programmes established by BPBD. Information system in Sleman district BPBD was revitalized to consolidate recent needs for disaster management.

Nine coordination forums (Indicator 2.2) were established in Central Java and nine in the Yogyakarta Special Administrative Region (DIY). The target was to set up 12 coordination forums: 6 in Central Java and 6 in DIY. Coordination forums in Central Java were focused on monitoring of Rehabilitation and Reconstruction (RR) implementation through implementation of social audit in Magelang and Klaten district. Coordination forums in DIY were focused on RR programming and institutionalization of RR coordination through formulation of 2013 RR programming and development of Governor Decrees for coordination, government support and community participation in RR.

The review on the progress of recovery (Indicator 2.3) undertaken by local BPBDs provided useful data analysis and identified the needs that remain to be addressed. The programme has supported Longitudinal Survey and Disaster Recovery Index for evidence based RR planning and re-planning. The survey was implemented through joint financing between BNPB and UNDP.

Disaster preparedness strategies and roadmaps for post-disaster recovery (Indicator 2.4.) have been created in two districts, as planned. Magelang district has developed academic paper of local disaster management law and disaster preparedness plan. Sleman district has developed rain lava contingency plan and DRR information system.

### ***2.2.3 Output 3: Enhanced community resiliencies and strengthened linkages between communities and relevant stakeholders***

By the end of the reporting period, 1,783 community members have acquired knowledge on community-based DRR (Indicator 3.1), which corresponds to 891.5% of the targeted number (initial target was 200 community member). Target number of beneficiaries were initially the members of the Village Disaster-Risk-Reduction Team (VDDRTs), but during the implementation of community risk mapping and contingency plan, high interest was also expressed by the wider community, including those members of the VDDRTs set up in the four villages (indicator 3.2), to participate and actively contribute in the process.



Within the reporting period, the following documents and information gathering were completed using a full community participatory approach:

- Twelve (12) community disaster risk maps, consisting of village hazard maps, village vulnerability maps, and village capacity and resource maps. All maps were coordinated with the Sleman and Magelang's BPBDs for approval and were used to develop the village contingency plans and refine the DM plans as well as the DRR Action plans;
- Four Village Contingency Plans (in this case, 3 villages developed Contingency Plans for volcano eruption and 1 village developed a Contingency Plan for mud flow).
- A series of Focused Group Discussion (FGD) attended by 60 VDRRT and VDRRF members were also facilitated in the four target villages to identify possible Early Warning Systems (EWS).

To help support the implementation of the above village-level DRR activities in the four target villages and build a general culture of risk resilience across the two target provinces, IOM and LPTP continued to actively engage in a number of socialization initiatives to raise public awareness on DRR in the four target districts (indicator 3.4), including:

- Ten radio shows and three TV talk shows (*Obrolan Angkring*) aired in Yogyakarta and Central Java; and,
- A total of 7000 copies of *Layang PRB* (DRR Forum Newsletter) were produced and distributed to all relevant stakeholders.

### *Programme Challenges and lessons learned:*

The following challenges, lessons learned and best practices have been identified during the implementation of the UNJP as outlined below:

- The UNJP was designed to play a catalytic role for the Rehabilitation and Reconstruction process post-2010 Merapi Eruption, meaning that the Joint Programme needed to compliment the implementation of RENAKSI by the Government and fill the gap, by providing technical inputs or assistance to the planned activities within the RENAKSI. However, the delay in RENAKSI implementation due to the lack of capacity of the local government caused considerable challenges. In order to address the challenges, the UN organizations worked closely with the Provincial and District BPBDs make available information on RENAKSI implementation. Through close cooperation with BPBD, the UN Organizations were able to engage with the relevant government departments responsible for livelihoods recovery assistance and also with risk reduction parameters.
- During the project period the targeted villages were in the process of moving to communal permanent housing sites provided by the Government. Construction in some villages was faster than others, a situation that created challenges for programme socialization and beneficiary identification. In response to these challenges, the UN Organizations maintained close communication and coordination with their implementing partners so they could regularly inform the stakeholders about the progress of the housing site and project implementation plan.
- There was an emerging risk that was quite relevant to the UNJP, which needs to be considered in the future programming. During project implementation in the community, and also advice from the Volcano Investigation and Technological Development Center (BPPTK), it was predicted that the most hazardous areas will be the locations lying on the southeast of Mt. Merapi. Those areas will have higher disaster risk level from the future Mt. Merapi eruption and the volcanic material flooding during the rainy season.

During the regular coordination meeting carried out between FAO, IOM and UNDP and the BPDD Sleman District, BPBD asked the UNJP to support the community in those most hazardous areas (Southeast parts of Merapi) by improving the community resilience level such as making the village disaster management contingency plan, and hazard maps and evacuation route for all affected villages both for the Merapi's future eruption and volcanic materials flooding.

- The delay of the disbursement of funds of the IMDFF-DR window supported by the World Bank and implemented by REKOMPAK has affected timely implementation. At the beginning of the UN-Joint Programme implementation, REKOMPAK committed to support the infrastructure of the communities livelihood in IOM target villages (such as refinement of the VPT joint showroom) whereas IOM focused on the engaging the business groups through trainings and technical assistance. However, until the closing of IOM's intervention in April 2013, the World Bank window has not started implementation. To ensure REKOMPAK's awareness of IOM's intervention and achievements of the assisted business groups, IOM shared the Village Profile with REKOMPAK for future reference.
- The UNJP implementation was also challenged due to the absence of a streamlined reporting mechanism and different implementation modes applied by the three participating organizations. This has caused delays to programme implementation, monitoring and evaluation, as well as to the discussions regarding an application for a Phase II of the UNJP.

### *Qualitative assessment:*

During its first phase of implementation, the joint program has achieved a broader level of influence with reference to the recovery support for both regions of Yogyakarta and Central Java. The focused work on income generation (Output 1) and DRR mainstreaming (Output 3) have further engaged with implementing partners to consolidate support to beneficiaries. At the same time, the capacity building work (Output 2) has provided strategic support for the evaluation on the implementation of the RENAKSI in 2012 as well as the programming for RENAKSI activities in 2013.

As IOM concluded its work under the UNJP, IOM in coordination with the Yogyakarta Provincial BPBD conducted a closing workshop on 24 April 2013 to socialize the results and lessons learned from IOM's project component implementation, within the framework of the joint UN Merapi Livelihood Recovery Programme. IOM received valuable feedback and positive acknowledgment of its work at the community level especially in relation to the livelihood assistance for the home-based industries combined with community-based disaster risk reduction activities. The BPBD acknowledged this programme as a good model for communities intervention as they also still learning on how to interlink livelihood intervention with the DRR. Some of the innovative approaches that were implemented during IOM's intervention in the four assisted received positive feedback from the key stakeholders (Community Settlement, Reconstruction and Rehabilitation Project (REKOMPAK)<sup>2</sup> Technical Support Team (TPT)<sup>3</sup>, Provincial and/or District Management Agency (BPBD) and the relevant Government Departments). The

---

<sup>2</sup>*RehabilitasidanRekonstruksiMasyarakatdanPermukimanBerbasisKomunitas* (REKOMPAK) is a program scheme under the management of Indonesia Public Work Department and funded by Multi Donor Fund (MDF) and Java Reconstruction Fund (JRF) to carry out the participatory community housing and settlement rehabilitation and reconstruction program in the disaster affected areas such as Aceh, Yogyakarta, and Mentawai

<sup>3</sup>The Technical Support Team (TPT) is a government-body formed by National Disaster Management (BNPb) to assist the government coordination mechanism in carrying rehabilitation and reconstruction activities after the 2010 eruption of Mount Merapi in Yogyakarta and Central Java Provinces

REKOMPAK, TPT and the relevant government departments stated that they will engage with the assisted communities and continue the provision of technical assistance as needed and within their available resources. The Head of Yogyakarta Provincial BPBD requested documentation of IOM's work in the field to be further coordinated and addressed by BPBD post IOM's intervention. In May 2013, the complete document of IOM's targeted village-profile was submitted and shared to all relevant stakeholders in the government, including to the IMDFF-DR Secretariat. The document serves as reference tool for further interventions.

The UNJP has been well received by the national government and also the local governments in the affected regions. This is evident from the regular conduct of the programme board meetings, where key stakeholders are involved in assessing the progress of the programme implementation. Overall the UNJP has certainly contributed to the increased income of the affected communities, strengthened the capacities of the local governments, and also increased community resilience of the effected regions through the work of DRR. The first and foremost, the UNJP has filled in the critical gap in the recovery process in the affected regions, channeling recovery assistance to the affected populations that are not reached by government assistance, while complementing the recovery assistance in areas reached by government assistance.

**2.2.4 Indicator Based Performance Assessment:**

	<b><u>Achieved</u> Indicator Targets</b>	<b>Reasons for Variance with Planned Target (if any)</b>	<b>Source of Verification</b>
<b>Outcome 1</b> <i>The Joint program outcome is improved sustainable livelihoods recovery and enhanced community resilience in areas affected by the 2010 Mt Merapi eruption.</i>			
<p><b>Output 1 Agricultural livelihoods restored, improved and diversified, incorporating the value chain approach</b></p> <p><b>Indicator 1.1</b> The number of impacted households (gender disaggregated) benefitting from agricultural livelihoods input  <b>Baseline: none</b>  <b>Planned Target:</b> 120 selected beneficiaries, 30% of which are women</p> <p><b>Indicator 1.2</b> The number of individuals trained in livelihoods related initiatives  <b>Baseline: 0</b>  <b>Planned Target:</b>                      IOM: Up to 600 selected beneficiaries, 30% women                      FAO: 120 selected beneficiaries, 24% women</p>	<p>FAO:                      Communal Cage in Kuwang: 54 cattle have been handed over to the 82 Households in Kuwang, 54 male headed household, and 28 female headed household                      Communal Cage in Blongkeng: 190 goat/sheep was handed over to 35 household, 27 male headed household, and 8 female household.                      Salak: 100 household.</p>	<p>The beneficiaries of Salak project increased from 100 household to 327 household (302 male headed household) due to more the increased number of household are interested to shift their product to organic agriculture product.                      Salak chips and fresh salak was promoted in Biofach, the largest annual organic production exhibition in the world that was held annually in Nuremberg-Germany</p>	<p>Quarterly Programme Report;                      Field Monitoring Report;                      copy of the BDT training module; copy of promotional flyers.</p>
	<p>IOM: 642 selected beneficiaries, 73,9% of which are women</p> <p>IOM: facilitated the establishment of Village Promotion Team (VPT) consisted of beneficiary business representatives</p>	<p>Female beneficiaries outnumbered male beneficiaries as the IOM's assessed home-based industries were mostly run by women in the target villages.</p> <p>VPTs are composed of several representatives of the beneficiary business groups whose main tasks are to promote the products and services to potential business partners and clients in view of expanding their business coverage.</p>	

<p><b>Indicator 1.3 The number of commodities developed into value-chain based marketing strategies</b>  <b>Baseline: none XXX</b>  <b>Planned Target:</b>  IOM: 4 units  FAO: 3 units</p>	<p>FAO: 482 selected beneficiaries, 149 (31%) of which are women</p> <p>FAO: Facilitate the establishment of Livelihoods Forum</p> <p>FAO: Provision of Business Development Training</p>	<p>The increase of the number of beneficiaries especially due to total calculation of the total training participant. One participant can participate in more than one training.</p> <p>FAO facilitated the launching of Merapi Resiliency Forum. This is a consortium of corporate, government representative, and civil society organization to support the sustainability of the project and to manage other disaster risk reduction project in surrounding Merapi.</p> <p>FAO facilitated the workshop on disaster risk reduction measures in communal cage management</p>	
<p><b>Output 2 Strengthened capacity of local government to manage and coordinate DRR-based recovery programmes and mainstream DRR with involvement of all stakeholders</b>  <b>Indicator 2.1</b> The existence of a functional data management system build in local BPBDs  <b>Baseline: XXX</b></p>	<p>IOM: 5 commodities (two home-based food processing, one batik-design, one handy-craft, and one volcano tour)</p> <p>FAO: 3 commodities (three varieties of Salac)</p> <p>UNDP: 1 commodities (Salac)</p> <p>6 BPBDs  9 villages  1324 people (28 % female and 72 % male participants)</p>	<p>The selection of target communities for home-based-industries in each village was done through value chain analysis (VCA). The assisted commodities were mushroom cultivation groups, food processing. and crafts groups</p> <p>The number of beneficiaries increased because of the increasing number of participating villages.</p> <p>Initiatives of programmes collaboration with BPBDs in Magelang and Sleman districts under Letter of Agreement have increased number of beneficiaries and local governments' ownership.</p>	<p>Quarterly Programme Report  Field Monitoring Report</p>

<p><b>Planned Target:</b> 6 BPBDs; 9 villages; 1,000 people</p> <p><b>Indicator 2.2</b> The existence of coordination forum facilitated by BPBD with active involvement of stakeholders</p> <p><b>Baseline:</b> XXX</p> <p><b>Planned Target:</b> 6 Central Java; 6 DIY</p>			
<p><b>Indicator 2.3</b> The number of reviews undertaken by local BPBDs on the progress of recovery and the remaining needs/gaps</p> <p><b>Baseline:</b> XXX</p> <p><b>Planned Target:</b> 1</p>	<p>9 Central Java 9 DIY</p>	<p>Coordination forums in Central Java were focused on monitoring of Rehabilitation and Reconstruction (RR) implementation. Coordination forums in DIY were focused on RR programming and institutionalization of RR coordination.</p>	
<p><b>Indicator 2.4</b> The existence and use of a disaster preparedness strategy and roadmap for post-disaster recovery</p> <p><b>Baseline:</b> XXX</p> <p><b>Planned Target:</b> 2 districts</p>	<p>4 events</p>	<p>Utilization of Longitudinal Survey for livelihoods recovery by local BPBDs for RR review and programming.</p>	
	<p>2 districts</p>	<p>Magelang district has developed academic paper of local disaster management law and disaster preparedness plan. Sleman district has developed rain lava contingency plan and DRR information system</p>	
<p><b>Output 3 Enhanced community resiliencies and strengthened linkages between communities and relevant stakeholders</b></p> <p><b>Indicator 3.1</b> Number of community members who have acquired knowledge on Community-Based Disaster Risk Reduction in selected districts</p> <p><b>Baseline:</b> 0</p> <p><b>Planned Target:</b> Up to 200 selected beneficiaries, 30% women</p>	<p>1,783 selected beneficiaries, 7.7% of which are women</p>	<p>The higher number of beneficiaries can be explained by the high interest of communities at large to learn about DRR. As such, trainings were made accessible not just for the VDRRTs, but also for all community members involved in the larger VDRRFs and VPTs. Their participation in the trainings enable them to also actively and efficiently contribute to the development of the community risk maps and village DM plans, DRR plans and contingency plans. As regard to the gender balance, the community requested that most of these</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LPTP Training Report</li> <li>• Copies of community disaster risk maps</li> <li>• Copies of the contingency plans</li> </ul>

<p><b>Indicator 3.2 The existence of coordination forum facilitated by BPBD with active involvement of stakeholders</b> Baseline: 0 Planned Target: 4</p>	<p>4 forum established and actively participated in the development process of the disaster risk mapping; the development of the Village DM Plans, DRR Action Plans and Contingency Plans; and the identification of the EWS</p>	<p>activities were conducted in the evening rather than during the day. Following local Javanese norms, male community members attended most of these village evening meetings, as a result the total number of male beneficiaries attended these activities were much higher than the female ones.</p>	
<p><b>Indicator 3.3 Number of villages that implement the Village Action Plan (VAP) developed by Community-Based Disaster Management Groups (CBDMGs)</b> Baseline: 0 Planned Target: 4</p>	<p>Based on the DM plans (jointly supported by REKOMPAK and IOM), 4 villages developed DRR action plans (with joint support from REKOMPAK), contingency plans, and identified EWS.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Copy of contingency plans</li> </ul>
<p><b>Indicator 3.4 Number of districts (with the population of more than 1,000,000) exposed to the risk reduction and community resilience message through monthly DRR information, education and communication (IEC) newsletter</b></p>	<p>4 districts (Sleman, Magelang, Boyolali, Klaten)</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>Copy of <i>Layang PRB</i>; copy of radio and TV show broadcast; copy of media articles covering radio and TV show events.</p>

<b>distribution to government, humanitarian agencies, affected communities and relevant stakeholders</b> <b>Baseline: 0</b> <b>Planned Target: 4</b>			
--	--	--	--



### **3 UNJP PROGRAMME EXTENSIONS**

The UN Joint Programme was initially extended through a No-Cost Extension until May 2013 as approved by the Steering Committee of IMDFF-DR in early 2013.

Based on the successful performance of UNJP during 2012, IMDFF-DR initiated a discussion on the programme expansion beyond the first phase. A series of consultations with IMDFFDR took place during the first half of 2013 in attempt to formulate the programme expansion to ensure the sustainability of results achieved during the first phase. Parallel to the above process, UNJP still maintained a limited presence from then until the end of 2013. With this the strategic presence, PUNOs have ensured that the results of the first phase were closely monitored, while necessary technical assistance was provided to local stakeholders when needed. Furthermore, the key networks were maintained, thereby ensuring programme continuation as expected.

In terms of team composition, this expansion process did not affect programme in Mentawai as the composition of PUNOs remained the same. Different situation happened in Merapi as among the three PUNOs, IOM completed its activities by the end of April 2013 and was not involved in the preparation for the programme expansion. Based on consultation with IMDFF-DR Secretariat, the programme components left by IOM were to be taken forward by FAO on livelihoods initiatives and by UNDP on DRR. At the same time, UNDP and FAO executed relevant activities until mid-2013 and continued their strategic presence to maintain relationships, networking and provision of technical assistance that were essential for the programme extension.

Then, as agreed by IMDFF-DR Steering Committee in December 2013, the UN Joint Programme has been further extended until June 2014 with cost implication. Any further details on the cost-extension of the programme will be provided in the next reporting cycle.

***Annex***

**Consolidated Annual Financial  
Report of the Administrative Agent  
of  
the Indonesia Multi-Donor Fund for Disaster  
Recovery (IMDFF-DR)  
for the period 1 January to 31 December 2013**

Multi-Partner Trust Fund Office  
Bureau of Management  
United Nations Development Programme  
**GATEWAY: <http://mptf.undp.org>**

## PARTICIPATING ORGANIZATIONS



Food and Agriculture Organization



International Labour Organization



International Organization for Migration



United Nations Development Programme

## CONTRIBUTORS



NEW ZEALAND, Government of

## DEFINITIONS

### **Allocation**

Amount approved by the Steering Committee for a project/programme.

### **Approved Project/Programme**

A project/programme including budget, etc., that is approved by the Steering Committee for fund allocation purposes.

### **Contributor Commitment**

Amount(s) committed by a donor to a Fund in a signed Standard Administrative Arrangement with the UNDP Multi-Partner Trust Fund Office (MPTF Office), in its capacity as the Administrative Agent. A commitment may be paid or pending payment.

### **Contributor Deposit**

Cash deposit received by the MPTF Office for the Fund from a contributor in accordance with a signed Standard Administrative Arrangement (SAA).

### **Delivery Rate**

The percentage of funds that have been utilized, calculated by comparing expenditures reported by a Participating Organization against the 'net funded amount'.

### **Indirect Support Costs**

A general cost that cannot be directly related to any particular programme or activity of the Participating Organizations. UNDG policy establishes a fixed indirect cost rate of 7% of programmable costs.

### **Net Funded Amount**

Amount transferred to a Participating Organization less any refunds transferred back to the MPTF Office by a Participating Organization.

### **Participating Organization**

A UN Organization or other inter-governmental Organization that is an implementing partner in a Fund, as represented by signing a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the MPTF Office for a particular Fund.

### **Project Expenditure**

The sum of expenses and/or expenditure reported by all Participating Organizations for a Fund irrespective of which basis of accounting each Participating Organization follows for donor reporting.

### **Project Financial Closure**

A project or programme is considered financially closed when all financial obligations of an operationally completed project or programme have been settled, and no further financial charges may be incurred.

### **Project Operational Closure**

A project or programme is considered operationally closed when all programmatic activities for which Participating Organization(s) received funding have been completed.

### **Project Start Date**

Date of transfer of first instalment from the MPTF Office to the Participating Organization.

### **Total Approved Budget**

This represents the cumulative amount of allocations approved by the Steering Committee.

## 2013 FINANCIAL PERFORMANCE

This chapter presents financial data and analysis of the Indonesia Disaster Recovery TF using the pass-through funding modality as of 31 December 2013. Financial information for this Fund is also available on the MPTF Office GATEWAY, at the following address:

<http://mptf.undp.org/factsheet/fund/IDR00>.

### 1. SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS

As of 31 December 2013, 1 contributor has deposited US\$ 3,236,100 in contributions and US\$ 27,215 has been earned in interest,

bringing the cumulative source of funds to US\$ 3,263,315 (see respectively, Tables 2 and 3).

Of this amount, US\$ 2,000,000 has been transferred to 4 Participating Organizations, of which US\$ 1,994,306 has been reported as expenditure. The Administrative Agent fee has been charged at the approved rate of 1% on deposits and amounts to US\$ 32,361. Table 1 provides an overview of the overall sources, uses, and balance of the Indonesia Disaster Recovery TF as of 31 December 2013.

**Table 1. Financial Overview, as of 31 December 2013 (in US Dollars)\***

	Annual 2012	Annual 2013	Cumulative
<b>Sources of Funds</b>			
Gross Contributions	791,700	-	3,236,100
Fund Earned Interest and Investment Income	6,468	4,533	27,215
Interest Income received from Participating Organizations	-	-	-
Refunds by Administrative Agent to Contributors	-	-	-
Fund balance transferred to another MDTF	-	-	-
Other Revenues	-	-	-
<b>Total: Sources of Funds</b>	<b>798,168</b>	<b>4,533</b>	<b>3,263,315</b>
<b>Uses of Funds</b>			
Transfers to Participating Organizations	2,000,000	-	2,000,000
Refunds received from Participating Organizations	-	-	-
<b>Net Funded Amount to Participating Organizations</b>	<b>2,000,000</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>2,000,000</b>
Administrative Agent Fees	7,917	-	32,361

Direct Costs: (Steering Committee, Secretariat...etc.)	-	-	-
Bank Charges	85	99	294
Other Expenditures	-	-	-
<b>Total: Uses of Funds</b>	<b>2,008,002</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>2,032,655</b>
<b>Change in Fund cash balance with Administrative Agent</b>	<b>(1,209,833)</b>	<b>4,434</b>	<b>1,230,660</b>
Opening Fund balance (1 January)	2,436,059	1,226,226	-
<b>Closing Fund balance (31 December)</b>	<b>1,226,226</b>	<b>1,230,660</b>	<b>1,230,660</b>
Net Funded Amount to Participating Organizations	2,000,000	-	2,000,000
Participating Organizations' Expenditure	1,224,044	770,262	1,994,306
<b>Balance of Funds with Participating Organizations</b>			<b>5,694</b>

\* Due to rounding of numbers, totals may not add up. This applies to all numbers in this report.

## 2. PARTNER CONTRIBUTIONS

Table 2 provides information on cumulative contributions received from all contributors to this Fund as of 31 December 2013.

**Table 2. Contributors' Deposits, as of 31 December 2013 (in US Dollars)\***

Contributors	Prior Years as of 31-Dec-2012	Current Year Jan-Dec-2013	Total
NEW ZEALAND, Government of	3,236,100	-	3,236,100
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>3,236,100</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>3,236,100</b>

## 3. INTEREST EARNED

Interest income is earned in two ways: 1) on the balance of funds held by the Administrative Agent ('Fund earned interest'), and 2) on the balance of funds held by the Participating Organizations

('Agency earned interest') where their Financial Regulations and Rules allow return of interest to the AA. As of 31 December 2013, Fund earned interest amounts to US\$ 27,215. Details are provided in the table below.

**Table 3. Sources of Interest and Investment Income, as of 31 December 2013 (in US Dollars)\***

Interest Earned	Prior Years as of 31-Dec-2012	Current Year Jan-Dec-2013	Total
<b>Administrative Agent</b>			
Fund Earned Interest and Investment Income	22,681	4,533	27,215
<b>Total: Fund Earned Interest</b>	<b>22,681</b>	<b>4,533</b>	<b>27,215</b>
<b>Participating Organization</b>			
<b>Total: Agency earned interest</b>			
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>22,681</b>	<b>4,533</b>	<b>27,215</b>

#### 4. TRANSFER OF FUNDS

Allocations to Participating Organizations are approved by the Steering Committee and disbursed by the Administrative Agent. As of 31 December 2013, the AA has transferred US\$ 2,000,000 to 4 Participating Organizations (see list below).

Table 4 provides additional information on the refunds received by the MPTF Office, and the net funded amount for each of the Participating Organizations.

**Table 4. Transfer, Refund, and Net Funded Amount by Participating Organization, as of 31 December 2013 (in US Dollars)\***

Participating Organization	Prior Years as of 31-Dec-2012			Current Year Jan-Dec-2013			Total		
	Transfers	Refunds	Net Funded	Transfers	Refunds	Net Funded	Transfers	Refunds	Net Funded
FAO	686,660		686,660				686,660		686,660
ILO	320,000		320,000				320,000		320,000
IOM	329,662		329,662				329,662		329,662
UNDP	663,678		663,678				663,678		663,678
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>2,000,000</b>		<b>2,000,000</b>				<b>2,000,000</b>		<b>2,000,000</b>

#### 5. EXPENDITURE AND FINANCIAL DELIVERY RATES

All final expenditures reported for the year 2013 were submitted by the Headquarters of the Participating Organizations. These were consolidated by the MPTF Office.

##### 5.1 EXPENDITURE REPORTED BY PARTICIPATING ORGANIZATION

As shown in table below, the cumulative net funded amount is US\$ 2,000,000 and cumulative expenditures reported by the Participating Organizations amount to US\$ 1,994,306. This equates to an overall Fund expenditure delivery rate of 100 percent. The agencies with the three highest delivery rates are: FAO, 105 percent, IOM and UNDP, both 100 percent



**Table 5. Net Funded Amount, Reported Expenditure, and Financial Delivery by Participating Organization, as of 31 December 2013 (in US Dollars)\***

Participating Organization	Approved Amount	Net Funded Amount	Expenditure			Delivery Rate %
			Prior Years as of 31-Dec-2012	Current Year Jan-Dec-2013	Cumulative	
FAO	686,660	686,660	351,009	370,424	721,432	105.06
ILO	320,000	320,000	250,640	32,132	282,772	88.37
IOM	329,662	329,662	247,370	82,292	329,662	100.00
UNDP	663,678	663,678	375,026	285,414	660,440	99.51
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>2,000,000</b>	<b>2,000,000</b>	<b>1,224,044</b>	<b>770,262</b>	<b>1,994,306</b>	<b>99.72</b>

### 5.3 EXPENDITURE BY PROJECT

Table 6 displays the net funded amounts, expenditures reported and the financial delivery rates by Participating Organization.

**Table 6. Expenditure by Project within Sector, as of 31 December 2013 (in US Dollars)**

Sector / Project No. and Project Title		Participating Organization	Total Approved Amount	Net Funded Amount	Total Expenditure	Delivery Rate %
<b>Indonesia TF Disaster Recovery</b>						
00081546	Mount Merapi	FAO	301,980	301,980	346,383	114.70
00081546	Mount Merapi	IOM	329,662	329,662	329,662	100.00
00081546	Mount Merapi	UNDP	368,358	368,358	367,521	99.77
00081547	Mentawai Islands	FAO	384,680	384,680	375,049	97.50
00081547	Mentawai Islands	ILO	320,000	320,000	282,772	88.37
00081547	Mentawai Islands	UNDP	295,320	295,320	292,919	99.19
<b>Indonesia TF Disaster Recovery: Total</b>			<b>2,000,000</b>	<b>2,000,000</b>	<b>1,994,306</b>	<b>99.72</b>
<b>Grand Total</b>			<b>2,000,000</b>	<b>2,000,000</b>	<b>1,994,306</b>	<b>99.72</b>

## 5.4 EXPENDITURE REPORTED BY CATEGORY

Project expenditures are incurred and monitored by each Participating Organization and are reported as per the agreed categories for inter-agency harmonized reporting. Effective 1 January 2012, the UN Chief Executive Board (CEB) modified these categories as a result of IPSAS adoption to comprise eight categories. Post 1 January 2012 all expenditure are reported in the new eight categories.

In **2013**, the highest percentage of expenditure was on General operating expenses, 29%. The second highest expenditure was on Staff & Personnel Cost, 24%, and the third highest expenditure was on Contractual Services, 23%.

### 2012 CEB

#### Expense Categories

1. Staff and personnel costs
2. Supplies, commodities and materials
3. Equipment, vehicles, furniture and depreciation
4. Contractual services
5. Travel
6. Transfers and grants
7. General operating expenses
8. Indirect costs

**Table 7. Expenditure by UNDG Budget Category, as of 31 December 2013 (in US Dollars)\***

Category	Expenditure			Percentage of Total Programme Cost
	Prior Years as of 31-Dec-2012	Current Year Jan-Dec-2013	Total	
Staff & Personnel Cost (New)	243,900	197,941	441,841	23.71
Suppl, Comm, Materials (New)	235,224	(91,523)	143,702	7.71
Equip, Veh, Furn, Depn (New)	21,603	53,136	74,739	4.01
Contractual Services (New)	59,585	365,398	424,982	22.80
Travel (New)	111,473	25,059	136,533	7.33
Transfers and Grants (New)	159,638	(49,146)	110,492	5.93
General Operating (New)	314,065	217,314	531,379	28.51
<b>Programme Costs Total</b>	<b>1,145,488</b>	<b>718,180</b>	<b>1,863,668</b>	<b>100.00</b>
Indirect Support Costs Total	78,556	52,082	130,638	7.01
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,224,044</b>	<b>770,262</b>	<b>1,994,306</b>	

**Indirect Support Costs:** The timing of when Indirect Support Costs are charged to a project depends on each Participating Organization's financial regulations, rules or policies. These Support Costs can be deducted upfront on receipt of a transfer based on the approved programmatic amount, or a later stage during implementation.

## 6. COST RECOVERY

Cost recovery policies for the Fund are guided by the applicable provisions of the Terms of Reference, the MOU concluded between the Administrative Agent and Participating Organizations, and the SAAs concluded between the Administrative Agent and Contributors, based on rates approved by UNDG.

The policies in place, as of 31 December **2013**, were as follows:

- **The Administrative Agent (AA) fee:** 1% is charged at the time of contributor deposit and covers services provided on that contribution for the entire duration of the Fund. In the reporting period US\$ **0** was deducted in AA-fees. Cumulatively, as of 31 December **2013**, US\$ **32,361** has been charged in AA-fees.
- **Indirect Costs of Participating Organizations:** Participating Organizations may charge 7% indirect costs. In the current reporting period US\$ **52,082** was deducted in indirect costs by Participating Organizations. Cumulatively, indirect costs amount to US\$ **130,638** as of 31 December **2013**.
- **Direct Costs:** The Fund governance mechanism may approve an allocation to a Participating Organization to cover costs associated with Secretariat services and overall coordination, as well as Fund level reviews and evaluations. These allocations are referred to as 'direct costs'. As of 31 December **2013**, there were no direct costs charged to the Fund.

Therefore, the Indirect Support Costs percentage may appear to exceed the agreed upon rate of 7% for on-going projects, whereas when all projects are financially closed, this number is not to exceed 7%.

## 7. ACCOUNTABILITY AND TRANSPARENCY

In order to effectively provide fund administration services and facilitate monitoring and reporting to the UN system and its partners, the MPTF Office has developed a public website, the MPTF Office Gateway (<http://mptf.undp.org>). Refreshed in real time every two hours from an internal enterprise resource planning system, the MPTF Office Gateway has become a standard setter for providing transparent and accountable trust fund administration services.

The Gateway provides financial information including: contributor commitments and deposits, approved programme budgets, transfers to and expenditures reported by Participating Organizations, interest income and other expenses. In addition, the Gateway provides an overview of the MPTF Office portfolio and extensive information on individual Funds, including their purpose, governance structure and key documents. By providing easy access to the growing number of narrative and financial reports, as well as related project documents, the Gateway collects and preserves important institutional knowledge and facilitates knowledge sharing and management among UN Organizations and their development partners, thereby contributing to UN coherence and development effectiveness.