

AUSTRALIA-WORLD BANK INDONESIA PARTNERSHIP

INDEPENDENT MID-TERM REVIEW

WOMEN IN LEADERSHIP SERIES BREAKING THE GLASS CEILING EXPERIENCES FROM WOMEN LEADERS



International Women's Day #BreakTheBias



Moderator
Prita Laura
Languages: Interpretations in Sign, English, and Indonesian are available.

- Satu Kähkönen**
World Bank Country Director for Indonesia and Timor Leste
- Retno Marsudi***
Minister of Foreign Affairs
- Sri Mulyani**
Minister of Finance
- Yenny Wahid**
Founder, The Wahid Institute
- Penny Williams PSM**
Australian Ambassador for Indonesia

LIVE AT
Katadata Indonesia
World Bank Indonesia and Katadata Indonesia
Registration: <http://tiny.cc/WomeninLeadership>

INDONESIA ECONOMIC PROSPECTS Australian Government THE WORLD BANK

A Virtual Launch of Indonesia Economic Prospects June 2021 R
BOOSTING THE RECOVER

Boosting the Recovery
Indonesia Economic Prospects, June 2021

Download the Report at www.worldbank.org/iep
Twitter #IEPBankDunia

IEP INDONESIA ECONOMIC PROSPECTS Australian Government THE WORLD BANK

PREPARED FOR THE AUSTRALIAN EMBASSY IN JAKARTA

JANUARY 2023

CONTACT DETAILS

Review Team Contact	DFAT Contact
Chloe Olliver	Julie Stalker
Team Leader	First Secretary - Development
Independent Consultant	Australian Embassy Jakarta
chloe@olliverkingconsults.com	Julie.Stalker@dfat.gov.au

DOCUMENT REVIEW AND AUTHORISATION

Version	Date distributed	Issued to	Comments
First draft	11 November 2022	Julie Stalker	Feedback provided
Second Draft	15 December 2022	Julie Stalker	Additional feedback provided
FINAL Report	16 December 2022	Julie Stalker	Additional feedback provided
FINAL Report and Summary (English and Bahasa Indonesian)	16 January 2023	Julie Stalker	

AUTHORS

Chloe Olliver, Joanne Sharpe, Deborah Thomas

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The Review team would like to thank all the people consulted (in person and online / virtually) at the Australian Embassy in Jakarta, the World Bank Jakarta, and Government of Indonesia for giving their time and views so willingly. We would also like to express our appreciation for the participation of bilateral program team members. All gave their time unsparingly.

We thank the Australia-World Bank Indonesia Partnership management team at the Australian Embassy in Jakarta, Julie Stalker, Reninta (Rere) Fitrianti, and Sasi Napitupulu for the excellent facilitation, coordination, and support for the Review process. The team also express their sincere appreciation to Megha Kapoor, Operations Officer for Australia-World Bank Indonesia Partnership at the World Bank for similarly providing excellent facilitation, coordination, and support.

We thank Anna Skelton for so efficiently handling the team's various logistical arrangements.

DISCLAIMER

This Independent Mid Term Review of the Australia-World Bank Indonesia Partnership was undertaken by a team including Chloe Olliver (Team Leader), Joanne Sharpe (Development Specialist), and Deborah Thomas (Gender Equality, Disability and Social Inclusion Specialist). The views expressed in this report are those of the Review team and do not necessarily reflect those of the Australian Government, the World Bank, the Government of Indonesia, or Abt Associates.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- Executive Summary*..... 6
- 1. Introduction**..... 9
 - 1.1 Background 9
 - 1.2 Review Purpose.....10
 - 1.3 Review Scope10
 - 1.4 Review Team.....10
 - 1.5 Review Methodology.....10
- 2. Review Findings**..... 11
 - 2.1 Modality – Relevance, influence & efficiency**12
 - 2.1.1 Relevance and influence 12
 - 2.1.2 Efficiency 15
 - 2.1.3 Governance 17
 - 2.1.4 Opportunities – modality (relevance, influence, and efficiency)..... 18
 - 2.2 Effectiveness and sustainability**.....21
 - 2.2.1 Opportunities – effectiveness and sustainability 23
 - 2.3 Gender equality, disability & social inclusion**23
 - 2.3.1 Opportunities – gender equality and inclusion..... 26
 - 2.4 Monitoring, evaluation & learning**27
 - 2.4.1 Opportunities – MEL..... 28
- 3. Program Future**..... 29
- Annex 1: IMTR Team roles and responsibilities* 32
- Annex 2: Key Review Questions* 33
- Annex 3: Literature and documents*..... 38
- Annex 4: Stakeholder consultation list*..... 41

ACRONYMS

Acronym	Definition
ABIP	Australia-World Bank Indonesia Partnership
BAPPENAS	National Development Planning Agency (Badan Perencanaan Pembangunan Nasional)
CMU	Country Management Unit
DFAT	Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade
EO	End Outcome
FLFP	Female labour force participation
G4G	Gender Equality for Growth
GEDSI	Gender Equality, Disability and Social Inclusion
Gol	Government of Indonesia
IEP	Indonesia Economic Prospects
IO	Intermediate Outcome
IMTR	Independent Mid-term Review
INKLUSI	Australia Indonesia Partnership Towards an Inclusive Society
INOVASI	Innovation for Indonesia's School Children (Inovasi untuk Anak Sekolah Indonesia)
KRQ	Key Review Questions
KIAT	Indonesia-Australia Infrastructure Partnership Facility (Kemitraan Indonesia Australia untuk Infrastruktur)
KOMPAK	Governance for Growth (Kolaborasi Masyarakat dan Pelayanan untuk Kesejahteraan)
MAHKOTA	Towards a Strong and Prosperous Indonesian Society (Menuju Masyarakat Indonesia yang Kokoh Sejahtera)
MEL	Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning
MoWECP	Ministry of Women Empowerment and Child Protection
MoF	Ministry of Finance
PASA	Programmatic Advisory Services and Analytics
PRISMA	Australia-Indonesia Partnership for Promoting Rural Incomes through Support for Markets in Agriculture
Prospera	Australia-Indonesia Partnership for Economic Development (Program Kemitraan Indonesia Australia untuk Perekonomian)
SKALA	Regional Disparities Program
TNP2K	National Team for the Acceleration of Poverty Reduction (Tim Nasional Percepatan Penanggulangan Kemiskinan)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Australia-World Bank Indonesia Partnership (ABIP) is a five-year (5 February 2020 to 31 December 2024), AUD30 million single-donor programmatic Australian funded trust fund with the World Bank in Indonesia. ABIP aims to support Government of Indonesia (GoI) efforts to increase inclusive economic growth, and to build on and strengthen collaboration between the World Bank, Australia, and GoI. It works across three priority themes (accelerating human capital development; improving economic governance and mobility; and building more and better infrastructure), with a cross-cutting focus on gender equality.

The Review finds that the World Bank remains a relevant and highly valued partner in Indonesia, and GoI values access to the World Bank through Australian support. ABIP is influential with the Bank and valued by Bank teams for providing the support and flexibility to undertake important work that is not otherwise funded through internal operational funding or development financing (loans). The consolidation of trust funds has enhanced visibility of the breadth of DFAT's work in Indonesia with World Bank staff and has raised the profile of the World Bank across the Embassy.

The consolidation of multiple single trust funds into one partnership has elevated the strategic nature of the Australia-World Bank partnership. The ABIP modality provides Australia with mechanisms to maximise strategic alignment. Australia and the Bank are collaborating in areas that are priority for Australia, Indonesia, and the World Bank. However, the findings showed mixed responses from GoI on whether Australia's support to GoI through ABIP was well understood.

Replacing multiple, siloed trust fund arrangements managed by different teams across DFAT and the World Bank with a single trust fund arrangement managed by Secretariat teams in each institution has improved management efficiency, fostered coordination and collaboration between Bank activities and other DFAT investments working in similar sectors, and ensured that Australia's reduced contribution to the Bank (compared with previous years) remained highly relevant and effective.

The effectiveness of Secretariat teams within DFAT and the World Bank has been essential to program performance. Secretariat staff were widely praised for the collegiate and effective coordination of activities and reporting within their respective institutions. DFAT sector teams noted the crucial role that the ABIP team play in maximising access to information on ABIP activities in their sectors and beyond.

Governance has been a challenge for ABIP. The breadth of ABIP's remit and number of sectors it covers means that it touches many parts of GoI, including multiple deputies in central ministries as well as line ministries. As in any country, GoI is not uniform, and priorities and ways of working, especially at activity level, may be contested between different parts of GoI. Finding ways to engage many GoI stakeholders efficiently, in ABIP governance arrangements, is difficult (or near impossible). While certain aspects of governance are working well, there are no easy solutions to meeting ABIP governance needs.

There is clear evidence that ABIP is tracking towards achieving Intermediate and End Outcomes. GoI stakeholders reported instances where recommended policy reforms and program solutions are being adopted, and that projects/ programs are implemented more effectively and efficiently due to World Bank assistance. There is some evidence of progress on reformed institutional arrangements and functionalities resulting from ABIP activities, although much of this work likely also occurs through lending operations.

GoI stakeholders and World Bank staff noted the value of DFAT's deep commitment to gender equality, which is reflected in ABIP's explicit focus on gender equality and in turn the momentum behind gender in the Bank. ABIP's twin-track approach to gender continues to be appropriate, and ABIP's gender mainstreaming strategy is also working, although the quality of gender mainstreaming is varied. The provision of specialist gender resources was noted by Bank staff as particularly important. However, gender lacks visibility in the ABIP governance space, and attention to disability and social inclusion has been limited. Potential ways to address these gaps are proposed as part of the review recommendations.

Providing a robust narrative on the performance of the ABIP investment, and Australia's influence in that narrative, is important to DFAT and GoI. DFAT has worked hard to align and leverage World Bank MEL and reporting systems and processes to meet internal DFAT reporting requirements. DFAT funding of the World

Bank ABIP Operations Officer to navigate Bank reporting and data capture systems has paid off. The Bank MEL system for ABIP does capture information that is useful for DFAT internal performance management and quality assurance processes, and the Bank has been able to deliver more detailed and development partner-driven reporting. The DFAT ABIP team invests much time in mining Bank reports for the data and evidence they need to meet DFAT reporting requirements. A light touch revision of the Theory of Change is warranted. In conclusion, ABIP represents a strategic investment for Australia and should continue into a second phase (2025 forward). In consolidating multiple single Australian funded trust funds into ABIP, DFAT has succeeded in achieving many of the objectives that consolidation was meant to deliver. This is a strong foundation on which to extend and enhance the investment. The current level of funding to ABIP is appropriate and should be maintained. If ABIP’s budget were to be increased beyond current levels, additional funds should be targeted towards agreed priorities.

Opportunities for building on the solid foundations in place have been identified throughout the review, and recommendations related to these opportunities are summarised in the table below.

Table 1: Opportunities and Recommendations

	Opportunities	Recommendations
1	Continuation of the ABIP investment.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continue ABIP into a second phase following the completion of the current phase in December 2024. Maintain broad-based ABIP funding at current levels. Target any increased funding (above base) to priority areas of engagement, as has been done with gender.
2	Developing and supporting a stronger Australian position on Australia’s contribution to development financing in Indonesia could be enhanced, with a view to more intentionally aligned ABIP investments.	DFAT to develop an internal coherent strategic vision for Australia’s contribution to development financing in Indonesia with a view to more intentionally aligned ABIP investments.
3	More DFAT sector teams could engage in policy dialogue with Bank counterparts to influence the shaping of ABIP activities.	Build capacity and incentives for DFAT and bilateral program teams to engage with World Bank staff in regular dialogue on priorities in their respective sectors.
4	The role of the DFAT ABIP Secretariat could be expanded beyond current (essential) management and coordination functions.	Support the DFAT Secretariat to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop direct relationships with Gol officials (where useful), especially for the purpose of reinvigorating activity-level governance. Engage directly with World Bank sector teams on selected topics (for example, poverty and inequality, gender for growth). Support DFAT staff learning about ABIP and ways of working with the World Bank.
5	DFAT and the Bank reconsider governance arrangements and re-engage Gol representatives on the right mechanism and level for effective engagement.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review ABIP stakeholder (DFAT, Gol, World Bank) strategic decision-making and accountability needs and consider changes to governance arrangements to ensure these needs are met, possibly through partnerships brokering discussions.

	Opportunities	Recommendations
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strengthen engagement with GoI stakeholders at Deputy Minister/Director General level to improve engagement in Advisory Committees.
6	Adopting elements of DFAT’s MEL guidance for Facilities may be useful for ABIP in the next phase (2025 forward). This may assist in framing expectations on the link between investments and outcomes. It may offer useful performance assessment indicators for partnership and program governance.	Consider adopting relevant and useful elements of DFAT guidance on Performance Assessment Frameworks for Facilities in the next phase (2025 forward).
7	A more explicit and deliberate localisation agenda could replace the current (outdated) “capacity building” narrative and enhance sustainability.	Consider a more explicit and deliberate localisation agenda in the next phase (2025 forward).
8	Increase the ambition on gender equality and broader inclusion and consider the creation of a separate gender equality pillar in the next phase (2025 forward).	<p>Continue and enhance the work on gender equality and strengthen attention to disability and social inclusion including ethnicity and indigenous inclusion by building on the progress made on gender equality to increase systematic attention to the needs and interests of disadvantaged population groups in their diversity.</p> <p>Elevate the work on Gender Equality to become an additional pillar in the next phase (2025 forward).</p>
9	Enhance the visibility of gender in ABIP governance arrangements.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the current phase, include gender as a standing agenda in all three Advisory Committee meetings and extend membership of the Advisory Committee structure to MoWECP. In the next phase (2025 forward), establish a separate Advisory Committee for gender equality to oversight the gender pillar.
10	The Theory of Change and Results Frameworks could be refined, and a light touch revision is warranted.	Undertake a collaborative review and light touch revision of the Theory of Change.
11	Funding of outcomes harvesting of Significant Policy Changes and other significant outcomes over the lifetime of the investment, and selective case studies that capture and detail successes (and sometimes failures) would be helpful for DFAT, GoI, and the Bank.	Fund retrospective harvesting of Significant Policy Change and other ABIP outcomes.
12	A stronger narrative about how ABIP is contributing to Bank lending would assist DFAT to put activities into context and demonstrate the relevance of the investment.	Enhance the narrative on ABIP contribution to lending.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 BACKGROUND

The Australia-World Bank Indonesia Partnership (ABIP) is a five-year (5 February 2020 to 31 December 2024), AUD30 million investment initiated as a single-donor programmatic trust fund with the World Bank in Indonesia. It was established to build on and strengthen collaboration between the World Bank (the Bank), the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT), and Government of Indonesia (GoI), avoid fragmentation, ensure alignment and complementarity with other DFAT investments, increase flexibility of programming across themes and deliver operational efficiencies.

ABIP aims to support GoI efforts to increase inclusive economic growth. It works across the following three priority themes, with a cross-cutting focus of gender equality:

- Accelerating human capital development: focused on education quality and better nutrition outcomes promoting more and better jobs and a strengthened social protection system.
- Improving economic governance and mobility: focused on economic governance including evidence-based policy making, better government spending and improved revenue collection.
- Building more and better infrastructure: focused on connectivity, energy, local infrastructure, and infrastructure finance.

Table 1 below outlines the three ABIP Pillar themes and the areas of cooperation under each pillar. ABIP is designed to be flexible, and the three priority themes can be revised to ensure that the program remains relevant and adaptive to changing priorities for GoI and the partnership.

Table 2: ABIP Pillars (development themes) and areas of cooperation

Theme 1: Accelerating Human Capital Development	Theme 2: Improving Economic Governance and Mobility	Theme 3: Building more and better Infrastructure
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accelerating Stunting Prevention • Increasing the Quality of Health, Education and Learning • Supporting Reform in Jobs and Skills • Strengthening Indonesia’s Social Protection System • Promoting Equity and Inclusion • Addressing Gender Gaps 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Macroeconomic Management and Structural Reforms • Expenditure Policy • Revenue Policy • Promoting Poverty Reduction, Inclusion, and Economic Mobility • Gender and Growth 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improving Indonesia’s Connectivity • Supporting Energy Sector Reforms • Strengthening Local Infrastructure Services • Increasing Finance for Infrastructure • Mainstreaming Climate Change and Disaster Resilience • Mainstreaming Gender Equality in Infrastructure

Australian development programs in Indonesia that have complementarity or links with ABIP activities include MAHKOTA, PRISMA, KOMPAK (now SKALA), KIAT, PROSPERA, INOVASI, and INKLUSI (See table of Acronyms). Additionally, DFAT’s regional programs (e.g., Southeast Asia Partnerships for Infrastructure), and the Bank’s other programs (e.g., Global Infrastructure Facility) and loans to GoI provide additional collaboration avenues for ABIP.

1.2 REVIEW PURPOSE

The agreement between Australia and the Bank stipulates an Independent Mid-Term Review (IMTR) of ABIP be conducted after two years of implementation. This review assesses whether ABIP is achieving what is intended and provides recommendations to inform ABIP's implementation and its future direction, including the potential to extend beyond 2024.

1.3 REVIEW SCOPE

This IMTR assesses whether ABIP is achieving the expected efficiency, collaboration, and coordination gains from consolidating multiple trust funds into a single arrangement. It assesses whether the partnership is progressing towards its intended outcomes, including whether it is effectively contributing to policy influence. The IMTR examines ABIP's progress on promoting gender equality and establishing an effective Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning (MEL) system, two areas that DFAT has emphasised as being important to ABIP's performance. Finally, it makes recommendations to strengthen implementation and management into the next phase (2025 forward).

The main components of the review include:

- Test the relevance, effectiveness, and efficiency of the modality (single donor, country trust fund), including whether it is:
 - Meeting partners' expectations (DFAT, World Bank and Gol).
 - Working to strengthen collaboration (DFAT, World Bank and Gol), avoid fragmentation, ensure alignment and complementarity with DFAT bilateral and regional programs, and increase flexibility of programming across themes.
 - Remaining relevant and flexible to shifting priorities.
- Assess program performance
 - Delivery of intermediate outcomes, progress towards end outcomes.
 - Activities' strategic coherence.
 - Relevance to Gol and sustainability for Gol.
- Assessing ABIP performance on gender equality, including achievements and future opportunities for ABIP to broaden the mainstreaming of gender equality to include disability and social inclusion.
- Test the relevance and effectiveness of ABIP's MEL to adequately report and measure performance, and triangulate results, including:
 - Relevance and effectiveness of Theory of Change.
 - Effectiveness of Results Framework.

1.4 REVIEW TEAM

The IMTR team included a Team Leader, a Development Specialist, and Gender Equality, Disability and Social Inclusion (GEDSI) Specialist. See Annex 1 for Review Team members and roles.

1.5 REVIEW METHODOLOGY

The IMTR Terms of Reference proposed five Key Review Questions (KRQs), and a range of sub-questions.

The Review team further elaborated on these questions to tease out lines of enquiry based on a review of relevant literature and early consultations. Key review questions are shown in Annex 2.

The team gathered information on the KRQs from relevant literature. The review team assessed the ABIP Concept Note, Investment Design Summary, Administrative Agreement, Operations Manual, World Bank Gender Strategy, ABIP Annual Work Plans, activity proposals, Annual Reports and Semi-Annual Updates, Governance committee meetings minutes and MEL documents. See Annex 3 for the list of documents and literature reviewed for this IMTR.

Key informant interviews and focus group discussions were conducted. The approach to key informant selection was purposive, taking advice from DFAT and World Bank teams, with the selection of key stakeholders for consultations being based on roles and perspectives on the program. Interlocutors included individuals from DFAT, the World Bank, Gol, and relevant Australian funded bilateral programs. Given the large number of sectors covered by the trust fund, the review team took the opportunity to group some participants together in focus group discussions. See Annex 4 for list of stakeholders consulted.

Given the breadth of sectors covered in the program, and the many competing demands on senior Gol stakeholder time, the Review team met with a limited range of stakeholders from the Ministry of Finance. Further, the Review team had limited consultation with representatives from Gol line Ministries. The team did not meet with anyone from the Ministry of Social Affairs, Ministry of Manpower or Ministry of Environment and Forestry. The team did meet with stakeholders covering these portfolios from within the Ministry of National Development Planning (Bappenas). The review team did not meet with representatives of DFAT's regional investments.

Meetings with relevant agencies and individuals were conducted in person in Jakarta (10-18 October), and consultations continued online / virtually up until 7 November. A shared semi-structured interview protocol was used, based on the KRQs. The Review Team also participated in a Care Economy event in Jakarta, and virtually in ABIP-led coordination events on gender and on social protection and jobs.

An Aide Memoire was presented to DFAT and World Bank teams, including the IMTR Reference Group, on 20 October. This provided an opportunity for the Review team to verify key messages heard by the team during consultations, and present initial findings and recommendations for discussion and clarification. A final Aide Memoire was submitted to the Australian Embassy on 30 October.

The Review follows DFAT guidelines and standards for monitoring and evaluation. The Review team has utilised inductive content analysis as the primary data analysis method. A data gathering matrix using the KRQs as a framework was developed, and emerging themes were tracked against KRQs throughout the literature review and consultations. Data gaps were identified, leading to further key informant interviews and document review. Data accuracy has been ensured through follow up queries and triangulation with other relevant sources to corroborate findings, address gaps and explore key issues in more detail.

2. REVIEW FINDINGS

The IMTR acknowledges that ABIP was initiated just as the COVID-19 pandemic was starting to take hold in 2020, and that this has impacted the management of the trust fund on both sides, as well as the implementation of activities. The pandemic has contributed to increased workloads for all partners, and travel and other restrictions impacted access and continuity of key personnel.

ABIP was designed around key relationships being developed and maintained through face-to-face interaction. Relationship building, engagement and influence have therefore been hampered to some extent by COVID-19 related restrictions and the program is yet to fully leverage all the coordination, relationships, and informal exchanges that ABIP can and should deliver.

On the DFAT side, there have been five Australian Embassy unit managers for ABIP since the design phase, although consistency of locally engaged Embassy staff has helped to maintain corporate knowledge and momentum. DFAT's Minister-Counsellor Governance and Human Development branch, having oversight

responsibility of ABIP, was involved with this program from concept to design/implementation, and this review, providing corporate knowledge and continuity of management, on the DFAT side, alongside locally engaged staff. This has been an essential component where there has been a complete turnover of international staff leading on ABIP work in both the Bank and DFAT, within the first 18 months of the program's commencement. On the Bank side, cautious corporate policy meant that key technical advisers and team members have only recently mobilised back to Jakarta and allowed to meet face-to-face. GoI has been appropriately preoccupied with responding to the health and economic impacts of the pandemic and has found it understandably challenging to fully engage (remotely) in ABIP.

2.1 MODALITY – RELEVANCE, INFLUENCE & EFFICIENCY

KRQ 1: To what extent is the single donor country trust fund achieving what it was set out to do?

- a) Is the Partnership achieving efficiency, coordination, collaboration, and policy influence gains as designed?*
- b) Is ABIP flexible and responsive to emerging priorities?*

2.1.1 Relevance and influence

The World Bank remains a relevant and highly valued partner in Indonesia, and GoI values access to the World Bank through Australian support. The Review team heard from numerous GoI stakeholders that the Bank provides valuable and influential over-the-horizon and just-in-time research and analytics, credible and authoritative technical assistance, and policy advice, and as a knowledge broker, supports GoI access to globally recognised expertise, networks, and knowledge exchange. GoI interlocutors valued the role of the Bank as a neutral actor with the profile to convene development partners and others to foster collaboration on shared issues. Some examples of ABIP-funded activities that are considered highly relevant and influential by GoI stakeholders, and responsive to needs include:

- **Analysis and technical assistance** relating to the labour market, skills and Technical and Vocational Training, linked to a USD 150 million loan currently under development to support the transformation of the labour market information and skills system (Bappenas)
- **Analysis and technical assistance** relating to the learning recovery and improvement through teacher and teaching materials development, and learning assessment improvement for primary and secondary Madrasah education linked to a USD 250 million loan (Ministry of Religious Affairs)
- **Technical assistance**, including drafting of regulations, for land value capture and State-Owned Enterprise asset recycling schemes (Coordinating Ministry for Economic Affairs)
- **Analysis** relating to women's workforce participation and the care economy (Bappenas)
- **High-frequency surveys** on the impacts of COVID-19 on poverty, used to brief senior policy makers (National Team for the Acceleration of Poverty Reduction - TNP2K).
- **Technical workshops** for example, on climate change modelling, and budget and economic policy 'Bootcamps', especially for junior staff (Fiscal Policy Office).

At the same time, **ABIP as a modality is influential with the Bank.** It is highly valued by Bank teams, all of whom noted that ABIP provided them with the support and flexibility to undertake important work that would not otherwise be funded through internal operational funding or development financing (loans). By funding this work, ABIP also supports Bank teams to build relationships and engage with GoI more broadly, convening activities, and other outcomes that support the relevance, responsiveness, and influence of World Bank work in Indonesia. World Bank teams acknowledged the value of being able to draw on DFAT and Australian programs teams to expand their areas of operations and access GoI stakeholders, for example on the Mangroves for Coastal Resilience program.

Bank teams noted that the **ABIP modality provided the flexibility for them to be nimble and responsive**. Whereas previous Australian funds into single trust funds could not be reallocated across trust funds, there is flexibility under ABIP to move money across pillars, and to reallocate resources to emerging priorities or away from areas where work has stalled. The Steering Committee can receive and approve out-of-session activity proposals, as was done for the additional gender work and in re-orienting village work for COVID-19 via an exchange of emails. Similarly, the scope and timing of agreed deliverables have been renegotiated and approved out-of-session and via email approvals.

The **consolidation of trust funds has enhanced visibility of the breadth of DFAT's work in Indonesia for Bank staff** as their activity proposals are assessed and discussed across the entire portfolio, tracked in a joint workplan, and reported on in a single reporting process. This is in stark contrast to the previous, siloed trust fund arrangements where there were few mechanisms or incentives for Bank teams working on one Australian funded trust fund to engage with other Australian funded Trust Fund work.

DFAT teams value what ABIP and the Bank delivers for Australia in Indonesia. DFAT and Australian program teams draw on useful information, analytics, and technical expertise, including the six-monthly Indonesia Economic Prospects (IEP) publication, research on labour reform, land registration, gender analytics, and so on. DFAT teams noted that Bank knowledge products are influential because the Bank brand lends gravitas and authority. These pieces generate and contribute to priority policy discussions, for example, on tax and subsidy reform, the care economy, and carbon markets. DFAT and program teams value influential convening activities funded through ABIP.

DFAT values the Bank's ability to do sensitive and political policy work. It was noted that the neutrality of the Bank usefully enables politically sensitive policy dialogue to occur without risk to Australia's relationships with GoI counterparts, such as in the highly contentious labour market reform agenda, which culminated in the Indonesian House of Representative ratification of the Jobs Creation Bill (widely known as the "Omnibus Law") on 5 October 2020, after approximately eight months of deliberation. DFAT values the Bank's ability to support policy reform in areas like trade liberalisation where bilateral engagement by Australia may be perceived as self-interest.

DFAT teams noted that the **ABIP investment both complemented and supplemented Australia's bilateral development assistance**. ABIP contributes additional areas of expertise such as attracting private sector investment in infrastructure, crypto currency, and land reform. DFAT teams valued the depth of Bank engagement with the Ministry of Finance (MoF). The global and macro reform work of the World Bank frames and is sometimes informed by the work of Australian bilateral programs, which often includes work at the sub-national level, and with socially excluded populations on civil society led and low priority agendas for the Bank. The work of the Bank sometimes supports DFAT to triangulate what they are hearing through bilateral programs.

Both the Bank and DFAT acknowledge that **ABIP provides a useful 'hook' for World Bank lending activities**. The Bank's lending operations are relevant to some (although not all) ABIP activities in several ways. ABIP-funded analytical work contributes to agenda setting and discussion with GoI that may eventually contribute to loan preparation. Some ABIP-funded technical assistance contributes to loan implementation. Conversely, Bank lending operations can be seen as useful in incentivising significant policy reform that complements other DFAT investments, for example, on tax reform. ABIP's ability to contribute to and leverage Bank lending operations is part of what makes it relevant and justifies Australia's continued funding of the Partnership.

Interestingly, **ABIP has raised the profile of the World Bank across the Embassy**. There is increased engagement with the Bank from teams that focus primarily on non-ODA functions. ABIP has highlighted the significant potential of working with an influential multilateral to prosecute a shared agenda of reforms that are of strategic priority to Australia. An example of this is engagement of the Australian Embassy's Economic and Trade team in advocating for the upcoming IEP to address the issue of protectionism and trade liberalisation.

While for the most part ABIP is funding relevant work, it is operating in a contested policy environment and there were instances where **Gol stakeholders said that World Bank input had been less useful, or where policy makers disagreed with analysis presented**. The review met with Gol stakeholders who were critical of technical advice for not being aligned with Gol policy, or for being duplicative of other work. In these cases, Gol respondents felt they had sufficient internal capacity to form their own views and contest World Bank advice. Reflecting differing views on whether and how Indonesia should borrow to achieve development objectives, loan operations in fields linked with ABIP activities had also been contested. Some Gol stakeholders questioned whether disbursement-linked indicators do drive policy and program change as intended, and whether lending is structured in a way that provides adequate resourcing and capacity for line ministries to implement programs effectively.

As with all governments, when working in the policy space, interactions can be inherently complex and contested, but this does not mean the advice is necessarily rendered as irrelevant. This underscores the complexity of working within the Indonesian government, which to some extent is to be expected. Nevertheless, it is useful for both DFAT and World Bank staff to understand where the World Bank is gaining traction with government (and where it isn't) to assess the ongoing relevance of some ABIP activities, reflect on alternate approaches and make course corrections if necessary. It highlights the need for triangulation of relevance and priorities with other sources, including through routine engagement with Gol.

The consolidation of multiple single Trust Funds into one partnership through ABIP has elevated the strategic nature of the Australia-World Bank partnership. The ABIP modality provides Australia with several key mechanisms to maximise and influence strategic alignment. Firstly, development priorities have been agreed through the pillar structure, and alignment of ABIP activities with these is reinforced through the activity selection criteria.¹ Access to ABIP funds is highly competitive internally in the Bank, with almost half of all activities proposed being dropped before they get to DFAT. As a result of this process, DFAT, to date, has not had to reject activity proposals, although in some cases it has provided substantial feedback on proposals with support conditional on changes. The World Bank Country Director and DFAT Deputy Head of Mission agreed that the Steering Committee allows for strategic dialogue that goes beyond activity planning and approvals.

Australia and the Bank are collaborating in areas that are priority for Australia, Indonesia and the Bank, and competition for ABIP resources within the Bank are ensuring tight alignment. For example, DFAT's focus and dedicated funding for gender has been effective in elevating gender-specific and gender mainstreaming across the Bank's work (see Section 2.3 for more details). ABIP funds have enabled and incentivised the Bank to move into new areas of work that reflect Australia's priorities, such as trade and protectionism.

However, the findings showed mixed responses from Gol on whether Australia's support to Gol through ABIP was well understood. In some ways, the ABIP investment does provide enhanced visibility for Australia in Indonesia. For example, on the one hand, a Communications Strategy is included in the Operations Manual, and Australian Government branding is proportionate and appropriately utilised by the World Bank. The IEP and other publications, presentations and events prominently feature the Australian Government Crest (logo) to promote Australia's contribution. On the other hand, some Gol partners were clear that ABIP related work was funded by Australia, the Review team could not be sure that Gol partners always knew when World Bank support was Australian funded. Where topics are sensitive this may well be desirable; in others, there may be room to better acknowledge DFAT funding of technical assistance and other work. There is also room to further enhance DFAT access to visiting global experts funded via ABIP where appropriate. As discussed in Section 2.1.3, improving Gol engagement in ABIP's formal governance arrangements may help to ensure that stakeholders are more aware of

¹ These are outlined in the ABIP Operations Manual (page 2)

Australia's contribution. DFAT can also use bilateral engagements with common stakeholders to discuss Australia's support through ABIP.

While the strategic engagement between DFAT and the Bank has been elevated, there is room for further enhancing Australia's influence via ABIP. The activity proposal and selection process remain largely Bank-driven. Regular engagement between DFAT and the Bank is largely around small activities. By way of example, dialogue at Advisory Committee meetings focuses primarily on activities rather than overall strategic priorities and policy dialogue. However, DFAT acknowledges that ABIP is a partnership with a large multilateral institution with an independent mandate and a large footprint (USD 8.4 bn in active loans in Indonesia, of which USD 2.6 bn came online in 2022) and does not want or expect to influence the Bank in the same way that it would an implementing partner.

2.1.2 Efficiency

ABIP set out to replace multiple, siloed trust fund arrangements managed by different teams across DFAT and the World Bank, with a single trust fund arrangement managed by Secretariat teams in each institution. The aim of this consolidation was to improve management efficiency, foster coordination and collaboration between Bank activities and other DFAT investments working in similar sectors, and to ensure that Australia's reduced contribution to the Bank (compared with previous years) remained highly relevant and effective. **The IMTR found that the single trust fund was broadly delivering on these aims.**

Strategic oversight from the World Bank's Country Management Unit (CMU) and senior DFAT staff adds value and ensures that ABIP activities are well aligned with World Bank and Australian priority areas of engagement. Where previously multiple trust funds created funding and management silos, consolidated arrangements allow for the flexible allocation of resources across a range of priorities. The Bank-led activity development process provides senior Bank staff in the CMU with a 'birds eye view' of proposals and allows them to select those deemed to be most 'catalytic'. CMU staff estimated that up to half of all proposals were not prioritised at the Bank country-level selection process, creating useful competition between teams, and ensuring ABIP funds were prioritised for the most relevant work. Strategic oversight and engagement, from senior DFAT staff, have ensured that Australian priorities (for example relating to gender equality) are meaningfully considered and resourced, and any management issues (for example relating to monitoring and evaluation) can be raised proportionately.

As set out in detail below, the IMTR finds that the consolidation of trust funds has had mostly positive effects on improved coordination between World Bank and DFAT activities, but that that the degree to which it has facilitated deeper collaboration or upstream policy engagement is mixed. This is partly a by-product of the consolidated structure, as it means fewer staff have management responsibilities towards the trust fund, so that incentives to meet and engage may be diminished. It is important to note here that higher-order policy engagement or collaboration does not always have to be the goal; it can be resource-intensive and is enabled or inhibited by a range of factors beyond the trust fund itself, including whether staff have the technical capability or time to engage, competing priorities, and the challenges of meeting remotely, especially during COVID-19. Nevertheless, as the review notes below, where collaboration and 'upstream' policy engagement is occurring, it can be particularly effective in working towards mutual objectives, and this should be encouraged and enabled where possible.

Broadly, the consolidation of trust funds appears to have been effective at improving coordination between Bank and DFAT teams, along with other Australian-funded investments. The ABIP work planning process ensures DFAT has visibility of Bank activities and provides meaningful opportunities for DFAT, with support from experts in bilateral programs, to engage with proposals and provide feedback. For example, in the last Activity consultation process, DFAT provided substantial feedback to 16 proposals, which the World Bank was able to take on board. This process also facilitates, and at minimum, can ensure coordination with other investments. This often includes seeking technical review of proposals from bilateral programs, where relevant subject-matter expertise resides. Reviewers noted a concerted and

largely productive effort to 'deconflict' and establish complementary divisions of labour between Bank and bilateral program activities. One example is the clear delineation between Bank and KIAT support to different aspects of Gol's asset recycling (land value capture/limited concession schemes) regulations and pilots, where Gol, DFAT and Bank teams all acknowledge the respective strengths and value of the different pieces of work.

In some cases, consolidated arrangements also appear to have allowed for greater collaboration and policy dialogue. Some respondents from both DFAT and the World Bank reported that centralised trust fund management and reporting by the ABIP Secretariats freed sector teams up to engage more in policy dialogue with their World Bank or DFAT counterparts. The relationship between teams and programs working on economic governance provides a case in point, enabling some collaboration between Prospera and Bank teams around the women's labour force participation and the care economy agenda. The review also heard of facilitated discussions on tax reform between the World Bank and Prospera with the Asian Development Bank (noting that the relevant ADB work is not funded by Australia). Regular meetings are occurring between Embassy and other Australian officials (such as Treasury and Australian Tax Office representatives), and senior Bank and bilateral program staff to discuss a range of issues, including more sensitive topics like trade policy. World Bank and bilateral program staff valued the key role DFAT staff played in establishing coordination, both through formal coordination meetings, as well as around specific issues.

In some instances, coordination and collaboration is also occurring around lending operations, where DFAT and bilateral programs have an interest both because ABIP (or its precursor trust funds) are funding relevant activities, or because other Australian-funded investments are working in the same policy spaces. There can be contestation or opportunities for learning between Bank and other DFAT-funded programs around needs, design and political economy of loans as they link to policy change or institutional reform. Interestingly, the review team heard of two Australian bilateral programs that had effectively used the introduction of World Bank lending operations as a pseudo-exit strategy from specific areas of work. In the case of KOMPAK, the program team had explicitly sought to have lessons learned from pilots relating to implementation of Indonesia's Village Fund reflected and embedded in loan design, although the extent to which this was successful is not clear. In the case of INOVASI, the program decided to wind up work on teacher quality with the Ministry of Religious Affairs once a loan covering similar topics was in place, in line with the broader trend towards establishing clear divisions of labour.

In some cases, however, the effective 'deconflicting' of areas of work seemed to mean that DFAT (and bilateral program) and Bank staff had fewer reasons to meet or explore collaboration. One DFAT activity manager pointed out that in the absence of management responsibilities or an overlapping workplan with the Bank, it was not clear whether they were expected to meet regularly with their Bank counterparts, and there were few incentives to do so. This may also have the effect that DFAT managers are not regularly checking in with common Gol counterparts about Bank activities working in similar sectors. Periodic coordination meetings convened by the DFAT and World Bank secretariats, organised around key themes, play an important role where coordination is not otherwise routine.

The variation in the degree of coordination and collaboration between DFAT and Bank sector teams and bilateral programs is to be expected given the breadth of ABIP and the number of people and sectors involved. Pragmatic decisions about where to invest finite time and staff resources, especially considering the resourcing and mobility challenges brought about by COVID-19, are reasonable. Nevertheless, the Review team notes that there may be trade-offs in some case between the efficiency and coherence gains of having fewer trust fund managers and less need to interact with counterparts, with opportunities for enhanced collaboration that leverages respective strengths.

The effectiveness of Secretariat teams within DFAT and the World Bank has been essential to the performance of ABIP. The single trust fund has created efficiencies by reducing the number of staff actively administering trust funds thereby reducing the transaction level burden. Secretariat staff were widely

praised for the collegiate and effective coordination of activities and reporting within their respective institutions. DFAT sector teams noted the crucial role that the ABIP team play in maximising access to information on ABIP funded activities in their sectors and beyond.

DFAT staff noted some concern that the Bank's ABIP coordinator had recently become a part time-role, while World Bank staff pointed out that the ABIP coordinator's expanded responsibilities within the CMU helped to ensure ABIP's alignment with broader World Bank activities. The review notes this and reiterates the importance of maintaining dedicated staff time to ensure these arrangements remain effective. There was a strong view that openness, willingness to collaborate and patience were key qualities required for success in this role. Reliance on key individuals (especially the Bank ABIP coordinator) creates risks in the case of staff turnover.

2.1.3 Governance

At the partnership management level, **governance has been a challenge for ABIP and has been the subject of much negotiation and discussion between the World Bank and DFAT** from the outset. Generally, including government representatives in program governance arrangements allows for local strategic leadership and accountability of development partners to host governments. Through program governance mechanisms, host country representatives are asked to provide *direction*, or guidance about needs and priorities to ensure relevance and effectiveness. Reporting to government and engaging in dialogue ensures *accountability*, so that senior staff from DFAT, the Bank and Gol alike can be assured that allocations are responding to and meeting those needs. The questions for any investment are, at what levels are direction and accountability required (for example around high-level priorities versus activity implementation), and what mechanisms will best achieve them?

The **breadth of ABIP's remit and number of sectors it covers means that it touches many parts of Gol**, including multiple deputies in central ministries as well as line ministries. As in any country, Gol is not uniform, and priorities and ways of working, especially at activity level, may be contested between different parts of Gol. Finding ways to engage many Gol stakeholders efficiently, in ABIP governance arrangements, is difficult (or near impossible). While certain aspects of governance are working well, there are no easy solutions to meeting ABIP governance needs.

ABIP has sought to manage this complexity through the establishment of three mechanisms:

- A **Steering Committee** co-chaired by the World Bank Country Director and Australia's Deputy Head of Mission. The role of the Steering Committee is to "provide strategic oversight to ABIP and approve its work program". The Steering Committee meets annually to provide strategic direction and approve funding allocations, review implementation progress, monitor results and evaluate impact. There is no Gol representation in the ABIP Steering Committee.
- An **Advisory Committee** has been established for each of the three pillars, and this includes relevant DFAT, Bank and Gol sector representatives. The role of the Advisory Committees is to "discuss government priorities, review activities and provide input into work planning".
- DFAT and the World Bank have attempted to establish a **Senior Officials Dialogue** between senior members of the MoF and Bappenas. The intention of this is to ensure strategic alignment through high-level dialogue between DFAT, the World Bank, and the two Gol leading interlocutors for ABIP programs. The Senior Officials Dialogue is not a part of ABIP's formal governance arrangements and is rather an informal meeting that DFAT and the Bank have agreed to convene.

Steering Committee

The Steering Committee succeeds as a forum for strategic dialogue and management discussion between Australia and the Bank. It helps to maximise Australia's influence with a credible and influential multilateral institution. Both DFAT's Deputy Head of Mission and the World Bank's Country Director agreed that

dialogue was a useful mechanism for discussing the partnership and was particularly useful for forward-looking discussion of emerging priorities. The Steering Committee represents an efficient mechanism for the approval of the annual workplan, as well as flexible, out-of-session approvals for emerging priorities.

The review heard from Gol that there was dissatisfaction with this element of ABIP governance. The Senior Officials Dialogue was partially envisaged as a remedy to addressing this concern, but to date it has been postponed on successive occasions.

Advisory Committees

Gol attendance at ABIP Advisory Committee meetings has changed over time, and there were mixed views of their effectiveness.² In 2020 and 2021, Advisory Committee attendance was focused on central agencies including MoF, Bappenas, and the relevant Coordinating Ministries for each Pillar. In 2022, the Human Capital and Infrastructure Advisory Committees were expanded to include representatives from line ministries. The Review team heard differing views on the merits of this approach.

There was a general view from both DFAT and Bank staff that **attendance had been increasingly delegated to junior staff less able to speak with authority about priorities and activities.** By way of example, the seniority of attendance has notably declined in the Human Capital Pillar over time, with neither Deputy Ministers (Echelon 1s) or Directors (Echelon 2s) represented at the 2022 Advisory Committee meeting. Given COVID-19 restrictions, these meetings have all been virtual, and attendance lists have grown long, including a lot of junior staff. Many Gol stakeholders interviewed for this review either had not or were not sure whether they had participated at the relevant Advisory Committee meetings.

In general, the review recognises that it has been difficult to meet effectively through the life of ABIP, with COVID-19 related institutional rules limiting in-person gatherings, and Indonesia's hosting of the G20 occupying Gol attention in 2022. Advisory Committees should be able to be conducted in person for the first time in 2023, and this may provide an opportunity to reinvigorate this mechanism.

Senior Officials Dialogue

As noted, DFAT has attempted to convene an informal Senior Officials Dialogue on three occasions, but none have gone ahead. The difficulty of aligning the schedules of very senior Gol staff from different Ministries, with the Bank and DFAT representation, was given as the explanation for this inability to convene. Comments from one Gol agency, also highlighted the challenges for the ABIP Secretariats in finding the correct Gol representative and level to invite. In reality, the level of desired representation may not be proportionate to the investment.

Working-level engagement

As outlined above, the Review team found ample examples where the Bank and Gol were engaging effectively at working level, and Gol reported that they had positive, regular, and responsive engagement with World Bank staff in most instances. This met the needs of Gol stakeholders, and they did not feel the need to provide more oversight or direction of World Bank work. However, there were instances where the Review team heard from some Gol stakeholders that World Bank staff needed to consult more before coming to government with formed proposals for activities. The lack of early engagement by Bank staff led to proposals and products that are not always aligned with Gol policies and priorities, and indeed were sometimes duplicative and / or at odds with Gol policy and regulations needs.

2.1.4 Opportunities – modality (relevance, influence, and efficiency)

By and large ABIP is working well, and the modality has elevated strategic engagement, ensured relevance and influence, and driven efficiencies in the partnership. There are opportunities to further enhance the

² Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes and attendance records were reviewed for all three pillars in 2020, 2021 and 2022 for this section.

relevance, influence, and efficiency of the Australia-World Bank partnership in Indonesia, through building on these gains and taking advantage of the lifting of many COVID-19 related restrictions.

A stronger, internal, Australian position on development financing in Indonesia

The World Bank remains a valued source of development financing for Gol, and as a matter of policy, Australia values the Bank's capacity to provide that financing as a responsible global lender.³ DFAT could pursue a deeper understanding and more coherent vision for development financing in Indonesia.

Building on Canberra's Development Financing Review, Post may seek to develop a more coherent strategic vision for Australia's contribution to development financing in Indonesia through global and local engagement with multilateral development banks, in discussion with Gol. Recognising that decision-making around loans is between the Bank and Gol, with a coherent strategic vision around the role of borrowing and lending in Indonesia more broadly, there is a potential role for ABIP to more intentionally fund activities that support loan preparation and implementation. By way of example, climate change financing came up as one area in consultations, given increased priority and attention from the new Australian Government.

There is scope for DFAT to engage more in strategic discussions with the World Bank, Gol and others regarding its priorities for supporting policy and institutional reform through development financing. This could be done in several ways, building on the examples of effective policy dialogue and coordination highlighted in this review. These include the Steering Committee, regular 'catch-ups' between World Bank and DFAT sector teams, along with sector experts working in aligned bilateral programs. Obviously, continuous engagement with Gol by all parties is essential.

The Review Team recognises that this agenda can be sensitive and contested within Gol, and that it is neither appropriate nor desirable for Australia to play a role in loan negotiation. Nevertheless, DFAT investments can inform and enhance Gol engagement on lending. Australia can engage in high level conversation in an informed way with the Bank on the potential pipeline of lending.

More DFAT teams to be forward leaning in their engagement with the Bank

Where effective policy dialogue and collaboration occurs, it can support the achievement of ABIP Intermediate and End outcomes and mutual objectives more broadly, as in the cases of Land Value Capture, tax harmonisation, the Jobs Omnibus, and others. There is a need to ensure this kind of engagement is enabled and supported as much as possible, and both incentivised and supported, through periodic coordination led by the Secretariat team. Variation in the way DFAT and World Bank teams is to be expected, but opportunities to enhance engagement between DFAT and Bank teams should be pursued as they arise.

Currently, ABIP activity proposals are developed internally within the Bank, quality assured and screened, and then presented to DFAT teams for comment and review. This has worked well to date, and where DFAT and Australian program teams are actively engaged, Australia is influencing the agenda of Bank work before it is well developed. This sort of informal influence of World Bank work under ABIP could be enhanced where appropriate and relevant.

World Bank and DFAT Secretariats could encourage greater upstream policy dialogue and program collaboration by:

- Maintaining current, periodic coordination meetings between DFAT and World Bank sector teams, where this coordination is not otherwise routine.
- Facilitating in-person meetings and catch-ups, especially when World Bank staff are visiting from other locations.

³ This is well articulated in the ABIP Investment Design Summary

- Provide briefings on the World Bank in Indonesia and ABIP to new DFAT staff, to build better understanding of the potential of the partnership.
- Facilitate opportunities for internal peer learning within DFAT and World Bank teams, about how to engage with their opposite counterparts.
- DFAT – particularly the Embassy’s Economic and Trade team and relevant Australian trade teams in Canberra and Geneva - hosting policy dialogue events to discuss areas of strategic alignment
- Where there is capacity (either in DFAT or via bilateral program teams) and substantial alignment and overlap in sectors and greater collaboration could add value, DFAT could consider incentivising DFAT and/or bilateral program staff to prioritise more regular engagement with World Bank counterparts by including it in DFAT staff performance agreements)
- Secondment of staff into the World Bank if appropriate

This would require:

- More DFAT teams to have a better understanding of the potential of working with the World Bank and ABIP.
- Those teams with capacity (either in DFAT or via bilateral program teams) to engage more with relevant Bank teams to support activities that align with Australia’s interests.

This opportunity must be caveated with the acknowledgement that the World Bank is a substantial (USD 8.4 bn), independent institution with its own mandate in Indonesia, not an implementing partner. But savvy DFAT officers can and do nudge Bank activity in significant portfolios. There is increased opportunity for DFAT teams to learn from each other on how to engage the Bank, and for DFAT staff to receive induction and updates on the Bank in Indonesia, and ABIP. Now that COVID-19 restrictions are easing, topical informal gatherings could be arranged between relevant DFAT and Bank teams.

Expanded role for the DFAT ABIP Secretariat

Strong ABIP Secretariat functions have been created and could now be stepped up to maximise partnerships. In addition to its role coordinating activities across the Embassy, ensuring that the DFAT ABIP team has a role in selected technical and policy areas, and a means for meaningful direct engagement with some Gol counterparts (not duplicating existing sector teams relationships) will add value to DFAT’s management of the partnership. Potential policy areas of focus for the DFAT ABIP Secretariat include Australia’s strategic vision for development financing, poverty and equity, and the gender for growth work. Allocating the DFAT Secretariat team defined policy areas of work could provide the Secretariat more direct Gol counterparts and engagement with Bappenas on ABIP coordination. This additional workload would require appropriate resourcing.

Reconsider governance arrangements

Acknowledging the complexity of governance mechanisms for an investment like ABIP, there is opportunity for DFAT and the Bank to re-engage Gol representatives on the right mechanism and level for effective engagement of appropriately senior Gol officials on ABIP. This should include clear consideration of where ABIP needs Gol engagement for the purposes of hearing *direction* – guidance from government about its needs and priorities – as well as *accountability* for DFAT as the donor. Formal governance mechanisms also provide an important mechanism for Australia to make its support for activities and reforms visible to Gol.

This could mean a focus on revitalising **Advisory Committees** to ensuring attendance by relevant Deputy Minister-level staff in the central agencies for each Pillar, including Bappenas. This may require renewed representation from DFAT as well as Bank staff and discussion of how to make the Advisory Committees more relevant to government stakeholders, for example by appointing Gol co-chairs of the committees. DFAT and the World Bank should target attendance to ensure meetings are effective and should discuss the relative value of including line ministries in Advisory Committee meetings.

One option might be to **consider ‘rebranding’ of governance arrangements**, so that Advisory Committees are better understood as effectively being the main governance forum for each of the three ABIP pillars. If they were dubbed “Steering Committees” they would be understood by Bappenas and others in Gol as an important priority setting and policy dialogue forum, although they may not have official activity approval powers. The current Steering Committee could then be renamed a “Partnership Board” or something similar that does not have the same connotation as a Steering Committee does with Bappenas.

Noting that the Senior Officials Dialogue has yet to be convened, there is opportunity to reconsider this mechanism. If dialogue is desired for either steering or accountability purposes, it could otherwise be achieved through bilateral discussion between senior DFAT and Gol officials.

Within DFAT, relationships with relevant government stakeholders for ABIP are primarily held by bilateral program managers and not by DFAT’s ABIP Secretariat, a side-effect of separating trust fund management from bilateral program management. Given the need to resolve governance challenges, the DFAT ABIP Secretariat team may need to (re)develop individual working relationships with key Gol counterparts, working either with World Bank or bilateral program colleagues.

2.2 EFFECTIVENESS AND SUSTAINABILITY

KRQ 3: To what extent is the program tracking towards its Outcomes?

a) Will Intermediate Outcomes and End Outcomes be achieved by December 2024?

The ABIP Theory of Change describes intended impact, End Outcomes (EO), Intermediate Outcomes (IO) and modalities. ABIP’s broad goal is to support Gol efforts to increase inclusive economic growth, including through the promotion of gender equality, by:

- i. accelerating human capital development
- ii. improving economic governance and mobility, and
- iii. building more and better infrastructure.

There is clear evidence that ABIP is tracking towards achieving Intermediate Outcomes. The Review team heard of numerous instances where **high quality analysis and technical assistance services has informed government partners (IO1)**. As noted, Gol stakeholders valued the over-the-horizon, just-in-time, and cutting-edge research, analysis, and technical assistance of the World Bank. This includes such things as the considerable support (80+ advisers from around the globe) working to support the drafting of the Job Creation Omnibus law. DFAT sector and bilateral program teams also acknowledged the niche skills and quality products funded through ABIP. As noted elsewhere, some World Bank analysis and assistance is contested and / or seen as less relevant in a few instances.

The Review team heard how **findings are shared and discussed with broader groups of stakeholders (IO2)**, and where the Bank has convened influential stakeholders on key reform issues. As mentioned, relevant examples include the work on tax reform as well as work on women’s labour force participation and the care economy, which cuts across numerous agencies and institutions in Gol, as well as development partner investments and activities.

The quality analysis and technical assistance provided under ABIP are enhanced by **opportunities to share findings and recommendations with top policy makers (IO3)**. Key examples include the Minister for Finance, the Office of the Vice President via TNP2K, and the Deputy Minister at the Coordinating Ministry for Economic Affairs. Over-the-horizon analytics were noted as particularly innovative and influential for medium term policy setting across multiple agencies. DFAT staff noted the value of analytical work and sensitive policy dialogue relating to fertiliser subsidy reform, along with high profile events with senior figures on women’s labour force participation. The Bank acknowledged the usefulness of leveraging

Australia's broad and deep engagement across Gol in some sectors, and that the partnership helped them to access top policy makers in some instances.

ABIP funded activities contribute to the development and / or improvements of **Gol design and financing of programs and projects to support reform agenda (IO4)**, including via World Bank loans, as described in some detail in Section 2.1.1 above. Bank teams noted that they use ABIP funds to undertake preparatory work for lending operations, as well as analytics, pilots, and technical assistance to enhance lending operations. As mentioned previously, DFAT sector teams and bilateral programs note that they benefit from the leverage that World Bank loans bring to particular reform agenda, with tax and labour market reform being two areas mentioned frequently.

Gol stakeholders described how **staff skills sets are enhanced (IO5)** and **Gol staff perform tasks independently and with better quality (IO6)** as a result of ABIP funded activities. The partnership between Gol and the Bank has evolved, and routine staff training such as in macro and fiscal economic policy and budgeting is no longer undertaken by the Bank. While capacity building and institutional strengthening are mentioned as Modalities in the Theory of Change, skills transfer is most often through niche technical training, and global knowledge exchange in new areas, and in some cases co-creation and collaboration around technical work. Gol staff have gained exposure to and hands-on experience using new skills, which they then adopted as part of their work. Examples include land value capture and labour market skills mapping. As discussed below, ABIP could consider extending this IO to include Gol's ability to effectively outsource and draw on other local capacities (including research institutions and professional services firms), as an appropriate way for government to access necessary expertise and capability.

While there is some evidence that **Gol agencies identify reform areas and agree to undertake reform plans (IO7)**, it is likely that this is more visible on loan operations than ABIP activities. Bappenas were clear that the work on jobs and skills had led to the development of a reform agenda which was being systematically pursued. Similarly, stakeholders at the Coordinating Ministry for Economic Affairs outlined the land value capture agenda of reform that has been planned and is being implemented as a result of World Bank analytics, technical assistance, co-design and piloting.

While **there is evidence that ABIP is tracking towards achieving program end outcomes**, the picture is more mixed than for intermediate outcomes, which is to be expected at the midway point of an investment. Gol stakeholders reported instances where **recommended policy reforms and program solutions are being adopted (EO1)** in areas already described above such as the Omnibus law, tax reform, Land Value Capture. However, as expected, it is more difficult to distinguish ABIP's contribution to these outcomes, especially where the Bank and others have been chipping away at a reform agenda such as the Labour Market reforms for many years, or where multiple partners are supporting the reform such as in the tax agenda.

Gol stakeholders noted that **projects/ programs are implemented (EO2)** as a result of World Bank assistance, although again this is likely more obvious when ABIP catalytic investments are continued through lending operations. Gol partners provided examples of programs that have been developed in response to policy priorities including on Land Value Capture, urban flood resilience, labour market jobs and skills, tax reform, and so on.

Progress against **EO3 - Gol implements projects/programs more effectively and efficiently** is evidenced in the sorts of progress outlined above under IO5, IO6, and IO7. As with EO2, outcomes in this area are likely more obvious in lending operations. Examples under ABIP include new methodologies being piloted and adopted such as the Labour Market Information System survey, Land Value Capture assessments, and spatial planning.

There is some evidence of progress on **EO4 – Institutional arrangements and functionalities are reformed**. One example is the establishment of the unit that now manages the Labour Market Information System. However, institutional arrangements and functionalities were difficult for the Review team to assess and are likely more obvious under loan operations and over longer time periods.

The ABIP investment is contributing to sustained outcomes. Where capacity building and institutional strengthening is being undertaken, skills and knowledge transfer is the approach expected by GoI and undertaken by the Bank. The emphasis on bringing about change to broader institutions and systems through policy reforms and reforming institutional arrangements and functions remains an appropriate approach to sustainability. Bank lending supports this where loans either fund the establishment of new systems (like the Labour Market Information System) or impose soft conditions linked to disbursements to drive reforms. However, as with all development outcomes, reforms can be quickly reversed when political approaches are altered, such as through changes in ministerial leadership.

Contributing to localisation, the Bank is drawing on locally engaged expertise to lead on work, and local service providers to undertake activities such as data collection, surveys, and environmental assessments. Where skills are scarce and / or cutting edge, global experts are brought in by the Bank to transfer skills through codesigned and collaborative working arrangements. Dependency on World Bank expertise has likely been further reduced with the restrictions imposed in response to COVID-19, with GoI counterparts referring to working more frequently with the Bank via Zoom and WhatsApp.

2.2.1 Opportunities – effectiveness and sustainability

Consider Adopting relevant and useful elements of DFAT’s Performance Assessment Framework guidance for Facilities in the next phase (2025 forward)

It may be useful to draw on DFAT’s Performance Assessment Framework guidance for Facilities in consideration of achieving outcomes for ABIP. As with many Facilities, not every ABIP activity or output is going to add up to an outcome, and it is not necessarily possible to say what the ‘whole’ body of work will add up to across all the streams and pillars in aggregate. It might be more helpful to capture which activities are contributing to significant outcomes and trusting that there are enough activities that do contribute to outcomes. This would allow for considered narrative around contribution (not attribution).

DFAT’s Performance Assessment Framework guidance for Facilities may add some valuable metrics such as those around the quality of the partnership, and governance.

Have a more explicit localisation agenda

Localisation agenda is happening but could be more explicit and deliberate to further entrench sustainability of outcomes. The Bank is using local technical advisers and service providers (lawyers, survey companies, environmental assessors, etc.). ABIP could re-frame some of the language on capacity building to focus on localisation, including the ability of GoI to effectively outsource and draw on other local capacities (including research institutions and professional services firms), as an appropriate way for government to access necessary expertise and capability.

2.3 GENDER EQUALITY, DISABILITY & SOCIAL INCLUSION

KRQ 4: To what extent is ABIP enhancing gender equality in Indonesia through its activities?

a) Do the activities reflect the priorities and approaches of the strategy?

b) Would there be benefits to increasing ABIP’s focus on gender equality, and what could this look like?

GoI stakeholders and World Bank staff noted the value of DFAT’s deep commitment to gender equality, which is reflected in **ABIP’s explicit focus on gender equality and in turn the momentum behind gender in the Bank.** ABIP takes a twin track approach to gender equality, mainstreaming gender across all activities and undertaking specific interventions. Gender specific activities were expanded in 2021 after additional

funding was allocated from ABIP to the Gender Equality for Growth (G4G) work which includes a Bank Gender Engagement and Outreach Strategy.

Placing gender issues front and centre of the ABIP design coincides with greater political commitment and leadership on gender equality in Gol and the Bank. From Gol, there is increased political commitment to closing the gap in female labour force participation (FLFP) to reap economic benefits. The National Medium Term Development Plan sets a target of 55% FLFP by 2024, and the G20 target translates to 58% by 2025.⁴ On the Bank side, key enabling factors are the commitment of the Bank Country Director and Operations Manager to advancing gender equality, the World Bank's Indonesia Country Gender Assessment (2020) which set the direction of travel for Bank work on FLFP, and stronger corporate prioritisation of gender equality.⁵ The force and optics of women leaders in the Australian Embassy, the World Bank, and MoF individually and together driving debate on gender equality is both feeding into Gol momentum, and the responsiveness of the Bank on gender equality.

ABIP's twin-track approach to gender continues to be appropriate. The approach includes (a) standalone gender specific work such as the G4G program, and (b) gender mainstreaming across ABIP activities. DFAT's additional financing of AUD 2.5 million for G4G in 2021 responded to increasing policy space around FLFP and demand for analytics. The G4G Programmatic Advisory Services and Analytics (PASA) and related care economy work funded from the Bank budget and ABIP is contributing to strategic, timely, high-profile analytics and engagement. This includes publication of *Boosting Growth through Women's Empowerment* as part of the IEP (2021) and *The Gendered Impacts of the COVID-19 Pandemic on Indonesia's Labour Market: How Does It Shape the Future of Indonesian Employment and Jobs* (2021). Work on the care economy is a good example of the complementarity of DFAT's bilateral programming and ABIP. In this case, Prospera's advocacy work has helped lay the foundations for engaging and supporting Gol, bringing development partners together to coordinate their response to policy demands, and for the Bank's care economy activities to step into the space.

ABIP's gender mainstreaming strategy is also working. The gender mainstreaming strategy includes:

- i. customised **gender tagging** of activities to ensure gender screening and incorporation of gender across ABIP activities.
- ii. **targets** to ensure that analytical activities have a principal (20%) or significant (30%) gender focus.
- iii. **financing** a resource person to ensure upstream review, support to task teams, and monitoring of the treatment of gender throughout ABIP activities.

The provision of specialist gender resources was noted by Bank staff as particularly important. Previously, sector teams were required to address gender but not necessarily resourced to do so. The enabling environment described above and the systematic approach to threading gender into the mechanics of how ABIP operates has raised the bar on how gender is considered across the three ABIP pillars. Gender has been mainstreamed into a wide range of activities across the three pillars and contributed to achievement of intermediate outcomes. For example, under the human capital development pillar ABIP supports work with Technical and Vocational Education and Training schools to attract women to male-dominated fields and help women transition from school to work, and support to the Ministry of Social Affairs on the development of a Family Development Session module on life skills training and health and nutrition information for Program Keluarga Harapan women beneficiaries. In the economic governance pillar, the new tobacco excise model developed under the Strengthening Fiscal Policy activity included sex disaggregated incidence of smoking and separate modelling of the impact of the excise on women and men. Economic bootcamps for Fiscal Policy Office tabled a seminar on 'gender for development: closing the gap to boost growth'. In the infrastructure pillar, a gender equality and social inclusion study was undertaken to inform the design of an urban flood resilience investment.

⁴ World Bank estimates this could add \$62 billion to the economy and increase annual economic growth by 0.7 percentage points.

⁵ World Bank, Indonesia Country Gender Assessment. Investing in Opportunities for Women (2020). The new World Bank Gender Strategy is to be launched late 2022 and country consultations in Indonesia are planned beforehand.

The **requirement for ABIP activity proposals to explicitly document how they have considered gender**, the internal competitive process by which the Bank selects proposals, and the prioritisation of proposals that contribute to meeting the gender targets, has been effective. As of June 2022, 12% of the investment was spent on completed analytical outputs that have a principal gender focus and approximately 24% of the investment is allocated to all planned or completed analytical outputs with a principal gender focus⁶. Bank staff overwhelmingly endorsed the value of this explicit attention to gender at the thematic and technical level as well as the access to gender expertise and resources to assist in gender mainstreaming. Bank staff reported how ABIP resources are helping them achieve gender tagging of investments.⁷ In 2021, 75% of World Bank operations were gender tagged as per the Bank's corporate standard, exceeding the country target.⁸

The quality of gender mainstreaming is varied. While gender is routinely considered in activity proposals, the depth and quality of the attention to gender in activity implementation is varied. In some sectors such as social protection and poverty reduction, gender equality and intersectional gender equality and social inclusion are thoroughly addressed, and proposals spell out Gol demand, policy reform agendas and linkages with DFAT bilateral programs. The consideration of gender in others is more superficial. This range in quality is to be expected given the low base from which ABIP is building and diversity of the portfolio. Internal Bank and ABIP processes provide some checks on the quality of gender work including ABIP and non-ABIP funded gender activities reviewed as part of the Bank's annual PASA review process.

In sectors where DFAT bilateral programs have been effectively progressing gender and inclusion agendas for some time and have established relationships with Gol partners in this space as well as analytics, tools, and experience to share (e.g., in education, inclusive economic growth, and infrastructure), they have the potential to enable the Bank's gender and inclusion work. One example of this working in practice is Prospera's convening activity around the care economy, which is helping to create space for the Bank's gender analytics and activities. **DFAT currently shares technical expertise and experience on gender and inclusion** with the Bank via the review of ABIP activity proposals, but this tends to be one-way communication. The ABIP gender coordination meetings are a starting point for sharing information, but more nuanced technical and sector specific discussions call for a more targeted agenda and participation. While this may be happening organically in some areas, for others it may require the respective ABIP Secretariats to be more directive and convene targeted cross-program technical sharing and engagement to leverage the learning and networks sitting in the respective programs.

Performance reporting on gender is systematic. Reporting against the gender indicators in the results framework is thorough and the Bank Secretariat invests considerable effort to extract this information from across the wide portfolio of work. While the annual report documents key gender activities under each pillar and the G4G, it is challenging to draw out coherence and impact of what appear to an external audience as piecemeal activities. The planned significant policy change briefs (see Section 2.4) could help to succinctly capture selective gender impact narratives in thematic or sector areas towards the end of the investment. The results framework includes two pilot indicators on gender, and targets set by the World Bank for each of these pilot indicators were met in 2021.⁹

Gender lacks visibility in the ABIP governance space. Gender is a standing agenda item in the Steering Committee but lacks visibility in the Advisory Committee structure. The lack of a dominant voice on gender representing Gol's position complicates membership. Individual representatives from Bappenas and line ministries may be gender advocates but with the traction behind the care economy, there is reason to extend membership to the Ministry of Women Empowerment and Child Protection (MoWECP) which is a

⁶ These calculations include G4G activities and activities under the three ABIP pillars. Analytical outputs include papers, reports, briefs, policy notes, case studies, and presentations.

⁷ The Senior Social Development Specialist who is the ABIP Gender Coordinator, has 8 weeks per year assigned to support ABIP gender mainstreaming across the pillars.

⁸ World Bank. 2022. ABIP Annual Report January 1- December 31, 2021.

⁹ Indicator 2b 'share of documented significant changes (from Indicator 2a) that have a gender-impact self-assessment rating of significant or moderate' and indicator 6c 'share of analytical activities in the ABIP portfolio that include a principal and significant gender focus' which has been set at 20% and 30% respectively.

leading agency on this agenda. Further discussion with MoWECP will be required to assess their level of interest in participating in the ABIP Advisory Committees and which ones. Inclusion of gender as a standing agenda in all three Advisory Committee meetings could also help ensure gender receives attention in the program governance arrangement.

Attention to disability and social inclusion has been limited. Disability inclusive work has been undertaken in education and urban flood resilience under ABIP, as well as digital identity and civil and population registration systems, and there is interest among World Bank infrastructure specialists to do more on indigenous inclusion. DFAT's bilateral programming and expertise in disability inclusion is far ahead of the Bank, and while DFAT does raise opportunities for consideration of disability inclusion when the Bank shares activity proposals, there is no system for tracking the response. Entry points to strengthen disability inclusion in ABIP without corporate Bank requirements and leadership are limited. DFAT is likely to remain a bilateral development partner leader on disability inclusion in the medium term and avenues to share learning with targeted Bank staff on disability inclusion as demand opens, will need to continue. The pathway and progress on gender equality also provides scope to incrementally push the boundaries to gender intersectionality where this makes sense and is likely to gain traction.

2.3.1 Opportunities – gender equality and inclusion

Increase the ambition on gender equality and broader inclusion

ABIP is advancing gender equality through its activities, and considerable progress has been made in elevating gender within the trust fund with opportunity to increase the ambition and visibility of gender equality in the next phase (2025 forward). The momentum behind closing the gap in FLFP and the care economy is expected to increase Gol demand for analytics and policy support, and the G4G PASA is well positioned to respond.

More interactive engagement on gender and inclusion of DFAT specialists (staff and program teams) with targeted Bank sector and thematic specialists could be a more effective way of sharing intelligence, networking and supporting the Bank to nudge towards a more transformative gender and inclusive agenda in target sectors such as education.

The elevation of gender equality in the next phase (2025 forward) could provide scope to strengthen attention to disability and social inclusion including indigenous inclusion, through an intersectionality pathway. To help build appetite for enhancing intersectional activities, there is opportunity for DFAT to initiate targeted technical engagement with Bank specialists drawing on INOVASI, KIAT and INKLUSI intersectional good practices, lessons learned and networks.

While there was consideration of creating a Gender Pillar at the outset of ABIP, it was agreed to first trial gender tagging, targets, and additional resourcing as a way of enhancing gender equality outcomes through ABIP. With the momentum behind FLFP, there is opportunity to create a separate gender equality pillar the next phase (2025 forward) that could absorb the G4G body of work and provide strategic coherence and leadership on gender equality across the ABIP portfolio.

Enhance the visibility of gender and inclusion in ABIP governance arrangements

In the current phase of ABIP, there is an opportunity to include gender as a standing agenda in Advisory Committee meetings and extend membership of the Advisory Committee to MoWECP.

If a standalone Gender Pillar is created the next phase (2025 forward), a separate Advisory Committee for gender equality could be established. This would fill the gap on gender in the current arrangement and have the advantage of convening stakeholders from across government agencies such as MoF, Bappenas, MoWECP and line ministries on advancing gender equality.

2.4 MONITORING, EVALUATION & LEARNING

KRQ2: Does the MEL remain fit for purpose?

- a) Is the MEL providing the World Bank and DFAT with adequate evidence to assess effectiveness?*
- b) Is the MEL assisting the World Bank and DFAT in making decisions on future direction?*

As with gender equality, **DFAT has taken the opportunity of consolidating trust funds into a strategic partnership with the World Bank to invest in and incentivise enhanced MEL.** A common challenge in managing previous World Bank agreements has been the disconnect between the Bank's MEL systems and DFAT's requirements. The ability for DFAT to provide a robust narrative on the performance of the ABIP investment, and Australia's influence in that narrative, is important to DFAT and GoI.

The **ABIP MEL framework was jointly developed by DFAT and the World Bank and is designed to be streamlined** to focus on priority areas, minimising complexity by reducing the number of indicators and data collections tools and templates. The light-touch MEL system uses existing World Bank and DFAT MEL mechanisms to reduce unnecessary double data collection and reporting. DFAT and the Bank are responsible for different components of a system that is built on the principles of partnership and enabling accountability by focusing on outcomes and impact rather than excessive output-based monitoring.

The **Theory of Change** is described in DFAT's ABIP Investment Design Summary, and the ABIP Concept Note. The ABIP Theory of Change includes the goal, four End Outcomes, seven Intermediate Outcomes, and six investment modalities. While there is a description of the goal and four of the six modalities, there is very little description of the Intermediate or End Outcomes, and the remaining two modalities. This lack of clarity made it somewhat difficult for the Review team to write concretely about progress against each Intermediate and End Outcome separately, and why our examples of progress and achievement appear somewhat overlapping and repetitive. Gender and inclusion are not integrated in Intermediate or End Outcomes, although there is a gender related modality. Capacity Building as a modality struck the Review team as somewhat antiquated and not necessarily reflective of the evolving nature of the partnership between GoI and the Bank.

A **Results Framework** has been developed to track performance, with a small set of key results indicators defined against which the Bank sets annual targets. Reflecting the lack of clear distinction between some Intermediate and End Outcomes in the Theory of Change, the Bank has defined performance indicators against combined End Outcomes (EO1 + EO2; and EO3 + EO4). This is also reflected in both Annual Investment Monitoring Reports developed by DFAT, which also collapses End Outcomes in reporting.

Performance indicators are for the most part self-assessed, and there is little or no definition of key concepts such as "on track" or "Highly Satisfactory". Annual targets for End Outcomes are perhaps not necessary: having stories of significant policy change each year is useful, but not necessarily against a target. Reporting against indicators such as "moderate / satisfactory policy change" is likely not very useful. There appears to be no increase in the targets for gender to correspond to the USD 2 million increase in investment in this area. The two pilot indicators for gender were seen as helpful, although the Review team found variation in the quality and gaps in disaggregation of data.

In terms of reporting, **the World Bank is required to provide an Annual Progress Report, Semi-Annual Deliverable Log, and Semi-Annual Financial Update.** DFAT has worked hard to align and leverage World Bank MEL and reporting systems and processes to meet their own internal reporting requirements. DFAT has funded the World Bank ABIP Operations Officer role for navigating Bank reporting and data capture systems and supporting Bank teams to deliver. This investment has paid off in that the Bank has been able to deliver more detail and development partner-driven reporting on ABIP than is usual. While a small number of Bank staff consider the ABIP reporting burdensome, most Bank staff were respectful of DFAT's need for accountability and noted that they had support to deliver the required reporting.

DFAT reported that the **Bank MEL system for ABIP does capture information that is useful for DFAT internal performance management and quality assurance processes**. Reporting is largely focused on the activity level, but it is important for DFAT to understand the context of the activity and the intended contribution of the activity to higher outcomes. It is then essential for DFAT to have a credible narrative when the outcome occurs. The DFAT ABIP team invests much time in mining Bank reports for the data and evidence they need to meet DFAT reporting requirements such as Investment Monitoring and Reporting and the country Performance Assessment Framework reporting. This is partly the result of an investment that funds a broad range of small activities and outputs (often linked to much bigger loans). It is also reflective of an understandable reluctance on the part of Bank teams to overclaim on contribution of small activities and broader outcomes. It is also an inevitable consequence of a bilateral donor with accountability to taxpayers trying to wrangle performance reporting for a relatively small investment from a multilateral institution with a USD 2.6 billion p.a. footprint.

Finally, the DFAT ABIP management team reported struggling to triangulate Bank reporting, although it was also noted that this is also true of outcomes reporting from DFAT bilateral programs. Expanding the scope of the DFAT ABIP unit team to include engagement and independent relationships with Gol (see Section 2.1.4) would assist in addressing this constraint.

2.4.1 Opportunities – MEL

Undertake a light touch revision of the Theory of Change

The Theory of Change and Results Frameworks could be refined, and a light touch revision is warranted. This could include:

- Further streamlining and defining of End Outcomes and Intermediate Outcomes
- Integration of gender and inclusion in End and intermediate outcomes
- Refining the language on “capacity building” to be more reflective of the localisation agenda, and a maturing Bank-Gol partnership
- Defining the two secondary modalities
- Consideration of ABIP as a Facility, and inclusion of relevant DFAT Facility performance indicators to enhance visibility over the quality of the partnership
- Entrenching disaggregation of data

DFAT fund retrospective harvesting of Significant Policy Change

Retrospective outcomes harvesting of Significant Policy Changes and other significant outcomes over the lifetime of the investment would be helpful for DFAT, Gol, and the Bank. Funding of selective case studies that capture and detail successes (and sometimes failures) is warranted. This qualitative reporting would complement the quantitative data already collected.

Outcomes harvesting and case studies could also capture the loan part of the story where relevant and appropriate. It could also support reporting on outcomes that result from collaboration between ABIP and bilateral programs.

Enhance the narrative on ABIP contribution to lending

A stronger narrative about how ABIP is contributing to Bank lending would assist DFAT to put activities into context and demonstrate the relevance of the investment. To some extent, data is collected in ABIP’s results framework as part of funding leveraged from a range of sources. However, details are relatively sparse, and the threshold for reporting is when new lending is finalised. In addition to this, it would be useful for annual reporting to more routinely contextualise ABIP activities by referencing the operations they are either working towards (where that information is not sensitive) or helping to implement on an

ongoing basis, especially when payment triggers are linked to reforms or institutional strengthening. The purpose of this is not to ‘over-claim’ the importance of ABIP’s contribution, which may itself be relatively small, but rather to illustrate the relevance of ABIP-funded activities to broader agendas.

3. PROGRAM FUTURE

KRQ 5: How could ABIP be strengthened going forward?

- a) How could DFAT and the World Bank improve implementation to better achieve IOs and EOs, and improve policy influence?*
- b) What opportunities are available to engage Gol more directly with priorities?*

ABIP represents a strategic investment for Australia and should continue into the next phase (2025 forward). In consolidating multiple single Australian funded trust funds into ABIP, DFAT has succeeded in achieving many of the objectives that consolidation was meant to deliver. ABIP is appreciated by Gol as a fast and flexible way to access relevant and responsive global expertise, influential analytics, policy advice and program implementation support. DFAT has greater policy influence both with the Bank, and via the Bank with Gol. DFAT now has joined-up strategic engagement with an influential multilateral bank with brand recognition that is progressing important and aligned agendas of policy reform and development outcomes. This partnership brings a large development financing portfolio to the table for significant leverage and extension of outcomes that complement and supplement Australian bilateral programs.

Efficiencies are evident on multiple fronts including reduced management transactions and fees, and enhanced coordination and collaboration across the two institutions’ respective teams and portfolios. ABIP is delivering greater visibility and traction on gender equality. Bank MEL is more aligned with DFAT needs. This is a strong foundation on which to extend and enhance the investment.

The current level of funding to ABIP is appropriate and should be maintained. It provides sufficient funding for the Bank to undertake high-quality work in a range of sectors but is lean enough to promote competition for funds within the Bank, which encourages their strategic use. If ABIP’s budget were to be increased beyond current levels, additional funds should be targeted towards agreed priorities, for example climate financing, adaptation, and mitigation. The Review team notes that the success of this approach with the G4G work was due to an alignment of Australian interest and funding, with increased leadership and institutional focus from the World Bank.

Opportunities for building on the solid foundations in place have been identified throughout the IMTR. The Review opportunities and recommendations are summarised in the table below, in order of how they appear in the narrative above (not priority).

Table 3: Opportunities and Recommendations

	Opportunities	Recommendations
1	Continuation of the ABIP investment.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue ABIP into a second phase following the completion of the current phase in December 2024. • Maintain broad-based ABIP funding at current levels. • Target any increased funding (above base) to priority areas of engagement, as has been done with gender.
2	Developing and supporting a stronger Australian position on Australia’s contribution	DFAT to develop an internal coherent strategic vision for Australia’s contribution to

	to development financing in Indonesia could be enhanced, with a view to more intentionally aligned ABIP investments.	development financing in Indonesia with a view to more intentionally aligned ABIP investments.
3	More DFAT sector teams could engage in policy dialogue with Bank counterparts to influence the shaping of ABIP activities.	Build capacity and incentives for DFAT and bilateral program teams to engage with World Bank staff in regular dialogue on priorities in their respective sectors.
4	The role of the DFAT ABIP Secretariat could be expanded beyond current (essential) management and coordination functions.	Support the DFAT Secretariat to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop direct relationships with Gol officials (where useful), especially for the purpose of reinvigorating activity-level governance. • Engage directly with World Bank sector teams on selected topics (for example, poverty and inequality, gender for growth). • Support DFAT staff learning about ABIP and ways of working with the World Bank.
5	DFAT and the Bank reconsider governance arrangements and re-engage Gol representatives on the right mechanism and level for effective engagement.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review ABIP stakeholder (DFAT, Gol, World Bank) strategic decision-making and accountability needs and consider changes to governance arrangements to ensure these needs are met, possibly through partnerships brokering discussions. • Strengthen engagement with Gol stakeholders at Deputy Minister/Director General level to improve engagement in Advisory Committees.
6	Adopting elements of DFAT’s MEL guidance for Facilities may be useful for ABIP in the next phase (2025 forward). This may assist in framing expectations on the link between investments and outcomes. It may offer useful performance assessment indicators for partnership and program governance.	Consider adopting relevant and useful elements of DFAT guidance on Performance Assessment Frameworks for Facilities in the next phase (2025 forward).
7	A more explicit and deliberate localisation agenda could replace the current (outdated) “capacity building” narrative and enhance sustainability.	Consider a more explicit and deliberate localisation agenda in the next phase (2025 forward).
8	Increase the ambition on gender equality and broader inclusion and consider the creation of a separate gender equality pillar in the next phase (2025 forward).	Continue and enhance the work on gender equality, and strengthen attention to disability and social inclusion including ethnicity and indigenous inclusion by building on the progress made on gender equality to increase systematic attention to the needs and interests of disadvantaged population groups in their diversity.

		Elevate the work on Gender Equality to become an additional pillar in the next phase (2025 forward).
9	Enhance the visibility of gender in ABIP governance arrangements.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the current phase, include gender as a standing agenda in all three Advisory Committee meetings and extend membership of the Advisory Committee structure to MoWECP. • In the next phase (2025 forward), establish a separate Advisory Committee for gender equality to oversight the gender pillar.
10	The Theory of Change and Results Frameworks could be refined, and a light touch revision is warranted.	Undertake a collaborative review and light touch revision of the Theory of Change.
11	Funding of outcomes harvesting of Significant Policy Changes and other significant outcomes over the lifetime of the investment, and selective case studies that capture and detail successes (and sometimes failures) would be helpful for DFAT, GoI, and the Bank.	Fund retrospective harvesting of Significant Policy Change and other ABIP outcomes.
12	A stronger narrative about how ABIP is contributing to Bank lending would assist DFAT to put activities into context and demonstrate the relevance of the investment.	Enhance the narrative on ABIP contribution to lending.

ANNEX 1: IMTR TEAM ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Role	Responsibility
Chloe Olliver Team Leader and ME Specialist	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure the Review is implemented according to the Terms of Reference and the Review Plan • Management of the Review Team and assignment of duties • Draft the Review Plan • Lead the development of reports and key deliverables • Take responsibility for liaison with DFAT • Lead / co-lead workshops and other activities in line with the Review Plan • Coordinate and lead author of the deliverables, and ensure submission of high-quality deliverables
Joanne Sharpe Development Specialist	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lead the coordination of selected components of the review • Lead / co-lead workshops and other activities in line with the Review Plan • Work with other Review Team members regularly to debrief and exchange information • Along with the Team Leader, generate findings, lessons learned and recommendations
Deborah Thomas GEDSI Development Specialist	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lead the team on its gender and social inclusion analysis • Guide the Review Team by providing local contextual knowledge, and technical GEDSI expertise • Undertake KIIs and other activities in line with the Review Plan • Work with other Review Team members regularly to debrief and exchange information • Review and add value to the Review's deliverables • Along with the Team Leader, generate findings, lessons learned and recommendations

ANNEX 2: KEY REVIEW QUESTIONS

Review Criteria	Key Review Question	Proposed lines of enquiry/sub-questions
Modality (Relevance, Efficiency)	<p><u>To what extent is the single donor country trust fund achieving what it was set out to do?</u></p> <p>a) Is the Partnership achieving efficiency, coordination, collaboration and policy influence gains as designed?</p> <p>b) Is ABIP flexible and responsive to emerging priorities?</p>	<p><i>Strategic relevance</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has the establishment of ABIP elevated the strategic nature of the Australia-World Bank partnership as intended? Is the dialogue with the World Bank over priorities sufficient/effective/reflective of Australian priorities? • Is ABIP supporting GOI priorities, and influencing GOI policy? • Is Australia’s contribution through ABIP leveraging World Bank and GOI financing? • Is ABIP building capacity and strengthening institutions in Indonesia as intended to support sustainability? • How significant is ABIP in supporting the World Bank’s continuing operations and influence in Indonesia? • Does ABIP contribute to Australian influence in Indonesia? <p><i>Flexibility/responsiveness</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How does ABIP identify emerging priorities? • Has it been flexible and responsive to emerging priorities? • Is ABIP proving an effective vehicle to support new Australian policy priorities (e.g., expanding DRRCC work in Indonesia, in line with increased funding). • What enables or inhibits flexibility and responsiveness? <p><i>Coordination/collaboration/coherence</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is ABIP fostering increased collaboration/coordination and coherence between World Bank-managed and bilateral and regional DFAT-funded programs working in similar fields, as intended? • What kind of collaboration/coordination are we talking about? (Drawing on the ‘spectrum of engagement’, for example, can explore) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Sharing relevant information, keeping each other in the loop (information sharing) ○ Improving complementarity of activities, reducing overlap, dividing up areas of work (coordination) ○ Actively collaborating on shared priorities, leveraging each others’ contributions to achieve shared outcomes (collaboration)

- What is the role of DFAT and World Bank internal coordinators (ABIP Secretariat in World Bank, ABIP team in DFAT) in driving or supporting coordination across the various areas of work?
- If areas of work become contested, how are conflicts resolved?
- Are DFAT/World Bank internal coordinators also helping to drive coherence within their respective institutions?
- Is greater coordination/collaboration with other development actors working in shared areas of interest occurring?

Efficiency

- Has consolidating trust funds reduced/changed/increased the management burden for DFAT and the World Bank?
- Has the World Bank been able to achieve efficiencies or resource new capabilities with predictable DFAT funding through ABIP?
- Is World Bank (and DFAT?) resourcing adequate to deliver tasks and achieve outcomes, and how does the Bank resource new emerging activities when existing ones are ongoing?
- How does the bank ensure activities are strategically coherent?
- Is ABIP effectively mitigating identified risks?

Governance/partnership

- Steering Committee
 - Is the Steering Committee achieving effective dialogue about priorities and activities?
 - Is it an effective mechanism for maintaining accountability and monitoring performance, for example relating to gender?
 - Is it an effective forum for discussion and resolution of partnership issues, if they arise?
- Advisory Committees
 - Are the Advisory Committee functioning as intended?
 - Do they effectively guide ABIP priorities?
- Is there a need to consider changing structures to obtain more formal GOI input from line ministries? Weighing up against logistics, challenges etc.
- Has ABIP formalised 'ways of working' to guide the Australia-WB partnership? If so, are these effective?
- Is Australia's contribution to ABIP and its work adequately visible, in terms of branding and GOI awareness?
- Does ABIP provide access to information and analysis useful for DFAT's internal purposes?

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does ABIP provide Australia with opportunities for policy dialogue and bilateral engagement?
MEL	<p><u>Does the MEL remain fit for purpose?</u></p> <p>a) Is the MEL providing the World Bank and DFAT with adequate evidence to assess effectiveness?</p> <p>b) Is the MEL assisting the World Bank and DFAT in making decisions on future direction?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent do the program’s End Outcomes and Intermediate Outcomes, approach, focus and key activities remain relevant to the policy priorities of GOI and DFAT? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ If not, what adjustments do you think should be made? • Are the current modalities and activities relevant? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ If not, what things should be added / removed / change? • Has the program MEL delivered convincing and timely data regarding outcomes? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ If not, why not, and how could this be addressed • Does the MEL system provide timely and useful reporting to GOI and DFAT? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ What do you like / want to change about the reporting you receive? • How has data, evidence and reporting informed program and other strategic decision-making? • Is World Bank reporting and MEL clear and robust enough to be useful for broader DFAT performance assessment framework and investment monitoring and reporting? • How does the Bank measure progress on gender equality mainstreaming given gender is absent at intermediate and end outcome levels? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ How can this gap be addressed to more robustly inform the Bank, DFAT and GOI? • Given the lack of visibility of gender in the Theory of Change and RF, how does AIBP leverage achievements, disseminate them within Bank networks and with GOI and other stakeholders in Indonesia? Is this area of the program being lost in the MEL system? • Is sex and other social identity disaggregated data routinely reported by AIBP? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ If not, why not and how can this gap be closed?
Effectiveness	<p><u>To what extent is the program tracking towards its Outcomes?</u></p> <p>a) Will Intermediate Outcomes (IOs) and End</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What have been ABIP’s primary achievements to date? • What do you think it might be able to achieve by December 2024? • How is ABIP progressing toward it’s EOs and IOs? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Is ABIP likely to achieve end outcomes by the end of 2024?

	<p>Outcomes (EOs) be achieved by December 2024?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What evidence is there that ABIP is delivering sustained impact? • What changes should be made to the design of the program to improve effectiveness and sustainability, particularly the ability of GOI to take over activities over time? • To what extent has the flexible, adaptive and responsive implementation approach addressed the changing needs of GOI?
<p>GEDSI</p>	<p><u>To what extent is ABIP enhancing gender equality in Indonesia through its activities?</u></p> <p>a) Do the activities reflect the priorities and approaches of the strategy?</p> <p>b) Would there be benefits to increasing ABIP's focus on gender equality, and what could this look like?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent have gender issues been front and centre of program planning and design? • Has the gender strategy (attached to the Concept Note) achieved its targets and if so, could the strategy be revised to raise the level of ambition? • Does it make sense to consider gender equality (or GEDSI) as a new dedicated theme and not just a cross-cutting area? What are the pros and cons of going down this path? • Is the Gender for Growth PASA on-track for completing analytical, convening and engagement activities? How are constraints being managed? What opportunities have emerged for additional/follow on activities, and what future activities are planned to increase impact? • What resources has the Bank deployed to gender equality mainstreaming in AIBP? Are there dedicated gender experts working across sectors, activity areas? • Outside of the Gender for Growth PASA, how does the Bank engage with GOI policy and senior management on gender equality? • In human development, economic governance (beyond the G4G PASA) and infrastructure, how has the Bank worked and what has been achieved in terms of advancing gender equality? • How do GOI stakeholders perceive gender equality being advanced through ABIP within the Gender for Growth PASA, and via human capital, economic governance and infrastructure thematic areas? • How would GOI stakeholders like to see the gender focus enhanced? • Are GOI stakeholders with the mandate for gender equality included in ABIP governance structures? How could this be strengthened? • What proportion of the investment has been spent on activities where gender is a principal objective? • What are the barriers and constraints to further gender prioritisation in AIBP and possible future funding beyond 2024?

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How is disability and other areas of social inclusion such as related to minority groups and indigenous people, LGBTQI being addressed by AIBP? What opportunity is there to do this better, what are the constraints and how could a more inclusive focus be integrated into ABIP? • How do DFAT bilateral programs engage with ABIP on gender equality and GEDSI more broadly? What do they see as the benefits, gaps and opportunities to do this better?
Future	<p><u>How could ABIP be strengthened going forward?</u></p> <p>a) How could DFAT and the World Bank improve implementation to better achieve IOs and EOs, and improve policy influence?</p> <p>b) What opportunities are available to engage GOI more directly with priorities?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How could DFAT and the World Bank improve the program? • Is the way ABIP engages with GOI (through Committees and at working level with line ministries) effective, and sufficient to ensure relevance, responsiveness, and effectiveness? • What else would you like to see ABIP doing? • Are there things that ABIP is currently doing that you think should stop / change? • What opportunities are there to engage GOI more?

ANNEX 3: LITERATURE AND DOCUMENTS

Author	Title	Date /s
	Program design, operations, and administration	
DFAT	ABIP Design Summary document	Jan 2020
DFAT / World Bank	ABIP Concept Note	Dec 2019
DFAT / World Bank	ABIP Operations Manual	Jul 2020
World Bank	Administration Arrangement	Feb 2020
World Bank	Amendment to the Administration Arrangement	Aug 2021
	Activity proposals, work plans and budgets	
World Bank	ABIP Workplan June 2022	June 2022
World Bank	<u>ABIP Activity Proposals 2020</u> EG 01 -20 Macroeconomics and Competitiveness EG 02 -21 Strengthening Fiscal Policy EG 03 -22 Poverty Reduction, Inclusion and Upward Economic Mobility EG 04 -13 Improving Public Spending Agriculture Transformation EG 05 -19 Digital Technologies for Inclusive Development Gender 01 -15 Gender Equality for Growth HC 01 -24 Better Jobs for All Indonesian HC 02 -16 Improving Student Learning HC 03 -17 Impact Evaluation online Teacher Training HC 04 -23 Indonesia Social Security Reform HC 05 -25 Strengthening Indonesia Social Assistance Systems Infra 01 -01 Innovative Financing for Infrastructure Infra 02 -05 Socially inclusive Urban Flood Resilience Diagnostics Infra 03 -11 Building Foundation for People Centric Model Infra 04 -18 Improving Frontline Service Delivery IN05 - PLN Liquidity Issue - Simplified Modeling	
World Bank	<u>ABIP Activity Proposals 2021</u> EG06 Country Climate and Development Report - noting additions EG07 Agriculture competitiveness (003) - noted additions EG08 Private Sector Development HC06 Stronger and more inclusive Social Protection in Indonesia IN06 Support PLN in responding to COVID-19 impact on PLN Liquidity IN07 Solid Waste Management in Indonesia IN08 Leveraging Subnational Infrastructure Financing	
World Bank	<u>ABIP Activity Proposals 2022</u> EG09 Inclusive Growth and Inequality COVID-19 and Beyond EG10 Macroeconomics Analysis and Policy EG11 Fiscal analysis and policy advice	

	<p>EG12 Boosting Indonesia's International Competitiveness</p> <p>EG13 Business Formalization in Indonesia Constraints and Gender Differentials</p> <p>EG14 Informality and Livelihoods in Indonesia</p> <p>HC07 Building Indonesia's Education System Back Better</p> <p>HC08 Supporting Strategic Improvements in Indonesia Higher Education System</p> <p>HC09 Advancing equal access and usage of digital identity and civil and population registration systems</p> <p>HC10 Labor market analytics to support an inclusive green transition for Indonesia</p> <p>IN09 Subsidized housing and public building as renewable-energy power grid</p> <p>IN10 Green Financing Capacity Building for PLN</p> <p>IN11 Low Carbon Sustainable Urban Mobility Pathways</p> <p>IN12 Accelerating digitalization of the maritime supply chain in Indonesia</p> <p>IN13 Area Based Urban Transformation to Catalyze Economic Growth in Indonesian Cities</p> <p>IN14 Impact Evaluation of the Mangroves for Coastal Resilience Program</p>	
	Gender equality, disability and social inclusion	
World Bank	<i>Indonesia Country Gender Assessment: Investing in Opportunities for Women</i>	2020
World Bank	GE02 Gender for Growth ABIP Activity Proposal	Nov 2021
World Bank	Gender Engagement and Outreach Strategy - DRAFT	Nov 2021
DFAT	INKLUSI Update - ABIP Gender Coordination meeting	Sept 2022
World Bank	World Bank Gender Program – presentation to DFAT	Sept 2022
	Program reports, reviews and communications	
World Bank	ABIP Annual Reports 2021 (CY2020)	Feb 2021
World Bank	ABIP Annual Report 2022 (CY2021)	Feb 2022
World Bank	ABIP Semi-Annual Update (2020)	Sept 2020
World Bank	ABIP Semi-Annual Update (2021)	Sept 2021
World Bank	ABIP Semi-Annual Update (2022)	Sept 2022
DFAT	Investment Moderation Report 2021	May 2021
DFAT	Investment Moderation Report 2022	
DFAT	ABIP Bilingual Information Sheet	May 2020
	Governance	
World Bank	Minutes from Advisory Committee Meetings – EG, HC, Infra	2020
World Bank	Minutes from Advisory Committee Meetings – EG, HC, Infra	2021
World Bank	Minutes from Advisory Committee Meeting	2022
World Bank	Minutes from ABIP Frist Steering Committee Meeting	2020

World Bank	Minutes from ABIP Second Steering Committee Meeting	2021
World Bank	Minutes from ABIP Third Steering Committee Meeting	2022
World Bank	Budget breakdown per theme - Presentations from Steering Committee meetings	Jun 2022
	Other	
DFAT	Safeguards and Risk matrix (AidWorks)	May 2019
DFAT	Indonesia COVID-19 Development Response Plan	
World Bank	Country Strategy	

ANNEX 4: STAKEHOLDER CONSULTATION LIST

Name	Institution & Position
<i>Australian Embassy Jakarta</i>	
Stephen Scott	Deputy Head of Mission
Kirsten Bishop	Minister Counsellor, Governance & Human Development
Tim Stapleton	Minister Counsellor, Economic, Investment and Infrastructure
Daniel Woods	Counsellor, Human Development
Sam Porter	Counsellor, Infrastructure and Economic Governance
Bill Rowell & Anisa Antono	Coordinator for Economic and Infrastructure
Nikolasia Budiman, Diah Pratiwi, Belynda McNaughton	Unit/Program Manager and Adviser, Education
Lulu Wardhani	Unit/Program Manager, Rural Development
Angela Naumann	Unit/Program Manager, Social Protection
Astrid Kartika	Unit/Program Manager, Decentralised Governance
Piter Edward	Unit Manager, Infrastructure
Sarah Stein	Climate Change, Disaster and Risk Reduction, and Humanitarian
Marsha Sudar	Unit/Program Managers (DRR and Climate Change)
Julie Stalker, Reninta (Rere) Fitrianti & Sasi Napitupulu	Unit/Program Manager, World Bank Partnership
Mark King, Nindy Silvie & Dan Schuurman	Gender focal point for Prospera and Investing In Woman
Felicity Lane & Patricia Bachtiar	GEDSI Unit
<i>World Bank, Jakarta and elsewhere</i>	
Satu Kahkonen	Country Director
Bolormaa Amgaabazar	Portfolio and Operations Manager
Imelda Noto	Senior Operations Officer
Megha Kapoor	Operations Officer
Habib Rab	Lead Economist
Achim Schmillen	Practice Leader Human Development
Shinsaku (Shin) Nomura	Senior Economist, Cluster lead for education
Sara Giannozzi	Senior Social Protection Specialist & Cluster lead for social protection and jobs
Indira (Dira) Hapsari	Economist, Macroeconomic policy
Wael Mansour	Senior Economist, Macroeconomic policy
Ralph van Doorn	Senior Economist, Fiscal policy
Rabia Ali, Ririn Purnamasari	Poverty analysis and policy
Alexandre Laure	Senior Private Sector Specialist

Animesh Srivastava	Lead Agriculture Economist
Alika Tuwo	Agriculture Economist
Emcet Tas	Senior Social Development Specialist / ABIP Gender Focal Point
Kate Shanahan	Former Senior Social Development Specialist / ABIP Gender Focal Point
Andre Aquino	Program Lead, Sustainable Development
Alessandra Campanaro	Program Lead, Sustainable Development
Haris Sanahuja	Senior Disaster Risk Management Specialist
Yuko Arai	Urban Specialist
Claudia Vasquez	Program Lead Infrastructure & Lead Energy Specialist
<i>Government of Indonesia</i>	
Bapak Maliki, Bapak Adhi, Bapak Jarot	Ministry of National Development Planning (Bappenas), Poverty Alleviation and Community Empowerment
Bapak Kurniawan Ariadi & Ibu Tami	Bappenas - Bilateral Funding
Mahatmi (Ibu Ami) & Bapak Rizky Bianco	Bappenas - Employment
Bapak M Cholifihani (Lifi)	Bappenas - Population Planning and Social Protection
Ibu Diah Lenggogeni	Bappenas - Disaster Risk Management
Bapak Abdurohman, Bapak Andy & Bapak Johar	MoF, Fiscal Policy Agency, Centre for Macroeconomic Policy
Bapak Elan Satriawan, Bapak Sudarno Sumarto	TNP2K
Bapak Wahyu Utomo, Ibu Kartika Listriana & Bapak Suroto	Coordinating Ministry for Economic Affairs, Regional Development and Spatial Planning Coordination
Bapak Wahyu Utomo & team	Fiscal Policy Agency
Bapak Anindito Aditomo (Nino)	Ministry of Education, Culture, Research and Technology
Ibu Nur Budi Handayani & Bapak Andri Syahrar	Team of Ibu Dyah Tri, Coordinating Ministry for Human Development and Culture (Kemenko PMK) – Social Security for Labour, Human development, Social Assistance
Bapak M. Ramdhani & team	Ministry of Religious Affairs
<i>DFAT Canberra</i>	
Darrell Hawkins, Tanya Morjanoff, Jo Pickles, Kirsty Madden	Previous ABIP Unit Managers
Emily Rudland	Indonesia Development Desk
Kevin Smith	Assistant Director, Multilateral Banks Section
<i>DFAT Bilateral Programs</i>	
Della Temenggung	Deputy Director, Advisory and Policy, PROSPERA
Bimbika Sijapati Basnett	Gender and the Care Economy, PROSPERA
Steven Chaytor, Arlan Rahman, Paul Wright	KIAT