



# FINAL REPORT- Evaluation of the Urban Sanitation Development Program, Phase 2 (USDP-2)

April – November 2022

**Ministry of Foreign Affairs**

**EKN - Indonesia**

MDF Training & Consultancy

Annemarieke Mooijman

Susy Soenarjo

Bart van Halteren

Indonesia, November 2022







**Ministry of Foreign Affairs**

**EKN - Indonesia**

November 2022

**MDF Training and Consultancy BV**

Jl. Bypass Ngurah Rai 379

Sanur, Bali, Indonesia

[mdfpi@mdf.nl](mailto:mdfpi@mdf.nl)

[www.mdf.nl](http://www.mdf.nl)

# Contents

<b>Acronyms</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Executive Summary</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>1. Context and Background</b>	<b>11</b>
1.1. Introduction to the USDP-2 program and the evaluation	11
1.2. Urban sanitation in Indonesia and the USDP-2	12
<b>2. Objective of the Evaluation</b>	<b>17</b>
2.1. Objective and expected outputs of the evaluation	17
<b>3. Methodologies and Main Activities</b>	<b>18</b>
3.1. Methodologies	18
3.2. Evaluation questions	20
3.3. The evaluation process; changes and constraints	21
<b>4. Evaluation Findings</b>	<b>23</b>
4.1. Relevance	23
4.2. Coherence	25
4.3. Effectiveness	26
4.4. Efficiency	32
4.5. Sustainability	34
4.6. Impact	36
<b>5. Conclusions and Recommendations</b>	<b>40</b>
5.1. Conclusions	40
5.2. Key recommendations	42
<b>Annex 1 Original USDP-2 LF</b>	<b>45</b>
<b>Annex 2 Evaluation Matrix</b>	<b>48</b>
<b>Annex 3 Interviewees</b>	<b>51</b>
<b>Annex 4 List of documents consulted</b>	<b>54</b>
<b>Annex 5 Original ToR</b>	<b>56</b>

# Acronyms

3R	Reduce, Reuse, Recycle (of solid waste)
AR	Annual Report
AKKOPSI	Alliance of Local Governments Caring about Sanitation (Alliansi Kabupaten Kota Peduli Sanitasi)
APBD	Local Government (province, city, district) Budget (Anggaran Pendapatan dan Belanja Daerah)
B2B	Business to Business
Bappeda	Development Planning Agency at the local level (province, city, district)
Bappenas	National Development Planning Agency
CBT	Capacity Building and Training
CF	City Facilitator
CLTS	Community Led Total Sanitation
CSR	Corporate Social Responsibility
DAK	Special Allocation Fund ( <i>Dana Alokasi Khusus</i> )
DKI	Jakarta Special Territory
DS	Desk Study
EKN	Embassy of the Kingdom of the Netherlands (in Jakarta)
FGD	Focus Group Discussion
FIETS	Financial, Institutional, Environmental, Technical, Social (sustainability dimensions)
FSM	Fecal Sludge Management
GOI	Government of Indonesia
IDR	Indonesian Rupiah (1 € = 15,200 IDR - Aug. 2022)
IPAL	Sewerage Treatment Facility ( <i>Instalasi Pengolahan Air Limbah</i> )
IPLT	Fecal Sludge Treatment Facility ( <i>Instalasi Pengolahan Lumpur Tinja</i> )
ISSDP	Indonesian Sanitation Sector Development Program
IUWASH	Indonesian Urban Water, Sanitation and Hygiene project
JaBar	West Java province ( <i>Jawa Barat</i> )
JatTeng	Central Java province ( <i>Jawa Tengah</i> )
KalSel	South Kalimantan province ( <i>Kalimantan Selatan</i> )
KSAN	National Conference on Sanitation and Water Supply
LF/ RF	Logical Framework/ Results Framework
LG	Local Government (provincial, city or district)
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MDGs	Millennium Development Goals
MOF	Ministry of Finance
MOH	Ministry of Health
MOHA	Ministry of Home Affairs
MoU	Memorandum of Understanding
MPS	Sanitation Development Memorandum ( <i>Memorandum Program Sanitasi</i> )
MTE	Mid Term Evaluation
NAWASIS	National Water and Sanitation Information System

NTB	West Nusa Tenggara province (Nusa Tenggara Barat)
O&M	Operations and Maintenance
PDAM	Local-level Drinking Water Enterprise
PerDa	Local Government Regulation
PerMen	Ministerial Regulation
PerPres	Presidential Regulation
PF	Provincial Facilitator
PIU	Program Implementation Unit
PIU-AE	PIU Advocacy and Empowerment
PIU-KP	PIU Institutional and Finance
PIU-T	PIU Technical
PMU	Program Management Unit
PPK-BLUD	Financial Management System for Public Service Agencies at LG Level ( <i>Pola Pengelolaan Keuangan - Badan Layanan Umum Daerah</i> )
PPLP	Development of Environmental Sanitation in Human Settlements ( <i>Pengembangan Penyehatan Lingkungan Permukiman</i> )
PPSP	Accelerated Sanitation Development in Human Settlements ( <i>Program Percepatan Pengembangan Sanitasi Permukiman</i> )
Prosda	Provincial Sanitation Development Adviser, the name during USDP-2. currently they are called Provincial and City/District Facilitators
PUPR	Ministry of Public Works and Public Housing ( <i>Pekerjaan Umum dan Perumahan Rakyat</i> )
RAL	Rapid Action Learning
RC	Results Chain
RPJMD	Local-level Medium Term Development Plan ( <i>Rencana Pembangunan Jangka Menengah Daerah</i> )
RPJMN	National Medium Term Development Plan ( <i>Rencana Pembangunan Jangka Menengah Nasional</i> )
S3	Sustainable Sanitation Services
Satker PPLP	Provincial PUPR manager for PPLP
SDGs	Sustainable Development Goals
SE	Circular Letter (Surat Edaran)
SHs	Stakeholders
SK	Decree of Mayor or Bupati (head of district) ( <i>Surat Keputusan</i> )
SKPD	Local Government Implementation Unit ( <i>Satuan Kerja Perangkat Daerah</i> )
SO	Strategic Objective
SOP	Standard Operating Procedures
SSK	City/District Sanitation Strategy ( <i>Strategi Sanitasi Kota/Kabupaten</i> )
STBM	Community Led Total Sanitation ( <i>Sanitasi Total Berbasis Masyarakat</i> )
SulSel	South Sulawesi province
Sultra	Southeast Sulawesi province
Sulut	North Sulawesi province
SumSel	South Sumatra Province
SWM	Solid Waste Management
TA	Technical Assistance

ToC	Theory of Change
ToR	Terms of Reference
TPA	Solid Waste Disposal site
TPS	Temporary Solid Waste Disposal site
UA	Universal Access
UPTD	Technical Implementation Unit at the Local Level (Unit Pelaksana Teknis Daerah)
WS	Workshop
WWM	Wastewater Management

# Executive Summary

## Introduction

This is the report of the Final Evaluation of the second phase of the Urban Sanitation Development Program – Phase 2 (“the USDP-2 program”, “the program”, or “USDP-2”), which ran from August 2015 until September 2020 in 9 provinces<sup>1</sup> in Indonesia. The evaluation took place between May and October 2022.

## Context and background

Over the last decades Indonesia has enjoyed important economic growth and realized a substantial increase of welfare of its population. Developments in the sanitation sector have however been lagging behind; both in urban and rural areas access to adequate facilities has been relatively low for long, leading to high open defecation rates and substantial related health risks which on their turn affected badly economic and social development.

According to Indonesia’s legal framework (UU 23 and PP 18/2017) related to local government organization, sanitation is essentially a domain of competence of district and city governments who are responsible and can be held accountable for achieving the sanitation-related targets. As such, sanitation should become an integral part of the LG organizational structure and budget.

The Government of Indonesia (GOI) set out in its National Medium-Term Development Plan (RPJMN, 2010-2014) a number of policies and strategies to overcome various constraints in sanitation development. This resulted in the establishment of the national Accelerated Sanitation Development Program 2010-2014 (PPSP), aimed at achieving the MDG goal related to sanitation, i.e. halving by 2015 the number of people without access to sanitation. The Embassy of the Kingdom of the Netherlands (EKN) initiated and funded the Urban Sanitation Development Program (USDP) to support the implementation of PPSP.

The GOI then decided to continue along the same way in the context of the United Nation’s Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) of providing secure water and sanitation for all by 2030. In its RPJMN for the 2015-2019 period it proclaimed the so-called “100-0-100” development target: water supply for all, eradication of slums and universal access (UA) to safe sanitation. Accordingly, a second phase of the PPSP program was launched for the period 2015-2019, which EKN continued to support through USDP-2, that, similar to its predecessor, was designed to essentially provide TA services.

The USDP-2 program ran from (August) 2015 through 2020 and was contracted to Royal Haskoning DHV (RHDHV). The purpose of USDP-2 was to work with local governments in finding solutions for accelerating infrastructure development and establishing sustainable service delivery, aiming to draw lessons for replication in the broader implementation of PPSP. Overall, the main goal was to achieve universal access to proper water and sanitation (“in 2019 85% of population has access to improved sanitation conform with SPM and 15% of population has access to basic sanitation”).

---

<sup>1</sup> The original 10 provinces were reduced to 9.

The USDP-2 intervention strategy (the Logical Framework) is depicted below:

<p><b>Strategic Objective 1: Acceleration of Implementation.</b> To contribute to the acceleration of implementation of sustainable sanitation development at local government level</p>
<p>Overall result 1: Increased budget allocation and expenditures for sanitation at LG level to over 2% of the annual LG budget in up to 90 LG units in 9 provinces and provide the best practices for dissemination to other provinces and LG units, and tripled allocation for sanitation from other sources (higher level of the government) at the end of 2018.</p>
<p><b>Strategic Objective 2: Sustainability.</b> To encourage the sustainability of existing and future sanitation investments, services and facilities and to incorporate all dimensions of sustainability in the PPSP</p>
<p>Overall result 2: The institutional, financial and environmental sustainability of sanitation services has improved in up to 27 Local Governments through a better understanding of all dimensions of sustainability including ability and willingness to pay, tariff setting and management of facilities and the inclusion in the PPSP process.</p>
<p><b>Overall Sub-objective 3a: Optimum implementation of PPSP-2 at central, provincial, and local level (≤ 90 LGs in 9 USDP-2 provinces)</b></p>
<p>Overall Result 3a: Substantial acceleration of sustainable sanitation development in 9 provinces and up to 90 Local Governments in 2018 and lessons learned contributed to accelerated sustainable implementation in other provinces.</p>
<p><b>Overall Sub-objective 3b: Scaling up impact of USDP-2 to national level</b></p>
<p>Overall Result 3b: Approaches, methodologies and tools developed to assist provincial and local government with their efforts in accelerating sanitation development and the establishment of sustainable sanitation services disseminated to up to 20 provinces and widely applied.</p>

This evaluation used the above objectives and aimed-for results of the USDP-2 program.

### **The evaluation objective, type, methods and challenges encountered**

#### **Objective of the evaluation:**

The objective of this evaluation is to assess the extent to which USDP-2 has supported the implementation of PPSP-2 in an effective, efficient and sustainable manner.

#### **Type of evaluation**

The evaluation is mostly a summative evaluation, learning from the past program.

The evaluation was conducted using the modified Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development/Development Assistance Committee (OECD/DAC) evaluation criteria<sup>2</sup>.

#### **Methodologies and data collection methods used, and challenges encountered**

The evaluation approach entailed reviewing/ redrafting 11 evaluation questions per OECD evaluation criterion and translating these into sub-questions and determining methods for data collection. This is presented in an Evaluation Matrix in Annex 2.

---

<sup>2</sup> <https://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/reviced-evaluation-criteria-dec-2019.pdf>

The main evaluation methods used:

- Desk study: 50 documents were consulted (some in part)
- Key informant interviews and focus group discussions: 28 people were interviewed
- Field visits to and interviews at two locations: NTB (Central and East Lombok) and Central Java (Karanganyar and Kebumen districts).

While overall the evaluation went well, some challenges were encountered:

- Availability of interviewees: some intended interviewees were not available, and some were only available for a limited time.
- The evaluation took place years after the program has ended and hence many members of the sanitation working group in the period 2015-2019 in all the visited locations had already moved to different divisions and some had retired.
- Hence, not many of the interviewees were actively part of, or working as counterparts of, the USDP-2 program.

## Final evaluation conclusions

### Relevance

1. USDP-2 was well timed: the government of Indonesia just started the implementation of PPSP-2, and the need for technical assistance was high. The provinces, cities and districts needed individuals/teams to discuss the adoption of the national program and adjustments to the local situation, to set targets, and to plan and implement activities to achieve the targets.
2. The USDP-2 program objectives and approaches were mostly well-aligned to the needs and demands of the Indonesian government (PPSP, RPJMN, RPJMD), both related to policies as well as related to the increase in awareness of the importance of sanitation of (local) government agencies themselves, their advocacy and lobbying power (to the national government as well as other provincial and local government agencies), and their motivation and commitment to sanitation.
3. Sometimes the USDP-2 program was perceived as ahead of the government systems and plans, particularly at the local levels. This sometimes led to situations where (USDP-2) plans had been prepared but could not be implemented because of a lack of budget and/ or staff allocated, or simply because the system did not consider this a priority yet (e.g. FSM or solid waste treatment, both surrounded with taboos).

### Coherence

4. The two main SDG 6 indicators that PPSP, and hence USPD-2, contributed to are indicator 6.2.1 (proportion of population using safely managed sanitation services.) and indicator 6.b.1: (proportion of local administrative units with established and operational policies and procedures for participation of local communities in water and sanitation management). Related to the first indicator: during the USDP-2 implementation period national sanitation coverage rates in Indonesia have gone up with 4.5%. While attribution of exact numbers to the USDP-2 program is not possible, respondents overwhelmingly agree that USDP-2 had a positive and significant influence on these numbers in the districts in which it operated. As for the SDG 6 indicator 6.b.1: USDP-2 assisted 9 provinces and 62 cities/districts and in its Final Report mentioned 69% achievement rate of the program objectives at city/district levels. Again, it was difficult to establish the rate of contribution of USDP-2 to the operationalization and implementation of policies, regulations and related capacities at the provincial/ local levels, but the feedback of respondents was very positive.

5. There was no link of USDP-2 with the Dutch Aid-to-Trade agenda. It simply never was the aim of the USDP-2 program, and never considered.

### Effectiveness

6. USDP2 focused on regulation and, to a lesser extent, on improving technical knowledge and operational measures. Although coverage rates went up with 4.5%, a direct impact on the increase of sanitation coverage rates cannot be attributed to the project.
7. During the USDP-2 period of assistance, the national budget for sanitation was satisfactory and increased every year. This continued until the COVID pandemic started in March 2020. During the pandemic period, the budget significantly reduced and was re-allocated for pandemic response. Local government spending data is notoriously difficult to find, and usually unreliable. The consensus among respondents is that the local budgets did not increase, and decreased significantly during the Covid pandemic. In this sense, the Overall Result 1 (and partly Overall Result 2) of USDP-2 - an increase in budget allocation- cannot be considered achieved or significantly contributed to.
8. However, the largest achievement of USDP-2 is especially found in Overall result 3a (optimum implementation of PPSP-2, from the national to local levels) and Overall result 3b (approaches, methodologies and tools to assist provincial and local governments, and only partly in the realm of awareness (Overall result 2). Especially the Provincial Sanitation Development Advisor (ProSDA) played an important role in assisting the provincial and city/district counterparts to produce and attain what was targeted in the RPJMD.
9. Gender approaches, poverty reduction considerations and the involvement of the private sector in USDP-2 strategies and implementation were notably absent or irrelevant, even after the MTR's recommendations to include these in the program.

### Efficiency

10. One success factor of USDP-2 was a strong, mostly Indonesian, team, which was (already) well connected to the national Indonesian government sanitation actors and BAPPENAS. This was considered a crucial element of the good cooperation between USDP-2 and the national government. Similarly, the presence of an USDP-2 Provincial Sanitation Development Advisor (ProSDA) in the provinces contributed to good relations and a (more) efficient implementation. During the evaluation it became clear that USDP-2 is perceived as having contributed to an environment which increasingly allows for open discussions on sanitation and the government's role in this.
11. USDP-2 was not an active partner in the sanitation sector national stakeholder groups, including UNICEF, USAID and WSP/WB. This is considered a missed opportunity.
12. Interviews revealed that a good relationship of USDP-2 with the government partners was deemed essential for the USDP-2 team, often prioritizing harmonious collaboration over 'harder' discussions on different viewpoints/ opinions on program strategies. Topics, such as private sector involvement, poverty reduction strategies and up to a certain extent gender, which potentially could have led to a bit more friction, seem to have been avoided. A somewhat more independent role of the USDP-2 team could have benefited the outcome of the project.

### Sustainability

13. At the central policy, level, the sustainability strategy and activities of USDP-2 assistance are reflected in many policies, guidelines and regulations that are still in force and actively used. Focusing strongly on the development/ contextualization of these policies and guidelines is an appropriate, and in case of USDP-2 successful, sustainability strategy.

14. Some elements of the USDP-2 approach still remain, especially at local and provincial level, such as the ProSDA (currently called Provincial and City/District ‘Facilitators’), considered crucial for effective implementation of sanitation policies at the provincial and local government levels. However, when the Dutch funding for USDP-2 stopped, the Indonesian government did not continue financing most USDP-2 funded activities. This, coupled with the sustainability risk of a high-turnover of Indonesian government staff, is cause for (sustainability) concern, but none the USDP-2 project could have tackled.

### Impact

15. The results achieved in all USDP-2 cities and districts contributed optimally to the national sanitation objectives. In 2020, 97.2% of the urban population in the country had access to improved sanitation up from 92.5% in 2015 and 78.7% in 2000 (WHO/UNICEF JMP 2021)
16. The USDP-2 focus on 9 provinces and (initially) 90 local government units was (too) ambitious, especially taking into account the diversity of program actions (FSM, SWM, awareness, policies, capacity building, advocacy, etc.). It would have been better to focus on less locations and go more-in-depth in each location (ensuring FS, SWM, awareness, etc. would all be addressed comprehensively). It is the evaluators view that these locations would then have achieved more solid and sustainable sanitation impacts.

### Recommendations

Six recommendations are provided (related conclusion numbers are mentioned in brackets behind the recommendation, when relevant):

1. The USDP-2 program’s focus on translating/ contextualizing and operationalizing (good) national policies on sanitation to the provincial and local government levels is recommended to be continued in future Dutch-funded interventions, although this is recommended to be done through a “systems strengthening approach”. In addition, the focus could be changed from basic sanitation to safely managed sanitation.
2. It is recommended to strengthen the awareness component of future similar interventions, addressing not only households but wider society as well, including sanitation professionals working on policies and guidelines (Conclusions 2, 3, 8, 9, 10).
3. It is also recommended to focus on fewer provinces/ locations, and go more in-depth in each location (ensuring FS, SWM, awareness, etc. are addressed comprehensively), to contribute to the sustainability of the results (Conclusions 3, 4, 9, 14, 16).
4. While it is acknowledged that government ownership is crucial, it is recommended that future interventions should find a better balance between government ownership and recognized international best practices and (Dutch) interests and priorities, notably gender equity and social inclusion approaches, systems strengthening, environmental protection and climate resilience, poverty reduction considerations, the involvement of the private sector and the Dutch Aid-to-Trade agenda (Conclusions 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 12).
5. Up-to-date information is a prerequisite for improving both day-to-day program management and long-term policy or investment decisions. It is recommended that future interventions have a monitoring and information system that can better capture (a selection of) the following: sanitation coverage data, SWM and FSM data, budget data, as well as hard-to-measure data such as an increase in local governments’ knowledge and capacities, gender equity and social inclusion, environmental impact/climate resilience and the impact on poverty (Conclusions 2, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9).
6. Lastly, the complex nature of sanitation requires coordination mechanisms for all actors working on urban sanitation: government, (inter)national partners/donors, and the private sector. This

recognition should lead to greater participation in national stakeholder discussion and coordination forums and groups. (Conclusions 5, 8, 9, 11, 12).

# 1. Context and Background

## 1.1. Introduction to the USDP-2 program and the evaluation

This is the report of the Final Evaluation of the second phase of the Urban Sanitation Development Program – Phase 2 (USDP-2). USDP-2 was a follow-on to USDP-1, which supported the GOI in implementing the first phase of PPSP (Program Percepatan Pembangunan Sanitasi Permukiman – the ‘Residential Sanitation Development Acceleration Program’, or ‘Accelerated Sanitation Development in Human Settlements’), which aimed to stimulate and assist local governments to formulate integrated City/Regency Sanitation Strategies (SSK) and Sanitation Program Memoranda (MPS), with the overall aim of halving the number of people without access to proper water and sanitation facilities by 2015.

After phase 1, when PPSP became an established program, managed by a PMU at Bappenas and PIUs (Program Implementation Units) at the Ministry of PU (Public Works and Public Housing), MOHA (Home Affairs), and MOH (Health), the PPSP-2’s objectives were to provide water supply for all, eradication of slums, and universal access to safe sanitation by 2019. The USDP-2 focused on providing support (to the implementation of PPSP-2) with particular attention for accelerating the development process and establishing actual sanitation services.

The USDP-2 program ran from (August) 2015 through 2020 and was contracted to Royal Haskoning DHV (RHDHV). The purpose of USDP-2 was to work with local governments in finding solutions for accelerating infrastructure development and establishing sustainable service delivery, aiming to draw lessons for replication in the broader implementation of PPSP. Overall, the main goal was to achieve universal access to appropriate water and sanitation (according to WHO/UNICEF JMP data in 2020, 97.2% of the urban population had access to improved sanitation, while 2.2 % of the population or 1 out of 45 applied open defecation). This program goal was translated into a Logical Framework (see Annex 1), which can be summarized as follows:

Abbreviated Logical Framework		
Overall objective: Universal Access achieved		
<b>Strategic objective 1:</b> ≤ 90 LGs able to plan, budget, and implement accelerated implementation	National	Supporting docs, guidelines, and tools prepared/improved and used Advocacy material developed
	Provincial	Legal instruments in place Specific support provided to province (RM, LK-MPS, Nawasis)
	Local	Legal instruments in place Supporting documents developed and used WWM and SWM infrastructure promoted and initiated
<b>Strategic objective 2:</b> ≤ 27 LGs able to provide sustainable sanitation management services	National	Supporting docs, guidelines, and tools prepared/improved and used (incl. private sector involvement, financial management)
	Local	Sustainable management promoted and initiated (incl. SSKs, Sanitation management plans, pilots w/ private sector)
<b>Strategic objective 3:</b> Best practices identified and developed in 10 provinces	National	Collaboration with other donors and projects Mainstreaming achieved International conference Best practices consolidated
	Provincial	Action research on scaling up & planning to impl. documented
	Local	Action research on acceleration and sustainability documented
<b>Strategic objective 4:</b> Focused CBT in 10 provinces with access for other provinces	National	Support structures and supporting documents prepared and used CBT supported
	Provincial	CBT supported
	Local	CBT supported

This intervention strategy (the Logical Framework) was later slightly changed to merge objectives 3 and 4 into one objective with two related results, as depicted below:

**Strategic Objective 1: Acceleration of Implementation.**

To contribute to the acceleration of implementation of sustainable sanitation development at local government level

Overall result 1: Increased budget allocation and expenditures for sanitation at LG level to over 2% of the annual LG budget in up to 90 LG units in 9 provinces and provide the best practices for dissemination to other provinces and LG units, and tripled allocation for sanitation from other sources (higher level of the government) at the end of 2018.

**Strategic Objective 2: Sustainability.**

To encourage the sustainability of existing and future sanitation investments, services and facilities and to incorporate all dimensions of sustainability in the PPSP

Overall result 2: The institutional, financial and environmental sustainability of sanitation services has improved in up to 27 Local Governments through a better understanding of all dimensions of sustainability including ability and willingness to pay, tariff setting and management of facilities and the inclusion in the PPSP process.

Overall Sub-objective 3a: Optimum implementation of PPSP-2 at central, provincial, and local level (≤ 90 LGs in 9 USDP-2 provinces)

Overall Result 3a: Substantial acceleration of sustainable sanitation development in 9 provinces and up to 90 Local Governments in 2018 and lessons learned contributed to accelerated sustainable implementation in other provinces.

Overall Sub-objective 3b: Scaling up impact of USDP-2 to national level

Overall Result 3b: Approaches, methodologies and tools developed to assist provincial and local government with their efforts in accelerating sanitation development and the establishment of sustainable sanitation services disseminated to up to 20 provinces and widely applied.

This evaluation used the above objectives and aimed-for results of the USDP-2 program.

## 1.2. Urban sanitation in Indonesia and the USDP-2<sup>3</sup>

Over the last decades Indonesia has enjoyed important economic growth and realized a substantial increase of welfare of its population. Developments in the sanitation sector have, however, been lagging behind; both in urban and rural areas access to adequate facilities has been relatively low for long, leading to high open defecation rates and substantial related health risks which on their turn affected badly economic and social development. In view, among others, of achieving Millennium Development Goal (MDG) Goal 7c on access to safe sanitation, in the early years of this century the Government of Indonesia (GOI) acknowledged the need to undertake action urgently and to intensify its efforts to improve sanitary conditions and practices.

The legal framework for the management of solid waste at household level is provided by the Presidential Decree 97 of 2017 that was preceded by PP 81/2012. These decrees state, among others, that household solid waste management is a competence of the LG and should focus both on the diminution and the management of solid waste at the household level using a 3R approach. According

<sup>3</sup> Partially from: Mid Term Review of the second phase of the Urban Sanitation Development Project (2018)

to Indonesia's legal framework (UU 23 and PP 18/2017) related to local government organization, sanitation is essentially a domain of competence of district and city governments who are responsible and can be held accountable for achieving the sanitation-related targets. As such, sanitation should become an integral part of the LG organizational structure and budget. Only in cases where cooperation among several cities/districts is required (e.g. for the construction and management of a landfill), the provincial government is meant to come in and play an active role.

Sanitation is addressed in the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, which calls for 'ensuring the availability and sustainable management of water and sanitation for all' under SDG6. Indonesia translates this into its RPJMN (the National Medium Term Development Plan). In the RPJMN 2020-2024, the sanitation target is as follows:

- 90 percent of people have access to basic sanitation
- including 15 percent with access to safely managed sanitation
- and zero percent open defecation (BABS).

As a baseline, the 2020 National Socio-Economic Survey (*Susenas*) noted the following progress made:

- 79.5% access to basic sanitation<sup>4</sup>
- including 7.6% to safely managed sanitation,
- a decrease of open defecation to 6.2%

By 2022, Indonesia has made more progress in water sanitation and hygiene. In 2020, it was estimated that 92.3% of the people in Indonesia had access to basic sanitation, either within their household or shared among households.

Despite the progress Indonesia has made thus far, inequality of access to sanitation persist. Factors that significantly affect the inequality are particularly the geographic location and service quality, (availability of human and financial resources, mainly), due to the fact that at present the majority of investments in sanitation is sourced from (local) governments (53% of the sanitation investments). Alternative funding sources were zakat (Islamic charity funds such as BAZNAZ), micro-credit funds (loans), and small and micro businesses (for human resources).

USDP-2, however, was primarily managed from the national level in a strong relationship with Bappenas. At the national level, in-depth technical know-how exists, and support can be, and was, provided to the provinces. Because of the decentralized legal framework, the support to provinces is very much demand-based, causing significant water and sanitation differences between the provinces. There is no apparent relation between poverty levels in provinces and strength of sanitation systems.

According to Indonesia's legal framework (UU 23 and PP 18/2017) related to local government organization, sanitation is essentially a domain of competence of district and city governments. City and district governments are responsible and can be held accountable for sanitation service delivery and achieving the sanitation-related targets. As such, sanitation should become an integral part of the local governmental organizational structure and budget. Only in cases where cooperation among several cities/districts is required (e.g. for the construction and management of a landfill), the provincial government is meant to come in and play an active role.

---

<sup>4</sup> Note that these are nationally published rates and different coverage rates than the WHO/UNICEF JMP data to which we further refer in the document.

Based on national policies on sanitation, the following national, provincial and local governments and agencies are involved, and their roles and responsibilities:

Ministries/ institutions	Roles and responsibilities
BAPPENAS – Badan Perencanaan Pembangunan Nasional (Ministry of Development Planning)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sanitation is part of the portfolio of the Directorate of Housing and Settlements. The directorate is responsible for planning, policy development, analysis and programming, and coordination of housing, water and sanitation development in Indonesia.</li> <li>• The Director of Housing and Settlements is also the Chairman of the National Working Group for Housing, Settlement, Water and Sanitation, or Pokja PPAS. This working group is an ad-hoc inter-ministerial coordination board consisting of those involved in development of the water, sanitation, and housing sectors.</li> <li>• In 2017, the directorate developed the National Water and Sanitation Information Services (NAWASIS) and became a member of SWA – Sanitation and Water for All, which is a global partnership forum to ensure the attainment of SDG #6 through high-level advocacy meetings. NAWASIS itself is a collaboration platform in the housing, settlements, drinking water and sanitation sectors. This platform consists of three components: Data, Information, and Capacity Development. It is managed by the Secretariat of the National Housing, Settlement, Drinking Water and Sanitation Working Group (Pokja PPAS) under the coordination and responsibility of the Directorate of Urban, Housing and Settlements.</li> </ul>
Ministry of Publics Works and Housing (MPW)	The Directorate General of Human Settlements (Directorate General Cipta Karya) of the Ministry of Public Works and Housing (MPW) provides local governments with infrastructure development and rehabilitation, technical assistance, and technical and service performance standards. MPW also collaborates with the Ministry of Finance in administering budgets for sanitation and wastewater management facilities at the national, regional, provincial, local and project levels.
Ministry of Health (MOH)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MOH is responsible for hygiene and sanitation promotion, capacity building and sanitation emergency response systems, especially in low-income communities.</li> <li>• MOH also responsible for promoting proper sanitation through the STBM and sets standards and monitors drinking water quality.</li> <li>• In conjunction with MPW, MOH also administers and enforces regulations for domestic wastewater, including wastewater treatment plants, Fecal Sludge Treatment Facility (Instalasi Pengolahan Lumpur Tinja – IPLTs), and community-based systems.</li> </ul>
Ministry of Home Affairs (MOHA)	MOHA has the responsibility for local governments. In sanitation, MOHA – through the Directorate General of Regional Development (Ditjen BANGDA) – develops capacities of local governments and supports the provincial and city/district level PPAS Working Group.
Provincial Governments	The provinces are required to monitor the development of local government, both cities and districts. The budget for the provinces to perform this task is charged to the National Budget (APBN) through the ‘Deconcentration budget’ (Dana Dekon). Provinces also receive substantial budget allocations from the central government, from MPW’s technical departments, as well as from other ministries to channel their support for local sanitation programs through their respective provincial offices.

Local Governments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• City and district local governments have the responsibility for delivering public services including sanitation. In most cases, the city or district environment department (Dinas Lingkungan Hidup - DLH) is responsible for arranging septic tank sludge emptying services and management of these IPLTs. The development of the sanitation infrastructure is the responsibility of the City/District PW-PH Office (the local government arm of the MPW).</li> <li>• In some cities/districts solid waste management is the responsibility of DLH, but in some other cities/districts, it is the responsibility of City/District PW-PH.</li> <li>• The local government owned water utility organization (Perusahaan Daerah Air Minum - PDAM) generally has a system of revenue collection in place.</li> <li>• Domestic wastewater is usually managed by a department of local government, or a separate local government owned sanitation utility (Perusahaan Daerah Penanganan Air Limbah - PD PAL). Most cities/districts in Indonesia do not have advanced wastewater management capacities.</li> <li>• The allocation of roles between the various departments and agencies for sanitation services varies greatly from one city/district to another.</li> </ul>
-------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

In this context, the Indonesia Sanitation Sector Development Program (ISSDP, 2006-2010) to which the Netherlands provided Technical Assistance (TA) via the EKN (Embassy of the Kingdom of the Netherlands), proved to be an important initiative as it helped, among others, to establish a framework for sustainable, poor-inclusive sanitation services in Indonesia through a combined set of measures including the development of effective and coordinated policy-making, institutional reform, strategic planning and awareness building. The success of the ISSDP program allowed the government of Indonesia to set out in its National Medium-Term Development Plan (RPJMN, 2010-2014) a number of policies and strategies to overcome various constraints in sanitation development. This resulted in the establishment of the national Accelerated Sanitation Development Program 2010-2014 (PPSP), aimed at achieving the MDG goal related to sanitation, i.e. halving by 2015 the number of people without access to sanitation. In line with earlier support measures, the EKN initiated and funded the Urban Sanitation Development Program (USDP) to support the implementation of the PPSP.

The consistent efforts undertaken allowed Indonesia to largely achieve the MDG target. The Indonesian government then decided to continue along the same way in the context of the United Nation's Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) of providing safe drinking water and sanitation for all by 2030. In its RPJMN 2015-2019 the Indonesian government proclaimed the so-called "100-0-100" development target: water supply for all, eradication of slums and universal access (UA) to safe sanitation. Accordingly, a second phase of the PPSP program was launched for the period 2015-2019, which the EKN continued to support through USDP-2, that, similar to its predecessor, was designed to essentially provide TA services. USDP-2 started in August 2015 and closed in 2020.

Compared to USDP-1, the focus of USDP-2 shifted from planning to implementation. The two main strategic objectives of the program related to contributing to the (1) *acceleration of implementation of sustainable sanitation development at local government level* and to (2) *contribute to the provision of sustainable sanitation services (S3) at the level of a selected number of local governments (LG)*, with a view of drawing lessons for upscaling and nationwide application. The program was owned by the government of Indonesia with Bappenas (the national development planning agency) as lead agency and implemented through a Project Management Unit (PMU), located at Bappenas, and three Project Implementation Units (PIU) at the key ministries: Ministry of Health (MOH), Ministry of Home Affairs (MOHA) and Ministry of Public Works and Public Housing (PUPR).

As mentioned in the mid-term review, the USDP-2 is entirely embedded in the PPSP-2 program as Indonesia's national program to achieve the government's aims related to improved sanitation. PPSP-2 takes the country's National Medium Term Development Plan (RPBMN) as a major reference, of which the key element of the government of Indonesia's national sanitation policy and ambition is the achievement, by 2019, of universal access (UA) to sanitation.

## 2. Objective of the Evaluation

### 2.1. Objective and expected outputs of the evaluation

This evaluation covers the intervention called the Urban Sanitation Development Program – Phase 2 (USDP-2), which is the second phase of the USDP-1 as described in chapter 1. In this report it will be referred to as ‘the USDP-2 program’, ‘USDP-2’, or ‘the program’.

#### Type of evaluation

As per the Terms of Reference (ToR), this evaluation is a summative evaluation: it will provide an independent evaluation of the USDP-2 program, and it will be forward looking by identifying key lessons for improvement and providing practical recommendations for ODA programs of this kind.

#### Objective of the evaluation

The objective of this evaluation is to assess the extent to which USDP-2 has supported the implementation of PPSP-2 in an effective, efficient and sustainable manner.

#### Expected outputs of the evaluation

The evaluation is expected to produce materials in which the general approach and specific activities will be described, and findings, assessments, conclusions and recommendations will be presented and explained. The following deliverables are expected:

- A draft final report (of maximum 25 pages, plus annexes).
- A final report, incorporating comments from stakeholders. Distribution of all reports in paper and electronic version will be as follows: 3 copies to the Netherlands Embassy; 8 copies to Bappenas

#### Scope of activities and limitations of the evaluation

The evaluation conducted the following activities:

- Kick-off meeting
- Desk reviews of documents
- Developing data collection tools and templates
- Field visits to locations in NTB and Central Java
- Online interviews with 28 key stakeholders
- Analysis and sense-making
- Final reporting

#### Location, timeline and period of reference of the evaluation

Geographically, the evaluation focused on the geographical area of the USDP-2 program: 9 provinces in Indonesia. The evaluation took place between May and September 2022. And was conducted mostly online, with two field visits to NTB (Central and East Lombok), and Central Java, (Karanganyar and Kebumen districts). These are the districts which received full/intensive USDP-2 technical assistance. The evaluation covers the program implementation period from August 2015 to September 2020.

# 3. Methodologies and Main Activities

## 3.1. Methodologies

In line with the objectives of the evaluation, a learning-oriented and participatory design of the evaluation methodology and analysis was used.

The evaluation adhered to the definition of the UNEG Norms and Standards for Evaluation<sup>5</sup>, of which the first paragraph of the definition of evaluation reads:

*An evaluation is an assessment, conducted as systematically and impartially as possible, of an activity, project, program, strategy, policy, topic, theme, sector, operational area or institutional performance. It analyses the level of achievement of both expected and unexpected results by examining the results chain, processes, contextual factors and causality using appropriate criteria such as relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability.*

*An evaluation should provide credible, useful evidence-based information that enables the timely incorporation of its findings, recommendations and lessons into the decision-making processes of organizations and stakeholders.*

The evaluation used a contribution analysis rather than attribution analysis (which would require a counterfactual- i.e., control groups and control areas).

### Type of evaluation

The evaluation is mostly a summative evaluation, learning from the past program.

The evaluation was conducted using the modified Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development/Development Assistance Committee (OECD/DAC) evaluation criteria<sup>6</sup>. Specifically, relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability as well as equity, gender equality and human rights considerations. A number of evaluation questions had been developed and are presented in this report in paragraph 4.2. These evaluation questions were reviewed, modified and merged from those originally mentioned in the ToR of this evaluation (Annex 4).

**Impact:** What difference does the intervention make? The extent to which the intervention has generated or is expected to generate significant positive or negative, intended or unintended, higher-level effects.

---

<sup>5</sup> <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/1914>

<sup>6</sup> <https://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/revised-evaluation-criteria-dec-2019.pdf>

**Relevance:** Is the intervention doing the right things? The extent to which the intervention objectives and design respond to beneficiaries', global, country, and partner/institution needs, policies, and priorities, and continue to do so if circumstances change.

**Coherence:** How well does the intervention fit? The compatibility of the intervention with other interventions in a country, sector or institution.

**Effectiveness:** Is the intervention achieving its objectives? The extent to which the intervention achieved, or is expected to achieve, its objectives, and its results, including any differential results across groups.

**Efficiency:** How well are resources being used? The extent to which the intervention delivers, or is likely to deliver, results in an economic and timely way.

**Sustainability:** Will the benefits last? The extent to which the net benefits of the intervention continue or are likely to continue.

Furthermore, the evaluation included cross-cutting evaluation criteria on human rights, gender equality and equity, where the latter two are defined as (UNICEF Regional Office for South Asia, Glossary 2017<sup>7</sup>, and UN.org website<sup>8</sup>):

**Gender equality:** The concept that women and men, girls and boys have equal conditions, treatment and opportunities for realizing their full potential, human rights and dignity, and for contributing to (and benefitting from) economic, social, cultural and political development.

**Gender equity:** The process of being fair to men and women, boys and girls, and importantly the equality of outcomes and results.

**Human Rights:** Human rights are rights inherent to all human beings, regardless of race, sex, nationality, ethnicity, language, religion, or any other status. Human rights include the right to life and liberty, freedom from slavery and torture, freedom of opinion and expression, the right to work and education, and many more. Everyone is entitled to these rights, without discrimination.

In line with the above and the objectives stipulated, MDF used three core methodological approaches which were used interchangeably, depending on the data and respondents available: the Theory of Change, Results-Based Management (the Results Chain) and Most Significant Change elements (during interviews and Focus Group Discussions).

### Main approaches and activities

The evaluation approach entailed reviewing/ redrafting evaluation questions per OECD evaluation criterion and translating these into sub-questions and determining methods for data collection. This is presented in an Evaluation Matrix in Annex 2.

We used mixed methods of desk studies, key informant interviews (KIIs) and focus group discussions (FGDs), depending on the evaluation question and evaluation criterion, as described in the Evaluation Matrix.

---

<sup>7</sup> <https://www.unicef.org/rosa/media/1761/file/Gender%20glossary%20of%20terms%20and%20concepts%20.pdf>

<sup>8</sup> <https://www.un.org/en/global-issues/human-rights#:~:text=Human%20rights%20are%20rights%20inherent,and%20education%2C%20and%20many%20more.>

### *Desk study*

50 documents were consulted (some in part), consisting of:

- USDP-2 program documents (Inception Report, BEMOs, Annual Plans, progress reports).
- The Mid-term Evaluation Report.
- Government of Indonesia sanitation policy-related documents
- Government of Indonesia USDP-2 related documents, at the national as well as the local levels.
- Other water and sanitation related studies and reports.

### *Key informant interviews and focus group discussions*

Interviewees were: embassy staff, implementing partners, government agencies at the national, provincial and local levels, and other externals (see Annex 3):

- 8 interviewees were PUNO's staff (3 male and 5 female).
- 1 interviewee was from the Joint UN SDG Fund head office (1 male).
- 5 interviewees were national level government agencies (3 male and 2 female).
- 8 interviewees were provincial and local level governments (7 male and 1 female).
- 6 interviewees were other UN and non-UN personnel - water and sanitation specialists (3 male and 3 female).

### *Field visits to two locations*

- NTB (Central and East Lombok) and Central Java (Karanganyar and Kebumen districts).

## 3.2. Evaluation questions

The following 11 Evaluation Questions were drafted to be answered (for the Evaluation Matrix, see Annex 2):

### Relevance

1. How did USDP-2 contribute to the policy needs of the GoI?
2. To what extent were these GoI policy needs properly identified and field tested to address the needs of the population?

### Coherence

3. To what extent did USDP-2 contribute to SDG 6 (related to sanitation) as well as to the Dutch WASH Strategy 2016-2030?
4. To what extent did the program respond to the principles and ambitions of the Aid-to-Trade agenda, i.e., continues to promote social development while at the same time identifying and promoting economic opportunities for the Netherlands Water Sector?

### Effectiveness

5. Were the formulated objectives achieved?
  - a. Central level: trends in central budget allocation, relevant national legislation, regulations and standards, formal adoption and roll-out of implementation guidelines (including distribution of responsibility and tasks at different governmental levels), continued use of CBT guidelines, etc.
  - b. Provincial level: trends in provincial budget allocation, adoption of provincial policies, establishment and maintenance of provincial *Pokjas* equipped and capacitated to perform their facilitation role successfully, creation and sustenance of provincial facilities (e.g. allocation of landfill sites)

- c. Local level: budget trends for investment and maintenance, establishment, operations and financial sustainability of local *Pokjas*, maintenance/continued operations of physical infrastructure (including capture-containment-emptying-transport-treatment-safe reuse/disposal).
  - d. Cross-cutting issues taken into account?
    - attention for cultural and social acceptability of newly developed sanitation technologies and practices including cost recovery
    - private sector engagement in financing and operating new sanitation facilities/services, in particular at provincial and local levels, and including public-private sector coordination
    - How are poverty reduction, gender and climate change considerations integrated parts of USDP-2.
6. What were the major factors hampering/ contributing to the achievement?
  7. To what extent did the program have a solid exit strategy, addressing transitional issues, in 2020, of Dutch ODA support to Indonesia.

#### Efficiency

8. How was the coordination and collaboration between USDP-2 and other sanitation sector stakeholders, such as ministries, UN/WSP/USAID etc., NGOs as well as the private sector.

#### Sustainability

9. To what extent are the results that were achieved at the central, provincial and local government levels likely to last (organization (staffing and structure), economic, environment)?
10. To what extent has inclusion, poverty reduction, gender and climate change considerations been taken into account by the program, both in the ambition and implementation of the program as well in the monitoring and reporting?

#### Impact

11. Overall, to what extent did the USDP-2 program contribute to the policy level sanitation objectives of the GoI?

### 3.3. The evaluation process; changes and constraints

#### Changes to the evaluation purpose, objectives and methods

The evaluation implementation did not deviate from the requested objectives or methods in the original ToR and proposal, except (at the request of the EKN) by reducing the number of field visits from 3 to 2. Furthermore, the evaluation questions in the ToR were reviewed, finetuned and detailed out (see the Evaluation Matrix in Annex 2).

Constraints to the evaluation (process) were encountered as well as mitigation strategies used are listed below:

#### Availability and willingness of resource persons, interviewees/ respondents

It was sometimes a challenge to get appointments with interviewees, and some were only available for a limited time. This has caused delays, but eventually this constraint did not impact the evaluation results.

Many members of the sanitation working group of the 2015-2020 period in all the visited locations had already moved to different divisions, and some had retired. In all areas visited – province and district

levels – the sanitation working group tried to ensure that at least one member of the sanitation working group during the USDP-2-period would meet with the evaluation consultant.

With some delays, due to the availability of interviewees or approval, the evaluation team members interviewed all relevant resource persons. However, not many of the interviewees were actively part of, or working as counterparts of, the USDP-2 program. An overview can be found in Annex 2. All online interviews were recorded.

#### Availability of documents, including in-depth reviews and evaluation documents

Most documents were provided by the EKN, and the consultants obtained several other through their connections within and outside the country as well as online available literature.

#### Methodological limitations

There were no significant methodological constraints encountered. Language barriers and remote data collection hurdles were effectively overcome by the use of an Indonesian-speaking consultant and an experienced WASH consultant.

Some notes on the limitations encountered are:

1. As mentioned above, many members of the sanitation working group of 2015-2020 in all the visited locations have moved to different divisions, and some retired. In all locations visited – province and district level, the sanitation working group tried to present at least one member of the sanitation working group during USDP-2 period to meet with the evaluation consultant. As a result, in the two provinces and four districts visited, there was one person who had limited interface with USDP-2 and could provide the evaluation consultant with information about the situation during USDP-2 technical assistance.
2. Many products could not be claimed as the sole result of USDP-2 technical assistance. There were many contributing factors to the result either due to the internal drive/commitment of the working group itself, the openness of the LG and/or the influence of other partners such as UNICEF, IUWASH, PLAN, etc.
3. The selection of NTB and Central Java is a sample, and hence cannot be interpreted to reflect the conditions in all of the 9 provinces and 62 cities/districts of USDP-2.

It should be noted that the selection of sites visited in NTB was to see progress made since the Mid-Term Review (MTR) performed in January 2012 at these locations. Meanwhile, Central Java (not part of the MTR) was selected as counterfactual to see how the local government's commitment has contributed to the results.

# 4. Evaluation Findings

## 4.1. Relevance

The evaluation has two evaluation questions on relevance:

1. How did USDP-2 contribute to the policy needs of the GoI?
2. To what extent were these GoI policy needs properly identified and field tested to address the needs of the population?

### USDP-2 contribution to the GoI's policy needs

USDP-2 focused its assistance to support the implementation of the second phase of the national program, PPSP (in English: accelerated sanitation development for human settlements program), at the local government level in 9 provinces<sup>9</sup> and 62 cities/districts. When USDP-2 started in 2015, the PPSP was entering its second phase.

### Findings:

1. With the PPSP-2, the GoI wishes to fulfil its commitment to the UN Sustainable Development Goals 2015 - 2030. Accordingly, PPSP was spelled out in the highest-level national policy document, RPJMN (National Medium-Term Development Plan). RPJMN 2015 - 2019, the third phase of implementation of the 2005-2025 National Long-Term Development Plan (RPJPN), clearly outlined the objectives of PPSP Phase-2. The placement of PPSP continued into RPJMN 2020 - 2024. The incorporation of PPSP in the highest national policy development is to advance the achievement of the UN SDGs, particularly SDG #6 – Ensure availability and sustainable management of water and sanitation for all.

At the national level, in its assistance to BAPPENAS and line ministries in the actualization of PPSP, USDP-2 produced numerous outputs and outcomes that supported the above-mentioned governmental goals at the national, provincial and district/city level. In each district/city, USDP-2 assisted the preparation of EHRA (Environmental Health Risk Assessment) and SSK – the City/District Sanitation Strategy.

Detailed information on this is elaborated in the program's Final Report and there is no need to repeat all deliverables, but this final evaluation wishes to mention some outputs that were repeatedly mentioned by the key informants (KIs) of this evaluation as especially appreciated:

- *Panduan Pendampingan Implementasi SSK* (Facilitation Guideline of SSK Implementation), with related tools (*Petunjuk Praktis*).
- The PPSP 2020 – 2024 Program Management Manual (PMM), endorsed by BAPPEDA and the implementing ministries (MOHA, MPW, and MOH) as a guideline for rolling out the application of SSK.
- Capacity Building and Training (CBT) program modules for stakeholders in sanitation.

---

<sup>9</sup> Originally the project included 10 provinces but after the inception phase one province was dropped.

- Coaching clinics.
2. At the provincial and city/district level, the RPJMN is ‘translated’ into a provincial RPJMD and city/district RPJMD, taking the local needs and context into account. In line with the objectives of PPSP and considering the result of the EHRA, an SSK is prepared or renewed. At this provincial and city/district level (both urban and rural), USDP-2 assisted in adopting and adjusting the national program of PPSP-2 to fit the local context. USDP-2 also assisted in the development of budgets and related calculations for implementation/ operationalization of the provincial and local plans: USDP-2 guided the preparation/renewal and implementation of the EHRA and the SSK, other policy documents, annual planning and advocacy initiatives, contextualized to fit the local needs. For instance, in West Nusa Tenggara (NTB) USDP-2 assisted the development of ‘policy package’ documents for sanitation. Of these, *Tasura Berbenah* of Central Lombok and *Pada Suka* of East Lombok are two documents which are still being used as a key reference in the sanitation program development of the two districts. The renewal of the district SSK places these documents as major references.
  3. During the evaluation it became clear that USDP-2 is perceived as having contributed to an environment which increasingly allows for open discussions on sanitation and the government’s role in this. Although there is still a need to work on ensuring support and commitment (which also means budget) for sanitation from local governments, the national level interviewees reported a marked improvement in the local governments’ support and commitment to sanitation. Similarly, at the community level, proper and safe sanitation is now openly discussed. As a result, communities’ attitudes have shifted towards accessing appropriate sanitation. Interviews in Central Java acknowledged that USDP-2 helped the relevant local institutions (in sanitation) to ‘grow’ in their awareness on the importance of sanitation. The inclusion of sanitation in the (provincial) RPJMD is considered a crucial element that ‘forced’ sanitation-related (government) institutions to act and at the same time welcome the assistance of the USDP-2 program.
  4. The USDP-2 assistance modality was (almost unanimously) hailed as effective and a suitable model for Indonesia’s institutional and programmatic set-up. While the USDP-2 implementation approach will be discussed below, under the effectiveness evaluation questions, specific elements of the approach that supported the acceleration of sanitation development by the government of Indonesia’s policies through, among others:
    - Formulation of national policy and local regulations on FSM and SWM well as well as its dissemination.
    - Facilitation of the finalization of the National Road Map for Sanitation.
    - Facilitation of the review of the PSR guidelines and formulation of program management manual.
    - Facilitation of workshops for guidelines and service operators as well as capacity building on PPSP-2 and MEL.

Currently, the USDP-2 approach is being adopted and adapted for drinking water, which is being included in the PPSP program.

### To what extent were these Gol policy needs properly identified and field tested to address the needs of the population?

The implementation of sanitation development is the responsibility of local governments, and as such the policy needs and identification of these needs, were tested at the provincial levels. As there is not much information available on how the USDP-2 program needs were identified prior to 2015

(respondents simply didn't know), the evaluation opted to assess the appropriateness (relevance) of the interventions at the provincial levels, as perceived by the provincial respondents. The two provinces visited during this evaluation are considered more economically advanced than other provinces (not necessarily in sanitation, however). Still, these provinces valued the provision of technical assistance from USDP-2, especially in the development of concepts and application of best practices from other similar situations, and match these with the needs at the local levels.

### Findings:

5. In Central Java and NTB, sanitation was one of the top priorities in RPJMD 2013 – 2018 and 2019 – 2023 of both provinces. In both provinces and cities/districts, together with MPW, MOH and MOHA, BAPPEDA leads and coordinates the planning of the sanitation program which includes infrastructure, behavioral change through STBM/CLTS, sanitation services provision, institutional arrangements and capacity strengthening. The technical facilitation from USDP-2 benefited the sanitation stakeholders at the provincial and the city/district levels as expressed by respondents in both provinces.
6. USDP-2 was strong in advocacy initiatives and highly relevant to the need, at that period, to advocate sanitation to local governments, as sanitation was (and still is to a certain extent) a taboo subject. At the start, it was very rare that a city major or a district regent provided support, let alone commitment, to sanitation. Considerable effort had to be exercised at the national level to gain the attention and support of the local government's influential persons. Although AKKOPSI (the All-Indonesian Sanitation Care District/City Alliance) was already formed in 2009 by 6 city majors, there were not many majors/regents who paid attention or gave their support and commitment to sanitation. USDP-2's focus on advocacy was a correctly identified need, and the work done contributed to progress made to overcome the taboo with local governments. In communities, however, the taboo is still strong and local governments need to continue to work on this.
7. The presence of USDP-2 in 9 provinces and 62 cities/districts boosted some government officials' motivation (and power) to lobby other decision-makers in their cities/districts, such as health-sector officials. This became evident in Karanganyar and Kebumen districts in Central Java and Central and East Lombok in NTB. The presence of USDP Prosda raised sanitation to be a high-profile strategic issue for local development. The subsequent advocacy contributed to the start of a health-sector facilitated community practice in sanitation STBM (adaptation of CLTS - community-led total sanitation, an internationally applied methodology to stop open defecation). This advocacy initiative was now continued by other government organizations at the provincial level as well, and included socialization events/festivals, which took place in key public places such as the central square (Alun-alun) in the district capital. As a result, the reach of the USDP-2 program increased and field tested by different local government organizations.

## 4.2. Coherence

The evaluation has two evaluation questions on coherence:

1. To what extent did USDP-2 contribute to SDG 6 (related to sanitation) as well as to the Dutch WASH Strategy 2016-2030?
2. To what extent did the program respond to the principles and ambitions of the Aid-to-Trade agenda, i.e., continues to promote social development while at the same time identifying and promoting economic opportunities for the Netherlands Water Sector?

## To what extent did USDP-2 contribute to SDG #6 as well as to the Dutch WASH Strategy 2016 – 2030?

Between 2002 – 2015, the MDG7c and, starting in 2016, the SDG6 have influenced the Indonesian sanitation national policies, program development and implementation as well as service delivery to the community at local level. Whilst USDP1 supported the government of Indonesia to attain the MDGs #7c, the USDP-2 assistance is aimed at supporting the government of Indonesia to attain (or rather: contribute to) SDG 6 ("clean water and sanitation for all"). The SDGs were adopted by Indonesia and reflected in the RPJMN. At provincial and city/district level, these were translated into the RPJMD.

SDG 6 has 6 indicators and a few sub -indicators.

### Findings:

8. USDP-2 focused on regulation and, to a lesser extent, on improving technical knowledge and operational measures. The two main SDG6 indicators that PPSP, and hence USPD-2, contributed to are indicator 6.2.1 (proportion of population using safely managed sanitation services...) and indicator 6.b.1: (proportion of local administrative units with established and operational policies and procedures for participation of local communities in water and sanitation management).
9. According to WHO/UNICEF JMP data, basic-urban-sanitation coverage rates in Indonesia have gone up from 92.5% in 2015 to 97.2% in 2020 (SDG 6 indicator 6.2.1). This increase was mostly due to the increase of septic tanks. Sewage connections, however, have remained stagnant since at least 2000 (the first year of reporting of JMP).
10. Since the RPJMN 2015 – 2019, and continued in RPJMN 2020 – 2024, PPSP has strongly given direction to provinces and local governments to implement national policies. Assisting the PPSP implementation in 9 provinces and 62 local governments, USDP-2 facilitated successfully an enabling environment for sanitation, and provided technical assistance to provinces and local governments to plan and implement sanitation target-oriented development through the actualization of the cities/districts RPJMD (SDG 6 indicator 6.b.1).
11. Both SDG6 and the Dutch WASH Strategy ("50 million people worldwide access to basic sanitation and focus on sustained service delivery") measure primarily sanitation coverage rates. While USDP-2 has no direct measurable contribution to coverage rates, it certainly has contributed to an enabling environment in which, at local levels, more access to (safely managed) urban sanitation has been achieved,
12. None of the program documents nor any of the persons interviewed could link USDP-2 with the Aid-to-Trade agenda. It simply never was the aim of the USDP-2 program. Although NGOs like SNV are still working on urban sanitation, no Dutch business is actively involved in any follow-up activity of USDP-2.

## 4.3. Effectiveness

The evaluation has three evaluation questions on effectiveness:

1. Were the formulated the objectives achieved?
  - a. Central level: trends in central budget allocation, relevant national legislation, regulations and standards, formal adoption and roll-out of implementation guidelines (including distribution of responsibility and tasks at different governmental levels), continued use of CBT guidelines, etc.

- b. Provincial level: trends in provincial budget allocation, adoption of provincial policies, establishment and maintenance of provincial *Pokjas* equipped and capacitated to perform their facilitation role successfully, creation and sustenance of provincial facilities (e.g. allocation of landfill sites)
  - c. Local level: budget trends for investment and maintenance, establishment, operations and financial sustainability of local *Pokjas*, maintenance/continued operations of physical infrastructure (including capture – containment – emptying – transport – treatment - safe reuse/disposal).
  - d. Cross-cutting issues taken into account?
    - attention for cultural and social acceptability of newly-developed sanitation technologies and practices including cost recovery
    - private sector engagement in financing and operating new sanitation facilities/services, in particular at provincial and local levels, and including public-private sector coordination
    - How are poverty reduction, gender and climate change considerations integrated parts of USDP-2.
2. What were the major factors hampering/ contributing to the achievement?
  3. To what extent did the program have a solid exit strategy, addressing transitional issues, in 2020, of Dutch ODA support to Indonesia.

### Were the formulated objectives achieved?

The UNDP-2 program objectives have changed slightly, in different documents as well as over time, and the evaluators worked with the UNDP-2 objectives as presented in Chapter 1.

### Findings:

13. With a broad scope of sanitation issues (fecal sludge, solid waste management and wastewater management) USDP-2 could generally only work on one aspect in a given city or district. There were exceptions where two of the USDP-2 scopes of assistance (FSM and SWM) could be covered and managed. Karanganyar and Kebumen Districts in Central Java were among these very few districts which could optimize the USDP-2 assistance for fecal sludge and solid waste. In NTB, both Central Lombok and East Lombok benefitted from USDP-2 assistance primarily in solid waste management. Wastewater management was not mentioned in any of the districts visited. This was probably due to the fact that it is grouped under domestic wastewater management, which includes Fecal Sludge Management.

14. In addition to the multi-faceted sanitation challenges, the mobilization of USDP-2 assistance was considerably late in some districts. In Central Lombok and East Lombok, USDP-2 technical assistance started only in mid- or late 2016 and already started to phase out in 2018 (just 2 years after its start). With a Prosda covering two districts in Lombok (Central and East Lombok) and one district in Sumbawa Island (Bima District), these districts were able to improve their solid waste management (SWM) but did very little on FSM.

In Central Java, USDP-2 provided intensive technical assistance to two districts: Karanganyar and Kebumen. Semi-intensive coaching was done to three districts: Wonogiri, Boyolali and Pati. Four districts (80%) increased their ability to plan and implement a sanitation program. Their revised SSKs (Local Government Sanitation Strategy) were also categorized as A and B (which signifies good quality). There was only one district (Wonogiri) which was considered to have not met the standard of ability to plan and implement. One other district was considered less responsive to the sanitation

program's needs. This district, Boyolali, had an EHRA (Environmental Health Risk Assessment) which was outdated and the SSK had not been revisited.

In NTB, USDP-2 intensively assisted three districts: Central Lombok and East Lombok in Lombok Island, and Bima District in Sumbawa Island. There was no information from the provincial working group about the ability of the three districts in planning and implementing sanitation program.

At district level, the two districts in Central Java (Karanganyar and Kebumen) enjoyed the benefit of having significant support and commitment from their local government. This was a result of intensive advocacy. The recognition from the central government, such as the AMPL10 award, also motivated the local government to allocate funding for sanitation (to meet the standards for the competition). The two districts in NTB, however, expressed disappointment of the lack of the local government's commitment to sanitation. This reportedly affected some acceleration activities.

In other words, the implementation 'intensity' and successes of USDP-2 in each province and/ or district varied considerably, mostly due to local capacities (in one with USDP-2's demand-driven approach).

15. Local governments in Indonesia are the central decision-making body, including decisions on budgets. The USDP-2 objectives may have stretched, but also sometimes overstretched, the local governments' commitment to allocate funding for sanitation. While many program ideas shared by USDP-2 were good, many could not be implemented because of very limited funding available from the local government's budget.
16. During the USDP-2 period of assistance, the national budget for sanitation was satisfactory and increased every year. This continued until the COVID pandemic started in March 2020. During the pandemic period, the budget significantly reduced and was re-allocated for pandemic response. The MPW claimed that in 2019 the budget for sanitation was IDR 5 billion. In 2020, it reduced to only IDR 2 billion. In 2023, it is anticipated that the budget could raise to more than 7 billion; for both sanitation and drinking water. Hence, the USDP-2 objective of an increased budget allocation for sanitation has not been met, but this mostly due to the COVID pandemic.
17. Most national policies simply have to be implemented by provinces and cities/districts. Hence, the national-wide sanitation policy, through PPSP, has been adopted by the 34 provinces, 98 cities and 416 districts. However, there are no budget policies that lower-level governments have to adhere to. As for the aimed-for objective of having 90 local governments allocate 2% of their annual budget on sanitation: the data is notoriously difficult to find, and usually unreliable. In January 2018, the project team has undertaken their own analysis of the financial performance of the project supported cities and districts<sup>11</sup>, because of a lack of data. The evaluation team tried to find reliable recent data on local government spending percentages, but came up empty handed. A World Bank document<sup>12</sup> stated: *In general, data on [water and sanitation] spending is limited across all levels of government, especially at the subnational level. It is not possible to split ... spending at the central government level before 2005. At the sub-national level, it is not possible to identify even aggregate ... spending after 2010.* The explanation given for this was that the decentralization

---

<sup>10</sup> AMPL = Air Minum dan Pembuangan Limbah, Water and Waste

<sup>11</sup> Financial Performance Kabupaten and Kota, USDP-2, WAT TA1315 R004, 0.1/Draft, 17 January 2018, 12 p.

<sup>12</sup> <https://thedocs.worldbank.org/en/doc/756411590233766450-0070022020/original/IDPER2020Ch12WaterSupply.pdf>

process of the last decade(s) made it impossible to collect this data. However, the main conclusion from the USDP-2 study (2018) was as follows<sup>13</sup>:

- The average direct spending (not budget allocation) out of the LG budget for the period 2015-2017 has been 2.11% and has remained fairly constant over these three years, with a lot of variation among the provinces, ranging from a low 1.22% in South Sulawesi to a high 3.45% in West Java;
- The average sanitation expenditure from other sources (provincial, national) has decreased by 9.86% from 2015 to 2017 (i.e. taking 2015 as the baseline).

The consensus among respondents is that the local budgets did not increase, and decreased significantly during the Covid pandemic.

18. Fecal sludge management is gradually getting adopted by local and provincial governments, but is far from being widely accepted among the general population. The program worked on building awareness of the principle "containment, emptying, transport, treatment, and disposal". This was locally successful but not program-wide. Until present, it remains challenging to apply the principle because, in urban areas, more than 80% of households had flush toilets discharged to on-site septic tanks which are not water-proof and the effluent liquids (slowly) discharge into the soil instead of being collected for safe fecal sludge treatment. According to WHO/UNICEF JMP 2020, less than 4% of these households utilized sanitation services to treat their sludge. In Central Java, all IPLTs (fecal sludge treatment installations) had unscheduled human sludge collection services (or known as Layanan Lumpur Tinja Terjadwal, L2T3 in Indonesia). Until the evaluation took place, there is only one city, the city of Surakarta, which has been able to apply the scheduled emptying and collection service (or known as Layanan Lumpur Tinja Terjadwal L2T2).

19. USDP-2 assisted 9 provinces and 62 cities/districts, in its Final Report mentioned 100% achievement rate of the program objectives at national and provincial level, and 69% at city/district level.

20. When asked about what the most effective deliverables/ strategies of USDP-2 were to achieve the higher-level results, respondents mostly mentioned the following:

- The technical assistance in preparing and implementing EHRA, the White Book of Sanitation (a blueprint of a district sanitation plan) and SSK were mentioned by all respondents. Until present, the EHRA and SSK are continued to be revisited and renewed. For this purpose, the province and districts adopted similar technical assistance approaches like applied by the USDP-2 team by recruiting provincial (funded by the central government through MPW) and district facilitators (2 districts are covered by the central government through MPW and the rest of the districts fund their facilitators from the district budget - APBD). All activities in sanitation at present are still planned and implemented according to the SSK (which is prepared based on the result of an EHRA). Up until now, there is only one district (Wonogiri) in Central Java that has not renewed its EHRA (2018) and SSK (2021).
- The preparation of PPSP program concept and the implementation plan in the assisted provinces.
- The pilot locations provided examples of best practices for scaling up to other locations in Indonesia.

---

<sup>13</sup> MTE (2019)

- Capacity building and training (CBT) for the provincial working group by USDP-2 enabled the working group to further assist the districts/cities. This CBT approach has been adopted by the government.
- USDP-2 technical assistance provided positive examples to coach and mentor the cities and districts in sanitation.

*Cross-cutting issues (social acceptability, gender, minorities, environmental issues, private sector or community engagement):*

21. At first, a special USDP-2 poverty reduction and gender specialist, based in the Netherlands and hired for 35 working days, worked only on request of the provinces and (hence) not in all provinces. She was being called when deemed needed. Her main focus was on gender and not on poverty reduction or wider inclusivity. During the Mid-Term Evaluation, a stronger gender focus was recommended, and subsequently, a national gender consultant was recruited for 40 more working days. However, no apparent shift in approaches to incorporate gender really materialized.
22. Gender and poverty alleviation issues are partly integrated in the government of Indonesia's policies and approaches and were (infrequently) used by USDP-2. However, there is evidence that gender issues, poverty alleviation and climate change issues are increasingly being adopted by government institutions. Since USDP-2 had no clear gender, poverty reduction or climate change approaches, the contribution of USDP-2 to these issues is tenuous.
23. Sanitation had been overlooked in many places in the country. As mentioned earlier in the report, sanitation is a taboo in the Indonesian society. People prefer not to talk about sanitation, even informally, let alone to be included in the local sanitation development ambitions. This challenged both the government and USDP-2 to address everything within a limited program period. USDP-2's work with local governments has been (partly) successful to tackle this taboo, but activities to overcome the taboo among the general population have not been undertaken, let alone specifically targeted to women, people with disabilities, minorities or other disadvantaged groups.
24. Poverty reduction strategies initially focused on the promotion of low-cost sanitation technologies in low-density areas (using local government budgets). In low-income rural settings, most toilets are discharged into a *cubluk*: an unsealed tank or soak pit, which can be discharged in surface water or a nearby environment. To stop open defecation and improve access to proper and safe sanitation, this was the government's first pillar of STBM (Indonesia's national policy to change community behavior related to WASH, adapted from the CLTS/community-led total sanitation approach), particularly for lower-income rural and peri-urban populations. As such it has been applied by local governments and NGOs for low-income peri-urban populations in USDP-2 areas. As a result of the governments sanitation efforts, starting in 2020, many USDP-2 assisted districts declared they were Open-defecation Free (ODF). In Central Java and NTB all cities and districts declared ODF in 2020.
25. All districts visited for the evaluation still applied controlled-landfill without further treatment. All landfill managers met during the evaluation wished they could manage the landfills to become - sanitary landfills (which are better planned and monitored), but there was not enough soil to cover the waste on a regular basis. However, Kebumen District has been able to turn some parts of its compacted cells to become a 'park' where they grow decorative plants and pigeons.
26. There has been no formal cooperation with the private sector in sanitation, through USDP-2 or otherwise. This is because no government regulation on private sector engagement exists. Because few septic tanks are being emptied, the number of private sector organizations working in sanitation is small, and they are relatively small in capacity and size. The private sector informal

involvement takes the form of fecal sludge suction, and bringing the sludge to a formal treatment plant or dumping it illegally. Some private sector engagement was observed in the form of provision of a Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) budget contribution for sanitation, in Muara Enim District – South Sumatera. There, PT Bukit Asam, a coal mining company, provided funds for the community to construct basic sanitation facilities at household level.

27. Cooperation has been nurtured between local governments and a religious-based organization, Baznaz. Baznaz collects and manages 2.5% of income from individuals for social activities. Baznaz provides resources to the community, especially to low-income areas. The support is in the form of budgets for building safe toilets, human waste suction (paying for its cost), and solid waste management at community level, i.e. through the waste bank (bank sampah) and temporary waste disposals which applied the 3R-concept: reuse, reduce and recycle.
28. USDP-2 activities addressed indirectly climate and resilience themes related to sanitation by focusing on fecal sludge management, flood protection of contamination by solid waste and septic tanks, and their planning activities in flood-prone areas.

### What were the major factors hampering/contributing to the achievement of the objectives?

#### Findings:

29. The program very much depended on the interaction between regulations, technical knowledge, operational measures, as well as awareness building and behavior change. According to the USDP-2 management, in hindsight they could have focused more on awareness building and behavior change because USDP-2 has not been very successful in making the general public and local governments aware of the importance of sanitation.
30. In some locations the program start-up was delayed. In Central Lombok and East Lombok, the Prosda was able to facilitate improved operations of solid waste management (SWM), but unable to attend the fecal sludge management (FSM) and wastewater management (WWM) issues accordingly. Part of the latter problem was due to limited time availability for attending to the issue. In Kebumen District, as an example of the opposite, the facilitation for FSM was provided optimally, but not for SWM. Similarly, this was due to limited time availability.
31. From the view of involved government institutions, the major factor inhibiting optimal achievement of USDP-2 assistance in several locations was due to the limited ability of the local government to commit funding for sanitation. As a result, a number of valid USDP-2 ideas could not be materialized. In comparison, the districts in Central Java did not encounter a budget problem for sanitation activities because of a high-level of commitment from the local governments.
32. The COVID-19 pandemic affected and slowed down the last phase of the implementation of USDP-2.

### To what extent did the program have a solid exit strategy?

The program's Final Report detailed the exit strategy and its status when the program phased out in 2020 into two major approaches and phases:

#### 1. Phasing out over time:

The program reduces activity levels over time in preparation for phasing out or transferring responsibilities. Special challenges included: timing; sensitizing counterparts; maintaining the activity/output/outcome link, building the capacity of organizations to take over responsibilities; viability of activities with reduced program support; managing reputational risks.

#### 2. Transfer of responsibility (handover):

The counterpart organizations gradually take over and continue providing services. The program will assist the counterparts in securing the required resources and enhance technical know-how and management capacity, essentially through a structured capacity building and training program. Special challenges included: timing of the transition; capacity building and training; whether scope, scale and quality of activities can continue; viability of the handover; managing reputational risks to the program if the transition is unsuccessful. Securing budgets, however, was deemed beyond control of USDP.

Based on the above ambitions the following findings can be mentioned:

#### Findings:

33. Provincial advisers (Prosdas) were financed by USDP-2 until 1.5 years before end of the program (9 Prosdas) after which the presence of Prosdas continued with provincial government funds until the end of the program. This was done intentionally as an exit strategy, so that when USDP 2 phased out, the local government was already prepared and had a sustainable solution in place. Currently, the provinces still have advisers/facilitators, funded/paid by the national government (through the Ministry of PW-PH). The provincial advisers assist the provincial working group and the working groups of two selected districts/cities (one province has a responsibility to assist at least two districts/cities within the province). When other districts/cities (out of the two selected districts/cities) within that province request technical assistance in sanitation, then the districts/cities have to fund their own facilitators/advisors, and the provincial advisor will further assist in implementation.
34. The 'high-level advocacy' approach, which was successfully initiated by USDP-2 in 9 provinces (and the selected cities/districts), has been continued and strengthened by the government at national, provincial, and city/district level in all 9 provinces and relevant cities/districts, and also outside these 9 provinces. During the data collection in NTB, the provincial sanitation working group teamed-up with the Central Lombok working group and lobbied the Central Lombok District Regent to provide more support to sanitation and enforce better commitment for the 5 STBM pillars. In Central Java, Karanganyar District continued to lobby the local governments for continued improvement of the IPLT and landfill.
35. As part of the handover, all USDP-2 technical assistance products have been compiled by BAPPENAS and some are still renewed regularly (i.e. the SSK and its implementation manual). To facilitate other cities/districts which did not get USDP-2 technical assistance to plan and implement their sanitation program, BAPPENAS has a knowledge management unit which manages the USDP-2 technical assistance products (including documentations of best practices and lessons learned), along with products from other external assistance programs, and other sources.

## 4.4. Efficiency

The evaluation has one evaluation questions on efficiency:

1. How was the coordination and collaboration between USDP-2 and other sanitation sector stakeholders, such as ministries, UN/WSP/USAID etc., NGOs as well as the private sector.

Coordination and collaboration between USDP-2 and other sanitation sector stakeholders, such as ministries, UN/WSP/USAID etc., NGOs as well as the private sector.

#### Findings:

36. The key team of technical experts working on USDP-2 was previously involved in USDP (and ISSDP) and hence knew the government actors. This made the implementation, especially at start-up easier. Where USDP aimed to establish strategic sanitation planning, USDP-2 focused on the implementation of the strategic sanitation plans. This change in strategy demanded a different mindset of the team, from a full technical assistance and BAPPENAS (and other ministries)-supporting role to a somewhat more critical and challenging role in which government approaches and decisions could be questioned. The latter was never fully taken up. This might have lowered the “ambition” of the project, especially related to fecal sludge management and private sector involvement.
37. For USDP-2, BAPPENAS formed and led a Project Management Unit (PMU). For overseeing implementation, the PMU formed three Project Implementation Unit (PIUs): Public Works and Public Housing (PW-PH) for the hard-ware aspects, MOH for ‘software’ aspects (specifically behavior change/demand creation), and the Ministry of Home Affairs for institutional aspect. Coordination mechanism with these three ministries was in the format of working groups: (*Pokja Air Minum dan Sanitasi* or Working Group Clean Water and Sanitation, which was a working group of BAPPENAS with sanitation-related government institutions (i.e. MPW, MOH and MOHA), meeting twice a year. Another working group was of BAPPENAS with all sanitation related donor assistance programs, including USDP-2. They would meet once a year. The private sector was not included in the working groups.
38. USDP-2 had monthly coordination meetings and almost daily contact with BAPPENAS outside the regular meetings with the above-mentioned working groups. From the respondents it became clear that there was very good and productive cooperation between the various parties. This was also the result of the collaboration in the pre-USDP-2 program where TA staff was located in the BAPPENAS offices.
39. At provincial and city/district levels, the coordination (in activity planning and implementation based on SSK) among the sanitation stakeholders also received positive feedback. The USDP-2 Provincial Sanitation Development Advisor (Prosda) was tasked with the proper coordination and ensured that meetings were frequently performed, led by BAPPEDA.
40. In a different forum, USDP-2 cooperated locally with NGOs working under the Dutch-financed WASH SDG Program (Plan International and Simavi). USDP-2 also engaged in coordination with IUWASH on the focus and scope of sanitation activities in the same locations. USDP-2 was not an active partner in the sanitation sector national stakeholder groups, including UNICEF, USAID and WSP/WB. Because of the strong position those groups have in national policy development, as well as USDP-2’s position in national urban sanitation, it was often mentioned as a missed opportunity for USDP-2 that they did not coordinate more at this level.
41. Cooperation and collaboration with the private sector did not take place as a strategy of the program. To some extent, however, engagement with the private sector happened in forums, such as KSAN, the conference for water supply and sanitation (Konferensi Air Minum dan Sanitasi, KSAN). KSAN is held every two years and is considered a high-level national event to highlight cooperation and collaboration of sanitation players (including the private sector) and knowledge sharing in sanitation. During its implementation period, USDP-2 contributed to the preparation and execution of the KSAN (in 2017 and in December 2019). For the government partners, generally, private sector involvement in sanitation is considered irrelevant. USDP-2, however, was requested quite a number of times (e.g. in the original contract and MTR) that setting up a formal engagement with the private sector was considered essential. Unfortunately, this never materialized. USDP-2 staff interviewed

could not explain why the private sector was not engaged better/ more. The evaluation team, however, feels this fits the pattern of a (too?) strong government demand-led approach of USDP-2.

## 4.5. Sustainability

The evaluation has two evaluation questions on sustainability:

1. To what extent are the results that were achieved at the central, provincial and local government levels likely to last (organization (staffing and structure), economic, environment)?
2. To what extent has inclusion, poverty reduction, gender and climate change considerations been taken into account by the project, both in the ambition and implementation of the project as well in the monitoring and reporting?

USDP-2 worked in three different administrative levels: central, provincial and local (city/district) level. Activities at these three levels were partially inter-connected, with some activities specific and applicable to one particular level only. Yet all these activities, both inter-connected and local specific, were contributing to the attainment of the project objectives. PPSP is continuing and the USDP-2 technical assistance model has been adopted and adapted by the central government to continue its application nation-wide.

**To what extent are the results that were achieved at the central, provincial and city/district levels likely to last?**

### Findings:

42. At the central, policy, level, the sustainability strategy and activities of USDP-2 assistance is reflected in some deliverables such as:

- Revision (Draft) of PerPres 185/2014 on PPSP.
- Revision of Ministerial Circular (Surat Edaran) No. 660/2012 on Management of PPSP in the region.
- Ministerial Decrees (MOHA) on Sanitation Development Management and on Sanitation Service Institutions.
- Revision of STBM Roadmap.
- National Roadmap on Sanitation.
- Mapping of Enabling Environment for Sustainable Sanitation Service (S3).
- Guideline on local regulation for FSM and/or SWM.
- Facilitation on the preparation of guidelines for translating 'universal access' (RPJMN target) to provincial and local levels.
- Facilitation of implementation strategy of the National Sanitation Roadmap in USDP-2 provinces.
- Preparation of draft Strategic Plan (Renstra).

All the above policies and regulations are still in force, enhancing the sustainability of USDP-2's interventions.

43. At the provincial level, the sustainability USDP-2's assistance is reflected, among others, in:

- Review and refinement of Provincial Sanitation Roadmap (PSR).
- Preparation of IPAL Kawasan Program.

- Initiation of GOI budget for sanitation through DAK.
  - Capacity strengthening of Provincial and City (or District) Facilitators (PFs/CFs).
  - Facilitation of AKKOPSI.
  - Facilitation of KSAN (Water and Sanitation Conference) 2015 and KSAN 2019 in Jakarta, and City Sanitation Summit (CSS) 2015 in Padang – West Sumatera and CSS 2019 in Banjarmasin – South Kalimantan.
44. The placement of provincial sanitation advisors, who coach and assist the provincial and city/district sanitation working groups, has been continued since the 2019, with funding from the central government channeled through the MPW.
45. At local level, USDP-2 worked on sustainable deliverables through:
- Technical facilitation of the implementation of PPSP in 33 local governments of the 9 provinces.
  - Facilitation in the preparation and conducting of EHRA, and use the EHRA findings for development/refinement of SSK/MPS.
  - Facilitation to ensure the programs/activities described in SSK/MPS are adopted into formal planning mechanisms. This included facilitating the sanitation working group (Pokja Sanitasi) to integrate the SSK/PS proposals into a formal planning cycle, especially on the Annual Budget Plan (RKA) of local government agencies.
  - Facilitation on the implementation of S3.
  - Training of Pokja Sanitasi in M&E and providing guidance in implementing the M&E.
  - Facilitation of data update for Nawasis.
46. All of the above are considered adequately addressing sustainability issues of USDP-2, and it became apparent that sustainability had been thought of, and addressed, right from the start of the planning of USDP-2: the guidelines and application instruments produced with assistance from USDP-2 have been utilized for PPSP throughout the country. The Capacity Building and Training programs (CBT) and the coaching clinics have also been applied for capacity building efforts outside of USDP-2. High-level advocacy has been continued and strengthened at central, provincial and city/district levels.
47. As a model, the USDP-2 approach to sanitation development will be adopted and adapted by the national government for safe drinking water/clean water program, primarily because drinking water has been integrated with sanitation, under PPSP.
48. In September 2022, BAPPENAS led the City Sanitation Summit (CSS) XXII. This was a high-level advocacy event that was attended by numerous city majors and district regents, as well as senior officials of BAPPEDA, PHO and DHO, and Provincial and city/district Public Works, and implementation partners such as UNICEF, USAID, Mercy Corps, Plan, etc. At the local government level, both Central Java and NTB showed continuous commitment to sanitation. During the time that this evaluation was conducted in NTB, the provincial working group was teaming-up with the Central Lombok working group to lobby the district regent to provide more support to sanitation.
49. The sustainability of the USDP-2 approaches and achievements could be considered at risk mostly because of the high level of relocation of Indonesian government staff. On average staff does not stay more than 3-5 years in the same position, which leads to the need of constant training of new staff, with all the needed resources (money and expertise). It is unclear if and to what extent the various provinces and local governments are addressing this issue. One of the strategies of USDP-2 was to document the best practices, so that new staff could benefit and that some of the capacity would be passed on. It is not clear if this practice is maintained after closure of USDP-2 (it is clear that BAPPENAS still uses the codified best practices of USDP-2).

To what extent has nutrition/health, poverty reduction, gender and climate change considerations been taken into account by the project, both in the ambition and implementation of the project, as well as in the monitoring and reporting?

This is mostly addressed in the Effectiveness paragraph, 4.3.

## 4.6. Impact

The evaluation has one evaluation question on impact:

1. Overall, to what extent did the USDP-2 program contribute to the policy level sanitation objectives of the GoI?

To what extent did the USDP-2 program contribute to the policy level sanitation objectives of the GOI?

The government's policy level sanitation objectives are mostly an increase in coverage of proper sanitation. However, formal measurement of the impact of USDP-2 at province level is not possible because it is difficult to compare provinces *with* USDP-2 interventions to provinces *without* USDP-2 interventions (there is no counterfactual data). Also, since, according to a World Bank document, there is no clear correlation between poverty and access to improved sanitation in Indonesia, there are other factors affecting sanitation coverage, assumedly the provision of government services (in FSM, SWM) and their awareness of, and commitment to, sanitation. USDP-2 is regarded as an important 'enabler' of precisely these factors, which are hence considered a measuring stick of the impact of USDP-2.

**Findings:**

### *Improved government sanitation services delivery*

#### *Fecal Sludge Management (FSM)*

50. In the two provinces visited, Central Java and NTB, and the districts visited in both provinces, it was evident that the sanitation delivery operations have been improved since 2015. In Karanganyar and Kebumen District – Central Java, the IPLTs and the landfills were both at optimal operations when the evaluation was conducted: of the 26 cities/ districts in Central Java with an IPLT, only 3 are not functioning optimally, according to the respondents. Although the IPLTs were operating based on an unscheduled desludging (Layanan Lumpur Tinja Tidak Terjadwal, L2T3) scheme, the service was fully accessible to the community. This service was in competition with the one offered by the private sector because the desludging fee was lower than the fee of the privately operated service. The IPLT Kaliboto – Karanganyar District Manager claimed that the IPLT operations have started to improve after training and coaching by the USDP-2 team. Since then, the IPLT has been able to continuously serve the community after fecal desludging of their facilities. The different government sectors were said to be effectively collaborating. These efforts resulted in a continuous increase of served households (HHs). In 2016, 299 HHs used fecal collection; in 2017 334 HHs, in 2018 a slight decrease to 310 HHs, in 2019 337 HHs, in 2020 317 HHs and in 2021 440 HHs. The increased number led to an increased fecal sludge volume in the IPLT from 667 m<sup>3</sup> in 2016 to 1,249 m<sup>3</sup> in 2021. However, most sludge was not treated after disposal. The IPLT manager and the Environment District Office, which oversees the IPLT, expects that in the coming years the IPLT could apply the scheduled desludging (Layanan Lumpur Tinja Terjadwal, L2T2) rather than on-call

desludging and fecal treatment. Within the period 2018 – 2021, the IPLT Kaliboto in Karanganyar District also collaborated with BAZNAZ – the religious-based organization, which covered the cost of human waste collection from 400 mosques. The PW-PH Karanganyar District Office also has a program for free human waste collection for 2,000 poor HHs started in 2017 until present.

51. An improvement in IPLT operations is also visible in Kebumen. The IPLT Kaligending, which currently is the primary fecal sludge disposal plant, was built in 2016 and was improved in 2019. Considering that the western part of Kebumen District was in the opposite direction of the IPLT Kaligending, which is in the eastern part of the district, the local government Kebumen built another IPLT to support the IPLT Kaligending in the eastern part of the district in 2021. While no direct attribution to USDP-2 can be made, the current operation mechanisms of these local governments were said to be the result of the overall USDP-2 technical assistance, through training and coaching.
52. Karanganyar and Kebumen were the two districts in Central Java which selected both FSM and SWM for the S3 assisted by the USDP-2. The FSM situation in Karanganyar and Kebumen is an interesting comparison to the governments' efforts in 2016, when the government built over 160 IPLTs across the country, of which only 10% (approximately) are still functioning<sup>14</sup>. The rest was lying idle mainly because of very limited sludge to be deposited. The idle IPLTs were also found in Central Lombok and East Lombok. The Central Lombok District in NTB, which selected both FSM and SWM, for S3 technical assistance from USDP-2, only succeeded in SWM and not FSM, for similar reasons: a minimal volume of human sludge was available for disposal in the district's IPLT.
53. With USDP-2's assistance, the IPLT in Karanganyar and Kebumen were:
- Having sustainable operational schedules – although still on-call based
  - Having local government regulations as a base for operation.

Examples of USDP-2's influence on policy and regulation can be drawn from Kebumen, where the local government's commitment to ensure S3 was reflected in the issuance of District Regent's Regulation No. 52/2018 re: Formation and the role and responsibility of UPTD (a business unit) for solid waste management, and UPTD for FSM, the *Perda* No 6/2018 re: Domestic Waste-Water (this includes human sludge) Management, and the *Perda* No 6/2012 re: Retribution of solid waste services; Renewed by District Regent's Regulation (This is based on the District Regent's authority) in 2017.

#### *Solid Waste Management (SWM)*

54. Between 2016 – 2017, 21 out of 31 (68% approximately) cities/districts in the nine provinces selected solid waste management over sanitation. These included Karanganyar and Kebumen District in Central Java, and Central and East Lombok in NTB, the visited provinces.
55. The SWM in all districts visited, both in Central Java and NTB, was considered in optimal operation. Although no district had been able to improve the controlled landfill system to become the expected sanitary landfill, the SWM in these four districts was considered relatively well-managed by the evaluators. A positive note was the fact that the community was (and still is) encouraged to be involved in managing the solid waste at household/community level (hence actively working on awareness).
56. In East Lombok, NTB, a proposed 'policy package' called Pada Suka emphasized the need of every village to be self-reliant in solid waste management and treatment. This proposed policy package was prepared with USDP-2 technical inputs and had been socialized to all sector heads in the

---

<sup>14</sup> World Bank, 2017

district. This implementation of Pada Suka in East Lombok resulted in 7 (seven) community-led garbage-banks formed. Currently, there are 65 garbage banks active, plus 2 garbage banks with 3R (temporary garbage disposal sites with reduce-recycle-reuse treatment concept) applications. These garbage banks have an association with the plastic bank in Bali, and a major vendor in Surabaya. Both the plastic bank in Bali and a vendor in Surabaya buy used plastic/plastic garbage in big volumes from the garbage banks in East Lombok. The community-led SWM in East Lombok has contributed to solving the solid waste problems of the district. In East Lombok, there were 655 tons of waste piled up daily from urban settlements, and 670 tons daily from rural household.

57. In the period of its preparation in 2016-2017, Pada Suka was first prepared in response to the need of achieving the sanitation target of the MDGs (MDG Target 10, point #7). Up to present, it still becomes a reference in the planning and implementation of the sanitation program in the district.
58. In Central Lombok, through the proposed policy package of Tasura Berbenah, the local government institutions facilitated SWM at household level, in order to reduce the amount of garbage to transport to the final disposal plant (TPA, the control landfill). This movement encouraged the formation of TPS 3R (Communal/local waste disposal with the 3R scheme: Reuse-Reduce-Recycle) throughout the district. In an advanced form, this movement created the development of an Intermediate Treatment Facility (ITF). The presence of an ITF with incinerator, gasification, pyrolysis, and Refuse Derived Fuel (RDF) is able to reduce 80-90% of the capacity in the ITF.
59. For SWM, within the period of USDP-2 assistance, the four districts visited for the evaluation still had ample local government support under a regulatory framework: in East Lombok through the District Regent's Regulation (Peraturan Bupati, Perbup) No. 46/2018 re. reduction, treatment and response to solid waste; in Central Lombok through the District Regent's Regulation (Peraturan Bupati, Perbup) No. 35/2018 re: policy and strategy on domestic solid waste; and in Kebumen District – Central Java through the District Regent's Regulation No. 46/2018 re: strategy for household solid waste management.
60. These two types of sanitation services (FSM and SWM) which were considered to be functioning optimally through proper government services, is considered an example of the contribution to the impact of USDP-2.

#### *ODF declaration*

61. All efforts on sanitation in Indonesia have been directed to achieve the 5 pillars of STBM declaration, with ODF as the first pillar. These pillars are part of the Minimum Service Standard, the Standar Pelayanan Minimum (SPM) which is the major set of criteria to measure local development. The SPM is assessed and reported on a yearly basis and becomes an indicator to rank cities and districts throughout the country. Meanwhile, STBM is an advancement of the internationally applied CLTS methodology, and covers not only ODF but also hand washing with running water and soap, household-management of drinking water, household-level solid waste management, and household-level domestic wastewater management. There is a pool of master trainers at the national, provincial and city/district level. These five pillars of STBM have become the key pillars of PPSP. It is also reflected clearly in the RPJMN and RPJMD, two policy documents which guide sanitation development in the country.
62. By the time USDP-2 phased out, the majority of USDP-2 assisted districts already declared ODF. However, this is in terms of access to safe sanitation facilities, not in terms of ownership of the facilities. Both in rural and urban areas, some community members have shared bathrooms and sanitation facilities. Some others utilize the sanitation facilities in the mosques.

63. Kebumen District declared ODF in December 2019, Karanganyar District declared ODF in 2017. In NTB, East Lombok declared ODF in 2020, and Central Lombok in November 2021. Compared to other districts in the province and outside the province, Central Lombok has had problems in water supply availability. This has contributed significantly to the overall sanitation performance of the district.
64. The results achieved in all USDP-2 cities and districts appear to have contributed to the national sanitation objectives, however, exact ODF data in these cities and districts is not available.

*Private sector engagement in sanitation service delivery*

65. In the four districts visited, there was no formal cooperation with the private sector in sanitation services delivery. Some mentioned this was due to the absence of government regulations. Also, the private sector working in sanitation is small in number and capacity. Until present, the private sector involvement is 'non-formal', in a form of fecal sludge emptying, and bringing the sludge to the IPLT, or, in most cases, especially in NTB, dumping it into the river or on empty land.
66. However, the government respondents met during the evaluation visits mentioned that the inclusion of the private sector in sanitation services would be required and a formal cooperation should be initiated soon. These private companies may be small in number and capacity, but certainly play an important role in responding to public demand for sanitation services, specifically fecal sludge. Central Java province has an informal cooperation with private sector companies in sludge emptying and disposing to IPLTs. This might be due to the fact that the distance of the IPLT location is within relatively short distance – 15 kms. Also, the districts in Central Java are relatively small compared to those in NTB.
67. Although USDP-2 is not the only party which can claim impact on the government's sanitation efforts, USDP-2 certainly contributed to the sanitation performance in the cities/districts assisted, in line with the governments' sanitation objectives. As these cities/ districts efforts yielded positive outcomes at the implementation level, as observed, these results contributed to the national governments performance and achievement of targets, and as such it is fair to claim that USDP-2 contributed to the attainment of the GOI policy objectives.

# 5. Conclusions and Recommendations

This chapter presents the conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation, based on the findings as presented in chapter 4. For readability and conciseness, the conclusions will be presented per evaluation criterion and are numbered. This way, the conclusions are easily matched/ traceable to the recommendations in paragraph 5.2.

When you plant a forest, after a while people do not remember that the forest was ever planted. This also happened during the evaluation of USDP-2. Many people knew the ‘forest’, but few knew that it was once not there. More than two years passed and much of the sanitation results that USDP-2 contributed to could still be found, mostly in the way the government pays attention to urban sanitation.

There are still several challenges on the path to proper sanitation for all, but the overall conclusion that USDP-2 has been a contributor to sanitation successes in Indonesia is certainly justified. We have tried to highlight this in the conclusions and recommendations below.

## 5.1. Conclusions

### Conclusions on relevance

1. USDP-2 was well timed: the government of Indonesia just started the implementation of PPSP-2, and the need for technical assistance was high. The provinces, cities and districts needed individuals/teams to discuss the adoption of the national program and adjustments to the local situation, to set targets, and to plan and implement activities to achieve the targets.
2. The USDP-2 program objectives and approaches were mostly well-aligned to the needs and demands of the Indonesian government (PPSP, RPJMN, RPJMD), both related to policies as well as related to the increase in awareness of the importance of sanitation of (local) government agencies themselves, their advocacy and lobbying power (to the national government as well as other provincial and local government agencies), and their motivation and commitment to sanitation.
3. Sometimes the USDP-2 program was perceived as ahead of the government systems and plans, particularly at the local levels. This sometimes led to situations where (USDP-2) plans had been prepared but could not be implemented because of a lack of budget and/ or staff allocated, or simply because the system did not consider this a priority yet (e.g. FSM or solid waste treatment, both surrounded with taboos).

### Conclusions on coherence

4. The two main SDG 6 indicators that PPSP, and hence USPD-2, contributed to are indicator 6.2.1 (proportion of population using safely managed sanitation services.) and indicator 6.b.1: (proportion of local administrative units with established and operational policies and procedures for participation of local communities in water and sanitation management). Related to the first indicator: during the USDP-2 implementation period national sanitation coverage rates in Indonesia have gone up with 4.5%. While attribution of exact numbers to the USDP-2 program is

not possible, respondents overwhelmingly agree that USDP-2 had a positive and significant influence on these numbers in the districts in which it operated. As for the SDG 6 indicator 6.b.1: USDP-2 assisted 9 provinces and 62 cities/districts and in its Final Report mentioned 69% achievement rate of the program objectives at city/district levels. Again, it was difficult to establish the rate of contribution of USDP-2 to the operationalization and implementation of policies, regulations and related capacities at the provincial/ local levels, but the feedback of respondents was very positive.

5. There was no link of USDP-2 with the Dutch Aid-to-Trade agenda. It simply never was the aim of the USDP-2 program, and never considered.

### Conclusions on effectiveness

6. USDP2 focused on regulation and, to a lesser extent, on improving technical knowledge and operational measures. Although coverage rates went up with 4.5%, a direct impact on the increase of sanitation coverage rates cannot be attributed to the project.
7. During the USDP-2 period of assistance, the national budget for sanitation was satisfactory and increased every year. This continued until the COVID pandemic started in March 2020. During the pandemic period, the budget significantly reduced and was re-allocated for pandemic response. Local government spending data is notoriously difficult to find, and usually unreliable. The consensus among respondents is that the local budgets did not increase, and decreased significantly during the Covid pandemic. In this sense, the Overall Result 1 (and partly Overall Result 2) of USDP-2 - an increase in budget allocation- cannot be considered achieved or significantly contributed to.
8. However, the largest achievement of USDP-2 is especially found in Overall result 3a (optimum implementation of PPSP-2, from the national to local levels) and Overall result 3b (approaches, methodologies and tools to assist provincial and local governments, and only partly in the realm of awareness (Overall result 2). Especially the Provincial Sanitation Development Advisor (ProSDA) played an important role in assisting the provincial and city/district counterparts to produce and attain what was targeted in the RPJMD.
9. Gender approaches, poverty reduction considerations and the involvement of the private sector in USDP-2 strategies and implementation were notably absent or irrelevant, even after the MTR's recommendations to include these in the program.

### Conclusions on efficiency

10. One success factor of USDP-2 was a strong, mostly Indonesian, team, which was (already) well connected to the national Indonesian government sanitation actors and BAPPENAS. This was considered a crucial element of the good cooperation between USDP-2 and the national government. Similarly, the presence of an USDP-2 Provincial Sanitation Development Advisor (ProSDA) in the provinces contributed to good relations and a (more) efficient implementation. During the evaluation it became clear that USDP-2 is perceived as having contributed to an environment which increasingly allows for open discussions on sanitation and the government's role in this.
11. USDP-2 was not an active partner in the sanitation sector national stakeholder groups, including UNICEF, USAID and WSP/WB. This is considered a missed opportunity.
12. Interviews revealed that a good relationship of USDP-2 with the government partners was deemed essential for the USDP-2 team, often prioritizing harmonious collaboration over 'harder' discussions on different viewpoints/ opinions on program strategies. Topics, such as private sector involvement, poverty reduction strategies and up to a certain extent gender, which potentially

could have led to a bit more friction, seem to have been avoided. A somewhat more independent role of the USDP-2 team could have benefited the outcome of the project.

### Conclusions on sustainability

13. At the central policy, level, the sustainability strategy and activities of USDP-2 assistance is reflected in many policies, guidelines and regulations that are still in force and actively used. Focusing strongly on the development/ contextualization of these policies and guidelines is considered an appropriate, and in case of USDP-2 successful, sustainability strategy.
14. Some elements of the USDP-2 approach still remain, especially at local and provincial level, such as the Prosdas (currently called Provincial and City/District ‘Facilitators’), considered crucial for effective implementation of sanitation policies at the provincial and local government levels. However, when the Dutch funding for USDP-2 stopped, the Indonesian government did not continue financing most USDP-2 funded activities. This, coupled with the sustainability risk of a high-turnover of Indonesian government staff, is cause for (sustainability) concern, but none the USDP-2 project could have tackled.

### Conclusions on impact

15. The results achieved in all USDP-2 cities and districts contributed optimally to the national sanitation objectives. In 2020, 97.2% of the urban population in the country had access to improved sanitation up from 92.5% in 2015 and 78.7% in 2000 (WHO/UNICEF JMP 2021)
16. The USDP-2 focus on 9 provinces and (initially) 90 local government units was (too) ambitious, especially taking into account the diversity of program actions (FSM, SWM, awareness, policies, capacity building, advocacy, etc.). It would have been better to focus on less locations and go more in-depth in each location (ensuring FS, SWM, awareness, etc. would all be addressed comprehensively). It is the evaluators view that these locations would then have achieved more solid and sustainable sanitation impacts.

## 5.2. Key recommendations

The above conclusions lead to the following recommendations for future (similar) programs (related conclusion numbers are mentioned in brackets behind the recommendation, when relevant):

1. The USDP-2 program’s focus on translating/ contextualizing and operationalizing (good) national policies on sanitation to the provincial and local government levels is recommended to be continued in future Dutch-funded interventions, although this is recommended to be done through a “systems strengthening approach”. In addition, the focus could be changed from basic sanitation to safely managed sanitation.
2. It is recommended to strengthen the awareness component of future similar interventions, addressing not only households but wider society as well, including sanitation professionals working on policies and guidelines (Conclusions 2, 3, 8, 9, 10).
3. It is also recommended to focus on fewer provinces/ locations, and go more in-depth in each location (ensuring FS, SWM, awareness, etc. are addressed comprehensively), to contribute to the sustainability of the results (Conclusions 3, 4, 9, 14, 16).
4. While it is acknowledged that government ownership is crucial, it is recommended that future interventions should find a better balance between government ownership and recognized international best practices and (Dutch) interests and priorities, notably gender equity and social

inclusion approaches, systems strengthening, environmental protection and climate resilience, poverty reduction considerations, the involvement of the private sector and the Dutch Aid-to-Trade agenda (Conclusions 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 12).

5. Up-to-date information is a prerequisite for improving both day-to-day program management and long-term policy or investment decisions. It is recommended that future interventions have a monitoring and information system that can better capture (a selection of) the following: sanitation coverage data, SWM and FSM data, budget data, as well as hard-to-measure data such as an increase in local governments' knowledge and capacities, gender equity and social inclusion, environmental impact/climate resilience and the impact on poverty (Conclusions 2, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9).
6. Lastly, the complex nature of sanitation requires coordination mechanisms for all actors working on urban sanitation: government, (inter)national partners/donors, and the private sector. This recognition should lead to greater participation in national stakeholder discussion and coordination forums and groups. (Conclusions 5, 8, 9, 11, 12).

# Annexes

# Annex 1 Original USDP-2 LF

	Summary	Deliverables	Verification	Assumptions
<b>Overall Goal</b>	<b>Universal access achieved</b>	In 2019 85% of population has access to improved sanitation conform with SPM and 15% of population has access to basic sanitation	BPS RISKESDAS	
<b>Strategic Objective 1</b>	<b>Up to 100 LGs able to plan, budget and accelerate implementation</b>	LG budget allocation (APBD) for sanitation at least 2% in up to 100 LGs in 10 provinces by end 2018 Tripled allocation for sanitation provincial and central funding by 2018 (2014 baseline)	LG Reports Nawasis USDP SAR APBD-P/APBD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- All necessary PF/CF are recruited on time and trainable on implementing the PPSP approach</li> </ul>
<b>National level</b>	N-1.1 Supporting Documents, Guidelines and Tools prepared or improved and used	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Institutional mandate and responsibilities described in <i>Perpres</i> (185, 2014) analyzed and modified including sustainability issues, as required in 2016</li> <li>- Institutional mandate and responsibilities described (draft) <i>PerMen</i> MOHA plus model bylaws on sanitation analyzed and modified as required in 2016</li> <li>- Policy/regulatory constraints to additional funding analyzed and remedial action identified, documented, proposed and implemented by 2016</li> <li>- "Buku Saku" on funding options updated, approved, disseminated by 2016</li> <li>- National sanitation dev. goals translated into PG and LG goals in 10 prov. and all LGs in 2016</li> <li>- Guideline for updating SSK/MPS improved with inclusion of acceleration and sustainability issues, approved by PIU-T in 2016 and used in 10 provinces</li> <li>- "Universal access" included in Practical Guideline for 2<sup>nd</sup> Cycle SSK/MPS in 2016</li> <li>- Readiness criteria reviewed, improved and accepted by PUP in 2016</li> <li>- NAWASIS expanded to include focus on acceleration and sustainability in 2016</li> </ul>	<i>PerPres</i> <i>PerMen</i> USDP Tech Reports and Guidelines USDP SAR Nawasis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- GOI ministries and agencies recruit additional local and foreign expertise to support implementation of PPSP nation-wide (as specified in the PPSP-2 Roadmap);</li> <li>- GOI ministries and agencies are able to second staff to PPSP activities and events and have budget to cover the associated operational cost;</li> </ul>
	N-1.2 Advocacy material developed	- Promotion campaigns and advocacy material developed for generating increased demand for improved sanitation specifically at household level	Adv. Materials USDP SAR	
<b>Provincial level</b>	P-1.1 Legal Instruments in place	- Gubernatorial decrees formalizing the incorporation of the Provincial Roadmaps in provincial planning (RPJMD) and budget documents (APBD) in 9 Provinces by 2017	<i>PerGub</i> USDP SAR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Provincial and local governments are aware of the sanitation development need and ready to assign the relevant budgetary priority to sanitation development;</li> </ul>
	P-1.2 Specific support delivered to PG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Improved/updated Provincial Road maps in 10 provinces by 2017</li> <li>- Nawasis promoted as tool for PGs to prioritize LG proposals</li> <li>- Lokakarya MPS process in 10 provs process with prioritized activities prepared for budgeting</li> </ul>	PRMs Nawasis USDP SAR	
<b>Local level</b>	L-1.1 Legal Instruments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Mayoral/District Head Decrees instructing use of SSK/MPS in formal planning and budgeting process in 100 LGs in 2017</li> <li>- Updated <i>perdas</i> on organization, management, and funding in up to 100 LGs by 2017</li> </ul>	SK Mayor/Bupati Perda	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- LGs understand the existential need for local revenue mobilization and the concomitant need to establish sanitation services with a customer orientation;</li> <li>- LGs are able to effect the necessary organization development and other changes within the next three years;</li> </ul>
	L-1.2 Supp. Docs developed and used	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Action plans for fund acquisition prepared and accepted in 100 LG in 2016 with additional funds allocated in 100 LG by 2017</li> <li>- Nawasis improved as decision support system to support 2<sup>nd</sup> Cycle planning</li> </ul>	LG Reports Nawasis USDP SAR	
	L-1.3 WWM and SWM Infra promoted and initiated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Promotion campaigns are used to generate increased demand for improved sanitation at household level in 100 LGs in 2017</li> <li>- Support to LGs on 2<sup>nd</sup> Cycle planning in delivered 100 LGs by 2017</li> <li>- 20 <i>IPAL Kawasan</i> identified and processed by PUP for financing by 2017</li> <li>- <i>IPAL Kawasan</i> pilots initiated in at least 1 LG in each of the 10 provinces in 2017</li> <li>- Centralized recycling (3R) facilities initiated, planned, prepared and implemented in 50% of the LGs in the project provinces in 2017</li> <li>- Sanitary landfills planned, prepared, implemented in 50% of LGs in USDP provinces in 2017</li> <li>- FSM concept promoted to and accepted at local level and planning/ implementation initiated in at least 1 LG in 10 provinces in 2017</li> <li>- IPLTs rehabilitated and/or built where necessary for FSM by 2017</li> </ul>	Updated SSKs LG Budgets LG Reports USDP SAR Nawasis	

	Summary	Deliverables	Verification	Assumptions
<b>Strategic Objective 2</b>	<b>Up to 20 LGs able to provide sustainable sanitation services</b>	Enhanced understanding of dimensions of sustainability (sanitation context) Improved institutional, financial and environmental sustainability of sanitation services Sustainability concept included in PPSP process		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Public awareness of the need for sanitation development increases rapidly in the next three years;</li> <li>Commitment from TC (and possibly others) with adequate training capacity to link up with PPSP for CB/T activities;</li> <li>Adequate training budget allocated.</li> </ul>
<b>National level</b>	N-2.1 Supporting Documents upgraded or developed and used	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Guideline to develop and establish sustainable FSM/SWM coupled with sustainable management structure agreed with MOH and MOHA by 2017</li> <li>Constraints to involvement of the private sector in especially WWM and SWM analyzed, and measures to overcome these described by 2016</li> <li>Approach to develop and establish sustainable sanitation management structures (like BLUD, PD) prepared in 2017 and accepted by MOHA</li> <li>Report on institutional, financial and environmental sustainability of on and off site facilities assessed and priority actions defined in 2016</li> </ul>	Guidelines Tech Reports Nawasis USDP SAR	
<b>Local level</b>	L-2.1 Sustainable management promoted and initiated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sustainability inclusive updated SSKs in 50 LGs in 2016</li> <li>Sanitation management plans agreed in 25 LGs in 2017</li> <li>SSMS advocated, institutionally embedded and functioning in 25 LGs in 2017</li> <li>Private sector involvement on WWM &amp; SWM piloted in 3 LGs per province in 2017</li> </ul>	Updated SSKs LG Budgets USDP SAR	
<b>Strategic Objective 3</b>	<b>Best practices identified and developed in 10 provs</b>	Best practices regarding accelerated sanitation development, establishing sustainable sanitation management structures and CBT consolidated and disseminated to other provinces and globally		
<b>National level</b>	N-3.1 Collaboration with other donors and projects	Active collaboration with other sanitation projects, including exchange of lessons learned (esp. with regard to sustainability issues), models, tools etc., established and incorporated in PPSP-2 in 2016	MOU USDP SAR	
	N-3.2 Mainstreaming achieved	Mainstreaming of sanitation development in other GOI programs achieved in 50 LGs in 9 provinces in 2017	USDP SAR	
	N-3.3 Intl. conference supported	PPSP knowledge products consolidated and disseminated during an international conference in 2018	Akkopsi Reports USDP SAR	
	N-3.4 Best practices consolidated	Best practices regarding accelerated sanitation implementation, sustainable sanitation management, and CB/T developed and worked into guidelines in 2017	Guidelines USDP SAR	
<b>Provincial level</b>	P-3.1 Local best practices tested in provinces	Action research on scaling up and moving from plan to action conducted and documented in 2018	Tech. Report USDP SAR	
<b>Local lev.</b>	N-3.1 Practices tested	Action research on acceleration and sustainability documented by 2016	Tech. Report	
<b>Strategic Objective 4</b>	<b>Focused Capacity Building</b>	Focused capacity building successfully conducted and sustained and contributing to accelerated sustainable sanitation development		
<b>National level</b>	N-4.1 Support structures and supporting documents prepared and used	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Formalized cooperation with training institutes (e.g. TCs Bekasi and Wiyung) etc.</li> <li>Institutes committed to incorporate PPSP related training in their curriculum</li> <li>Expanded modules, guidelines, and notes focused on acceleration prepared/ available in 2016</li> </ul>	MOUs TC Reports USDP SAR	
	N-4.2 CBT supported	AHL events organized by Akkopsi regarding acceleration and SSM in 2016 and beyond	Akkopsi Reports	
<b>Provincial level</b>	P-4.1 CB/T supported	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Prov Pokjas strengthened on increased (tripled) APBD (Prov) in 10 provinces in 2017</li> <li>CB/T conducted on 2<sup>nd</sup> Cycle Planning (incl. acceleration and sustainability aspects)</li> </ul>	PG Budgets USDP SAR	
<b>Local level</b>	L-4.1 CB/T supported	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Capacity building covering sustainable delivery of sanitation services by designated sanitation management organizations conducted in 10% of LGs in 2017</li> <li>Continuous support by Prosdas coaching LG Pokjas and PFs for 2<sup>nd</sup> Cycle planning</li> </ul>	USDP SAR	

# Annex 2 Evaluation Matrix

Abbreviations used for methods and approaches: **ToC**: Theory of Change. **RC**: Results-Based Management (the Results Chain).

Abbreviations used for data collection methods: **KII**: Key Informant Interviews. **DS**: Desk Study. **FGD**: Focus Group Discussions. **OB**: Observations.

Category	Evaluation Question (from ToR EKN and with MDF input)	Sub-questions	Data collection methods
<b>Relevance</b>	How did USDP-2 contribute to the policy needs of the GoI?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How was this designed?</li> <li>• How is this still visible?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DS</li> <li>• KII</li> <li>• OB</li> </ul>
	To what extent were these GoI policy needs properly identified and field tested to address the needs of the population?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How is this still visible at the local levels?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DS</li> <li>• KII/ FGDs</li> <li>• OB</li> </ul>
<b>Coherence</b>	To what extent did USDP-2 contribute to SDG 6 (related to sanitation) as well as to the Dutch WASH Strategy 2016-2030?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Do the objectives/ aimed-for results match?</li> <li>•</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DS</li> </ul>
	To what extent did the project respond to the principles and ambitions of the Aid-to-Trade agenda, i.e., continues to promote social development while at the same time identifying and promoting economic opportunities for the Netherlands Water Sector?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Do the objectives/ aimed-for results match?</li> <li>• What is the scope for technological innovation and medium and long-term opportunities for a shift from (NL) technical assistance /advice to (NL) technologies and equipment?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DS</li> <li>• KII</li> </ul>
<b>Effectiveness</b>	Were the formulated objectives achieved?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Central level: trends in central budget allocation, relevant national legislation, regulations and standards, formal adoption and roll-out of implementation guidelines (including distribution of responsibility and tasks at different governmental levels), continued use of CBT guidelines, etc.</li> <li>• Provincial level: trends in provincial budget allocation, adoption of provincial policies, establishment and maintenance of provincial <i>Pokjas</i> equipped and capacitated to perform their facilitation role successfully, creation and sustenance of provincial facilities (e.g. allocation of landfill sites)</li> <li>• Local level: budget trends for investment and maintenance, establishment, operations and financial sustainability of local <i>Pokjas</i>, maintenance/continued operations of physical infrastructure (including capture-containment-emptying-transport-treatment-safe reuse/disposal).</li> </ul> <p>Cross-cutting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• attention for cultural and social acceptability of newly developed sanitation technologies and practices including cost recovery</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DS</li> <li>• KII</li> <li>• FGDs</li> <li>• OB</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• private sector engagement in financing and operating new sanitation facilities/services, in particular at provincial and local levels, and including public-private sector coordination</li> <li>• How are poverty reduction, gender and climate change considerations integrated parts of USDP-2.</li> </ul>	
	What were the major factors hampering/ contributing to the achievement?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At national, provincial and local levels</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DS</li> <li>• KII</li> </ul>
	To what extent did the project have a solid exit strategy, addressing transitional issues, in 2020, of Dutch ODA support to Indonesia.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What was the exit strategy, and how was it designed?</li> <li>• Was it implemented as planned?</li> <li>• What was the follow-up to the recommendations in MTR (including exit-strategy)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DS</li> <li>• KII</li> </ul>
<b>Efficiency</b>	How was the coordination and collaboration between USDP-2 and other sanitation sector stakeholders, such as ministries, UN/WSP/USAID etc., NGOs as well as private sector.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How has the PMU functioned and how were stakeholders involved?</li> <li>• Are the stakeholders satisfied with their involvement and engagement?</li> <li>• How was the engagement of, and collaboration with, the different government levels? Reasons?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DS</li> <li>• KII</li> </ul>
<b>Sustainability</b>	To what extent are the results that were achieved at the central, provincial and local government levels likely to last? (organization (staffing and structure), economic, environment).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proof of policies? Organizational changes? Staff capacities?</li> <li>• Check the implementation of this at the local levels: awareness of gov officials, proof of implementation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DS</li> <li>• KII</li> <li>• FGD</li> <li>• OB</li> </ul>
	To what extent has inclusion, poverty reduction, gender and climate change considerations been taken into account by the project, both in the ambition and implementation of the project as well in the monitoring and reporting?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have the, etc.) been taken into consideration during the planning?</li> <li>• Is there evidence of this during implementation as well?</li> <li>• Was there a risk identification and management process in the development and operation of new sanitation infrastructure?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DS</li> <li>• KII</li> <li>• FGDs</li> <li>• OB</li> </ul>
<b>Impact</b>	Overall, to what extent did the USDP-2 project contribute to the policy level sanitation objectives of the Gol?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Identify the larger Gol sanitation policy objectives and see if there is an impact relation with the USDP-2</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DS</li> <li>• KII</li> </ul>

# Annex 3 Interviewees

Organisation	Name
<b>Intake</b>	
EKN	Robin van Boxtel + assistant
EKN	Carel de Groot
RHDHV	Mees van Krimpen
<b>Inception</b>	
RHDHV	Mees van Krimpen
RHDHV	Wita Purwasi
RHDHV, now Arcadis	Marco Piet
IRC	Christine Sybesma
<b>Research Phase</b>	
<b>National level</b>	
Bappenas, dir. Perkim	Mrs. Virgiyanti, Mr. Wahanuddin and Ms. Alin Armafitriani
PMU/BAPPENAS	Mr. Wahanuddin and Ms. Alin Armafitriani
PUPR-Sanitation Department	Rinaldy Pradana
MoH Sanitation Dept.	Bapak Zainal Nampira, SKM
<b>Ministry of Health</b>	Mrs. Tutut, Ms. Anita Gultom, Ms. Kristin, Ms. Yustina and Ms. Muthia (no surnames given)
USDP II Team	Mr. Dhanang Wuriyandoko
<b>Regional level</b>	
<b>LG - District</b>	
Central Java Province	The representatives of BAPPEDA, Public Works and Public Housing (PW-PH), Perkim, Environment District Office (DLH), and District Health Office (DHO)
Karanganyar District	The representatives of BAPPEDA, Public Works and Public Housing (PW-PH), Environment District Office (DLH), District Health Office (DHO), Social Affairs Office, LG's company on water supply service (PDAM).
Kebumen District	Mr. Edi Riyanto (the Head of Development Administration of the Regent's office who is currently the Head of BAPPEDA Kebumen District), the representatives of Environment District Office (LH) – IPLT and TPA divisions, and District Health Office (DHO)
West Nusa Tenggara Province	The representatives of BAPPEDA, Public Works and Public Housing (PW-PH), Perkim, Environment District Office (DLH), and District Health Office (DHO)
West Lombok District	The representatives of BAPPEDA, Public Works and Public Housing (PW-PH), Environment District Office (DLH), and District Health Office (DHO)
Central Lombok District	Mr. Muhammadun (Mr. Madun) from the Environment District Office and the representatives of BAPPEDA, Public Works and Public Housing (PW-PH), Perkim, and District Health Office (DHO)

East Lombok District	Mr. Deddy from Environment District Office (DLH) and the representatives of BAPPEDA, Public Works and Public Housing (PW-PH), Perkim, and District Health Office (DHO)
	Provincial Sanitation Adviser (Prosda) in Central Java (it is called Pokja PKP) and West Nusa Tenggara / NTB (it is called Pokja PPAS)
	Private sector in fecal sludge management (FSM) <i>penyedotan tinja</i> : done in Karanganyar and Kebumen – (Central Java) and Central Lombok
	Community members: done in Central Java (Karanganyar and Kebumen districts) and West Lombok

# Annex 4 List of documents consulted

## List of Documents

#	LIST OF DOCUMENTS		
1.	3.a Public Bemo USDP-2 - MINBUZA-2015.587368 [Activity Appraisal Document (BEMO), Urban Sanitation Development Program Phase II]	3.b Public Bemo USDP-2 - Amendment Extension AUG2019-JUN2020 - MINBUZA-2021.701197 [Appraisal Document for Financial Adjustment of 27382 – RHDHV - USDP-2]	3.c Public Bemo USDP-2 - Amendment Bemo Annex 1 - Proposal Extension AUG2019-JUN2020 - MINBUZA-2019.292586
2.	3.d Public Bemo USDP-2 - Amendment Bemo Annex 2 - Approval BNE - MINBUZA-2019.292581	3.e Public Bemo USDP-2 - Amendment Bemo Annex 3 - Cover Email Exit Strategy - MINBUZA-2019.292582	3.f Public Bemo USDP-2 - Amendment Bemo Annex 4 - Exit Strategy - MINBUZA-2019.292584
3.	3.h Public Bemo USDP-2 - Completion Bemo Corona Pandemic - MINBUZA-2020.313065	4. Inception report USDP-2 - MINBUZA-2015.650335	5. Final Report USDP 1 - MINBUZA-2016.35202
4.	6. Evaluation Report USDP 1 - MTR	7.a Progress Report USDP-2 - Jan-Jun 2016 MINBUZA-2016.538099	7.b Progress Report USDP-2 - Jul-Dec 2016 MINBUZA-2017.32902
5.	7.c Progress Report USDP-2 - Jan-Jun 2017_Improved MINBUZA-2017.1105616	7.d Progress Report USDP-2 - Jul-Dec 2017 Part Narrative MINBUZA-2018.30310	7.e Progress Report USDP-2 - Jul-Dec 2017 Part Financial MINBUZA-2018.396101
6.	7.f Progress Report USDP-2 - Jan-Jun 2018 Part Narrative MINBUZA-2018.865021	7.g Progress Report USDP-2 - Jan-Jun 2018 Part Financial MINBUZA-2018.1002947	7.h Progress Report USDP-2 - Jul-Dec 2018 Part Narrative MINBUZA-2019.198300
7.	7.i Progress Report USDP-2 - Jul-Dec 2018 Part Financial MINBUZA-2019.245964	7.j Progress Report USDP-2 - Jan-Jun 2019 Part Narrative Improved MINBUZA-2019.672998	7.k Progress Report USDP-2 - Jan-Jun 2019 Part Financial MINBUZA-2019.581442
8.	7.l Progress Report USDP-2 - Jul-Dec 2019 Part Narrative MINBUZA-2020.55164	7.m Progress Report USDP-2 - Jul-Dec 2019 Part Financial MINBUZA-2020.140344	7.n Final Report AUG2015-SEP2020 + Progress Report Jan-Sep2020 MINBUZA-2020.833839
9.	8.a Annual Plans USDP-2 - 2016	8.b Annual Plans USDP-2 - 2017	8.c Annual Plans USDP-2 - 2018
10.	8.d Annual Plans USDP-2 - Jan-Jul 2019	1. Final Report USDP-2 - MINBUZA-2020.8284231	160518_City Wide Sanitation Investment Program_Waste Water Management Investment Road Map_Final
11.	APPENDIX A: Terms of Reference Technical Assistance to the USDP-2 for Indonesia (2015-2018)	Mid Term Review of the Second Phase of the Urban Sanitation Development Project 06/03/2018 (in Word file)	Mid Term Review of the Second Phase of the Urban Sanitation Development Project 06/03/2018 (in PDF file)
12.	Making Urban Sanitation Strategies of Six Indonesian Cities More Pro-poor and Gender-Equitable: The Case of ISSDP (May 2008)	USDP-2-R-PMU-0001_Inception Report 2015_Final	120411-WP-PUBLIC-Improving Service Levels and Impact on the Poor 12-10-2017 9-35-19-W
13.	150418 Social References Book _v.6	Economic Impacts of Sanitation in Indonesia, Research Report August 2008	ACADEMIA: Public Service Provision under Conditions of Insufficient Citizen Demand: Insights from the Urban Sanitation Sector in Indonesia
14.	Social Options in Urban Sanitation Development, for SSK and MP-Christine Sijbesma, PPSP/USDP (PPT)	UTS-UI-UNICEF_2021_Climate Resilient Urban Sanitation in Indonesia - Final Report	Water Supply and Sanitation in Indonesia, Turning Finance into Service for the Future- Service Delivery Assessment, May 2015

# Annex 5 Original ToR

See separately shared document.