

Better Policies Better Lives

EVALUATION OF THE INDONESIA DEVELOPMENT FORUM (IDF)

A FINAL REPORT

MARCH 2022



Evaluation of the Indonesia Development Forum (IDF)

A Final Report

March 2022

Acknowledgments and Disclaimer

This report was commissioned and funded by the Knowledge Sector Initiative. Migunani would like to acknowledge and thank all those who contributed to the data collection and assisted with the evaluation including Bappenas and KSI staff; and IDF conference participants, speakers and facilitators. The views expressed in this document are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of KSI, RTI International, DFAT or the Australian Government.

Migunani

Karanglo, RT/RW 003/032
Donoharjo, Ngaglik, Sleman – Yogyakarta 55581
Telp: 0274 865523 / 0815 10351807
www.migunani.or.id

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|------|
| Acronyms | ii |
| Executive Summary | iii |
| Ringkasan Eksekutif | viii |
| Evaluation of the Indonesia Development Forum (IDF) | 1 |
| A. Background | 1 |
| B. Evaluation Framework and Methodology | 2 |
| C. Findings | 2 |
| C.1 IDF’s achievements | 2 |
| C.2 Challenges and lessons learned | 12 |
| C.2.1 Logistics | 12 |
| C.2.2 The strategic direction and purpose of the IDF | 13 |
| C.2.3 IDF monitoring, evaluation, and learning (MEL) | 13 |
| C.3 Sustainability | 14 |
| C.4 Aspirations for the future | 15 |
| D. Conclusion and recommendations | 17 |
| D.1 Conclusion | 17 |
| D.2 Recommendations | 18 |
| Annex 1 – List of informants | 21 |

Acronyms

| | |
|------------|--|
| AIDRAN | Australia-Indonesia Disability Research and Advocacy Network |
| APBN | State Budget (Indonesian: Anggaran Pendapatan dan Belanja Negara) |
| BAPPENAS | The Ministry of National Development Planning (Indonesian: Kementerian Perencanaan Pembangunan Nasional Republik Indonesia-abbreviated Bappenas) |
| CSO | Civil Society Organisation |
| DFAT | Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade |
| DPO | Disabled People Organisation |
| EO | Event Organiser |
| FGD | Focus Group Discussion |
| GEDSI | Gender, Equality, Disability, and Social Inclusion |
| IDF | Indonesia Development Forum |
| KII | Key Informant Interview |
| KSI | Knowledge Sector Initiative |
| KOMPAK | the Australia-Indonesia Governance for Growth Program |
| MAMPU | Australia-Indonesia Partnership for Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment |
| MEL | Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning |
| MUSRENBANG | Consultative forum on development planning (Indonesian: Musyawarah Perencanaan Pembangunan) |
| NGO | Non-government organisation |
| PRI | Policy Research Institute |
| RKA | Ministries and Government Institutions Working Plan (Indonesian: Rencana Kerja dan Anggaran Kementerian dan Lembaga) |
| RKP | Government’s Working Plan (Indonesian: Rencana Kerja Pemerintah) |
| RPJMN | Indonesia’s Medium-term Development Plan (Indonesian: Rencana Pembangunan Jangka Menengah Nasional) |
| SOP | Standard Operating Procedure |
| PwD | People with Disabilities |

Executive Summary

The Indonesia Development Forum (IDF) is a platform for national dialogue on Indonesia's development that has been convened by Bappenas, with support from the Knowledge Sector Initiative (KSI), in 2017, 2018 and 2019, and the 2020 that has been delayed until now. IDF is envisaged as a sustainable platform for key stakeholders in the knowledge sector to engage with one another and share knowledge, discuss ideas and identify opportunities for collaboration to strengthen the use of evidence in policy processes in Indonesia.

To understand the cumulative achievements, learning and readiness of IDF as a premier self-managed development forum, KSI assigned Migunani Yogyakarta to conduct an evaluation, to support KSI and Bappenas in their continuing efforts to improve the quality and relevance of the Forum, and to enhance its sustainability.

The evaluation employed a qualitative approach using key informant interview (KII) and focus group discussion (FGD) methods to collect primary data. To complement the primary data, we used a meta-evaluation approach to analyse how the IDF has evolved as an influential forum for knowledge-to-policy processes.

Key findings

Reputation; How has IDF evolved as a premier development event?

On convening capacity, IDF has evolved as a massive national gathering; it grew from about 1,400 participants in 2017 to more than 3,100 in 2019. Participants were distributed relatively evenly across the four knowledge sector actors (producing, intermediary, developing policy, and implementing policy). IDF managed to attract high-level policymakers (minister, echelon 1 and 2), competent researchers and experienced practitioners, but there is the perception that IDF missed some critical actors from the everyday policymaking process, i.e. the echelon 3 bureaucrats and officials from the Ministry of Finance.

In terms of visibility, IDF is gaining profile as a premier development event. The IDF's position as reported in the media increased in 2019 compared to 2018 and 2017. The IDF 2019 evaluation (that took place in 2020) also reported that media coverage continued well past the end date of the event. This is a positive sign that the media will be watching out for and ready to cover the next IDF.

Knowledge: How has IDF evolved in increasing knowledge/perspectives of participants?

In all IDFs, participants in general acknowledged the contribution of IDF in expanding their understanding of the information, the landscape of policymaking actors and ideas on what works. Each year, IDF selected a different theme based on priorities of the Indonesian government and Bappenas' development strategy, however, what remained the same was the focus on derivatives of economic development themes.

The IDF 2018 and 2019 evaluation reports documented high satisfaction and agreement on the quality and relevance of the knowledge presented at the IDF. At IDF 2019, 73% of the participants reported their agreement that the research presented at IDF was of high quality and 82% of them agreed that the research presented at IDF is relevant to addressing Indonesia's policy challenges. The 2018 evaluation

had 60% of the participants “agreeing” or “strongly agreeing” that they had heard new information at IDF that would change the way they think about their work.

In recognising the need for different forms of knowledge in policy process, IDF intentionally provided space for interactions between the three forms of knowledge (scientific/research, professional, and local knowledge). However, it is interesting to note that the retention and relevance of the knowledge presented at the IDF were more related to professional and local knowledge, rather than evidence generated from scientific research (scientific knowledge). For example, good practices from Kulonprogo district on inclusive village (professional knowledge) and sustainable farming from NTT (local knowledge). There is a perception that IDF is an exchange platform for development practices informed by professional and local knowledge rather than as a platform for a scientific conference. This is not necessarily good or bad, but it may influence the reputation as a premier development forum that is featured by the best and most rigorous research evidence (what we term scientific knowledge).

Relationships: To what extent have the three IDFs contributed to the interaction and collaboration on policy issues in the lead-up to, during and after the conference?

IDF has provided a space for engagement among the participants to identify and explore opportunities for collaboration. Participants in all three IDFs reported satisfaction with this opportunity provided by IDF. Some informants view this connecting role as being more important than the knowledge exchange itself. One informant (a prominent CSO activist) said, “We used the IDF event as a place for us to have a reunion. It is kind of a side event by CSO activists”.

However, IDF was not designed to nurture relationships after the event. IDF is more about a marketplace platform to serve on-the-spot interactions. The IDF 2019 evaluation report shows that a number of collaborations are happening as a result of these interactions. Almost half (48%) of the participants reported that they did reach out to someone outside their organisation that they met at IDF 2019 to follow up on ideas or activities and 71% of these groups reported they were still in touch in the second survey (February 2020). This seems to be the same for the design of IDF 2022 where event-based connections (both road to IDF and the IDF) serve as the main approach. All IDF events, including the 2022 Forum, by design, assume a matchmaking role but not for preparing and nurturing relationships.

Uptake of IDF

IDF was perceived as a knowledge-sharing and collaboration event, rather than aiming to achieve certain policy outcomes. IDF had influence on the facilitating factors and mechanisms to influence policies i.e. through expanding policy capacities and broadening policy horizons, but stays largely clear of policy content. Since IDF is not legally positioned in Bappenas’ formal policymaking process, nor a mandated forum by the president such as the Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) Forum, the uptake works through informal pathways, i.e. through increasing awareness, or as referred to in the 2019 evaluation “policy literacy” and “policy attitude” instead of a direct uptake into policy content.

GEDSI (gender equality, disability, and social inclusion)

Awareness and intentional attention to GEDSI were clearly reflected in all editions of the IDF since 2017 and became even more evident in 2019. In the 2022 design, informants from KSI and Bappenas confirmed a commitment to deepening GEDSI in proceedings, participants, and sub-themes. In all three IDFs, GEDSI was intentionally integrated into various ways: diversity of participants, spaces available for all parts of the knowledge sector (researcher, policymaker, and intermediaries), and inclusion of

different forms of knowledge (scientific, professional, and local knowledge), as well as logistics that reduce barriers for people with disabilities.

The evaluation emphasised the importance of being persistent in GEDSI because its structural vulnerability which may lead to treating GEDSI as logistic issues and items that only need to get checked off. GEDSI issues and sessions in IDF seem to be continuously vulnerable of being neglected not because of resistance or disagreement, but largely for structural reasons. Three datasets (evaluation 2018, 2019 and KIIs in 2021) recommend continuing to emphasize GEDSI beyond logistics and representation, i.e. using a GEDSI lens and participation over just representation.

Challenges and lessons learned

Logistics

In terms of creating settings, infrastructure, and proceedings to reduce barriers for people with disabilities (PWDs), there is evidence that the organizers, especially from Bappenas, have adequate awareness and commitment to sustain and improve the inclusiveness of IDF. KIIs with Bappenas staff showed that the 2022 IDF design has learned lessons from previous IDFs. This is reflected in various ways, such as: quota to ensure diversity of participants; outreach to sub-national stakeholders; spaces available for all parts of the knowledge sector and different forms of knowledge (scientific, professional, and local knowledge); and infrastructure for PWDs.

Logistical challenges and concerns, however, were still reported around the following:

- 1) **Procuring the right event organizer (EO).** The critical role of the EO in all IDFs is emphasized in all documents,
- 2) Hiring **Facilitators or Moderators.** Both the 2018 and 2019 evaluation reports emphasised the important role of facilitators in operationalising the mission of IDF as an exchange and matchmaking event, especially in ensuring that high-quality evidence/research is communicated strategically and effectively to the participants. The role of the facilitator is equally critical as that of the presenter.
- 3) **Covid-19 and other potential disruptions.** IDF 2020 was postponed to 2021 due to Covid-19, and postponed again to 2022, because of the prolonged pandemic in 2021. Bappenas keeps planning that the main event and road to IDF (site visits by Bappenas staff to provinces/sites) will be conducted in person. The concept of a hybrid conference is still under discussion. Bappenas is exploring two forms of a hybrid conference, first is organising the main event in-person and offline and virtual road-to-IDF events, and second is a "live stream" of in-person main event, and online the road-to-IDF events.

IDF monitoring, evaluation, and learning (MEL)

Bappenas has mechanisms in place to monitor and evaluate their activities. For each forum, since 2017, Bappenas organized a reflection session within 3 months after the event. Bappenas acknowledged the importance of technical evaluation and expressed their appreciation for the learning and feedback provided by KSI. However, changing the existing MEL methodologies is still challenging for the IDF committee because: 1) The key determinant of success for an event/activity managed by Bappenas is the fact that it happened as planned, and; 2) There are disincentives to employ rigorous MEL. Employing rigorous MEL may result in findings that are considered sensitive as it involves making a judgment about the distribution and use of resources as well as the performance of the implementing unit.

Sustainability

Financing IDF seems not to be an issue for Bappenas because there is a consensus among the leadership that Bappenas needs to organise IDF on an annual basis. While the existence is secured, the amount (how much) faces some degree of uncertainty. In terms of human resources (people), Bappenas reported their confidence to manage IDF in the future. Continued commitment among Bappenas leadership (the minister and echelon 1 staff) has increased this confidence, along with experience with KSI since 2017 in co-managing IDF. Specifically, they are confident in knowing which areas they can directly manage and which processes they need assistance (and which are therefore outsourced). Some works, however, were identified as areas that need support or collaboration with external parties. For example, on the managing and curating of the research and evidence to be presented in IDF.

From the IDF 2019 to the end of 2021, there is no significant progress in the institutionalisation of IDF governance in Bappenas. While strong enthusiasm for continuing the IDF as an annual event is evident at all levels in Bappenas along with a dedicated budget item for IDF and adoption of SoP, the establishment of a permanent secretariat to plan and manage IDF as a regular annual event and a Ministerial decree are still in process of review by the Legal Bureau. Bappenas is preparing an option if this institutionalisation process is still uncertain; a unit in Bappenas (PAKK-Pusat Analisis Kebijakan dan Kinerja-Center for Policy and Performance Analysis) may take over the governance.

Recommendations for Bappenas

- **Uptake of IDF.** There is a need to clarify on which dimensions of “shaping the development agenda” that the IDF can realistically achieve results, i.e. what success looks like in terms of knowledge uptake or policy influencing. A framework for measuring policy influence is recommended both for informing the design and format of the sessions and interaction, and for evaluating the success of IDF.
- **Reputation.** Provide a mechanism for co-arrangement of IDF to increase participation and ownership. The limited role of academic institutions (one of the suppliers of knowledge) and technical ministries (users) in the IDF can result in passive participation, which is a risk and can diminish the reputation of IDF as a premier knowledge-to-policy platform. Mechanisms could be created for better co-design and co-delivery to be a truly knowledge sector event. Being seen as an event of one agency limits the interest and commitment of others. A recommendation in the 2019 evaluation for IDF to facilitate some side events is still relevant in this regard. This will improve the vibrancy and legitimacy of the development agenda.
- **GEDSI.** While most participants acknowledge that the IDF design and implementation is GEDSI-sensitive, the IDF as an inclusive national event needs consideration. The positive GEDSI atmosphere in all IDFs is an aspect of IDF that could be built on going forward. Being intentionally GEDSI-sensitive, especially in breaking the vicious cycle of social exclusion, especially among people with disabilities is recommended.
- **Relationship.** The low participation from other ministries and from the technical level of ministries was perceived as a signal that IDF is more about Bappenas. More substantive participation (not only representation) of sub-national actors and technical ministries would enhance the inclusiveness of the IDF.
- **Knowledge.** In terms of the types of knowledge presented in IDF there was a trend where practical knowledge in the forms of “what worked” initiatives are getting more attention from

the majority of the participants. If this trend continues, IDF could be perceived as an exhibition of good practices (or, as it is called in Indonesia, a “pameran pembangunan”)—a typical government showcase exhibition to show how great is the government in administering development. While this type of knowledge is important, the right balance between scientific, professional, and local knowledge to be exchanged in IDF should be managed strategically.

- **Monitoring, evaluation and learning.** Bappenas’ monitoring and evaluation system is adequate to inform questions around IDF’s output and accountability. However, questions related to IDF’s outcome are beyond the mandate of the IDF steering committee or the Bappenas’ unit that is responsible for monitoring and evaluation. We recommend Bappenas to explore collaborations with external entities to design a specific monitoring, evaluation and learning system and integrate it in IDF’s steering committee scope of work.

Recommendations for DFAT and other development partners

- **Sustainability of IDF.** If sustainability of IDF is defined as a continuation of IDF by Bappenas with its own budget, the inclusion of IDF in the two Bappenas planning documents namely Strategic Plan 2020-2024 and the annual work plan and budget (RKA) is critical. It is recommended that DFAT or other development partners initiate a dialogue with Bappenas on inclusion of IDF in Bappenas’ RKA. To create an enabling environment for Bappenas to include IDF in their work plan and budget, an advocacy initiative to include IDF in the formal government’s development planning process (through presidential regulation or similar regulations) is recommended.
- **Reputation.** DFAT and other development partners could intentionally link their supported knowledge events, research, and evaluation to IDF. This will improve the reputation and legitimacy of the IDF.
- **Monitoring, evaluation and learning.** While Bappenas may focus on the evaluation of the event (process evaluation), DFAT and other development partners could support Bappenas to expand the scope of the evaluation beyond event and complement with outcome evaluation to make a case if and how IDF works in shaping Indonesia’s development agenda.

Ringkasan Eksekutif

Indonesia Development Forum (IDF) adalah sebuah wadah (platform) untuk mengadakan dialog nasional menyangkut pembangunan Indonesia, yang telah diselenggarakan oleh Bappenas dengan dukungan dari Knowledge Sector Initiative (KSI) pada tahun 2017, 2018, dan 2019, serta tahun 2020, yang telah ditunda hingga saat ini. IDF menganut visi sebagai platform berkelanjutan bagi para pemangku kepentingan kunci di sektor pengetahuan untuk terlibat satu sama lain dan berbagi pengetahuan, mendiskusikan ide, dan mengidentifikasi peluang berkolaborasi untuk memperkuat penggunaan bukti dalam proses pembuatan kebijakan di Indonesia.

Untuk memahami pencapaian, pembelajaran, dan kesiapan IDF secara keseluruhan sebagai forum pembangunan swakelola yang utama, KSI menugaskan Migunani Yogyakarta untuk melaksanakan evaluasi dalam rangka mendukung KSI dan Bappenas dalam upaya mereka untuk terus meningkatkan kualitas dan relevansi forum tersebut, dan memperkuat keberlanjutannya.

Evaluasi ini menggunakan pendekatan kualitatif dengan metode wawancara informan kunci (KII) dan diskusi kelompok terfokus (FGD) untuk mengumpulkan data primer. Untuk melengkapi data primer tersebut, kami menggunakan pendekatan evaluasi meta untuk menganalisis bagaimana IDF telah berevolusi sebagai forum yang berpengaruh untuk proses pengetahuan-ke-kebijakan.

Temuan kunci

Reputasi; Bagaimana IDF berevolusi sebagai acara pembangunan yang utama?

Terkait kapasitas untuk mempertemukan para pihak, IDF telah berevolusi menjadi ajang perkumpulan nasional yang masif; jumlah pesertanya naik dari sekitar 1.400 peserta di tahun 2017 menjadi lebih dari 3.100 di tahun 2019. Para peserta terbagi relatif setara dari empat aktor di sektor pengetahuan (penghasil, perantara, penyusunan kebijakan, dan pelaksanaan kebijakan). IDF berhasil menarik pembuat kebijakan tingkat tinggi (Menteri, eselon 1 dan 2), peneliti yang kompeten, dan praktisi yang berpengalaman. Namun, ada persepsi bahwa IDF luput menyasar beberapa aktor yang penting dari proses penyusunan kebijakan sehari-hari, yakni para birokrat eselon 3 dan pejabat dari Kementerian Keuangan.

Dalam hal visibilitas, IDF semakin mendapatkan profil sebagai acara pembangunan yang utama. Posisi IDF, sebagaimana dilaporkan di media, meningkat di tahun 2019 dibandingkan dengan tahun 2018 dan 2017. Evaluasi IDF 2019 (yang berlangsung di tahun 2020) juga melaporkan bahwa liputan media terus berlanjut jauh melewati tanggal berakhirnya acara. Ini menjadi tanda positif bahwa media akan memantau dan siap untuk meliput IDF berikutnya.

Pengetahuan: Bagaimana IDF berevolusi dalam meningkatkan pengetahuan/perspektif peserta?

Dalam setiap IDF, para peserta secara umum mengakui kontribusi IDF dalam memperluas pemahaman mereka terhadap informasi, tataran aktor pembuatan kebijakan, dan ide-ide tentang apa yang telah berhasil dilakukan. Setiap tahun, IDF memilih tema yang berbeda, berdasarkan prioritas pemerintah Indonesia dan strategi pembangunan Bappenas. Namun, fokus terhadap turunan dari tema-tema pembangunan ekonomi tetaplah sama.

Laporan evaluasi IDF 2018 dan 2019 mendokumentasikan kepuasan yang tinggi dan setuju dengan baiknya kualitas dan relevansi dari pengetahuan yang dipaparkan di kedua IDF tersebut. Pada IDF 2019, 73% peserta melaporkan sepakat bahwa riset yang dipaparkan di IDF berkualitas, dan 82% diantaranya setuju bahwa riset yang dipaparkan di IDF relevan untuk mengatasi tantangan kebijakan di Indonesia. Evaluasi untuk tahun 2018 mencatat 60% peserta “setuju” atau “sangat setuju” bahwa mereka telah mendengarkan informasi baru di IDF yang mengubah cara mereka memikirkan pekerjaan atau kegiatan yang mereka lakukan.

Karena mengakui perlunya berbagai bentuk pengetahuan dalam proses penyusunan kebijakan, IDF dengan sengaja menyediakan ruang interaksi antara tiga bentuk pengetahuan (ilmiah/riset, profesional, dan pengetahuan lokal). Namun, menarik untuk dicatat bahwa retensi dan relevansi pengetahuan yang dipaparkan di IDF lebih berkaitan dengan pengetahuan profesional dan lokal dibandingkan dengan bukti yang dihasilkan dari riset ilmiah (pengetahuan ilmiah). Contohnya, praktik baik dari Kabupaten Kulonprogo tentang desa inklusif (pengetahuan profesional) dan pertanian berkelanjutan dari NTT (pengetahuan lokal). Ada persepsi bahwa IDF merupakan platform pertukaran praktik-praktik pembangunan yang berasal dari pengetahuan profesional dan lokal, dan bukan platform untuk konferensi ilmiah. Hal ini tidak berarti baik atau buruk, tetapi dapat mempengaruhi reputasinya sebagai forum pembangunan utama yang menampilkan bukti riset yang terbaik dan paling kuat (yang kita sebut dengan pengetahuan ilmiah).

Relasi: Sejauh mana ketiga IDF tersebut berkontribusi terhadap interaksi dan kolaborasi isu-isu kebijakan menjelang, selama, dan setelah penyelenggaraan konferensi?

IDF telah memberikan ruang pelibatan di antara para peserta untuk mengidentifikasi dan menjajaki peluang untuk berkolaborasi. Peserta di ketiga IDF melaporkan puas dengan peluang yang diberikan IDF ini. Sebagian informan melihat peran penghubung ini lebih penting dibandingkan pertukaran pengetahuan itu sendiri. Salah satu informan (seorang aktivis LSM/Ormas yang ternama) mengatakan, “Kami menggunakan acara IDF sebagai tempat bereuni. Reuni ini menjadi semacam acara sampingan oleh para aktivis LSM”.

Namun, IDF tidak didesain untuk membina hubungan setelah acara berakhir. IDF lebih berfungsi sebagai platform pasar untuk melayani interaksi langsung di tempat acara tersebut. Laporan evaluasi IDF 2019 menunjukkan bahwa sejumlah kolaborasi terjalin karena adanya berbagai interaksi tersebut. Hampir separuh (48%) dari peserta melaporkan bahwa mereka menghubungi seseorang di luar organisasi, yang mereka temui di IDF 2019, untuk menindaklanjuti suatu ide atau kegiatan, dan 71% dari kelompok ini melaporkan masih saling berkomunikasi pada survei yang kedua (Februari 2020). Ini sepertinya akan sama dengan desain IDF 2022, dimana koneksi yang terjalin pada saat acara (baik jalan menuju IDF dan IDF itu sendiri) berfungsi sebagai pendekatan utama. Seluruh acara IDF, termasuk pada tahun 2022, secara desain, memainkan peran menjodohkan, tetapi tidak untuk mempersiapkan dan membina hubungan.

Penyerapan IDF

IDF dianggap sebagai ajang berbagi pengetahuan dan berkolaborasi, bukan bertujuan untuk mencapai hasil kebijakan tertentu. IDF berpengaruh pada berbagai faktor fasilitasi dan mekanisme untuk mempengaruhi kebijakan, yakni dengan meningkatkan kapasitas kebijakan dan memperluas wawasan kebijakan, tetapi tidak masuk ke dalam isi atau konten kebijakan. Karena IDF tidak diposisikan secara

legal dalam proses penyusunan kebijakan resmi dari Bappenas, dan bukan merupakan forum yang dimandatkan oleh Presiden, seperti Forum Tujuan Pembangunan Berkelanjutan (TPB/SDG), penyerapannya diperoleh melalui jalur informal, yaitu dengan meningkatkan kesadaran, atau sebagaimana disebutkan dalam evaluasi 2019, “literasi kebijakan” dan “sikap kebijakan”, tidak masuk secara langsung ke dalam konten kebijakan.

GEDSI (Kesetaraan Gender, Disabilitas, dan Inklusi Sosial)

Kesadaran dan perhatian yang sengaja ditujukan untuk GEDSI dengan jelas tercermin di seluruh edisi IDF sejak 2017, dan menjadi lebih jelas lagi di tahun 2019. Dalam desain IDF 2022, informan dari KSI dan Bappenas mengonfirmasi komitmen untuk memperdalam GEDSI dalam rangkaian acara, peserta, dan subtema. Di ketiga IDF, GEDSI dengan sengaja diintegrasikan dalam berbagai cara: keragaman peserta, ruang yang tersedia untuk seluruh bagian di sektor pengetahuan (peneliti, pembuat kebijakan, dan perantara), dan diikutsertakannya berbagai bentuk pengetahuan (ilmiah, profesional, dan lokal), serta logistik yang mengurangi hambatan bagi penyandang disabilitas.

Evaluasi ini menekankan pentingnya bersikap konsisten dalam GEDSI karena kerentanan strukturalnya, yang dapat berujung pada memperlakukan GEDSI sebagai isu logistik dan hanya hal-hal dalam daftar yang perlu dipenuhi. Isu-isu GEDSI dan sesi-sesi di IDF sepertinya terus memperlihatkan kerentanan untuk diabaikan, bukan karena penolakan atau ketidaksepakatan, tetapi terutama karena alasan struktural. Tiga perangkat data (evaluasi 2018, 2019 dan KII di tahun 2021) merekomendasikan untuk terus menekankan GEDSI melampaui isu logistik dan representasi, yakni menggunakan lensa GEDSI dan melihat partisipasi lebih dari sekedar representasi.

Tantangan dan Pembelajaran

Logistik

Dalam hal menciptakan pengaturan, infrastruktur, dan proses rangkaian acara untuk mengurangi hambatan bagi penyandang disabilitas, terdapat bukti bahwa pihak penyelenggara, terutama dari Bappenas, memiliki kesadaran dan komitmen yang memadai untuk mempertahankan dan meningkatkan inklusivitas IDF. Wawancara informan kunci (KII) dengan staf Bappenas menunjukkan bahwa desain IDF 2022 dibuat dengan mengambil pelajaran dari IDF-IDF sebelumnya. Hal ini tercermin dalam berbagai cara, seperti: kuota untuk menjamin keragaman peserta; penjangkauan ke pemangku kepentingan daerah; ruang-ruang yang tersedia untuk seluruh bagian sektor pengetahuan dan berbagai bentuk pengetahuan (ilmiah, profesional, dan lokal); dan infrastruktur untuk penyandang disabilitas.

Namun, beberapa tantangan dan kekuatiran logistik, masih dilaporkan seputar hal-hal berikut ini:

- 1) **Memilih pihak penyelenggara acara (EO) yang tepat.** Peran penting EO di seluruh IDF ditekankan di seluruh dokumen.
- 2) Menggunakan **Fasilitator atau Moderator.** Laporan evaluasi tahun 2018 dan 2019 menekankan pentingnya peran fasilitator dalam mengoperasionalkan misi IDF sebagai acara pertukaran dan mempertemukan para pihak, terutama dalam memastikan bahwa bukti/riset berkualitas tinggi dikomunikasikan secara strategis dan efektif kepada peserta. Peran fasilitator sama pentingnya dengan peran pemapar materi.
- 3) **Covid-19 dan disrupsi potensial lainnya.** IDF 2020 ditunda menjadi 2021 karena Covid-19, dan Kembali ditunda hingga 2022, karena masih berlangsungnya pandemi di tahun 2021. Bappenas terus merencanakan agar acara utama dan jalan menuju IDF (kunjungan staf Bappenas ke

provinsi/lokasi) dilakukan secara langsung. Konsep untuk konferensi dengan kombinasi dua sistem (hibrida), masih didiskusikan. Bappenas sedang menjajaki dua bentuk konferensi hibrida, yang pertama adaah menggelar acara utama secara langsung dan tatap muka, dan acara jalan menuju IDF secara virtual, dan yang kedua adalah “siarang langsung” acara utama secara tatap muka, dan jalan menuju IDF secara daring.

Monitoring, evaluasi, dan pembelajaran (MEL) IDF

Bappenas sudah mempunyai mekanisme untuk memonitor dan mengevaluasi kegiatan mereka. Untuk setiap forum, Bappenas menyelenggarakan sesi refleksi dalam jangka waktu 3 bulan setelah acara. Bappenas mengakui pentingnya evaluasi teknis, dan mengutarakan apresiasinya atas pembelajaran dan masukan yang diberikan oleh KSI. Namun, mengubah metodologi MEL yang ada masih menjadi tantangan bagi komite IDF, karena: 1) Faktor penentu keberhasilan kunci untuk acara/kegiatan yang dikelola oleh Bappenas adalah acara berlangsung sesuai rencana, dan; 2) Terdapat disinsentif apabila menggunakan MEL yang terlalu ketat. Hal ini dapat berakibat pada temuan yang dianggap sensitif, karena melibatkan membuat penilaian tentang distribusi dan penggunaan sumber daya, serta kinerja dari unit pelaksana.

Keberlanjutan

Membayai IDF sepertinya tidak menjadi masalah bagi Bappenas karena adanya konsensus di antara para pimpinan bahwa Bappenas perlu menyelenggarakan IDF setiap tahun. Meskipun adanya pembiayaan sudah aman, jumlahnya (berapa jumlah pembiayaannya) menghadapi ketidakpastian. Dalam hal sumber daya (manusia), Bappenas melaporkan keyakinan mereka untuk mengelola IDF di masa mendatang. Komitmen yang terus diperlihatkan para pimpinan di Bappenas (Menteri dan staf eselon 1) meningkatkan keyakinan ini, beserta pengalaman mengelola IDF sejak 2017 bersama KSI. Secara khusus, mereka yakin sudah mengetahui mana yang dapat mereka kelola sendiri dan proses mana yang membutuhkan bantuan (dan karenanya mana yang harus dikerjakan oleh pihak luar). Namun, beberapa kegiatan telah teridentifikasi sebagai bidang-bidang yang memerlukan dukungan atau kolaborasi dengan pihak eksternal. Contohnya, dalam hal mengelola dan mengumpulkan riset dan bukti yang akan dipaparkan di IDF.

Dari IDF 2019 hingga akhir 2021, tidak ada perkembangan signifikan dalam melembagakan tata kelola IDF di Bappenas. Meskipun antusiasme yang kuat untuk melanjutkan IDF sebagai ajang tahunan terlihat di semua tingkatan di Bappenas, beserta mata anggaran yang khusus diperuntukkan untuk IDF dan pengadopsian SoP, pembentukan sekretariat permanen untuk merencanakan dan mengelola IDF sebagai gelaran tahunan dan Surat Keputusan Menteri masih dalam proses peninjauan oleh Biro Hukum. Bappenas tengah mempersiapkan opsi apabila proses pelembagaan ini masih belum pasti; sebuah unit di Bappenas (PAKK-Pusat Analisis Kebijakan dan Kinerja) dapat mengambil alih tata kelola tersebut.

Rekomendasi untuk Bappenas

- **Penyerapan IDF.** Perlu adanya klarifikasi tentang dimensi mana dari “membentuk agenda pembangunan” yang hasilnya secara realistis dapat dicapai IDF, yakni seperti apa bentuk keberhasilan dalam hal penyerapan pengetahuan atau mempengaruhi kebijakan. Bappenas direkomendasikan agar menyusun kerangka untuk mengukur pengaruh terhadap kebijakan, baik

untuk menginformasikan desain dan format sesi-sesi dan interaksi maupun mengevaluasi kesuksesan IDF.

- **Reputasi.** Memberikan mekanisme untuk penyelenggaraan IDF bersama untuk meningkatkan partisipasi dan rasa memiliki. Terbatasnya peran lembaga akademis (salah satu penyedia pengetahuan) dan kementerian teknis (pengguna) di IDF dapat mengakibatkan partisipasi yang pasif, yang menjadi risiko dan dapat menggerus reputasi IDF sebagai platform pengetahuan-kebijakan yang utama. Agar dapat menjadi ajang sektor pengetahuan sejati, dapat disusun mekanisme untuk mendesain bersama dan pelaksanaan bersama dengan lebih baik. Anggapan sebagai acara dari satu lembaga saja membatasi ketertarikan dan komitmen pihak lain. Dalam hal ini, rekomendasi di evaluasi tahun 2019 agar IDF memfasilitasi beberapa acara tambahan atau sampingan masalah relevan. Hal ini akan meningkatkan semangat dan legitimasi dari agenda pembangunan.
- **GEDSI.** Meskipun sebagian peserta mengakui bahwa desain dan pelaksanaan IDF sensitif terhadap GEDSI, IDF sebagai ajang nasional yang inklusif masih memerlukan beberapa pertimbangan. Suasana GEDSI yang positif di semua IDF merupakan aspek yang dapat dibangun IDF ke depannya. Direkomendasikan agar IDF sengaja menjadi sensitif terhadap GEDSI, terutama dalam meruntuhkan siklus eksklusi sosial yang kejam, terutama di antara penyandang disabilitas.
- **Relasi.** Rendahnya partisipasi dari kementerian lain dan tingkatan teknis kementerian dianggap sebagai sinyal bahwa IDF lebih berkaitan dengan Bappenas. Partisipasi substantif yang lebih besar (bukan hanya representasi) dari aktor-aktor di tingkat daerah dan kementerian teknis akan meningkatkan inklusivitas IDF.
- **Pengetahuan.** Dalam hal jenis-jenis pengetahuan yang dipaparkan di IDF, ada tren dimana pengetahuan praktis dalam bentuk inisiatif “yang berhasil” mendapatkan perhatian lebih besar dari mayoritas peserta. Apabila tren ini berlanjut, IDF dapat dianggap sebagai pertunjukan praktik baik (atau sering disebut dengan “pameran pembangunan”) – pameran pemerintah yang tipikal untuk menunjukkan betapa baiknya pemerintah dalam menjalankan pembangunan. Meskipun jenis pengetahuan ini penting, keseimbangan yang tepa tantara pengetahuan ilmiah, profesional, dan lokal yang dipertukarkan di IDF harus dikelola secara strategis.
- **Monitoring, evaluasi, dan pembelajaran.** Sistem monitoring dan evaluasi Bappenas sudah memadai untuk menginformasikan pertanyaan seputar keluaran dan akuntabilitas IDF. Namun, pertanyaan terkait hasil IDF berada diluar mandat komite pengarah IDF atau unit Bappenas yang bertanggung jawab atas monitoring dan evaluasi. Kami merekomendasikan Bappenas untuk menjajaki kolaborasi dengan lembaga eksternal untuk mendesain sistem monitoring, evaluasi, dan pembelajaran yang spesifik, dan mengintegrasikannya di dalam ruang lingkup pekerjaan komite pengarah IDF.

Rekomendasi untuk DFAT dan mitra pembangunan lainnya

- **Keberlanjutan IDF.** Apabila keberlanjutan IDF didefinisikan sebagai kelanjutan IDF oleh Bappenas dengan anggarannya sendiri, dicantumkannya IDF dalam dua dokumen perencanaan Bappenas, yakni Rencana Strategis (Renstra) 2020-2024 dan Rencana Kegiatan dan Anggaran (RKA) menjadi sangat penting. Kami merekomendasikan agar DFAT atau mitra pembangunan lainnya mengadakan dialog dengan Bappenas tentang pencantuman IDF dalam RKA Bappenas.

Untuk menciptakan lingkungan pendukung bagi Bappenas untuk dapat mencantumkan IDF dalam RKA mereka, kami merekomendasikan untuk melakukan inisiatif advokasi untuk mencantumkan IDF dalam proses perencanaan resmi pemerintah (melalui peraturan presiden atau peraturan serupa).

- **Reputasi.** DFAT dan mitra pembangunan lainnya dapat secara sengaja menghubungkan acara pengetahuan, riset, dan evaluasi yang mereka dukung dengan IDF. Ini akan meningkatkan reputasi dan legitimasi IDF.
- **Monitoring, evaluasi dan pembelajaran.** Sementara Bappenas dapat fokus pada evaluasi acara (evaluasi prosesnya), DFAT dan mitra pembangunan lainnya dapat mendukung Bappenas untuk memperluas cakupan evaluasi di luar acara dan melengkapinya dengan evaluasi hasil untuk menunjukkan apakah dan bagaimana IDF bekerja dalam membentuk agenda pembangunan Indonesia.

Evaluation of the Indonesia Development Forum (IDF)

A. Background

The Indonesia Development Forum (IDF) is a platform for national dialogue on Indonesia's development that has been convened annually by Bappenas since 2017 with support from the Knowledge Sector Initiative (KSI). IDF is envisaged as a sustainable platform for key stakeholders in the knowledge sector to engage with one another and share knowledge, discuss ideas and identify opportunities for collaboration to strengthen the use of evidence in policy processes in Indonesia. Due to protocols related to minimizing the spread of Covid-19, the IDF 2020's and 2021's main events were postponed. Bappenas is planning the fourth conference in September 2022 while, on the other hand, KSI will be closing on 30 June 2022.

Different from the previous events where KSI played a significant role in co-managing the forum, future IDFs will be managed by Bappenas. This shows Bappenas' ownership of the event as well as its commitment to take up the ideas underpinning IDF i.e. inclusive, and better use of evidence to inform Indonesia's policymaking process. In this regard, strategic learning from the IDF implementation since 2017 until the current planning for the 2022 IDF implementation can provide useful evidence to inform the future IDF design and implementation.

To understand the accumulative achievements, learning and readiness of IDF as a premium self-managed development forum, KSI assigned Migunani Yogyakarta to conduct an evaluation, to support KSI and Bappenas in their continuing efforts to improve the quality and relevance of the Forum, and to enhance its sustainability.

Key evaluation questions are structured around platform, content, uptake and gender, equality, disability, and social inclusion (GEDSI) as described below:

- a. **Platform:** How has IDF evolved as a knowledge exchange and policy dialogue platform? How sustainable is this platform in a post-KSI environment? To what extent has the IDF contributed to the interaction and collaboration among stakeholders on policy issues in the lead-up to, during and after the conference? How is the governance and implementation of IDF, and what are the key lessons to be learned?
- b. **Content:** Has the IDF contributed new thinking and approaches to addressing Indonesia's key development challenges? Has IDF provided added value or filled knowledge gaps in terms of policy issues of the policymaking process, and how is this added value distributed among the stakeholders in the knowledge sectors (i.e. who benefited what and how)? How are the contents managed to provide input to the development planning process (Musrenbang)?
- c. **Uptake:** Indications of the uptake of the knowledge generated or exchanged throughout IDF by policymakers, including Bappenas, other ministries and agencies, and sub-national governments. What mechanisms are in place to ensure that the knowledge generated from the sessions feed into the development planning process? What can Bappenas and other stakeholders learn from the implementation of the events in 2017, 2018 and 2019?

- d. **GEDSI:** How have GEDSI perspectives evolved and how were they represented in each point above? How will GEDSI aspects be maintained and sustained post-KSI program?

The following section details key evaluation frameworks and employed methods to answer the evaluation questions, preliminary findings and resulting recommendations. Data from the final stage of interviews along with a series of consultation and sensemaking processes in February 2022 has informed the finalization of this preliminary report.

B. Evaluation Framework and Methodology

To investigate the above domains of the evaluation, we employed a qualitative approach using key informant interview (KII) and focus group discussion (FGD) and complemented with a meta-evaluation approach. To complement the primary data, we used a meta-evaluation approach to analyse how the IDF has evolved as an influential forum for knowledge-to-policy processes. This approach refers to Patton's (2001)¹ definition; it is a re-analysis of an evaluative study, which has already been concluded; taking into consideration several aspects of the previous study such as methodology, subject selection, adopted criteria, results and analysis. The analysis presented in the findings reflect a synthesis of primary and secondary data.

We have conducted 21 KIIs with former participants from KSI-supported policy research institutes (3 KIIs), Bappenas staff (5 KIIs), technical ministry (1 KII), development partner (2 KIIs), disabled people's organisation (1 KII), NGO (4 KIIs), private sector (1 KII), and 1 KII with an academician. Two FGDs with KSI team and the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT) staff were also conducted to triangulate the findings.

C. Findings

The findings presented in this report constitute a final analysis that are structured into four sections: achievements, challenges, sustainability and aspiration for the future.

C.1 IDF's achievements

Reputation; How has IDF evolved as a premier development event?

IDF is envisaged as a sustainable platform for knowledge-to-policy dialogue in shaping Indonesia's development agendas. This vision requires IDF to have a good reputation as a premier conference which comprises of three dimensions:

- 1) capacity to convene the right stakeholders in the policymaking process, attract the competent minds in development, and incentivize innovators/other positive disruptors,

¹ Patton, M. Q. 2001. Qualitative research and evaluation methods (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- 2) ability to be intentionally inclusive and proactively solicit voices from the under-represented groups, and;
- 3) perception and media coverage.

On convening capacity, in terms of size, IDF has evolved into a massive national gathering. Evaluation of IDF 2019 reported that it grew slightly from 2017 to 2018, from about 1,400 participants to 1,800. It then grew tremendously, almost doubling in 2019 to over 3,100 people. In terms of proportion of the participants, participants were distributed relatively evenly across the four knowledge sector actors (producing-20%, intermediary-25%, developing policy-19%, and implementing policy-17% and 19% others-journalists, students, etc.). This data-based composition is confirmed by participants' perception in the survey where 72% of them reported agreement on a statement, "there was a good balance of participants across researchers, policy analysts, policymakers and the private sector". Follow-up interviews with 15 participants in December 2021 and January 2022 confirmed this positive sentiment.

In terms of participants' perception on IDF as a knowledge-to-policy platform, an informant in the follow-up interview in 2021, an echelon 1 (director general) from a technical ministry who attended both IDF 2018 and 2019 reported that although IDF managed to attract high-level policymakers (minister, echelon 1 and 2) as well as competent researchers and good practices from the community, but IDF missed a critical actor in the everyday policymaking process, i.e., the echelon 3 bureaucrats and officials from the Ministry of Finance. He said, "IDF was successful in entertaining cognitive needs, but the translation to concrete development policy is unknown due to the absence of dedicated sessions for those who are able to turn knowledge and political commitment into implementable (budgeted) policies, namely echelon 3 and officials from the Ministry of Finance." This observation is confirmed by all informants, including a director of a national women NGO with thousands of members across Indonesia who reported that what was most useful for her was the opportunity to meet other people. She did not see an opportunity and dedicated space to influence policy through IDF. An informant from Bappenas underlined this observation. To this informant, IDF is designed to harness ideas (or in Indonesian, during the KIIs, the informant called IDF as a forum "*untuk menjangring aspirasi dan gagasan*"), therefore, while some participants are the "doers" in the bureaucratic process of policymaking, there was no dedicated session for them.

IDF 2022 seems to be still under this framework. An informant in Bappenas who is part of the design team, described the story plot of IDF 2022, although the "sub-nationalization" of IDF as recommended by IDF 2019 evaluation is very well taken (i.e., by organising hybrid "road to IDF" events and site visits to 10 provinces), IDF is still designed as a big national exhibition or showcase of knowledge and development practice to inspire development agenda—where the selected ideas and practices will be handed over to the President².

In addition to the lack of dedicated sessions for the policymaking implementers, both the 2018 and 2019 evaluation and the 2017 proceedings noted the limited participation from the university community (and primarily student participants). The IDF 2019 evaluation specifically recommended that this situation should be addressed because the university community is an important community in the generation of evidence.

² Back to the statement of the echelon 1 informant, this may be effective to create political commitment to policy uptake, but the real uptake requires the participation and dedicated sessions for the doers (echelon 3 and officials from the Ministry of Finance).

Regarding reputation as an inclusive forum, in terms of diversity of participants, the IDF 2022 design has accommodated the recommendations from both the 2018 and 2019 evaluations on the lack of representation from off-Java, and even out of the Greater Jakarta area. IDF 2022 is affirmatively designed to have multiple approaches (national and sub-national events) as well as a hybrid model (online and in-person). This was possible due to KSI's support through establishing the GEDSI standard operating procedure (SOP), establishment of criteria in the decision on selecting the case studies from the regions and engagement of technical ministries.

However, an interview with Bappenas indicates that participation from other ministries and from the technical level of ministries, especially the Ministry of Finance, remain uncertain although there is already an understanding that more active participation of both other ministries and of technical staff along with the "doers" staff would enhance the effectiveness of the IDF in terms of policy uptake.

Regarding inclusiveness in the session process and proceedings, KIIs and review of the 2022 story plot agree that reputation as an inclusive forum was evident, and that awareness and commitment to GEDSI is becoming stronger. Some concerns, however raised by an informant from a disabled people's organisation (DPO) whether there is an affirmative commitment to gender parity and participation of people with disabilities since there is no specific GEDSI objective related to participation³. Informants from policy research institutes (PRIs) raised a concern that inclusiveness is not only about facilities and proceedings, but also topics and types of knowledge. Knowledge and themes related to core development issues such as economics, poverty, industrialization are still perceived as dominant. Issues like religious intolerance and barriers to public services and environmental degradation are considered less important.

In terms of visibility, both from Bappenas and DFAT perspectives, IDF is gaining profile as a premier development event. IDF 2022 for example, is planned to engage the President of the Republic of Indonesia not only as a ceremonial keynote speaker, but as the "recipient" of the curated knowledge and development practices. DFAT, in all the reports (the 2017 proceedings, 2018 and 2019 evaluation reports) and the recent FGD confirmed this perception and added that for DFAT, IDF is a strategic flagship of their presence in Indonesia's policy dialogue.

The reporting on IDF in the media in 2019 was higher than in 2018 and 2017⁴. The 2019 evaluation that took place in 2020 also reported that media coverage continued well past the end date of the event. This is a positive sign that the media will be watching for and ready to cover the next IDF. However, with the two years gap (2020 and 2021), it might be harder to keep up the goodwill generated with the media to sustain and even increase coverage in the future, especially, this increasing trend in media coverage was attributed to KSI for which KSI provided significant support to Bappenas and for which Bappenas expressed appreciation (IDF evaluation 2019).

³ The 2019 evaluation report (p.16) documented that IDF 2019 was the first year there was gender parity (55% women participants). There was also an increase in the proportion of female panelists, from 34% in 2018 to 39% in 2019. As well, the participation of people with various disabilities and the services to support their participation were clearly stronger with 11% of participants identifying as having some sort of disability in 2019. A balanced gender ratio and affirmative participation as well as spaces for people with disabilities to participate were evident.

⁴ Media coverage has improved over the three years of the IDF. In 2019 coverage lasted well past the end of the event for the first time. While the public relations (PR) estimated value is decreasing (from IDR 36 billion in 2017, IDR 26 billion in 2018 and IDR 19 billion in 2019), media coverage by substance in 2019 was coverage in 60% of monitored publications as compared with coverage in only 40% of monitored publications in 2018). PR value in 2019 only covers publication from 22-28 July 2019. Might be higher if we included PR for road to IDF and publications beyond 28 July 2019. No estimates for 2017 are available. (IDF 2019 evaluation report p.21)

In terms of its reputation as an international event, there is a significant decline in international participation in IDF over time. In 2017 IDF brought in a number of high-profile international development thinkers. In 2018 the numbers were down significantly, with usually one international speaker on a panel. In 2019, there was an international speaker in each of 'Inspire', 'Imagine', 'Innovate' and 'Initiate'. This is not necessarily good or bad, but it may influence the reputation as a premier development forum. The 2018 report notes considerable effort put into the identification and engagement of relevant international speakers. The KII with DFAT also confirmed the importance of having a good balance of international and national speakers.

Knowledge: How has IDF evolved in increasing knowledge/perspectives of participants?

In all IDFs, participants in general acknowledged the contribution of IDF in expanding their understanding about the information, the landscape of policymaking actors and ideas on what works. Each year, IDF has selected a different theme based on priorities of the Indonesian government and Bappenas' development strategy, however, what remained the same was the focus on derivatives of economic development themes such as 'Fighting Inequality for Better Growth' (2017); 'Regional (infrastructure) Disparities' (2018); 'Job Creation and Productivity' (2019) and 'Industrialisation' (2022).

As reported in the KIIs with PRIs, the social agenda has received less attention, with the exception of the priority on inclusion of people with disabilities and efforts to increase the role of women as well as the role of culture in economic development, both co-promoted strongly by KSI and non-governmental partners. In two separate KIIs with the Director General, Ministry of Education and Culture and the Indonesian Art Coalition (Koalisi Seni Indonesia) in December 2021, the focus on mainstream themes is understandable as they also reflect the current administration's priority issues, however, knowledge that matters for effective development is not only about those mainstream themes. In addition, both informants suggested a non-traditional format for mainstreaming social and cultural issues in the arrangement of the speakers. For example, if the Director General for culture is asked to present that culture matters in economic development, it has shown limited resonance. However, if the cultural issues are presented by a CEO of a start-up company, he believes it will have different influence on the uptake of the issue.

As an event that addresses a different policy domain each year, the IDF does not intentionally build institutional knowledge that are needed for policy influence. Therefore, the assessment of increasing knowledge is focused on participants' perceptions as reported in the 2018 and 2019 evaluation reports. High satisfaction and agreement on the quality and relevance of the knowledge presented in the IDF were documented in both evaluation reports. In IDF 2019, seven out of 10 participants (73%) reported their agreement that the research presented at IDF was of high quality and 82% of them agreed that the research presented at IDF is relevant to addressing Indonesia's policy challenges while the 2018 evaluation reported that 60% participants agreeing or strongly agreeing that they had heard new information at IDF that would change the way they think about their work.

KIIs with Bappenas in 2022 confirm this assessment. According to the informants, the quality of the knowledge presented in IDF was possible due to an effective joint review mechanism with external reviewers supported by KSI. Both evaluation reports also conducted systematic review of the abstracts and papers and reported that there were spaces available for different actors (types of knowledge

providers) and different forms of knowledge (scientific, professional, and local knowledge) to actively engage.

It is interesting to note that both the 2018 and 2019 evaluation reports documented that the retention and relevance of the knowledge presented in the IDF was more related to professional and local knowledge, rather than scientific knowledge. For example, good practices from Kulonprogo district on the inclusive village (professional knowledge) and sustainable farming from NTT (local knowledge). There is a perception that IDF is an exchange platform for development practices informed by professional and local knowledge rather than a platform for a scientific conference. This is not necessarily good or bad, but it may influence the reputation as a premier development forum that is featured by the best and most rigorous research evidence (what we term scientific knowledge). One informant appreciated Bappenas' growing ownership and policy relevance, but at the same time, in terms of organising a (scientific) knowledge conference, "This year simply wasn't up to par with international standards, but last year I felt it was".⁵ This perspective is reflective of some varied understanding and expectations among participants about the intent of IDF. IDF has evolved over time from a more academic event in 2017 to a practice-oriented event in 2019⁶. This shift has not been clearly communicated to participants and seems to have happened again in the 2022 design. As reported in the 2019 evaluation and underlined by two informants in the KIIs in 2021, the intent here is not to assess the relative merits of the priority but to advocate for more clarity in purpose and communication. This recommendation from the 2019 evaluation remains relevant, "the purpose of, and participants segmentation in, the IDF needs to be rethought and then be clearly explained and clarified to potential participants".

Relationships: To what extent have the three IDFs contributed to the interaction and collaboration on policy issues in the lead-up to, during and after the conference?

In addition to providing a platform for policy dialogue, IDF is designed to provide a space for engagement among the participants to identify and explore opportunities for collaboration. Participants in all three IDFs (2017, 2018 and 2019) reported satisfaction with this opportunity provided by IDF. For instance, a survey conducted by the 2018 IDF evaluation team showed that 68% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the statement: 'the IDF was effective in enabling engagement between researchers, policymakers and other key players in the knowledge sector' and '60% of the participant said that they had met new people at IDF that would change the way they worked; and over two-thirds of the respondents recorded an intent to collaborate with stakeholders around new ideas and solutions for tackling Indonesia's policy challenges'.

This functional connecting platform continued in IDF 2019, where the majority of participants (84%) reported that the IDF was effective in enabling engagement between key players in the knowledge sector. The follow-up survey in December 2019 reported that 48% of the respondents did reach out to someone outside their organisation that they met at IDF 2019 to follow up on ideas or activities and 71% of these groups reported they were still in touch in the second survey (February 2020). Ten KIIs in 2021 reported that collaboration beyond exchange information such as joint program and co-financing was limited.

⁵ Interview with a participant from a donor agency in 2020.

⁶ IDF 2018 evaluation report indicated that scientific or academic works were presented but limited evidence was found of participants from academic institutions interacting with non-academic sectors post-conference. Participants from universities were more interested in networking with academic peers, rather than influencing policy.

There were some collaborations reported such as collaboration between the Australia Indonesia Disability Research and Advocacy Network (AIDRAN) with Brawijaya University in Malang and funding from the Directorate General of Culture with a foundation in Bali, and a seed company with Lewowerang Farmers Group in NTT. These collaborations were possible due partly by their relationship prior to the IDF. In general, the participants expressed their appreciation to this facilitation by IDF, even one informant, as reported above, valued this connecting role as more important than the knowledge exchange. One informant, who is a prominent CSO activist re-confirmed her statement as documented in the 2019 IDF evaluation, “We used IDF event as a place for us to have a reunion. It is kind of a side event by CSO activists”.

However, according to a senior member of the organising committee of IDF 2019, IDF was not designed to nurture relationships after the event. IDF is more about a marketplace platform to serve on-the-spot interactions. This design seems to be the same with the design of IDF 2022 where event-based connection (both road to IDF and the IDF) serve as the main approach. All IDF events, including the 2022 Forum, by design, assume primarily a matchmaking role but not necessarily for preparing and nurturing relationships. The design of interactions relies on one-off, on-the-spot interactions. An event that aims to contribute to in-depth and purposeful relationships, especially in the knowledge-to-policy realm, requires intentionality in design, with specific program and curated policy dialogue/debates that are attended by the relevant policymakers and pay adequate attention to the follow-up activities.

The IDF 2019 evaluation and KIIs in 2021 underline that this mode of interaction was insufficient for fostering relationships. This structure has strengthened the tendency to use it to reconnect, not make new connections. In addition, a social network analysis conducted in the 2018 evaluation showed that cross-sector relationships were limited. Participants from the private sector are more likely (and the most likely) to build collaborations outside their sector than they are within their sector. University researchers, civil society organisations, and government individuals are more likely to build collaborations within their sector than with others. This phenomenon continued in 2019. An interview with a Jakarta-based development professional in 2019 and a KII with a leader of women NGO in 2022, quoted below, support this situation,

“I’m here to network, but I’m not here to meet new people. I’m trying to meet people I know, to renew my old relations. So, I’m not trying to make new connections” (Informant, a CEO of an International NGO, July 2019).

“Thanks to IDF, I used the Forum in 2018 and 2019 to gather our women network. We had some side events to reconnect with members of our organisation from many places in Indonesia. Will do the same thing in IDF 2022” (Informant, a leader of a national women NGO, December 2021).

In this regard, the recommendation of the 2019 evaluation remains relevant, that “to be truly useful and successful as a development forum, IDF needs to be thought of as a continuum with well-aligned pre- and posts-events.”

An interesting note from the 2019 evaluation report is about the role of IDF in strengthening relationships beyond person-to-person relationship, i.e. IDF fosters healthy relationships between the state and citizens to evolve through creation of both spaces for citizen engagement and the necessary skills of citizens to contribute to public policies constructively and effectively. Informants from PRIs agreed that

for them, IDF was and will always have big potential to be a good platform to promote a diversity of knowledge sources and inclusive participation, a hallmark of healthy policymaking. In a KII with a participant from a CSO in Eastern Indonesia,

“IDF is like mini-Indonesia. You can visit various types of knowledge, innovations from different provinces, meeting people from almost all provinces--help to realize our motto, diversity in unity.” (Informant, CSO, 2021)

Uptake of IDF; What mechanisms are in place to ensure that the knowledge generated from the sessions feeds into the development planning process?

On one of his slide deck presentations during the opening session of IDF 2017, the Minister of Development Planning/Head of Bappenas presented how the results of IDF will be used to inform a cabinet meeting in September 2017 that would discuss development priorities and the government’s development agenda. In the 2018 Forum, he also said that IDF 2018 encourages open discussion on key challenges in addressing disparities in human and economic development so that the recommendations could be used to inform the mid-term development plan (RPJMN) 2020-2024. These statements indicated a specific form of knowledge uptake, i.e. adoption of knowledge/evidence exchanged in IDF in the development policies such as RPJMN or the national government development plan (Rencana Kerja Pemerintah—RKP) or the ministries and government institutions working plan (Rencana Kerja dan Anggaran—RKA).

One of the key evaluation questions in the 2019 IDF evaluation was, “How has the IDF informed policymaking in Indonesia, especially in economic/labour reform?”. Both evaluation reports, although using different policy frameworks in measuring policy uptake, agree that IDF is more about knowledge-sharing and collaboration and knowledge-to-practice, rather than policy outcomes. Further, the 2019 IDF evaluation report explained that IDF had influences on the facilitating factors and mechanisms to policy influence i.e., through expanding policy capacities and broadening policy horizons, but not yet to policy content. Three informants from government agencies in 2021 KIIs underlined this finding, that since IDF is not legally positioned in the Bappenas’ formal policymaking process, the uptake works through informal pathways, i.e. through increasing awareness or, as it was described in the 2019 evaluation, as “policy literacy” and “policy attitude” instead of a direct uptake to policy content.

The supply of evidence is one necessary but insufficient part of an effort in influencing policy. Cairney and Weible (2016) recommend that the right time to act is one of the important strategies to influence policymaking processes⁷. In this regard, if IDF is specifically designed to inform the ministerial or government agency level development plan (RKA), an interview with a government official in 2021 suggested that IDF should consider a November meeting to seize the moment where the ministries and government institutions are in the process of finalising their activity plan. This statement is correct when we refer to the last stage in the development planning, i.e. finalisation of the activity plan. However, if we

⁷ Cairney P, Jones M (2016) Kingdon’s Multiple Streams Approach: What Is the Empirical Impact of this Universal Theory? *Policy Stud J* 44(1):37–58

refer to the overall planning process, the timing of IDF to seize the development policymaking process actually is not an issue. There are many windows and channels to influence the development planning along the government planning, implementation and evaluation cycle (Table 1).

An interview with PRI staff whose expertise is in budget advocacy, along with a review of Bappenas' regulation on development planning (Permen PPN No. 2/2021) and the Minister of Finance Decree No. 208/PMK.02/2019 on the procedure for reviewing RKA, show that the opportunity to influence development policy is always available throughout the year through the five streams of planning process (Bappenas, ministries, sub-national government, national government and legislative). For example, in the first stream—development of the RKP--, we can influence the processes that are led by Bappenas: from the kick-off meeting in December to Bappenas technical meetings with ministries and government institutions to harmonise the RKA and RKP in May. Influencing the policymaking process could be done also in June when the parliament (DPR) has to review and approve the RKP. Once the RKP and RKA are approved in July, there are also opportunities to influence the development plan at ministries and government institutions level through the finalisation of projects' scope and activities. In addition, Law No. 2/2020 on state financial policy and stability allows the government (ministries and institutions) to revise the RKP and RKA anytime. In this regard, the issue of policy uptake of IDF is not about the timing—when the IDF should be conducted--, but it is about which planning stream and the nature of influence (policymaking process or evaluation of policy implementation).

GEDSI; To what extent and how have the three IDFs shared knowledge on GEDSI policy issues? How has it managed the logistics to be GEDSI sensitive?

Review of the 2017 proceedings and evaluation reports 2018 and 2019 showed that awareness and intentional attention to GEDSI were clearly reflected in all editions of the IDF since 2017 and became even more evident in 2019. In the 2022 design, informants from KSI and Bappenas confirmed commitment to deepening GEDSI in proceedings, participants, and sub-themes. As reported in the 2019 evaluation, GEDSI was integrated in various ways: diversity of participants, spaces available for all parts of the knowledge sector and different forms of knowledge (scientific, professional, and local knowledge), as well as logistics that reduce barriers for people with disabilities.

Table 1. Government Development Planning Process

| Stream | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | Jun | Jul | Aug |
|--|--|---|---|---|---|--|---|---|-------------------------|
| Bappenas | Bappenas internal kick-off meeting for RKP | Bappenas-Bappeda-Ministerial meeting on development priorities and policies | Developmental Planning Technical Coordination Meeting (Rakortekrenbang) with sub-national govts on strategic priorities and projects (ref: RPJMN and relevant policies) | | Bappenas-Bappeda meeting on draft RKP and budget (with MoF) | Bappenas technical meetings with ministries and government institutions* to finalise RKA as final input to RKP (harmonization RKA + RKP) | | | |
| Technical ministry or agencies annual work plan and budget (RKA) | | Planning Bureau sends RKA template and guide | The planning bureau compiles and curates work plans from divisions (ref: Strategic plan + performance indicators) | | | | |  | |
| Sub-national actors | | Bottom-up development planning forums (Musrenbang) at village, sub-district and district level. | | A series of provincial level Musrenbang | | National Development Planning Forum (Musrenbangnas) | | | |
| Executive | | | | Cabinet meeting to discuss draft RKP | Cabinet meeting on indicative budget allocation | Cabinet meeting to finalize draft RKP | | | |
| Legislative (DPR) | | | | | | | Finalization with DPR | | |
| President | | | | | | | Presidential Decree on RKP and public launching | | President speech in DPR |

Note: *Three types of Bappenas technical meetings with ministry: Multilateral meeting (Bappenas, Ministries, and Ministry of Finance—MoF, and Central Bank); Bilateral (Bappenas + Ministry), and Trilateral (Bappenas + Ministry + MoF)

It is important to note that both evaluation reports (2018 and 2019) emphasised the importance of being persistent in GESDI because of its structural vulnerability which may lead to treating GESDI as logistic issues and checklist. For example, as raised by an informant from a DPO, without having specific GESDI objectives in terms of participation, topics, panellists, and the abstract review process, the risk of GESDI being neglected in the planning and implementation of IDF is high due to some “reasonable” excuses such as, there are only a few papers on GESDI, all papers on GESDI are not rigorous enough, budget limitation, etc. (AIDRAN case study, 2019). The IDF 2018 evaluation report indicated this vulnerability. For example, a special session that focused on “Disability, Policy and Services: Regional Disparities in the Indonesian and Australian Experience”, sponsored by AIDRAN (Australia Indonesia Disability Research and Advocacy Network) was in danger of being cut due to time and budget pressures by the committee, but KSI’s continued support of the issue ensured the session remained on the agenda of IDF 2019. **GESDI issues and sessions in IDF seem to be continuously vulnerable of being neglected not because of resistance or disagreement, but in large part for structural reasons.** As reported by AIDRAN in one of the case studies of the IDF 2019 evaluation report, quoted below, there are complexities and challenges in integrating disability and social inclusion in a highly contested policy arena like development policy where the evidence base is limited.

This reflects a vicious cycle where the evidence base is limited because there are not adequate resources allocated for research on GESI issues; therefore, the issues have limited visibility so do not attract research and advocacy funding. So, there is not a strong evidence base to support political pressure and to advocate for more resources. For them persistence is key to breaking the vicious cycle of social exclusion, especially among people with disabilities. The positive GESI atmosphere in 2019 is an aspect of IDF that could be built on going forward.

Three datasets (evaluation 2018, 2019 and KIIs in 2021) recommend continuing to emphasize GESDI beyond logistics and representation, i.e. using a GESDI lens and participation over simple representation. The planning process for future IDFs should continue to develop specific GESDI objectives that could be translated into measurable actions – before, at the conference, and post conference -- to promote the participation of women, people with disabilities and other key stakeholders and inclusion of non-mainstream issues. An informant from a Yogyakarta-based DPO in December 2021 gave a practical idea to operationalise this inclusiveness in IDF. He told the evaluation team that to be inclusive, the event might need to employ stratified events where Bappenas does not have to be the sole host. Some road-to-IDF events could be co-hosted with or sub-managed to DPOs, CSOs or other government agencies. He referred to “*Temu Peduli*” and “*Jambore Desa*” two CSO-led events that according to him successfully employed the motto, “nothing about us without us”. He used this motto in commenting on Bappenas’ road to IDF visits to some provinces which according to him is a good initiative to solicit aspirations from sub-national stakeholders, but this formal approach might not be able to understand under-represented issues. He categorised this approach in Indonesian, “*orang pusat berkenan berkunjung ke daerah untuk menampung aspirasi*” (look, people from central government are “willing” to pay a visit to pool our aspirations). Some other genuine forms of pooling aspirations like “*Temu Peduli*” and “*Jambore Desa*” should be explored to truly solicit aspirations from under-represented groups and issues.

C.2 Challenges and lessons learned

C.2.1 Logistics

In terms of creating settings, infrastructure, and proceedings to reduce barriers for people with disabilities (PWDs), there is evidence that the organiser, especially from Bappenas have adequate awareness and commitment to sustain and improve the inclusiveness of IDF. KIIs with Bappenas staff showed that the 2022 IDF design has learned from lessons from previous IDFs. This is reflected in various ways: quota to ensure diversity of participants, outreach to sub-national stakeholders, spaces available for all parts of the knowledge sector and different forms of knowledge (scientific, professional, and local knowledge), and infrastructure for PWDs. Logistical challenges and concerns, however, were still reported in 7 KIIs, including two KIIs with Bappenas. They are around the following:

1. **Procuring the right event organizer (EO).** The critical role of the EO in an IDF is emphasized in all documents (evaluation reports, KSI After Action Review report) and in the KIIs. The 2019 evaluation report specifically reported that the committee hired a new event organiser that was not familiar with the design and approaches of IDF, resulting in many complaints from participants and presenters that are related to the preparation and implementation, and are associated with the roles of the event organisers. It was reported that KSI had to pick up the pieces and make sure the event went as smoothly as possible. Two KIIs with Bappenas staff and a KII with KSI reported a strategy how the committee is trying to accommodate the recommendations on dealing with procurement issues of the EO. This includes a scenario plan to anticipate potential high-level, in short-notice requests and scenarios to anticipate new pandemic outbreak (hybrid meeting). KSI's inputs on how to appropriately weight both the logistics and technical elements of EO's roles are well appreciated by informants from Bappenas.
2. **Facilitators or Moderators.** Both 2018 and 2019 evaluation reports emphasised the important role of facilitators in operationalising the mission of IDF as an exchange and matchmaking event, especially in ensuring that high-quality evidence/research is communicated strategically and effectively to the participants. The facilitator is equally critical as the presenter. In this regard, the logistics of facilitators (recruitment and management) is one of the critical elements of IDF logistics and financial management. In the previous IDF 2017/2018, Bappenas financial/procurement structure did not allow a direct hire of this critical actor in the Forum. KSI provided support in management of the facilitators⁸. The 2019 evaluation report documented a lesson to be learned for future IDFs that these facilitators should be actively involved from the beginning so that it is quickly apparent if they are suitable. The challenge, in addition to financing the facilitators, as reported in a KII with a former facilitator is identifying the right (capable and legitimate) facilitators to bridge communication and relationships, not only about moderating a session, but also translating in both ways how knowledge, policy and practice interact. As a knowledge and session broker, it requires more than just "master of ceremony" and

⁸ The 2019 evaluation report documented the evolution of the governance of facilitators in three IDF series. Since IDF 2017, the facilitators have played an important role in managing the flow of the sessions and presentations as well as ensuring an inclusive atmosphere and the dynamics of each session. However, in IDF 2019, due to the event organiser's ignorance, the decision to engage the facilitators who supported the event was made just a few weeks before the event when the initial facilitators who were selected proved unable to deliver. In this regard, the contribution of KSI was critical, able to engage and mobilise experienced facilitators (i.e. facilitators from previous IDF) at short notice. The coordinator of the facilitation team reported in an interview that their flexible and supportive support was partly driven by their moral obligation to sustain the credibility of IDF.

communication skills, but also legitimacy and trust from both parties, the knowledge sector actors. In this regard, developing a pool of facilitators or moderators with information about their area of expertise and engage them earlier, even at the beginning of the design phase may help the committee to address the challenges.

3. **Covid-19 and other potential disruptions.** IDF 2020 was postponed to 2022 due to Covid-19. Bappenas keeps planning that main event and road to IDF (site visit by Bappenas staff to provinces/sites) will be conducted in person. Other processes like “inspiring” session could be done virtual. In this regard, the concept of a hybrid conference is still under discussion, whether it is about separating process or having two platforms on the same event.

C.2.2 The strategic direction and purpose of the IDF

Influencing policy. The evidence documented in the 2018 and 2019 evaluation reports along with the 2021 KIIs consistently show that there were varied understandings and expectations among participants, as well as mixed views among the organisers on the strategy and purpose of the IDF. As described in the findings section (uptake of IDF), the Minister explicitly showed commitment that IDF is a forum to inform/shape the development agenda. This has raised some expectations that IDF will contribute to policy change. Some forms of policy influence were reported in IDF 2018 and 2019, but they do not refer to change in policy content, instead, refer to influence in the policymaking process i.e. expanding policy capacities and broadening policy horizons—two important dimensions of policy impact.

International conference? Having international speakers does not certify a conference is considered as an “international class” conference. Recognition by the international community is one dimension that the IDF committee might need to pursue if IDF is to be envisioned as an international conference. From the findings of the 2018 and 2019 evaluations and participants’ perception, IDF has not yet been considered an international class conference due to lack of incentive and international recognition. The 2019 evaluation recommended that to strengthen international recognition, DFAT and Bappenas could develop an agreement with a regular international development conference(s) (such as The Australasian AID Conference), to provide an incentive for the winners of IDF/Road to IDF submission and presentation awards to present also in their conference. In addition to this incentive, this collaboration will sustain the quality of research and evidence presented at IDF and RIDF, as well strengthen the Forum’s reputation among other international development forums (2019 evaluation report, p.6).

Matchmaking platform. All documents and KIIs show how IDF’s on the spot approach successfully connected most of the participants with various degrees relationships that some have led to post conference interactions and collaborations. Review of meaningful relationships and collaborations reported in the 2019 case studies, along with 2021 KIIs show that these relationships in large have gone through some level of preliminary interactions prior to the event. The lesson to be learned, therefore, if IDF is envisioned as a matchmaking forum, especially between innovators/start-ups with potential investors, more pre-planning and curation of participants is needed. This includes not only who engages from the private sector and CSO community but what technical ministries (especially the Ministry of Finance) - and from what levels - are needed to ensure follow-up actions are taken.

C.2.3 IDF monitoring, evaluation, and learning (MEL)

Bappenas has mechanisms in place to monitor and evaluate their activities. For each forum, since 2017, Bappenas organized a reflection session within 3 months after the event. Interestingly, this event was merged with the “dissolution” event of the IDF committee (or “pembubaran panitia” in Indonesian), a

popular term for closing out an event. In addition to this “MEL” event, Bappenas’ administration unit employed administrative accountability-driven evaluation to assess how accountable is the spending of their budget for IDF. According to the informants from Bappenas, there was no significant issue raised from this accountability/administrative perspective. For programmatic MEL, Bappenas staff in the interviews acknowledged the importance of technical evaluation and expressed their appreciation for the learning and feedbacks provided by KSI. However, changing the existing MEL methodologies is still challenging for the IDF committee for the following reasons:

1. What success looks like of any event/activity managed by Bappenas in large is the form of output, that the activity is conducted as planned/targeted. Assessment of the outcomes is conducted through different categories of activity, such as assessment and research, that administratively is separated from the event. It does not mean that Bappenas is not aware of the importance of outcome level evaluation, but this administrative arrangement in many cases created a mismatch in the momentum of the utilisation of the evaluation.
2. Disincentive to employ rigorous MEL. Technically MEL aims to inform performance optimisation. In this regard, MEL should provide an honest assessment. However, MEL is also not immune from politics. Employing rigorous MEL may result in findings that are considered sensitive as it involves making a judgment about the distribution and use of resources. The findings could be associated with evaluating the performance of the implementing unit.

The above barriers have inspired KSI to approach MEL as an operating procedure to ensure essential processes and data are captured, on one hand, and on the other hand, the analysis of MEL data as a separate process. This approach seems to be accepted by informants from Bappenas, a strategic way to “depoliticise” MEL. The 2022 IDF will be a testing ground for the implementation of this standard operating procedure (SoP) and utilization of the findings of the MEL processes. KIs with Bappenas show acceptance and commitment to improve the MEL system for IDF, but the institutionalisation of this SoP is suggested through the (in progress) IDF Secretariat. For IDF 2022, it seems not realistic to see full implementation of the new way of doing MEL by Bappenas.

C.3 Sustainability

Financing IDF seems not to be an issue for Bappenas. In an interview, an informant from Bappenas said, “(availability) of state budget for IDF is not an issue because there is a consensus among leadership that Bappenas needs to organise IDF on an annual basis”. In an interview with a senior official (echelon 1, Deputy Minister), the informant confirmed Bappenas leadership’s commitment to host the IDF 2022 in September 2022.

Since IDF 2018, Bappenas has shown its commitment to allocate state budget (APBN) for IDF. For IDF 2022, Bappenas reported having allocated IDR 10 billion. While the existence is secured, the amount (how much) faces some degree of uncertainty. For example, the 2018 evaluation report documented how uncertainty about the budget that Bappenas had for IDF 2018 caused some difficulties. Bappenas reduced the allocation from AUD 500,000 to AUD 380,000 to cover the venue, event organiser and pre-conference events. In addition to this, the Minister’s preference on the format and venue (which may come out just a few weeks before the event) may change not only the amount but also the budget structure.

To some extent, this pattern of uncertainty continued in IDF 2019 and IDF 2022. One of the informants in Bappenas mentioned that even if a permanent secretariat is established, and the ministerial regulation (Permen) on IDF is issued, the likelihood of having various kinds of disruptions in the months prior to the

event is high. For this reason, this informant considered this situation should be considered as a constant operating environment rather than a problem. This assessment might be based on the informants' understanding that IDF is not explicitly stipulated in both the Bappenas's Strategic Plan 2020-2024 and 2022 work plan (RKA). From a legalistic perspective, it shows that IDF is still "not as a must-have" event for Bappenas⁹. KSI's efforts to sustain and institutionalise IDF so far were focused on the process (through co-development of SoP) and the structure (ministerial decree and establishment of secretariat), missing the administrative process to ensure that IDF is included in those two key planning and budgeting documents.

In terms of human resource (people), informants from Bappenas showed their confidence that Bappenas has capable and adequate people to manage IDF in the future. Continued commitment among Bappenas leadership (the minister and echelon 1 staff) has increased this confidence, along with experience with KSI since 2017 in co-managing IDF. Specifically, they are confident in knowing which areas that they can directly manage and for which processes they need assistance (outsourcing). Some works, however, were identified as areas that need support or collaboration with external parties. For example, on the managing and curating the research and evidence to be presented in IDF, a director in Bappenas, in an interview with the IDF 2019 evaluation team acknowledged their need for engaging the academic community to ensure diversity in perspectives. Informants from other ministries and CSOs also confirm this point expressed by informants from Bappenas in running IDF as an annual event, but on some economic development topics like GEDSI, climate change, culture, and conflict resolution, Bappenas must engage other actors. An informant from a technical ministry added an arena where Bappenas needs help, namely, in engaging the participation of other ministries, especially the Ministry of Finance which is influential in following up policy recommendations to budgeted (implementable) policy.

From the IDF 2019 to the end of 2021, there was no significant progress in the institutionalisation of IDF governance in Bappenas. While strong enthusiasm for continuing the IDF as an annual event is evident at all levels in Bappenas along with a dedicated budget item for IDF and adoption of SoP, the establishment of a permanent secretariat to plan and manage IDF as a regular annual event and a Ministerial decree are still in process of review by the Legal Bureau. Bappenas is preparing an option if this institutionalisation process is still uncertain, a unit in Bappenas (PAKK-Pusat Analisis Kebijakan dan Kinerja-Center for Policy and Performance Analysis) may take over the governance. Interestingly, according to the informants, the institutionalisation of IDF through a Ministerial decree may put IDF at risk in terms of limited space for innovate because this decree will earmark some "must have" activities and stakeholders.

The other form of institutionalisation that may contribute to the sustainability of IDF in terms of its knowledge products is integration of IDF into the formal government's development planning process (Table 1). With this integration, IDF will be treated as a part of mandatory process rather than a "nice to have" event to solicit inputs for policy process.

C.4 Aspirations for the future

Framework on knowledge uptake. On the strategic direction and purpose of IDF, clarity on what success looks like in one of the IDF's goals to influence the development agenda in the form of policy influence is

⁹ Having an activity stipulated in the strategic plan is one of the strategies to ensure that the ministry will implement and allocate budget for the activity because the Bappenas' guidance for the development of ministerial work plan and budget (RKA-K/L) says that the annual activities and budget is an operationalisation of the strategic plan.

needed. It is evident from many datasets (the 2018 and 2019 evaluation, KIIs) and literature that knowledge uptake in the form of change in policy content through a conference is rare. The aspiration for the future IDF is that the committee clearly communicates the purpose of IDF regarding knowledge uptake. The 2019 evaluation report suggested a framework that instead of changing the content of policy, efforts on increasing knowledge uptake could be focused on how the knowledge and interactions in IDF will increase knowledge policy actors' capacities and behaviours, i.e., expanded policy capacities and broadened policy horizons as described below:

- 1) Expanding policy capacities through:
 - a. Improving the knowledge of relevant actors which includes the right balance between three types of evidence: the best and most rigorous research evidence (scientific knowledge); the most knowledgeable experience and expertise (professional knowledge); and values and perspectives of the person or community affected by the intervention (local knowledge).
 - b. Supporting actors to develop innovative ideas
 - c. Improving abilities to communicate ideas
 - d. Developing new talent for research and analysis
- 2) Broadening policy horizons through:
 - a. Providing opportunities for networking both in situ and remotely
 - b. Introducing new concepts to frame debates, put ideas on the agenda or stimulate public debate
 - c. Stimulating quiet dialogue among decision makers and between decision makers and other actors in the policy community.

As the 2019 evaluation report documented, this framework is used because direct policy influence is often not attainable nor is it identifiable from a single event. IDF design, sessions, and interactions/knowledge exchange settings as well as curation of participants could be aligned with this framework.

Collaborative hosting. The limited engagement of the other parts of the knowledge sector in planning and delivering IDF as reported in the 2018 and 2019 evaluation reports will reduce enthusiasm for participation and will inhibit its development, limiting potential for sustainability and create “free-riders” attitude where participants used the Forum for their own interests. Interviews with all informants from CSOs, development partners and other government agency emphasise the importance of the vibrancy and collaborative dimensions of IDF where all actors in the knowledge sector, both at national and sub-national levels actively participate and benefit. The following aspirations were documented for future IDFs:

- Co-hosting and co-sponsored sessions. While Bappenas will continue hosting the core sessions for gaining high-level political support/awareness, the other specific and thematic sessions including road to IDF events might be co-hosted with the private sector, CSOs, regional governments, and/or technical ministries. This recommendation echoed by an informant from a DPO, especially in applying “nothing about us, without us” principle. Aspirations from people with disabilities (PWDs) and under-represented groups will be much easier to be harnessed through co-hosting arrangement.
- To be able to attract ~~competent minds~~ prominent speakers and well-informed participants, IDF needs to gain and sustain a reputation as a prestigious event. To do so, Bappenas through their network with other international development partners could explore collaboration/agreement

with a regular international development conference(s) to increase IDF's prestige/reputation that will attract competent knowledge producers.

D. Conclusion and recommendations

D.1 Conclusion

The findings, both from primary data and analysis of secondary information, have informed the following conclusions about the IDFs.

IDF is a novel event in Indonesia's development sector. It is getting more attractive as a premier development forum. IDF grew slightly from 2017 to 2018, from about 1,400 participants to 1,800. It then grew tremendously, almost doubling in 2019 to over 3,100 people. With a more intense road to IDF events and hybrid approach, the planned IDF 2022 is estimated will engage more participants. Public relations and the promotion of IDF were effective to engage public attention. Media coverage increased in 2019 as compared to 2018. While clarity on its objective in influencing policy is needed, in terms of visibility among policymakers, IDF is gaining profile as a premier development event. IDF 2022 for example, is planned to engage the President of the Republic of Indonesia not only as a ceremonial keynote speaker, but as the "recipient" of the curated knowledge and development practices.

While scientific publication of the papers or knowledge presented in IDF is not documented, from participants' perspective, there is a general acknowledgment about the contribution of IDF in expanding their understanding about the landscape of policymaking actors as well as ideas on what works. As a forum that provides a platform for participants to interact, all three IDFs since 2017 documented success. A clear majority of the participants reflected strong satisfaction with the event in various ways: the opportunity to engage with a range of actors linked to policy processes, satisfaction with the quality and relevance of research and evidence presented.

As a vehicle for capacity development, co-management of IDF with KSI shows evidence of improved capacity and demonstrated behaviour change among bureaucrats in Bappenas on how to manage a non-ordinary conference and especially in managing inclusive events.

GEDSI. A combination of repeated interviews with IDF participants in 2019 and 2021 and reviews of the evaluation reports that include case studies, surveys and observation by the evaluators show that GEDSI perspectives were operationalized, presented and mainstreamed in Bappenas' recent planning and design of IDF. While the need for being persistent in promoting GEDSI is still needed in future IDFs, the significant level of awareness and acceptance by Bappenas should be celebrated.

There are dimensions of sustainability that are in place that could be leveraged to secure the sustainability of IDF. A strong commitment that is demonstrated in the creation of a dedicated budget item for IDF is one of the dimensions of sustainability that could be leveraged. Although in terms of the amount (how much) will always be subject to the emerging context in the respective year, the existence (budget item) for IDF as an annual event so far is secured, but still vulnerable as it is not stipulated in the Bappenas' strategic plan. Since IDF 2018, Bappenas has shown their commitment to allocate state budget (APBN) for IDF. For IDF 2022, Bappenas reported has allocated IDR 10 billion. Bappenas also has capacitated and

motivated staff to run the event on an annual basis. These personnel including the “alumni” of previous IDFs, are equipped with tools and the necessary network to source technical assistance.

While the establishment of a permanent secretariat seems to take longer than expected due to other priorities in Bappenas in 2022 (new capital city and pandemic response), the committee has already a scenario to cope with this situation. A ministerial decree (SK or Surat Keputusan) to assign the management of IDF to PAKK should be adequate to manage IDF 2022. While a high level of confidence in managing IDF was expressed by Bappenas, some works, however, were identified as areas that need support or collaboration with external parties. For example, on managing and curating the research and evidence to be presented in IDF and how to engage other ministries, especially the Ministry of Finance which is influential in following up policy recommendations to budgeted (implementable) policy.

D.2 Recommendations

We propose the following recommendations on key topics in the evaluation where the findings have highlighted strategic points.

For Bappenas:

Uptake of IDF. Since IDF is not yet part of the formal development planning process in Indonesia’s bureaucracy, expecting IDF to directly inform Indonesia’s development agenda seems to be not realistic. IDF has been understood and expected as an event to shape Indonesia’s development agenda. Bappenas (and also relevant development partners) may need to clarify the expected outcome of IDF in terms of knowledge uptake, i.e. what concrete products or actions reflect the objective of IDF to “shape development agenda”.

The four dimensions of possible policy influence adapted by Jones (2011)¹⁰ below could be considered as a framework to define the scope of the uptake of IDF:

- Framing debates and getting issues on to the political agenda: this is about drawing attention to new issues and affecting the awareness, attitudes or perceptions of key stakeholders. For example, there is evidence that all IDFs have brought social inclusion in development in the national discourses, reflected in the national media coverage after the events. We may expand this target to frame debates through IDF.
- Encouraging discursive commitments from state and other policy actors, for example, promote recognition of specific groups or issues or endorsements of CSOs or community declarations. For instance, IDF 2019 reported a recognition by a senior official who manages Technical and Vocational Education Training to include people with disabilities and marginalized groups like youth and women.

¹⁰ Jones, H. (2011). A guide to monitoring and evaluating policy influence (Background Note). Retrieved from Overseas Development Institute website: <https://cdn.odi.org/media/documents/6453.pdf>

- Promote procedural change at policymaking or policy implementation level: changes in the process whereby policy decisions are made, such as opening new spaces for policy dialogue; changes in the implementation/promote modifications.
- Policy dialogue, input for change in policy content: presentation of policy-oriented research or evaluation to policymakers

IDF might accommodate all the above dimensions through organising various sessions and engaging the appropriate presenters and participants. For example, for encouraging discursive commitments or recognition of specific groups or issues from the state, the session will be designed for increasing awareness and opening the horizon for recognition instead of intellectual debates on policy content. The participants could be political leaders and the interest groups.

Reputation. Co-arrangement of IDF to increase participation and ownership. The limited role of academic institutions and technical ministries in the IDF may lead to passive participation in the future IDF. In the medium term, it may ruin the reputation of IDF as a premier knowledge-to-policy platform. PRIs, universities, the private sector, and other thematically relevant government departments could have made valuable contributions to the design that would have increased their level of participation. Mechanisms could be created for more co-design and co-delivery to be a truly knowledge sector event. Being seen as an event of one agency limits the interest and commitment of others. **A recommendation in the 2019 evaluation for IDF to facilitate some side events and link to other events is still relevant** in this regard. When IDF provides spaces for non-Bappenas development events such as the Indonesia Civil Society Forum and Forum Peduli to share their aspirations, it will improve the reputation and legitimacy of the IDF.

GEDSI. While acknowledgment by most of the participants on how GEDSI-sensitive in the design and implementation of IDF is evident, the IDF as an inclusive national event needs consideration. The IDF 2022 is trying to address this issue with a series of site visits to 10 provinces/sites to solicit input or aspirations, however, this effort might not be effective to capture the under-represented issues or voices. The positive GEDSI atmosphere in all IDFs is an aspect of IDF that could be built on going forward. Being intentionally GEDSI-sensitive, especially in breaking the vicious cycle of social exclusion, especially among people with disabilities is recommended.

Relationship. The low participation from other ministries and from the technical level of ministries was perceived as a signifier that IDF is more about Bappenas. **More substantive participation (not only presentation) of sub-national actors and technical ministries would enhance the inclusiveness of the IDF.**

Diversity of knowledge. In terms of the types of knowledge presented in IDF, there was a trend where practical knowledge in the forms of “what worked” initiatives are getting more attention by the majority of the participants. The retention and relevance of the knowledge presented in the last two IDFs were more related to professional and local knowledge, rather than scientific knowledge. IDF has evolved over time from a more academic event in 2017 to a practice-oriented event in 2019 resulting in weak participation by scholars from the academic sector in 2018 & 2019. If this trend continues, IDF could be perceived as an exhibition of good practices (or in Indonesia is called “*pameran pembangunan*”)—a typical government showcase exhibition to exhibit how great is the government in administering development.

While this type of knowledge is important, **the right balance between scientific, professional, and local knowledge to be exchanged in IDF should be curated strategically.**

Monitoring, evaluation and learning. Bappenas' monitoring and evaluation system is adequate to inform questions around IDF's output and accountability. However, questions related to IDF's outcome are beyond the mandate of the IDF steering committee or Bappenas' unit that is responsible for monitoring and evaluation. **We recommend Bappenas explore collaborations with external entities to design specific monitoring, evaluation and learning system and integrate it in IDF's steering committee scope of work.**

For DFAT and other development partners:

Sustainability of IDF. The support provided to Bappenas with regard to the sustainability of IDF has been focused on the technical dimension, such as development of SoP and the governance. If sustainability of IDF is defined as a continuation of IDF by Bappenas with its own budget, the inclusion of IDF in the two Bappenas planning documents namely Strategic Plan 2020-2024 and the annual work plan and budget (RKP/A) is critical because any activities and budget allocation should refer to these documents. Although RKP from 2019-2021 has already taken the themes from the IDF as government planning for a year, however, the uptake is in the state of informal inclusion. It is recommended that DFAT or other development partners initiate a dialogue with Bappenas on the inclusion of IDF in Bappenas' RKP/A in a more formal mechanism.

In a broader context, i.e. the government's development planning cycle (Table 1), it might be good to consider an advocacy initiative to include IDF in this process (through presidential regulation or similar regulations). This will create an enabling factor for Bappenas to include IDF in their work plan and budget.

Reputation. DFAT and other development partners could intentionally link their supported knowledge events, research, and evaluation to IDF. This will improve the reputation and legitimacy of the IDF.

Monitoring, evaluation and learning. While Bappenas may focus on the evaluation of the event (process evaluation), DFAT and other development partners could complement with outcome evaluation to make a case if and how IDF works in shaping Indonesia's development agenda.

Annex 1 – List of informants

| No | Gender Informant | Stakeholder/Institution |
|----|------------------|--|
| 1 | Female | Dosen - Universitas Islam 45 |
| 2 | Male | Rapporteur IDF 2017, former CSR Danamon |
| 3 | Male | Former IRE staff |
| 4 | Female | SMERU |
| 5 | Male | SIGAB |
| 6 | Female | Koalisi Seni Indonesia |
| 7 | Female | British Council |
| 8 | Female | WWF |
| 9 | Male | Former Perkumpulan Wallacea. Sektor Ekonomi Kecil |
| 10 | Male | PPIM UIN |
| 11 | Female | PEKKA |
| 12 | Male | Ministry of National Education |
| 13 | Male | Direktur PMAS - Bappenas |
| 14 | Female | IPEK – Bappenas |
| 15 | Female | Deputi Bidang Ekonomi – Bappenas |
| 16 | Male | Kepala Biro Humas TUP - Bappenas |
| 17 | Male | Kepala Biro Perencanaan dan Plt. Kepala Pusat Analisis Kebijakan dan Kinerja (PAKK) Bappenas |
| 18 | Female | KSI |
| 19 | Male | Former Seknas Fitra |
| 20 | KSI team | Group discussion |
| 21 | DFAT team | Group discussion |

