



Case Study: BaKTI

Supporting decision makers in eastern Indonesia

Key features

- This study demonstrates the value of a partial application of OM, where the Intentional Design was developed as a guide but not stringently adhered to.
- The major value that BaKTI gained from OM was the behaviour-oriented approach. Although the terminology and process of OM weren't necessarily adopted by the project, the concepts that embody OM have been absorbed quietly and comfortably.
- Institutional rigidity proved to be an obstacle in mainstreaming OM. BaKTI was required to work within the more traditional log frame approach.



A multi-stakeholder event on Public Expenditure Analysis hosted at BaKTI

Background

The Eastern Indonesian Information Exchange (BaKTI) is one of the components of the Eastern Indonesian Programme, a multi-donor effort to boost development activities in the east of the country. Originally intended as a knowledge bank for donor project information and lessons learned in the region, it has evolved into a knowledge sharing service supporting and facilitating agents of change. Its aim is to encourage eastern Indonesian stakeholders to be more knowledge-based and to raise the profile of the region among donors and central government.

The project team were drawn to Outcome Mapping because of its unique focus on behaviour change and its innovative methodology. They initially saw Outcome Mapping as an evaluative tool but after further exploration they discovered that OM could provide much more. OM offered a more effective method for linking their strategic framework to their outputs, through outcomes. The BaKTI project involves a number of knowledge management activities and pilot projects, working in diverse areas, and the varied outputs could look unstructured; OM gave them an analytical tool to help bring coherence across their activities, and to demonstrate the range of linkages between various strategies, outputs, and outcomes.

Introducing and Applying Outcome Mapping

OM was used as a planning tool to inform their strategy and enhance their logframe. The intentional design framework was built through unstructured interviews with project staff and a workshop led by the team themselves. They redesigned their vision and mission, and



identified and grouped their boundary partners around common rationalities, this helped them plan and orient their activities and strategies.

One of the biggest challenges that BaKTI faced was the inability of its funding partner (Decentralization Support Facility or DSF) to modify its strategic approach. DSF required that all reporting be prepared against the previously agreed logframe rather than the OM framework. The fact that OM hadn't been used by BaKTI or DSF previously worked against them.

The funding partner was unable to modify its methodology and required that all reporting be prepared against the existing logframe rather than the OM framework.

Another challenge was the lack of 'socialisation' of the methodology. It proved to be difficult for people to become comfortable with OM. The methodology demands a certain mind-shift and learning new concepts and terminology which is difficult to instil when there is a



resistance to change. The language barrier proved a particular challenge. They found that language was being used very loosely with no common definitions which caused confusion and lack of cohesion. But from a positive point of view, they found that the language barrier actually forced a high level of clarity in language and helped staff to understand the various terms that M&E introduces, for example the difference between output, outcome and impact.

It was felt that a formal training workshop for the project team would have made the process much easier, putting everyone on the same level and ensuring a common understanding of the terms and the process.

Concluding remarks

OM helped staff to focus on the qualitative outcomes they were aiming for, rather than logframe outputs and goals. They found that Outcome Mapping emphasised the need to relate activities and outcomes to strategic direction and that it required sensitivity to contextual issues, giving equal weight to the culture of the beneficiaries as to that of the donors. The actor-centred approach to development that embodies OM was seen as a risky way of working but actually they found that OM helped to mitigate and justify the risks.

They also found that OM encouraged people to think laterally about the process of development, and gave space for people to critically reflect on their approach. This was seen by some as too cerebral but others appreciated the recognition of complexity. In the

They have seen a shift in behaviour among their staff; people are starting to look day-to-day at how they are doing in relation to their outcomes rather than waiting for milestones



Indonesian culture, there is usually a tendency towards consensual approaches, with people tending to skate over problems. OM gave BaKTI a space to be explicit about the various outcomes that they were aiming for.

They have seen a shift in behaviour among their staff; people are starting to look day-to-day at how they are doing in relation to their outcomes rather than waiting for milestones. But other than these conceptual changes they haven't yet been able to institutionalise Outcome Mapping. The framework that was developed hasn't been reinforced and many people are falling back to old habits, particularly in the use of indicators and targets.

Further information

BaKTI homepage: <http://www.bakti.org>

The Eastern Indonesian Knowledge Exchange: a journey of change. Karejti, P. 2005. KM4Dev Journal, Volume 1(3), 66-77. www.km4dev.org/journal

Acknowledgements

The authors wish to thank Petra Karetji, Tony O'Dowd and Robert Brink for their valuable input into this case study.

This is part of a collection of case studies developed by ODI and published by the Outcome Mapping Learning Community (OMLC) to review and document the increasing use of the Outcome Mapping methodology. It is based on research undertaken by Harry Jones and written and edited by Simon Hearn and Harry Jones.

A synthesis paper has been published by ODI and is available from www.odi.org.uk.

