Child Protection Information Management Mapping: Towards a Data Surveillance System in Indonesia
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Background
Successful implementation of child protection and social welfare services is dependent upon the availability and use of relevant child protection and social welfare data. Yet Indonesia does not currently possess a system capable of providing accurate and timely information of key child welfare and protection concerns—including the magnitude of these problems, causality analysis and pattern and, impact of programs and interventions. These limitations have been acknowledged by the Government of Indonesia.

Methods and Approach
The purpose of the project was to obtain a clear understanding of the current child protection information system in Indonesia. Specific objectives included:

• Identifying the existing data collection and information management mechanisms.

• Analysis of the appropriateness and efficiency of existing data collection and information mechanisms identified at national and provincial level.

Research focused on key national level government ministries, commissions, and civil society actors involved in child protection. It also focused on child protection actors at the provincial, district, sub-district, and community levels in Central Java and Nusa Tenggara Barat.

A case definition was established to guide the project: a **child protection information system** is an integrated set of processes for the routine collection, analysis and interpretation of data used in the planning, implementation and evaluation of child protection programming. A functional system requires organizational and staff capacity for data collection and analysis. It also requires timely dissemination of information to those who can undertake effective prevention and response activities. The higher-level function of a system is to protect children from violence, abuse, exploitation and neglect.

Four kinds of data are required to activate a child protection system:

• Prevalence of risk factors (root causes of protection vulnerability)
• Prevalence of cases (magnitude of a given protection problem)
• Case Management and Coverage (detailed information on children in the system, and percentage of all children in need of protection or prevention services that have entered the system)
• Evaluation (effectiveness evidence based on outcome and/or impact assessments)

This case definition and these data components comprise the research framework. Research methods, in turn, included an analysis of existing reports and data collection tools; a semi-structured interview tool for key informants; focus groups with community leaders, families and data collection volunteers; and, site visits to integrated service centers and selected institutions providing services for children.
The research process also included an assessment of the effectiveness of current data collection procedures. This assessment was based on criteria that emerged from an adaptation of guidelines established by the Centers for Disease Control for evaluating health surveillance systems. These evaluation guidelines focus on system attributes that indicate the level of effectiveness of the key characteristics listed below:

- **Simplicity**: refers to both a system’s structure and ease of operation
- **Flexibility**: ability to adapt to changing information needs or operating conditions with little additional time, personnel or allocated funds
- **Data Quality**: reflects the completeness and validity of the data recorded in the surveillance system
- **Acceptability and Accessibility**: reflects the willingness and feasibility of organizations and people, whether children, parents, teachers or community members, to participate in and feed information into the system
- **Timeliness**: reflects the speed between steps in a system.
- **Stability**: refers to the reliability and availability of a system.
- **Coordination**: refers to the level of integration and sharing across different agencies.

**Findings**

**Key Actors**

A number of actors are playing a key role in the child protection information system. While the Ministry of Planning (“Bappenas”) does not currently contribute directly to the information system, Bappenas allocates funding and monitors the progress of programs within ministries such as the Bureau of Statistics or Badan Pusat Statistik (“BPS”), the Ministry of Social Affairs (“Depsos”), and the Ministry for Women’s Empowerment (“KPP”) at the central and provincial levels. Through coordination and performance-based budgeting functions, Bappenas plays an important role in evaluation.

The Ministry of Social Affairs (Depsos) is housed under the Coordinating Ministry of Social Welfare. This department is responsible for monitoring the implementation of guidelines, standards, and programs related to child welfare at the national and provincial level with a limited role in service delivery since social services have been decentralized. Depsos systematically collects information on more than twenty “social dysfunctions”, including several specifically related to child protection.

The Bureau of Statistics or Badan Pusat Statistik (BPS) is tasked with providing data to the government and the public and assisting in building the capacity of other government departments and institutions. BPS contributes primarily to prevalence of cases and prevalence of risk factors; however, its national survey includes very few items relevant for child protection.

The Ministry for Women’s Empowerment (KPP) facilitates policy development and implementation in areas of health, education, social welfare, child development and child participation. It does not generate primary data; but instead collects secondary data on issues of violence, abuse, trafficking and exploitation received from other agencies.
The Commission for the Protection of Indonesian Children's (KPAI) is mandated to serve as a watchdog for child protection concerns by collecting data on critical issues, including family and alternative care, children in need of special care and protection, and child rights. KPAI commissioners are also responsible for addressing cases that are brought directly to the commission. KPAI does not generate primary data; but instead relies on secondary data provided by partner agencies, media and other sources.

**Information Coordination**

There is no lead actor for child protection at the national level. There is no agreed upon data collection priorities, procedures or methods or a shared data collection system. Rather, each ministry gathers data relevant to its own policies and programs. The majority of NGOs and international actors also collect data around their specific programs; however several NGOs and UN actors have also supported government child protection data collection and analysis.

Indonesia has a variety of actors working on child protection programs, but no mechanism exists for formal collaboration on data sharing. Instead, information is shared on an ad-hoc basis. Oftentimes, it is associated with program achievements, project monitoring, or advocacy purposes. Data sharing pilot projects have recently been launched to good effective, but are not widespread at this time.

**Analysis**

The Law on Child Protection forms a solid legal foundation for addressing child protection concerns in Indonesia. However, the lack of a specific legal mandate for the creation, coordination and maintenance of a child protection information system underscores the incomplete nature of the legal framework for child protection. Such legislation would be fundamental to developing an effective child protection surveillance system in Indonesia.

There is a lack of understanding amongst child protection actors on the goals, objectives and components required of a child protection information system. The absence of a designated leader on child protection information management and insufficient coordination has contributed to collective confusion on the definition, objectives, components and activities of a child protection information system. As a result, three of the four kinds of data required to support a robust information system are lacking: prevalence of cases; prevalence of risk factors; and, evaluation information. The absence of this critical data has contributed to insufficient resource allocation, prevention and protection services, and evidence-based programming and budgeting.

The data collection methods relied on by district government offices and NGOs are too ad hoc to support prevalence and coverage requirements through routine incident data collection procedures. One problem is the amount of child protection data that goes “undetected.” A second problem is the collection and transfer of information from community to district-province levels which relies heavily on paper records.

Only a handful of the child protection practitioners reported receiving training in survey or prevalence research methodologies or program evaluation methodologies. The vast majority indicated that their university training was not oriented to the realities they face in their current work environments.
Moving Forward

At the global level, there is a move to reframe the dominant language from a “child protection information management system” to a “child protection surveillance system.” The use of "information system" is ambiguous and confusing. Adopting surveillance as a goal will promote clear data collection objectives and activities.

Deposos partnerships with BPS, international agencies and universities will be required to support a child protection surveillance system. The major focus of these partnerships would be to ensure surveys to establish prevalence of case and prevalence become standard practice. There are opportunities to learn from good practice in sectors such as health and nutrition, where effective and efficient systems of reporting and actions—using survey and surveillance approaches to data collection monitoring—have been developed through partnerships.

Addressing obstacles that limit child protection incident detection at the community level must be addressed. A pilot project could be launched to activate community actors, while also introducing more effective ways for recording and transferring child protection data from community to district-province levels. These pilot projects would focus on a limited number of child protection concerns. CBOs would promote a community awareness raising component to establish a common understanding amongst community members on what these child protection concerns and to report on their occurrence.

A simple cell-phone-SMS system could be introduced to ensure different kinds of data are transferred to relevant district-province level service providers in an efficient and timely manner. An SMS-based reporting system could help support an effective child protection surveillance system through improvements in three particular areas: training for community leaders on how to report incidences; training for community leaders on how to report child protection cases that require immediate attention; and, training community leaders to report cases that require long term monitoring. Improved community detection and reporting would lead to the improvement of prevalence estimations through routine data collection activities, a key sustainability objective.

University engagement is critical in promoting long term human capacity and systems development. Women's Studies Centers at a number of Indonesian universities have trained a new generation of practitioners and provided substantial technical support to government ministries in the areas of policy development and gender mainstreaming. In contrast, while a number of faculty members at Indonesian universities engage in child protection concerns on an individual basis, Child Studies Programs, Protection Centers or equivalent university programs are non-existent.

Recommendations

Identify a lead agency to oversee a comprehensive child protection information system: A gap in the nation’s policy framework is the absence of a legal mandate for the creation of a child protection information system. As a result, various government ministries that oversee child protection issues have created ad hoc and incompatible data systems. National
legislation should be drafted to identify and empower a key actor to implement and coordinate a comprehensive surveillance system.

**Adopt “surveillance” as the key operative goal of the nation’s child protection information system:** Moving to a surveillance goal will focus child protection data collection system toward clear objectives and activities. The terminology around ‘information systems” has not sufficiently defined data needs in this field.

**Develop a “National Index Scorecard” for child protection:** A blueprint for child protection programming and data collection needs to be guided by the development of a National Index Scorecard. This template based on quantitative data should show, at a glance, a country profile for child protection risks and concerns as well as capacities for response. A Scorecard of this nature should serve as basis of coordinated action.

**Link data collection improvements to “performance budgeting:”** The current child protection information system does not provide information required to support performance based programming. Key types of information--scale, coverage and program effectiveness—are lacking. Bappenas should therefore convene a series of working level meetings to ensure required improvements in data collection are linked to the government’s promotion of “performance budgeting.”

**Enhance Depsos capacity to develop the prevalence and the evaluation components of a surveillance-oriented system:** Depsos has more operational capacity for data collection than other government child protection actors. Strategic partnerships will be required, however, to enhance this capacity to levels required to promote high quality prevalence surveys and program evaluation studies. BPS, international organizations and university partnerships to train Depsos staff and support prevalence surveys are recommended.

**Enhance community level surveillance:** The Government of Indonesia (Bappenas, Depsos, KPP, and Police) should develop a plan to pilot community surveillance enhancement initiatives in a rural and an urban district. The initiative’s purpose would be to activate a root level child surveillance system to identify, record and report on a select set of child protection concerns. A key objective is to increase national capacity to issue reliable prevalence estimations through improved routine community level surveillance.

**Develop a SMS-based reporting system as a key component of community surveillance:** A key component of the community surveillance enhancement project recommended immediately above should be a simple SMS–based reporting system. The user scenarios provided in this report should serve as a basis for development of a system capable of collecting child protection data through a customizable SMS program, including a web-based interface for editing data, displaying graphs and exporting reports.

**Engage Universities for the Long Term:** Universities are not equipping government or civil society practitioners with the kinds of population based methodologies and skills required to activate a robust national child protection surveillance system. Bappenas, Depsos, the Minister of National Education and UNICEF should therefore develop a program to engage universities and academically based child protection centers for the long term.
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I. INTRODUCTION

1.1 CHILD PROTECTION

The field of child protection focuses on building a safe environment for young people in which they are protected from neglect, exploitation, abuse and violence. It has been increasingly recognized that children’s right to “protection” is often systematically overlooked, necessitating specific strategies and commitments on the part of government institutions, humanitarian actors and academic partners. UNICEF suggests that child protection mechanisms embrace eight functions, spanning macro- to micro-level: strengthening the capacity of governments to fulfill their responsibilities to children; advocating for legislation that systematizes children’s rights; working to change “harmful attitudes, customs and practice;” fostering dialogue and discussion related to pressing concerns and best-practices in the child protection arena, including outreach to media and civil society organizations; assisting children to develop skills, knowledge and to participate actively in their communities; providing essential services including health and education for children that assist in building their resilience; and, ongoing monitoring and evaluation and assessment to build a body of best practices.¹

1.2 INFORMATION SYSTEMS

The adoption of UNICEF’s Child Protection Strategy in 2008 signaled an important shift in the work of child protection actors. This new approach acknowledges the role of systems as fundamental in the protection of children. Because the components of child protection systems are often spread across government ministries, local authorities, non-government providers and community groups, it is becoming widely understood that the development of an effective child protection system requires coordination, integrated referral mechanisms, and a strong normative legal framework that builds on government accountability for protecting children.

A commitment to collecting and analyzing accurate information along with ongoing development work on child protective systems, implementation capacity and building solid policy and practices at all levels will ensure country systems are better able to respond to protection concerns on a daily basis, as well as those that emerge more urgently in emergencies. Successful implementation of child protection program interventions as well as child protection services in Indonesia is in part contingent upon the availability and timely use of good quality information. Availability of good quality strategic information is fundamental for guiding policies and for designing, monitoring and evaluating programs.

A model currently under development by the UN - presented in Figure 1 below - outlines the key components of an effective system for child protection. These components include a legal and policy framework; institutions representing the spectrum of government, non-government and private sector actors that have specific child protection functions; processes, such as monitoring and evaluation, referral, and coordination that are central to

¹ UNICEF, “What is Child Protect”, Retrieved on 11/9/09:
http://docs.google.com/gview?a=v&q=cache%3A4PPqDOvL1acj%3Awww.unicef.org%2Fprotection%2Ffiles%2FWhat_is_Child_Protection.pdf+what+is+child+protection&hl=en&pli=1
the implementation of these functions; and human and organizational capacity. Along the bottom of the diagram is “research and data analysis” to inform evidence-based practice and budgeting processes. This signifies the importance of information and information systems on child protection that underpin critical activities and interventions.

Figure 1. Child Protection Systems Components²

![Diagram of Child Protection Systems Components]

Information systems on child protection are necessary in order to clarify the magnitude, characteristics and trends of child protection problems, and are essential to appropriately allocate budgets and to design effective programs for preventing and responding to child protection concerns. High quality data are thus needed on the prevalence of child protection problems as well as on the risk and protective factors that influence child protection outcomes.

Information on the functioning of a child protection system and the children who are in contact with it is also essential. Such data are vital for monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness of ongoing interventions and services. These data include the following information:

- Characteristics of children in direct contact with the child protection system, separable by categories such as age, sex, ethnicity, and other vulnerability factors;
- All placements of children outside the home, in institutions, and all forms of alternative care and detention;
- The outcomes of interventions; and
- The effectiveness of strategies and programs to prevent and respond to child protection problems.³


³
1.3 **Indonesian Context**

Despite the fact that Indonesia is considered a middle-income country, children in Indonesia still suffer from threats of violence and exploitation, particularly related to domestic violence and abuse, child trafficking for labor and commercial sexual exploitation, and ongoing psychological effects of conflict and natural disaster such as the 2004 Tsunami.4

In the last decade, the government of Indonesia has made some significant improvements to the child protection system. In addition to signing the Convention on the Rights of the Child ("**CRC**") and its optional protocols, it has also enacted a number of laws addressing child protection issues. Despite progress with respect to the legal and policy framework, however, gaps remain in terms of institutional structures and service implementation. Child protection initiatives in Indonesia continue to be response-driven, targeting specific categories of children in need of protection, rather than employing preventative approaches that identify vulnerable children and intervene before a problem has manifested.

Indonesian structures for child protection have not identified a single, designated agency responsible for overseeing child protection functions, and the process of decentralization has added further complications. Provincial and district authorities now exercise significant autonomy. There are often insufficient structural linkages between the national and the provincial levels within ministries. Additionally, capacity for child protection work at the district and sub-district levels is currently quite low.5

Structures for independent monitoring and oversight of policies, programs and services relating to child protection have been established at the national and provincial levels. However, although these bodies have been mandated to perform an independent monitoring role, most have not been structured to be fully independent, or to carry out their monitoring mandate effectively. At the national and sub-national level, they have tended to focus on handling individual cases of violence, abuse and exploitation of children, rather than identifying and dealing with more systemic issues and complaints.6

To address these issues, UNICEF Indonesia has partnered with the Ministry of Social Affairs to assess the state of child protection services at the national and local levels and respond to the results of this assessment. The professionalization and training of the social service workforce discussed here is part of the larger systems focused strategy being implemented in Indonesia, and follows on prior extensive work to comprehensively map and analyze current child protection systems in Indonesia.

In order to support evidence-based advocacy and decision making for the care and protection of children, as well as the possibility of measuring the impact of various interventions and being more results-oriented, there is a recognized need to develop a comprehensive information system on the child and family welfare system in Indonesia both

---

6 Ibid
at the national and sub-national levels. This requires a clear national framework, core national indicators, tools and protocols for data collection, information sharing, analysis, reporting and utilization.

1.4 **PROJECT OBJECTIVES**

At the global level, this initiative mirrors UNICEF’s efforts in supporting stronger national child protection monitoring and country-level diagnosis in child protection issues and its work with partners on consolidating, analysis and disseminating information on child protection. This initiative is also part of the regional effort to strengthen child protection information management and a specific focus of an EAPRO-supported project for which Indonesia was designated specific funds. The main goal of the project is to support the development of a comprehensive child protection information system. The project is being carried out in two different phases:

1. **Development of a clear understanding of the current child protection information system in Indonesia, including a comprehensive mapping/analysis of the current data and information system across different government departments, universities and other institutions.**

2. **Development of a comprehensive framework for a national child protection information system.**

The assessment described in this report covers the first phase of the above-mentioned project.

The first phase targeted three specific objectives:

1.4.1 **Mapping the current child protection information system in Indonesia.**

This component aimed to identify the existing data collection and information management mechanisms including the following aspects:

- Identification of current child protection information management systems in place in different ministries, departments, units, and other governmental and non-governmental institutions at national and provincial/districts level currently involved in relevant child protection data collection and analysis;
- Mapping the existing information management, analysis, utilization and presentation of the data collected by the above mentioned agencies; and
- Identification of coordinating mechanisms in place and information sharing systems among institutions involved.

1.4.2 **Assessment of the data collection and information management mechanisms in place for child protection.**

This component aimed to analyze the appropriateness and efficiency of the mechanisms identified at national and provincial level, including the following aspects:
- Organizational capacity for data collection, analysis and reporting, focusing on internal structures and mechanisms within institutions analyzed to conduct research, collect data and evidence;
- Staff capacity analysis, including assessment of attitudes, technical and professional capacity of individuals involved;
- Assessment of child protection indicators currently in use, data collection and information analysis conducted on a regular and ad hoc basis;
- Identification of good practices where found;
- Gaps analysis and identification of flaws in the system within institutions and among different instances; and
- Coordination and sharing of information deficiencies.

1.4.3 Support national and provincial consultative meetings to present the findings of the assessment, with the view to outlining a comprehensive strategy for the establishment of a national child protection
II. METHODS

2.1 RESEARCH TEAM

The mapping project was a joint initiative of the Government of Indonesia and UNICEF. The research team was composed of three faculty members from the University of Indonesia, one faculty member and five research associates from Columbia University. The research team also worked with several translators in the two provinces in which the assessment was focused. In addition to expertise in the field of child protection, this interdisciplinary team brought with it expertise in law, public health, international relations, criminology, social welfare and new media technologies.

2.2 GEOGRAPHIC AREAS OF FOCUS

National Level

At the national level the mapping project focused on key government ministries, commissions, and civil society actors involved in child protection information gathering, analysis and dissemination. An initial list of these key actors was compiled through a desk review, consultation with UNICEF, and consultation with the Ministry of Planning (“Bappenas”). Additional child protection actors were identified through interviews with these initial informants.

Sub-National Levels

The mapping project also targeted child protection actors at the provincial, district, sub-district, and village levels. The research team focused on two representative provinces, Central Java and Nusa Tenggara Barat (“NTB”), in order to identify strengths and weaknesses in existing information systems at these sub-national levels. Both provinces are pilot sites where UNICEF is working together with other key actors to launch an integrated services program to assist victims of abuse among other initiatives to create a protective environment for children.

2.3 METHODOLOGICAL PROTOCOLS

The methodological process of the project was largely qualitative in nature, and included the components listed below.

- A desk review of existing reports, data collection tools, evaluations and other information pertaining to child protection data in Indonesia.
- Use of a semi-structured interview tool, attached as Annex 2 to this report, in meetings with key actors at the national level and in the selected provinces. These key actors included national and provincial-level policy makers and responsible individuals in government ministries and non-government organizations (“NGOs”) dealing with data collection and analysis at the national, provincial and district levels.
- Focus group discussions with community members, attached as Annex 3 to this report, to provide a context for individuals at the district and village levels to share key understandings of and attitudes towards formal and informal child protection reporting mechanisms, and to measure the behavioral intent of community members.
to report child protection concerns to formal and informal mechanisms. These meetings also provided group estimates of the incidence of reporting trends for child protection concerns.

• Visits to integrated service centers and selected institutions providing services for children.

2.4 Analytic Framework

2.4.1 Developing a Case Definition of an Information System

In engaging in conversations with relevant stakeholders, it became clear that different individuals had different ideas about what an information system included. As such, the research team’s first step was to create a case definition for an information system. To do so, the team drew on definitions from the public health and health disciplines. Existing standards and evaluation protocols for surveillance systems from the Centers for Disease Control and the World Health Organization were utilized. The research team adapted these standards and definitions that were developed for health information systems to make them relevant for child protection information systems. The resulting definitions and model are presented below.

What is a child protection information system?
A child protection information system is an integrated set of processes for the routine collection, analysis and interpretation of data used in the planning, implementation and evaluation of child protection programming. A functional information system requires organizational and staff capacity for data collection and analysis. It also requires timely dissemination of information to those who can undertake effective prevention and response activities. Although the core of any system includes the collection, analysis and dissemination of data, the process can be understood only in the context of specific child-focused outcomes. In other words, the higher-level function of an information system is to protect children from violence, abuse, exploitation and neglect.

What are the key components of a child protection information system?

• Information on the prevalence of risk factors enables an information system to identify and monitor key risk factors (such as children living in poverty or children living without parental care) that make children more susceptible to protection concerns. The ability to identify a vulnerable child before he or she becomes a victim of a more serious problem allows child protection actors to monitor the child and provide preventive protection services. A system that is well-equipped to identify risk factors and implement prevention strategies will result in lower prevalence rates of key child protection problems. Additionally, knowing which children are at risk is key to defining prevention activities and programs.

• Information about the prevalence of cases provides a complete picture of the extent of any given child protection problem, which is essential for monitoring trends over time and understanding whether specific protection problems are getting worse or improving. Prevalence data can also help to deliver programs where they are most needed by identifying whether certain geographic areas or segments of the population appear to be more or less at risk. To date, obtaining reliable prevalence
figures on child protection problems has been challenging globally. However, with the development of new methodologies, prevalence data are increasingly available and should form the foundation of an effective information system.

- Data on case management provides detailed information on children in the formal system. Coverage refers to the proportion of children that are accessing a system out of the total number of children in need of these services. In order to calculate a “coverage rate” two pieces of information are required: information on the total number of children receiving services (case management) – whether preventative or responding to an existing problem, and information on the total number of vulnerable children (prevalence). Access to accurate information about the coverage rate is an important part of strategic and evidence-based planning. Actors can utilize this information to make informed decisions about where services need to be expanded, which key protection areas and risk factors are not being adequately addressed and whether there have been any advances in coverage for particular child protection issues or risk factors.

- Evaluation data cut across each of the three components described above. Routine evaluation is necessary to ensure that the activities and services being provided are effective. As government actors and donors shift to evidence-based budgeting and planning, access to high-quality information about the effectiveness of existing programs is increasingly critical.

Figure 2 shows how these key components of an information system interact. In an ideal system the area of prevalence of risk factors, which comprises the largest sphere in the model, should be where most activity occurs since information about risk factors will inform prevention programming which can greatly reduce the actual number of children with protection concerns. The prevalence of cases sphere of this model represents children who are victims of key protection concerns. Within this total population of affected and at-risk children, a certain proportion of these children will come into contact with formal systems. This group of children is represented by the case management/coverage sphere. The evaluation sphere cuts across these three spheres, symbolizing the importance of monitoring and evaluating activities at every stage of the process in order to guarantee effective prevention activities, data collection and services.

---


How is data from the information system used?
At a national level, data are used to monitor trends over time. Such information is also used to measure the effectiveness of specific interventions. More complicated analyses can be conducted to identify risk factors that might make a child more vulnerable to protection concerns, such as living in poverty or living without parental care. The quality of national level data is closely linked to the quality and completeness of data at the community level. If community level data is incomplete and of poor quality, the statistics aggregated at higher levels will suffer.

One type of reporting format that encourages complete, timely data and provides a picture of incidence and prevalence is ongoing active surveillance at the community level. If done well, this type of information gathering provides more complete data than national level prevalence surveys and is less expensive. With this type of reporting structure, a case is documented and “counted” as soon as it is identified by a lower level structure that is actively monitoring and responding to protection concerns and risks.

Other methods may include periodic or routine surveys. These are also important tools for data collection, though as mentioned above, there is a larger chance that a case will be missed compared with ongoing active surveillance at the community level. Data on the prevalence of risk factors and cases – through ongoing community level surveillance and/or through national level surveys - are invaluable for monitoring trends, estimating the magnitude of problems and understanding how child protection issues are distributed in a population. Electronic systems for reporting data are making this type of information system more timely and effective.
In summary, data from an information system may be used to:

- trigger interventions to prevent neglect, abuse and exploitation of children;
- measure trends over time;
- measure risk factors for children to initiate prevention activities;
- provide an evidence base for intervention programs and budget allocation during planning;
- monitor effectiveness and evaluate the impact of prevention measures, intervention strategies, and policy changes;
- identify high-risk groups or geographic areas to target interventions; and
- measure progress in protecting children from key protection problems over time.

2.4.2 Evaluation Criteria for an Information System

Once a working case definition was established, the team developed an analytical framework to evaluate the effectiveness of the information system. The analytical framework for the mapping project was guided by an adaptation of the guidelines established by the Centers for Disease Control for evaluating surveillance systems. These guidelines include system attributes that indicate the level of effectiveness by describing the actions taken as a result of analysis and interpretation of the data from the information systems, characterize the entities that have used the data to make decisions and take actions, list other anticipated uses of the data, and evaluate each of the key characteristics listed below.

**Simplicity**

The simplicity of an information system refers to both its structure and ease of operation. An information system should be as simple as possible while still meeting its objectives. The following measures might be considered in evaluating the simplicity of an information system:

- amount and type of data necessary to establish that the child protection concern has occurred for verification purposes;
- number of organizations involved in receiving case reports;
- level of integration with other systems;
- methods of collecting the data, including number and types of reporting sources, and time spent on collecting data;
- method of managing the data, including time spent on transferring, entering, editing, storing, and backing up data;
- methods for analyzing and disseminating the data, including time spent on preparing the data for dissemination; and
- staff training requirements.

**Flexibility**

A flexible information system can adapt to changing information needs or operating conditions with little additional time, personnel or allocated funds. For example, flexible

---

systems can accommodate new child protection risks, changes in legal definitions or technology, and variations in funding or reporting sources.

Data Quality
Data quality reflects the completeness and validity of the data recorded in the information system. Quality of data is influenced by the performance of screening (and the case definition) for the risk, the clarity of paper forms or electronic data collection forms, the quality of training and supervision of persons who complete these forms, and the care exercised in data management. A review of these factors provides an indication of data quality.

Acceptability and Accessibility
Acceptability and accessibility reflects the willingness and feasibility of organizations and people, whether children, parents, teachers or community members, to participate in and feed information into the system. Acceptability is a largely subjective attribute that encompasses the willingness of persons on whom the information system depends to provide accurate, consistent, complete, and timely data.

Timeliness
Timeliness reflects the speed between steps in a system. The time interval usually considered first is the amount of time between the onset of an event and the reporting of that event to the agency responsible for instituting response and prevention measures. Another aspect of timeliness is the time required for the identification of trends or the outcomes of control and prevention measures. Factors that influence timeliness can include the severity of the event, staffing of the responsible agency, and communication among involved agencies and organizations.

Stability
Stability refers to the reliability and availability of an information system. In other words, stability measures the ability to collect, manage, and provide data properly without failure and the ability to be operational when necessary. A lack of dedicated resources might affect the stability of a system. For example, workforce shortages can threaten reliability and availability.

Coordination
Coordination refers to the level of integration and sharing across different agencies. This includes the decision patterns around which agencies are responsible for data collection, analysis and dissemination of particular concerns. It also considers overarching use of the data to address those concerns. In evaluating coordination, it is important to determine whether the information system:

• measures indicators of well-being in a timely way to permit accurate identification, prevention or response when appropriate;
• provides estimates of the magnitude of problems related to the domains of interest, including the identification of causal factors and outcomes associated with the domain;
• detects trends that signal changes in the occurrence of adverse or protective indicators;
• permits assessment of the effect of prevention and response programs;
• leads to improved social and policy practices; and
• stimulates research intended to lead to prevention or response.

2.5 LIMITATIONS

Child protection systems and information systems are relatively new fields of investigation. A study of this magnitude could have been extended over a very long time frame as more tangentially related components of the system could have been examined. As such, the scope and boundaries of the project were continually being examined and refined by the partners involved in order to maximize learning within the project’s timeframe.

The findings from the mapping project were affected by the large number of child protection actors which limited interview times to between one or two hours. Agency restrictions on access to certain kinds of information also limited the scope and depth of this analysis. Finally, confusion among child protection actors over what constitutes a child protection information system necessitated lengthy discussion and multiple meetings with different staff within participating organizations. While an important finding in itself, it also restricted the scope of the project.
III. MAPPING

3.1 LEGAL FRAMEWORK

The legal framework for child protection issues in Indonesia is based on basic rights enshrined in the Constitution of 1945. Article 28(B)(2) of the Constitution ensures that each child “shall have the right to grow and develop, and shall have the right to protection from violence and discrimination.” In the decades following the establishment of the Constitution the national government began to expand upon these broad guarantees, most notably through the passage of Law 4 of the year 1979 on Child Welfare. This brief statement of principles about the rights of children also set out corresponding obligations for parents and sketched a basic administrative structure for the government and community. The national government ratified the international CRC a decade later through Presidential Decree 36 of the year 1990. Ratification of the CRC was an important advance, although passage by means of a Presidential Decree rather than by a Law meant that the protections affirmed by the CRC are not accorded absolute legal authority in Indonesia, where Presidential Decrees are superior to Regional Regulations but have less binding power than do the Constitution, Laws or Government Regulations.

In the years following ratification of the CRC the national government further developed legal protections for children in Indonesia by passing Law 3 of the year 1997 on Juvenile Courts. This legislation amplified brief references to legal protections for children in conflict with the law that had been included in previous law on the justice system, Law 12 of the year 1995 on Corrections. Law 16 of the year 1997 on Statistics instituted basic guidelines for the collection of data for use in statistical surveys undertaken by the national government. This law framed how the Bureau of Statistics might collect data for use in a child protection information system. However, because the law does not directly mention child protection concerns, the most relevant sections of this law are article 12 and article 13. Article 12 authorizes each government institution to collect relevant sectoral statistics in accordance with its particular duties and functions and to cooperate with the Bureau of Statistics when such statistics can only be obtained by census and are to be collected on a national scale. Article 13 authorizes non-government institutions and organizations to collect special statistics (to be utilized to fulfill the specific needs of business, education, socio-cultural, and community interests) so long as a synopsis of the collected information is provided to the Bureau of Statistics. In all cases, whether statistics are collected by a government institution or a non-government organization, this law mandates cooperation and coordination with the Bureau of Statistics.

Protections against child labor were boosted by passage of Law 20 of the year 1999 and Law 1 of the year 2000, which ratified the International Labor Organization conventions on the minimum age for employment and elimination of the worst forms of child labor, respectively. This legislation prepared the legal foundation for Law 23 of the year 2002 on Child Protection (the “Law on Child Protection”), which is the key legal document in the existing framework for child protection issues in Indonesia.

The Law on Child Protection supplemented Law 4 of the year 1979, and in comparison with the earlier law it provides substantially more detail about the rights and obligations of
children as well as the obligations and responsibilities of the national government, the community, and families. It addresses issues not previously codified within the same piece of legislation, including guardianship and adoption. The Law on Child Protection also includes a specific chapter on the protection of children, which establishes normative standards for children with respect to religious belief, health care, education, social development and special protection in the variety of circumstances that comprise child protection concerns.

Since passage of the Law on Child Protection the national government has continued the process of codifying government policy on issues directly related to key child protection concerns. Some of the legislation described below has addressed issues and questions left unanswered by the sparse language used in the Law on Child Protection, while other legislation has extended the approach of the Law on Child Protection in new directions.

Law 23 of the year 2004 on the Elimination of Household Violence ("Law 23-2004") emphasizes the role of the national government, working through district and village level institutions, in protecting Indonesians from abuse within the home. Law 23-2004 introduced special sanctions for such abuse, defined to include negligence in addition to physical, emotional or sexual violence, when perpetrated by any immediate or extended family member against another family member. Although the substantive provisions of Law 23-2004 explicitly mention children in only one instance, a reference in Article 27 to the process for reporting violence, the definition of “family member” is extended to cover anyone living in the household during the period when abuse occurs. It is noteworthy that many of the other important definitions in Law 23-2004 are similarly broad. For example, “emotional violence,” which carries a maximum of three years of imprisonment or a fine of nine million rupiah, includes any act that brings about “hopelessness” or a “loss of self-confidence” – terms that are difficult to quantify even if they reference, as Law 23-2004 does not, identifying characteristics or standard indicators. Though vagueness and over-breadth are common concerns in much of the Indonesian legislation examined with respect to child protection issues, they raise questions about fairness and predictability. Nonetheless, with respect to child protection concerns the spacious definition of “family member” may provide another avenue for protecting children who are forced to work as household servants and is therefore one of the most significant aspects of Law 23-2004.

Law 32 of the year 2004 regarding Regional Administration (the “Decentralization Law”), also passed in 2004, symbolizes the broad shift within Indonesian politics over the last decade from a strong central government to a system characterized by increasingly independent and powerful provincial governments. The Decentralization Law did not directly address any child protection issues, but as noted above it created new challenges for the implementation of policy directives set by national legislation by granting broad autonomy to the thirty-three provincial governments. The national government has delegated most authority and responsibility for government affairs to sub-national governments aside from justice, armed forces, police and religious affairs where these issues retain their vertical structure down to the local level. For the other ministries, including education, health, women’s empowerment and social affairs, local departments have been created – not as an extension of the national ministries – but as departments at the provincial level. Though the process of decentralization has unquestionably complicated the relationship between the national and sub-national governments, the comprehensive impact
of decentralization thus far seems mixed. While many government ministries and state actors at the national level focus on the difficulties of implementing policy in recent years, their counterparts at the sub-national levels generally value their new powers under the current system.

Law 21 of the year 2007 on the Eradication of Trafficking (“Law 21-2007”) followed the legal developments in 2004 by setting specific sanctions for the act of trafficking in persons within Indonesia or across international borders and also stipulates measures to be taken to protect and support victims. The scope of Law 21-2007 intentionally includes children, yet like Law 23-2004 only a few of its provisions directly address children apart from adults. 10 Although provisions prohibiting trafficking in persons were already set forth in the penal code, and the Law on Child Protection had previously prohibited the trading, sale or abduction of children, Law 21-2007 expanded on existing protections by clarifying the legal definition of trafficking and imposing heavier punishments on perpetrators. Law 21-2007 focuses less attention on broad normative statements and includes more language on structures, procedures and sanctions than other child protection legislation, perhaps because prohibitions on trafficking were already embedded in previous laws.

Law 11 of the year 2009 on Social Welfare (“Law 11-2009”) is the most recent addition to the framework of national legislation addressing issues that relate to child protection concerns. It replaced the outdated Social Welfare Act of 1974, which did not account for developments in process of decentralization. Like much national legislation in Indonesia, Law 11-2009 sets forth broad principles but only vaguely describes the substantive areas to which those principles are meant to apply. Although Law 11-2009 does not reference children at any point, the accompanying elucidation indicates that it is intended to address the government’s obligation to care for neglected children. Unlike most legislation relating to child protection issues in Indonesia, Law 11-2009 does state principles to guide administration and budgeting for the social services it covers, and also sets general expectations for the registration and licensing of social service providers, including sanctions for noncompliance. Even in these sections, however, vagueness is troubling. With respect to funding, for example, Article 36 states that sources shall include “public donations… [and] funds provided by the private sector in fulfillment of social and environmental responsibilities and obligations.” Yet those responsibilities and obligations are not described, nor is the amount of funds to be received from donations and private sources established or estimated. Instead, the details of how Law 11-2009 is to be interpreted and implemented are explicitly delegated to subsequent Government Regulations. In sum, aspects of Law 11-2009 seem to indicate useful improvements in the approach to structuring national legislation, but concerns associated with persistent vagueness and over-breadth remain.

3.2 Child Protection Actors In Information Systems

There are a number of governmental, NGO, and other actors involved in child protection work in Indonesia. For the purposes of the mapping, this section describes the agencies that emerged through the mapping exercise as key actors in the child protection information system. A complete list of actors interviewed can be found in Annex 1.

10 See Articles 5, 6 and 39 of Law 21-2007.
3.2.1 National Development Planning Agency (Bappenas)

Bappenas’ role was set out through Presidential Decree No. 138 in 1999 to provide oversight to a broad range of national development plans related to economic, infrastructure, human resources, natural resources, development budgeting, and administration. Bappenas oversees the allocation of cash and block grant funds as well as conducts evaluations of programs at the national level. The provincial and district offices, referred to as Bappeda, also have a large role in coordinating departments at their respective administrative levels since funding is allocated from the national level to the local Bappeda office, who then allocate funds to the relevant government partners.

Child Protection Data Collection
Bappenas does not engage in direct child protection data collection or analysis, but its role in coordinating the development planning process and monitoring responsibilities are essential to an effective child protection information system. Through these functions, Bappenas Directorate of Planning & Budgeting allocates funding and monitors the progress of these funded programs within ministries such as BPS, Depsos, and KPP at the central and provincial levels.

Information Management
Bappenas does not currently contribute to any of the four components of the information system, but its roles in evaluation and coordination create the potential for Bappenas to play a larger role in the future (see section 5.2.1 of this report). These coordination and performance-based budgeting functions most notably imply a greater role to be played in evaluation.

3.2.2 The Department of Social Affairs (Depsos)

The Ministry of Social Affairs (Depsos) is housed under the Coordinating Minister of Social Welfare. This department is responsible for monitoring the implementation of guidelines, standards, and programs related to child welfare at the national level. At the provincial level Dinsos (Dinas Sosial) reports to the governor and has a limited role in service delivery11.

Child Protection Data Collected
Depsos, referred to as Dinas Social (Dinsos) in sub-national levels, systematically collects information about a list of more than twenty identified social dysfunctions (see Annex 4 for the complete list of dysfunctions). The relevant categories on child protection are:

1. ABT (Anak Balita Terlantar: Neglected children under five)
2. AT (Anak Terlantar: Abandoned Children)
3. AN (anak Nakal: Children with behavior disorders, Children in conflict with the law)
4. AJ (Anak Jalanan: Street Children)
5. KTK (Korban Tindak Kekerasan: Victims of violence)

In addition, there are categories relating to HIV/AIDS, families with social problems, and migrant workers. These categories do not identify children specifically, but Depsos includes children in this composite data.

Depsos is involved at the national level and Dinas Social is involved at the provincial level in social welfare programs, such as the pilot program for Conditional Cash Transfers ("CCT"), which captures data on children and families who then receive cash grants. The CCT program was launched in 2007 as a joint initiative together with BPS, Bappenas, Ministry of Health and Ministry of Education. Relevant child protection data from the CCT program comes from households captured through the BPS annual survey. Poor households are identified and then categorized under one of three pre-set categories of poverty, which influences the amount of cash assistance that the household will receive through regular quarterly cash transfers. Continuation of these transfers depends on the household meeting specified health and education conditions; thus information is coordinated with the Ministry of Education and the Ministry of Health. Although this data does not reflect child protection-specific information, there are relevant indicators that can be used from this regularly collected data to contribute to the information system.

**Contribution to the Information System**

The data collected on social dysfunctions allows Depsos to contribute to the prevalence of cases component of the four domains within an information system. The CCT program data also relates to this domain as well as capturing data relevant for prevalence of risk factors. In the provinces where Dinsos provides service delivery through trained volunteer community workers who directly respond to and document cases within a community; case management/coverage data can be extracted.

**Information Management**

All Depsos information is stored in the Social Welfare Data and Information Center (Pusdatin) at the national level, which has the infrastructure and capacity to hold and process data. Pusdatin has also developed standardized training modules together with the Directorate for Child Social Services, including one used to train community social workers on case definitions and indicators for the list of social dysfunctions, thereby improving the quality of detected cases. Although this structure is thorough, the degree of timeliness in the Pusdatin system is low. However, Pusdatin has developed standardized training modules, including one used to train community social workers about case definitions and indicators for a list of social dysfunctions, which improve the quality of detected cases.

Dinsos offices at the district level employ surveyors, data collectors, and social welfare service providers that act as first responders to social welfare and protection issues. Yet without a presence at the sub-district level, the effectiveness of these Dinsos efforts is diminished. A large portion of the work done by Dinsos at the community level is undertaken by volunteer social workers, known as “Communal Workers”. Dinsos also uses the services of core social agencies on a volunteer basis. Communal Workers carry out many Dinsos functions at the village level, including response and data collection activities. Data is collected manually by these Communal Workers, then compiled and entered into a database at the provincial level that stores information from all of the Dinsos district-level offices.
Additionally, Depsos, with support from Save the Children (discussed in more detail in the coordination section below), is building a database that collects and houses information on children without family care, including children living in institutions or Islamic boarding schools. Called “dBase Anak,” the database gathers information on individual children. This is the first effort to systematically collect information on children in institutions that includes protection indicators such as history of trafficking, history of abuse and existence of disabilities, and goes beyond providing a simple count of total children in order for institutions to receive more funds.

Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Characteristics</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contribution to Key Surveillance Activities</td>
<td>Potential for collecting relevant data in all surveillance areas. Pusdatin (Social Welfare Data and Information Center) holds macro data; works closely with BPS for annual surveys.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Strengths</td>
<td>Regular data collection with tools, training procedures for data collectors in place. Pusdatin has infrastructure capacity to hold data, strong partnerships with BPS. Positive attitudes and will towards data collection and analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Weaknesses</td>
<td>Capacity to understand social issues and regularity of staffing (high-turnover), lacks presence at sub-district level, focused more on rehabilitative services rather than prevention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Opportunities</td>
<td>New database on institutional care, linked with accreditation for institutions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attribute Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System Attributes</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Simplicity</td>
<td>Data is housed in one central location (Pusdatin- Data and Information Center), which can be accessed relatively easily.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>Categories of dysfunctions are set at national level. Not easy to change, but Dinsos at provincial level can omit few which are not relevant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Quality</td>
<td>4 categories specifically related to children, coupled with data from BPS (considered a reliable source). Variations exist in capacity and depth of training provided to data collectors at village level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptability</td>
<td>Hesitancy for informants to share sensitive information with data collectors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitivity</td>
<td>Proportion of cases detected by the system is unknown, currently little ability to detect in CP concerns, but more could be done with existing data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representativeness</td>
<td>Data is representative only on particular indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeliness</td>
<td>Regular data collection occurs annually. Database in development will help considerably to contribute timely data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stability</td>
<td>Data infrastructure exists and online database has been formed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2.3 The Bureau of Statistics or Badan Pusat Statistik (BPS)

BPS is a Non-Departmental Government Institution directly responsible to the President. BPS is instituted by Law Number 16, 1997 on Statistics; Government Regulation Number 51, 1999 on Statistics Undertakings; Presidential Decree Number 166, 2000 on Status, Task, Function, Authority, and Organizational Structure of the Non-Departmental Government Institution; Presidential Decree Number 178, 2000 on Organizational Structure and Task of the Non-Departmental Government Institution; Presidential Decree Number 163, 1998 on College for Statistics; Executive Act Number 001, 2001 on The Organization and Task of the BPS; Executive Act Number 101, 1998 on The Organization and Task of College for Statistics. Previously, BPS was Biro Pusat Statistik or Central Bureau of Statistics (CBS) instituted by Law Number 7, 1960 on Statistics;

The aforementioned law required BPS:

- To provide data to the government and the public.
- To assist statistics divisions of government departments and other institutions, in developing statistical system, needed to setup work program and periodic reporting scheme.
- To develop and promote standards to be incorporated in the implementation of statistical techniques and methods, and to provide necessary services in the field of education and training in statistics.
- To establish cooperation with international institutions and other countries for the benefit of Indonesia's statistical development.

Child Protection Data Collected

BPS's main activities are undertaken in a regular cycle. The population Census is conducted every ten years, at the years ended with zero. In between censuses, BPS conducts statistical surveys in two cycles – annual surveys and modules that are undertaken every 3 years. Every year, BPS collects a National Socio-Economic Survey. Within this annual survey, the nature of information collected includes the following:

- Characteristics of household members – includes sex, age, marital status, school participation, and deaths of household members in the past year
- Health and education characteristics – includes health problems that disrupted school or work, whether treatment was sought, birth attendance for 0-4 year olds, whether 0-4 year olds are being breastfed, whether 0-4 year olds received immunizations, educational status and level for those 5 and older, literacy of those 5 and older
• Activities of household members ages 10 and older – includes questions about work activities including type of work, hours spent working
• Fertility and family planning – includes questions on age of first marriage, number of live births, use of contraception and type of contraception used
• Housing and environment – includes questions on construction materials of home, source of light, drinking water source, toilet facility
• Average monthly household expenditure and sources of income – includes questions on cost of food consumption, costs of non-food items, main source of household income

As is evident from this list, very few questions in the annual survey directly relate to child protection per se. Most of the information collected on children is linked to health and education. The most direct data that can be extracted on child protection relates to child labor and potentially on early marriage. Data on education and dropouts are also valuable as risk factors for other protection concerns.

In addition to the annual surveys, special modules are collected according to 3-year cycles. The modules are variable, but fall under the headings of “Income and expenditure”, “Welfare, Socio-culture, Criminality and Tourism”, and “Health, Nutrition, Education Cost and Home Environment”. Ministries and other government entities can request modules be developed to examine other issues, and these are proving to have more salience to child protection actors. For example, a BPS survey module in 2006 captured prevalence data on domestic violence and abuse. In addition, a child-specific labor survey module will be conducted by BPS in 2009. This effort intends to capture national estimates of child labor, in particular those hidden or illegal activities not captured by regular survey data.

Contribution to the Information System
In considering the four domains within our case definition of an information system, BPS contributes primarily to prevalence of cases and prevalence of risk factors through information collected concerning education, child health, and household income contributors. The population-based BPS surveys create an appropriate structure for collecting prevalence data. The fact that the annual surveys ask the same questions each year also allows for the collection of trend data to determine whether things are getting better or worse on relevant topics. This is not the case for the module surveys, which are not sequenced on the same subject.

Information Management
The planning and design of the surveys are the responsibility of the central office, while the heads of provincial statistics offices are responsible for administrative and technical operation of the survey in their respective regions. These provincial level officials are assisted by the heads of the statistical offices at the district or municipality level who are designated as coordinators for the field work.

Before the interviewers are deployed, they are required to attend training sessions on the surveys. BPS surveyors receive approximately 20 hours of training that include how to work with socio-economically different groups. Role-playing and piloting always precede actual enumeration. Upon completion of the forms or questionnaires, the data is checked for
quality before being accepted for processing at the data processing unit. BPS data is analyzed using computer programming at the headquarters level.

In terms of reporting and sharing results, BPS conducts seminars where survey results are shared and discussed. Results are also shared in the form of published reports. These reports are intended for general data users and contain averages, totals, etc. disaggregated by one or two characteristics. The reports also contain definitions of variables, survey goals, sampling procedures, and other technical information. Requests for additional analyses not included in the published results can be requested and purchased from BPS. Raw data sets have been shared with the World Bank, universities and research institutions by request.

Summary

Data Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Characteristics</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contribution to Key Surveillance Activities</td>
<td>Prevalence data: annual surveys and modules; ILO/BPS module on child labor; KPP/BPS module on domestic violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Strengths</td>
<td>Regular collection, compilation and dissemination of data; quality data collection with trained staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Weaknesses</td>
<td>Does not explicitly cover child protection issues within its annual surveys; accessibility and analysis fees hinder coordination; not all data collected is published/disseminated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Opportunities</td>
<td>Enter child protection variables into relevant modules or develop CP specific module; partner with other organizations to build quality/capacity for data collection; extract and analyze potential child protection data; publish a child profile</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attribute Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System Attributes</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Simplicity</td>
<td>Structured annual system; simplicity in terms of consistency; Large system (the amount of data collected and stored), sharing is more complex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>Low flexibility for annual survey; some flexibility possible for including additional variables in cyclical modules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Quality</td>
<td>Regular systematic collection; however no child protection variables included (annual survey)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptability</td>
<td>Depending on topic (ie.- domestic violence) and other sensitive issues (ie.- child labor); willingness to disclose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitivity</td>
<td>Data not utilized to detect shifts or monitor changes in coverage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeliness</td>
<td>Annual regulated system, regular publication and dissemination of findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stability</td>
<td>Reliable, available institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination</td>
<td>Internal Vertical data sharing well established; external sharing ie DINSOS good relationship; other/most agencies fee basis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2.4 The Ministry for Women’s Empowerment and Child Protection (KPP)

Housed within the Ministry of Women’s Empowerment is the Directorate on Child Protection. This Directorate serves as a coordinating body that was established to coordinate, monitor and evaluate the implementation and protection of children’s rights. KPP does not participate directly in service delivery, nor is it structured or mandated to do so. Instead this coordinating body facilitates policy development and implementation in areas of health, education, social welfare, child development and child participation, collects secondary data on issues of violence, abuse, trafficking and exploitation received from other agencies. KPP receives aggregate case data reports every six months from offices at the provincial levels. Key distinctions between the national and sub-national KPP offices are discussed below. Province-level KPP offices feature four divisions: child protection, women’s empowerment, family planning and welfare, and information, data and institutional relations.

KPP also plays a large role in the Integrated Services centers (“PPT”). The PPT Centers were a joint directive of the Minister of Women’s Empowerment, Minister of Health, Minister of Social Affairs, and National Police Commander to address and respond to the needs of women and children victims of violence in a comprehensive and coordinated manner. The PPT components include health, legal, psychological, and other support services including referrals and temporary safe shelter provision.

In that capacity, KPP is responsible for several key elements:

1. Establishment of Centers
2. Training of Staff
3. Funding & Supervising
4. Development of inter- ministerial regulations and standard operating procedures, which is still in development.

Child Protection Data Collected

While Biro PP offices gather primary data from victim-based reporting sources at the provincial level, their role is largely to collect, coordinate and compile secondary protection data from other organizations. With support from UNICEF, KPP at the national level has

---


13 Ibid.
developed and is currently piloting a violence, abuse, and exploitation of children database in six provinces across Indonesia. Province-level Biro PP offices have been tasked with coordinating information from participating NGOs and government agencies that capture child protection cases of violence and abuse. Each Biro PP office receives regular reports from participating child protection actors that are entered into the database, compiled and made available to provincial and to KPP at the national level.

**Contribution to the Information System**

KPP's principle role in coordinating and compiling secondary data from other institutions is to inform the three other divisions within the Ministry of Women’s Empowerment for evidence-based programming decisions. Secondary data are received directly from the district level through reports from integrated service systems and indirectly from links to informal networks of community governance. KPP thus currently contributes most comprehensively to coverage/case-management data.

**Information Management**

Information management for Biro PP that are not piloting the violence, abuse, and exploitation of children database relies on a manual data collection and compilation process. Although some offices have the technological and staff resources to input data into simple computer systems, this is not the situation across the board. Many provincial level offices are still reliant on paper, carbon copy and regular paper file management. Conversely, in database pilot provinces, KPP provincial offices are receiving reports from other agencies that have manually collected data, and this data is inputted into the violence, abuse, and exploitation of children database.

**Summary**

**Data Assessment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Characteristics</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contribution to Key Surveillance Activities</strong></td>
<td>Case Management (Coverage) Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data Strengths</strong></td>
<td>Strong database system with partners (though continued use is dependent on extension of pilot programs). Data is reviewed twice: once on input at district level, then again at provincial level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data Weaknesses</strong></td>
<td>Lack of capacity for data collection at sub-national levels due to funding issues. Absence of infrastructure for routine data collection. Coordination difficulties between national and sub-national levels impede full implementation of existing pilot partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data Opportunities</strong></td>
<td>Expansion of existing pilot programs in new districts and provinces could improve coordination and sharing of data among case management actors at district level (requires additional funding commitment from government). Continued development of database system</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attribute Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System Attributes</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Simplicity</td>
<td>Pilot partnership collection process at district level is simple.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>High flexibility for pilot partnerships, which can be altered to best fit circumstances in districts and provinces where operational.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Quality</td>
<td>High quality for data collected through pilot partnerships.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptability</td>
<td>High acceptability but only for persons who choose to report themselves or are reported by others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitivity</td>
<td>Not sensitive (dependent on case-level reporting that may not represent total number of cases).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representativeness</td>
<td>Pilot programs are somewhat representative of the limited provinces where active.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeliness</td>
<td>Collected data is compiled and transmitted in timely fashion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stability</td>
<td>Unstable funding sources for current pilot partnerships.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination</td>
<td>Mandate is clear but coordination between national and sub-national offices needs improvement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2.5 Commission for the Protection of Indonesian Children (KPAI)

KPAI was established in 2004 under the mandate of a Presidential decree and Article 74 of the Law on Child Protection. Its purpose is to conduct socialization of the Law’s regulations and report on progress towards Indonesia’s commitment to the Convention of the Rights of the Child. Therefore, KPAI is an independent institution established by the government to supervise other government agencies working on child protection issues. However, it does not have enforcement power even if it finds the efforts of a government ministry to be deficient or lacking. KPAI is only authorized to provide recommendations to the President, and the President can then discuss the issue in meetings with the ministry.

The aforementioned law requires KPAI to conduct the following:

1) “socialization” of laws and regulations pertaining to child protection issues;
2) collect data and information from government agencies;
3) respond to concerns and complaints about the performance of the government agencies that are providing child protection services;
4) monitor, analysis, evaluation and supervision on child protection issues; and
5) provide reports, input, evaluations and recommendations to the President.

*Child Protection Data Collected*

The primary KPAI role is to serve as a watchdog for child protection concerns by collecting data on thirteen critical issues, including family and alternative care, children in need of special care and protection, and child rights. KPAI commissioners are also responsible for addressing cases that are brought directly to the commission. However, little primary data is
collected directly by KPAI, since their mandate is to compile information from other government agencies such as the Ministry of Social Affairs, the Ministry of Home Affairs and the Ministry of Education. KPAI does collect data on its own advocacy efforts, tracking the numbers and types of individual and community complaints received.

**Contribution to the Information System**
KPAI does not currently collect data that can contribute in a meaningful way to the four components identified in the information system. The data it holds primarily falls into the coverage category but it reflects cases that are collected from other government agencies on an as-needed basis. KPAI also receives incident information and complaints on vulnerable children, so has data on factors it considers as risks, such as children of divorced parents. However this data is not comprehensive, and as such would not be categorized as contributing to prevalence of risk.

**Information Management**
Information is used primarily as a means for advocacy amongst news media and international actors. KPAI is comprised of a chairman, two vice-chairs, one secretary and five members. These members are appointed and removed by the President, subsequent to the deliberation of the House of Representatives. They represent sectors of society including religious groups, community groups and business. As a commission, KPAI does not have offices at the provincial and district levels. Some provinces have counterparts to KPAI which are established by the governors, but these organizations are not directly linked with KPAI and relate directly to the governor at the provincial level.

**Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Assessment</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data Characteristics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution to Key Surveillance Activities</td>
<td>Not relevant to surveillance since KPAI does not collect unique data for surveillance purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Strengths</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Weaknesses</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Opportunities</td>
<td>Has great potential to contribute to surveillance through data evaluation and monitoring of other child protection agencies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute Assessment</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>System Attributes</td>
<td>Assignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simplicity</td>
<td>System is not very simple as data is collected from various agencies in different forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>Flexible. Data also collected on topics outside of child protection, which arguably adds complexity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Quality</td>
<td>Quality entirely dependant on partnerships and sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptability</td>
<td>High acceptability but is essentially pre-screened through partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitivity</td>
<td>Not sensitive since dependant on partner data and coverage is unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representativeness</td>
<td>Not representative of the child protection sector, only government actors required to give data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeliness</td>
<td>Collected data is compiled and transmitted in relatively timely fashion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stability</td>
<td>Mandated to cover child protection issues and data, some data published on internet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination</td>
<td>Mandate is clear but coordination for data collection not well defined</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2.6 Police and Special Units for Women & Children (PPA)

The Special Unit for Women & Children (PPA) are designated and specially trained officers responsible for all women and children that come into contact with the law, whether as perpetrators, victims or witnesses. Their collective responsibilities include multiple courses the process of investigating cases, implementing diversion tactics to prevent juvenile offenders from entering into the justice system if restorative justice is deemed an option, conducting child friendly interviews. In essence the PPA is the gatekeeper that can close cases through diversion tactics or refer them on to the Prosecutor and entry into the formal system.

Child Protection Data Collected

The PPA are responsible for collecting and documenting primary data on all reported cases of violence, abuse, or any other criminal acts or violations where children are involved as offenders, victims or witnesses of a crime. This process is largely done manually through a “child friendly” interview of the victim and/or child. It is later inputted into a computer system that is well coordinated through vertical channels of the police infrastructure. The PPA also works in cooperation with Integrated Services (PPT) as part of the integrated referral system (See section??) and collects forensic evidence for cases that may pursue a legal route and prosecution of the perpetrator. In the context of pilot provinces, the PPA share the same database used by shelters and PPTs. Data collected, including biological information and case details, are documented in narrative manner. This data is logged into case reports that are updated in the computer system as the case develops. The flow of data is dictated by the route chosen, being diversion, prosecution or a closed case. While all data is kept and maintained in the system interviews with PPA staff suggest the more data is not collected once the case is closed, or passed to the Prosecutor. Additionally, PPA officers provide information to victims and family members on legal rights and options in terms of prosecution. The PPA are responsible for the full breadth of police responsibilities and actions when handling these special victim cases, including the investigation, apprehension and questioning of the alleged perpetrator; preparation of a criminal case for presentation to
Contribution to the Information System
While the PPA clearly contributes to the coverage component of the information system, and is an important data source, interviews with PPA staff indicated this case management data likely does not accurately reflect the prevalence of protection problems, nor is it indicative of the greatest protection risks children face within their respective communities. See section 4.4 for more details on detection of child protection risks and concerns. The data collected by the PPA unit can be considered useful and effective but within the bounds of its own limitation in that collectively speaking it is partial data, in the sense that it is not reflective of what is actually happening in communities and therefore cannot be used to accurately establish prevalence nor calculate coverage.

Information Management
Case information is collected manually on paper forms through the interview processes mentioned above. This information is then inputted into the PPA computer system. The case report data that is logged into the computer system are updated in the system as the case develops. Information inputted into the PPA computer system is shared through vertical channels of the police infrastructure in a general reporting process as well as for referral purposes. Actual case referrals, meaning cases transferred from the responsibility of one PPA to a higher level police unit for investigation, are dictated by the severity of an incident, such as rape and/or sexual assault.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Characteristics</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contribution to Key Surveillance Activities</td>
<td>Case management data (coverage)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Strengths</td>
<td>Establishment of PPA unit to collect and investigate child case data. Structured system holds potential for better data flow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Weaknesses</td>
<td>Low reporting/not representative; narrative format of data is difficult to extract; limited access to this information due to confidentiality issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Opportunities</td>
<td>Reformat case collection forms to improve evaluation and analysis of data. Improve coordination and information sharing with other actors (ie. PPT psychosocial services)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14 Child Frontiers Draft; Child and Family Welfare Services in Indonesia: An assessment for preventing and responding to Violence, Abuse and Exploitation of Children. 2008
### Attribute Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System Attributes</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Simplicity</td>
<td>Easy to fill-out forms; requires narrative responses, but loses systematic collection of key data variables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>Possible to create new variables to separate critical data points within the narratives (no intention at this juncture to do so)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Quality</td>
<td>Dependent upon person filling out form; depth of investigation; resources; willingness of victim/perpetrator to cooperate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptability</td>
<td>Low willingness of community to report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitivity</td>
<td>Low sensitivity due to low reporting, community level mediation, and undetected cases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representativeness</td>
<td>Data is not representative of actual child protection problems and concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeliness</td>
<td>Varies upon staffing and resources, moderate to good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stability</td>
<td>Stable, reliable and available system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination</td>
<td>Vertical/Horizontal internal coordination very structured; Vertical/Horizontal external coordination difficult and poor due to confidentiality</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.3. Child Protection Information Coordination

A key characteristic of an effective child protection system is the level of meaningful coordination between different government actors. This includes coordination amongst central government agencies at the national level as well as between the actors at the provincial, district and sub-district. It also includes how civil society and local leaders engage with the government. The following section on coordination is described using various indicators¹⁵ that examine leadership, roles and responsibilities, technical support, broad inclusion, joint planning of child protection services, and coordination on policies and procedures.

#### 3.3.1 Is there a lead government agency responsible for coordinating child protection information?

There is currently no lead actor for child protection at the national level, and neither is there a single system to collect child protection data. Each ministry gathers data relevant to its own policies and budgeting, with Bappenas acting as an overall coordinating body. There are no routine or regularly scheduled meetings or forums where information on child protection is systematically shared, reviewed, or analyzed.

---

3.3.2 Do all government departments and agencies understand the roles and responsibilities of relevant actors in regards to information systems? Are there formal agreements between departments?

It was not clear to many agency representatives which government actor should have the responsibility to lead child protection initiatives or the information system. Although there is a role for KPAI to play in child protection data collection, it was not perceived to be filling a comprehensive role, and, indeed, does not currently appear to have the capacity to fill this gap in a meaningful way. For key agencies involved in child protection, their formal role and mandate did not always match the perceived role in the view of its partners. Though particular mandates exist on paper, it is not clear how these are actually put into action. There was also confusion at the local level as to which counterparts should receive organizational data and reports at the provincial or national levels.

A small number of formal agreements on information sharing do exist between departments, usually when there is a joint initiative requiring specific collaboration such as the national program for conditional cash transfers. Standard agreements on data collection and information sharing exist between members of the integrated service networks as well as the regular planning coordination led by Bappenas for each budgeting cycle. Within sectors, agencies have more clearly defined roles, such as within child labor or child trafficking, which correspond with their agency’s specific scope of programming. However, these roles are often designed by donors and less so by government actors. Child protection agencies and civil society actors know of other agencies working on similar protection issues at the local and national levels, and there are a number of informal discussions that take place to share information in response to specific cases, or when agencies want to collaborate on specific projects such as forming better links within a particular sector.

3.3.3 Are there agencies providing technical support to the government to strengthen the national child protection information system?

International NGOs as well as UN agencies do provide significant technical support to individual components of a potential system through government counterparts. The majority of NGOs and international actors collect data primarily around their own programs to monitor and evaluate project achievements associated with their objectives. However, NGOs and UN actors have also supported government agencies in their information systems. In particular, three international organizations give significant support to government ministries to further child protection data collection: International Labor Organization (ILO), the Save the Children Alliance (Save) and UNICEF. Although not all of their activities are outlined here, their specific roles and relationships in supporting government agencies for the formal information system are highlighted.

ILO works with BPS to collect information related to child labor; the 2009 BPS module on child labor was the first national child specific labor survey supported with technical assistance and funding from ILO. ILO provided the initial funding and technical inputs for the pilot child labor module; BPS will decide to include the module in subsequent years and will be responsible for taking the lead if it chooses to continue it. Although the module focuses on child labor, it is a model in terms of the process and input required to implement a new module focused on child protection. ILO also separately conducts rapid assessments
on child labor and child trafficking activities at the sub-district level in order to guide its program interventions.

UNICEF supported KPP at the national level to develop the integrated services network including the above-mentioned database for referral agencies at the district level. Technical assistance was also provided to the Civil Registration offices at the district levels which collect data and provide certificates for births, marriage and deaths. UNICEF has also conducted various research projects on juvenile justice, children in formal care, and child protection systems, which are used to inform government policy at the national level.

All three agencies provide technical assistance to their government counterparts in data collection methods and information management. Both Save the Children and UNICEF provided support to Depsos and KPP respectively for the development of database infrastructure and for training to database managers at the field level. Survey tools and case definitions used for the 2009 BPS child labor survey are based on international frameworks such as described by the International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour (IPEC). These tools are adapted to the Indonesian context, but the standardization allows for ILO to compare data between different countries.

3.3.4 Are NGOs, professional associations, academic institutions, and others involved in a broad-based coordinated approach towards data sharing on prevention and response of child protection concerns? Are there formal agreements or partnerships between them?

Indonesia has a variety of actors working on child protection programs but no mechanism exists for formal collaboration, especially in data sharing. Information is currently shared on an ad-hoc basis, oftentimes associated with program achievements, project monitoring, or advocacy purposes. Levels of coordination vary between sectors of child protection as well. ACILS, an international NGO predominately focused on trafficking, has a web-based system for sharing information between local organizations, but it is not intended to be a data management system.

Compared to the national level, more effective coordination for collecting coverage data was observed at the district levels, particularly where integrated services exist. This is predominately because of the need to report to one another to respond to specific cases as well as the creation of specific information sharing systems in the form of a shared database. The difficulty lies in consolidating data in a meaningful way that can then be shared from the district level to the provincial and national levels. Decentralization was often cited as a basis for non-reporting from the district level to the provincial level, or the provincial level to the national level.

There is some local collaboration between academic institutions and child protection actors but they are not based on formal partnerships. They may be asked to take part in short-term projects or research, or provide input on specific technical child protection issues.

3.3.5 Are there local interagency bodies to develop and agree on child protection policies and procedures within national frameworks?
Local bodies do exist within the integrated service providers at the local level. However these networks are currently pilot projects and thus not present in most locations. In addition to the need for standardized policies and procedures at the local level, an agreement on child protection indicators and definitions is necessary at the national level as well. There is a lack of consistent case definitions used within child protection actors at all levels of governance and programming. Even the basic definition of “child” varies, as do the terms “orphan”, “neglected child”, and “street child”. (For a full list of case definitions used by ministries and agencies, see Appendix 5.)

One definition of “child” is as an individual under the age of 18 years, based on the CRC and the ILO Convention on the Worst Forms of Child Labor, 1999 (No. 182). However, a second definition is also used, which states that "once married, a person is no longer a child," which is incorporated into laws such as juvenile court law and child welfare law. Definitions of orphans also vary depending on if the child has one parent or both, referred sometimes as a “single orphan,” or “double orphan,” respectively. Depsos’ definition of “neglected child” was admitted to be unclear even to the agency, as the term does not necessarily refer to children who are neglected, but rather to children “whose parents are unable to meet their needs” which refers to families of a lower economic status below the identified poverty line. Lastly, “street child” is defined by UN as “any boy or girl … for whom the street in the widest sense of the word … has become his or her habitual abode and/or source of livelihood, and who is inadequately protected, supervised, or directed by responsible adults”. The ILO describes that the widely accepted set of definitions defines street children into two main categories: “children on the street are those engaged in some kind of economic activity, and children who actually live on the street (or outside of a normal family environment).” Depsos’ definition is less clear, with the description of “children 5-18 years of age who spend most of their time on the street to earn money or just hang around.” The definition leaves out children who actually live on the street.

In order for an interagency body to coordinate effectively, case definitions and indicators must be standardized to inform policy and practice. These are also vital for accurate data collection and analysis. The following table was compiled after desk review of the major actors’ survey materials and results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Labor</td>
<td>Number of children in prostitution (on Java Island)</td>
<td>ILO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Those in prostitution under 18 years old</td>
<td>ILO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of child domestic workers</td>
<td>ILO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of children working in agricultural sector</td>
<td>ILO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boy's participate rate in labor sector (agriculture, industrial, services)</td>
<td>BPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Girl's participate rate in labor sector (agriculture, industrial, services)</td>
<td>BPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Working boy illiterate</td>
<td>BPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Working girl illiterate</td>
<td>BPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participation rate in labor force (various age groups)</td>
<td>BPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutions</td>
<td>Number of shelters (with various age groups and services)</td>
<td>YKAI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of institutions and children by district</td>
<td>BPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>School drop out rate (various age groups)</td>
<td>BPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School Enrollment (various age groups)</td>
<td>BPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Net enrollment ratio or working boy</td>
<td>BPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Net enrollment ratio of working girl</td>
<td>BPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Care</td>
<td>% Children by age group, living place and existence of parent</td>
<td>BPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% Children who live without parent by age group and status in family</td>
<td>BPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% Children by status in family and existence of parent</td>
<td>BPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of child who has birth certificate by sex, area type, and district</td>
<td>BPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of early childhood neglected by mother or trustee more than 20 hours in a week</td>
<td>BPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% early childhood whose mother or trustee works</td>
<td>BPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of early childhood whose mother is not his/her family member</td>
<td>BPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neglect</td>
<td>% of early childhood who is fatherless, motherless, or orphan by district</td>
<td>BPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of adopted children by domestic and international, and by district</td>
<td>BPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of trafficked children by district</td>
<td>BPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of separated children by district</td>
<td>BPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of street children</td>
<td>Depsos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neglected early childhood</td>
<td>Depsos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neglected children</td>
<td>Depsos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children and Law</td>
<td>Delinquent juveniles</td>
<td>Depsos</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although not exhaustive, the information in the above table is consistent with the researchers’ conversations with the key actors in terms of what areas data is currently focused on. One major gap is that the lack of indicators related to violence; BPS did conduct a specific module on domestic violence together with KPP, but its results were not considered valid, and thus not included in this list.

### 3.4 Data Flows

When child protection information is captured within the formal data structures, there are numerous pathways through which data are transferred in the existing information system. The process of decentralization described in the Legal Framework section of this report, and the subsequent autonomy that decentralization has provided to provincial and district-level child protection actors, has increased the complexity of data coordination between national and sub-national government ministries. Depending on the function of the government ministry, the structure, capacity and mandate of the ministry may differ at the provincial and district levels. As a result, the quality and delivery of the data that national-level government ministries receive from their provincial and local-level partners varies from one ministry to the next.
Horizontal Coordination

Horizontal coordination, which describes the sharing of information among actors within a specific district or province, is successful in areas where coordinated referral systems exist and there is a mechanism for the agencies to share information. These systems, such as implemented within the piloted Integrated Services (PPT), are relatively new initiatives to ensure better quality services and referral mechanisms. In practical terms, it has developed specific tools such as an information database as well as defined organizational roles and responsibilities to handle case management.

Coordination within the PPT is aided by formal referral mechanisms, but also relies on the informal relationships that develop between service providers who know and work with each other. Much relevant and important information is consequently lost through informal documentation. The quality of reporting is also largely dependent on the capacity of staff, the complexity of data inputs, and the willingness of participating actors to provide complete data. Another constraint within the PPT system is that its structure and operations vary by location. In one district, the PPT is comprised of eighteen organizations, and although the local KPP office provided coordination, responsibilities were unclear and certain services were better funded than others. As a result many functions are duplicated and gaps in services persisted.

At the national level, there is horizontal coordination among actors who collect child protection data, primarily between BPS and Depsos. The coordination of this data is linked to the national CCT program overseen by Bappenas, also involving the Ministry of Education and Ministry of Health. Within the CCT program, there is additional information that is useful to child protection programming that goes largely unused.

Vertical Coordination

An effective vertical structure between ministry offices at the national, provincial and district levels was also exhibited in the national CCT program. Although the process of data collection is devolved to the district level, BPS retains a dominant role in data collection and analysis while Bappenas is involved in coordinating the ministries that are active in the CCT program through its role in budgeting for program activities.

The potential for vertical data coordination within partnerships such as the PPT program or initiatives like the community forum remain largely unrealized since the varied structures, and functions of government ministries at the district and provincial levels complicate reporting to national offices. Although requirements for quarterly or annual reporting do exist, there is often confusion about which national level actor should “own” this data. This confusion is notable between KPP and KPAI with respect to data collected through the PPT program. Provincial and national actors also periodically request data when on an ad-hoc basis, rather than using data for regular analysis and policy-making. Additionally, the data that does flow through vertical channels are predominantly aggregate figures from service-delivery data inputs, such as the numbers of cases served by a particular intervention, or a narrative about a specific case that can be used for advocacy purposes.
Community Coordination

Although there are differences in the reporting structures within the two provinces examined by the research team, useful structures for community-level coordination were observed within local governance structures at the village level, beginning with the RT. Such coordination is a key component of prevention measures such as the identification of risk factors, as well as a means to monitor legal aid and care interventions. These community systems also can ensure the provision of accurate and timely information. It is often difficult to institute this level of governance given the limited capacities and resources of local communities. However, the community structures already widely in place can be considered a strong resource for child protection systems and a focal point for greater support and capacity building.
IV. ANALYSIS

The section above provides an overview of findings on the child protection information system in Indonesia, based on research activities in Jakarta, Central Java and NTB. This section, in turn, offers an analysis of these findings based on the framework and methodologies described in the Methods Section.

4.1 FINDING ONE: Despite advances in the basic legal framework for child protection concerns in Indonesia, the existing legal structure does not provide a clear mandate for development of a comprehensive child protection information system.

The Law on Child Protection forms a solid legal foundation for addressing child protection concerns in Indonesia. However, the lack of a specific legal mandate for the creation, coordination and maintenance of a child protection information system underscores the incomplete nature of the legal framework for child protection. This law leaves responsibility for substantively developing the normative framework for actual implementation of child protection policies including information issues to the various government ministries whose portfolios include child protection concerns. As also noted by other recent research examining some of the policies and directives issued by the Department of Social Affairs and other government ministries,16 there are many ongoing concerns about the existing mechanisms for implementation of the legal framework for child protection issues mandated by the Law on Child Protection, not to mention concerns about the remaining gaps in that framework (such as a mandate for child protection information systems). These concerns include the following:

- whether government ministries responsible for producing implementing legislation and guidelines have both the capacity and the proper incentives to create necessary guidelines and to oversee the creation of new processes within existing institutions;
- whether the regulations, plans, policies, decisions and circulars issued by the national government and by the government ministries tasked with implementation of legislation have the legal authority needed to compel action from other state ministries at the national and sub-national levels;
- whether government ministries that have stakes in the successful implementation of child protection legislation yet are not legally tasked with implementation responsibilities have the authority to engage in the process without directives from other ministries; and
- whether government ministries at the national level can successfully manage implementation processes given the dramatic shifts in power, responsibility and resources from the national level to the provincial and district levels following the advent of the decentralization era in Indonesia, highlighted by passage of the Decentralization Law.

Notwithstanding the efforts to expand and solidify the legal framework for child protection issues in Indonesia signified by passage of the Law on Child Protection and the other national laws summarized above, the framework remains incomplete. Furthermore, the challenges of effectively implementing broad legal directives at the sub-national level in

---

16 See Child Frontiers Report. (final reference to be provided by UNICEF)
Indonesia remain significant and merit ongoing attention from government ministries as well as other key actors concerned with child protection issues. The development of a specific legal mandate for the creation of a comprehensive child protection information system in Indonesia would ideally identify a key actor responsible for collecting and coordinating information on child protection concerns, and empower that key actor to carry out such a role. Although the creation of such a mandate would certainly contribute to the existing legal framework and help to build an effective information system for child protection concerns, the process of developing and ratifying acceptable legislation on this front is a task that will require significant time and persistent effort from many key government actors. The passage of such legislation may not be as easily realized as some of the other tasks set forth in the recommendations section of this report. Nonetheless, the research team has concluded that such legislation is an important step forward on the path to development of an effective child protection surveillance system in Indonesia.

4.2 FINDING TWO: Data collection in three of the four child protection system components is inadequate.

While the Government of Indonesia and its partners have made impressive progress in developing many of aspects of the legal framework and service delivery components of a child protection system, the data collection and analysis component has lagged behind. The lack of child protection information system capacity has contributed to insufficient resource allocation, prevention and protection services, and evidence-based programming.

The current child protection information system does not possess the quantity, quality or types of data required to support a protective environment for children. The following summarizes the study’s findings on both the level of data collection activity and the use of these data per the four information components that were investigated.

4.2.1 Case Management

Data Collection
Case Management data is the primary type of data collected by Indonesian government agencies and other actors interviewed by the team. Cases are captured through both active and passive methods of data collection: community relationships, referrals from other agencies, media reports, and direct reports from victims to both formal and informal reporting structures. The main child protection actors involved in the detection and collection of routine case management data are Depsos (Dinas social at the provincial level), KPP (Biro PP at the provincial level), the police and its PPA, and the PPT Integrated Services. Local NGOs that operate in this arena and participate in the integrated referral system are largely contributing episodic case management data. Although the actors identified above capture child protection data, the nature of the anecdotal and episodic information provides little in terms of representative coverage data for the child protection issues.
Below is a more in-depth analysis of case management data per identified key actors:

- **Depros/dinas sosial & Case Management**

  When examining Depros’ capacities for the collection and management of case management data, there are several key findings. Firstly, the national and provincial level (dinas sosial) presence is weak in its abilities to effectively carry out its data collection and vertical coordinate duties between national and provincial level offices. These weaknesses are a product of heavy reliance on volunteer staff that lack the requisite training and expertise to carry out population-based surveys and analysis, high staff turnover, lack of a presence at the sub-district levels, and a heavy focus on rehabilitative services rather than prevention. As a result, the information collected is not comprehensive (See section 3.2.2 for data categories)

- **KPP/Biro PP & Case Management**

  Ideally, data on all child protection issues should be compiled into a single central database housed within an agency that has the capacity to coordinate and compile information from various entities at the district level. A number of the child protection actors interviewed during the mapping exercise identified KPP as the optimal government agency for coordinating, compiling and housing district and province-wide data on child protection issues. However, the development of existing KPP institutions to the point where such data could actually be coordinated and compiled would require an immense amount of focused capacity building and resource allocation, both technical and monetary. Other opportunities lie within the expansion of the existing pilot programs in new districts and provinces as well as improved coordination and sharing of data among case management actors at the district level.

  Points of consideration worth noting are that while heavily reliant upon good vertical and horizontal coordination, the piloted partnership collection process at the district level is relatively simple and very effective. Also the system offers a high level of flexibility for pilot partnerships, which can be altered to best fit protection circumstances in districts and provinces where operational. Issues remain in the lack of stability in terms of funding for the current pilot partnerships as well as the reliance on an insensitive system which is dependent on non-representative case-level reporting.

- **Police (PPA) & Case Management**

  In terms of case management data, positive attributes include high level of stability and internal coordination of the Police (PPA) system. Negative attributes include low external coordination, forms that are too simplistic and incur the loss of systematic collection of key variables in its narrative response categories, and low community acceptability, which leads to low system sensitivity. Improved coordination and information sharing with integrated referral systems, primarily on psychosocial services that are not referred out of the PPA unit, is an essential step toward
capturing a more representative picture of the types of services that children victims or perpetrations are accessing. Police officials at all levels point to the opportunities for improved case management data collection through increased community awareness and sensitization about legal rights, the criminal code, and the existence and functions of the PPA, as well as the importance of actually reporting protection incidents and concerns. Gaps in coverage detection are principally due to the low level of community reporting about incidents, the lack of community understanding of legal rights (including the right to protection), and a lack of sufficient staffing resources that leads to overwhelming ratios between police officers and the populations they monitor and protect.

Simple efforts such as reformatting of case collection forms that would aggregate essential pieces of information such as gender from the incident summary would improve evaluation and analysis of data as well as the ease of extraction without compromising confidentiality issues.

Information System Attributes

Key information system attributes in terms of case management data is as follows:

- **Simplicity:** There is currently a lack of standardized case definitions (see Section 3.3.5), indicators (see Section 4.6) and categories of child protection across actors. This leads to complications in an information system that needs to coordinate information amongst segmented areas of child protection.

- **Flexibility:** The case management/coverage component of the information system, in its current state, is too flexible and lacks structure. The information system requires development of standardized child protection definitions, indicators, and a standard listing of categories of risk and protection concerns. While protection risks and concerns will vary and all categories may not be applicable to all settings throughout Indonesia, the development of categories with standardized definitions and indicators should be made available to protection actors to provide consistency within the information system and enable comparability across varied protection contexts within Indonesia.

- **Data Quality:** Reliance on a volunteer-based staffing system with few incentives invariably affects the quality and consistency of reporting and case detection; lack of standardized case definitions, indicators, and categories of child protection across various actors leaves space for low quality and incomplete data to enter into the information system.

- **Acceptability & Accessibility:**
  - Acceptability is variable. Through the focus group work, it emerged that communities generally have positive views towards their own community-based systems. However, there were varied responses to police and other formal structures such as the legal system. Hesitancies described ranged from: not helpful to not trusted to general expressions of fear for entering the formal legal system. Focus group activities indicated that Acceptability was degraded mostly by child protection issues that intertwine with cultural taboos,
including the lack of willingness on part of the community to report domestic violence issues and other issues such as rape and sexual abuse. Communities were less likely to report due to intense stigma or the belief that an issue was a family matter. Similarly, issue such as child labour were not perceived to be a protection problem, rather, this practice was viewed as a key contribution to the household income and an important step in preparing a child for adulthood. As such, it would not be reported as a protection concern.

- Accessibility on the community level was largely hampered by lack of community awareness of services and, in some cases, lack of services in near proximity. For protection actors themselves, accessibility presented itself as an issue in several ways: (1) lack of technological access and support, (2) lack of coordination amongst actors, (3) and refusal amongst actors to share relevant information with police, health workers or any other formal reporting mechanism.

- Timeliness: Timeliness of the information system suffers due to heavy reliance on manual documentation and information management, lack of technological and staff capacity, and volunteer based staffing that are not held accountable to rigid timelines for response or delivery of data that is collected. This negatively impacts internal timeliness of agencies as well as timeliness of raw and processed data to be shared within the system amongst horizontal and/or vertical partners.

4.2.2 Prevalence of Cases

Data Collection

Within the current information system no comprehensive child protection prevalence of case data is currently being collected on a routine basis. While the information that Depsos collects is the greatest source of prevalence of case data, it is not comprehensive and data quality comes into question. Largely, there was an absence of understanding and institutional knowledge concerning prevalence of case data; often the concept had to be explained and expanded upon in order to get an appropriate response. Responses across national, provincial and community level actors revealed that staff could ruminate on the percentage that their case capture likely represents; however, it was largely conjecture and coupled with acknowledgement that they did not know how large child protection problem(s) are, nor aware of any other agency that may hold such information.

Currently there is indirect nominal activity on the prevalence of case data front; however it is essential to discuss the potentially extensive role that BPS could play in contributing to prevalence of case data through their surveys and database. It is important to note up front the hindrances to this process:

1. The information collected does not explicitly cover child protection issues
2. Accessibility and analysis fees hinder coordination
3. Not all data that is collected is published or disseminated.

Opportunities that lie within BPS to contribute to the information system include regular extraction and analysis of potential child protection data, entering child protection variables
into relevant modules or the development of a child protection specific module, and publication of a child profile in addition to building regular partnerships with other organizations to build the capacity for quality data collection.

Examples of good practice include the compilation of a “Child Situation” booklet in the Nusa Tengarra Barat (NTB) that extracted child specific data from the annual BPS survey in 2007. Although this publication has not been shared with other child protection actors, if that model were taken a step further and contained analysis along with raw numbers, it could prove valuable in helping to improve the availability and accessibility of prevalence of case level child protection information that is already being collected through the BPS annual surveys.

In addition to the compilation of raw child-specific data, the opportunity for the routine extraction and analysis of child protection variables is critical to informing various child protection actors. For example, the Save the Children Alliance requested an extraction of existing information from BPS survey data in order to inform their project on children living without family care, living in institutions, or living in Islamic boarding schools. The data that was extracted and analyzed from annual BPS surveys helped the Save understand the prevalence of such child protection issues in Indonesia.

Furthermore, the coordination between BPS and UN specialized agencies such as the ILO that led to the production and deployment of a child labor module accompanying the BPS survey in 2009 is a valuable effort that should improve the ability of child protection actors to accurately assess the magnitude of various protection problems in Indonesia.

Notwithstanding these encouraging developments, BPS data on prevalence of cases has generally not been extracted, analyzed, processed or distributed in a fashion that would be of use to interested child protection actors. Additionally, inquiry into the likelihood of adding child protection variables into the annual household surveys was quickly rejected. Constraints included the general inability to change the annual survey. However, there was an indication of flexibility within the modules.

Information System Attributes
While all information system attributes are essential to a well functioning system, key system attributes that should be considered in conjunction with prevalence of case data are as follows:

- Data Quality: This attribute, which reflects the completeness and validity of the data recorded, is weak in terms of prevalence of case data. Efforts are not comprehensive enough in the data collection arena to offer quality data to a prevalence of case data category. Quality is hindered by volunteer staff without proper skills in Depsos, the general lack of child protection case definitions and indicators.

- Flexibility: The prevalence of cases component of the information system is somewhat inflexible in its current state. The BPS annual survey has a rigid structure and remains unchangeable. The modules suggest a bit more flexibility and leave room for adding child protection components. If
advocated for strongly enough, a child protection module could be created, which is strongly recommended.

- **Stability:** There is a stable structure in place to collect prevalence of case data. BPS and Depsos have routine functions and schedules that they follow to collect their population-based information. However, the lack of resources and capacity weaken Depsos and reduce its ability to collect, manage and provide prevalence case data. As mentioned above, BPS data on prevalence of cases has generally not been collected, extracted, analyzed, processed or distributed in a fashion that would be of use to interested child protection actors.

- **Coordination:** Due to the fragmented nature of the child protection system in Indonesia amongst various actors, the level of integration and sharing of data across agencies that collect child protection information is paramount to establishing quality and valid prevalence of case data. Low level of coordination amongst some actors and issues with possessiveness over data and/or unclear mandates of who to share data with has complicated and weakened the information system’s ability to establish prevalence of case data.

- The key surveillance system attributes that should be addressed on an individual level for Depsos, the primary contributor of prevalence of case data, include system simplicity, quality and representativeness. While the system offers simplicity by housing the data at one central location (Pusdatin), data quality in terms of accuracy, completeness, and comprehensive information, and representativeness are affected by the limited number of categories that relate to children and variations that exist in the capacity and depth of training provided to data collectors.

### 4.2.3 Prevalence of Risk Factors

*Data Collection*

Currently there is no comprehensive effort to collect and analyze prevalence of risk data, and this limits the ability of child protection actors to anticipate situations ripe for protection incidents. Systematic and routine collection of this type of data is crucial in enabling child protection actors in Indonesia to shift from response-oriented services and activities to prevention. Ultimately, the availability of quality prevalence of risk data would enable protection actors to engage in preventative interventions and strategic development, employing essential programmatic interventions and identifying gaps in child protection services. Opportunities within the existing information system in Indonesia that could provide useful prevalence of risk data include the Conditional Cash Transfer (CTT) for Poor Families program and the program for birth registration. Low system sensitivity, simplicity, data quality and coordination attributes amongst the various actors involved in those data collection activities would need to be addressed and improved in order to adequately use this information for preventative purposes. At the present time data that are collected and made available through both the BPS and Depsos surveys are not
being fully utilized. Accessing existing datasets in regards to BPS information on education, household income contributors and health as well as Depsos surveys that cover an array of protection concerns is a viable option to be considered. These datasets present the opportunity to gain accessible and relevant prevention data that is at this juncture not an established activity of any agency. If routine extraction and analysis of preventative factors were used to identify at-risk children, households or communities it could be used to appropriately develop preventative interventions.

Information System Attributes

While there is currently no prevalence of risk data specifically being collected, activities that are being carried out by BPS, Depsos and the CTT program that could be used to inform prevalence of risk data are assessed as follows:

- **Simplicity:** As previously mentioned, this component of the system is still burdened by complexity due to lack of standardized case definitions and indicators for child protection.
- **Data Quality:** Low data quality remains a concern due to a lack of understanding of what risk factors are for child protection problems, a lack of human and technical capacity to conduct analysis and to use data collected to identify and inform prevalence of risk; and a lack of professionally trained and paid and/or incentivized staff for data collection and analysis.
- **Coordination:** Lack of coordination amongst the various actors involved in data collection activities would need to be addressed and improved in order to adequately use this information collected for preventative purposes.

4.2.4 Evaluation

**Data Collection**

None of the child protection actors interviewed in the course of the mapping exercise are currently conducting regulated, systematic, external evaluations. In fact, the term “evaluation” is often misunderstood. When evaluation procedures were discussed in interviews with child protection actors, some would refer to their regular formal or informal review meetings to discuss cases, or describe budget documents detailing funds spent for a particular program. The collection of useful evaluation data will require child protection actors at all levels to begin to regularly utilize detailed and clearly defined evaluation procedures that include standardized and measurable indicators. Useful evaluations should be able to explain whether or not an intervention or program had desired (or undesired) effects—based on project goals, processes, outcomes, and/or impacts.

While most agencies and organizations must build capacity in order to implement internal evaluation procedures, a key role can be played by Bappenas Directorate of Planning and Budgeting. This office has suggested introducing incentive mechanisms such as performance-based budgeting in order to improve the collection of high-quality evaluation data. The implementation of incentive schemes such as performance-based budgeting should be encouraged, supported and implemented by all actors in the child protection sector. This would contribute to the information
system in terms of creating priority and a layer of accountability for evaluation data, as well as increasing the quality of reporting and promoting efficacious programming. Constraints lie in the actual development and implementation of this plan; however, Bappenas has the institutional power and weight, as the branch charged with disbursement of funding allocations, to see such an incentive through.

*Information System Attributes*

The assessment of the information system’s attributes in terms of evaluation data is not possible at this point accept to point to the information system attributes as criterion for a structured and effective way forward in building a system that collects and uses valid evaluation data. This is due to the fact that no agency is conducting systematic, rigorous, external evaluations to assess the quality, effectiveness or efficiency of interventions and data collection methods.

*Summary of Findings*

We offer a second analytic perspective based on a comparison of what an “ideal” information system would achieve compared to what this system achieves. An ideal child protection information system would provide policy makers and practitioners with a comprehensive national portrait on the magnitude of key protection concerns (prevalence of cases); an understanding of the social, economic, individual and cultural factors that predispose children to protection risks (prevalence of risk factors); detailed information on children in the system (case management information) and, evidence of program effectiveness (evaluation information). Moreover, an ideal system allows for coverage determinations: the percentage of children with a protection problem that receive prevention or remedial assistance.

In comparison, the current information in Indonesia provides an incomplete portrait of the magnitude of child protection concerns; little insight or understanding of vulnerabilities underlying protection problems; moderate to good case management information (with improved coordination of these data through interagency data base projects); no coverage perspective (number of children in need compared to number of children served); and, no evaluation outcome or impact evidence to inform the program planning and budget processes.
The following chart summarizes findings of this comparative analysis:

**Figure 3. Comparative Analysis of Current and Ideal Systems**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Prevalence of Cases</th>
<th>Prevalence of Risk Factors</th>
<th>Case management Information</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ideal System</strong></td>
<td>• Provides comprehensive national picture of the magnitude of child protection concerns</td>
<td>• Provides knowledge and insights on risk factors that underline vulnerability</td>
<td>• Provides comprehensive information on children within system exists</td>
<td>• Provides independent findings on program performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current system</strong></td>
<td>• Limited national picture</td>
<td>• No routine risk studies</td>
<td>• Regular case data collected with completeness and relevancy</td>
<td>• No formal evaluation system for government programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• DEPOSOS social dysfunctions surveys</td>
<td>• Does not extract risk factors from existing data sets (neglect/poverty/school drop outs, orphans)</td>
<td>• New interagency data bases piloted is enhancing coordination</td>
<td>• Some Project-based NGO evaluations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key constraints</strong></td>
<td>• Technical capacities lacking</td>
<td>• Lack of agreement on case definitions and indicators</td>
<td>• Pilot programs not capturing complete or uniform data</td>
<td>• Technical capacity insufficient budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Insufficient budgets</td>
<td>• Relevant data is not extracted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3 **FINDING THREE: The consequences of these child protection information system shortcomings are significant.**

The lack of child protection prevalence of cases, prevalence of risk factors, and evaluation information has contributed to insufficient resource allocation, prevention and protection services, and evidence-based programming and budgeting. Specifically:

- The lack of data about the prevalence of cases means key government actors do not know the magnitude of any given protection concern and cannot monitor changes or trends.
- The lack of data about the prevalence of risk factors means that basic measures to protect children in advance of rights violations and prevent physical and emotional harm are late or lacking altogether.
- While case management data on children in service programs is the strongest aspect of the current system, coverage data about the percentage of children accessing services out of the total number of children in need of services cannot be ascertained due to the lack of data about the prevalence of cases.
- The lack of evaluation data means the quality, efficiency and effectiveness of government child protection programs are unknown.
4.4 FINDING FOUR: Many child protection problems are not identified.

There are both formal and informal reporting and detection mechanisms that capture information on vulnerable children (risk factors) and/or children with protection concerns (cases/prevalence) based on the visits to NTB and Central Java. Our mapping is limited to be able to generalize these findings to the national level, though from what we were told, systems such as these exist in most areas of Indonesia. Figure 4 represents a child-centered map of common detection alternatives that a child can choose in Indonesia.

Figure 4. System Map and Detection Alternatives that a Child Can Choose

Focus group findings indicated that the large majority of vulnerable children and children with protection problems are not identified. Reasons provided by interviewee’s for this finding included: cultural factors, lack of awareness of programs and support, and fear of being involved in the formal police or judicial system. Unidentified children can be understood as those that are not identified at all (Undetected), those that are known by family or community members but are not identified or reported to any formal or informal reporting mechanism (Family and Community Information), and those that are recorded at the community level only (Community Governance).

- Undetected. In some cases a child in need of prevention (at risk) or response services (case) may not be discovered by either formal or informal reporting systems. Family or community members may not know the child is in a dangerous situation for a number of reasons. For example, a child may be working in hazardous conditions for long hours without pay or be a victim of physical abuse in the home. Such cases
often go undetected because these children are not considered to have a protection concern by the family or the community (lack of awareness on CP)

- **Family and Community Information.** In other cases, family and community members may detect a vulnerable child or a case, but the concern may not be formally reported. For example, a child who is left behind when a parent leaves to seek work in Malaysia may not be reported. The solution for this child might be dealt with by the family who places the child with an elderly relative, not realizing that this child may now be at increased risk for exploitation. In another example, a family member or neighbor who is not a perpetrator may know about a child who has been abused at home. This problem may first be discussed within the family before it is brought to the community. Community and family members may not realize their legal options or the availability of services to respond to such issues. Also, community and family members may not understand when a case becomes serious or what kinds of cases require legal intervention.

- **Community Governance.** This detection mechanism contains both formal and informal channels of data including but not limited to: the head of a neighborhood (the “RT”), the community forum, or community level police. Although the community may ultimately consider these governance systems as formal structures, the data on children does not get recorded and counted at a higher level. Individuals at the village level are empowered to monitor, verify and mediate problems in nearly all communities in Indonesia. The RT and other community leaders also play roles in collecting population information on births, deaths, and marriages, and they assist in official registration systems attached to government ministries. While these systems are well-defined and often used at the community level, the critical information that they capture is not recorded and counted in any systematic way, resulting in a major gap in the current information system.

Another community-based system, which works within the community governance system described above, is known as the community forum. Its purpose is to improve the processes for monitoring, mediation, diversion and restitution at the community level. National initiative Skep Kapolri 737/2005, relating to the development of strategies to support police work in local communities, charges police at the district level with implementing these community forums in coordination with police at the community level. Community police are usually best positioned to directly engage with the community forum. Detection of a case that is sent to the community forum generally occurs when a victim, family member or community member reports an incident to an RT or to the community head, known as the Rukun Warga (“RW”).

- **Social Welfare Programs.** National or provincial level social welfare programs, such as the pilot program for Conditional Cash Transfers, capture data on children that could be used to improve the existing information system.

- **Service Providers.** Information about a child at risk or with a protection problem may first be captured when the child comes in contact with a formal service provider.
Although not all children in need of protection receive formal services, this is currently the detection mechanism that captures the most data about child protection concerns in Indonesia.

4.5 **Finding Five: Community-district-province data management is ineffective.**

Child protection actors participating in mapping project interviews were asked to identify their methods for collecting, managing and sharing information with their affiliate offices at higher and lower levels as well as with other key actors. National level offices and well-funded NGOs were generally better equipped to collect and share information than locally-funded NGOs or provincial, district, sub-district and village level governmental offices. The degree of access to reliable internet connections and electronic databases affects the capacity of organizations to quickly and efficiently support the collection, management and sharing of information. Although a handful of local governmental offices and NGOs were equipped with computers, printers and internet connections, a majority of these organizations have limited connectivity; no designated data manager or separate data management computer; and rely to varying degrees on hand-writing reports, filing paper records, or sending reports by mail. In addition, many of these local governmental offices and local NGOs are under-staffed, which means they suffer from diminished capacities for large caseloads and lack the resources needed to collect valuable data from remote communities.

While formally organized prevalence surveys are important elements of a child protection information system, one of the most effective and sustainable means of ensuring consistence prevalence data collection is to also anchor this information component in routine incident data collection mechanisms. If there is widespread and systematic incidence monitoring, in other words, prevalence and coverage concerns may be accurately estimated through this incident information.

The methods relied on by most district government offices and NGOs, however, are too ad hoc and time-consuming to support prevalence and coverage requirements through routine incident data collection procedures. One key problem as noted above is the amount of child protection data that goes “undetected.” A second key problem is the collection and transfer of information from community to district-province levels which relies heavily on paper records. Such a collection and transfer system poses significant data flow challenges, including filing, sharing and compiling data for review and evaluation. In addition, paper records are vulnerable to transcription errors as they pass from one person to another, especially from lay persons in the community to service providers or police at the district or provincial levels. How to engage community based actors in routine detection of child protection incidents in a manner that would also permit accurate prevalence estimations will require rethinking the way incidence data is collected and transferred from community to district and province levels.

4.6 **Finding Six: There is no shared vision of what core indicators a national child information system would include.**

Aside from the dysfunctions that Depsos has committed to measuring, there has been little to no discussion of a national set of indicators for child protection. Progress towards an
effective information system will require the formulation of a clear vision of what national child protection surveillance means (explained in Section 5.1) and what an effective information system would achieve. It will also require a coordinated effort to harmonize definitions of child protection terminology.

Such a vision could be guided by recent global efforts to create a National Index Template (a “Template”) to show, at a glance, a country profile for child protection concerns as well as capacity to respond to those concerns. This effort began in 2008 and is being led by Save the Children Sweden and Columbia University. In the spring of 2009, a core set of indicators was proposed that every country should ideally be able to measure and share. Inter-agency input was sought and the indicators were further refined in light of the feedback received. The final set of indicators is shown in the model Template included in Annex 6 of this report. The sections of the Template include:

- Demographics that contain indicators on root causes and risk factors that make children vulnerable such as poverty rates, population pyramids, and literacy rates;
- Prevalence rates and trend data on key child protection concerns such as separated children, orphaned children, and number of child victims of sexual violence;
- Specific country concerns that might not be routinely measured in all countries such as numbers of children associated with armed groups, early marriage, or rates of female circumcision;
- The legal and policy framework in place to protect children that includes whether the country has signed on the CRC, has a specific law on child protection, etc.;
- Information on access to services for children such as number of trained social workers, ratio of teachers to students, and existence of school fees; and
- An overall child protection system rating.

Annex 7 to this report shows the indicators for which there is currently no data available in Indonesia. Key prevalence rates on 5 out of the 6 protection domains could not be identified through our research. There was no available prevalence data for separated children, trafficked children, children with disabilities, rates of child rape and sexual abuse, and rates of the worst forms of child labor. Other gaps include that there is no sense of current budget allocations for child protection programming. What becomes apparent from this analysis is that while information was available on many of the domains identified above, data about the prevalence of cases is lacking for key child protection concerns including rates of trafficked children, separated children, children with disabilities, sexual violence and child labor. However, in spite of these limitations the research team was able to construct a Template for Indonesia, which is included as Figure 5 below.
Figure 5. National Index Template for Indonesia (sources included as Annex 8)
4.7 **Finding Seven:** Child protection practitioners are not adequately prepared to technically support a child protection information system.

While BPS staff and a small cohort of Depsos staff engage in prevalence and coverage studies, the majority of child protection practitioners focus solely on incident, client referral and service delivery data. Indeed, many practitioners involved in case management information activities interviewed for this mapping initiative did not realize that a complete child protection information systems requires three other kinds of data. There is thus an overall lack of understanding amongst child protection actors—both government and non-governmental—on the goals, objectives and components required of a child protection information system. The lack of effective child protection leadership and coordination (see above) contributes to collective confusion on the definition, objectives, components and activities of a child protection information system.

Interviews of government and civil society child protection practitioners suggested that the vast majority of these actors also do not possess the skills required to achieve three of the four components (prevalence of cases, prevalence or risk factors and evaluation) of a child protection information system. Only a handful of the child protection practitioners interviewed for this study reported receiving training in survey or prevalence research methodologies or program evaluation methodologies. The vast majority also indicated that their university training was not oriented to the realities they face in their current work environments.

The research team was only able to identify a handful of Indonesian universities that offered a child protection course of any kind, and found no courses that addressed issues related to child protection information systems or data collection. While there are a number of professors and academics who engage in child protection research on an individual bases, some with impressive results, no academically based child protection centers, think tanks or dedicated training programs were identified through this research initiative.
V. MOVING FORWARD

5.1 SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM APPROACH

One notable development in global discussions on child protection systems has been the move to reframe the dominant language from a child protection information management system to a child protection surveillance system.¹⁷

The founding disciplines of information management systems are business, engineering and library science.¹⁸ ¹⁹ ²⁰ The systems used for discussion in the information systems community revolve around mathematical and graphical modeling, programming languages, digital logic, and machine and assembly languages. Methods to analyze information systems have traditionally utilized requirements analysis, empirical analysis and experimentation techniques.²¹

The origins of a surveillance system, on the other hand, come from the field of public health and draw on principles of the health and social science disciplines. In 1968, the Technical Discussions of the 21st World Health Assembly made a full examination of surveillance as an established and essential function of public health practice. The concept of population surveillance was adopted and its three basic characteristics were identified as: systematic collection of data; consolidation and analysis of the collected data; and dissemination of information to relevant actors and the public.²² The concept of surveillance was further expanded at the 1968 World Health Assembly Technical Discussions, when surveillance was said to imply the responsibility of following up to see that effective action had been taken.²³

Moving to surveillance objectives defines or focuses a system in a way that makes its development possible. The more loosely defined "information system" is ambiguous and adds to the confusion previously identified in this mapping initiative. Because 'information system” is not sufficiently defined, it becomes more difficult to make a system that is functional or achievable. Using the terminology and objectives of surveillance will create a clearer path forward.

5.2 LEADERSHIP AND COORDINATION

Child protection planning in Indonesia is currently more improvised than strategic, more reactive than evidence-based, and more donor-driven than performance-supported. The lack of a common understanding of what a child protection system is and should do reflects

²³ Ibid.
this fragmented approach. While BPS and Depsos generate relevant child protection data, the fact that no one single actor can be identified as the lead ministry points to the gaps in coordination and a persistent disconnect between ministry mandates and ministry capacities. The dysfunctional nature of current data collection processes, in which the players and methods of collecting data are numerous and diverse, must be simplified if the “system” is to become effective. Improving existing data collection systems will require identifying complementary roles for key actors.

No clear consensus emerged on which agency should assume an overall leadership and/or coordination role. However, the following roles for key government actors were identified as possible ways to approach leadership and coordination concerns:

5.2.1 Bappenas

Most practitioners interviewed during this mapping initiative believed that Bappenas can play an important leadership role in the Indonesian system. Before decentralization, budgeting and planning were linked vertically from the national to the provincial levels, meaning that province level offices would submit budgets to the national Depsos office and receive directives through this vertical channel. However, the current governance structure now requires provincial level actors to liaise with one another more closely than before. For example, each provincial Dinas sosial office now submits its budget to the provincial Bappenas office, which has stronger oversight and coordinating functions than it did before the advent of decentralization.

The oversight role for Bappenas at the national level and Bappeda at the provincial level could therefore be leveraged to improve child protection data collection and analysis. Bappenas/Bappeda could take the lead role on program evaluation and also implement a series of working level meetings to identify the kinds of child protection information that are required to achieve “performance-based” programming and budgeting. Moving towards a performance-based programming and budgeting approach would require more robust prevalence, coverage and evaluation data than currently exists. Funding programs based on the magnitude of the problem and the scope and effectiveness of the programmatic response would necessitate strengthening the four components of an effective information system. Once key child protection information needs are identified, a rationale for coordination and implementation roles could follow.

5.2.2 Depsos

Depsos has more child protection data collection capacity than other government actors. Its Pusdatin department has experience in establishing case definitions and indicators for social dysfunctions (see Mapping Section) and in developing guidelines and training for supporting data collection activities. Its social dysfunction survey, while not specific to child protection, is one of the few government efforts to collect relevant prevalence case data. District offices also employ surveyors, data collectors, and social welfare service providers that act as first responders to social welfare and protection issues. However, with no sub-district level office, a large portion of the work for which Dinas sosial is responsible for at the community level is undertaken by volunteer social workers who manually collect data that are then compiled and entered into a database at the provincial level.
The capacity of Depsos to collect and analyze child protection prevalence of case, prevalence of risk and case management data could be enhanced through partnerships with BPS, universities and international organizations as described below.

5.2.3 BPS

BPS is recognized as a competent national survey data collector. However, its routine surveys and tools are inflexible, so its ability to focus adequately on child protection concerns is limited. There are two key BPS support roles to promote in the future. First, BPS can partner with Depsos, NGOs and international organizations to ensure that child protection issues are routinely addressed (see below).

5.2.4 KPP

Many of the child protection actors interviewed during the mapping project identified KPP as a potential government ministry to coordinate, compile and store district and province-wide data on child protection issues. However, the development of existing KPP structures to the point where different kinds of child protection data required for rigorous surveillance could actually be coordinated and compiled would require an immense amount of focused capacity building and resource allocation, both technical and monetary. Better KPP opportunities lie within the case management information component alone. Indeed, an expansion of existing database pilot programs in new districts and provinces as well as improved coordination and sharing of data among case management actors at the district level would represent important contributions towards the development of a national child protection surveillance system.

5.2.5 KPAI

The primary KPAI role is to serve as a watchdog for child protection concerns and is also mandated to implement certain kinds of projects which, to do so effectively, would require collection information through assessments, monitoring and reporting and evaluation. However, it currently does not have the financial resources or technical capacity to do so. This limits its immediate role to advocating for better data collection, for improved analysis and dissemination of data, and for the establishment of sounder procedures to resolve current data collection problems such as double counting. KPAI should, however, be included in Depsos-related capacity building partnerships described above.

5.3 PARTNERSHIPS AND PREVALENCE STUDIES

Depsos partnerships with BPS, international agencies and universities will be required to improve the child protection surveillance system. The major focus of these partnerships would be to ensure surveys led by Depsos to establish prevalence of case and prevalence of risk are designed, implemented and become standard practice. There is considerable opportunity to learn from good practice in sectors such as health and nutrition, where effective and efficient systems of reporting and actors—using survey and surveillance approaches to data collection monitoring have been developed—in partnership with relevant government and international actors.
Depsonos and UNICEF could work together and with others to determine the focus, case definitions and indicators to be included in the surveys. BPS and Depsonos, in turn, would work together to design the surveys, implementation guidelines and training procedures. Initial trainings could first focus on developing Depsonos capacities and second on supporting inter-department and agency trainings at provincial levels. Close supervision of pilot survey efforts, followed by an outcome evaluation, would be critical to the process of establishing prevalence studies as a standard component of a national child protection surveillance system.

Depsonos’ current practice of staff rotation will impede efforts to establish and maintain expertise and competence in the area of data collection. Depsonos will therefore need to rethink its policy to enable specialized staff to continue to engage in data collection activities for longer periods of time—or develop procedures to ensure outside expertise is routinely available for the foreseeable future.

5.4 Community Level Surveillance

Much of the child protection data that exist or potentially could exist never enter the formal information system. Lack of awareness at the community level results in a significant number of child protection concerns remaining undetected, especially those associated with hazardous child labor, sexual exploitation, and domestic violence and abuse. Family and community members also may detect a protection concern, but never formally report it because they do not realize their legal options or the availability of support services.

At the same time, community governance throughout Central Java and NTB is highly structured, from village heads and sub-heads to community heads and neighborhood heads. Community forums also exist to promote mediation, diversion and restitution processes for the justice system at the local level. These community officials, volunteers and mechanisms are well situated to monitor and report on child protection concerns. However, these potentially potent root-level guardians are currently not sufficiently equipped or activated to contribute to the development of an effective system in Indonesia.

Moving forward will require addressing obstacles that limit child protection incident detection as well as activating potential root-level detection agents. A pilot project could launched to address these two concerns simultaneously, while also introducing more effective ways of recording and transferring child protection data from village to district-province levels. Such a project would focus on a limited number (no more than five) of child protection concerns. Community based organizations would promote a community awareness-raising component to establish a common understanding amongst community members on what these child protection concerns and to report on their occurrence. Community organizations/Dinas sosial would also provide specific training for village sub-heads, neighborhood heads and selected others to ensure they understood their monitoring and reporting roles. A simple cell-phone-SMS system would be introduced to ensure different kinds of data are transferred to relevant district-province level service providers in an efficient and timely manner.

Such a system would be able to identify (and promote an immediate response to urgent child
protection incidents as needed; record child protection incidents (case management information) on a regular basis; and, through these routine data collection activities, permit informed estimations of prevalence of case rates for the child protection concerns selected for the pilot project. Improved community surveillance and efficient data dictionary, transfer and management procedures would strengthen three of the four required information system components.

5.5 SMS Based Data Management

Globally, there is growing interest in utilizing mobile phones to support information collection and transfer initiatives, including in areas such as health, finance and education. Many of these initiatives initially focused on using mobile phones to share valuable information with remote communities, but more recent initiatives are examining the role of mobile phones as reporting tools for the collection of valuable data. One such example is RapidSMS, a system developed by UNICEF and contributors from the open source community. RapidSMS is a framework organizations can use to build an SMS-based reporting system for specific needs. The system allows users to collect qualitative and quantitative data through a customizable SMS and to create a web-based interface for editing data, displaying graphs and exporting reports.

Based on what the research team learned from participants during this mapping initiative, it seems clear that an SMS-based reporting system could help support an effective child protection surveillance system through improvements in three particular areas. The first involves training for community leaders on how to report incidences either on a periodic schedule or on a case-by-case basis. This data could be used to identify the needs of specific communities and provide valuable information about child protection issues to government ministries and NGOs via automated online reports. The second is training for community leaders on how to report child protection cases that require immediate attention. This data could be used, for example, to alert proper authorities about a child in need of protective custody. The third involves implementing a system to train community leaders to report cases that require long term monitoring. This data could be used to support prevention and early detection efforts by sending out periodic alerts that remind community leaders and other child protection actors to monitor at-risk households. Improved community detection and reporting would also lead to the improvement of prevalence of case estimations.

User Scenarios

The following set of user scenarios demonstrate how an SMS-based system might be used to support the reporting of child protection cases. Proper transference, management and analysis of these child protection cases at the district provincial level would, in turn, yield valid estimations of prevalence.

These scenarios are built on the assumption that participants have been trained to use the system and to correctly identify incidences of abuse or neglect. These scenarios have not yet been tested and a pilot program as described above is recommended to determine best-case use and implementation.
• **System Set-Up**

A government official at the provincial level receives news from the national office that an SMS-based system is being established to assist with the reporting of child protection cases. In this particular province, only a few district level offices have an internet connection, so the official decides to set-up the web-based interface at the provincial level.

Once the district and sub-district level offices have been notified about the system, the sub-district level offices send representatives to train and register sub-village heads. After learning about the system and their duties as reporters, sub-village heads register by sending an SMS to the designated reporting number indicating their name and village name, as in the example below. The system confirms this information by sending an SMS back to the sub-village heads, giving them the opportunity to correct the entry if there are any mistakes.

Once the sub-village heads have registered, officials from the sub-districts register their information, including the village they represent, by calling or texting the information to the provincial level where it can be entered manually through the web interface. Rather than being registered as reporters, sub-district officials are registered as contacts that may be designated to receive alerts and reminders reported by the sub-village heads.

---

### Format

- **r rname v vname**

### Example

- **r iwan koswara v duduk atas**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>r = reporter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>r name = reporter’s name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v = village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v name = village name</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

• **Incidence Reporting**

A sub-village head discovers that a child from his village has been working long days on local farm with very little rest or pay. The sub-village head decides to speak to the child and the parents to resolve the issue. Since there have been no previous incidents with this particular child or family, the sub-village head decides to inform the parents about the national child labor laws and tells them that they must stop asking their child to work and that there will be penalties if the child is discovered to be working again. Although the incident is successfully resolved by the sub-village head he sends an SMS to the designated reporting number indicating the type of incident, the age and sex of the child and the type of perpetrator, as in the example below.
• **Alert Reporting**

A sub-village head receives a report from a witness that a family member has physically abused a child. The sub-village head follows standard practice and visits the household where the incident took place. After confirming that the child has been physically abused the community leader decides to report the abuse as a severe case requiring immediate attention. The sub-village head then sends an SMS to the designated reporting number indicating an alert, the kind of incident, the age and sex of the victim and the type of perpetrator, as in the example below. Upon receiving the SMS, the system logs the information as a case and immediately alerts the sub-district level official representing the village.

**Format**

```
i itype cage csex ptype
```

**Example**

```
i 4 12 m 1
```

- **i** = incident
- **itype** = incident type (1=physical abuse, 2=sexual abuse, 3=trafficking, child labor=4)
- **cage** = child’s age
- **csex** = child’s sex
- **ptype** = perpetrator type (1=family, 2=neighbor, 3=stranger)

**Format**

```
a itype cage csex ptype
```

**Example**

```
a 1 16 m 1
```

- **a** = alert / severe case
- **itype** = incident type (1=physical abuse, 2=sexual abuse, 3=trafficking)
- **cage** = child’s age
- **csex** = child’s sex
- **ptype** = perpetrator type (1=family, 2=neighbor, 3=stranger)
• Prevention and Early Detection

A sub-village head finds out that a single mother has decided to travel to Malaysia to work for one year. The mother has arranged to leave her daughter with her parents, the daughter’s grandparents. Although the daughter is currently enrolled in school, there is a risk that she may be pulled out of school to help support her grandparents. The sub-village head sends an SMS to the designated reporting number with the type of case and the child’s name, age and sex, as in the example below. Upon receiving the SMS, the system logs the information as a case and creates a reminder that is sent out once a week to the sub-district level official representing the village to request follow up.

**Format**

\[ p \ rtype \ cName \ cage \ csex \]

**Example**

\[ p \ 2 \ saskia \ susanto \ 12 \ f \]

- \( p = \) prevention / early detection reminder
- \( rtype = \) risk type (1=school dropout, 2=absent parents)
- \( cName = \) child’s name
- \( cage = \) child’s age
- \( csex = \) child’s sex

**DATA SNAPSHOT**

Data collected by an SMS based reporting system would allow government officials with access to the web based interface to review data and create reports. The data could also be filtered to create snapshots of a combination of data sets such as report type by village or incident type by child’s age.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REPORT TYPE</th>
<th>INCIDENT TYPE</th>
<th>CHILD’S AGE</th>
<th>CHILD’S SEX</th>
<th>REPORTER</th>
<th>VILLAGE</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>alert</td>
<td>physical abuse</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>iwan koswara</td>
<td>duduk atas</td>
<td>6/5/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>incident</td>
<td>physical abuse</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>erwin gusti</td>
<td>kadilanggo</td>
<td>8/7/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>incident</td>
<td>child labor</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>iwan koswara</td>
<td>duduk atas</td>
<td>11/7/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prevention</td>
<td>school dropout</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>iwan koswara</td>
<td>duduk atas</td>
<td>28/7/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alert</td>
<td>sexual abuse</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>hari ngurah</td>
<td>pacing</td>
<td>14/8/09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.6 UNIVERSITY ENGAGEMENT

There is evidence to suggest that university engagement can be critical to promoting long-term human capacity and systems development. Women’s Studies Centers at a number of Indonesian universities, for example, have trained a new generation of practitioners and provided substantial technical support to government ministries in the areas of policy development and gender mainstreaming. In contrast, while a number of faculty members at Indonesian universities engage in child protection concerns on an individual basis, Child Studies Programs, Protection Centers or equivalent university programs are non-existent.

Various options for engaging universities in the development of a more active child protection surveillance system were examined. Subsequent discussions of these options with UNICEF and Bappenas resulted in the identification of three inter-related priorities:

- Training
- Technical support
- Operational research

Specialized centers within universities could be established to serve as critical hubs of learning for government and civil society practitioners. These centers could review existing national practitioner training programs and develop a series of competence-based courses to contribute to government and civil society capacity development. Skills-based short courses, condensed workshops and internet-based curriculum options could be pursued. Building upon the reviews of national training programs, these centers could write and disseminate training materials as a part of the curriculum options offered. Centers could further develop graduate training programs in social protection and child well-being, with a strong emphasis on skills required to enhance child protection surveillance, including survey and prevalence research skills, and program design and evaluation methodologies.

Technical support could be provided to government and NGO actors to strengthen protective environment systems, including through data collection and analysis, and through monitoring and reporting on child protection trends. Technical support could assist government and civil society actors in the development of:

- Policy options and programmatic strategies to strengthen child protection surveillance
- A key set of child protection indicators to be monitored through the child protection surveillance system
- Data management and analysis within and between key child protection actors

Specialized centers could promote a sequential research agenda to systematically address existing deficits. Inter-disciplinary approaches could be pursued, including strategies to effectively disseminate research findings, thereby making child protection issues more salient to relevant actors, and shaping policies, budgets, and planning. Finally, there is little evaluation data on child protection services in Indonesia. These specialized centers could undertake independent evaluation projects on a regular basis.
VI. RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1 RECOMMENDATION ONE: National legislation is required to designate a lead agency to oversee a comprehensive child protection information system.

The legal framework for child protection issues in Indonesia remains incomplete. The Law on Child Protection and subsequent national legislation has significantly improved legal protections for children, but a major gap remains: the absence of a legal mandate for the creation of a child protection information system. Though the Bureau of Statistics is generally charged with overseeing the collection of statistics in Indonesia there is no specific legal mandate for the development and oversight of a comprehensive information system in Indonesia. As a result the various government ministries that oversee child protection issues have created a number of incompatible data systems on an ad hoc basis. National legislation should be drafted to identify and empower a key actor to implement and coordinate a comprehensive surveillance system.

6.2 RECOMMENDATION TWO: Adopt “surveillance” as the key operative goal of the nation’s child protection information system.

Moving from “information system” to “surveillance system” goals enables clearer data collection activities and activities. The terminology around ‘information systems” has not sufficiently defined data collection requirements for the field of child protection. Lack of clarity of data goals is a major reason why the system is dysfunctional.

6.3 RECOMMENDATION THREE: Develop a “National Index Scorecard” for child protection.

A vision for child protection programming and the purpose of data could be guided by the development of a National Index Scorecard. This template based on quantitative data could show, at a glance, a country profile for Indonesia child protection risks and concerns as well as capacity for response. A Scorecard of this nature would act as a blueprint and help agencies understand the bigger picture of child protection in Indonesia, and plan for future action in a more coordinated manner.

6.4 RECOMMENDATION FOUR: Bappenas should link data collection improvements and evaluation results to “performance budgeting”

A major constraint with the current child protection information system is it does not provide information required to support performance based programming. Key types of information—scale, coverage and program effectiveness—are lacking. Bappenas should therefore convene a series of working level meetings to ensure required improvements in data collection are linked to the government’s promotion of “performance budgeting.”

As part of these improvements, Bappenas should also ensure effectiveness becomes a key component of the performance budgeting process. This will require that Bappenas take the lead on ensuring evaluations of key government programs are implemented on a regular basis. Bappenas should partner with UNICEF, the World Bank, academic institutions, and
other relevant partners to ensure evaluations are rigorous and independent. Evaluation results, in turn, should inform budgetary allocations.

6.5 **RECOMMENDATION FIVE: Enhance Depsos capacity to develop the prevalence component of a surveillance oriented system.**

Depsos has more operational capacity for data collection than other government child protection actors. Strategic partnerships will be required, however, to enhance this capacity to levels required to promote high quality prevalence surveys and program evaluation studies. Specifically:

- UNICEF should ensure its child protection focus, case definitions and indicators are integrated into Depsos’ broader data collection needs and efforts
- Indicators and definitions should then be standardized across all agencies.
- Recommendations for the government: Depsos should harmonize its indicators and definitions with those at the international level. UNICEF should support this process and support Depsos to extract and analyze prevalence of risk factors from existing data sets on poverty, school drop outs, neglect and orphans
- Partnerships--Depsos, international organizations and BPS--should be formed to ensure a nation wide child protection prevalence survey is implemented every 3 years
- Partnerships--Depsos, BPS and qualified university faculty—should be formed to ensure practitioners have access to training to improve their data collection knowledge and skills, and build the capacity for government and civil society collaboration for data collection, analysis and dissemination

6.6 **RECOMMENDATION SIX: Enhance community level surveillance.**

The Government of Indonesia (Bappenas/bappeda, Depsos/dinsas, KPP/Biro PP, and Police), civil society actors (NGOs and CBOs) and international organizations (UNICEF and Save the Children) should develop a plan to pilot community surveillance enhancement initiatives in a rural and an urban province. The initiative’s purpose would be to activate a root level child surveillance system to identify record and report on a select set of child protection concerns. Key actors should include village and sub-village heads, neighborhood heads, and community forum leaders. By strengthening community level surveillance, the initiative would simultaneously lay the foundation for reliable prevalence estimates to be issued from routine community level data collection activities. Training, capacity building, monitoring and evaluation inputs will be critical.

6.7 **RECOMMENDATION SEVEN: Develop a SMS-based reporting system as a key component of community surveillance.**
A key component of the community surveillance enhancement project recommended immediately above should be a simple SMS-based reporting system. The user scenarios provided in this report should serve as a basis for development of a system capable of collecting child protection data through a customizable SMS program, including a web-based interface for editing data, displaying graphs and exporting reports. This reporting system would address urgent incident, risk prevention and incidence accumulations data system needs. Proper district-provincial analysis of incidence accumulations would also enable valid and reliable prevalence of risk and case estimations. Training for community leaders on the different responses required for reporting urgent cases, cumulative figures, and risk prevention will be required.

6.8 RECOMMENDATION EIGHT: Engage Universities for the Long Term

Universities are not equipping government or civil society practitioners with the kinds of population based methodologies and skills required to operationalize a national child protection surveillance system. Bappenas, Depsos, the Minister of High Education and UNICEF should therefore support and promote the development of a program to engage universities and academically based child protection centers for the long term. Programs to be considered for core support should:

- Promote faculty capacity in population based research methodologies and approaches required to meet child protection data collection needs
- Offer a skills based graduate training program for child protection practitioners that includes opportunities in hands-on field experience
- Undertake operational research and practitioner training with key government ministries that contributes to a protective environment, including child protection surveillance.
## ANNEX 1. Child Protection Actors Interviewed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National</th>
<th>Central Java</th>
<th>NTB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACILS</td>
<td>Komnas PA</td>
<td>BPS Community Leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPS</td>
<td>PERADI</td>
<td>Dukcapil Polda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAPAS Jakarta Barat</td>
<td>Bappenas (including planning and budgeting)</td>
<td>PTPAS (consortium of integrated services) Badan Pemberdayaan Perempuan dan Keluarga Berencana Provinsi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dirjen Pemasyarakatan</td>
<td>Lapas Anak Pria Tangerang</td>
<td>Dinas Sosial Pusat Pelayanan Terpadu Rumah Sakit Bhayangkara Polda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kementrian Pemberdayaan Perempuan</td>
<td>Pengadilan Negeri Jakarta Barat</td>
<td>Bappeda Lembaga Perlindungan Anak Provinsi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Komnas HAM</td>
<td>Save The Children</td>
<td>Legal Aid SANTAI (local NGO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departemen Sosial (including Pusdatin)</td>
<td>ILO Community Leaders</td>
<td>DINAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Attorney General</td>
<td>IOM Hospital</td>
<td>BPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mabes Polri</td>
<td>PLAN Crisis Center</td>
<td>University of Mataram; Human Rights Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECPAT</td>
<td>Diknas Pontiasih (children’s center)</td>
<td>PPT; Mataram (West)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBH</td>
<td>Disnaker Biro Pemerintahan</td>
<td>KPP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPAI</td>
<td>LPA</td>
<td>BAPAS Mataram</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNEX 2. Semi-Structured Interview Tool

Survey Interview Guide, Version 1
Key Agency Staff

Assessing Child Protection Information Systems in Indonesia
A Joint Initiative of Columbia University, UNICEF and University of Indonesia
Survey Instrument 1, Version 1: Key Agency Staff

This semi-structured survey instrument is intended for use in conducting interviews with key agency staff from Indonesia involved in Child Protection.

Name of Organization:

Date of Interview:

Interviewer:

Location of Interview:

Contact person: (Name & Title):

Email Address:

Website:

Areas of Work:

Organization's Mission:

List any documents to take away from meeting, or to request in follow up email:

List any people or organizations mentioned that require follow up for information or interviews:
Thank you once again for speaking with us today. This interview is part of a joint initiative between UNICEF, the University of Indonesia and Columbia University. Our objective is to map the flow of information in Indonesia's child protection system to understand which aspects of the system are effective and what improvements could be made. This study is not linked to any kinds of funding or special benefits for the participants involved.

This evaluation will be used to make recommendations to the Government of Indonesia and other relevant parties on how to strengthen the protective environment for children. This interview will last approximately 45 minutes to one hour. We will be taking notes during this interview as a part of our data collection process. If you would like to provide information confidentially, you can tell us at any time during the interview. Any statements provided confidentially will be used for informational purposes only, and will not be attributed to an individual or organization.

Do you have any questions or concerns? May we begin?

SECTION 1. Introduction

I will begin with a set of questions that covers some basic introductory details about your organization.

Where does [ministry/organization] work? (PROMPT: Nationally? What Province? Districts? Sub-districts?) Can a list of coverage areas made available to us?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>DK</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>Notes:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Children Without Family Care (includes: children living alone, in institutions, those who need to be removed from abusive families)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Exploitation and Abuse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Child Trafficking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section B: High-Level Overview

Now I would like to ask you a question to better understand how the information flow and surveillance system for [thematic area X] ideally works. We will have more detailed questions in the interview, but please spend a few minutes to describe the following situation:
Can you think of an actual case or situation when a child was in trouble, where the information flow worked well to help that child (either between agencies, or within your agency). Can you tell me the story starting from the time the child was identified, until the time the case was closed?
Section 2: Interagency Coordination

In this section, I am going to ask you some questions about how [ministry/agency] handles data coordination. When I say data coordination, I mean data collection, analysis, dissemination and use.

4. What if any, standardized policies do you follow to collect data [CP issue X]?

5. Which ministries or organizations do you most closely work with related to gathering and sharing child protection data?

6. Who do you think SHOULD lead in managing the data in a national child protection system? I am not talking about ministry or agencies that may be leading right now; I would like to know, in an IDEAL system, who would be managing this data? And Why? [PROMPT: level of involvement]

What are the current mandates, capacities and/or weaknesses that might help or hinder their taking the lead in coordination efforts?
How do you think decentralization has impacted the flow of data between provincial to national levels?
Section 3: Data Gathering and Monitoring

In this section, I am going to ask you some questions about how your ministry/agency gathers and monitors data. This includes the content of the data you collect, methods of collection as well as the quality and flexibility of data and how it is managed.

**DATA CONTENT, TOOLS, PROCESS**

8. What child protection data do you collect?

9. What Child Protection Indicators do you use? For example, "number of children [CP Thematic Issue X]"

10. What data on prevention or early identification do you collect?
    [PROBE: What risk factors do you monitor?]

11. How does your ministry/agency collect this information? I am interested in what methods your ministry/agency uses.
When we made this appointment with you we asked you to make some of your standardized forms and tools available to us, I would like to ask you a few questions about those forms/tools now.

--Firstly, What are the titles or types of forms/tools?

--Secondly, Who fills them out?

Finally, Can you take me through each form and tell me how reliable the data is on these forms?

[Interviewer: Note the Thematic category for each form]

Interviewer:

Please Circle Y/N:  Provided: Y / N  Readily Accessible: Y / N  Organized: Y / N

How does information travel? For example, paper, electronic, e-mail, etc?

Does your agency conduct or participate in any national-scale surveys? Please describe.

Does your agency have reliable numbers or statistics to understand how many children are [CP thematic issue X] in Indonesia?

For example, out of 100 children in your area, how many are at risk of [CP thematic issue X]?

What country-level or district-level data would help you in terms of programming, policy-making or fundraising?
Section 3 (continued): Data Gathering and Monitoring

DATA QUALITY

16 What do you do to make sure your data is of high quality? How often do you do this?

Do you have a regularly scheduled audit of data collected by your agency or your implementing partners?
A How often does this happen?

17 Are data quality challenges identified and are mechanisms in place for addressing them?

18 Are there clearly defined and followed procedures to reconcile discrepancies?
[PROMPT: could you please take us through the process of reconciliation?]

19 Does your agency have standardized case definitions for [CP Issue X]? Are these different from national standards? Could you provide us with a written record of the case definitions you use?
20 What do you think could be done to improve the quality of the data your agency collects?
What information/data is still needed within your sector?
Section 3 (continued): Data Gathering and Monitoring

DATA MANAGEMENT

Has there been a time where you had to incorporate new tools or data fields into your current system? If so, when did this happen, and can you describe an example?

A  How long would it take to implement those changes...

   within days,                                  
   within weeks,                                 
   within a month, or
   longer and 1 month?                            

B  What made this process easy or difficult?

What do you do to maintain the confidentiality of the data?

How often is the data you collect analyzed?

What kind of analyses are performed on the data? For example trend analysis, frequency reports or other types of analysis...
Are there types of analysis that your agency would LIKE to perform, but may not have the inputs, time, capacity, knowledge, etc?

---

Are your data findings shared with the public and/or the communities you serve? How, and how often does this happen?

---

In summary, could you please tell us how the data you collected is used to identify children at risk of [CP Theme X]?

---

On a similar note, can you explain how the data collected is used to help children in need of assistance?
Section 4: Attitudes

In this section I am going to ask you some questions about your opinions on the data collection process and other details.

How important do you think the child protection community considers data collection? Do you think they find it to be...

27

| Very Important | Important | Somewhat | Important, or Not Important at All? | DK |

In general, how important do you think people in the community consider data collection? Do you think they consider it to be...

28

| Very Important | Important | Somewhat | Important, or Not Important at All? | DK |

Section F: Organizational Capacity

In this final section, I am going to ask you some questions about your ministry/agency organizational capacity.

29 Do you think you have enough staff to meet the needs of the communities in which you are working? Why or Why not?

30 Do staff have the resources required to complete their tasks in a timely and efficient manner? Why or Why not?
31 Do you have standards or limits set for number of cases per worker?

A How often do you think the field staff’s caseloads exceed ministry/agency’s standards or
Always  
Often  
Sometimes  
Rarely, or  
Never  
DK

32 How quickly are you able to respond to a new child protection issue X?
Within hours  
Within a day  
Within a week, or  
Within a Month  
DK

Conclusion:

Thank you so much for taking the time to speak with us today. Before we end, I would like to ask you whether you have any other general comments about how child protection data systems could be improved or anything else [leave room for additional notes/comments]. Your comments have been very helpful and will ultimately inform our recommendations to the Government of Indonesia and other relevant parties on how to strengthen the protective environment for children. We greatly appreciate your time.
ANNEX 3. Focus Group Discussion Guide

This method seeks:

- To provide a context for community members to share key understandings of and attitudes towards formal and informal child protection reporting mechanisms.
- To measure community members’ behavioral intent to report a child protection concern to formal and informal mechanisms.
- To provide a group estimate of the incidence of reporting trends for child protection concerns.

1. Within each village select a house at random. Approach household resident and list women (or men) present in the house aged between 18 and 65*. Select one woman (or man) at random from this list. Explain goal of the discussion is to identify child protection concerns in the community and understand reporting patterns. Invite that person to schedule a group discussion with other community members selected by that individual.

2. A facilitator and a note-taker should be present for all group discussions. The facilitator explains that the aim of the group is (1) to understand the biggest risks facing children in the community and (2) whom the community can tell to get help for these children. It is explained that people should be able to speak freely. Who says what will not be recorded. It is the views of the group that is important. Encourage participants to name major risks. Ask clarifying/ supplementary questions (of all in the group) to clarify the nature of each suggested ‘problem’. Note-taker lists ‘problems’ in the sequence they are suggested (numbering each clearly in turn). Continue until ten separate problems have been identified, or until there are no additional suggestions by women for 30 seconds. Facilitator should collapse categories as appropriate (e.g. if a group mentions ‘children are used as house servants’ and ‘children are made to farm in the field’, the facilitator should encourage the group to collapse this into the category of ‘child labor’).

3. When the above condition has been met and the key thematic areas of interest for UNICEF have NOT been raised by group, ask ‘some communities have reported that [child protection concern X] is a major problem for children. Is that the case here?’ If it is accepted as a problem by anyone add it to the list. Continue until all of the key thematic areas not already included have been put to the group.

4. Once the full list has been compiled, the facilitator asks the group ‘where can a child having one of these problems go? Who could a concerned adult inform?’ A list of formal and informal reporting mechanisms is compiled. The facilitator should continue to probe (‘Is there anyone else a person could tell?’ ‘Is there any where else the child could go for help?’) until a list of reporting mechanisms has been exhausted.

5. The facilitator brings out 3 bowls and explains that the first bowl represents ‘formal reporting mechanisms’ (lists all of the formal reporting mechanisms the group has generated). The facilitator explains that the second bowl represents ‘informal reporting mechanisms’ (lists all of the informal reporting mechanisms the group has generated). The facilitator explains that the third bowl represents ‘keeping it secret.’
6. The facilitator next brings out 10 dolls (or other objects to represent 10 children). The facilitator explains that the dolls represent 10 children in their community with [child protection concern X](select one of the key thematic areas for the UNICEF project that the group has identified as a key concern). Ask the group to agree on how many of the ten children would be formally reported [the group agrees on how many dolls to put in the ‘formal report’ pot]. Leaving those dolls in the pot, ask the group how many of the remaining dolls’ cases would be kept secret. Have the group discuss and agree on how many of the remaining dolls belong in the ‘keeping it secret’ pot. If there are dolls remaining, the facilitator places them in the ‘informal reporting’ pot, and checks with the group that they belong in this pot.

7. When the sorting is complete, the facilitator checks with the group by asking: ‘So you are saying that X of our ten children would have their problem reported to [list formal reporting mechanisms named], Y of our ten children would have their problem reported to [list informal reporting mechanisms named], and Z of our ten children would not have their problem reported to anyone at all. The facilitator prompts the group to make adjustments to the pots if their discussion suggests they wish to change their sorting. The note-taker then records the final sorting of problems.

8. Repeat this process until all 6 thematic areas of interest have been asked about [assuming all 6 were deemed to be relevant in that community].

9. The facilitator then explains to the group that they would like to spend the rest of time finding out about how the community feels about the various formal reporting mechanisms that have been named. The facilitator begins with the first formal reporting structure named, asking how the community feels about [reporting structure X]. Probes might include questions like:

“What would make a person want to report the situation of a child to [reporting structure X].”

“What would make a person NOT want to report the situation of a child to [reporting structure X].”

“What have you heard about [reporting structure X]?”

“Think of someone you know how has brought a child or reported a case to [reporting structure X]. What happened to that child? What was the experience like for the person who reported the case?”

“What would make community members more likely to report things like [list child protection concerns] to [reporting structure X]”

10. Repeat the process for each of the formal reporting mechanisms named.

11. The facilitator thanks the group for their participation, and reminds people that the names of who said what have not been recorded: it was the views of the group that were of
interest to the team. The note-taker records any parting comments from participants regarding the exercise.
ANNEX 4: English Translation of Depsos’ 22 Social Dysfunctions

Description:

Those who have problems with Social Welfare are:

1. ABT- Anak Balita Terlantar (Abandoned children under five)
2. AT- Anak terlantar (Abandoned Children).
3. AN: Aanak Nakal (Children with behavior disorders)
4. AJ- Anak Jalanan (Street Children)
5. WRSE- Wanita Rawan Sosial Ekonomi (Women who are economically at risk)
6. KTK- Korban Tindak Kekerasan (Victims of violence)
7. LUT- Lanjut Usia Terlantar (Abandoned Senior Citizens)
8. PACA- Penyandang Cacat (Disabled people)
9. TS- Tuna Sosial (Commercial Sex Workers/Prostitutes)
10. PNG- Pengemis (Beggars)
11. GLD- Gelandangan (Homeless People)
12. BWBP- Bekas Warga Binaan Pemasyarakatan (Ex criminals, including political crimes)
13. NAPZA- Korban Penyalahgunaan (Drug-addicted people)
14. KFM- Korban Bencana Alam (Victims of Natural Disasters)
15. RTLH- Keluarga yang Tinggal Di Rumah tak layak Huni (Those who live in sub standard housing)
16. KBSP- Keluarga Bermasalah Sosial Psikologis (Families who have psychological and social problems)
17. KAT- Komunitas Adat Terpencil (Communities of Remote Cultures)
18. KBA- Korban Bencana Alam (Victims of Natural Disasters)
19. KBS- Korban Bencana Sosial (Victims of Social Disasters)
20. PMT- Pekerja Migran Terlantar (Abandoned Migrant Workers)
21. ODHA- Orang dengan HIV/AIDS (People with HIV/AIDS)
22. KR- Keluarga Rentan (Risky Families)

Sources and Potential Sources of Social Welfare:

1. PSM- Pekerja Sosial Masyarakat (Community Social Workers)
2. ORSOS- Organisasi Sosial (Social Organizations)
3. KT- Karang Taruna (Youth Unity)
4. WKSBM- Wahana Kesejahteraan Sosial Berbasis Masyarakat (Community Based Social Welfare Unity)
5. Dunia Usaha (Business Sectors)

Data Sources:
BPS: Institution for Statistical Centre
Dinas/Provincial Social Affair Department up to October 2008
Dinas/ Regency Level Department of Social Affairs up to October 2008

24 Depsos, Data PMKS Brochure, 2008
25 This is an informal and unofficial translation only
ANNEX 5. Case Definitions for Child Protection Terms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thematic Area</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Definition(s)</th>
<th>Source(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Children Without Family Care</td>
<td>Orphan</td>
<td>Child has one parent</td>
<td>Interview with Save the Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Double Orphan</td>
<td>Child has no parent</td>
<td>Interview with Save the Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abandoned Child</td>
<td>A child whose reasonable needs, whether physical, mental, spiritual or social, are not fulfilled</td>
<td>Law 23/2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adopted Child</td>
<td>A child over whom rights have been assigned by his parents, lawful guardians, or such other persons as my have responsibility in respect of his upkeep, education, and upbringing to adoptive parents pursuant to a decision or ruling of the court</td>
<td>Law 23/2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Foster Child</td>
<td>A child who has been placed in foster care with an individual or institution for the purpose of guidance, upkeep, education, and healthcare due to the fact that one or both of his parents are unable to guarantee his proper development and growth</td>
<td>Law 23/2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploitation and Abuse</td>
<td>Exploitation</td>
<td>ECPAT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All forms of slavery or practices similar to slavery, debt bondage and serfdom and forced or compulsory labor, including forced or compulsory recruitment of children for use in armed conflict; the use, procuring or offering of a child for prostitution, for the production of pornography or for pornographic performances; the use, procuring or offering of a child for illicit activities, in particular for the production and trafficking of drugs as defined in the relevant international treaties; work which, by its nature or the circumstances in which it is carried out, is likely to harm the health, safety or morals of children; work done by children below the minimum age for admission to employment; threat or use of force or other forms of coercion, abduction, fraud or deception, or the abuse of power or a position of vulnerability at any point of the recruitment and movement do not need to be present in case of children (other than with adults), but are nevertheless strong indications of child trafficking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children (CSEC)</td>
<td>The use of girls and boys in sexual activities remunerated in cash or in kind (commonly known as child prostitution) in the streets or indoors, in such places as brothels, discotheques, massage parlors, bars, hotels, restaurants, among others; child sex tourism; the production, promotion and distribution of pornography involving children; and the use of children in sex shows (public or private).</td>
<td>ECPAT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child pornography</td>
<td>Showing anything or with anyhow which involve children into real or explicit sexual activity or exhibit parts of body of the children</td>
<td>ECPAT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Labor</td>
<td>Child Labor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children sex tourism</td>
<td>Commercial sexual exploitation done by person who are travel from different area or country for the purpose of having sex with children</td>
<td>ECPAT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early marriage</td>
<td>Marriage with child or teenager under 18 years old</td>
<td>ECPAT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Labor</td>
<td>Child Labor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child labor</td>
<td>Children who are responsible for supporting their family, including bonded labor</td>
<td>ECPAT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Work</td>
<td>Light work should neither be harmful to a child’s health and development, nor prejudice attendance at school and participation in vocational training or “the capacity to benefit from the instruction received”. The works performed in light work should not be a hazardous work and should not exceed 14 hours per week.12-14 y.o for countries where economy and education is not well developed; 13-24 y.o. for countries where economy and education are developed</td>
<td>ILO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazardous Work</td>
<td>activity or occupation which, by its nature or type, has or leads to adverse effects on the child’s safety, physical or mental health, or moral development. Hazards could also derive from excessive workload, physical conditions of work, and/or work intensity in terms of the duration or hours of work even where the activity or occupation itself is known to be non-hazardous or “safe”.</td>
<td>ILO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unconditional Worst Forms (of Child Labor)</strong></td>
<td>(a) all forms of slavery or practices similar to slavery, such as the sale and trafficking of children, debt bondage and serfdom and forced or compulsory labor, including forced or compulsory recruitment, of children for use in armed conflict; (b) the use, procuring or offering a child for prostitution, for the production of pornography or for pornographic performances; (c) the use, procuring or offering of a child for illicit activities, in particular for the production and trafficking of drugs as defined in the relevant international treaties.</td>
<td>ILO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Street Child</strong></td>
<td>In terms of labor, &quot;street children&quot; is a term often used to describe both market children (who work on the streets and on markets selling or begging, and who live with their families) and homeless street children (who work, live and sleep on the streets, often lacking any contact with their families). At highest risk is the latter group. A widely accepted set of definitions defines street children into two main categories: 1. Children on the street are those engaged in some kind of economic activity ranging from begging to vending. Most go home at the end of the day and contribute their earnings to their family. They may be attending school and retain a sense of belonging to a family. Because of the economic fragility of the family, these children may eventually opt for a permanent life on the streets. 2. Children of the street actually live on the street (or outside of a normal family environment). Family ties may exist but are tenuous and are maintained only casually or occasionally.</td>
<td>ILO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Street children</strong></td>
<td>Children 5-18 years of age who spend most of their time on the street to earn money or just hang around</td>
<td>Depsos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Domestic Violence and Neglect</strong></td>
<td>Children 0-4 years of age whose parent are unable to meet their needs: had breast-feed or formula at 0-2 years old, had decent immunization/vaccination at his/her age, had 4 types of healthy food last week. Contain: carbohydrate, protein, vitamin, mineral, had medical service when needed</td>
<td>Depsos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neglected in early childhood</strong></td>
<td>Children 0-4 years of age whose parent are unable to meet their needs: had breast-feed or formula at 0-2 years old, had decent immunization/vaccination at his/her age, had 4 types of healthy food last week. Contain: carbohydrate, protein, vitamin, mineral, had medical service when needed</td>
<td>Depsos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neglected children</td>
<td>Children 5-18 years of age whose parent are unable to meet their needs: had decent immunization/vaccination at his/her age, had 4 types of healthy food last week. Contain: carbohydrate, protein, vitamin, minerals; had 9 years formal education at as his/her age; had medical service when needed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neglected child</td>
<td>A child whose reasonable needs, whether physical, mental, spiritual or social, are not fulfilled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children in Conflict with the Law</td>
<td>Delinquent juvenile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Children 5-18 years of age who has delinquent behaviors that harm themselves, their families and other people, and also disturb public order.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child (Juvenile) Detainees</td>
<td>Children who are detained during the course of the criminal justice process up until the handing down of a judicial determination by the District Court</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Child) Police Detainees</td>
<td>When detention is ordered by the Police, such children are known as Police detainees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Child) Prosecution Detainees</td>
<td>When ordered by the Prosecution Service as prosecution detainees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Child) Judicial Detainee</td>
<td>When ordered by the District Court as judicial detainees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile Prisoners</td>
<td>Children who have been convicted by the court and sentenced to a term of imprisonment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>Child Protection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;The protection and promotion of all child rights, rather than the protection of children from violence, abuse, neglect, and exploitation. The Law addresses the protection of children's right to freedom of religion, health, education, and social development, and also governs issues of guardianship, adoption, and special protection.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social welfare activist</td>
<td>Person who has been educated and trained professionally to conduct service activities and social problems intervention, and/or person who works in the field of social welfare both GO or NGO.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Social Worker</td>
<td>Person working at GO or NGO who get competences, profession, and awareness in social work by education, training, and/or practical experience to conduct service activities and social problems intervention</td>
<td>Law 11/2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social volunteer</td>
<td>Person and/or community member, with or without social work background, conduct social activities outside government organization voluntarily with or without financial profit.</td>
<td>Law 11/2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community social workers</td>
<td>Member of community who voluntarily serve in social welfare activities based on self-willingness and social responsibility</td>
<td>Depos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>The smallest unit in society and shall consist of a husband and wife, or husband, wife and child, or father and child, or mother and child, or a family consisting of blood relations in a straight line up to the third degree</td>
<td>Law 23/2002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>A natural father and/or mother, or stepfather and/or mother, or adoptive father and/or mother</td>
<td>Law 23/2002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guardian</td>
<td>A person or body that acts in loco parentis to a child</td>
<td>Law 23/2002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child</td>
<td>&quot;Once married, a person is no longer a child&quot;. &quot;Incorporated into laws such as juvenile court law and child welfare law&quot;</td>
<td>UNICEF document (not legal ref)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child</td>
<td>Defined as an individual under the age of 18 years, based on the 1989 United Convention on the Rights of the Child and the ILO Convention on the Worst Forms of Child Labor, 1999 (No. 182)</td>
<td>ILO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNEX 6: Model National Index Template

DEMographics

- Total population
- Total population < 15
- Total population < 5
- <5 mortality rate
- Literacy rate
- # Girls in school
- # Boys in school

PROTECTION CONCERNS

LEGAL AND POLICY FRAMEWORK

INTERNATIONAL AND REGIONAL
- UN Convention on the Rights of the Child: Yes
- Optional Protocol on the Involvement of Children in Armed Conflict: Yes
- ILO Convention No. 138: Minimum Age Convention: Yes
- ILO Convention No. 182: Worst Forms of Child Labour Convention: Yes

NATIONAL
- Minimum age for work: 14
- Minimum age for criminal responsibility: 10
- Minimum age for marriage: 16 (girls), 18 (boys)
- Corporal punishment of children prohibited in schools: No
- Corporal punishment of children prohibited in the penal system as disciplinary measure: No
- Existence of poverty reduction strategies/programmes addressing children’s situation: Partial
- Existence of emergency preparedness plan where child protection is integrated: x
- Mechanisms established to monitor progress on the implementation of the CRC: Partial

ACCESS TO SERVICES

- Number of social workers per 100,000 people: 10
- Existence of Children’s Ombudsperson: 10
- School fees: Yes
- Existence of parenting and other response programmes: Partial
- Existence of child friendly juvenile justice system: No
- Existence of relevant health care for children affected by HIV: Partial

SPECIFIC COUNTRY CONCERNS

OVERALL CHILD PROTECTION SYSTEM RATING

- Strength of National Child Protection System: Moderate

COUNTRY ABC CHILD PROTECTION INDEX
ANNEX 7. Gaps in Indonesia Data Collection for Key Indicators

Indonesia 2009
CHILD PROTECTION INDEX GAPS

DEMOGRAPHICS

PROTECTION CONCERNS

SPECIFIC COUNTRY CONCERNS

LEGAL AND POLICY FRAMEWORK

INTERNATIONAL AND REGIONAL

MATERIAL
Percentage of budget allocated to child protection
Existence of emergency preparedness plan where child protection is integrated

ACCESS TO SERVICES

Existence of Children’s Ombudsperson
Existence of parenting and other response programmes

OVERALL CHILD PROTECTION SYSTEM RATING

Strength of National Child Protection System: XXXX

INDONESIA
CHILD PROTECTION INDEX GA
Annex 8: Data Sources for Indonesia Draft National Index Report

### National Index Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Item</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>231,627,000</td>
<td>UNESCO, 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population under 18</td>
<td>75,805,000</td>
<td>UNICEF, 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population under 5</td>
<td>21,167,500</td>
<td>BPS, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 5 Mortality Rate</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>UNICEF, 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Expectancy</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>BPS, 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Literacy Rate</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>UNESCO, 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Primary Enrollment</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>ILO, 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Domestic Product</td>
<td>$408 billion</td>
<td>IMF, 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population with income under 2USD per day</td>
<td>52.4%</td>
<td>UNDP, 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children in the labor force</td>
<td>948,686</td>
<td>BPS, 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated child domestic workers</td>
<td>700,000</td>
<td>ILO, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated street children</td>
<td>109,454</td>
<td>Depsos, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile delinquents</td>
<td>198,578</td>
<td>Depsos, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Community Social Workers</td>
<td>177,213</td>
<td>Depsos, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children in institutionalized care</td>
<td>91,051-130,000</td>
<td>Depsos, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% children living in households without parent</td>
<td>various</td>
<td>BPS, N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neglected children</td>
<td>various</td>
<td>BPS, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School drop out rates</td>
<td>various</td>
<td>BPS, 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children in contact with the law</td>
<td>various</td>
<td>BPS, 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School service ratios</td>
<td>various</td>
<td>BPS, 2004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>