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Abstract. These studies were to respond whether the UT social-aid management had been executed under CO-CD principles (Ife J. 1995) and what CO-CD base community service management model can be built. The goals of these evaluational studies were UT social-aid managerial performance profile (2011-2013) and CO-CD management model development. The methods used were Survey and FGD. For data collection were involving the UT officers, the counterparts, and the documents. The analysis used combination between the Performance Analysis (Irawan P., 2003) and the CIPP (Staffelbeam, D. L., & Shinkfield, A. J., 1985). The findings showed that the quantitative targeting in program completion was credible in achievement (85%). However, the “qualitative targeting” of the management goals was indicating far from a good-stage (≤5.0, Interval-Force: 1-10 Scale). The “Gap” was due to the absent of socialization_needs-analysis_maintenance_release factors on the UT social-service grand-policy. The trial of CO-CD Base Management Model had been imposed to the community that turned out to be very effective to self-help, and the ensuing SOP had been successfully defined. Conclusion, ‘CO-CD Principles’ were not designed in UT community service programs management. However, if efficiency and effectivity likely to be achieved, the SOP of ‘CO-CD Base Management Model has to be adopted.

1. Introduction

The implementation of community engagement program is mandatory for all universities. Through the involvement their lecturers, it is expected to be run effectively. The objectives of UT’s community engagement program so called ‘Abdimas-Bansos’ are to develop the capacity of the marginal community and to revitalize the environmentally critical areas.

The management of Abdimas program, accountabellly has to be subjected to Permenkeu No. 13 Year 2003, and substantially based on the community empowerment the principles known as CO-CD (Community Organization - Community Development). The monitoring and evaluation activities of the UT Abdimas program have been limited to the general performance issues of administration and financial accountability. Similarly, the substantive aspects of intervention in community empowerment and improvement of critical areas are also still weak in design. The weakness of the conceptual basis of CO-CD on the community engagement program management have been still low in its effectivity and inefficiency pursuing its objectives of the Abdimas program.

The strength of the UT strategic plan policy on the Abdimas program is an appropriate momentum for the development of the CO-CD base management model for UT Abdimas program.
2. **Problem Statement**
What look a like is the profile of the UT Abdimas-Bansos 2011-2013 management performance? And what management model is more effective that needs to be built to fit the principles of CO-CD on UT community engagement program?

3. **Scope**
The scope of this research and development included review of UT Abdimas-Bansos program management performance through performance factors mapping and development of CO-CD base management model.

4. **Goal and Benefit**
The purpose of this study was to obtain a better level of effectiveness on the management of UT Abdimas-Bansos program. While the benefits would be a built CO-CD Base Management Model for effective UT Abdimas-Bansos program implementation.

5. **Theoretical Framework**
The high population growth, malnutrition, and high illiteracy rate still illustrate that the nation is still poor, which indicated by the low value of HDI in Indonesia (Nugroho, Y. 2007). The people of Indonesia to this day still do not enjoy the development results evenly (Hadiyanti, P. 2006 and EFA, 2006 in Samhadi, Kompa 18 Maret 2008). The economic development alone that address poverty will not add any value without being followed by social welfare improvement (Midgley, 1995: 23).

The argument according to Elliot (Isbandi Rukminto Adi, 2002: 23) is that social development is essentially proactive and preventive in order to empower the various potential laxities that exist in the community, as well as implementing a multisystem-wide intervention strategy. In the view of the NGOs, the success of development is when members of society with their social institutions can carry out their improvement from within the society itself (Tesoriere F, Samuel M and Annadurai P, 2006). Community development model is a community development activity that is considered able to increase community access to achieve social, economic, and cultural conditions (Rudito B., et al., 2003: 40). Thus, according to Ife (1995: 182), empowerment is to prepare the community with various resources, opportunities or opportunities, knowledge, and expertise to increase people's capacity in determining their future.

Empowerment is a collaborative process (Wibowo A. 2009), benefactors and the communities must work together as partners. Some important things in the design of the management of the empowerment program to be undertaken must consider some determinant factors inside the CO-CD to its success (Ife, 1995). Principles of implementation of community empowerment programs should be undertaken on the basis of CO-CD principles through implementation stages starting from the socialization stage, organizing activities, identifying needs, applying training and non-training, maintenance and release (Kusuma, E., 2006). The design of community empowerment interventions at least includes three important factors, which must always be targeting, empowering, and community (Rothman J, Erlich J & Tropman J, 2007).

Various government and non-government institutions including universities such as UT are expected to facilitate marginalized communities that allow the potential of vulnerable groups to grow. The UT Social Aid Program is a manifestation of UT's role in the success of the Government's program in alleviating marginalized communities so that they can afford to help themselves.

Conceptually, this study had been done through the use of a combination of concepts between Performance Analysis model (Irawan P, 1998, 2003), with the Context-Input-Process-Product (CIPP)-Evaluation model (Stuffelbeam, D., & Shinkfield, A., 1985), and the use of CO-CD principles released by Kusuma E. (2006) and Ife (1995). In the basic concept of performance analysis described there were seven 'cells' that must be done through research, namely (1) identifying performance standards, (2) formulating actual performance, (3) identifying performance gaps, (4) identifying problems, (5) identify the evidence of the problem, (6) identify the cause of the problem, (7) formulate the solution alternative. The Milles and Hubermann Interactive Model of Analysis (Biglen & Bogdan, 1998) was also employed to facilitate the data analysis process through out the study.
6. Research and Development Model

In diagram the research and development model looks like this:

![Research and Development Model Diagram]

**Figure 1.** Research and Development Model

7. Basic Assumption

By optimizing the integrative community enabler resource management, between the needs base and the appropriate ‘CO-CD’ intervention capability will certainly increase the positive impact on the community development outcomes.

8. Research Locus

This study covered the identification of various managerial problems of UT Abdimas-Bansos program 2011-2012-2013, which samples were drawn from the total population of 46 program activities that had been selected in 15 communities spread over Jabodetabek and 3 greening-partners in 4 reforestation areas on the island of Sulawesi and Java.

9. Methodology

The main methods used were a survey for performance analysis and FGD for the CO-CD Management Base development. The performance analysis of UT Abdimas-Bansos program management was basically descriptive qualitative, and the data collection techniques used were Depth-Interview, Observation, and Document Review.

10. Population and Sample

The population in this study were all managers within the PPM-LPPM-UT and partners of the UT Abdimas-Bansos program organizer. The description of the relationship among samples and data collection techniques to be implemented in this study is shown in the following diagram.

11. Data Analysis

The explanation of the use of research tools had focused on answering the two research questions, such as the following:

The principles of data analysis were used Performance Analysis (Irawan P., 2003) to analyze and illustrate the value of UT Abdimas-Bansos management performance through which responded by the interview guideline instrument, that covered the standard issues of UT Abdimas-Bansos management, the actual management performance, the implementation gap, the implementation problematics, the cause of problematics, and alternative solution of the UT Abdimas-Bansos management. Then in parallel CIPP analysis instruments (Stuffelbeam, D., & Shinkfield, A., 1985) had been employed to identify stage by stage of managerial performance processes. Miles-Huberman Interactive Model Model Data Analysis had also been used in the process of checking the
validity of data through the check and recheck process of key informant responses, through phasing and clustering of data collected (Cluster-1 and Cluster-2) before each of them is conclusively drawn.

Figure 2. Data Collection Process According to Research Model

12. Performance Analysis Results

12.1 General Results of UT Community Service Programs Perfromance Management 2011-2013

The realization of the program in general is the absence of socialization stage by the managers of PPM-UT to the partners causing the emergence of the disefficiency and the effectiveness of program implementation. The results of the training intervention on training product and the fulfillment of institutional needs directly can be realized, but this performance is not incapable of creating Sustainably Self-help condition. This is because the coordinating partners of NGO/Community Group Leaders only follow the TOR (Terms of Reference) as the work reference in the implementation of the program of Bimus-Bansos Th 2011-2013. While TOR is not based on CO-CD. There is no 'Maintenance' or 'Release' phase in any unit of intervention program implementation to ensure the achievement of self-help of beneficiary communities. Therefore, it is necessary to draw up a TOR script that explicitly mentions the indicative targets of the 'Maintenance' and 'Release' stages.

12.2 Results of Interview with the Working Partner on Greening Program 2011-2013.

The interview results taken from the NGO Working Partners to do with their management performance are presented in Table 11 in the Appendix.

---

1 The data contained in Table 1 has similar profiles (Data Sharing) to the data profiles compiled by Nurcholis H, Kridasakti SW, Siregar H 2014 Impact Analysis of the UT Community Service Program 2013 on the Beneficiary Community and the Target Areas, Fundamental Research Reports PP- LPPM UT and Dikti. The difference was laid on the data collection technic, one used management-performance base the other one used program impact base. See also the research design in Kridasakti S W 2014 Analisis Kinerja Pengelolaan Program Abdimas-Bansos Universitas Terbuka Tahun 2012 dan Dampaknya Terhadap Komunitas Masyarakat Penerima Manfaat (Performance Analysis of The Management of Community Services through Social-Aid Program of Universitas Terbuka 2012 to the Beneficiary Community) Thesis Graduate Study University of Muhammadiyah Jakarta
12.3 Document Review Results of UT Abdimas-Bansos 2011-2013 Management Performance

The result of the 2011-2013 document review taken from the Abdimas reports indicated that quantitatively had succeeded 85% accountable. The remaining 15% was a failure related to the failed performance and commitment of the Working-Partners in executing the program. However, qualitatively the management performance results measured by CO-CD principles were still showing substantial weakness. The overall, the management of the UT Abdimas-Bansos 2011-2013 programs were not executed according to CO-CD principles. As with no socialization phase, weak needs-assesment and organizing practices such as poor scheduling and loose quality outcomes were the major crucial issue of the performance. Of the 11 (eleven) Abdimas-Bansos UT Th 2011-2013 programs, not all can be executed thoroughly, and only 7 (seven) program packages can be completed.

From the perspective of Needs Analysis component, the weakness was inconsistent application of variables and indicators of needs-assessment parameters to the candidate-communities. The perspective of Program-Implementation component, the emergence weaknesses was in the technical implementation of the intervention, which case was of the difficulty creating consistency between the planning and the program realization. The next, in the perspective of Maintenance and Release components of CO-CD, UT did not adopt these components. The Maintenance and Release components of the CO-CD intervention program were not recognized in UT Abdimas-Bansos 2011-2013. So that, of the six crucial components in the CO-CD management procedure, UT was limited to only three components e.g.: organizational, needs analysis, and program implementation component.

12.4 Results of the Observation of UT Abdimas-Bansos Management Performance

The UT 'Greening' projects, which were especially taken place at Situ-Gintung Tangerang Selatan and Pandeglang (Banjarnegara and Kadu Hejo), after 2 years of running had shown no impact at all or 'Fail'. The other problem was the low rate of success of the reforestation programs, since the average intervention programs on the critical areas were not based on the community-based reforestation. On top of it of, the impact of the greening program was very difficult to verify due to the lack of clear greening design, whether it involves verifying technic to the number of trees planted in such land-contour or the supervising techniques by PPM-UT. Below is the result of aggregate observation of the executed programs 2011-2012-2013².

| No | Effectivity of the UT Community Service Program Management | Scores of Performance Quality Calculated with Forced Interval |
|----|-----------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1  | Program policy and planning socialization of UT community service programs related to CO-CD principles | Organized 0 Disorganized                                  |
| 2  | Development of policy analysis and resource management of UT community service programs related to CO-CD principles | Organized 5 Disorganized                                  |

² The data contained in Table 2 shares similar profiles (Data Sharing) to the data profiles gathered by Nurcholis H, Kridasakti SW, Siregar H 2014 Impact Analysis of the UT Community Service Program 2013 on the Beneficiary Community and the Target Areas, Fundamental Research Reports PP- LPPM UT and Dikti. See also for replication of the design in Kridasakti S W 2014 Analisis Kinerja Pengelolaan Program Abdimas-Bansos Universitas Terbuka Tahun 2012 dan Dampaknya Terhadap Komunitas Masyarakat Penerima Manfaat (Performance Analysis of The Management of Community Services through Social-Aid Program of Universitas Terbuka 2012 to the Beneficiary Community) Thesis Graduate Study University of Muhammadiyah Jakarta
12.5 Result of Self Observation on the Program Implementation

The self-observation results showed that in the Socialization component, there was no socialization activity prior to its implementation to the beneficiary partners. So the Working-Partners found it difficult to understand the background and purpose of program. The various organizing activities were troublesome, especially the difficulty of understanding the procedures of financial accountability under the scheme of 'Pure Bansos or Non-pure Bansos'). The implementation of needs analysis activities became difficult to understand, because the stage of socialization was not adopted. There was unsuitable needs assessment parameter set by PPM-UT applied to the candidate-communities, whose needs did not meet criteria of assessment parameter. So it must undergo the process of adjusting the proposal to the criteria determined by UT as the donor.

The overall implementation of activities carried out in the allocation is very limited in time wise, so that the results becoming less maximal. There were no 'Maintenance' and 'Disengagement' activities to be implemented, after being given further aid of training-nontraining assistance.

12.6 Trial Results of the CO-CD Base Management Model

The trial implementation of the CO-CD Base Management Model of UT Abdimas program was conducted from March to November 2015. The goals, besides testing the implementability of the CO-CD management model were also developing a learning studio for the poor children (30 members) in Cilengok village, Padarincang sub-district, Serang regency, to access learning resources. The capacity development program was called "Science and Technology for Society: Learning Center for Unfortunate Children". The implementation of the trial CO-CD Base Management program was consistently following the CO-CD principles designed by the Enabler Team (lecturers) from UT. This intervention design-pattern was arranged into 6 phases of activities, namely: Socialization Phase, Organizing Phase, Needs Analysis Phase, Implementation Phase, Maintenance Phase, and Release Phase. The CO-CD intervention design was a pilot-project in synergy with the research program of the CO-CD Base Management Model development program granted by DIKTI 2015.
collaborative synergy between the UT Abdimas program and the DIKTI research program was to improve the efficiency and effectivity of both given project-program. On the side of the CO-CD Base Management Model program development, a full trial that based on the six phases of CO-CD intervention principles was simulated to the beneficiary community.

The trial result of the CO-CD Base Management Model through the "Science and Technology for Society: Learning Center for Unfortunate Children" project in Cilengo Village, Padarincang Sub-district, Serang Regency was reportedly successful. All six phases of CO-CD principles had been successfully executed to the community up to the self-help level (Reports can be seen on Website: Simpen UT).

12.7 Manuscript Development Results of CO-CD Base Management Model

This CO-CD Base Model Management manuscript had been developed for three types of UT community engagement for enablers, e.g.: Lecturers as individual (Abdipelmas-Mandiri), Lecturers at regional office, and Lecturers at headquarter. These three types of community engagement have different characteristics, so the management model is also slightly done differently but remains in the same based on CO-CD principles. This CO-CD Base Management Model is aims to provide a stronger leverage to the impact of the results of the implementation of the UT community engagement program. The manuscript of UT Abdimas CO-CD Base Management Model provides technical guidance to all UT stakeholders such as the managers of the UT Abdimas working unit (PPM-LPPM-UT), the lecturers in community engagement implementation that start with the proposal submission, reporting activities, procedures for obtaining certificates, and the potential working-partners of the beneficiary communities. This manuscript can be accessed on UT Website: Simpen UT, which systematically is as follows:

Table 2. The Systematic of UT CO-CD Base Community-Engagement Management Model

| FOREWORD | ii |
| TABLE OF CONTENTS... | |
| CHAPTER I FOREFRONT | 3 |
| A. Background... | 3 |
| B. The Purpose of CO-CD Base Management Model... | 3 |
| C. The Scope of the UT Community-Engagement Program CO-CD Base Management... | 4 |
| D. Implementation Procedure of UT-CO-CD Base Management... | 5 |
| E. The Scheme of UT CO-CD Base Management... | 8 |
| CHAPTER II. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK... | 9 |
| A. Platform of Theory and Framework of the CO-CD... | 9 |
| B. Program Design and the Framework for the Development of the CO-CD Base Management Model... | 10 |
| C. Basic Assumptions... | 11 |
| CHAPTER III. DEVELOPMENT METHOD... | 11 |
| A. Locus of Trial and Development... | 11 |
| B. Method of Trial and Development... | 12 |
| C. Results of Trial and Development... | 13 |
| CHAPTER IV. UT COMMUNITY-ENGAGEMENT CO-CD BASE MANAGEMENT MODEL... | 20 |
| A. Phase-1: Socialization of Empowerment... | 20 |
| B. Phase-2: Organization of Empowerment... | 32 |
| C. Phase-3: Needs Analysis of Empowerment... | 76 |
| D. Phase-4: Implementation of Empowerment... | 79 |
| E. Phase-5: Maintenance of Empowerment... | 81 |
| F. Phase-6: Release of Empowerment... | 95 |
| CHAPTER V. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS... | 98 |
| ATTACHMENT... | 99 |
The more detail of the CO-CD principles in developing the model of the proposal would look like this below in Table 3.3.

**Table 3. The Design of Community Development Proposal Based on CO-CD Principles**

| Component                          | Description                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| **Title**                          | The title writing is formulated and reflects the substance and locus of activities undertaken in the territory of the community who obtained the social-aid program. For example: Development of a Reading Garden for Community Students of Community Programs of Illiterate Eradication in groups ... Villages / Sub-districts / Sub-districts ... or Abdimas Improving Domestic Waste Processing Skills into Compost for Community Groups ...... ... Villages / Sub-districts ... ... |
| **Situition Analysis**             | 1) Describe briefly, clearly and as fully as possible the current partner condition  
2) Display data both qualitatively and quantitatively in support of partner condition information  
3) Explain the meaning of partner's existence to the environment (impact of its existence) |
| **Community Problematics**         | 1) Partners or communities are people who will get abdimas or community programs that are willing to be involved in the abdimas program.  
2) Identify problems faced by partners.  
θ Write down clearly your justification with your partner in determining priority issues to address.  
3) Keep the problem specific, concrete and really a partner issue |
| **Strategies and Solutions offered** | 1) Describe the strategies and approaches offered to support the implementation of the Abdimas program, shall be based on CO-CD procedures and principles, including: Socialization, Organizing, Critical Needs Analysis of partners / communities, Implementation / Training-nontraining, Maintenance of Intervention Results, and Release - Self-help sustainability.  
2) Write down each stage of activity in accordance with CO-CD procedures / principles that demonstrate concrete steps to the solution of mutually agreed issues to the disposal stage,  
3) Describe how partner participation in program implementation is at least 8 CD-CD determinant factors. |
| **Targeting Outputs**              | 1) Write the type of output that will be produced in accordance with the activity plan either in the form through Training and Nontraining;  
2) If the output is in the form of product or goods or certificate and the like, state also its specifications based on the principles of Critical Needs of partners / communities, Training-nontraining interventions Strategy, and Self-help Sustainability according to 8 factors determine CO-CD. |
| **Feasibility of Implementing Community Service at the Region** | 1) Describe the Implementation Team Qualification, Team Skills Relevance, Team Synergy and Community Experience, especially for the Team Leader;  
2) Schedule of Activities, covering all stages of CO-CD-based implementation procedures. |
| **Budgeting**                      | 1) Create a Table showing the relationship between activity and cost  
2) Feasibility of Proposed Fees specified from item 1) in the transport and reporting classification (maximum 20%), consumables, equipment, other expenses;  
3) Program costs include PPn (10% Added-Value Tax), PPh (Income Tax) Article 21. |

13. **Discussion**  
The overall data taken from the interviews and observations that are presented in Table 1 and Table 4 have confirmed the findings that the implementation of the UT community-engagement 2011-2013 did not adopt the CO-CD principles. The key findings that can be discussed are as follows:

---

3 Sudira, Kridasakti S W., Siregar H. 2015 Pengembangan Model Pengelolaan Program Abdimas Universitas Terbuka (Development of the Open University Community Service Program Management Model) Fundamental Research Competitive Grant Dikti 2015.
In the case of project proposal submission that which executed by the working-partners, there was a major difference between the 'Initial-Proposal' and the 'Revised-Proposal'. The difference between the two proposals were due to the wrong perception of the working-partners in which no socialization was given by PPM-UT managers prior to the proposal submission.

Quantitatively, the overall UT community-engagement programs apparently could be well organized, which 85% of the program realization was completely executed. However, when it was quantitatively measured from the perspective of CO-CD principles, the management of UT community-engagement programs was necessarily in need of managerial reformation. The reason is that the program managers and working-partners did not adopt CO-CD principles, neither is in existent in the Terms of Reference for implementation.

The absence of a written feed-back from the needs analysis results supposedly made by PPM-UT reviewers to the working-partners, it led to the uncontrollable proposal quality improvements. So it is crucial that the working-partners who submited a proposal are given a written feed back through the PPM-UT standard selection process.

In the short term there was a direct physiological and physiological impact of the intervention on the beneficiary community members. However, in the long term it was not sustainably leading to self-help. This situation was due to the absence of CO-CD Base Terms of Reference for community-engagement program implementation during 2011-2013. Therefore, the UT Terms of Reference for community-engagement program has to be developed based on the principles of sustainable self-help. The short term psychological and physiological impact of the intervention on the beneficiary community members so far have been so inefficient in donation-wise. At the same time there has always been no assurance in the achievement of sustainable self-help, and it is notified due to the absence of CO-CD base on the Terms of Reference that covers the instruments to control sustainable success rates.

In the case of CO-CD Base Management Model development, the trial had been imposed on the unfortunate community in learning access at Cilengok Village that turned out to be very effective in creating self-help. Furthermore, the formulation of CO-CD Base Management Model, the ensuing manuscript had been successfully defined.

14. Conclusion
The findings showed that the quantitative targeting was found credible as achievement (85%). However, the "qualitative targeting" of the performance management goals is indicating the far from a good-stage (≤5.2 Interval-Force 1-10). The "Gap" was due to the absent of socialization_needs-analysis_maintenance_release factors on the UT social-service grand-policy.

More specifically, the 'Program Socialization' component was not adopted in the guidelines of the implementation of the UT community-engagement programs (Abdimas-Bansos 2011-2013). The non-adoption of CO-CD principles had resulted in the absence of the Socialization component. While the components of 'Organizing', the scheduling and execution of community-engagement programs, especially Abdimas-Bansos 2012 was very weak, marked by the absence of absolute absorption of that year budget program. The programs implementation schedule was so cramped (Oct-Nop-Dec 2012), so that the outcomes were not optimal. In the 'Needs Analysis' component, the crucial issue was about 'to determine the appropriate tolerance level' in the provision of social-aid to the prospective beneficiary communities. In the case of the 'Program Implementation' component, it was marked by a heavy workload due to the short duration of the program implementation period, and the weakness of the community-engagement program managers to perform the planning consistency with its realization. Furthermore, the Program Maintenance component was not adopted at all in the design of the UT Community-Engagement Terms of Reference, so that there was no assurance that the outcome of the intervention could bring about the self-help stage to the beneficiary community. Similarly in the 'Release' or disengagement component, the UT management did not adopt this component so that the results of the intervention could not achieve the maximum Self-help condition.

In the scope the trial of CO-CD Base Management Model, this model had been imposed to the beneficiary community at Cilengok Village that turned out to be very effective up to the self-help condition, and the ensuing manuscript of CO-CD Base Management Model had been successfully defined.
15. **Recommendation**

A CO-CD Training program is required for all Abdimas-UT program stakeholders. UT needs a CO-CD base Terms of Reference, which covers all six CO-CD components. The weak factor in the program scheduling requires the controls strengthening through sufficient time allocation including multi-year enforcement. For the weakness of the Needs Analysis, it is necessary to give timely more tolerance in the selection process to the managers and the working-partners. In the 'Implementation' component, an instrument for evaluating and monitoring is required to be implemented from the beginning of socialization until the release phase. Recommendations on the issue of non-adoption of the the 'Program Maintenance' and 'Program Release' stage in the community-engagement program intervention, it is required a university-level policy on the importance of adopting the CO-CD principle at the UT community-engagement management system, started from the strategic-plan up to the implementation guidelines and the best-practices CO-CD training programs for all UT stakeholders.

The pilot test of the CO-CD base management model had demonstrated the effective outcomes, so that this community-engagement management model should immediately be utilized as a standard terms of reference for UT community-engagement program implementation, if efficiency and effectivity are likely to be achieved.
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| No | Observation Object | Time | Locus | Gaps & Causes |
|----|---------------------|------|-------|---------------|
|    | Phase of Socialization of Greening / Environment Program and Community Service Programs on HDI (Hunam Development Index) dominantly on Welfare empowerment. | 2011. | Greening the environment in Situ Gintung, South Tangerang, - Community Service Programs in Jakarta, Bogor, Depok, Tangerang, Bekasi | 1) Success rate of 0% program. 2) Fundamental issues was lack of understanding of the importance of socialization stage. 3) The lack of a CO-CD perspective by all UT stakeholders, especially PPM-UT managers on Greening Programs implementation and Comdev (Community Development) programs causes the stage of socialization was not done and it is not included in the TOR of Cultivation and Reforestation Program nor Comdev Programs. 4) No CO-CD base socialization TOR for the UT forestation and community service programs. |
|    | Procurement of trash/plant in South Tangerang | 2011. | 100% failure rate, pots broken & crop failure to live. 2) Ibidem (having the same case as above column). 3) Ibidem (having the same case as above column). 4) Ibidem (having the same case as above column). |
|    | Forestation Melung Village, Kedung Banteng District, Purwokerto: 12,000 trees of aren & mangit. | 2011. | 25% failure rate plants failed to live. 2) Ibidem (having the same case as above column). 3) Ibidem (having the same case as above column). 4) Ibidem (having the same case as above column). |
|    | Forestation Muara Borneo- Pangkajene River, Village Tekolabbua, Pangkajene District, Makassar, Community Service Programs in Jakarta, Bogor, Depok, Tangerang, Bekasi | 2012. | 40% failure rate failed to live. 2) Ibidem (having the same case as above column). 3) Ibidem (having the same case as above column). 4) Ibidem (having the same case as above column). |
|    | Forestation Lateri Village, Teluk Dalam-Ambon, Community Service Programs in Jakarta, Bogor, Depok, Tangerang, Bekasi | 2013. | 40% failure rate failed to live. 2) Ibidem (having the same case as above column). 3) Ibidem (having the same case as above column). 4) Ibidem (having the same case as above column). |
|    | Forestation Wonosalam Village, Rungkut-Surabaya, Community Service Programs in Jakarta, Bogor, Depok, Tangerang, Bekasi | 2013. | 40% failure rate failed to live. 2) Ibidem (having the same case as above column). 3) Ibidem (having the same case as above column). 4) Ibidem (having the same case as above column). |
| 2  | Stage of Organizing the Greening / Environment Prog and Community Service Programs on HDI (Hunam Development Index) dominantly on Welfare empowerment. | 2011. | Greening the environment a Situ Gintung, Tangerang Selatan, - Community Service Programs in Jakarta, Bogor, Depok, Tangerang, Bekasi. | 1) Success rate of organizing is 0%. 2) Fundamental issue was poor design of organizing the project that linked maintenance stage. 3) The lack of a CO-CD perspective by all UT stakeholders, especially PPM-UT managers on Greening Programs implementation causes the stage of organizing was not done properly on the TOR of Cultivation and Reforestation Program nor the Comdev programs. 4) No CO-CD base organizing in the TOR for the UT forestation and community service programs. 5) Weak scheduling and execution of organizing the UT community service program. |
|    | Procurement of trash / plant in Tangerang Selatan. | 2011. | Failure rate is 100%, Vases/Pots were damaged & trees fail to live. 2) Ibidem (having the same case as above column). 3) Ibidem (having the same case as above column). 4) Ibidem (having the same case as above column). 5) Ibidem (having the same case as above column). |
|    | Forestation Melung Village, Kedung Banteng District, Purwokerto: 12,000 trees of aren & mangit. | 2011. | 25% failure rate failed to live. 2) Ibidem (having the same case as above column). 3) Ibidem (having the same case as above column). 4) Ibidem (having the same case as above column). 5) Ibidem (having the same case as above column). |
|    | Forestation Muara Borneo- Pangkajene River, Tekolabbua Village, | 2012. | 40% failure rate failed to live. 2) Ibidem (having the same case as above column). |
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### Gaps & Causes

| No | Observation Object | Time | Locus | Gaps & Causes |
|----|---------------------|------|-------|---------------|
| 1  | Incomplete scheme   | 1    |       | 1) No scheme for project development. |
| 2  | Weak implementation | 2    |       | 2) Weak implementation of project development. |
| 3  | Lack of monitoring  | 3    |       | 3) Lack of monitoring of project implementation. |
| 4  | Poor communication  | 4    |       | 4) Poor communication between stakeholders. |
| 5  | Resource allocation  | 5    |       | 5) Inadequate resource allocation for project development. |

### Needs Analysis Phase of Greening /
Environmental Program Needs and Community Service Programs on HDI Hunam Development Index Dominantly on Welfare empowerment.

| No | Observation Object | Time | Locus | Gaps & Causes |
|----|---------------------|------|-------|---------------|
| 1  | Forestation Lateri Village, Teluk Dalam-Ambon. | 2013 | Pangkajene District, Makassar. | 1) 40% failure rate failed to live. 2) Ibiden (having the same case as above column). |
| 2  | Forestation Wonosalam Village, Rungkut-Surabaya. | 2013 | Pangkajene District, Makassar. | 1) 40% failure rate failed to live. 2) Ibiden (having the same case as above column). |
| 3  | Procurement of trash / plant in Tangerang Selatan | 2011 | Pangkajene District, Makassar. | 1) 100% failure rate failed to live. 2) The lack of a CO-CD perspective by all UT stakeholders, especially PPM-UT managers on Greening Programs implementation and Comdev (Community Development) programs causes the stage of needs analysis was done poorly and the CO-CD principles was not included in the TOR of Cultivation and Reforestation Program nor Comdev Programs. 3) No CO-CD base needs analysis in the TOR for the UT forestation and community service programs needs analysis. 4) Weak application of firmed variables and indicators on the needs analysis instrument on the community needs for selection and decision to give social aids. |
| No | Observation Object | Time | Locus | Gaps & Causes |
|----|---------------------|------|-------|--------------|
| 1  | Community Service Programs in Jakarta, Bogor, Depok, Tangerang, Bekasi | 2011 | Forestation Melung Village, Kedung Banteng District, Purwokerto: 12,000 trees of aren & mangit. | 1) 25% failure rate failed to live. 2) Ibidem (having the same case as above). 3) Ibidem (having the same case as above column). 4) Ibidem. |
| 2  | Community Service Programs in Jakarta, Bogor, Depok, Tangerang, Bekasi | 2012 | Forestation Muara Borneo- Pangkajene River, Tekolabbua Village, Pangkajene District, Makassar. Community Service Programs in Jakarta, Bogor, Depok, Tangerang, Bekasi | 1) 40% failure rate failed to live. 2) Ibidem (having the same case as above column). 3) Ibidem (having the same case as above column). 4) Ibidem (having the same case as above column). |
| 3  | Community Service Programs in Jakarta, Bogor, Depok, Tangerang, Bekasi | 2013 | Forestation Lateri Village, Teluk Dalam- Ambon. Community Service Programs in Jakarta, Bogor, Depok, Tangerang, Bekasi | 1) 40% failure rate failed to live. 2) Ibidem (having the same case as above column). 3) Ibidem (having the same case as above column). 4) Ibidem (having the same case as above column). |
| 4  | Community Service Programs in Jakarta, Bogor, Depok, Tangerang, Bekasi | 2013 | Forestation Wonosalam Village, Rungkut District- Surabaya. | 1) 40% failure rate failed to live. 2) Ibidem. 3) Ibidem. 4) Ibidem. |
| 5  | Maintenance Phase of Greening / Environment Program and Community Service Programs on HDI (Human Development Index) dominantly on Welfare empowerment. | 2011 | Procurement of trash / plant in Tangerang Selatan Community Service Programs in Jakarta, Bogor, Depok, Tangerang, Bekasi | 1) 100% failure rate _ Pots broken & trees fail to grow. 2) The lack of a CO-CD perspective by all UT stakeholders, especially PPM-UT managers on Greening Programs implementation and Comdev (Community Development) programs causes the stage of maintenance stage was not inexistence and the CO-CD principles was not included in the TOR of Cultivation and Reforestation Program nor Comdev Programs maintenance. 3) No CO-CD base maintenance in the TOR for the UT forestation and community service programs. |
| 6  | Release Phase of Greening / Environment Program and Community Service Programs on HDI (Human Development Index) dominantly on Welfare empowerment. | 2011 | Environment Greening and forestation in Situ Ginting Tangerang Selatan Community Service Programs in Jakarta, Bogor, Depok, Tangerang, Bekasi | 1) Success rate of 0% program. 2) The lack of a CO-CD perspective by all UT stakeholders, especially PPM-UT managers on Greening Programs implementation and Comdev (Community Development) programs causes the stage of release stage was not inexistence and the CO-CD principles was not included in the TOR of Cultivation and Reforestation Program nor Comdev Programs release. 3) No CO-CD base release in the TOR for the UT forestation and community service programs. |
|   | Coordination of forestation in Melung Village, Kedung Banteng District, Purwokerto: 12,000 trees of aren & mangit. | 2011 | Forestation Melung Village, Kedung Banteng District, Purwokerto: 12,000 trees of aren & mangit. | 1) 25% failure rate failed to live. 2) Ibidem (having the same case as above). 3) Ibidem (having the same case as above column). 4) Ibidem. |
|   | Procurement of trash / plant in Tangerang Selatan | 2011 | Procurement of trash / plant in Tangerang Selatan | 1) 100% failure rate _ Pots broken & trees fail to live. 2) Ibidem (having the same case as above). 3) Ibidem (having the same case as above column). 4) Ibidem (having the same case as above column). |
| No | Observation Object | Time | Locus | Gaps & Causes |
|----|---------------------|------|-------|---------------|
|    | Forestation Melung, Kec. Kedung Banlang, Punwokerto: 12.000 Aren & Aangit Village trees. | 2011 | 1) 25% failure rate failed to live.  
2) Ibidem (having the same case as above column).  
3) Ibidem (having the same case as above column). | |
|    | Forestation Muara Borneo - Pangkajene River, Tekolabba Village, Pangkajene District, Makassar. Community Service Programs in Jakarta, Bogor, Depok, Tangerang, Bekasi | 2012 | 1) 40% failure rate failed to live.  
2) Ibidem (having the same case as above column).  
3) Ibidem (having the same case as above column). | |
|    | Forestation Lestari Village, Teluk Dalam - Pulau Ambon. Community Service Programs in Jakarta, Bogor, Depok, Tangerang, Bekasi | 2013 | 1) 40% failure rate failed to live.  
2) Ibidem (having the same case as above column).  
3) Ibidem (having the same case as above column). | |
|    | Forestation Wonosalam Village, Rungkut-Surabaya. | 2013 | 1) 40% failure rate failed to live.  
2) Ibidem (having the same case as above column).  
3) Ibidem (having the same case as above column). | |