

A VALUE-DRIVEN YOUTH DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK FOR KEMENPORA: INTEGRATING GOVERNANCE, KPIS, AND MULTI-STAKEHOLDER COLLABORATION

Mira Dallima Andini¹, Manahan Parlindungan Saragih Siallagan²

¹Master of Business Administration Program, School of Business and Management, Institut Teknologi Bandung

²School of Business and Management, Institut Teknologi Bandung

Corresponding author: Mira Dallima Andini

Email : dallimaandini@gmail.com

Received : 04 June 2026

Accepted : 25 June 2026

Revised : 10 June 2026

Published : 29 July 2026

Abstract

Youth development is part of Indonesia's long-term strategy to create better human capital and can help realize the vision of Indonesia Emas 2045. With its responsibility for youth affairs, Kemenpora has an essential role to play in increasing the quality of Indonesian youth; improving their levels of participation; and developing their character and contributions. Kemenpora currently has a number of foundations to build youth development, such as policy directions for youth development, youth development programs, regulatory support, networks with stakeholders, and the Youth Development Index or Indeks Pembangunan Pemuda (IPP), which are used at a macro level to measure youth development. The problem is not the lack of foundations, but the low degree of integration between values, programs, governance, measurements, and collaboration with stakeholders. The objective of this research is to develop a new youth development framework for Kemenpora by employing a values-driven approach. Specifically, the values are Patriotism, Grit, and Empathy. A qualitative and design-oriented case study methodology is employed. Data collection is carried out using document analysis and semi-structured expert interviews with three key experts from Kemenpora. Analysis employs the Resource-Based View (RBV); VRIO model; PESTEL; SWOT/TOWS models; and thematic analysis to determine what the internal resources/capabilities of Kemenpora are; what are the external factors influencing Kemenpora; where are there strategic gaps; and what are some outputs from the framework? Findings indicate that Kemenpora has many good aspects as institutions (i.e., national mandate, regulatory authority, existing programs, stakeholder networks, etc.) however, there is a significant gap in integrating strategic values with program design; governance mechanisms with program level KPIs; stakeholder collaboration with implementing programs; and implementing readiness with all prior factors. Thematic analysis produces five practical outputs: a Value-to-Program Alignment Matrix, Governance Roles and Responsibilities Model, KPI-Based Monitoring & Evaluation Framework, Multi-Stakeholder Collaboration Cycle, and Phased Implementation Roadmap. These outputs provide the foundation for a proposed new youth development framework for Kemenpora. This article provides both theoretical knowledge on how to manage public sectors and operational knowledge on how to implement youth development practices through providing a structured framework that enables practitioners to take strategic youth values and convert them into program designs; governance roles/responsibilities; measurable indicators; stakeholder collaborations; and phased implementations. In addition, the proposed framework will be complementary to the use of IPP and facilitate a transition from activity-based program delivery to value-driven; outcomes-focused; measured; governed; and collaborative youth development management.

Keywords: youth development, Kemenpora, governance, KPIs, collaboration, value-driven framework

1. Introduction

Indonesian youth development is one aspect of Indonesia's medium- to long-term Human Capital Development Strategy. Given Indonesia's aim for "Indonesia Emas" (Gold Indonesia) by 2045, youth development will have a significant impact upon national competitiveness, social cohesion, innovation, civic engagement and future leadership. Youth are both recipients of public services and also potential leaders, businesspeople, inventors and participants in national development. In line with the Asta Cita Mission 4 that focuses on education, science & tech, health, sport, gender equity and inclusion, and youth empowerment, the Indonesian government has identified

human capital development as a major strategic area of focus. In this regard, the Ministry of Youth and Sport (Kemenpora), plays a key role in planning and coordination of youth development programs at the national level. Kemenpora has articulated a youth development approach driven by three core values: Patriotism, Grit and Empathy. These values represent the ideal characteristics of Indonesian youth. Patriotism represents the national identity and civic obligations of Indonesian youth; Grit represents their ability to persevere and demonstrate resilience in the face of adversity; while Empathy reflects the social awareness, inclusivity and collaboration that they should demonstrate. Youth development cannot be solely dependent on policy statements or the existence of programs. While Kemenpora does exist with youth development programs, legal frameworks supporting these programs, networks of stakeholders, and a large-scale measurement tool (IPP) currently available to measure youth development at a macro level, there needs to be greater systematic integration of each of these components. The challenge therefore is not the lack of values, nor is it the lack of programs or regulation, nor the lack of stakeholders or measurement tools; rather it is the limited degree of integration amongst these various elements.

This paper seeks to address the following research questions:

1. How does Kemenpora's present youth development structure relate to Patriotism, Grit and Empathy? This includes how each relates to Kemenpora's programs, governance structures, measurement systems and stakeholder collaborations.
2. What are the primary strategic gaps in Kemenpora's current youth development structure from both internal and external perspectives as well as from interviews with experts?
3. What is an appropriate way to develop an enhanced youth development framework that ties together Patriotism, Grit and Empathy with program designs, governance mechanisms, KPI-based monitoring and evaluation, multi-stakeholder partnerships and implementation roadmaps?

The purpose of this paper is to create an enhanced youth development framework for Kemenpora that enhances program-design-value-alignment; improves governance mechanisms; incorporates KPI-based monitoring and evaluation; fosters multi-stakeholder partnerships; and creates a phase-by-phase implementation plan.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Youth Development and Human Capital Development

Youth Development is about enhancing the ability, character, involvement and contributions that young people can make to their societies. As such it is closely associated with Human Capital Development; Young People will be the future productive population of a country, the source of its leaders and innovators in Society. Thus youth development is an important social agenda for Indonesia Emas 2045 and also as a National Strategic Priority.

2.2 Value-Driven Youth Development

The core of a value-based method is that the value or values are to be placed at the center of the youth development. The three (values) of Patriotism, Grit, and Empathy have been utilized in this study for developing youth character. Patriotism refers to civic duty/responsibility and national contributions. Grit refers to persistence/tenacity/problem solving. Empathy refers to being sensitive to others, inclusive, and collaborative. The values must then be transformed from abstract concepts to concrete program objectives, activities, indicators, governance systems, and roles of stakeholders. If these transformations do not occur with respect to values; they will likely remain an idealistic goal and thus impossible to measure.

2.3 Governance in Public Sector Programs

Public programs require effective governance as it will help define how all of the parties involved (government at every level; youth organization; schools; private sector entities; development partners; local community) will work together by defining responsibility, accountability for program outcomes and results, and establishing a common framework for the delivery of youth development programs.

2.4 KPI-Based Monitoring and Evaluation

Monitoring and Evaluation for Public Organizations allow them to determine if programs are being implemented efficiently and that they achieve their desired results. Key Performance Indicators (KPI) take strategic objectives and turn them into quantifiable measures. For Youth Development Programs, KPI's do not have to be solely about measuring Outputs (Number of Participants; Number of Activities), however can measure Outcomes and Value-Based Impacts (Leadership Practice; Resilience; Civic Responsibility; Empathy; Community Contribution). IPP is still an important Macro-Level Measurement Instrument; however it cannot measure Program

Level Value-Based Outcomes such as Patriotism, Grit and Empathy. As such, complementary program level KPIs will need to be developed.

2.5 Multi-Stakeholder Collaboration

Youth development involves a collaborative effort from multiple stakeholders and geographic locations. Kemenpora can't develop young people on its own. Collaboration among all of the various stakeholders provides for the opportunity to share resources, provide access to the widest possible audience, allow for better context based application, and facilitate ongoing learning. While collaboration is currently in an event focused format (i.e., coordinating events) it will need to evolve into an established, planned structure that includes joint planning, joint implementation, joint reporting, providing and using evaluation feedback, and replicating successful learning.

3. Research Methodology

This research employs both a qualitative and design-based approach in this study as a case study. A qualitative approach has been adopted due to this studies focus on understanding Institutional Context, Policy Direction, Governance Arrangements, Stakeholders Collaboration and Framework Development. Design-based approaches have been employed as the ultimate deliverable of this study will be a proposed improved framework. Document Analysis and Semi-Structured Interviews with Experts were utilized as methods of collecting Data Document analysis included secondary data such as: Strategic Documents for Kemenpora, Documents related to Youth Development Programs, Regulations, Reports by Institute for Public Private Partnerships (IPP), and National Development Documents. Primary Data collection was achieved via Semi-Structured Interviews with Three Key Informants at Kemenpora; namely: Special Staff to the Minister, Deputy for Youth Affairs and Expert Staff to the Minister.

A number of Stages were involved in the Analytical Process. Firstly, the Study Identified the Current Youth Development System of Kemenpora; Including Values, Programs, Governance, Measurement & Stakeholders. Secondly, an Internal Analysis was undertaken using Resource Based View & VRIO. Thirdly, an External Analysis was carried out using PESTEL. Fourthly, SWOT Analysis was employed to Synthesize Findings of Both Internal & External analyses. Fifthly, TOWS Analysis was applied to Develop Strategic Directions. Sixthly, Thematic Analysis was Used to Organize the Research Findings into Themes and Outputs that are part of a Proposed Improved Framework.

Table 1. Research Data Sources and Analytical Use

Data Source	Type of Data	Analytical Use
Kemenpora strategic documents	Secondary document	To identify strategic direction, institutional priorities, and youth development policy context
Youth development program documents	Secondary document	To identify existing programs, value foundation, program focus, and implementation direction
IPP reports	Secondary document and quantitative reference	To understand the existing macro-level youth development measurement system
Regulations and youth service documents	Secondary document	To understand the legal basis, governance scope, and youth service framework
National development documents	Secondary policy document	To understand alignment with Indonesia Emas 2045, RPJPN, RPJMN, and Asta Cita
Semi-structured interviews with Special Staff to the Minister, Deputy for Youth Affairs, and Expert Staff to the Minister	Primary qualitative data	To enrich the analysis with strategic insights on policy direction, implementation gaps, governance issues, KPI needs, stakeholder collaboration, and framework improvement

4. Findings

4.1 Kemenpora Has Strong Foundations for Youth Development

The research demonstrates that Kemenpora currently have all the building blocks needed to successfully promote youth development based on values. There is a national legislative and programmatic alignment in terms of the legal

basis for Kemenpora; Kemenpora's institutional base provides it with legitimate status as an organization; Kemenpora can enforce regulations; there are existing programs promoting youth development; Kemenpora has developed partnerships with various stakeholders; and, through IPP (Indonesia Youth Survey), Kemenpora has access to data at the level of entire generations; and, finally, the three values – Patriotism, Grit and Empathy – which underlie many Indonesian educational institutions' curricula. However, none of this information is being used in a coordinated way to develop youth development frameworks for Indonesia.

4.2 Strategic Gaps in the Current Framework

The study found many gaps in strategy. First, the value-to-program alignment gap has occurred due to Patriotism, Grit, and Empathy (the values) being mostly left out from the program's objectives, activities, expected outcomes and indicators. Second, there is also a governance/role clarity gap with respect to Kemenpora, as it operates within a large stakeholder system requiring better coordinated and accountable systems. Third, the program level measurement gap exists because IPP works at the macro level and does not measure specific youth development programs relating to Patriotism, Grit and Empathy. Fourth, the collaborative process among youth development stakeholders is still largely fragmented and mainly focused on projects. Lastly, while some regions/stakeholders are prepared for implementation others will require gradual implementation. The thematic analysis identified the above research findings and grouped them into 5 themes and 5 practical framework outputs. The output became the basis for an enhanced youth development framework.

Table 2. Thematic Findings and Framework Outputs

Thematic Finding	Key Finding	Framework Output	Implication for Proposed Framework
Value-to-program alignment gap	Patriotism, Grit, and Empathy have been introduced as core youth character values, but their translation into program logic and measurable outcomes needs to be strengthened.	Value-to-Program Alignment Matrix	The proposed framework must link each core value with program focus, activities, expected outcomes, and suggested indicators.
Governance and role clarity gap	Kemenpora has a broad stakeholder ecosystem, but stronger role clarity, accountability, and coordination mechanisms are needed.	Governance Roles and Responsibility Model	The proposed framework must clarify the role of Kemenpora, Dispora, youth organizations, Gerakan Pramuka, educational institutions, private sector, development partners, and communities.
Program-level measurement gap	IPP provides macro-level measurement, but program-level KPIs are needed to capture value-based outcomes related to Patriotism, Grit, and Empathy.	KPI-Based Monitoring and Evaluation Framework	The proposed framework must include complementary KPIs covering output, outcome, value-based impact, and learning feedback indicators.
Fragmented stakeholder collaboration	Youth development requires collaboration across sectors and regions, but collaboration needs to move beyond project-based coordination.	Multi-Stakeholder Collaboration Cycle	The proposed framework must structure collaboration through joint planning, shared implementation, shared reporting, evaluation feedback, and learning replication.
Uneven implementation readiness	Regional capacity and stakeholder readiness vary across regions, creating the need for phased implementation.	Phased Implementation Roadmap	The proposed framework must be implemented gradually through framework alignment, pilot implementation, capacity building, and national scale-up.

5. Proposed Improved Youth Development Framework

The proposed framework consists of five interconnected components. These components are derived from the thematic findings and framework outputs identified in the analysis. The five components are: Value-to-Program Alignment Matrix, Governance Roles and Responsibility Model, KPI-Based Monitoring and Evaluation Framework, Multi-Stakeholder Collaboration Cycle, and Phased Implementation Roadmap.

5.1 Value-to-Program Alignment Matrix

The Value-to-Program Alignment Matrix links Patriotism, Grit, and Empathy with program focus, example activities, expected outcomes, and suggested indicators. This matrix helps Kemenpora ensure that each program is not only activity-based but also value-driven and outcome-oriented.

Table 3. Value-to-Program Alignment Matrix

Core Value	Program Focus	Example Activities	Expected Outcomes	Suggested Indicators
Patriotism	Civic responsibility, national identity, public contribution	Youth leadership program, civic engagement, community service, national dialogue, youth participation forum	Youth demonstrate stronger civic awareness, national commitment, and willingness to contribute to public interest	Civic participation, public contribution, national identity engagement, participation in community or national development activities
Grit	Resilience, perseverance, discipline, problem-solving, long-term commitment	Entrepreneurship program, internship, leadership challenge, competition, innovation project, skills development	Youth demonstrate persistence, adaptability, problem-solving ability, and commitment to completing goals	Program completion, persistence in challenges, problem-solving behavior, sustained participation, resilience in achieving goals
Empathy	Social awareness, inclusiveness, collaboration, respect for diversity, community care	Volunteer program, social inclusion project, community empowerment, intercultural dialogue, youth service program	Youth demonstrate social sensitivity, inclusive behavior, collaboration, and contribution to community well-being	Volunteer participation, inclusive collaboration, social sensitivity, respect for diversity, contribution to vulnerable groups or communities
Integrated Values	Combination of Patriotism, Grit, and Empathy in one program	Youth camp, youth exchange, debate program, international youth program, character development program	Youth develop balanced character as patriotic, resilient, empathetic, participative, and collaborative individuals	Combined value score, leadership practice, teamwork, civic engagement, resilience, and social contribution

5.2 Governance Roles and Responsibility Model

The Governance Model defines which stakeholder is responsible for what in the youth development system. Kemenpora owns the policies that are used to set standards nationally. The regional governments/Dispora have adapted these into their own frameworks and implement them locally. Organizations working with young people/Gerakan Pramuka work on mobilizing and developing the character of young people. Schools/educational institutions offer a learning environment. Private enterprise provides internships; mentorship; entrepreneurial activities; innovations. Partners involved in development assist technically and provide an opportunity for evaluation.

Table 4. Governance Roles and Responsibility Model

Stakeholder	Main Role	Contribution to Framework
Kemepora	Policy owner, national coordinator, and standard setter	Defines framework direction, develops national standards, coordinates stakeholders, and monitors implementation
Regional Governments / Dispora	Regional implementer and local adapter	Translates national framework into local programs, adapts implementation to regional needs, and reports progress
Youth Organizations / OKP	Youth mobilizer and participation partner	Mobilizes young people, supports community-based participation, and delivers youth engagement activities
Gerakan Pramuka	Character education and experiential learning partner	Supports leadership practice, discipline, teamwork, civic responsibility, and character development
Educational Institutions	Learning ecosystem and capacity-building partner	Provides learning spaces, training support, youth access, and knowledge development
Private Sector	Economic empowerment and innovation partner	Provides internships, mentoring, entrepreneurship support, funding, and innovation opportunities
Development Partners	Technical assistance and knowledge partner	Supports benchmarking, capacity building, research, monitoring, and evaluation
Communities	Grassroots implementation and feedback partner	Provides local participation, community needs, social contribution opportunities, and feedback for improvement

5.3 KPI-Based Monitoring and Evaluation Framework

The KPI-based Monitoring and Evaluation Framework serves as a complementary resource to IPP (Initiative to Prepare Patriots), providing programmatic metrics. The KPI monitoring and evaluation framework includes four layers: Output Measures/KPIs; Outcome Measures/KPIs; Value-Based Impact Measures/KPIs; and Measures of Learning & Feedback/KPIs. Output Measures/KPIs measure program implementation such as number of participants; total number of activities delivered; geographic area served by the program; and number of partners involved with the program. Outcome Measures/KPIs measure how participating in the program improves or impacts an individual's ability to demonstrate new leadership practices, improved problem-solving skills, increased collaboration with others, and greater contributions to their community. Value-Based Impact Measures/KPIs are designed to measure how much each participant increases their contribution to the values of Patriotism, Grit, and Empathy. Measures of Learning & Feedback/KPIs determine whether data collected through evaluations are used to modify and/or improve the program.

Table 5. KPI-Based Monitoring and Evaluation Framework

KPI Level	Purpose	Example Indicators	Link to Value-Driven Youth Development
Output KPI	Measures direct program deliverables	Number of participants, number of activities, number of regions involved, number of partners engaged, number of training sessions completed	Shows program reach and implementation scale
Outcome KPI	Measures changes resulting from program participation	Increased youth participation, improved leadership practice, increased community contribution, improved problem-solving, program completion rate	Shows whether programs create meaningful changes in youth capacity and behavior

KPI Level	Purpose	Example Indicators	Link to Value-Driven Youth Development
Value-Based Impact KPI	Measures contribution to Patriotism, Grit, and Empathy	Civic responsibility, resilience behavior, persistence in completing tasks, inclusive collaboration, volunteerism, social sensitivity	Shows whether programs contribute to the intended character development outcomes
Learning and Feedback KPI	Measures whether evaluation results are used for improvement	Program feedback collected, evaluation reports completed, improvement actions implemented, lessons learned documented	Supports continuous program improvement and institutional learning

5.4 Multi-Stakeholder Collaboration Cycle

The collaboration model consists of five stages: joint planning, shared implementation, shared reporting, evaluation feedback, and learning replication. This model helps move collaboration from project-based coordination toward ecosystem-based collaboration. It also supports accountability, resource sharing, alignment, and continuous improvement.

Table 6. Multi-Stakeholder Collaboration Cycle

Collaboration Stage	Main Activity	Expected Output
Joint Planning	Stakeholders define program objectives, target groups, values, roles, KPIs, and expected outcomes together.	Shared program plan and common understanding of youth development objectives
Shared Implementation	Stakeholders implement programs based on their roles and capacities.	Coordinated program delivery across sectors and regions
Shared Reporting	Stakeholders report progress, outputs, outcomes, challenges, and lessons learned using agreed reporting formats.	More consistent data and stronger accountability
Evaluation Feedback	Reported data and results are reviewed to identify success, gaps, and improvement needs.	Evidence-based feedback for program improvement
Learning and Replication	Best practices and lessons learned are documented, adapted, and replicated in other programs or regions.	Continuous improvement and scalable youth development practices

5.5 Phased Implementation Roadmap

The implementation will be a phased process over three (3) years; with phase one focused on aligning the framework to local government preparedness during the first year, phase two focusing on pilot implementations for developing technical capacities in selected municipalities within one (1) to three (3) years, and phase three focused on scaling nationally, implementing institutionally, and improving continuously through the third (3) to fifth (5) years. By having this multi-phased structure, Kemenpora can assess its' framework by piloting it initially, develop capacities among stakeholders, improve KPI's, provide a way to continue refining reporting processes, and implement successful pilots at a gradual pace.

Table 7. Phased Implementation Roadmap

Phase	Timeframe	Main Focus	Key Activities	Expected Output
Phase 1: Framework Alignment and Preparation	0–1 year	Building foundation for implementation	Develop value-to-program mapping, prepare KPI guidance, clarify stakeholder roles, design reporting templates, select pilot regions and programs	Clear implementation guideline, initial KPI framework, stakeholder role clarity, and pilot design
Phase 2: Pilot Implementation and Capacity Building	1–3 years	Testing and refining the framework	Implement pilot programs, train stakeholders, apply KPI-based monitoring, collect program data, conduct evaluation, identify best practices and implementation gaps	Pilot results, improved KPI system, stakeholder capacity improvement, and refined framework
Phase 3: National Scale-Up and Institutionalization	3–5 years	Expanding and embedding the framework into the youth development system	Scale successful practices, integrate framework into planning and reporting systems, strengthen digital monitoring, institutionalize collaboration mechanisms, conduct periodic review	Nationally adopted framework, stronger governance, integrated reporting system, and continuous improvement mechanism

6. Discussion

The findings show that Kemenpora's main challenge is not the absence of youth development resources, but the limited integration of existing elements. Kemenpora already has policy legitimacy, programs, values, stakeholders, regulatory support, and IPP. However, these elements need to be connected through a more coherent framework. The proposed framework contributes to public sector youth development management in three ways. First, it translates abstract values into program-level planning and measurement tools. Second, it strengthens governance by clarifying stakeholder roles and responsibilities. Third, it complements macro-level youth development measurement with program-level KPIs that can capture outputs, outcomes, and value-based impacts. The framework also responds to implementation challenges by emphasizing multi-stakeholder collaboration and phased implementation. This is important because youth development is multidimensional and requires participation from various actors across national and regional levels.

The expert interviews strengthen the relevance of the proposed framework by confirming that Kemenpora needs a more operational, measurable, coordinated, and feasible approach. The interview insights support the need for clearer value-to-program alignment, stronger governance mechanisms, more specific program-level indicators, structured stakeholder collaboration, and gradual implementation. Therefore, the proposed framework should be understood not as a replacement for the existing system, but as a complementary mechanism that strengthens integration. IPP remains useful as a macro-level measurement instrument, while program-level KPIs provide a more specific way to assess the contribution of particular programs to Patriotism, Grit, and Empathy.

7. Conclusion

This study proposes an improved youth development framework for Kemenpora based on a value-driven approach through governance, KPIs, and multi-stakeholder collaboration. The findings show that Kemenpora already has important foundations for youth development, including national policy alignment, institutional legitimacy, regulatory authority, youth development programs, stakeholder networks, and IPP. However, these elements need stronger integration. The thematic analysis generates five practical outputs: a Value-to-Program Alignment Matrix, Governance Roles and Responsibility Model, KPI-Based Monitoring and Evaluation Framework, Multi-Stakeholder Collaboration Cycle, and Phased Implementation Roadmap. These outputs form the basis of the proposed improved framework.

A VALUE-DRIVEN YOUTH DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK FOR KEMENPORA: INTEGRATING GOVERNANCE, KPIS, AND MULTI-STAKEHOLDER COLLABORATION

Mira Dallima Andini et al

The proposed framework does not replace Kemenpora's existing system or IPP. Instead, it complements and strengthens the current system by helping Kemenpora move from activity-based youth development implementation toward value-driven, outcome-oriented, measurable, governed, and collaborative youth development management. Future research can test the proposed framework through pilot implementation, develop behavioral indicators for Patriotism, Grit, and Empathy, involve broader stakeholders, and evaluate program-level impacts on youth participants.

REFERENCES

- Barney, J. B. (1991). Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. *Journal of Management*, 17(1), 99–120.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101.
- Kaplan, R. S., & Norton, D. P. (1996). *The balanced scorecard: Translating strategy into action*. Harvard Business School Press.
- Kementerian Pemuda dan Olahraga Republik Indonesia. (2025). *Rencana Strategis Kementerian Pemuda dan Olahraga 2025–2029*. Kemenpora.
- Kementerian Pemuda dan Olahraga Republik Indonesia. (2025). *Laporan Indeks Pembangunan Pemuda*. Kemenpora.
- Kementerian Pemuda dan Olahraga Republik Indonesia. (2026). *Peraturan Menteri Pemuda dan Olahraga Republik Indonesia Nomor 6 Tahun 2026*. Kemenpora.
- United Nations Development Programme. (n.d.). *Youth strategy and youth empowerment documents*. UNDP.
- World Bank. (n.d.). *Human capital and youth development resources*. World Bank.