



General Assembly

Distr.: General
6 September 2010

English only

Human Rights Council

Fifteenth session

Agenda item 3

**Promotion and protection of all human rights, civil,
political, economic, social and cultural rights,
including the right to development**

Written statement* submitted by the International NGO Forum on Indonesia Development (INFID), a non- governmental organization in special consultative status

The Secretary-General has received the following written statement which is circulated in accordance with Economic and Social Council resolution 1996/31.

[24 August 2010]

* This written statement is issued, unedited, in the language(s) received from the submitting non-governmental organization(s).

Efforts of controlling poverty in regards of economy, social and cultural rights in Indonesia

The common situation in Indonesia, poverty level is escalating drastically during monetary crisis; same as in majority of Asian countries, such as Thailand, South Korea and Philippines. The number of poor people in 1998 reaches 49.5 millions of person, or nearly a quarter of population in Indonesia at that time. In the next period of time, which is seven years post the crisis, poverty level tends to decline although slightly slow. However in 2006, some because of the impact of raising fuel price policy, the poverty number rise again. The Government then started to reinforce several programs of poverty control in order to pacify price fluctuation due to the rise of fuel cost. Nevertheless, in spite of numerous program of poverty control driven to facilitate instability post monetary crisis, poverty number does not go through significant regression. If we observe the quantity of budget allocation and number of poverty level, there is an anomaly in Government struggle in pressuring poverty degree. It can be noticed from the tendency of State Budget and Expenditure (APBN) for 2009, the budget for poverty control reach 66.2 billions. It is equal with an escalation of nearly three times higher within five years. However the rise of allocation up to that point does not followed by diminution of poverty number. From the perspective of policy implementation and even from ratification of international regulation on economy, social and cultural rights within the Law No.11 of 2005, one of channels to answer question of political budgeting is the importance of observing performance of poverty control programs. The observation on budget allocation, program and activity directed for poverty control can provide illustration on how precisely allocation of budget, program and activity are able to be implemented appropriately in order to control poverty. From the spirit of establishment of National Strategy in Controlling Poverty (SNPK) that functions as base in the National Middle Term Development Plan (RPJMN) of Indonesia, Government clearly applies rights based approach. In this approach the State is obliged to respect, protect, and fulfill basic rights of poor people including their rights of economy, social and cultural (Ekosob). The rights based approach are supposed to implicate on the transformation of way of seeing relationship between the Government and the people, particularly poor society regarding the fulfillment of their rights, specifically of their economy, social and cultural rights.

Various problems that become reason behind program of poverty control and fulfillment of economy, social and cultural rights in Indonesia can be observed from the affected aspects:

1. Failure in the fulfillment of basic rights; insufficiency quantity and quality of foodstuff, limited access and low-grade of health care quality, inadequate job and business opportunities, restricted access of housing and sanitation, limited access of clean water, inferior claim of ownership and possession of land, deterioration of environment condition and natural resources and restricted access of natural resources for the people, inferior guarantee of safety and low-grade of participation.
2. Population burden carried by poor citizens; poor people's burden is getting heavier because of the amount of family's loads and life pressure. Therefore it escalates migration. Data from Bureau of Statistic Center (BPS) says that poor households in the cities are averagely contain 5.1 persons of family members, while in the rural areas are 4.8 persons. Therefore with household burden, the opportunity of children from poor family to continue their study and obtain health care becomes obstructed. It is frequently happened because family members must work to help family needs.
3. Inequality and unfairness of gender. Different poverty experience between male and female, some are caused by existence of patriarch culture, approach and

paradigm of development. In the practice, development has hegemony and patriarch characteristics and in hierarchy of decision making has secluded women systematically from policy, program and institution that is not gender responsive. So in this case it causes poor women group will be difficult to be out from this disadvantage situation.

While overall, the program conducted in the frame of controlling poverty and fulfilling economy, social and cultural rights implemented by the Government are classified into 3 categories:

1. National Program of Family Based Integrated Social Aid that aspire to conduct fulfillment of basic rights, reduction of cost of living and improvement of poor people's quality of life. For example: Raskin (Rice for Poor People), Jamkesmas (People's Health Insurance), PKH, Scholarships, etc.
2. National Program of People Empowerment (PNPM), PNPM intends to develop potency and strengthen capacity of poor groups to be involved in development that is based on empowerment principle. For example: Urban PNPM and Rural PNPM.
3. National Program of Empowering Micro and Small Business (UMK) aims to provide access and strengthen the economy of small and micro business. For example: Credit for People's Business (KUR).

From the programs of poverty control and also fulfillment of economy, social and cultural rights, practically seems that the program is directed to the sector of poverty control based on economy and social rights. If compared with national and international targets of poverty control, it will become an incredibly tedious homework where the Government must conduct a series of breakthrough and innovation to pursue those targets. This is as a result of the situation where the sum of poor people in 2007: 16.58%, in 2008: 15.42%, in 2009: 14.87% and in march of 2010: 13.33%; while the targets set by Government of Indonesia are: in RPJMN years of 2004-2009: 8.2% (failed), RKP 2010: 12-13.5%, RPJMN 2014: 8-10%, MDGs: 7.5%.

It will become shared challenge that the programs aimed for poverty control and fulfillment of economy, social and cultural rights through a series of program and activity priorities, i.e.:

1. Enhancing the implementation of health and social aid for poor families, such as the formulating of appropriate organizing health insurance institution both on national and regional levels, the assessment of health cost structure, the setting of benefit package, the formulating of rationalization of cost calculation that required specifically by poor citizens.
2. In regard of family based Program such as Family of Hope, besides evaluation is the refining of verification and synchronizing it with other sectors like health and national education
3. Program of people empowerment; the necessity to harmonize definite institution that authorized for decision making at regional level, harmonize programs of empowerment that has sectioning character and the needs of performance enhancement synergy between central and local Governments. Another support is systems of data collection, data base and effective program targeting.