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Poverty Reduction, Social Protection and Child Protection in Indonesia: Commitment, Progress and Work Ahead

Indonesia, a country of over 240 million citizens, and 13600 islands, with considerable diversity, has firmly moved in the direction of democracy and decentralization since the overthrow of President Suharto in the late 90s. It is also considered as a lower Middle Income Country with considerable regional and international clout and aspirations with regards to leadership in the G20 and in ASEAN, as well with the Post-MDG 2015 Development Agenda and other international processes. Indonesia has much to be proud of and showcase and share, as is quite widely and increasingly recognized and as I will be further sharing. However, as taken on board also by its political and other leaders, much more remains to be done in terms of equity and social justice.

I will be sharing and reflecting on some of these developments, opportunities and challenges within the poverty reduction/social protection and child protection discourse and practice. It will obviously be only a partial representation of what is happening in this dynamic country but I do hope that will give you a sense of some of the main directions and also look forward to receiving your inputs, suggestions and guidance as to how we in UNICEF Indonesia can play a more strategic role in supporting the Government and other development partners in the realization of the Rights of Children with a focus on the most disenfranchised.

The GOI has a strong focus on poverty reduction and social protection. These are integrated within its larger vision for the social development of the country and reflected in its 25 year and five year plans consistently, firmly and strongly. The calibre of Government staff who are the visionaries and leaders in this regard is really considerable and impressive.As a consequence of its economic growth as well as poverty reduction/social protection programmes, the country has been able to reduce poverty to the pre-1997 crisis level. By March 2012, it was at 12 per cent (using the Government’s poverty line). However, the speed of reduction has slowed down and inequalities have increased as reflected in a growing gini coefficient (from .33 in 2001 to .41 in 2011)[[1]](#footnote-1). Between March to September 2012, the poverty gap and poverty severity have somewhat further deteriorated.Some additional information to demonstrate some of the key challenges include:

* Only 55% of children have been registered at the national level. In some districts of Papua and West Papua, only one in five children is registered.
* 36% of children under-five in Indonesia are stunted.
* Only 65% of children 12-23 months have been fully immunized. In Merauke, Papua, five out of ten children are fully immunized but only one in five in Jayawijaya, Papua.
* Indonesia is the second country with the largest numbers of people practising open defecation or 63 million people.
* 56% of household use improved sanitation. Only three of ten households in Jayawijaya, Papua use improved sources of drinking water.
* Only 38% of children have access to ECD.
* There are still 9.3 million children age 7 to 18 years out of school.
* Teacher absenteeism in Tanah Papua is as high as 33.5%.
* 9 out of 10 children in Jayawijaya, Papua, reported experiencing severe violent disciplinary methods.
* One in four women are married under the age of 18 in Indonesia.
* Child Poverty rate is higher is rural areas than in urban areas
* Due to big numbers of population, Java has the biggest share of children living in poverty (54% of total in Indonesia)

Some of the more unique features of poverty in Indonesia include 1) a significant number of highly vulnerable people who live very close to the poverty line and go in and out of poverty often. This is estimated to be 40% of the population. Catastrophic health costs, volatile labour market, frequent natural disasters etc. are all contributing factors. 2) non-monetary poverty is significant and 3) there is considerable inter-regional poverty.

The highest poverty rates are in Eastern Islands but there is also a high concentration of poor people in Java Island. There are 16 million poor people in the three Java provinces but in Papua, the poverty rate is higher at 37.5%. In addition to inter-regional disparity, there are provincial, inter-provincial, quintile related and other disparities also for indigenous populations, female headed-households, households with disabled persons and other marginalized groups such as those living with HIV and AIDS etc.[[2]](#footnote-2) UNICEF continues to work closely with partners to further highlight these issues and advocate for their integration in policy frameworks.

There is a strong institutional set-up for the poverty reduction/social protection work including through the Ministry of Planning, Ministry of Social Affairs, line ministries and the more recent Vice President’s National Team for the Acceleration of Poverty Reduction (TNP2K) etc. and also a number of - though not enough – academic and research support from the like of SMERU – the most respected think-tank in Indonesia in the area of poverty.

TNP2K has focused in a number of strategic areas including a) design, plan and budgeting for poverty reduction policies and programmes b) Synergize, synchronize, harmonize, and integration of poverty reduction policies and programmes and c) Supervise and control the implementation of poverty reduction programmes and activities – a clearing house.[[3]](#footnote-3) improving the unified database (PPLS) of 40 per cent of Indonesians living close and under the line of poverty. This is to be updated in 2014. Concerns remain exclusion errors affected the most vulnerable of children such as street children. Coordinator for sure remains a challenge as well as how best to mobilize Development Planning Agencies at the sub-national level who exert considerable influence and can play a key role.

Social protection schemes and frameworks came to the forefront of GOI priorities at the time of the 1997 crisis when scholarships for the poor, health coverage, unconditional cash transfers and public work programmes demonstrated they were quite effective in preventive much more serious levels of poverty, school drop-outs etc. Though evolving and changing, such programmes have been moving forward since that time. Indonesia has also benefited from and learned from other countries such as those in Latin America in this regard.

The various programmes are categorized to reflect Social Insurance schemes (i.e. pension, Old Age Security, Health Insurance, work injury and death related insurance) and then the 3 clusters which are 1)Family based integrated social assistance programmes like scholarship for the poor, subsidized rice, CCT, cash to disabled persons, children living in adversity etc. 2) Block grants to communities/community-based poverty reduction and empowerment programmes (usually related to small scale infrastructure, health, education or social programmes within the community) and 3) Development of micro and small enterprises including credit to SMEs.

There are many different social protection programmes and also some established at sub-national level. Therefore there is concern with their fragmented nature, as well as with targeting[[4]](#footnote-4), weak M&E frameworks, limited impact evaluations, issue of complaint systems, supply vs demand balance, exit strategies etc. though efforts have and are being made in all these areas.

With the passing of the National Social Security System and Law in 2011, its implementation including that of Universal Health Coverage by 2014 are also enormous challenges for the GOI and its partners.

At the same time the GOI is moving towards a more integrated/ transformative/ inclusive/ better coordinated PR and SP Framework that also has a life-cycle perspective. Also there will be a SP index as part of the regular socio-economic survey of the GOI in place within a year. What does already exist is the unified database (PPLS) which was updated in 2011 with enhanced coverage using registration and proxy means testing. The expectation is that in due course all relevant programmes will use this database and studies have and will be undertaken on how to further improve the targeting and new generation of the database. The information is available on TNP2K’s website.[[5]](#footnote-5)

UNICEF has in the past years gradually increased its engagement with the above and increasingly become a partner to some of the key players in this area of work at national and provincial level and also attempted to fine tune its programme and approaches more towards upstreaming/social policy and now also child-sensitive social protection.

UNICEF has done this through a number of strategies including provision of research and evidence for policy-makers such as through the Child Poverty Study, Out of School Study, VAC study, Investment Case (Maternal and Child Health Bottleneck Analysis), School Block Grants Study, MICS in Papua and West Papua, HIV/AIDS and Social Protection Mapping etc. While UNICEF has and is sharing the findings with policy-makers to influence social development policies and programmes, we also have room for further improving our evidence-based advocacy.

The first CP Study shows a higher percentage of child poverty as compared to adult poverty from 2009 data. It is estimated from 2009 data that around 44.3 million children were living on less than the equivalent of US$2 per capita per day, of which 13.8 million lived below the National Poverty Line and 8.4 million children lived in extreme poverty. [[6]](#footnote-6) More than 50% of poor children reside in Java and Bali but it is provinces in the Eastern part of the country that have the highest percentage of poverty amongst children. The study also shows that only 18.3 per cent of Indonesian children are free from any of the studied deprivations and 59% face one or two deprivations. It also shows that the situation gets worse for children living in lower income quintiles with only 4.85% being free of such deprivations whereas it is 39.75% in quintile five. UNICEF has and will continue to use this study for policy advocacy at various levels with its partners and integration into its own programme.

UNICEF has also focused on building up more strategic partnerships in this area and done in-house capacity building as well as with and for partners in relevant areas. It has supported the establishment of a network of researchers working on children’s issues and Annual Research Conferences. The next one focuses on Child Poverty and Social Protection and will happen on 10 to 11th of September in Jakarta.

UNICEF Indonesia in addition developed its SP Strategy in 2012 after considerable consultation to strengthen its synergies and focus to better support the Government and other partners. The Social Protection Strategy[[7]](#footnote-7) makes the following recommendations as focus areas of work for UNICEF.

1. Strengthen cash transfers and other social assistance programmes.
2. Ensure appropriate child benefits within Universal Health Care
3. Strengthen attention to children within the community-based PNPM
4. Help identify particularly vulnerabilities of children in excluded groups and design appropriate interventions
5. Contribute to resource mobilization around social protection and children and
6. Strengthen national partnerships and capacity building around social protection for children

UNICEF has in addition focused on innovations/pilots including the PKH/Prestasi which is UNICEF’s first such effort and also the first time AusAid has funded a UNICEF SP related pilot. In this pilot UNICEF and its partners focus on strengthening the impact of the CCT on reduction of stunting – one of the most dire consequences of poverty in Indonesia.[[8]](#footnote-8) This pilot is focused in Brebes, the poorest district in Central Java, and Sikka, in NTT, which is amongst the poorest provinces of Indonesia and where the stunting rates are, 48.7% and 49.6% respectively. By working with multiple partners at the national and sub-national level, as also inspired by Latin American experiences as documented in the Lancet series – with a focus on strengthening coordination, communication and capacity building – the pilot aims to demonstrate how CCTs and nutrition services can be mutually reinforcing in the reduction of stunting. The pilot is supported also by TNP2K, Ministry of Planning, Ministry of Health and Ministry of Social Welfare.

The above builds on the country’s largest CCT programme – PKH - which has a number of health and education related conditionalities – reaching 3 million households by 2014. It is highlighted in GOI presentations that PKH is expected to have an impact on street and working children. Though more impact evaluation is needed, what has been collected so far [[9]](#footnote-9)shows an overall positive impact on visits to health centers and school attendance etc. Less is known regarding the actual long-term impact. Nevertheless, it is expected that it will encourage children to stay longer at school with all the positive consequences that has – including reduction in terms of vulnerability and risks. UNICEF will continue to engage on the next steps of enhancing PKH – advocating also for greater consideration for holistic and integrated ECD and out of school children. It is also important to note that the Government is now working on the Transformation Strategy for PKH which includes graduation, recertification and linkages with other programmes.

There is also a Scholarship for Poor Children in place, reaching 8 million children currently. And a large block grants to schools programme (BOS). Nevertheless, all these programmes reach children in school and there is not enough focus on reaching children out of school – an area UNICEF is working on with partners at national and sub-national level through back to school campaigns and other initiatives. The existing education programmes have various challenges including the timeliness of payments, the insufficient amount, opportunity cost of accessing them etc. The block grants study being undertaken by UNICEF will also provide recommendations for further improvements.

Having shared a bit of a snapshot on poverty reduction and social protection, I will turn to child protection, which though related is still also in some ways separate.

In terms of Child Protection, Indonesia has regulations to put children at the focus of its development as stipulated in the Constitution (Article 34 Clause 1) which says Poor People and Abandoned people should be under the custody of the State. Some laws have been issued to protect children: Law on Child Protection (Law No. 23/2002); Civic Administration System (Law No. 23/2006); law on Social Welfare (Law No. 11/2009); Law on Criminal Juvenile Justice System (Law No. 12/2011); and so on.

Like social protection, the work in this regard is also fragmented and spread amongst the Ministry of Planning, Ministry of Social Affairs, Ministry of Women’s Empowerment and Child Protection, Ministry of Law and Human Rights etc. Also the GOI definition of child protection is the whole Child Rights agenda which is often a bit confusing with regards to the CP agenda we have and as defined by the CRC. However, the broader child protection definition is for sure now integrated in the five year Government plan which is of course a big step forward.

UNICEF has been focusing on promoting the SBA to CP with the GOI and other partners over the past few years with some level of success and buy-in. The GOI is indeed committed to building a comprehensive and effective child protection system focusing on family and community based are, and less reliance on institution care. Indonesia has over 8000 childcare institutions where over half a million children spend the greater part of their childhoods. And only ten per cent of these were orphans having lost both parents.

Amongst the work done with UNICEF has been mapping of CP systems[[10]](#footnote-10) which includes also the social welfare and social protection services. The mapping highlighted the need for a stronger legal framework for a functioning child protection system, a more Child Friendly Justice System, a stronger Social and Family Welfare System and improved Social Behaviour Change programmes and strengthening the database on child protection.

In addition, UNICEF has and is working on Strengthening Family Based Care with a focus on linking with social protection schemes. Child protection CSOs are also active in the country in these areas but unlike stronger CSOs working on poverty reduction/budget transparency/governance – they are largely still focused on projects and specific issues rather than engagement at policy level.

Within SBA, and with the realization that in order to not only focus on tertiary care – the continuum of also primary and secondary care in CP is key – a greater attention to frontline workers who play a determining role has evolved. It is they who can and should – if in possession of the right skills and clout be able to do preventive work and also make linkages with social protection schemes and other services.

One of UNICEF’s CP priorities is to work with the GOI to thus strengthen social workers in terms of criteria, training, certification etc and in this regard has a three year partnership also with Griffith University in Australia[[11]](#footnote-11) Key recommendations include 1) Legislation and policy gaps to be addressed 2) review and renewal of governance and coordination 3) improving service delivery and 4) workforce development especially for social work.. Social workers of course can and will be able to support the whole spectrum of child protection concerns from street children, trafficking, institutionalized children, children in prisons etc. UNICEF is also working with the CP Center of the U. of Indonesia with possible AusAid funding on a six month pilot project to undertake a bottleneck analysis of families and children facing various CP vulnerabilities including difficulties in accessing social protection schemes.

With regards to child protection and social protection, Indonesia also has PKSA (Child Welfare Programme)[[12]](#footnote-12) as a CCT directly targeting currently 170,000 children at risk or exploited including street children, children in prison, children who have been sexually exploited etc. The assessment identifies weaknesses in terms of the absence of a baseline, need for improved indicators, need for good prevalence data, linkage to de-institutionalization, improving quality of services provided, increase in professionally trained social workers etc.

There is also a Ministry of Labour CCT for child labourers that focuses on their education and skill development. ILO supports this programme. Again, these are not as coordinated as they should be but nevertheless are providing some support and show how CP and SP can be and needs to be mutually reinforcing.

UNICEF is also working with partners in some new areas like research on impact of migration on children which will hopefully identify the vulnerabilities of such children and how they can be further supported. More is also now being done on inclusiveness with regards to those living with disabilities etc. The low coverage of birth registration mentioned earlier also further complicates such children being reached effectively by poverty reduction/social protection and child protection services including in terms of prevention of trafficking.

Partnerships with faith-based organizations. Private sector, CSOs, within the UN with the UN SP Taskforce are other areas of further work for UNICEF.

At the Setting the Agenda for an Integrated Social Protection System for Children and Families in Indonesia Event[[13]](#footnote-13) in May 2012, as organized by Bappenas as well as USAID, Columbia University and the CP Center of the U. of Indonesia, the following final recommendations were concluded: 1) Need for greater focus on children and their families especially the poor and vulnerable 2) Prioritizing comprehensive preventive measures 3) Developing a social protection programme that promotes family capacities for care and protection 4) Combining protection within other sectors 5) Increased investment on families to care and protect their children and 6) Reforming and strengthening policies and programmes based on evidence in above areas.

As I have tried to capture in this short presentation – a lot is being done in Indonesia in the axis of Poverty Reduction, Social Protection and Child Protection. However, these efforts are still relatively young and fragmented. Some baselines do exist but these are not comprehensive especially with regards to Child Protection. While some assessments and evaluations exist – still not enough is known about the longer term impacts of these programmes.

Though efforts have been made, considerable work still needs to be done to pull these various programmes together, to have improved coordination, to develop a mutual baseline, improve the targeting and map the continuum of poverty reduction/social protection and child protection. Many of the elements are there but they need to be further synergized and situated more strategically with a stronger evidence base and M&E framework.

It is only by going to the next level – next generation of programmes and of looking further at root causes and prevention, and improving its current PR/SP and CP programmes in synergy and coordination with each other that Indonesia will be able to see poverty rates reduced to even lower levels more quickly and sustainably, inequality and disparities reduced further, social justice reached wider and vulnerability especially amongst its children minimized.

We in UNICEF Indonesia are indeed trying to situate our interventions in these areas and hope to further fine-tune our programme and strategies in our forthcoming MTR with the priorities of the GOI in this regard. In addition, by establishing an in-house Social Protection Task Force we are working across the clusters/sectors to further strategize our efforts. As demonstrated in my presentation – it is only by pulling efforts together with improved coordination and collaboration, that we, like the Government and other partners, can move forward even more effectively. Your suggestions and inputs will be highly appreciated.

Thank you for your attention and look forward to receiving your feedback, questions, comments and guidance.

Niloufar Pourzand, Chief, SP and M, UNICEF Indonesia
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