Recent development of legal system on disaster management in Indonesia and its function:

The role of law to support sustainability of society under the disaster

At 8th Asian Law Institute Conference, 26 May 2011, Kyushu University

SHIMADA, Yuzuru

Associate Professor, Graduate School of International Development

Nagoya University, Japan.

Earthquakes struck densely populated areas in Indonesia 2004-2009



Location of law in Disaster (Risk, Hazard, Vulnerability)

Root causes	Dynamic pressures	Unsafe conditions	Disaster	Hazard
Limited Access to •power •structures •resources Ideologies •political systems •economic systems	Lack of local institutions •training •appropriate skills •local investments •local markets •press freedom •thical standards in public life •thical standards in public life •apid population growth •rapid urbanization •arms expenditure •debt repayment schedule •deforestation	 Fragile physical environment dangerous locations unprotected buildings and infrastructure Fragile local economy evels evels Vunerable society special groups at risk lack of local institutions Public actions endemic disease 	RISK=Hazard +Vulnerability	Earthquakes High winds (cyclone/ hurricane/ typhoon) Flooding Volcanic eruption Landslide Drought Virus and pests

Source: Weisner, Ben; Blaikie, Piers; Cannon, Terry and Davis, Ian, At Risk: Natural Hazards, people's vulnerability and disasters (second edition), Routledge, 2010, p.49.

Disaster management law

Comprehensiveness

- Vulnerability exists before a disaster
- Legal system for reducing vulnerability should cover pre-disaster as well as post-disaster.
- Independence
 - Vulnerability comes from various sectors.
 - There should be inter-sectoral efforts.
 - Necessity of administrative and financial independence to coordinate various government organs.
- Empowerment
 - Enhancement of local institution
 - Extension of social capital
 - Participation and chance of access

development of these factors in disaster management laws

Aceh (2004)



Central Java (2006)



Law no.24/2007 on disaster management



West Sumatera (2009)



- high independence
- high
 empowerment
- less
 decentralization
- Insufficient daily supervising or inefficient monitoring?

Problems in West Sumatera

- Damage evaluation
- Quality of facilitator
- Lack of monitoring and checking
- Personal connection in community

Damage evaluation

Primary survey by community leader

- No clear criteria on damage level
- Possibility of data manipulation
- Validation by facilitator
 - Criteria provided by government agency
 - Heavier damage to lighter damage
 - Reduction of subsidy \rightarrow trouble with people
- Role of TPM (Accompanying People Team)
 - Representative of administration and community, community member with expertise knowledge, security sector
 - Actually, insufficient knowledge on particular community

Quality of facilitator

- Insufficient capacity, corrupt and irregular behavior.
 - Unlawful deduction of allocated subsidy
 - Facilitator requests extra payment
 - Irregular deduction is a rule rather than exception.
- Institutional reasons
 - Tight and rigid budget schedule
 - Must execute 3 trillions rupiah in a half year.
 - Government's slow response
 - Those problems had already been recognized before, but government failed to correct it.

Case 1: Urban area

Fictive data

- Some victims are excluded from subsidy program.
 - Personal relation with community leadership (trouble on corruption in village administration etc.)
- Fictive damage
 - Get subsidy, but already ruined before the quake
 - In residential quarter under construction, empty plots recorded as damaged.
 - Collusion among leaders, plot owners and developer



According to data made by community leader, there should be 35 heavily damaged houses on this empty area.

A ruin of traditional wooden house. This ruin is recorded as a collapsed in validated data (no habitant since before the quake).

Case 2: Remote area

Earthquakes in 2007

- No clear criteria on damage evaluation.
 - Arbitrary data survey by particular persons who close to village leadership.
 - Government also recognized the problem.
- Earthquake in 2009
 - Relation between village leader and facilitator
 - primary data is not checked by facilitator.
 - Data manipulation
 - Primary data by leader's family \rightarrow 158hh
 - Data by university team \rightarrow 181hh \rightarrow discarded
 - Fettered by "harmony"
 - Villagers afraid to have trouble with village leadership.

Implications

Limitation of local wisdom (gotong-royong)

- Necessity of impartial check and monitoring to avoid negative aspects of personal social relation.
- Enhancement of civil society
 - Padang government considers NGOs as opposition.
 - Minimum participation of NGOs
 - Smaller stock of civil society (academic and business)
- Formalism in disaster management
 - Execution of budget
 - Lack of flexibility