



New Administrative Territories in Indonesia and its Implications to Fisheries Extension Activities

Taryotoi AH*

Department of Fisheries Extension School of Fisheries, Fisheries College, Indonesia

*Corresponding author: Andin H Taryoto, Department of Fisheries Extension School of Fisheries, Fisheries College, Bogor, Indonesia, Email: andincikaret@gmail.com

Mini Review

Volume 6 Issue 4

Received Date: August 22, 2022

Published Date: November 01, 2022

DOI: 10.23880/ijoac-16000228

Abstract

Democratization process in Indonesia is implemented, among other thing, through the enactment of Decentralization policy nation-wide. Fisheries extension activities are activities that are also impacted directly and indirectly by the policy. By using qualitative indicative approach at provincial level, this study was conducted accordingly. It was found that no substantial indication that the decentralization policy led to a better performance of fisheries extension at provincial level. Moratorium policy for the establishment of new administrative territories is therefore supported by this result of the study.

Keywords: Fisheries

Abbreviations: ATs: Administrative Territories; ROI: Republic of Indonesia; FE: Fisheries Extension Activities; GSFE: Government-Supported FE Workers; VTPE: Voluntary FE; PO: Provinces of Origin; NP: New Provinces.

Introduction

Decentralization is one of key words in the process of democratization in Indonesia. This key word has begun to flourish since 1999 up to now. Through decentralization passage, a massive number of new administrative territories were established so that a special policy is assigned to ban new administrative territories temporarily. Different type of "decentralization", however, found in Ukraine [1]. In this country, before the Ukraine-Russia war, decentralizaion was implemented by applying amalgamation of small municipalities, combined with an effort to reallocate political, administrative and financial arrangement to the new amalgamated local communities (hromady in Ukraine terms).

Some considerations are raised to back up decentralization policy in Indonesia; improving services

delivery by the government, promoting the accountability of local government, improving intraregional economic competitiveness, and fostering bottom-up regional development are among the objectives [2]. Nevertheless, decentralization in Indonesia is still characterized by some obstacles and weaknesses. Shoesmith, et al. [3], for example, mentioned that decentralization was not performing well on administration and fiscal viability matters. In addition, Heriyanti, et al. [4] declared that at village level, decentralization is still characterized by the lack of capacity and capability in managing village government.

Fisheries extension activities are among the aspects that are impacted directly by the decentralization policy. Theoretically, decentralization policy should lead to a better practice of fisheries extension. This is especially related to the objective of improving service delivery by the government. This article is therefore directed toward examining whether fisheries extension practices are getting better after the implementation of decentralization policy in Indonesia. Qualitative indicative approach at provincial level is designated for this study.

Trend of New Administrative Territories Establishment In 1999-2012

On May 7, 1999, the Law No. 22/1999 on Administrative Territory Autonomy was launched formally. About one year before (May 21, 1998), Soeharto resigned as President of the Republic of Indonesia (ROI), after ruled the country for about 32 years. After ROI's independence on August 17, 1945, up to 1999 (54 years interval), there were only 319 administrative

territories (ATs) in Indonesia, in the forms of Provinces and Municipalities/Cities [5]. Both Soeharto's resignation on May 21, 1998, and the launching of the Law No. 22/1999 were considered as the triggers for massive proposals of new ATs in Indonesia [6]. In the period of 1999-2009, there were 205 new ATs established, that consisted of 7 new provinces, 164 new municipalities, and 34 new cities [7]; in ten years, more than a half of the number of previous ATs was generated...! (Table 1).

Date	Province of Origin	New Established Province
Oct. 4, 1999	Prov. of Maluku	Prov. of North Maluku (27 th Prov.)
Oct. 17, 2000	Prop. of West Java	Prov. of Banten (28 th Prov.)
Dec. 4, 2000	Prop. of South Sumatra	Prov. of Bangka-Belitung (29 th Prov.)
Dec. 22, 2000	Prop. of North Sulawesi	Prov. of Gorontalo (30 th Prov.)
Nov. 21, 2001	Prop. of Papua	Prov. of West Papua (31 st Prov.)
Oct. 25, 2002	Prop. of Riau	Prov. of Riau Kepulauan (32 nd Prov.)
Oct. 5, 2004	Prop. of South Sulawesi	Prov. of West Sulawesi (33 rd Prov.)
Oct. 25, 2012	Prov. of North Kalimantan	Prov. of East Kalimantan (34 th Prov.)

Source: adapted from Herawati, et al. [7].

Table 1: 7 New Provinces in Indonesia, 1999-2012.

There were 2 important chapters of the Law No 22/1999 that were seen as important legal supports for the immense proposals for new ATs: Chapter 6 and Chapter 115. It was mentioned in Chapter 6 that a territory could be divided into two or more territories, while Chapter 115 mentioned about the role of a special body related to the establishment of the new ATs, and its rights to recommend the establishment of new ATs to the President. In 2004, a new Law No. 32/2004 was launched. It was the updated version of the Law No. 22/1999. In this new Law, it was explicitly mentioned the objectives of the establishment of new ATs:

- To improve the quality and the equality of services provided to the communities;
- To promote economic development, especially for the periphery regions;
- To improve democratization process in all regions of the country;
- To promote safety and stability of all regions of the country, and
- To contribute to the unity of the nation. Nevertheless,

It was realized that different motives were found in the process of the establishment of ATs. According to Herawati, et al. [7] those were, among other things, creating more effective governance, homogeneity motive (in terms of ethnic, language, religion, income level), financial motive related to the valuable financial supports of the central government to the newly established ATs, rent-seeking motives, in terms of the eagerness to be the new ATs ruling classes and securing

the old "dynasty".

Related to the issue of Decentralization, the establishment of ATs is also followed by significant changes regarding to greater authority, political power, and financial resources to the regencies and municipalities authorities [8]. A couple of sectoral activities are also assigned to be the regencies and municipalities' responsibilities; those are, among other things, responsibilities for managing health, primary and middle-level education, public works, environment, communication, transport, and agriculture (including fisheries aspects). It is expected that regencies and municipalities could optimally managed their local resources effectively and could improve people's welfare in those regions. Due to different managerial capabilities in each region, Nasution further indicated that not all authorities could achieve the ideal goals of the decentralization. Related to this concern, Wardhana, et al. [9] supported Nasution's conclusion; he found that there was no significant correlation between decentralization and local service delivery/social protection for the people, and also on poverty reduction. These might be connected to the earlier warning specified by Darmawan (2008) that the decentralization practices in Indonesia was still characterized by poor institutional arrangement, lack of local finance contribution, and low human resource capacity. Nevertheless, current study showed that decentralization has improved the political practices mechanism in political and legislative aspects, while a special effort should be directed toward lessening the interregional disparity [10,11].

Moratorium of New Administrative Territories Establishment

The 6th President of Indonesia, General Yudhoyono (known popularly as SBY), had seen that the tendency of forming new ATs, both at provincial and municipality/city level, could impacted negatively to Indonesian political stability, when no proper restrictions were applied. Therefore, General Yudhoyono introduced the concept of "Moratorium"

for further proposal for new ATs establishment. He mentioned this notion in 2006 and repeated it again in 2009. Since then, no further new ATs were established, except in 2012, when SBY thoughtfully signed the law of establishing the 34th province of North Kalimantan. Table 2 shows the massive development of administrative areas in Indonesia so that the moratorium policy is implemented.

Administrative Level	1980	1990	2000	2010	2013
Province	27	27	26	33	34
District	246	241	268	399	413
Municipality	54	55	73	98	98
Sub District	3349	3625	4049	6699	9982
Village	65.372	67.033	69.05	77.548	80.414

Source: adapted from Nasution, 2016.

Table 2: Administrative Unit Development in Indonesia, 1980-2013.

In the next Jokowi Presidency, the idea of Moratorium is still implemented consistently. In 2021, for example, Vice President Ma'ruf stated that there would be no new ATs except for Papua. There were some political considerations for Papua, especially related to the government's efforts to speed up development processes in Papua region. In June 2022, Minister of Home Affairs Karnavian repeated that the government would continue to implement moratorium policy. He underlined that the evaluation to the newly established ATs showed that 5 new provinces, along with 5 other "old" provinces, could not reach the minimum target of generating their own regional income up to 30 percent. This situation was among the most important reasons for the continuation of Moratorium policy.

The impacts of the New Administrative Territories Establishment on Fisheries Extension

In developing country like Indonesia, agricultural extension activities, including fisheries Extension activities (FE), are still needed by small-scale farmers and small-

scale fish growers or aqua culturists [12,13]. In the case of FE, it is proposed that each sub-district in Indonesia will be served by at least 1 FE worker. This target could not still be contended up to the year of 2022. There was an average of 1,14 sub-district/FE workers by April 2022; 5 provinces with average less than 1, 20 provinces with average of 1,1-1,9, and 9 provinces with the average of more than 2. Limited budget allocated by the government to the government-supported FE workers' (GSFE) activities lead to the limited activities could be performed by GSFE workers. This situation led the government to convince community leaders and experienced fish growers to become Voluntary FE (VTPE) practitioners for their community. On the average, there were 29% of VTPEs of the total FE workers in Indonesia.

By using % VTPE, average sub-district per FE (SD/FE), and average sub-district per GSFE (SD/GSFE), the situation in 8 new provinces (Table 1) compared to their provinces of origin were analyzed. The three indicators could be perceived as general indicators of FE approximately. The results are shown in Table 3.

Administrative Level	1980	1990	2000	2010	2013
Province	27	27	26	33	34
District	246	241	268	399	413
Municipality	54	55	73	98	98
Sub District	3349	3625	4049	6699	9982
Village	65.372	67.033	69.05	77.548	80.414

Sources: calculated from the Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries Data Bank (2022).

Notes: Provinces in bold letters are Provinces of Origin (PO).

Table 3: Fisheries Extension Indicators in 16 Provinces in Indonesia, April 2022.

Further analyses were applied to compare Province of Origin (PO) with the New Provinces (NP), in terms of the 3 FE indicators. Table 4 showed the results of the analyses. From Table 3, there was no clear indication whether the establishment of the NP would positively improve the performance of FE for the 8 pairs of provinces.

Moratorium of the establishment of new ATs is still adopted in Indonesia up to August 2022, due to some financial, political, and manageability of administrative territories in Indonesia. The results of the general analysis of FE strengthen the reason that the moratorium policy should still be implemented; in these circumstances, no clear indication that the establishment of new provinces would lead to a better FE performance. In this situation, it is hard to fulfill the expectation that fisheries extension activities should improve fish farmers' well-being that would further support the economic development [14-16].

Code	Province	% VTFE	SD/FE	SD/GSFE
A1	Riau	8	1,65	1,79
A2	Riau Archipelago	15	1,95	2,30
B1	South Sumatra	15	1,25	1,47
B2	Bangka Belitung	6	0,89	0,94
C1	West Java	49	1,15	2,24
C2	Banten	51	1,60	3,23
D1	East Kalimantan	52	0,84	1,75
D2	North Kalimantan	40	0,65	1,08
E1	North Sulawesi	9	1,20	1,33
E2	Gorontalo	21	0,80	1,01
F1	South Sulawesi	21	0,67	0,85
F2	West Sulawesi	26	0,85	1,15
G1	Maluku	13	0,88	1,02
G2	North Maluku	10	1,24	1,38
H1	Papua	8	5,70	6,19
H2	West Papua	2	2,60	2,66

Table 4: Provinces Of Origin compared to the New Provinces.

Conclusion

Indonesia has undergone Decentralization formally since 1999. Massive number of new administrative territories had been established during 1999-2012 period. Due to some administrative and political considerations, decentralization moratorium has been applied since 2009. As one of the aspects impacted by decentralization policy, fisheries extension activities are not getting better with the execution of decentralization policy. Accordingly, it is still necessary

to retain the moratorium policy of the establishment of new administrative territories, until everything could be guaranteed that it would be beneficial to the community, including to the fisheries community in Indonesia.

References

1. Romanova, Valentyna, Umland A (2019) Ukraine's Decentralization Reforms Since 2014: Initial Achievements and Future Challenges. Research Paper. Ukraine Forum. Chattam House. London.
2. Tessa T, Tommy F, Delik H (2020) Welcoming two decades of decentralization in Indonesia: a regional development perspective. *Territory, Politics, Governance* 8 (5): 690-708.
3. Dennis S, Franklin N, Hidayat R (2020) Decentralised Governance in Indonesia's Disadvantaged Regions: A Critique of the Underperforming Model of Local Governance in Eastern Indonesia. *Journal of Current Southeast Asia Affairs* 39(3): 359-380.
4. Desy H, Holidin D, Mulia IC (2020) Centralized Local Development versus versus Localized Central Arrangement in Village Autonomy Policy Implementation in Indonesia. *Jurnal Ilmu Administrasi dan Organisasi* 27(2): 97-106.
5. Tenrini, Helbra R (2013) Regional Expansion: The Need or the Euphoria of Democracy? Why It Must Bloom. Analysis. Center for State Budget and Expenditure Policy, Fiscal Policy Agency of the Ministry of Finance.
6. Rudy, Hasyimsum Y, Heryandi, Siri K (2017) 18 Years of Decentralization Experiment in Indonesia: Institutional and Democratic Evaluation. *Journal of Politics and Law* 10(5): 132-139.
7. Retno Herawati's Unique Retno Herawati's Unique (2013) "Regional Explanation in Indonesia," *Politics: Journal of Political Science* 2(1): 57-65.
8. Nasution A (2016) Government Decentralization Program in Indonesia. ADB: Asian Development Bank Institute.
9. Dharendra W (2019) Decentralization, Democratization, and Social Protection In Indonesia: A Systematic Review of the Literature. *The Indonesian Journal of Development Planning* 3(2): 165-184.
10. Baidhowah, Adfin Rochmad (2022) Explaining Decentralization Performance in Indonesia. Member of Parliament Decision, Political Networks, and Constitution Amendment. *Jurnal Bina Praja* 14(1): 97-109.

11. Raksaka MB (2016) Indonesian Decentralization: Evaluation, Recent Movement and Future Perspectives. *Journal of Indonesian Economy and Business* 31(1): 119-133.
12. Andin T (2018) *Dari Perbatasan Menuju Penyuluhan Disruptif*. CV Rajawali Corporation. Bogor. Indonesia.
13. FAO (2017) Extension for Aquaculture Development. Committee on Fisheries Sub-Committee on Aquaculture. Ninth Session. Rome, pp: 24-27.
14. Sajesh VK, Suresh A, Mohanty A, Sajeew MV (2020) Streamlining Fisheries Extension. Model Training Course on Pluralistic Extension for Upscaling Secondary Fisheries. ICAR-CIFT, Kochi, India, pp: 1-11.
15. Andin HT (2020) Aquaculture and Fisheries Extension during Covid-19 Outbreak in Indonesia: A Descriptive Qualitative Perspective. *Fisheries Extension during the Covid-19 Pandemic in Indonesia: A Qualitative Descriptive Review*.
16. Chowdhury, Rahman A, Mamun-ur-Rashid, Hossain S (2016) Effect of Public Fisheries Extension Service on the Selected Socioeconomic Aspects of the Clients in Two Selected Sub-districts under Barisal District in Bangladesh. *Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology* 13(1): 1-13.

