

# ***POLICY PAPER***

## **THE PROTECTION AND ADVANCEMENT OF FAMILY FARMING IN INDONESIA**

Drafter

Nining Erlina Fitri

Amir Mahmud

Priadi Talman



**The National Committee of Indonesian Family  
Farming  
2017**

## **Background**

The preparation of the *policy paper* is intended to roll out the expanse of reality and the characteristics of Family Farming in Indonesia to the public, and in turn perform corrective actions with the protection and development of the Family Farm optimally and sustainable, as well as the promotion of knowledge and practices of Family Farming in economic, political, social and culture in Indonesia through policies contained in the regulations of law.

Though the reverberations of the family farm echoed lately and not found in the law and policy, however, in practice Family Farming is still ongoing in the community with a variety of forms in each location and its ecosystem. The reality of Family Farming that will be held related to the current condition and changes, the main issues, opportunities, threats and potentials. Based on these facts, then the measures in supporting Family Farming are made through public policies and work-creative work in the field.

The policy paper is compiled from an in-depth review and engaged stakeholders, including the relevant ministries. The initial study is a literature review and the field study in three locations with different agroecological and commodities. The research report examined together in the CSO and NGO by inviting each representative. Then followed up by the study with the parties, involving representatives from the Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Maritime Affairs and Fisheries, Ministry of Village, Development of Disadvantaged Regions And Transmigration and the Indonesian Institute of Sciences (LIPI) which formed in *the multi-stakeholder meeting*. In two joint studies of the research result appears some input and suggestions related to the research findings; the gap extant between the activities that have been carried out by the ministries and the unresolved issues faced by Family Farming in the field level; and the wide spacing extant between the ideal aspects of the quality of the law with the reality of the field.

The United Nations (UN) established the year 2014 as the year of Family Farming, as a form of recognition and appreciation of the nations in the world to small farmers. The Family farm is defined as a way of organizing agricultural production, forestry, fisheries, pastoral (grazing), and aquaculture (inland fisheries) which are managed and worked by a family and rely mostly on family labor, both women and men, and is the base of sustainable production (FAO, 2014).

There are characteristics that refer to the definition of the family farm. The FAO noted there are 32 definitions of the family farm, and until now there is no universally agreed-upon definition. The family farm concept is not yet known in Indonesia, but the characteristics of family farms have been practiced in vary depending on the conditions of social culture in each region.

## **The Family farm in Indonesia**

In Indonesia, the family farm has some of the characteristics based on research conducted in three villages, namely: food crops village (Blitar Regency, Jawa Timur), food crops village (Agam Regency, Sumatera Barat), and fisheries, specifically for the commodity of the crab village (Cirebon Regency, Jawa Barat) (Fitri et al, Mahmud et al, 2017).

**a. *The characteristics of family farm based on family form***

The form of the family in a family farm in Indonesia consists of the main family and the extended family. This family consists of mother, father, and a son (*nuclear family*) which majority found on the Island of Java. While the extended family is consist of the nuclear family and other family outside the nuclear family, which is still bound in the legal entity and/or other social institutions. This can be seen from the family that comes from the customary law community unit. For example the customary law community unit in Minangkabau, West Sumatera for food crops farm, and the customary law community unit in Maluku for fishery. The land management of the extended family in Minangkabau performed with rotation system, while for nuclear family it is managed by permanent system.

**b. *The family farm characteristics based on the size of the holding and the ownership of production tools***

For food crop, the production tools/land holding is divided into two, namely (1) owned land, and (2) land owned by others which occupied by lease system, income sharing and pledge. The land area which occupied by a farmer family is  $\leq 0.5$  ha. For the fisherman family, the fleet volume ranged between  $\leq 5$  GT-10 GT.

**c. *The characteristics of family farm based on production management***

Farming/fishing management is done by the family, but in the process is employed labor from inside and outside the family (wages).

**d. *The characteristics of family farm based on source of capital***

For farming/fishing, the capital is obtained from the family and other parties in the form of loans/debt from middleman, banks, neighbor, etc.

**e. *The characteristics of family farm based on marketing management***

Agricultural and fisheries products are marketed in the form of raw material to the consumer through the long marketing chain, with the result the *margin* price is mostly perceived by the intermediary/merchant. If venture capital is obtained from loans from middlemen then the selling price is much lower than the market price.

The use of technology on food crops that has been applied organic farming system, the capital expenditure for farming is smaller as the rice production facilities is self-prepared by utilizing local resources. Marketing chain is shorter because it only involves the organization as an intermediary, so the farmer's profit is higher. In addition, most of the labor is from within the family. Coupled with the effort to practice the mutual aid tradition in every stage of farming work.

**f. *The characteristics of family farm based on vulnerability***

The family based farming management is very vulnerable to *climate change*. The erratic and unpredictable climate raises the risk of crop failure and other farming risks.

**g. *The characteristics of family farm based on technology***

In general, farmers and fishermen in the study site depend on technology from the outside. The plant food farmers have a very high dependence on fertilizers, pesticides and other chemicals produced by the corporation. A small portion of farmers is applying natural farming that relies on local resources in the production process. Similar thing happened to fisher families, which strongly depends on the small traders/middlemen.

#### ***h. The characteristics of family agriculture based on the division of work between man and woman***

In performing farming activities, male and female share the equal and fair roles.

## **The Problems of Family Farm in Indonesia**

### ***Farmer Family***

In the research finding in two locations, namely in the farmer community with conventional farming system and natural farming, there are some key things either intersect or not. The basic findings of conventional agriculture include: (a) the narrowing of the land tenure (*guremisasi*), (b) the increase of hired labor, (c) land degradation, (d) the dilution of the mutual aid culture, (e) marketing chain is getting longer, and (f) diverse threat from the outside. While the basic findings for the natural agriculture include: (a) the narrowing of the land production; (b) the farmer regeneration crisis/aging; (c) stuff related to the supporting production facilities. In natural farming, there are various good changes since the practice of natural farming management principles which includes: (a) the increase of mutual aid/reciprocity culture, (b) the increase in production and the decrease in production cost, (c) the short marketing chain.

Various of farming issues in Java (in particular) and Indonesia can be seen from the green revolution policy in the 1960s and the impact that can still be felt until present. Among them, the narrowing of land tenure process, farmers' dependence on outside technology, the land degradation, the paid labor culture, etc.

At the present, the agricultural land in Java is owned by the nuclear family (*batih*). The average of the ownership and agricultural land tenure by farmer family ranged between 0.2-0.3 ha with an average income per month is around Rp1.530.375,-, while the cost per month reach Rp1.581.916. From this calculation, the farming outcome is not sufficient to finance the necessities of daily living. In able to survive, the farmer families are looking for additional work as farm laborers, construction workers and migrated abroad as informal workers (domestic helper, plantation workers etc.). Unlike in West Sumatra, the agricultural lands are controlled by the extended family (*tribe/farm*). The management is done with the rotation system between the family members themselves. The development of the extended family members resulted in the duration to get a turn to manage and working in the rice fields.

The continuing of the green revolution impacts can be seen from the practices use of inorganic fertilizers and pesticides excessively on the farm. This became the root of soil degradation, environmental pollution and natural ecosystem destruction. The use of fertilizers, pesticides and other chemicals also cause the high production cost. Meanwhile, the soil requirement of nutrients and the pesticide dose are always increasing. On the other hand, the farmer becomes dependent on corporation seed products as a result of the loss of farmer's self-reliance on local seed. Until now, farmers also face the uncertainty of price warranty on the farmers' products.

Nevertheless, some of the findings in the locations that deploy natural farming have given the example of various attempts to restore the farmers' self-reliance. The practice of natural farming shows that the cost is much lower compared to conventional farming,

because the farmers were able to utilize local resources as the ingredients to make fertilizers and pesticides.

Such is the case with the production chain or agricultural product marketing issues. This study finding shows that the production chain in conventional farming is longer compared to natural farming's chain production. This resulted in the high and low of the commodity price. In natural farming, the natural commodity selling price turns out higher than conventional farming commodities. Although profitable, the practice and the spread of natural farming can be said to be very slow. This is due to the lack of supporting facilities to make production facilities such as livestock, and others.

The other important thing that becomes finding in this study is the change in the use of labor. The mutual aid tradition which previously became a special character in the farming management in the study locations is now increasingly fade and replaced with paid labor. Family farmers hired others to perform some kind of works such as plowing (land preparation), planting, milling and harvesting. Other work such as seed selection, seeding, plucking the seeds, planting, maintenance, fertilizing, weeding, drying, and sale made by the father and the mother. While children are very rarely involved in farming, even if it's just to help their parents. The farmers children alienated from the farming world and assume the farmer is a profitable, dirty and muddy job.

### ***The Fisher Family***

Fisher, particularly the small fisher faced two problems at once, namely poverty and the coastal resource and fisheries deterioration. Both issues are interrelated accompanied by the peculiarities of the coastal and marine resources (types of mobile resources, climate/weather and so on). Poverty arises and takes place in social relations during the process of domination or utilization of coastal and marine resources, production, marketing to income sharing.

The two main issues above partly caused by the unequal utilization of coastal and marine resources. The density of the fishing fleet and fishing gear are not evenly distributed, and they are dominantly operating near the coast. Similarly, the occurrence of the inequality in the aspect of income sharing between the ship owner with the crew (ABK) in producing. The dependence to production tools and capital operations in the production (as in small trader) to marketing also contribute to deepening poverty. Poverty aggravated by the damage to the resources in which over-exploitation of the certain catch and coastal and marine areas damage. The use of fishing gear that is not ecologically friendly, catch density (fleet and fishing gear) in a region impacted to the coastal ecosystem damage.

Fisher family poverty has three aspects, namely (a) domination or utilization of coastal resources, (b) production, (c) distribution/marketing. Too dense utilization of a coastal area potentially resulted in the emergence of conflict between the small fisher, coastal ecosystem damage, over-exploitation to the lack of small fisher catch. The density of utilization is sourced from the inequality distribution of coastal resource technology utilization (fleet and fishing gear) so as to bring up catcher exploitation concentration in certain areas such as in the Java Sea. Coastal areas regulation is needed not only for the fishing technology redistribution in utilization through fisheries modernization, but also on the political and economic context able to ensure the domination and utilization of

collective small fishers to the coast in order to avoid the threat of exclusion (such as reclamation) and of ecological disaster or environmental.

The catch fisheries production of small fishers constrained about venture capital and catch operating capital, both for start a business and in the catch technology rejuvenation. In facing the venture capital and operating capital plus the catch instability issues, small fisher build social relations with the small trader to save the small fisher subsistence. Social relations with the small trader is made in the midst of uncertainty: the sea resources, catches, catch price, and the fulfillment of the daily needs. There are not many small fishers that utilize the conventional bank loan service for their business. Compared with conventional bank, the loan service by small trader have the convenience includes administrative barriers free, the fast process, no interest, and include venture capital/business operations and the daily needs. However, for the said loan service provision, the small trader gets benefit in the form of profits from the catch operational raw materials and of the catch price provision.

Not only on the production aspect, the small trader also controls the production distribution/marketing. Price control of fisher catches on the marketing aspect closely related to the dependence on production aspects. The emergence of small trader that operate in the capital and production to the marketing domains as the service coverage of conventional lending institutions to fishing business is not functioning effectively, the lack of safety mechanism for fisher in times of famine and the catch auction malfunction. In addition to owner fisher or fishing gear possessor, the crew also has problems related to the income sharing system from the catch. Due to the dependence to venture capital and operating capital, the catch selling price is determined by the small trader. This affects the size of sales proceeds that will be distributed between the ship owner with the crew and among the crew itself.

Tied with catch amount, the income sharing system (owners and crew) problems, and the like which culminate to the welfare level, emerge a phenomenon of the difficulty to get crews in formation of fishing business and widespread of migration in the fisher village. Most of the fisher family members and the fisher village migrated to the city, abroad or work on outside of fisheries field to fill the fisher family economy. The main job as a fisher is not able to meet the daily needs of the family. Similarly, most of the younger generation the fisher family are more interested to migrate and work outside of fisheries field. If they have to work as a fisher, sometimes it as a "last resort" only.

Observing the fisher condition above, a portrait of poverty experienced by most of fisher families becomes a reality. The coast tenurial tend to be not safe (*tenurial insecurity*) accompanied with insecurity in production and marketing so it is not easy to maintain and develop catch fisheries culture. Coupled with fisher family face a lack of access to basic services such as education, health and other so the problem is more complex.

### **Codification of Legislation that Supports the Concept of Family Farming in Indonesia**

The family farming concept which is found in several research areas, shows the differences as has been discussed on the classification of family forms and derivatives above, that the form of the classification itself was born based on the cultural wisdom of

each region. On the other hand, the creation of family farming condition in Indonesia is also driven by the existence of several laws and regulations that indirectly support the concept of the family farm.

The concept of Indonesian farming family as described above, indirectly supported and encouraged by the existence of several laws, among other are the Laws of the Protection and Empowerment of Farmers, Law of the Protection and Empowerment of Fishers, Law of the Cultivation System, and the Law of the Village. A combination of these laws indirectly give the State recognition of the existence and the role of farmers and fishers, as well as to give protection to farmers and fisher families.

If in a farmer family, based on the research findings in the field, there are some things that encourage the occurrence of high levels of poverty, among others are; (a) narrowing of land tenure (guremisasi); (b) the increasing use of hired labor; (c) soil degradation; (d) the dilution of the mutual aid culture; (e) longer marketing chain; and (f) various threats from the outside, then on the fisher family the researchers found the high level of poverty, and the destruction of coastal resources and fisheries.

### ***The Law of the Protection and Empowerment of Farmers and Fishers Aspects that support farming family***

The recognition of the farmers and fishers fundamental rights have been tried to be protected by the state through the enactment of the Laws of the Protection and Empowerment of Farmers and Fishers. The state in realizing a fair and prosperous society and to fulfill the rights and basic needs of citizens, organize the protection and empowerment of society, particularly farmers and fishers in a planned, purposeful, and sustainable way. Another reason of the formation of the *a quo* Law, is the trend of climate change escalates, vulnerability to natural disasters and business risks, globalization and global economic turmoil, as well as the market system does not favor the farmers and fishers, so that farmers and fishers in need of protection and empowerment in a comprehensive, systemic, and holistic way.

### ***The Law of the protection and empowerment of farmers and fishers problems related to the family farm concept***

Associated with the adoption of the *a quo* Law in the field, the rise of various problems can be found, as the findings of the researchers, among other problems, tenure and utilization of farming land in farmer family. Farming land tenure owned by farmer family on average less than 0.5 ha (small farmer), in fact, many of farmer families do not own farming land or often called tenant farmers, or even just become a farm laborer. The mechanism of land provision for farmers who did not enter the land redistribution agenda as part of the farmers empowerment agenda, has undermined the existence and purpose of the *a quo* law. Likewise, with the absence of the clear determination of the marine and coastal zone has increasingly discredited the existence of fisher in sustaining their economy.

The policies application related to government assistance and subsidies based on farmer's organizations and fishers institutional cannot be applied properly. The institution identification, that the researchers found in the field, that there should be a formal legal (the letters of correspondence recognition from the state), has been stunting the existence of the farmers and fishers institution that sometimes is not *clearly* identified in

the *a quo* law. So, at the time of subsidy distribution, the beneficiaries cannot receive it evenly. Also the subsidy distribution is done in a haphazard manner without first researching the needs of what is most important and urgently needed by local farmers and fishers.

In other terms, the *a quo* law does not focus on discussing the importance of the farming and fishing culture inheritance as well as the scientific development of farming and fisheries for the next generation which should be an important part of the *a quo* law, that lead to the lost of the sustaining strength of *a quo* law. How should the *a quo* law able to do deeper empowerment approach so that farming and fisheries can become the activities that are in demand by Indonesian people again.

Likewise, the involvement of female farmers and female fishers, which is in practice are so powerful in the struggle to meet the needs of the family economy. Female farmer and fisher position in the society system that is so patriarchal is not highlighted carefully in the *a quo* law. In the application of the *a quo* law in society, founds many of government services inequality between men and women. The problem of the application of all legislation related to farming and fisheries in the field must become the main concern of the legislation executives.

That the *a quo* law is indeed set about the consolidation and guaranteed the farmer's land area, but it's not giving farmers the opportunities to have "property rights" over the land. The sovereignty of the land managed by farmers can not be met by *a quo* law. Farmers don't have the collective property rights and difficult to manage the land independently. The provisions regarding the land consolidation will not be effective as long as no correction on the inequality of the land ownership, tenure, use, and utilization through redistribution as the core of the *land reform* (agrarian reform).

The regulation regarding to certain licenses for state land or derelict land in this law has narrowed the object/land that can be accessed by the farmer for his welfare, and do not have implications for the improvement of the lame agrarian structure as a source of injustice during this time. Hence, the potential object/land and juridically possible, for example: (1) the production forest area land that can be converted; and (2) land from other sources, such as; (a) the state land of former barat rights; (b) the state land from the no man's land; (c) the state land of former autonomous region; (d) the state land from used mineral, coal, and geothermal mining; (e) the state land from the forest area relinquishment; (f) the state land from the exchange or civil code acts in the Agrarian Reform framework; (g) or land that is submitted by the concessionaire to the state for Agrarian Reform) will not be facilitated legally by the *a quo* law. On the narrowing of the meaning of this, it has been forced farmers to trust solely from the identification of the derelict land existence itself.

Farmer institution become the next spotlight, where in practice, the application of the *a quo* law still does not give the freedom and legal certainty to farmer institutions outside of Poktan, Gapoktan, and cooperatives. Whereas, the article related to farmer institution has been interpreted in the decision of the Constitutional Court of the Republic of Indonesia (MKRI), which states the state recognition against another form than has been known by the government. Other forms it these could be in the form of union, the association of non-legal bodies, alliances, or communities or other groups. The confusion grew even more when the policymakers interpreted the recognition of the farmer institution through the certification legal bodies by identification recognition based on the



issuance of a certificate from the notary. Policy in the field like this is not very wise to be applied when the farmers and fishers have a normative livelihood that does not recognize the structural rigidity and / or formal legal bodies. The imposition of this legal body also as if put the farming community to face the corporate and large investors and compete directly. The effort to legalize the farming and fisheries institutions has caused their rights and obligations at the stage of production or in the other private law are equal in the eyes of the law if they face the corporate legal bodies. This immediately waives the state responsibility to protect and empower farmers as well as fishers which is mandated in the *a quo* law.

Subsidies and various forms of aid from the state through the government, which are channeled to the farmer institutions or the distributor instead of making farmers become self-sufficient, but raises the dependency to the fertilizer availability, seeds, even the dependence of the distribution of their farming product. This dependence removes the farmer's local wisdom, eliminate the mutual aid culture, eliminating the scientific breeding of farmers, obliterating the protection of agricultural land natural concept. When the state is not present to the answer these dependences, then we can not blame the farmers to feel more comfortable dealing with the middlemen.

Farming budget policy politics has led to the extinction of the family farm known by Indonesian people. The local farming knowledge is actually emphasized the farmer sovereignty to achieve food sovereignty that has been degraded. Budget politics policy misdirected the distribution of farming aid that should be able to achieve food sovereignty itself, has been wasted. Not to mention the implementation problems of the *a quo* in the field, where not all farmer family feels protected. Still, there is the criminalization of farmers in the field, the implementation of the criminalization article in other Law (for example: SBT Law) has ignored the existence of the *a quo* law.

Fisher families experiencing similar things, the vagueness of the catch area zone, which caused small fishers experiencing difficulty in catch cruise to be more optimal in catching the fish. The fishing gear usage rules that aim for the sustainability of marine products without any appropriate solution or misdirected subsidies make difficult for fisher families in meeting the daily needs. On the one hand, the fisher access to the various fields is also misdirected. There are many unproductive fish auctions. The fisher family still goes to the small trader to distribute and sell their catch. It's difficult for them to access the latest fishing technology. New piers were built, but not all the pier works as it should. A lot of piers are empty because it does not keep up with the fishers need analysis. Likewise, the adequate *cold storage* to accommodate the fishers catches.

### ***The Law of Vegeculture System Aspects that support the family farm in the a quo law***

The law of Vegeculture System (SBT) mandates the need of management and utilization of natural resources of vegetable that has a wide variety and has an important role for the people life and prosperity. The other purposes in the framework of agricultural development in accordance with the sustainable and environmentally sound development system. The next is an advance, efficient, and resilient farming, the update of agrarian law, and has an important role in the achievement of national development objectives, namely the creation of a fair and prosperous society based on Pancasila and the Constitution of 1945.

### ***The a quo law's problem related to family farming***

The farmer family involvement in the planning of the plant cultivation system may be said not to exist at all. In the *a quo* law which supposedly aims to develop the Indonesian native plant cultivation, which are very environmentally wise even more lost. The plant cultivation that is enforced in society becomes the government policy direction related to agriculture.

This government policy more less does not include farmer or farmer family in planning their farm cultivation in accordance with their respective nature and culture. The preference of each region related to Agriculture has been replaced with the interests of pursuit food self-sufficiency launched by the government, even if the said self-sufficiency is never realized again since 1984. Farmers can no longer plan their farming system in accordance with the conditions of their territory. Farmers in particular were never included directly to determine the territory of their farm.

The tendency of climate change also weakened the farmers. Farmers are very vulnerable to natural disasters. Business risk due to the market globalization is not siding with the farmers and the global economic turmoil plays an important role in the weakening of the Family Farm. It's familiar when suddenly farmers are faced with the corporation when the food imports on a large scale happened, or when the farmer must always impose themselves to get chemical fertilizers and hybrid seeds that are disposable without able to cultivate.

The absence of firm government policy in order to protect the germ plasm and Indonesian native seed can be seen with the proliferation of corporation seed products which necessarily also exploit the Indonesian native germ plasm native for its own interests. This has happened since the year of 2008, where, according to the United Nations Special Rapporteur on the Right to Food, Olivier de Schutter, *Silent Tsunami* takes place. That is, a state where the transnational companies undertake the development of biotechnology in agriculture and promoted by international institutions, corporations, and even the government itself. And this occurred in Indonesia, where the field counseling program become agents for introducing a wide range of agricultural technology upon these corporations.

*A quo* law which is a form of protection and empowerment of the State to the farmer and fisher has been lowered into various regulation implementations. However, based on the results of research in the field, it found a variety of problems that has been mentioned above. In the field of agriculture, farmer family on the contrary has a very small agricultural production land. Also, with the agriculture system applied through the field counseling by the government, has resulted in the chemical fertilizers excessive consumption with the result the extinguish of the soil function. Even the use of other chemicals has been killing the ecosystem that supports the natural and ecological farming formation. When the agriculture system counseling upon government applied, automatically, the culture of farming in the community has also been extinguished slowly. This leads to the farmer dependence to chemical fertilizer overuse and dependence to the corporation seeds.

The purpose of the enactment of the *a quo* law *juncto* the Law of Farmer Protection and Empowerment and Law of Fisher Protection and Empowerment has been disallowed by itself, when the policy is based on the both laws is interpreted differently by the decision

makers in the government. The farmer and fisher protection policy included in the law has been interpreted as the excessive chemical fertilizers subsidies and a variety of hybrid seeds or genetically modified seed product of the corporation. It necessarily has extinguished the farming culture from the farmer family in Indonesia. When the policies were perceived by farmers as the wrong policies, the farmers began to discriminate even criminalized.

The government as the main implementer of the enactment of the SBT law is not too serious in implementing it. The farmer protection and empowerment according to the farming culture that should be a priority to be developed is not implemented. Even now, the increase of the corporation's product has attacked the agriculture cultural system.

The farming culture with majority small land on the contrary subsidized with things that don't suit the needs. The up and down of land contours and the narrow land area is not suitable, for example, if given the hand tractor aid. The size of the female farmer and male farmer body does not become the next consideration in developing the agriculture mechanical technology. Likewise, the development of farmer's farming culture all directed by the agricultural counselors which are based on college scholarly, without regarding the local wisdom. Farmer empowerment, from farmer to farmer is needed.

### ***Village Law***

#### ***Aspects that support the family farm in the a quo law***

The village law has given a special place in identifying the farmer family. The Village Law identified village as an area that has community with main activity is agriculture, thus indirectly the sustainability of Family Farming can flourish. The Village Law recognizes the existence of the rights of origin and traditional rights to manage and take care of the local community interests and contribute to actualize the independence ideals based on the Constitution of State of Republic of Indonesia of 1945.

The existence of the Village Law has brought positive expectations in rural communities, especially in farmer families. The Village Law clearly identifies that it's destined for the village which the region is an area with agriculture as a main activity, including the management of natural resources with the arrangement of the region as a function of rural settlement, services, government, social services, and economic activities. The placement of village preference as agriculture area is in line with the recent government policy direction to implement the Nawacita with the slogan build from the edge.

The early years of the application of the a quo law, seen the preference of infrastructure development in rural areas as the main target. But it cannot be denied, this empowerment program is urgent to be sharpened again in forming an independent farmer community. The empowerment program in the a quo law also needs to form the farming culture with the concept of the Family Farm.

In recent years, the plus-minus of the Village Law application start showing. But the progressive effort from the relevant ministries in controlling the law implementation and application is enough to be appreciated positively. But constant supervision should perform. Not only for the purpose village funds use, but also how is the development and empowerment embodied in village life. The use of the village funds can develop the village to be not only become the agricultural pocket, but further, to create cultured

village, independent in political economy, and become the new mainstream of Indonesia future development.

### ***The law related to family farming in the a quo law problem***

The Village Law gives serious attention to infrastructure and the village community empowerment. In the last few years, the development of village infrastructure is always encouraged. While the farming culture which supposed to be entered into the empowerment realm, is still less touched. Even many village people do not understand about the empowerment concept, so the application of Village Fund budget in the field of empowerment is not maximized. Rightly at the present time, the village community empowerment program, particularly in the field of agriculture, become a serious thing to be encouraged.

The farming culture in the Family Farm should be a top priority to be preserved and developed. However, in the education curriculum occurs farming culture annihilation. The farming culture in the formal education curriculum should be more echoed, so that agriculture not become as a last profession, but a profession to be proud of. Agriculture can be the pillar of the nation development.

All this time the a quo law application paid less attention to the democratization implementation on the agriculture sources which can ensure the farmer family life sustainability in the village. The village community capacity building is necessary in identifying and managing agricultural sources optimally with respect to local wisdom and culture, as well as the sustainability of village natural resources.

## **Recommendations**

The implementation of the various implementing regulations mentioned above need to be audited simultaneously between the parties. So those rules can reach the right target and fully implemented to achieve the Indonesian prosperity and welfare, in this case also through the application of the Family Farming concept where the family becomes the engine that drives the farming and fisheries culture itself.

Based on the above description, we can see some strategic recommendations that can be carried forward, among others:

1. The necessity to strengthen farmer organizations as the liaison and guard of the policy implementation.
2. The necessity to strengthen and support the Family Farm system jointly between stakeholders with various laws (Law 19/20013 Protection and Empowerment of Farmer, Law 18/2013 Food, Law on the Protection of Agricultural Land Sustainable, Law 6/2015 Village, Law SBT).
3. The necessity to formulated parameters (dimensions of agricultural inputs, production process, processing and marketing) to measure the success level of the concept of the Family Farming application based on several existed policies and legislation.
4. Expanding access to and the guaranteed of agricultural land ownership and tenure.
5. The need to rearrange the institutional or strengthen the institutional system of farming/fishing and the involvement of youth and women.

6. The Family Farming can form a collective farming model tor group based on the spirit of mutual aid among the farmers/fishers and other supporting parties.
7. Increase the budget amount in the process of focused, purposeful, and measurable empowerment as well as to build partnership with farmer organization and fisher organization to improve the organization quality.
8. Sharpen the policy direction of sustainable agricultural development, which ensures the *sustainability* in the production process, distribution and business certainty, so as to increase the income and saving of farmer/fisher.
9. Restore and strengthen the traditions and knowledge of the farmer/fisher family about the seed breeding, the management of water resources and institutional food system.
10. Develop an ecosystem friendly family farming system;
11. Protection of germ plasm and the knowledge and skills development of breeder seed farmer in the scope of Indonesian Family Farming.
12. Develop the agricultural industry which is based to the farmer/fisher family owner in the village;
13. Initiate the policy preparation in a variety of forms that are intended to provide a guarantee of prosperity for the farmer/fisher family and able to create the implementation of the Family Farming concept in Indonesia.
14. Develop the farmer creativity on the narrow land/yard utilization to improve the farmer/fisher family's nutrition.
15. Develop catch gear technology that is environmentally fit and friendly, as well as ensure the fisheries sustainability.
16. The clear establishment and surveillance of the catchment area zone and the spawning and fish preservation zone.
17. Government officials and law enforcement officers should be given a clear understanding related to the interpretation, meaning, and the applicable laws and regulations related to the Family Farming.