



The Role of Law No. 6 of 2014 Concerning Villages in Strengthening Family Farming in Indonesia

A Case Study in Indonesia

A SERIES OF ACTIVITIES IN THE FRAMEWORK
OF THE UN DECADE OF FAMILY FARMING

Activity 2. Documentation and systematic analysis of case studies about policies, strategies, initiatives, and programs successfully supporting family farming





The Role of Law No. 6 of 2014 Concerning Villages in Strengthening Family Farming in Indonesia

Case Study Writers:

Eko Cahyono, Gunawan, Nining Erlina Fitri, and Priadi Talman

March 2023

This document has been produced under the framework of the Letter of Agreement on “A series of activities in the framework of the UN Decade of Family Farming” between the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) and the Southeast Asian Regional Center for Graduate Study and Research in Agriculture (SEARCA). The views expressed in this product are those of the author(s) and SEARCA and do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of FAO.

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION	1
POLICY DESCRIPTION AND ANALYSIS	2
Agenda Setting.....	2
Formulation	3
Adoption	4
Implementation	8
Monitoring and Evaluation	13
RECOMMENDATIONS	18

Acronyms and Abbreviations

ADD	Alokasi Dana Desa (Village Fund Allocation)
APBDes	Anggaran Pendapatan Dan Belanja Desa (Village Revenue and Expenditure Budget)
APBN	Anggaran Pendapatan dan Belanja Negara (State Budget)
API	Aliansi Petani Indonesia (Indonesian Farmers Alliance)
BUMDes	Badan Usaha Milik Desa (Village-Owned Enterprises)
BPS	Badan Pusat Statistik (Central Bureau of Statistics)
COVID-19	Coronavirus disease
DAK	Dana Alokasi Khusus (Special Allocation Fund)
DPR	Dewan Perwakilan Rakyat (House of Representatives)
FGD	Focus group discussion
IDR	Indonesian Rupiah
IDM	Individual deprivation measure
IHCS	Indonesian Human Rights Committee for Social Justice
KNPK	Komite Nasional Pertanian Keluarga (National Committee on Family Farming)
KRPK	Komite Regional Pertanian Keluarga (Regional Committee on Family Farming)
KPK	Komisi Pemberantasan Korupsi (Corruption Eradication Commission)
MPR	Majelis Permusyawaratan Rakyat (People's Consultative Assembly)
MSME	Micro, Small, and Medium Enterprises
MUSDES	Musyawaharah Desa (Village Deliberation)
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
NCFF	National Committee for Family Farming
NGO	Non-governmental organization
NTP	Nilai Tukar Petani (Farmer's Exchange Rate)
Kemendesa PDTT	Kementerian Desa, Pembangunan Daerah Tertinggal, dan Transmigrasi (Ministry of Villages, Development of Disadvantaged Regions and Transmigration)
POKTAN	Farmers Groups
POKMAS	Community Groups
RPJMDes	Rencana Pembangunan Jangka Menengah Desa (Village Medium Term Development Plan)
SDG	Sustainable Development Goals

List of Tables

Table	Title	Page
1	Poverty Rates in Rural Areas	14
2	Annual Village Fund Utilization, 2015-2019	14
3	Comparison of Poverty Reduction, Poverty Severity, Depth Index, and Gini Coefficient, Before and after village funds (%)	15

The Role of Law No. 6 of 2014 Concerning Villages in Strengthening Family Farming in Indonesia

Eko Cahyono, Gunawan, Nining Erlina Fitri, and Priadi Talman

I. INTRODUCTION

Background

The chosen public policy for this case study is the Village Law, No. 6 of 2014. There is an urgency of the Village Law for family farming in Indonesia because, through the derivative program of the Village Law No. 6 of 2014, the family farming community received support in terms of the following: (1) strengthening the capacity and skills of farmers to develop natural and technical agriculture in agricultural cultivation, plantations, and other activities through training and education programs for farmers in rural areas; (2) funding for development programs, especially in increasing business both at the production and distribution levels; (3) agricultural facilities and infrastructure, through the improvement of agricultural and rural infrastructure supported by village funds.

The development process of Village Law No.6 of 2014, as described in this report, is the result of the long political struggle of various groups of rural and agrarian activist movements in Indonesia since post-Reformation. Some of them are members of family farming in Indonesia, such as the Indonesian Human Rights Committee for Social Justice (IHCS), Aliansi Petani Indonesia (API), Bina Desa, Sajogyo Institute, etc. The policy cycle of the birth of the Village Law is an example of ideas born from the “bottom” (people's voice), then advocated at a national policy level, pushed into a presidential strategic program, and systematically advocated through parliament. The important lesson is that ideas from the people (voices from the ground/grassroots) can become national policies when there is intensive collaboration and simultaneous action between the power of the people's movement outside the country and activists in power. Such a process can serve as an example and inspiration for increasing the understanding of local actors in formulating public policies.

The study covers two cases. First is the Family Farming Community in Blitar Regency. This location represents the success story of the family farming community in Java Island supported by village funds for the development of natural farming and organic koi carp farming. Second is the Family Farming Community in Nagari Canduang Koto Laweh, Kabuten Agam, West Sumatra. This case represents an indigenous-based community that has successfully developed natural agriculture, cooperative institutions, and agricultural resources and livestock development in collaboration with the village government through village law funds.

Data collection methods and research procedures used were qualitative, with data research techniques including literature review, qualitative in-depth interviews, focus group discussion (FGDs), and policy cycle analysis. Meanwhile, employees and key informants were selected from two family farming communities in East Java province and West Sumatra to participate in the interviews. Key informants identified were the following: (1) Network of Rural and Agrarian Civil Society Organizations (central figures in drafting the Village Law); (2) farmer activists in the community; (3) community facilitators; (4) community administrators; and (5) farmer group leaders (both women and men).

II. POLICY DESCRIPTION AND ANALYSIS

Agenda Setting

National Context - The Birth of the Village Law

The government has made legislation regarding villages since the beginning of the Republic of Indonesia, which was established on August 17, 1945. Changes to village laws and regulations have been continuously carried out since 1945 (Law No. 1 of 1945 concerning Regional Government) until 2014 (Law No. 6 of 1945). However, a fundamental change occurred under an instituted policy called the New Order during President Suharto's authoritative and militaristic regime (1967 -1998). The New Order was enacted by Law No. 5 of 1979 on Village Government, which uniformed the village's name, form, structure, and position. The enactment of Law No. 5 of 1979 led to "marginalization" (even some consider destruction) of villages with their authority, autonomy, function, role, and power.

The New Order's political policies placed the village as a "complement and object" of national development. This policy homogenizes and reduces historical diversity, socio-cultural characteristics, ecological typology, and village natural wealth. This policy also excludes local rural knowledge, values, governance, and local democracy in all regions of Indonesia. Even in the political sphere, the New Order prohibited political parties from entering villages to prevent rural communities from participating in politics. This kind of policy gives birth to a floating mass that is neither critical nor ideological. The main objective of the New Order's policies was to make all the natural wealth of the village solely become an economic asset for national development, which at that time enriched the power of the elite in the central government but neglected the welfare of the people in the countryside.

After the 1998 Reformation, efforts to correct all national policies inherited from the New Order reappeared. The 1998 Reformation Movement encouraged life improvements in politics, economy, socio-culture, environment, education, health, and agriculture, including political policies in rural areas. The Regional Autonomy Policy or decentralization based on Law No. 23 of 2014 has become one of the drivers of development initiatives back to the regions, including rural development. The actors involved in the 1998 reform include people from the academe, student movements, civil society movements, labor groups, farmer organizations, fishermen, indigenous peoples, pro-democracy politicians, journalists, and pro-democratic communities. Some returned to their respective mass bases in the countryside, while others entered politics. They became employees and expert staff at both regional and central governments and others at the village government level.

Thus, it can be said that the spirit of the birth of Village Law No. 6 of 2014 was motivated by the aim of returning villages as "Victims of the New Order"¹ and other development policies that subordinated "village authorities" as mandated in the 1945 Constitution. The 1945 Constitution recognized the village community's uniqueness and rights of origin.

Article 18 of the 1945 Constitution states that the division of Indonesia into regions, both large and small, with the form of government structure, is determined by law, considering, and based on deliberation on the state government system, and the rights of origin in the regions which is special. Therefore, it can be emphasized that the issuance of Village Law No. 6 of 2014 aims to provide a new "political opportunity" to return villages and their areas back to constitutional mandate or villages that are autonomous and democratic.

The existence of the Village Law is meant to reaffirm the following: (1) a village is not a uniform administrative village; rather, it can be regulated through various systems, including traditional villages; (2) village-wide authority is based on recognition and subsidiarity principles; (3) consolidation of village

¹ The New Order was the period of President Soeharto's leadership from 1967-1998, in this era the national political policies were top-down, repressive, authoritarian, and militaristic. In the rural context, uniformity occurs and positions the village as subordinate to the city. As a result, the village loses its authority and autonomy rights. On the other hand, there was massive exploitation and extraction of natural resources in the countryside for the benefit of the national political elite who supported the New Order. Source: <https://www.jurnal-adhikari.id/index.php/adhikari/article/view/41>.

finances and assets; (4) integrated development planning; and (5) democratization through participation, empowerment, and assistance. An essential part of this Village Law is that recognizing villages also means “economic redistribution” from the state to villages through the Anggaran Pendapatan dan Belanja Negara (APBN) in a sustainable manner. The Village Law thus allows villages to develop according to the countryside's resources and cultural ecological features². In addition, the Village Law opens opportunities for the democratization of state-village relations and village-to-village relations, primarily democratization in the issue of natural resource management.

Formulation

Process for Village Law No. 6 of 2014

The basic constitution that forms the basis of the community's struggle to push for the birth of the Village Law is the highest constitution of the Republic of Indonesia, the 1945 Constitution. The 1945 Constitution recognizes the uniqueness of village communities, starting from the right of origin and various local governance systems based on democracy. The amendments to the 1945 Constitution also state that the State recognizes and respects customary law community units along with their traditional rights if they are still in existence and in accordance with the development of society and the principles of the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia, which are regulated by law. This constitutional basis became the initial reference for forming derivative regulations to form and realize the idea of village autonomy, which would later become the Village Law.

However, legally, before the Village Law was issued, the village did not specifically have its own statutory rules. Villages are only regulated through the Regional Government Law. The absence of a separate law on the village does not necessarily indicate that the village is not regulated. As mentioned earlier, efforts to regulate villages as part of the state structure have occurred since the inception of the Republic of Indonesia. However, the priority arrangements at that time included (1) uniformity of villages for the entire territory of Indonesia, (2) village autonomy, and (3) village finance and funding, although, in fact, legally, this is not regulated.

In the early days of independence, the recognition of autonomy at the village level began as explicitly declared in Law No. 22 of 1948. It is stated in this law that the form and structure, as well as the authority and duties of the Village Government, as an autonomous region that has the right to regulate and manage its government. However, this did not happen.

In the post-reform era, in the Majelis Permusyawaratan Rakyat (MPR) Decree Number XV/MPR/1998 concerning the Implementation of Regional Autonomy, it was stated that the Regions had the autonomy to regulate their development policies by adhering to the principles of democracy, justice, and equity. This MPR Decree was then followed by the enactment of Law No. 22 of 1999 concerning Regional Government. Regulations regarding the existence and administration of the Village Government are included in this law. It is stated that Law No. 5 of 1979 contradicts the 1945 Constitution. This law also recommends recognizing the rights of origin, which are special in front of the (rights of) the State, and the social and cultural diversity of each original arrangement (village or other names)³. This is an essential foundation of national policy politics to encourage the formulation of the Village Law.

In 2004, Law No. 22 of 1999 was revised into Law No. 32 of 2004. Law No. 32 of 2004 and its implementing regulations, namely the Implementing Regulation 72/2005, did not bring any significant changes. It can even be said to be even worse when compared to Law No. 22 of 1999. In 2005, the Government and the House of Representatives agreed to split Law No. 32 of 2004 into three laws: the Regional Government Law, the Direct Election Law, and the Village Law⁴. Through Law No. 32 of 2004, the formulation of the Village Law policy is more explicit and regulated more strongly.

² Mohamad Shohibuddin, “Opportunities and Challenges of the Village Law in Democratizing the Governance of Village Natural Resources: A Critical Agrarian Perspective.” *SOCIETY: Journal of Sociology*, 21 (1), 2016:1-33.

³ These three points are the essence of the Indonesian constitutional recognition of villages, as stipulated in Article 18, Article 18B, and Article 28i of the 1945 Constitution.

⁴ The process of discussing the Village Bill in this sub-chapter is quoted from Wahjudin Sumpeno et al., *Training Module for Community Empowerment Expert Pratas*, Ministry of Village Development of Disadvantaged Regions and Transmigration, Jakarta, 2016.

After a long struggle in the policy advocacy process (since the New Order and getting stronger after the Reformation), legal advocacy, policy politics, and social movements by civil society organizations, academics, politicians (former agrarian-rural activists who are in power), and various alliance movement of farmer union organizations, finally in 2007 succeeded in encouraging the government to prepare Academic Papers and Draft Village Laws. This Academic Paper framed the Village Law's policy formulation more thoroughly and comprehensively.

The Academic Paper was compiled by pro-people in the academe and rural-agrarian intellectual- activists.⁵ It is stated in the paper that village problems include: (a) no recognition of the existence of diverse villages; (b) village autonomy is “residual autonomy from the rest”, meaning that it is still part of regional autonomy; (c) the flow of supra-village intervention is so strong that the village government and villagers cannot have their own policies; (d) community participation is limited to the involvement of formal institutions at the village level only; (e) in the context of village and rural development, development is still taking place through two channels, namely through the role of the village government and through development channels in the name of community-based development through various projects, which are not/not yet vertically integrated; (f) development programs organized by the village government and the community and/or village level and supra-village level programs almost never meet, so that optimization of benefits is difficult to achieve; and the Village Fund Allocation (Alokasi Dana Desa - ADD) is relatively small and its implementation is uncertain. In addition, it is not for the villagers' good but for the continuity of power at the central level⁶.

The policy formulation of the Village Law was finally able to become the President's political agenda when President Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono issued the Presidential Mandate in January 2012. This was an important milestone in formulating the Village Law on a national level, ensuring that it became the president's priority agenda. Then, it was followed by submitting the Village Bill to the Indonesian House of Representatives (Dewan Perwakilan Rakyat - DPR). Then, the Legislative Board of the House of Representatives (DPR Republik Indonesia) formed a Special Committee on the Village Bill. Finally, after going through political contestation and deliberation at the parliamentary level for almost a year, the Village Bill was ratified as a Village Law at the Plenary Session of the People's Representative Council of the Republic of Indonesia on 18 December 2013.⁷

Adoption

Milestone Adoption of the Village Democratization Idea to Become a National Policy

Bureaucratically, the Sixth 1998 reform agenda has been implemented nationally. Although substantially, not all that was aspired to have been achieved. One of the reform agendas that has been implemented and has become a “gateway” for policy changes in rural areas is Regional Autonomy (Decentralization). Through the Regional Autonomy policy, there is a process of decentralization and distribution of authority to the regions from what was previously centralized. This prompted the birth of various policy breakthroughs to “build from below”, including development in rural areas and agriculture.

In the early days of reform, the Central Government issued two policies regarding regional autonomy: Law No. 22 of 1999 concerning Regional Government and Law No. 25 of 1999 concerning Financial Balance between the Central and Regional Governments. These two policies became the basis for correcting rural and agricultural policies that were previously uniform and had “a top-down approach.” This policy encourages regional political, administrative, bureaucratic, and economic decentralization. This law gives village rights, authorities, and responsibilities to manage village government and development in a sovereign manner. Through this post-reform regional autonomy “policy opportunity”, the process of adopting the Village Law policy can be carried out.

⁵ This Academic Paper is the version of the Ministry of Home Affairs (Ministry of Home Affairs together with the Civil Society Network and Academics, 2007), and the Academic Paper for the preparation of the Village Law version of the Regional Representative Council of the Republic of Indonesia (2011).

⁶ Allocation of Village Funds (Alokasi Dana Desa) is regulated in Article 1, Paragraph 11 in conjunction with Article 68, Paragraph 1, Point C. of the Government Regulation No.72 of 2005 concerning Villages.

⁷ https://www.dpr.go.id/dokjdi/dokument/uu/UU_2014_6.pdf.

In summary, the critical milestones of policies and regulations that became the legal political context for the birth of the Village Law can be seen in the following figure:



Figure 1: Milestone of Village Law Politics

From the matrix image above, adopting a policy on the idea of a village has a long process until it becomes the Village Law. Although there is a political context of openness because of the 1998 Reformation and the birth of several supporting regulations/rules, the proposal to restore democratization and village autonomy has not been fully implemented. It took approximately seven years for civil society groups, pro-people academics, and agrarian-rural activists in Indonesia to fight for the birth of Village Law No. 6 of 2014. As explained in the previous chapter, various legal political contestations and refinement processes exist in each process of changing regulations.

Advocacy Strategy, Policy Intervention Stage, and Main Actors of the Village Law

Starting with constitutional awareness and the urgency of an independent and sovereign village as well as opportunities for conditions of open democracy as a result of the 1998 Reform, intervention strategies and policy advocacy began to be prepared by various groups fighting for village autonomy and sovereignty issues. The main actors carrying out this political push include the Association of Village Heads, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), academics, politicians, former activists in power, village activists, and activists, with the support of journalists-activists in various media⁸.

In summary, the essential stages in the Village Law policy intervention process include the following: (1) a critical analysis of previous regulations and policies on villages to point out the deficiencies of these regulations and policies and what needs to be perfected; (2) campaigning for the idea of the Village Law to the public at large through the media and seminars, forums, discussions, workshops, training, and other social media; (3) pushing for the idea of changing regulations on villages at various policy levels: village, regional, central and parliamentary governments; (4) providing strong and authoritative Academic Papers as material for negotiations and lobbying for multi-party policymakers; (5) ensure that the idea of the Village

⁸ There have been many claims of who was the main actor in pushing for the birth of the Village Law, because of that there was an effort to straighten out history. The following article is one of them: <https://kumparan.com/paluposo/meluruskan-History-uu-desa-1qubPBKTJDz>.

Law becomes the president's political agenda to produce an official decision from the president; and (6) oversee the policy advocacy in parliament and ensure the passing of the law.

Meanwhile, the political strategy used to urge changes to the Village Law's political policies was carried out in various ways, including lobbying with politicians in political parties in parliament, public and academic discussions at several universities and public forums, campaigns in the media, public education/training in NGO networks, and forming coalitions of social movement networks with a village focus.

The Practice of Adopting the Village Law in the National Policy Program and Connection Points with Family Farming in Indonesia

The ratification of the Village Law No. 6 of 2014 becomes the basis for the village government to be able to run its administration, formulate policies according to rights and authorities in a participatory manner through village consultations, which will produce the Village Medium-Term Development Plan and Village Revenue and Expenditure Budget. On the other hand, through the Village Law, villages are increasingly given greater authority, rights, and autonomy. The government provides guidelines through a Ministerial Regulation regarding village rights and authorities. Regarding the issue of financing village development, after the issuance of the Village Law, the government allocates a special budget for each village through the APBN, referred to as the Village Fund. Previously, villages only received the ADD and special financial assistance for villages. The priority of using the Village Fund is regulated through a Ministerial Regulation.

Through this “village fund”, various policies begin to reconnect reciprocally and mutually adopt between national policies and programs in rural areas. One is the national agenda related to the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) until a special program emerged from the Ministry of Villages, popularly called the “SDGs Desa.”⁹ As an effort to achieve SDG targets at the village level and respond to the impact of the Coronavirus disease (COVID-19), new guidelines for the use of village funds have been issued based on the Regulation of the Minister of Villages, Development of Disadvantaged Regions, and Transmigration Number 13 of 2020 concerning Priority for Using Village Funds in 2021. Village SDGs is an integrated effort to realize villages without poverty and hunger, economic villages that grow evenly, villages that care about health, villages that care for the environment, education care villages, women-friendly villages, networking villages, and culturally responsive villages to accelerate the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals.¹⁰

Village rights and authorities originating from traditional and local scale rights, which can be used to develop family farming based on the Village Law, can be in the form of (a) village treasury land, (b) customary land, (c) village market; (d) animal market; (e) boat moorings; (f) fish auction; (g) auction of agricultural products; (h) forest belonging to the village; (i) village-owned springs; (j) public baths; and (k) other village-owned assets. Meanwhile, village authority regarding agrarian resources and their relation to family farming is still increasing if you refer to Permendagri No. 44 of 2016 concerning Village Authority and Permendesa 1/2015 Guidelines for Authority Based on Origin Rights and Village-Scale Local Authority, namely: (1) management of village ponds; (2) village-scale drinking water management; (3) development and management of floating net cages and fish charts; (4) construction and management of food storages and determination of village food reserves; (5) determination of village agricultural and fishery superior commodities; (6) regulation of the implementation of agricultural and fishery pest and disease control in an integrated manner; (7) determining the type of organic fertilizer and feed for agriculture and fisheries; (8) local seed development; collective livestock development; (9) independent energy development and management; (10) pasture management; (11) village tourism development; (12) management of fish seed halls; (13) development of appropriate technology for processing agricultural and fishery products; and (14) development of agricultural production business systems that rely on resources.

Through village rights and authority that are more independent and autonomous over village assets, there will be great opportunities for the development of family farming programs in rural areas, which are generally very much aligned with local needs and resources in rural areas, with the principles of

⁹ Sources: <https://sdgsdesa.kemendesa.go.id/sdgs-desa-dan-rekonstruksi-paradigma-pembangunan-berkelanjutan/> and <http://sarimekar-buleleng.desa.id/index.php/first/artikel/68-SDGs-Desa--Pengertian-Tujuan-dan-Sasaran->

¹⁰ Source: <https://sdgsdesa.kemendesa.go.id/dari-tpb-ke-sdgs-desa/>.

sustainability, nature conservation, organic/natural farming, integrated agriculture, clean energy, with the aim of socio-cultural, and economic and political self-sufficiency and sovereignty for village communities.

The explanation above shows that the process of adopting the Village Law No.6 of 2014 policy occurred at various policy levels. Both at the level of national policy programs, such as the village SDGs, to issuing various village ministry-level regulations, and encouraging recognition of village diversity, encouraging changes in authority and autonomy in managing village funds for development in rural areas in line with local needs. At this point, the Village Law can precisely encourage expanding various programs, activities, and objectives of family farming in rural areas.

Adoption and Influence of the Village Law in the Paradigm Change of Rural National Development Policy: From the "Building to the Village" Paradigm to "Building from the Village"

Law No. 6 of 2014 concerning villages is an important milestone in changing the rural development paradigm. From the paradigm of "Building to the Village" to "Building from the Village". This is because the village has received recognition with the birth of the Village Law, which has provided a portion for prioritizing village development from below. Thus, through this law, the village has been returned as a subject of development.

According to the book *Developing Villages, Independent Villages* (2016),¹¹ there has been a change in village development policies from the old paradigm (the 1960s to the 1980s) to a new paradigm (the 1990s to the present). The old paradigm is state-centric: autocratic, top-down, centralized, hierarchical, sectoral, etc. The new paradigm seems to contain a spirit of society-centric recognition and subsidiarity: democratic, bottom-up, autonomous, independent, locality, participatory, emancipatory, and so on (Eko et al., 2014). In short, developing villages is the spirit of Law No. 6 of 2014 concerning villages. Even though normatively, Village Law No.6 of 2014 has explained the paradigmatic changes in rural development policies, in practice, it is not easy to change the old paradigm that has been decades into how to build villages, both at the national, regional, and local village levels. For this reason, national coordination and consolidation are needed to unite the various parties' aspirations in implementing the Village Law with a new paradigm.

In summary, the criticism of the Village Law on the old paradigm policy in developing villages is on two counts: First, the village and its people are still considered "Development Objects" by the Central Government, thus losing the recognition of their rights, authority, and autonomy; and second, uniform policies from national development politics, especially regarding the development needs of villages in Indonesia which have various characteristics.

In addition, Village Law No. 6 of 2014 is the basis for restoring village rights, authorities, and autonomy previously neglected. The implications are as follows: (1) each village gets an APBN allocation of 10 percent of the balancing funds received by the district/city in the APBN after deducting the Special Allocation Fund (Dana Alokasi Khusus - DAK); (2) providing clarity on the status and legal certainty of villages in the constitutional system of the Republic of Indonesia in order to realize justice for all Indonesian people; (3) preserving and advancing the customs, traditions and culture of the village community; (4) encourage initiatives, movements and participation of village communities to develop village potential and assets for shared prosperity; (5) form a village government that is professional, efficient and effective, open and responsible; (6) improving public services for villagers in order to accelerate the realization of general welfare; (7) increase the socio-cultural resilience of the village community in order to create a village community that is able to maintain social unity as part of national security; and (8) advancing the economy of rural communities and overcoming national development gaps and ninth, strengthening rural communities as subjects of development¹².

Based on the explanation above, the process of adopting Village Law No. 6 of 2014 in national development policies, especially in the rural and agricultural sectors, has had a significant impact because of changing the

¹¹ Kurniawan, Borni, *Desa Membangun, Desa Mandiri*, diterbitkan oleh Kementerian Desa, PDT, dan Transmigrasi, 2015.

¹² Evan Lahur, "Desa: Dari Revolusi Industri Hingga Lahirnya UU Desa" Source: <https://www.floresa.co/2015/02/06/desa-dari-revolusi-industri-hingga-lahirnya-uu-desa/>.

paradigm of the new rural development policy, which is characterized by “Building from the Village” and leaving the old ways of the “Building to the Village” paradigm.

This new spirit of the “Building from the Village” paradigm is the basis for developing various family farming programs and activities more broadly in Indonesia. Through this new paradigm, villages increasingly have autonomy and independence in managing natural resources in a more sustainable and financially equitable way that can help prioritize activities aligned with the characteristics of their own village needs. Meanwhile, family farming activities and programs are generally born from efforts to respond to the needs of village communities in a participatory and “from below” or grassroots way (one spirit with the paradigm of “developing villages” and rejecting “development from above”) with the same goal, namely farmer independence, village autonomy to more sustainable and equitable management of natural resources.

Implementation

Implementation of the Village Law: The Case of Family Farming Communities in Blitar Regency – East Java Province

(1) Process and Connection Point of the Village Law to the NCFE Program in Blitar Regency

The Village Law has given rights, authorities, and village assets related to agrarian and rural area development to foster village innovation and the use of village funds to achieve the SDGs at the village level. The use of village funds from 2021 until now is prioritized to support the achievement of 10 Village SDGs, especially national economic recovery activities, national priority programs, and adaptation of new village habits. Based on the above context, managing village funds through SDGs Desa, along with its goals and priorities, is one of the connecting points from the mandate of the Village Law to the goals of Family Farming. The agenda for the ten priority village SDGs coincides with the priority programs of the National Committee for Family Farming (NCFE) Indonesia. The 10 SDGs referred to in the COVID-19 pandemic situation and conditions are (1) villages without poverty; (2) villages without hunger; (3) the village is healthy and prosperous; (4) involvement of village women; (5) clean and renewable energy village; (6) equitable village economic growth; (7) environmentally conscious village consumption and production; (8) village of peace and justice; (9) partnerships for village development, and (10) dynamic village institutions and adaptive village culture.¹³

In the case study of the family farming community in Blitar Regency, the Village Government Development Agenda has supported the development of family farming through the use of village funds for agricultural infrastructure development and training for farming families with the aim of SDGs point No. 1: Village Without Poverty and No 6: Village with Equal Economic Growth. In addition, there is another excellent program in the form of koi fish cultivation developed by small fish farmers based on the family farming community, involving village women's groups and receiving support from the Ministry of Villages, Development of Disadvantaged Regions, and Transmigration (Kementerian Desa, Pembangunan Daerah Tertinggal, dan Transmigrasi - Kemendesa PDTT) to be developed as part of growing village innovation. The goal of this program is at least in line with points No. 4: Involvement of Village Women Groups and No. 7: Environmentally Aware Village Consumption and Production.¹⁴

(2) Forms of Program Implementation at the Village Level

In general, the influence of the Village Law on family farming activities in rural Blitar Regency can be divided into two major parts: First, rural-agricultural development programs with priority on agricultural infrastructure, such as the construction of rice field irrigation, farming roads, or agricultural facilities and infrastructure. In practice, the village funds allocation in rural areas for developing agricultural infrastructure and other support still accounts for around 70% of the total funds. Second, the agricultural rural development program prioritizes empowering and strengthening farmer skills. In the case of Blitar Regency, the activities carried out are Agricultural Production Input Training, particularly the manufacture of plant-

¹³ <http://sarimekar-buleleng.desa.id/index.php/first/artikel/68-SDGs-Desa---Pengertian--Tujuan-dan-Sasaran>

¹⁴ Interview results with Ms. Nining Supra, member of API and organizer of the Regional Committee for Family Agriculture in Blitar Regency, East Java, 25 June 2022.

based pesticides, fertilizers, and nutrients for developing organic and natural agriculture. Several villages in Blitar Regency that have conducted this training include Salam Village and Kec. Wonodadi, Plosorejo Village, Kec. Kademangan, Kemloko Village, Kec. Look etc.

The two priority programs, namely infrastructure development to support farming, as well as activities to empower and strengthen farmers' skills in the case of Blitar Regency, the institutional network of farmers used is through Farmer Groups (poktan) and Community Groups (pokmas) which in Blitar Regency the majority are members and partners of the Family Farming Regional Committee (Komite Regional Pertanian Keluarga – KRPK).

In addition, the objectives and programs of the Village Law implemented in Blitar Regency have also driven efforts to encourage the “Harmonization of Rural Area Arrangement” process between agricultural policies in the district and the village. This is manifested in the Planning for Mapping Potential Agricultural Products in almost all villages in Blitar Regency into four priorities, namely: (a) product centers and aquaculture (koi fish cultivation priority); (b) organic farming development center; (c) vegetable cultivation development center, and (d) fruit plant development center.

Another interesting thing from the implementation of the Village Law in the case of Blitar Regency is its influence in enriching the village administration's articulation of Family Farming proposals/initiatives in village policies through the Village Deliberation (Musyawarah Desa - MusDes) for the preparation of the Village Medium Term Development Plan (Rencana Pembangunan Jangka Menengah Desa - RPJMDes) and the Village Revenue and Expenditure Budget (Anggaran Pendapatan Dan Belanja Desa- APBDes). The main elements of family farming activities in the village are the village community, the majority of whom work as farmers, and the village government, which has local-scale authority in farming—the meeting of the two elements through the Village Deliberation to formulate the RPJMDes and the APBDes. The series of processes from the MusDes to the formation of the RPJMDes and APBDes, as well as Village-Owned Enterprises (Badan Usaha Milik Desa - BUMDes) in the democratic political process can be referred to as the village government's efforts to carry out political articulation and aggregation as well as political education for village communities. For the village community in Blitar Regency, this is the opportunity for political policy opportunities so that the family farming agenda can be included in the development and empowerment agenda in the village.

(3) Main Actors in the Implementation Process

The entire process of implementing the Village Law practices in the Blitar Regency area related to the family farming program includes the following stakeholders and their respective roles: (a) East Java Indonesian Farmers Alliance (API East Java) - to propose and link programs from the local government to the village and community levels; (b) East Java KRPK. Its primary role is as performed by API East Java. However, also ensure that these programs give priority to natural farming issues and other family farming goals; (c) Poktan - to implement the program at the praxis level with pokmas; (d) Pokmas are also executing program practices at the praxis level with pokmas and coordinating activities at the village level with KRPK and API East Java; and, (e) Network of National Committee for Family Farming (Komite Nasional Pertanian Keluarga - KNPK) political actors. Several leaders of the Indonesian KNPK member organizations in Jakarta, for example, the Secretary General of the API, the IHCS Coordinator, the Director of Village Development, etc., helped to connect and urge at the Ministry of Village level and other ministry institutions related to the Village Law and Family Farming.

(4) Learning the Implementation of the Village Law in the Blitar District Case

One of the critical lessons from implementing the Village Law in Family Farming Communities in Blitar Regency is the increasing importance of strengthening and developing family farming programs by farming families and their institutions because there are political opportunities from the Village Law. The goal is to ensure that the idea and agenda of family farming can become the village government's agenda legally and regularly.

In addition, there are differences in the level of understanding and depth of understanding of the substance of the Village Law among the Regional Government, the Village Government, and the family farming community. This requires assistance/facilitation by a third party since this will affect the process and implementation of derivative programs from the Village Law, especially if you want to link it more strongly to the family farming agenda at the practical level. The furthest result is that the orientation of the implementers of the Village Law and Village Facilitators will be more focused on the purpose of fulfilling only program administration (formalities-procedural) in the form of output only and will move away from or minimally achieve more substantive outcomes for both the implementation of the Village Law and agricultural objectives.

Another problem that can also be an important lesson from this case is the importance of policy advocacy strategies and synchronization of family farming community programs/activities with the agenda of supra-village institutions, especially the Agriculture and Food Security Service with the District and Provincial Community Empowerment Offices with the Village Government and rural communities. Facilitators are the key to bridging and encouraging multi-stakeholder collaboration in this area.

Thus, the learning from the Blitar case shows how family farming can work better if supported by two things: (1) Supporting regulations and policies. Because the bureaucracy works based on rules and regulations, the Village Law is an essential foundation for this purpose; (2) Establishment of multi-stakeholder collaboration in the village and supra-village both in terms of program implementation ideas and practices.

Implementation of the Village Law Policy: A Case Study of Family Farming Communities in Agam District, West Sumatra

(1) The Connection Point for the Implementation of the Village Law with Family Farming in Agam Regency

Village Law No. 6 of 2014 in Chapter IV has regulated the matter of authority to empower communities so that village governments can use budgets from village funds for farmer empowerment programs. In the case of the implementation of the Village Law in Agam District, the priority for the use of village funds is regulated by the Agam District Head Regulation No. 7 of 2021 concerning Procedures for Distribution and Determination of Details of Village Funds for the 2021 Fiscal Year. The distribution of village funds is based on the number of people living in a Nagari (traditional village). In 2021, village funds received by Nagari Canduang Koto Laweh, which is the location of this study, amounted to IDR 949,058,000.00 (\$ 61,825). One of the activities related to family farming is community empowerment in the form of training/technical guidance/introduction of appropriate technology for agriculture and animal husbandry with a budget of IDR 13,983,590.46. In addition, the use of village funds related to strengthening family farming is the construction and maintenance of the Nagari road to facilitate farmers' access to selling agricultural products to the market or to bring the harvest from the garden/field to the house. Before COVID-19, village funds were used more for physical development, such as constructing tertiary irrigation canals, rehabilitation of farming roads, and community empowerment activities.

Thus, the connecting point of the Village Law with the family farming agenda in Agam Regency is through villages for the following three things: (1) capacity building of farming communities, (2) development of physical infrastructure to support agriculture, and (3) maintenance of infrastructure and development of agricultural technology supporting natural farming activities.

(2) Family Farming in the Policies of Nagari Canduang Koto Laweh¹⁵ Distrik Agam

Proposed programs to be funded and become priority programs for the Nagari (traditional village) emerged during the Nagari Deliberation and were outlined in the Nagari Medium Term Development Plan (Nagari RPJM) document, valid for six years. The Nagari RPJM is described in more detail in the Village

¹⁵ "Nagari" is the designation of traditional villages, especially those in the province of West Sumatra. Canduang Koto Laweh is the name of the nagari (traditional village), which is the case study of this research.

Government Work Plan document and is valid for one year. The procedure for implementing a Village Deliberation is regulated by the Regulation of the Minister of Village, Development of Disadvantaged Regions and Transmigration No. 16 of 2019. A village deliberation is a deliberation between the Village Consultative Body, the Village Government, and community elements held by the Village Consultative Body to agree on strategic matters such as Plans for Village Medium Term Development. In 2022 at the village/nagari meeting in Nagari Canduang Koto Laweh, members of the Natural Farmers Community—members of the Indonesian KNPk, voiced the interests of farmers. Both in terms of procuring natural agricultural training activities, procuring agricultural production facilities and infrastructure, and others. The agreement in the MusDes is then outlined in the Village Medium Term Development Plan (RPJMDes)/Nagari Canduang Koto Laweh.

Based on the RPJMDes Nagari Canduang document, several programs can be seen that support the implementation of the Indonesian Family Farming National Action Plan, especially those related to the Indonesian Family Farming Pillars. These pillars include pillars of food insecure and vulnerable areas and target farming families; pillars of central and regional policy formulation; pillars of youth engagement and gender equality; pillars on providing vocational education, training, and mentoring; pillars on strengthening adaptation and mitigation capacity to climate change; pillars on strengthening farmer families' access to capital, production facilities, and farming insurance; as well as the pillar on developing diverse food cultivation, processing and marketing of agricultural products for the sustainability of farming and maintaining biodiversity¹⁶.

If the pillars of Indonesian Family Farming are used as references and comparisons for the matriculation of the Nagari Canduang RPJM, the Nagari (customary village) program outputs intersect or align with the Indonesian Family Farming Pillars. These include the following activities and programs: (1) Health Sub-Sector, (2) Public Works and Spatial Planning Sub-Sector, (3) Forestry and Environment Sub-Sector, (4) Marine and Fisheries Sub-Sector, (5) Sub-Sector of Agriculture and Livestock, (6) Sub-Sector of Cooperatives, Micro, Small, and Medium Enterprises (MSMEs), and (7) Community Empowerment.

(3) Main Actors Involved in the Implementation Process

The parties involved in these activities are the Nagari Government (executive), Nagari Consultative Body (legislative), Nagari-Owned Enterprises (economic development), Poktan and Gapoktan (implementation), traditional leaders as well as Nagari community leaders (ensure that customary systems and values are maintained and adhered to), women's and mothers' groups, Nagari youth, the Regional Family Agriculture Committee (ensures the continuity of the Village Law agenda with the family farming agenda) as well as parties deemed to have participated in the success of the program and activities to be carried out. In contrast to regular villages, their respective roles and functions have been agreed upon and regulated in official regulations in the Nagari (Customary Village) structure. So that they do not overlap with each other because they already know the limits of their respective powers.

(4) Implementation Lessons in the Candungan Village

It is difficult to maintain the spirit of gotong royong (reciprocity). The program's implementation in Nagari Canduang is carried out in a spirit of togetherness and cooperation. The strength of customary values largely determines whether the reciprocity values are still the basis of Nagari policies. The expansion of modernism from the outside and the dynamics of social change from an internally changing society often collide into problems and challenges that are not easy to deal with. The increasing culture of materialism and hedonism often clashes with traditional values based on helping, simplicity, and sufficiency. Therefore, the biggest challenge is to invite and ensure that Nagari millennials are willing to be involved in agriculture in the spirit of Nagari customs.

Instant and fast-paced cultural orientation. The purpose of carrying out family farming activities that require time and special adaptation situations, for example, natural farming, is often faced with the general agricultural

¹⁶ Source: <https://www.familyfarmingcampaign.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/04/Indonesia-National-Action-Plan-UNDF-BUKU-RAN-1.pdf>.

model, which is based on fast and instant principles. The general habit of using chemical drugs and pesticides in agriculture with fast yields is still challenging to abandon quickly. Farming communities need stable yields and production but often ignore ecological damage. This paradigm and habit change is still a serious challenge in implementing family farming, which has been linked to the agenda of the Village Law in Nagari Canduang.

Changes in program priorities to deal with the impacts of the pandemic. At the time of the COVID-19 pandemic, the Nagari Government, a new structure resulting from the Canduang Nagari General Election of 2019, prioritized implementing activities that could overcome the consequences of the COVID-19 pandemic. The implementation of Direct Cash Assistance activities as a way to balance the economic crisis that occurred was carried out intensively.

New leadership. The Nagari government structure led by the newly appointed Wali Nagari is also somewhat overwhelmed in running the programs in the RPJM Nagari as mandated by the Village Law. There is confusion in the implementation of many activities, whether it originates from the Village Fund, which is an embodiment of the implementation of the Village Law, or from the Allocation of Village Funds, which is an order from another law.

With the explanation and analysis above, it can be concluded that the practice and implementation of Village Law No. 6 of 2014 in the Family Farming community in Agam Regency covers almost all sectors and dimensions of agricultural and rural life. Among them are the development of infrastructure, agricultural infrastructure, and increasing skills and knowledge to empower the community.

Comparative Analysis of the Implementation of the Village Law in Two Cases

From the explanation and description of the implementation results of the Village Law in the two cases above, the following similarities and differences were identified and analyzed:

- a. Similarities in the two cases:
 - i. In both cases, the Village Law is interpreted positively as a new opportunity to support rural development or strengthen development initiatives “from below” (bottom-up approach);
 - ii. Exploiting the opportunities of the Village Law especially begins with the inclusion of village authority to regulate their allocation of development funds.
 - iii. The implementation of the Village Law program based on the two cases covers three matters: development of agricultural and rural supporting infrastructure, capacity-building of farmers through training/education, and provision of agricultural equipment/technology.
 - iv. In both cases, the Village Law was given a new meaning to support family farming programs, especially those related to the development of natural agriculture, which later became the flagship program in the village.
 - v. The key to the successful implementation of the Village Law in harmony with the objectives of natural farming in the two cases is due to the good relations of the natural farming community with multiple actors at the national level, “insiders” in the government and serious assistance from civil society movements.
 - vi. The role of women farmers in both cases is vital in the entire implementation process of the Village Law and family farming activities.
- b. Additional notes on implementing Family Farming in the Blitar and West Sumatra cases.
 - i. *Different types of community.* The family farming community in Blitar Regency is ordinary, not based on custom, so the developed agenda and programs are more general, like other agricultural and rural communities. Meanwhile, the family farming community in Agam is custom-based in a traditional village (Nagari), so the program and its activities overlap with the customary system values that apply in the village/nagari.
 - ii. *The main actors involved.* The prominent supporters of the family farming community in Blitar District are a combination of national and regional Farmers' Unions. In contrast, in

- Agam District, there are more figures and members from adat/nagari structures in the local community, although they also have the same national network.
- iii. *Lessons learned.* The implementation of the Village Law in the Blitar District case was more on the importance of a strategy to bridge the gap in knowledge and substance regarding the Village Law and family farming issues, vertically and horizontally. Meanwhile, the case in Agam Regency was more a political issue of changing the new leadership in the Traditional Village (Nagari), which could change all the previously agreed upon agendas.
 - iv. *Differences in village policy meeting points with family farming agendas.* In the case of Blitar Regency, the meeting point for village government policies with family farming starts with the interpretation of the authority and autonomy of governance of village policies from the Village Law. Whereas in the case of Agam Regency, the meeting point starts from the politics of priority allocation of village funds, especially for traditional villages (nagari).
 - v. *Implementation challenges.* In the case of Blitar District, the main challenge in implementing the Village Law for family farming is integrating the Family Farming program into the official agenda of the Village and Local Government. Whereas in the case of Agam District, the main challenge is how to continue to strengthen the customary system (nagari) amid a strong hedonic-materialistic and instantaneous culture.

The five things above can be important factors in implementing Family Farming. That is, understanding the village's character, potential, strengths, and weaknesses socially, politically, and culturally correctly is the key to helping the success of implementing a family farming program in a village.

Monitoring and Evaluation

The process of evaluating and monitoring Village Law No. 6 of 2014 has been carried out by various parties since it was ratified, either by internal parties in the government or related ministries, by social movements and NGOs that focus on the Village Law, or by groups of academics/researchers on villages and agrarian affairs.

Monitoring and Evaluation of Government Perspective

One of the Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) methods for the Village Law used by the government is to measure the Developing Village Index. The strategy is to collect data from the government based on indicators that will be assessed to see village development.

Another M&E strategy carried out by the government is to look at the achievement of the Village SDGs, whose achievement targets have been set by the government. The method is to collect data through villages inputting data independently. The government and regional governments also allotted money to realize village funds and ADD, measured through the number of poor people and the dynamic development village index.

The results obtained through this monitoring and evaluation model include (1) changes in the status/category of the village, whether it is a very underdeveloped, underdeveloped, developing, or developed; (2) Village SDGs data collection results in addition to measuring achievements are also used as a basis for village planning; (3) Village funds and ADD M&E are helpful for the government and regional governments in determining the amount of each calculation formula in village funds and ADD. As stated in the previous chapter, the study used more SDG data collection in both cases.

Learning from this government M&E model, an innovation strategy from the village is needed so that individual deprivation measure (IDM) indicators can be developed based on family farming indicators, including inputting Village SDG data based on family farming and the need to develop a village government performance formula in family farming that is considered in village funds and ADD. The research shows that the SDGs indicators have been included in the measurement in both cases. Family farming programs and activities are also aligned with the pillars of the SDGs but have not explicitly made farming the primary indicator. This should be on the agenda and recommendations for the future.

Monitoring and Evaluation of the Village Law from the Perspective of the House of Representatives and NGOs

Some of the Village Law's objectives were to advance rural communities' economies, overcome national development gaps, and overcome rural poverty problems. To measure the success of the implementation of the Village Law, particularly in rural areas, several parameters can be used, including the poverty rate in rural areas, the depth and severity of poverty in rural areas, the Gini coefficient in rural areas, and the exchange rate of farmers and fishermen in rural areas¹⁷.

Village funds have been allocated in the APBN since 2015, amounting to IDR 20.76 trillion. Until 2020, the allocation of village funds through the APBN has reached IDR 328.07 trillion. Village fund budget allocations tend to increase from year to year. The average fund received by each village also increased, from 280 million per village in 2015 to 950 million per village in 2020.

The following are the six parameters used for the M&E of the Village Law and the results obtained from the evaluation model.

First is the poverty rate. The government stated that rural poverty has decreased from 2015 to 2021. The following is the data on rural poverty from 2015 to 2021.

Table 1. Poverty Rates in Rural Areas

No	Year	Number of Poor Population (in Mn persons)
1	2015	17.89
2	2016	17.28
3	2017	16.31
4	2018	15.54
5	2019	14.93
6	2020	15.51
7	2021	14.64

Source: Central Bureau of Statistics, 2022

The BPS (Badan Pusat Statistik) data above proves the government's claim about reducing poverty in rural areas triggered by the distribution of village funds. Village funds are allocated for various activities. Based on data from the Ministry of Villages, the utilization of village funds from 2015 to 2019 can be seen in the following table:

Table 2. Annual Village Fund Utilization, 2015-2019

Sector	Target	Amount
Supporting community economic activities	Village road	231.709 km
	Bridge	1.327.069 meter
	Village market	10.480 unit
	Village-owned enterprises	39.226 activity
	Ground retainer	215.989 unit
	Boat mooring	6.312 unit
	Dum	4.859 unit
	Irrigation	65.626 unit
	Sport facilities	25.022 unit
	Drainage	36.022 unit
	Clean water	993.764 unit

¹⁷ Sirait, Robby Alexander, A Brief Review of the 2015-2020 Village Funds, Quick Brief Analysis 01/ARC.PKA/III/2021.

Improving people's quality of life	Bath, wash, toilet facilities	339.909 unit
	Village polyclinic	11.599 unit
	Village early childhood care	59.640 activities
	Integrated healthcare center	30.127 unit
	Citizen's well	58.259 unit

Source: Ministry of Village, 2020

In response to the handling of the COVID-19 pandemic, the 2020 village fund is prioritized for financing social safety nets in the form of direct cash assistance to affected village communities and COVID-19 handling activities in the village.

The government's claim that there has been an improvement in the welfare of rural communities after the allocation of village funds since 2015 is not entirely correct. Based on an analysis conducted by the DPR Republik Indonesia's Center for Budgetary Studies, it was found that the change or speed of change in welfare indicators after implementing village funds since 2015 is lower than before village funds were introduced. Using the poverty rate in 2011 and 2014 (before village funds), the poverty rate in rural areas decreased by 11.74 percent. Meanwhile, after the village fund (change from 2015 to 2019), the poverty rate could only decrease by 8.43 percent. This figure is much lower than the decline in the poverty rate in urban areas in the same period, which decreased by 19.61 percent.

Second, the poverty severity index (spending inequality among people experiencing poverty) in rural areas is improving, but at a slower rate than before the village fund. When the village fund was implemented, the poverty severity index fell 7.02 percent in rural areas. However, this achievement is lower than before the village fund (2011-2014), which reduced the severity index to 16.18 percent.

Third, the poverty depth index (the average expenditure gap of each poor person to the poverty line) is decreasing, but at a slower rate than before the village fund. In the 2015-2019 period (the village fund period), the expenditure gap of the rural poor towards the poverty line was only able to decrease by 6.22 percent. Whereas in the period before village funds (2011-2014), it decreased by 13.79 percent.

Fourth, the rate of decline in the rural Gini ratio in the village fund period was faster than before the village fund, but the speed was not as fast as in urban areas. During the period when the village fund was implemented, the income gap in rural areas (Gini coefficient) decreased by 6.25 percent. This achievement is faster than the period before village funds. However, this reduction in inequality is still lower than the decline in the Gini coefficient in urban areas in the same period (2014-2019), which was 9.7 percent.

Fifth, the speed of poverty reduction, the poverty severity and depth index, and the Gini coefficient in rural areas are lower than in urban areas where funds are not allocated from the APBN. In the period when the village funds were implemented (2015-2019), the rate of decline in poverty rates, the poverty severity and depth index, and the Gini coefficient in rural areas were much lower than the decline in urban areas that did not receive direct budget support from the APBN. The poverty rate is 8.43 percent (rural) compared to 19.61 percent (urban). For the poverty severity index, 7.02 percent compared to 25.81 percent. The poverty depth index is 6.22 percent compared to 18.40 percent. Furthermore, the Gini coefficient is 6.25 percent compared to 9.70 percent.

Table 3. Comparison of Poverty Reduction, Poverty Severity, Depth Index, and Gini Coefficient, Before and after village funds (in %)

Description	Before Village Fund	After Village Fund
Changes in Rural Poverty Rates	-11.74	-8.43
Changes in the Rural Poverty Severity Index	-16.18	-7.02
Changes in the depth of rural poverty	-13.79	-6.22
Change in the Rural Gini Coefficient	2.13	-6.25

Source: BPS processed in the Agrarian Resource Center (ARC), 2021

Sixth, the exchange rate of farmers did not increase significantly. Rural areas have the characteristics of people who work or depend on their livelihoods from the agricultural sector. Therefore, village funds are expected to increase the welfare of rural communities; indeed, the majority work in the agricultural sector. One of the measuring instruments for achieving the impact of village funds on the welfare of people in rural areas is the Farmer's Exchange Rate (Nilai Tukar Petani - NTP). In the 2014-2019 period, NTP has relatively increased. However, the increase was insignificant, which could only increase by 1.15 percent. From 102.03 in 2015 to 103.21 in 2019. This means that the farmer's profit or welfare level can only grow by 1.15 percent during the implementation of the village fund.

Until this report was written, monitoring and evaluation of practices had not been carried out in the two villages in the case of this study through the six stages of the method above. However, it is being scheduled for the following year. Nonetheless, the program evaluation and monitoring process is carried out informally through regular program meetings from API and the national and regional committees for family farming.

Lessons Learned

The six notes remind the government that the massive allocation of village funds has not significantly impacted the improvement of rural communities' welfare and reduced the development gap in rural areas. If we look at the type of use of village funds, the slow pace of this decline is inseparable from the small proportion of village funds used for community empowerment.

This can serve as a “mirror” to look further at implementing the Village Law in all villages nationally, which are likely to have similar conditions and problems. This is because, in general, village funds are used more for physical infrastructure development and a small portion for rural community empowerment programs. One of the arguments is for the efficiency of financial reporting and ease of budget uptake.

In the 2015-2019 period, the average use of village funds for community empowerment was only around 14 -15 percent. Far adrift compared to the use for physical development, which reaches almost 80 percent yearly. Community empowerment is a type of activity that has a direct impact on the community (direct impact), especially the level of welfare. Meanwhile, physical development is more of an indirect impact. In line with the results of the evaluation conducted by the DPR Republik Indonesia Secretariat above, a study conducted by the Smeru Institute in 2019 found the same thing, namely that infrastructure development dominates the use of village funds, and empowerment activities receive very minimal attention. So, it can be concluded that activities related to increasing the capacity of farmer families have not been carried out optimally.

Evaluation of the Substance of the Village Law from an Academic Perspective

The following description is part of the results of a critical evaluation conducted by academics and researchers in rural and agrarian areas. The method used is content analysis and review of how the substance of the ideas contained in the Village Law document provides space or not to resolve rural problems, especially in the context of the problem of agrarian inequality and rural structural crises.

As affirmed normatively, the main objective of the Village Law is to create democratization, independence, and prosperity for the village and its people. Several strategies are generally practiced in building village independence from within. First, build the critical and dynamic capacity of citizens and civil society organizations in the village. Second, strengthen government capacity and dynamic interaction between citizen organizations in the administration of village governance; Third, build a responsive and participatory village planning and budgeting system that builds local economic institutions that are independent and productive. These four ideal strategies can only be achieved if they have the requirements of a village leadership model that has integrity and is fully supported by the political system in the government and human resources with good governance skills. In practice, these socio-political conditions are more easily fulfilled by villages on the island of Java. However, it will be challenging for villages in the interior of the islands of Papua, Maluku, Sulawesi, Kalimantan, Sumatra, etc.

The two cases studied in this research showed that both villages in Blitar Regency and Agam Regency had good social and political conditions in village governance so that they could respond quickly to all the objectives of the Village Law. Able to carry out and fulfill administrative and substantive requirements. So that the Village Law can be relatively well implemented and connected with the programs, activities, and objectives of the family farming community in the village.

In the Blitar case, it was explained that “the existence of the API East Java, which is also a member of the KRPK, which is a companion in the village for implementing Family Farming, is an important factor in understanding the implementation of the Village Law.” This was conveyed by Naning Suprawati, one of the village organizers¹⁸.

The same thing also happened in the case of Nagari Canduang Koto Laweh, West Sumatra. The implementation of the Village Law can occur smoothly because of good understanding and knowledge from the government and village communities, because of socialization and assistance by the KRPK. Without good understanding and knowledge, there will be a gap between ideality and reality¹⁹.

When viewed from the perspective of access and exclusion dynamics focusing on natural resource issues, the Village Law normatively has opened wider political opportunities for villagers' access to natural resources. However, at the same time, it also suffers from several exclusion threats (Shohibuddin et al., 2017)²⁰. The formulation of the Village Law was primarily aimed at restoring village autonomy from the long history of state corporatism. However, the legislative process did not consider (and, as a result, failed to address) the marginalization of villages due to agrarian and ecological crises and the expansion of capitalism to remote rural areas.

In turn, this limitation at the normative level can create an actual threat of exclusion due to its implications on the practical level. As previously stated, implementing the Village Law is not smooth from the structural context and the power relations surrounding it. Instead of being in a vacuum, implementing the Village Law is faced with the structural problem of the “rural crisis”, whose scale and intensity are very concerning as capitalism expands more and more massively²¹.

Results From Monitoring and Evaluation and Learning

Based on the criticism above, it is important to emphasize that the big idea of the Village Law is not the answer and a “holy mantra” for all village and rural problems today. It is important to emphasize that the proposed solutions in the Village Law must be reconsidered in empirical practice, according to the diversity of real problems faced in each village. Because village and rural problems are also inherent in the problem of agrarian structural inequality, a prerequisite should be added for how the restructuring scheme for agrarian inequality problems in rural areas can be responded to through the Village Law.

With the realization that the Village Law needs to add to the prerequisites for sensitivity to agrarian structural problems in rural areas, it is crucial to try out implementation in various typologies of rural structural problems. At least it can be tested and implemented in three typologies (role models) of structural problems of rural agrarian crisis as follows, namely: (1) villages with high agrarian structural inequality, (2) villages with complex agrarian conflicts, and (3) villages which have a severe ecological crisis and damage. The critical question that can be asked in this regard is: “What will the result be if the Village Law is put into practice in the three typologies of the villages?”. From there, the lessons learned can be drawn. Is the Village Law able to be a problem solving, or is it a new problem in rural areas? If the latter is the case, then a serious evaluation is needed at what point the underlying problem is actually²².

¹⁸ Results of interviews and FGD with Naning S, API East Java and KRPK, 25 June 2022.

¹⁹ Results of interviews and FGD with Novrian, Nagari village community of Canduang Koto Laweh, 24 June 2022

²⁰ https://www.researchgate.net/publication/326032465_Undang-Undang_Desa_dan_Isu_Sumberdaya_Alam_Peluang_Akses_atau_Ancaman_Eksklusi.

²¹ Moh. Shobudidn, Eko Cahyono, Adi Bahri, Village Law and Natural Resource Issues: Opportunity for Access or Threat of Exclusion?, WACANA, JURNAL TRANSFORMASI SOSIAL, NOMOR 36/TAHUN XIX/2017.

²² Eko Cahyono, Village Law, Agrarian Crisis and Rural Area Problems.

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/359037197_UndangUndang_Desa_Krisis_Agraria_dan_Masalah_Kawasan_Pedes_aan.

In the case of the Blitar district, there is no problem of agrarian conflict. In this case, the Village Law can be easily implemented and connected to family farming programs. The village government is strong and complicated in terms of managing the village's bureaucratic resources. The same thing happened in the case of Agam. The difference is, in the case of Kabupaten Agam, the village is traditional (nagari). However, the two cases did not encounter the problem of cases of conflict and severe structural inequality. So, in both cases, the Village Law can be an opportunity for the development of family farming programs and activities and problem-solving for rural problems.

The evaluation results from the perspective of agrarian academics and researchers above are only part of the monitoring and evaluation efforts of other Village Laws with various models and different actors/institutions, which inevitably produce different outputs. This is because the Village Law has already been implemented for eight years. The multi-stakeholder monitoring and evaluation are essential to ensure that "all good intentions and will to improve" contained in the Village Law can be implemented to the maximum, and the "lack" things can be improved, revised, and re-furnished both the substance of the idea and the empirical practice.

"The urgency of evaluation and monitoring is not only to see the program's achievements and obstacles but also to review whether the initial ideals of the Village Law are still in line with empirical practice. So, whatever the type and model of program evaluation, the most important thing is to ensure the ultimate goal of the Village Law: it can prosper and fulfill socio-economic and political justice for village communities and make villages more democratic, as mandated by this law from the start"²³.

III. RECOMMENDATIONS

The following are recommended based on the results of the case study:

For Central Government

1. Conduct a comprehensive national evaluation of the achievements of the implementation of the Village Law with the aim that it remains under its initial objectives.
2. The importance of systematic monitoring of the use of village funds that are prone to corruption at the village level. So, it is crucial for strict law enforcement in villages that are proven to have corrupted village funds. If necessary, there is a special supervisory team for village fund corruption in collaboration with the Corruption Eradication Commission (Komisi Pemberantasan Korupsi - KPK).
3. Include one of the indicators of the achievements of the Village Law, primarily related to the Village SDGs and the environmental conservation objectives at the level with the goals and pillars of Family Farming.
4. Aligning the national strategic agenda, especially for agricultural policy (in its broadest sense) with the National Action Plan, Family Farming in Indonesia is the umbrella of the joint program.

For Local Governments in the Blitar and Agam Districts

1. Bridging the knowledge gap on the Village Law between the district, village government, and rural farming communities, including the family farming community, so they can work together more systematically.
2. Develop the design and planning of a "building from the village" policy with the dimension of family farming as its ultimate goal. This is because the paradigm of "building from the village" aligns with the goals of family farming, such as independence, democratization, and sovereignty for farmers and people in rural areas.
3. Strengthening collaboration and innovation in concrete programs of the district agriculture office with village governments and family farming communities through financial support and Village Law programs, both with the objectives of developing agricultural support infrastructure and developing sustainable agriculture as well as organic/natural farming and preserving rural natural resources in an equitable manner, social and ecological.

²³ Results of interviews with Gunawan (IHCS), one of the drafters of the Village Law draft, 23 June 2022

For Family Farming Community Network

1. Strengthening understanding of the Village Law and various agricultural policies to widen opportunities for integration and collaboration of joint programs in the development of family farming at the regional and village levels.
2. Capacity building for policy advocacy to open up political policy opportunities at the regional and national levels to be used as the basis for collaborative family farming development programs at the village level.
3. Develop a national roadmap for family farming with the Village Law based on the diversity of types of family farming communities throughout Indonesia. Through this, all members of the family farming community in Indonesia can respond to the opportunities of the Village Law more optimally.
4. Increasing knowledge sharing between family farming communities between villages, districts, provinces, and nationally about success stories in program collaboration with village, district, and central government in responding to the Village Law and other national agricultural policies.