



# General Assembly

Distr.: General  
9 March 2012

Original: English

---

**Human Rights Council**  
**Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review**  
**Thirteenth session**  
Geneva, 21 May - 4 June 2012

**Summary prepared by the Office of the High Commissioner  
for Human Rights in accordance with paragraph 5 of the  
annex to Human Rights Council resolution 16/21**

**Indonesia\***

The present report is a summary of 32 stakeholders' submissions<sup>1</sup> to the universal periodic review. It follows the general guidelines adopted by the Human Rights Council (HRC) in its decision 17/119. It does not contain any opinions, views or suggestions on the part of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR), nor any judgement or determination in relation to specific claims. The information included herein has been systematically referenced in endnotes and, to the extent possible, the original texts have not been altered. As provided for in Resolution 16/21 of the HRC, where appropriate, a separate section is provided for contributions by the national human rights institution of the State under review that is accredited in full compliance with the Paris Principles. The full texts of all submissions received are available on the OHCHR website. The report has been prepared taking into consideration the periodicity of the review and developments during that period.

---

\* The present document was not edited before being sent to United Nations translation services.

## **I. Information provided by the national human rights institution of the State under review accredited in full compliance with the Paris principles**

### **A. Background and framework**

1. Indonesian Human Rights Commission (Komnas-HAM) reported that the Government had not met the recommendations to ratify a number of international human rights treaties and recommended that the Government immediately ratify them<sup>2</sup> and ICRMW.<sup>3</sup>

2. Komnas-HAM stated that education and training in human rights for law enforcement officials, if any, had not demonstrated results. This was evident from human rights abuses committed by security forces, especially police. In 2009, there were 4926 complaints. 890 cases were of citizens concerns about the process of police investigation and 177 complaints questioned the legality of detention by the police.<sup>4</sup> The draft Penal Code did not refer to CAT as a whole.<sup>5</sup> Komnas-Ham asked that its education and training programmes be a condition met by all law enforcement officers.<sup>6</sup>

### **B. Cooperation with human rights mechanisms**

3. According to Komnas-HAM, the consultation process between the Government and stakeholders was more temporary (just before a report's submission) rather than continuous and long term. It recommended a more permanent and institutionalized consultation particularly in the process of formulating and harmonizing national legislation with ratified international treaties.<sup>7</sup>

### **C. Implementation of international human rights obligations, taking into account applicable international humanitarian law**

4. Komnas-HAM reported that its inquiry revealed that crimes against humanity were likely committed in five identified cases: May 1998 riots; Semanggi and Clover II in 1998; forced disappearances 1997-8; Talangsari; Wasior and Wamena. The Attorney General was informed of these findings but had not acted upon them. Komnas-Ham recommended immediate follow-up of the Commission's investigations.<sup>8</sup>

5. The absence of the right to security guarantees for human rights defenders (HRDs) led to the birth of the draft "Law on Human Rights Defenders" and the Government was recommended to speed up Parliament's endorsement of the Act.<sup>9</sup>

6. During the last four years there had been a series of steps backward in the implementation of state obligations to respect, fulfil and protect human rights, mainly in the following issues: Freedom of Religion or Belief, Protection of Migrant Workers,<sup>10</sup> and Corporate Responsibility in respecting human rights.<sup>11</sup>

7. Freedom of religion suffered a set-back, as reflected in the attack on Jemaah Ahmadiyah followers in Cikeusik and the deterrence of Jemaah Christians from worshiping in the Church of Yasmin, Bogor.<sup>12</sup> Komnas-Ham recommended the formation of a new law that guarantees the protection of freedom of religion or belief and a shift in managing religious plurality from repressive and discriminatory practices to fair treatment of all religions and beliefs.<sup>13</sup>

8. Regarding issues relating to freedom of expression, Komnas-Ham reported on 44 cases of violence against journalists in 2010; and criminalization of opinions on the internet.<sup>14</sup> The international community was asked to support Indonesia in ensuring security and protection for the journalistic profession.<sup>15</sup>

9. Concerning violence against Papuans, Komnas-Ham reported that the Government's handling of the Papuan People's Congress (KRP) III on 19 October 2011 resulting in 3 persons killed, others wounded and the arrest of KRPIII leaders for treason was not in line with the principles of human rights and democracy. Komnas-HAM recommended that Indonesia accelerate human rights-based development to fulfill and restore the rights and freedoms of the people of Papua.<sup>16</sup>

10. There were 4.5 million Indonesian migrant workers abroad often experiencing abuse and physical and sexual violence. They faced legal issues, with over 300 allegedly threatened with the death sentence, in a neighbouring country.<sup>17</sup> Komnas-Ham recommended that Indonesia take diplomatic action and provide legal assistance to protect them.<sup>18</sup>

## **II. Information provided by other accredited national human rights institutions and other stakeholders**

### **A. Background and framework**

#### **1. Scope of international obligations**

11. According to Joint Submission 11 (JS11), ratification plans<sup>19</sup> had encountered a number of obstacles. First, the lack of coordination and support among government institutions. For example, the rejections by the military and the Ministry of Labour of the ratification of the Rome Statute and the ICRMW, respectively. Second, the lack of initiative, consistency, and political will within the Government and the Parliament.<sup>20</sup> Komnas Perempuan (Komnas-Perempuan) encouraged the Government to promptly fulfil its commitment to ratify these legal frameworks.<sup>21</sup>

12. JS13 urged Indonesia to accede to the Rome Statute<sup>22</sup> and ratify the recently signed CED.<sup>23</sup> JS11 urged the Government, through the Ministry of Law and Human Rights, to immediately proceed with preparations for ratifying OP-CEDAW<sup>24</sup> and OP-CAT<sup>25</sup> and simultaneously improve the conditions of places of detention.<sup>26</sup> JS9 urged the ratification of OP-CRC-SC<sup>27</sup> and OP-CRC-AC<sup>28</sup> JS11 urged the Government to ratify ILO Convention 189 as pledged by the President during the 2011 ILC session.<sup>29</sup> JS12 recommended ratification of ILO C. 169.<sup>30</sup> International Commission of Jurists (ICJ) recommended that Indonesia become a party to ICCPR- OP 1 and OP2, OP-ICESCR, ICRMW and the Convention on the Status of Refugees and immediately sign with a view to ratification the Third Optional Protocol to the CRC.<sup>31</sup>

#### **2. Constitutional and legislative framework**

13. JS7 stated that Indonesia ratified CAT in 1998 but did not criminalize torture in the national military and civilian penal codes.<sup>32</sup> JS2 stated that the adoption of the draft criminal code, which included the crime of torture, had been pending for many years and was unlikely to occur in the near future, as it was not being treated as a high priority<sup>33</sup> Given delays in the adoption of the criminal code, Indonesia should consider passing a stand-alone criminal law that punishes torture in line with the provisions of CAT.<sup>34</sup>

14. Amnesty International (AI) reported on other shortcomings in the Criminal Code. It retained the death penalty in law; criminalized some forms of peaceful expression,

including in Articles 106 and 110 for “rebellion” against the state (makar); and discriminated against women and religious minorities. It did not meet the requirements of international human rights law in other areas.<sup>35</sup>

### **3. Institutional and human rights infrastructure and policy measures**

15. Christian Solidarity Worldwide (CSW) stated that Indonesia should ensure the impartiality and independence of Komnas-Ham.<sup>36</sup> JS3 recommended the establishment of a protection unit for human rights defenders under Komnas-Ham.<sup>37</sup>

16. JS13 stated that an entire section on accountability for gross human rights violations in the 2004-2009 National Human Rights Action Plan no longer existed in the current one. That omission reflected a step backward in Indonesia’s political commitment to combat impunity.<sup>38</sup>

## **B. Cooperation with human rights mechanisms**

17. For the second UPR cycle, ICJ recommended that Indonesia present to the Council, during adoption of its UPR outcome document, a national plan of action for the implementation of accepted recommendations and voluntary pledges and commitments;<sup>39</sup> and two years after adoption of the outcome document, a mid-term progress report on the status of implementation of recommendations and voluntary pledges and commitments.<sup>40</sup>

18. Komnas-Perempuan reminded the Government to follow up on the recommendations of CEDAW and the Special Rapporteur on violence against women.<sup>41</sup>

### **1. Cooperation with treaty bodies**

19. AMAN recommended that Indonesia implement CERD’s recommendations.<sup>42</sup>

### **2. Cooperation with special procedures**

20. CSW urged Indonesia to extend a standing invitation to the Special Procedures.<sup>43</sup> Komnas-Perempuan recommended that the Government should accept the requests of the UN Special Procedures, including on freedom of religion, to visit Indonesia.<sup>44</sup> Similar recommendations were made in nine other submissions.<sup>45</sup> JS12 recommended that Indonesia invite other special procedures relating to: transnational corporations and business enterprises, right to food and on indigenous peoples.<sup>46</sup>

## **C. Implementation of international human rights obligations, taking into account applicable international humanitarian law**

### **1. Equality and non-discrimination**

21. JS11 noted that there were 154 discriminatory bylaws against women in 2009 and 189 in 2010.<sup>47</sup> Komnas-Perempuan recorded in August 2011 that there were 207 discriminatory policies in the name of religion and morality, 78 were specifically targeting women.<sup>48</sup> The majority of those policies (200 of 207 policies) existed at district and provincial levels. At the national level discriminatory policies included: Law No. 44 of 2008 on Pornography; and Ministry of Health Regulation No. 1636/MENKES/PER/XI/2010 regarding Female Circumcision.<sup>49</sup>

22. Komnas-Perempuan recommended the government to: annul any regulations that prescribe flogging and stoning to death or other forms of corporal punishment; seriously

examine the regulations on khalwat (intimacy) and adultery in the provincial regions so that they do not contradict human rights principles.<sup>50</sup>

23. JS11 reported that conflicts between indigenous peoples and peasants and palm oil plantation companies were persistent. There were 660 cases in 2010 and around 240 cases in 2009. Criminalisation of those taking part in the conflicts increased from 112 in 2009 to more than 130 people in 2010. The increase in conflicts allegedly resulted from the issuance of rights to cultivate to palm oil plantation companies, allowing the confiscation of peoples' lands.<sup>51</sup>

## 2. Right to life, liberty and security of the person

24. JS2 stated that eleven national laws and regulations, including the penal code and subversion and corruption laws, prescribe the death penalty.<sup>52</sup> JS1 stated that there were reportedly approximately 100 people on death row – 58 of them for drug offences.<sup>53</sup> AI reported on heightened concerns with the 2010 amendment of the Clemency Law (No. 22/2002), restricting those sentenced to death to the submission of only one plea for clemency to the President within a year of the verdict.<sup>54</sup> Calls were made for the abolition of capital drug laws by JS1 and for the death penalty and the commutation of death sentences to prison terms by AI.<sup>55</sup>

25. JS3 alleged that in October 2011, two HRDs and members of the labour union SPSI (All Indonesia Labour Federation), working at the Freeport McMoran gold and coppermine, Petrus Ayamiseba and Leo Wangdagau, were shot dead by police when taking part in a strike and rally calling for improved labour conditions at the mine.<sup>56</sup> JS7 stated that on 19 October 2011, military and police forces violently dispersed indigenous participants at the 3rd Papuan People's Congress, a peaceful gathering which had been held at a football field of the Catholic Church in Abepura, Jayapura City, Papua Province.<sup>57</sup> Noting that the new standard operating procedures regarding crowd control allowed for the use of firearms by police against unarmed civilians, JS2 recommended that they should be reviewed to ensure the prevention of human rights abuses.<sup>58</sup>

26. JS2 alleged that hundreds of cases of torture were reported every year, mostly concerning the police in order to obtain information or confession. The use of torture was widespread during interrogation.<sup>59</sup> The police required resourced capacity building programmes concerning investigation and interrogation techniques.<sup>60</sup>

27. Human Rights Watch (HRW) stated that its research revealed a pattern of arbitrary detention and ill-treatment, particularly in the provinces of Papua and West Papua.<sup>61</sup> According to JS3, political prisoners were generally treated badly and denied access to health services, such as in the case of Filep Karma and Kimanus Wenda, who had been suffering from serious illnesses.<sup>62</sup>

28. Global Initiative to End All Corporal Punishment of Children (GIEACPC) stated that since the review, Indonesia has made no progress in prohibiting corporal punishment of children and it remained lawful in the home, schools, penal institutions and care settings, and in some cases may be imposed as a sentence for crime under Islamic law.<sup>63</sup>

29. VIVAT International (VIVATI) alleged that violence was carried out by the military in the context of Territorial Military Operation at camps for internally displaced people, at the border of Papua. Reportedly, common types of violence committed by military and police included rapes, sexual slavery, human trafficking for sexual exploitation and sexual abuse.<sup>64</sup> JS9 stated that Ahmadi women often experienced threats of rape and sexual violence resulting in prolonged depression and reproductive disorders.<sup>65</sup>

30. According to Komnas-Perempuan stated that data from the past four years showed that VAW was still a huge problem and measures to deal with it remained limited.<sup>66</sup> Of the

303,114 cases handled, approximately 95% occurred within the personal domain.<sup>67</sup> JS7 indicated that domestic violence was largely tolerated in indigenous culture.<sup>68</sup> JS9 stated that traditional practices harmful to girls still occurred in Indonesia and were rooted in discrimination and control of the sexuality of women from a young age and reflected in the practice of female genital mutilation.<sup>69</sup> JS10 reported that the latest census in 2010 showed the average age of marriage was now 15 years old.<sup>70</sup> JS10 reported that restrictive abortion laws combined with stigma associated with pregnancy outside of marriage meant that unmarried adolescent girls who become pregnant were often forced into marriage.<sup>71</sup> Orchid Project (OP) recommended immediate repeal of the 2010 Ministry of Health Regulation regarding female circumcision<sup>72</sup> and the adoption and implementation of the WHO guidelines on stopping healthcare professionals from performing FGM/C and promoting the abandonment of FGM/C.<sup>73</sup>

31. JS5 stated that the legal framework failed to criminalize individuals or companies that advertised, promoted or arranged child sex tours.<sup>74</sup> JS5 recommended that the implementation of Indonesia's National Plan of Action (on the eradication of the criminal act of trafficking in persons and sexual exploitation of children) should be coordinated and monitored by task forces at the national and local levels.<sup>75</sup>

32. JS1 recommended that treatment for drug dependence should be consensual. Compulsory treatment should be abolished and drug dependant people in detention should have access to opioid substitution therapy.<sup>76</sup> Regarding harm reduction services, JS1 stated that needle and syringe programmes were conducted through outreach. However, many outreach workers had been arrested.<sup>77</sup>

### **3. Administration of justice, including impunity, and the rule of law**

33. JS2 reported that the new 2009 police internal regulations were not being enforced effectively.<sup>78</sup> A lack of professionalism, command responsibility and enforcement of human rights principles, allowed for violations by the police to continue with impunity.<sup>79</sup> Prosecutors often refrained from initiating criminal procedures in cases where the police's division for profession and security (PROPAM) commenced examination of complaints. However, PROPAM did not provide judicial remedies.<sup>80</sup> JS2 recommended that a vetting mechanism should ensure that violations of police regulations such as the use of torture feature in personnel promotion or transferal decisions.<sup>81</sup>

34. HRW alleged that despite significant reforms to the military in recent years, members of Indonesia's security forces –in particular Detachment 88 and the special forces, Kopassus– continued to engage in serious abuses with near-total impunity.<sup>82</sup> JS11 drew attention to the lack of a vetting mechanism in the military (TNI) and the application of the unrevised Law No. 31 Year 1997 on Military Court<sup>83</sup> as affecting the settlement of past human rights violations' cases and made recommendations to address them.<sup>84</sup>

35. According to JS2, Indonesia's State intelligence agency had frequently been involved in human rights violations and allegedly key perpetrators of the 2004 murder of human rights defender Munir were members of this agency. The agency was criticised for its politicisation, lack of civilian oversight and the impunity that its members enjoyed for human rights abuses and criminal acts.<sup>85</sup> ICJ stated that the State Intelligence Law enacted on 11 October 2011 was vague, in contravention of the principle of legality, which could lead to misinterpretation and abuse, and lacked accountability measures that presented the danger of greater impunity on the part of intelligence agencies.<sup>86</sup>

36. JS2 stated that while the President of Indonesia expressed his commitment to support victims' struggles for justice and ensure the punishment of all perpetrators of serious human rights violations under the Suharto regime, there was no judicial progress in that regard.<sup>87</sup> Similar concerns were raised by Komnas-Perempuan.<sup>88</sup> JS13 highlighted little

progress in removing people implicated in human rights violations from public office, and referred to some who had been appointed to senior positions.<sup>89</sup>

37. JS13 stated that during the review period, little progress was made in mediating an impasse between Komnas-Ham and the Attorney General's office (AGO). The commission found that crimes against humanity were committed in five major cases<sup>90</sup> that were then referred to the AGO. According to JS13, the AGO claimed that the dossiers were incomplete, they could not investigate retroactive cases without the establishment of an ad hoc court (which required a parliamentary recommendation and a presidential decree), and double jeopardy existed for cases in which low-level perpetrators were already tried in military courts.<sup>91</sup>

38. According to JS13, the previous human rights action plan targeted the drafting of a new law and establishment of a national truth commission by 2009. A draft law was registered for discussion in Parliament. There was little political support for it. This failure had resulted in indefinite delays in establishing truth commissions for Papua and Aceh that were legally mandated by their respective special autonomy laws.<sup>92</sup>

39. JS2 indicated that the "Witnesses and Victims Agency" was unable to protect victims, witnesses and whistle blowers, due to a lack of resources; the "Criminal Procedure Code" did not specifically provide for the protection of victims and witnesses; and the lack of effective witness protection allowed for continuing impunity.<sup>93</sup>

40. JS2 stated that corruption in the judiciary was a major cause of impunity for perpetrators of religious violence, arbitrary detention, torture, or land and mining disputes. Despite the work of the Anti-Corruption Commission (KPK), judicial corruption remained rampant. The Judicial Mafia Task Force set up by decree in 2009 had acted in several cases of bribery, but allegedly continued to face resistance from the police, prosecution and judiciary, which it had been set up to oversee. The KPK had allegedly faced repeated stand-offs with the National Police and Parliament concerning cases of corruption in those institutions.<sup>94</sup>

#### **4. Right to privacy, marriage and family life**

41. JS9 reported that the protection and fulfilment of the rights of children of female inmates<sup>95</sup> remained disturbing. They can only be taken care of by their mothers for two years, after which they must be handed over for adoption or temporary treatment.<sup>96</sup> JS9 made recommendations to increase support for these children; and to repeal the prohibition of marriage of different religions.<sup>97</sup>

#### **5. Freedom of religion or belief, expression, association and peaceful assembly, and right to participate in public and political life**

42. Issues relating to freedom of religion and belief were raised in about 17 submissions including<sup>98</sup> by the Centre for Human Rights and Democracy (CHRD),<sup>99</sup> European Centre for Law and Justice (ECLJ),<sup>100</sup> Equal Rights Trust (ERT),<sup>101</sup> Human Rights First (HRF),<sup>102</sup> Jubilee Committee (JC),<sup>103</sup> JS8,<sup>104</sup> OpenDoors (OD),<sup>105</sup> Pax Christi International (PCI).<sup>106</sup> Particular reference was made to violations affecting the Ahmadiyah in Cisuek<sup>107</sup> and the Indonesia Christian Church Taman Yasmin Bogor.<sup>108</sup>

43. HRW stated that since 2008, the situation for religious minorities had significantly worsened.<sup>109</sup> HRW reported that attacks increased from 135 incidents in 2007, to 216 in 2010 and 184 for the first nine months of 2011.<sup>110</sup> JS4 stated that Indonesia had institutionalised inequality and hierarchy between religious beliefs, with religious minorities at the bottom.<sup>111</sup> ERT's research indicated that there was a strong connection between the continued existence of laws which restricted religious freedom, and the rising

influence of extremist factions which promote and engage in discrimination and violence against religious minorities.<sup>112</sup> JS3 drew attention to the spreading of hatred and intimidation.<sup>113</sup> According to JS8, the 3 Ministries Joint Decree in 2008 triggered the increase of violence against Ahmadiyya congregation perpetrated by vigilante groups (Islamic-radical).<sup>114</sup> HRW stated that longstanding impunity for religious violence had fostered larger and more brutal attacks by Islamist militants against religious minorities, particularly against Christians and the Ahmadiyah.<sup>115</sup> According to JS2, youth unemployment and poverty had allowed Islamist leaders to gain support and spread fundamentalist views that violated Indonesian constitutional values of diversity and religious freedom.<sup>116</sup>

44. ERT,<sup>117</sup> JS8<sup>118</sup> and Komnas-Perempuan drew attention to the discrimination faced by adherents of indigenous faiths regarding their right to equality before the law and government.<sup>119</sup> JS8 indicated that the Government was in the process of generating electronic ID cards (E-KTP) which, when applied would make the rehabilitation of victims' identities more complicated.<sup>120</sup> JS8 urged the Government to revise legislation and policy such as Law No. 23/2006 (Population Administration);<sup>121</sup> and revise Law No. 1/PNPS/1965 concerning the "Prevention of the Misuse and/or Defamation of Religion" and declare the law inapplicable.<sup>122</sup>

45. JS4 stated that Parliament in 2011 was presented with the Religious Tolerance Bill and considered that its restrictions on proselytizing, building places of worship and religious education were incompatible with article 18 of ICCPR.<sup>123</sup> According to PCI, many religious leaders in Indonesia had objected to the bill, raising the fear that it would further entrench discrimination against religious minorities and strengthen support for the extremist fringe.<sup>124</sup>

46. JS3 stated that the past four years had seen an increase in violations towards press workers and journalists with 17 cases in 2008 compared to 69, 66 and 87 cases in 2009, 2010 and up to November 2011, respectively.<sup>125</sup> JS4 expressed concern with Indonesia's use of the Criminal Code to regulate media content, instead of the more progressive Press Law No. 40/1999.<sup>126</sup> JS4 alleged that vague terminology in the Criminal Code and the 2008 Electronic Information and Transaction Law allowed public officials to use defamation as a means to criminalise critical voices.<sup>127</sup> JS4 stated that the government has drafted new laws and amendments to existing ones that would further control the media and expression.<sup>128</sup> JS4 indicated that the Law on Public Information Disclosure, enacted on 4 April 2008, which guaranteed citizens the legal right to access to information held by public institutions, had not been effectively implemented.<sup>129</sup> According to JS4, the passage of the State Intelligence Law, with its provisions on state secrets, posed serious threats to the effective and just implementation of the Law on Public Information Disclosure.<sup>130</sup>

47. JS3 stated that very little progress had been made in response to the recommendations made by the United Nations Special Rapporteur on Human Rights Defenders in 2007 and the 2008 recommendation of Indonesia's first UPR.<sup>131</sup> AI stated that Indonesia's Parliament failed to pass a law to protect Human Rights Defenders (HRD).<sup>132</sup> JS3 emphasized that threats towards those defending environmental and land rights continued.<sup>133</sup> Specific alleged cases were referred to by Komnas-Perempuan<sup>134</sup> and JS3<sup>135</sup> in North Sumatra and Central Sulawesi. According to JS2, in 2010 alone, at least four HRDs working as journalists exposing corruption were killed.<sup>136</sup>

48. According to JS3, threats towards HRDs working to promote and defend rights of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender and Intersex (LGBTI) people had starkly increased in recent years. Allegedly, this deterioration could be ascribed to a general rise in intolerance and the strengthening of conservative Islamic groups, including political parties, which became part of the coalition cabinet after the last general elections in 2009.<sup>137</sup> JS3 alleged that fundamentalist groups used violence against those defending the rights of LGBTI

people and that the National Police Chief had stated that he would work more closely with these groups to uphold “national morals” and prevent “moral decline”, instead of promising to guarantee the safety of all civilians.<sup>138</sup> JS11 urged the Government prosecute those committing violence against LGBTIQ and promote respect for their rights.<sup>139</sup>

49. JS3 stated that increasingly difficult access to the region for international human rights workers and journalists had added to the isolation of HRDs working in Papua, increased their vulnerability and led to a decline in accountability of security forces in the two provinces.<sup>140</sup> Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre (IDMC) reported that since 2009, the Government had banned ICRC, Cordaid and Peace Brigades International from the Papuan provinces.<sup>141</sup>

50. AI had documented a significant increase in arrests after the authorities issued Government Regulation No. 77/2007 and at least 90 people were currently imprisoned for peaceful political protests or for possessing, raising or waving the pro-independence flags of Maluku and Papua.<sup>142</sup> JS6 noted no significant change in the practice of using makar to criminalize peaceful political activities<sup>143</sup> and called for the unconditional release of all those in detention for non-violent political activities as part of a comprehensive policy to end punishment for free expression. Victims of arbitrary detention should receive adequate reparations and assistance to access services needed for recovery and rehabilitation.<sup>144</sup>

#### **6. Right to work and to just and favourable conditions of work**

51. HRW stated that Indonesia’s labour law excluded domestic workers from basic protections such as a minimum wage, limits to hours of work, and weekly rest days. Whether at home or abroad, domestic workers often faced months or years of unpaid wages; long work hours without rest; confinement in the workplace; psychological, physical, and sexual abuse; and in some cases forced labour and trafficking.<sup>145</sup> Komnas-Perempuan stated that protection for domestic workers was urgently needed and recommended prompt enactment of the Bill on Domestic Workers.<sup>146</sup>

#### **7. Right to social security and to an adequate standard of living**

52. JS12 estimated that of 31.02 million people living below the poverty line, almost half lived inside and around forest areas. According to JS12, communities that lived in villages inside and around forest areas had been directly affected by forest destruction and had gained little or no benefit from large-scale licensed operations.<sup>147</sup> Likewise, the highly comparable promises propagated through REDD+ (Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation) scheme had not paid serious or in-depth attention to the fulfilment of the economic, social and cultural rights of rural communities and indigenous peoples.<sup>148</sup>

#### **8. Right to health**

53. World Vision (WV) recommended an allocation of a minimum health budget of 5% from the National and 10% of the Province budgets, as mandated in Article 171 of Law No.36/2009. The budget must be allocated to those interventions for which there is evidence of a reduction of maternal and child mortality and increase of maternal and child nutrition.<sup>149</sup>

54. WV reported on findings that the wider gap of infant and under-five mortality rates occurred in Nusa Tenggara, Moluccas and Papua group of islands.<sup>150</sup> According to AI, Indonesia had one of the highest maternal mortality ratios in the East Asia and Pacific region with an estimated 228 maternal deaths per 100,000 live births.<sup>151</sup> AI recommended that Indonesia repeal all laws and regulations, at both the central and local levels, that violate sexual and reproductive rights; remove legal and policy provisions on matters related to sexual and reproductive health that discriminate on the grounds of marital status;

repeal legal provisions criminalizing abortion in both the Criminal Code and the Health Law.<sup>152</sup>

55. JS9 reported on estimations of a future increase in HIV prevalence in the 15 to 49 age group, and HIV infections in women and children.<sup>153</sup> JS9 stated that female patients with HIV/AIDS experienced rejection by health officials because of their status and, in some cases, were subjected to forced removal of their uterus after delivery, without counselling.<sup>154</sup>

#### **9. Right to education**

56. JS10 stated that unmarried girls who became pregnant continued to be threatened with expulsion from school and married adolescent girls continued to leave school. Indonesia had no policy or alternative education opportunities for girls in these circumstances.<sup>155</sup> JS10 recommended that Indonesia involve civil society and young people in the process of drafting government regulations on Pornography Law No. 44/2008 particularly its articles 13 and 14 to prevent sexuality material for education purposes being categorized as pornographic materials.<sup>156</sup>

#### **10. Persons with disabilities**

57. As follow-up to the ratification of CRPD, Komnas-Perempuan urged the Government to ensure revision to the Marriage Law<sup>157</sup> include the elimination of discriminatory treatment against women with disabilities, to develop monitoring on the vulnerability of women with disabilities to violence and the difficulties they face in accessing justice.<sup>158</sup>

#### **11. Indigenous peoples**

58. AMAN stated that between 2008 and 2011, indigenous peoples continuously experienced various forms of discrimination, coercion and exploitation of their lands, territories and resources.<sup>159</sup> Specific allegations<sup>160</sup> related to the development of the Merauke Integrated Food and Energy Estate (MIFEE) in West Papua, affecting the indigenous of Malind,<sup>161</sup> the occupation of lands of indigenous in north Sumatera by a state-owned plantation (oil palm and sugar cane) company (PTPN II);<sup>162</sup> the occupation of Koronsi'e Dongi community land in south Sulawesi by PT Inco, a nickel mining company;<sup>163</sup> and the loss of land and forest resources to logging companies for Dayak Punan communities in Kalimantan.<sup>164</sup> JS12 highlighted the lack of respect for Free Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC).<sup>165</sup> VIVATI alleged that islands such as Flores, Timor, Lembata and Sumba had been mined by force by local government with multinational corporations.<sup>166</sup> AMAN recommended scheduling discussion of the Draft Law on the Recognition and Protection of the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.<sup>167</sup>

#### **12. Migrants, refugees and asylum-seekers**

59. JS9 stated that despite the 2004 law and the creation of the National Agency, the problems experienced by Indonesians working abroad remained<sup>168</sup> HRW stated that Indonesia's diplomatic efforts to address abuse of migrants abroad, such as bans on sending domestic workers had been largely ineffective<sup>169</sup> In 2011, Indonesia revised a Memorandum of Understanding with Malaysia with improvements for a weekly day off for domestic workers and the ability to hold on to their passports, which lacked other key labour and monitoring protections.<sup>170</sup> Komnas-Perempuan recommended developing a comprehensive case-handling system for the problems of migrant workers, especially domestic workers.<sup>171</sup>

**13. Internally displaced persons**

60. IDMC provided information that in some areas where reconciliation and peace-building efforts had been insufficient, episodes of violence between segregated ethnic or religious communities had continued to cause displacement. During 2010 and 2011, tens of thousands of people were temporarily displaced by inter-ethnic violence in East Kalimantan and Papua<sup>172</sup> Province. In September 2011, inter-communal violence in Maluku province<sup>173</sup> displaced at least 4,000 people in Ambon, some of them losing their home for the fourth time in twelve years. As of early 2011, IDMC estimated that between 170,000 and 180,000 people remained displaced in Indonesia or had failed to achieve durable solutions.<sup>174</sup>

**14. Right to development and environmental issues**

61. According to JS12, Indonesia's reservation to article 1 of ICCPR and ICESCR contributed to the continued neglect of the rights to lands, territories and natural resources of rural communities, particularly indigenous peoples.<sup>175</sup>

62. JS12 highlighted the importance of integrating human rights into policies and practices relating to the natural resources, development and climate change impact mitigation sectors.<sup>176</sup>

**15. Situation in or in relation to specific regions or territories**

63. JS7 reported that Papua was a highly militarized area with an estimated 14,842 troops whose primary mission was to secure the state against the threat of separatism.<sup>177</sup> The military was however also engaged in economic activities in the resource rich region.<sup>178</sup> CSW alleged that on 17 June 2010 the Papuan People's Assembly formally handed back the special autonomy status known as 'OTSUS', introduced in 2001, as this status has not delivered anything meaningful for their people.<sup>179</sup>

64. JS6<sup>180</sup> and Komnas-Perempuan urged the Government, inter alia, to: place importance on dialogue with the people of Papua rather than taking a security approach in addressing the problems of Papua; adopt a development plan according to the needs and voices of the indigenous people of Papua and focus on the solutions to the roots of the problems of injustice, discrimination, and violence in Papua; reallocate monies from the exploitation of natural resources in Papua to the welfare of Papuans<sup>181</sup> Komnas-Perempuan urged the Aceh government to use its special authority to establish a special independent mechanism for fulfilling women's human rights in Aceh.<sup>182</sup>

*Notes*

<sup>1</sup> The stakeholders listed below have contributed information for this summary; the full texts of all original submissions are available at: [www.ohchr.org](http://www.ohchr.org). (One asterisk denotes a national human rights institution with "A" status)

*Civil society*

AI	Amnesty International, London, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland;
AMANA	Aliansi Masyarakat Adat Nusantara/AMAN (Indigenous Peoples Alliance of the Archipelago), Indonesia;
CHRD	Centre for Human Rights and Democracy, Faculty of Law, University of Brawijaya, Malang, Indonesia;
CSW	Christian Solidarity Worldwide, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland;
ECLJ	European Centre for Law and Justice, Strasbourg, France;

ERT	Equal Rights Trust, London, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland;
GIEACPC	Global Initiative to End All Corporal Punishment of Children, London, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland;
HRF	Human Rights First, United States of America;
HRW	Human Rights Watch, New York, United States of America;
ICJ	International Commission of Journalists, Geneva, Switzerland;
IDMC	Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre of the Norwegian Refugee Council, Geneva, Switzerland;
JC	Jubilee Campaign, United States of America;
JS1	Joint submission 1 submitted by LBH Masyarakat, Indonesia, Harm Reduction International, London, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and Asia Harm Reduction Network, Chiang Mai, Thailand;
JS2	Joint submission 2 by Asian Legal Resource Centre, Hong Kong, China and KontraS, Jakarta, Indonesia;
JS3	Joint submission 3 by Civil Society Coalition for the Protection of Human Rights Defenders, by Arus Pelangi, Jakarta, Indonesia; Community Alliance for Pulp Paper Advocacy (CAPP), Indonesia, Commission for the Disappeared and Victims of Violence (KontraS), Jakarta, Indonesia, Consortium for Agrarian Reform (KPA), Jakarta, Indonesia, Human Rights Working Group (HRWG), Jakarta, Indonesia, Indonesia Corruption Watch (ICW), Jakarta, Indonesia, Imparsial, Jakarta, Indonesia, Legal Aid Foundation Jakarta (LBH Jakarta), Jakarta, Indonesia, NGO Cooperation Forum- Papua (FOKER-LSM Papua), Jayapura, Papua, Press Legal Aid Foundation (LBH- Pers), Jakarta, Indonesia, Protection International, Surrey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Setara Institute for Democracy and Peace, Jakarta, Indonesia, Walhi (Friends of the Earth Indonesia), Jakarta, Indonesia;
JS4	Joint submission 4 by ARTICLE 19, London, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Southeast Asian Press Alliance (SEAPA), Bangkok, Thailand, Media Defence Southeast Asia (MD-SEA), Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, Aliansi Jurnalis Independen (AJI), Jakarta, Indonesia, and Institut Studi Arus Informas (ASAI), Jakarta, Indonesia;
JS5	Joint submission 5 by The National Coalition for the Elimination of Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children (ECPAT affiliate group in Indonesia), which is a coalition of 21 child rights NGOs: Pusat Kajian dan Perlindungan Anak (PKPA), Jakarta, Indonesia; Center for Community Development and Education (CCDE), Aceh, Indonesia; Yayasan Perkumpulan Bandungwangi (YPB), Jakarta, Indonesia; Yayasan Kesejahteraan Anak Indonesia (YKAI), Jakarta, Indonesia; Yayasan Kusuma Buana (YKB), Jakarta, Indonesia; Bangun Mitra Sejahtera Sehati (BMS), Jakarta, Indonesia; Sekretariat Anak Merdeka Indonesia (SAMIN), Yogyakarta, Indonesia; Yayasan Indriya-Nati (YIN), Yogyakarta, Indonesia; Yayasan KAKAK, Surakarta, Indonesia; Arek Lintang (ALIT), Surabaya, Indonesia; Yayasan SETARA, Semarang, Indonesia; Yayasan Dinamika Indonesia (YDI), Bekasi, Indonesia; Bina Sejahtera Indonesia (BAHTERA), Bandung, Indonesia; Yayasan Tunas Alam Indonesia (SANTAI), Mataram, Indonesia; Yayasan Sosial Solidaritas Nusantara (YSSN), Pontianak, Indonesia; Lembaga Advokasi Anak (LADA), Bandar Lampung, Indonesia; Yayasan Pendidikan Kesehatan Perempuan (KASEH PUAN), Kepulauan Riau, Indonesia; Yayasan Mitra Kesehatan dan Kemanusiaan (YMKK), Batam, Indonesia; Yayasan ASA PUAN, Indonesia; Yayasan SETARA KITA, Indonesia; in collaboration with ECPAT International, Bangkok, Thailand;

- JS6 Joint submission 6 by TAPOL, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and BUK (Bersatu untuk Kebenaran – United for Truth, Biak, Indonesia);
- JS7 Joint submission 7 by Joint submission 7 by Franciscans International (FI), New York, United States of America, Faith Based Network on West Papua (FBN), Indonesia, and Asian Human Rights Commission (AHRC), Hong Kong, China;
- JS8 Joint submission 8 prepared by Indonesia’s NGO Coalition for International Human Rights Advocacy (HRWG), Institute for Policy Research and Advocacy (ELSAM), Jakarta, Indonesia, Legal Aid Institute (LBH Jakarta), Jakarta, Indonesia, Setara Institute, Jakarta, Indonesia, Indonesian Legal Resource Center (ILRC), Jakarta, Indonesia, and Wahid Institute, Jakarta, Indonesia, in collaboration with Centre for Marginalized Communities Studies (CMARs), Surabaya, Indonesia;
- JS9 Joint submission 9 by Indonesia’s NGO coalition for Women and Children Rights: Yayasan Pemantau Hak Anak (YPHA), Jakarta, Indonesia, Kapal Perempuan, Jakarta, Indonesia, Bina Desa, Jakarta, Indonesia, Asian Muslim Association Network, Bangkok, Thailand, Ikatan Perempuan Positif Indonesian, Indonesia, and Koalisi Perempuan Indonesia untuk Keadilan dan Demokrasi, Jakarta, Indonesia;
- JS10 Joint submission 10 by the Indonesian Planned Parenthood Association (IPPA) Jakarta, Indonesia, and The Sexual Rights Initiative;
- JS11 Joint submission 11 prepared by a number of human rights organizations attached to the Indonesia’s NGO Coalition for International Human Rights Advocacy (Human Rights Working Group, HRWG) and its networks, Indonesia;
- JS12 Joint submission 12 by HuMa (Perkumpulan untuk Pembaharuan Hukum Berbasis Masyarakat dan Ekologis), Jakarta, Indonesia ; Pontianak Institute, Pontianak, Indonesia, Down to Earth, Cumbria, ; PUSAKA, Indonesia; WALHI (Wahana Lingkungan Hidup), Central Kalimantan, Indonesia; Aliansi Masyarakat Adat Nusantara (Indigenous Peoples Alliance of the Archipelago), Jakarta, Indonesia; Forest Peoples Programme, Moreton-in-Marsh, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland; Komunitas Konservasi Indonesia/KKI Warsi, Jambi, Indonesia; Yayasan Merah Putih/YMP, Central Sulawesi, Indonesia; Rain forest Foundation Norway (RFN), Norway;
- JS13 Joint submission 13 by Commission for the Disappeared and Victims of Violence (KontraS), Indonesia; and International Center for Transitional Justice (ICTJ), New York, United States of America;
- Komnas-Perempuan Komnas Perempuan Indonesian National Commission on Violence against Women, Indonesia;
- OD OpenDoors, The Netherlands;
- OP Orchid Project, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland;
- PCI Pax Christi International, Brussels, Belgium;
- VIVATI VIVAT International, New York, United States of America;
- WV World Vision, Middlesex, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. National Human Rights Institutions
- Komnas-HAM\* Indonesian National Human Rights Commission.
- <sup>2</sup> Komnas-HAM, p. 3, para. 10 b.
- <sup>3</sup> Komnas-HAM, p. 6, para. 12.
- <sup>4</sup> Komnas-HAM, p. 3, para. 10 a.
- <sup>5</sup> Komnas-HAM, p. 4, para. 10 e.
- <sup>6</sup> Komnas-HAM, p. 3, para. 10 a.
- <sup>7</sup> Komnas-HAM, p. 4, para. 10 f.
- <sup>8</sup> Komnas-HAM, p. 3, para. 10 d.
- <sup>9</sup> Komnas-HAM, p. 3, para. 10 c.

- <sup>10</sup> Komnas-HAM, p. 4, para. 10 g.  
<sup>11</sup> Komnas-HAM, p. 1, introduction and p. 4, para. 10 g.  
<sup>12</sup> Komnas- HAM, pp. 4-5, para. 11.  
<sup>13</sup> Komnas- HAM, p. 5, para. 11 d.  
<sup>14</sup> Komnas HAM, pp. 6-7, para. 14.  
<sup>15</sup> Komnas HAM, p. 5, para. 14 a.  
<sup>16</sup> Komnas HAM, pp. 6-7, para. 14 c.  
<sup>17</sup> Komnas HAM, p. 5, para. 12.  
<sup>18</sup> Komnas HAM, p. 6, para. 12.  
<sup>19</sup> JS11, paras. 5-6. See also JS13, para. 5; and ICJ, para. 9.  
<sup>20</sup> JS11, para. 6.  
<sup>21</sup> Komnas-Perempuan, para. 6.  
<sup>22</sup> See also AI, page 5, ICJ, para. 12, Recommendation vii), JS2, para. 5.  
<sup>23</sup> JS13, para. 17. See also AI, page 5, JS11, para. 19, JS2, para. 5.  
<sup>24</sup> See also JS9, para. 27, ICJ, para 12, recommendation vii).  
<sup>25</sup> JS7 para. 14, recommendation a), and CSW, para. 4, ICJ, para. 12, recommendation vii), JS2, para.5.  
<sup>26</sup> JS11, para. 9, recommendation (2).  
<sup>27</sup> See also JS5, para 1.4.1, recommendation, JS2, para. 5.  
<sup>28</sup> JS9, para. 27. See also JS2, para. 5.  
<sup>29</sup> JS11, para. 33, recommendation (2).  
<sup>30</sup> JS12, para. 32 c.  
<sup>31</sup> ICJ, para. 12, recommendations vii) and viii).  
<sup>32</sup> JS7, para. 11.  
<sup>33</sup> JS2, para. 17.  
<sup>34</sup> JS2, para. 18.  
<sup>35</sup> AI, p. 2. AI made recommendations (p. 5).  
<sup>36</sup> CSW, para. 10.  
<sup>37</sup> JS3, p.10, Recommendation 2.  
<sup>38</sup> JS13, para. 4.  
<sup>39</sup> ICJ, para. 12, recommendation xi).  
<sup>40</sup> ICJ, para. 12, recommendation xii).  
<sup>41</sup> Komnas-Perempuan, para. 14. See also JS7, para. 45 a and VIVATI, p.8, Recommendation 4.  
<sup>42</sup> AMAN, p. 6, para. 23 c.  
<sup>43</sup> CSW, para. 13. See also ICJ, p. 3, para. 12, recommendation ix).  
<sup>44</sup> Komnas-Perempuan, para. 27.  
<sup>45</sup> AMAN, para. 23 f and h; HRF, p. 5, Recommendations, HRW, recommendations in sections on religious freedom, accountability for abuses by military forces and freedom of expression, ICJ, para. 12, recommendation x), JS3, p. 10, Recommendation 6; JS4, p. 9, para. 24; JS6, p. 6, para. 36, JS7, paras. 23 a, 30 a, 34 a, 40 a and 45 a; and VIVATI, p. 8, Recommendation 4.  
<sup>46</sup> JS12, para. 32 g.  
<sup>47</sup> JS11, para. 41.  
<sup>48</sup> Komnas-Perempuan, para. 16 and its annexes 11 and 12.  
<sup>49</sup> Komnas-Perempuan, para. 16.  
<sup>50</sup> Komnas-Perempuan, para. 19. See also Komnas-Perempuan, Annexes 9 and 12.  
<sup>51</sup> JS11, para. 46.  
<sup>52</sup> JS2, para. 32 and recommendation in para. 33.  
<sup>53</sup> JS1, p.1.  
<sup>54</sup> AI, p.4.  
<sup>55</sup> JS1, pp. 1-2 and 5 and AI, p. 6, recommendation.  
<sup>56</sup> JS3, para. 41.  
<sup>57</sup> JS7, para. 12.  
<sup>58</sup> JS2, para. 43, recommendation 6.  
<sup>59</sup> JS2, para. 14.  
<sup>60</sup> JS2, para. 41.  
<sup>61</sup> HRW, p. 2.  
<sup>62</sup> JS3, para. 40, p. 9.

- <sup>63</sup> GIEACPC, paras. 1.1 and 1.2. *See also* JS9, para. 12.
- <sup>64</sup> VIVATI, p. 7. *See also* IDMC, paras. 6 and 16-17 and Komnas-Perempuan, Annex 10.
- <sup>65</sup> JS9, para. 15. *See also* Komnas-Perempuan, para. 26.
- <sup>66</sup> *See also*, Komnas-Perempuan, para. 5.
- <sup>67</sup> Komnas-Perempuan, para. 11.
- <sup>68</sup> JS7, paras 42 and 43.
- <sup>69</sup> JS9, para. 11.
- <sup>70</sup> JS10, para. 3, recommendation para. 24 (a) and JS9, para. 9.
- <sup>71</sup> JS10, para. 4. JS10 made a recommendation (para. 24 (b)). *See also* JS9, p. 5, para. 9.
- <sup>72</sup> OP, para. 4.3.
- <sup>73</sup> OP, para. 4.4.
- <sup>74</sup> JS5, p. 6. JS5 made recommendations (pp. 6-7).
- <sup>75</sup> JS5, p. 10, recommendation 1.
- <sup>76</sup> JS1, p. 3.
- <sup>77</sup> JS1, p. 4. JS1 made a recommendation.
- <sup>78</sup> JS2, paras. 39 and 14.
- <sup>79</sup> JS2, para. 39. *See also* AI, p. 3. AI made recommendations (p. 5).
- <sup>80</sup> JS2, para. 40 and para. 43, recommendations.
- <sup>81</sup> JS2, para. 43, recommendation 5.
- <sup>82</sup> HRW, p. 2.
- <sup>83</sup> JS11, para. 20.
- <sup>84</sup> JS11, para. 20, HRW, p.2 and p. 4, JS13, para. 12, JS2, paras. 48-50.
- <sup>85</sup> JS2 para. 51.
- <sup>86</sup> ICJ, para. 2. *See also* ICJ, paras. 3-8, para. 12, recommendations i)- vi), JS2, paras. 52-54 and para. 55, recommendation.
- <sup>87</sup> JS2, para. 21.
- <sup>88</sup> Komnas-Perempuan, para. 14.
- <sup>89</sup> JS13, para. 13.
- <sup>90</sup> *See also* Komnas-Perempuan, paras. 8 and 14 and Annexes 6-9.
- <sup>91</sup> JS13, para. 6. *See also* JS11, paras. 16-17.
- <sup>92</sup> JS13, para. 10. *See also* Komnas-Perempuan, para. 14.
- <sup>93</sup> JS2, para. 44. *See also* para 45, recommendations.
- <sup>94</sup> JS2, para. 46. *See also* para 47 and Annex.
- <sup>95</sup> *See also*, Komnas-Perempuan, para. 11.
- <sup>96</sup> JS9, para. 13.
- <sup>97</sup> JS9, para. 30.
- <sup>98</sup> *See also* AI, p. 4 and recommendations, p. 6; CSW, paras. 5-9 and 14-25; HRW, pp1-2 and recommendations p.4; Komnas-Perempuan, paras. 26-27; JS2, paras. 24-27 and recommendations, para. 28 ; JS3, paras. 32-38; JS4, paras. 11-12; JS11, para. 23 and recommendations; and VIVATI, pp.3-4.
- <sup>99</sup> CHRDR, paras. 1-14 and recommendations 15-21-
- <sup>100</sup> ECLJ, paras. 1-17.
- <sup>101</sup> ERT, paras. 1-21.
- <sup>102</sup> HRF, paras. 12-22 and recommendations.
- <sup>103</sup> JC, pp.1-5.
- <sup>104</sup> JS8, paras. 1-55 and Annexes.
- <sup>105</sup> OD, pp.1-5.
- <sup>106</sup> PCI, pp. 2-5.
- <sup>107</sup> HRW, p. 1; AI p. 4; CSW, para. 21; Komnas-Perempuan, para. 26; JS2, para. 27; JS4, para. 11 a; JS11, para. 23; CHRDR, para. 11; ERT, para. 14; JC, p. 4; JS8, para. 27; OD, p. 3.
- <sup>108</sup> JS8, paras. 31-37; Komnas-Perempuan, para. 26; CSW, para. 16; CHRDR, para. 13; ECLJ, para. 14; JC, p. 2; OD, p. 2.
- <sup>109</sup> HRW, p. 1.
- <sup>110</sup> HRW, p. 1.
- <sup>111</sup> JS4, para. 12.
- <sup>112</sup> ERT, para. 3.

- 113 JS3, para. 33.  
114 JS8, para. 24.  
115 HRW, p. 1.  
116 JS2, para. 24. See also para 28, recommendations.  
117 ERT, para. 19  
118 JS8, para. 51 and 53.  
119 Komnas-Perempuan, para. 18.  
120 JS8, para.54.  
121 JS8, para. 12.  
122 JS8, para. 20.  
123 JS4, para. 11 (c).  
124 PCI, p. 5.  
125 JS3, para. 14.  
126 JS4, para. 17.  
127 JS4, para. 18. See also, JS3, para. 15.  
128 JS4, para. 17. See also para. 17, (b) and (c).  
129 JS4, para. 21.  
130 JS4, para. 23.  
131 S3, para. 1.  
132 AI, p. 1. AI made recommendations (p. 6).  
133 JS3, para. 22.  
134 Komnas-Perempuan, para. 9.  
135 JS3, paras. 23-27.  
136 JS2, para. 8. See also JS3, para. 16.  
137 JS3, para. 17.  
138 JS3, para. 21.  
139 JS11, p. 8, recommendations in section on the absence of protection of the LGBTIQ. See also Komnas-Perempuan, para. 13, recommendations.  
140 JS3, para. 6.  
141 IDMC, para. 17. See also JS7, recommendation, para. 23 e), and JS3, para. 43.  
142 AI, p- 4.  
143 JS6, para. 32.  
144 JS6, paras. 12 and 43.  
145 HRW, p. 3. HRW made recommendations (p. 5); See also AI, p. 3. AI made recommendations (p. 5).  
146 Komnas-Perempuan, para. 25.  
147 JS12, para. 9. JS12 made recommendations (para. 32).  
148 JS12, para. 9.  
149 WV, p. 2, recommendations.  
150 WV, page 2.  
151 AI, p. 3. See also JS9, para. 17.  
152 AI, p. 5, recommendations, section on maternal health and sexual and reproductive rights.  
153 JS9, para. 18.  
154 JS9, para. 19.  
155 JS10, para. 7. See also JS10, para. 24, recommendation b).  
156 JS10, para. 24, recommendation e).  
157 See also, Komnas-Perempuan, para. 7.  
158 Komnas-Perempuan, para. 8.  
159 AMAN, para. 9.  
160 See also JS12, paras. 10-15.  
161 AMAN, para. 10.  
162 AMAN, para. 11.  
163 AMAN, para. 12.  
164 AMAN, para. 16.  
165 JS12, paras. 11 and 18. See also, paras 17 and 23.  
166 VIVATI, p. 6.  
167 AMAN, para. 23 a.

- 
- <sup>168</sup> JS9, para. 7. See also Komnas-Perempuan, para. 24 and annex 13.
- <sup>169</sup> HRW, p. 3. HRW made recommendations (p. 5).
- <sup>170</sup> HRW, p. 3. HRW made recommendations (p. 5).
- <sup>171</sup> Komnas-Perempuan, para. 24 (c). See also para. 25 and annex 13.
- <sup>172</sup> See also IDMC, paras. 1 and 6.
- <sup>173</sup> See also IDMC, paras. 5, 12 and 13.
- <sup>174</sup> IDMC, para. 2.
- <sup>175</sup> JS12, para. 5.
- <sup>176</sup> JS12, para. 30. JS12, recommendations, para. 32.
- <sup>177</sup> JS7, para. 7. See also JS6, paras. 16-20; JS4, paras. 13-14; JS3, para. 39; JS2, para. 15; VIVATI, pp. 4-5, IDMC, para. 16; HRW, p.2.
- <sup>178</sup> JS7, para. 7 and HRW, p. 2.
- <sup>179</sup> CSW, para. 26
- <sup>180</sup> JS6, para. 16, paras. 13, 15, 18 and 20, recommendations. See also paras. 14 and 19, recommendations.
- <sup>181</sup> Komnas-Perempuan, para. 15.
- <sup>182</sup> Komnas-Perempuan, para. 19. See also Komnas-Perempuan, Annexes 9 and 12.
-