



**Musyawarah
Petani PHT
INDONESIA**

The Indonesian IPM Farmer's Congress

Sumber Agung Village, Moyudan, Sleman, Yogyakarta
16-21 July, 1999

This summary was prepared by the FAO Programme for Community IPM in Indonesia based on numerous documents created during the planning and conduct of the IPM Farmer's Congress.

Preface

The first national meeting organised by and for IPM farmers was attended by more than 540 participants from 12 rice-bowl provinces. The organising committee, comprising 31 farmers' representatives from 5 provinces, had been established since February 1999 through a series of preparation meetings and site visits conducted in Yogyakarta and Jakarta. The preparatory activities were facilitated by the National IPM Program of the Ministry of Agriculture and the FAO-IPM team. The budget for the Congress was provided on a cost-sharing basis by the concern parties: the farmer participants, local governments from 12 provinces, MoA and FAO.

The objectives of the Congress, as prepared by the farmer's organising committee, were as follows:

- a) To create a strong and dynamic network of IPM Farmers
- b) To develop Community IPM in the rice growing areas.
- c) To firmly establish the basic principles of IPM in the farming communities.
- d) To improve the quality of support and co-operation of all concerned parties based on farmers' interests.

In addition, the guidelines prepared by the committee stated that the IPM Farmers should become aware of the importance and benefits of co-operation in the planning and implementation process of the agriculture development. More specifically,, the committee recognised that the National IPM Program had encountered certain obstacles and challenges such as:

- a) Some of the government policies, in particular of Ministry of Agriculture, are not in compliance with the principles of IPM Programme.
- b) Nationally, there is no farmers' entity to follow-up the IPM Programme.
- c) In some regions, the IPM activities are not well organised.
- d) There is no guarantee of regular funds for Community IPM.

- e) In some regions, the Agriculture officials are not too concerned with the Community IPM.
- f) At the farmers' level, there are different perceptions on farmers' science and its development.
- g) IPM Programme awareness is not yet disseminated to all walk of life of the Indonesian society.

Process of the Congress

The farmer participants brought their own papers and had discussions in four parallel groups, focussing on the following topics:

- a) farmer's science;
- b) farmer's organisation and network;
- c) IPM development and institutionalisation; and
- d) current issues.

There were around 228 papers submitted to the organising committee as the basis for three full days of discussion.

The discussion was conducted in four different tents located in a soccer field at Sumber Agung village, Moyudan sub-district, Yogyakarta. Around 500 participants stayed at farmer's houses in surrounding villages, while around 40 men and women farmers from West Java erected their own tents.

Other activities conducted in the congress were as follow:

- a) IPM exhibitions and farmers trade fair;
- b) Art performances by participants on 3 consecutive nights;
- c) Two group discussion sessions with local and national mass-media journalists;
- d) More than 2 hours of dialog with Sri Sultan Hamengkubuwono X, the King and the Governor of Yogyakarta who attended the opening ceremony; and
- e) More than 3 hours of presentation to, and a lively dialog with, the Minister of Agriculture on 20 July 1999.

Two additional points. Firstly, the organising committee rejected the offer of financial support from pesticide companies, which wanted to hold their own exhibition and promote their products during the Congress. Secondly, the committee successfully negotiated with Government officials so that they would not use this event for promoting their own agricultural programmes.

Statements by IPM Farmers

The conclusions and action plans resulting from the 3 days of discussion were centred on the issue of **Farmers/Peasant Rights**. The following statements are excerpted from 20 pages of results. These are divided according to the 4 discussion topics.

1. IPM Development and Institutionalisation

Goals

- To increase number of self-funded FFS and Farmer's TOT in their own area;
- To establish IPM Farmer's Association in local and national level, and to conduct regular meetings at all levels;
- To strengthen and extend the IPM village and sub-district strategies;
- To disseminate IPM knowledge and skills via field studies, cross-field visits, farmer's organisation workshops, leaflets, learning-plots, art performances, newspaper and radio, and farmer's meetings in collaboration with other institutions, e.g. government research and training, NGOs,
- To establish farmer's co-operatives and farmer's networks/organisations which recognised by the government in order to protect farmer's interests.

Observations and Proposals presented to the Government

- a) The National IPM Programme must be continued and widely disseminated like the Family Planning Programme;
- b) IPM has to be incorporated in formal curricula of the agriculture high school system;
- c) The Law must be enacted and enforced to protect important natural enemies (frog, snake, owl, etc.);
- d) Sustainable allocation of funds for IPM has to be secured under the village, district, province and national budget;
- e) A common vision, mission and perception on IPM has to be strengthened among agriculture officials;
- f) The number of government's pest and disease observer (PHP) must be increased to achieve ratio one person for each sub-district;
- g) The Government Crop Protection Service has to be strengthened for the benefit of IPM Farmers and have a bigger role in agriculture development;
- h) Support is needed for Farmer Trainers to perform their service to the community;
- i) IPM information is needed for the public through broad media campaigns e.g. stamp, newspaper, pictures/symbol in Rupiah currency;
- j) Government policy must be consistent with Presidential Decree No. 3/1986 regarding strict control of pesticides use and with Law No. 12/1992 regarding growing healthy crops;
- k) Farmer Trainers should have the right to monitor pesticide use in their area;
- l) Farmer Trainers should have a clear role in the management of intensification programmes (BIMAS);
- m) Farmer Trainers should receive seats in parliament;
- n) The number of vegetable Field Schools has to be increased;
- o) Health institutions at all levels have to disseminate information about the hazards and consequences of consuming pesticide residue in agricultural products;

- p) The agricultural research system has to serve farmer needs and problems;
- q) Other social organisations should support IPM programmes;

2. Current Issues

Observations and Proposals presented to the Government

- a) Some government policies and programmes must be evaluated based on their stated purpose and actual impact on the lives of farmers, including:
 - *Gema Palagung* (intensification programme 2001 for rice, soybean and corn),
 - *IP 300* (triple rice cropping system),
 - re-allocation of agriculturally productive land for use by the industrial sector,
 - the importation tax on agricultural products, and
 - subsidised fertiliser pricing.
- b) Pesticide needs stricter control due to negative impacts on the ecosystem, human health, pest resistance and outbreaks. The government has to control the activities of pesticide companies, disseminate biological control methods and preserve natural enemies. IPM farmers demand that the pesticide companies should pay back 10% of their net-profit for programmes to rehabilitate damaged ecosystems and the improve the health of poisoned agricultural workers. In addition, the law must be enforced whenever anybody is involved in producing fake pesticides and fertilisers, and stock-piling fertilisers.
- c) IP 300, a campaign to promote triple cropping of rice as a part of the intensification programme, has to be stopped because it destroys local cropping patterns, treats farmers as an 'object' to be manipulated, prolongs the pest cycle, creates new pest outbreaks, increases acidity of the soil and increases the chances of harvest loss.
- d) Government extension workers (PPLs) seldom go to the field and are very busy managing the allocation of credit in order to collect management fees. The PPLs and the PHPs (pest and disease officers) have very little collaboration. It seems that the IPM Programme is owned by PHP but on another side PPL is very supportive to pesticide formulators. The performance of extension workers (PPL) needs to be improved and, if this is not possible, they should be removed from their posts because they create a lot of confusion and have conflicting interests.
- e) The use of fresh University graduates as field staff for the crop intensification programme should be stopped because these people do not support farmer's interests, they can not assist on problem solving in the field and they reflect a waste of investment. The job could be done better by farmers.
- f) The Indonesian Farmer's Association (HKTI) which has no farmers' constituency, and produces no benefits for farmers, must be abolished and be replaced by a new farmer's organisation which should have a clear vision and mission with respect to farmer needs.
- g) Due to increasing input prices versus decreasing of rice price the farmers' income is not secure. The government has to change and enforce its policy to create a balance between the price of farmer's products and the price of agricultural inputs. There is a

need to implement policies, such as high import duties, which will limit food importation.

- h) Up to now, IPM is not well institutionalised due to absence of a national entity for this purpose. Pest outbreaks are happening in some areas. Farmers urge government institutions and agriculture-related officials to support the IPM Programme through clear practices and budgetary allocations. The farmers themselves have to establish their own network and IPM education has to be incorporated in formal school systems. In addition, the government must make a concerted effort to disseminate the IPM Program through other line Ministries, such as Health, Social Welfare, Plantation and Forestry, and Education and Culture.
- i) The role of farmers in agricultural development needs to be strengthened due to the facts that farmers are not currently involved in the policy making process, farmers are treated as the objects of agricultural projects and as receivers of top-down programmes.
- j) Due to a decreasing acreage of productive land, the government has to enforce the law and punish everybody whom changes the function of productive land for other purposes.
- k) The IPM Training Project has to be continued and extended, and the management system has to be improved.
- l) The government credit system has an important role to support farmer's needs but the 'package approach' has no benefit for farmers. The management of credit usually means business opportunities for government officers. Village co-operatives are usually run by people who are not interested in supporting farmer's needs. The management of the credit system needs to be streamlined and based on farmer's needs because at present the disbursements are delayed and the input price are more expensive than in the open market. There is a need for farmers to have direct contact with bank representatives. Co-operative officers have to go to the field to know exactly the farmer's needs. And the 'generalised' credit package system must be changed to cash or specific inputs needed by farmers.
- m) Credit proposals have to be prepared by farmers themselves based on their collaborative decisions. This will solve problems such as the many credit proposals which do not reflect the actual need of farmers, fictitious farmer groups in many areas, and credit packages which come too late in the season.
- n) Farmers presently have to repay loans even when do not get a harvest. Often they have to lease, mortgage or sell their own lands in order to repay loans. IPM Farmers urge the government to change its policy and extend the repayment period, and write off debts if farmers do not get a harvest for three consecutive planting seasons.
- o) The availability of irrigation water is increasingly a big issue for farmers in many areas. Many channels are broken and a lot of dams are silting up. It is also a fact that irrigation water is being used for other purposes which are not related to farmer's interests. Meanwhile, farmers pay the water fees (IPAIR) to the officers in charge, who do not have a transparent management system. The government must repair the technical irrigation system and make clarification on the use and distribution of the money collected from the farmers. Farmers urge the government to set-up a partnership team to do this task and reform the management of water fees based on farmer's interests.

3. Farmer's Science

Goals

The goals of this topical discussion group are as follows:

- a) To achieve a positive change on the farmers thinking framework;
- b) To promote creativity, innovation, commitment and self-help behaviour as part of farmers domain;
- c) To promote farmers' dignity and positive attitude of others to farmer's capacity;
- d) To increase role of farmers as subject in agriculture sector;
- e) To increase farming productivity and quality such as pesticide free/low agricultural products

Discussion

Farmers stated that they are treated just as a consumer, or an object, of technology. They often lack an understanding of certain technological packages before implementing them, and they have limited opportunity to explore these technologies because of systemic pressures. But they do have the ability and eagerness required to conduct field tests and find the answers to their problems.

The characteristics of farmer's studies are as follow:

- Farmer's studies have to be carried by themselves not other people;
- Farmer's studies have a number of stages from problem identification, pre-hypothesis, experimentation plan, field experiment, observation, data gathering, data analysis and conclusion, evaluation, re-testing,....., and dissemination;
- Farmer's studies can answer: what, why, who, which other possible factors involved, where and when.

They defined the differences between science and technology. Science for them means a learning process, which generates knowledge which can be developed and remain useful for a long period, and which empower them. By comparison, technology means that farmers just get results, which have a limited function, leaving them feeling like objects or dependent on outsiders.

They even made a classification between science by farmer and science by researcher. Science by researchers is general in scope, it is something undertaken in a limited timeframe with expensive tools and methods, it tends towards theoretical understanding which is not always applicable for farmers, it is often project-based or driven by the need to produce academic degrees, and it usually needs budget support. Science by farmer is locally specific, with no time limitation because it is on-going in farmer's field, the tools/methods are simple, the analysis is based on actual conditions and experiences, the result are directly implemented by farmers, it is motivated by the need to solve problems, and it is self-funded activities.

The farmers at the Congress divided in three groups to discuss specifically the process and results of field studies conducted in a) agronomic practices, b) pest/disease and c) technology testing. The first sub-group analysed around 11 field studies which covered topics like planting distance, selection of good seeds, balanced fertiliser, soil pH, pesticide-free rice, shallow planting, worm culture and manuring, hand-operated planting

machines, and organic fertiliser. The second group discussed 12 field studies including, decomposing bacteria, tungro control studies, botanical pesticides, farmer's pest surveillance system, bio-agents *beauveria*, *metarizium*, etc. The last group discussed around 18 studies, including SP36 variety study.

Observations and Proposals presented to the Government

- a) The government has to recognise, legitimise and give copyright for farmer's innovation/study results;
- b) The government has to support farmer's field research with facilities e.g. farmers' field laboratories ;
- c) The government has to support a partnership between farmer and researcher to conduct research in farmer's field;
- d) Farmers need training on how to conduct field research and to enable farmer to function as researchers;
- e) The government must enforce a stricter control on pesticide use and use environmental-friendly pesticides only;
- f) The government must enforce a stricter control on proposals to build new pesticide plants.

4. Network and Organisation

Goals

An IPM farmer's network means a close interaction with mutual benefits, common vision and goals among farmers in a farmer's group or inter farmers' groups. The network comprises of three categories of operation: a) an information network, b) a business network and c) a programme network. The types of representatives of the network are: farmer groups, village co-ordinators, sub-district co-ordinators, district co-ordinators, sub-province co-ordinators, provincial co-ordinators, the secretariat of the Indonesian IPM Farmer Association, and the National Congress.

The goals for the IPM Farmer's Network are as follow:

- a) To create collaboration among farmers from farmer-group basis up to national level;
- b) To disseminate information on IPM programmes;
- c) To increase the life quality and income of IPM farmers;
- d) To increase the role of farmers in policy making processes which effect farmer's life;
- e) To protect the stability of the ecosystem.

There are 5 guiding principles of the network:

- Mutual benefits,
- Openness and Transparency,
- Democracy,

- Honesty and Accountability, and
- Independence.

The programme prepared by this group for three types of networks mentioned above is as follows:

a. Information Network:

- To disseminate IPM programmes through mass printed and electronic media due to lack of media concern on agricultural issues;
- To establish IPM Mini Laboratories in each region;
- To prepare IPM brochures or leaflets for distribution to wide audience;
- To disseminate IPM programmes through art and cultural performances, and radio-listening and newspaper reader groups in rural areas.

b. Business Network:

- To establish farmers' owned co-operative to increase farmer's quality of life;
- To establish a farmer's supply system on free-pesticide products;
- To establish farmer's owned rice breeder business;
- To establish mutual partnership programmes with companies or NGOs.

c. Programme Network:

- To procure farming machinery;
- To establish participatory planning methods;
- To establish collaboration among farmer groups on pest control activities;
- To establish good relationships with related institutions;
- To establish regular meetings among alumni of FFS at local level;
- To conduct FFS and Follow-up FFS;
- To develop farmers' field studies and disseminate results.

Observations and Proposals presented to the Government

- a) The National IPM Farmers' Congress needs be organised at maximum every three years, and needs some budget support from the government.
- b) There is a need to set-up the IPM Farmers' Network from the farmers' group up to national level with a title "The Indonesian IPM Farmers Association" which should be recognised by the government and certified by the Minister of Agriculture.
- c) The IPM Training Project has to be continued until it reaches out to all Indonesian farmers.
- d) All farmer organisations or associations which do not have programmes in favour of farmer needs or aspirations have to be abolished.
- e) Some PPLs (Extension Worker) and PHPs (Pest and Disease Officer) have to take an active role in IPM.

- f) Government has to formally recognise IPM Farmers and IPM Farmers Trainers.
- g) The role of IPM Farmers and Women Farmers in IPM Programme development has to be increased by the farmers themselves.

All of these proposals have to be achieved in order to:

- a) Increase farmers income;
- b) Manage environmental-friendly agriculture;
- c) Empower farmers' role as the subject in agriculture development;
- d) Enable farmers to fight for their rights; and
- e) Establish farmers' network.

Dialog with Sri Sultan Hamengku Buwono X, the King and Governor of Yogyakarta Special Province at the opening:

The Sultan attended the Farmers' Congress on the 16 July between 2.00-4.30 pm. He made a strong speech which used plain language, and conducted a warm dialog with farmers. The most important point from his speech was:

...Human resource development at the farmers level is not enough. Farmers' role and empowerment in agriculture development has to be increased. The farmers could be more capable and skilful but these become meaningless if they still act at the marginal position. Under the new decentralisation law, I will follow-up on this matter in the regions of Yogyakarta.

Dialog with the Minister of Agriculture on 20 July:

The Minister joined the Congress with an entourage comprised of 50 central and local officials. Everybody sat together on the mat under a big tent on the soccer field between 9:30am-1:00pm. Four farmers presented the results of the group discussion results, after which the Minister made lengthy comments. At the outset, a farmer organiser requested that the Minister's remarks should be noted down. A one-page statement was prepared and then signed by the Minister, after which he had lunch with the farmers. Below is a translation of the Minister's signed statement which was distributed to all IPM farmers representatives at that day.

Statement of the Minister of Agriculture of the Republic of Indonesia at the Indonesian IPM Farmers' Congress 1999:

- 1) I support the Indonesian IPM Farmers' Congress;
- 2) I admit that the IPM farmers' statements are true;
- 3) I will accommodate the IPM farmers' aspirations;
- 4) I will follow up the IPM farmers' proposals;
- 5) Issuance of license for pesticide factories will be scrutinised more strictly;
- 6) I recommend the use of bio-pesticides;
- 7) I will follow-up the IPM Farmers' request for some seats in Parliament;
- 8) The Ministry of Agriculture supports the emergence of Farmers' Organisations;

- 9) The “brown plant hopper pests” of agricultural credits have to be wiped out;
- 10) The ceiling of agricultural credits will be continuously increased with low interest;
- 11) Agriculture must be the leading sector;
- 12) The agriculture credit input for rice must be in line with the rice floor price;
- 13) The secondment of university fresh graduates (who assist the Gema Palagung programme implementation) will be terminated if they do not perform as expected. The budget would be diverted to empower IPM Farmers;
- 14) IPM Farmers' Field Laboratories will be increasingly set-up in many locations;
- 15) In Yogyakarta special province, these laboratories can be set up in each sub-district;
- 16) Please report to me, if there is any village co-operative which is not supportive to farmers' aspirations;
- 17) I will support the follow-up action plans as the result of the IPM Farmers' Congress in the 12 provinces.

Yogyakarta, 20 July 1999

The Minister of Agriculture of the Republic of Indonesia,
H. Soleh Solahuddin