JOINT STAKEHOLDERS' REPORT

ON ISSUES RELATING TO THE DEATH PENALTY

TO THE UNITED NATIONS HUMAN RIGHTS COUNCIL
ON THE UNIVERSAL PERIODIC REVIEW (UPR)
OF THE REPUBLIC OF INDONESIA
27TH SESSION (APRIL-MAY 2017)

SUBMITTED BY:

INDONESIAN CIVIL SOCIETIES COALITION AGAINST DEATH PENALTY

The Institute for Policy Research and Advocacy (ELSAM), Human Rights Working Group (HRWG) Indonesia, Community Legal Aid Institute (LBH Masyarakat), The Institute for Criminal Justice Reform (ICJR), The Indonesian Human Rights Monitor (Imparsial), Foundation for International Human Rights Reporting Standards (FIHRRST), The Indonesian Legal Resources Center (ILRC)















Jakarta, Indonesia
September 2016

JOINT STAKEHOLDERS' REPORT ON THE UPR OF INDONESIA (THIRD CYCLE)

ON ISSUES RELATING TO THE DEATH PENALTY

I. INTRODUCTION

1. This stakeholders' report was jointly prepared by seven civil societies[1] that are concerned with the issues relating to the death penalty in Indonesia. Notwithstanding the Government of Indonesia's rejection of recommendations to abolish the death penalty,[2] this report conveys other recommendations relating to the nation's death penalty policy that have been accepted by Indonesia during the previous Universal Periodic Review (UPR) process at the fifth meeting on May 23, 2012, as enunciated in the following sections.

II. REFORMATION OF PENAL CODE (Recommendations 108.26-28, 30-31, 85, 104)

2. In June 2015, the Government of Indonesia proposed the 2015 Bill of the Penal Code (*Rancangan Kitab Undang-Undang Hukum Pidana*, RKUHP)[3] to the Indonesian House of Representatives (DPR RI). Despite its commitment to revise the Penal Code, RKUHP keeps placing the death penalty as a principal punishment with a special characteristic. The speciality of this punishment is manifested in Articles 67 and 89 of the RKUHP, which place capital punishment as an alternative punishment. Article 91 of the RKUHP translates the alternative nature of capital punishment as a postponement of the execution up to 10 years upon the President's refusal to the accept clemency petitions, provided that (i) there is not a strong adverse public reaction to the inmate; (ii) the inmate demonstrates remorse and there is hope for rehabilitation; and (iii) the role of the inmate was not vital in the commission of the crime. Should the convict satisfy these requisites, the Minister of Law and Human Rights may issue a decree to commute the sentence to life imprisonment or 20 years imprisonment. We are concerned the prolongation period of execution up to 10 years that will lead to a death row phenomenon is amounted to torture, or cruel, inhuman or degrading treatement (CIDT).[4]

3. Under the Bill, the provision of capital punishment is contained in 26 articles and covers at least 15 offences, *inter alia*, treason, drug crimes, terrorism and corruption. The rationale behind this is that the Academic Manuscript to the RKUHP prepared by the National Legal Development Agency (*Badan Pembinaan Hukum Nasional*, BPHN) has defined "the most serious crimes" as crimes that are penalised by more than seven (7) years imprisonment.[5] Notably, the BPHN's description does not satisfy the threshold of the most serious crimes under international norm – as prescribed by Article 6(2) of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) – namely the crimes that involved "intentional killings".[6]

---

1 See Annex.
2 UN Doc. A/HRC/21/7 (2012) para 109.21-23.
3 The 2015 Bill of Penal Code can be accessed at <http://reformasikuhp.org/r-kuhp/> (available in Bahasa Indonesia).
4 UN Doc. A/67/279 (2012) para.49.
5 BPHN, *Draft Naskah Akademik Rancangan Undang-Undang tentang Kitab Undang-Undang Hukum Pidana (KUHP)*, (Jakarta: BPHN Kementerian Hukum dan HAM RI, 2015) p.32-33.
6 UN Doc. A/HRC/24/18 (2013) para.24.

III. TORTURE AND CRUEL, INHUMAN OR DEGRADING TREATEMENT (Recommendation 108.71)

4. With respect to Indonesia's commitment to fully implement the Convention Against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (CAT), we regret that Indonesia has disregarded its international obligations under Articles 1 and 16 of the CAT, as well as Article 7 of the ICCPR, by reviving executions in 2015 and 2016, permitting the continuation of the death row 'phenomenon', physical abuses to the convicts, as well as psychologically affecting the convicts, their relatives and law enforcement officials. Moreover, existing self-incrimination cases add up on the numerous issues of CIDT in Indonesia.

Method of execution

5. Pursuant to Law No. 2/PNPS/1964 on the Means of Implementation of the Death Penalty Imposed by the General and Military Courts (Law No. 2/PNPS/1964), the only recognised method of execution in Indonesia is through shooting by firing squad. This method has caused physical and mental suffering to the executed convicts. As admitted by Father Charlie Burrows, a spiritual companion to the convicts who was present at the moment of numerous executions, the convicts died in pain over a period of time that may range from 5 to 15 minutes (for the Third Batch of execution), before being formally pronounced dead by the doctor.[7] Meanwhile in the Second Batch of executions, all the executed convicts were pronounced dead 27 minutes after being executed. A similar pattern wass also found in the First Batch of execution where Tran Thi Bich Hanh (Vietnam) was proclaimed dead 35 minutes after being shot by the squad.[8] Such similar sufferings imposed on convicts post-execution, as described, constitute definite proof of the existence of CIDT under Article 16 of the CAT.

Death row phenomenon

6. The notion of "death row phenomenon" refers to a combination of circumstances that produce severe mental trauma and physical suffering for prisoners sentenced to death, including prolonged periods waiting for uncertain outcomes, solitary confinement, and poor prison conditions.[9] We contend that these circumstances are present today in Indonesia, as elaborated below.

7. *First*, according to the Insitute for Criminal Justice Reform (ICJR) recapitulation, there are at least 59 inmates awaiting execution for a time frame that ranges from 8 to 25 years in prison.[10] The uncertainty regarding the date of execution results in a "double punishment" for the convicts, as they must undergo both prolonged imprisonment and the death sentence.[11]

---

[7] Constitutional Court of Indonesia, Judgement No. 21/PUU-VI/2008, p.13; ABC News, "Indonesia executions: Prisoners can take up to 15 minutes to die, priest says", 30 July 2016, <http://www.abc.net.au/news/2016-07-29/indonesia-execution-prisoners-took-15-minutes-to-die-priest-says/7674152>.

[8] Supriyadi W. Eddyono, et al., *Update Hukuman Mati di Indonesia 2016*, (Jakarta: ICJR, 2016) p.17 [Eddyono 'Update'].

[9] OHCHR, *Moving Away from the Death Penalty: Lessons in South-East Asia*, (Bangkok: OHCHR, 2014) p.15.

[10] Supriyadi W. Eddyono, et al., *Hukuman Mati dalam R KUHP: Jalan Tengah yang Meragukan*, (Jakarta: ICJR, 2015) p.43.

[11] Komnas HAM and FIHRRST, *Submission to the President of the Republic of Indonesia on Capital Punishment in Indonesia,* (2016) p.10 [Komnas HAM-FIHRRST]. The Submission can be accessed at http://www.fihrrst.org/images/file/1472540460-Submission_to_the_President_-_Komnas_HAM_FIHRRST_-_Capital_Punishment_in_Indonesia.pdf (available in Bahasa Indonesia & English).

8. *Second*, pursuant to Article 5 of the Law No. 2/PNPS/1964, the death row inmates are isolated and separated from other prisoners whilst waiting to be executed. Therefore, this isolation should be considered as a form of solitary confinement leading to the CIDT.[12]

9. *Third*, the critical situation related to prisons density in Indonesia is marked by an over-capacity of up to 166%. According to the data of the Ministry of Law and Human Rights in September 2016, prisons in Indonesia serve 197,963 detainees and prisoners. This number is considerably higher than the actual capacity to accommodate 118,976 persons.[13] This density problem may potentially lead to the practice of torture in prisons, thus being tantamount to a violation of CAT and ICCPR *per se*.

Physical abuses to the convicts and the witnesses

10. The practice of physical abuses of death row prisoners during their detention period has become an undeniable fact. According to the ICJR's finding, at least 11 out of 47 death row prisoners were intimidated and tortured:[14] Humprey Jefferson, Zulfikar Ali, and Michael Titus Igweh were tortured during their imprisonment; while Merri Utami was been sexually harassed during her time in prison.[15] This has also occurred to the minor inmates, Yusman Telaumbanua and Rasula Hia, who have been tortured by police officers during the investigation.[16]

11. The degradation of the criminal justice system in Indonesia is also manifested by the intimidation and torture of witnesses. In most cases involving a death row accused, *inter alia*, in the Hillary K. Chimezie's and Zulfikar Ali's cases,[17] the life of the [crown] witnesses is put in peril, for they are likely to encounter torture and even death if testifying against the investigators' will.

Mental suffering of the convicts, relatives and law enforcement officials

12. As a consequence of the prolonged waiting period before execution, the convicts often suffer from mental disorders.[18] This issue has been supported by the testimony of convicts' lawyers and spiritual companions, of prison doctors, as well as of the Deputy Chairwoman of the National Commission on Violence Against Women, witnessing to the psychological instability of the convicts as a consequence of their conviction.[19]

13. Capital punishment entails a psychological as well as a psychosocial dimension. The whole extended process eventually affects the convicts' families, friends and lawyers.[20] The relatives of the prisoners, co-victims, equally suffer from the imposition of death penalty.[21]

---

12 UN Doc. A/67/279 (2012) para.48.

13 See <http://smslap.ditjenpas.go.id/public/grl/current/monthly/year/2016/month/9>.

14 Anggara, et al., *Judicial Killing: Dibunuh Demi Keadilan (Fair Trial dan Hukuman Mati di Indonesia)*, (Jakarta: ICJR, 2015) pp.33-35 [Anggara].

15 LBH Masyarakat, "Rilis Pers – Eksekusi Merri Utami Dosa Pemerintah", 27 July 2016, <http://lbhmasyarakat.org/rilis-pers-eksekusi-merri-utami-dosa-pemerintah/>.

16 KontraS, "Rekayasa Kasus Yang Berujung Pada Vonis Hukuman Mati Terhadap Yusman Telaumbanua dan Rasula Hia", 16 March 2015, <http://www.kontras.org/home/index.php?module=pers&id=2013> [KontraS 'Yusman'].

17 See Indonesian Supreme Court Judgements No. 45 PK/Pid.Sus/2009 and No. 2253 K/PID/2005.

18 Komnas HAM-FIHRRST, *Op.Cit.*, p.10.

19 Eddyono 'Update', *Op.Cit.*, p.17.

20 Komnas HAM-FIHRRST, *Op.Cit.*, p.10.

21 *Ibid*, p.6; ELSAM, *Capital Punishment: A Cruel Practice in Violation of Humanity*, Policy Brief, (Jakarta: ELSAM, 2015) pp.3-4 [ELSAM].

14. In its development, death penalty psychologically negatively impacts also on the law enforcement officials (executioners, prison officers and judicial authorities), as they are also susceptible to the trauma resulting from the process of execution itself. Unfortunately, despite clear indications given by the psychologists on this rampant condition, no response was taken by the officials of Ministry of Law and Human Rights of the Republic of Indonesia to prevent this obstacle.[22]

Self-incrimination cases

15. The UN Human Rights Committee has stated that the ill treatment against the suspects towards self-incrimination is tantamount to a violation of Article 7 of the ICCPR.[23] Presently, numerous cases in Indonesia have seen convicts such as Zainal Abidin, Zulfikar Ali, Gurdiph Singh, Humprey Jefferson and Michael Titus Igweh, compelled, under duress, to confess guilty during the investigation phase.[24] Unfortunately, also minors like Yusman Telambanua and Rasula Hia havefaced such practice and were forced towards self-incrimination.[25] These cases are tangible evidence of the existence of torture and CIDT for purposes of self-incrimination.

IV. ADMINISTRATIVE OF JUSTICE AND FAIR TRIAL (Recommendation 108.89)

16. Despite its commitment in the previous UPR, practices of unfair and improper legal action still occur within Indonesia's judicial system, including those related to the death row inmates. In many cases, the inmates face hurdles in accessing legal aid, interpreters, and consular representatives. Moreover, the proper 72 hours notification is not always followed prior to the execution, and the opportunity to pursue clemency procedure as well as other appealate mechanism prior to the execution is not thoroughly exercised. In invoking the sentences, the Judges continue to use discriminative deliberations and fabricated cases, as well as placing minors on death row.

Lack of access to legal aid, interpreters and consular representatives

17. The lack of fairness in Indonesia's administration of justice is shown by the lack of access to legal aid for the suspects. ICJR found at least 11 persons out of 47 convicts are not accompanied by lawyers during the preliminary examination,[26] as seen in Merri Utami, Zulfikar Ali, Agus Hadi, Pujo Lestari, Yusman Telaumbanua and Rasula Hia. In other cases involving inmates of foreign nationality, they were not accompanied by a proper interpreter according to the language they understand,[27] nor was access to their consular representatives provided at the first stage, which is paramount in protecting foreign nationals facing the death penalty.[28] Marry Jeane Veloso's and Zulfikar Ali's cases are clear examples of how lack of a proper interpreter and difficulties in communicating with consular representatives can place these persons' lives in peril.

The 72 hours notification duty

18. Under Article 6(1) of the Law No. 2/PNPS/1964, the Attorney General's Office of Indonesia (AGO) is mandated to notify convicts and their relatives (family, lawyers and consular representatives)

---

22 Komnas HAM-FIHRRST, *Op.Cit.*, p.5.
23 HRC, General Comment No. 32 to the ICCPR, UN Doc. CCPR/C/GC/32 (2007) para.60.
24 Anggara, *Op.Cit.*, pp.36-38.
25 *Ibid*.
26 *Ibid*, p.35.
27 *International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights*, 999 UNTS 171 (1966) art.14(3)(a),(f) [ICCPR].
28 UN Doc. E/2015/49 (2015) para.98.

72 hours prior to the execution. We contend that this mechanism is generally not enough for the convict to prepare and submit a petition for commuting his sanction.[29]

19. Notwithstanding the legality of the above-mentioned provision, the AGO's duty to notify the convicts 72 hours prior to their execution has in practice not been properly implemented. Cases in the Third Batch of execution have shown that the execution was carried out less than 72 hours after the convicts had received the notification letter from the AGO.[30]

Clemency procedure

20. Articles 3 and 13 of the Law No. 22 of 2002 on Clemency (Clemency Law) state that the execution cannot take place prior to the promulgation of the Presidential Decree on the refusal to the clemency petition. During the Third Batch of executions, Seck Osmane, Humprey Jefferson, and Freddi Budiman lodged their clemency petitions to the President. In spite of this attempt, the AGO carried out the execution overstepping the President's obligation to respond to such petitions, as stipulated in the Clemency Law.[31]

21. Another critical point relating to the clemency procedure in Indonesia is filled with positive and negative signs. Although we appreciate the Constitutional Court of Indonesia's judgement No. 107/PUU-XII/2015 that gives no time limitation for the death row prisoners to seek clemency petition to the President, obstacles remain in Indonesia, above all the lack of the Government's transparency in disclosing all Presidential Decrees on Clemency.[32] In relation to this issue, the ICJR submitted an application to the Commission of Public Information (KIP). While the State Secretariat Ministry argued that non-disclosure of the Decrees is justifiable on the basis of "State secrecy", the KIP, in the end, accepted the Application and declared that the Presidential Decrees on the refusal of clemency petition to the death row convicts are documents open to the public.[33]

Appellate judicial mechanism

22. The appellate mechanism, including the Case Review (*Peninjauan Kembali*, PK), plays an important role in ensuring that the accused does not face unjustifiable death sentences. Regrettably, however, the judicial authority in Indonesia has failed to carry out its obligations. In the Zainal Abidin's case, for example, the Supreme Court of Indonesia examined the convict's petition for PK in 2015, 10 years after the submission had been lodged. However, Zainal Abidin was transferred to the isolation cell prior to the announcement of the Supreme Court's judgement. In other words, this shows that Zainal Abidin was about to be executed, despite the petition still pending.[34]

23. At the procedural level, the PK mechanism has been recently tightened. In 2014, the Constitutional Court decided that it is possible to submit the application for PK more than one time, should the

---

[29] Cf. UN Doc. A/HRC/33/20 (2016) paras.46-47 (Botswana (6 weeks), Egypt (14 days) and Vietnam (7 days) are several notable example where the UN Secretary General considered such timeline as a disproportional period to submit the petitions).

[30] ICJR, "Koalisi Masyarakat Sipil untuk Hapus Hukuman Mati (HATI) Laporkan Jaksa Agung ke Ombudsman RI dan Komisi Kejaksaan", 15 August 2016, <http://icjr.or.id/koalisi-masyarakat-sipil-untuk-hapus-hukuman-mati-hati-laporkan-jaksa-agung-ke-ombudsman-ri-dan-komisi-kejaksaan/>.

[31] *Ibid*.

[32] Eddyono 'Update', *Op.Cit.*, pp.20-21.

[33] See KIP Decision No. 58/XII/KIP-PS-A-M-A/2015.

[34] ICJR, "ICJR Questions Legal Process on Zainal Abidin", 22 May 2015, <http://icjr.or.id/icjr-questions-legal-process-on-zainal-abidin/>.

convicts be able to provide new substantial evidence (*novum*).[35] Later in 2014, the Supreme Court of Indonesia enacted the Circular Letter No. 7 of 2014 on the Application of Case Review in Criminal Matter allowing only one submission of PK.[36] The dualism between the two supreme judicial institutions in regulating the appeal procedure indeed hampers the convicts' right to seeking and establishing the complete truthfulness of their respective cases.[37]

Discriminative judgement

24. In countries whose court system is influenced by corruption or by the intervention of "special interests", capital punishment is potentially employed as a means to "punish" certain parties on political, ethnic, religious or group basis.[38] Indonesia's judiciary system continues to rest its decisions on discriminatory reasonings. This was evident in the Humprey Jefferson's case, when the Central Jakarta District Court stated in its consideration that "*bearing in mind that […] black people coming from Nigeria often become police surveillance targets*".[39] This is a clear demonstration that such tainted judicial system in Indonesia often leads to unfair trials.

Fabricated cases

25. In addition, numerous cases in Indonesia [as mentioned in paragraph 15 *supra*] ending with conviction and a death sentence are fabricated, potentially increasing the risk of wrongful conviction of innocent people (miscarriage of justice).[40] Such case fabrication is also often built on self-incrimination, which is prohibited under ICCPR.[41]

Invocation to minors

26. In contrast to various international instruments[42] and Law No. 11 of 2012 on Juvenile Justice System that proscribed the invocation of the death penalty for minors, the District Court of Gunungsitoli[43] sentenced Yusman Telaumbanua to death despite the fact that he was only 16-years-old at the time of his conviction.[44]

V. RIGHT OF DISABILITIES (Recommendation 108.134)

27. Under international law, the execution of those who have suffered from any mental or intellectual disability is prohibited.[45] Indonesia has disregarded its obligations not to execute persons with disabilities, as mandated by Article 25 and 26 of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, and Article 44 of the Penal Code (KUHP) on Exclusion, Mitigation and Enhancement of

---

35 See Judgement No. 34/PUU-XI/2013.
36 Eddyono 'Update', *Op.Cit.*, pp.22-24.
37 ICCPR, *Op.Cit.*, art.14(5).
38 Komnas HAM-FIHRRST, *Op.Cit.*, p.1.
39 LBH Masyarakat, "Press Release – Humprey Jefferson's Execution is Illegal", 28 July 2016, <http://lbhmasyarakat.org/en/press-release-humprey-jeffersons-execution-is-illegal/>.
40 ELSAM, *Op.Cit.*, pp.2-3.
41 ICCPR, *Op.Cit.*, art.14(3)(g).
42 *Ibid.*, art.6(5); *Convention on the Rights of the Child*, 1577 UNTS 3, (1989) art.37(a); ECOSOC Resolution 1984/50, UN Doc. E/1984/84, (1984) annex, para.3 [ECOSOC Res.1984/50].
43 Judgement No. 08/Pid.B/2013/PN-GS.
44 KontraS 'Yusman', *Op.Cit.*.
45 ECOSOC Res.1984/50, *Op.Cit.*, annex, para.3; UN Commission of Human Rights Resolution 2005/59, UN Doc. E/CN.4/RES/2005/59, para.7(c).

Punishment.[46] Presently, despite the overwhelming medical evidence that showed Rodrigo Muxfeldt Gularte was suffering from schizophrenic disorder and was a bipolar psychopath, and a request to transfer him to the mental health facility; the AGO executed him in 2015.[47]

VI. PROTECTION OF MIGRANT WORKERS (Recommendations 108.137-138)

28. The dualism of Indonesia's standing on the issue of death penalty appears from the fact that although Indonesia supported the invocation of death penalty domestically, on the other side Indonesia continues to struggle to release its migrant workers abroad from death penalty execution. According to the data of Migrant Care, there are at least 281 Indonesian migrant workers that are convicted to death, spread in various countries, inter alia, 212 in Malaysia, 36 in Saudi Arabia, 1 in Singapore, 28 in China, 1 in Qatar, 1 in United Arab Emirates, and 1 in Taiwan.[48] Among of these numbers, 59 persons have been sentenced to death, whilst the other 219 migrant workers remain in process for their cases.[49] The ability of Government of Indonesia to protect its migrant workers abroad will be hampered, should Indonesia continue to invoke death penalty as part of its national policy.

VII.RECOMMENDATIONS

29. We call upon the UPR Working Group and the UN Human Rights Council to urge the Government of Indonesia to:

(a) Conduct a moratorium on the executions in consideration of the following:

i.) Death penalty does not provide a solution to the recent increase of of drug offenses. Drug offenses require more comprehensive, effective and sustainable solutions;

ii) Wrongful imposition of death penalty becomes an unavoidable possibility primarily due to lack of impartial trialfor the accused, minimal access to legal aid and advocacy, plus indications of torture in regard to those under sentence of death;

iii) The RKUHP stipulating, among others, capital punishment is currently still under deliberation between the Government of Indonesia and DPR RI; and

iv) The necessity to strengthen the bargaining position of Indonesia in its international diplomacy strategy in protecting Indonesian migrant workers abroad that are convicted to death penalty;

(b) Revoke the provision of capital punishment under RKUHP and other existing legislations;

(c) Grant the commutation into life sentence or 20 years imprisonment for all death row prisoners;

(d) Provide psychological check-ups to the convicts' relatives and to those officers who are involved in the executions, every six months at a minimum;

(e) Provide access to legal aid, interpreters and consular representatives for the suspect/accused being charged to death;

---

[46] Komnas HAM-FIHRRST, *Op.Cit.*, p.6.

[47] KontraS, "Presiden Joko Widodo: Segera Batalkan Eksekusi Mati terhadap Penyandang Disabilitas Kejiwaan Rodrigo Gularte", 19 April 2015, <http://www.kontras.org/home/index.php?module=pers&id=2030>.

[48] Migrant Care, "Peringatan Hari Anti Hukuman Mati Internasional", 10 October 2015, <http://migrantcare.net/siaran-pers-bersama-memperingati-hari-anti-hukuman-mati-internasional/>.

[49] *Ibid*.

(f) Disclose all Presidential Decrees related to the application for clemency on death penalty related cases;

(g) Void the Supreme Court Circular Letter No. 7 of 2014 on the Application of Case Review in Criminal Matter; and

(h) Train judges and public prosecutors on human rights related subjects in order to prevent, or to the very least minimise, the imposition of death penalty in the near future.

ANNEX

PROFILE OF THE SUBMITTING ORGANISATIONS

Institute for Policy Research and Advocacy (ELSAM), established in August 1993 in Jakarta, is a policy advocacy organisation with limited association as its legal entity. To actively participate in the efforts to develop, promote and protect civil and political rights and other human rights, as mandated by the 1945 Constitution and Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR), has become ELSAM's driving objective. From the outset, ELSAM has committed itself to developing a democratic political order in Indonesia by empowering civil society through advocacy and promoting human rights.

Jl. Siaga II No. 31, Pejaten Barat, Pasar Minggu, Jakarta Selatan, Indonesia (12510)
Ph. (+62) 21 7972662, Fax. (+62) 21 79192519
Website: www.elsam.or.id | E-mail: office@elsam.or.id

Human Rights Working Group (HRWG) Indonesia was established in 2003 by the majority of NGOs working in different issues but share interest in human rights to serve the need for elaborate advocacy works already in place with the aim of maximizing the goals and putting more pressures on the Indonesian government to execute its international and constitutional obligations to protecting, fulfilling, respecting and promoting human rights in the country. As one of the organization core functions of advocacy, HRWG Indonesia is working closely with the UN Human Rights Mechanisms to ensure the State parties' duties.

Jiwasraya Building, 1st Floor, Jl. R.P. Soeroso No. 41, Gondangdia, Jakarta Pusat, Indoensia (10350)
Ph. (+62) 21 3143015, Fax. (+62) 21 3143058
Website: www.hrwg.org | E-mail: hrwg.indonesia@gmail.com

Community Legal Aid Institute (LBH Masyarakat) is a not-for-profit legal aid organization that provides free legal services for the poor and victims of human rights abuses; undertakes legal empowerment for marginalized groups; and advocates for legal reform and human rights protection through strategic litigation, public campaigns, and research and analysis.

Jl. Tebet Timur Dalam VI E No. 3, Jakarta Selatan, Indonesia (12820)
Ph. (+62) 21 83789766, Fax. (+62) 21 83789767
Website: http://lbhmasyarakat.org/ | E-mail: contact@lbhmasyarakat.org

Institute for Criminal Justice Reform (ICJR), having established in 2007, commits to take the initiative to support measures in realizing the reformation of law and criminal justice system towards a democratic direction is one of the crucial issues faced by Indonesia during the current transition era. ICJR is formed with an exclusive mission to support collective actions in honoring the Rule of Law and realizing criminal justice system with strong human rights protection character.

Jl. Siaga II No. 6F, Pejaten Barat, Pasar Minggu, Jakarta Selatan, Indonesia (12510)
Ph. (+62) 21 7945455, Fax. (+62) 21 7945455
Website: http://icjr.or.id/ | E-mail: infoicjr@icjr.or.id

Indonesian Human Rights Monitor (Imparsial), established on 2002 by 18 prominent human rights activist of Indonesia; Todung Mulya Lubis, Karlina Leksono, M. Billah, Wardah Hafidz, Hendardi, Nursyahbani Katjasungkana, Ade Rostina Sitompul, Robertus Robet, Binny Buchory, Kamala Chandrakirana, HS Dillon, Munir, Rachland Nashidik, Rusdi Marpaung, Otto Syamsuddin Ishak, Nezar Patria, Amiruddin, dan Poengky Indarti. The name of "Imparsial" taken from word "impartial", a sight to respect fairness for all individuals without difers by race, religion, of nations for justice, with the special attention to those who less fortunate.

Jl. Tebet Utara II C No. 25, Tebet, Jakarta Selatan, Indonesia (12820)
Ph. (+62) 21 83786997, Fax. (+62) 21 83786997
Website: www.imparsial.org | E-mail: office@imparsial.org

Foundation for International Human Rights Reporting Standards (FIHRRST) is a not-for-profit foundation dedicated to the protection and the fulfillment of human rights. It was established to develop and promote standards by which adherence to human rights principles can be demonstrated. In particular, FIHRRST work revolves around three main areas, consisting in: Human Rights and Business, Human Rights and Cities, and Human Rights and Religious Beliefs. To realize this intention, FIHRRST commits to work together with central and local governments, business people, civil society, communities, human rights defenders, and universities, engaging in activities in the areas of research, development of standards, and the promotion and dissemination of human rights ideals.

Marccus Building, Jl. Majapahit No. 10, Jakarta Pusat, Indonesia (10160)
Ph. (+62) 21 34830789, Fax. (+62) 21 34830965
Website: www.fihrrst.org | E-mail: contact@fihrrst.org

Indonesian Legal Resources Center (ILRC) is a non-governmental organisation that concerned with the reformation of legal education. In the transition era to democracy, Indonesia faced various problems on corruption, lack of human rights guarantee in legislative level, and weak of law enforcement. The establishment of ILRC was part of our concerned towards the irresponsive of legal education with the problem of social justice.

Jl. Tebet Timur I No. 4, Jakarta Selatan, Indonesia (12820)
Ph. (+62) 21 93821173, Fax. (+62) 21 8356641
Website: http://mitrahukum.org/ | E-mail: ilrc-indonesia@cbn.net.id