

CHAPTER III

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

A. Findings

According to William N. Dunn to conduct an evaluation, several indicators are needed which then become an illustration of the success or failure of a policy that has been made. In this study, the author focused on 6 evaluation indicators according to William N. Dunn.

1. Effectiveness

Effectiveness is an indicator that gives an answer whether the results of the desired policy implementation have been achieved (Dunn W. N., Evaluation of Public Policy, 1994). The effectiveness of Law No. 8 of 2016 concerning Fulfillment of Political Rights of Persons with Disabilities in the 2014 & 2019 Elections in Sleman Regency can be seen from the desired results of policy planning. Based on opinions from several sources the General Election Commission (KPU) of Sleman Regency and also the Government continue to make improvements and give more attention to persons with disabilities through pre-election programs and provision of accessibility and adequate facilities at the TPS. However, on the ground, there are still many problems found.

The author conducted an interview with the Commissioner of the Implementation Technical Division & the Commissioner of the Planning, Data and Information Division of the General Election Commission (KPU) of Sleman Regency, Chairperson of the Election Supervisory Body (BAWASLU), and 2 persons with

disabilities in Sidoarum Village, namely with 1 person with physical disabilities & 1 person with visual disorders. In this case of evaluating the effectivity of Law No. 8 of 2016, author used an indicator of reaching the goals by using 4 parameters that should be reach, as follows:

a. Data Collection and Mapping of Disability Voters

From the results of interviews conducted with the Commissioner of the Organizing Technical Division & the Commissioner of the Planning, Data and Information Division of the General Election Commission of the Sleman Regency, they stated that the effectiveness of Law No. 8 of 2016 has been achieved as their implementation has always followed the SOP (Operational Standards) accompanied by innovations that they continue to do to provide accessibility, facilities, and also make persons with disabilities a priority for election administrators so that they always pay attention to their rights and the needs of people with disabilities. However, in fulfilling the first parameter, the KPU is deemed to have failed to fulfill it. In the field there are still problems complained by persons with disabilities in Sidoarum Village, Godean District. Such problems include the Disability Voter List that is considered invalid. According to Mr. Supriyatno (person with visual disorders) in Cokrobedog Village, Sidoarum Village, he is not registered as a voter with a disability. This is what the author believes can cause problems at polling stations on election day both from the preparation of facilities and assistive devices, because the KPU does not have valid data regarding voters with disabilities at the polling station. According to him, KPU and the village government have never conducted a door-to-door data collection for each person with a disability (Supriyatno, Nopember 7th

2019). Another finding that the author got in the field related to the invalid data on disability voters provided by the KPU is that most of the names on the disability voter list are not persons with disabilities, but of normal and healthy people. This information was obtained by the author through confirmation with the head of the village of Tinom whose citizens entered the list of writers' informants. The response was very surprising and then provided information that the name on the list is not a person with a disability but a healthy and normal person as in general. This has made the effectiveness of Law No. 8 of 2016 in the implementation carried out by the General Election Commission in question.

Table 3.1
Selected Disability Voter List to be informant in Sidoarum Village

No	Name	Date of Born	Adress
1	Wakijo(M)	24-03-1982	Cokrobedog
2	Slamet(M)	06-07-1960	Cokrobedog
3	Anugrah Prasetya(M)	05-04-1996	Krapyak
4	Nur Marfianto(M)	05-04-1974	Krapyak
5	Tupar Raharjo(M)	30-12-1987	Sebaran
6	Ngatinem(F)	1-10-1974	Sebaran
7	Paryati(F)	28-12-1964	Tinom

Source: (KPU Kabupaten Sleman, 2019)

The table above is a list of informants in this research. However, after confirming with the Village Head and Village Office Administration Staff, it was found that the voters on behalf of Nur Mafianto, Tupar Raharjo and Paryati were not persons with

disabilities according to any disability category. This proves that the data collection conducted by KPU has not been maximized so that data errors appear as the author explained earlier.

b. Organizing Election Education for Disability

The second parameter was organizing the election education for disabilities voters and it's already reached by holding the socialization regarding to the election materials for the disabilities. The socialization was done by KPU & several disability community/group. The socialization was carried out at certain times, when persons with disabilities were holding regular meetings and then the KPU came and gave socialization related to matters relating to elections that needed to be known. In this socialization as well, KPU provided materials related to the election in the form of material in braille letters, and also videos featuring body language translators (Aswino, Indah, October 31st 2019). Another finding was from Mr. Supriyatno (person with visual disoreder) who also a Chairman of PERTUNI Godean District, the organization he participated in actually did not get the opportunity to participate the socialization with the Sleman Regency KPU. The socialization he received was provincial level socialization, socialization from the Provincial KPU of D.I Yogyakarta (Supriyatno, Nopember 7th 2019). The same response also came from the Head of BAWASLU Sleman Regency that he still receive many reports related to uneven socialization carried out by KPU. It means that the provision of election education, in this case was the socialization has not been done evenly for all people with disabilities.

c. Accessible TPS Location.

The third parameter the accessible TPS location for the disabilities. Based on the results of a joint interview with the KPU, the KPU claimed to have implemented the SOP in accordance with applicable regulations. In other words KPU always considers carefully the election-related matters in the pre-election including the selection of places to be made into accessible TPS for persons with disabilities (Aswino, Indah, October 31st 2019). This is in line with the confession of Mr. Supriyatno and Mrs. Watini, persons with disability in Sidoarum Village who claimed that the polling station where they conducted the election was accessible and easy to reach (Supriyatno, Nopember 7th 2019). It means that the provision of accessible locations for persons with disabilities has been done well.

d. Provision of facilities and special needs

The fourth parameter was provision of the special needs of people with disability. In this case the author uses a sample at the time of pre-election socialization and also on the day of the election. In carrying out the KPU program, which is socialization, the KPU constantly innovates to provide tools and props that ease for persons with disabilities. For example, KPU provided books containing election material with braille letters that are specific to people with visual disorders, and KPU provided video as a watch for hearing & speaking disorders in which there is a translation of body language that is easy to be understood. Furthermore, at the time of the election, KPU provided a C3 form, which is a form containing a letter of approval for assistance for persons with disabilities who need assistance at the polling station. In the TPS area there were also templates that contain procedures for

selecting persons with disabilities. TPS location and layout adjustments were also considered carefully, such as the height of the voting booths, and also the height of the ballot box so that it is easily reached by persons with disabilities who use wheelchairs (Aswino, Indah, October 31st 2019). It can be concluded that the provision of facilities and accessibility as well as tools and special needs have been carried out well by the KPU.

According to the Head of Technical Implementation Division, the effectiveness of Law No. 8 of 2016 can also be seen from the achievements of the KPU who won the first place in the D.I Yogyakarta provincial level (Aswino, Indah, October 31st 2019).

Furthermore, according to the Head of the Election Supervisory Committee (BAWASLU), Sleman Regency has its own assessment as the election supervisor, according to Law No. 8 of 2016 concerning the Rights of Persons with Disabilities has become a good regulation for the needs of persons with disabilities in Indonesia, in this case in the form of fulfilling political rights for persons with disabilities, both in terms of administration and provision of accessibility (Mustofa, Nophember 6th 2019).

Different responses are from the Commissioner of the General Elections Commission (KPU) and the Chairperson of the Election Supervisory Body (BAWASLU), they think that the existence of Law No. 8 of 2016 became an effective law in solving problems for persons with disabilities during the electoral stages in theory.

Tabel 3. 2**Disability Voter List in Sidoarum Village**

No	Name	Adress	Disability Category
1	Novia Rokhayati	Bantulan	Mental Retardation Disability
2	M Nur Rahmad	Bantulan	Speaking Disorder
3	Wahyudi	Candran	Speaking Disorder
4	Nur Samsiyah	Candran	Speaking Disorder
5	Solihah	Candran	Speaking Disorder
6	Muhammad Khudloifan Md	Candran	Hearing Disorder
7	Nugrahani Hs	Candran	Ex - Mental Disability
8	Setyani	Cokro Bedog	Double Disability
9	Wakijo	Cokro Bedog	Physical Disability
9	Slamet	Cokrobedog	Physical Disability
10	Ponidi	Cokrobedog	Speaking Disorder
11	Muhammad Nur Azzam	Cokrobedog	Visual Disorder
12	Kasiyem	Cokrokonteng	Physical Disorder
13	Santoso	Dukuh Tangkilan	Double Disability
14	Siti Mufatikah	Dukuh Tangkilan	Double Disability
15	Nur Widayat	Dukuh Tangkilan	Mental Retardation Disability
16	Nur Hadi	Dukuh Tangkilan	Mental Retardation Disability
17	Mangun Kariyo Ny	Dukuh Tangkilan	Visual Disorder
18	Widodo Raharjo	Gesikan	Mental Retardation Disability

19	Indriyani	Jambon	Mental Retardation Disability
20	Sujarwanto	Karang Tangkilan	Mental Retardation Disability
21	Tri Maryani	Karang Tangkilan	Double Disability
22	Puryani	Karang Tangkilan	Speaking Disorder
23	Djoko Warsito	Karang Tangkilan	Mental Retardation Disability
24	Fajar Udin	Kramat Kidul	Mental Retardation Disability
25	Ari Wahyuni	Kramat Lor	Mental Retardation Disability
26	Harni	Krapyak	Mental Retardation Disability
27	Sugeng	Krapyak	Ex- Mental Disorder
28	Paeyem	Krapyak	Double Disability
29	Warni Sugiyarti	Krapyak	Double Disability
30	Warno Sugiyanto	Krapyak	Double Disability
31	Anugrah Prasetya	Krapyak	Double Disability
32	Sariyah	Krapyak	Mental Retardation Disability
33	Nur Marfianto	Krapyak	Double Disorder
34	Ukasyah Al Asharry Utama Jati	Krapyak	Speaking Disorder
35	Jumadi	Krapyak	Speaking Disorder
36	Walinah	Ngemplak	Double Disorder
38	Muttaqin	Nglarang	Hearing Disorder
39	Deni Sujarwanto	Pengkol	Mental Retardation Disability
40	Ny Sugi Hartono	Pengkol	Physical Disability
41	Anton Cahyono	Potrowangsan	Mental Retardation Disability
42	Jumiyati	Potrowangsan	Mental Retardation Disability

43	Prasetiya	Potrowangsan	Double Disorder
44	Panca Muhammad Ikhwan	Potrowangsan	Mental Retardation Disability
45	Diah Anindia Wardani	Potrwangsan	Speaking Disorder
46	Husain Ibnu Latief	Potrwangsan	Double Disorder
47	Maryadi	Sebaran	Mental Retardation Disability
48	Tupar Raharjo	Sebaran	Visual Disoder
49	Ngatinem	Sebaran	Visual Disorder
50	Lathifah Yusriyawati	Sebaran	Mental Retardation Disability
51	Nur Rahmawati	Sidoarum	Double Disorder
52	Rifky Adi Wijaya	Tangkilan	Double Disorder
53	Painem	Tegal Krapyak	Hearing Disorder
54	Marjuki	Tinom	Mental Retardation Disability
55	Paryati	Tinom	Physical Disorder
56	Minto Pawiro / Paimin	Tinom	Ex- Mental Disorder

Source: (KPU Kabupaten Sleman, 2019).

From the table above, it can be seen that in Sidoarum Village there are 56 voters with disabilities in various categories who each divided into 18 hamlets. Krapyak has 10 persons with disabilities, followed by Cokrobedog, Tangkilan, and Potrowangsan each 6 persons, Candran 5 persons, Sebaran and Karang Tangkilan each 4 persons, Tinom 3 persons, Bantulan, Nglarang, Pengkol, each 2 persons, Gesikan, Jambon, Kramat Kidul, Kramat lor, Sidoarum, Ngemplak, and Tegal Krapyak each 1 person. However nowadays after confirmation is made with village office staff, most of the names listed in the table are not persons with disabilities.

In this research, the author uses a comparative study between the 2014 elections before Law No. 8 of 2016 came into effect, and the 2019 Election when Law No. 8 of 2016 has been valid, whether there are significant changes or differences or vice versa. In this thesis, the writer makes a comparison between the application Pre & Post Law No.8 of 2016. In the 2014 elections before Law No. 8 of 2016 applied, KPU has conducted a series of programs and activities in terms of fulfilling political rights for persons with disabilities. The programs carried out are also exactly the same as those conducted in the 2019 elections, namely socialization, provision of accessible and accessible places, mapping of TPS locations with persons with disabilities and the distribution of logistics specifically for persons with disabilities. However, there were only a few complaints from persons with disabilities in Sidoarum Village which according to Supriyatno, he felt that the data collection in 2014 was far more valid than the 2019 election when many of the disabled were not registered in the DPT, whereas many of the normal people were actually registered in the DPT with disability. According to him, this might have happened because of the reshuffle of the commissariat and members in the KPU so that the performance was different and slightly decreased (Supriyatno, Nopember 7th 2019).

Overall, there are several things that the writer can conclude for the effectiveness rate of the implementation of Law No. 8 of 2016. The data collection conducted by the KPU was through the lowest level in the hamlet, and the village government, and whether the people who carry out the data collection know and understand correctly about the categorization of persons with disabilities. This is in line with the findings of healthy and normal people data who are categorized as persons with disabilities

and then included in disability voters, meanwhile actual persons with disabilities are not registered with voters with disabilities. If the common thread is drawn, the source of this problem is the absence of direct or door-to-door data collection conducted by the KPU & Village Government, so that the assessors cannot directly see the situation of persons with disabilities and categorize properly. The validity of the data greatly influences the provision of facilities and special aids for voters with disabilities, and therefore the accuracy of the data must be confirmed by the KPU. In addition, the findings that the author found in the field that it turns out that not all organizations and persons with disabilities have the same opportunity to participate in the socialization carried out by the KPU. Apart from that, the implementation of the socialization should be done evenly both for persons with disabilities who are members of an organization or community, and also for persons with disabilities who are not registered in certain organizations or communities so that the distribution of benefits can be achieved properly. Furthermore, in terms of providing accessibility, facilities, special aids and placement of TPS locations so far it has been done well by the KPU based on applicable laws and SOPs so that the principle of accessibility can be fulfilled properly. Meanwhile, in terms of comparison, based on the results of the author's research, there are no significant differences and changes in terms of programs and efforts made by the KPU. However, there are other problems related to data collection that is felt to be declining compared to the 2014 election.

Table 3.3

Conclusion of Effectiveness Rate of Law No. 8 of 2016

Variable	Parameters	Rate	Conclusion
Effectiveness	a. Data Collection & Mapping the Disabilities Voters b. Organizing the election education for disability c. Accessible TPS location d. Provision the facilities and special needs	Not effective enough	Based on the results of research conducted by the author, in order to maximize the implementation of Law no. 8 of 2016, KPU constantly makes changes and improvements in all issues both in the provision of facilities, accreditation, as well as the provision of assistive devices and the organization of election education for persons with disabilities. However, it turns out that, in particular, the spotlight for the writer after conducting the research is that in reality, problems that occur in the field such as the inaccessibility of a TPS and lack of adequate facilities, are rooted in a data error. In this case the author

			<p>highlights a finding that illustrates that the KPU's performance has not been maximized. In this case due to the absence of an accurate data collection process so that data invalidity is still a big problem in the 2019 election, whereas according to the Disability Voter, voter data for people with disabilities in the 2014 election was fairly sufficient and accurate. Therefore, the authors felt that there was a decrease in the quality of the implementation of Law No. 8 of 2016 in the 2019 elections compared to the 2014 elections. In this case, based on Law No. 8 of 2016, the law fully covers and regulates all needs in terms of providing accessibility for persons with disabilities in theory, but in practice there are</p>
--	--	--	---

		<p>still a number of problems arising from the non-optimal performance of the KPU. In addition, the second parameter that has not been met by the KPU is the implementation of socialization that has not been evenly distributed. This is because KPU only focuses on socializing to communities / groups of people with disabilities, meanwhile persons with disabilities who are not affiliated with any organization, do not get the same opportunity to participate.</p>
--	--	---

2. Efficiency

Efficiency is a description of how much effort must be done to achieve the intended goal or result. Efficiency also can be interpreted as the output that have already achieved and input that is used. In this section, to find out the level of efficiency in the implementation of Law No. 8 of 2016 author will use parameters as follows:

a. Holding the election Socialization

The first parameter was holding a socialization concerning the election materials. The socialization is conducted on a scheduled basis, following the schedule of activities of each of these organizations so that the KPU can participate in coming and socializing important matters related to the elections that will be conducted. Apart from that, the General Election Commission also continues to innovate to make a variety of props that are displayed at the time of socialization such as the book braille letters material election for people with visual disorder and video contains election material that is equipped with a sign language translator making it easy for the hearing disorder to understand the material. The socialization material was also fulfill the second parameter. After conducting research, the author then gained a new perspective from persons with disabilities in Sidoarum Village, Godean District. According to Mr. Supriyatno (person with visual disorder) who is also served as Chairman of PERTUNI Godean District, the organization he participated in actually did not get the opportunity to socialize together with the Sleman Regency KPU and the socialization he received was only provincial level socialization, socialization from the Provincial KPU D.I Yogyakarta (Supriyatno, Nopember 7th 2019). In contrast to Mr. Supriyatno, Mrs. Watini (Tuna Daksa), a resident of Sidoarum Village, Godean Subdistrict, admitted that she didn't participate in the KPU socialization conducted at the organization that she participated in. When asked about the reason Ms. Watini participated in the socialization because she had other activities. However, when asked about the issue of whether or not the socialization was carried out in the organization she participated in, she later confirmed that there

was an election-related socialization conducted in the HWDI (Indonesian Women with Disabilities Association) (Watini, Nophember 7th 2019). The efforts carried out by the Sleman Regency KPU are conducting pre-election socialization for persons with disabilities. KPU also cooperates and works with several disability organizations such as the HWDI (Indonesian Women's With Disabilities Association), PERTUNI (Indonesian's Visual Disorders Association), and PPDI (Indonesian's People with Disabilities Association).

b. Provision of the election socialization facilities

In conducting the socialization, KPU innovated to make various kinds of teaching aids containing content and important matters related to the election in the form of a braille book for visual disability. Video content in which there is a physical language translator for people with hearing impairments and speech impaired. According to the KPU commissioners, even though neither the legislation nor PKPU explained in more detail the additional facilities and props, the KPU realized that the special needs of persons with disabilities were very important. Therefore, the Commission continues to innovate in the fulfillment of facilities and special needs for persons with disabilities (Aswino, Indah, October 31st 2019).

c. Holding the Technical Guidance for KPPS

The last parameter was holding the technical guidance for the KPPS. KPU also holds the technical guidance for KPPS which includes material on their duties and obligations before and after the election, which also includes technical instructions for KPPS to serve voters with disabilities. However, Indah Sri Wulandari

acknowledged that various KPU programs including data collection and outreach could only be done in groups / organizations, so according to her it was still ineffective considering that many people with disabilities did not participate in or were included in the groups / organizations. Factors that influence it are because the General Election Commission itself has many shortcomings in terms of human resources, budget and costs, so that according to her socialization is less able to touch persons with disabilities out there other than people with disabilities who are members of a disability group / organization (Aswino, Indah, October 31st 2019).

According to the Chairman of Election Supervisory Body (BAWASLU) related to the efficiency of Law No. 8 of 2016, Law no. 8 of 2016 has more or less regulated persons with disabilities to participate in the political process. The programs carried out by the KPU have also so far followed the primary regulations regarding the holding of elections, both voter data collection, coordination with disabled communities, and also socialization to persons with disabilities (Mustofa, Nophember 6th 2019).

In terms of a comparison between the 2014 election and the 2019 election in this case there were no significant changes or differences. All of these parameters have been implemented by the KPU. Even though at that time there was no Law No.8 in 2016, KPU stated that they had KPU regulations (PKPU) as the basis for every program and activity they had and according to him, within PKPU itself there was already a technical guidance for organizing that regulates accessible principles aimed at voters with disabilities (Aswino Wardhana, Indah Sri Wulandari, October 31st 2019). Therefore, the author concludes that there are no significant changes and

differences between the 2014 elections and the 2019 elections. Overall, which the author can conclude from the results of interviews with the KPU, PERTUNI, and also persons with disabilities that the pre-election programs carried out by KPU have been followed by those who are members of organizations or groups of people with disabilities. However, according to the Chairperson of BAWASLU, he still receives many reports that there are still many persons with disabilities who do not get the opportunity to attend the socialization. This is because the KPU only conducts outreach to persons with disabilities who are members of groups or organizations with disabilities, whereas the rest, for persons with disabilities who are not members of the community and organization, will not get the same opportunity. According to the author, this should be consideration in the future. Socialization is expected to be carried out evenly at both the organization and community level, and from the lowest level in villages or sub-districts that have voters with disabilities. Therefore the socialization program carried out by the KPU has received a lot of criticism from persons with disabilities who did not get the same opportunity to participate in the socialization carried out by the KPU. The reason is the lack of human resources and the limited budget and program funding funds which causes the program to be run by the KPU not optimally. It's also made KPU unable to carry out dissemination evenly and thoroughly to all persons with disabilities who are registered in a group or not registered with any disability organization. Then the next two parameters namely relating to the provision of props at the time of socialization and also technical guidance for KPPS has been carried out properly by the Commission without any obstacles.

Table 3.4**Conclusion of Efficiency Rate of Law No.8 of 2016**

Variable	Parameters	Rate	Conclusion
Efficiency	a. Holding the Election Socialization b. Provision of Election Socialization Facilities c. Holding the Technical Guidance for KPPS	Not Effective Enough	Based on the findings that the writer got while doing research in Sleman Regency, the writer concludes that the level of efficiency of Law No. 8 of 2016 has not been fully achieved. This is because there are still many voters with disabilities who do not get the same opportunity to be able to participate in the programs carried out by the KPU, including socialization. Based on the report the researcher got, there are still many complaints from people with disabilities who do not get the facilities and opportunities to participate. This is in line with the response of the Chairman of BAWASLU who confirmed that there are still complaints related to this matter. Justification was also carried out by Mr. Supriyatno as the chairman of the PERTUNI branch of Godean Sub-district who claimed not to get a turn at the socialization carried out by the Sleman Regency KPU, but rather the socialization by KPU of the Yogyakarta Provincial D. I. This is in line with the recognition of KPU commissioners who stated that there

			were various difficulties they encountered in the field, especially because the KPU could not touch persons with disabilities who were not registered in a community or disability organization, therefore socialization could not be carried out maximally and evenly for various reasons. The main problem is HR & budget.
--	--	--	--

3. Adequacy

Adequacy is a view of how far the achievement of the desired results solves the problem at hand. The accuracy can be in the form of how far the act can solve the problems that occur. Adequacy also deals with how far the level of effectiveness of these regulations so that they can satisfy the needs, values, or opportunities and answer problems that occur. (Dunn W. N., Evaluation of Public Policy, 1994). In this section, the author will use some parameters to measure the rate of adequacy of Law No. 8 of 2016 that have been reached, as follows:

a. Proper Programs

Based on the findings of the author regarding the effectiveness of law no.8 of 2016 that in theory the law includes all the rules that guarantee the full rights of persons with disabilities, both in terms of accessibility, facilities, and the same opportunities as people in generally. The first parameter was holding a proper program for the disability voters, programs as part of KPU's responsibility and concern are always carried out. The programs are in the form of data collection and

mapping of TPS with disability voters who then relate directly to the ease of distribution of logistics specials. The next program is election-related socialization of voters with disabilities. The next program is technical guidance for KPPS for the creation of convenient and easy elections for persons with disabilities.

b. Providing Accesibility, facilities, and special needs

The second parameter was providing the accessibility, facilities, and special needs of people with disabilities which also have been carried out by the KPU, especially in considering the place that will be the location of the polling station so that it is accessible and easily accessible for persons with disabilities. Through an interview with the General Election Commission (KPU), Mr. Aswino explained that the KPU always strives to meet all the needs of voters with disabilities including:

- 1) Provision of C3 form or form of assistance for persons with disabilities who need a companion when making an election.
- 2) Provision of election material templates with braille letters for persons with visual impairment.
- 3) Preparation of places, especially election booths so that they are accessible and easily accessed to persons with disabilities who use wheelchairs. (Aswino, Indah, October 31st 2019)

c. Additional Services

An additional service that the author intend to do is pick up the ball that should be carried out by the KPU. The ball pick-up service in this sense is in the form of additional services in the form of intercourse for persons with disabilities

who have mobility constraints in order to be able to attend polling stations to give their voting rights. New problems revealed during in-depth research were the absence of ball pick-up facilities complained of by most people with disabilities. The ball pick-up facility in question is the readiness of the KPU and the Organizing Committee to facilitate persons with disabilities who are impeded by mobility so they cannot attend the polling station. The expected facilities are actually simple. From some people with disabilities admit that if they want their friends who are disabled people with mobility impaired to continue to participate in providing choices through the ball pick-up facility, it can be an opportunity to vote at home, or providing mobility facilities for people with disabilities. According to Ms. Watini, in the last 2019 election there was a ball pick-up facility in the form of providing mobility transfer facilities for persons with disabilities who had difficulty in mobility, but she regretted that the facility was not provided by the KPU as the organizer but was provided by Prospective Legislative Members (Watini, Nophember 7th 2019).

"In the 2019 election it is true that the KPU has covered persons with disabilities who are included in the DPT, but it is only limited to administration, whereas for ball pick-up or shuttle facilities, it has not been provided by the General Election Commission" (Mustofa, Nophember 6th 2019) According to M. Abdul Karim Mustofa as chairman of the Election Oversight Body (BAWASLU) that BAWASLU still receives complaints from persons with disabilities who feel they have never been touched in KPU programs such as election socialization and KPU has not provided election facilities at several crucial points such as Hospitals and

Homes Mental illness, so that people who are registered in the DPT can't vote they are being treated in hospital. In addition, based on his observations, there are still a lot of polling stations that are not friendly with disabilities (Mustofa, Nophember 6th 2019).

In this case the author conclude, in the process of preparation to the implementation of elections, the General Election Commission and the government actually have prepared everything related to the provision of accessibility, facilities, and tools for persons with disabilities. It's just that in some cases, the General Election Commission and the Government seem to override data through face to face so that data errors still occur and then become the public spotlight especially for people with disabilities. However then what is still a problem is because there is no additional service provided by KPU in the form of a system of thumb to the disabled disability registered in the DPT but cannot attend TPS due to limited mobility, which then makes the level of abstentions increase.

Table 3.5

Conclusion of the Adequacy Rate of Law No. 8 of 2016

Variable	Parameters	Rate	Conclusion
Adequacy	a. Proper Program b. Providing Accessibility.	Not Good Enough	The first parameter that the author will measure is about the right program for people with disabilities. Based on the findings obtained by the author when conducting research that the programs carried out by KPU

	<p>Facilities, and special needs c. Addition al Services</p>		<p>are fully appropriate & beneficial for the education of voters with disabilities, but then the problem is because not all people with disabilities have the same opportunity to participate in the socialization carried out by the KPU. This happened because the KPU limited the socialization program only to organizations / communities of persons with disabilities, meanwhile other persons with disabilities could not be touched by KPU programs. Adequacy assessment basically is by analyzing whether the Law is successful in answering and solving problems that occur in the field. The second parameter was providing the facilities & the special needs of people with disabilities. From the results of the author's research, the existence of Law No. 8 of 2016 has succeeded in solving problems related to the provision of facilities, accessibility, as well as tools and programs that are very useful for voters with disabilities. The problems that previously occurred in the form of polling stations that were not</p>
--	--	--	---

		<p>accessible for persons with disabilities seemed to have been resolved according to some persons with disabilities in Sidoarum Village who were interviewed a few days ago by the author. The next parameter is the provision of additional services for persons with disabilities, meaning that the KPU does not add additional services in the form of ball pick-up services for persons with disabilities registered in the DPT but are unable to come to the polling station due to limited mobility. This also becomes the spotlight of many parties and gets the main criticism is from persons with disabilities.</p>
--	--	--

4. Equity

The intended of equity is whether the benefits have been distributed equally among different groups. In this case, persons with disabilities are categorized in many types, with different needs. In this equalization assessment, it will then be discussed whether the facilities, accessibility, and tools provided by the General Election Commission can be felt by all categories of persons with disabilities. Equity can also be interpreted as justice given by the relevant agencies to optimize the implementation of Law No. 8 of 2016 (Yenchilia Tresna Damanik & Aufarul Marom). Equity theory also concludes that

basically humans like being treated fairly and this is directly related to the satisfaction that humans receive, fair and unfair treatment they get (Adams, 1965). In this section, author will use several parameters to measure the level of equity of the Law No. 8 of 2016, as follows:

a. Accessible TPS Location for all Types of Disability

Long before election day, KPU had prepared everything carefully including determining the location of accessible TPS for persons with disabilities and the mapping was done based on data collection at any polling station with disabilities so as to facilitate the Commission in determining the location and distribution of special logistics. This then must be taken into consideration by the KPU in order to constantly update data and conduct data collection directly door-to-door, because the distribution of logistics and the provision of other special facilities are sourced from data owned by the KPU. According to the KPU commissioner, lacking in deficiencies in the field such as the absence aids was caused by improper distribution and improper distribution sourced from invalid data (Aswino, Indah, October 31st 2019). Through an interview with the General Election Commission (KPU), Mr. Aswino explained that the KPU always strives to meet all the needs of voters with disabilities including:

- 1) Provision of C3 form or form of assistance for persons with disabilities who need a companion when making an election.
- 2) Provision of election material templates with braille letters for persons with visual impairment.

- 3) Preparation of places, especially election booths so that they are accessible and easily accessed to persons with disabilities who use wheelchairs. (Aswino, Indah, October 31st 2019).

This was justified by Pak Sugiyatno & Mrs. Watini who explained that at the polling station where they conducted the election, it was already fairly accessible for the types of disabilities they had, such as polling stations without stairs and easily accessed, spacious election booths making it easier for persons with disabilities using wheelchairs, as well as high ballot boxes that are easily accessible by persons with disabilities. At the time of the pre-election socialization, KPU also provided various special tools for persons with disabilities in the form of books containing election-related matters with braille letters, then videos of election material in which there were sign language interpreters. This is part of the example of distributing the same effort to different groups of people with disabilities according to their needs.

b. Election Materials & Special Needs for all Types of Disability

Persons with disabilities are people with disabilities as well as people in general. Therefore, the needs they need at the time of election are very complex and varied, depending on the type of disability they have. For the provision of material for persons with disabilities, KPU Sleman has provided several tools for persons with disabilities in each polling station based on data collected previously. The tool is in the form of a selection template in braille letters and ballots with braille letters for visual disorders. Basically, the special needs of people with disabilities are very

complex. Considering that disability has many categories and of course the needs they need differ from one another.

Overall, what the author can conclude in this level of equity is that the KPU has maximally fulfilled facilities and special needs for voters with disabilities from various categories so that there is no discrimination in the field, so that all types of disabilities feel satisfied and comfortable in the TPS, accessible TPS locations for all categories of persons with disabilities, spacious and spacious voting booth placement and low ballot boxes placement and easy to reach. Besides, KPU succeeded in making the latest innovations related to the provision of props in socialization so that material and important matters related to the election can be understood by all categories of persons with disabilities. Meanwhile in terms of comparison of the 2014 elections and the 2019 elections, there were no changes or striking differences that occurred.

Table 3.6
Conclusion of Equity Rate of Law No. 8 of 2016

Variable	Parameters	Rate	Conclusion
Equity	<p>a. Accessible TPS Location for all types of Disability</p> <p>b. Election materials & special aids</p>	Good Enough	Based on the findings that the authors get when conducting research, the authors can conclude that the level of Equity in the implementation of Law No. 8 of 2016 is good enough. This is the author's conclusion from the results

	for all types of Disability		of a joint interview with KPU, BAWASLU, and also people with disabilities. According to KPU itself, the availability of accessibility and facilities is an obligation that must be carried out by the KPU although in practice, the special needs of persons with disabilities are very complex and diverse, but the KPU in this case is trying its utmost to meet all types of special needs of persons with disabilities in accordance with the categories so that the benefits can be distributed evenly and without discrimination.
--	-----------------------------	--	---

5. Responsiveness

Responsiveness is a view of whether the results of policies made successfully satisfy the needs of the object or target, (Dunn W. N., Evaluation of Public Policy, 1994). In other words, responsiveness contains the response of target groups about the results of the implementation of a policy, whether in the end they feel satisfied and fulfilled

their needs or vice versa. In this section, author will use several parameter to measure the level of responsiveness of the Law No. 8 of 2016 as follows:

a. Right on Targets

After conducting research, researcher gets answers from informants about their satisfaction with the implementation of Law no. 8 of 2016 and according to them, they are very grateful for the existence of the Act so that their rights can be more considered. According to Supriyatno, a resident of Sidoarum Village, he felt helped because at this time there were so many parties who were intensively making improvements to fulfill the rights of persons with disabilities. It means that the implementation of Law No. 8 of 2016 already right on the target mainly in the electoral series, starting from pre-election socialization to the provision of accessibility, facilities and tools for people with disabilities during the election. According to him at this time many offices of government agencies also continue to improve the convenience of persons with disabilities which means that it's already right to the targets.

b. Target Satisfaction

According to Mr. Supriyatno, although it has not been fully successful and there are still one or two problems appearing in practice, he acknowledged that this was common in the early implementation of a policy. He also hoped that the government and the Election Commission would continue to innovate and make improvements for the realization of elections that are accessible and comfortable for people with disabilities (Supriyatno, Nopember 7th 2019). In contrast to Mr.

Supriyatno, Ms. Watini acknowledged that she had felt helped, but had not reached the point of satisfaction. According to her, the implementation of this law is only the first step of a government effort to fulfill the rights of persons with disabilities so there are still many problems that arise. She hopes that in the future practice of implementing Law number 8 of 2016 will be improved so that it can be implemented as should and also minimize the problems that still often arise (Watini, Nophember 7th 2019).

This was later confirmed by the KPU commissariat, Mr. Aswino Wardhana. He felt that in terms of providing facilities and accessibility, many people with disabilities had felt helped and satisfied. On the other hand in terms of data collection and administration, he admitted that there were still many protests that were filed to the Commission related to data errors. The intended data error is that people are generally in a healthy condition but are included on the disability voter list, meanwhile people with disabilities are not included in the list. Then this is what makes the protest filed to the Commission (Aswino, Indah, October 31st 2019).

Overall, what the author can conclude here is that all types of businesses and programs carried out by the KPU in the context of fulfilling the rights of persons with disabilities both in the provision of facilities, accessibility, assistive devices, and also the implementation of pre-election socialization have received good reception from people with disabilities voters. They also admitted that they were very grateful that in the end, the fulfillment of their rights became a new priority for the KPU and also the government. Even if asked about satisfaction, they cannot say that they are satisfied, but from the writer's perspective they accept and fully

support all programs carried out by the KPU and hope that in the upcoming elections, the fulfillment of the rights of persons with disabilities may be improved.

Tabel 3.7

Conclusion of Responsiveness Rate of Law No.8 of 2016

Variabel	Parameters	Rate	Conclusion
Responsiveness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Right on Targets b. Target Satisfaction 	Good Enough	<p>Based on the results of research conducted by the author, it can be concluded that the level of responsiveness in the implementation of Law No. 8 of 2016 is good enough. Basically, to measure the level of responsiveness of a law can be seen from how satisfied the object / target is intended. In this case, the intended target is voters with disabilities. From the results of interviews conducted by the author, obtained information that voters with disabilities are satisfied. This is in line with KPU's innovation and efforts in terms of fulfilling the rights of persons with disabilities. According to them, although in practice there are still many shortcomings, but they still</p>

			<p>feel helped by the existence of this Act along with the implementation of the program and the fulfillment of facilities and facilities for persons with disabilities in elections. According to persons with disabilities, this is an appropriate first step by making them a new priority in KPU performance. The main target of the assessment of responsiveness is entirely based on the opinion of the target, in this case persons with disabilities.</p>
--	--	--	---

6. Appropriateness

Appropriateness is a theory that refers to the results of the objectives of a policy and really useful and valuable for a group, (Dunn W. N., Evaluation of Public Policy, 1994). In this case whether through the implementation of a policy, the benefits and uses are really valuable or vice versa. In this section, the author used several parameters to measure the level of appropriateness of the Law No. 8 of 2016 as follows:

a. The Intended Result are Valuable for Groups

According to the KPU Commissariat for Data & Information, Ms. Indah, the fulfillment of the rights of persons with disabilities is very important and

valuable both in terms of the perspective of democracy and in terms of human rights. As a human being born with the rights she has, Ms. Indah feels that the fulfillment of the rights for persons with disabilities is as important as the fulfillment of the rights for healthy and normal people. It's just that according to her, persons with disabilities have special needs so that in terms of their provision must be truly really pay close attention and mature (Aswino, Indah, October 31st 2019). Furthermore, according to the Chairperson of the Election Oversight Body (BAWASLU), fulfilling political rights for the disabled clearly has an important role for the sustainability of democracy in Indonesia. Democracy has placed equal rights for everyone, both normal people and people with disabilities (disabilities). The realization of the same rights is regulated by the 1945 Constitution Article 28 D paragraph 1, Law 8 of 2016, and Law 19/2011 concerning ratification of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities). The rights of every citizen must be protected and guaranteed. Participation in the form of the right to vote and be elected is part of the legal protection of the rights and obligations of all citizens including persons with disabilities, (Mustofa, Nophember 6th 2019).

b. The Result Achieved are Valuable/Beneficial to the Targets

From the perspective of persons with disabilities, they assume that the results of the implementation of this law are very valuable to them. The equality of rights and opportunities afforded to them, coupled with the provision of special facilities and tools for persons with disabilities is a new breath for them. According to Mr. Supriyatno, the fulfillment of the rights of persons with disabilities in the present is increasingly becoming the attention of the government, accompanied by

improvements and innovations for better reforms so that the intended end result can be achieved well. It is very valuable according to him, (Supriyatno, Nopember 7th 2019).

Overall, what the author can conclude from the results of this research is that the KPU is well aware that the fulfillment of the rights of persons with disabilities is an important thing. Especially in elections, the KPU as the organizer is well aware that democratic life in this country does not only belong to healthy and normal people in general, but the right for persons with disabilities to be able to participate in it. Therefore, the provision of facilities, accessibility and assistive devices for persons with disabilities has become a priority for the KPU.

Table 3.8

Conclusion of the Appropriateness Rate of Law No. 8 of 2016

Variable	Parameters	Rate	Conclusion
Responsiveness	a. The intended result are valuable for groups b. The result achieved are valuable/beneficial to the target	Good Enough	Based on the results of research that the author get in the field about the Appropriateness level of Law No. 8 of 2016 is good enough. Basically, the level of appropriateness of implementing a law is seen by analyzing whether the results of a law or regulation are valuable or valuable to a group. Based on the results of interviews conducted by the author, both from the KPU as the organizer of the election,

		<p>and BAWASLU as the observer of the election, and also voters with disabilities as the target of the implementation of this Act feel that the fulfillment of the rights for persons with disabilities is very valuable and meaningful both in terms of human rights of persons with disabilities, as well as in terms of democratic state of life. In an interview conducted by the author, the writer concluded that the existence of this law was considered important and valuable by all parties involved in the election. This is what makes the level of Appropriateness in the implementation of Law No. 8 of 2016 in Sleman Regency is considered good and sufficient.</p>
--	--	--

In the conclusion table above, author describes the points of a good evaluation indicator. From these points questions are then developed to be able to answer the existing problems in the field. Of the 6 indicators of policy evaluation, there are two of them which are still considered lack by the author. Both are the level of effectiveness and efficiency of Law No. 8 of 2016. In this case the author is intended in terms of practice and facts in the field, in accordance with the performance of the Commission

as the organizer of the election. This is what the author hopes to become the main suggestion for the KPU to continue to be active in innovating for the sake of creating accessible elections for persons with disabilities in the future.

B. Factors Influencing the Un-successful of the Implementation of Law No. 8 of 2016

After conducting research and data collection, the author obtain information about the factors that influence the implementation of Law No. 8 of 2016 as follows:

- 1) Lack of Human Resources so that the data collection is not done door-to-door, causing inaccurate voter data with disabilities. Based on the results of the author's research, the first factor affecting data invalidation is due to a lack of human resources which then makes it difficult for the KPU to collect data. Most of the data was collected through groups and organizations of people with disabilities and some of it was also obtained from data from the sub-district level. The things that then occur are the invalid data obtained because not all people with disabilities are incorporated into organizations or groups of people with disabilities and there are still many people with disabilities out there who feel untouched just because they are not affiliated with any disability organization. In addition, data collection per sub-district was also deemed insufficient because there was no door-to-door data collection conducted by the sub-district but only through mouth-to-mouth.
- 2) Lack of Budget & Costs so that pre-election programs such as socialization cannot be carried out maximally and evenly to all organizations / groups of people with disabilities. Lack of funds and financing is a complex problem in this regard. A program will not run smoothly without sufficient funds and budget. According to the KPU commissioners, to save costs, socialization is carried out between regular

gatherings at DPOs, so that expenses can be handled properly. However, given the large number of disability organizations divided by sub-districts, the costs required are certainly not small, and in the end cannot be covered properly.