

CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSION & SUGGESTIONS

A. Conclusion

Based on the results of research that the author do related to the evaluation of the implementation of Law No. 8 of 2016 concerning the fulfillment of political rights for persons with disabilities in the 2014 elections and 2019 elections in Sleman Regency by using indicators of effectiveness, efficiency, adequacy, equity, responsiveness, and appropriateness, the author concluded as follows:

1. The effectiveness rate in the implementation of the Law No.8 of 2016 is still negative because of there are still many problems that arose in the field, namely the problem of invalid data on voters with disabilities in the Sleman Regency KPU. The factor that influence the negative rate of effectiveness were because KPU are lack of human resource to do door-to-door data collecting.
2. The efficiency rate in the implementation of Law No.8 of 2016 has is still negative because with limited costs and human resources, KPU has not been able to reach all groups of people with disabilities in Sleman Regency. The factor that influence the negative rate of efficiency were because KPU are lack of budget so that they couldn't hold the socialization fairly to all PWD's voters in Sleman Regency.

3. The adequacy rate of the implementation of Law No. 8 of 2016 is felt to be lacking and negative because although the KPU has been able to provide the right program accompanied by the provision of facilities for persons with disabilities, the KPU has not provided additional services in the form of ball pick-up services for persons with disabilities who are handicapped by mobility, so as to suppress abstentions (GOLPUT) in Sleman Regency. The factor that influence the negative rate of adequacy were because KPU are lack of budgeting & human resource so that they couldn't provide any pick-up services for PWD's voters.
4. In terms of the equity rate in the implementation of Law No.8 2016 is positive and enough because Sleman KPU has been able to provide an accessible TPS location, election materials that is understandable, as well as special needs for all types of disabilities participating in elections.
5. In terms of the responsiveness rate in the implementation of Law No.8 of 2016 is already positive and enough because it is right on the target of persons with disabilities as well as targets intended to be satisfied with the implementation of the Act.
6. In terms of appropriateness, in the implementation of Law No.8 2016 is positive and enough because both parties, both between the KPU as the executor of the election and also the person with disability as the target of implementing Law No. 8 of 2016 is well aware that the results of the implementation of the Act are

very valuable both for the equality of human rights and for democratic life in this country.

7. In terms of comparisons according to the results of the author's research, between the 2014 elections before Law No.8 in 2016 came into force, and the 2019 elections after the law came into effect, the author can conclude that no difference whatsoever occurred in the field. This is caused by the existence of KPU regulations, for example regulation no. 29 of 2009 which first regulates the special rights for persons with disabilities at the time of the election which later became the technical basis for organizing elections in 2014. Therefore, the author can conclude that in terms of preparation and programs carried out by the KPU is not far different from year to year.

Based on the conclusions the author describe above, it can be concluded that the 3 evaluation indicators have not actually been fulfilled, in other words it is still negative. While the other 3 indicators are well fulfilled, or in other words it's positive. Whereas the main indicator in evaluating a law is to measure its effectiveness. Effectiveness is a way to measure whether the intended purpose of making a policy has been achieved or vice versa. In evaluating Law No.8 of 2016 in Sleman Regency, the main indicator is effectiveness has not been fulfilled properly or in other words it is still negative, this then makes the author conclude that the application of Law No.8 of 2016 in Sleman Regency it has not been fully

successful due to several factors namely the lack of human resources to carry out the specified programs and also the lack of budget to be able to distribute the same benefits to all groups of people with disabilities in Sleman Regency.

B. Suggestions

Based on the conclusions above about important things related to the Evaluation of the Implementation of Law No. 8 of 2016 in Sleman Regency, here are some suggestions that the writer want to convey and might be taken into consideration in making improvements in the fulfillment of political rights for persons with disabilities to the Government as the policy maker, and also the KPU as the election organizer as follows:

1. In the future, the data collection should be done directly or door to door so that the data collectors will know the real condition of persons with disabilities in the field in order to minimize data errors and also facilitate the preparations and distribution of special disability voter logistics.
2. The data collection process should be carried out by people who truly understand the categories and types of disabilities so that no more data errors are encountered in the field.
3. Going forward, the KPU will conduct a fair and equitable outreach to all persons with disabilities both who are registered in an organization or disability group or who are not registered in any disability organization.

4. KPU should provide access and additional services in the form of shuttle services for persons with disabilities who have difficulty in mobility so that there are no more persons with disabilities who cannot exercise their voting rights.
5. KPU will should additional services to "pick up the ball" for persons with disabilities who cannot attend the polling station at all because of their physical and mental limitations.