



## The problem of justice for Indonesian fishermen in Marine Environmental Management

Sri Endah Wahyuningsih<sup>1</sup>, Dody Hartono<sup>1</sup>, Anis Mashdurohatun<sup>1</sup>, Mahmutarom HR<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Faculty of Law, Sultan Agung Islamic University, Semarang, Indonesia

<sup>2</sup> Faculty of Law, Wahid Hasyim University, Semarang, Indonesia

### Abstract

In Indonesia, management of the marine environment has not been able to realize the welfare of fishermen, because there is injustice, so efforts are needed to manage the environment in a sustainable and fair manner through the substance of fisheries management, supervision and optimal law enforcement. The aim of this research is to analyze the problem of injustice in marine environmental management in Indonesia and to find its weaknesses. The research paradigm is the positivism paradigm. , this type of research is normative juridical with secondary data sources obtained through literature study, while data analysis in this research uses qualitative data analysis with the process of systematically searching and compiling the data obtained. Research results in Indonesia. In the management of coastal areas, there is still environmental injustice. in the form of distributive, corrective, procedural and social injustice. Distributive injustice in coastal area management is reflected in the unequal distribution of risks or impacts and benefits from coastal area management activities. Apart from that, reducing environmental risks is also not a priority

**Keywords:** Law Enforcement, Criminal act, Fishery, Indonesia

### Introduction

The main problem faced in managing fish resources is that economic policy has tended to favor fish resource exploitation activities, resulting in weak management institutions and law enforcement. So far, law enforcement against illegal fishing has not been able to realize protection in the context of managing and exploiting potential fish resources, as well as protecting the sovereign territory of the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia. Apart from that, the application of sustainable development principles into organizational systems and government work programs, both central and regional, is still not running well.

From the above facts, it is known that Indonesia's marine potential has not been managed wisely, resulting in losses due to fisheries crimes. The problem of theft of potential marine resources or fisheries crimes committed by foreign or regional vessels by using destructive fishing gear such as bombs and anesthetics, as a result of which coral reefs are damaged and fish seeds die. The extinction of the coral reef ecosystem will eliminate a number of benefits it has, namely as a source of food, for fish, shellfish, seaweed as well as medicinal and cultivation ingredients <sup>[1]</sup>.

Law enforcement against perpetrators is still very low. The government is also still turning a blind eye to the impacts. This not only has economic implications in the form of a lack of state income (foreign exchange) from fisheries products which reaches trillions of Rupiah, but can also damage marine ecosystems, including coral reefs.

The potential of our fisheries resources is undoubted, but if they are not protected, utilized and conserved, they will have an impact on the country's economic life. Therefore, the government in adopting various policies related to the protection of fish resources should provide guarantees, as well as be able to implement them. Regarding efforts to protect fisheries resources, it turns out that the government has not yet fully provided guarantees in accordance with the principles of legal protection. The government as the party holding power should view the aquatic environment as one

of the state's territories which is inseparable from the state government system in general, which deserves reasonable protection. The fishing community as one of the parties who has the right to utilize fisheries resources is often in the spotlight, because does not pay attention to the preservation of fisheries resources, this is due to fishing methods that can damage the environment. Therefore, awareness and community participation are needed to jointly protect fisheries resources <sup>[2]</sup>.

The conditions that occur in the protection of fish resources show that there is no synergy between all components involved in implementing the regulation and management of fishery resources, so researchers conducted a study to answer various problems that arise related to law enforcement regulations for fisheries crimes in the use of fishing gear. Fish by justice-based fishermen. It turns out that law enforcement regulations regarding fisheries crimes in the use of fishing gear by fishermen are not based on justice as they should be, so that sustainable and fair environmental management efforts through the substance of fisheries management, supervision and optimal law enforcement have not been achieved. In this regard, we hope that justice-based enforcement of legal rules relating to regulations on law enforcement against fisheries crimes in the use of fishing gear by fishermen can be realized. If not, the consequences will have an impact on the marine ecosystem and affect the country's economy. This is very worrying, because if it is not done wisely, the ecosystem as a support for the life of aquatic biota now and in the future will be damaged. Therefore, the problem of justice for Indonesian fishermen in managing the marine environment will be studied <sup>[3]</sup>.

### Research Methods

In this research the author uses the positivism paradigm, a paradigm which views that law deals with applicable laws and regulations which are the source of formal law. And in its application, the law must realize justice as its goal. The

approach method used in resolving fishermen's justice problems is a normative juridical approach, namely research sourced from secondary data, carried out by literature study of various rules and regulations, scientific works in the form of books, journals and research results as well as other sources that can support the research data required. The data obtained was then analyzed using qualitative descriptive methods.

### Research Results and Discussion

That the management of coastal areas has not yet achieved environmental justice for the people living in these areas, environmental injustice is reflected in the existence of several empirical problems that occur. Several concrete cases will be presented to help describe the reality of environmental injustice that still happens in coastal area management <sup>[2]</sup>.

#### a. The problem of distributive injustice

As previously explained, environmental justice as distributive justice requires a fair distribution of risks or benefits for activities, programs and policies related to the environment. However, distributive justice requires a reduction in environmental risk rather than a redistribution of environmental risk. The problem of distributive injustice is not simple. Many factors influence this injustice. For example, in the United States, race and income factors influence the unfair distribution of environmental impacts.

If we look at the context of coastal area management in Indonesia, we can note several problems related to distributive injustice. Regarding the distribution of environmental risks, injustice occurs in the form of damage to the coastal environment caused by reclamation projects, mining and other uses carried out without paying attention to the sustainability aspects of coastal areas. The impact of environmental damage is felt mainly by coastal communities who do not carry out these activities <sup>[4]</sup>.

Based on a search of existing literature, there are 41 reclamation projects with a total area of 79,348 ha in 20 provinces of Indonesia. This causes environmental damage and has a negative impact on the quality of life of the community in the form of a decrease in the income of fishermen in the area. 158 The reclamation projects carried out also threaten human rights.

Regarding the aspect of benefit distribution, there are also several problems in the form of unequal access to utilizing coastal areas and problems with the allocation of living space for fishermen. These projects have the potential to deny coastal communities access to coastal resources due to space grabbing. Apart from that, several regional regulations regarding the Zoning Plan for Coastal Areas and Small Islands (RZ WP3K) also do not support the protection of fishermen. Based on a study of the RZ WP3K Regional Regulations in twenty-two provinces, there are ten provinces that do not provide space allocation for fishermen's settlements. 159 This regulation certainly does not prioritize the welfare of fishermen, weakens fishermen's access to coastal resources in their respective regions, and has the potential to cause eviction at a later date <sup>[5]</sup>.

Another example is Article 14 paragraph (8) of the RZWP3K Regional Regulation of Maluku Province which is considered to threaten the protection of the rights of Customary Law Community Units because it does not include norms regarding the recognition of Customary Law Community Units. In this case, the state has a task that is

not easy. The state must optimize the management of coastal areas by creating regulations that encourage distributive justice. The unequal distribution of risks and benefits from coastal area management must be considered. Apart from that, the direction of legal politics in Indonesia in managing coastal areas also tends to ignore social and environmental problems. This means that ecological impacts due to activities carried out in coastal areas are not a priority.

If you look closely at several cases that have been described, people living in coastal areas are significantly disadvantaged. Considering that there are vulnerable people living there, the threat of environmental damage continues, and climate change. Meanwhile, fulfilling their right to a good and healthy environment is a fixed price for them. Indeed, there are weaknesses that need to be recognized regarding the realization of environmental justice as distributive justice. There is no standard measure regarding the distribution of both benefits and risks or ecological impacts. However, taking sides with vulnerable people who live in coastal areas in order to obtain distributive justice still has meaning and must be fought for <sup>[6]</sup>.

#### b. The problem of procedural injustice

Environmental justice as procedural justice demands the right to be treated equally, in this case equal opportunities in every decision making related to the environment. Some call this procedural justice political justice because environmental justice requires a change in political dynamics that allows all parties to be treated equally in the decision-making process regarding the environment. The emphasis on procedural justice relates to issues of public participation, the right to information and access to justice <sup>[7]</sup>.

In environmental law, procedural aspects occupy a very central position. This procedural aspect received attention in one of the international conventions, namely the 1998 Aarhus Convention. In this convention there are three pillars of the procedural element which are the rights of every person in the environmental sector, namely access to information, public participation in decision making, and access to justice. 162 This procedural aspect is closely related to the fulfillment of substantive rights, namely a good and healthy environment, and is a pillar of environmental democracy itself which is regulated in Article 65 paragraph (2) UU.N0.32 of 2009 Environmental Protection and Management .

When looking at the context of coastal area management, procedural justice is an aspect that must be fulfilled. Making decisions without adequate access to information, not providing access to participation for the community and hampering access to justice will definitely cause problems in the future. Protests from people who feel disadvantaged and not involved will also arise as a consequence. Fulfillment of this procedural aspect is very important because it has the function of increasing the acceptance of decisions by the community and making the decision-making process more democratic <sup>[6]</sup>.

In coastal area management, there are several problems related to procedural justice. Based on a study by the Center for Monitoring the Implementation of the Law on the Expertise Body of the Secretariat General of the DPR RI in 2021, there are problems in the aspect of public participation. Implementation of planning for the Zoning

Plan for Coastal Areas and Small Islands (RZWP3K) in DKI Jakarta Province and the use of marine space for strategic project purposes still excludes input from the community. Apart from that, the problem of minimal public participation is also reflected in the weak coordination and synergy between several government agencies and stakeholders. Several provinces also do not yet have regional regulations regarding RZ WP3K, which has resulted in the interests of traditional fishermen and local residents being neglected. In terms of access to information, several local governments also do not have adequate platforms or facilities as a means of communication. This results in the public not getting enough information regarding a policy or program.

In the aspect of the right to access justice, several litigation mechanisms (through formal justice) are available for people who feel disadvantaged to seek justice and demand restoration of rights. However, the right to obtain justice must be interpreted broadly and not only limited to litigation mechanisms. There are non-litigation mechanisms such as complaints to the Indonesian Ombudsman, Komnas HAM, and peaceful demonstrations. 167 Non-litigation mechanisms also tend to be used more often in environmental advocacy for several reasons, namely the lack of understanding of law enforcement officials regarding environmental law and their bias. Environmental interests are very minimal. 168 Decisions related to the environment that exist so far also rarely satisfy those who suffer losses<sup>[8]</sup>. It needs to be acknowledged that in the Indonesian context, especially in coastal areas, realizing environmental justice as procedural justice is not easy. Apart from the things that have been mentioned, obstacles can also arise from the community itself, namely limitations in utilizing existing communication and information facilities, and there are communities that do not have a participatory legal culture. This is where the government's task is to provide education to the community so that it becomes a democratic society because no matter what, the procedural aspect is a means for achieving common interests.

But on the other hand, procedural justice also has a weakness, namely that it cannot guarantee the elimination of claims of distributive injustice, because procedural justice only focuses on the process and not the results. However, this does not mean that procedural aspects can be simply ignored. Procedural aspects remain significant for realizing environmental justice. In procedural justice, it can be interpreted that justice takes the form of a continuous search process rather than a ready-made and final result, or in other words justice in the making<sup>[9]</sup>.

### c. The problem of corrective justice

The focus of environmental justice as corrective justice is providing punishment to parties who cause harm to other parties and demanding remedial action due to the impact of ecological damage caused. Corrective justice is often compared to compensatory justice. An essential element in compensatory justice is treating all parties equally, finding the losses suffered by someone due to the activities of another party, then trying to return the victim to the condition before the injustice occurred. However, the term corrective justice is used more often because compensatory justice implies that unfair actions can be accepted as long as compensation can be provided.

Laws and regulations in Indonesia related to the environment which contain sanctions against environmental polluters and destroyers are the embodiment of a tool to achieve corrective justice. But even so, the sanctions contained in statutory regulations are not the only means because justice requires punishment for losses suffered by a person or community from activities carried out, whether regulated or not regulated in law, as well as recovery action that allows the victim to return to his original condition. In the context of coastal area management, corrective justice is very important to pay attention to considering the high potential for coastal natural resource management activities to have a negative impact on social and environmental aspects<sup>[10]</sup>.

Several problems of pollution and environmental damage caused by mining activities, as well as the impact of climate change felt by communities living in coastal areas, are within the scope of corrective justice for aspects of legal protection and restoration of environmental damage. In addition, parties who cause environmental injustice for coastal communities (including community members themselves) must also be punished. In this case, the main obstacle is weak law enforcement, especially those relating to environmental law enforcement.

There are also problems within the scope of justice that appear to injure the community's sense of corrective justice, such as when compensation cannot be given because there is a natural disaster as an excuse in cases that cause environmental damage. Natural disasters are not a reason to ask for responsibility for the losses experienced. This is in accordance with the principle of *actus dei nemini facit injuriam*. When referring to this principle, natural disasters are considered *notoir feiten* which do not need to be proven because they are natural events. There is also a postulate which is almost the same as this principle, namely *ad vim majorem vel ad casus fortuitos non tenetur quis, nisi sua culpa intervenerit* which means that there is no responsibility for a person for accidents or circumstances that are beyond his control, unless he is the one who caused it.

If this principle is applied to every environmental case without using appropriate legal logic and careful consideration regarding social and environmental interests, it will definitely have a negative impact on society and the environment, especially in coastal areas and will hinder the realization of corrective justice. Based on research conducted by Wibisana regarding the use of excuses for natural disasters in the United States, the use of these pretexts can only be accepted if three conditions are met, namely:

- a. The natural disaster that occurs must be an ordinary disaster.
- b. These natural disasters are events that are unforeseeable or cannot be predicted and cannot be anticipated, and
- c. These natural disasters are the sole and direct cause of the losses that occur.

### b. Problems in realizing social justice

Environmental justice as social justice is the highest goal to be achieved. The three elements of environmental justice that have been explained lead to the creation of social justice. Environmental justice as social justice means that there is the best effort to achieve community welfare. The focus of social justice is that everyone can have sufficient

resources and abilities to live as a human being and that someone who has privileges must be responsible to everyone for the use of the benefits they have. Social justice is an integration of concern for environmental interests with broader aspects, namely social, racial and economic justice. 173 Thus, social justice is also correlated with the creation of sustainable development <sup>[11]</sup>.

One of the problems faced by coastal residents is poverty. Based on the presentation by the Vice President of the Republic of Indonesia, poverty in coastal areas is at 4.19 percent. Of the total extreme poor population of 10.86 million people, 1.3 million of them are in coastal areas. 174 Poverty, especially in coastal areas, can be divided into three types, namely structural, superstructural and cultural poverty. Structural poverty is poverty caused by variables outside the individual. Superstructural poverty is poverty caused by policies that do not favor coastal communities or fishermen. Meanwhile, cultural poverty is poverty caused by factors inherent in the community. 1 The state has an obligation to overcome these three types of poverty, especially suprastructural poverty. The superstructural poverty that occurs can be explained by looking at the actors who have an interest in natural resources. In managing natural resources, especially coastal resources, there are three main actors, namely the government, private sector and the community (commoners). The government acts as a regulator, the private sector is the strongest party to be able to access or utilize available natural resources, and society is the party that is weak in accessing natural resources. 176 Apart from being weak in being able to access natural resources, society is also vulnerable to becoming victims of environmental degradation caused by natural resource utilization activities. The private sector gains the power to access natural resources. Apart from having capital, it is also possible for these private actors to approach the government or even sit in the seat of the government itself <sup>[12]</sup>.

Furthermore, activities carried out in the industrial sector can also cause global warming as previously described. Global warming has a significant influence on weather uncertainty which makes it difficult for fishermen to go to sea and thus their income will decrease. Apart from that, the impact of rising sea levels can also damage the environment where they live. These things are a form of social injustice. This problem is very relevant to pay attention to, because in environmental justice as social justice, efforts to eradicate poverty are also seen as an inseparable part of environmental protection and management. If we look closely, poverty and environmental damage are related to each other, namely that poverty is the cause of environmental damage and other environmental problems, and eradicating poverty is a prerequisite for realizing environmentally friendly things.

Thus, to realize environmental justice as social justice in the management of coastal areas, the state is obliged to pay attention to the welfare of the people living on the coast, of course with legal politics that favors their interests and welfare and by considering distributive, corrective and procedural aspects in environmental justice. A breakthrough is needed in the form of alternative development methods that do not damage the environment, an environmentally based economic system, as well as encouragement, education, and providing access for the community to take part in order to become more democratic in every decision making <sup>[13]</sup>.

It is time for the conflict between environmental sustainability and economic interests to end, although in the end it always leaves a dilemma. In the concept of environmental justice as social justice, these two aspects are equally considered proportionally. Social justice wants to achieve the same goal as sustainable development, namely that there is always consideration of economic, social and ecological aspects in every program or policy made. This is where the commitment and role of the state as a critical actor is really needed in addition to the existence of a grassroots movement that must continue to voice environmental justice. Environmental justice will be achieved if these two forces can work mutually.

Based on the discussion in the previous section, it can be emphasized that the problem of environmental injustice in coastal area management still occurs. After the enactment of Perpu no. 2 of 2022, which has now been stipulated in Law no. 6 of 2023, there are still several articles that have the potential to cause problems of environmental injustice in coastal areas. Regarding the changes made by the Perpu to Law Number 7 of 2016 concerning the Protection and Empowerment of Fishermen, Fish Farmers and Salt Farmers, changes to the definition of small fishermen will result in several problems.

Firstly, the removal of unique criteria for small fishermen, namely the use of a vessel of no more than 10 GT, will result in uncertainty in determining who these small fishermen are. Second, this problem will have an impact on the loss of affirmative treatment for small fishermen, but in reality small fishermen often experience unequal distribution of benefits from their environment. In some of the cases described previously, what is even worse is that they also have to bear more significant environmental risks than parties who have substantial access to coastal and marine natural resources. Therefore, this change could exacerbate the problem of status inequality between small fishermen and other parties in taking advantage of coastal and marine natural resources and widen the disparity in the distribution of environmental risks. This problem will lead to the creation of distributive injustice <sup>[14]</sup>.

The next problem is that most of the provisions in Perpu No.2 of 2022 provide convenience and/or acceleration for projects initiated by the government itself, namely National Strategic Projects. This Perpu adds Article 17A to Law Number 27 of 2007 concerning Management of Coastal Areas and Small Islands (UU No. 27 of 2007). This article stipulates that if there is a strategic national policy but there is no spatial allocation and/or spatial pattern in the RTR and/or RZ, or even if the RTR and/or RZ do not yet exist, the Suitability of Marine Space Utilization Activities can be provided by the Government Center.

During the solid strategic development direction initiated by the government, the fate of the community, tiny fishermen, will be at stake if their procedural rights are not guaranteed because it is very likely that their living space will be allocated for other activities such as projects initiated by the government and even activities extractive business actors. The risks of environmental pollution, loss of fishing areas, and other spatial disparities they have are very large. It should be noted that Article 47 of Law no. 27 of 2007 regulates the implementation of PWP3K education, training and counseling to improve the quality of human resources in this field. This activity is really needed so that coastal communities are able to understand their rights and are able

to optimize their opportunities to fight for their rights in making RZ WP3K. Until now, there are no implementing regulations for Article 47 and Perpu no. 2 of 2022 does not discuss this much. Apart from that, protecting people who are exercising their right to participate is also a problem in itself.

Regarding corrective justice, Perpu no. 2 of 2022 amends several sanctions provisions in Law no. 32 of 2009. Administrative sanctions tend to be highlighted in this Perpu. Several actions that were previously threatened with criminal sanctions are now under administrative sanctions. Considering that corrective justice focuses on demanding the imposition of sanctions and taking remedial action, both criminal and administrative sanctions can actually be used. Regarding the changes to administrative sanctions in this Perpu, there are positive things, namely the confirmation of administrative fines in Article 508 paragraph (1) of Government Regulation Number 22 of 2021 concerning the Implementation of Environmental Protection and Management (PP No. 22 of 2021) as well as Article 82C which was added to the Law No. 32 of 2009, is a separate type of sanction<sup>[15]</sup>.

Administrative fines have been differentiated from fines for delays in implementing government coercion (forced money). Conceptually, the two types of sanctions are different, because administrative fines have a punitive nature, while forced money is more reparatory in nature. However, it is a little strange when you look at the provisions of Article 514 paragraph (3) PP No. 22 of 2021 because it regulates administrative fines applied simultaneously with government coercion. These two sanctions should not be imposed simultaneously and can be applied non-cumulatively because they have different characteristics.

In relation to corrective justice, the problem lies in the implementation of the sanctions provisions. If indeed administrative sanctions are emphasized, of course optimizing aspects of monitoring compliance with legal subjects carried out by the government will be a challenge in itself, especially for activities carried out in coastal areas. Apart from that, in terms of environmental restoration, the allocation of funds obtained due to delays in implementing government coercion is also less clearly regulated. These funds should have a repair function and not to increase income. In Article 513 paragraph (3) PP No. 22 of 2021, these funds are included in Non-Tax State Revenue.

These three aspects, namely distributive, procedural and corrective aspects, must be considered and realized so that social justice can be successfully achieved, namely the ability of coastal communities to live as human beings and be able to meet their daily needs. Based on the matters previously explained, it can be judged that Perpu no. 2 of 2022 has not been able to fully overcome the problem of environmental injustice. This Perpu has ambitions in the realm of economic development and there are still problems related to distributive, procedural and corrective injustice. It can also be said that the social and environmental interests of coastal communities have not yet been optimally considered.

In the management of coastal areas, there is still environmental injustice. This injustice can take the form of distributive, corrective, procedural and social injustice. Distributive injustice in coastal area management is reflected in the unequal distribution of risks or impacts and

benefits from coastal area management activities. Apart from that, reducing environmental risks is also not a priority. In corrective justice, injustice also occurs due to weak environmental law enforcement in coastal areas. Existing legal norms are also not ideal for realizing this justice, especially regarding the impacts of climate change<sup>[16]</sup>.

Furthermore, procedural injustice also still occurs. Fulfillment of the right to information, the right to access participation and access to justice has not been realized optimally. Apart from that, obstacles for the community to participate in the form of intimidation, SLAPP, etc. have not been eliminated. Lastly, social injustice occurs related to problems with the welfare of coastal communities. The high rate of poverty and the ongoing environmental damage in coastal areas are problems that cannot be resolved.

The enactment of Law no. 11 of 2020, which has now been revoked with Perpu no. 2 of 2022 and has been stipulated in Law no. 6 of 2023, is also considered to have not been able to resolve the problem of environmental injustice in the management of coastal areas. There are still obstacles in realizing distributive, procedural and corrective environmental justice which will ultimately hinder the creation of social justice. To realize environmental justice for coastal communities, aspects of environmental justice must be integrated both at the level of legal norms and their implementation, especially in the implementation of economic development projects that will be carried out by the government using coastal areas in the future.

Indonesia is classified as a maritime country because most of its territory is territorial waters (sea). This fact is supported by Indonesia's territorial location on the equator, which is also the location where hot and cold ocean currents meet, causing fish resources in Indonesia to be very diverse. Such diverse fish resources should be utilized for the welfare of the people, or in this case fishermen. This is because fishermen are a group of people who depend for their livelihood on fish resources in the sea, so it is fitting that fishermen are the first group of people to prosper through Indonesia's marine biological resources. However, besides the function of the sea as an ecosystem that provides welfare to the people, a balance of use is also needed so that the condition of the sea is always maintained. Therefore, efforts to utilize marine resources today must be oriented towards preserving the aquatic environment<sup>[17]</sup>.

Protection of marine ecosystems is an absolute requirement that fishermen must uphold when they carry out marine product fishing activities. Efforts that can be made to achieve these ideal conditions are through the policy instruments of the authorities or known as public policy.

The conflict anatomy above illustrates how complex fishing conflicts are. From the past until now, coastal fishermen de facto control a specific water area, and limit access rights to outside fishermen. This is a consequence of the characteristics of ownership of marine resources which are common property. This ownership institution is very strong at the community level, so it is highly respected by any fisherman.

However, on the contrary, this institution is very vulnerable to external forces and capital forces which then encourage the emergence of class conflict. This unequal conflict arena ultimately confirms the existence of fishermen with capital to dominate the fishing areas of traditional fishermen. The fishermen want to show the marine ownership institutions

that they had a long time ago, which collapsed due to the power of capital. In fact, fishermen just want to show that they are empowered and their identity as fishermen who feel entitled to a specific area is respected<sup>[8]</sup>.

### Conclusion

1. In Indonesia, in the management of coastal areas, there is still environmental injustice. in the form of distributive, corrective, procedural and social injustice. Distributive injustice in coastal area management is reflected in the unequal distribution of risks or impacts and benefits from coastal area management activities. Apart from that, reducing environmental risks is also not a priority. In corrective justice, injustice also occurs due to weak environmental law enforcement in coastal areas. Existing legal norms are also not ideal for realizing this justice, especially regarding the impacts of climate change. Procedural injustice can be seen in the fulfillment of the right to information, the right to access participation, and access to justice have not been realized optimally.
2. Barriers for the community to participate in accessing environmental justice and are related to the high rate of poverty and the still significant amount of ecological damage in coastal areas are carried out through the policy instruments of the authorities with Law no. 2 of 2023 concerning Job Creation which is considered unable to resolve the problem of environmental injustice in the management of coastal areas.

### Suggestions

1. There needs to be intense communication between governments so that there is an understanding on various applicable regulations so that we can jointly maintain the sustainability of the marine environment.
2. It is necessary to prepare standard operating procedure guidelines for supervision so that the supervision system can run as it should, as well as equipping facilities and infrastructure as supporting tools for carrying out supervision.

### References

1. IOJI. Fishers and Ocean Justice: A Study on the Implementation of the Fishers Protection Law and the Coastal Areas and Small Islands Management Law in Seven Locations in Indonesia, 2022, 80.
2. Roisah K, Rahayu R, Yusliwidaka A, Mubarok Z, Buditama A. Legal Development in the Overcoming Overfishing in Indonesian Coastal Areas. *J Indones Leg Stud*,2023;8(2):1065-1102.
3. Nugrahaa A. Legal analysis of current Indonesia's marine protected areas development. *Sriwij Law Rev*,2021;5(1):14-28.
4. Rahmadani FP, Triono A. Ship Sinking Policy: a Legal Choice To Eradicate Illegal Fishing in Indonesia. *Lampung J Int Law*,2022;4(2):55-66.
5. Manik JDN, Wirazilmustaan W. 'Ocean Grabbing!': Deprivation of Fishermen's Rights or Management Rights of Coastal and Marine Resources. *Society*,2021;9(1):289-301.
6. Dirhamsyah D, Umam S, Arifin Z. Maritime law enforcement: Indonesia's experience against illegal fishing. *Ocean Coast Manag*,2022;229(May 2021):106304.

7. Wahyuningsih SE. The implementation of legal protection against children who commit criminal acts in the judicial process in Indonesia. *Int J Psychosoc Rehabil*,2020;24(8):1097-1110.
8. Ambarsari KT, Rahmansyah I, Fajar MA, Putri ADA. Concept of Illegal Fishing for Indonesian Regulations and UNCLOS. *Yuridika*,2023;38(1):1-16.
9. Jing Z, Sutikno. Legal Issues on Indonesian Marine Plastic Debris Pollution. *Indones Law Rev*,2020;10(1):87-110.
10. Kumala MT, Vinata RT, Suharti T, Setyowati PJ. Fishermen Human Rights Protection and Sustainable Development in the Indonesian Marine Sector. *Lex Portus*,2023;9(4):16-27.
11. Henriksson PM, Tran N, Mohan C, Chan C, Rodriguez U, Suri S, et al. Indonesian aquaculture futures – Evaluating environmental and socioeconomic potentials and limitations. *J Clean Prod*,2017;162:1482-1490.
12. Wahyuningsih SE, Atmoko S, Iksan M. The implementation of punishment theories in the verdict of narcotics case by judge in Indonesia. *Test Eng Manag*,2020;83:2797-2806.
13. Holzer J. When justice answers to the president: Reexamining the effect of cabinet partisanship on human rights in presidential democracies. *Soc Sci J*,2021;58(2):237-246.
14. Kim H, Button M, Lee J. Public perceptions of private security in shopping malls: A comparison of the United Kingdom and South Korea. *Int J Law Crime Justice*,2018;53(April 2017):89-100.
15. Button M, Shepherd D, Blackburn D. 'The iceberg beneath the sea' fraudsters and their punishment through non-criminal justice in the 'fraud justice network' in England and Wales. *Int J Law Crime Justice*,2018;53:56-66.
16. Khasanah P, Kusuma I. Anti-Corruption Disclosure and Earnings Management: a Case in Indonesian Capital Market. *J Akunt dan Keuang Indones*, 2020, 17(1).
17. Awogbemi O, Von Kallon DV. Pretreatment techniques for agricultural waste. *Case Stud Chem Environ Eng*,2022;6:100229.