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Abstract

Indonesia has an abundant fisheries resource. The potential has not been well this is marked by the small contribution of marine and fishery sector to the national income of only 14.7% of the total gross domestic product (GDP), compared to other countries. The dramatic phenomenon between the potential and utilization of marine resources implies to the predominant level of coastal communities who mostly work as fishermen at sea. In order to go to sea with a simple technology also with low human resources make the living standard of traditional fishermen may be categorized as poor. When compared to other farming groups in the agricultural sector, traditional fishermen are among the poorest. With an already many government empowerment programs, yet it has not managed to raise the standard of living for the traditional fishermen. The research is aimed to describe the implementation and weakness of Coastal Community Economy Empowerment Program (PEMP) and National Program of Community Empowerment of Independent Marine and Fisheries (PNPM-MKP) on the traditional fishermen of Percut Village, Percut Sei Tuan in North Sumatra, Indonesia. Type of research is descriptive with 10 traditional fishermen, the fishermen group committee and the marine and fisheries department’s officials. Data were collected by observation, in-depth interview and focus group discussion (FGD). The result of the study of socio-economic condition of traditional fishermen of Percut Village is badly seen from the indicators of housing and sanitation that are not suitable for healthy living, limited fishing equipment and over fishing catching area.
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1. INTRODUCTION

As an archipelagic country, 70% of Indonesia's territories are ocean with 99,093 km coastline length with marine economic resources, especially abundant fisheries resource. Retnowati (2011) said that in Indonesia's sea territory there are at least 13 sectors which can be developed and contribute to the national income and the welfare of the people, especially for the fishermen which include: capture fishery, aquaculture, cultivation processing industry, marine biotechnology industry, mining and energy, marine tourism, marine transportation, maritime industry and services, small islands, nonconventional resources, marine buildings, valuable objects and cultural heritage, environmental services conversion and biodiversity.

In fact, the potential is not well managed. It is marked still with small contribution of marine and fishery sector to national income, only reach 14.7% of the total gross domestic product (GDP), compared to other countries, such as Japan which only has 31,000 km coastline but contributed to 55% of their GDP.
In addition, according to Nugroho (2013), the value of Indonesian exports from the marine and fisheries is still relatively small, only reached US$ 3.5 billion, compared to Vietnam and Thailand. These two countries have reached US$ 6.2 billion and US$ 8.6 billion respectively, even though their respective coastlines are much smaller when compared to Indonesia. This dramatic phenomenon between the potential and utilization of marine resources is directly proportional to the life of coastal communities who mostly work as fishermen. Some literature (Mubyarto 1990, Masyhuri 2003; Sudarso 2011, Tahawila 2014) mentioned that fishermen are among the poorest, compared to other farming groups. The dense, slum, polluted, low-income, and highly vulnerable neighbourhoods are the stereotypes that are commonly attached to traditional fishermen communities in Indonesia.

According to Kusnadi in Sudarso (2011), the poverty of fishermen could be influenced by two main factors. First, the internal factors, including limited human resources quality, limited capital and technology of fishery, unfavourable working relationship, the difficulty of diversifying fishing efforts, high dependence on occupation to sea and a lifestyle that is considered wasteful and thought to be less oriented for the future. Second, the external factors, including fisheries development policies which mostly are more productivity-oriented to support national and partial economic growth, product marketing system that is more profitable for intermediary traders, damage to coastal and marine ecosystems, and mangrove forest conversion in coastal areas. Poverty is increasingly complex due to the use of unsuitable fishing gear, weak law enforcement against environmental destruction, limited post-harvest processing technology, limited employment opportunities in nonfishery sectors in the villages, natural conditions and seasonal fluctuations, and geographical isolation on the mobility.

According to Sudarso (2011), the ‘blue revolution’ or modernization of the fishery sector undertaken by the government in the 1970s contributed to the process of marginalization of traditional fishermen. Studies conducted by Siahaan (1990), showed that the ‘blue revolution’ has significantly affected the condition of marine resources. Export-oriented policies that only emphasized on aspects of productivity improvement, have encouraged coastal waters to be in a more overfishing situation. In addition, the use of large and uncontrolled modern fishing gears has led to an increasing competition between the commercial-industrial fishermen and the traditional fishermen. In fact, it often leads to open conflicts such as burning trawl (tiger trawling, trawler trawl, teri trawler) and so forth. The ‘blue revolution’ on one side provides great advantages for the commercial-industrial fishermen, but on the other hand, contributes greatly to the increasingly socio-economic disparity and widespread poverty in the coastal region.

The description of the life of these communities (poor, without access) according to Siahaan (1990) almost occurred in all coastal communities in Indonesia, including coastal communities in the East Coast of North Sumatra, including coastal communities in the Percut Village, Percut Sei Tuan Subdistrict in Deli Serdang of North Sumatra Province. Ginting (1996) revealed that there are at least three factors that influenced the poverty of the perched family of Percut Village. The first is the lack of human and capital resources that lead to the lack of initiative and creativity of the fishermen families. Location of the village adjacent to the city of Medan City, should have positioned the community of Percut Sei Tuan as part of an inseparable economic condition of Medan. The presence of workshops building, tourism centres, and shrimp-packing factories located around the village should make new job opportunities for fishermen families outside of fishing activities. But due to the lack of resources and capital, this opportunity is more utilized by outsiders. Second, consumptive lifestyles are the fewer results obtained from the activities of the sea, exacerbated by consumptive behaviour of the fishermen families. The third is the limit of access. This caused traditional fishermen could not achieve benefits from various programs and policies conducted by the government, especially the PEMP and the PNPM-MKP. The reason for PEMP and PNPM-MKP became less successful in tackling the poverty of traditional fishermen in Percut Village will be described in the results of this study. At least, the initial description of the results of the field research shows that PEMP and PNPM-MKP did not take a comprehensive approach (covering all aspects, measurable, participatory, sustainable, and local resources).

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Economy Empowerment Program

Improve socio-economic and prosperity strengthening institutions and also community participation, optimization and utilization of marine resources and coastal sustainability. While the goal particularly including the reduction of the impact of the increase of Energy cost, making work and alternative business
opportunities for coastal communities, increasing participation communities in the planning, implementation, control and develop economic activities coastal communities (Sirojuzilam et al., 2017; Ferine et al., 2017; Nurlina et al., 2017 & Tarmizi et al., 2017). Strengthening economic institutions, support development management mechanism community with participation and transparency as well improve the ability of officers and residents coastal areas in the framework of managing development.

The concept of empowerment in the discourse of community development always connected with independent concepts, participation, networking and justice. On basically, empowerment is put on individual and social level of power. Empowerment implies the meaning of existence a strong mental attitude (Sirojuzilam et al., 2016; Badaruddin et al., 2017 & Achmad et al., 2017). From the concept of empowerment, it can be said that empowerment coastal communities and oceans coastal community empowerment for utilize and manage resources fisheries and marine resources optimally and sustainable efforts to improve welfare. The program policies of economic empowerment program of coastal communities are as follows: (1) applying the concept of co-management in fishery resource management, where there are clear boundaries and division of authority between government and society (Muda et al., 2017; Sirojuzilam et al., 2017; Sihombing et al., 2017; Sadalia et al., 2017 and Muda et al., 2018). This concept also minimizes the existing weaknesses in community-based fisheries resource management and fishery resource management by the government. This concept is carried out by applying various strategies and approaches; (2) any concept that develops in economic theory and development models in accordance with Indonesia is formulated into a new concept, and can be packaged into the Concept of Indonesian Development that Performs; (3) policies and programs of economic empowerment of coastal communities still pay attention to and take into account the value of resource bundling and the value of externalities generated so that there is equal distribution of welfare in the current generation and (4) the implementation of policy alternatives and programs in each region is based on priority analysis taking into account local potentials and needs. The policy or program priorities of each region may differ as a form of decentralization to address the forces that impede development (Yahya et al., 2017; Badaruddin et al., 2017; Achmad et al., 2017 & Lubis et al., 2017). Policies and empowerment programs must also maintain the sustainability of resources so as to create sustainable development and ensuring the welfare of future generations;

2.2. Coastal Community Empowerment

Coastal Community Empowerment program is a community empowerment program. The program is focused on coastal activities, as most of the population is livelihoods as fishermen/farmers (Muda et al., 2017). This program facilitates the enhancement of knowledge and skills for assisting groups through technical training, such as:

1. composting training;
2. Seaweed nursery;
3. processing of coconut husk waste;
4. mangrove cultivation;
5. marketing and networking.

Program objectives is to increase people’s income by empowering human resources in managing natural resources (Lubis et al., 2016; Gusnardi et al., 2017; Nurzaimah et al., 2016; Muda et al., 2017 & Dalimunthe et al., 2017). The Approach used refers to the principles of openness, participation, local characteristics and sustainability and activity results is community group assistance includes; organization, administration, capital, and productive enterprise and development of new groups.

2.3. Implementation of PEMP and PNPM-MKP Programs

The Coastal Community Economy Empowerment Program (PEMP), according to Kurniasari and Reswati (2011), was launched in 2001 and ended in 2009. PEMP objectives in general are to improve socio-economic welfare of fishermen communities, strengthening institutions and community participation, and also aimed to optimize the utilization of marine resources and coastal sustainability.

The first target of the PEMP is the reduction effort of the rising fuel prices impact through increased revenues from business improvement and creating employment opportunities. Second, the establishment of sustainable marine resource-based productive economic activities at the lower level of society. Third, the processes of learning and participation are formed as an effort to empower local communities. Fourth, the establishment of microeconomic institutions in coastal communities (LEPP-M3).
Based on the poverty theory of Chambers, it can be said that the targets of the PEMP program above are an effort to get the poor out of the deprivation trap that would enable the potential of the poor to access the potentials around their environment and eliminate dependence.

For Deli Serdang District during 2001-2007, the PEMP fund disbursed was about IDR 1,582,600,000 (one billion five hundred and eighty two million six hundred thousand rupiahs). The fund was rolled out in two stages, the first stage of IDR 632.6 million in 2001, and the second phase of IDR 950 million in 2007. The fund was allocated in two villages, namely the Percut Village and Tanjung Rejo Village in the Percut Sei Tuan subdistrict. The allocation of the fund was channelled to motorboat assistances, bakulan, BBM, salted fish management, and revolving fisheries interest. Before the fund was given, the fishermen of Percut Village formed a group of fishermen whose members numbered about 4-5 people. For PEMP's 2001 budget allocation in Percut, 15 groups of fishermen or so-called Community Beneficiaries (KMP) were formed, these groups then formed a parent cooperative to oversee all the groups that was later named as the Institution of Partnership of Rural Micro Coastal Economy Development (LEPP-M3). In 2001, the allocation was done by looking at the conditions of coastal communities that are in great need and the allocation of fund from the PEMP program was given to 55 families of fishermen.

About the management of productive economic funds (DEP), originally undertaken by the LEPP-M3, was formed as a company owned by the coastal communities. Based on the data found in the field, the PEMP in Percut went well initially. This was marked by the increasing number of fishermen beneficiaries: from 15 groups (55 households) in 2001 to 24 groups (100 households) in 2005. This condition occurred because of the growing role of LEPP-M3 from the initial role to simply facilitate the marketing of seafood. The origin program was for LEPP-M3 to become a marketing container of fishery and marine commodity processing, such as mangrove seed juice, seaweed jellies, and salted fish marketing, all of which are the result of industry-based households and members of the beneficiaries, and increased budget allocations disbursed by the government to the LEPP-M3 cooperative (IDR 632,600,000 in 2001 increased to IDR 950,000,000 in 2007). But at the end of the year 2008, the program (PEMP) has decreased, until then in 2010 the program stopped along with termination of Bank Bokupin's contract with the fishermen's cooperative, due to the large number of unpaid credit arrears by members of the cooperative. For Percut Village, the PNPM-MKP fund is used for Direct Community Assistance for Rural Business Development (BLM-PUMP) Capture Fisheries and BLM PUMP Processing and Marketing. Based on data from informants, in 2012 there were four groups of fishermen who received assistance, consisted from 2 groups of capture fishermen and 2 groups of processing and marketing fishermen. In 2013, there should be 6 groups of fishermen entitled to get aid, 3 groups of capture fishermen and 3 groups of processing and marketing fishermen, but because of disputes that occurred within the 3 groups of processing and marketing fishermen, only the group of capture fishermen who had gotten assistance.

2.4. Program Impact and Cause of Failure

The results of research, at the beginning of the implementation of both of the PEMP PNPM KP programs ran well. For PEMP programs starts from 2001 to 2010 for example, business units developed by Mitra Mina Sejahtera Cooperation includes (1) fishing business unit (2) Mina Swamitra savings and loan unit (3) coastal shop business unit. The effort is very beneficial for group members. These benefits are among other things; the change of fishing gear from canoes to motorboats, causing the fishermen fishing roaming range to increase by 2-3 miles from the beach. In turn, increasing the total number of fish caught. What is found on the field is not different than what Suryawati and friends found (2013), there is an increase in the number of fish caught by group members of the program before and after the program was implemented. For the PUMP BLM program for example, from the fourteen provinces studied, they mentioned that there has been an increase in the number of fish caught from program beneficiaries from only 3,400 tons to 4,000 tons. This growth also occurred in the number of production groups of beneficiaries of PUMP BLM program of aquaculture fishery. From the production side there is an increase of 4000 kg - 9000 kg. Changes in fishing gear induce an increase in fishermen's income, let alone the selling price of fisherman catches at Mitra Mina Sejahtera cooperative is higher compared to the selling price of traders and other merchants. The findings are similar to those found by Nuraini (2008) in other villages, namely from 21 types of catches, there are 4 types of fisherman catches priced with the highest price in the PEMP institutions, namely medium shrimp, kelong shrimp, tongue fish, and octopus. For the other 17 catches, the selling price of fishermen catch varies, however, the prices offered by PEMP institutions are higher when compared to bargain prices and other merchants. The assistance of the fishing gear program also reduces the expenditure because the fishermen no longer spend boat rent to merchants.
3. METHODS

The type of this research is qualitative descriptive one. Qualitative descriptive research attempts to describe a social phenomenon. In other words, this study aims to describe the nature of something that is going on at the time of study (Nasir et al., 2017; Muda, 2017; Azlina et al., 2017). This qualitative method provides complete information, so that it is useful for the development of science and more applicable to various problems. Descriptive method of investigation is focused on solving existing issues in the present. This method tells, analyzes, and classifies; investigate by survey technique, interview, questionnaire, observation, or by test technique; case studies, comparative studies, time and motion studies, quantitative analysis, cooperative or operational studies (Tarmizi et al., 2016; Sirojuzilam et al., 2016; Marhayanie, 2017; Handoko et al., 2017; Erlina et al., 2017; Hasan et al., 2017 and Muda et al., 2018). Descriptive method is interprets existing data, for example about the situation experienced, a relationship, activity, outlook, attitudes that appear, or about an ongoing process, the influence that is being worked, the disorder that is emerging, inclining tendencies, tapered contradictions and so on.

The main purpose of qualitative research is to understand the phenomenon or social phenomena by emphasizing more on the complete picture of the studied to detail it into interrelated variables (Muda and Dharsuky, 2015 & Lutfi et al., 2016 and Muda, 2018). The hope is obtained a deep understanding of the subject for subsequent generated a theory. Because the objectives are different from quantitative research, the data acquisition procedure and the type of qualitative research are also different (Muda, 2018). The research that has been conducted is aimed to describe the implementation and weakness of Coastal Community Economy Empowerment Program (PEMP) and National Program of Community Empowerment of Independent Marine and Fisheries (PNPM-MKP) on the traditional fishermen of Percut Village, Percut Sei Tuan in North Sumatra, Indonesia. Type of research is descriptive through qualitative approach with informant which has been determined by 10 traditional fishermen, the fishermen group committee and the marine and fisheries department’s officials. Data were collected by observation, in-depth interview and focus group discussion (FGD).

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

4.1. Results

Despite the positive impacts of the program at Suharto’s (2009) beginning, in assessing the impact of the program, it is not only seen how large the program contributes to the increase in income, but also can be seen how large the program can reduce the amount of expenditure. In the context of PEMP and BLM PUMP, the reduction of fishermen’s expenditure can be seen in several ways. First, the cost of rent and of profit sharing with the merchant. According to the informant of the pattern of profit sharing that has been done, the amount of all the profits cut by expenditure (fuel operations and other sailing needs). Two parts to merchant, one and a half part for captain (captain of the ship). The rest is distributed evenly to all crew members who went to the sea. For example the earnings of sailing of Rp.500.000 with the number of personnel who went to sea, three members (one ship captain and two crew members) then the profits respectively are each is Rp. 200.000 for the merchant, Rp. 150.000 for ship captain, two crew members each get Rp.75.000. This pattern is actually very detrimental to fishers, because in addition merchant getting more profit (two parts of the profit), they are also obligated to sell the catch to the merchant, which usually has a cheaper price if sold to another merchant. Second, it is about the ship repair costs. In addition to unbalanced returns, in the context of rent and profit sharing, fishermen are also charged other expenses, ie the cost of repairing the ship in case of damage. The costs of fishermen are much reduced after the fishermen get PEMP and or PUMP assistance, they no longer need to pay for profit sharing, because the vessels are their own, and the cost of repairing the vessels is cheaper because the need for sparepart is provided by the cooperative with cheaper price than that provided by the merchant.

Another impact was the increase in the number of vessels given to fishermen beneficiaries of the PEMP and PUMP programs between 2001 to 2013, from 14 units in 2001. Then, it increased to 21 units in 2005 (ships unit assistance from the PEMP program), and grew to 26 units in 2012 and 2013 (ship assistance units from PUPM 2 units in 2012 and 3 units in 2013). The addition of this number of vessels automatically adds job opportunities for fishers. This additional labour does not include additional labour as a cooperative employee, as well as processing of the catch (salted fish processing), and other household-based businesses (making mangrove seed juice, seaweed jellies) and so forth.

Why are these programs unsustainable? One form of assistance provided by the government either PEMP program or PNPM MKP to Percut Village fishermen is a ship with a capacity of 3-5 GT, as well as
other fishing gear such as nets, fishing rods and buoys. The aid of fishing gear is ideally able to contribute to the improvement of the fishermen’s economy, since this assistance is in addition to being equipped with operational assistance (fuel subsidies and other operational needs through coastal shops). It can also deduct rent or profit sharing that fishermen have to pay to the merchant. But in reality it is not so, from the research conducted, it is found the fact that the aid of ships and a set of fishing gear and other operational assistance, especially fuel can not be utilized properly by fishermen. There are several reasons why fishers utters why the fishing gear can not be utilized: First the fishing gear is not in accordance with the needs, according to the recognition of the ship’s fishing aid needed is actually a vessel with a capacity of over 20 GT even with a capacity of over 30 GT but the program is a ship with 3-5 GT capacity. The words of this fisherman if we search using existing studies is not exaggerated; Bailey (1998), Betke (1998), Imron (2003), M Rifa’i (2013) and Kinseng (2014) states that with outboard motors or motor boats smaller than 20 GT, fishermen can only catch the furthest four miles from the coastline, while the waters above 4-12 miles can only be reached by vessels with a capacity of over 30 GT which amounts to no more than 19% of the total fishermen overall. This condition causes the fishing area about 4 miles from the coast to become a means for small fishermen to scramble about, while the fishing area of 4-12 miles to the Exclusive Economic Zone is only controlled by a handful of large fishermen and fishery companies. The fishing area is very wide and has a much more abundant fish resources. Even sadder, in reality, it turns out the area or the four miles area from the beach that should be the fishing area of small-traditional fishermen also encroached by modern fishermen with sophisticated fishing equipment. Unconsciously the program has encouraged competition among fishermen to compete for the catch of the “maximum” fishing areas (fishing grounds) whose stock of fishery resources is running out (overfishing).

Secondly, subsidized fuel provided does not meet the needs of ship engines. According to the fishermen, the fuel provided by the Solar Pocked Dealer for Fisher (SPDN) is actually more suitable for the needs of industrial machinery, so if used on the ship engine, the engine will experience excessive heat, and can trigger ship engine damage. This condition then encourages fishermen and or beneficiary groups to take shortcuts, by selling aid in the form of vessels and fishing gear and diesel (BBM) to other parties, and the proceeds are distributed to all members of the group.

It seems that what is found in the research location is not much different from Suharto’s research (2008, 2009) that in the implementation of community empowerment the government tends to be trapped in the context of locality, partial, and uniformity so that the term warungsasasi, cubeisasi, kambingisasi and shipisasi appears. There is a tendency that as if poverty can only be eradicated by community “empowerment” programs in a narrow sense. Empowerment seems to include only the provision of capital: opening small stalls in the village corner, giving cattle or goats for breeders and others. The simple assumption is that if poor people are given capital and trained, then they will have jobs and income. Then their life will be better and not poor anymore. Riatmosurato (2003) said that the government’s poverty reduction programs tend to be stuck on a charity program in a broad sense, in the farmer empowerment program, for example, the government provides various assistance from seeds, fertilizers, pesticides and others without trying to understand more problem of farmer poverty, namely the absence of agricultural land. This opinion gives the message that how could PEMP and PUMP program be able to solve the problem of poverty of fishermen, because he did not touch the root of the helplessness of the fishermen, helpless because competing with modern ships, bribing with nature, powerless to increase opinions and aggravated because capture areas have experienced overfishing.

4.2. Discussion

4.2.1. Business Capital Assistance Failure

Another type of assistance provided by the PEMP program in Percut Village is business capital assistance through the Productive Economic Fund (DEP). The purpose of DEP is actually to break the chain of the dependence of fishermen on loan sharks and merchants. So that productive economic efforts can develop and provide maximum benefits to fishermen. However, this DEP program did not run optimally. From studies conducted and studies conducted by other parties (Nuraini.2008, Lestari 2005, Hamdan, 2005, Nugroho, 2015, Sutomo 2003, Zamzami) against the effectiveness of DEP, they found several obstacles. First, the obligation to provide collateral in the form of land certificates to a Management Bank has an account with the Bank as a prerequisite for obtaining capital assistance (Muda et al., 2016; Syahyunan et al., 2017). This obligation in addition caused the absorption of DEP funds become very small because most fishermen do not have a letter of land either in the form of land certificate from the village head, sub-district head, or certificate from the national land agency, also resulted in the distribution of DEP funds not on target, is not a member of the most vulnerable groups (poor), but fishermen whose economic side is good
enough. In about 2003 there was a change to these conditions indeed. The obligation to provide collateral in the form of land certification was removed, and for the granting of credit, the implementer only sees the location of the residence that the fisherman is a native of the village without having to complete the land guarantee requirements.

Secondly, aid funds are not used for productive economic activities, but are used for household “consumer” purposes; purchasing electronic goods, motor vehicles, tuition fees, home improvements, etc. This problem ultimately leads to a very small rate of return and rolling, especially at some level fishermen also developed an understanding that the funds distributed are grant funds and have no obligation to be returned. The third model of return is considered burdensome. The revenue share that must be incurred by fishermen in LEPP-M3 is 2-touch or 50% of the total yield with the following calculation; LEPP-M3 requires profit sharing from fishermen of 50% of income, then from 50% is divided 75% for installments, 5% for maintenance, 7.5 percent for capital development, and 12.5% for LEPP-M3 institutions. The revenue share for LEPP-M3 is 12.55 and then divided into 25% for administrators, 50% for managers, 5% for administration, 10% for Village Partners, 25% for village or village, 2.5% social funds, and 5% for coaching fund. This 2-touch load is considered to be very burdensome for fisherman, so to avoid the burden the fishermen then do not sell the catch or other productive economic yields to LEPP-M3 but sold it to other sides such as selling to an agent/merchant, even many of them who sell their catch at sea. Another reason why fishermen are not paying the installment is that of the lack of catch and/or failure to harvest in the fishpond. Extreme weather is the cliched reason put forward by fishermen when asking why the small catches and ponds are failing to harvest.

4.2.2. Failure of Cooperatives and Coastal Stores

In addition to functioning as a provider of venture capital and other necessities for fishermen in fishing operations, co-operatives and coastal councils also serve to accommodate sea products and or another productive business outcome. Besides, the Cooperative and Coastal Store is also mandatory to shorten the lane/business of trading and marketing of marine products. As we know, the fish trade route is very long and every lane/chain there is a profit margin that if trimmed will prospering the fishermen. As already mentioned earlier that based on the results of a Study conducted by Adjuh (2006) and Manulang (2007) in Percut Village, showed that there is a considerable margin between the catch of fishermen to take with toke sales to retailers and consumers, catch of local commodities, especially export commodities. For the catch of the catch of local commodities such as margin can reach 7-15 thousand rupiah/kg, where fish sold by toke from fishermen only worth Rp 18,000 but at the consumer level the price can reach Rp 27,000 - Rp 35,000. For export commodities more considerate, Krapu fish, for example, is only priced at Rp 120,000/kg, but the price changed to Rp 400,000 when sold by toke to the exporter, and will reach Rp 800,000/kg (62 $ USA) at the aboard level consumer. The difference margin between the sales price to cooperatives, toke, and other collectors only in the range of Rp 500 - Rp 3000 rupiah. With installment load factor that will be cut off, the difference is not too big, coupled with the sale system in the cooperative indirect cash (payments made by cooperative 2-3 days after the transaction), then the group assemblies prefer to sell their catch and or their cultivation to other parties (other than cooperatives): toke, middlemen, and other collecto Despite the existing PEMP, as well as PNPM-MKP, the fact of these programs does lack the understanding of the traditional fishermen objective conditions in the fishermen community structure in general let alone the program initiated by top down planning. Although in the implementation of the program according to technical guidelines had combined both top-down planning and bottom-up planning models, in reality the bottom-up application is more concerned with the needs of the program. As a result, the program introduced by the government did not succeed in raising the standard of living of sustainably living of traditional fishermen.

In general, PEMP and PNPM-MKP have not provided significant changes to the economic condition of the fishermen communities of Percut Village. This is characterized by low income, low level of education, cramped housing conditions, and minimal job diversification. The program has not been able to break the dependence of the fishermen on capitals either on the production side or the finance. Supposedly, the program should have been based on the felt-needs of the target group and in its implementation there should be an assigned assistant from the government to reside with the target group. Thus, the government could not be separated from the implementation but instead be present within the community, both physically and emotionally, so that the program can be sustainable.
5. Conclusion

From the facts found in the field can be said that community empowerment programs, especially coastal communities (traditional fishermen) Percut Village, Percut Sei Tuan district, Deli Serdang regency failed. Regarding benefits, only the beginning of this program has enough benefits for fishermen: open opportunities/employment opportunities, increase the amount of income, and reduce the amount of "expenditure". It is just that the sustainability aspect, such as the PEMP program and PNPM MKP, for example, only runs for approximately eight years, while PNPM MKP (PUMP) only runs for approximately two years. Although there have been empowerment programs undertaken by ministries and local governments, the facts on the ground, these programs, lack of understanding of traditional fisherman objective conditions in the structure of fisherman community in general let alone programs that were top down planning. Indeed, in the implementation of the program according to technical guidelines combined with bottom up planning in effort to to empower the fishermen community, but in reality the bottom up application field is more concerned with the needs of the program. As a result, the introduced program is not able to raise the standard of living of substantially living of traditional fishermen. Supposedly, the program plan based on the felt needs of the target group and in its implementation is assigned an assistant from the government by residing with the target group. Thus, the government can not be separated from the implementation but present emotionally so that the program can be sustainable.
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