

CSR Indonesia



Newsletter

Vol. 3 Minggu 31 2009

www.csrindonesia.com



<http://www.ministrylive.org/index.php/>

Dari Redaksi

Politik Indonesia bulan ini diwarnai dengan kenduri akbar lima tahunan berupa penyelenggaraan Pemilihan Presiden dan Wakil Presiden RI periode 2009-2014 sebagai bagian rangkaian dari Pemilihan Umum Indonesia 2009 (Pemilu Indonesia 2009). Peristiwa akbar politik ini akan menentukan siapa nahkoda negeri ini dalam jangka waktu lima tahun ke depan serta menentukan kebijakan Indonesia dalam membawa negeri ini menuju kesejahteraan secara menyeluruh.

Tak terkecuali dalam praktik CSR. Harapan atas pimpinan politik yang amanah itu pula yang digantungkan para penggiat CSR di Indonesia agar pemerintah menjelma layaknya entitas sosial yang turut berperan aktif mewujudkan CSR terbaik di negeri ini. Sinergi antar tiga entitas sosial (pemerintah-bisnis-masyarakat sipil, *tri sector partnership*) merupakan fondasi awal dalam mewujudkan langkah pembangunan berkelanjutan yang substansial.

Upaya tak kenal lelah ini pula yang terus diretas oleh para akademisi Indonesia dan internasional. Di tengah hingar bingar pesta demokrasi, para akademisi Indonesia dengan setia tetap menjaga pemahaman CSR sebagai alat dan langkah komitmen entitas bisnis untuk berkontribusi positif bagi pembangunan. Fakultas Ekonomi Universitas Indonesia turut ambil bagian sebagai penjaga setia konsep CSR dengan penyelenggaraan konferensi internasional dan inagurasi empat *academic chair* dalam CSR. Peristiwa akademik itu dan peristiwa senada lainnya kian menunjukkan bahwa CSR merupakan subjek ilmu pengetahuan dengan urgensi yang tinggi di Indonesia.

Integritas para akademisi itu pula yang tercermin dari inisiatif Sekolah Bisnis Universitas Harvard untuk mengambil sumpah para wisudawan-wisudawan pascakrisis 2008-2009. Komitmen bekerja dengan penuh etika dan berupaya menciptakan kemakmuran ekonomi, sosial, dan lingkungan di dunia merupakan segelintir isi bunyi sumpah para wisudawan tersebut. Harapan terciptanya generasi dengan integritas keseimbangan *triple bottom line* merupakan keniscayaan tersendiri hasil jerih payah para akademisi dalam mengawal konsep CSR.

Dalam edisi ini perkembangan CSR juga direfleksikan oleh Richard Welford. Melalui esainya *The End of the Glossy Report?* Welford menyampaikan bahwa sudah bukan saatnya lagi laporan berkelanjutan hanya sekadar "benda perhiasan" perusahaan. Publikasi kinerja ekonomi-sosial-lingkungan merupakan hal yang kian dinanti para pemangku kepentingan. Kebijakan transparensi dan akuntabilitas maksimum merupakan langkah progresif menuju terwujudnya praktik CSR terbaik.

Salam lestari, Selamat membaca!

Tentang A+ CSR Indonesia

A+ CSR Indonesia hadir sebagai *social enterprise* yang menghimpun berbagai keahlian profesional dalam isu-isu seputar CSR. Dengan keahlian itu, berbagai permasalahan yang ada dalam pelaksanaan CSR dapat diidentifikasi dengan tepat dan peluang bagaimana melakukan perbaikan atasnya dapat direkomendasikan. Di sisi lain A+ juga menghimpun keahlian yang sama untuk memajukan konsep CSR yang substansial, agar khalayak dapat membedakannya dengan upaya menggunakan konsep tersebut untuk kepentingan di luar pembangunan berkelanjutan. A+ bertekad menjaga keseimbangan antara kritisisme terhadap kinerja sosial dan lingkungan perusahaan dengan optimisme rasional untuk perbaikannya.

CSR Indonesia Newsletter

Redaksi

Jalal (jalal.csri@gmail.com)

Taufik Rahman (rahman.taufik@gmail.com)

Irpan Kadir (irpan.kadir@gmail.com)

Reza Ramayana (reza.ramayana@gmail.com)

Endro S. (muhammad.endro.sampurna@gmail.com)

Website & Publikasi (media@csrindonesia.com)

Alamat: Jl Danau Sentani No. 9 Duta Pakuan, Bogor Jawa Barat 16114; Telpn: +62 251 8336349

Daftar Isi

2 Editorial

CSR itu menghuntungkan –Tambah Bukti Lagi CSR yang Inovatif

4 Berita CSR

9 Publikasi A+

Catatan dari Jalur Penembakan Timika-Tembagapura

13 Artikel Pilihan

CR or CSR – Does it Matter?

Pulling Yourself Off the Ground By Your Whiskers

16 Liputan

Green Ads Space

Untuk mengiklankan produk yang ramah sosial dan lingkungan, *sponsorship*, *link* ke laporan CSR perusahaan, agenda kegiatan CSR (pelatihan, seminar, lokakarya, ekspo) atau lainnya yang relevan silakan kontak ke media@csrindonesia.com.

CSR Itu Menguntungkan—Tambahan Bukti Lagi

27 Juli 2009

Tampaknya, pencarian bukti bahwa menjalankan CSR menuju keberlanjutan dan kaitannya dengan keuntungan masih saja terus menjadi topik penting. Walau sudah seabreg bukti diberikan, dan teori yang menjelaskan kaitan keduanya telah dibuat, tetap saja pertanyaan penting itu masih seakan meminta bukti tambahan terus-menerus.

Minggu lalu, dua peneliti SAM—sebuah lembaga keuangan dari Zurich yang memfokuskan diri pada investasi berkelanjutan—bernama Wilma de Groot dan Christophe Churet, kembali menghasilkan bukti itu. Laporan mereka yang bertajuk Alpha from Sustainability kembali meyakinkan kita bahwa memang kaitan antara CSR dengan keuntungan itu nyata adanya. Dengan data yang mereka olah dari 400 perusahaan setiap tahunnya, mereka menunjukkan perbedaan kecenderungan yang signifikan dari tahun 2001-2008 di antara lima tingkatan portfolio. Perusahaan-perusahaan mereka dikelompokkan ke dalam lima tingkat berdasarkan kinerja keberlanjutannya—didasarkan pada gabungan kriteria ekonomi, sosial, lingkungan—lalu mereka uji apakah ada perbedaan kinerja finansial di antara perusahaan-perusahaan itu. Supaya lebih meyakinkan, mereka juga menetralkan pengaruh ukuran, sektor, dan region di mana perusahaan-perusahaan itu beroperasi.

Apa hasilnya? "Overall, the findings of this research provide us with credible evidence that firms adhering to sustainability are not contradicting their primary function, which is to maximize the profits of shareholders. On the contrary, it would appear that the puzzle of corporate financial performance broadly encompasses both financial and extra-financial considerations." Data menunjukkan bahwa dibandingkan rata-rata portofolio investasi, para sustainability leaders (20% tertinggi dalam kinerja keberlanjutan) unggul 1,48% setiap tahunnya. Sementara, sustainability laggards (20% terendah) memiliki kinerja 1,46% di bawah rata-rata. Dengan uji selama 8 tahun, t-stat yang dihasilkan adalah bernilai 1,7, sehingga dapat dinyatakan dengan derajat kepercayaan 90% bahwa perbedaan antarportofolio bukanlah suatu kebetulan.

Hasil ini sebetulnya "cuma" menambah daftar yang panjang dari bukti-bukti yang selama ini sudah

dikumpulkan. Hampir seluruh penelitian menyepakati kesimpulan bahwa menjalankan CSR dengan benar—yaitu yang sesuai dengan definisi CSR arus utama—sebetulnya menguntungkan. Namun, sama dengan berbagai jenis investasi bagus lain, masih banyak perusahaan yang ragu-ragu mengambil keputusan untuk menjalankannya. Karena itu, para aktivis pro-CSR masih terus ditantang untuk menghasilkan bukti. De Groot dan Churet (2009) pasti bukanlah yang terakhir, karena selama belum semua perusahaan "bertobat", maka para aktivis masih akan terus berjuang menghasilkan dan mempresentasikan bukti-bukti yang diperlukan.

Lebih jauh lagi, beberapa peneliti bahkan sudah menyampaikan teori bagaimana hubungan positif keduanya itu timbul. Tahun lalu misalnya, Sirsly dan Lamertz (2008) telah menyimpulkan bahwa hanya apabila sebuah inisiatif CSR itu bersifat centrality, specificity dan visibility sajalah maka perusahaan akan bisa mengambil manfaat optimal. Centrality dimaksudkan bahwa CSR sudah menjadi kebijakan tertinggi perusahaan, sehingga sumberdaya—organisasi, manusia, maupun finansial—yang dibutuhkan untuk melaksanakannya selalu tersedia. Specificity dimaksudkan sebagai CSR yang sesuai dengan bisnis inti dan ditujukan kepada pihak-pihak yang benar-benar merupakan pemangku kepentingan perusahaan. Sementara visibility menyaratkan agar inisiatif CSR benar-benar diketahui oleh para pemangku kepentingan itu, sehingga bisa diterjemahkan menjadi keuntungan reputasional. Kalau ketiganya dipenuhi, maka perusahaan "dijamin" akan mendapati CSR-nya menguntungkan.

Yang juga sangat penting diperhatikan adalah bahwa perusahaan seharusnya tidak melulu memikirkan business case dari menjalankan CSR. Karena bagaimanapun CSR yang baik adalah CSR yang juga menguntungkan pemangku kepentingan. "Business case for CSR" perlu diimbangi dengan "society's case for CSR". Sehingga, perusahaan perlu berpikir keras bagaimana setiap rupiah dan setiap jam yang dicurahkan untuk CSR memang berdampak optimal untuk pemangku kepentingan, selain juga untuk dirinya. Kalau keduanya seimbang, maka barulah bisa dikatakan CSR menjadi alat transformasi bisnis dan masyarakat yang efektif.

CSR yang Inovatif

20 Juli 2009

Selasa 14 Juli 2009 lampau, Sekretariat Indonesia Global Compact Network (IGCN) mengadakan sebuah diskusi bertajuk "Rethinking the Role of Innovative CSR in Advancing Business Growth and Socio-economic Development." Diskusi setengah hari tersebut bertempat di Universitas Katolik Atma Jaya, dengan dua pembicara, Y. W. Junardy (Presiden IGCN) serta Dr. Eric Santosa (Kepala Pusat Studi Ekonomi Kreatif Unika Atma Jaya).

Dalam undangan yang disebar, termaktub latar belakang dari diskusi tersebut: "Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) is not charity. However, most of CSR activities in Indonesia are not more than allocating some amount of money for certain underserved or disadvantaged people. ...As such, CSR activities are more often seen as a burden that impedes the company's growth. ...In contrast, international community sees CSR as important part of business sustainability. ...Business leaders nowadays are faced with the challenge to come up with innovative CSR activities for sustainability of their business and its contribution to economies and societies." Sebuah pengantar diskusi yang sangat bernas dan faktual. Hingga sekarang, sebagian sangat besar perusahaan di Indonesia yang menyatakan dirinya menjalankan CSR memang baru sampai pada tingkat memberikan donasi. Padahal, dalam survei CSR Asia (2007) ditemukan bahwa donasi adalah bentuk paling rendah dari aktivitas yang dianggap sebagai CSR oleh para pemangku kepentingan se-Asia.

Sangat tepat pula pernyataan bahwa aktivitas CSR yang inovatif—yang sekaligus menjamin keberlanjutan bisnis dan menyelesaikan berbagai masalah yang dihadapi masyarakat—merupakan tantangan yang harus dijawab oleh para pebisnis yang memiliki rasa tanggung jawab sosial. Dalam kata-kata Adam Werbach—bekas Presiden termuda Sierra Club yang kini menjadi seorang "corporate activist"—para manajer CSR yang gagal menyatukan kepentingan komersial perusahaan dengan kepentingan masyarakat yang luas pasti akan terpinggirkan. Dalam tajuk artikelnya di majalah *Ethical Corporation* edisi terbaru, ia seakan mengancam, "Reform or Die."

Jadi, bagaimana caranya agar CSR menjadi inovatif, atau (meminjam ungkapan Werbach) agar CSR tak segera menemui ajalnya? Junardy menyarankan agar

perusahaan melongok kemungkinan pasar yang inklusif. Pasar ini—yaitu sumberdaya yang dimiliki oleh masyarakat yang berada di dasar piramida ekonomi—adalah ceruk yang selama ini tak diurus benar oleh perusahaan. Padahal, sebagaimana yang ditunjukkan oleh Muhammad Yunus, CK Prahalad atau Stuart Hart, melayani kepentingan ekonomi mereka sangatlah menguntungkan. Tantangannya adalah bagaimana perusahaan menemukan produk yang benar-benar bermakna untuk meningkatkan kesejahteraan—bukan sekadar konsumsi!—mereka dengan mendapatkan model bisnis yang tepat. Maka, Junardy menyarankan kita untuk belajar baik-baik dari Grameen Bank serta konsep Bottom of Pyramid untuk membuat berbagai aktivitas CSR yang sekaligus menguntungkan perusahaan.

Santosa lain lagi pemikirannya. Meminjam pemikiran dari artikel seminal karya Porter dan Kramer (2006), ia menyarankan perusahaan untuk melakukan value chain analysis terhadap masyarakat sekitar terlebih dahulu sebelum membuat berbagai aktivitas CSR. Kalau itu dilakukan, maka perusahaan akan mengetahui kondisi sosial, budaya dan ekonomi masyarakat sekitar, sehingga memungkinkan aktivitas CSR yang mengikutsertakan masyarakat dalam partisipasi penuh. Tapi dalam hal apa aktivitas itu dilakukan? Menurut Santosa, dalam aktivitas "...that introduce a little more advance form of activity systems." Ini berarti bahwa perusahaan menjadi agen perubahan sosial yang strategis, yang tidak bermaksud dengan sekonyong-konyong mengubah kehidupan masyarakat setempat dalam loncatan kebudayaan yang konyol—sebagaimana yang ditunjukkan oleh banyak perusahaan selama ini.

Memfokuskan diri pada kelompok masyarakat rentan, dan berusaha menjadi agen perubahan sosial yang sabar dan telaten tampaknya merupakan jawaban yang diajukan oleh kedua pembicara atas pertanyaan di atas. Itu juga jawaban yang pernah diajukan oleh Michael Hopkins dalam *CSR and International Development* (2007). Jadi, hampir pasti bahwa jawaban itu benar adanya. Dan, kalau begitu, perusahaan-perusahaan di Indonesia yang kecenderungan donasinya masih besar sangat perlu belajar banyak. Semoga saja mereka bisa belajar dengan cepat.

Carmakers Eager for 'Green' Incentives

27 Juli 2009

Sumber : <http://www.thejakartapost.com/news/2009/07/27/carmakers-eager-%E2%80%98green%E2%80%99-incentives.htm>

Jakarta - The planned fiscal incentives to encourage the production of eco-friendly low-cost vehicles will take effect in 2012 as the need to address climate change issues by lowering carbon emissions and pollution becomes more pressing, an official says. "The government will provide fiscal incentives to produce eco-friendly low-cost cars in 2012 as part of its targets to minimize carbon emissions and pollution," the Industry Ministry's director general for transportation, telecommunication and informatics industries Budi Darmadi said on Sunday.

"The incentives are still being discussed. We are still determining the criteria for the technical and performance aspects of the low-cost automobiles," he said. Budi's remarks confirmed the acting Coordinating Minister for the Economy Sri Mulyani Indrawati's statements last Friday regarding Indonesia's desperate need for low-cost automobiles with carbon emission reduction and fuel efficiency friendly technologies. "The government will foster a business climate conducive to these efforts by supporting regulations and import tariffs," she

said. Car manufacturers have long said the lack of incentives was partly responsible for making eco-friendly automobiles relatively more expensive than ordinary cars. By comparison, eco-friendly cars like hybrids cost above Rp 550 million each, while the cost of a multi-purpose vehicle (MPV) for instance ranges from Rp 100 million to Rp 250 million.

Toyota, Mitsubishi and Honda have launched several models of hybrid cars in Japan and the US since the late 1990s. In Indonesia, PT Toyota Astra Motor recently launched the Indonesian version of its new best-selling hybrid car model, the New Prius, which boasts higher mileage and lower emissions with a price tag of Rp 585 million.

PT Toyota Astra Motor marketing director Joko Trisanyoto said his company would welcome the financial incentives. "We have in fact been urging the government to give incentives to produce low-cost eco-friendly vehicles," he said. Gunadi Sindhuwinata, president director of Indomobil, said the incentives could be the catalyst to lowering the high prices of eco-friendly cars. "People want to buy

quality cars at affordable prices, which are expected to be lower than the current prices," he said.

Gunadi said the eco-friendly-based technology cost twice as much as much as the ordinary one. The high cost of hybrid technology also has an impact on truck manufacturers in the country. "We don't sell hybrid trucks like the Mitsubishi Fuso Canter Eco Hybrid truck here because of the high production cost," said Intan Vidiyari, spokesperson for PT Krama Yudha Tiga Berlian Motors, an authorized distributor of Mitsubishi Motors and Mitsubishi Fuso Trucks.

The Fuso hybrid models have been sold in Japan and Europe since 2006. Krama Yudha registered the highest share of truck sales in 2008, with 60.2 percent of total domestic sales. The Indonesian Automotive Industry Association (Gaikindo) said car sales in 2009 were expected to reach 450,000 units, down by 34 percent from a year earlier due to the impact of the global financial crisis.

Mekanisme Ganti Tegakan Pohon Harus Berlaku

23 Juli 2009

Sumber :

<http://koran.kompas.com/read/xml/2009/07/23/03560833/mekanisme.ganti.tegakan.pohon.harus.berlaku>

Jakarta - Pemerintah harus memberlakukan mekanisme pembayaran tegakan pohon di kawasan hutan yang dicadangkan untuk kegiatan budidaya perkebunan. Langkah ini akan mendorong investor yang telah memperoleh izin hak guna usaha atas tanah dari kawasan hutan,

serius untuk berinvestasi. Direktur Eksekutif Greenomics Indonesia Elfian Effendi di Jakarta, Rabu (22/7), mengatakan, mekanisme ini harus diterapkan untuk seluruh jenis investasi yang memanfaatkan areal kawasan hutan. "Selain mendapat pemasukan baru, cara ini juga membuat investor tidak

menelantarkan izin HGU yang sudah didapat," ujar Elfian. Pemerintah mencadangkan 32,1 juta hektar hutan produksi yang bisa dikonversi (HPK) dan saat ini tersisa 13,8 juta hektar.

Untuk perkebunan, Dephut sudah mencadangkan areal seluas 8,8 juta

hektar. Sampai Desember 2008, Dephut sudah melepaskan 4,6 juta hektar HPK dan 2,4 juta hektar di antaranya sudah memiliki izin HGU. Akan tetapi, Dephut menyesalkan baru 1,6 juta hektar yang ditanam komoditas perkebunan dan sisanya masih telantar. Untuk itu, Greenomics Indonesia mendesak pemerintah segera menetapkan tarif atas tegakan pohon dalam areal yang sedang dimohon investor. "Sudah bukan rahasia lagi ada pengusaha yang memohon izin pemakaian lahan di kawasan hutan untuk mengambil keuntungan dari tegakan kayu dengan dalih ingin membuka perkebunan kelapa sawit," ujar Elfian.

Jual-beli sertifikat HGU

Kondisi ini diperburuk dengan alih fungsi kawasan hutan menjadi

perkebunan tanpa melalui prosedur. Direktur Pengukuhan dan Penatagunaan Kawasan Hutan Dephut Dwi Sudharto menegaskan, praktik seperti ini banyak terjadi di daerah. Pengusaha yang telah memegang izin prinsip usaha perkebunan dari kepala daerah kerap langsung menebang pohon sebelum izin pelepasan hak kawasan hutan dari Menteri Kehutanan terbit.

Hal ini melanggar Undang-Undang Nomor 41 Tahun 1999 tentang Kehutanan dan UU Nomor 26/2007 tentang Penataan Ruang "Bagi yang melanggar tentu harus menjalani konsekuensi hukum karena aturan melarang pemutihan (perkebunan yang merambah hutan). Dampak ekonomi terlalu besar memang (akibat penegakan hukum)," ujar

Dwi. Direktur Penatagunaan Tanah Badan Pertanahan Nasional Iwan Isa menegaskan, BPN akan menarik izin HGU atas tanah yang telantar. BPN juga bersikap tegas terhadap investor yang menelantarkan tanah. BPN menyesalkan praktik jual-beli sertifikat HGU yang sudah terbit. Untuk itu, BPN akan lebih mengedepankan optimalisasi tanah yang ada ketimbang menerbitkan izin untuk areal baru.

Secara terpisah, Sekretaris Jenderal Asosiasi Petani Kelapa Sawit Indonesia (Apkasindo) Asmar Arsjad mendesak pemerintah lebih serius mendukung sertifikasi lahan petani. "Pemerintah pusat harus meningkatkan komunikasi dengan daerah agar program sertifikasi lahan petani bisa lebih efektif," ujar Asmar Arsjad.

Freeport's Human Rights Problem in Indonesia

20 Juli 2009

Sumber : http://www.csr-asia.com/weekly_detail.php?id=11754

Three deaths over the weekend have again shone a spotlight on Freeport's human rights problem in Indonesia. Sitting atop the largest reserves of gold in the world, the company's Grasberg gold and copper mine has become – according to one human rights activist – a 'magnet' for violence. Human Rights Working Group head Rafendi Djamin told AFP this week that 'It's difficult to speculate on any scenario behind the weekend attacks. But one thing is for sure: they are part of a wave of violence in Papua over the last six months. (The attacks) are heavily politically tainted, but from which side we don't know.'

Two workers of Arizona-based mining giant Freeport McMoRan, including Drew Nicholas Grant a 29-year-old Australian technician, were shot dead by unidentified attackers on the weekend, and Marson Freddy Pattipeilohy, a policeman, was found dead on

Monday after fleeing an ambush the day before. A police spokesman in Jakarta said he fell to his death but a policeman in the field said he appeared to have been stabbed. Freeport, which has made billions of dollars from the Grasberg mine in Indonesia's Papua region, has consistently faced human rights accusations over its use of local security forces. The Freeport mine has been targeted by the separatist Organisasi Papua Merdeka (Free Papua Movement, OPM) for years, but the company's history of paying Indonesian security forces for protection has only provided extra incentive, say observers, for security forces to attack the mine.

According to an AFP report (14 July), the company continues to pay for the allowances of troops guarding its mine, despite government rules designed to get the military out of the security business. The reports says that Freeport admitted to AFP that it

paid less than 1.6 million dollars, out of an overall eight million dollars in "support costs" to the security forces, to provide a "monthly allowance" for 1,850 police and soldiers during 2008. An article published in the academic and peer-reviewed South East Asia Research during 2008 alleged the Indonesian authorities and American investigators colluded to cover up military involvement in a 2002 attack in which two American schoolteachers and one Indonesian colleague died. The deaths were officially blamed on OPM rebels, but some rights groups and academics allege a military hand in the killings. With an Australian killed in the most recent attack, Indonesia has granted access to Australian investigators investigating the death, but Human Rights Watch analyst Andreas Harsono says a transparent investigation will be difficult. 'Foreign investigators are needed but they have to work

harder than the FBI back in 2002," he said.

Indonesian Human Rights Monitor (Imparsial) has urged the government to seriously investigate the weekend's attacks and not immediately jump to the conclusion that the OPM is responsible. 'We ask security forces not to so hastily place the blame on the OPM before it is legally proven,' Imparsial's director of external relations, Poengky Indarti, told a press conference earlier this week.

As reported by the Business & Human Rights Resource Centre, Freeport is a defendant in a legal suit filed in the US. In 1996 Tom Beanal, a leader of the Amungme people of West Papua, filed suit against Freeport in a US federal court. The same year, Yosefa Alomang also filed suit against Freeport in Louisiana state court. Beanal alleged that Freeport was complicit in human rights abuses committed against him and the Amungme people by security forces employed by Freeport; the human rights violations alleged were surveillance, mental torture, death threats and house arrest.

Beanal also alleged that Freeport's mining operations resulted in "cultural genocide" by destroying the Amungme's habitat and religious symbols. The district court dismissed the case in 1998 on the basis that the environmental and human rights abuses alleged by Beanal were not violations of the "law of nations". Beanal appealed this ruling, but the court of appeals affirmed the lower court's dismissal of the case in 1999. In the Louisiana state court case, Alomang alleged that Freeport had engaged in human rights and environmental violations through its corporate policies and conduct at its Grasberg mine in West Papua. She claimed relief under Louisiana state tort law. Alomang's case was dismissed by the state court in 2000 for failure to state an actionable claim against Freeport.

Freeport has always denied knowledge of abuses, but in 2003 the company requested an outside non-profit to conduct an independent human rights audit of its Papuan mining complex. A report of the International Center for Corporate Accountability Inc. (ICCA), was released in 2005 (and

is still available online). The report detailed a raft of problems, but claimed that the egregious military abuses had stopped. In a formal reply to the audit, Freeport acknowledged the problems and vowed to address them. 'We haven't accepted all the recommendations because some aren't culturally the right way to go about it, but the findings are right,' said Stan Batey, then Freeport's senior adviser on community relations.

No other global mining or oil company has come close to such transparency, and the question now must surely be what the company will do under a new round of scrutiny that will inevitably result from the latest murders. The Freeport human rights audit was – and still is – regarded as a benchmark in the area. It is often cited as an example of how companies that are willing can open up even in the most challenging environments. It will be interesting to see how the company responds and what actions it can take in a human rights environment that is one of the most challenging in the world.

Many CSR Loans go to Wrong SMEs

17 Juli 2009

Sumber : <http://www.thejakartapost.com/channel/business>

Corporate social responsibility (CSR) funds used to finance small and medium enterprises (SMEs) have mostly been given to the wrong SMEs, said Santi Susanti of the Indonesian Chamber of Commerce and Industry (Kadin) on Thursday. "Many private and state companies want to provide soft loans for SMEs as part of their CSR programs. Yet, they do not closely scrutinize the program's implementation," Santi, vice-chairwoman of Kadin's Tasikmalaya chapter, told The Jakarta Post after attending a seminar about CSR.

Under Indonesian law, private companies are obliged to carry out CSR programs. State-owned companies are also bound by the law to carry out CSR programs known as Partnership Programs and Community Development (PKLB). "In my personal opinion, the policy to make CSR programs mandatory is a good policy. However, most companies currently view CSR as an obligation rather than a responsibility. Based on my observation, companies are becoming less responsible in carrying out CSR programs such as in the case of SMEs loans." State Minister of State Enterprises Sofyan

Djalil, as reported by Antara, said this year the ministry aimed to give soft loans worth Rp 1.6 trillion through PKLB.

Many private companies are also doing similar programs. Yet both government and the private sector have not done enough to inform the availability of the soft-loans to small and medium entrepreneurs, Santi said. "Some entrepreneurs who did not really need the soft loans got them several times. On the other hand, the ones who really need it, did not know how to acquire it," said Santi who also manages a medium handicraft

company in Tasikmalaya. "I wonder why the companies who provide loans keep on making the same mistakes.

Maybe they are just too lazy to do their research before distributing loans." Ron Perkinson, the Chief Executive Director of Putra Sampoerna Foundation, also

stressed the importance of society stakeholders in implementing CSR programs. "Based on my experience, when you want to do a CSR program in a region, you better speak first with the people who will take part in the program. Ask them what they really need, tell them what your company is willing to do, and ask for the society's support.

"After having this support, the company could tell the regional administration about the program." Perkinson said he did not suggest talking to the regional administration as a first step since regional administration tend to have "different mindsets.

Gagal Panen Diduga karena Penambang

17 Juli 2009

Sumber : <http://koran.kompas.com/read/xml/2009/07/17/04500554/gagal.panen.diduga.karena.penambangan>

Samarinda - Warga Kecamatan Bentian Besar, Kabupaten Kutai Barat, Kalimantan Timur, mengancam akan menghentikan aktivitas perusahaan pertambangan batu bara PT Trubaindo Coal Mining. Penyebabnya, perusahaan belum melunasi ganti rugi lahan dan tanaman serta belum membangun instalasi air bersih seperti yang dijanjikan. Kepala Adat Bentian Besar Rusli Remusa Bae mengatakan hal itu saat dihubungi dari Kota Samarinda, Rabu (8/7).

Rusli mengatakan, sekitar 5.500 hektar lahan adat warga diganti rugi oleh perusahaan Rp 10 juta per hektar. Namun, warga mendapat berkas laporan program tanggung jawab sosial perusahaan untuk Grup Banpu, induk usaha Trubaindo, yang menyatakan, ganti rugi lahan Rp 40 juta per hektar. "Yang Rp 30 juta per hektar, menurut laporan, diberikan kepada aparat Pemerintah Kabupaten Kutai Barat. Kami sudah konfirmasi serta

dibantah bupati dan anggota DPRD," kata Rusli.

Menurut Rusli, warga belakangan mengetahui, pembukaan lahan untuk ditambang juga bermasalah. Pembabatan hutan dengan luas minimal 5.000 hektar harus disetujui DPR. "Dalam penelusuran kami, DPR belum memberikan persetujuan. Pemanfaatan kayu hasil pembabatan juga tidak dilengkapi izin," katanya. Selain itu, perusahaan belum merealisasikan janji membangun instalasi air bersih untuk 1.500 warga Dayak Bentian di Kampung Penarung, Dilang Puti, dan Suakong. Rusli mengatakan, warga telah mengirim surat kepada Presiden, Polri, dan DPR, tetapi belum direspons. Perusahaan juga tidak bersedia bertemu warga. "Kalau tidak ada respons, sesuai pilpres kami akan menutup aktivitas Trubaindo," katanya. Kepala Kepolisian Resor Kutai Barat Ajun Komisariss Besar I Wayan Sunartha yang dihubungi

terpisah mengatakan belum menerima laporan dari warga.

Hingga berita ini dibuat, PT Trubaindo belum bisa dihubungi. Nomor telepon seluler pemimpin perusahaan atas nama Chirasak Cantanapelin tidak aktif. Koordinator Jaringan Advokasi Tambang (Jatam) Kaltim Kahar Al Bahri mendukung rencana warga. Namun, ia berharap aksi tidak berbuntut kekisruhan.

Trubaindo adalah satu dari lima anak perusahaan PT Indo Tambangraya Megah Tbk. Trubaindo yang didirikan pada 13 Maret 1990 memiliki areal konsesi batu bara 23.650 hektar meliputi Kecamatan Muara Lawa, Bentian Besar, Muara Pahu, dan Damai di Kutai Barat. Produksi batu baranya berkalori tinggi, yakni 6.500-7.300 kilokalori per kilogram. Produksi pada tahun 2008 mencapai 4,5 juta ton.

Amdal Perlu Diperkuat di Lapangan

16 Juli 2009

Sumber : <http://koran.kompas.com/read/xml/2009/07/16/04254545/amdal.perlu.diperkuat.di.lapangan>

Jakarta - Efektivitas dokumen analisis mengenai dampak lingkungan menjadi salah satu sorotan dalam pertemuan sejumlah unsur pimpinan perguruan tinggi dengan anggota Komisi VII DPR, Rabu (15/7). Masih ada kesempatan memperbaiki

ketentuan dalam RUU Pengelolaan Lingkungan Hidup. "Amdal selama ini tak dijadikan instrumen penting karena banyak hal. Mata rantai amdal perlu diperbaiki," kata wakil dari Universitas Diponegoro, Sudharto P Hadi, dalam rapat dengar pendapat umum dengan

Komisi VII DPR di Jakarta, kemarin. Selain Undip, hadir wakil dari Institut Pertanian Bogor, Institut Teknologi Sepuluh Nopember Surabaya, Institut Teknologi Bandung, Universitas Gadjah Mada, dan Universitas Padjajaran. Satu-satunya yang tidak datang adalah

wakil dari Universitas Indonesia.

Menurut Sudharto, mata rantai tersebut mulai dari perencanaan, penyusunan, hingga pemantauan. Selama ini amdal berhenti pada dokumen dengan pemantauan lemah. Pelanggaran fatal, yaitu mulai dari praktik menyalin amdal hingga tak menerapkannya, tidak ada sanksi. Akibatnya, terjadi kerusakan lingkungan masif di seluruh Indonesia. "Selama RUU PLH ini tak kuat mengaturnya, UU baru itu tak akan berbeda dengan UU No 23/1997," kata Kepala Pusat Studi Lingkungan UGM Eko Sugiarto, yang belasan tahun

menangani isu lingkungan di lapangan. Ia mengusulkan perubahan kalimat "wajib memiliki dokumen amdal untuk memperoleh izin melakukan usaha dan/atau kegiatan" pada Pasal 14 (1). Kata "memiliki" tanpa penegasan mengharuskan penerapannya di lapangan dengan ancaman sanksi dipastikan tidak akan efektif, seperti selama ini.

Daya dukung terlampaui

Kajian lingkungan terbaru di bawah Menko Perekonomian menunjukkan, daya dukung lingkungan Pulau Jawa sudah terlampaui. Sebanyak 13 UU yang

mengatur sumber daya alam tumpang tindih dan saling menegasikan. "UU yang kuat sangat dibutuhkan melihat kondisi sekarang. Namun, jangan sampai waktu pembahasan yang terbatas justru jadi masalah pada kemudian hari," kata Rektor IPB Herry Suhardiyanto. Wakil dari ITS menilai saatnya ada UU lingkungan yang tak menakut-nakuti iklim investasi, tetapi bukan berarti lemah.(GSA)

Indonesia Issues World's First Rules on Forestry Credit Revenue-Sharing

14 Juli 2009

Sumber: <http://www.businessgreen.com/business-green/news/2245944/indonesia-issues-world-first>

Indonesia has become the first country to release rules governing revenue-sharing for forest carbon projects under the UN-led Reduced Emissions from Deforestation and Degradation (REDD) mechanism. Under the new rules, between 10 and 50 per cent of all carbon credit earnings generated from forest protection projects would go to the government, with the allocation divided between national, municipal and provincial jurisdictions.

Meanwhile, between 20 and 70 per cent of the revenues would go to local forest communities, with the ratio split between the government and local communities dependent on the type of forest. The rules expand on Indonesia's existing regulations governing REDD, which the government formally enacted in

May, making it the first country to do so. The regulations specify who can carry out a REDD project and spell out what types of forest are eligible. It allows for foreign entities to team up with a local partner to develop a REDD project, which could run for 30 years and possibly be extended. Meanwhile, a national REDD commission would work to vet projects, ensuring they deliver real quantifiable carbon emission reductions. According to the World Bank, there are about 20 Indonesian forest carbon projects in various stages of development under REDD.

According to some studies, Indonesia ranks as the world's third-largest emitter of carbon dioxide, after China and the US, largely as a result of the large number of forest fires set each year

on peat lands to clear the way for palm oil plantations. While research by Australia's Applied Environmental Decision Analysis has surmised that issuing carbon credits to palm oil to protect rainforests could help prevent deforestation, Greenpeace has taken a different view, arguing that forests in tropical nations such as Indonesia would be better protected if industrialised countries contributed to a global fund that would pay for forest conservation projects.

Last month, the US signed a deal to cancel \$30m in debt owed by Indonesia, in return for a commitment to protect tropical rainforests on Sumatra Island. It is the largest debt-for-nature swap to date under the US Tropical Forest Conservation Act.

Catatan dari Penembakan di Jalur Timika-Tembagapura

Taufik Rahman

Aktivis Lingkar Studi CSR

Atas kejadian penembakan di jalur Timika-Tembagapura yang menewaskan sejumlah karyawan PT Freeport, analisa dan pemberitaan media mengarahkan kasus itu sebagai bukan sebagai soal kriminal murni.

Kendati semua pihak tampak sepakat bahwa semua kesimpulan dan keterangan harus menunggu hasil investigasi kepolisian, namun opini publik setidaknya mengarah pada tiga asumsi besar: *Pertama*, kejadian itu berhubungan dengan soal konflik klasik tentang soal peralihan kue "jasa" keamanan objek vital nasional antara TNI dan POLRI; *Kedua*, penembakan itu dialamatkan sebagai aktivitas gerakan Organisasi Papua Merdeka (OPM); *Ketiga*, soal sejarah hubungan antara Freeport dengan masyarakat adat Papua yang masih penuh dengan tinta merah.

Dari perkembangan berita di Media, ketiga arus asumsi itu masih tampak dominan. Penemuan puluhan dan mungkin ratusan peluru buatan pindad, penangkapan sejumlah karyawan Freeport yang diduga terlibat dalam aksi penembakan yang berimplikasi kemungkinan adanya analisis hubungan tidak harmonis antara karyawan lokal dan non-lokal, merupakan kerangka yang tampak masih dipertahankan. Belum ada ketegasan bahwa kejadian itu adalah sebuah tindakan kriminal yang menandakan lemah dan "gagal"-nya aparat keamanan di lingkungan Freeport yang terkenal sangat ketat.

Freeport memang hingga kini masih menyisakan soal warisan masa lalu mengenai "perampasan" wilayah adat. Kendati pada saat yang bersamaan Freeport telah banyak berkontribusi bagi kemajuan Papua dan Indonesia, namun catatan sejarah kelam ini hingga kini masih belum bisa terhapus dengan sempurna. Dan mungkin, jika memerhatikan pola pikir dan budaya masyarakat adat Papua, apalagi berkenaan dengan penghilangan nyawa, sepertinya tidak akan pernah mendapatkan titik temu dan kesepakatan penyelesaian masalah yang tuntas.

Timika dan Tembagapura sendiri jelas menjadi sebuah kota yang relatif jauh lebih maju dan lebih modern dibandingkan wilayah lain di Papua adalah berkat Freeport. Pun dengan dinamika dan arus perputaran ekonomi di wilayah itu yang sedemikian kencang. Kendati demikian, demikianlah Papua. Suka atau tidak suka, memang pembangunan Papua masih

menyisakan soal perubahan kultur yang masih memerlukan waktu teramat panjang. Baik berupa perubahan dari dari kultur tribal menuju ke kultur yang lebih maju, apalagi perubahan kultur menjadi masyarakat industri yang diujakan dan ditampilkan oleh kerja Freeport.

Semuanya, bisa saling beradu pendapat bahwa Freeport telah berkorban sedemikian banyak—dengan tentunya juga sudah meraup untung yang tak terhingga, versus pengorbanan yang tiada terhingga pula dari masyarakat adat Papua. Belum lagi jika dihubungkan dengan masih lemah dan masih jauhnya kinerja pemerintah daerah yang menurut pengamatan banyak pihak masih jauh dari pemenuhan standar minimal. Operasi Freeport di Papua, memang berada di *remote area*, lengkap dengan berbagai dinamika sosial-budaya yang teramat unik.

Terlepas dari itu semua, kejadian penembakan dan kembali menjadikan Timika-Tembagapura menjadi wilayah dan jalur yang mengerikan, pastilah merupakan sebuah tragedi. Dan penjelasan akan itu semua, sepertinya akan tetap menjadi sebuah misteri. Pastilah akan banyak versi dan pada akhirnya bisa jadi akan menguap begitu saja.

Freeport sendiri sepertinya tidak akan mungkin mengeluarkan ancaman untuk hengkang dari Papua. Hingga kini wilayah Papua bagi Freeport masih tampak sebagai gunung es emas, intan dan bahkan mungkin uranium yang baru tergal di permukaannya saja. Sebaliknya pemerintah Indonesia juga sepertinya masih memiliki pandangan bahwa kematian yang terjadi di bulan Juli di jalur Timika-Tembagapura, tidak menjadi alasan kuat untuk mengusir operasi Freeport di Papua. Publik juga sepertinya tidak akan bisa banyak berharap memperoleh kejelasan yang memuaskan atas kejadian yang mengenaskan itu. Semuanya akan terancam mengambang.

Sepertinya semua pihak hanya akan bermain di level penjelasan umum yang multiinterpretasi. Bahwa Freeport masih memiliki agenda besar tentang pemahaman kultur masyarakat adat Papua. Pun dengan para penegak hukum. Mengapa? Penganiayaan dan apalagi peristiwa pembunuhan di

lingkungan masyarakat adat Papua, pastilah memiliki alasan-alasan kultural yang kuat. Dan kejadian seperti ini, di masyarakat adat Papua, alih-alih terjadi

penyelesaian masalah yang tuntas, biasanya lebih sering menyisakan dendam dan memori penderitaan yang berkepanjangan

Info

CSR ASIA

Corporate Social Responsibility in Asia
Business Solutions for Global Challenges

Community Investment Round Table (CIRT)?

CSR Asia has launched the Community Investment Round Table (CIRT), working with companies and other stakeholders to take community investment in Asia to a new level. The Roundtable is designed for those people working in companies who take responsibility for community investment, community engagement and partnership related activities.

Purpose

- Share and disseminate best practice on community investment and corporate community impact in Asia. The roundtable will support companies at a regional and at a local level in markets throughout the region with an initial launch in Hong Kong, Malaysia and Singapore. It is a confidential space for companies to share good and bad practice and potentially identify opportunities where collaboration may be a possibility.
- Develop and refine tools and methodology for measurement: The roundtable will build upon tools such as the LBG model and support members with the application of the LBG for valuing community investment. We will move beyond valuing inputs to further develop tools and best practice for impact measurement.

Next Community Investment Round Table (CIRT)

Hong Kong - 10 September 2009

Topic: Challenges and opportunities for skills-based volunteering

Pre-registration required.

Who will attend the Summit?

- CEOs, directors and managers from various sectors and industries across Asia including extractive, manufacturing, apparel, electronics, utilities, logistics, information technology, agriculture, risk consultancies, service sectors and financial and educational institutions
- CSR/ Environmental/ Community Investment/ SRI/ compliance directors and managers
- Companies, NGOs and governments looking to update themselves on the latest CSR developments

For more info, please visit: <http://www.csr-asia.com/CDF/index>.

CR or CSR – Does it Matter?

Rikke Netterstrom

CSR Asia Weekly Vol 2/29

Tanggal 23 Juli 2009

Sumber: http://www.csr-asia.com/weekly_detail.php?id=11741

The one question I am asked at every talk I give, and every training session I conduct, is “what is the difference between Corporate Responsibility (CR) and Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR)”. There seem to be a notion that there is somehow a philosophical divide between the two – with CR being the more “strategic” of the two. My plain response is always that as far as I’m concerned there should be no difference. CSR/CR is about running a responsible business; taking responsibility for the potential adverse impacts of your business and attempting to enhance the positive aspects. A responsible business should minimize its environmental impacts and create good, safe employment opportunities; it should work to ensure that communities benefit from the company’s operations, and that investors’ long-term interests are served; that its customers receive high quality services and products; and so on.

In certain industries and countries, CR/CSR is described as Corporate Citizenship, Sustainability or similar labels. I am sure that each company has a reason for using these terms. They might resonate better with the company’s internal stakeholders, or they might reference a certification standard or a customer requirement. Ultimately, however, the practices and outcomes should be the same, regardless of the label. A responsible business is a sustainable business and vice versa. A company that acts as a good corporate citizen takes responsibility for its people, community and the natural environment in the short, medium and long term.

A Dangerous Obsession

I suppose that academics could argue the finer points of the use of language, but to use Paul Krugman’s controversial phrase, I think the discussion on labels is “a dangerous obsession” and can be counterproductive. It takes away from the real debate; that is, “what is good CSR?” It also leads to some very problematic outcomes.

Here in Malaysia, many companies seem to equate CSR with philanthropy or community donations. Likewise, sustainability is often linked to environmental management. This means that companies can receive CSR awards for “giving back to the community” while at the same time engaging

in highly unsustainable environmental practices in their day-to-day operations. In my view, awards can be extremely useful in helping raise the bar, as a means of internal leverage and a tool to promote examples of good practice. I have no problem with awards for good environmental performance or outstanding community work. But awarding blanket CSR awards to companies that do not reach at least a minimum standard across all key aspects of CSR will encourage greenwash and cherry picking.

Another issue that the label-debate raises is responsibility, governance and communications. I often come across companies that I know have excellent sustainability standards, but that fail to address these in their corporate communications and reports. This is usually because the Communications Department or Company Secretary is in charge of “CSR”, while the operational teams are responsible for “sustainability”. So a high-impact company that has invested significantly in environmental management systems and certification might fail to address this, and instead spend several pages in its annual report discussing a small project to plant trees. This can lead stakeholders to (wrongly) assume that the company is not addressing its impacts. At CSR Asia, we have seen this to be the case in much of our research; both the CSR Asia Business Barometer and a survey carried out for Bursa Malaysia in 2007 arrived at this conclusion. Many companies who we know to perform well scored poorly due to a lack of relevant disclosure. Some might argue that this is unfair to companies and that focusing on disclosure is a flawed methodology. However, I think that a company’s disclosure is also reflective of its governance and the extent to which CSR is embedded in company strategy. If the communications department and company secretaries do not understand what is really happening in the company they are poorly placed to communicate with key stakeholders, such as customers and investors. In all likelihood, the Board of Directors is also likely to have a similarly limited understanding of the sustainability impacts and performance of its operations.

Through almost 15 years of working in “CSR”, I have used a variety of labels, including Social Responsibility, Sustainability, Values, CSR and CR.

However, the name has always seemed more a communications question than a question of substance. But my ultimate goal was always to reach a stage where such labels were no longer used. I work in the hope that one day, all companies are

sustainable, responsible, and good corporate citizens, which report on their impacts on society as a matter of course; without the need for fancy names. That day is still a long way off. But in the meantime, let's cut the semantics and get to work!

Pulling Yourself Off the Ground By Your Whiskers

George Monbiot

Tanggal 14 Juli 2009

Sumber: <http://www.monbiot.com/archives/2009/07/14/pulling-yourself-off-the-ground-by-your-whiskers/>

Well at least that clears up the mystery. Over the past year I've been fretting over an intractable contradiction. The government has promised spectacular cuts in greenhouse gas emissions. It is also pushing through new roads and runways, approving coal-burning power stations, bailing out motor manufacturers and ditching its regulations for low-carbon homes. How can these policies be reconciled?

We will find out tomorrow, when it publishes a series of papers on carbon reduction. According to a person who has read the drafts, the new policies will include buying up to 50% of the reduction from abroad. If this is true, it means that the UK will not cut its greenhouse gases by 80% by 2050, as the government promised. It means it will cut them by 40%. Offsetting half our emissions (which means paying other countries to cut them on our behalf) makes a mockery of the government's climate change programme. The figure might have changed between the draft and final documents, but let's take it at face value for the moment, to see what happens when rich nations offload their obligations. What I am about to explain is the simple mathematical reason why any largescale programme of offsets is unjust, contradictory and ultimately impossible.

Last week the G8 summit adopted the UK's two key targets: it proposed that developed countries should reduce their greenhouse gases by 80% by 2050 to prevent more than two degrees of global warming(1). This meant that it also adopted the UK's key contradiction, as there is no connection between these two aims. An 80% cut is very unlikely to prevent two degrees of warming; in fact it's not even the right measure, as I'll explain later on. But let's work out what happens if the other rich nations adopt both the UK's targets and its draft approach to carbon offsets.

Please bear with me on this: the point is an important one. There are some figures involved, but I'll use only the most basic arithmetic, which anyone with a calculator can reproduce.

The G8 didn't explain what it meant by "developed countries", but I'll assume it was referring to the nations listed in Annex 1 of the Kyoto Protocol: in other words, those which have promised to limit their greenhouse gases by 2012. (If it meant the OECD nations, the results are very similar). To keep this simple and consistent, I'll consider just the carbon emissions from burning fossil fuels, as listed by US Energy Information Administration(2). It doesn't publish figures for Monaco and Lichtenstein, but we can forgive that. The 38 remaining Annex 1 countries produce 14982 million tonnes of CO₂, or 51% of global emissions. Were they to do as the UK proposes, cutting this total by 80% and offsetting half of it, they would have to buy reductions equal to 20.5% of the world's total carbon production.

This means that other countries would need to cut 42% of their emissions just to absorb our carbon offsets. But the G8 has also adopted another of the UK's targets: a global cut of 50% by 2050. Fifty per cent of world production is 14598mt. If the Annex 1 countries reduce their emissions by 80% (including offsets), they will trim global output by 11986 million tonnes. The other countries must therefore find further cuts of 2612mt. Added to the offsets they've sold, this means that their total obligation is 8581 million tonnes, or 60% of their current emissions.

So here's the outcome. The rich nations, if they follow the UK's presumed lead, will cut their carbon pollution by 40%. The poorer nations will cut their carbon pollution by 60%.

If global justice means anything, the rich countries must make deeper cuts than the poor. We have the most to cut and can best afford to forego opportunities for development. If nations like the UK

cannot make deep reductions, no one can. We could, as I showed in my book *Heat*, reduce emissions by 90% without seriously damaging our quality of life(3). But this carries a political price. Business must be asked to write off sunk costs, people must be asked to make minor changes in the way they live. This country appears to be doing what it has done throughout colonial and post-colonial history: dumping its political problems overseas, rather than confronting them at home.

Befuddled yet? I haven't explained the half of it. As the G8 leaders know, a global cut of 50% offers only a faint-to-non-existent chance of meeting their ultimate objective: preventing more than two degrees of warming. In its latest summary of climate science, published in 2007, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change suggested that a high chance of preventing more than two degrees of warming requires a global cut of 85% by 2050(4). In drafting the climate change act, the UK government promised to keep matching the target to the science. It has already raised its cut from 60% to 80% by 2050. If it sticks to its promise it will have to raise it again.

Global average CO2 emissions are 4.48 tonnes per person per year. Cutting the world total by 85% means reducing this to 0.672t. Average per capita output in the 38 Annex 1 countries is 9.98 tonnes: to hit this target they must cut their emissions by 93.3% by 2050. If the rich persist in offsetting 50% of this cut, the poorer countries would have to reduce their emissions by 6989mt to absorb our offsets. To meet a global average of 0.672t, they would also need to chop their own output by a further 10838mt. This means a total cut of 17827mt, or 125% of their current emissions. I hope you have spotted the flaw. In fact, even the IPCC's proposal has been superseded. Two recent papers in *Nature* show that the measure which counts is not the proportion of current emissions produced on a certain date, but the total amount of greenhouse gases we release(5,6). An 85% cut by 2050 could produce completely different outcomes. If most of the cut took place at the beginning of the period, our cumulative emissions would be quite low. If, as the US Waxman-Markey bill

proposes, it takes place towards the end, they would be much higher. To deliver a high chance of preventing two degrees of warming, we would need to cut global emissions by something like 10% by the end of next year and 25% by 2012(7). This is a challenge that no government is yet prepared to accept.

Carbon offsetting makes sense if you are seeking a global cut of 5% between now and forever. It is the cheapest and quickest way of achieving an insignificant reduction. But as soon as you seek substantial cuts, it becomes an unfair, impossible nonsense, the equivalent of pulling yourself off the ground by your whiskers. Yes, let us help poorer nations to reduce deforestation and clean up pollution. But let us not pretend that it lets us off the hook.

www.monbiot.com

References:

1. G8, 2009. Responsible Leadership For A Sustainable Future. http://www.g8italia2009.it/static/G8_Allegato/G8_Declaration_08_07_09_final.0.pdf
2. <http://www.eia.doe.gov/environment.html>
3. George Monbiot, 2007. *Heat: how to stop the planet burning*. Penguin, London.
4. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, 2007. Fourth Assessment Report. Climate Change 2007: Synthesis Report. Summary for Policymakers, Table SPM.6. http://www.ipcc.ch/pdf/assessment-report/ar4/syr/ar4_syr_spm.pdf
5. <http://www.nature.com/nature/journal/v458/n7242/full/nature08019.html>
6. <http://www.nature.com/nature/journal/v458/n7242/full/nature08017.html>
7. There's some interesting background in this paper: Kevin Anderson and Alice Bows, 2008. Reframing the climate change challenge in light of post-2000 emission trends. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A*. Published online. doi:10.1098/rsta.2008.0138 http://www.tyndall.ac.uk/publications/journal_papers/fulltext.pdf

Green Ads Space

Untuk mengiklankan produk yang ramah sosial dan lingkungan, *sponsorship*, *link* ke laporan CSR perusahaan, agenda kegiatan CSR (pelatihan, seminar, lokakarya, ekspo) atau lainnya yang relevan silakan kontak ke media@csrindonesia.com.

SEMINAR SEHARI “PEMBERDAYAAN YANG MEMANDIRIKAN” MASYARAKAT MANDIRI

Dalam sebuah negara berkembang seperti Indonesia data menunjukkan bahwa salah satu praktik CSR paling populer adalah program pengembangan masyarakat (*community development*, CD). Program ini dianggap sebagai langkah strategis perusahaan dalam turut berkontribusi positif bagi pembangunan. Selain merupakan bentuk nyata kemitraan perusahaan dengan para pemangku kepentingan, CD juga dapat berfungsi sebagai upaya memandirikan masyarakat dan turut berperan aktif dalam memerangi angka kemiskinan seperti juga termaktub dalam Millenium Development Goals (MDGs).

Melihat begitu besarnya potensi CD sebagai upaya mensejahterakan masyarakat, Masyarakat Mandiri (MM) sebagai salah satu jejaring sosial Dompot Dhuafa Republik menyelenggarakan seminar sehari bertajuk **“Pemberdayaan yang Memandirikan”**. Bertempat di Ruang Lotus 1 Jakarta Design Centre pada 16 Juli 2009, MM menghadirkan para penggiat yang selama ini memang memiliki minat tinggi dalam pemberdayaan masyarakat sebagai pembicara seminar, seperti:

- Prof. Drs. Isbandi Rukminto Adi, MKes, PhD dari FISIP UI,
- Maya F. Tamimi, SME sebagai Program Manager PT Unilever Indonesia, Tbk,
- Ir. Nana Mintarti, MP sebagai *advisor* Masyarakat Mandiri.

Adapun dari pemerintah seharusnya hadir Dr. Ir. Sujana Royat, DEA sebagai Deputi Menko Kesra Bid. Kood. Penanggulangan Kemiskinan namun beliau berhalangan hadir.

Antusiasme atas isu kemandirian masyarakat juga tergambar dari berbagai kalangan yang hadir sebagai peserta seminar. Mulai dari kalangan akademisi, organisasi non pemerintah (ornop), pelaku usaha hingga pemerintah hadir dalam seminar dan turut menyumbangkan pemikirannya dalam sesi diskusi hingga sesi ramah tamah dalam jamu makan siang.

Hal yang perlu dicatat bahwa kini kian meningkat kesadaran ragam kalangan bahwa kontribusi dalam menanggulangi kemiskinan dan memberdayakan masyarakat tidak cukup hanya sekadar tindak karitatif, temporer, dan tidak terencana. Tahap perencanaan, identifikasi masyarakat tujuan, strategi pendekatan secara partisipatif, identifikasi kebutuhan masyarakat, pemilihan, pelaksanaan hingga evaluasi program merupakan rangkaian panjang dan komprehensif dalam menjalankan pemberdayaan masyarakat secara utuh. Termasuk kala perusahaan berkehendak untuk bermitra dengan masyarakat. Dengan melalui kerangka rantai pasokan (*supply chain*) guna memasok bahan baku operasional inti perusahaan, program CD merupakan langkah yang strategis dalam mewujudkan masyarakat yang benar-benar mandiri dan mampu berdiri sendiri.

CD memang telah menjelma menjadi salah satu praktik CSR paling populer di Indonesia. Namun perwujudan tanggung jawab perusahaan kepada para pemangku kepentingannya tidaklah hanya berhenti pada CD saja. CD merupakan bagian dari CSR. Isu kerja CSR lainnya telah menunggu untuk segera diwujudkan. Isu tata kelola perusahaan termasuk peran aktif dalam transparansi dan turut memerangi tindak suap serta korupsi, isu tenaga kerja, isu HAM, isu etika perdagangan, perlindungan konsumen hingga isu lingkungan hidup dan kontribusi perusahaan dalam turut menangani pemanasan global merupakan rangkaian CSR lainnya yang seharusnya turut menjadi fokus kinerja perusahaan menuju terwujudnya praktik CSR substansial di negeri ini.

