

**AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT  
PPC/CDIE/DI REPORT PROCESSING FORM**

ENTER INFORMATION ONLY IF NOT INCLUDED ON COVER OR TITLE PAGE OF DOCUMENT

**1. Project/Subproject Number**

497-0357

**2. Contract/Grant Number**

497-C-00-98-00045-00

**3. Publication Date**

August 12, 2003

**4. Document Title/Translated Title**

The Public Finance Perspective on User Charges in Indonesia and Its Implication for Reform

**5. Author (s)**

1. Armida S. Alisjabana  
2.

**6. Contributing Organization (s)**

Nathan/Checchi Joint Venture/PEG Project

**7. Pagination**

17

**8. Report Number**

PEG 136

**9. Sponsoring A.I.D. Office**

ECG, USAID/Jakarta

**10. Abstract (optional - 250 word limit)**

It is understood that the process in formulating user charges is not a process to be judged from the public finance perspective only. The types of user charges and prices set by any public agency reflect the outcome of a political and administrative process. User charges, therefore, are inevitably politically determined to some extent, and it is important from the beginning to provide an adequate process both of consultation with affected groups and of review by the public in order to ensure that the fees are justifiable, the prices set are reasonable and acceptable, and subsequent adjustments can and will be made as appropriate. Some general principles in user charges price setting can be stated as: 1) It is important to set out clearly the parameters within which individual public sector managers can determine prices. The issues of equity, fairness comes into consideration. 2) It is important to provide clear and strong incentives for managers to impose efficient user charges. 3) The types of charges and prices set are subject to review by central (or higher level) agency. The principles that will guide such review should be clearly stated and the application of those principles demonstrated clearly to the affected managers and the concerned public. 4) Determine who the real public to whom any decision about what and how much should be charged for a particular service is. In a democratic political setting, the representatives of the population as a whole are their elected officials.

**11. Subject Keywords (optional)**

1. Indonesia  
2. Decentralization  
3. Regulatory Reform  
4. Business Climate  
5. Public Finance  
6. User Charges

**12. Supplementary Notes**

**13. Submitting Official**

C. Stuart Callison, Chief of Party

**14. Telephone Number**

011-62-21-520-1047

**15. Today's Date**

October 21, 2003

.....DO NOT write below this line.....

**16. DOCID**

**17. Document Disposition**

DOCRD [ ] INV [ ] DUPLICATE [ ]

August 7, 2003

**The Public Finance Perspective on User Charges in Indonesia  
and Its Implication for Reform**

Armida S. Alisjabana  
Department of Economics and  
Development Studies  
Faculty of Economics  
Padjadjaran University

**Conference on “Decentralization, Regulatory Reform and  
the Business Climate”**

**Organized by PEG-USAID<sup>1</sup>**

Jakarta, August 12, 2003

---

<sup>1</sup> PEG, the Partnership for Economic Growth, is a United States Agency for International Development (USAID)-funded Project with the Government of Indonesia. The views expressed in this report are those of the author and not necessarily those of USAID, the U.S. Government or the Government of Indonesia.

## **The Public Finance Perspective on User Charges in Indonesia and Its Implication for Reform**

Armida S. Alisjabana\*  
Department of Economics and Development Studies  
Faculty of Economics  
Padjadjaran University

### **1. Introduction**

Regional governments in Indonesia have gained authority to create new taxes and charges since the implementation of decentralization in 2001 and the new regional taxes and user charges law No. 34/2000.<sup>2</sup> There are preconditions to establishing such taxes and user charges, that regional governments must have clear reasons and objectives and must persuade their citizens and parliaments of such reasons and objectives. Formally, there is supervisory mechanism by central government in place to keep new regional taxes and charges in check. The reality after two and half years of decentralization does not always conform with the intention or rules. Cases of new regional taxes and charges that are inappropriate and harmful to the economic and business environment is abound (Ray, 2003a and 2003b). Most of the problems appear to be in the form of charges/user charges or “retribusi” (Lewis, 2003).

This observation begs the question on: what is the appropriate rationale for imposing user charges in the first place? If it is justifiable, the next question would be how should pricing be set in terms of services provided and considering its implication for efficiency and equity, how has the establishment of user charges being regulated in Indonesia. What kinds of problems are encountered in practice and what guiding principles need to be observed in reforming the regulation and implementation of user charges in Indonesia? Those are the set of questions that this short paper attempts to shed light on. While no specific solutions are intended to come out of this paper, it is hoped that the discussion and analysis made in this paper will contribute to finding the correct answers from the public finance perspective.

### **2. The Public Finance Rationale for User Charges<sup>3</sup>**

The main rationale for charging user fees is in its relation to the provision of public services. The formulation of a well-designed user charges for cost recovery in the provision of public services will lead to the best possible use of scarce public resources. User charges in principle should be levied on the direct recipients of benefits from particular public services

---

• Senior lecturer/researcher, Department of Economics and Development Studies, Faculty of Economics, Padjadjaran University, Jl. Dipati Ukur 35, Bandung 40132. E-mail: [alisjabana@bdg.centrin.net.id](mailto:alisjabana@bdg.centrin.net.id)

<sup>2</sup> I use the term regional to mean provincial and local governments, and local to mean only district level of governments.

<sup>3</sup> General approach based on Richard Bird, n.d., “User Charges in Local Government Finance”, and Ronald C. Fisher, 1996, “State and Local Public Finance”.

is to improve the efficiency of its provision. Thus, the main rationale for user charges is not to produce revenue, but rather to promote economic efficiency.

A well designed user charges will achieve the objective of promoting efficient provision of public services by being able to inform how much people are willing to pay for the particular services, and at the same time by ensuring that what the public sector supplies is valued at the (marginal) cost by the citizen. An alternative of public services financing is through general taxes, but this approach has its drawback in that if government expenditures are financed only through general taxes than more will be consumed than people as a whole would really be paying if the real costs were taken into account. There will be problems of “under-pricing” (i.e. the free provision of public services) that would lead to “over-consumption” of such services.

Another rationale for the imposition of user charges is in the case of license fees or fees paid for the privilege of undertaking some activity, or in the case of special assessments. The later, for example, in the case of betterment levy or of property tax levied for a specific service and based on some physical characteristics of the property.

It is clear that the general rational for local taxes and user charges would be different. Local taxes as any other taxes are obligatory payments from the citizens to the government that bear no specific relation to the services that the taxpayers receive. Local taxes are important source of revenue for local governments and part of the “pool” of funds of local government budget. In contrast, user charges are fees imposed by local government on services provided. The services provided can be in the form of licensing, public goods or services, and in the case of Indonesia user fees are charged as well in relation to the provision of business services by local government (see the following section 3.1 for details).

On the pricing aspect for financing of public services, in principle part of the benefits that accrue to the individuals directly should be financed from user charges, and part that benefits the society as a whole could be financed from taxes.

### **3. Regulation and Practice of User Charges in Indonesia**

#### **3.1. Government regulation on user charges**

The current regulation of user charges is Law 34/2000 on Local Taxes and User Charges and Government Regulation 66/2001 on User Charges. Law 34/2000 is a revision to Law 18/1997 on Regional Taxes and User Fees, the later had rationalized some taxes and user charges that have created disincentives to the local economy. The introduction of Law 18/1997 was intended to increase local economic efficiency by rationalizing regional taxes and user charges under the previous Law. Under decentralization Law 18/1997 has been revised to become the current law 34/2000 which give provision on the creation of new local taxes and user charges subject to central supervision. The sub-optimal arrangements governing the supervision of local regulations has resulted in distorting local taxes and user charges being implemented without effective review of their impact on the economy (Ray, 2003). Many other problems have been encountered on the imposition of certain user charges as has been thoroughly analyzed in studies under PEG-USAID and summarized succinctly in David Ray’s paper in this conference (David Ray, 2003a and 2003b).

I will not dwell into the same details, however, I will try to highlights some of the user charges distorting problems from the view of public finance. To put the matter into perspective, I will first summarize the current regulation on user charges in Indonesia. I will then summarize the impending problems on the current practice of user charges in the following sub-section.

There are three types of user charges known in Indonesia, each one serves its different purpose and role: General public services provision user charges (*retribusi jasa umum*), Business services user charges (*retribusi jasa usaha*), and License fees (*retribusi perizinan tertentu*). Summary of user charges regulation as it relates to object, subject, purpose, pricing, retention/cost recovery, type and description for each of the user charges category is described in the following Table 1:

**Table 1**  
**Summary of Government Regulation on User Charges**

	<b>General Public Services Provision User Charges (<i>Retribusi Jasa Umum</i>)</b>	<b>Business Services User Charges (<i>Retribusi Jasa Usaha</i>)</b>	<b>License Fees (<i>Retribusi Perizinan Tertentu</i>)</b>
<b>1. Object</b>	Public goods or services provision	Business services provision by the local government	Licensing
<b>2. Subject</b>	Individual or corporation/bodies (profit and non-profit)	Individual or corporation/bodies (profit and non-profit)	Individual or corporation/bodies (profit and non-profit)
<b>3. Purpose</b>	To provide general public services provision based on regional/local government functions and responsibilities as stipulated by the law	To provide business services that should have been provided by the private sector, but is still inadequate, or related to the ownership or control of assets by region/local government	To provide regulatory functions based on regional/local government functions and responsibilities as stipulated by the law
<b>4. Pricing</b>	Based on costs of services provision, ability to pay and equity consideration	Based on profit orientation similar to that if the services are provided by the private sector which operates in an efficient manner	To cover part or all of the licensing costs
<b>5. Retention/cost recovery</b>	a. Part of the revenues is to be retained by the respective agencies to finance activities related to the services provision b. To be determined further through local regulation (Perda)	a. Part of the revenues is to be retained by the respective agencies to finance activities related to the services provision b. To be determined further through local regulation (Perda)	a. Part of the revenues is to be retained by the respective agencies to finance activities related to the licensing provision b. To be determined further through local regulation (Perda)
<b>6. Type and description</b>	See article II sub-article 2.2 of PP 66/2001	See article III sub-article 3.2 of PP 66/2001	See article IV sub-article 4.2 of PP 66/2001
<b>7. Other type of user charges</b>	Could be added through Perda based on certain criteria as stipulated by the law (and subject to Central supervision)	Could be added through Perda based on certain criteria as stipulated by the law (and subject to Central supervision)	Could be added through Perda based on certain criteria as stipulated by the law (and subject to Central supervision)

Source: Law 34/2000 and Government Regulation 66/2001.

The law and regulation on user charges also provides clauses on supervisory arrangement on local regulation, the main provision of which is as follows:

- (1) Local regulation on user charges should be submitted to the Minister of Home Affairs and Minister of Finance within 15 days since its ratification.
- (2) If the local regulation on user charges does not conform with higher level regulation or in conflict with public interest, Minister of Home Affairs with consideration from Minister of Finance shall repeal the said local regulation.
- (3) The process in (2) above should be within one month since the receipt of the said local regulation.

The central government has the right to cancel any new regional taxes or charges that it judges not complying with the stated criteria. If central government elects to do so, it has to revoke the new taxes or user charges within one month of receiving the Perda from the regional government.

### **3.2. User charges in practice**

#### Share of user charges in provincial and local budget

The importance of user charges in provincial and local budget has remained small as shown by the consolidated budget data for province and district level in Indonesia in 2001. The trend has not changed much after decentralization as compared with before. It is clear that in terms of revenue potential, user charges are not considered as main source of revenue of local and provincial governments. If we look at the data at a more disaggregated level, there is some variation as to the role of user charges in local finance. User charges are more significant as sources of revenue for Kota as opposed to Kabupaten. This reflects the sources of user charges and their potentials in Kota as opposed to Kabupaten.

An example of a disaggregated APBD data from Kabupaten Bandung for 2003 reveals the following pattern of user charges role in local finance (Appendix Table A-1):

User charges that account for more than 5% of total user charges revenues are:

Public services delivery:

Health services fees, local public hospitals, market services fee (total they account for about 60% of total user charges)

License fees:

Building permit, labor service permit (total they account for about 25% of total user charges)

The other user charges are negligible at best in terms of their revenue contribution to the local budget.

**Table 2**  
**Share of user charges in provincial and local budget (Consolidated budget)**  
**Budget year 2001**

Code	Description	District in-Indonesia	Share	Province in-Indonesia	Share
1	TOTAL REVENUE (exclude Cash and Counting)	109,240,344.15	100.00%	29,289,752.18	100.00%
101	THE EXCESS PART OF LAST FISCAL YEAR COUNTING	6,156,319.79	5.64%	3,999,295.67	13.65%
102	LOCAL OWNED-SOURCE REVENUE	15,155,577.19	13.87%	9,924,298.36	33.88%
10201	<i>Regional Tax</i>	10,727,118.91	9.82%	8,458,663.60	28.88%
10202	<i>Regional Charges</i>	2,235,643.46	2.05%	486,126.95	1.66%
10203	<i>Profit from Local Owned Enterprises Post</i>	253,546.63	0.23%	143,905.03	0.49%
10204	<i>Other Own Source Revenue Post</i>	1,939,268.19	1.78%	835,602.78	2.85%
103	FISCAL BALANCE	83,626,960.27	76.55%	14,330,509.41	48.93%
10301	<i>Share Tax Revenue Post</i>	10,071,540.05	9.22%	4,313,343.51	14.73%
10302	<i>Non Tax-Natural Resources Share Post</i>	11,617,195.30	10.63%	3,338,930.01	11.40%
10303	<i>General Purpose Allocation Fund Post</i>	60,929,387.07	55.78%	6,521,945.40	22.27%
10304	<i>Specific Allocation Fund Post</i>	1,008,837.86	0.92%	156,290.50	0.53%
104	REGIONAL BORROWING	495,278.98	0.45%	10,823.69	0.04%
10401	<i>Domestic Borrowing Post</i>	451,337.79	0.41%	10,823.69	0.04%
10402	<i>Regional Bond Post</i>	-	0.00%	-	0.00%
10403	<i>International Borrowing Post</i>	43,941.19	0.04%	-	0.00%
105	OTHER LEGAL REVENUE	3,806,207.92	3.48%	1,024,825.04	3.50%
10501	<i>Central Government Transfer Revenue</i>	590,197.02	0.54%	313,062.82	1.07%
10502	<i>Province Transfer Revenue</i>	1,340,719.51	1.23%	29,567.38	0.10%
10503	<i>Other Region Transfer Revenue</i>	38,823.78	0.04%	190.00	0.00%
10504	<i>Emergency Fund</i>	328,283.12	0.30%	199,613.19	0.68%
10599	<i>Others</i>	1,508,184.49	1.38%	482,391.65	1.65%
1UKP	Cash and Counting	4,362,278.26	3.99%	619,744.22	2.12%

Source: Ministry of Finance, Directorate General Fiscal Balance, 2003.

### Rationale, type of user charges being imposed and pricing

The regulation is quite clear on the type of user charges and the rationale for imposing it. There is one provision, however in the regulation that is not very clear in which case it has a clause on other types of user charges not classified in either one of *Retribusi perizinan*, *Retribusi jasa umum*, or *Retribusi jasa usaha*. This clause has created an open interpretation and most likely is interpreted ambiguously by the local government as well.

As shown by the data, significant contribution to the local budget usually comes from user charges for the purposes of general public services delivery. On the other hand, user charges that have the “doubtful” regulatory motivation usually only contribute insignificant amount of revenue to the local budget. The rationale of some local government in their imposition of certain licensing fees to raise owned source revenue does not seem to be supported by the

data.<sup>4</sup> The revenue potential is negligible at best, making them more suitable as “nuisance taxes/charges”.

In the case of commercial services user charges, its role in overall user charges is minimal, and problems encountered in the inappropriate categorization of some user charges into commercial services user charges. For example as happened in the case of Forest resources services license fees (*Retribusi izin aneka usaha hasil hutan*), and Transportation business services license fees (*Retribusi izin usaha angkutan*) in Kabupaten Tasikmalaya (Table 3).

A recent study by Lewis (2003) tested the hypothesis of regional government claim that their motivation for creating new charges (and taxes) is to assist in meeting their new expenditure requirements under decentralization. The results of the study argue against the claim by local governments that the charges (and taxes) creation is a function of fiscal capacity.<sup>5</sup> There are certainly other reasons that need to be explored as to why some local governments are very aggressive in imposing new taxes and user charges.

On the type of user charges being imposed by local governments, there seems to be wide variation across the Kabupaten/Kota in Indonesia especially after decentralization and the implementation of Law 34/2000. For example, from the study compiled by Sawala (2003) for Kabupaten Garut and Kabupaten Tasikmalaya, many of the new charges are imposed for no real reason. Although, the majority is form regulatory purposes (license fees), however the local government does not seem to provide any such regulatory functions.

The issue of tariff setting (pricing) is another problem, where often there is no clear rationale for calculating the tariff. In principle, a user charge in the form of license fee should not bear any cost to the public, except if the local government budget is still inadequate in which case then it can assess fee less or equal to the cost of providing the regulatory service. Another parallel issue with pricing is on cost retention, how much of the revenue is to be retained by the respective local agency. The regulation is unclear on this issue, and local government does not seem to have any clear idea on how best to calculate this aspect as it relates to incentives and efficiency of the service provision. The issue of cost retention is more relevant for the case of licensing.

In the case of general public services provision, the important pricing issue is as it relates to cost recovery of delivering the services. Most public services, such as health care provision, has some elements of equity and therefore the pricing issue has to take into account on how best to structure the tariff to accommodate people from lower income households. The public finance literature on this financing scheme has been well developed, for example: multi-part tariff, peak load pricing, etc. (Bird, n.d. and Fisher, 1996).<sup>6</sup>

The issue of pricing for commercial services provided by local government is not much on the pricing per se. The pricing in this case is clear, i.e. it should follow whatever price is set based on market mechanism. The issue in this case, rather is on whether the local government itself who should provide the services. In other words, wouldn't it more efficient

---

<sup>4</sup> See for example the results of Sawala study in Kabupaten Garut and Kabupaten Tasikmalaya on this issue.

<sup>5</sup> Fiscal capacity in Lewis (2003) study is proxied by expected per capita staff expenditures and expected per capita revenue, per capita gross regional domestic product, and poverty incidence.

<sup>6</sup> Due to insufficient information on the pricing practice for general public services provision in Indonesia, this paper does not attempt to discuss the topic here.

if the services provision is given to the private sector, whereas local government still retain the ownership and regulatory rights, if deemed necessary.

#### Overlapping taxes and inadequate supervision by central (higher level of) government

As has been amply exposed in the press and in research studies during the past two years, the main conclusion seems to be that regional governments have been excessive in imposing new taxes and charges instruments (Lewis, 2003 and Ray, 2003). Most of these newly imposed charges have been harmful and created disincentive to the local economy. Many are implemented without no clear objectives relevant to the purpose of either type of user charges that can be applied in Indonesia (Retribusi perizinan, Retribusi jasa usaha, Retribusi jasa umum).

As has been pointed by many observers, excessive local taxes and charges under decentralization is due to the lax or inadequate supervision by the central government (Lewis, 2003 and Ray, 2003). Although on this later issue, there is another indication as well worth noting that many regional governments may have by-passed the central supervisory mechanism altogether. Some of them acted unilaterally in implementing the new local revenue instruments.

The above point is supported, for example from the observation of new user charges being implemented for Kabupaten Garut (Table 4) that overlaps with existing similar provincial or local tax. The case for overlapping taxes is evident for user charges: Tourism and business license (overlap with Hotel and Restaurant local tax, and underground and surface water utilization license (overlap with the provincial tax on underground and surface water utilization).

Other examples from the case of Kabupaten Tasikmalaya dan Kabupaten Garut, is in the unclear objective of the imposition of the new charges. In the case of license fees, the rationale is not adequately justified as a means of regulation, supervision on the part of the local government on certain business activities. There does not appear to be any services provided to the parties charged with the user fees. The above illustration serves to support the widely held believe that the central government is either failing in its supervisory role on the establishment of new (taxes) and charges, or is powerless at best in the case of local governments by-passing the central review mechanism entirely.

**Table 3**  
**Selected cases of Kabupaten/Kota Tasikmalaya User Charges**

Type of user charges/ Assessment	Administration services on log processing user charges ( <i>Retribusi pelayanan administrasi pengelolaan kayu milik</i> )	Forest resources services license fees ( <i>Retribusi izin aneka usaha hasil hutan</i> )	Transportation business services license fees ( <i>Retribusi izin usaha angkutan</i> )	Commercial transportation route license fees ( <i>Retribusi izin trayek</i> )	Motor vehicle inspection license fees ( <i>Retribusi izin pengujian kendaraan bermotor</i> )
1. Rationale	a. To regulate the sustainable management of logs b. To raise PAD	a. To regulate the management of forest resources: silk worm, honey bees, swallow nest, <i>kapinis</i> . b. To raise PAD	To foster and supervise transportation business services development	To regulate commercial route usage (to avoid road congestion)	To regulate vehicle emission level
2. Type of user charges based on current regulation	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	License fees	General services user charges
3. Pricing	Based on costs components: administrative, operational services	Based on area of commercial services	Based on vehicle seat and load capacity	Based on route and commercial vehicle category	a. Based on inspection cost components and motor vehicle category (reasonable) b. Other cost (opportunity cost of waiting)
4. Revenue potential	Rp 112.5 million in 2001 (potential)	Minimal (Rp 3.2 million in 2001)	Rp 28.6 million in 2001	n.a.	n.a.
5. Funding of real services	None, only provide license	None, only provide license	None, only provide license	Regulate commercial transportation route usage	Inspect and regulate commercial vehicle emission level

Source: Compiled based on Sawala (2003)

**Table 4**  
**Selected cases of Kabupaten Garut User Charges**

Type of user charges/ Assessment	Log processing license fees ( <i>Retribusi izin pengelolaan kayu milik</i> )	Tourism business license fees ( <i>Retribusi izin usaha kepariwisataan</i> )	Quality inspection on dairy milk processing license fees ( <i>Retribusi pelayanan susu perah</i> )	Underground and surface water utilization license fees ( <i>Retribusi perizinan pengambilan air bawah tanah dan air permukaan</i> )
1. Rationale		Only to raise PAD		Only to raise PAD
2. Type of user charges based on current regulation	Unclear, possibly could be categorized as licensing fee	Unclear, possibly could be categorized as licensing fee	a. None b. Categorized as commercial licensing fee under Perda	a. None b. Categorized as licensing fee under Perda
3. Pricing	a. Based on trees being cut down, age, diameter, volume, and type of chain saw used b. To cover part or all of the licensing cost	a. Based on type of tourism commercial services offered (hotel, restaurant, etc) b. To pay for operational costs, and maintenance	Rp 4 per liter	a. Based on type of water source b. Based on cost components: exploration, drilling, utilization, etc c. For 3 years
4. Revenue potential	Minimal (Rp 12 million in 2001)	Minimal (Rp 10 million in 2002)	Potential (Target of Rp 105 million in 2002)	Minimal (Target of Rp 5 million in 2002)
5. Funding of real services	None, only provide license	None, only provide license	Milk quality inspection	None, only provide license
6. Problem of overlapping taxes	Whether overlap with central taxes on forest resources (IHH/IHPH)	With local tax: hotel and restaurant taxes. The objects are the same.	n.a.	With provincial tax on underground and surface water utilization.

Source: Compiled based on Sawala (2003)

#### 4. Issues for Reform

The following are some issues for reform based on issues and problems of user charges as being implemented in Indonesia today as opposed to what is desirable from the perspectives of public finance<sup>7</sup>:

1. It is understood that the process in formulating user charges is not only a process to be judged from the public finance perspective only. The type of user charges and prices set by any public agency reflects the outcome of a political and administrative process. User charges, therefore, are inevitably politically determined to some extent, and it is therefore important from the beginning to provide an adequate process both of consultation with affected groups and of review by the public in order to ensure that the fees are justifiable, the prices set are reasonable and acceptable, and subsequent adjustments can and will be made as appropriate.
2. Some general principles in user charges price setting can be stated as (although the detail for each particular area needs more elaboration):
  - It is important to set out clearly the parameters within which individual public sector managers can determine prices. The issue of equity, fairness comes into consideration.
  - It is important to provide clear and strong incentives for managers to impose efficient user charges.
  - The type of charges and prices set are subject to review by central (or higher level) agency. The principles that will guide such review should be clearly stated and the application of those principles demonstrated clearly to the affected managers and the concerned public.
  - Determine who the real public to whom any decision about what and how much should be charged for a particular service is? In a democratic political setting, the representation of the population as a whole is their elected officials.

It is within the context of the above principles, can we then devise an appropriate strategy for user charges reform in Indonesia on the issues of its rationale, pricing, and supervisory mechanism.

---

<sup>7</sup> Based on general conclusion and principles as set forth in Bird (n.d.) and Fischer (1996).

## References

- Arnott, Richard, Kenneth Arrow, Anthony B. Atkinson, and Jacques Dreze, 1996, "Public Economics: William Vickrey", Cambridge University Press.
- Bandung Institute for Governance Studies, 2002, "Merancang kebijakan perijinan yang pro-pasar dan sensitif kepentingan publik", in cooperation with the Partnership for Economic Growth, Jakarta.
- Bird, Richard M., n.d., "User charges in local government finance", mimeograph.
- Fisher, Ronald C., 1996, "State and local public finance", Irwin, Chicago, Ill.
- Lewis, Blane, 2003, "Tax and charge creation by regional governments under fiscal decentralization: estimates and explanations", *Bulletin of Indonesian Economic Studies*, Vol. 39, No.2, 2003: 177-92.
- LP3M Sawala, 2003, "Hasil penelitian dan pengkajian peraturan-peraturan daerah tentang retribusi (studi kasus di Tasikmalaya dan Garut)", in cooperation with the Partnership for Economic Growth.
- Ray, David, 2003a, "Regulatory reform and local government in Indonesia", paper presented at the 5<sup>th</sup> IRSA International Conference, jointly organized by IRSA and the Department of Economics and Development Studies, Padjadjaran University, July 18-19, 2003 in Bandung.
- Ray, David, 2003b, "Decentralization, regulatory reform and the business climate", paper presented at the Conference on "Decentralization, Regulatory Reform and Business Climate", organized by PEG USAID, August 12, 2003 in Jakarta.
- Republik Indonesia, 2000, Undang-undang nomor 34 tahun 2000 tentang pajak daerah dan retribusi daerah.
- \_\_\_\_\_, 2001, Peraturan pemerintah nomor 66 tahun 2001 tentang retribusi daerah.
- World Bank, 1994, Intergovernmental fiscal relations in Indonesia: Issues and reform options, World Bank Discussion Paper no. 239, the World Bank, Washington, D.C.

## **Appendix**

### **Peraturan Pemerintah Nomor 66 Tahun 2001 Tentang Retribusi Daerah**

#### **Bab II: Retribusi Jasa Umum**

##### **Pasal 2**

(1) Objek Retribusi Jasa Umum adalah pelayanan yang disediakan atau diberikan Pemerintah Daerah untuk tujuan kepentingan dan kemanfaatan umum serta dapat dinikmati oleh orang pribadi atau badan.

(2) Jenis-jenis Retribusi Jasa Umum adalah:

- a. Retribusi Pelayanan Kesehatan
- b. Retribusi Pelayanan Persampahan/Kebersihan
- c. Retribusi Penggantian Biaya Cetak KTP dan Akte Catatan Sipil
- d. Retribusi Pelayanan Pemakaman dan Pengabuan Mayat
- e. Retribusi Pelayanan Parkir di Tepi Jalan Umum
- f. Retribusi Pelayanan Pasar
- g. Retribusi Pengujian Kendaraan Bermotor
- h. Retribusi Pemeriksaan Alat Pemadam Kebakaran
- i. Retribusi Penggantian Biaya Cetak Peta
- j. Retribusi Pengujian Kapal Perikanan

(3) Subjek Retribusi Jasa Umum adalah orang pribadi atau badan yang menggunakan/menikmati pelayanan jasa umum yang bersangkutan.

#### **Bab III: Retribusi Jasa Usaha**

##### **Pasal 3**

(1) Objek Retribusi Jasa Usaha adalah pelayanan yang disediakan oleh Pemerintah Daerah dengan menganut prinsip komersial.

(2) Jenis-jenis Retribusi Jasa Usaha adalah:

- a. Retribusi Pemakaian Kekayaan Daerah
- b. Retribusi Pasar Grosir dan/atau Pertokoan
- c. Retribusi Tempat Pelelangan
- d. Retribusi Terminal
- e. Retribusi Tempat Khusus Parkir
- f. Retribusi Tempat Penginapan/Pesanggrahan/Villa
- g. Retribusi Penyedotan Kakus
- h. Retribusi Rumah Potong Hewan
- i. Retribusi Pelayanan Pelabuhan Kapal
- j. Retribusi Tempat Rekreasi dan Olah Raga
- k. Retribusi Penyeberangan di Atas Air
- l. Retribusi Pengolahan Limbah Cair
- m. Retribusi Penjualan Produksi Usaha Daerah

(3) Subjek Retribusi Jasa Usaha adalah orang pribadi atau badan yang menggunakan/menikmati pelayanan jasa usaha yang bersangkutan.

## Bab IV: Retribusi Perizinan Tertentu

### Pasal 4

(1) Objek Retribusi Perizinan Tertentu adalah kegiatan tertentu Pemerintah Daerah dalam rangka pemberian izin kepada orang pribadi atau badan yang dimaksudkan untuk pembinaan, pengaturan, pengendalian dan pengawasan atas kegiatan pemanfaatan ruang, penggunaan sumber daya alam, barang, prasarana, sarana, atau fasilitas tertentu guna melindungi kepentingan umum dan menjaga kelestarian lingkungan.

(2) Jenis-jenis Retribusi Perizinan Tertentu adalah:

- a. Retribusi Izin Mendirikan Bangunan
- b. Retribusi Izin Tempat Penjualan Minuman Beralkohol
- c. Retribusi Izin Gangguan
- d. Retribusi Izin Trayek

(3) Subjek Retribusi Perizinan Tertentu adalah orang pribadi atau badan yang memperoleh izin tertentu dari Pemerintah Daerah.

**Table A-1**  
**Kabupaten Bandung RAPBD 2003**

<b>I</b>	<b>REVENUES</b>	<b>RAPBD 2003</b>	<b>Share</b>	<b>% User Charges</b>
<b>1.1</b>	<b>Own Revenue</b>	<b>86,634,863,000.00</b>	<b>8.84%</b>	
1.1.1	Local Taxes	36,637,500,000.00	3.74%	
	Hotel Taxes	450,000,000.00	0.05%	
	Restaurant Taxes	1,300,000,000.00	0.13%	
	Entertainment Taxes	850,000,000.00	0.09%	
	Advertisement Taxes	550,000,000.00	0.06%	
	Street Lighting Taxes	33,000,000,000.00	3.37%	
	C-Category Mining Product Excavation Taxes	437,500,000.00	0.04%	
	Parking Taxes	50,000,000.00	0.01%	
<b>1.1.2</b>	<b>User Charges</b>	<b>30,900,402,500.00</b>	<b>3.15%</b>	<b>100.00%</b>
	Health Service Fees	2,536,000,000.00	0.26%	8.21%
	Local Public Hospital Majalaya (RSUD Majalaya)	5,000,000,000.00	0.51%	16.18%
	Local Public Hospital Soreang (RSUD Soreang)	4,472,224,000.00	0.46%	14.47%
	Garbage Services Fees	1,100,000,000.00	0.11%	3.56%
	Identity Card Services	1,856,563,000.00	0.19%	6.01%
	Birth Certificate Fees	707,236,500.00	0.07%	2.29%
	Funeral Services Fees	30,000,000.00	0.00%	0.10%
	Parking Fees	300,000.00	0.00%	0.00%
	Market Services Fees	3,750,000,000.00	0.38%	12.14%
	Vehicle Testing Fees	600,000,000.00	0.06%	1.94%
	Fire Equipment Fees	20,000,000.00	0.00%	0.06%
	Local property Utilization Services	90,000,000.00	0.01%	0.29%
	Land and building rent	37,800,000.00	0.00%	0.12%
	Heavy equipment rent	60,000,000.00	0.01%	0.19%
	Building,Room, hall and barrack rent	6,000,000.00	0.00%	0.02%
	Canteen rent	4,000,000.00	0.00%	0.01%
	Laboratorium rent	30,000,000.00	0.00%	0.10%
	Pemda Land Use	110,000,000.00	0.01%	0.36%
	Training	50,000,000.00	0.01%	0.16%
	Trade permit	325,000,000.00	0.03%	1.05%
	Station Services Fees	900,000,000.00	0.09%	2.91%
	Resthouse Rent	56,140,000.00	0.01%	0.18%
	Slaughterhouse Service	81,000,000.00	0.01%	0.26%
	Cattle Examination Fees	243,000,000.00	0.02%	0.79%
	Sport and Recreation Place Utilization Fees	223,111,000.00	0.02%	0.72%
	liquid waste processing services	36,000,000.00	0.00%	0.12%
	Liquid Waste Permit	90,000,000.00	0.01%	0.29%
	Local Production Sales	115,000,000.00	0.01%	0.37%
	Built permit	5,178,883,000.00	0.53%	16.76%
	Guidelines Fees	180,000,000.00	0.02%	0.58%
	Disturbance permit	950,000.00	0.00%	0.00%

	Route Permit	85,000,000.00	0.01%	0.28%
	Utilization of Road Exemption	200,000,000.00	0.02%	0.65%
	Loading and unloading permit	175,000,000.00	0.02%	0.57%
	Transportation Services Permit	22,540,000.00	0.00%	0.07%
	General Repair Shop Fees	3,300,000.00	0.00%	0.01%
	Employee Transportation Permit	5,355,000.00	0.00%	0.02%
	Labor Services Permit	2,500,000,000.00	0.26%	8.09%
	Cooperation Permit	20,000,000.00	0.00%	0.06%
<b>1.2</b>	<b>Balancing Fund</b>	<b>831,992,723,000.00</b>	<b>84.92%</b>	
1.2.1	Shared Taxes and non Taxes	68,470,353,000.00	6.99%	
	Shared Taxes	61,000,000,000.00	6.23%	
	Land and Building Taxes	37,500,000,000.00	3.83%	
	Land Sales Tax	11,500,000,000.00	1.17%	
	Personal income Tax	12,000,000,000.00	1.22%	
	Non-Tax Sharing (Natural Resources)	7,470,353,000.00	0.76%	
1.2.2	General Allocation Fund	726,240,000,000.00	74.13%	
1.2.3	Specific Allocation Fund	1,000,000,000.00	0.10%	
1.2.4	Balancing fund from Province	36,282,370,000.00	3.70%	
<b>1.3</b>	<b>Other Revenues</b>	<b>61,115,000,000.00</b>	<b>6.24%</b>	
<b>1.3.03</b>	<b>Contingency Fund/Bantuan Penyeimbang dari Pemerintah</b>	<b>61,115,000,000.00</b>	<b>6.24%</b>	
	<b>Total Revenues</b>	<b>979,742,586,000.00</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	

Source : Kabupaten Bandung, RAPBD 2003