

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

A. Conclusion

Based on the analysis of the results of the research that has been carried out, the following conclusions can be drawn:

1. The effectiveness of safe houses in protecting the witnesses and victims in LPSK has been said to be quite effective. This is because the purpose of safe houses, as stipulated in Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 31 of 2014 concerning Amendments to Law Number 13 of 2006 concerning the Protection of Witnesses and Victims, has been achieved. This is implemented through comprehensive physical protection, including strict security protocols and the provision of a confidential residence, as well as extensive non-physical protection, such as legal assistance, psychological support, and psychosocial-economic aid for protected individuals.
2. In implementing the safe house program, LPSK faces several significant challenges. While the legal substance (regulations and norms) is comprehensive and very strength in prioritizing security, particularly regarding restrictions on personal communication devices, create an implementation dilemma. This cultural friction impacts the psychological well-being and

compliance of protected individuals, often leading them to prematurely terminate their protection despite LPSK's efforts in providing alternative activities and psychological supports.

B. Recommendation

1. LPSK is encouraged to develop more innovative and efficient financial management strategies to optimize its existing budget, especially considering the increasing demand for protection. This could involve prioritizing fund allocation for cases with the highest threat levels and exploring potential partnerships with non-governmental organizations or international bodies for additional financial support. This is crucial, considering that financial support is directly related to the fulfillment of the right to protection for witnesses and victims of criminal acts as an integral part of a fair criminal justice system.
2. LPSK is expected to evaluate the restrictions on the use of personal communication devices within safe houses, while still prioritizing caution and security. A policy alternative that may be considered is the provision of limited and supervised communication facilities, such as the use of mobile phones facilitated by officers or access to communication through LPSK-owned devices, in order to maintain the psychological

stability of the protected individuals without compromising security aspects.

