

the President-elect and the people, which were held in the afternoons of Sept 21 to Sept 30, 2004, in the front yard of his house. The expectations are that development should reach villages, unemployment should be reduced, adequate attention should be given to education and healthcare, corruption should be eradicated, and the rule of law should be upheld.

Against this backdrop, it can be said that Indonesia still badly needs foreign aid. Based on my experiences over the past several years in facilitating consultations between several donor agencies and civil society organizations (CSOs), and my experiences of attending meetings of CSOs, I will put forward their vision regarding foreign aid, their strategies and the approaches that they prefer. For example, in the consultation with CSOs facilitated by YAPPIKA at the end of 2001, which focused on Canadian aid for Indonesia, Indonesian CSOs aired their specific views and recommendations on new strategies and approaches that should be adopted for Canadian aid for Indonesia, as channeled through CIDA. Some of the recommendations stressed priorities in accordance with the challenges faced by SBY's government, and with the current situation of Indonesia. Broadly speaking, the perspectives of Indonesia's civil society concerning overseas assistance for Indonesia, and Canadian aid in particular, are as follows:

1. CSOs are highly concerned about the large size of Indonesia's international debt. Accordingly, CSOs take the view that future assistance in the form of loans should be drastically reduced, and, if possible, avoided or stopped. Ethical, moral, economic and political considerations justify the provision of grants rather than loans from rich countries to developing countries. Accordingly, Indonesian CSOs appreciate CIDA's move of stopping loans to Indonesia since 1984.
2. Indonesian CSOs agree that bilateral aid is preferable to multilateral aid. Assistance under bilateral cooperation has several strengths like: (1) the focus of programs can be better maintained because they are directly controlled by the donor country; (2) CSOs can more easily administer a project involving only one country; (3) competition between donor countries can be promoted, leading to the improvement of their services to receiving countries; (4) there may be more flexibility for the receiving country to creatively develop social programs; and (5) this will provide greater opportunities for small NGOs on the