



Policy Implementation Analysis of Restrictions on Participatory Planning Proposals in Development Planning Consultation

Idris Wahyudianto¹, Agus Sholahuddin², Roos Widjajani³

^{1,2,3}University of Merdeka Malang

Indonesia

ABSTRACT

This research aims to analyze the implementation of the policy of Limiting Participatory Planning Proposals in the Development Planning Conference (Musrenbang), as well as to identify supporting and inhibiting factors based on the Circular Letter of the Head of Bappeda of Malang Regency. The research was conducted in Kasembon Village, Bululawang Subdistrict, Malang Regency. The data analysis technique in this research uses descriptive analysis. The findings show that implementing the policy limiting participatory planning proposals in Kasembon Village based on the Circular Letter of the Head of Malang Regency Bappeda has fulfilled communication, resources, disposition, and bureaucratic structure indicators. The main obstacles include the lack of direct socialization, limited technical capacity, community pressure to accommodate more than 10 proposals, and suboptimal coordination. Supporting factors include clear policies, Regional Government Information System (SIPD) application, and commitment of implementers. Efforts to improve communication, technical capacity, and coordination are needed to support the success of this policy. The study results are expected to provide input for 33 sub-districts in Malang District to organize Musrenbang more effectively per the policy.

Keywords: Development Planning Consultation, Proposal Limitation, Planning.

1. INTRODUCTION

One form of implementation in the Regulation of the Minister of Home Affairs Number 86 of 2017 is the implementation of the Regional Government Work Plan Development Planning Conference (Musrenbang RKPD) as a stage in the preparation of development planning documents. Musrenbang RKPD is conducted annually at the Regency / City and District levels to formulate the Regional Government Work Plan (RKPD). This process aims to accommodate input from various parties and harmonize regional development planning by the Regional Long-Term and Medium-Term Development Plans.

The Regional Government prepares regional development plans as part of the national development planning system through four approaches: (1) A political approach, accommodating the regional head's program; (2) A technocratic approach, using scientific methods by professional planners; (3) A participatory approach, through Musrenbang from village to district involving stakeholders; and (4) A bottom-up and top-down approach, which is a tiered process from village to national (bottom-up) and central programs (top-down). This approach aims to harmonize local and national development to be more effective, participatory, and aligned with the community's needs.

The participatory approach in development planning is carried out through the Development Planning Conference (Musrenbang) as a stakeholder forum for preparing national and regional development plans. Musrenbang has the role of collecting community proposals from the village level based on priority needs. This forum effectively captures the community's aspirations so that the planned development meets their needs. Developing is expected to be more effective, efficient, and sustainable by involving the community. The proposals collected in the Musrenbang are harmonized with regional apparatus programs to produce a development work plan that agrees on community needs and government policies.

The Musrenbang proposal in Malang District is carried out through the Regional Government Information System (SIPD) by Minister of Home Affairs Regulation No. 70 of 2019, facilitating the planning, control, and evaluation of regional development electronically. The process starts from the village to the sub-district Musrenbang through SIPD, based on the Circular Letter of the Head of Bappeda. Proposals are limited to 10 per Village, consisting

of 5 physical and five non-physical proposals according to the duties and functions of the Regional Apparatus. This restriction aims to make local governments more focused on determining priority programs by considering budget constraints and ensuring community proposals are truly based on needs.

Implementing the Circular Letter of the Head of Bappeda regarding the Proposal for Musrenbang Village Activities in 2025 through SIPD still experiences obstacles. First, many proposals from villages are not made by the authority of the Malang District Government, and the formulation is in the SIPD proposal dictionary. Second, some proposals were not prioritized, and there were multiple proposals, so the number of proposals inputted was not optimal. Third, some villages submitted proposals that exceeded the maximum limit. Fourth, villages were less than optimal in determining development priorities in their areas. These obstacles resulted in the Musrenbang process being less effective and not by the stipulated provisions.

Based on this problem, this research is interested in conducting further research, so the objectives of this research are to describe and analyze the implementation of the policy of Limiting Participatory Planning Proposals in the Development Planning Conference (Musrenbang) by the Circular Letter of the Head of Bappeda Malang Regency. In addition, this research also aims to identify and analyze the factors that support and hinder the implementation of the policy in the Musrenbang process in the village.

The results of this study are expected to contribute theoretically to enriching knowledge about implementing the policy limiting participatory planning proposals at the Sub-district Musrenbang and become a reference for similar research in the future and also contribute practically as input for the sub-district government, especially in the 33 sub-districts in Malang Regency, in organizing a more effective Musrenbang by paying attention to restrictions on participatory planning proposals. The findings can also be used as a comparison and reference for other researchers studying similar topics.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

According to Dye (1992) in Widodo (2021: 12), public policy is everything the government chooses to do or not do. Edward III and Sharkansky added that public policy includes what the government says, does, or does not do, which is the purpose of government programs. Kartasmita in Widodo (2021: 13) explains that public policy includes what the government does or does not do, its causes, and its impacts. Meanwhile, Friedrich defines policy as action directed at specific goals by individuals, groups, or governments in a certain environment by considering the obstacles and opportunities to achieve goals. Public policy is a series of government decisions affecting society and the environment.

Dye (in Widodo, 2021: 13), the public policy system has three main elements, namely public policy, policy actors (implementors), and the policy environment. These three elements include the process of input, implementation, output, and feedback to assess whether the policy meets the community's needs. Policies must be formulated, implemented, and evaluated by the authorized parties to be right on target. Anderson (in Widodo, 2021: 14) adds that public policies always have goals through real actions by government officials, not just plans. Policies can be positive (actions to address problems) or negative (decisions not to act). Positive policies are based on laws and regulations and are authoritative and binding.

Public policy is not born suddenly but through a long process. Anderson (1979) suggests five steps in the policy process: agenda setting, policy formulation, policy adoption, policy implementation, and policy evaluation. Meanwhile, Ripley (1986) divides it into four stages: agenda setting, formulation and legitimating of goals, program implementation, and decision on policy future. On the other hand, Thomas R. Dye (in Widodo, 2021) mentions six stages of implementation, namely identification of policy problems, agenda setting, policy formulation, policy ratification, policy implementation, and policy evaluation. This process involves various parties, such as public officials, interest groups, political parties, and the media. It is carried out through bureaucracy, public budgets, and evaluation by the government and society.

Public policy implementation is an important process in the policy cycle involving complex activities, not just elaborating bureaucratic procedures. According to Udoji (1981), implementation is more important than policymaking because policies only become plans if they are not implemented. Van Meter and Van Horn (in Abdul Wahab, 2017: 135) emphasize that implementation involves individual, official, or group actions to achieve policy objectives. Jones stated that implementation requires implementers, funds, and organizational resources. Meanwhile, Mazmanian and Sabatier (in Widodo, 2021: 87) added that implementation includes the behavior of administrative bodies and political,

social, and economic forces that affect the success of policies. Implementation is turning formal policies into reality by achieving real outputs, outcomes, and impacts for target groups (Sadhana, 2013).

According to Van Meter and Van Horn (1975), the public policy implementation model is influenced by several factors, namely policy standards, resources, characteristics of implementing agencies, inter-organizational communication, implementing attitudes, and economic, social, and political conditions. George Edward III (1984) mentions four main variables that determine the success of policy implementation, namely communication, which ensures that policies are conveyed clearly and consistently; resources, which include funds, personnel, and supporting facilities; disposition, namely the willingness and commitment of implementers in carrying out policies; and bureaucratic structure, which affects the effectiveness of policy implementation through clear division of authority and SOPs. All four greatly affect the success rate of policy implementation, which is the theoretical basis of this research.

Participatory planning is a planning process that involves the community in its preparation and implementation. Abe (2002:81) calls this planning focused on community interests: participatory, dynamic, synergistic, legal, and realistic. Wicaksono and Sugiarto (in Wijaya, 2003:16) emphasize the importance of community involvement in solving problems independently. Samsura (2003) adds that participation involves all stakeholders through negotiation and collective learning. Abe (2005:90) states that community involvement reduces manipulation and increases legitimacy and political awareness. Ndraha (1990:104) emphasizes that communities are active policy formulation and implementation partners. Cahyono (2006) highlights the importance of fact-based planning, considering community capabilities, and involving local organizations in short- and long-term programs that are easy to evaluate.

According to Arnstein (1969), community participation has eight levels, from the lowest to the highest: manipulation (the community is only symbolic), therapy (involved with orders), informing (one-way information provision), consultation (the community proposes ideas), placation (can influence decisions), partnership (power is shared between the community and the government), delegated power (the community is given the authority to make decisions), to citizen control (the community fully manages the program). Samuel Paul (1987) emphasizes the stages of participation ranging from information sharing, consultation, and joint decision-making to community initiative to act independently. Isbandi (2007) and Mardikanto (2013) assess participation from community involvement in problem identification, decision-making, implementation, evaluation, and utilization of development results. Marschall (2006) adds the importance of forums and access for the community in the process.

According to Law No. 25/2004 Article 1 Point 21, Development Planning Consultation (Musrenbang) is a forum between actors to prepare national and regional development plans in stages from the village to the national level. The Minister of Home Affairs (2007) states that Musrenbang is conducted after the situation analysis and plan design stages in participatory planning. The objectives of Musrenbang include encouraging stakeholder participation, identifying priority issues, optimizing funds, and mobilizing political support. Musrenbang should be inclusive, sustainable, participatory, and follow strategic thinking to produce real solutions. The process also serves as a medium for conflict resolution by encouraging an understanding of different perspectives and finding solutions that benefit all parties.

3. RESEARCH METHODS

3.1 Research design

This research uses a qualitative descriptive method. The focus of the research is to describe the problems regarding the implementation of the policy limiting participatory planning proposals in the Musrenbang, based on the Circular Letter of the Head of Malang Regency Bappeda.

3.2 Scope and Location of Research

The scope of this research is the policy of limiting participatory planning proposals in the Musrenbang. The research location is the object of research where the research is conducted. In this research, the location used as a place to conduct research is Kasembon Village, Bululawang Subdistrict, Malang Regency, which was chosen because the village has not fully implemented the policy contained in the Circular Letter of the Head of Malang Regency Bappeda.

3.3 Research Informants

The informants in this study were village and sub-district government officials and community leaders in Kasembon Village, Bululawang Sub-district, Malang District. The informants were selected based on their roles and involvement in policy implementation.

3.4 Data Analysis Technique

Data collection in this study was conducted through observation, interviews, and documentation. Meanwhile, data analysis used the Miles and Huberman model, including collection, reduction, data presentation, and conclusion drawing. Data were reduced by simplifying important information, then presented in tables or narratives, followed by drawing conclusions based on patterns and themes until data saturation was reached.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Research Results

Kasembon Village is one of 14 villages in Bululawang Sub-district, Malang Regency. Kasembon Village is one of the villages in Bululawang Sub-district, Malang Regency. Kasembon Village itself is a village that has potential in the fields of agriculture and animal husbandry. From the available data, almost 80% of Kasembon villagers work as farmers and livestock breeders. Farmers in Kasembon Village grow rice, corn, sugar cane, vegetables, sweet potatoes, and cassava. The large number of farmers in Kasembon Village can also be seen because almost every house in Kasembon Village has cattle. In addition, one of the hamlets in Kasembon Village, Krajan Hamlet, has the potential for worm farming, where the worms from the livestock will be sold to collectors to be processed again.

According to Miles and Huberman (Miles et al., 2014), data analysis is carried out interactively and continues continuously until completion so that the data is saturated. In implementing the policy based on the Circular Letter of the Head of Bappeda Malang Regency, in Kasembon Village, Bululawang Subdistrict, Malang Regency, data collection was carried out first. This data collection is obtained from interviews with informants who implement the policy. Next is the presentation of data, which presents the results of interviews with implementers.

This research uses an approach to analyze the implementation of the Musrenbang Policy, which refers to the theory of George C. Edwards III, which states that four main factors influence public policy: communication, resources, disposition, and organizational structure. Communication is an important indicator of the success of public policy implementation. Socializing policy information to implementers is the main process in supporting policy success. Socialization is an important step in increasing the understanding and involvement of policy implementers and ensuring that policy information is conveyed consistently and on target. With effective communication, obstacles in policy implementation can be minimized, allowing optimal achievement of policy objectives.

The intensity of socialization regarding the limitation of a maximum of 10 proposals per village in Kasembon Village was conducted through a circular letter from the Head of Bappeda of Malang Regency to the Camat of Bululawang, the Kasembon Village Head and the RW level. However, a meeting involving all RW and Community Institutions and stakeholders has not been conducted. Additional communication is conducted by the Head of Planning Affairs and the Head of BPD through direct coordination and telephone calls with RW heads to ensure understanding of the policy. The Camat of Bululawang said: "So far, Bululawang Sub-district has conducted socialization related to the limitation of musrenbang proposals to 14 villages in Bululawang Sub-district, including Kasembon Village by the Circular Letter of the Head of Bappeda. The delivery is also routinely carried out every year in the Musrenbang proposal. However, the socialization is only in the form of sending a letter by the Camat attached to the Circular Letter. Direct socialization to Village Heads in Bululawang Sub-district, during my tenure as Camat, has never been carried out" (Interview on 16 August 2024).

Clear communication about the limitation of musrenbang proposals was conveyed by the Camat, village officials, and the Head of the Kasembon BPD. Proposals were limited to 10 per village, with each RW allocated one physical and non-physical proposal. The Head of the Community Development and Empowerment Section (Sie PPM) of sub-district Bululawang said: "I effectively communicated the limitation of village proposals, namely the Circular Letter of the Head of Bappeda has been forwarded to 14 villages through a follow-up letter from the Camat, attaching the policy. This step is a very important administrative communication to ensure the message has been formally conveyed to the 14 villages. The policy of limiting village proposals (to a maximum of 10 proposals) has been conveyed and ensured that each village understands the importance of this policy and how to implement it because this policy aims

to encourage the preparation of more prioritized and strategic proposals so that development efficiency can be achieved" (Interview on August 23, 2024).

Human resources and capital are important indicators of the success of public policies. An interview with the Bululawang Sub-district SIPD Operator regarding human resources' understanding of the policy limiting 10 proposals per village showed that: "As a SIPD Operator in Bululawang Sub-district, I have understood and comprehended the limitation of 10 proposals and I always remind village operators through communication in the group to submit proposals that are prioritized in inputting in the SIPD application according to the existing provisions" (Interview on September 17, 2024). The Head of Village Planning Affairs (Kaur. Perencanaan) also said: "I understand and understand the restrictions on proposals, that the policy limits proposals, and I always coordinate with the Head of the Development and Community Empowerment Section in Bululawang Sub-district and the 5 RW heads in Kasembon Village, but I still face many obstacles with more proposals than the specified limit because there are concerns from the community in Kasembon Village regarding the accommodation of proposals at the next level" (Interview on September 27, 2024).

Policy implementers from the sub-district to the village level can support the implementation of restrictions on musrenbang proposals. At the village level, the SIPD operator in Kasembon Village also assists in inputting musrenbang proposals into the SIPD Application. All parties generally understand the limitation of a maximum of 10 proposals per village. However, implementing this policy still faces obstacles regarding direct socialization, consistent communication, and managing community expectations regarding the musrenbang mechanism. These constraints can affect the effectiveness of policy implementation. Therefore, collaborative steps are needed among the parties involved and improved, more effective communication at all levels to ensure full compliance with the policy and achievement of the expected goals.

In addition to resources, the fulfillment of adequate supporting facilities is an important factor in successful policy implementation, especially regarding resources. The interviews highlighted the importance of these facilities in supporting the implementation of restrictions on musrenbang proposals. The Bululawang sub-district head said: "Adequate supporting facilities are a key factor in the successful implementation of the policy limiting musrenbang proposals to a maximum of 10 proposals per village, one of which is a Meeting Room or Hall to carry out socialization or direct meetings with 14 Village Heads in Bululawang Sub-district as well as IT equipment and projectors as tools to support policy presentations, including technical explanations and the impact of limiting proposals" (Interview on 16 August 2024). In addition, the Head of the Village Consultative Body (BPD) also had an opinion: "In my opinion, the existing facilities in Kasembon Village in supporting the implementation of the proposal limitation policy are the Discussion Room to facilitate meetings with the community or other village officials related to the musrenbang proposal and as socialization materials in the form of guidebooks or copies of circular letters to be distributed to the community and communication tools" (Interview on 17 October 2024).

The facilities available are adequate to support the implementation of the Musrenbang proposal limitation policy. These facilities include meeting rooms in Bululawang sub-district and Kasembon Village, computer or laptop devices, printers, a stable internet network, and mobile phones to communicate between villages and RW in Kasembon Village. Each party can carry out their roles and responsibilities with these facilities more effectively. The availability of adequate facilities facilitates coordination and ensures that the policy of limiting the number of proposals to a maximum of 10 per village can be implemented properly by the Circular Letter of the Head of Bappeda of Malang Regency, thus supporting the achievement of optimal policy objectives.

Disposition is the third indicator that plays an important role in the successful implementation of a policy. Disposition reflects the attitude, commitment, and consistency of implementers in implementing policies, so it is a key factor affecting the effectiveness of implementation. Implementers' perceptions show the extent to which they understand, accept, and are committed to the policies implemented, including maintaining consistency in their implementation. The Head of the Community Development and Empowerment Section (Sie PPM) of Bululawang Sub-district argues that: "As the Head of the Community Development and Empowerment Section in Bululawang Sub-district, I believe that the policy of limiting proposals requires strict supervision so that the implementation runs according to the rules. This policy helps to align village needs with existing budget capacity, and direct socialization to the community needs to be improved to avoid misunderstandings" (Interview on 23 August 2024).

Disposition is the main driver in ensuring the policy can be implemented per the stated objectives. A positive attitude and high commitment from implementers are important elements in creating the synergy needed to overcome obstacles and ensure policy success. Bululawang Sub-district SIPD Operator staff also argued, "As a SIPD operator in

Bululawang sub-district, I see this policy as a good step to prevent overload of proposal data in the SIPD application. I often face difficult situations when villages continue to enter more than 10 proposals for various reasons. I feel that directives and policies from superiors should be more assertive so that villages comply with the proposal limitation rule, and the pressure from villages who want additional proposals is my main challenge during my time as a SIPD operator in the sub-district" (Interview on September 17, 2024).

The division of tasks of the implementers has been done well, but each implementer at various levels has various perceptions of the proposal limitation policy. In general, they understand the benefits of this policy in improving the efficiency and effectiveness of musrenbang. However, major challenges remain, especially in uneven socialization, inconsistent communication, and implementation that require better coordination. To overcome these challenges, a collaborative strategy is needed that involves all parties, starting from the sub-district, village, and community levels. This synergy between stakeholders is expected to increase understanding, strengthen communication, and ensure that policy implementation runs optimally according to the objectives set by the proposed restriction policy.

The response of implementers is assessed by their attitudes, commitments, and actions in supporting the policy, ensuring that each step is by the objectives set to achieve successful implementation. The Kasembon Village Head said: "As Kasembon Village Head, I always try to find a middle point between fulfilling the community's aspirations and complying with the policy. I convey the Circular Letter on the limitation of proposals through official letters to RW and community institutions in the village. However, I also often anticipate submitting more proposals if there are proposals that are not accommodated in the musrenbang" (Interview on September 27, 2024). The Kasembon Village SIPD Operator staff added: "As a SIPD Operator in Kasembon Village, I respond to this policy by tightening the data entry into the SIPD application, but often facing pressure to enter more than 10 proposals, I always adjust to handle additional requests for musrenbang proposals so that the proposals entered into the SIPD application exceed the maximum limit of 10 proposals per village" (Interview on September 27, 2024).

The policy implementers have responded well to the proposal limitation policy by the Circular Letter of the Head of Bappeda of Malang Regency. Their response shows a commitment to implementing the policy of limiting the number of proposals to a maximum of 10 per village. However, there are still several problems in its implementation, such as the number of proposals that exceed the predetermined maximum limit. This shows that further efforts are needed to overcome the existing obstacles. Measures such as improving effective communication, thorough socialization, and coordination between parties are key to ensuring the success of this policy. With good collaboration and improvements, policy implementation is expected to run more optimally by the objectives set.

Implementers' actions are the final focus, assessing how they implement the Circular through concrete steps to ensure the policy is implemented as intended. Bululawang sub-district head argues: "As the Camat of Bululawang, I issued a follow-up letter to 14 villages in Bululawang sub-district to emphasize the limit of a maximum of 10 proposals per village and to provide direction and guidance to sub-district officials to assist villages in the process of selecting and prioritizing musrenbang proposals" (Interview on 16 August 2024). The Head of Village Planning also commented: "I always consult with the sub-district officials who handle Musrenbang, namely with the Kasi. PPM regarding proposal selection policies and procedures and always coordinate directly with RW heads to help filter and determine proposals prioritized at the RW level". (Interview on September 27, 2024). The Head of BPD added: "I always inform the proposal restrictions to all RW heads in the RW deliberation, monitor the selection process of prioritized proposals, and act as a mediator between the community and the village government in preparing priority proposals" (Interview on October 17, 2024).

The division of tasks of the implementers has been carried out well, starting from the Camat of Bululawang to the lowest level, namely the BPD as the representative of the Kasembon Village community. The actions taken by each implementer showed solid coordination and commitment to implementing the policy of limiting proposals to a maximum of 10 proposals per village. However, implementing this policy still faces challenges, such as uneven understanding and resistance from some parties. To overcome this, strategic steps are needed in the form of more intensive socialization, continuous monitoring, and technical assistance for implementers. These efforts are expected to strengthen policy implementation, ensure the policy runs by its objectives, and increase community participation in supporting musrenbang effectively.

An effective organizational structure influences the policy's success through a clear, systematic, and easy-to-understand framework. A structured division of tasks is an important criterion in its implementation. The Section Head of Community Development and Empowerment opined: "In my opinion, the current bureaucratic structure is quite effective in implementing the restrictions on musrenbang proposals based on the Circular Letter of the Head of

Bappeda Malang District. Although there are still proposals not covered by the provisions, overall, the proposals submitted have been guided by the Circular Letter. This is because there is a clear division of tasks for each individual, which helps smooth the implementation of the musrenbang proposal. The most crucial thing is understanding the circular letter" (Interview on August 23, 2024).

The division of tasks has been carried out by the provisions and authorities, including the roles of the Sub-district Head, the Head of the Development and Community Empowerment Section, the SIPD Operator Staff of Bululawang Sub-district, as well as the Village Head, the Head of Planning Affairs, the SIPD Operator Staff, and the Head of the BPD of Kasembon Village. A clear division of tasks from the sub-district to the village level created an effective coordination mechanism to support the implementation of the policy, limiting proposals to a maximum of 10 proposals per village. The sub-district head and sub-district officials function as policy directors and supervisors. In contrast, village officials are responsible for the operational selection, preparation, and inputting of proposals into the system. This organized structure ensures that the policy can be implemented efficiently, transparently, and accountable to achieve the policy objectives optimally.

Coordination between task implementers is an important element in the bureaucratic structure, creating a solid and organized team to ensure tasks can be carried out effectively and efficiently. Bululawang, the sub-district head, said, "Coordination between task implementers in the sub-district and villages is an important element in implementing the policy, limiting proposals to a maximum of 10 per village. I always coordinate with the Head of the Community Development and Empowerment Section to provide strategic direction and assign him to lead the technical implementation of the policy at the village level. Likewise, with the SIPD Operator in the Sub-district, I always provide an understanding of the limitations and monitor the input from the village according to the policy, with the Village Head, I often convey the policy through circulars and meetings and facilitate discussions to resolve the obstacles faced by the village in implementing this policy" (Interview on August 16, 2024).

Coordination between task implementers has gone well, where each individual can work together and share information needed to support the implementation of their respective tasks. Structured coordination between task implementers allows the implementation of the proposal limitation policy to run consistently and by the provisions. The roles of each implementer complement each other, starting from the policy socialization stage, the preparation of proposal priorities, and the input process into the system. This integrated working mechanism creates effective synergy so that each policy implementation stage can be carried out well. With solid coordination, obstacles in implementation can be minimized, supporting the success of the proposal limitation policy by the stated objectives.

Researchers found supporting and inhibiting factors for policy implementation from internal and external aspects, with internal supporting factors including human resources that support the success of policies in Kasembon Village. The Bululawang sub-district head said: "The internal supporting factors in this implementation are human resources who can understand and carry out their roles well, and the facilities and infrastructure owned can also support the implementation of restrictions on musrenbang proposals based on the Circular Letter of the Head of Bappeda." (Interview on August 16, 2024). The Head of Village Planning Affairs added: "Coordination and collaboration from each individual to support the successful implementation of the Circular. Each implementer's commitment to carrying out tasks is also a support. How hard the team works to make the restrictions on proposals to be proposed are priority and quality proposals" (Interview on September 27, 2024).

Internal support in the form of human resources who understand their duties well and can carry out their roles optimally is an important factor in supporting the successful implementation of a policy. Competent and skilled human resources can carry out their duties efficiently, ensuring that each policy implementation stage goes according to plan. The role of human resources is not only as technical implementers but also as movers who ensure coordination, communication, and decision-making run smoothly. Therefore, the quality of human resources greatly affects the smooth implementation of policies. In this context, training, supervision, and a clear division of tasks are important to empower human resources to contribute optimally to supporting policy success.

In addition to internal factors, external factors also play an important role in supporting the successful implementation of the Circular Letter of the Head of Bappeda Malang District. External support for implementing the proposal limitation policy relies heavily on internal factors, such as the competence of implementers and strong leadership, and external factors, including technical support from the district government and active community participation. Technical support ensures smooth administrative processes and data entry, while community participation creates a sense of engagement and supports policy acceptance. With a good synergy between these

internal and external factors, policy implementation can run effectively, efficiently, and by the predetermined objectives, increasing the overall success of policy implementation.

This is to the statement of the Bululawang sub-district head: "In my opinion, the external factor that can support is the implementation of socialization by Bappeda Kabupaten Malang to provide instructions and understanding about the restrictions on musrenbang proposals. The socialization is expected to invite relevant regional apparatus, sub-districts, and villages" (Interview on 16 August 2024). The Head of the Community Development and Empowerment Section added: "External factors that support the existence of the SIPD application owned by the Ministry of Home Affairs, which synergizes the process of proposing musrenbang proposals until the final stage and the realization of the proposal and the reporting to the proposer that the proposal is accepted or not" (Interview on 23 August 2024). The Kasembon Village Head also argued, "The role of the Sub-district starts from identifying problems, assisting in each proposal process until the proposal is accommodated" (Interview on September 27, 2024).

In addition to supporting factors, there are also inhibiting factors in the implementation of the Circular Letter of the Head of Bappeda Malang Regency Number 000.7.1/7629/35.07.401/2023 in Kasembon Village, Bululawang Sub-district, including several internal aspects that affect the success of policy implementation. Internal inhibiting factors include the limited capacity of human resources, such as a lack of technical understanding and skills in carrying out tasks, and non-optimal communication between implementers and the community. In addition, pressure from the community, which has high expectations of the Musrenbang proposal, is also challenging. These obstacles can reduce the effectiveness of policy implementation if not handled properly. Therefore, strategic steps are needed, such as increasing human resource capacity, improving communication mechanisms, and managing community expectations, to overcome these obstacles and support policy success.

The Bululawang sub-district SIPD operator argued that: "There are limited technical resources, so there are many technical difficulties in using SIPD, especially if there is a network or system disruption and communication is not optimal so that information is not delivered consistently to village operators" (Interview on September 17, 2024). The Head of Village Planning also stated that: "Difficulties in screening proposals to filter priority proposals from the community are often a challenge due to limited data or support and a high workload so that I have to handle many tasks and it is difficult to focus on the implementation of this policy" (Interview on September 27, 2024). In addition, the Kasembon Village SIPD Operator also added: "The lack of technical competence in which not all operators have sufficient technical skills in inputting proposals into the SIPD application and the demands to input all proposals such as pressure from the village head or the community have forced operators to input more than the maximum limit" (Interview on September 27, 2024).

External factors that hindered the successful implementation of the Circular Letter of the Head of Malang District Bappeda include several aspects identified through interviews with informants. These external barriers include the lack of adequate technical support from related parties, disruptions to the SIPD system that hamper the administrative process, and community expectations that are not always in line with the policy of limiting proposals. These barriers can affect the effectiveness of policy implementation if not addressed immediately. To overcome these problems, efforts are needed to improve implementation coordination, technical training to increase human resources capacity, and a more effective communication approach at all levels. With these measures, external barriers can be minimized, thus supporting the success of policy implementation.

The Head of the Community Development and Empowerment Section stated: "I think the lack of training and guidance has made the input process in the SIPD application not optimal" (Interview on August 23, 2024). The Head of Village Planning Affairs added, "Information about the policy of limiting musrenbang proposals was not conveyed directly to all levels of society, confusing the community" (Interview on September 27, 2024). In addition, the Head of the Village Consultative Body also argued that: "Uneven communication about the limitation of musrenbang proposals has resulted in villagers still wanting to propose more than the maximum limit that has been determined" (Interview on October 17, 2024).

4.2 Discussion of Research Results

The discussion of the research results related to the implementation of the policy limiting participatory planning proposals in the Musrenbang in Kasembon Village, Bululawang District, Malang Regency, shows that the implementation of the Circular Letter of the Head of Bappeda Malang Regency has run by the provisions. Based on G. Edward III's theory, four indicators influence the success of policy implementation: communication, resources, disposition, and bureaucratic structure, which are interconnected and influence each other. Observations and

interviews conducted by researchers confirm that various related parties have supported the policy of limiting musrenbang proposals, with a maximum of 10 proposals per village consisting of 5 physical and five non-physical proposals, and equipped with a proposal dictionary so that its implementation runs smoothly.

In the communication indicator, Bappeda Malang Regency routinely holds coordination meetings and technical guidance on inputting proposals through the SIPD application every year with regional apparatus, including 33 sub-districts. This activity aims to ensure that development planning is based on regional priorities and budget constraints and provides guidance for sub-districts and villages in focusing proposals on priority programs. The results of this activity were outlined in a Circular Letter of the Head of Bappeda that regulates the limitation of Musrenbang proposals to a maximum of 10 proposals per village, consisting of 5 physical proposals and five non-physical proposals, and is equipped with a proposal dictionary. Socialization of the circular letter was carried out through sub-districts and villages but was still limited. The Camat of Bululawang only sent a follow-up letter, while the village head and the head of the BPD of Kasembon conveyed the information to RW without direct discussion. Therefore, a socialization forum involving all parties is needed to increase community understanding and support for this policy.

The next indicator is resources, which include human resources and supporting facilities for policy implementation. In implementing the Circular Letter of the Head of Bappeda Malang Regency regarding restrictions on Musrenbang proposals, the resources that play a role have run according to their roles and needs. Resources in the Bululawang sub-district, such as the Head of the Development and Community Empowerment Section and the SIPD operator, have adequate technical competence. However, time constraints and high workloads are obstacles. Meanwhile, resources in Kasembon Village, especially SIPD operators and village officials, still need technical training to prioritize proposals according to policy. Therefore, capacity building through regular training and technical guidance is needed to support the effective implementation of the policy on limiting Musrenbang proposals in Malang District.

The next indicator that supports the success of policy implementation is disposition. The division of tasks was carried out according to the role of each implementer, and the implementers' perception of their duties showed conformity with the policy. The commitment of the implementers, especially the Camat and the Head of the PPM Section of Bululawang sub-district, is quite high in directing the 14 villages in their area to comply with the policy of limiting Musrenbang proposals. However, the lack of direct communication with the villages is an obstacle to implementation. Meanwhile, the Kasembon Village Village Head, Head of Planning, SIPD Operator, and BPD Chair attempted to align the policy with community needs despite pressure to submit more than the 10 proposals specified in the Head of Bappeda's Circular Letter. Therefore, increasing commitment through a participatory approach is necessary so the community feels involved in decision-making.

The last indicator that supports successful policy implementation is the bureaucratic structure. A clear, systematic, and straightforward bureaucratic structure is an important factor in supporting the implementation of the Circular Letter of the Head of Bappeda Malang District regarding restrictions on Musrenbang proposals. The organizational structure at the sub-district level, such as the sub-district head, the head of the PPM section, and the Bululawang sub-district SIPD operator, has a clear division of tasks. However, coordination between implementers still needs to be improved. At the village level, the village head, the head of the planning division, the SIPD operator, and the head of the BPD in Kasembon village have performed their duties according to their roles. However, coordination between village officials and the community, especially the RW, is still not optimal. Therefore, it is necessary to strengthen the coordination structure through regular village meetings involving all elements and online communication platforms to improve the effectiveness of coordination in policy implementation.

Based on Edward III's theory analysis, implementing the Circular Letter of the Head of Bappeda Malang Regency regarding restrictions on Musrenbang proposals still faces several weaknesses, especially in communication and coordination between implementers. Suboptimal policy socialization and ineffective coordination between sub-districts, villages, and communities resulted in a low understanding of the policy. To overcome this, improvements are needed in more intensive communication, increasing the capacity of human resources through technical training, strengthening the commitment of implementers at all levels, and optimizing a more directed organizational structure. With these steps, policy implementation can run more effectively, thus supporting more focused, sustainable development planning and the Malang District's priority needs.

During the implementation process of the Circular Letter of the Head of Bappeda Malang Regency in Kasembon Village, Bululawang Sub-district, there were supporting factors that played a role in encouraging the success of the policy limiting Musrenbang proposals to a maximum of 10 proposals per village. Internal supporting

factors include the existence of a clear policy through a Circular Letter that provides guidelines for sub-district and village officials, the use of the SIPD application that facilitates the management of proposal data, and the commitment of implementers at the sub-district and village levels, such as the Camat, village head, and SIPD operator. A clear division of tasks in the organizational structure also supports implementing this policy. External supporting factors include community support that understands the importance of limiting proposals and is willing to prioritize important programs. In addition, the measurable direction of regional development also supports this policy, as the proposal limitation helps align village programs with regional development priorities to make them more effective and targeted.

The inhibiting factors in implementing the policy limiting Musrenbang proposals to a maximum of ten proposals per village include internal and external factors that can slow down the policy's success. Internal factors include limited human resources, where village officials are not yet fully capable of sorting and prioritizing proposals by the provisions. Village heads and officials often face pressure from local stakeholders who want more proposals accommodated. The lack of direct socialization also causes the community to have a poor understanding of the policy, leading to resistance. External factors include community pressure that fears important proposals will not be accommodated and technical constraints in the SIPD application, such as network or system disruptions. In addition, suboptimal coordination between sub-districts, villages, and communities is a challenge that needs improvement to ensure policy implementation runs effectively and efficiently.

To overcome the constraining factors described, it is necessary to increase the capacity of human resources through training for village and sub-district officials to filter proposals that are truly prioritized according to policy. Direct socialization to the community is also important in explaining the purpose and benefits of limiting proposals to reduce resistance. In addition, coordination needs to be strengthened by improving communication between implementers through regular discussion forums to discuss progress and obstacles in implementation. By overcoming inhibiting factors and maximizing supporting factors, implementing the Circular Letter of the Head of Bappeda Malang Regency is expected to run more effectively, accelerate the realization of priority programs, and positively impact directed and sustainable development in Malang Regency.

The implementation of the Policy on Restricting Participatory Planning Proposals in Musrenbang by the Circular Letter of the Head of Bappeda Malang Regency in Kasembon Village, Bululawang Subdistrict, was analyzed using Edward III's theory which includes four indicators: communication, resources, disposition, and bureaucratic structure. The analysis results show that this theory is largely accepted because it can explain the dynamics of policy implementation, although there are some limitations. From the communication aspect, Edward III's theory emphasizes the importance of effective information delivery. In Kasembon Village, communication through circulars has been carried out. However, the lack of direct socialization hinders community understanding, supporting the theory that effective communication is a prerequisite for policy success. From the resource aspect, the theory is also relevant as it highlights the importance of human and technical resource readiness. In Kasembon Village, limited technical capacity in SIPD management is an obstacle that affects the effectiveness of implementation.

In the disposition aspect, Edward III's theory is relevant in describing the attitude and commitment of implementers in policy implementation. The disposition of the implementers in Kasembon Village shows an effort to implement the policy according to the provisions. However, community pressure to accommodate more proposals shows that the social context can influence the attitude of implementers. This supports Edward III's theory and emphasizes the importance of an adaptive approach in policy implementation. Meanwhile, the bureaucratic structure in Kasembon Village reinforces the relevance of the theory, with a clear division of tasks and a bureaucratic system that supports implementation. However, coordination between stakeholders still needs to be improved. Overall, Edward III's theory is accepted in explaining the implementation of this policy but requires additional enrichment to deal with social and technical challenges at the local level.

5. CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

Based on the research results regarding the implementation of the policy limiting participatory planning proposals in the Musrenbang, it is found that this policy has been implemented by the Circular Letter of the Head of Bappeda Malang Regency in Kasembon Village, Bululawang District, Malang Regency. The implementation fulfills the four indicators of policy implementation according to G. Edward III's theory: communication, resources, disposition, and bureaucratic structure. Each indicator shows that the participatory planning process has been limited by applicable regulations to increase the effectiveness of policy implementation at the village level without reducing the essence of community participation in the development planning process.

Communication in policy implementation in Kasembon Village was carried out through letters, but the lack of direct socialization meant that the community did not fully understand the policy. In the resource indicator, the limited technical capacity of village officials is an obstacle, although using the SIPD application facilitates the technical process. On disposition, the commitment of implementers in Bululawang Sub-district and Kasembon Village is quite high. However, community pressure still wants more proposals to be accommodated beyond the maximum limit. The bureaucratic structure shows that the division of tasks is clear. However, coordination between implementers and the community in Kasembon Village still needs to be improved to make policy implementation more effective.

Supporting factors for implementing the Musrenbang proposal limitation policy in Kasembon Village include a clear policy and the utilization of the SIPD application, which facilitates the management of proposal data. Support from some communities who understood the importance of this policy in selecting priority proposals and the commitment of implementers in Bululawang sub-district and Kasembon Village were also key strengths. However, obstacles encountered include the lack of face-to-face socialization, limited technical personnel, understanding of SIPD operators, community pressure to accommodate more than ten proposals, and suboptimal coordination, which led to perceptions of the policy as limiting community aspirations.

Based on the conclusions outlined, several recommendations are expected to strengthen the implementation of the policy-limiting proposals in Kasembon Village. Direct meetings at the village level are needed to provide more comprehensive explanations, supported by communication media such as WhatsApp groups, social media, and announcement boards. Periodic technical training for SIPD operators and providing easy-to-understand technical guidelines are needed. Community involvement in selecting proposals through thematic musrenbang or RW-level deliberations needs to be strengthened to prioritize. Regular coordination forums and clarification mechanisms for unaccommodated proposals are important to reduce community resistance.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, James. 1979. *Public Policy Making*, (Second ed), New York: Holt Rinehart and Winston, New York.
- Abady, A. P. *Perencanaan partisipatif dalam pembangunan daerah*. (2013). *Otoritas: Jurnal Ilmu Pemerintahan*, III (1), 25–34.
- Abdul Wahab, Solichin. 2017. *Analisis Kebijakan Dari Formulasi Ke Penyusunan Model-model Implementasi Kebijakan Publik*. Bumi Aksara. Jakarta.
- Abe, Alexander. 2005. *Perencanaan Daerah Partisipatif*. Pustaka Jogja Mandiri. Yogyakarta.
- Ach. Wazir Ws., et al., ed. 1999. *Panduan Penguatan Manajemen Lembaga Swadaya Masyarakat*. Sekretariat Bina Desa dengan dukungan AusAID melalui Indonesia HIV/AIDS and STD Prevention and Care Project. Jakarta.
- Adi, Wijaya. 2003. *Kebijakan Pembangunan Daerah Dalam era Otonomi*. P2E-LIPI.: Jakarta.
- Adi, Isbandi Rukminto. 2007. *Perencanaan partisipatoris berbasis aset komunitas dari pemikiran menuju penerapan*. FISIP UI Press. Depok.
- Adriansyah Samsura. *Participatory Planning, Good Governance, and Civil Society*. (2003). Artikel. 9 January 2003.
- Anwar, dan Adang. 2013. *Sosiologi Untuk Universitas*. PT Refika Aditama. Bandung.
- Arnstein, Sherry R. *A Ladder of Citizen Participation*. (1969). *JAIP*, Vol. 35, No. 4, July 1969, pp. 216-224.
- Bintoro, TjokroAmidjojo. 1985. *Perencanaan Pembangunan*. Penerbit PT Gunung Agung. Jakarta.
- Cahyono. B.Y. *Metode Pendekatan Sosial Dalam Pembangunan Partisipatif*. (2006). [Ippm.petra.ac.id/ppm/COP/download](http://ppm.petra.ac.id/ppm/COP/download). Di akses, 2 November 2007
- D. Conyers and Hill. 1984. *Konsep Perencanaan Pembangunan*.
- Edward III, George C. 1980. *Implementing Public Policy*. Congressional Quarterly Press. Washington DC.
- Glasson, John. 1990. *Pengantar Perencanaan Regional*. Terjemahan Paul Sitohang. LPFEUI.
- Himawan, Muammar. 2004. *Pokok-Pokok Organisasi Modern*. Bina Ilmu. Jakarta
- Khairuddin H. 1992. *Pembangunan Masyarakat: Tinjauan Aspek, Sosiologi, Ekonomi, dan Perencanaan*. Liberty. Yogyakarta.
- Lawrence M. Friedman, 1974, *The Legal System, A Social Science Perspective*. Russel Sage Foundation. New York.
- Marschall. 2006. dalam (Arif Wahyu Kristianto). *Peningkatan Partisipasi Masyarakat Dalam Pembangunan Infrastruktur Jalan*.
- Mardikanto, Totok dan Poerwoko Soebiato. 2013. *Pemberdayaan Masyarakat dalam Perspektif Kebijakan Publik*. Penerbit Alfabeta. Bandung.

- Ndraha, Taliziduhu. 1990, Pengembangan Masyarakat Mempersiapkan Masyarakat Tinggal Landas, Rineka Cipta. Jakarta.
- Nierras, R.M, et al. Making Participatory Planning in Local Governance Happen. (2002). Institut of Development Studies, University of Sussex, Brighton. United Kingdom.
- Paul, Samuel, 1987. Community Participation in Development Projects-The World Bank Experience. The World Bank. Washington DC.
- Ripley, Randall B. Dan Franklin, Grace A. 1986. Policy Implementation and Bureaucracy. The Dorsey Press. Chicago.
- Sadhana, Kridawati. 2013. Realitas Kebijakan Publik. Universitas Negeri Malang (UM Press). Malang
- Sugiyono, 2020. Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif dan Kombinasi (Mixed Methods). Alfabeta. Bandung.
- Sugiyono, 2021. Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif dan R&D. Alfabeta. Bandung.
- Sholahuddin, Agus, 2021. Metodologi Penelitian Sosial. Perspektif Kualitatif-Kuantitatif. Edulitera hal. 3. Malang.
- Udoji, Chief J.O, 1981. The African Public Servant as Public Policy in Africa, African Association For Public Administration and Management. Addis Abeba.
- Undang-Undang Negara Republik Indonesia Nomor 25 Tahun 2004 tentang Sistem Perencanaan Pembangunan Nasional.
- Undang-Undang Negara Republik Indonesia Nomor 32 Tahun 2004 tentang Pemerintahan Daerah.
- Peraturan Menteri Dalam Negeri 86 Tahun 2017 tentang Tata Cara Perencanaan, Pengendalian Dan Evaluasi Pembangunan Daerah, Tata Cara Evaluasi Rancangan Peraturan Daerah Tentang Rencana Pembangunan Jangka Panjang Daerah Dan Rencana Pembangunan Jangka Menengah Daerah, Serta Tata Cara Perubahan Rencana Pembangunan Jangka Panjang Daerah, Rencana Pembangunan Jangka Menengah Daerah, Dan Rencana Kerja Pemerintah Daerah.
- Peraturan Menteri Dalam Negeri Republik Indonesia Nomor 70 tahun 2019 Sistem Informasi Pemerintahan Daerah.
- Widodo, Joko, 2021. Analisis Kebijakan Publik. Media Nusa Creative. Malang.
- Wijaya, R. Forum Pengambilan Keputusan dalam Proses Perencanaan Pembangunan di Era Otonomi Daerah (Studi Kasus Di Kelurahan Jebres Kecamatan Jebres Kota Surakarta. (2001). Universitas Gadjah Mada.