

# **BUILDING GOOD GOVERNANCE IN INDONESIA**

## **Cases of Local Government Efforts to Enhance Transparency<sup>1</sup>**

Dr Agus Pramusinto, MDA<sup>2</sup>

### **Abstract**

Good governance has become a serious concern in developing countries. In Indonesia, a number of initiatives have been introduced to enhance local government transparency. Some provincial and district governments have passed regulations that support the local government to build institutions to enhance transparency. It is expected that this will facilitate citizens' involvement in the public policy processes. Some have created the commission on information transparency and participation while others have a provincial-level ombudsman.

This paper discusses the process of the formation of these institutions and assess their effectiveness. Although the initiatives of the creation of the institution were similar, their legal status vary. In the case of Lebak district, the Commission on Information Transparency and Participation was established and supported by local regulation passed by the local parliament. On the contrary, the case of the ombudsman in the Special Region of Yogyakarta (SRY) was based on a gubernatorial decree, which can be declared null and void anytime by the same governor.

### **Introduction**

The term good governance is relatively new in public administration. The concept was coined by the World Bank in 1989 to identify the "*crisis of governance*" in Africa (World Bank 1992: 5). It refers to "the manner in which power is exercised in the management of a country's economic and social resources for development" (World Bank 1992: 1). Although it is new, many studies have so far been conducted on good governance (Hume & Turner 1997; Larmour 1998; Jabbara & Dwivedi 2004; Jreisat 2004; MAP-UGM 2006). In Indonesia, good governance has also been a matter of interest to academics and donors. Dwiyanto (2005), for example, gives prescriptions regarding aspects of good governance in public service delivery. Dwiyanto (2006) continued the study but with a particular focus on governance assessment intended to yield an instrument cum diagnostic tool.

---

<sup>1</sup> Paper presented at the EROPA Conference: Modernising the Civil Service Reform in Alignment with National Development Goals, Bandar Seri Begawan Brunei Darussalaam, 13-17 November 2006.

<sup>2</sup> Director of the Master Program of Public Policy and Administration, Gadjah Mada University, Jl. Prof. Sardjito, Sekip Yogyakarta 55281 INDONESIA; Telp: +62 274 563825; Email: [agus\\_pramusinto@map.ugm.ac.id](mailto:agus_pramusinto@map.ugm.ac.id); [guspram2001@yahoo.com](mailto:guspram2001@yahoo.com)

From 1999 when the decentralization policy was adopted, many people were pessimistic. This arose from rampant negative practices that characterized the conduct of local government officials. To others, decentralization (local autonomy) was seen as a potential cure to some the ills above. Nevertheless excess like corruption have emerged (Pramusinto 2005). In some cases, local government regulations do not take into account the interests of citizens (World Bank 2006). Moreover, the investment climate is not attractive to bussinesses (SMERU 2001).

Although innovative efforts have been taken by districts to create good governance in Indonesia, it is unfortunate that such efforts have not been appreciated. The best practices have not yet been recognized by many, consequently the lessons from the experiences have not been learnt by other districts who could borrow it in order so as to build a better system.

Arising from the foregoing observations, this paper attempts to appreciate existing practices. The case studies cited are the Commission on Transparency and Participation under the local government of Lebak in the Province of Banten and the Local Ombudsman in the Special Region of Yogyakarta (SRY).

## **Lessons from Experience**

The Indonesian experience shows that the governmental system of the last 32 years of the new order regime gave birth to an imbalance of political power a far cry from cherished democratic values. The governmental system was centralistic, monolithic and all powers were in the hands of President Soeharto. Overall it led to a closed non participatory government (bureaucratic polity). Public decision making processes remained a privilege of the elite. This in turn weakened actors' positions both for those in government and the civil society. In the end, the system assumed too much powers. It effectively turned into an authoritarian and repressive government.

The failures of the centralistic closed government affected the level of citizens' trust in government which later required a drastic change in leadership and reformation of all aspects of political and economic life. Although the New Order Government was able to gain legitimacy through its economic success attained under a centralistic system, at the end it was proved that the system was very fragile.

Foremost, government bureaucracies tend to serve the demands of the central government above, it therefore becomes uninnovative and unresponsive to local demands by the citizens. Secondly, when resources for development are handed down from the central government to recipient communities, it creates an apathetic public. In the event that the capacity of the central government gets limited, public institutions become impotent due to this dependency on the good will of the government and cannot cater for the needs of the citizens.

Experiences have thus far shown that 'successful' development which is attained without citizens' participation, economic and political stability needs to be reexamined. The widespread corruption in the country is not merely a result of lack of transparency in government management but also the absence of citizens control over public policy processes. Development paradigms that have since been dominated by emphasis on government actors in many disciplines should be reassessed with a view to opening windows of transparency and participation to the public.

### **Why Emphasize Information Transparency and Participation?**

Demanding information transparency and participation from governmental systems is a consequence of the global and domestic efforts geared towards reformation. At the global level, the 1990s is considered an open decade where many governments like: Japan, the Republic of Korea, Thailand and India made laws that guarantees citizens access to government information. The Asian Development Bank (ADB) by 1994 made a document which explained its communication policy with the public, called 'the secrecy policy and policy of expression' which effectively altered its policies and information strategy. International promises of civil political and civil rights so far signed by over 20 members of ADB is an indication that there is a global concern over the importance of the rights of citizens to know and influence decisions affecting their daily lives<sup>3</sup>.

---

<sup>3</sup> Lihat [www.adb.org/documents/translations/bahasa/public-communications\\_Policy\\_Draft\\_ID.pdf](http://www.adb.org/documents/translations/bahasa/public-communications_Policy_Draft_ID.pdf)

### ***The Importance of Information Transparency***

”Knowledge is the true organ of sight, not the eyes”<sup>4</sup>. Although it was said long ago by Frances Bacon in 1597 that “knowledge is power” and Dwight Schrute that “information is power”<sup>5</sup>. If the democratic assumption is that authority lies in the hands of the people, then the source of knowledge must fully be in the hands of the citizens. As long as the citizens do not have sufficient knowledge, there and then, sovereignty slips out of their grasp into the hands of an oligarchy of elite groups.

Usually it is said in the realms of democracy that the public has a right to know. However the fundamental question which also crops up is: Does the public have that right? If the answer is yes, the how is this right acknowledged, protected and given? This question has turned into long debate. James Madison, a founding father of the American Constitution said: popular government without popular information or the means to provide it is only a long journey to a buffonery or tragedy or both. Knowledge will always organize the ignorant; and people who want themselves organized, or organize themselves on their own, must arm themselves with the power derived from knowledge’.<sup>6</sup>

In the principal policy document of ADB it is said ”access to accurate information at the right time about the economy and government policies can be vital for private sector policy making.” Transparency is needed so that the citizens get that access to information on what was, what is and what will be done by government. So far, in the case of Indonesia, information control is still highly dominated by government especially the executive.

The legislature which should have authority to control is not capable enough and their access information is very limited. Under conditions like this, roles that should be played the legislative institutions becomes very inadequate. In addition to that, at the citizens’ levels, access to information is equally insufficient. When the legislative institutions cannot work maximally and the citizens do not make inputs to their representatives, government works unrestrained.

In the end, transparency is an issue of considerable importance due to the following: First, a knowledgeable public well equipped with information participates more in the

---

<sup>4</sup> Panchantantra (c. 5<sup>th</sup> century). Lihat [www.transparency.org/sourcebook/24.html](http://www.transparency.org/sourcebook/24.html)

<sup>5</sup> [http://blogs.nbc.com/office/entry\\_22.html](http://blogs.nbc.com/office/entry_22.html)

<sup>6</sup> Lihat [www.transparency.org/sourcebook/24.html](http://www.transparency.org/sourcebook/24.html)

democratic processes; secondly, parliament, press, and public must be capable and swiftly follow and investigate governmental actions which is a prime obstacle to accountability; thirdly, public services makes important decisions that affects many people, to be accountable then administrators must provide a feedback mechanism of information concerning what it is doing now; fourthly, good channels of information are bound to result in a government which more effective and helps to create more flexible policies; and fifthly cooperation between the public and government shall improve through the abundant information available.

### ***Transparency and Political Participation***

There is a very strong relationship between transparency and political participation. The push to undertake participation was instigated by the changes in the political structures termed democracy, whereby citizens insist on the formation of a political arrangement which allows room for different groups in the civil society to join in the public policy processes.

In political sciences, political participation consists of activities connected to voting, electoral campaigning, and non-partisan lobbying<sup>7</sup>. From a public policy perspective however, political participation is defined more at the levels of involvement of society in the process of public decision making. Participation is understood as influence from the society on the process of planning, implementation and evaluation of public policies. According to the World Bank, participation is a process in which stakeholders influence various planning activities related to development planning, decision making and resources to that effect<sup>8</sup>.

The World Bank also distinguishes the conceptions of popular participation from the stakeholder participation. Popular participation tends to lean towards participation by the poor or disadvantaged groups along the lines of wealth, education, ethnicity or gender. On the other hand, stakeholder participation is the inclusion of all relevant stakeholders in the development processes. Similarly, stakeholders who poses power, interest and resources tend to collaborate and work together. In the language of Friedmann (1987), participation in public policy processes is a political process to allow for opportunities of collective

---

<sup>7</sup> W.L.Miller, 'Political Participation and Voting Behaviour', Encyclopedia of Government and Politics, Volume 1: 428.

<sup>8</sup> Participation Learning Group Final Report, The World Bank Participation Sourcebook, [www.worldbank.org/wbi/sourcebook/sb0100.htm](http://www.worldbank.org/wbi/sourcebook/sb0100.htm)

agreement through activities involving negotiations among stakeholders. Participation must be understood as a right and not a privilege granted to the people by government. It must as well be seen as a voluntary process from the citizens and not a mobilization process conducted by government apparatuses that ends up in *enforced participation*.

Government throughout the New Order period embraced the practice of engineered participation. Whenever there was a people's involvement, emphasis was put more on implementation of development programs already made by government. Other forms of participation were oppressed to bring about social shock which would disturb the investment climate.

Participation is necessary for the legitimization of government policies. Citizens participation in every public policy is a process of expressing views more specifically channelling complaints against government services which is perceived to be unsatisfactory. Mediums of participation are meant to allow the citizens to be heard, understood, respected, get an explanation and listen to apologies from government besides getting information about remedial actions to correct mistakes made by government.

## **The Commission on Transparency and Participation: A Case Study of Lebak district**

### ***Background of Lebak***

Lebak is a poor district located on the western side of Jawa Islands. Long ago when it was still part of the Province of west Jawa, Lebak was ranked number 24 out of the existing 24 districts then. After four districts and two cities broke off to form the Province of Banten, Lebak was still ranked lowest. Its *PDRB* per capita is a meagre Rp 3.174.960,00 (2002 figures). This figures rank far lower than that of say Tangerang which is as high as Rp. 15.260.365,00. Compared to the city of Cilegon whose revenue is as high as Rp 30.499.086,00. According to Drs. Robert Chandra, *MPP* who is the secretary for planning in the district, out of 300 villages in Lebak, up to 148 are categorized as remote.

### ***The Processes of the Formation of CITP***

The wishes of some groups of people in the district facilitated by the *Initiative for Local Governance Reform (ILGR)* resulted in extended debates to create clean governance. After socialization and the exchange of opinions through radio talk shows and publications in the

newspaper, a Multi Stakeholder Forum (MSF) was formed. MSF is a coalition made up of: civil servants, district councillors, journalists, students, CSOs, citizens, women activists etc all in all 17 people. These people were divided in three working groups termed *Task Force*: First was the task force on transparency and participation; task force on participation of the poor and task force on bussiness competition. The task force on transparency and participation was the most dynamic of all; capable of raising serious issues.

Thereafter, it succeeded in compiling an academic paper on transparency which was latter presented before the district council. After that the council set up a special committee to make a draft on transparency to be followed by public discussions intended to get the views of the public. By 1/06/2004 the district council successfully passed the draft into a regulation No. 6 of 2004 about transparency and participation in governance and development in the district of Lebak.

From the above processes, it is clearly shown that efforts to create good governance can succeed where there is political will from all stakeholders. Interviews with many respondents at the begining led to controversies related to the need for such regulation.<sup>9</sup> Some of whom are straight from the district bureaucracy to test their feelings but it was difficult because not all bureaucrats have a common perception of transparency.<sup>10</sup>

Public policy processes and control over information is still a luxurious thing owned by public officals. Providing information and involving citizens in public participation is seen to be a loss of previlleges by some people in the district councillors who apparently have not internalized it yet<sup>11</sup>.

### ***Structures and Resources***

CITP is an independent organization which functions as a watchdog, overseer, facilitator and mediator established under local regulation No. 6 of 2004 and inaugurated on the 12th September 2005. CITP personnel originate from among activists. They are selected out of a total of 152 applicants who after screening through interviews and essay writing. Out of 40 people shortlisted, ten (10) names were presented to the district council for consideration .

---

<sup>9</sup> Interviews with all CITP officials in Lebak district on 6<sup>th</sup> June, 2006.

<sup>10</sup> Interview with the secretary Bappeda -Lebak, 6 June, 2006.

<sup>11</sup> Interviews with the fractional leader of PDIP, members of PKS and PKB, 7th June, 2006.

The names were called out to undergo a *fit and proper test* which would see five people pass and get appointed by the district head.

The personnel of CTIP above belong to five job categories: the chairperson; secretary who also doubles as the legal governmental affairs officer; development economy affairs officer; education and welfare affairs officer, and finance and licensing affairs officer. They are in charge of different jurisdictions for which they are responsible.

The managers of CTIP above are assisted by six civil servants and three volunteers (Sudi 2006). To facilitate their operations, CTIP is funded with a sum of Rp 250 million per year. Since it is not a department of the local government, their budgets belong to the law section of the Lebak district. This budget covers the salaries of the five administrators. It is also used to cover operational costs such as socialization at the lower local government levels including the villages. Due to limited finances and personnel, up to present CTIP has just socialized only 23 subcounties. Moreover, socialization at much lower levels has reached only 10 villages.

Much as the CITP budget is very minimal as compared to the work load to be accomplished, the support of the district Chairperson Mr. H. Mulyadi Jayabaya and his councillors together with the public helps to boost morales among the administrators of CITP. Whenever interviewing bureaucrats, councillors, or citizens, CITP is always mentioned as an indication that they are very proud of it. However, this does not mean that CITP has no challenges. Some groups of people still query the sustainability of CITP.

Is it feasible that CITP is independent enough when its budget depends on the good will of the LG? They also fear CITP is just a *back up* organization for the endorsement of the policies of Lebak local government. Or that CITP can only sort and choose in the interests of the powers that be; or that CITP simply waits for reports yet it should collect it from the lowest levels and must get proactive.

### ***Implementation and Effectiveness***

How effective is CITP? The answers to this question should be seen from two indicators: Foremost, what is the response of the district bureaucrats towards the issue of transparency; secondly, how do the citizens put to use the organization to present their complaints regarding government and development related problems?

The public officers are very receptive and welcoming to citizens making inquiries about public information compared that of in other districts. Generally, the officials are easy to access and provide public services with a smile as experienced by the research team. This is not limited to the levels of bureaucracy alone but also elected representatives of the district council. On many occasions I tried to meet the bureaucrats and had an interview with the secretary to the *Bappeda* for up to one and a half hours.

When I entered the licensing office, I was right away interviewed the chairperson without any difficulty. In another office when I met the officers of the local auditing agency, *Bawasda*, the officer in charge was as well available and ready to be interviewed, an interview which lasted an hour or more. In the district council, I was also able to meet face to face two councillors to get information on public services in the district. This openness is alleged however stems from the local regulation which stipulates that anyone who intentionally obstructs access to information is liable to imprisonment for a maximum of five years in jail or a fine of five million rupiahs.

CITP officials are also highly respected by the peers from other departments in the district. By the exercise of the authority entrusted to them, they are able to easily provide data required for clarifications and verifications of complaints as reported by the public. There are several instances of problems that arise and requires the attention of CITP eg the recruitment of civil servants in the districts which became the hottest issue and had not been settled yet. A big number of civil servants alleged that the recruitment processes were not open. In this case, CITP had to obtain data and answer queries raised by the district service commission to inform the complainants.

Another case in point was about the handling of a School's Facilitation Grants (BOS) and cash transfer (BLT) which always does not follow regulations set by government. Besides, problems of development like schools, roads, market as a result of practices that deviate from the set rules are some of the complaints raised by the citizens (See tables 1 and 2).

Arising from criteria number two, that is citizens' response, I discovered that they are very high. Records from the visitors' book for the months of May show at least 100 guests who visited CITP either on courtesy or register their problems in connection with local government policies. This attendance by the citizens keeps increasing. By 6th June of 2006

up to 129 citizens had sought and used the services of CITP. Many district councillors too felt the need to visit the CITP offices to seek information on problems being encountered by the public. They use the public aspirations as received by CITP but it is not clear whether such aspirations reach the agenda table of the district council.

**Table 1: List of Complains and Public Informational Request to the Tranparency and Participation Committee for Lebak District Year 2005**

No	Set of Problems	CITP Actions
1.	Performance of village heads	Noted as inputs
2.	Cash transfers	Clarification in the field; clarification in village heads and subdistrict heads to be continued to the district head.
3.	Construction of Primary School in Sindang Ratu III, Panggarangan	Noted as inputs
4.	Sticker of cash transfer receiver bearing photo of the district head and chairperson district council.	Continued to Regent/Bupati and Chairperson of DPRD; Regent's Answer letter No. 463/919-Pem/2005 dated 22 December 2005 has already been forwarded to the petitioner
5.	Cash transfers	Letter forwarded to the LG Administration section head
6.	Comformity with data on needy families.	Consultation with bureau of statistics
7.	Replace building costs of Junior High school, II, Curugbitung	Meet the related parties, result of agreement signed by both parties
8.	Lack of transparency in building and rehabilitation of Muncang Primary School.	Noted as inputs
9.	Selling rice designated for needy families by 9 Village leaders to rice broker at Pandeglang Cikulur subdistrict, Lebak	Field Investigation (subdistricts, Police offices, village offices); deliver letter to district chairperson, Lebak
10.	Explanation concerning Fresh Money/cash and balance and rice for the poor.	Field investigation (Political district and public)
11.	Complain BLT Majasari Village Sobang Neighbourhood	Establish field investigation (Subdistrict head, reciever of cash transfer, village head, secretary, and citizens.
12.	Governmental affairs section, district secretariat	Contiued to Lebak and Local investigators.

Source: CITP, 2005

**Table 2: List of Indicment and Public Information Request to the Transparency and Participation Committee of Lebak Regency Year 2006**

No	Problems	CITP Action
1.	To receive explanations about road infrastructure funds at Parakan Village Besi Bojongmanik Neighbourhood	Request data to Public works Agency and surrender it to requested party
2.	Village leader of Gunung Kencana; realisation of cash is not in accordance with real figures	Request information to department of local services and give it to the interested party
3.	Request for information in relation to the building of Rangkasbitung market	Request information to LG then related it to party in need
4.	Request for rice for the needy because it's distribution is stagnating at Curugbitung	Propose to the requester to directly confirm to depot of logistics Whether there isn't any appreciation Transparency and Participation Committee will follow-up
5.	Cash transfers and fuel subsidies not properly done especially at Curugbitung	Establish an investigation in the field, establish, make confirmation to the bureau of statisticts
6.	Concerning quota distribution of milk to children under 5 years	Suggested to the complainant and directly confirm with health centre. There is no appreciation if CITP committee for follow-up
7.	Concerning (cash) transfers money year 2005 and cash balance year 2005 at Wanasalam	Request information to district secretary and deliver to complainant
8.	Budget proposal for thew building of junior high school II Curugbitung	Request budget proposal to go school committee and deliver it to requested party
9.	Data for Gunung Kencana planned activities year 2005	Request information to LG services Lebak and give to complainant.
10.	Concerning the deduction of cash transfer funds by as much as Rp 100.000,0 per person with the reason that is a deed of transparency and participation Committee and Family Card	Establishing an investigation in the field on on needy families who receive cash transfers. Confrontation with the village leaders for explanations
11.	House shop application (rumah toko) Rangkasbitung Market	Data requested in relation to Pemkab (Asekda II) party
12.	Announce details for all building plans and budget proposal and instalments	Data request in relation to LG (Asekda II) party

Source: CITP, 2006 (June)

## **The Local Ombudsman: Case Study of Yogyakarta.**

### *Description*

The Special Region Yogyakarta (SRY) is the smallest province after the Special Region cum Capital-Jakarta. It has a total land area of 3.185,80 kilometers squared divided into 4 districts

and a city viz: Bantul, Gunung Kidul, Kulon Progo, Sleman and Yogyakarta City. To the south, it is bordered by the Samodra Indonesian Sea, to the north the Merapi Mountains and the Province of Central Java.

Information from the national statistics body, shows that Yogyakarta's economic structure is as follows: service sector (19,60%), trade, restaurants and hotels (19,10%), agriculture (16,60%). Manufacturing contributes only (14,70%). This data takes due cognizance of the education and tourism sectors which make significant contributions to the economy of Yogyakarta. It is however different from a general picture of the Indonesian economic structure which is generally dominated by the manufacturing sector (28,10%).

### ***Processes of LO Formation***

LO Yogyakarta is an organization formed and owned by the local government. It has no relationship whatsoever with the National Ombudsman Commission. The idea of LO is a brainchild of several NGOs under the umbrella of *Gatra Tri Brata*. Their membership is approximately fifty (50) people. After a series of meetings lasting about four months. These discussions involved a broad spectrum of society including NGOs, the bureaucrats, district parliamentarians and the general public. The processes at this stage was being financed with the support of Partnership for Governance Reform.

The series of discussions above culminated in the formation of LO which functions as an institution outside the local government entrusted with overseeing public service performance and upholding laws therein. LO is also committed to realising a dream of ensuring ease, speed and fairness in public service delivery with a view to promoting good governance with a clean government. With the involvement of LO, the local government can attain desired performance levels based on *zero tolerance for poor governance*. The principles underlying the implementation of LO are: Independence, impartiality, objectiveness, non-discrimination, liberation, high moral standards and simple procedures. After mature deliberations, the formation process climaxed in the governors' decision to create LO.

### ***Structures and Resources***

Whereas the Transparency and Participation Commission was established by a local regulation, the LO SRY was established through the Governors letter (SK DIY No 134/2004) on the LO's formation and organisation signed on the 30 June 2004. Its composition in terms of membership was determined through another letter (SK No 52/KEP/2005).

The LO organisation structure consists of a Chairperson, deputy-chairperson and 3 members who are in charge of the following departments: The department of cooperation and services; monitoring and investigation and the department of education and research. Each of these departmental heads is supported by an assistant. Besides, there are three secretarial staff who handle day to day secretarial work, administration and accounts. The supervisors, assistants and administrative staff are recruited through an open recruitment process. However, civil servants, members of political parties and the army are exempted.

Recruitment was conducted by an independent team of academics, journalists, NGO, human rights and gender activists. Registration is done openly with announcements put on the newspaper and electronic media. Out of about 66 applicants only 33 were shortlisted on condition that they met the required qualifications.

The shortlisted applicants then took written interviews to examine their knowledge on ombudsmanship, public administration, maladministration, advocacy of citizens interests and matters of gender. Twenty candidates passed and then proceeded to take public interviews as a means to ascertain their vision and mission. Finally out of the twenty, five were invited for oral interviews to gauge their commitment to the job. These five were publicly announced and went ahead to undergo a second public test to determine whether or not they had any shortcomings which would disqualify them.

The LO receives assistance from the local governments budget to the tune of 750 million Rupiahs for their activities per year. This amount is small compared to the scope of the region covering up to five districts including the provincial local government of Yogyakarta province as well. Moreover, complaints reported for investigation ranges runs right from governance issues at the provincial, district, county up to the village levels.

### ***Implementation and Effectiveness***

What does LO implementation and effectiveness look like? Distinct from CTIP, LO's zone of operation covers a wide area of five districts and the provincial government which is six times bigger in scope than that of KTP in Lebak. However, its performance can be judged from how the citizens use the presence of LO to give feedback on the activities of local governments. The time span of just a year is not enough to allow us to measure the impact of LO on bureaucratic performance.

Table 3 below elaborates the kind of cases received by LO, 187 in total. These reports can be categorized as follows: Complaints(105), consultations (76), and reports initiated solely by LOD (6). The following table gives a detail picture of the cases received by LO. Obviously, most of them are law related and governance issues. (See Tabel 4).

**Table 3: Categories of Cases Reported to the LO, Yogyakarta.**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Type of case</b>	<b>Total</b>
1.	Complaint	105
2.	Non-Complaint request for attention and consultation	76
3.	LO Initiative	6
	Total	187

**Table 4: Types of Cases Reported to LO**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Type of Case</b>	<b>Total</b>
1.	Tax	4
2.	Personnel	8
3.	Spatial regulations	2
4.	Work force	4
5.	Law (Police and Justice)	28
6.	Health	6
7.	Land Affairs	8
8.	Labor	1
9.	Public Works	3
10.	Economy	3
11.	Governmental Affairs	14
12.	Immigration	2
13.	Education	9
14.	Sosial Welfare	4
15.	Population	3
16.	Water	1
17.	Security and Order	2
18.	Forestry	1
19.	Goods and Services Procurement	1
20.	Budget	1
	Total	105

**Table 5: Cases for Consultations with LO, Yogyakarta.**

No.	Case Type	Total
1.	Law	9
2.	Immigration	1
3.	Land Affairs	5
4.	Governmental Affairs	5
5.	Public Works	3
6.	Health	1
7.	Agriculture	1
8.	Workforce	4
9.	Sosial Welfare	1
10.	Security and Order	1
11.	Personnel	2
12.	Others	43
	Total	76

Source: Pusham-UII, 2006

The total number of cases reported can be grouped thus: Sleman (51); Yogyakarta city (87); Gunung Kidul (8); Kulon Progo (18) and Bantul (23). Accordingly, there are indications that the distance from a district to the LO offices affects the public's access to LO services. Besides, education level too appear to influence their expectations. Sleman and Yogyakarta city have high level of education, meaning that the demands for LO services are higher compared to other districts.

### **Closing Remarks**

What conclusions can be drawn from the cases of CITP-Lebak district and LO Yogyakarta? Good governance can only be achieved through the collective commitment of stakeholders. We cannot expect too much political from the local governments. On the contrary, local governments are just one of the institutions that must be pushed into it by external forces. The processes of the formation of institutions requires time. Besides, for the values to get internalized by the local government apparatuses and the general public, time is an important factor needed to ensure a long period of socialization.

Legally, LO's foundation seem to be weaker compared to the (CITP) because the legal foundation is limited to the spheres of the Governor's decision. There are still many problems around the very existence of this institution. First, it is formed by the governor, the basis of its independence is as such questionable. Nevertheless, the personnel coming from

activist circles defend themselves against the allegation that they are dependent on the local government by citing the origin from the activist circles. Secondly, the funds at the disposal of LO is very limited. Each time the local Parliament must pass a regulation providing for funding to the Ombudsman. Finally, the existence of the Ombudsman as an institution that gives recommendations only is not strong enough since it does not have the powers to open cases which bear financial implications to the country and the public.

**Table 6: Comparing CITP and LO**

Profile	CITP	LO
Processes	Society initiative	Society initiative
Organisation	District level	Provincial level
Coverage	1 District	1 Province,5 districts
Legal status	Local regulations	Governors' Decree
Staffing	Open recruitment 5 non bureaucrats	Open-recruitment 5-Non-Bureaucrats
Assistants	3 Volunteers	Open recruitment, 3 Non Bureaucrats
Secretariat Staff	6 Bureaucrats	3 Non- Bureaucrats
Funding	Local Budget: 250m/yr	Local budget: 750 M
No. of complaints	24 complaints	105 complaints; 76 consultation; 6 own initiatives
Bureaucratic reponses	More open	Not yet

The availability of the CITP and LO, provides the public with alternative channels outside the legislative institutions in the event that LG policies are perceived to be unfavourable by the citizens. Furthermore, the formation of these two organizations serves as a control mechanism for LG policies. Good public policy thus derived tends to be better and in the public interests. They also enhance LG authority since through them LGs are seen to be more legitimate in the eyes of the public.

## **Bibliography**

- Dwiyanto, A. et al., *Mewujudkan Good Governance Melalui Pelayanan Publik*, Gadjah Mada Press, Yogyakarta, 2005.
- Hulme, D. and Turner, M., *Governance, Administration and Development, making the state works*, Macmillan, London, 1997
- Jabbara, J.G. and Dwivedi, O.P., "Globalization, Governance and Administrative Culture" *International Journal of Public Administration*, Vol 27 Nos. 13 &14: 1101-1127, 2004
- John Friedmann, *Planning in the Public Domain, From Knowledge to Action*, Princeton University Press, New Jersey, 1987.
- Jreisat, J., "Governance in a Globalizing World" *International Journal of Public Administration*, Vol 27 Nos. 13 &14: 1033-1029, 2004
- Kabupaten Lebak, *Profil Komisi Transparansi dan Partisipasi Kabupaten Lebak*, Rangkasbitung, 2005.
- Larmour, P., *Governance and Reform in the South Pacific*, Research School of Pacific and Asian Studies, ANU Canberra 1998.
- MAP-UGM dan Local Government Support Program USAID, *Local Government Assessment, A Case Study at Kabupaten Klaten*, Report, 2006.
- Miller, W.L., 'Political Participation and Voting Behaviour', *Encyclopedia of Government and Politics*, Volume 1: 428.
- Participation Learning Group Final Report, The World Bank Participation Sourcebook, [www.worldbank.org/wbi/sourcebook/sb0100.htm](http://www.worldbank.org/wbi/sourcebook/sb0100.htm)
- Pramusinto, A. The Dynamics of Change in Decentralisation, Implications for Government-Business Relations: A Case of Decentralisation in Sidoarjo, East Java, Indonesia, *Ph.D Thesis*, Australian National University, 2005.
- Pusham-UII, Workshop Refleksi Kinerja Satu Tahun Lembaga Ombudsman, *Proceeding*, Yogyakarta, 2006.
- SMERU, *Regional Autonomy and the Business Climate: North Sulawesi and Gorontalo*, SMERU, Jakarta, 2001.
- Sudi, D.M. Implementasi Transparansi Informasi di Kabupaten Lebak Banten, *paper dipresentasikan pada lokakarya "Kebebasan Memperoleh Informasi dan Tata*

*Pemerintahan Daerah yang Baik di Indonesia*”, Hotel Atlet Century Park, Jakarta 7-8  
Juni 2006.

Waki, A. (ed.), *Lembaga Ombudsman Daerah*, Pusham-UII, Yogyakarta.

World Bank, *Governance and Development*, World Bank, Washington DC, 1992.