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FOREWORD

The Local Governance Support Program (LGSP), a technical assistance program to the Government of the Republic of Indonesia from the United States Agency for International Development, is designed to demonstrate that, through a decentralized system of governance, local communities can accelerate the democratic development process and improve government performance and transparency in the delivery of public services. LGSP provides technical assistance to citizen’s organizations and their local governments to help them to set their own objectives and priorities in democratic development and service provision and work together to achieve them. LGSP partners with more than 60 local governments and community organizations in Aceh, North Sumatra, West Sumatra, Banten and West Java, Central Java, East Java, South Sulawesi and West Papua.

Indonesia’s decentralization reforms launched in 2001 reflect the country’s commitment to democratic local governance and sustainable development. As an enabling instrument, the landmark legislation opened immense opportunities for local development initiatives and for greater citizen participation in governance. In the years since its implementation, communities and local governments have responded with unsurpassed enthusiasm and creativity, offering both openness and innovation.

The institutions of civil society enable citizens to share in charting the future of their societies. Commitments to citizenship are best developed through concrete action in real-time where people live and work. A healthy, functioning civil society builds relationships, cooperation, and communication across sectors, across borders, and across community lines – it helps people to understand their own needs and their neighbors’ needs and to take action to improve public services. Strengthening civil society means encouraging and enabling the participation of all people in the processes and decisions that affect their lives on a daily basis. The quality of public service delivery can and should contribute to strengthen democratic citizenship, and the bonds of confidence and trust between citizens, and between citizens and their democratic governments.

The present report by Hetifah Sj. Sumarto is one small contribution to a growing literature on citizen participation in Indonesia. Based on real experiences in five jurisdictions in Indonesia. The report will be hopefully useful for donor agencies, government officials and civil society activists alike in their partnerships to promote democratic decentralization in Indonesia.

Maret, 2008

Judith Edstrom
Chief of Party,
USAID-Local Governance Support Program
RTI International
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<tr>
<td>FPPD</td>
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<tr>
<td>FPPPM</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
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<tr>
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<td>ISAI</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGSP</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPJKDes</td>
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<tr>
<td>LPMK</td>
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<td>MPKT</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORNOP</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2KP</td>
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<tr>
<td>Perda</td>
<td>Peraturan Daerah (local regulation or bylaw)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perda PTA</td>
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</table>
PerDes : Peraturan Desa (village regulation)
PERFORM : Performance Oriented Regional Management Project
PKMD : Penguatan Kapasitas Masyarakat Desa (Village Community Capacity Building Program)
PRSP : Poverty reduction strategy papers
RAPBD : Rancangan Anggaran Pendapatan Daerah (Local Annual Budget Draft)
RDTRK : Rencana Detil Tata Ruang Kota (Urban Spatial Plan)
RPJMDs : Rencana Pembangunan Jangka Menengah Desa (Village-level Medium-Term Development Planning)
RPTDs : Rencana Pembangunan Tahunan Desa (Village-level Annual Development Planning)
SKPD : Satuan Kerja Pemerintah Daerah (Local Administration Work Unit)
SOMPIS : Solidaritas Masyarakat Pinggiran Solo (Solo Marginalized Community for Solidarity)
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UNDP : United Nation Development Program
USAID : United States Agency for International Development
Walikota : Mayor (head of Kota)
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PREFACE

Some five years ago, I wrote a preface to Hetifah Sj Sumarto’s first book, “Inovasi, Partisipasi dan Good Governance: 20 Prakasa Inovatif dan Partisipatif di Indonesia” (published by Yasasan Obor Indonesia, 2003). That preface ended with the words: “what we need to think about – and Hetifah helps us along here – is how to provide incentives for local governments to adopt more innovative approaches to deliver public services. I hope that we will soon see more writings from Hetifah’s skilful hand on this topic”. It is with great pleasure that I now return to write the preface for another of Hetifah’s book-lengths reports in which, indeed, the topic is how to promote citizen participation in local governance and improve public services.

During the past decade, we have seen the rapid emergence of citizen participation in Indonesia. Governance changes and reforms are taking place at the local level, often outside of formal political structures, with new leaders challenging old power structures and attempts being done to enlarge and deepen local democracy. These innovations are being spearheaded by civil society activists, by newly-emerging social movements and by community-based social action groups. Some are also pushed by brave government officials who support local-level reform and democracy. There is a lot of energy in Indonesia today, a lot of experimentation and trying out of new governance forms, such as citizen forums, town-hall meetings and budget hearings.

This new report looks in some lengths at best practice of citizen engagement in local governance in five jurisdictions in Indonesia: Solo, Bandung, Sumedang, Kebumen and Parepare. The study collects and systematizes material on existing patterns of best practices, innovation in government and use of various techniques of participation in Indonesia. The research also maps innovative practices both from the perspective of donors, the government, local governments and civil society organizations. The aim is not to assess and evaluate the approaches of these actors, but rather to draw lessons and record good practices in citizen engagement in order to inform various donor programs.

It is our hope that this report will provide important inputs into how to design programs aimed at encouraging citizen engagement in local governance. The report concludes with several concrete recommendations. For instance, the passing of local legislation of good governance (such as Perda Transparansi) is only a first step towards transparency and needs to be followed by steps to actually allow for the freedom of information. Komisi Transparansi dan Partisipasi in Lebak (Banten) is an excellent example of how a committed local government can institutionalized achievements made in the field of transparency. The emergence of partnerships between reform-minded government officials and commitment civil society activists are also a key factor in explaining some of the best practices described in this report.

Since Hetifah Sj Sumarto published her first book 4 years ago, notable achievements have been made in the field. There are no longer any concerns that the central government will back-track on decentralization; there is a strong commitment in the Department of Home Affairs and others to support regional autonomy. Local governments, on their part, have overcome their initial bewilderments of the 2001 decentralization policies, and are beginning to achieve some true innovations in local government. Through this, local governments have also been able to build trust with citizens and civil society activist, who eagerly have made the most of their rights to participate in public policy making.
Local government, central government agencies, NGOs and international organizations alike are all supportive of democratic decentralization in Indonesia. It is our hope that the present report will support efforts to continue to push for local-level governance reforms, the sharing of best practices, and the capacity of government and non-governmental actors to support the promotion of transparency, accountability and participation.

Maret, 2008

Hans Antlov
Governance Advisor,
USAID – LGSP
RTI International
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Civic engagement in policy formulation and decision-making is an increasingly popular topic, attracting the attention of academics, donors, and local government actors alike. There is, however, one important question about the topic that remains difficult to answer: “How far has the process of civic engagement in local governance progressed?” Although different reforms have been carried out to encourage broader and deeper public involvement, there are still some serious doubts about the extent this participation has taken hold in Indonesia. Many different publications on the subject have been written based on their authors’ empirical experiences, and most put forward two opposing realities: on the one hand, participation is improving slowly with encouragement from local and outside sources, on the other, ingrained attitudes and embedded power structures seriously reduce its effectiveness and threaten its sustainability. The present study attempts to address these issues through looking at real experiences in five jurisdictions in Indonesia: Solo, Kebumen, Bandung, Parepare and Sumedang.

Amid the heartening developments of the past decade, this present study confirms the testimonies already put forward in earlier studies; that there remain many obstacles facing pioneers in encouraging participation. The enthusiasm for implementing participatory practices in Indonesia is still vulnerable and continues to experience vicissitudes. In some locations there are indications this eagerness has seriously deteriorated. One of the reasons is the lack of political will from regional heads who successfully and repeatedly undermine citizens’ attempts at change. It is not surprising to find those who were supporters of participation turn into opponents when the benefits of such an approach are not quickly apparent. Many of the deliberative forums that had developed and gained popularity in the early 2000s have stopped, experiencing stagnation or goal displacement.

The objective of this study is to complement the documentation on participation practices in Indonesia and to learn from the experiences of different regions about promoting citizen participation. This document is also an empirical study of various opinions about the character of this participation. There are several more specific research questions that will hopefully be clarified through this study:

- Why have people in certain districts been able to expedite participation while it this has not occurred in other places. Can these areas be used as examples to consolidate participation in other places?
- What are the favorable conditions that help the creation of participatory approaches, especially in places where no donors give financial assistance?
- What policies, strategies, and agenda are needed at the local and national levels to develop effective and sustainable civic engagement? To be more specific, what actions could be taken by the government, civil societies and organizations, DPRDs, and donor agencies to create civic engagement?
Six years might be too short to assess the effectiveness and sustainability of a participation initiative, nevertheless, the findings of this study indicate that some areas have proven to be capable of implementing, enhancing, and sustaining participation while others have not. Effective participation calls for certain pre-conditions. Based on the experiences of the five studied areas these are: the presence of leadership, the willingness of decision makers and mid-level staff in location to implement change; the culture of association that produces competent citizens — sometimes referred to as social capital; and the availability of supporting resources, including laws, policies and regulations.

Experiences in the five areas have confirmed the results of earlier studies, namely that citizen participation is often being implemented unevenly in Indonesia and the longevity of these programs is uncertain at best. These uncertainties and differences have prevented supporters of public participation in Indonesia understanding the complexities in each area and formulating the appropriate strategies for dealing with particular situations.
1. TOPIC OF STUDY AND METHODOLOGY

1.1. Introduction

Civic engagement in policy formulation and decision-making is an increasingly popular topic, which is attracting the attention of academics and local government actors in Indonesia. There is, however, one important question about the topic that remains difficult to answer: “How far has the process of civic engagement in local governance progressed?” Although many different reforms have been conducted to encourage broader and deeper public involvement, there are still some serious doubts about the extent this participation has taken hold in Indonesia. Many different publications on the subject have been written based on their authors’ empirical experiences, and most put forward two opposing realities: on the one hand, participation is improving slowly with encouragement from local and outside sources, on the other, ingrained attitudes and embedded power structures seriously reduce its effectiveness and threaten its sustainability.

The distinct opinions and experiences of the supporters of citizen participation are compiled in a book titled Orde Partisipasi (2005), which details advancements made in the reform era. At the same time, however, the writers admit the existence of certain “traps” that have made participatory practices less meaningful. One of these is the tendency to treat participation merely as a formal-procedural step. Another study carried out by the Democratic Reform Support Project (2006) suggested that decentralization had opened new opportunities for community groups in civic engagement. However, it also underlined a series of problems that need to be overcome if participatory movements are to generate meaningful changes in communities. Worth mentioning also is the study published by the Forum Pengembangan Partisipasi Masyarakat (FPPM, the Forum for Popular Participation), a multi-stakeholder network actively promoting participatory approaches in development programs. This work recorded many benefits coming from participatory processes implemented in Indonesia. Nevertheless, it too stressed that further participation would only be made possible if a number of unresolved barriers to change were solved. These include a lack of community education and empowerment and the absence of cooperation between bureaucrats, politicians, and communities.

---

1 The term ‘civic engagement’ indeed has a more extensive meaning than ‘citizen participation’. Citizen participation is one form of civic engagement. Nevertheless, both terms are used interchangeably in this report.


During the past five years, there have been numerous interesting developments in Indonesian community life. Many programs have been implemented since decentralization began at the start of the decade. These activities were initiated by central and local governments, civil society organizations, and through partnerships, often but not always with the support of international donor agencies. Many of these initiatives have used innovative ideas to promote public acceptance of the new ideas. Coalitions of non-government organizations (NGOs), local government associations and agencies, such as APEKSI and the Center for Local Governance Innovation (CLGI, now Yayasan Inovasi Pemerintahan Daerah), are developing and actively involved in documenting and extending initiatives to encourage public participation. The activities of community groups are also increasing rapidly and citizen forums are more actively demanding their rights to influence public policies.

Amid the heartening developments, this present study confirms the testimonies already put forward in earlier studies; that there remain many obstacles facing pioneers in encouraging participation. The enthusiasm for implementing participatory practices in Indonesia is still vulnerable and continues to experience vicissitudes. In some locations there are indications this eagerness has seriously deteriorated. One of the reasons is the lack of political will from regional heads who successfully and repeatedly undermine citizens’ attempts at change. It is not surprising to find those who were supporters of participation turn into opponents when the benefits of such an approach are not quickly apparent. Many of the deliberative forums that had developed and gained popularity in the early 2000s have stopped, experiencing stagnation or goal displacement.

If one believes and is still optimistic that a citizen’s access to decision-making processes is worth promoting, then it is necessary to comprehend the real problems faced in this effort. The first step is to reflect on what has been occurring. The accounts revealed in this report will hopefully aid this vital reflective process.

1.2. On Participation

An encouraging finding of this study is that many Indonesian citizens have become relatively more organized and critical and are no longer easily manipulated by elites through forms of pseudo-participation. In certain selected cases, these local governments and legislatures (DPRDs) are more seriously responding to their citizens’ wishes for better access to public decision-making processes and are creating enduring mechanisms to achieve this. Another

---


positive indication is shown by the better quality of participation in some areas where citizens are increasingly involved in policy making and are protected by more laws\(^8\), and have more financial resources available to finance participatory programs. The results of successful programs indicate the existence of diverse potentials, such as:

- Where participation helps scrutinize and correct important public policies, such as budget allocation and planning. The effects of these corrections are greater in areas where civil groups are active and where local regulations protect their involvement.
- Where the engagement of citizens and civil society organizations in governance create approaches and programs that are inventive and innovative. These are more common in situations where the local governments embrace progressive ways of thinking.
- Where the active involvement of potentially marginalized groups becomes an instrument for producing programs and eliminating discriminative policies. The more organized the marginalized groups, the greater the likelihood they will become influential.
- Where participatory processes are made into communication media that could reduce the potential of future conflicts, but only if the forums are managed as deliberative forums.\(^9\)

Nevertheless, we are reminded by Arnstein in his important article, ‘Ladder of Citizen Participation’\(^10\), that people are often involved in local government policy-formation without any significant effects on the decisions that are made. The experiences of participation in our five areas of study also indicated significant weaknesses influencing the quality and effectiveness of participation. These include:

- The unequal level of political will and comprehension among the ranks of government (including DPRD legislators) on the importance of participation and the benefits gained from the participatory process. Although the term participation seems to be well-known and popular in executive and legislative circles, only a few of the executives and even fewer members of legislatives in our study were fully aware or believed in the importance of participation or were willing to become promoters of it. Quite often participatory exercises were carried out merely as project formalities. Many legislators feared dependence on certain individuals or small citizen groups would threaten the sustainability of an initiative.
- The policies and regulations dealing with processes of participation in local governance (for example, the provincial regulation on Participation, Transparency and Accountability) are not sufficiently binding and do not provide adequate incentives for elites to seriously implement them. In some localities, the regulations are not made through participative processes and are not well disseminated. Compromises in the drafting of regulations protecting public involvement have resulted in a reduction of their enforcement, and

\(^8\) Several studies on legal frameworks for participation processes reminded us also that the increasing number of regulations will call for harmonization and synchronization, one of the big problems for decentralization in Indonesia.

\(^9\) The term deliberate process refers to a collective decision-making model that is preceded by discussion processes that consider seriously the reasoning that supports or opposes a proposition or action. Supporters of deliberate processes argue that discussions will enhance quality of the decisions being made.

monitoring their implementation or effectiveness have not yet been made a priority by either central or regional governments.

- Potential citizen or multi-stakeholder forums that could effectively channel citizens' voices often do not have the capacities to grow and continue as strong or effective bodies. Many groups are in need of strengthening and many face the same basic issues confronting them, which are related to basic problems with leadership, transparency, competence, and access to resources. They are also often hijacked by the special interests of elites.

- The planners, implementers and facilitators of participatory programs often face difficulties in answering the question of how to create new participatory mechanisms or procedures. What should be done to make citizens participate effectively and to prevent the domination of special interests in participatory forums? Unfortunately, in many of the communities studied, the desire to encourage consultative programs has waned in the past few years, and many groups have experienced some involution or degradation.

1.3. Objectives and Research Question

The objectives of this study are to complement the documentation on participation practices in Indonesia and to learn from the experiences of different regions about promoting citizen participation. This document is also an empirical study of various opinions about the character of this participation. There are several more specific research questions that will hopefully be clarified through this study:

- Why have people in certain districts been able to expedite participation while it has not occurred in other places. Can these areas be used as examples to consolidate participation in other places?

- What are the favorable conditions that help the creation of participatory approaches, especially in places where no donors give financial assistance?

- What policies, strategies, and agenda are needed at the local and national levels to develop effective and sustainable civic engagement? To be more specific, what actions could be taken by the government, civil societies and organizations, DPRDs, and donor agencies to create civic engagement?

The results should stimulate more comprehensive and critical dialog on current policies and outside intervention to encourage meaningful participation. This in turn will hopefully create new strategies to promote civic engagement.

1.4. Methodology

This study is of a qualitative nature, which uses a range of diverse initiatives. It was carried out in five stages:

1. The first stage was mapping the many initiatives for encouraging participation initiated by local governments, international donor agencies and civil society organizations. The result of the mapping was a compilation of strategies for promoting participation, their potential and suggested locations for case studies.
2. The second stage was to conduct field surveys in five selected areas: the cities of Solo and Parepare, and the regencies of Kebumen, Bandung, and Sumedang. Considerations used for selection were: the existence of local leadership (mayors, bupatis and legislators) who were considered as innovative and who had a commitment to promoting participation; the existence of initiatives from civil society organizations that actively encouraged public participation of far-reaching nature, and the availability of good data about the groups and their efforts.

3. The third stage was to identify participation development models, based on experiences in the five studied areas.

4. The fourth stage was to analyze and draw conclusions, which will be divided into discussions on the necessary criteria for effective participation and matters related to the innovation and replication of participatory initiatives.

5. The fifth stage was formulating recommendations, policies, strategies, and agenda for future efforts to promote participation.

1.5. Contents

In the introduction we describe the context and background of this study, elucidating why it is important, stating its objectives and research questions, and finally putting forward our findings. The contents section is divided into four parts:

- Part One puts forward a brief review on the literature on reform and innovation toward participatory governance.
- Part Two reveals and discusses the dynamics of participation in the five study areas and formulates participation development models based on innovations that took place in each location.
- Part Three sets forth the lessons learned and the conclusions about the necessary criteria for implementing meaningful public participation.
- Part Four presents several proposals for policies that would promote the future implementation and sustainability of effective participation.
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2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE: REFORM AND INNOVATIONS TOWARD PARTICIPATORY GOVERNANCE

There are a great number of books and studies that describe definitions of participation, why it is important, its levels and forms, and its threats. This report will not repeat these discussions. Instead it will focus on how to initiate and sustain participatory programs and why certain strategies work in some areas but not in others.

The discussion will be divided into two sections. First, the focus will be on the desired quality of participation. What natural setting will support an expected quality of participation? Second, we will discuss why it is easier in some areas to promote and sustain participation than it is in others.

2.1. Quality of Participation

Many experts have studied diverse participatory practices and found difficulties in achieving expected objectives. Their studies often talk about the hijacking of the process by a dominant group of participants who have some advantage over the others, such as position, wealth, education, articulateness and self confidence. Their voices frequently subordinate the voices of minorities and the marginalized, who invariably lack education; people who are not usually engaged or involved in public decision making. Being aware of this situation has led to more critical thought about the quality of participation that should be developed in the future and the kind of environments that best support this development.

Recent discussions on participation have put an emphasis on the importance of decentralization as an enabling environment. However, there is also a realization that decentralization could also bring in new problems. Some experts have proposed a theory called “Accountable Autonomy”, which stresses the importance of interactions between local government institutions and the public for meaningful reform. The approach emphasizes the importance of grassroots innovations rather than policies thrust on communities by higher authorities. In this situation, the anticipated quality of participation is called empowered participation.

Brinkerhoff and Azfar also highlight the strong relation existing between decentralization and community empowerment. For them, the prospects for public participation in Indonesia were enhanced by the progress of decentralization, while this empowerment would improve the delivery of public services. The study stressed the importance of the central government’s role in this empowerment through the provision of incentives and sanctions. Unfortunately, it turned out that many of the government’s mechanisms to strengthen participation were not being effectively implemented.

---

13 Ibid., p. 4.
14 Brinkerhoff, Derick W. and Azfar, Omar, Ibid.
Brinkerhoff and Azfar believe effective public participation is created through forums where citizens have the opportunity to discuss and influence events. It is this idea that also pushes local governments, donor agencies, and civil society groups to establish these forums in the hope of empowering citizens. For them, such groups are frequently effective instruments for organizing and consolidating the strength of minorities. However, several studies have shown how vulnerable these forums are to domination by narrow interests. Therefore it is important to define what forums will most likely resist negative influences and create quality participation. In this regard, three characteristics are considered ideal:

- **Influence**: that the process should have the ability to influence policy and decision making.
- **Inclusiveness**: the process should be representative of the population and inclusive of diverse viewpoints and values, providing equal opportunity for all to participate.
- **Accessible**: the process should provide open dialog, access to information and space for each participant to respect and understand the other, reframe issues, and plan a movement toward consensus.\(^{15}\)

These criteria can be used to evaluate the quality of participation forums developed otherwise known as “Musrenbang” (Musyawarah Perencanaan Pembangunan). A 2004 World Bank study on the effect of these forums on local government policies\(^{16}\) indicated they could effectively promote dialog between local governments and communities. However, their effectiveness was greatly determined by:

- **Representative membership**: a forum is more effective when its members represent a wide range of stakeholders, including members of civil society groups, legislatures and executives. Generally, forums that involve members of the executive and legislative councils have greater authority than those with only citizens on board.
- **Relationships with other institutions**: good ties with formal bodies like donor agencies will affect the forum’s effectiveness and ability to attract funding. Good relationships with donor agencies can reduce local resistance and facilitate access to information. Nevertheless, this study warned that establishing relationships with donor agencies, regional executives and legislatives was not without risk. Many of the forums ended up focusing for the interests of other parties than those they were originally set up to represent.
- **Forum location**: Cities are seen as the best places to set up forums because of their nearness to local governments and because of the better access to public information there.

### 2.2. Ways to Successfully Promote Participation

Some places in Indonesia are known for being more successful at instituting positive reforms than others. Gorontalo province has become a reference point for other locations that wish to promote investment. The cities of Sragen, Parepare, and Sidoarjo have become good models


for other municipalities that wish to reform their local licensing laws. The kapupaten of Jembrana, meanwhile, has become the focus of many comparative studies because of innovations made there to improve the quality of public services, especially for the poor. Many of the discussions about the factors leading to the effectiveness of these areas have focused on leadership, in the form of a visionary local-area leader, who has the courage to take risks and has clear objectives during his or her term of office. Good leadership, it was found, was often more important than the activities of civil society groups in the area.

However, other literature suggests that long-lasting positive change will not be achieved without coordination between all stakeholders. Sue Goss, in her book, *Making Local Governance Work*, observes that a true systemic change in governance is the result of a harmonious movement involving the citizens and leading figures of communities, businesspeople, politicians and civil servants. The role of leadership at the local level, to ensure the changes made are consistent and sustainable, is also important.17

What other factors affect the success of an area? The book *The Creative City* suggests that an location’s cultural resources help decide whether positive transformations occur. These include historical and social traditions and customs relating to economics and politics. These aspects influence the establishment of social capital and determine an area’s capacity to respond to change. The more creative thinkers a region has, the more possibilities the area will be able to innovate to solve problems.18

Almost all literature on best participation practices suggest that how a program is implemented early on, greatly affects its success and sustainability. Of course programs are more likely to fail in places where conflicts and differences of interests are common, where there are few resources, and where there are great differences between the rich and the poor. Nevertheless, programs can be successful in “difficult” areas if they are implemented properly.

Another supporting driver of positive change is the presence of an adequate legal framework. The study carried out by Logolink (2003), an international consortium dedicated to strengthening participation in local government, underlined the importance of regional and national laws to support participatory systems. The study notes that laws will only be effective if they are drawn up in response to demands from citizens and supplemented with clear policies to ensure politicians and bureaucrats properly implement them. A legal framework is insufficient in itself to create effective citizen participation. Once laws are passed, their implementation will be influenced by the level of trust between government and citizens, the strengths and experiences of civil groups, the support of political parties and other actors, and the level of openness in local governance. 19

2.3. Initiating and Disseminating Participatory Approaches

In many developing countries, including Indonesia, the most structured innovations in participation begin with the pilot projects of international agencies. Many of these programs have been implemented here with different donors applying a wide range of methods and criteria for measuring their success. Often these programs focus on encouraging change within local governments and legislatures.

Experiences here have revealed that an innovative approach can emerge through a process of collective learning. These projects often involve long discussions between donor agencies, civil society groups and local leaders, some of which have proved quite successful.

Civil society organizations are obviously an important part in this process. In many places, these organizations have spurred on the development of new, more innovative ways to encourage citizen participation in the planning, implementation and monitoring of public policies. These groups have also played an important role in the dissemination of ideas. From observations in the study areas, we found activists and CSOs had made significant efforts to document initiatives and processes. Along with writing books and designing websites, activists had also written articles published in scientific and popular journals and presented these ideas at national and international seminars.
3. DYNAMICS, ACHIEVEMENTS, AND ISSUES IN IMPLEMENTING CITIZEN PARTICIPATION: EXPERIENCES AT FIVE LOCALITIES

This section will discuss the experiences of activists promoting public participation in the five study areas. Beginning with a brief profile of each of these areas, it will also detail the models and approaches adopted by local governments and CSOs and include data on the achievements and challenges these regions face.

3.1. The Study Areas

The five areas of study are first introduced briefly:

3.1.1. Kota Solo

Solo, also known as Surakarta, is a city situated in lowland Central Java covering an area of 44 km². The population in 2005 was around 560,000, occupying five kecamatan (sub-districts), comprising of 51 kelurahan (village or wards). Solo is famous in Indonesia as a cultural city and is an important symbol of Javanese culture. Citizens of Solo are known for their adherence to the traditional values of the kraton (Javanese royal court). On the other hand, life in the city is also colored by radicalism, conflicts, and violence, and therefore, Solo had gained another nickname, ‘the divided city’. Trade and tourism dominate the economic activities in Solo. The relatively rapid growth of the city in recent years had resulted in a flow of newcomers from the surrounding areas, which has led to the creation of large and poor inner-city communities.

3.1.2. Kabupaten Kebumen

Kapupaten Kebumen is one of the 35 regions in Central Java province and covers an area of 1,281 km², comprising 26 sub-districts, 11 kelurahan (urban villages) and 449 desa (rural villages). In 2004, the population in Kebumen was recorded at more than 1.2 million people. Most of the population lives in rural areas and their main source of income is from agricultural activities. In 2000, the region was announced as the third-poorest area in Central Java. More recently, however, the name Kebumen has been associated with positive change due to the popularity of the local bupati, Rustiningsih, a woman considered to be an innovative reformer. Kebumen has received several local and international awards because of these innovations.

3.1.3. Kabupaten Bandung

Kapupaten Bandung in West Java is the largest and most populated among the five studied areas. The region surrounds the city of Bandung and covers about 3,092 km², comprising 45 sub-districts, seven urban villages and 436 village areas. In 2003, the population had reached
four million. A predominantly hilly, upland area, the income of Kapupaten Bandung comes mostly from agriculture and industry and the district’s economy is characterized by large discrepancies of wealth.

3.1.4. Kota Parepare

Parepare is a small town in the province of South Sulawesi, located about 155 km from Makassar, the province’s capital. Covering an area of around 100 km², the resident population numbers around 120,000, but swells to up to 400,000 people during weekdays, a mixture of traders and commuters. Geographically, Parepare is strategic as it interconnects other areas in South Sulawesi and the town is a city of trade and services, supported by a seaport that contributes greatly to its economic development. The city comprises three kecamatan and 21 kelurahan, occupying hilly and coastal areas.

3.1.5. Kapupaten Sumedang

Kapupaten Sumedang is located in the highlands of West Java, about 45 km to the northeast of Bandung city. The district covers and area of around 1,522 km², comprising 26 kecamatan with seven kelurahan and 262 desa. In 2003, the population of Sumedang had reached more than one million. Jatinangor subdistrict, which lies in the southwestern part of Sumedang, is a center for education where several national-level universities are located. The main economic activity in this district is agriculture.

Table 1: Summary of Profiles of Studied Locations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location (Province)</th>
<th>Kota Solo</th>
<th>Kapupaten Kebumen</th>
<th>Kapupaten Bandung</th>
<th>Kota Parepare</th>
<th>Kapupaten Sumedang</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>Central Java</td>
<td>Central Java</td>
<td>West Java</td>
<td>South Sulawesi</td>
<td>West Java</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main activities</td>
<td>Trade and services</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>Trade and Services</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical condition</td>
<td>Plains</td>
<td>Lowlands, hills</td>
<td>Uplands and hilly areas</td>
<td>Coastal and hilly areas</td>
<td>Mountainous areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of sub-districts</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nickname</td>
<td>Cultural City</td>
<td>Tourism City</td>
<td>Agricultural City</td>
<td>Madani (Civil) Port City</td>
<td>Educational City</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Local governments in each of the five areas have expressed a formal commitment to increasing citizen participation in line with national regulations on development. However, each area is unique and change is not progressing uniformly. One area began its governance initiative earlier than the others, however, the progress there remains slow. Another indicates progressive development that seems to be sustainable. Yet another area has made some signifi-
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cant achievements, however, this progress has depended heavily on outside intervention, casting doubt on the sustainability of long-term change. In another, citizen participation is advancing rapidly, in spite of some serious resistance from local government actors.

In all the areas, change is a result of interactions or contests between reformers and entrenched, obstructive groups. How much power and influence the reformers have generally determines the feasibility, resilience, and overall quality of their participatory initiatives. All five areas show positive trends. In each, Musrenbang, or development planning forums, are organized regularly and local governments have provided funds for financing participatory processes down to the village level. Most areas also have local leaders or bureaucrats who are reformers and the presence of active and dynamic civil society groups that enjoy the support of donor agencies. The enthusiasm of community groups to organize themselves in non-traditional associations seems to be growing, as does the professionalism of NGOs and their networks. As the desire to promote equitable and participatory government increases, public life also becomes more complex. This involvement is also facilitated by the development of mass communication media like newspapers, mobile phones and the internet.

Despite the positives, there are also some significant challenges. In many areas, local government actors frequently ignore or pervert the law, while community groups do not necessarily work together. Meanwhile, professionalism in government is still low, with legislators and bureaucrats often unable to draft good plans. With high hopes for change, many people have become impatient and disheartened by reform efforts that have stalled and some times public expectations are also unrealistic. In the executive and legislative branches of government, bureaucrats are often described as overly project-oriented and frequently complain about the absence of clear guidelines to institute new policies. A lack of incentives to promote change and insufficient local government openness have also allowed bureaucrats and DPRD members to resist reforms in many places. Worsening the situation is the inappropriate behavior of some donors and the lack of the enforcement of regulations seen to encourage public participation and good governance.

3.2. Experiences from the Field

3.2.1. Participation of Marginalized Groups: The Experience in Kota Solo

The city of Solo has shown gradual but consistent improvement in the quality and quantity of local participation. Efforts to involve communities in planning and budgeting have received widespread recognition; and this is evident from the many publications written on the subject and the visits by other local governments officials in comparative studies. Solo’s success in applying participatory processes can be assessed from the degree of inclusiveness in the participation forums, the steady increase in the value of the grants channeled to the kelurahan level, the increasing number of community-driven programs adopted in local government budgets, and the steadily rising budgets allocated to marginalized groups. This process has been institutionalized in the form of a mayoral decree. Developments within the past year alone have been highly encouraging and largely attributed to the actions of the city’s new mayor, who is generally considered a progressive.

---

20 Conventional associations are, among others, grouping of people based on a certain religion or kinship
Since 2001, a Participatory Planning and Budgeting Model (Model Perencanaan dan Penganggaran Partisipatif) has promoted the development of agendas at the kelurahan, sub-district and city level. The presence of a partnership initiative has helped local government officials effect changes in the planning process. Involving citizens in this process has not been difficult because Solo has a long history of participation, with its citizens involved in many business associations and professional clubs. Networking with these established institutions are the newer NGOs, and this process has seen the creation of new groups that lobby for a range of interests at the city level.

Citizen forums here have proven quite effective in influencing public policy. Marginalized associations together with the Street Vendors Union recently pressed for revision of a perda (local regulation) on the management and supervision of street vendors, which they felt was not in their interests. While this perda has not yet been revised, the advocacy work carried out by these groups has improved the municipal administrations’ dealings with the vendors, a group that now receives greater recognition than before. This has translated into a more comprehensive and participative policy at the grassroots.

Developing this new policy began with a survey of street vendors, which was then used as the basis for managing existing and potential disputes. Generally, these have been handled through the regulation and the administration of street vendors through a permits system, with permits issued quickly and on site. Specific zones for vendors have been created, with shelters, pushcarts, and tents, while the vendors have started to become involved in the policy process. A compromise was recently reached with the new mayor to relocate around 1000 sidewalk vendors from Banjarsari to a new location, which was made possible by an adequate budget allocation.

3.2.2. Institutionalization of Participation by Village Communities: the Experience of Kebumen

One innovative effort to strengthen community participation in Kebumen was the implementation of the Village Community Capacity Building program (PKMD) in the 2005 and 2006 local budgets. The aim of this program is to apply village-level autonomy through the Village Fund Allocation (ADD) program as mandated by the Regional Autonomy Law and a range of local regulations. The program encourages active public participation in the drafting of village regulations (PerDes) on transparency, participation and accountability, medium-term and annual village development plans (RPJMDs and RPTDs), annual village budgets (APBDs) and village financial accountability reports (LPJKADs).

PKMD is a program run by the local Family Planning and Community Development Service Office (KBPM), which was proposed by NGOs and community-based organizations in the Civil Society Forum (FORMASI). The evolution of the PKMD is linked to the World Bank’s Initiatives for Local Government Reform project, which created the bylaws that mandate the process. As one of its activities, ILGR helped FORMASI and the local government to create a pilot project for the drafting of RPJMDs in five villages, which were then replicated in all villages and sub-districts.

Although this program faced many obstacles, it is deemed to have produced the intended result. During 2000-2004, before the PKMD program, only around 10 percent of the villages...
in Kebumen had complied with their obligation to produce APBDs and LPJKDs; in 2005, the compliance rate shot up to 92 percent. For other ADD requirements, the compliance rate was also very high, at over 80 percent (TPADs: 82 percent, RPJMDs: 89 percent and RPTDs: 81 percent). Because of these successes, the local government has allocated funds for the PKMD II program in its 2006 budget.

Another important achievement of this program has been to strengthen the participation of village communities. Through training and guidance at the village level, groups have developed the knowledge and skills needed to participate effectively. This is demonstrated by increased enthusiasm in complying with the ADD prerequisites and improved working relationships between village administrations and representative councils (BPD) because completion of the ADD prerequisites requires the approval of the two parties. Local officials are now properly trained in village planning, budgeting and development in an open, participatory, and accountable system. Externally, village-level governance institutions have also expanded by fostering inter-village communication. Examples are the establishment of the village officials communication forum (Forkom Perkasa), the village heads association, and the village representative council communication forum (Forkom BPD). Through these groups village governments can play an active role and have a stronger bargaining position in development planning at the district level.

Other actors playing a very important role in Kebumen are the donors. Over a dozen agencies are operating in Kebumen some of them funded by USAID, the World Bank, and the Asian Development Bank. The presence of these donors has contributed to community participation by encouraging the formulation of regulations on citizen participation, establishing and enhancing the capacity of residents’ forums and creating networks for these forums.

3.2.3. Participation by Professional Groups: the Experience in Bandung

The Bandung local government’s efforts to implement participatory governance has faced many challenges because members of the local bureaucracy and legislature are skeptical or pessimistic about the idea and have resisted it. At the same time, the local civil society organizations, which should have been a force to support reform, are weak and do not play an optimal role. The local government feels that CSOs do nothing but protest without providing alternative solutions to its policies.

Despite this there has been some good progress in the institutionalization of participation in Bandung, perhaps better than in most other West Java regions. Since 2002, Bandung has received much favorable attention from the central government for developing the Annual District Planning Conference (MPKT) and several local regulations intended to provide space for community participation.

It is interesting that quite a few important innovations in community participation did not come from local civil society groups, but instead were encouraged by a CSO developed outside – the IPGI, which was recently renamed Yasayan Inisiatif. Established in 2000, the group focuses on efforts to reform the bureaucracy and public services in Bandung and has membership from CSOs, intellectuals, and influential reformers in local government. With outside independent funding from donors the Ford Foundation in 2000-2004 and the TIFA
Foundation in 2005, it has personnel with strong skills in development planning, which enables it to offer planning concepts that are intellectually and practically defensible.

In its efforts to promote change, IPGI/Inisiatif has chosen persuasion and partnership as its advocacy strategy, establishing networks within government and the bureaucracy, particularly with the relatively reformist Regional Secretariat and the Regional Development Planning Agency (Bappeda). These contacts have pushed along efforts to promote further policy changes and mean proposals made by IPGI/Inisiatif are readily approved by the executive and the legislature.

The technical approaches used by IPGI/Inisiatif also have some weaknesses. Most important is the absence of public monitoring of policy implementation. Realizing this situation, IPGI/Inisiatif is encouraging citizen groups to perform this important function. As part of these efforts a local Community Resource Centre and Budget Discussion Forum were created – part of network of 18 local civil society and community organizations that are currently active in criticizing budgeting policy in the district.

3.2.4. Donor-Driven Participation: The Experience of Kota Parepare

Parepare is a small city in South Sulawesi, which has most of its economic activity in the trade and service sectors. Its strategic location makes it a destination for migrants from nearby areas who seek better opportunities. Parepare has grown as a multi-ethnic and heterogeneous city and its people are quite critical of and concerned about local government policies, especially those dealing with public services.

Although it is a small city, Parepare has at least 30 different civil society organizations operating in the town with different ideologies, sector interests and political and economic affiliations. This complexity is one reason why it has been difficult to consolidate these groups, because they tend to operate separately. It has also made it difficult to create a shared understanding between citizens and the local government.

Discourse and programs on openness, transparency, and participation have been proposed by international donor institutions, such as Perform-USAID, P2KP-World Bank, Bridge-UNDP, TAF, AusAID and LGSP-USAID. The local government has acknowledged the help these donors have given the development process in Parepare, particularly in disseminating new ideas and capacity building with government officials and the public.

One example of this work is the programs of Perform-USAID, which between 2001 and 2004 created a space for participation and bridged communications between the bureaucracy, civil society organizations and the public. The work helped to defuse confrontation between civil groups and the government, strengthened the functions of the Kelurahan Community Empowerment Institutions (LPMK), and saw the drafting of a perda, or local bylaw, regulating community-based development.

Perda No.17/2004 on the Conduct of Community-Based Development, is an important regulation although its implementation remains limited to the sharing of ideas and dialogue and does not reach to collective decision making. It does, however, stipulate public involvement.
in the annual planning and budgeting processes. To strengthen the public’s role in planning, the local government has created the position of Kelurahan Facilitators, who are charged with leading community participation in local government planning, implementation and the evaluation of policy. These facilitators also work with Local Administration Work Units (SKPDs), and generally play a role as mediators between citizens and the local government.

Local government officials have also been encouraged to increase their interaction with the public. The mayor and other officials now go into the community more often. They also communicate new policy or developments through print media, cellular phone text messages and face-to-face meetings in public places, such as coffee houses and markets. The government has even set aside funds in the local budget to provide a special page, “Exploring the City,” in the Pare Pos newspaper to air public criticisms and complaints and present the government’s responses. These efforts are also supported by the emergence of five community radio stations, which actively discuss public policy.

Formally, open doors for participation and transparency have been created through the active involvement of a multi-stakeholder work team, which is tasked with providing input to the mayor in policy making, based on voices from “below”. The mayor consults this team whenever a new policy is drawn up and later implemented. When drafting new bylaws, the Parepare administration now consistently implements the Regulatory Impact Analysis (RIA) program, which gives citizens a say in the law-making process.

3.2.5. Participation Stalled: the Experience in Sumedang

In the initial phase of decentralization, Sumedang was led by a bupati with a clear vision on the types of reform needed in the area. The original idea of Village Fund Allocations (ADD) emerged here and was first applied in the district of Sumedang long before Bandung or other areas had even begun improving governance. One-stop services were also introduced in Sumedang before 2001, while the innovative Jatinangor Citizen Forum was established and became influential in the district at about the same time. This desire for change was also expressed in the existence of many civil society groups, including the Multi-stakeholders Forum, the Tampomas Forum, the Pro-Sumedang Coalition, and the Joint Forum. There was even a group initiated by young civil servants, the Governance Innovation Forum, to accelerate good governance.

However, this all changed in 2003 when a new bupati was elected by the local legislative assembly (DPRD). This official had received the lowest ranking in the fit–and-proper test conducted by the DPRD involving experts from universities in Sumedang. The lack of a proactive leader damped the enthusiasm for good governance in Sumedang. Instead of further reforms, the new bupati brought no positive developments to the area and restored a bureaucratic culture resistant to change.

Sumedang is now no longer a target area for donor agencies. Despite this, more recently the area has seen renewed efforts from activists and reform-minded DPRD members to improve governance.
Box 1: What Conditions are Conducive for the Development of Effective Participation? A Comparison of Two Places

Solo is the area this study considers the most conducive for developing participatory governance. The city is relatively small, with a population at around 550,000 and an area measuring 44 km², and this allows adequate interactions between its many stakeholders. Existing participatory initiatives in the area have produced significant changes, which are showing indications of longevity. The local walikota (mayor) directly elected last year, has a background as a businessperson and is widely considered to be serious about developing the area. Although not all of in the local government are convinced of the benefits of increased participation, not many of these organizations can show their resistance openly. Also driving change are a number of proactive civil society organizations with the financial support from international agencies. More important than all of the above, however, is that Solo has a long history of associational life. This is what makes the citizen groups, including those representing marginalized people, well organized.

Helping increase public awareness are some important and influential mass media, which are independent and have proved to be good partners for civil society organizations in monitoring governance. In Solo, the citizens’ trust in the law is also relatively high because of the successful litigation by civil groups against corrupt bureaucrats and politicians, which has resulted in several high-ranking members being jailed for graft.

Although Bandung is considered to be more advanced than other areas in West Java in institutionalizing participation, the process is showing some signs of serious vulnerability. There is something about Bandung that makes it difficult for good initiatives to succeed. Its large and varied area exceeding 3000 km² comprising 45 kecamatan and its total population of more than four million people, has complicated the interactions between the local government and the people. Because of this size community organization is probably best done at the sub-district level, however, policies affecting these local areas are still decided in the region’s capital, Soreang, and citizens groups pushing for change must go there.

The present bupati of Bandung was recently elected through direct election for the second time. Many people in the region, including some bureaucrats, believe he has shown a lack of commitment to reforming governance in the region, which is at present still considered of a “top-down” nature, inconsistent and lacking in transparency. Other high-ranking officials in the administration have openly resisted programs fostering popular participation, especially those involving marginalized groups. Meanwhile, the organizations most active in advocating for change are based in the nearby city of Bandung, while other community-level organizations are neither interested in nor have the capacity to play such a role. The existing news media in the area cover the province of West Java generally and are not focused specifically on Bandung. Many reporters operating in the district also accept bribes for writing nicely about officials and policies. In the district, citizens’ trust in the law is very low. Although corruption in the executive and legislature are frequent topics of discussion, there are few examples that such offences will be punished by the courts.
3.3. Models and Approaches

Each of the locations has implemented a combination of several approaches to encourage public participation. Based on these experiences, a set of models can be formulated that have already improved the quality and quantity of citizen involvement. These are:

1. Model for issuing a framework of laws and regulations
2. Model for improving planning and budgeting
3. Model for facilitating and empowering deliberative forums
4. Model for funding

3.3.1. Models for Issuing a Framework of Laws and Regulations

The first approach adopted by several cities and regencies for encouraging participation is to formalize and protect participation initiatives through an umbrella of laws and regulations. Efforts to formalize participation in law have been supported by donor agency programs pursued by the Build-UNDP, ILGR-World Bank and multi-stakeholder networks.

In this undertaking, Kebumen and Bandung have used a model facilitated by the ILGR-World Bank to create local bylaws, or perda, regulating matters of transparency, participation, and accountability in governance. This work as seen the creation of Perda No. 53/2004 issued in Kebumen and Perda No. 6/2004 in Bandung. Bandung had also issued Perda No. 8/2005 on participatory local development planning procedures. Parepare, meanwhile, has issued Perda No. 17/2004 on the organization of community-based development, facilitated by the Perform Program from USAID. In Sumedang, a legal structure for participation has been created from initiatives by the executive and legislature. Besides Perda No. 1/2000 on procedures for making perda, Sumedang has also produced a breakthrough – a local area regulation on procedures for local area planning and budgeting to ensure a better quality of citizen participation. Kota Solo has also adopted this approach for promoting participation in the area and has issued a new regulation in the form of a mayoral decree.

3.3.2. Changes in the Mechanism for Planning and Budgeting

Citizen participation had until relatively recently been channeled solely through musrenbang, or development planning deliberative forums. However, this process has many weaknesses — most importantly that its products are essentially wish-lists that do not adequately reflect a community’s needs. Often this consultation process was also carried out superficially and only involved elite groups, and there was no assurance the programs proposed would be carried out. Because of this, all the five local governments have made changes in the planning and budgeting mechanism, aimed at:

- Making the process and stages of deliberative meetings clear
- Promoting a greater variety of participants through engaging marginalized groups
- Ensuring the results of musrenbang represent more of actual community’s needs and not only focused on proposals relating to physical development
- Enhancing monitoring of proposals and their implementation

At the time of writing of this report (December 2006), the Perda had just been approved and ratified by the DPRD and was still in the Kabupaten’s Legal Section for numbering.
Since 2002, in Solo the mechanism for planning and budgeting has been continuously improved, partly to accommodate the interests of marginalized groups. In Kebumen, the “General Guidelines for Reinforcing Rural Community Capacities” stipulate that a musrenbang should be preceded by a village or smaller deliberative forum, and it will then be the task of the village government to draft the necessary planning documents. In Bandung, these activities have been improved through a process called Musyawarah Perencanaan Kegiatan Tahunan (MPKT, or annual planning meetings), to project realistic budget targets before organizing a musrenbang. In Parepare, a new participatory mechanism was introduced by Perda No. 17/2004 on community-based development planning. A new perda on procedures for local area planning and budgeting in Sumedang stipulates the importance of establishing local budgeting forums that comprise community delegates who engage in the DPRD budgeting process.

**Box 2: Factors that Reduce Effectiveness of Participatory Meetings**

- Participants often do not adequately comprehend the context of the meeting, and they have no clear idea concerning the role and contribution expected from them. Invitations are often delivered at a short notice and the necessary materials are distributed at the last minute.
- Lengthy and boring opening presentations, usually by government officials or DPRD members. When presentations are given by consultants, the materials are usually very academic and difficult to comprehend by most participants. The presentation of materials tends to be monotonous, making the participants feel sleepy.
- No note-taking materials are made available to participants and often important results of a discussion are lost.
- The participants attending meetings do not represent an adequate cross-section of community interests. Participants usually engaged include (1) well-known figures, (2) those considered to be “safe” and non-critical people, (3) those who are the most easily accessible, and (4) those who are considered as generally capable. Many more invited or relevant participants are often not present due to schedule conflicts. Sometimes participants will not come if the invitation to do so is not signed by the bupati/mayor or other high-ranking officials.
- The discussion is not closed with a clear decision, and there are no notes as such on the follow-ups and continuity with earlier or future meetings.
- The facilitators and moderators lack the ability to lead discussions. Sometimes discussions are lead by a master of ceremonies or a presenter, and not a facilitator. Moreover, the presenters are frequently observed to be busy answering phone calls in the middle of the meeting. Quite frequently moderators suddenly also become resource persons or start conversations with just one or two participants.
- Many times outcomes of the meetings have already been decided by certain parties or the decisions made in the process are decided arbitrarily or forced upon unwilling participants.
- The meeting room is hot and suffocating, not spacious, or is too spacious. Sometimes several discussion groups are arranged together in the same room.

Authors’ observations from different participation forums
3.3.3. Facilitating and Strengthening Deliberative Forums

Facilitating and strengthening deliberative forums assumes that better public participation will result from well-informed civil groups with clear guidelines on how to discuss and decide an issue. Workshops to practice decision making have been established by partners of the Ford Foundation and through various NGOs and universities affiliated with the Kaukus 17++ network.

In Kota Solo, for example, the SOMPIS (Solo’s Marginalized Society for Solidarity) citizen forum organized public discussions on issues affecting marginalized groups, like street vendors, pedicab drivers, and the disabled. In Kebumen, FORMASI monitored local government policies, including budgets, and in encouraged people to participate in budget initiatives at the village level. Bandung’s umbrella-NGO Budget Discussion Forum, consisted of about 18 organizations, which met every month to discuss and criticize the budget policies in the region. A participation forum developing in the city of Parepare is an institution called the Kelurahan Community Empowering Institute (LMPK), while in Sumedang, a multi-stakeholder forum called Forum Jatinangor once actively discussed the planning and development in the area. Another group, the Governance Innovation Forum involved young bureaucrats, although its activities have petered out recently.

3.3.4. Allocation of Block Grant Funds to the Villages/Kelurahan

This approach uses the assumption that one of the key obstacles faced in efforts to promote effective participation is the absence or limited resources at the community level. The effort strongly recommended some “fiscal devolution” to lower levels (village, or desa/kelurahan, and even to neighborhood units) to promote effective participation, one in line with the spirit of decentralization. This initiative for implementing Village Allocation Funds arose because of pressures from local civil society organizations and support from parties and alliances at the village level, such as associations of village heads.

In Solo, the allocation of block funds to kelurahan started in 2001 and in the beginning, each kelurahan was allocated Rp 50 million, with a new formula to calculate funding based on need not established until 2006. Meanwhile, grants for Bandung, and Sumedang have increased year after year. In Sumedang each village received between Rp 35 million and Rp 55 million in 2002, which increased to Rp 65–100 million a village in 2006. The regencies of Kebumen, Bandung and Sumedang have passed perda to decide how to allocate village funds. Supported by FORMASI, the funds have now range from between Rp 190 and Rp 400 million a village. The local government of Kebumen is also working closely with villages to improve participatory planning and it is expected the funds will soon be used more effectively.

---

22 Fiscal devolution is the allocation of funding to the lower level of government (kelurahan/desa) in the form of block grants in accordance with decisions made through participatory processes.
### Table 2: Matrix of Participation Models in Five Study Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area Existing Model</th>
<th>SOLO</th>
<th>KEBUMEN</th>
<th>KAB. BANDUNG</th>
<th>PAREPARE</th>
<th>SUMEDANG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Regulation that Support Participation | • Mayoral Decree on Participatory Development Planning  
• Since 2005, the name of the decree has been changed to the Development Planning Deliberative Meeting in accordance with a 2005 joint Ministerial Circular issued by the State Minister for National Development Planning and the Ministry of Home Affairs. | • Perda No. 53/2004 on Civic Participation in Development Planning Process  
• Civic participation is guaranteed by Perda No. 53/2004 on Civic Participation in Development Planning Process  
• Implementation of pre-village development planning conference, prior to village development planning conference; formulation of Village Mid-term Development Planning, Village Government Activity Plans, and Village Revenue and Expenditure Budget.  
• Village Development Planning Conferences have produced program priority instead of a wish-list of proposals. | • Mayoral Decree on Annual Development Planning Deliberative Meetings  
• Perda on Transparency, Participation and Accountability  
• Perda No. 8/2004 on the Mechanism for Local Development Planning  
• Perda No. 2/2006 on the Financial Balance between Districts and Villages | • Perda No. 17/2004 on the Implementation of Community-Based Development  
• The perda was initiated by Perform-USAID and was formulated through active participation. | • Perda No. 1/2000 on the Mechanism of Legal Drafting  
• The perda states that public participation is a must when formulating all laws.  
• Draft of a Perda on Local Government Planning and Budgeting Procedures |
| Participatory Planning and Budgeting Mechanism | • Since 2002, Solo has implemented kelurahan, sub-district, and city-level deliberative meetings stipulated by 2002 Mayoral Decree on the Guidance of Development Planning Conferences.  
• The regulation was initiated by Indonesian Partnerships on Local Governance Initiatives Solo and the Local Development Planning Agency (Bappeda) | • Civic participation is regulated by Perda No. 17/2004 on People-based Development Implementation | • Mayoral Decree on Annual Program Planning Conference initiated by IPGI (an NGO from outside Bandung)  
• The decree regulates the mechanism of participatory development planning from the village to district level | • Civic participation regulated by Perda No. 17/2004 on People-based Development Implementation | • Perda No. 1/2007 on Procedures for Local Planning and Budgeting  
• The perda proposes the establishment of a budget forum consisting of people representative of district-level development planning to represent citizens in the regional budgeting process  
• Representatives from the legislature, executive and citizens will be involved in the budgeting process. |
### Deliberative Forums

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>SOLO</th>
<th>KEBUMAN</th>
<th>KAB. BANDUNG</th>
<th>PAREPARE</th>
<th>SUMEDANG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing Model</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deliberative Forums</strong></td>
<td>• The use of local media to disseminate new polices and achievements</td>
<td>• Daily government communication with people through local TV and radio in Good Morning Bupati. The establishment of press centers in government offices.</td>
<td>• CSO Consortium: a government initiative to consolidate CSO networks. The Consortium is under National Unity and Civil Protection Bureau (Home Affairs).</td>
<td>• People Strengthening Institution (LPMK): a body initiated by government to encourage representation at the sub-district level to improve and speed up development.</td>
<td>• Forum Jatinangor established in 2000. Consisting of academics, activists, bureaucrats and ordinary citizens, it aims to promote sustainable regional development in Jatinangor through increased participation. Governance Innovation Forum established in 2001 by a group of reform-minded bureaucrats to accelerate bureaucratic change. Forum discontinued after new regional leadership took over in 2003.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Civic forums like SOMPIS emerge to increase the voice of marginalized groups.</td>
<td>• Website</td>
<td>• Forum 17: a NGO Forum established by ILGR.</td>
<td>• Working team to support the mayor. The team consists of 11 people including bureaucrats, lawyers, and civil society activists.</td>
<td>• Forum Jatinangor Coalition established in 2002 by activist in the Governance Innovation Forum. Group was supposed to accelerate reform in the bureaucracy and civil society institutions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Fiscal Devolution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>SOLO</th>
<th>KEBUMAN</th>
<th>KAB. BANDUNG</th>
<th>PAREPARE</th>
<th>SUMEDANG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing Model</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fiscal Devolution</strong></td>
<td>• Since 2001 the mayor has issued annual Mayor Decrees on Sub-district Budget Allocations.</td>
<td>• Perda No. 3/2004 on Village Budget Allocation. The Regulation declares 10 percent of total local government budgets to be allocated to villages through ADD or village grants.</td>
<td>• Perda No. 2/2006 on the Financial Balance between Districts and Villages.</td>
<td>• Perda No. 52/2001 on Financial Balance between district and villages. The Perda declares 10 percent of total local government budgets must be allocated to village grants (ADD).</td>
<td>• Since 2002, the sub-district allocation budget has been distributed proportionally based on differing needs and priorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Total grants have increased significantly, about 100 percent, from 2002 to 2005.</td>
<td>• Prior to the village grants scheme implementation in 2006, the Kebumen administration launched a program, Village People Capacity Building, to help villagers to effectively manage ADD block grants.</td>
<td>• The Perda declares 10 percent of total local government budgets, excluding infrastructure expenditure and special allocation funds, to be allocated to villages grants (ADD).</td>
<td>• About a 100 percent increase in total village budget allocations from 2002 to 2004.</td>
<td>• Was initiated by Perform-USAID but could not be implemented. The main obstacle was an unclear regulation from the central government on how to implement village grants in municipalities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3: Description Of Current Changes In Five Study Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Change</th>
<th>Solo Score</th>
<th>Kebumen Score</th>
<th>Parepare Score</th>
<th>Bandung Score</th>
<th>Sumbaddang Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regulations that support participation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Region has perda/decree on participatory planning mechanisms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Region has perda on public involvement in budgeting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Region has perda on transparency, participation, and accountability</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participatory Planning and Budgeting Mechanisms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Region has changed planning mechanism</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Region has involved marginalized groups in the planning process</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Region has conducted community capacity building for involvement in the planning process</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Region has changed budgeting mechanism</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Region has involved the public in the budget drafting process</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Region has media to disseminate information on local budget (APBD)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Region has opened community access to budget documents</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Total</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliberative Forums</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region has provided space for community to participate through print and electronic media such as television, radio, newspapers, websites</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region has an institution that functions as an information center</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region has informal participation mechanisms for leaders to meet directly with the public</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region has sustainable citizen forums</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region has forum for marginalized communities</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Total</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Fiscal Devolution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Change</th>
<th>Solo</th>
<th>Kebumen</th>
<th>Parepare</th>
<th>Bandung</th>
<th>Sumedang</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Region has perda/decree on balancing funds for sub-districts/villages</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Region has schemes/systems for calculation/allocation for each sub-district/village</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Region has a mechanism for community involvement in planning and implementation of ADD</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Region has system to control implementation of ADD</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Region increases funding allocation to subdistricts/villages</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Region has program to strengthen subdistrict/village communities in implementing ADD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Sub Total | 16 | 18 | 11 | 15 | 16 |
| TOTAL     | 51 | 51 | 40 | 38 | 46 |

**Legends:**

- [ ] Fully functional
- [ ] Adequate
- [ ] Not operational
3.4. Emerging Issues from Experiences in Five Locations

Although the above tables indicate some encouraging and sustainable changes over a wide area, the following important issues have also arisen.

The first question is how far do the developments really reflect the commitments of the politicians, bureaucrats and local leaders to meaningful change? This study reveals a range of different motivations for these initiatives, and not all of them reflect a true willingness to change.

One motivation is a desire for increased popularity in the eyes of the people. The bupati of Kebumen Rustriningsih, for example, developed a mechanism for communicating with the public through a daily talk show program called ‘Selamat Pagi Bupati’ (Good Morning Bupati), broadcast over local radio and television. While this initiative has been praised in some quarters, others observers worry the program is overly personality based and could become a propaganda tool for the administration.

Meanwhile, the regencies of Bandung and Sumedang have been criticized by civil society activists for only issuing local government regulations pertaining to participation, transparency, and accountability because they were required to do so in order to gain World Bank funds.

With the inclusion of these regulations into annual budgeting (APBD) programs, musrenbang systems are becoming institutionalized nationwide as part of regional fiscal devolution. However, this does not mean these structures cannot be hijacked for the interests of a certain group.

A final factor motivating change is the attitudes of civil society organizations or consultants, who obtain funding from international donor agencies. Their skills, demands for technical assistance, aspirations and their commitments to change also help shape how programs work out.

The second question is whether the initiatives will be sustainable, particularly when there is no longer any assistance from outside actors such as donors or NGOs. While it is hard to predict this, there have been some encouraging developments. Several local governments have allocated funds from their budgets (through APBD) to what are already considered routine activities such as the yearly musrenbang, while others have invested in more innovative undertakings. The drafting of the perda on Kebumen village funds is one example. Local legislative councils might also allocate special budgets to deliberate local government regulations, such as in Bandung and Sumedang, at the same time providing procedural guidelines, as in the perda on procedures for planning and budgeting. This idea is also being followed up by the Kebumen legislature.

From observations, it seems that budgets for promoting the programs vary greatly across the areas of study. In Sumedang, the budget allocated for the yearly musrenbang could reach Rp 400 million, a large amount for a small city, meanwhile, Kebumen had allocated about Rp 600 million for the Village Medium Term Development Planning Program (RPJMD) where the government worked closely together with communities in 449 villages. At last observa-
tion, the program was progressing well, especially with the support from CSO members who worked semi-voluntarily. However, in several other areas, the executives are in need of technical support from more professional institutions to undertake better-quality participatory programs.

Experiences in all the five locations revealed that local CSOs have started to become involved in district budgeting programs. This partnership with local governments could become more balanced and successful when the respective organizations find extra sources of funding. Although certain CSOs would face considerable obstacles if funding from outside donors stopped, experiences have also shown that technical support from the respective organizations could be sustained by local governments.

More complex situations face civil society organizations in efforts to institutionalize participation by strengthening deliberative forums. Forums that are successful are generally those which are flexible and obtain continuous support from outside parties, although the nominal amount of support might not be large.

The third question concerns the position of legislative councils (DPRDs). To what extent should legislative bodies initiate participatory programs? Experiences in the five areas of this study reveal that DPRDs could become an important driver of change, particularly when the regions’ executives are showing resistance to such programs. In the regencies of Bandung and Sumedang, the DPRDs have taken the initiative to arrange for more reforms to local regulations with the technical assistance of CSOs. The two councils are outspoken in their criticisms of their executives’ policies. In Solo there is a slightly different story. During the previous term the council was criticized for lacking transparency, and to change this, a local civil society group, the Coalition for Promoting Participation, advocated a change in the body’s rules and decision-making powers.

It should be acknowledged that in all the locations, DPRDs’ capacities to function as monitoring bodies are still in need of strengthening. Unfortunately, donor agencies and CSO programs have so far been more often focused on executives, and have ignored legislatures.

DPRDs are certainly in need of support to renew their commitments to disseminating information to communities. These councils have shown an interest in learning further about how they could consult with their constituents in a wider and more meaningful way. Councils also need help to push their executives to seriously implement current best practices in governance.

The fourth question relates to the effects of existing regulations, such as the perda on participation, transparency, and accountability. How far are the regulations being implemented? A range of studies have revealed that there is no significant difference in participation, transparency, and accountability in places that have already implemented the perda compared to other areas which don’t yet have such regulations. Although the very phenomenon of the perda could be considered progress, it seems that far greater attention needs to be given to their implementation.

Two of the five studied areas already have PTA perda, Bandung and Kebumen with the help of the ILGR project supported by the World Bank. The two regencies also have the Perda.
Alokasi Dana Desa, a local area government regulation about allocation of village funds. In Kebumen, the idea of the need for fiscal devolution to villages was initiated by civil society groups, which later established the FORMASI network. Meanwhile, the Perda ADD in the district of Bandung was initiated by IPGI, which later become part of the Inisiatif program. Despite this work, both local governments’ readiness to implement the Perda is consistently low.

The forces pushing for change in local government are often strongly resisted. While local regulations are supposed increase community participation and scrutiny, they often fail to do so. The contents of most regulations are greatly influenced by the facilitators and participants involved in the drafting process, and their final shape is often seriously compromised by a resisting force in the bureaucracy.

It was initially expected that Transparency and Participation Commissions (KTP) would be established nationwide to guide the implementation of Perda. However, the idea was strongly opposed in bureaucratic circles and after some hard lobbying the article mandating a KTP was deleted from the draft Perda in Bandung. To date, only one KTP has been established in the area, in Banten’s Lebak district.

Both legislative councils and local governments have experienced difficulties in drafting satisfactory Perda, including those on how to properly engage stakeholders in the creation of such regulations. For this reason, most initiatives related to regulations are organized through technical assistance from outside parties like civil groups and donor agencies. The main difficulty is in convincing the stakeholders about the need for such regulations. The others concern substance and process.

**Box 3: Implementation of Perda on Participation**

A recent study by the Indonesian Institute for Studies on the Free Flow of Information (ISAI) reveals that in general, the level of implementation of PTA Perda in government regulations is still low. Although the Perda have been enacted, observers are still complaining about a lack of transparency in local government project tenders, procurements and other “lucrative” undertakings.

Nevertheless, this study asserts that local government regulations on transparency are essential for good governance. Also important is the law pertaining to the freedom of access to public information at the national level. This underlines that the serious weakness in the perda process is monitoring and implementation.

This study suggests two important requirements if PTA Perda are to succeed. First is the participatory process, which should be properly promoted. Second is the need for a special body to safeguard the implantation of perda; a PTA commission. This official body should have competent members and distinct authorities. It should also have capacities to carry out documentation, and classify and supply information.

(Source: Researchers from ISAI).
4. CONDITIONS SUPPORTING THE DEVELOPMENT OF PARTICIPATION

Six years might be too short to assess the effectiveness and sustainability of a participation initiative, nevertheless, the findings of this study indicate that some areas have proven to be capable of implementing, enhancing, and sustaining participation while others have not. Effective participation calls for certain pre-conditions.

Based on the experiences of the five studied areas these are: the presence of leadership, the willingness of decision makers and mid-level staff in location to implement change; the culture of association that produces competent citizens — sometimes referred to as social capital; and the availability of supporting resources, including laws, policies and regulations.

4.1. Leadership and the Attitudes of Decision Makers and Mid-level Staff

Diverse studies on reform in developing countries have concluded that leadership and the perceptions and behavior of the decision makers are some of the important factors affecting the success or failure of reform initiatives. One of the requirements necessary for promoting participation is the adequate attention and the willingness of the decision makers — executives and legislatures — to engage citizens. In some of the studied areas, the situation indicated increasingly active citizen engagement where mid-level bureaucratic staff were supportive of such ideas.

Resistance of mid-level staff can obstruct or reduce the effects of an initiative. While reforming local area government regulations may have been issued, the rules for implementation or technical guidelines are generally compiled by the bureaucracy. Depending on its commitment, the contents might not conform with the spirit of the perda, and sometimes it will be made an instrument for those who are oppose change.

There are several reasons why local government bodies and expert staff acting as consultants can oppose participation. One these is that widespread consultation with the public will create obstacles to their work. Apart from increasing the time of a job, it can also cause inconveniences and cost increases. Many officials currently perceive that participatory undertakings have more disadvantages than benefits and government bodies are ignoring the demands of citizens to participate because the advantages this process creates have not been clearly defined.

If leaders are not interested in change then this reduce the will of those below them to encourage greater participation. When this willingness only arises from a small group of bureaucrats and does not have the support of their superiors, the possibility for realizing such efforts is low.

As a vital component of mid-level government, planners should be encouraged to change these views. They should:

- no longer consider themselves the only important actor in designing plans
- comprehend better the basic idea behind the regulations stipulating participation and the political processes during planning
- function as facilitators to bring together interests of the elite and communities

4.2. Associational Culture

A culture of associational life provides opportunities for participation through informal media and enable communities to solve their own problems. A growing associational life will provide new opportunities for the middle class, women, youth, and the marginalized to organize and be involved in public affairs.

Associational culture can be developed through CSOs and community forums. Although their roles of these groups are very important, so far community organizations do not yet have a clear mandate to play effective roles in local-level governance. For such reasons, they are frequently resisted by unsympathetic local governments and legislatures and are unable to easily access or scrutinize important information.

While more people are engaged in participatory meetings and monitoring programs than before, most prefer for these issues to be channeled through CSOs or forums they trust.

The civil groups in the areas of study have indicated some growing capacity in comprehending and articulating the problems faced by communities. In some areas they have become experts in political communication and mass media, and are good at mobilizing, networking, and organizing agendas of actions. In other places they are playing important watchdog, advocate, and facilitator roles.

Most also have adequate expertise to provide technical assistance to local governments. Nevertheless, improvements to CSO human resources are vital, especially the capacity to penetrate and influence decision-making institutions such as Local Government Work Plans (SKPDs) and legislative bodies. They also need to have more clear information on the details and dynamics of bureaucratic bodies, the decision-making process, and the skills to carry out their function as consultants.

In areas where executives and legislatives are corrupt, inattentive, and inefficient, the main role of CSOs is to propose reforms to protect public interests. In this case, the role of CSOs is more as a guardian and advocate.

Wherever the executives and legislatives have started to reform, CSOs can become complementary forces to provide assistance and promote a better quality of participation. They can (1) disseminate information, (2) work to strengthen citizen and community forums, (3) monitor the implementation of planning, budgeting and other development programs, and (4) provide technical assistance to implement reform initiatives. In this case, the role of civil society organizations is more as a consultant.
CSOs are also learning about how to establish clean, beneficial partnerships with local government and politicians. Some organizations have reached successful agreements, formally stipulated in memorandums of understanding with local governments, to promote changes collectively. Initiatives of this kind will have greater possibilities for success when there is a mutual trust between local government and CSOs.

Another difficulty facing these organizations is their capacity to cooperate and network. In all the studied areas, these groups’ actions tended to be fragmented. Fractures within these organizations also often reduce their ability to push for change.

**Box 4: Civil Groups in Kota Parepare: Obstructions to Promoting Effective Participation**

The work of civil society groups in Parepare has not yet been fully consolidated. This has led to difficulties in arriving at a mutual agreement on the direction of developments for the area. Many policies initiated by local government have been criticized strongly by activists, who local leaders perceive as “anti-government”. Efforts toward public communication, particularly in the organization of meetings for discussing the policies are often not arriving at a compromise or mutual agreement. This disunity has made it difficult for the government to engage the many interests in public consultation meetings.

Decision making by local government, therefore, remains technocratic, although beforehand it has organized communications with stakeholders. However, the administration is using these public forums to push through and justify unilateral decisions, rather than engaging citizens to find solutions to problems.

**Box 5: The Importance of Trust: Experiences of Partnerships in Kabupaten Bandung**

As a senior official in Bandung told the researchers: “There are already many ‘barking NGOs’, but it still hard to find those who are cooperative and have the capacity for directing”.

His comments about the activities of Initiatif-IPGI were that its activities were successful because of the use of the partnership approach. However, the official was disappointed as lately, the IPGI had became ‘ferocious’ and he considered this counterproductive to smooth change in Bandung. He said further: “Being in a good partnership, one should safeguard eastern customs and traditions. Most important is laukna beunang caina herang (you can catch the fish but you must keep the water clear) — this Sundanese saying means that you can make changes without messing up other things.”

While saying the government had a strong wish to change, the official also believed the experiences of administrators were still limited, and that they were “not used to the new customs that we should adopt.”

There was also no guidance for officials on how to change, he said. “There are many NGOs criticizing us, however, we can find few willing to assist us in revising the perda and drafting the bupati-led regulations.”

On their part, the IPGI/Initiatif activists felt the willingness of the local area government of Bandung to change was extremely limited. In the recent local government reshuffle, the group saw the executive populated with more reactionary officials. As IPGI activists frequently encounter obstacles and opposition to their work, their trust in the political will of the Bandung government is dwindling. “We have produced sets of guidelines (for change) but the local government never implements them”, complained one. All lobbying to amend the perda on village budgets (ADD), have failed because of opposition from institutions that should support the initiative, the activist said.
4.3. Citizens’ Competence

Many academics and practitioners are still arguing whether citizens need a certain level of competence to meaningfully participate in government. Some academics believe that every person, whether they are competent or not, has the right to participate. However, experts and local government bodies here are skeptical about such ideas and often believe that expanded participation will not produce quality products. They think that most citizens are concerned only with their own interests and do not adequately comprehend public affairs. Many officials and consultants believe that deliberative processes will only be effective when citizens participate in fields they understand and are familiar with. The more complex the problem, the more difficult it is for citizens to contribute inventive and constructive ideas, produce collective decisions or alternatives of quality. The question that follows from this, is what kind of knowledge and competences should citizens have before they can increase their participation.

4.3.1. Political Competence

There are a number of international studies on the competences expected from democratic citizens. Of the skills needed, competent citizens must be able to judge which government actions or policies are unfair, unwise, or uneconomical. When collective decisions are made, they must be open to a range of arguments, and not just those that accommodate their personal or group’s interests. When citizens submit criticisms of government they should be reasonable, logical and based on legal argument or policy. Tolerance is another important competence. Activists who are politically skilled should be articulate, but they must also have the ability to listen and respect other people’s opinions.

4.3.2. Technical Competence

Decisions made collectively through participation processes often need technical support. This may be in the form of access to accurate information and the expertise to interpret this data. A lack of information and expertise is the main reasons local governments give for not properly engaging citizens in the drafting of regulations, spatial planning, or budgeting. Only with accurate, timely and accessible information will people be able to influence public policies.

One example of this is when citizens in the Bandung sub-district of Majalaya became involved in the production of Urban Detailed Spatial Plan — for more details, see Antlov 2004. The experience the author took from in that case was that it is imperative for citizens to effectively communicate their aspirations through (1) an ability to interpret data; (2) being able to set priorities and comprehend that available resources are limited; and (3) properly assess and monitor local governments and legislatures and make constructive criticisms.

4.3.3. Organizational Competence

The citizens groups most frequently put at a disadvantage in the development process are usually those that are disorganized. Even if groups are successfully organized and led, they often have difficulties staying focused on an issue and, later, maintaining their existence.
However, the experiences of Solo and Kebumen have indicated that marginalized groups and rural communities are capable of making policies that are acceptable to their members, local governments and other stakeholders

**Box 6: How to Enhance Citizens’ Competence?**

**Increased access to information**
Access to up-to-date and accurate information will increase citizens’ opportunities to make intelligent decisions. Having comprehensive information, the citizens will be able to better assess policy alternatives or choices of candidates. Below we elaborate on the most common information sources and how to access them.

**Civic and political education**
Civic and political education takes place formally and informally. A good curriculum and suitable teaching will produce active, politically aware citizens.

**Strengthening of organizations and citizen forums**
Some experts have underlined the importance of institutional innovation to drive and strengthen civic forums. Through these groups, citizens have the opportunity to carry out deliberative processes in decision making. Next, we elaborate particular areas in forums that need strengthening and how to achieve this.

**Opening of structured participation opportunities**
The most effective way to enhance citizens’ competence is by directly involving them in a structured decision-making processes. This process should be legalized so it functions satisfactorily and is properly supported through the resources of local government — financially, in terms of human resources and easy access to information. To ensure that the ideas catch on, participatory decision making should be carried out at many levels; in schools, work environments, community neighborhood units, citizen associations, and government programs. Participatory bodies like school and health boards and community development agencies can also take part.
5. IMPLEMENTING AND SUSTAINING PARTICIPATION: POLICIES AND AGENDA

Experiences in the five areas have confirmed the results of earlier studies, namely that citizen participation is often being implemented unevenly in Indonesia and the longevity of these programs is uncertain at best. These uncertainties and differences have prevented supporters of public participation in Indonesia understanding the complexities in each area and formulating the appropriate strategies for dealing with particular situations. But there are also useful things that can be learned from these areas.

- Experiences in Solo gave observers hope that more meaningful participation, which affects public decision making and is fairer to marginalized groups, could be implemented, although slowly, and in stages. Solo is yet to have a specific local regulation on participation, nevertheless, these processes have been successfully encouraged by innovative local leaders, active CSOs, and a strong associational culture, which even involves some of the city’s most marginalized groups. The greatest challenge facing Solo currently is to maintain these participatory processes and encourage more cooperation among citizens’ groups.

- While dynamic forms of participation do exist in the regencies of Kebumen and Bandung, the desire for change is being resisted by the local bureaucracy and the legislative council. Before changes of government in these areas, the two regencies had been singled out for their good performance. Although the laws in both locations mandate public engagement in governance, this involvement still depends on the collaboration between local governments and civil groups and bureaucrats and leaders’ agendas.

- Experiences in Kota Parepare indicated participation at a relatively low level. While there was discourse in the area about openness and participation, agents for change still depended heavily on the encouragement and funding of external parties, mainly donor agencies. If significant change is to occur, the programs of donor agencies must be properly carried out to strengthen civil groups.

- In Kabupaten Sumedang there have been a series of inconsistent participation experiences. While some important innovations have been made, changes in local government leaders have seen the area regress in other areas. The Sumedang legislative council is currently emerging as the real engine for change in the leadership. The greatest challenge in implementing meaningful participation will be to strengthen fading civil society organizations and impel the local government to consistent reforms.

5.1. Policy Implementation

A recent study on local governance highlights that the success of a policy is mostly determined by its implementation. This study identifies several likely scenarios encountered during the implementation of a policy:

- a policy or a regulation has been formulated and implemented in stages
- a policy or a regulation is not implemented and there are no sanctions for those who ignore the implementation, and
• when the policy or regulation is implemented, in practice it is not done seriously or in the spirit of the policy, or
• government actors and citizens encounter difficulties or do not have adequate skills to effectively implement policy or regulations

This study recommends that a set of policies, strategies, and agenda should be made available to promote and implement more effective and sustainable participation in governance. This includes the following steps.

5.2. Enhancing Monitoring and Law Enforcement to Increase Participation and Transparency

This study has attempted to analyze the arguments whether it is necessary to pass a special regulation, or perda to promote participation. Some of the donors that facilitated such perda believed they were necessary, although they acknowledged that laws alone were not enough to guarantee effective participation. However, by passing regulations, changes can be institutionalized into a system, changes which are difficult to reverse. The process of drafting the perda can itself be made an instrument for encouraging the active participation of communities.

Drawing up local government regulations can be a way to establish a consensus on the content and direction of the desired reforms. Unfortunately, although several regulations in the study areas have been designed through a long consultation process, the local government and important decision makers in the area are not always involved, and therefore their desire to implement the regulations varies. In Bandung, for instance, the process of formulating the Perda on Participation, Transparency and Accountability (PTA) took almost two years through dozens of stakeholder meetings but the local bupati never attended the process.

Because of this, making the drafting of perda target programs for citizen-government collaboration should be seriously contemplated, otherwise reforms may not stick.

While supporting regulations are important, the existence of these policies do not automatically lead to increased participation. Many local governments in the study were already equipped with regulations but they were not properly implemented. In these areas, the existing bylaws should be explained to local CSOs, which should be encouraged to monitor their implementation. Regions without such regulations, meanwhile, should look at the areas where these laws were implemented successfully.

It is also crucial to decide on measurable and realistic standards for a performance audit. At present, there is almost no effort in monitoring the quality of participation in an area. Sometimes the government conducts such an evaluation, however, the results are often shelved. This process should be carried out regularly by regional and central government, the latter’s role being of an external auditor and funding body. Some of standards in audits that should be used are:
• the availability of information in the participatory processes
• the level of representation in participatory processes
• the level of authority and devolution of resources to lower levels

5. IMPLEMENTING AND SUSTAINING PARTICIPATION: POLICIES AND AGENDA
5.3. Developing Strategies to Renew Participation

Many local-level actors are not fully aware of the benefits of enhancing participation and therefore it is vital that these ideas are promoted and marketed effectively. One way to do this would be to compile a handbook in Indonesian designed for local planners, local government bodies and DPRD members, focusing on the benefits of participation and other requirements for successful participation, with the inclusion of several positive examples from other areas.

5.4. Organizing and Promoting Effective Participation

To promote effective and meaningful participation, proponents of change should organize activities to improve the knowledge and competence of local officials in the executive and legislative branches of government. Training programs and workshops backed up with regular technical assistance will be very useful here. Best practices and the replication of successful participation processes should also be encouraged and disseminated.

5.5. Enhancing the Roles of Legislative Councils

This study has found that the crucial role local legislative councils can play in effecting change is generally under-valued. To date, the councils’ main role in promoting engagement has been to approve perda promoting citizen participation. But these bodies can also do work in other areas by:

- Enhancing two-way interactions between DPRD members and communities, and implementing consultation processes with citizens on budgeting and regulations, before they are legalized.
- Encouraging DPRDs to publish draft annual budgets (RAPBD) and planned regulations using pamphlets, newspapers or websites.
- Encouraging DPRDs to monitor the implementation of perda on public participation.
- Revising DPRD standing orders to provide greater access to the public to participate in decision-making processes.
- Encouraging DPRDs to draft local regulations that explicitly accommodate citizens’ rights to information.

5.6. Empowering Citizens and Multi-Stakeholder Forums

Understanding the issues confronting different citizen and multi-stakeholder forums is the first step before the empowerment process can begin. When a citizen forum vanishes, one needs to understand why they have disappeared. At present, many of these forums find themselves in a difficult situation. Most need to develop core competences to cope with internal and external threats. Priorities need to be set to: (a) develop internal democracies within forums on electing leaders, and skills training for deliberative processes; (b) develop partnerships with local government institutions and DPRDs; (c) ensure donor agencies and governments finance their daily activities.
Venues where people and decision makers can meet and discuss the issues considered priorities should also be created and supported. This can be done by organizing deliberative forums at different levels of government, in the kecamatan, kota, kabupaten levels and at the provincial level to discuss the issues of common concern and seek solutions. Successful examples include forums on education and rural development (Kebumen), small-scale businesses and cooperatives (Sumedang), spatial planning (Kecamatan Majalaya, Kapupaten Bandung), the simplification of licensing (Parepare), and the arrangement of street vendors (Solo).

Simple, practical guidelines on how to organize and run forums effectively should be created and given to members of these civic organizations. Skills would include how to delegate tasks, how to develop leadership and how to organize meetings — and youth, women, and marginalized groups should be singled out for special training.

**5.7. Innovations in Participation Methods and Techniques**

Efforts to promote participatory initiatives and deliberative forums must have the presence of skillful facilitators. These actors can later become models for change in other areas. Many materials to help facilitators design and lead deliberative forums have already been developed by different organizations however, most are still written in English. One exception is the Asia Foundation, which once translated, disseminated, and organized training programs on the Technology of Participation, which was adopted from experiences of the GOLD Project in the Philippines, an innovation that needs to be replicated in other areas.

The more specific the methods and techniques, the better they will work. They should include “How to implement participation in spatial planning”; “How to organize participatory Musrenbang and SKPD Forums”; and “How to carry out effective public consultation in law making”. Facilitators need to be trained on how to select and frame issues, how to modernize and improve forums and how to share their experiences with others.

**5.8. Securing Reliable Financial Resources**

Reliable financial support is necessary if participatory processes at the community level and government organizations are to be sustained. It is, therefore, important to work closely with local governments in budget allocations and in initiatives of a participatory and deliberative nature.

From observations in the studied areas, it is apparent donor agencies contributed considerably to promote innovative and participatory initiatives. Apart from being a source of ideas and helping civil society organizations into governance roles, these agencies opened up access to information, increased trust between civil society organizations and local governments and bridged the gap between citizens and leaders.

These groups have also not been immune to criticism, especially related to issues of coordination and their engagement of CSOs. Different donor agencies often have related ideas, similar focus areas and similar targets. However, this does not mean that they automatically coordinate their field activities. Often workers in different programs, who have a sense of owning their innovations, are reluctant to change their ideas or work practices. One worker in an agency said: “Donors are in general, not willing to add to other people’s work. They prefer...
to use their own templates.” In one example, several programs were initiated by the same donor agency in an area, however, despite obvious instances of overlap, the different participation forums competed with each other. Coordinating programs to prevent unnecessary rivalry has lately become a critical issue.

One initiative for coordinating donor agencies was developed in Kebumen, although it has not yet been used. It is interesting to note that this initiative was internally driven by local activists who wanted to see improvements to the established participatory process.

Competition is occurring because international donor agencies have begun to channel aid through CSOs rather than local governments. The main reason for this change is to reach the poor more effectively. But this has also resulted in the role of non-governmental organizations moving from watchdogs to consultants or service providers. This also increases the demand for professionalism in CSO activists, along with a similar demand for higher fees or salaries. While no one denies activists should be properly paid, there are risks in commercializing CSO work.

Another matter affecting success of an initiative relates to how funds are channeled. When a participatory program is connected to loans, the funds are usually channeled through the central government, which later transmits them to local authorities. In general, the implementation of programs is the work of consulting firms appointed by the central government. When selecting CSO partners, donors are supposed to consider proposals from these organizations or their networks in an open tender process. However, this process is not always as transparent as it should be.

Finally, there are indications the working system being used will strongly influence the running of a participatory program. Projects financed by donor agencies that have very strict time limits or exacting criteria are usually overly inflexible, as one implementing consultant put it:

“Our project activities are determined by a manual that is centrally arranged. Even the matters on how to assemble people and who are to be engaged, all are determined by the manual. Standardization is carried out to a detailed level as well as the other technical aspects. Notwithstanding the fact that empowering is unique, it is imperative to have a space for creations. The difficult problem is that evaluation of performance of the consultants and facilitators will also be decided based on how far the manual is implemented. The donors should work more flexibly, and not be target-oriented …”

5.9. Conclusions

It can be concluded that the factors supporting the institutionalization of citizen participation in local governance are the existence of:

• pioneers (individuals, organizations and programs) who or which are dedicated consistently to advocating change
• exemplary studies that document a particular initiative, incorporating a record of the difficulties faced by its proponents
• a cooperating network between pioneers, to be managed in a democratic way, and encourage interaction for reflection and improvement
sustainable financial resources to support innovations and multi-stakeholder networks
- regulations at the national level formulated through a participatory process, which are “umbrella” laws protecting similar initiatives in other areas
- Central and provincial governments that stimulate and strengthen local-area initiatives rather than curtail them
- Proactive leaders at the local level along with properly trained supporting staff at the middle level of bureaucracy
- Innovators and change agents from civil society groups and universities, who can confidently analyze budgets, help draft new bylaws and undertake other skilled, technical work

Table 4: Summary of Strategies for Promoting and Improving the Quality of Citizen Participation in Local Government

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problems to be solved</th>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Key steps or activities</th>
<th>Initiator/engaged actors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>· Diverse experiences indicate that the availability of supporting regulations is not a guarantee for participation. This is mainly due to weak law enforcement and an absence of pressure from civil society groups.</td>
<td>· Reviewing regulations that can open opportunities for participation and analyzing how to make them more effective. · Monitoring and law enforcement of perda on Participation, Transparency and Accountability. · Deciding on realistic and measurable standards of performance to improve the quality of participation. · Encouraging the replication of effective regulations.</td>
<td>· Disseminating existing regulations to communities · Encouraging local civil society organizations to monitor their implementation in several pilot projects. · Encouraging other regions to replicate the legal framework for participation, considering beforehand the lessons learned from areas that have successfully implemented them. · Encouraging local government associations and DPRD members to disseminate and replicate programs.</td>
<td>· Donor agencies - the World Bank, DSF, LGSP, DRSP, GTZ — and civil society networks · CSO institutions wotj experience advocating for participation, including Visi Anak Bangsa, CLGI · Central government organizations and ministries — MOHA, Menpan, Bappenas and provincial governments · Local area governments and legislative assemblies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· The implementation of the participatory approaches already adopted other regions is being delayed by resistance from bureaucrats and politicians, who are not aware of the benefits and incentives they will enjoy from enhancing participation.</td>
<td>· Developing promotional strategies to deepen participatory practices.</td>
<td>· Encouraging a deeper understanding of the benefits of participation and preparing short-term incentives for those implementing the participatory approach. · Compiling a handbook in Indonesian designed for local area planners, government agencies and DPRD members, which focuses on the benefits of participation and prerequisites for successful participation processes, including successful examples of implementation. · Disseminating information about best practices and encouraging the replication of successful participation processes.</td>
<td>· Bappeda, planners, · Progressive local government practitioners, and DPRD members</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Problems to be solved

- Many of government bodies and DPRD members are not yet convinced that participation is the right approach.
- Many citizen groups are not well organized and are often not capable of developing and maintaining themselves to become strong, inclusive, and democratic institutions.
- Citizen representatives are often not capable of playing their role in channeling the aspirations and interests of the communities at large, but are more influenced by personal interests.
- Some citizens have no access to policy making.

### Strategies

- Enhancing awareness of the benefits of participation and methods for organizing and promoting effective public engagement.
- Preparing the necessary instruments.
- Publish a guide for evaluation and monitoring that can be used by both executives and legislatures to assess the strengths and weaknesses of the participation mechanism being used.
- Compile a handbook designed for planners, local government bodies and DPRD members, explaining the advantages and disadvantages of participation, the prerequisites for successful participation processes, with the inclusion of real-life examples.
- Training bureaucrats and DPRD members in participatory methods, a process supported with regular technical assistance.

### Key steps or activities

- Cooperating with higher education institutions — like the *Institut Pemerintahan Dalam Negeri* — Ministry of Home Affairs training institute for the development of a curriculum on participation.

### Initiator/engaged actors

- Donor agencies
- Government bodies like Bappeda, and SKPD, DPRD members
- DPRDs and their secretariats (Setwan)
- Institutions of higher education, such as planning institutions and IPDN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problems to be solved</th>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Key steps or activities</th>
<th>Initiator/engaged actors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Many of government bodies and DPRD members are not yet convinced that participation is the right approach.</td>
<td>Enhancing awareness of the benefits of participation and methods for organizing and promoting effective public engagement.</td>
<td>Publishing a guide for evaluation and monitoring that can be used by both executives and legislatures to assess the strengths and weaknesses of the participation mechanism being used.</td>
<td>Donor agencies, Government bodies like Bappeda, and SKPD, DPRD members, DPRDs and their secretariats (Setwan), Institutions of higher education, such as planning institutions and IPDN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many citizen groups are not well organized and are often not capable of developing and maintaining themselves to become strong, inclusive, and democratic institutions.</td>
<td>Enhancing citizen competence through empowerment of citizen and multi-stakeholder forums.</td>
<td>Revisiting and conducting diagnostic studies on the situations encountered by citizen and stakeholder forums.</td>
<td>Donor agencies — FF, LGSP, GTZ-SfGG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen representatives are often not capable of playing their role in channeling the aspirations and interests of the communities at large, but are more influenced by personal interests.</td>
<td>Opening access to broader participation for marginalized groups.</td>
<td>Deciding on priorities.</td>
<td>National civil society networks, including Kaukus 17++, FPPM, Satunama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some citizens have no access to policy making.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Creating venues where citizens and decision makers can meet and discuss policies and public issues.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Publishing practical materials designed for members of civil society organizations or participants of citizen forums providing guiding principles on how to organize and manage these associations effectively.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Developing series of learning tools for ordinary citizens, particularly youth, women and marginalized groups.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Problems to be solved

- The knowledge and skills for organizing participatory forums are not increasing in the field and some of these bodies are stagnating or dissolving.
- The need for more reliable facilitators and event organizers to prepare participatory forums.
- The need for the continuous funding of participatory forums and the monitoring of these forums.

### Strategies

- Innovating participatory methods and techniques.
- Creating experts to facilitate participatory forums.
- Improving the competence of existing facilitators.
- Teaching the importance of “tiny empowerments” and “small victories”
- Documenting the experiences of other areas where participatory approaches have already been applied.
- Creating new participatory methods and techniques and modifying existing programs.
- Translating, distributing, and conducting training programs on participation methods and techniques.
- Organizing a series of training programs for facilitators and professionals to improve their skills, giving them a chance to reflect on their work and share their experiences.
- Ensuring the availability of reliable financial resources.
- The provision of block grants down to the community level.
- Securing the allocation of funds for the organization of deliberative and participative forums.
- Funding to train facilitators.

### Key steps or activities

- Innovating participatory methods and techniques.
- Creating experts to facilitate participatory forums.
- Improving the competence of existing facilitators.
- Teaching the importance of “tiny empowerments” and “small victories”
- Documenting the experiences of other areas where participatory approaches have already been applied.
- Creating new participatory methods and techniques and modifying existing programs.
- Translating, distributing, and conducting training programs on participation methods and techniques.
- Organizing a series of training programs for facilitators and professionals to improve their skills, giving them a chance to reflect on their work and share their experiences.
- Ensuring the availability of reliable financial resources.
- The provision of block grants down to the community level.
- Securing the allocation of funds for the organization of deliberative and participative forums.
- Funding to train facilitators.

### Initiator/engaged actors

- Civil society organizations
- Donor agencies
- DPRD
- Bappeda
- Donor agencies and civil society organizations
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Civic engagement in policy formulation and decision-making is an increasingly popular topic, which is attracting the attention of academics and local government actors in Indonesia. There is, however, one important question about the topic that remains difficult to answer: “How far has the process of civic engagement in local governance progressed?”

The objectives of this study were to complement the documentation on participation practices in Indonesia and to learn from the experiences of different regions about promoting citizen participation. This document is also an empirical study of various opinions about the character of this participation.