



Jurnal Pertahanan

Media Informasi tentang Kajian dan Strategi Pertahanan
yang Mengedepankan *Identity*, *Nationalism* dan *Integrity*
e-ISSN: 2549-9459

<http://jurnal.idu.ac.id/index.php/DefenseJournal>



THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE SPECIAL AUTONOMY OF PAPUA PROVINCE FROM THE ASPECT OF IMPROVING PUBLIC SERVICES

Purwoko Aji Prabowo¹, Bambang Supriyono², M.R. Khairul Muluk³, Irwan Noor⁴

^{1,2,3,4}Doctoral Study Program of Administrative Sciences, University of Brawijaya

Veteran Street, Malang, East Java, Indonesia 65145

Corresponding Email: purwoko92aji@gmail.com¹

Article Info

Article history:

Received 25 September 2019

Revised 31 March 2020

Accepted 31 March 2020

Keywords:

Authority,
Finance,
Institutional,
Special autonomy for Papua
Province,
Welfare

Abstract

This research is motivated by the implementation of special autonomy in Papua Province to overcome the unequal welfare problems compared to other provinces in Indonesia. The welfare issues raised in this study cover the fields of education, health, finance, and infrastructure. This research views the special autonomy policy of Papua Province as the formation of institutions, the transfer of authority, and financial management to improve the welfare of the community. Therefore, this study aims to explain the facts related to institutions, authority, and financial management in Special Autonomy in Papua Province to improve the welfare of the community. This research was conducted an assessment program activities approach and data collection through in-depth interviews and documents. Institutions and powers to make welfare include institutions and authorities in terms of education, health, finance, and infrastructure, each of which is carried out by the education office, health office, special autonomy bureau of the regional secretariat and regional financial and asset management agencies, and public works services. Meanwhile, financial arrangements in terms of education are carried out with formal and non-formal PAUD financial allocations (5%), 6-year compulsory basic education in elementary school (35%), 3 years of junior high school (25%), high school (10%), Vocational High Schools (5%), Non-formal and Informal Education (10%), other relevant Higher Education and Education (10%), health is carried out with a 15% fund allocation, the finance is carried out with a 25% fund allocation, and infrastructure is allocated funds of 20%.

DOI:

<http://dx.doi.org/10.33172/jp.v6i1.591>

© 2020 Published by Indonesia Defense University

INTRODUCTION

Papua Province was granted Special Autonomy status through Law No. 21 of 2001 concerning Special Autonomy for the Papua Province. The granting of Special Autonomy status is motivated by several things. Papua Province is the largest province in Indonesia with an area of 316,553.07 km². Papua Province has a very broad geographical condition and diverse topography resulting in difficulties in regional management and development. Uneven population distribution in Papua Province makes it difficult to accelerate the development. The complexity of the problem such as the movement of armed criminal groups. Papua Province also has levels of life expectancy, education, and standard of living in Papuan society that is still far from expectations.

Other causes that need to be carried out by Special Autonomy in Papua Province can also be seen from several indicators. The level of poverty of the Papuan community is quite high if compared to the national scale. This is indicated by Papua Province which occupies the third-lowest percentage of the poor population, namely provinces of Papua, West Papua and East Nusa Tenggara with percentages respectively 27.43%, 22.66%, and 21.03% (Central Statistics Agency of Papua Province, 2019). The low level of education of the Papuan community such as the lack of early childhood access to education, facilities and infrastructure that are still limited, the high level of illiteracy, and the ratio of teachers to classes that is still low. It is indicated by the APS (School Participation Rate) for ages 7-12 years old which reached 82.43 percent, and 16-18 years old reached 63.48 percent. Meanwhile, the health sector also experienced a lack of access and quality of health services. It is indicated by the Community Health Center Ratio (Puskesmas)/100,000 Population in 2013: 11,81, the General Physician Ratio/100,000 Population in 2013: 18,3 (Indonesian R DU: 37,2), and the Hospital

Ratio/100,000 population in 2013: 33,7. The Human Development Index in the majority of districts in Papua Province is also still in the low category. It is indicated by the HDI value which is still below 60 and therefore the human development index of Papua Province is still included in the 'low' status category compared to the national HDI as a whole.

The Special Autonomy of Papua Province is carried out to improve the welfare of the Papuan community. The welfare can be achieved by implementing Law No. 21 of 2001. Law No. 21 of 2001, Special Autonomy is a special authority that is recognized and given to the Papua Province to regulate and govern the interests of the people/ local community according to their initiative based on the aspirations and rights of the Papuan community. Through the implementation of the Constitution on Special Autonomy, it is expected to be able to realize justice, uphold the rule of law, respect for human rights, accelerate financial development, improve welfare and advancement of Papuan community. Welfare in this research includes education, health, finance, and infrastructure.

Previous researchers stated that the decentralization policy includes the allocation and distribution of power. Other researchers explained that decentralization is carried out when there is a transfer of authority, decision making, and management of public functions, decentralization if there is a transfer of authority, functions, and resources from the central government to the regional government, and the purpose of autonomy is to achieve better welfare and welfare can be seen based the improvement of education and health indicators (Dufhues et al., 2015).

Law No. 21 of 2001 stated that the decentralization form of Papua Province is a Special Autonomy. The framework of Special Autonomy refers to institutions, regional development, regional authority, forms and structures of government,

legislative bodies, executive bodies, the Papuan People's Assembly, apparatus and employment, political parties, the economy, and the protection of the rights of indigenous peoples. The construction of the decentralization model in the form of Special Autonomy is a solution taken by the Government of Indonesia and has considered the considerations of stakeholders from various backgrounds.

Literature Review

This research conducted a literature study related to the concept of decentralization. The purpose of decentralization is to ensure the identity of interests between the government and the community. Decentralization is divided into 3 namely political decentralization, legal decentralization, and administrative decentralization. Other researchers conveyed the purpose of decentralization to have its balance so that each country or each governmental system would be different in its implementation. Decentralization is divided into two, namely special functional bodies and multi-functional territorial bodies. Decentralization aims to make services to the community more efficient and to broaden the scope of services, by giving responsibilities to local administrative units. Decentralization is divided into three, namely government, regional and state-owned enterprises.

Decentralization aims to create the most efficient and accountable form of government. Decentralization is divided into political, administrative and fiscal issues. Decentralization to improve service delivery also improve the planning and implementation of development activities by taking into account local needs and conditions, improve coordination between various government agencies involved in development at the regional or local level, reduce the level of decision-making delays and increase flexibility in development administration, mobilize local resources and increase local commitment.

Decentralization is divided into special functional bodies or territorial-based bodies based on factors namely the socio-economic and political structure of the local community. Decentralization aims to reduce obstacles in administration, communication, delays, and ignorance of administrators towards customer's needs. Decentralization is also divided into 4, namely deconcentration, delegation, devolution, and privatization.

Indonesian Regulatory Framework

Papua Province is a province that has special characteristics in the form of granting Special Autonomy status, a model of autonomy that gives special authority that has been recognized and given to Papua Province to regulate and govern the interests of local communities according to their initiatives based on the aspirations and basic rights of the Papuan community. Implementation of Special Autonomy in Papua Province which is based on the Special Autonomy Law, detailed more operational with special regional regulations and provincial regulations. Special regional regulations are the Regional Regulations of the Papua Province in the context of implementing certain articles in the Special Autonomy Law. Meanwhile, provincial regulations are Provincial Regulations of Papua Province in the context of exercising authorities as stipulated in the legislation.

Papua Province has a government structure consisting of provincial, districts/cities, districts, and villages. The governance structure of the Papua Province refers to the government structure that has been regulated in Law No. 21 of 2001. In addition to the structure of the regional government, based on the Special Autonomy Law, Papua Province is also given the freedom to form special regions as long as it is in accordance with applicable law.

The implementation of the Papua Province government based on Law No. 21 of 2001, has characteristics consisting of

the Papuan People's Representative Council (DPRP), the Provincial Government, and the Papuan People's Assembly (MRP). DPRP is a legislative body, the Provincial Government is an executive institution, and MRP is a cultural representation of indigenous Papuans who have a certain authority in the context of protecting the rights of indigenous Papuans, based on respect for custom and culture, empowering women, and strengthening religious harmony. Provincial Government Institutions as the foundation for implementing Special Autonomy consists of the Provincial Government, DPRP, and MRP. The Provincial Government is the executor of Papua's Special Autonomy and simultaneously serves as an extension of the central government in Papua Province. DPRP is a legislative institution in the preparation of provincial regulations with specific characteristics of the Special Autonomy of Papua. Meanwhile, the MRP is a typical form of Papuan institution that does not exist in other provinces in Indonesia. This existing institution in Papua Provincial government (Papua Provincial Government, 2018) represents a unique form when compared to other provinces in Indonesia.

The Regional Government of Papua has the authority based on Law No. 21 of 2001 which includes authority in all fields of government, except those in the fields of foreign policy, security defense, monetary and fiscal, religious and judicial and certain authorities in other fields determined in accordance with the legislation. The authority of the provincial government based on the law can include international agreements, mutually beneficial cooperation with foreign institutions, and coordinate with the central government in terms of defense spatial planning. The form of authority possessed by the Papua Province in its implementation is based on Special Regional Regulations (Perdatus) and Provincial Regulations (Perdasi). The

authority of the DPRP explained in article 7 paragraph (1) includes electing the Governor and Deputy Governor, proposing the appointment of the elected Governor and Deputy Governor to the President of the Republic of Indonesia, proposing the dismissal of the Governor and / or Deputy Governor to the President of the Republic of Indonesia, formulate and determine the policy direction of the implementation of regional government and regional development programs, as well as benchmarks of performance together with the Governor. The authority of the MRP includes giving consideration and approval to prospective Governor and Deputy Governor candidates proposed by the DPRP; provide consideration and approval of prospective members of the People's Consultative Assembly of the Republic of Indonesia regional representatives of the Papua Province as proposed by the DPRP; provide consideration and approval of the Draft Perdatus submitted by the DPRP together with the Governor.

There are four exclusivities of financial rights for Papua that differ significantly from other regions, including the percentage of balance funds from Petroleum Mining of 70% during the first year to the 25th year and to 50% for the 26th year onwards; the percentage of balance funds from Natural Gas Mining of 70% during the first to the 25th years, and to 50% for the 26th year onwards; special revenue in the context of implementing Special Autonomy which is equivalent to 2% of the ceiling of the National General Allocation Fund, mainly aimed at financing education and health; and additional funds in the context of implementing Special Autonomy determined between the Government and the House of Representatives of the Republic of Indonesia (DPR-RI) based on the Provincial proposals each year, primarily aimed at financing infrastructure development.

Based on the theoretical framework and legislation on the Special Autonomy of

Papua Province, in this study, the Special Autonomy of the Papua Province is defined as the Special Autonomy of Papua Province as the formation of institutions (Toubeau & Wagner, 2015; Zendeli, 2015), the transfer of authority (Agung & Bambang, 2015; Pratama, 2015), and financial management which is a special form of resources aimed at improving welfare.

Welfare can be characterized by the existence of social services in the form of guaranteed health levels, fulfilled education levels, able to develop themselves, and guaranteed security, and eliminated from poverty (Spicker, 2013). Based on Law No. 21 of 2001 concerning the Special Autonomy of Papua Province, welfare is achieved through the fulfillment of public services for the Papuan community that includes the needs of education, health, finance, infrastructure, and others. Based on the literature review and the Special Autonomy Law of Papua Province, in this study welfare can be assessed based on attention to the fields of education, health, finance, and infrastructure to support the public services of the Papuan community.

METHODS

This study uses a qualitative approach to the type of formative evaluation research. This type of research will refer to Bingham, R.D. (Bingham, Richard D., and Felbinger, 2002) the process evaluation section consists of two approaches, namely monitoring daily tasks and assessing program activities. This research uses the second approach, which is to assess program activities and client satisfaction with services. This approach focuses on program participants being implemented. So that consideration arises in this section in the form of what is done to whom and what activities actually and how it can be done efficiently. In addition, whether the client is satisfied with the services provided or the image of the service. In evaluating this process also requires staff

and client involvement to complete.

Process evaluation in this study is also considered as ex-ante because it hypothetically anticipates and evaluates the impact and consequences of the policies determined to provide information benefits in a decision-making process, both in the future and ongoing. If the implementation of policy courses and alternative actions, therefore ex-ante evaluation is an instrument used in making alternative policy choices that are more transparent, predictable and debatable. Thus, this includes pre-assessments to analytically anticipate the implementation of policies that pay attention to the process, environmental impact assessments made to predict the consequences of policy considerations and actions on the environment.

Miles et al (2014) explained that qualitative research was carried out through intense and/or prolonged contact with participants in naturalistic settings to investigate the lives of individuals, groups, communities, and organizations every day and/or extraordinary. The role of the researcher is to get a comprehensive picture of the context studied: social regulation, how it works, and its explicit and implicit rules. Standard instrumentation is relatively little used. The researchers are the main instrument in this study. The researchers tried to capture data about perceptions from within local participants through a process of in-depth attention, understanding of empathy, and the suspicion of delay or bracketing about the topic being discussed.

Furthermore, most of the analysis is done with words. The words can be arranged, sublicensed, or broken up into segments. They can be reorganized to enable researchers to compare, differentiate, analyze and build patterns thereof. By reading empirical material from the data, researchers can develop certain themes and patterns that can be reviewed with participants. Its main task is to describe the way people in certain

situations understand, calculate, take action, and manage their daily situations. Many interpretations of this material may occur, but some things are more interesting for theoretical reasons or reasons of credibility and trust. This feature may be more relevant for naturalistic studies, but it is also configured and used differently in certain research traditions. The various understandings and explanations above will then be used to conduct a study on evaluating public policy on Special Autonomy in Papua Province.

Data collection in this study was carried out by conducting in-depth interviews with informants related to the Special Autonomy of Papua Province and documents in the form of secondary data related to the Special Autonomy of Papua Province such as laws and regulations and data from the Provincial Government of Papua.

The data collected in this study are classified according to the purpose of the study. For the first purpose of the study, the type of data collected consisted of legislation related to Papua's Special Autonomy, *Perdatus*, and *Perdasi* on Papua's Special Autonomy. In addition to this qualitative data, the study also collected data consisting of the receipt of the Special Autonomy Fund, the role of the Special Autonomy Fund in the Regional Revenues and Expenditures Budget (APBD), allocations for priority matters and village empowerment, as well as the distribution for districts/cities and provinces.

The types of qualitative data collected for the second purpose of the study are the activities of the management and examination of Special Autonomy, the perceptions (opinions) of regional officials regarding Special Autonomy, the results of the Internal Control System (SPI) examination, the types of findings and recommendations, and the follow-up of the examination. The types of data that have been identified are the Performance Accountability Report of the Papua

Provincial Government of 2013, 2014, 2015 (Papua Provincial Government, 2018). Qualitative data collected for the third purpose of the research is adjusted to the issues and problems of Special Autonomy that have emerged since the enactment of Special Autonomy in 2001 to 2016, Papua Holistic development data from the Coordinating Ministry for Maritime Affairs of 2016, Papua in Figures of 2015 and 2017, as well as data on the direction of development policies in the initial draft of the Provincial Government Work Plan (RKPD) of Papua Province of 2017.

The location of the study was carried out mostly in Papua Province with a research site at the Regional Development Planning Agency (Bappeda) of the Papua Province. The main reason is that the Papua Provincial Government (Papua Provincial Government, 2018) is a government entity that implements the Papua Special Autonomy policy. This is confirmed in Law 21 of 2001 that Papua's Special Autonomy is a special authority that is recognized and given to the Papua Province to regulate and govern the interests of local communities according to their initiatives based on the aspirations and basic rights of the people of Papua (Article 1 letter b). The consequence of this special authority arrangement is that the Special Autonomy fund is allocated to the Papua Provincial Government (Papua Provincial Government, 2018) entity, which at this time the arrangement is distributed to the district/city government with a significant comparison.

This research was conducted in three phases. The first phase of this research was to conduct a literature study that covers the concept of decentralization. The second phase of this research was to analyze the concept of decentralization of previous research based on Indonesian laws and regulations to develop a framework for the implementation of Papua's special autonomy. The final phase of this research was to analyze the condition of Papua in

carrying out special autonomy.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Institutional in Decentralization

Institutional in decentralization includes the Central and Regional Governments in terms of the political, legal and administrative authorization. Institutional is also seen as political institutions that track and gather the interests of every citizen and turn them into policy decisions. Whereas in this research, it produces special autonomy that forms institutional that make regulations and implementation specifically and separately from the central government intervention. Thus, these institutional was formed based on mutual agreement with the people who carried out the special autonomy. Therefore, the institutional according to Muttalib and White (1982) with this research has a slightly different function, but institutional development is both carried out by the government at the next level.

Institutional in the regions is divided into political, law and administrative issues. Besides, institutional decentralization has become political, administrative and fiscal institutions. In contrast to the two studies which divide institutional decentralization by function, this study divides institutions in the Special Autonomy of Papua Province which includes MRP and DPRP for legislative functions, and the Provincial Government for executive functions.

Institutional in decentralization consist of certain units including Government Units, Government Sub-ordinate Units, companies, and private organizations carried out in the matters of politics, markets, and administration. Meanwhile, this study covers institutions related to politics including MRP and DPRP. As for the market, the institutions in the Special Autonomy of Papua Province was not made specifically related to the market but has been covered in the Provincial Government institutions. For the last one, in terms of administration, the John and

Peterson model has similarities with the Special Autonomy of Papua Province because all administrative problems are found in all institutions within it. Thus, for the John and Peterson institutional model, it has a difference with the institutional of the Special Autonomy Papua Province, namely the purpose of creating each institution.

Other researchers also explained that institutions in decentralization were divided into two, namely special functional bodies and multi-functional territorial bodies. This institution is also divided into several levels, namely Province, City, and Village. Thus, the institutions created in the form of special and territorial bodies are divided into each Province, City, and Village. Looking at the model when compared to the Special Autonomy of Papua Province, too, but not every village has a multi-functional territorial body. Special Autonomy of Papua Province has special bodies such as the MRP. Thus, Smith (Weiher & Smith, 1987) has similarities with research in institutions by forming a special body, but at different levels of implementation.

Meanwhile, other researchers also explained that the institutions in decentralization, according to them, were divided into three, namely the Regional Government and State Enterprises. Therefore, if compared to the Special Autonomy of Papua Province, there is no state-owned company or similar institution level, this shows differences with those opinions related to institutions. Differences are also seen in the problems set out in the institutional of the state-owned company, decentralization is also formed in delegations to state-owned companies. Meanwhile, in the Special Autonomy of Papua Province, there is no institutional state-owned company that has the authority. Special Autonomy Papua Province has institutions that regulate special problems in the form of MRP institutions. Thus, related to decentralization both the opinion of

Shabbir with Special Autonomy that is having the same purpose in transferring authority to lower levels of government but in different institutional forms.

Institutional according to Conyers (1986) also formed into special functional bodies or territorial-based agencies based on factors of the socioeconomic and political structure of the local community. Likewise, with the Special Autonomy of Papua Province, the institutions in the form of MRP and DPRP were also formed into a special functional body but for the territorial based body of the Special Autonomy Papua Province did not form the institution clearly but the functions contained therein already included in the MRP and DPRP institutions. So that Conyers' opinion supports what has been done by the Special Autonomy Province of Papua by forming a special functional body. Thus, Conyers' (1986) opinion supports what has been done by the Special Autonomy Papua Province by forming a special functional body.

Katorobo (2006) explained that institutions in decentralization at the regional level, there are strong National Ministries and Local Governments by guiding decentralization policies and programs. The General Auditor Agencies, the National Planning Agency, the Government Inspectorate, and the Directorate of General Personnel must carry out capacity development to ensure effective planning and accountability of the decentralized local government. However, within the Special Autonomy, these bodies have not been specifically formed but are done limitedly by MRP and DPRP regarding planning. So that the Katorobo decentralization model has little in common in terms of institutional planning in decentralization. Thus, the Katorobo decentralization model has little in common in terms of institutional planning in decentralization (Katorobo, 2006).

Authority in Decentralization

Authority according to Muttalib (Muttalib, M.A. and Khan, 1982) is given to superiors and subordinates so that superiors help subordinates, in other words, subordinates carry out their functions on the orders of superiors. Unlike the case with this study, the Special Autonomy of Papua Province gives authority to Papua Province based on a political compromise between the Papuan community and the Central Government. Thus, the Central Government provides compensation to the Papua Province in the form of a separate fund to regulate the Province.

White (2011) explained that the authority in question was related to political decisions about fiscal matters and the rules for their implementation to be carried out by the government under it. This research results in a Special Autonomy that authorizes the Papua Provincial Government (Papua Provincial Government, 2018) to manage not only fiscal matters independently, but also the problems of education, health, finance, and infrastructure.

Comparison between White (2011) and the results of this study is the expansion of the type and level of authority. There are 3 types of authority according to White (2011), including authority in politics, authority in administration, and fiscal. Meanwhile, this research regulates authority in the types of education, health, finance, and infrastructure.

The level of authority according to White (2011) is limited to the implementation of the decentralization of authority. In this situation, financial regulation and how to use it have been determined by the Government above it, where the lower-level government only has to carry out what has been decided or at the moment by the higher level of government.

The authority in the Special Autonomy of Papua Province gives the Papua

Provincial Government (Papua Provincial Government, 2018) the freedom to act further. The Central Government only provides funds in the form of the Special Autonomy of Papua Province. The fund is regulated by the Government of the Papua Province. The arrangements include a plan for use, implementation of the use, and evaluation of use.

The authority according to John M Cohen and Stephen Peterson (1999) in decentralization is to make regulations by the Central Government, while the vertical agencies in the regions only carry out administrative or administrative authority. Vertical officials and agencies in the regions are subordinates and representatives of central government officials or agencies in their respective regions. Therefore, in general, the delegation of authority, staff, and regional vertical agencies make decisions that are routine, implement decisions, and regulations made by the central government with local conditions and directives made by the central government. Whereas in this study, the Special Autonomy of the Province of Papua resulted in the authority delegated from the Central Government and has freedom in making special regulations of Papua Province carried out by the MRP and the DPRP.

The difference of authority between the opinions of John M Cohen and Stephen Peterson (1999) with the Special Autonomy of Papua Province lies in the authority maker himself. Therefore, in the Special Autonomy of Papua Province, vertical agency officials who are given authority act on behalf of the Regional Government, not on behalf of the Central Government.

Smith (Weiher & Smith, 1987) explained that the transfer of authority to carry out certain government functions from the Central Government to autonomous regions. The existing authority is given to regulate and govern local interests. By using a political

perspective, the nuances of power distribution, autonomy in governing, authority in regulating local and regional scale government are given authority in making regulations within the scope of government. All of this illustrates the division of authority and the separation of political and administrative affairs between the central and regional governments. Likewise, with the Special Autonomy of Papua Province, political issues are also regulated in this authority besides other issues such as education, health, finance, and infrastructure are also regulated in this Special Autonomy.

Shabbir explained that the authority was given from the state government to the regional government related to administrative and fiscal matters. Thus, the given authority can open up opportunities for regional governments to be more effective in administrative matters. Similar to the Special Autonomy of Papua Province, the Central Government also gives authority to the Government of Papua Province to carry out decentralization and open opportunities for Papuan communities to participate in government. This is carried out by the Papuan communities by participating in the MRP in solving problems in the Papua Province. The Shabbir model is clearly in accordance with the Special Autonomy of Papua Province, but this model does not explain other issues such as education, health, finance, infrastructure.

Rondinelli (Cheema & Rondinelli, 2008) also explained that the authority given to the Regional Government was in accordance with the direction of the central government with local conditions. But in this study, the Special Autonomy of Papua Province was given the freedom to regulate and govern the Papuan communities. Thus, Rondinelli's (Rondinelli, Dennis A. and Cheema, 2003) opinion is different from the reality in Papua Province, the Special Autonomy of Papua Province through the results of a compromise with the Central Government, it is authorized to govern

various issues such as education, health, finance, and infrastructure. This was also carried out with direct assistance from the Central Government in the form of funds for the Special Autonomy of Papua Province to support the resolution of all problems for the people of Papua. Conyers (1986) also explained that the authority in this decentralization, its power can be divided into matters of law, finance, and personnel in the form of services, supervision, discipline and so on. This is also contained in the Special Autonomy of Papua Province, with the result that the issue of law authority is given to the DPRD to make special regulations for Papua Province. In addition, financial matters are also clearly regulated in regulations that have been made between the Papuan community and the Provincial Government of Papua. However, for the issue of authority related to personnel matters, the Special Autonomy of Papua Province has not clearly exercised that authority, only that each authority is granted with regulations that have been mutually agreed upon between the Central and Regional Governments.

Katorobo explained that the regional government exercises delegated authority and sectoral ministries with deconcentrated authority at the regional level. The most typical are the three levels of the central, state and local governments. If Special Autonomy is not like that, then the authority is given directly to local governments. In addition, there is no authority in the state. This is the point of difference between the Katorobo model and the Special Autonomy of Papua Province (Katorobo, 2006).

Financial Arrangements in Decentralization

Muttalib (1982) explained that finance obtained by the lower-level government from the higher-level government due to delegation of tasks to the top-down government, the amount of financial assistance is not specifically explained but

is based on a program delegated from the top-down government. In contrast to this study, the value of central government assistance to the region is 2% of the total DAU (General Allocation Fund). Furthermore, the Special Autonomy model of Papua Province divides the value of the Special Autonomy fund to various sectors such as education by 30%, health by 15%, economy by 25%, and infrastructure by 20%.

White (2011) explained that decentralization gave authorities to lower levels of government by collecting expenditure taxes and correcting imbalances. Whereas the use is regulated by the government at the top level. Meanwhile, the Special Autonomy model of Papua Province partly applies direct tax collection to the Government of the Papua Province and partly to the Central Government. However, there is a compensation of the Special Autonomy Fund from the Central Government of 8.2 trillion. So, it can be concluded that the problem of financial regulation in this Special Autonomy model is different from the decentralization model presented by White (2011).

Cohen (1999) also explained about finance that decentralization related to finance can be done by referring to three things, namely stabilization, distribution, and allocation. Stabilization is carried out because most of the local-level government units lack monetary stabilization tools. As a result, they are unable to make deficit financing policies due to a lack of financial demand. Achieving the desired distribution in the form of wealth and income. This is carried out because recipient mobility and the tax base are potentially high. Efficient resource allocation. The purpose of this allocation is to adjust the production and supply of public sector goods and services to individuals.

Meanwhile, the Special Autonomy of Papua Province also distributes Special Autonomy funds to various sectors,

especially education, health, finance, and infrastructure. In addition, the financial arrangements for the Special Autonomy Papua Province also allocate Special Autonomy funds from proceeds from the Central Government. However, for financial stabilization, Special Autonomy can only follow the situation of the Central Government and does not have the authority to stabilize the Special Autonomy funds. Therefore, in short, this Cohen model has been implemented well but in the implementation of stabilization related, the Special Autonomy of Papua Province still has difficulties to do so (Cohen, John M., and Peterson, 1999).

Smith (Weiher & Smith, 1987) explained that decentralization avoids financial and tax redistribution from the rich to the poor areas. Decentralization will only eliminate the responsibility of the bourgeoisie for oppressed regions. Likewise, with the Special Autonomy of Papua Province, financial redistribution is also avoided from the Provincial Government of Papua and in the meantime tax collection is carried out directly to the Provincial Government of Papua and some of it is carried out to the Central Government. Thus, Smith's (Weiher & Smith, 1987) financial regulation model with Special Autonomy has similarities with not doing tax collection to stressed areas. Shabbir explained that finance related to decentralization is carried out to the extent that local governments have the power to plan and use budgets, allocate budgets, determine the time to allocate funding to implementing agencies/bodies, the authority to collect financial resources and spend them at the local level. Financial arrangements according to Shabbir have been carried out by the Special Autonomy of Papua Province, with the results of special regional regulations governing the details of budget allocations from the Special Autonomy Fund for the welfare of the Papuan community. The Central Government has provided Special Autonomy fund for Papua Province so that

the Regional Government can freely implement regional autonomy.

Conyers (Conyers, 1986) explained that financial arrangements are carried out by dividing the income and expenses. In addition, it was also stated that the mobilization of local resources was carried out including financial matters. Meanwhile, the Special Autonomy Papua Province also does this by dividing the Special Autonomy funds in the fields of education, health, finance, and infrastructure. Local resources from the Papua Province were also arranged by the Regional Government to assist the economy of the Papua Province. Thus, the Conyer's financial management model has similarities to the Special Autonomy of Papua Province.

Rondinelli (Rondinelli, Nellis, & Cheema, 1983) also explained that financial arrangements in the decentralization carried out would affect regional finances. In addition, Rondinelli (Rondinelli et al., 1983) also explained that to what extent the availability of adequate funds or financial resources for organizations that have delegated responsibility. This financial arrangement is carried out in decentralization to address interesting regional financial policy issues. The results showed that the Special Autonomy of Papua Province uses Special Autonomy funds for issues that are important in achieving the welfare of the Papuan community. Sources of Special Autonomy funds are available from the central APBN budget and are ready to improve the education, health, finance, and infrastructure.

Katorobo (2006) explained that the financial arrangements of regional authorities must adapt to more stringent standards of accountability related to financing their activities with commercial requirements. National authorities must adapt to the role of effective regulators, moving away from the more traditional role of directly controlling the finances of local governments. Meanwhile, the Special

Autonomy of Papua Province does not adapt to commercial standards because it has its standards. In addition, the Special Autonomy of Papua Province also does not adapt to the regulator because it already has its regulator from the results of making rules that have been agreed between the central and regional governments.

Institutions in the Special Autonomy of Papua Province

Institutions in Papua's Special Autonomy include several things such as education, health, finance, and infrastructure. Institutions in the field of education are accommodated by the Office of Education of Papua Province. Institutions governing education are also regulated in Papua Governor's Regulation No. 36 of 2016 concerning the Organization and Administration of the Education Office in Papua Province.

Institutions in the health sector are accommodated by the Health Office of the Papua Province. Health-related institutions are also regulated by the Health Office of the Papua Province, it is stated that drug distribution is carried out by the Health Office of the Papua Province (Sembiring, 2018). Institutions in the field of finance are accommodated by the Special Autonomy Bureau, the Regional Secretariat of Papua, the Sub-Division of Administration Bureau, the Office of Tourism and Creative Economy, and the Regional Financial and Asset Management Agency (BPKAD) of Papua Province. Financial related institutions are also explained in Regional Regulation of Papua Province Number 11 of 2008 Article 41 which states that the Financial and Regional Assets Management Agency of Papua Province has the main task of carrying out governmental affairs in the area of financial management and regional assets and other tasks given by Governor.

Institutions in the infrastructure sector are accommodated by the Public Works Office of the Papua Province. This is also in accordance with Papua Province

Regional Regulation No 10 of 2008 concerning the Organization and Work Procedures of the Regional Offices of the Papua Province. This institution consists of the Head of Office, Secretariat, the Field of Technical Control and Construction Development, the Field of Water Resources, the Field of Roads and Bridges, the Field of Human Settlements (*Cipta Karya*) and Clean Water, the Program Synchronization Division, the Office Technical Implementation Unit, the Functional Position Group.

Authority in the Special Autonomy of Papua Province

The authority related to education was given to the Education Office of the Papua Province. In accordance with article 2 of Regulation No. 36 of 2016 concerning the Organization and Work Procedure of the Papua Provincial Education Office, the Education Office is an element of implementing government affairs in the field of education which is the regional authority.

Health-related authority is managed by the Papua Provincial Health Office. The authority related to drug distribution is also exercised by the Papua Provincial Health Office. These authorities include formulating technical policies in the health sector, conducting government affairs and public services in the health sector, fostering and carrying out tasks in the health sector, carrying out administrative services and, carrying out other tasks given by the Governor in accordance with their duties and functions.

The authority related to finance is managed by the Special Autonomy Bureau of the Regional Secretariat of Papua Province, Sub-Division of Administration Bureau, the Department of Tourism and Creative Economy, and the Regional Financial and Asset Management Agency (BPKAD) of Papua Province. Subsequent authority from the Office of Tourism and Creative Economy. This Office was formed based on the Papua Province

Regional Regulation No 12 of 2013 concerning the Organization and Work Procedures of the Regional Offices of Papua Province. Papua Province Regional Regulation Number 11 of 2008 Article 41 states that the Regional Financial and Asset Management Agency of the Papua Province has the main task of carrying out government affairs in the area of financial management and regional assets and other tasks assigned by the Governor.

The authority related to infrastructure is managed by the Public Works Agency in accordance with article 13 of the Papua Province Regional Regulation No. 12 of 2013 concerning the Organization and Work Procedures of the Regional Offices of the Papua Province. Furthermore, in Article 14, the authority of the Public Works Agency is mentioned, among others, formulating technical policies in the field of public works, holding government affairs and public services in the field of public works.

Financial Arrangements in the Special Autonomy of Papua Province

Financial arrangements related to education are carried out by the Education Office of the Papua Province. Financial arrangements in the education sector are allocated from the Special Autonomy of Papua Province by dividing finance towards education by 30%. This is reflected in article 36 of Law No. 21 of 2001. This is explained by at least 30% of the receipt of Special Autonomy funds for education costs. Financial arrangements in terms of education are carried out by allocating Early Childhood Education (PAUD)-Non Formal and Formal (5%), 6-year compulsory basic education of elementary school (SD) (35%), 3-year compulsory basic education of junior high (SMO) (25%), high school (10%), Vocational High School (5%), Non-formal and Informal Education (10%), Higher Education and other relevant Education (10%), health is performed with a 15% allocation of funds, the economy is

performed with a 25% allocation of funds, and infrastructure is performed by 20% fund allocation.

Furthermore, in the Special Regional Regulation No. 13 of 2016 concerning Amendments on the Special Regional Regulation of Papua Province Number 25 of 2013 concerning the Distribution of Financial Receipts and Management of the Special Autonomy Fund in article 11, it is explained that the financing of education services with a minimum of 30% of the budgeting to cover illiteracy, early childhood education, nine-year basic education, secondary education, non-formal education, and higher education.

Health-related financial arrangements are carried out by the Health Office. This is reflected by the allocation of Special Autonomy funds for the health sector by 15% according to Special Regional Regulation No. 13 of 2016 article 11. With a minimum of 15% of funds intended to finance the basic health services, referral health services, prevention and eradication of diseases, improvement of community nutrition, fostering environmental health and basic sanitation, and health services in disaster situations.

Financial arrangements related to finance are allocated from the Special Autonomy of Papua Province by 25%. The budgeting is allocated for the formation and fostering of the roles and functions of professional institutions for the development of small/micro businesses, credit financing for public finance, subsidized prices for staple goods, and development of leading commodities.

Financial arrangements related to infrastructure are allocated with a Special Autonomy fund of 20%. This financial arrangement is made by allocating for the construction of the infrastructures public housing, lightings, clean water, and telecommunications. In addition, there is also an Infrastructure Supplementary Fund Post for the implementation of Special Autonomy, in which the amount is determined between the Government and

the DPR based on the Provincial proposals in each fiscal year, which is mainly intended to finance the infrastructure development.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATION

Based on the results of research and discussion, therefore, researchers conclude as follows:

1. Institutions to achieve prosperity in the Special Autonomy of Papua include institutions in terms of education conducted by the Education Office of Papua Province, health carried out by the Health Office of Papua Province, finances carried out by the Special Autonomy Bureau of the Regional Secretariat of Papua Province, Sub-Division of Administrative Bureaus and the Regional Financial and Assets Management Agency (BPKAD) of Papua Province, as well as infrastructure that is carried out by the Public Works Office of Papua Province.
2. The authority to achieve prosperity in Papua's Special Autonomy includes the authority in terms of education carried out by the Head of Education Office of Papua Province, health carried out by the Health Office of Papua Province, finance carried out by the Special Autonomy Bureau of the Regional Secretariat of Papua Province, Sub-Division of Administration, the Tourism and Creative Economy Office, and the Regional Financial and Asset Management Agency (BPKAD) of Papua Province, and infrastructure carried out by Public Works Office of the Papua Province.
3. Financial arrangements to achieve prosperity in the Papua's Special Autonomy include financial arrangements in terms of education carried out by the allocation of PAUD-Non Formal and Formal (5%), compulsory basic education 6 years elementary school (35%), 3-year compulsory basic education of junior

high school (25%), High Schools (10%), Vocational High Schools (5%), Non-formal and Informal Education (10%), Higher Education and other relevant Education (10%), health is carried out with a fund allocation of 15%, the economy is done with a fund allocation of 25%, and infrastructure is done with a fund allocation of 20%.

Based on research related to special autonomy factors in order to improve the welfare of the people of Papua Province that have been done. Researchers provide the following recommendations:

1. The institutional formation is needed by dividing the territory of the Papua Province into several new Provinces based on cultural or ecosystem similarity. Thus, further research needs to be done relating to institutional effectiveness if carried out in smaller areas.
2. The authority of each institution in carrying out Papua's special autonomy often overlaps, so that there is a need for better rules in regulating the authority of each institution. Strengthening institutional authority needs to be supported by special regional regulations and provincial regulations.
3. The proportion of financial arrangements for the Special Autonomy of Papua Province so far does not distinguish between high or low HDI levels. Therefore, it is necessary to reconsider the percentage of Special Autonomy finances based on the HDI status of each district. Meanwhile, the regencies in Papua that still have the 'low' HDI status, it is necessary to continue the implementation of Special Autonomy.

REFERENCES

- Agung Wara Laksana, Bambang Supriyono, S. (2015). Delegation of Regent's Authority to the District Head in the Implementation of Regional Government Affairs.

- Journal of Social and Political Sciences*, 4(3), 506–517.
- Bingham, Richard D., and Felbinger, C. L. (2002). *Evaluation in Practice: A Methodological Approach* (Second Edi). New York: Cleveland State University. American University.
- Central Statistics Agency of Papua Province. (2019). *Important Indicators Papua Province* (December 2). Papua: Central Statistics Agency.
- Cheema, S., & Rondinelli, D. (2008). Decentralizing Governance: Emerging Concepts and Practices. In *The Architecture of Government: Rethinking Political Decentralization*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/publius/pjm037>
- Cohen, John M., and Peterson, S. B. (1999). *Administrative Decentralization: Strategies for Developing Countries*. United States: Kumarian Press.
- Conyers, D. (1986). Decentralization and Development: A Framework for Analysis. *Community Development Journal*, 21(2), 88–100.
- Dufhues, T., Theesfeld, I., & Buchenrieder, G. (2015). The Political Economy of Decentralization in Thailand: How Past and Present Decentralization Affects rural Actors' Participation. *The European Journal of Development Research*, 27(5), 793–810. <https://doi.org/10.1057/ejdr.2014.68>
- Katorobo, J. (2006). Decentralization and local autonomy for participatory democracy. In *Public Administration and Democratic Governance: Governments Serving Citizens*.
- Muttalib, M.A. and Khan, M. A. A. (1982). *Theory of Local Government*. New Delhi: Sterling Publisher Private Limited.
- Papua Provincial Government. (2018). *Papua in Figures 2018*. Jayapura: Central Statistics Agency of Papua Province.
- Pratama, A. Y. (2015). Implementation of Asymmetric Decentralization in Local Governance in the Era of Democracy. *Journal of Pancasila and Citizenship Education*, 28(1). Retrieved from <http://journal.um.ac.id/index.php/jppk/article/view/5434>
- Ridder, H. G., Miles, M. B., Michael Huberman, A., & Saldaña, J. (2014). Qualitative data analysis. A methods sourcebook. *Zeitschrift Fur Personalforschung*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/239700221402800402>
- Rondinelli, Dennis A. and Cheema, G. S. (2003). *Reinventing Government for the Twenty-First Century: State Capacity in a Globalizing Society*. Bloomfield: UNCTAD-UNDP Global Programme, Kumarian Press.
- Rondinelli, D. A., Nellis, J. R., & Cheema, G. S. (1983). Decentralization in developing countries: a review of recent experience. *World Bank Staff Working Paper*.
- Sembiring, T. (2018). *Interview: Special Autonomy for Papua Province*. Jakarta: KSP.
- Spicker, P. (2013). *Principles of Social Welfare: An Introduction to Thinking about the Welfare State*. United States: Routledge.
- Toubeau, S., & Wagner, M. (2015). Explaining Party Positions on Decentralization. *British Journal of Political Science*, 45(1), 97–119. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0007123413000239>
- Weiher, G. R., & Smith, B. C. (1987). Decentralization: The Territorial Dimension of the State. *CrossRef Listing of Deleted DOIs*. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3330033>
- White, S. (2011). *Government Decentralization in the 21st Century*. Washington D.C.: CSIS.
- Zendeli, F. M. (2015). Decentralization of

Power in the Republic of Macedonia as Problem-Solving in the Inter-Ethnic Relations. *Journal RSP*, 11(48), 42–51. Retrieved from [https://cis01.ucv.ro/revistadestiintepolitice/files/numarul48_2015/5.ZENDELI 42-51.pdf](https://cis01.ucv.ro/revistadestiintepolitice/files/numarul48_2015/5.ZENDELI%2042-51.pdf)