

The Influence of the Special Autonomy Policy of the Papua Province on the Welfare of its People

**Purwoko Aji Prabowo^{a*}, Bambang Supriyono^b, Irwan Noor^c, M. Khairul
Muluk^d, ^{a,b,c,d}Faculty of Administrative Science, University of Brawijaya,
Indonesia, Email: ^{a*}purwoko.aji.ub@gmail.com**

This study is to find out the influence of the special autonomy policy of the Papua province on the welfare of the people of Papua province. This study will use a qualitative approach to the type of formative evaluation research that uses the approach of assessing program activities with primary and secondary data sources. Data collected from this study is data on Papua Province's Special Autonomy policy to improve the welfare of the people of Papua province. The location of this research was conducted in Papua province with a research site in Bapeda, Papua province. The results of this study indicate that the characteristics of the special autonomy of Papua province are identical to the characteristics of the asymmetric decentralisation model which has not yet led to success nor has yet shown the things that lead to better effectiveness. This can have an impact on the failure of the special autonomy of Papua province if no evaluation is carried out. This study discusses the evaluation of the special autonomy policy that was implemented in Papua province in order to improve the welfare of the people of Papua province. Special autonomy is part of special regional autonomy.

Keywords: *Special Autonomy, Papua, Decentralisation.*

Introduction

The geographical conditions of Papua province show that Papua is the largest province in Indonesia with an area of 316,553.07 km² (Central Bureau of Statistics of the Province of Papua: Papua in Figures 2015: 17), and is located between the coordinates 01 garis00 'LU - 09⁰10' LS and 134⁰00 ' BT - 141⁰05 'BT. Papua province consists of 28 districts and 1 city. The topography of the Papua province varies greatly from the lowlands of the Merauke Regency to a height of 3.5 meters above sea level, and the highest plains are in the Jayawijaya

Mountains. Investment is known as one of the basic pillars of economy in every society (Solimun and Mangesti, 2019).

Development policies in the Papua region are currently implemented differently from other regions which have broad implications on aspects of development in the political, economic and social fields. Papua province, which was originally established on the basis of Law No. 12 of 1969 and Law No. 45 of 1999, generally operates with special treatment that is different from other provinces in Indonesia. Papua province was granted special autonomy status through Law Number 21 of 2001 concerning Special Autonomy for the Province of Papua. Subsequent to developments in 2003, President Megawati issued Presidential Decree (Keppres) No. 1 of 2003 which divided the Papua province into two: Papua and West Irian Jaya. All these laws and regulations are made so that the implementation of special autonomy can run well. The result of parliamentary ratification of the participating countries principally agreed on the liberalisation of global goods and services that freely enter the domestic market, and also the protection of the goods and services of domestic products of a participating country which is not restricted (Raharjo etc., 2018).

Since the implementation of the special autonomy policy for the province of Papua has been carried out up to now, it can be said that the welfare conditions of the people of Papua have improved, but it is still not quite as significant as expected. This can be seen in the indicator of the percentage of poverty levels of the Papuan people which is quite high when compared to the national scale. In the field of education there are still salient problems such as many young children who have not yet had access to education, educational facilities and infrastructure; the high level of illiteracy (ABH 15-24 years: 15.16%); and the ratio of teachers to classes is still low (Musaad, 2016: 53). In the health sector there are several problems such as access and quality of health services that are still inadequate and less affordable. There is still a lack of numbers, types and quality of health workers and their distribution is uneven. Other indicators of the level of community welfare can be seen through the Human Development Index (HDI). The HDI in Papua province currently still does not provide a satisfactory picture. The implementation of the Papua Special Autonomy policy shows that the achievement of the Human Development Index at the district/city level in Papua in 2016 was quite varied. The significance of the politics of organisational learning has been emphasised in the organisational learning literature (Limba etc., 2019).

From some of the explanations above and with the implementation of the Papua Special Autonomy policy since 2001, in general it can be said that there are still salient issues that require comprehensive handling of issues such as infrastructure development, poverty alleviation, improvement of education services and health. It can also be seen that up to now the achievements obtained by the Papua Provincial Government in controlling the regional development process have not been able to align with the progress of other provinces in

Indonesia and their development achievements are still not optimal. Many notes on development progress can be learned from the comparative relative progress of various other provinces in Indonesia. Therefore, the researcher tries to describe some of the problems that arise, both empirical, theoretical and normative problems in the implementation of the special autonomy policy in Papua province. Specific attention needs to be paid to gart strategy that can act as a medium for tourism marketing in some of the aforementioned regions (Hutahayan, 2019).

The Empirical Problems

To understand the empirical problems of the Papua province after the implementation of the special autonomy policy, the following will describe a number of things that affect the level of welfare of the people. It can be said that the implementation of the special autonomy policy for the Papua province has not been effective in boosting the expected level of welfare. This arises because there are several empirical problems as follows:

First, the regulation and application of authority between the Central Government and Regional Governments carried out on the principle of specificity have not yet been able to operate in accordance with the principles of delegation of authority. There is still overlapping understanding of the laws and regulations that apply to the granting and implementation of decentralised authority. The exercise of delegation of authority according to Law Number 32 of 2004 governing Regional Government still needs to be synchronised with Law Number 21 of 2001 concerning Special Autonomy for the Province of Papua at the provincial or district/city level.

Second, the recognition and respect for the basic rights of indigenous Papuans and their strategic empowerment have not been well implemented. In the field of basic education rights, there is a lack of building infrastructure, school facilities and infrastructure. In addition, the teaching staff are still very limited for primary, secondary and higher education. Next, the environment and culture for formal education is still low. Meanwhile, in relation to recognition and respect for basic rights in the health sector, there are still some problems such as access and quality of health services that are still inadequate and less affordable. There is still a lack of numbers, types and quality of health workers, and their distribution is uneven.

Third, good governance has not yet been realised. This is due to several obstacles such as:

- 1) The effectiveness of the implementation of yhr development activities program has not been able to show a positive thing.
- 2) The efficiency of implementing development programs in improving the welfare of the community also still needs to be greatly improved.

- 3) The maximum community participation in planning, implementation and supervision in the administration of government, as well as the implementation of development through the participation of representatives of adat, religion, and women in general has been carried out, but in reality still does not involve actual representation.
- 4) The responsiveness of the local government is actually quite a lot.
- 5) Transparency in budget execution encountered many problems such as those obtained from internal control reports such as delays in receiving special autonomy funds, spending exceeding the budget ceiling, expenditures that are not budgeted in the APBD, assistance is not reported and work (activities) are not in accordance with the contract.
- 6) Accountability.

Fourth, the clear division of authority, duties and responsibilities between the legislative, executive and judicial bodies, as well as the Papuan People's Assembly as a cultural representation of indigenous Papuans is still not able to function properly due to various individual/group interests that arise.

The Theoretical Problems

To find out the theoretical problems associated with the policy of special autonomy, the following will explain some of the opinions of scientists about theories related to the transfer of authority of the central government to the regions (decentralisation) which came to be known as autonomy in general and in Papua province later known as special autonomy. The special autonomy policy in Papua province explicitly contained political demands to implement decentralisation, and implicitly also contained administrative needs to maintain the National Unity framework, namely the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia.

B.C Smith in *Decentralisation: Territorial Power of the State* (1985: 46) explains that a balance between "Political Demand vs. Administrative needs" is needed. An effort needs to be made to distinguish the basic types of decentralised state systems and the consideration of differences within a broad ideological framework. More than that, it requires in-depth knowledge about political and historical forces in each country to find out why the state apparatus is organised the same as in the provinces. Thus, the evaluation of special autonomy policies in Papua province in theory must pay attention to the balance between political demands and growing administrative needs.

The central obstacle to regional autonomy is to prevent the potential for potential fragmentation from realisation in practice. If all local units are forced by the centre to behave in the same way, then there is no point in migrating across the region to get a different service package. In the same way, if all levels of local government in an area are subject to strict central control, then the community should try to apply fiscal sanctions or elections for poor performance.

The scientists in the area of regional autonomy or decentralisation are Dennis A. Rondinelli, James S. McCullough and Ronald W. Johnson (1989). In *Analyzing Decentralization Policies in Developing Countries: a Political-Economy Framework*, they explain that the public choice and public administration and finance approaches have limitations to be used in analysing decentralisation policies in developing countries, but both can still contribute in assessing alternative policies and designing program success implementation of the decentralisation policy. This can only be done in areas that apply neoclassical economic theory that is integrated with public and financial administration approaches. This is because: first, the concept of public finance that directly imposes service users on 'private' goods has a common foundation with public choice theory. Second, practitioners of cost recovery have experimented with local community organisations as intermediaries between government service agents and individual service consumers (Rondinelli et.al., 1989: 62).

But David Slater (1989) criticises the approach of Rondinelli et al. mentioned in *Territorial Power and the Peripheral State: The Issue of Decentralization*. Slater conveyed a number of things ranging from the relationship of the theme of decentralisation of a country to a series of theoretical concerns relating to development, democracy, social struggle and state power. Slater also discusses the various perceptions and links of the meaning of decentralisation in their ideological terms significantly, and at the end of the text he criticises the discourse of decentralisation for Rondinelli et.al's 'developing countries'. (1989). Slater argues that centralisation is something that can be chosen as a strategy in a country if it can direct the justice of the local area and is beneficial in the distribution of welfare. Slater said: "... if centralization leads to territorial justice or the redistribution of wealth it could be considered a preferable strategy ..." (Slater, 1989: 502).

Slater tended to defend the view of centralisation with various arguments such that logically the internal development of the state bureaucracy had become a strong centralised factor. In a variety of peripheral societies, the core or political power has formed a 'political class' or 'bureaucracy', which has become accustomed to functioning centrally, hierarchically and pyramidically. The state organisational structure will tend to strengthen the centralisation of internal decision-making processes (Slater, 1989: 505). Slater stressed that a decentralised government structure in contemporary countries not only requires political choices made by political elites and activists, they also need social scientists to make important choices of methods, approaches and fundamental assumptions about power and the state. Decentralisation is too important to be left to a few thinkers, the terrain is very open, including for very open debate (Slater, 1989: 524).

The concept of 'decentralisation in centralisation' - or decentralisation as a means of 'recentralisation' (Apthorpe & Conyers, 1982) - is one of the important features of the current interest in decentralisation, especially as seen by countries that have an interest.

Decentralisation is considered, at least in part, as a tool to align national and local development interests, through improved management of rural development, which is important for the welfare of the nation as a whole and for the inhabitants of individual rural areas, and the achievement of popular participation combined with national unity. Taking into account the theories of decentralisation/autonomy experts in the above explanations that are mutually critical and believe in the truths they believe in, then to evaluate the decentralisation policy in this case special autonomy in Papua province requires a fairly complex approach within the framework of national unity within the Republic of Indonesia.

Scriven (1967) defines evaluation as identification, clarification and application of criteria that can be maintained to determine the value of the object of evaluation (value or feasibility) in relation to these criteria (Fitzpatrick et.al., 2004: 3). Scriven (1967) explains that evaluations use methods of investigation and assessment, including: (1) determining standards for assessing quality and determining whether those standards must be relative or absolute; (2) collecting relevant information; and (3) applying standards to determine value, quality, usefulness, effectiveness or significance (Fitzpatrick et.al., 2004: 5). The specification and use of explicit criteria distinguish formal evaluations from informal evaluations that most of us make every day. Evaluation differs from research in its objectives, its attention to generalisation capabilities, stakeholder involvement and the breadth of practical training it needs.

The basic purpose of evaluation is to provide an assessment of the value of the object being evaluated. Other objectives include providing information for program improvement, working for a better community, encouraging meaningful ideas among many diverse stakeholders and providing oversight and compliance with the program. Evaluations can be formative or summative. Formative evaluations are designed to improve the program and its listeners, usually stakeholders who are close to the program. Summative evaluation provides decisions about the adoption, continuation or expansion of the program. This evaluation must have the ability to make "go no-go" decisions (Fitzpatrick et.al., 2004: 28).

In general, from the theories of the several experts above, there is still a lot of ambiguity about decentralisation/regional autonomy. Some experts agree, but some experts think differently about decentralisation as a form of regional autonomy, in this research in the context of special autonomy in Papua province. It seems that there are still many things that cannot be answered in explaining special autonomy, meanwhile the evaluation criteria above cannot be applied to evaluate the policy of the special autonomy province of Papua so that it still leaves theoretical problems that must be resolved.

Normative Problems

The current administration of the Papua province is based on autonomy which is adjusted to the mandate of the 1945 Constitution where the Republic of Indonesia as the unitary state adheres to the principle of decentralisation in the administration of government by providing opportunities for regional freedom to carry out regional government autonomy. This is stated in Article 18 of the 1945 Constitution in which the regional government has the authority to regulate and manage its own government affairs (decentralisation) according to the principle of autonomy and assistance tasks. The first law on regional governance in the reform era (Law No. 22 of 1999) mandates that the principle of regional autonomy uses the principle of broad autonomy.

The granting of regional autonomy as broadly, or as broadly as possible, to the regions is to accelerate the realisation of the welfare of the regional community through increased services, empowerment and community participation, as well as to increase competitiveness with the principles of democracy; equity; justice and privileges; specificities and regional potential; and diversity in the unitary state of the Republic of Indonesia.

In consideration of Law No. 22 of 1999 it has also been explained that in the implementation of regional autonomy, it is deemed necessary to put more emphasis on the principles of democracy, community participation, equity and justice, and pay attention to the potential and diversity of the region. The diversity of this area then gave birth to asymmetric decentralisation which came to be known as "special autonomy".

Papua province is one of the regions in the unitary state of the Republic of Indonesia which was later granted special autonomy status through Law No. 21 of 2001 concerning Special Autonomy for the Province of Papua. This special autonomy law is the recognition of the government of the Republic of Indonesia to protect the rights of Papuans to Papua's land, water and wealth, a prerequisite to lift Papuans from the backwardness compared to their relatives in the central and eastern regions. With the division of Papua province into Papua province and West Papua Ppovince, changes were made to Law No. 21 of 2001 established by Government Regulation Number 1 of 2008 concerning Amendments to Law Number 21 of 2001.

According to the mandate of Law No. 21 of 2001, special autonomy is a special authority that is recognised and given to the Papua province to regulate and manage the interests of the people/local people according to their own initiative based on the aspirations and rights of the people of Papua. The authority of the Papua province encompasses authority in all fields of government except foreign policy, security, monetary and physical security, religion and justice, as well as certain authorities in other fields stipulated by legislative regulations. In addition, as an embodiment of this special autonomy status, the province of Papua receives a

large special autonomy fund from the government which is stipulated in the state budget every year.

In general, normative problems arise with the lack of clarity of the existing laws and regulations for the implementation of the special autonomy of Papua, coupled with the Perdatus and Perdasi, which not all of them can accommodate the needs of implementing the special autonomy Papua policy (Ramses, 2013: 93). These normative problems result in a number of misuse of policies such as low transparency, autonomy coupled with corruption, autonomy coupled with administrative complexity, ineffectiveness and inefficiency, declining quality of public services, squabbles between the centre and regions, quarrels between regions, and quarrels between communities and regional officials.

Background

Special Regional Regulations and the Province of Papua

Papua province is the province of Irian Jaya which has been granted special autonomy within the framework of the unitary state of the Republic of Indonesia (Law No. 21 of 2001). The implementation of the special autonomy province of Papua, which is based on the special autonomy law, is spelled out more operational with special regional regulations and provincial regional regulations.

Papua Special Autonomy Province Institution

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 certain authority in the context of protecting the rights of indigenous Papuans, based on respect for customs and culture, empowering women, and strengthening religious harmony.

The city or regency government in Papua province consists of the city or regency government as an executive agency. Meanwhile, the DPRD institutions in the city or regency government act as legislative bodies as the DPRD institutions in other cities or regencies in Indonesia. Meanwhile, institutions at the village level were formed by the Village Deliberation Board and the village government or can be referred to by other names. Unlike the provincial, district/city and village government institutions, district institutions are an extension of the role of district/city governments. So that in the district there are no institutions that play the role of the executive and legislative roles.

Institutional Authority of the Papua Special Autonomy Province

The Papua Regional Government has authority based on Law 21/2001 covering authority in all fields of government, except for the authority in the fields of foreign politics, security, monetary and fiscal security, religion, and justice as well as certain authorities in other fields determined in accordance with statutory regulations.

The authority of the provincial government based on the law can include international agreements, mutually beneficial cooperation with foreign institutions and can coordinate with the central government in terms of defence spatial planning. The form of authority possessed by the Papua province in its implementation is based on the Perdasus and Perdasi.

The positions of governor and deputy governor of Papua province have different characteristics compared to other provinces in general. One of the peculiarities of the governor and deputy governor of the Papua province is that there are requirements for native Papuans. By definition, indigenous Papuans are people who belong to the Melanesian race, which consists of indigenous tribes in the Papua province and/or people who are accepted and recognised as native Papuans by the indigenous Papuan people. Based on this definition, a person is said to be a native of Papua based on ethnic groups and the determination of the indigenous Papuan people. In addition to these special requirements, provincial government agencies have the obligation to submit a Perdasus draft and set it as a Perdasus together with the DPRP after obtaining MRP consideration and approval and submit a draft Perdasi and establishing it as a Perdasi together with the DPRP.

MRP institutions consist of individual members who have rights in carrying out their duties. These rights include asking questions, submitting proposals and opinions, immunity, protocols, and finance/administration. Based on these rights, a MRP member cannot be given legal sanctions while carrying out his duties within the framework of his duties. The MRP consists of indigenous Papuans consisting of adat representatives, religious representatives and female representatives, each making up one third of the total MRP member. The number of members of the MRP is stipulated in government regulations and for a term of 5 years.

In addition to having inherent authority and rights, the MRP institution also has binding obligations. These obligations include:

- 1) maintaining and preserving the integrity of the unitary state of the Republic of Indonesia and serving the people of the province of Papua;
- 2) to practice the Pancasila, the 1945 Constitution and obey all laws and regulations;
- 3) fostering the preservation of the administration of indigenous Papuan customs and culture;
- 4) fostering harmony in religious life; and encouraging women's empowerment.

Research Method

Sample and Data Collection

One of the main objectives of this research is to analyse the influence of the Papua special autonomy policy on the welfare of the people of Papua province. This includes investigating the effectiveness of the Papua special autonomy policy, the Institutional policy of special autonomy to improve the welfare of the people of Papua province, the policy of special autonomy authority to improve the welfare of the people of Papua province, the financial policy of special autonomy to improve the welfare of the people of Papua province, and the policy of special autonomy that is good for improving the welfare of the people of Papua province. The location of this research was carried out mostly in Papua province with a research site in Bapeda Papua province.

In the form of qualitative research, data collection tools or research instruments are the researchers themselves (human instruments), the procedure of data collection is highly dependent on the researcher. Researchers who are key instruments in data collection, must go directly to the field. Data collection is a technique used by researchers to obtain the data needed in scientific research from sources. If viewed from the data source, in collecting data one can use primary sources and secondary sources. Primary sources are data sources that directly provide data to data collectors, and secondary sources are sources that do not directly provide data to data collectors, for example through other people or through documents. Primary data sources come from observations, interview techniques and documentation while secondary data sources come from field studies, literature, scientific journals, previous research, written documents from related institutions, national journals, international journals, electronic media, internet and print media. Data collection techniques used in this study were observation techniques, interview techniques and documentation.

Data Analysis

Data analysis in qualitative research was carried out in several steps. In the first step of data collection, data collection activity is usually carried out near local settings for an ongoing period of time. The next step is data condensation, this refers to the process of selecting, focusing, simplifying, decomposing and or transforming data that appears in the full corpus (body) of written field notes, interview transcripts, documents and other empirical material. With condensation, we make data stronger. (This method moves away from data reduction as a term because it means we are weakening or losing something in the process). The next step is data display, the flow of the next flow analysis activity is data display. In general, a display is a collection of organised information that enables image capture and action. Seeing the display helps us understand what is happening and does something, either analysing further or

taking action based on that understanding. The next analysis activity is drawing and verifying conclusions (conclusions and verification). From the start of data collection, qualitative analysts interpret things by noting patterns, explanations, flows of causes and propositions. Competent researchers easily hold this conclusion, maintain openness and scepticism, but the conclusions are still there, vague at first, then more explicit and reasonable. "Final" conclusions may not appear until data collection is complete, depending on the size of the corpus of field notes; the coding, storage and retrieval methods used; researcher's sophistication; and deadlines that need to be met.

Results and Discussion

The Purpose of Decentralisation

Muttalib and Khan (1982) explain the purpose of decentralisation is to insure the identity of interests between government and society. Jhon M Cohen and Stephen Peterson (1999) say that decentralisation aims to assist the colony in initiating the transition to independence, achieving political justice and responding to increased demand for public goods and services. Brian C Smith (1985) stated that decentralisation aims to have its own balance so that each country or every government system will be different in its implementation. Whereas Shabbir and Dennis (2007) explain that decentralisation aims to make services to the community more efficient and to expand the scope of services by giving responsibilities to local administrative units.

Rondinelli (1982) also explains the purpose of decentralisation is to reduce obstacles in administration, communication, delays and indifference of administrators to customer needs. White (2011) says the purpose of decentralisation is to create the most efficient and accountable form of government. Katorobo (2004) stated that the objectives of decentralisation are to determine the lower main units that can formulate and implement decentralisation policies. Meanwhile, this research refers to special autonomy which aims to prosper the people of Papua province. The welfare of the people of Papua is seen in terms of education, health, economy and infrastructure.

In general, the aim of decentralisation in some of the theories presented above and also special autonomy/asymmetric decentralisation is the granting of freedom from above/central government units to subordinate/local government units to formulate the policy itself and implement it without the influence of the above government units.

Decentralisation Category

Muttalib and Khan (1982) explain in their book Theory of Local Government that decentralisation is divided into 3 groups, namely political decentralisation, legal

decentralisation, and administrative decentralisation. John M Cohen and Stephen Peterson (1999) divide decentralisation into 4 groups, namely deconcentration, devolution, delegation and privatisation. Meanwhile Brian C. Smith (1985) explains that decentralisation is grouped into two, namely political decentralisation and administrative decentralisation. Shabbir Chema and Dennis also divided decentralisation into 3 groups including deconcentration, devolution, and delegation.

Likewise, White (2011) divides decentralisation into 3 groups, namely deconcentration, delegation and devolution. Furthermore, White also focused the decentralisation in depth by dividing decentralisation into 3 groups namely political decentralisation, administrative decentralisation and fiscal decentralisation. Meanwhile, Rondinelli (1982) divides decentralisation into 4 groups, namely deconcentration, delegation, devolution and privatisation. In addition, Conyers (1986) also divides decentralisation into 2 groups, namely devolution and deconcentration. Katorobo divides decentralisation into 3 groups, namely deconcentration, delegation and devolution. Of the several opinions/theories, on average there is a similarity in terms of the decentralisation category, only White persists in the opinion that decentralisation includes political, administrative and fiscal decentralisation. Meanwhile, this study divides asymmetric decentralisation or special autonomy into 3 approaches namely institutional, authority and financial management that are more like the White approach but are applied to asymmetric decentralisation.

Institutionality in Decentralisation

Muttalib and Khan (1982) describe institutions in decentralisation which include the central and regional governments in terms of political, legal and administrative authorisation. White (2011) explains that institutions are 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 institutions that make regulations and implements it specifically and separately from central government intervention. So that these institutions are formed based on mutual agreement with the people who carry out special autonomy. Thus, the institution according to Muttalib & Khan (1982) and White (2011) with this study has a slightly different function but in institutional development are both carried out by the government at the next level.

In the study of Muttalib and Khan (1982) institutions in the regions are divided in terms of politics, law and administration. Whereas White (2011) divides institutions in decentralisation into institutions in political, administrative and fiscal matters. In contrast to these two studies which divide institutional decentralisation by function, this study divides institutions in the special autonomy province of Papua, including MRP and DPRP for legislative functions, and provincial governments for executive functions.

John M Cohen and Stephen Peterson (1999) explain that institutions in decentralisation consist of certain units including government units, government subordinate units, companies, and private organisations that are carried out in terms of politics, markets and administration. Whereas in this study, it covers institutions related to politics including MRP and DPRP.

Authority in Decentralisation

Authority according to Muttalib 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. Another case with this research is that the special autonomy province of Papua gives authority to the province of Papua on the basis of political compromise between the people of Papua and the central government. So that the central government provides compensation to the Papua Province in the form of a separate fund to regulate the province.

White (2011) explains the intended authority related to political decisions about fiscal and the rules of their implementation is to be carried out by the government under it. This research results in a special autonomy that authorises the Papua provincial government to manage not only fiscal matters independently, but also the problems of education, health, economy and infrastructure.

In the comparison between White (2011) and the results of this study there is an extension of the type and level of authority. There are 3 types of authority according to White, including authority in politics, authority in administration and fiscal. Meanwhile, this research regulates authority in the types of education, health, economy and infrastructure.

The level of authority according to White is limited to the implementation of the decentralisation of authority. In this situation, financial regulation and how to use it have been determined by the government above it. Where the government at the lower level only needs to carry out what has been decided or at the time by the upper level government.

The authority in the special autonomy of Papua province gives Papua provincial government the freedom to act further. The central government only provides funds in the form of special autonomy in Papua province. The funds are regulated by the government of the Papua province. The arrangements include a plan for use, implementation of use and evaluation of use.

The authority according to John M Cohen and Stephen Peterson (1999) in decentralisation is to make regulations by the central government, whereas vertical agencies in the regions only carry out administrative or administrative authority. The difference in authority between the opinions of John M Cohen and Stephen Peterson (1999) with the special autonomy of the province of Papua lies with the author of the authority itself. So that 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. Logistic conditions in Indonesia from year to year have been gradually improving (Kirono etc., 2019).

Financial Arrangements in Decentralisation

John M Cohen and Stephen Peterson (1999), explained financial matters that decentralisation related to finance can be carried out referring to three things, namely stabilisation, distribution, and allocation. Stabilisation is carried out because most local-level government units lack monetary stabilisation tools. As a result, they are unable to make a deficit financing policy caused by lack of economic demand. Achieving the desired distribution of wealth and income. This is done because the 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.

B.C. Smith (1985) explains that decentralisation avoids financial and tax redistribution from rich to poor regions. Decentralisation will only eliminate the responsibility of the borluists for depressed areas. Likewise with the special autonomy of the province of Papua, financial redemptions are also avoided from the government of the province of Papua and in the meantime tax collection is done directly by the government of the province of Papua and some of it is carried out by the central government. So that the model of Smith's financial arrangements with special autonomy has in common by not doing tax collection to stressed areas.

The Decentralisation Model for Special Autonomy in Papua Province

Based on the previous discussion, it can be seen that the problems found in the special autonomy model of Papua province currently stem from several things including:

- a. Legal provisions that are not yet mutually supportive. Most of the laws and regulations are constructed only to support a partial system. These regulations must be reformed so that they can support the efforts of the central government comprehensively in the implementation of decentralisation.
- b. Human resources who play a direct role in special autonomy have a small amount, lack of skills, limited knowledge, low motivation, and the absence of good networks or connections.
- c. Some special autonomy governance facilities do not have good office infrastructure. So that will require renovation, repair, improvement and development of office facilities and infrastructure needed.
- d. The existing system of procedures and processes may only be suitable for centralised government systems but not specifically for decentralised local government systems.

- e. Data collection and information systems as well as information technology contained in the special autonomy government (both hardware and software in general) are still weak because local governments are not familiar with modern information technology.
- f. Funds related to special autonomy when viewed in general are still very low, meanwhile regional revenues have not been able to support it. As a region with limited local administration, there are obstacles in the activities of paying local taxes. This has become one of the major obstacles to the decentralisation process of Papua's special autonomy.
- g. There is no network. At this time it is not possible to develop optimally for the implementation of autonomy in particular.

Furthermore, the asymmetric decentralisation model in the special autonomy of Papua province needs to pay attention to the following matters:

- a. Increasing the capacity of actors (HR), can be pursued by carrying out activities such as improving the skills of each institutional compiler, changing attitudes and motivations, etc.
- b. Action strategy, carried out to achieve capacity building from several sources in the government system.
- c. This activity is carried out as a concrete action from what has been done in the study of human resource capacity building strategies, this is done by training, recruitment and so on.

Conclusions

This research was conducted because of the phenomenon of special autonomy in Papua province. In addition, this research is also driven by problems that arise as a result of the implementation of the special autonomy policy of the Papua province that has not yet provided optimum results. So this study aims to make policy recommendations for the special autonomy province of Papua in order to improve the welfare of the people of the province of Papua.

In order to achieve the objectives of this research, research steps were carried out which included the study of legislation relating to the special autonomy of the province of Papua, the study of literature on models of regional autonomy, development of a research framework, data collection and analysis, as well as research conclusions and recommendations.

The research framework includes three variables that play an important role in the special autonomy of Papua province, namely institutional, authority and financial regulation. Each variable is used to photograph the indicators of the success of the special autonomy province of Papua which includes education, health, economy and infrastructure.

Furthermore, the results of the study can be seen that the institutional variables related to the implementation of the special autonomy of Papua province show the following matters:

- 1) Institutions in terms of education regulation are supported by the existence of the Papua Provincial Education Office which is run will lead to ineffective and transparent.
- 2) Institutions in terms of health regulations are supported by the existence of the Papua Provincial Health Service which is already running but leads to conditions that are not yet effective and responsive.
- 3) Institutions in terms of economic regulation are supported by the Special Autonomy Bureau of the Regional Secretariat of the Papua Province Sub-Division of Administrative Bureau, the Office of Tourism and Creative Economy, the Regional Finance and Asset Management Agency (BPKAD) of Papua Province showing symptoms that have not been running effectively, efficiently or accountably.
- 4) Institutions in terms of infrastructure regulation are supported by the existence of the Public Works Department of Papua Province which has not been effective, transparent, accountable or responsive.

The authority variables related to the implementation of special autonomy in Papua province produce the following matters:

- 1) The exercise of authority in the matter of educational arrangements that have been carried out has not been effective and responsive, as indicated by the slight change in APKs and increasing HDI.
- 2) The exercise of authority in terms of health regulation has not yet shown symptoms to be carried out effectively, transparently, and responsively by showing that there are still many victims of HIV / AIDS.
- 3) The exercise of authority in terms of economic regulation shows symptoms that have not been carried out in an effective, efficient, and participatory manner by showing low economic growth.
- 4) The exercise of authority in terms of infrastructure development has been carried out but has not yet led to an effective, transparent, accountable and responsive manner with a slight increase in the number of roads and bridges being shown.

Variables in financial arrangements relating to the implementation of the special autonomy province of Papua produce the following matters:

- 1) The implementation of financial arrangements in terms of the development of education has been carried out showing symptoms that have not been effective, transparent nor accountable with the allocation of a minimum of 30% of education funding outlined in PAUD-non formal and formal (5%), 9-year elementary school education fair (35 %), 9-

- year basic education elementary school-middle school (25%), High School (10%), Vocational High School (5%), non-formal and informal education (10%), higher education and other relevant education (10%) .
- 2) The implementation of financial arrangements in terms of improving health shows symptoms have not been done effectively, participatively nor responsively with a minimum budget allocation of 15%.
 - 3) The implementation of financial arrangements in terms of economic development shows symptoms that have not been carried out effectively, efficiently nor in a participatory manner with a minimum funding allocation of 25%.
 - 4) The implementation of financial arrangements in terms of infrastructure development shows symptoms that have not been carried out effectively, accountably norresponsively with a minimum funding allocation of 20%.

This research shows that there is a phenomenon of the characteristics of the special autonomy of Papua province which is identical to the characteristics of the asymmetric decentralisation model which has not led to success even though the time is already approaching 20 years of implementation. So if there is no evaluation of improvements, the special autonomy of Papua province will potentially fail.

Based on Katorobo's asymmetric decentralisation model (2004), the local government of Papua province seems to have the authority to formulate policies and implement the policies themselves independently without influence from the central government, this has also been reflected in the existing institutional, authority and financial patterns. However, in order to avoid the potential for the implementation of the special autonomy of Papua province that leads to this failure, special attention and capacity building of human resources need to be increased, and tightening supervision on institutions, authorities and financial arrangements in matters related to the fields of education, health, economy and infrastructure.

The effectiveness of decentralisation success does not depend on the symmetric or asymmetrical system of the implementation of decentralisation but many other factors that influence such as the institutional system, the pattern of ongoing authority transfers and financial management in areas directly related to welfare levels such as education, health, economic empowerment and the development and management of its infrastructure.

So, from the evidence and research results of Katorobo's (2004) theory, it can be refined to the success that the asymmetric decentralisation model still needs other factors which are the determining factors, namely the need for decentralising governance. Governance values such as effectiveness, efficiency, transparency, responsiveness, accountability and participation must go hand in hand in implementing the asymmetric decentralisation model. Decentralising governance becomes very crucial in achieving the success of Papua's special autonomy.



In terms of institutionalisation, the possibility of empowering or even eliminating the MRP institution becomes an important consideration because the MRP institution is still a number of times the institution that initially put the independence of the Papuan people but has not shown anything positive, meanwhile after the Papua province blossomed into the Papua province West Papua, in West Papua province this institution does not function.

In terms of finance, the amount of the 2% national allocation fund allocated to Otsus is divided into two provinces, while the amount of funds still occupies about half of the Papua province APBD funds, so that if Otsus is stopped there will be a substantial loss of development funds and it can be seen that Papua province is not ready if this happens at this time. So Otsus still needs to be continued with the improvement of the system and financial management such as considering areas that are more advanced in the coastal areas and plains than in the mountainous regions for financial sharing.



REFERENCES

- Cohen, John M. and Peterson, Stephen B. 1999. *Administrative Decentralisation: Strategies for Developing Countries*, Kumarian Press: USA.
- Conyers, Diana. 1986. *Decentralisation and Development: A Framework for Analysis*. *Community Development Journal*. Vol. 21 No. 2. pp.88-100.
- Fitzpatrick, Jody L., Sanders, James R., Worthen, Blaine R., 2004. *Program Evaluation: Alternative Approaches and Practical Guidelines*. Pearson Education Inc: USA.
- Hutahayan, B. (2019), Performance art strategy for tourism segmentation: (A silat movement of Minangkabau ethnic group) in the event of tourism performance improvement, *Journal of Islamic Marketing*, Forthcoming Issue
- Hoessein, B. (2011). *Changes in the models, patterns and forms of local government: from the new order era to the reform era*. Department of Administrative Sciences, Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, University of Indonesia.
- Katorobo, J. (2004). *Decentralisation and Local Autonomy for Participatory Democracy*. 6th Global Forum on Reinventing Government: Participatory Toward and Transparent Governance 24-27 May 2005. Seoul, Republic of Korea.
- Kirono, I., Armanu, Hadiwidjojo, D., & Solimun (2019) “Logistics performance collaboration strategy and information sharing with logistics capability as mediator variable (study in Gafeksi East Java Indonesia)”, *International Journal of Quality and Reliability Management*, Vol 36 Issue 7.
- Limba, R.S., Hutahayan, B., Solimun, & Fernandes, A.A.R. (2019), “Sustaining innovation and change in government sector organisations: Examining the nature and significance of politics of organisational learning”, *Journal of Strategy and Management*, Vol 12 No 1, pp 103-115.
- Muttalib, M.A. and Khan, Mohd Akbar Ali. 1982. *Theory of Local Government*. Sterling Publisher Private Limited: New Delhi. India.
- Papua Provincial Government. 2014. *Papua in Figures 2013*. Central Statistics Agency of Papua Province: Jayapura.
- Papua Provincial Government. 2016. *Papua in Figures 2015*. Statistics Agency for the Province of Papua: Jayapura.



- Raharjo, K., Nurjannah, Solimun, & Fernandes, A.A.R. (2018), "The influence of organisational culture and job design on job commitment and human resource performance", *Journal of Organisational Change Management*, Vol 31 No 7, pp 1346-1367.
- Ramses, Andi. (2003). Direct Regional Head Election, in the Journal of Government Science Edition 19 of 2003. Jakarta: MIPI.
- Rondinelli, Dennis A., Nellis, John R., Cheema, G. Shabbir. 1982. Decentralisation in Developing Countries: A Review of Recent Experience. The World Bank: Washington DC. The USA.
- Rondinelli, Dennis A., McCullough, James S. and Johnson Ronald W. 1989. Analysing Decentralisation Policies in Developing Countries: a Political-Economy Framework. Development and Change. Vol. 20 SAGE: London. pp.57-87.
- Rondinelli, Dennis A. 1990. Decentralisation, Territorial Power and the State: a Critical Response. Development and Change. Vol.21. SAGE: London. pp.491-500.
- Rondinelli, Dennis A. and Cheema, G. Shabbir. 2003. Reinventing Government for the Twenty-First Century: State Capacity in a Globalising Society, UNCTAD-UNDP Global Program, Kumarian Press: Blue Hills Avenue, Bloomfield. The USA.
- Rondinelli, Dennis A. and Cheema, G. Shabbir. 2007. Decentralising Governance: Emerging Concepts and Practices, John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University, Brookings Institution Press: Washington, DC. The USA.
- Slater, David. 1989. Territorial Power and the Peripheral State: The Issue of Decentralisation. Development and Change. Vol. 20 SAGE: London, UK. pp. 501-531.
- Slater, David. 1990. Debating Decentralisation - A Reply to Rondinelli. Development and Change. Vol.21. SAGE: London. pp.501-512.
- Smith, Brian C. 1985. Decentralisation: The Territorial Dimension of the State. George Allen & Unwin (Publisher) Ltd. London. UK
- Smith, Kevin B. and Larimer, Christopher W. 2009. The Public Policy: Primary Theory. Westview Press: Philadelphia. The USA.
- Solimun, Mangesti, S. (2019), "The relationship between audit quality and risk taking toward value creation in Indonesia", *Journal of Accounting in Emerging Economies*, Vol 9 No 2, pp 251-267.



White, Stacey. 2011. Government Decentralisation in the 21st Century. CSIS: Washington DC, USA.