



Strategic Policy for Acceleration and Optimization of Border Area Development

Endang Try Setyasih¹, Bambang Heru Purwanto², Eddy Jusuf Sp³

Program Doktor Ilmu Sosial, Universitas Pasundan, Bandung, Jawa Barat, Indonesia¹²³

*e-mail: endangtrysetyasih@yahoo.co.id¹

bambangherupurwanto@unpas.ac.id²

eddy.jusuf@unpas.ac.id³

ABSTRACT

Most of the regions in the border are less developed due to the development paradigm in the past, more emphasizing the security approach rather than the security approach and inward-looking instead of outward-looking. In essence, the government has been striving to expedite border region development, but the border region is still less developed and marginalized. The roadmap of authority in border areas yet to be delimited between Government and Local Government, lack of synergic coordination, limited budget, the hardship of topographical features, isolated, remote, and inaccessible areas are the major problems. Therefore, to rapidly foster and prosper millions living in border regions, the government should formulate strategic and stringent policies.

Keywords: Strategic Policy, Border Area Development

INTRODUCTION

The land boundary between Indonesia and Malaysia on the island of Kalimantan stretches $\pm$ 2004 km, with the drawing of the boundary in the form of a watershed (hill) with an altitude between 1000 to 3000 meters above sea level, so that in several leading sub-districts / Priority Locations (Lokpri) There is still a limited area of road infrastructure and inadequate, such as heading to Puring Kencana (Kapuas Hulu Regency, West Kalimantan Province), there is no adequate road infrastructure and can only be reached via pioneer aircraft to Krayan District (Nunukan Regency, Kalimantan Province), by using a plane perintis and Long Boat by the river such as heading to Bahau Hulu (Malinau Regency, Kalimantan Province), Long Boat by the river by rafting to Long Pahangai and Long Apari (Regency) Mahakam Ulu, East Kalimantan Province) and Krayan (Nunukan Regency, Kalimantan Province).

The land border on the island of Timor between Indonesia and Timor Leste on land has 268.8 km. Unlike the Indonesia-Malaysia border area, although the boundary line is determined through the watershed and thalweg (river median line), access to the border area can be reached by road, but the lack of adequate road infrastructure the rainy season, it is tough to reach the area. The border is not even biased like going to East Amfoang (Kupang Regency, NTT Province).

The land border area between Indonesia and Papua New Guinea stretches as far as $\pm$ 770 km, along the 1410 00' east longitude meridian, the Fly River thawed, after which it follows 1410 01' east longitude meridian. Similar to the condition of the Indonesian border area, limited road infrastructure in terms of connectivity to the border area must be reached by air with a pilot aircraft such as heading to Lokpri Oksibil (Bintang Mountains District, Papua Province) and in several villages in Sota District (Merauke Regency, Papua Province). In addition, full swamp paths using kelingting, even to Kampung Kondo in Naukenjerai District (Merauke Regency, Papua Province), must be reached by boat with a minimum weight of 7 GT by sea along the coast of Merauke.

Based on data obtained from the 2015-2019 RPJMN, the 2015-2019 BNPP Border Area Management Master Plan, as well as the results of field surveys, the general border area in Indonesia are still underdeveloped and marginalized; this can be seen from several indicators, including:

1. Sluggish economic growth and lack of essential services
2. Lack of energy availability
3. Isolation due to limited basic infrastructure
4. The minimum of Telecommunication access
5. The number of illegal activities is due to a lack of security

This is due to the development approach in the past, with an inward-looking paradigm, which prioritizes development in urban and rural growth centers in Java (java-centric-oriented). Apart from this paradigm, the border area is an area that needs to be closely guarded because it is an area prone to security disturbances. Thus, the border development paradigm prioritized a security approach rather than a prosperity approach in the past. Thus, the border areas in several areas have become untouched by the dynamics of development.

Problems Faced in Managing the Border Area

The RPJMN 2004 - 2009 was an era in which there was a shift in orientation in developing border areas. Development of the border area prioritizes a prosperity approach rather than a security approach. Hence, the transformation from the inward-looking paradigm with the java-centric development pattern to outward-looking prioritizing border areas to become the front porch of the Republic of Indonesia.

Through the 2009 - 2014 RPJM, in general, the development of border areas that has been implemented has not shown the expected results. Border policies and programs are spread across 37 Central Agencies (75 echelon I units), 12 Provinces and 16 Regencies / Cities (land), and 25 Regencies / Cities (sea). Meanwhile, coordination between institutions that deal with border issues has not run synergistically due to institutional constraints, human resources, mechanisms, and procedures that are not well structured. As a result, many of the resources allocated to develop border areas have not produced encouraging results. If this continues, the dream of making the border area the "front porch" of the Republic of Indonesia is challenging to come actual, and border areas may remain marginalized.

Even though it has gone through 2 1/2 (two and a half) master planning periods, namely: RPJM 2004-2009, RPJMN 2009-2014, and RPJM 2014-2019, the development of border areas have not shown the optimal results expected. The development of the border area seems slow. Many even assume the development of border areas such as on-site roads. This is due to several constraints that have caused development in the border area, which has not shown a progressive development acceleration in border areas. Some of the factors that become obstacles include:

1. The authority to manage border areas does not yet have a clear authority map, either the Central Government or the Regional Government.
2. Synergic coordination between Ministries / Institutions both at the Central and Regional Governments has not been thoroughly researched in developing border areas (Border Management, still emphasizing sectoral egos).
3. The fiscal capacity of regional governments to develop border areas is minimal; on the other hand, the state budget cannot finance all physical development needs simultaneously in a short time.

Strategic Policy for Acceleration and Optimization of Border Area Development

The direction of the 2015-2019 border area development policy is to accelerate the development of border areas to increase economic, social, and secure growth and make the border area a gateway for economic and trade activities with neighboring countries in an integrated, environmentally friendly border area and sustainable manner. Development strategies in order to accelerate the development of border areas include:

1. Development of economic growth centers in border areas based on regional characteristics, local potential, and considering market opportunities in neighboring countries, supported by the development of infrastructure for transportation, energy, water resources, and information telecommunications;
2. Building reliable human resources (HR) and the use of knowledge and technology (IPTEK) in utilizing and managing local potential to create competitive and environmentally friendly border areas;
3. Building connectivity of the main transportation node centers of national strategic activities with villages in sub-districts of priority border locations and surrounding sub-districts, regional activity centers (district capitals), national activity centers (provincial capitals), and connecting with neighboring countries, as well as building connectivity through sea transportation services. To improve the quality and intensity of services to sea border areas.
4. Opening access within villages in priority location districts by land, river, sea, and air transportation by road / mode / non-status pier and pioneering services;
5. We are building energy, telecommunication, and information sovereignty in all border areas of the country.
6. Implementing asymmetric decentralization policies for border areas of the country in providing public services (primary regional and basic social infrastructure) and distribution of state finances;
7. We are reforming public services in border areas by strengthening villages in priority locations to handle border areas through facilitation, supervision, and Assistance.

Steps to Overcome Constraints in Acceleration and Optimization of Border Area Development

As outlined in the RPJMN 2015-2019 above, the direction of development policies will not be realized immediately if the constraints in implementing Government policies to accelerate development in border areas are not immediately resolved. Thus, efforts are needed that can overcome these obstacles with the following steps:

1. Overcoming The authority to manage border areas does not have a clear authority map, either the Central Government or the Regional Government.

As with the problems faced in accelerating and optimizing the development of border areas, the roadmap of authority in the management of border areas has not been delimited. Thus, the tendency of overlapping authority in managing and developing the area can be avoided as early as possible. Likewise, the overlapping authority in implementing a development program did not occur. However, there was no single agency to implement a development program or project at the border when there was negligence that the development program was not under its authority.

As an illustration, when in Oksibil District, Bintang Mountains District, Papua Province, a sub-health center will be built to fulfill essential health services for the local community, and this has become a struggle for program activities between related Ministries / Institutions at the Central and Local Governments, at the Directorate General of Health Efforts, Ministry. Health wants to work on this program of activities, and the Papua Provincial Health Office and the Bintang Mountains District Health Office are fighting over each other. Thus, it is necessary to delineate the roadmap of the authority of each agency.

On the one hand, Article 361 of Law 23 of 2015 concerning Regional Government states that apart from designing the spatial layout of border areas, building facilities and infrastructure is also the central government's authority. However, on the other hand, in Article 12 of the Law, in the matter of concurrent affairs of primary health care providers, the Regions are obliged to implement them as well, both Province and Regency / City. What is more, the worst possibility is that the Central and Regional Governments do not carry out the Puskesmas Pembantu development program because they are throwing balls of confidence at each other.

To avoid this, it is necessary to have a dividing line of authority or delegation regulated in the statutory instrument. However, this instrument is by the mandate of Law 43 of 2008 concerning State

Territory and Law Number 23 of 2014 concerning Regional Government; a Government Regulation must be made that comprehensively explains the authority of the Central Government and Regional Governments and the management of Border Areas. However, the said Government Regulation has not been resolved; it is still being discussed with the related Ministries / Agencies.

As an alternative solution recommendation, it is deemed necessary to increase the institutional capacity at the central and regional levels to overcome the delimitation issue of the road map of authority between the Central Government and Regional Governments in developing border areas. By the provisions and urgency, so far the Ministry of Home Affairs, in this case, the Directorate General of Regional Administration, has routinely allocated Deconcentration budget every year to hold a Coordination Meeting by inviting related Ministries / Agencies from the Center (BNPP and other technical K / L) with Regional Apparatus (BPP / Cooperation and Border Bureau in Provinces and Regencies / Cities and related services).

Through the Coordination Meeting, it is necessary to build a shared understanding of eliminating the roadmap of authority. About overcoming the problem of allocation of authority as illustrated above, in a coordination meeting to increase the capacity of officials who manage border areas, it is necessary to eliminate the authority roadmap as follows:

- a. Regarding the budget for constructing the Puskesmas Assistance in Puring Kencana, if Kapuas Hulu District or West Kalimantan Province can compile, determine and allocate a budget, the Puskesmas development will be carried out by the Region because the scale of the construction project is small. In addition, if the Region is unable, the Central Government, in this case, the Directorate General of Health Efforts, the Ministry of Health, can budget through the applicable procedural mechanisms, through Assistance Tasks (TP) or Special Allocation Funds (DAK).
- b. If building a hospital and medical equipment needed to serve several sub-districts on the border and require a large budget allocation, the Directorate General of Health Efforts, the Ministry of Health, can allocate a budget, and the mechanism for the construction of the RSUD is carried out through the TP. However, for Medical Devices' provision, the Central Government can directly handle it due to the limited availability of medical equipment providers in the Regions.
- c. The provision of medical personnel such as doctors and nurses is the central government's authority, given the limitations of the regions in providing specially qualified resources.

Thus, through the increase in Apparatus Capacity, it can be a solution to Overlapping of Authority or negligence or neglect of authority, which is why development in border areas cannot be accelerated and optimized. The Ministry of Home Affairs CQ, the Directorate General of Regional Administration Development, routinely allocates the Deconcentration Budget to the Papua Province annually through the Border Bureau and Border Management Foreign Cooperation.

2. Overcoming coordination that is not synergistic or sectoral ego in Building Border Areas

The management and development of the K / L sector's listas border areas at the Central and regional agencies have not reflected synchronously integrated coordination synergy in supporting the acceleration and optimization of development in border areas because coordination has not been fully implemented in the context of budgeting, planning, and implementation of development in border areas. Moreover, coordination is still just a discourse in the provisions of laws and regulations governing the management of border areas.

Theoretically, according to Paul R. Lawrence and Jay W. Lorch (Handoko, 2003: 197), there are 4 (four) types of differences in attitudes and ways of working that complicate the task of coordinating, namely:

- a. Differences in orientation towards specific goals.

Several Ministries / Agencies in the central government and agencies in the regions that manage border areas have their views on building border areas through infrastructure facilities. For example, for related Ministries / Agencies at the center that prioritize Regional Development to encourage Economic Growth in the Krayan Region (Krayan District, East Krayan District, West

Krayan District, South Krayan District, and Central Krayan District), consider that Physical Infrastructure Development (Road Axis and Parallel), Basic Service Infrastructure (Sarpras Providing Water and Electricity, Health and Education Services), Government Infrastructure (Head Office, Village, etc.) and Economic and People's Welfare Infrastructure (Markets, Cooperatives, etc.) were built in Krayan because Krayan is besides Lokpri also projected as PKSN.

b. The difference in time orientation.

The Directorate of Bridges, Directorate General of Highways, Ministry of PUPR prioritizes issues that must be resolved immediately to benefit Cross Border People and Goods in Motamasin by building a temporary bridge where the previous bridge had collapsed due to flooding. However, the Research and Development Section of the Ministry of PUPR emphasizes that long-term interests are going forward. Therefore, the construction of a temporary bridge in a short time will cause the damage to return in a short time. Thus building a permanent bridge with a concrete foundation structure that allows for long-term interest.

c. Differences in inter-personal orientation (between organizations).

As an illustration of the Directorate of Development Arrangement and the Directorate of Borderlands, the Directorate General of Cipta Karya and the Regional Government of East Nusa Tenggara Province agree that the revitalization of the PLBN and Motamasin Bridge construction can be completed by the end of 2016, so that it can be inaugurated simultaneously with the consideration that credit points have successfully carried out 2 (two) infrastructure developments. Simultaneously, but the PUPR, Research and Development Agency, proposes that the inauguration at the end of the year is only the Motamasin PBLN, considering that building a Permanent Bridge that is often damaged needs to be reviewed first so that the new Permanent Bridge to be built will not be damaged quickly and pay more attention to cross safety factors. Boundaries, especially when heavy vehicles often pass them to transport goods.

d. The difference informality of structure.

BNPP's task of coordinating the development of border areas, in terms of coordinating development in border areas, is regulated by the Presidential Decree and the NTT Provincial Border Management Agency, in terms of coordinating development in border areas, a Presidential Regulation regulates it when there is an urgency to build a Border Parallel road from Lokpri Amfoang Timur (Kupang Regency) to Lokpri Bikomi Nilulat (North Central Timor Regency) in strengthening diplomatic support so that the completion of the unresolved segments boundary line in Noel Besi can be completed by the end of 2016. However, the Directorate General of Highways, The PUPR Ministry, has allocated parallel roads from Lokpri Motaain (Belu Regency) to Lokpri Motamasin (Malacca Regency).

The NTT Provincial Border Management Agency cq BNPP cannot directly coordinate with the NTT Provincial Highways Office CQ the Directorate General of Highways of the Ministry of PUPR, divert the construction of the parallel road to the Mountain - Motamasin border into the construction of a parallel road to the East Amfoang - Bikomi Nilulat border. This is because structurally, the authority to coordinate BNPP by the Perpres and BPP of NTT Province is by regional regulation. At the same time, the construction of parallel border roads, which are national roads carried out by the Directorate General of Highways, Ministry of PUPR CQ, the Office of Bina Marga, NTT Province, is regulated by law. Thus, the legal basis coordinated with the coordinating party has a higher position in the hierarchy of statutory regulations.

Of the four factors that become problems incoordination, a, b, and c can be clustered as "sectoral ego" constraints. Meanwhile, d can be categorized as a "bureaucratic" obstacle. Thus, to overcome the problems of coordination caused by or constraints of "sectoral ego" and "bureaucracy," solutions to overcome these problems of coordination are:

- i. Constraints on "sectoral egos" are easier and faster to make alternative decisions by choosing coordination steps based on priority choices from priorities.
- ii. Bureaucratic constraints take a long time because they wait for revisions or deregulation, becoming the legal basis for coordination.

3. Overcoming budget constraints in Developing Border Areas

Fiscal decentralization implemented in Indonesia allocates APBN funds to APBD to finance infrastructure development programs or facilities and infrastructure throughout Indonesia, including border areas. However, the development of physical infrastructure, government, essential services, economy, and welfare in border areas has not been fully realized, given the limited financial capacity of regional governments.

Thus, the Regional Government is expected to explore local revenue sources to increase revenue or PAD. Several alternative modalities that local governments can implement to increase PAD include:

- a. The extensification of taxes and levies includes public services, business services, specific permits, and others.
- b. It is creating new sources of income by creating a new production sector through creative financing efforts that involve private parties with attractive stimulants (permits, land, transparent markets, tax incentives) to invest in the regions. In addition, the sector is adjusted to the local potential, which needs to be explored and developed consistently as a potential source of PAD, such as tourism, mining, agricultural plantations, and trade.
- c. We are attracting investors through light tax incentives, easy bureaucracy, supporting infrastructure, as well as increasing MICE (meetings, incentives, conferences, exhibitions) to create a conducive business climate, which in turn will increase regional revenue, which is directly proportional to services to communities on the border.

CONCLUSION

The government has made efforts to accelerate the development of the border area as a whole, but in reality, the border area is still underdeveloped. As a result, development in the border area looks slow and less than optimal, this is due to constraints, including Clarity of Authority of the Central Government and regions in the Border Area, Not yet implemented synergic coordination between related Ministries / Agencies at both the Central and Regional Governments in developing border areas, and the limited budget owned by regions to develop border areas.

In this regard, to overcome obstacles in order to accelerate development in border areas, it is deemed necessary:

- a. Accelerate the completion of Government Regulations concerning the Authority of the Government and Regional Governments in the Management of Border Areas as an instrument for delimiting the roadmap for the Authority of the Central Government and Regional Governments in the Management of Border Areas.
- b. Formulation of action plans to strengthen institutions at the central and regional levels to eliminate sectoral egos and build constructive communication between ministries / institutions at the Central Level and the relationship between the central and regional governments.
- c. Increase Regional Income with Tax Estensification and Restitution, and involve the role of the private sector to invest in developing and developing border areas.

REFERENCES**Books**

Handoko, T. Hani, Personnel and Human Resources Management, Yogyakarta: BPFE, 2003.

Government Laws and Legislations

Law No. 43 of 2008 concerning the Territory of the State.

Law No. 23 of 2014 concerning Local Government.

Presidential Decree No. 12/2010 concerning the National Agency for Border Management.

Presidential Decree No. 179 of 2014 concerning the Spatial Plan for Border Areas in East Nusa Tenggara Province.

Presidential Decree No. 31 of 2015 concerning the Spatial Plan for Border Areas in Kalimantan.

Presidential Decree No. 32 of 2015 concerning the Spatial Plan for Border Areas in Papua.

Presidential Decree No.2 of 2015 concerning RPJMN 2015 - 2019

National Agency for Border Management Regulation No. 1 of 2015 concerning the 2015-2019 National Border Management Master Plan

Regional Regulation No. 4 of 2010 concerning the Organization and Work Procedure of the Border Management Agency of East Nusa Tenggara Province

Government Publications / Documents

Dr. Kautsar, Development of Border Areas in order to Guarantee the Sovereignty of the Republic of Indonesia, roundtable Discussion of Task Group II Lemhannas Professional Staff, Friday, 11 December 2009

Dr. Suprayoga Hadi, Director of Special Zones and Disadvantaged Areas, BAPPENAS, Border area development, 2010.

Journal Articles

Faozan, Haris. "Strengthening the Institutional Capacity of Regional Governments as the Main Agenda for Optimizing the Management of Border Areas." *Journal of Borneo Administrator* 2.2 (2006).

Kurnia, Mahendra Putra. "RI's Border Area: Endless Patience, Waiting for Promises as Promises." [92] *TRANSITION JOURNAL* 7 (2011).