
Implementation of the Papua Special Autonomy Policy to Improve the Welfare of the Indigenous Papuan Community in Papua Province

Timed Magayang ¹, Muchlis Hamdi ², Hyronimus Rowa ³,
Mansyur Achmad ⁴

Abstract

This research analyzes the implementation of special autonomy policies to improve the welfare of indigenous Papuans in Papua Province. The Papua region is the region with the highest poverty rate among the 38 provinces in Indonesia, but the poverty rate in the region is still stagnant. Even though special autonomy has been implemented for 20 years with a transfer of APBN funds of 1.25% from 2001 to 2020 through Law No. 21 of 2001, and increased to 2.25% from 2021 to 2041 through Law No. 2 of 2021 concerning Special Autonomy for Papua, but the government has not succeeded in improving the welfare of the indigenous Papuan people due to inconsistencies, conflicts and less firm policies. This research uses a qualitative method with a descriptive analysis approach. Primary data collection techniques used include interviews, observation and documentation. The documents required by researchers include related laws and regulations, data archives from Papua regional government offices, and other relevant data. Based on research results, during the treatment of special autonomy in Papua it has not reduced the poverty rate and improved the welfare of indigenous Papuans for twenty years. Then the results of data analysis related to the implementation of the Papua special autonomy policy to improve the welfare of the people in Papua Province, are divided into two dimensions, namely: The "content" dimension includes aspects: interests affected, types of benefits, level of change, location of decision making, program implementation, and resource availability. The research suggestion is for political and power stakeholders in Indonesia that the implementation of Papua's special autonomy policy to improve the welfare of indigenous Papuans requires strict supervision, mutual trust, open dialogue, public consultation, and reducing top-down policies and implementing policies that bottom-up based.

Keywords: *Implementation, Public Policy, Special Autonomy; and Increasing Welfare*

¹ Institut Pemerintahan Dalam Negeri, Jakarta, Indonesia. timedsella@gmail.com

² Institut Pemerintahan Dalam Negeri, Jakarta, Indonesia.

³ Institut Pemerintahan Dalam Negeri, Jakarta, Indonesia.

⁴ Institut Pemerintahan Dalam Negeri, Jakarta, Indonesia.

1. Introduction

Papua's special autonomy policy is an effort to reduce the disintegration of the nation and improve the standard of living for indigenous Papuans better within the framework of the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia as a home for the people of the archipelago. Apart from that, the Papua special autonomy policy is "a way and alternative to encourage inclusive economic and social development in Papua".

The level of well-being and well-being in Papua differs between regions, such as mountainous areas, coastal plains and beaches. Meanwhile, efforts to improve community welfare face various obstacles, both from the physical and socio-cultural conditions of the communities in these three regions. Apart from minimal human resources, the low performance of implementers or executors and the corrupt behavior of bureaucrats are a chronic disease that is growing rapidly in Papua and West Papua. Regional development, which basically seeks to improve the level of welfare of the community (indigenous Papuans), still really needs to take into account the socio-anthropological conditions of people in mountainous, inland and coastal areas whose characteristics are very different.

Then the main objective of special autonomy for Papua Province is aimed at responding to the uneven economic development and social welfare after more than decades. Papua Province became part of the territory of the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia (NKRI), after being handed over by the Dutch Government through the United Nations Temporary Executives Authority (UNTEA). High social inequality and poverty are the root problems of endless horizontal conflicts in Papua (Widjojo 2020).

For example, in 2019, the gap between the highest HDI in Jayapura City (80.16) and the lowest in Nduga Regency (30.75) was 60.68%. Of the 29 regencies, only one district has a very high HDI of 80.16, namely Jayapura district, three districts have a high HDI, namely: Jayapura, Mimika and Biak Numfor districts, while the districts with medium HDI are obtained by nine districts, while seven districts have the lowest HDI below fifty to with a low of 30.75. With the amount of funds given to the Papua provincial government for human development, it does not yet provide hope for a better future than before special autonomy was treated. The situation is almost the same in Papua during the 20 years that special autonomy was treated.

According to the government, through BPS, 2020, it can be concluded that the highest poverty rate in Papua is due to: "The lack of basic service facilities and infrastructure is the main cause of the most pockets of poverty in mountainous areas, where the poverty rate was highest in 2019, in Deyiai Regency amounting to 43.65% and Intan Jaya amounting to 42.92%," while the lowest was 12 districts, namely: brought by 29% from 29 districts in Papua Province.

Of the 34 provinces in Indonesia, only 3 (three), the poorest provinces are Papua, West and NTT, the big question for most people is whether natural resources are rich and the APBN has increased every year for the provinces of Papua and West Papua for 20 years by 2 % of the APBN but still the lowest HDI figure is 60.44 while the highest is 71.94 nationally. The Human Development Index is used to measure how big the impact is from efforts to increase basic human capital capabilities. Development is calculated using the size of education, health and purchasing power. The higher the number obtained, the more the development goals will be achieved. Development is a process of making changes for the better (Bouckennooghe et al., 2019).

The Open Unemployment Rate (TPT) in Papua in August 2020 was 4.28 percent lower than the TPT in Indonesia which was at 7.07 percent, but the TPT for Papua Province tended to increase by 0.77 percent from the same condition in the previous period. The increase in TPT occurred in both urban and rural areas. The greater increase in TPT occurred in urban areas, namely around 2.69 percent, while the increase in TPT in rural areas was around 0.79 percent. The unemployment rate in Papua is still far below the national unemployment rate of 4.99 percent. So far, from an ethnicity perspective, published data cannot inform "who" is in various job categories - whether migrant community groups or indigenous community groups commonly called indigenous Papuans (OAP) (Hadiprayitno 2017).

The cause of the poverty line in three different years is because in Papua every year there is a massive addition of immigrants or population movement from outside Papua (Ananta et al., 2016). Population data through the Papua Province Central Statistics Agency recorded that: in 2018, 1,994 people, higher than the previous year, while in the following year, namely 2019, there were 926 people, while in 2020 there was an increase of 14,815 people, since implementing special autonomy and opening new autonomous regions. the escalation of the influx of foreign residents is very high every year as described above. We need to know that when registering the population, native Papuans and non-Papuans did not record this, which caused confusion.

Data from the Central Statistics Agency (2020) states that in March 2020 poverty in Papua Province increased by 0.16% compared to the poverty level in September 2019. The percentage increase in poor people in Papua, especially in rural areas, increased by 0.14 percent (Central Statistics Agency, 2020).

In the education sector, villages with the presence of SD/MI up to SMU/MA and Vocational Schools have experienced an increase. The biggest increase occurred in the presence of SMU/MA. In terms of education of village/lurah heads, there are 1,817 village/lurah heads with at least high school/equivalent education (an increase of 33 percent compared to 2014). However, the data presented by the government is different from the situation in the field where most rural areas are unemployed due

to teacher vacancies. Teachers with civil servant status move from functional positions to structural positions, this is a common case throughout the Papua region.

Meanwhile, in the health sector, villages holding posyandu activities once a month increased by 18 percent compared to 2014 to 2,012 villages/kelurahan. Villages/kelurahan with the presence of community health centers and sub-district health centers increased by 9 percent (to 422 villages/kelurahan) and 17 percent (to 1,146 villages/kelurahan) respectively. In the housing and environmental sectors there were several improvements compared to 2014. Villages with electricity users increased by 39 percent (to 4,050 villages/subdistricts). Villages/sub-districts with users of clean drinking water sources increased by 12 percent (to 3,906 villages/sub-districts). Villages/sub-districts with latrine users as defecation facilities increased by 44 percent (to 3,020 villages/sub-districts).

The government only focuses on infrastructure development in Papua, from the aspect of its use, providing benefits to larger economic actors, native Papuans, not foreign investors or foreign immigrants. In economic studies, it is stated that: "the presence of infrastructure can be a catalyst for increasing economic activity which has positive implications for improving community welfare."

2. Theoretical Background

Implementation is a practical administrative process and is distinguished from policy formulation which can be seen as a political stage. Meanwhile, in developed countries, in general, a policy is debated during its formulation in parliament because the public is included so that once the policy has been issued there is no longer any debate in society, whereas in developing countries, debate only occurs at the time of implementation because the public is not involved in parliament, for example in Indonesia. There are already representatives in the DPR so what can be discussed are those who are represented in Parliament.

Implementation of public policy is an essential stage in the public policy process because implementers implement policies with all the consequences from both parties, namely the first party, as the party giving the task and second as the party who is the target or affected.

In the process of policy formulation it becomes a benchmark in implementation. Indonesia as a developing country has weaknesses and problems, one of which is that the asymmetric policy in Papua failed in the formulation process. Policy implementation can simply be interpreted as the process of translating regulations into action. In practice, policy implementation is a very complex process, often even politically charged because of the intervention of various interests (Cahn 2012), Implementors are accepted through a political policy in the form of statutory regulations, in this case according to Hill & Hupe (2021), policy implementation can simply be interpreted as the process of translating regulations into action. The same

opinion regarding implementation according to Reply and Franklin in (Rahman et al., 2022) is as follows: what happens after a law is enacted that gives program authority, benefit policies or a type of tangible output.

Meanwhile, according to Schofield (2001), in implementing public policy, there are four approaches that can be used, namely structural approach, procedural and managerial approach, behavioral approach, and political approach. Meanwhile, according to Videira et al (2010), there are five things that must be done, namely the right policy, the right implementation, the right target, the right environment and the right process. According to Innes & Booher (2010) public policy implementation refers to how the government works so that policies produce conditions as planned.

The implementation process plays an important role in bridging public policy design and the desired results. Immediate results are short-term impacts resulting from the implementation of a policy. Meanwhile, the final impact is the accumulation of short-term impacts and is the final result expected from the implementation of public policy. Meanwhile, the impact of a policy has four dimensions, namely: 1) Main subject dimensions, 2). Group and situation dimensions 3). Time Dimension and 4). Cost dimensions, (Agustino, 2020:204). Meanwhile, another opinion is according to Egonman in Makinde (2005:63). "It refers to the process of converting financial, material, technical and human into output-goods and services.

3. Methodology

Penelitian ini menggunakan pendekatan kualitatif dengan metodologi deskriptif. Pendekatan ini memungkinkan peneliti untuk mengamati dan menganalisis fenomena secara mendalam tanpa membatasi diri pada rumusan hipotesis awal. Metode deskriptif memungkinkan peneliti untuk memberikan gambaran yang rinci tentang situasi atau kejadian yang diamati, tanpa mencoba untuk menguji hubungan sebab-akibat atau membuat generalisasi. Dalam penelitian ini, pendekatan deskriptif digunakan untuk memahami implementasi kebijakan otonomi khusus Papua dalam meningkatkan kesejahteraan masyarakat asli Papua di Provinsi Papua.

4. Empirical Findings/Result

Conten Policy

Interest Affected

Improving social welfare is a process that aims to improve the quality of life, happiness and overall well-being for a group of individuals that make up society. The Papua region is the number one contributor to the poorest region in Indonesia and a contributor to state finances through natural resources. Papua has abundant natural wealth but its people are poor, whereas Papua's natural wealth can guarantee the lives of the world's people, while Papuan land owners live in poverty based on 2022 Central Statistics Agency (BPS) data of 26.03% nationally.

Results of the researcher's interview with 1 (one) informant, Mr. Dr. Frans Pekey, M.Si. Regional Secretary Mayor of Jayapura Province (PJ. Mayor of Jayapura Province) The interests that influence him (Interest Affected) are as follows: interests that influence the Implementation of the Special Autonomy Policy to Improve the Welfare of Indigenous Papuans (OAP), there has been miscommunication and stiffness between the central and regional governments from the beginning of the Papua Special Autonomy Law in 2001 until the end of Special Autonomy in 2021 because the contents of the policy itself had not been fully realized. This can influence the improvement of the welfare of the Papuan people. Politically, the central government's policy has been given to the Papua Provincial government, but so far it has not been given the authority to regulate independently without any interference from the central government, but in reality it is like "holding the tail and leaving the head". Apart from that, the central government has not given complete trust. Having implemented special autonomy in Papua for 21 years, the central government has provided enormous value for money, but in reality, in Papua, the people who are not yet prosperous are actually increasingly left behind, despite the government's efforts to eradicate poverty in this area.

From the results of the researcher's interview with informant 1. Interests that influence him (Interest Affected). According to the researcher, to increase the welfare of indigenous Papuans with the aim of providing special autonomy based on the dictum of Law No. 2 of 2021, Letter (g) that "the administration and implementation of development in Papua Province so far has not fully fulfilled the sense of justice, has not fully enabled the achievement of prosperity. people, have not fully supported the realization of law enforcement, and have not fully demonstrated respect for Human Rights in Papua Province, especially the Papuan people."

This influences policy decisions that are not based on data, research results and orders from the Special Autonomy Law, but are driven by the regional government's compulsion to spend the special autonomy budget. Followed by the results of the researcher's interview with informant 2 (Mr. Dr. Muhamad Musa'ad). The interests that influenced him (Interest Affected) were as follows: "Jakarta's interests, and Papua's interests in the Implementation of Special Autonomy for Papua, the people are held hostage to. The difference of opinion regarding the history of Papua is that the Jakarta government is of the opinion that the problem of the Papua region has been resolved through the 1969 Pepera, while the Papuan people state that the Papuan problem has not been resolved because the Pepera was carried out in the Indonesian way, namely a deliberation represented by 1026 people from the total population at that time of 815,906. This continues to flare up in the land of Papua and is also affected by government administration. Then the Jakarta government gave little trust to Papua, therefore this special autonomy policy was like holding the tail and letting go of the head to Papua.

From the results of the researcher's interview with informant 2 Interests that

influence him (Interest Affected). Indeed, according to researchers, the implementation of the special autonomy policy is formulated and explained in derivative laws which will serve as operational guidelines, with concrete principles, including: increasing efficiency, transparency and accountability then improving effectiveness, improving service quality, no conflicts of interest, oriented towards the public interest, carried out openly, meets the values of propriety, and the results can be accounted for, not for one's own interests. However, the reality that occurs in the field is that there is obstruction or the opposite of these principles.

Results of researcher interviews with informants 3 Abner Singgir, SE; MM, as head of the Papua special autonomy bureau) that the interests that influence it (Interest Affected) are as follows: Implementation of the Papua special autonomy policy to improve the welfare of indigenous Papuans, the interests of the community are also influenced by the interests of the central elite in Jakarta and the interests of the Papuan people are ignored. Because many articles in the special autonomy law have been removed and until now there has been no regional regulation that is pro-Papuan.

The asymmetric autonomy policy in Papua has a significant impact on various aspects of life and interests in the Papua region. Several parties that are not directly or directly affected by this policy involve various elements in society and certain sectors. In the policy process involving the community, policy makers should practice listening rather than imposing their will. So far, the policies taken for Papua have been to forcefully impose Jakarta's will and then ignore every aspiration expressed by the community, both through government institutions and directly through open spaces (through peaceful demonstrations). Then Regulations, the practice of administering government in Papua are two regulations at once, namely sectoral laws and laws within the framework of asymmetric decentralization policies.

Type of Benefits

Benefits are advantages or positive results that can be obtained from an action, activity, or situation. The benefits of implementing special autonomy are not always achieved automatically. Good management, transparency and accountability are needed in the use of resources and implementation of policies to ensure that these benefits can be realized.

The results of the researcher's interview with informant 1 Nurdina, analyst staff at the Papua and West Papua Special Autonomy Subdivision at the Directorate General of Regional Autonomy, Ministry of Home Affairs, Type of Benefits are as follows: That the type of benefits produced and/or expected from the Papua Special Autonomy Policy in its implementation for Increasing the welfare of indigenous Papuans (OAP) in Papua Province. The authority to improve the welfare of indigenous Papuans based on Law No. 21 of 2001 is the duty and authority of the regional government. The government, in this case the Ministry of Home Affairs,

only controls and reminds the extent to which perdasi and perdusus are issued. Meanwhile, regarding the management of special autonomy funds, this is not our authority so far, as far as I know, that's how it is. Meanwhile, the government has not officially issued twenty derivative laws, which have officially issued two Government Regulations based on Law No. 2 of 2021 concerning Special Autonomy, the result of a revision or extension of the Special Autonomy policy for the Papua region. The benefit of the spirit of special autonomy is that authority is given specifically to Papua to freely develop Papua better than before. This means that as long as injustice in development and policy has been paid off.

The results of the researcher's interview with informant 2 Types of Benefits are as follows: Informant 2 Maurits Valentino V. Hege, S.STP, analyst staff Regional planning of the Ministry of Home Affairs Benefits expected from the Papua Special Autonomy Policy to improve the welfare of indigenous Papuans in Papua Province, of course, the community really expects support from the regional government because it is given full authority through the Special Autonomy Law and is regulated in Perdasi and Perdusus. As long as Papua is treated with special autonomy, there is no intervention from the central government. The government is only limited to reminding or controlling and that is only limited to reminding only through letters regarding whether or not to carry out statutory orders. We have received and heard complaints from the public regarding partiality towards indigenous Papuans, because in the 20 years that have passed there have been many obstacles in implementing special autonomy in Papua.

Results of the researcher's interview with informant 3 Agus Salim, head of the Regional Planning Division, Director General of the Ministry of Home Affairs. Types of Benefits are as follows: The resulting benefits are progress and prosperity through the construction of health and education facilities in the Papua region and in my opinion the regional government has been through this for twenty years. has built several buildings both in the province and inland and even coastal areas. From the results of the interviews with the informants above, authority in the implementation of special autonomy seems to be contradictory between the central and regional governments. The authority is given to regional governments to execute legal orders, while the reality in Papua has not yet reached the target.

Extent Of Change Envision

There are benefits to be gained from the policy in terms of implementing the Papua special autonomy policy related to improving the welfare of indigenous Papuans in Papua province. To comply with Papua's special autonomy policy, a law has been prepared. The obstacles faced in the process of implementing the special autonomy policy, in this case issuing a regional regulation after an interview was conducted with the Head of the sub-section of the Papua Province Regional Secretariat's legal bureau, consisted of the following aspects: 1) Political interests were more dominant in making the sensitive Regional Regulation; 2) The level of trust between the central government and the Papuan people is not good. What the Regional

Apparatus Organization has done to overcome obstacles is to build good communication at the level of the relevant agencies, the provincial government, both executive and legislative, as well as the Ministry of Home Affairs.

The Papua Province regional government's performance dimension is to improve the welfare of indigenous Papuans, issuing 23 *perdasi* and 9 *perdasus*, while it has been postponed until the special autonomy volume one is finished and the remaining *perdasus* and *perdasus* are 1 *perdasi* and 3 *perdasus*. Based on an analysis of the Papua special autonomy law, the three regional regulations that were abandoned were very urgent, one of which was regarding the ad hoc commission. The granting of special autonomy to Papua Province was based on the demand for secession from the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia, therefore the answer to this demand was through granting special autonomy to Papua, the contents of which were policies that answered issues regarding Papua. Provincial regulations (*Perdasi*), as administrative arrangements, are not a solution to solving Papua's problems.

Efforts to advance the welfare of the Papuan people through development in a broad sense, law enforcement and providing ample space and space for indigenous Papuans to become masters of their own land. Because of this, the government affirms the special support of Papuans in various fields to uplift, advance and equalize citizens of other countries in Indonesia.

The regional government of Papua Province as the executor of the special autonomy policy has responsibilities based on statutory regulations. The big responsibility to take care of Papua is very complicated because there are groups for and against the policies taken by the central government regarding Papua. The central government's tendency in the context of implementing Papua's special autonomy on political issues between Papua and Indonesia regarding the history, background and national ideology of both parties is an inhibiting factor in political decision making. The special regional regulations which are the spirit of special autonomy have not been maximized and give the impression that Papua's special autonomy is being treated half-heartedly and less seriously. The reason is that article 28 concerning Local Parties was abolished by the Constitutional Court because it was ineffective and for political reasons how local political elites controlled parliament and would threaten the sovereignty of the unitary state of the Republic of Indonesia. However, based on data in the field, the control of non-Papuans in Parliament in several districts and provinces in Papua is very massive and mushrooming. Obtained Legislative seats in Jayapura Province 13 seats for native Papuans out of 40 seats and this mother province is dominated by immigrants (non-Papuans), in Jayapura Regency 7 native Papuans out of 25 seats dominated by non-Papuans (immigrants) Keerom Regency 7 seats for native people Papua from 23 legislatures and finally Merauke Regency, 3 indigenous Papuans from 30 seats dominated by immigrants.

Results of the researcher's interview with informant 1 Yosep Busup, Member of the Papuan People's Representative Council, the degree of change to be achieved

(Extent of Change Envision) is as follows: The change to be achieved from the Implementation of the Papua Special Autonomy Policy to improve the welfare of Indigenous Papuans in Papua Province, Change systematic and holistic, especially changes to work systems and performance systems. Apart from that, there is partial support for indigenous Papuans, not partial in all fields. Then, in implementing special autonomy, trust is required. What is meant by trust here is from the central government to the Papua Provincial government because trust is an important key to implementing a policy.

Results of the researcher's interview with informant 2 Amos Wonda, Head of Subdivision of Secretary of Papua Province, the degree of change to be achieved (Extent of Change Envision) is as follows: The degree of change to be achieved Implementation of the Papua Special Autonomy Policy to increase the welfare of indigenous Papuans in Papua Province, which is expected produce legal products that are pro for native Papuans, through this arrangement we can provide excellent services supported by modern technological devices and human resources who have good competence and are supported by adequate funding sources so that the services provided to the community can be carried out optimally.

5. Discussion

The discussion on the results of the study highlights several key aspects regarding the implementation of the Papua Special Autonomy (Otsus) policy and its impact on improving the welfare of Indigenous Papuans (OAP).

Firstly, the study sheds light on the interests that influence the implementation of the Special Autonomy Policy. It identifies miscommunication and rigidity between the central and regional governments as significant barriers hindering the full realization of the policy's objectives. Despite significant financial investments from the central government, the desired improvements in Papuan welfare have not been adequately achieved.

Moreover, the study reveals varying interests among stakeholders involved in the policy implementation process. These interests range from political considerations to historical perspectives, leading to challenges in decision-making and trust-building between Jakarta and Papua. The lack of trust and differing opinions regarding Papua's history further complicate the implementation of the policy (Druce 2020).

Furthermore, the discussion explores the types of benefits expected from the Special Autonomy Policy. While the policy aims to empower indigenous Papuans and enhance their welfare, challenges such as partiality towards certain groups and obstacles in fund management hinder the realization of these benefits (Ndou 2004). The study underscores the need for transparent and accountable management of resources to ensure equitable distribution of benefits.

Regarding the extent of change envisioned through the policy, the study highlights the importance of systemic and holistic transformations, emphasizing changes in work and performance systems. However, achieving these changes requires trust-building between the central and regional governments, along with a pro-Papuan legal framework and efficient service delivery mechanisms.

Finally, the study draws conclusions based on Merilee S. Grindle's theoretical analysis, which identifies eight key factors influencing policy implementation. These factors include influencing interests, types of benefits, the degree of desired change, decision-making processes, program implementers, resource allocation, institutional power, and institutional characteristics. By analyzing these factors, the study identifies obstacles such as lack of coordination, weak institutional capacity, and unequal benefit distribution, which hinder the effective implementation of the Special Autonomy Policy.

6. Conclusions

The implementation of the Papua Special Autonomy (Otsus) policy in improving the welfare of Indigenous Papuans (OAP) is still not optimal. Based on the results of Grindle's (1980) theoretical analysis, it helps analyze the obstacles and strategies faced in implementing Special Autonomy for Papua. Eight key factors in policy implementation: 1).Influencing Interests: Understand the various interest groups involved in Special Autonomy for Papua and their influence on policy. 2).Type of Benefit: Determines the type of benefits that Special Autonomy Papua offers to OAP and how these benefits are distributed. 3).Degree of Change Desired: Measures the level of change expected from Special Autonomy Papua and the readiness of stakeholders for these changes. 4). Location of Decision Making: Determine where decision making regarding Special Autonomy for Papua is carried out and how this affects the effectiveness of the policy. 5). Program Implementers: Identify implementers of the Papua Special Autonomy program and assess their capacity in implementing the program. 6). Resources: Determine the resources available for the implementation of Special Autonomy for Papua and how these resources are allocated. 7) Institutional Power: Understand the power and influence of institutions involved in the implementation of Special Autonomy for Papua. 8). Institutional Characteristics: Assess the organizational structure and culture of the institutions involved in Special Autonomy for Papua and how this influences policy implementation. By analyzing these eight factors, obstacles and strategies for implementing Special Autonomy for Papua can be identified. Obstacles that may be faced include: 1). Lack of coordination between institutions. 2). Weak institutional capacity. 3). Lack of OAP participation in decision making. 4). Unequal distribution of benefits. 5). Lack of resources. 6). Conflict and unstable security situation. 7). Lack of coordination and evaluation of the policies provided.

References

- Ananta, A., Utami, D. R. W. W., & Handayani, N. B. (2016). Statistics on ethnic diversity in the land of Papua, Indonesia. *Asia & the Pacific Policy Studies*, 3(3), 458-474.
- Bouckenooghe, D., Devos, G., & Van Den Broeck, H. (2009). Organizational change questionnaire—climate of change, processes, and readiness: Development of a new instrument. *The Journal of psychology*, 143(6), 559-599.
- Cahn, M. A. (2012). Institutional and noninstitutional actors in the policy process. *Public policy: The essential readings*, 2, 199-206.
- Druce, S. C. (2020). Political impasse vs economic development: a history and analysis of the West Papua conflict in Indonesia. *Managing conflicts in a globalizing ASEAN: incompatibility management through good governance*, 89-116.
- Grindle, M. S. (1996). *Challenging the State: crisis and innovation in Latin America and Africa*. Cambridge University Press.
- Hadiprayitno, I. I. (2017). The limit of narratives: ethnicity and indigenous rights in Papua, Indonesia. *international journal on minority and group rights*, 24(1), 1-23.
- Hill, M., & Hupe, P. (2021). *Implementing public policy: An introduction to the study of operational governance*. Sage.
- Innes, J. E., & Booher, D. E. (2010). *Planning with complexity: An introduction to collaborative rationality for public policy*. Routledge.
- Ndou, V. (2004). E-government for developing countries: Opportunities and challenges. *Electron. J. Inf. Syst. Dev. Ctries.*, 18(1), 1-24.
- Rahman, B., Akmal, M., Muzaffarsyah, T., & Agustina, S. U. (2022, December). Implementation of Child Protection Policy in Lhokseumawe City. In *Proceedings of International Conference on Social Science, Political Science, and Humanities (ICoSPOLHUM)* (Vol. 3, pp. 00012-00012).
- Schofield, J. (2001). Time for a revival? Public policy implementation: a review of the literature and an agenda for future research. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 3(3), 245-263.
- Videira, N., Antunes, P., Santos, R., & Lopes, R. (2010). A participatory modelling approach to support integrated sustainability assessment processes. *Systems Research and Behavioral Science*, 27(4), 446-460.
- Widjojo, M. S., Elizabeth, A., Al Rahab, A., Pamungkas, C., & Dewi, R. (2010). *Papua road map: Negotiating the past, improving the present, and securing the future*. Yayasan Pustaka Obor Indonesia.