

**FRICITION OF COOPERATION APPROACH AMONG TWO LOCAL GOVERNMENTS
IN PUBLIC INFRASTRUCTURE MANAGEMENT**

M. Daimul Abror

Candidate Doctor of Administrative Science,
Faculty of Administrative Science,
Universitas Brawijaya

Sumartono, Mardiyono, Choirul Saleh

Faculty of Administrative Science,
Universitas Brawijaya

Abstract

Specially this research aims to describe, analyze and interpreted friction dynamic of cooperation approach between Surabaya Government and Sidoarjo Government in Purabaya Station Management, including three perspective (Smith, 1985; Hattinght, 1998, Roux et.al, 1996), which are: law and administrative approach, financial approach and democratic approach. The frictions happened will decide how both local government make a decision about the most profitable cooperation sustainability of Purabaya Station management. This research has used qualitative research method with case study approach. Research result has shown that friction happened for two periods of Purabaya station cooperation management, which were in pre-reform period and post-reform period, unless for law and administrative approach which stand still, because cooperation agreement used as legal was standing still based on the old regulation (Cooperation document 1983 and SKB-Joint Decree year 1991). In financial approach, for first period, Purabaya station is funded by APBD – Regional Expenditure budget of Surabaya city and helped by central government APBN - National Expenditure Budget, in second period, the management is fully funded by APBD. While in Sidoarjo district only received profit share based on “gross income” from Purabaya station. In democratic approach, in first period, management cooperation policy of Purabaya station directly ruled by provincial government of East Java as representative of central government. In second period, everything involving management cooperation of Purabaya station directly managed by government of Surabaya city.

Key words: *Cooperation Approach Between Regions, Cooperation Between Regions, Public Infrastructure Management, Surabaya Government, Sidoarjo Government.*

1. Acknowledgment

Local politic heterogeneity in Indonesia is reflection of differences in geographic location, economic statue, social culture, ethnic, history and ideology experience (Supriyono, 2010). This condition reflected that there was autonomy perception as a momentum to fulfill their own local interests without noticing wider context which are national interest as a whole and other local interest which lives closely. That reality shown that need a serious thought in manage relationship between local governments (Keban, 2009:1). Indirectly, local autonomy momentum implicate to the demands of few cooperation approaches adjustments between local governments which has happened before local autonomy era.

In the case of public infrastructure management cross local area, Purabaya station is the implementation of GERBANGKERTASUSILA (Gresik, Bangkalan, Mojokerto, Surabaya, Sidoarjo, Lamongan) area development which require adjustments in its management. Cooperation concept between Surabaya and Sidoarjo government in Purabaya station management has already done for two periods in fact was having a conflict in its implementation, as an effect of perception differences in understanding Local autonomy spirit.

Based on Nakkok Aruan research result (2007:65) that the conflict was began from statue change of Purabaya station land area from ownership right to use right of Surabaya city government. That change of statue was stated in decree of the head of office area National Defense Body East Java number 221/530.3/35/1990.

That Polemic is stronger follows by the implementation of local autonomy. Nakkok Aruan (2007:66-67) has stated that there are two things which become main trigger of conflict for both area. First, institutional aspect, in that joint decree explained that Station management was manage as an open management and follows principal such as coordination, integration, synchronization, and simplification (KISS) vertically and horizontally. But in its practice is hard to be implemented because the implementation mechanism and instrument still unavailable. Those principal only written in agreement paper, but in reality is vice versa, Sidoarjo district government is hard to control that station management. Second, in income aspect, Sidoarjo district government has asked for more share in the second period of that cooperation agreement, because Sidoarjo government earn share far under what Surabaya government has.

That phenomenon above has shown that it is require cooperation approaches adjustment between Surabaya city government and Sidoarjo district government in Purabaya station management.

2. METHODOLOGY

This research focus are to describe, analyze and interpreting friction of cooperation approach between Surabaya city government and Sidoarjo district government, by elaborating few relationship cooperation approach theories stated by Smith (1985:91), Hattingh (1998:12) and Roux al (1996). This research method used a qualitative research sourced from human instrument, incident and document. Data collection technic used in-depth interview, observation, and documentation. While data analysis which used are interactive model data analysis initiated by Miles, Huberman and Saldana (2014), including data condensation, data explanation and making conclusion/verification.

3. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The friction of cooperation approach between Surabaya city government and Sidoarjo district government in Purabaya station management.

3.1 Law and Administrative Perspective

According to research result, in law and administrative perspective data gained, regulation used as legal standing by Surabaya city government and Sidoarjo district government in Purabaya station cooperation management whether in new-era/pre-reform or post-reform is not having a friction, which is still follow cooperation agreement paper between Second level of Surabaya city major and Second level of Sidoarjo regent number 30 and 32 year 1991. Even though since local autonomy regulation friction happened in national level (Act number 22 year 1999, Act number 32 year 2004, and Act number 23 year 2014) that generally arrange about guidance of cooperation implementation between local governments, but cooperation paper in 1982 and joint agreement number 30 and 32 in 1991 still used as legal standing in implantation of Purabaya station cooperation management.

Agranoff (2003) in his paper titled "A New Look at value-adding functions of intergovernmental networks" explained that one of the aspects which can be referenced towards affectivity of cooperation between local areas is transformation rules. Align with Agranoff statement (2003), Smith (1985:92) explained that transformation rules is a manifestation from relation dynamic between local government which has characteristic like some negotiation forms with persuasive approach and dialogue to overcome conflict which has happened which still follow relevant regulations. In normative perspective, clause 364 article 1 Act 23 Year 2014 explained that cooperation between adjacent areas for implementing government issues which has cross area externality and providing public service more efficient if it could managed together. If it follows regulation change about cooperation in national level, Surabaya city government and Sidoarjo district government should have addendum towards cooperation paper and joint decree which has been a legal standing in implantation of Purabaya station cooperation management.

According to elaboration result theoretically or in normative and also contradictive reality as theoretic and normative reference, the change of regulation which will become legal standing for implementing cooperation between local areas is undeniable, so the change of that regulation will be able to create new legal standing to accommodate change of demands, whether because there was an adjustment toward rules with higher hierarchy or the demands of adjustment in right sharing and obligation in each local area involve in that agreement.

That reality above has shown that in supporting cooperation sustainability between both government in Purabaya station management still lack of the change of rules/regulation in local area as an accommodation manifestation toward change of interest and requirement of both government as local autonomy which collaborating. Regulation stagnancy in local area level caused by the domination of intergovernmental relationship paradigm while each orientation tend to inward looking (Kickert, Klijn and Koppenjan, 1999). There is shown that each local government still have strong egocentrism to influence each other to gain their own profit.

Considering cooperation between both local governments is the implication from consensus between them. That is why needs regulation adjustment in local area level as a guarantee of cooperation sustainability (Peters, 1998). Besides that, it needs strengthening facilitation by province government in its attempt to guidance and control cooperation implementation between local areas.

3.2 Financial Perspective

In financial perspective, from research data result has shown that there was a friction in Purabaya station cooperation management in its financial aspect and profit sharing. In financial aspect of Purabaya station for first period/pre-reform charged to Surabaya city government which came from Regional Expenditure Budget (APBD) of Surabaya city government and loan from National Expenditure Budget (APBN) from central government. While in profit sharing aspect in first period has identified that Surabaya city government gained 95% share, 50% for return of investment, 25% to cover operational cost and 20% for net income. While Sidoarjo district government gained 5% sharing from Purabaya station income.

While in second period/post-reform has identified that in financial aspect of Purabaya station is pure from Surabaya city Regional Expenditure Budget. Income share from Purabaya station was 70% for Surabaya city government, the details are 30% for operational budget and 40% net income. In fact, Sidoarjo district government was gained 30% of share from Purabaya station income.

Hattingh (1998:11) in his book "Governmental Relations: A South African Perspective", stated that financial approach in relationship between governments represent a financial relationship between different government institutions. Align with Hattingh statement (1998), Du Toit (1998) pointed that financial approach in Intergovernmental Relation (IGR) focused on responsibility of each government institutions which can be seen and financial resource which stick to its institutions. In normative perspective, which in Act number 23 year 2014 about financing relationship between local area has explained in clause 364 article 5 that cooperation implementation cost between local area must be calculated from each local area Regional Expenditure Budget (APBD).

Based on theoretical and normative elaboration result, if we contextualized with data founding in field about Purabaya station cooperation management, where operational cost aspect fully charged on Surabaya city government and sharing system aspect was refer to station gross income, identified that in financial perspective, Purabaya station in cooperation context was not representing fair cooperation in

operational cost (burdens) aspect and profit sharing aspect (benefits). While Yudhoyono (2003) stated that cooperation between local areas should give benefit aspects such as: sharing of experiences, sharing of benefits, and sharing of burdens. According to Act number 23 year 2014 clause 363 article 1 that local area allow to have cooperation considering of implementing efficient and effectiveness public service and mutual benefit.

Reality above has shown that for supporting cooperation implementation between local areas efficiently and effectively, in financial perspective, Purabaya station cooperation implementation was not still representing fair and proportional responsibility sharing of operational cost and profit between Surabaya city government and Sidoarjo district government. Friction only focused on profit sharing both local areas while financial aspect still charged on Surabaya city government. It also happened for profit sharing which still according to Purabaya station gross income. There should be friction/adjustment about responsibility sharing which fair and proportional towards operational cost and profit sharing of Purabaya station between both local areas (Hattingh, 1998, Du Toit, 1998, Yudhoyono, 2003) also change profit sharing system according to net income of Purabaya station as recommendation from east java Financial and development supervisory bodies (BPKP).

3.3 Democratic Perspective

In democratic perspective, based on data analysis in previous chapter that management cooperation of Purabaya station between Surabaya city government and Sidoarjo district government has some frictions. In early period/Pre-reform has identified that those cooperation management initiated by East Java province government, where Surabaya city government and Sidoarjo district government did not have authority to decide right and obligation in making cooperation agreement paper. In this period, whether Surabaya government or Sidoarjo government was only implementing technical policy which has already decided by east java governor number 645.7/9605/210/82 and number 645.7/27143/210/82. In cooperation paper between Second level of Surabaya city major and Second level of Sidoarjo district major year 1982, in clause 15 explained that Second level government in Surabaya and Sidoarjo obligate and responsible to process cooperation agreement conditions to make joint regional regulation.

When Purabaya station cooperation management come into second period/post-reform, where local autonomy has applied, the sustainability of Purabaya station cooperation management normatively, according to Regional government Act (Act 22 year 1999, Act 32 year 2004, and Act 23 year 2014), has been handed over to both local governments based on local autonomy principle. In this second period, both local government has already coordinated to make addendum towards their cooperation management paper. But since 2008 until 2014 still did not have a definitive deal about that agreement. For 6 years there was tug between local governments because they feel the one who got loss by the existence of Purabaya station. Surabaya government stated that kept having loss in operating Purabaya station, while Sidoarjo government claim that they did not gain transparency data about Purabaya station income and expenses, and also about negative impact of safety in Purabaya station area.

Along with the implementation of Act number 23 year 2014, relationship between Surabaya city government and Sidoarjo district government in context of Purabaya station cooperation management were kept unclear. It is because there are regulation in Act number 23 year 2014 which regulate that station type A, the authority is in central government. For Purabaya station which in Type A category automatically taken over by central government before become cooperation object of two local governments.

Main focused on democratic approach in cooperation relationship between local governments are giving autonomy right to local government (province government and city/district government). It implicate to increase local government independency (Hattingh, 1998:12). But in reality, tug will happen between local and central government authority in their effort to maintain and widen their authority (Hattingh, 1984:47). Explicitly, Hoessein (2001) stated that in unitary state context, although the relationship between central and local government have an organizational public characteristic, but the existence of local government still as a sub-ordinate and dependent towards central government. Hoessein statement (2001) align with Hattingh (1998:12) in a real world, the realistic of autonomy idea is that there are clear limitations/measurements from central government to give the autonomy to local government.

In a context of Purabaya station cooperation management that in democratic perspective, authority friction in cooperation implementation normatively already regulated in Local government Act (Act

number 22 year 1999, Act number 32 year 2004, Act number 23 year 2014) explained that Purabaya station management left entirely to government involved in the cooperation. But in reality, both local government directly involved in Purabaya station management did not make addendum towards Cooperation paper in 1982 and Joint agreement in 1991. Democratically, both legal standing should adjusted with how both local government coordinated to rearrange more proportional and fair agreements in right and obligation sharing each local government in Purabaya station management. As the implication of has not change of legal and administrative regulation from cooperation implementation, so what happen is a conflict occurred between Surabaya city government and Sidoarjo district government. Surabaya government claimed that they have right to manage everything about Purabaya station. While Sidoarjo government demanding the increasing of role and profit sharing of Purabaya station.

From theoretical elaboration result, normative discussion and data presentation concluded that in democratic perspective, Surabaya government still has a dominant role as main administrator of Purabaya station whether in local retribution withdrawal, financial management and Local Technical implementer Unit (UPTD) Purabaya station. This reality was not represented equality of right and obligation sharing in cooperation between local governments or in this matter the cooperation management of Purabaya station still authoritarian. About this, Hattingh (1998:12) confirmed that autonomy right stick to each local government representing the equality and dominancy power between autonomy areas. Therefore, cooperation built has able to reach local autonomy purpose which has tight relation with public service efficiency and affectivity.

4. CONCLUSION

According to the result data and research explained above, few conclusions from research findings are as follows: (a) in legal and administrative perspective, approach used in this cooperation management of Purabaya station still based on old regulation. (Cooperation paper 1982 and Joint Agreement in 1991). So, stagnancy of legal standing in local level implicated conflict interest between both local governments. (b) In financial perspective, cooperation approach having a friction in profit sharing aspect. In financial sector, whether in first or second still become a burdens for Surabaya city government. The different only in first period there was a loan from National Budget Expenditure (APBN) of central government. This reality has shown that in financial perspective, Cooperation management of Purabaya station was not representing fair and proportional sharing of burdens and sharing of benefits, so it was implicated a conflict occurred between both governments. (c) in democratic perspective, cooperation management of Purabaya station approach was having a friction. In first period/pre-reform both local governments (Surabaya and Sidoarjo) technically implementing based instruction from east java province government. While in second period/post-reform, Surabaya city government have right to manage and supervise Purabaya station management entirely. While Sidoarjo district government control public order and traffic around Purabaya station. This reality indicates that there was inequality in right and obligation sharing between both parties and implicates a conflict between Surabaya city government and Sidoarjo district government.

References

- [1]. Agranoff, Robert. 2003. *A New Look at the Value-Adding Functions of Governmental Networks*, paper presented for seventh national public management research conference, georgetown university, october 9-11,2003.
- [2]. Aruan, Nakkok. 2007. *Potensi Konflik Kerjasama Pengelolaan Terminal Purabaya*. ITS Press.
- [3]. Du Toit, D.F.P., Van der Waldt, G., Bayat, M.S. & Cheminai, J. 1998. *Public Administration and Management for Effective Governance*. Cape Town: Juta & C0.Ltd
- [4]. Hattingh, J.J. 1998. *Governmental Relations: A South African Perspective*. Pretora. University of South Africa
- [5]. Hoessein, Bhenyamin. 2001a. *Prospek Resolusi Kebijakan dan Implementasi Otonomi daerah dari sudut pandang hukum tata Negara*. Makalah dalam seminar dan lokakarya nasional strategi resolusi kebijakan dan implementasi otonomi daerah dalam kerangka Good governance yang diselenggarakan Pusat kajian Kinerja Otonomi daerah. Lembaga Administrasi Negara. Jakarta: 30 Oktober
- [6]. _____. 2001b. *kewenangan pengelolaan sumberdaya alam dalam pelaksanaan otonomi daerah*. Makalah dalam seminar : Pemberdayaan daerah dalam pelaksanaan otonomi daerah yang diselenggarakan badan Pembinaan Hukum Nasional Departemen Kehakiman dan Hak Asasi Manusia RI. Jakarta: 30-31 Oktober.
- [7]. Keban, Jeremias, T. 2009. *Membangun kerjasama Antar Daerah dalam era Otonomi*. Jurnal Ilmu Pemerintahan. Jakarta.
- [8]. Keputusan Bersama Walikotamadya KDH II Surabaya dan Bupati KDH II Sidoarjo Nomor 30 dan Nomor 32 Tahun 1991 tentang Pengelolaan Terminal Angkutan Penumpang Umum Antar Kota.
- [9]. Keputusan BPKP Nomor LS-40/PW13/3/2015 tentang laporan Review atas Perjanjian Kerjasama Pengelolaan Terminal Purabaya antara Pemerintah Kota Surabaya dengan Pemerintah Kabupaten Sidoarjo
- [10]. Mattew B. Miles, A. Michael Hubberman, and Johnny Saldana (2014). *Qualitative Data Analysis: A Methods Sourcebook (3rd Edition) Arizona State University, CA: Sage Publications*.
- [11]. Roux. Et.al. 1996. *Critical issues in Public Management and Administration in South Africa*. Pretoria. Kagiso Tertiary.
- [12]. Smith, B.C. 1985. *Decentralization: The Territorial Dimension of The State*. George Allen & Urwin: Sydney Australia.
- [13]. Supriyono, Bambang. 2010. *Sistem Pemerintahan Daerah Berbasis Masyarakat Multikultural*. Pidato Pengukuhan Jabatan Guru Besar dalam bidang Ilmu Sistem Pemerintahan Daerah pada Fakultas Ilmu Administrasi Universitas Brawijaya Malang. FIA-UB Malang.
- [14]. Undang-Undang Nomor 22 tahun 1999 tentang Pemerintahan Daerah
- [15]. Undang-Undang Nomor 32 tahun 2004 tentang Pemerintahan Daerah
- [16]. Undang-Undang Nomor 23 tahun 2014 tentang Pemerintahan Daerah
- [17]. Yudhoyono, S.B. 2003. *Pentingnya Networking Antara Pilar Good Governance dan Antar Daerah sebagai wujud Integritas Nasional dalam Menghadapi Era Perdagangan Bebas ASEAN tahun 2003* dalam Pratikno Kerjasama antar Daerah. Kompleksitas dan Tawaran Kelembagaan. Program S2 PLOD dan J.I.P. FISIPOL. UGM. Yogyakarta