

Multi Stakeholders Governance Body Model in Achieving The Excellence Public Policy

¹ NOVITA TRESIANA,² NOVERMAN DUADJI

^{1,2} FISIP Unila, Jl. Prof. Soemantri Brojonegoro 1 Bandarlampung
email: ¹ novitaresiana@yahoo.co.id, ² novermanduadji@yahoo.co.id

Abstract. The phenomenon of the government failure in the rural can be viewed on the lack of the provision of public facilities. This study aims to: 1) analyze the reasons of failure of village government in producing an excellence policy; 2) analyze the existing institutions in the community, as the realization of the carrying capacity of an excellence policy; and 3) develop a model of institutional strengthening to achieve the excellence of public policy. This study uses a qualitative approach with description methods. The data used is the primary and secondary data. Secondary data were obtained from the local government in the form of the relevant documentation. The primary data obtained from interviews, observation, focus group discussions. The data collected are analyzed qualitative descriptive. The results show that the failure of development due to the institutional model of village planning meetings is bureaucratic, formalism and the measurement focuses on the process instead of the result. There are no institutional supporting communities and the village planning meetings do not involve stakeholders. Required solutions are in the form of representative models of institutional strengthening, and the necessity to know to the community residents through a deliberative forum with a multi stakeholders.

Keywords: multi stakeholders, governance body

Introduction

The phenomenon of the failure of the local government in the context of rural development is a condition in which the government does not have the governability capacity, which is characterized by low capacity of the government in the provision of public means goods in the village. Research conducted by Akadun (Akadun, 2011: 190) found some evidence of failures in public participation model that emphasizes political and administrative factors, yet the prepared without any preparation of the framework and mechanisms of how participation takes place, and has not yet developed an alternative model of community empowerment. Mulyawan (2012: 162) reinforce the above opinion by portraying poor performance of organization of civic governance, which essentially is a participatory development model, which requires the development of a community-based management. Fisabililahi, Vidayani and Hudalah (2014: 218) through their research complements of the above

arguments by highlighting the importance of social capital that should possess by every actor involved in participation of the village. Special local government, research conducted by Tresiana and Duadji (2015: 1) in South Lampung regency as the selected sites, have found the government's failure in the provision of public goods in the village, although *musrenbang* (Development Planning Forum) village should be an institutional forum of deliberative (consultation) official and formal already available, but it has not been able to produce an excellence policy / program development which, capable of solving the problem of poverty.

The study focused on rural development planning which is an application of the idea of deepening democracy, promoted by UNDP (in Nugroho, 2012: 13), as an idea which characterless bottom up, involving multi-stakeholders in the community, allowing every citizen to participate in a system of local governance (Denhardt & Denhardt, 2013: 35). The application of this idea is

Received: June 19, 2016, **Revision:** August 29, 2016, **Accepted:** December 30, 2016

Print ISSN: 0215-8175; **Online ISSN:** 2303-2499. Copyright@2016. Published by Pusat Penerbitan Universitas (P2U) LPPM Unisba Accredited by DIKTI. SK Kemendikbud, No.040/P/2014, valid 18-02-2014 until 18-02-2019

considered to be implemented in the village and will be a panacea to overcome the failure of rural development.

The election focus on rural development planning as an object of study is in the underlying considerations: (1) *musrenbang* village is a forum of deliberative (deliberation) formulation of policies / programs villages interactive, it should be developed jointly between the government and society; (2) the benchmark of the success of *musrenbang* village is the active involvement of multi-stakeholders in the village, in the form of participation, deliberation, negotiation, and the support, to overcome poverty; (3) in a public policy perspective, the model describes the village *musrenbang* deliberative policy that emphasizes the involvement of the parties' arguments, deliberations and negotiations of the parties outside the village government. The Deliberative model is what is considered as the embodiment of the *deepening democracy* concept, which is believed to be capable of producing excellence public policies and capable of tackling the poverty.

The idea of deepening democracy is a model through the involvement and active participation of all citizens in the policy/ program villages, ranging from the formulation, implementation, and evaluation. The strength of this model is the democratic process and not the outcome / output democracy. This has led to dissatisfaction and failure phenomenon of the government in the provision of public goods. This model is certainly still needed for the growth of democracy, but as stated by Akadun (2011: 191), it is more important to revitalize this model at the right place and suitable to grow and develop public participation in every process and mechanism of *musrenbang* village, to produce a model of community empowerment that could have implications for improving the welfare of the community. Through the understanding, the authors see no logical of unbroken chain that must be addressed, where deepening democracy is seen as a goal and the person elected is just a tool in a process of selection. Democracy that is expected in the village, is a working democracy. Mulyawan stated (2012: 1), the basic of decomcracy is to strengthen the civic governance, which means an action is needed to open a forum of interaction and discussion among all local governance stakeholders (government, civil society, businessmen), in order to cook up development policies and programs which superior (excellence policy),

so that the welfare of rural communities can be manifested.

At this point, the importance of a change on deepening democracy towards deliberative democracy (Hajer and Wagenaar, 2003: 23-24) needs to be done so that the excellence of the policy will be produced by local governance stakeholders (Denhardt and Denhardt, 2013: 35). These are the essentials points to put the correct understanding of the democracy in the country. Democracy must be interpreted as the beginning of the process (primary) towards supporting efforts of interaction of respective stakeholders to work together, mutually reinforcing, supervise (check and balance) and negotiate their interests. a policy substance rooted in the local context for implementing the common consensus among local stakeholders governance as a manifestation of the strength of the government to achieve the goal, namely the success of producing superior policies/ programs. Without such understanding, it's difficult for policy and program development to realize the people's welfare.

The various fact of the failure of the development in South Lampung reGENCY, requires a serious efforts as to improve *musrenbang*. Therefore the keyword policy/ program chosen determined how the implementation of democratic governance towards the implementation of the deliberative policy. One effort to overcome this problem is to develop a model of a multi-stakeholders governance body.

The study describes the three points, namely: (1) analyzing the factors causing the failure of the government to produce a policy that is superior, which is able to solve the problems of society; (2) analyzing the institutional-institutions in the community, as the carrying capacity of the realization of the policy is superior; (3) developing a model of institutional strengthening to achieve superior public policy. The usefulness of this study is to contribute to the development of public policy, especially in the formulation of public policies oriented to democratization, promote the involvement and active participation of multi-stakeholders in the formulation process. It is also helpful in recommending policies to *musrenbang* village, which can be managed in a more targeted, appropriate methods and in accordance with its objectives, so that the product of deliberation of rural development does not stop in the process of democratization alone, the excellence of public policy objectives

Table 1
Occupation Profile in South Lampung

No.	Business Field	Population		Amount
		Male	Female	
1	Agriculture	83.451	33.289	116.740
2	Industry	62.863	8.272	71.135
3	Service	119.815	71.808	191.622
	Total	266.129	113.368	379.497

Source: South Lampung in Figures, BPS 2014

Table 2
Number of Family Based on Welfare at South Lampung

Region	Pre-Welfare	Level of Welfare				Total
		I	II	III	III+	
Lampung Selatan	105,345	61,216	56,394	30,691	2,346	255,992

Source: South Lampung in Figures, BPS Lampung Selatan 2014

and the real product of *musrenbang* village.

This research uses descriptive qualitative method, which seeks to describe the process and the essence of life of local governance stakeholders' interactions. The focus of research is directed to process and the efforts that made to produce excellence the policy and should be done in a forum *musrenbang* villages in South Lampung Regency of Lampung Province. The data used are primary and secondary data. Secondary data were obtained from the local government in the form of the relevant documentation. The primary data obtained from interviews and observations. Techniques of collecting is done by (1) observation; (2) In-depth interviews; (3) Documents; and (4) Focus Group Discussion (FGD). Data were collected, analyzed by qualitative analysis using the interactive model of Miles and Huberman (1992: 132). Location of the study was conducted in 9 (nine) selected villages in South Lampung regency, namely: Village Karang Anyar, Budi Lestari, Jati Mulyo, Margo Mulyo, Merak Batin, Pancasila, Pemanggilan, Way Galih and Suka Marga.

Poverty Overview in South Lampung Regency

South Lampung regency is the location of this study. The total area of the district is 2.007,01 km. The number of people living in this area is 932 552 inhabitants are distributed into 17 subdistricts and 256 villages with a growth rate of 1.1%. In terms of poverty, in

2014 the carrying amount of 177.740 people or 19.23% of the poor in the district. When viewed from the working population, the field of business/society main job is reflected in the table 2 (BPS South Lampung Regency, 2014)

Observing the above issues, according to Chambers (1983: 83), the core of the problem of rural poverty lies in the influx of people into deprivation trap. First, the reality (empirical) field observation and residence documents as shown in the above table shows that the villagers in this district are poor, which from 366.234 the number of families (KK) that is, in the ratio indicates 98.98% KK is still at the level of the family pre-prosperous, prosperous 1, 2 and prosperous 3; while only 1: 02% are categorized as a prosperous plus. Secondly, much physical weakness is caused by lack of capacity (purchasing power) of society towards family nutrition and limited health facilities (health facilities, medical personnel and medicines). Third, isolation/ insulation due to the many infrastructures damaged and abandoned that cause high economic cost. Fourth, susceptibility / vulnerability is a condition in which a poor family does not have the mental and material readiness in the face of a difficult situation. Fifth, helplessness is a reflection of the poor were objects, not placed as the subject. Not a few elite surrounding the functioning of the poor themselves as persons who solicit help (APBDes) is actually used for the poor.

The above description illustrates that

the cause of the poverty of rural communities caused more by structural factors (policy bias). To overcome this problem, the necessary steps and efforts are needed to be done by all parties. Measures and efforts need to be directed towards the strengthening of 8 (eight) elements of basic social force poor people as expressed by Friedmann (1992: 97), namely: (1) The defense of living space; (2) the creation of leisure time; (3) knowledge and skills; (4) the right information; (5) social organizations; (6) social networks; (7) means in the work environment; (8) financial resources. Eighth these forces will be realized through the availability of space and public participation in the policy formulation process (program) development at all levels of commitment and real protection from the government.

Analysis of Causes of Failure in Producing Excellence Policy

Analysis of the factors causing the failure of village government in developing policies and programs that focused on the process and implementation of the development planning meetings (*musrenbang*) village, as one of the vehicles of public participation. *Musrenbang* Village is concrete efforts undertaken by the government as a step to realizing participatory planning, where the community is considered as one component in development of policy stakeholders. Processes

in *musrenbang* village is expected to bring a sense of belonging (sense of belonging), involvement (sense of participation) and partly responsible for the success of development efforts (sense of accountability) so that the management of rural development really reflects the community-based resource paradigm (in Tresiana and Duadji, 2015: 73). In a public policy perspective, the model describes the village *musrenbang* deliberative policy (consultation) which requires the active involvement of multi stakeholders in the village, in the form of role, deliberation, negotiation, support. Model deliberative policy is what is considered as the actualization of deepening the concept of democracy (in Nugroho, 2012: 13), which is believed to produce excellence public policy or public policy that is superior (Nugroho, 2012: 765), that are expected to overcome poverty area.

Musrenbang village is a series of important activities in preparation of an integrated national development plan. These activities are carried out every year; the first phase is done at the village level and then the district level. The proposal prepared and submitted in stages / terraced ranging from the level of RT / RW, rural / urban villages and sub-districts. Data proposals from all villages / wards that have been collected, will be compiled and discussed. This district meeting results set forth in the documents as

Table 3
Weaknesses of Musrenbang in the Village

Village	Main Actor	Involvement	Form	Activities	Committee	Mechanism	Institution
Karang Anyar	Village Government	Limited	Formal Meeting	Socialization	Village Government	Procedural	There is no
Budi Lestari	Village Government	Limited	Formal Meeting	Socialization	Village Government	Procedural	There is no
Jati Mulyo	Village Government	Limited	Formal Meeting	Socialization	Village Government	Procedural	There is no
Margo Mulyo	Village Government	Limited	Formal Meeting	Socialization	Village Government	Procedural	There is no
Merak Batin	Village Government	Limited	Formal Meeting	Socialization	Village Government	Procedural	There is no
Pancasila	Village Government	Limited	Formal Meeting	Socialization	Village Government	Procedural	There is no
Pemang-gilan	Village Government	Limited	Formal Meeting	Socialization	Village Government	Procedural	There is no
Way Galih	Village Government	Limited	Formal Meeting	Socialization	Village Government	Procedural	There is no
Suka Marga	Village Government	Limited	Formal Meeting	Socialization	Village Government	Procedural	There is no

Source: Interview and Observation in 2015 (in Tresiana dan Duadji 2015)

Table 4
Types of Grassroots Organization in South Lampung

No	Regency	Types of Organization								Total	
		NGO		Social Organization		Government Maked Organization		Cultural Organization			
		Amount	%	Amount	%	Amount	%	Amount	%	Amount	%
1	South Lampung	66	11.8	120	21.5	7	1.3	365	65.4	558	10

Source: adopted from Kesbanglinmas document of social organization, observation note and questionnaire at South Lampung, may-June 2015 (in Tresiana & Duadji, 2015)

a list of proposed activities will be proposed district *Musrenbang* district / city level. At this stage of *musrenbang* districts / cities, all the aspirations that go through *musrenbang* districts will be accommodated together with the proposed activities of each working unit (SKPD). At this stage SKPD will verify the proposal outlined in the districts before the proposed list of activities on education. Programme / proposed activities that have passed the verification stage will be set forth in the Work Plan Work Unit area (Renja-SKPD), and subsequently to the provincial and national level. This long process, expected at the village level to obtain benefits as follow: (1) the villagers started to learn empowering authority of their roles and functions that they began to be responsible for the implementation and results of a joint decisio; (2) the quality of decision *Musrenbang* Desa (Development Village and RKP Desa) become more qualified as directly related to the issue, the interests and needs of rural people so that it will have an impact on the productivity of the results achieved; (3) strong commitment of the community to the decisions they adds zest and satisfaction to realize the benefit of their participation in *Musrenbang* (Tresiana and Duadji, 2015: 54).

Based on interviews, observation and FGD informant related to selected research sites, it is found that general *musrenbang* village is just held a regular agenda, annual and a formality. Substantively, it doesn't convey important issues and needs of rural people. Implementation of the government is still dominated by the village, while elements of the stakeholders have a low representation. The process of *musrenbang* village, new limited supporting data collection activities for *Musrenbang* District and District *Musrenbang* so that the programs were arranged over the government 's development plans and the District of the District government.

The overview weakness of *musrenbang* villages are: (1) on the side of the mechanism, the participatory planning process still is rhetorical, because actor important and dominant in the formulation of development planning in the village is the village government; (2) on the process side, only contain activities such as exposure of the head village and devices. Participants are only given the opportunity to ask questions about these activities. There are no discussions and negotiations (dialogue) between village government with the participants about issues or problems as well as problem solving; (3) on the side of the content / quality of the program, still low and less systematic and only contain a recapitulation of activities and the funds needed. In terms of destinations, how to realize the activities and time are not described in detail; (4) Involvement of stakeholders, not represented as a whole, only by BPD, Head of The village, LPMD Chairman, Chairman of the PKK and Community Leaders. They know, while the interest of organizations such as NGOs, local institutions, traditional leaders, or private organizations are not included in the participant *musrenbang*. Ideally, at least attended by the Village, BPD Member, Board LPMD, Community Groups (Karang Taruna, Takmir Mosque, Farmers Group, and so on), Kader Women (PKK, Posyandu), and Representative Hamlet taking into account gender balance.

Interviews and observations revealed the weaknesses in village *musrenbang*, which are: First, it was revealed that the elected village head had no experience of how to govern of the village and the document RKP many previous villages was a copy and paste from another village planning documents. Second, it was revealed that *musrenbang* scheduling stages starting from the formation of the team who will compose RKP *musrenbang* village, it was formed

Table 5
Pattern Affiliates (Association) Based on The Trend Orientation
Activities Local Institutional in South Lampung Regency

District	Organizational forms	Shape / pattern of participation										Total	
		PP		MM		DPG		CP		MP			
		Amo-unt	%	Amo-unt	%	Am-ount	%	Amo-unt	%	Amo-unt	%	Amo-unt	%
South Lampung	NGO	0	0	4	6.06	3	4.55	59	89.4	0	0	66	100
	Social organization	0	0	0	0	0	0	120	100	0	0	120	100
	Government Maked Organization	0	0	0	0	7	100	0	0	0	0	7	100
	Cultural Organization	0	0	0	0	0	0	365	100	0	0	365	100
	Total	0	0	4	0.72	10	1.79	544	97.5	0	0	558	100

PP=political participation ; MM=The mass movement; DPG= democratic participation in government; CP=Community participation; and MP: more participation.

Source: adopted from Kesbanglinmas document of social organization, observation note and questionnaire at South Lampung, may-june 2015 (in Tresiana & Duadji, 2015)

in a hurry and it found but the team without preparation. Third, the absence of organized meetings with people (deliberative forum does not exist), but these things can be overcome by using a social gathering event (Mr. and Mrs.) Women's groups should be facilitated by the forum itself, that is when a meeting of PKK cadres and integrated to ensure the proposed women's groups are accommodated; Fourth, many institutional local can be used to capture the aspirations of citizens. Community leaders have the ability to capture the perceived problems in society. Their closeness to society and their persona becomes the key to success to resolve the stagnation of the dialogue (a forum of citizens).

The implications are apparent from the village *musrenbang* mapping, envisaged development planning models tend to cause the villagers dependent on development funds from the local government, a model from one village to another is almost similar, tends to connote merely physical development (not substantive). Innovation development does not occur in the actual development model of designed patterned bottom up, but in reality, its implementation is top down colored pattern. Akadun (2011:190) through his research confirms that the action of lie to the public and violation to democratic ethic. Causing for the low involvement of various elements (stakeholders) at the village level. Such practices at selected locations not only violates the basic mechanisms that have been outlined but the tronic reality showed that

the programs do not touch the real problems faced by people in the village and that is the root which caused the failure of development.

Institutional Analysis: Community Needs and Capability Policy for Excellence

Contextually, the life and environment of democratic governance is an energy booster as well as a creation of democratic civil society are characterized by growth and development of grassroots institutions. Grassroots institutions of civil society is an association formed on a voluntary basis, common background, and similarities of interest on a local scale and specific domain among grassroots communities (growing from the bottom layer). It was not structured to the level of international, even less so, grassroots organizations grow only at a local level. Tresiana research results and Duadji (2015: 62), in general, grassroots organizations in South Lampung, include a diversity of spaces, actors and institutional forms with variations in the level of formality, autonomy and power respectively. Arena institutions are often manifested in the form of grassroots organizations such as charities, organizations, non-governmental development organizations, community groups (clubs, associations, traditional institutions), women's organizations, faith-based organizations, professionals, trade unions, self-help groups, social movements, business associations, coalitions and advocacy groups. In short, all institutions or

Table 6
Media and Forms of Participation in The Formulation of Program

Regency	Types of Organization	Participation media & authority relations	Types of participation
South Lampung	NGO	Rural development planning meetings. Public Hearing	Being an active participant Initiator and Originator
	Social organization	Rural development planning meetings. Public Hearing	Being an active participant Initiator and Originator
	Government Maked Organization	Rural development Planning meetings.	Being a passive participant
	Cultural Organization	Deliberation and Indigenous Meetings Democratic Party	Proposed Program Activities Statement attitude and determination good choice for Chief Pekon as well as Regent and Vice Regent

Source: adopted from Kesbanglinmas document of social organization, observation note and questionnaire at South Lampung, may-june 2015 (in Tresiana & Duadji, 2015)

Table 7
The Tendency Value of Local Institutions in South Lampung Regency

No	Form Organization	The tendency Value		
		Social	Economy (Productive Business Development)	Politics and Development (Governance)
1	NGO	Interests Orientation Elite	Undeveloped	Issue maker, negotiations interests with government
2	Social organization	Interests Orientation Elite	Undeveloped	Issue maker, negotiations interests with government
3	Government Makes Organization	balancing social strength	Providing assistance on behalf of the ruling elite	Instrument power of Government
4	Cultural Organization	Harmony, Tolerance mutual cooperation, Kinship, Entanglement ethnicity / culture Social care, Adherence to traditional leaders	Undeveloped	Participation is merely a proposal, statement and participation in the democratic party

Source: Results of observation data processing, documentation, simulation and FGD 2015 (in Tresiana and Duadji, 2015)

organizations outside the context of state and private organizations can be organized into grassroots institutions.

Based on interviews, observation, and documentation, and mapping the indication governance body in South Lampung regency ,it was found, that the participation of the villagers change power relations and ties of citizenship with the opening of new the halls of power (spaces of power). This situation

allows a group of citizens who have been marginalized, have room to improve the representation of non-parties, which, based on the key issues and citizen participation. Impact, spaces, and new powers have pushed the authorities as strong parties willing to give up some of their power and believe that ordinary people have the right to participate in government. The author puts citizens forum best suited for the new spaces of power that is distributed in the context of citizenship.

Gaventa and Valderama (2001: 106), take a closer look at other forms of space in which participation occurs and believes that they must be understood in the context of how the spaces were created. Further confirmed that discrimination based on the participation of a number of factors, including space law (invited space) formed from above, either by the donor or government intervention, in the space allotted through collective action from below (a popular space). Therefore, the participation of villagers through citizen forums, to orientate the creation of spaces where citizens talk by thematic issues that stem from their knowledge and capacity. Attention and responsiveness form of government to be a room to listen. The process, proved that there is no perfect power, so that it always requires daily interaction with the mandate givers to listen to their voice, and make their views into consideration for the decision, or even the decision that was made jointly.

Based on the concepts put forward by Villarin (in Gaventa and Valderama: 2001: 42) regarding the form of citizen participation, it was explained that the context and substance of the participation of local organizations or institutions in South Lampung regency, patterns of affiliation (bond) institutional follow the trend of orientation activities. For the case of institutions in South Lampung regency have identified that the pattern of the NGO affiliate of 6.06% tendency of orientation activities leading to the mass movement patterns of participation. As much as 4.55% was classified as democratic participation in government (PDP) with the form of the action (participation) that represents the component (element) community in the planning and budgeting of development programs, both at the level *musrenbang* village/sub-district, district and at the district level. Unfortunately, this pattern character is still on the participation of the mandate of the local government, the relationship is spontaneous and short-term as well as the benefits which still limited to the fulfillment of interests and alliances not touched the issue of substantive elite members of society (public) wider. Then, 89.4% of the number of existing NGOs, participation is more oriented towards community participation (PK). Character pattern is still limited to the fulfillment of the rights movement of the delivery of opinion and media scrutiny statement as a citizen on the governance and implementation of development programs (governance). While 365 to 120 CBOs and

traditional institutions in South Lampung regency, patterns of orientation activities are 100% focused on community participation. The character of this pattern is still limited to a spontaneous movement as an effort to fulfill the rights and freedoms constitutional citizens to assembly, association, and expression on various problems of their communities. While the seven institutions / organizations formed by the local government, the pattern is more affiliates is oriented on democratic participation in government (PDP). Therefore, built strategic alliances are pseudo and substantively no voice and promote the interests of the wider public. Thus, the pattern of institutional affiliation in South Lampung regency amounted 0:51 tendency towards mass movements, 1.91% lead to democratic participation in government (PDP) and amounted to 97.6% lead to community participation (PK).

In general, forum *musrenbang* is considered as a media of participation and institutional relations between local authorities and regional government. The pattern of the forum are the limited participation in the proposed program, the statement attitudes, opinions, and expectations of citizens. These patterns are not yet binding. The analysis of the location of research illustrated that the forerunner to the popular forum in South Lampung regency can actually be a quite important force in politics and village governance. Occurrences forum activities of residents in some villages have the potential to build trust and social capital among community groups, and can form a partnership between the villagers and the village government. Fisabililah, Vidayani and Hudalah (2014: 218) says, with its components of social capital, ie the interaction, similarity of cultural values, networks, trust, solidarity, mutual relations between citizens and the government, then it could be carrying the success, that it is necessary supported by institutional collective action.

The existence of citizen forum, as institutional embodiment of collective action is the media to mobilize citizen involvement in the development context. This forum is used by villagers to formulate joint problems, find solutions to the problems faced by the community. The existence of citizen forums is an alliance of various non-governmental organizations (NGOs / NGOs), community-based organizations, associations, as well as local luminaries.

Institutional Development Model-Based Multi Stakeholders Governance Body

To realize excellence public policy, it is necessary to repair the specific model which in accordance with the realities faced by local communities/villages, with space (body) are right. The hope is to optimize the existing public policies, and to anticipate the failure of local authorities in the provision of public goods. For those reasons, the model of multi-stakeholders governance body needs to be done as shown in Figures 1 and 2 below.

The determination of institutional development model based multi-stakeholders governance body resulting from some findings from the field, namely: 1) The root of the problem of failure in policy formulation because of existing institutional weaknesses, namely *musrenbang* village as an institution that is not entrenched, formalistic and autocratic. Therefore, to solve these problems, which need to be touched is the institutional design *musrenbang* village. 2) An aspect of governance body is alive, growing and has become a community needs. Institutional popular expectations, the main point of activity and awareness in participating actively in the preparation of the program, because the process of egalitarian interaction will be more intertwined and look if it becomes wishes of the people.

The root of the problem lies in recognized institutions, namely *musrenbang* as an idea of deepening democracy in the country. Scans taken by Tresiana and Duadji (2015: 77) to the forum for this *munsrenbang* found a number of weaknesses in almost all levels. Planning meetings at lower levels also experienced distortions in its implementation. Facts of research findings, describe *musrenbang*, as a manifestation of the idea of deepening democracy and newly interpreted and simply stop to the point of the "process" and not the "outcome / output". Some characters who often appear in the implementation of deepening democracy, as pointed out by Nugroho (2012: 13): First, the understanding, and implementation of democracy areas pseudo, which on the one hand occurred advances form, but on the other form no changes or developments in quality of the substance of the policies which made and implemented. Second, democracy is understood as part of the outer skin of governance, namely political democratization

domain, where the output of the parameters is measured organizing political democracy (the pull of decision-making) and not the result of a superior public policy. At this point, which is a weakness as well as a critique of the idea of deepening democracy in the context of *musrenbang* village. *Musrenbang* village as if viewed as an end, but it was just a tool and process selected. Democracy expected in the village is working democracy. This means that after *musrenbang*, the most important is the excellence of public policy, which is a post-factum of deepening democracy (Nugroho, 2012: 25).

Figures 1 and 2 is a correction of the manifestations of heart of village life, namely, democracy and it is a good product that is superior policy (excellence policy), which was developed in the context of democratic process. Therefore, the action is required to open the forum of interaction and discussion among all local governance stakeholders (government, civil society, private sector) for brewing rural development excellence policies and programs so that the welfare of rural communities can be realized. The result of all of the outer shape is a public service that is based on good governance, and strengthening of civic governance (Mulyawan, 2012: 157).

Development towards deepening democracy deliberative democracy (democratic dialogue, significant involvement of citizens) needs to be done immediately. Local governance stakeholders will produce an excellence policy. The idea of deepening democracy, are still needed for the growth of democracy in the country, but more important to realize, revitalize and put the idea of deepening democracy in the right place and suitable to cultivate dialogue, public participation in *musrenbang* village. It can produce policies and programs development as the solution of problems and in fact has implications for improving the welfare of rural communities.

To gather all parties and institution related to take part in the development of a village, it requires instruments as: (1) improvement of the process of representation, decision making processes, and power tie-making forum and forums deliberation of villagers in making public policy/program villages and monitoring of rural development; (2) the design of these practices of citizen participation at the local level which give benefits can be felt by the citizens and by the ruling government. Legal instruments and policy

operations is certainly very necessary in practice the participation of villagers; (3) participation of citizens do not serve only as a means of consolidation of local resources, but it must have a direct impact on the change of power relations that encourage the deepening of democracy and the creation of justice among community groups, and between genders. This cooperation is mainly focused on utilizing the "new space" participation of villagers who had been granted by the law into practice. Furthermore, a variety of practices that ever existed, is still alive and reference for designing the more functional policy of citizen participation.

The idea of a development model in order to strengthen the capacity of government through institutional strengthening, which is the utilization of new space for dialogue and community involvement, in the form of models of multi stakeholders governance body aligned and in conformity with the statement Siang Neo and Geraldine (2009: 51), that reinforces the government do to strengthen the ability government in building an excellence public policy. Denhardt and Denhardt (2013: 254), through the perspective of new public services, reinforces the above, with a view, that the service starts from an important position as the government and citizens are able to act together for the greater good. The new public service, cultivate shared values and common interests through dialogue and wide spread citizen engagement.

The form of new space for the success of village *musrenbang* is the establishment of a deliberative forum, where residents speak thematic issues that stem from the knowledge and capacity of citizens. On the other hand, the attention and shape of responsiveness of the village government into a room to listen, so that the process, prove there is no perfect power. It always require daily interaction with citizens, to listen to their voice, and make their opinions for consideration in the decision, or even the decision was made jointly. This is where the spaces are called Denhardt and Denhardt (2013: 254) as a space of power that occurred. Forms of the popular deliberative forum in the village is a Forum Citizens and Stakeholders Forum.

The findings were described by Tresiana and Duadji (2015: 79), indicating the presence of citizen forums in South Lampung can be used to formulate the problem together, find solutions to the problems faced by rural communities, and hope it can provide

recommendations for action particular, as well as media conflict resolution at the local level. The forerunner of citizen forums in South Lampung regency found an alliance of non-governmental organizations, community based organizations, associations/groups of sectorial and local luminaries. Forum residents often perform its function in correcting the distortion that occurs in the decision-making system in the village. Occurrences forum of citizens into a new room, for its the character and unique role. Hence the development of this model is believed to have the potential to build trust and social capital among community groups as well as build trust and partnership between the public and officials.

Furthermore, the forum residents should be upgraded to a multi-stakeholders forum. In further stages, this forum may form organizations or implementing agencies (pushed into a formal organization or institution) if necessary in accordance with the dynamics and local needs. There are several reasons and advantages gained from multi stakeholders forum as proposed by Tresiana and Duadji (2015: 81): (1) Participation is a right of citizens, which is part of the rights inherent in every citizen. Recognition of these rights contained in the International Covenant and Legislation in force in our country; (2) Public participation and transparency in village governance has proven to provide a significant contribution to the improvement of good governance, to facilitate the implementation because the trust has been built; (3) Reflection experience of program / projects earlier (eg PNPM) with no or less participative cause failure; (4) The participation proved to increase public confidence; (5) Participation, including of women and marginalized groups will ensure sustainability.

While the advantages are: (1) developing an understanding of cross actors and stakeholders to improving the performance of policies/programs of rural development; (2) Building commitment and togetherness of multi stakeholders to work as a team to support various efforts to improve rural development programs; (3) All parties agree on the benchmark performance improvement policies/programs of rural development.

Conclusions

The failure of development in South Lampung regency is caused by *musrenbang*

institutional model village as a manifestation of the idea of deepening democracy based on village democracy, which is not able to produce excellent policies / programs. The cause is the meaning of *musrenbang* village which stressed on the outcome/output, occurred advances form, without any changes, output parameter measured from the implementation of political democracy which give us the result. This is the weak point as well as a critique to the idea of deepening democracy. An essential element for the achievement of excellence of public policy, necessary don through an institutional model of development that is expected to become a new space of dialogue and community involvement.

The realization of new space to the success of the village *musrenbang* result is the formation of a deliberative forum, multi-stakeholder forum, which is expected to replace the pre *musrenbang* village, and placed as the highest positions in the village *musrenbang* forum. Suggestions are: (1) the political aspects, citizen forum/ multi-stakeholders will be effective if it is provided the rules villages; (2) the dimensions of the membership, required the involvement of community characteristics variation in citizen forums / multi-stakeholders; (3) in the social dimension, the trust is necessary to bord between the citizens, the community leaders, traditional leaders and village government; (4) Developing the broad dimension of social networks, which covers all area of dimensions, and other development sectors.

References

- Akadun. (2011). *Revitalisasi Forum Musrenbang Sebagai Wahana Partisipasi Masyarakat Dalam Perencanaan Pembangunan Daerah*. Mimbar, Jurnal Sosial dan Pembangunan Vol. XXVII Nomor 2, Desember, pp.183-191.
- BPS. (2014). *Lampung Selatan dalam Angka*. Badan Pusat Statistik Kabupaten Lampung Selatan
- Chambers, Robert. (1983). *Rural Development: Putting the Last First*. New York: Longman
- Denhardt, Janet dan Denhardt, Robert. (2013). *Pelayanan Publik Baru: Dari Manajemen Steering Ke Serving*. Yogyakarta: Kreasi Wacana.
- Fisabilillah, Vidayani dan Hudalah.(2014). *Pera n Modal Sosial Dalam Kerjasama Antar Daerah Kartamantul*. Mimbar, Jurnal Sosial dan Pembangunan Vol. 30 Nomor 2, Desember, pp.209-219
- Friedmann, J .(1992). *Empowerment:The Politics of Alternative Development*. Cambridge Massachusetts: Blackwell Publisher.
- Gaventa, J. &Valderama, C. (2001). *Participation, Citizenship and Local Government: Background note prepared for workshop on Strengthening participation in local governance*. Institute of Development Studies.
- Hajer, Maarten, A. and Henderik Wagenaar (eds). (2003). *Deliberative Policy Analysis, Understanding Governance in The Network Society*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Miles, Matthew dan Huberman Michael. (1992). *Analisis Data Kualitatif: Buku Sumber Tentang Metode-Metode Baru*. Jakarta: Universitas Indonesia Press.
- Mulyawan,Rahman.(2012). *Penguatan Civic Governance Melalui Partisipasi Masyarakat Dalam Proses Penyelenggaraan Pemerintahan*. Mimbar, Jurnal Sosial dan Pembangunan Vol. 28 Nomor 2, Desember, pp.157-162.
- Neo, Boon Siong & Chen, Geraldine. (2009). *Dynamic Governance: Embedding Culture, Capabilities and Change in Singapore*. Singapore: World Scientific Publishing Co. Pte Ltd.
- Nugroho, Riant. (2012). *Public Policy*. Jakarta: Elex Media Komputindo
- Tresiana dan Duadji. (2015). *Laporan Akhir Tahun Pertama Penelitian Fundamental: Kegagalan Pemerintah Lokal dalam Pembangunan Era Otonomi Daerah (Kebijakan Deliberatif: Menggagas Multistakeholders Governance Body dalam Musrenbang Desa untuk Mewujudkan Kebijakan/Program)*. Bandar Lampung: Lembaga Penelitian dan Pengabdian Kepada Masyarakat Universitas Lampung. Tidak Dipublikasikan.