



CAPACITY PLANNING OF THE NEW AUTONOMOUS REGION IN EMERGING COUNTRY

Titi Darmi¹, Iqbal M. Mujtahid², Udin Udin^{3*}

¹Universitas Muhammadiyah Bengkulu, Indonesia, ²Universitas Terbuka, Indonesia, ³Universitas Muhammadiyah Yogyakarta, Indonesia.

Email: ¹titi.harmadi@gmail.com; ²iqbal@ecampus.ut.ac.id; ^{3*}udin_labuan@yahoo.com

Article History: Received on 05th December 2019, Revised on 25th January 2020, Published on 19th February 2020

Abstract

Purpose of the study: This study examines the capacity planning of the new autonomous region (DOB) in the Seluma regency of Bengkulu province, Indonesia.

Methodology: By applying the descriptive qualitative research and interactive model, the results show that capacity planning becomes an important process involved by all stakeholders. Moreover, the planning process, which reflected the development and implementation of the DOB's objectives, includes four approaches (1) technocratic; (2) political; (3) top-down/bottom-up; and (4) participatory.

Main Findings: The findings imply that policy actors are required to respond to parts of the process that have not been effectively accommodated. Additional planning further should be based on the results of academic studies and expert opinions. Therefore, it needs a strategy and capacity planning to deal with these threats employing diversification strategies to increase creativity and innovation.

Applications of this study: This study can be useful in the government and regional development. This study can be useful to plan work programs every year as set out by the Regional Revenue and Expenditure Budget (APBD) in line with the vision and mission of the elected Regent. In addition, this study also can harmonize the APBD with the National Long-Term Development Plan (RPJPN), the National Medium-Term Development Plan (RPJMN), and the Regional Long-Term and Medium-Term Development Plan, so that all work programs can be implemented according to community needs.

Novelty/Originality of this study: There are a few studies have been done so far on this sample. This study has value for the implementers (ASN) of BAPEDA in planning the work program of the new autonomous regional government.

Keywords: *Capacity Planning, New Autonomous Regions, Regional Development.*

INTRODUCTION

Previous studies have shown that the performance of a new autonomous region (DOB) can be relatively low (Darmi, Suwitri, Yuwanto, & Sundarso, 2016, 2017) and contribute to such poor performance (Yuliadi, 2012). Moreover, after separating from its main region, a DOB includes numerous deficiencies from both human and non-human resources (Darmi, Titi & Suwitri, 2017; Tembo, 2004). To fulfill the compulsory and optional affairs of Local Government Law No. 23/2014, the organizers of a DOB must carry out capacity planning, including short, medium, and long-term development plans. More specifically, the governance of a DOB must be in line with the National Long-Term Development Plan (RPJPN), National Medium-Term Development Plan (RPJMN), and Long-Term Development Plan (RPJP) as well as the Provincial Medium-Term Development Plan (RPJM). Besides, the DOB development planners must be able to carry out the mandates of Law No. 25/2004, which outlines future options by considering the available resources and optimizing the potential of the region. Moreover, the local government refers to Government Regulation (PP) No.8/2008, which guides local policymakers to improving community welfare in terms of income, employment opportunities, access to policymaking, and human development index (Firman, 2013).

However, the DOB of Seluma district, established under Law No. 3/2003, is one DOB in particular that has shown relatively low performance. Therefore, this study aims to explore the capacity planning of DOB, especially regarding the implementation of its goals and objectives. It has been shown that, with effective planning, the future conditions in an area can be illustrated. Besides, good planning is based on accurate, valid, and accountable data regarding the potential of the region (Bunn & Oliveira, 2016; Dawes, Vidasova, & Parkhimovich, 2016), while regional government profiles can serve as the guidelines for future development planning (Bourgeois & Cousins, 2013).

LITERATURE REVIEW

Capacity Building

The concept of capacity building has been widely written by researchers. This concept was written from a variety of perspectives or multidisciplinary sciences, which in essence that it is an effort to manage organizations effectively and efficiently in both public and private sector organizations. Therefore, this study will discuss a literature review of the process of planning work programs in the new autonomous regional government (DOB). Capacity building in the governance structure of governance is a long-standing institutional change in development, the changes are made in a way how to manage available resources can be managed effectively and efficiently (Grindle, 2011). Factors that

determine the success of capacity development are determined by external and internal factors (Horton, 2003). The need for capacity building in implementing organizational governance (or local government) is a matter of necessity for the leadership of the organization, therefore, increasing the leadership role capacity is very important.

Capacity planning can be interpreted as how stakeholders can improve the capacity of a local government in the planning and development of a DOB (Morgan, 2006). The overall dimensions in capacity planning include human resource development, organizational strengthening, and institutional reform (Horton, 2003; Jabbour, Jabbour, Govindan, Teixeira, & Freitas, 2013; Matachi, 2006).

The development process consists of three additional levels that should be focused on an organization (Matachi, 2006; Merino & Carmenado, 2012). They are (1) the system level, which is reflected in existing regulations; (2) the organizational level, which is reflected in institutional reforms; and (3) the individual level, which is reflected in available human resources. Although many important factors support the successful planning and implementation of a capacity-building program, there are at least five factors that should be considered by stakeholders, including joint commitment, leadership, regulatory reform, institutional reform, and recognition of strengths and weaknesses (Horton, 2003).

In the governance of a DOB in Indonesia, there is a special institution, known as the Regional Development Planning Board (BAPPEDA), which handles the development planning of the Seluma regency. In carrying out the various tasks, there are minimum requirements as well as standard capacity planning guidelines to be fulfilled by the planning agency to ensure the suitability of the plan. In this regard, the capacity of the planning agency can be interpreted as dynamic aspects that change according to their function and purpose regarding the main task. In other words, the capacity planning of BAPPEDA is similar to existing human resource planning competencies.

Planning for the Government Implementation of DOB

Planning capacity in the context of this study means that the ability of planners that have been mandated to design work programs. That is capacity as a process by which individuals, groups, organizations, institutions, and communities can improve their ability to plan to achieve the vision and mission of the New Autonomous Region Government. The planning capacity involving the planning part has been carried out in rural Kenya, with the aim of achieving the government's national plan policy. The aim is to coordinate and stimulate development at the local level by involving in the planning process not only Government officials but also people through their representatives (Rondinelli, 1981). There are studies related to the development planning process driven by the elite (inclusive), budget constraints slowing down national development plans (Chimhowu, Hulme, & Munro, 2019). However, the results of this study explain that the success of national development planning is a factor of commitment to increasing capacity and ensuring that there is the capacity to produce credible plans.

Formation of the New Autonomous Region (DOB) of Seluma Regency, Bengkulu Province (Undang - Undang Nomor 3 Tentang Pembentukan Daerah Otonomi Kabupaten Seluma, 2003), explicitly and implicitly it has at least 3 goals namely to educate the community, make the community physically and mentally healthy and make the community financially independent, in essence, the goal is for the welfare of the community. To realize this, reflected on how the capacity of development planning has been done according to the needs of the community or not.

The formation purpose of a DOB is to improve community welfare (Undang - Undang Nomor 3 Tentang Pembentukan Daerah Otonomi Kabupaten Seluma, 2003). Indicators of effective community welfare are reflected in the performance of a DOB, through the provision of high-quality services (Darmi & Suwitri, 2017). Therefore, effective capacity planning is necessary, and the administrators should understand whether certain actions are following the overall plan. For instance, to implement the mandates of Law No. 23/2014, a DOB's organizers should carry out 26 mandatory functions, including eight optional affairs. The determination of the work program related to compulsory affairs and choice affairs should be planned in accordance with the vision and mission of the elected Regent, which is always carried out with the right plan, implementation of integrity and supervision which has follow-up actions for future development.

METHODOLOGY

This study applied the descriptive qualitative research. The subject of this study focused on the interactive process of development planning in a DOB, where the data were integrated by the researchers (Creswell & Creswell, 2017). This study was conducted in the Seluma regency (through the cooperation of BAPPEDA) by using primary data gained from interviews with those involved in the development planning of the DOB, and secondary data from meeting notes, documentation, reports (e.g., the LPPD, EKPPD, LAKIP, and LKPJ), PPs, and Regional Regulations as well as other related records.

The informants firstly were selected by using purposive sampling. More specifically, the researchers determined the informants who knew about the process or contributed to the implementation of DOB governance. Overall, the informants consisted of 11 individuals. They were divided into three classifications: 1) those that implemented the policy or contributed to the planning process, e.g., the Regional Secretary, Assistant I, the Secretary of BAPPEDA, the Sub-Director of Research for BAPPEDA, the Head of BPKAD, and the Head of Governance; 2) those that oversaw the

planning, implementation, and evaluation of DOB governance in the Seluma Regency, e.g., the Deputy Chairman of the Regional House of Representatives (DPRD), the Chairman of Commission III, and five members of the House of Representatives (DPR) through focus group discussions; and 3) those from the community that oversaw the planning process, e.g., Mr. Marzuki (the Chairman of NGO Segay), Mr. Herwan (Chairman of NGO Mata Corruption Smash), and Mrs. Kamsiatun (Head of the Village). The researchers secondly met the informants in Classifications 1 and 2 as well as the policy implementer responsible for the development planning process. The researchers also met the informants in Classification 3, after which the data were compared with those of Classifications 1 and 2.

The data analysis finally included (1) arranging the data (both primary and secondary); (2) condensing the data for analysis; (3) performing the data analysis and confirming the results; and (4) discussing the findings and presenting the conclusions (Miles, M.B. Huberman, A.M., 2014).

To ensure the truth of data obtained from various sources. Namely, data (policy documents, reports), the researcher compares and analyzes data from informants who contribute to the planning process, then the data is juxtaposed with data obtained from the regional government internal control and external supervision (DPRD), then the data analyzed is done confirmation of the truth to the community as beneficiaries in planning work programs for the development of new autonomous regions.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The approach of the overall planning process can be seen in the Medium-Term Development Plan (RPJMD) 2010–2015, which contains the vision, mission, objectives, strategy, and policy direction. Preparation of the RPJMD 2010–2015 for the Seluma Regency Government was guided by the Long-Term Development Plan (RPJPD) 2006–2025. Both the RPJMD and the RPJPD for the Seluma Regency refers to Law No. 25/2004 Article 5, which includes the following provisions:

The approach of the overall planning process can be seen in the Medium-Term Development Plan (RPJMD) 2010–2015, which contains the vision, mission, objectives, strategy, and policy direction. Preparation of the RPJMD 2010–2015 for the Seluma Regency Government was guided by the Long-Term Development Plan (RPJPD) 2006–2025. Both the RPJMD and the RPJPD for the Seluma Regency refers to Law No. 25/2004 Article 5, which includes the following provisions:

1. The RPJPD for the Seluma Regency is an explanation of the vision, mission, and program of the Head of Region in which its compilation is guided by the RPJM and the RPJP of Bengkulu province as well as the National RPJM and RPJP.
2. The RPJPD of the Seluma Regency is based on the objective of establishing the Seluma Regency by considering the Spatial Plan and the Spatial Plan of Island/Coastal. These provisions are by the following statement by the Sub-Directorate of Research for BAPPEDA and see Figure 1.

Preparation of this process was based on the government's mission and the RPJP, RPJMN, and RPJMD of both Bengkulu province and the Seluma regency, as conducted by the Regent/Vice-Regent and special/expert staff members, after which it was submitted for legalization by the DPR (interview on September 5, 2016).




Figure 1: Program Planning Flow Chart of the RPJPN, RPJPD, and RPJMD

Source: Data from 2016 and the 2011 RPJMD of the Seluma Regency

The creation of the RPJM 2010–2015 for Seluma regency included the following:

1. Perform initial preparations, including i) reviewing the legislation related to medium- and long-term regional planning; ii) conducting a series of consultations and discussing strategic issues to determine new initiatives; iii) preparing a conceptual framework; and iv) preparing human, material, and financial resources.
2. Collect supporting data from Seluma regency’s strategic planning documents, conduct scenario building of the Seluma regency itself, examine public dialogs and review the findings of the strategic planning workshop as well the interview results with the stakeholders of Seluma regency.
3. Create a preliminary draft of the RPJM for the Seluma regency.
4. Formulate the RPJM for Seluma regency with a team of experts.
5. Determine the regional regulations on the RPJM 2010–2015 for Seluma regency.

These stages are following the interviews with the informants. For example, the BAPPEDA Secretary stated the following:

The approaches in creating vision and mission of the work program included three stages: 1) top-down, by referring to the RPJMN, RPJPD, and RPJMD of Bengkulu province; 2) bottom-up, by examining the aspirations of the community and the findings at the Development Planning Meeting (Musrenbang); and 3) technocratic, by formulating/analyzing the policy in cooperation with various universities, and by conducting public discussions in which the results are analyzed through SWOT analysis (interview on September 5, 2016).

The regulations and legislation completed the preparation of conceptual planning by the regional government of the Seluma regency. The systematic preparation of the RPJM is shown in Figure 2.




Figure 2: The Process of Creating the RPJMD for the Seluma Regency

Source: Data from 2016 and the 2011 RPJMD for the Seluma regency

The planning process of the Seluma District Government policy is based on the initial objectives of the DOB formation in 2003, which aimed at reforming all fields of development, especially in the economic, political, socio-cultural, legal, and religious fields. Besides, the principles for creating the general regional policy were part of an effort to achieve the vision, mission, strategy, and objectives set out in the RPJM for Seluma regency, which, in turn, were translated into the Revenue and Expenditure Budget (APBD). Although various approaches were used to create the work program by the local government, the process was somewhat similar, as expressed by the Head of the Sub-Department of Research for BAPPEDA:

The process of the work program was almost the same as the mission and vision. It was performed every year, based on the RPJMD, by gathering the aspirations of the community (e.g., the residents of the villages, sub-district, and district), holding public discussions, and legalizing it through the DPR. In addition, the completed objectives were stated in the Performance Accountability Report of Government Agency (LAKIP) and the Local Government Management Report (LPPD), after which they were delivered by the Organization of Regional Apparatus (OPD) to the governance authority (Tapem), at the request of the Regional Secretary (interview on September 5, 2016).

After determining that the 11 informants provided the same answers about the process of creating the work plan for the Seluma regency, this researcher confirmed the responses with the Secretary of BAPPEDA and Kasubdin Research. Table 1 presents the approaches used to create a work program.

Table 1: The Approaches Applied to Create Work Program (RPJMD, RKPD, and RKT)

Informant	Approach			
	Political	Top-down/ bottom-up	Technocratic	Participatory
Regional Secretary (Sekretaris Daerah)	✓	✓	✓	✓
Assistant I	✓	✓	✓	✓
Vice-Chairman of the DPR	✓	✓	✓	✓
Chairman of Commission III and members of the DPRD (FGD results)	✓	✓	✓	✓
NGO (Mr. Herwan)	✓	✓	✓	✓
Secretary of BAPPEDA				
Head of the Sub-Department of Research for BAPPEDA	✓	✓	✓	✓
Head of the Governance Department (Kabag Tapem)	✓	✓	✓	✓
Head of DPKAAD	✓	✓	✓	✓
NGO (Mr. Marzuki)	✓	✓	✓	✓
Kamsiatun (Head of the Village)	✓	✓	✓	✓

Source: Primary data, 2016

The top-down approach was mentioned the most regarding whether the regional government had accommodated the public's interest, while the bottom-up approach was used in community participation, including the Development Planning Meeting (*Musrenbang*). The RPJMD 2010-2015 was the medium-term local government plan, while the RKPD was the local government plan for each year. In determining the annual work plan, there was information that differed from the previous ones. According to Mr. Herwan, the Chairman of the NGO Mata Corruption Smash:

Indeed, the stages, procedures, and approaches in creating work plans have been achieved, based on the government and other regulations. Yet, the government wants the work program to be realized, especially since it was one of the campaign promises made during the elections (interview on October 10, 2016).

This information indicates that, although the implementation of the planning process was successful, the work program had to be realized due to various stakeholders, namely, the government. The approaches in the planning of the government programs have been made in line with the vision and mission of the Seluma regency. Meanwhile, medium- and short-term development planning (e.g., the RKPD) had already followed the overall vision, mission, and policy direction. Besides, each program and activity was outlined in various policies, and they were followed by a medium- or short-term development plan created by each OPD.

The realization and achievement of the local government work program can be seen in the LKPI (which is the accountability report by the local government) as well as the DPRD and LPPD (which are the accountability reports by the local government, based on Law No. 23/2014 and PP No. 3/2007). Then, as seen in the Local Government Performance Report (LKPD), which was based on Government Regulation No. 6/2006, there is an obligation to report the success (or failure) of such implementation.

The contents of the RPJMD for the Seluma regency are reflected in the annual APBD (approved by the DPRD), as a series of downstream planning and implementation lines, starting from the vision of the mission described by the RPJMD, RKPD, and RKT. Application of APBD usage by each OPD needs to be evaluated and reported to measure the target achievement levels of each fiscal year effectively. Moreover, the performance evaluations of the district government are conducted by each OPD. The purpose of such evaluations is to determine the effectiveness of the local government's implementation of the plan. The results may be presented to the Ministry of Home Affairs for further development based on regional capacity.

The performance evaluations of the Government of the Seluma regency are conducted on an annual basis, starting from December 31 until March of the following year (or no later than three months after the end of the fiscal year). The EKPPD is derived from the key performance indicators (KPIs) and further elaborated in the LPPD, which will become part of the LKPI. According to the Head of Sub- Office Governance for the Seluma regency:

When the IKK and LPPD, which highlights the Regent's responsibility of organizing the local government under Regulation No. 3/2007, one of the constraints was the difficulty of acquiring data from the SKPD. In most cases, we, as the executors, had to obtain the data on our own. Moreover, the commitment of the Head of the SKPD was rather low. Typically, the data is requested by December, and the end of January should submit it. Since the making of the

IKK and LPPD takes time, the report submitted by the SKPD sometimes lacks the necessary data (interview on September 5, 2016).

The basis for creating the LPPD, as regulated in Law No. 23/2014 (Article 69, Paragraph 1; Article 70, Paragraph 3; and Article 71, Paragraph 2), is that the Regent must submit the LPPD to the Minister of Internal Affairs and the accountability report (LKPJ) to the Regional Representatives Council. Overall, there are two purposes of such actions. First, to assess the performance achievement index variables at the policymaking level, which includes a performance evaluation of the Regent and consists of 13 aspects? Second, to assess the performance of the managerial work unit of the SKPD, this consists of nine aspects (i.e., eight from the perspective of public administration and one from the level of performance achievement/Minimum Service Standards (SPM)?

The performance evaluation of the regional government consists of 13 aspects, of which the 43 IKKs received a high achievement score of 2.6770. The assessment at the policy implementation level includes nine aspects, including eight aspects and 21 IKKs covering 26 compulsory affairs, and eight optional affairs with 714 IKKs, which received a high achievement score of 2.899. Besides, the aspects of government affairs consist of 26 compulsory affairs and eight optional affairs, which received a high achievement score of 2.190. Moreover, government affairs were divided into three aspects, including 1) compulsory affairs, which received a high achievement score of 2.319, based on 26 obligatory functions; 2) optional affairs, which received a fair achievement score of 1.675, based on eight optional affairs; and 3) the material suitability index, including decentralization affairs, co-administration, and the general duty of the government, coupled with the general overview of local conditions, the completeness of the RPJMD (according to Regulation No. 3/2007), and the presentation of the IKKs, which received a high achievement score of 4.000.

Based on the Seluma regency's performance evaluation, the Seluma District was ranked third out of the ten districts/cities, with a high achievement score of 2.6082. The results of this performance evaluation were validated by the provincial and central (Ministry of Home Affairs) teams.

Finally, the EKPPD showed that the management of the government in the Seluma Regency was categorized as -Good, while its realization of the program and target achievement levels (based on the LAKIP) received a -Fair score of 60. Meanwhile, the assessment of financial management from the State Audit Agency (BPK) was categorized as -Fair with Exception (WDP). Overall, the evaluations of the performance, realization, and achievement of the work program were performed in three ways: 1) the local government annually reports on the implementation of the work program, usually from the Regent to the DPRD; 2) the LPPD reports the findings to the community, through the Ministry of Home Affairs; and 3) the LAKIP reports on performance accountability to the Ministry of Administrative Reform and Bureaucracy Reform (*MenpanRB*). Based on these findings, it can be concluded that the realization and achievement of the target goals were realized 90% to 100% of the time.

In creating the work plan of the Seluma regency government, under the guidance of BAPPEDA, the administrators implemented various approaches to accommodate all interests ([Brigham & Houston, 2001](#)). The primary data showed that BAPPEDA conducted preparatory phases, including the following: formatting TIM, formulating the RKPD, and preparing the work agenda. The approach of BAPPEDA in creating the work plan showed that, before the DPR legalized it, certain actions were performed, such as the participatory planning process, and the initial draft was discussed by the stakeholders in the *Musrenbang* forum, which, in turn, became the reference for discussing the work plan at the OPD forum. However, some informants stated that the political approach still dominated the process; that is, the actors that implemented the work plan were oriented toward the political promises of the elected Regent ([Firman, 2013](#)). However, some people did not consider this to be a problem, especially those who voted for the Regent. Unfortunately, some people believed that the ones who had networks to the Regent would be accommodated, and they considered this to be discrimination by the government ([Puatu, 2010](#)), rather than the optimization of community participation in the planning process ([Winterton, Warburton, Clune, & Martin, 2013](#)). In the future, it is hoped that policymakers can overcome this problem so that there will be no conflicts between the communities.

Benchmarking the implementation of the work program was based on a predetermined work plan. This work plan referred to the performance agreement between the Regional Government of the Seluma regency and the community. For the year 2015, the RKPD was determined, based on Regent Regulation No. 27/2015 ([Peraturan Bupati Kabupaten Seluma Nomor 27 Tentang Rencana Kerja Perangkat Daerah, 2015](#)). Measuring the achievements when implementing the RKPD for the Seluma regency, the performance realizations were compared with the predetermined targets ([Direktorat Jenderal Otonomi Daerah Kemendagri RI, 2011](#)).

Regarding performance, three reports must be prepared by the Regional Government of the Seluma regency. First, the Accountability Information Report (LKPJ), which is a report from the Regent to the DPR regarding the program implementation conducted at the end of the fiscal year. It is one of the government's accountability mechanisms to the people, in an attempt to meet the demands of transparency and accountability in governance. Unfortunately, the contents of the report only reveal what was achieved, without describing whether the regional government's objectives were successful.

Second, to measure the work plan's target achievement, the District Government of the Seluma regency issued the LPPD. The legal basis for preparing this report was based on Articles 1 to 3 of Law No. 23/2014. The data from the 2015 LPPD and EKPPD documents received a high score of 3.0 or a -B with a score of 80. This report also described that the Seluma District Government could handle the performance of compulsory and optional affairs.

Third, the performance measurement of the District Government of the Seluma regency can be viewed from the Government Institution Performance Report (LAKIP). Theoretically, this report should describe the performance of the District Government of the Seluma regency, i.e., a description of the achievement targets set in the work program's planning process. Based on the LAKIP, performance achievement received a score of 60 or -CC, which describes the achievement of the Local Government of the Seluma regency for implementing the program and activities funded by the APBN/APBD. The contributions of capacity planning were also critical for improving overall organizational performance (Abdullah & Van Dyk-Robertson, 2010; Grindle, 2010; Merino & Carmenado, 2012; Reddy, Moodley, & Maharaj, 2000). However, there were some shortcomings in the LAKIP, LKPI, and LPPD submitted by the Seluma District Government, since they did not describe the performance achievements as outcomes, but only mentioned that they had been performed. Overall, the input of the performance achievement was regarding budget and output, which, in general, was between 90% and 100%.

The evaluations of development planning focused on three aspects, including policy level, implementation, and planning results. The subjects were the RPJP, RPJMD/Renstra OPD, and RKPD/Renja OPD. At the policy level, the evaluations examined the drafting of the documents in the planning process and whether they were prepared according to Appendices I-VI of Permendagri 54/2010, which requires that the local government must control and evaluate the development planning policies (Hung, Huang, & Chen, 2003; Liaghat et al., 2013; Taut, 2007).

Finally, these performance evaluations were important performance management functions. Performance management is a method used to measure the progress of programs/ activities undertaken by public sector organizations in achieving the expected outcomes of their respective communities. In this case, the reporting patterns made by the district government adopted a performance management approach, which included setting strategic performance targets, measuring performance, collecting, analyzing, and reporting performance data as well as using the data to boost performance improvement.

CONCLUSION

Based on the findings, this study concluded that capacity planning of the DOB in the Seluma regency was effectively implemented following the various laws and regulations. Overall, development program planning was conducted through four approaches: 1) technocratic; 2) political; 3) top-down/bottom-up; and 4) participatory. In determining the development planning process, the Seluma regency performed several actions: 1) determining the actors, based on the decisions of the Regent and the designated team; 2) creating the RPJP, RPJMD, and RKPD, in line with the RPJPN, RPJMN and RPJP/RPJM of Bengkulu province; 3) implementing the work plan program's targets and goals, based on the acceptance of the LKPI by the Regent; and 4) acknowledging that political factors were more dominant in determining the overall work plan.

LIMITATIONS AND STUDY FORWARD

The difficulty of researchers to explore information to the public who directly feel the benefits of development programs throughout the Seluma Regency, due to geographical conditions and transportation facilities that are difficult to reach. This limitation has not yet been able to confirm whether the stages of the planning process using the Bottom Up Planning model and being transparent to the community, have been done according to what they should be. Given factually have differences between those in the field with those in the document report. But to explore the cause requires time, money and energy.

In addition, for optimal planning capacity, it is necessary to synchronize the preparation of programs between the Regional Long-Term Development Plan (RPJPD), the Regional Medium-Term Development Plan (RPJMD), Local Government Work Plan (RKPD), SKPD Strategic Plan (SKPD Renstra) and SKPD Work Plans (Renja SKPD) is not an easy thing for BAPPEDA to do. More complicated and complex if an area consists of many SKPDs and each SKPD carries out many activities, plus the ability of the HR of the State Civil Apparatus has not been qualified.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This study was successful because of the in-depth information from informants in the field.

REFERENCES

1. Abdullah, A., & Van Dyk-Robertson, H. (2010). Enhancing the Performance of the Public Service in a Developmental State: A Country Case Study of Nigeria. Paper prepared for the 2008 African Association for Public Administration and Management (AAPAM) Roundtable. Accra, Ghana. October 2008.
2. Bourgeois, I., & Cousins, J. B. (2013). Understanding Dimensions of Organizational Evaluation Capacity. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 34(3), 299-319. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1098214013477235>

3. Brigham, E. F., & Houston, J. F. (2001). *Manajemen Keuangan*. Buku 1 edisi 8. Jakarta: Erlangga.
4. Bunn, D. W., & Oliveira, F. S. (2016). Dynamic capacity planning using strategic slack valuation. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 253(1), 40-50. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejor.2016.02.013>
5. Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2017). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approach*: Sage publications.
6. Darmi, T., & Suwitri, S. (2017). Strengthening the Capacity of Human Resources Apparatus in the Implementation of New Autonomous Regions. *European Journal of Social Sciences*, 55(4), 427-438.
7. Darmi, T., Suwitri, S., Yuwanto, & Sundarso. (2016). *The Capacity of Local Leaders to Improve Performance of New Autonomous Region (Dob) in Indonesia*. Paper presented at the Proceedings of the 2016 International Conference on Public Management (ICPM 2016). <https://doi.org/10.2991/icpm-16.2016.27>
8. Dawes, S. S., Vidiyosova, L., & Parkhimovich, O. (2016). Planning and designing open government data programs: An ecosystem approach. *Government Information Quarterly*, 33(1), 15-27. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2016.01.003>
9. Direktorat Jenderal Otonomi Daerah Kemendagri Republik Indonesia Laporan Hasil Evaluasi Daerah Otonom Hasil Pemekaran (EDOHP) (2011).
10. Firman, T. (2013). Territorial Splits (Pemekaran Daerah) in Decentralising Indonesia, 2000–2012: Local Development Drivers or Hindrance? *Space and Polity*, 17(2), 180-196. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13562576.2013.820373>
11. Grindle, M. S. (2010). Good enough governance: the inflation of an idea. *Governance: an international CID*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-7679.2011.00526.x>
12. Horton, D. (2003). *Evaluating capacity development: experiences from research and development organizations around the world*: IDRC.
13. Hung, Y. H., Huang, M. L., & Chen, K. S. (2003). Service quality evaluation by service quality performance matrix. *Total Quality Management & Business Excellence*, 14(1), 79-89. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14783360309706>
14. Jabbour, C. J. C., Jabbour, A. B. L. d. S., Govindan, K., Teixeira, A. A., & Freitas, W. R. d. S. (2013). Environmental management and operational performance in automotive companies in Brazil: the role of human resource management and lean manufacturing. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 47, 129-140. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2012.07.010>
15. Liaghat, M., Shahabi, H., Deilami, B. R., Ardabili, F. S., Seyedi, S. N., & badri, H. (2013). A Multi-Criteria Evaluation Using the Analytic Hierarchy Process Technique to Analyze Coastal Tourism Sites. *APCBEE Procedia*, 5, 479-485. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apcbee.2013.05.081>
16. Matachi, A. (2006). Capacity building framework. *Addis Ababa*.
17. Merino, S. S., & Carmenado, I. d. I. R. (2012). Capacity Building in Development Projects. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 46, 960-967. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.05.231>
18. Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook*. 3rd: Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
19. Peraturan Bupati Kabupaten Seluma Nomor 27 Tentang Rencana Kerja Perangkat Daerah (2015).
20. Puatu, A. K. S. (2010). Community Capacity Building and Local Government Leadership: Describing Transformational Leadership Practices in Naga City, the Philippines. *Ritsumeikan Journal of Asia Pacific Studies*(28).
21. Reddy, P. S., Moodley, S., & Maharajj, S. (2000). Human Resources Capacity-Building in Local Government. *Public Personnel Management*, 29(2), 293-304. <https://doi.org/10.1177/009102600002900210>
22. Undang - Undang Nomor 3 Tentang Pembentukan Daerah Otonomi Kabupaten Seluma (2003).
23. Taut, S. (2007). Studying Self-Evaluation Capacity Building in a Large International Development Organization. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 28(1), 45-59. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1098214006296430>
24. Tembo, F. (2004). NGOs' role in building poor people's capacity to benefit from globalization. *Journal of International Development*, 16(7), 1023-1037. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jid.1155>
25. Winterton, R., Warburton, J., Clune, S., & Martin, J. (2013). Building Community and Organisational Capacity to Enable Social Participation for Ageing Australian Rural Populations: A Resource-Based Perspective. *Ageing International*, 39(2), 163-179. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12126-013-9187-2>
26. Yuliadi, I. (2012). Kesenjangan Infestasi dan Evaluasi Kebijakan Pemekaran Wilayah di Indonesia. *Jurnal Ekonomi Pembangunan: Kajian Masalah Ekonomi dan Pembangunan*, 13(2), 276. <https://doi.org/10.23917/jep.v13i2.174>