COLLABORATIVE GOVERNANCE IN ACHIEVING SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS: A CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

Samodra Wibawa[1] dan Darulfa Aziza Nur'aini[2]

[1]Universitas Gajah Mada, Indonesia
samodra03@yahoo.com
[2]Universitas Gajah Mada, Indonesia
darulfa.a@mail.ugm.ac.id

Abstract

Following the Millenium Development Goals (MDGs), the United Nations published their resolution of Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) in October 2015. This has driven and inspired development plan of almost every nation. The government of Indonesian (i.e. Bappenas) should have formulated a roadmap and action plan in early 2018. Many local governments, despite the lack of guidance, claimed that they had adapted the SDGs goals into their local policies. This article aims to provide a conceptual framework of collaborative governance in order to achieve the goals of SGDs in Indonesia. There will be identification of indicators and prerequisites for collaborative governance practice. In other words: what factors can stimulate the practice of collaborative governance towards the achievement of SDGs goals quickly, democratic and inclusively?

Keywords: *SDGs, collaborative governance, network, democracy, inclusive*

INTRODUCTION

According to the United Nations, the current global problems are climate change, democracy, poverty, hunger, gender equality, health and human rights, and these are all expected to be resolved by 2030 (UN, nd1). This ambition is contained in the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) document, a UN resolution in October 2015 as a substitute for the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) launched in 2000. SDGs are blueprint documents compiled to achieve a better and sustainable future for the world.

SDGs have inspired and instructed almost all countries in the world to formulate their national development plans. The Indonesian government (i.e. Bappenas) has made –lately-- a roadmap in mid-2019 (UNICEF, 2019), which should have been completed in early 2018 (Liputan6.com, 2018). Even so, it seems that the SDGs have colored the contents of the policies of various ministries and local governments. The government claims to have integrated 17 goals and 169 targets of SDGs into the 2020-2024 RPJMN [National MediumTerm Development Plan] (Bappenas, 2017). In addition, the government also followed up on the UN resolution with Perpres No. 59/2017 concerning the Implementation of Sustainable Development Goals. Then in May 2018, PermenPPN No. 7/2018 concerning Coordination, Planning, Monitoring, Evaluation and Reporting on the Implementation of Sustainable Development Goals. Then in June 2018 the National Action Plan (NAP) for the SDGs was launched. This NAP was prepared by involving around 200 non-governmental organizations and became a guideline for realizing 319 indicators of the SDGs into thousands of concrete activities (Bappenas, 2018).

In the foreword to the brief version of the roadmap (highlight), the Minister of PPN said that

achieving this ambitious target required strong collaboration between stakeholders in terms of funding and program implementation practices (UNICEF, 2019). In this regard, this paper would like to offer a conceptual framework for conducting studies on collaborative governance (CG) of community activities in order to support the achievement of SDGs performance. Here various indicators of CG will be identified along with the prerequisites that must be met. In other words: What factors can influence the creation of CG, which are expected to achieve the SDGs goals faster, democratic and inclusive?

Sustainable Development Goals

SDGs are reference documents for the direction of world sustainable development. The document contains 17 goals, ranging from no poverty (goal number 1), no hunger (2), clean water and sanitation (6), to partnerships to achieve these goals (17) (UN, nd2). Each goal is broken down into many targets, some of which are grouped into several fields. For example, goal no. 17 is broken down into 19 targets in five areas, including: finance, technology, capacity building, trade, and systemic issues (policy relations with institutions, multi-stakeholder partnerships, and accountability and data monitoring) (UN, nd3). All of this is intended to make our earth more prosperous together (no one left behind) while still paying attention to the sustainability of natural ecosystems (Stuart and Woodroffe, 2016).

In practice in the international world, SDGs are manifested in many ways such as in Germany where the government issued a law regulating the use of land and agricultural land (LDN, land degradation neutrality) in the context of implementing SDGs no. 15 (Wunder, et al., 2018). While in Indonesia, the implementation of SDGs is still in the stage of forming the roadmap in mid-2019 and the launch of the National Action Plan (RAN) (Bappenas, 2017; 2018). Is Indonesia lagging? In fact, countries in the world have difficulty in designing programs, mainly

because of their inability to produce quantitative indicators as a reference for policy evaluation design. In a forum attended by 22 countries in the world, France and Morocco have succeeded in quantifying half of the 230 indicators, while South Korea as an Asian representation is only able to make 31% (Brimont, 2018). Indeed, quantitative indicators cannot necessarily be used to measure the success of a country in its efforts to implement the ambitious goals of the SDGs but can be a very good start.

Collaborative Governance

Implementing efforts to achieve the SDGs goals requires the participation of all parties. In fact, the partnership is not just a method that must be done but also becomes one of the goals of the SDGs themselves (goal no. 17). According to the UN, the world faces a complexity of problems that cannot be faced without collaboration between various parties. This happens because the problems of countries in the world are very complex. This phenomenon is commonly called the wicked problem (Weber and Khademian, 2008). Wicked problems are characterized by blurring the geographical boundaries of a problem and demanding solutions that involve both government and non-government actors. Examples of wicked problem phenomena are haze from forest fires and refugees seeking asylum. Both problems are related to the goals of the SDGs. The emergence of problems across national borders is known as part of globalization where every aspect of the lives of the world's people is connected to each other. Therefore, the principle of inclusive partnerships is needed to be able to achieve the goals of the SDGs. A partnership that transcends geographical, sectoral, industrial and community groups (UN, nd4).

Related to this, in the science of public administration the concept of collaborative governance has emerged since the 1980s and 1990s, when people have felt the inability of the state (more precisely: the government) in solving wicked problems (Uphoff, 1993). The approach

in this discipline experienced a shift in concept, from "old public administration" then "new public management" and "new public service" to "new public governance". In the third and fourth paradigms, this is the concept of collaborative governance, where there is a mention of "cooperation with the third sector" in the NPS and "public deliberation" in the NPG (Xu, et al., 2015). (See Table 1.)

Collaborative governance can be distinguished from other concepts in the science of public administration. Ansell and Gash (2008) state that collaborative governance is different from adversarialism because it does not carry the concept of the winner takes all but rather the results of cooperation among stakeholders in making

Table 1. OPA, NPM, NPS and NPG Source: Xu, R. Y. , Sun, Q. G., & Si, W. (2015)

	Traditional public administration and management	New public management	New public service	New public governance
Value orientation	Regime & procedure	Efficiency	Democracy	Democracy & efficiency
Theoretical basis	Bureaucratic system, political & administrative dichotomy	Economics theory, management philosophy of private sector	Democratic citizenship, civic society, humanistic theory of organization, postmodern administrative theory	Contractualism, integrity theory, collectivism
Behavior	Policy-making & execution-separating, centralized government	Government service outsourcing & marketing	Cultivation of government service spirit, cooperation with third sector	Citizen independence, public deliberation, polycentric governance
Role of citizen	Leader	Customer	By the service of the citizens	Participate in decision
Research method	Institutionalism research method	Positivism research method	Humanism research method	Collectivism research method

The word "governance" as a concept is often paired with, or at least has the nature of, collaborative networks. Governance is a "work/solve together (pengeroyokan)" of problems by various actors from various levels and systems of government, politics and society. Stoker (1998; 2006) states that governance is a rule that guides the collective decision making so that nothing is made individually or comes from only one party. This management model, according to him, occurs when the nature of public or private agents is no longer important. This understanding spawned the term collaborative governance, where one or more public agencies directly involved non-government actors in the process of making decisions that are formal, consensus-oriented and deliberative, aimed at making or implementing public policies or assets (Ansell and Gash, 2008). The term of public agencies appoints not only the government (executive), but also prosecutors, the House of Representatives etc.

decisions. Also different from managerialism because collaborative governance involves the participation of all parties in the decision-making process. Participation in question is a face-to-face meeting, government actors must not only consult and make their own decisions. Before collaborative governance, the term PPPs (public private partnerships) was familiar. Although at first glance it looks the same, there are distinguishing aspects between the two concepts. Collaborative governance is more focused on the policy process, while PPPs usually refer to coordination between the government and the private sector in implementing something. The collective decision-making process is also limited to secondary understanding, unlike collaborative governance which is a must (Ansell and Gash, 2008).

Embodiments of collaborative governance can vary, such as inter-governmental collaboration, public-private cooperation, government-NGO

cooperation or government-NGO-private-community cooperation. These activities have been going on for a long time. It's just that in a decade or two the public administration scientists popularized the term collaborative or network and synergy (Hasbi, 2016). But there are still new things, namely: democracy, participation and dialogue (the real thing is also not new in European-American countries). So, in the governance regime there is an emphasis on public value. Some even mentioned public value to refer to the concept of governance (see Table 2).

governance, multi-stakeholder
- Network approach
- Participation in the decision-making process
- Dialogue.

These indicators overlap, or one can be part of the other. For example, dialogue can be seen as part of participation in decision making, or even the second indicator and the other is a part or description of democracy. However, for further

Table 2. OPA, NPM and Public Value (ie. NPG)

Source: Evans 2016

	Traditional Public Administration	New Public Management	Public Value
Manager's role	Follow rules	Meet targets	Steering Networks and Engaging in Public Deliberation
Delivery system	Hierarchy	Competitive agencies	Pragmatic Choice but will often go with network approach
Culture	Public service ethos	Business-like	Shared community values
Democratic	By Accountability	By delivery	By dialogue
Ultimate Goal	Probity	Effectiveness	Well-Being

So, it would not be excessive if governance, public governance or new public governance, which gives emphasis to public value, collaboration and networking is referred to in very Indonesian terms as: administrasi negara gotong-royong, ANGRo (mutual, cooperative public administration). Then, what are the indicators of a public administration that can be called ANGRo? From the two tables above indicators can be listed as follows:

- Efficient but democratic (and vice versa)
- Collective
- Shared public value
- Freedom of society, public deliberation
- Polycentric governance, multi-level

research, it is necessary to increase the source of literature so that a stronger indicator summary is obtained, and then formulate conceptual and operational definitions of the above indicators (which are now more accurately called concepts or at least sub-concepts of the big concepts of "governance" in understanding in this article (Asian Development Bank, 2013).

Obstacles in Doing Collaborative Governance

As a new concept that arises due to the failure of adversarialism and managerialism, collaborative governance positions itself as an inclusive concept that is able to solve all public problems (Ansell and Gash, 2008). However,

this claim does not necessarily make the implementation of collaborative governance run smoothly. Evans (2016), for example, believes that there are many obstacles in realizing good collaborative governance. These obstacles include:

- Problems in controlling relations between government and NGOs beyond the boundaries of traditional organizations.

- Absence of operational rules (drawing a command line after contract approval through setting performance targets).

- The issue of democratic control / accountability.

- Problems in building public trust and increasing public participation in decision making processes, operational services and learning after evaluations are conducted.

- While Hasbi (2016) highlights that potential problems exist in each line of the collaborating parties, including:

- Government: Commitments are still low for example in the amount of budget allocation; the capacity and commitment of institutions and human resources to conduct partnerships is still low.

- NGOs or the private sector: Overly (even completely) relying on government funding and initiatives.

- QUANGO (hybrid organizations, committees): Formed legally (by the government / country) but not given adequate personnel, funds and infrastructure so that they do not have the resources to carry out any type of potential partnership.

- Community: Low participation, too much expectation or dependence on government and other organizations' assistance. During this time the community has lost confidence in whatever is done by the government.

Discussing collaborative governance can never be separated from suggestions for increasing participation in the process, but it seems that participation is a problem in itself. The negative behavior and response of government officials towards community participation has become the biggest stumbling block for community volunteerism to actively participate in public activities. Public servants tend to worry about the impact that might occur if the community has too large a role in the process of policy formulation, for example fear of declining government legitimacy. Government officials have also been criticized because they tend to fight for their own interests and are reluctant to share power. Coupled with the lack of resources and the burden of responsibility that was too large allegedly became one of the causes of their excessive anxiety over direct participation from the community. On the other hand, big obstacles also come from the community itself. They are often judged to be less competent, inexperienced, lacking skills and lazy to participate. However, people who are diligent in participating tend to carry personal interests and rarely speak on behalf of groups (Yang and Callahan, 2007; Nguyen et al., 2015).

Closing Remarks

Collaborative governance is considered to be the most appropriate way to achieve the SDGs goals. Apart from having to involve non-government actors in collective partnerships, these conditions are also included in the SDGs themselves. Collaboration between stakeholders is essentially participation based on mutual trust. The tradition of administering in Indonesia so far seems to need to undergo a massive overhaul because it is not yet conducive to achieving collaboration conducted on a relationship of mutual trust. A movement of mindset and culture and institutional environment is needed in such a way that the parties are willing and able to participate in all stages referred to by Ansell and Gash (2008) as collaborative processes which include the process of decision making, planning, budgeting, implementation, supervision, and

evaluation of activities.

The need for changes in the tradition of administration in Indonesia can be achieved through the following things:

- Facilitative leadership. To be able to implement collaborative governance, one of the most needed is a leader who can act as a facilitator. Leaders in the collaborative governance system can be found in the public manager figure whose job is to increase the participation of all actors involved inclusively. In creating these inclusive conditions, public managers must successfully combine information and perspectives from 3 domains, namely political, technical, and experience (Feldman and Khademian, 2007). Leadership and good examples of leaders include readiness to be complained and able to deal with problems that have the potential to arise in the collaborative process. This must not only be the character of the leader but also be conditioned in the institution, organization or work system.

- Initial conditions before collaboration. Initial conditions before collaboration between stakeholders is absolutely a consideration in choosing partners. The initial conditions themselves can be divided into a balance of resources or power, incentives to participate, and the history of conflict (Ansell and Gash, 2008). Asymmetric resources and power can lead to manipulation and the winner takes all from a strong party so that the concept of equality in partnership cannot be achieved. Even though the concept of equality is crucial in the collaborative governance system. These conditions can result in the low incentives obtained. The incentive according to Ansell and Gash (2008) is not only material goods but also the achievement of the collaboration goal itself. When going to collaborate, it is

necessary to pay attention to the conflict history of the parties that will be invited to partner. When these parties have been involved in conflicts, collaboration will build on mistrust, and vice versa if they have collaborated and succeeded, it can increase the level of trust in each other.

- Good institutional environment. In making changes, one of the most crucial things is institutional conditions. Lowndes and Roberts (2013) state that institutions can be understood as: rules, i.e. rules as a way of institutionalizing behavior; practice, which is a behavior that is done every day so that it turns into a habit; and narrative or value where there are norms in the organization that are inspired by sociology and theology. Meanwhile Steinmo in Gudono (2016) said that institutions are merely rules which form the basis of behavior, which can be formal or informal. The government as the authority holder should be able to create rules as a legal collaborative guide in an inclusive institutional environment (Ansell and Gash, 2008).

In summary, it can be stated that a change or movement of mindset, culture-set and institutional-set is needed in such a way that the parties (government and non-government) are willing and able to participate in all stages: decision making, planning, budgeting, implementation, monitoring and evaluation. This demand requires:

- Outlined in the law and other regulations, it is not enough to just be spoken about and advised.

- Leadership and good example from the leader, including the character and institutional conditioning that he/they are ready to be complained and able to handle.

- Adequate incentives and disincentives or reward and punishment.

REFERENCES

Ansell, C., & Gash, A. 2008. Collaborative Governance In Theory And Practice. Journal of Public Administration Research And Theory, 18(4), 543-571.

Asian Development Bank. 2013. Asian Development Outlook 2013 Update: Governance and Public Service Delivery. https://www.adb.org/publications/asian-development-outlook-2013-update-governance-and-public-service-delivery, accessed on 10 September 2019.

Bappenas. 2017. Siaran Pers: Komitmen Serius Indonesia dalam Melaksanakan Sustainable Development Goals 2015-2030. https://www.bappenas.go.id, accessed on 9 September 2019.

Bappenas. 2018. Siaran Pers: Peluncuran Rencana Aksi Nasional Pencapaian Tujuan Pembangunan Berkelanjutan atau Sutainable Development Goals. https://www.bappenas.go.id, accessed on 9 September 2019.

Brimont, L. 2018. Implementation of the SDGs: Where Does France Stand?. https://ideas4development.org/en/implementation-sdgs-france/, accessed on 10 September 2019.

Evans, M. 2016. "Understanding Governance: Towards A Research Agenda", Seminar MKP UGM 16-17 Desember 2016.

Feldman, M. S., & Khademian, A. M. 2007. The Role of The Public Manager In Inclusion: Creating Communities of Participation. Governance, 20(2), 305-324.

Gudono. 2016. Teori Organisasi. Yogyakarta: BPFE.

Hasbi, M. 2016. Aktualisasi Sinergitas Komponen Governance Dalam Peningkatan Pelayanan Pendidikan Kecakapan Hidup di Kota Makassar. Ad'ministrare, Vol. 3 No. 1.

Liputan6.com. 2018. Bappenas Perlu Terbitkan Peta Jalan Realisasikan Program SDGs. https://m.liputan6.com/bisnis/read/3613540/bappenas-perlu-terbitkan-peta-jalanrealisasikan-program-sdgs, accessed on 9 September 2019.

Lowndes, V., & Roberts, M. 2013. Why Institutions Matter: The New Institutionalism In Political Science. Macmillan International Higher Education.

Nguyen, T. V., Le, C. Q., Tran, B. T., & Bryant, S. E. 2015. Citizen Participation in City Governance: Experiences from Vietnam. Public Administration and Development, 35(1), 34-35.

Stoker, G. 1998. Governance As A Theory: Five Propositions. International Social Science Journal, 50(155), 17-28.

Stoker, G. 2006. Public Value Management: A New Narrative For Networked Governance?. The American Review of Public Administration, 36(1), 41-57.

Stuart, E., & Woodroffe, J. 2016. Leaving No-One Behind: Can The Sustainable Development Goals Succeed Where The Millennium Development Goals Lacked?. Gender & Development, 24(1), 69-81.

UNICEF. 2019. Roadmap of SDGs Indonesia: A Highlight. https://www.unicef.org/indonesia/reports/roadmap-sdgs-indonesia, accessed on 9 September 2019.

United Nations. Nd1. Global Issues Overview. https://www.un.org/en/sections/issues-depth/global-issues-overview/, accessed on 9 September 2019.

United Nations. Nd2. About the Sustainable Development Goals. https://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/sustainable-development-goals/, accessed on 9 September 2019.

United Nations. Nd3. Goal 17: Revitalize The Global Partnership for Sustainable Development. https://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/globalpartnership/, accessed on 9 September 2019.

United Nations. Nd4. Goal of the Month. https://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/goal-of-the-month/, accessed on 10 September 2019.

Uphoff, N. 1993. Grassroots Organizations and Ngos In Rural Development: Opportunities With Diminishing States And Expanding Markets. World Development, 21(4), 607-622.

Weber, E. P., & Khademian, A. M. 2008. Wicked Problems, Knowledge Challenges, and Collaborative Capacity Builders in Network Settings. Public Administration Review, 68(2), 334-349.

Wunder, S., Kaphengst, T., & Frelih-Larsen, A. 2018. Implementing Land Degradation Neutrality (SDG 15.3) At National Level: General Approach, Indicator Selection and Experiences From Germany. In International Yearbook of Soil Law And Policy 2017 (pp. 191-219). Springer, Cham.

Xu, R., Sun, Q., & Si, W. 2015. The Third Wave of Public Administration: The New Public Governance. Canadian Social Science, 11(7), 11-21.

Yang, K., & Callahan, K. 2007. Citizen Involvement Efforts and Bureaucratic Responsiveness: Participatory Values, Stakeholderspressures, and Administrative Practicality. Public Administration Review, 67(2), 249-264.