

Implementation of Law Number 14 of 2008 on Public Information Transparency in the Indonesian House of Representatives (DPR RI)

Feri Firdaus¹, Zaimasuri Zaimasuri²

Institut Pendidikan Dalam Negeri, Indonesia¹

Universitas Lampung, Indonesia²

feri.komunikasi@gmail.com¹



Article History

Received on 27 December 2023

1st Revised on 2 January 2024

Accepted on 23 January 2024

Abstract

Purpose: The House of Representatives of the Republic of Indonesia (DPR-RI) is mandated to represent the people's voice through general elections. This role becomes meaningful when DPR ensures transparency by providing public access to information. However, its commitment to information disclosure is questionable, especially after limited public access to documents related to the KPK Law revision, Omnibus Law, and the Job Creation Bill. This study analyzes the implementation of public information disclosure policies within the DPR-RI.

Methodology: This study uses a descriptive qualitative method. Primary and secondary data were obtained through in-depth interviews with key informants and literature studies related to the topic.

Result: The research shows that the implementation of the Public Information Disclosure Law in the DPR-RI is not yet optimal. This is particularly seen in the underutilization of media channels and poor management of information sources.

Conclusion: The ineffectiveness of public information disclosure implementation in DPR-RI stems from limited use of digital media, weak performance of the Information and Documentation Management Officer (PPID), and lack of institutional commitment. These factors obstruct transparency and accountability in a democratic legislative institution.

Limitation: This study is limited to evaluating the DPR-RI and does not include a comparative assessment with other government institutions or legislative bodies.

Contribution: This research contributes to the theoretical and practical understanding of public information policy implementation in legislative institutions as part of communication policy studies.

Keywords: *Policy Implementation, Public Information Disclosure, UU KIP, PPID DPR*

How to Cite: Firdaus, F., Zaimasuri, Z. (2024). Implementation of Law Number 14 of 2008 on Public Information Transparency in the Indonesian House of Representatives (DPR RI). *Dynamics of Politics and Democracy*, 3(2), 101-113.

1. Introduction

Elected members of the House of Representatives (DPR) are obligated to fulfill their mandate through their legislative, oversight, and budgeting functions. The realization of this mandate can be achieved through a continuous relationship between the DPR and its members with the public in carrying out their duties. This involves absorbing and collecting the aspirations of the people through various available channels, as well as following up, advocating, and providing moral and political accountability to constituents in their respective electoral districts, commonly known as the representation function. The representation function can be effective and have a tangible impact if the DPR is made public.

DPR's openness includes, at the very least, two aspects: first, openness in conducting activities and proceedings; and second, openness regarding documents (Dewi, 2022; Wahyudin, 2021). Openness provides opportunities for the public to access information and services. Information is a right that must be guaranteed, including the right to seek, receive, and disseminate information and ideas (Huang, 2020; Sanudyantoro, 2014). The public can only actively participate in the policy-making process and contribute positively to the performance of their representatives when sufficient information is available about the elected representatives, what they do, and how they do it. In a democracy, the people are the determinants of how power is structured and implemented (Arifin, 2016). According to Jurgen Habermas, information is a crucial element in the public sphere, which is a social realm where public opinion is formed (Hardiman, 2010). Within the framework of accountability, there are three stages that must be followed: (1) the flow of information and data transmitted by the mandate holder to the giver of the mandate. The information provided must be complete and accurate. (2) The occurrence of dialogue and integration in official and accountable public forums or spaces. In this process, the giver of the mandate is free to question the information received; (3) public evaluation of the work of the mandate holder. Whether the benefits can be felt (Boven, 2003).

Public information transparency must be achieved in government institutions. The more open the government is to public scrutiny, the more accountable it becomes (Subagiyo 2009). The House of Representatives (DPR) is regulated by many laws regarding public information transparency, including the 1945 Constitution, MD3 Law, P3 Law, Archives Law, KIP Law, and internal regulations in the form of the DPR's code of conduct. There is a strong legal basis for mandating the DPR to be open. The implementation of optimal information transparency will facilitate active public participation in policy formulation and decision-making and the ability to criticize anything that does not align with their expectations and aspirations. As the public becomes more significant, communication demands a means of dissemination and influence (Hardiman 2010). Peter Dahlgren stated that the public sphere is a place where information, ideas, and discussions on political opinions can be discussed among the public (McKee, 2005). With transparency, public trust in Parliament is expected to improve.

Although public information transparency in the DPR has been regulated by various laws, the commitment to public information transparency in the DPR is still doubted by various elements of society. However, an open government requires guaranteeing the public's right to access information (Santosa, 2001). The DPR has never been classified as an informative public body (Center 2017). From 2012 to 2018, the DPR was never recognized as an informative public body. Out of the seven monitoring and evaluation processes conducted during that period, only in 2018 did the DPR undergo an audit/examination of its information transparency until the final assessment stage by the Indonesian Information Commission (KIP RI). From 2012 to 2017, the DPR did not participate in or reach the monitoring and evaluation stages conducted by KIP RI because it did not meet the standards of information transparency stipulated in the KIP Law and its implementing regulations (Triayuni, 2018).

Civil society still faces significant challenges in accessing data, information, and documents in the DPR. Particularly concerning data, information, or legislative documents that have high political and economic interests, such as bills related to forestry, coal mining, the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK), job creation, and others. Ultimately, the public's right to actively participate in the process of making public policies is hindered. Furthermore, the level of public trust in the DPR is low. Independent surveys conducted by the Polling Center and Indonesia Corruption Watch regarding the level of public trust in state institutions consistently show that the DPR ranks among the lowest or second lowest (F Ferdaus & Zaimasuri, 2023). This is due to limited access to public information in the DPR. Another issue is that the DPR is still perceived as lacking transparency and often deviates from procedures in the policymaking process. One case that has garnered significant public attention is the enactment of the revision of Law Number 30 of 2002 concerning the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK Law) on September 17, 2019. According to Transparency International Indonesia (TII) and the Indonesian Legal Roundtable (ILR), this revision of the KPK Law was conducted in a closed manner, disregarding public participation and not adhering to proper procedures (Putri, Yustikaningrum, & Devitasari, 2021).

The commitment to information transparency in the DPR was questioned in 2014. The General Secretariat of the DPR was sued by a citizen of the Central Information Commission (KI Pusat) because their request for information, including work and budget plans, procurement of goods, work reference frameworks, and others, to the DPR did not receive a response or was ignored. After a series of information dispute hearings by the Central Information Commission, both parties agreed to settle the dispute through mediation. Ultimately, the DPR was willing to provide the requested information to the citizen. Considering the objectives of the Law on Public Information Disclosure (UU KIP), it is contradictory that the DPR has not yet become an informative public body. This is despite the fact that UU KIP has been in effect since April 30, 2010, which is a period of 2 (two) years from its enactment, and 11 (eleven) years if counted until 2021. This is a considerable amount of time for any public institution to implement the UU KIP and achieve the goals of this law. Research on the implementation of public information disclosure policies has been extensive. For example, a study conducted by Taufiq et al. (2014) examined the implementation of the Public Information Disclosure Law in Pesawaran Regency. The research findings showed that the implementation of the UU KIP policy in Pesawaran Regency was influenced by several aspects, including institutional and substantive achievements, constraints, and opportunities. Another study by Indraswati et al. (2016) examined communication and information openness in the Supreme Audit Agency (BPK) of the Republic of Indonesia. The findings of this study also indicate that the implementation was not yet optimal.

Many studies have examined the implementation of public information disclosure policies that have not reached their maximum potential. Sjoraida (2015) studied the implementation of public information disclosure policies in the West Java Provincial Government and found that it was not yet optimal. Purnawansyah (2014) studied the implementation of the Public Information Disclosure policy in the Regional People's Representative Council (DPRD) of Sidoarjo Regency. The aforementioned studies conclude that public information disclosure in public institutions is still not optimal and is even poor. However, the Public Information Disclosure Law has been in effect since April 30, 2010. These conclusions indicate that the theories and concepts used in previous studies can illustrate the achievements and constraints faced in policy implementation. However, there is a research gap in this area. Furthermore, based on the author's search, no studies have been found that examine the implementation of the Public Information Disclosure Law with a focus on the aspect of public information disclosure in the legislative field of the Indonesian Parliament (DPR RI) (Ferdaus & Zaimasuri, 2023). Considering that the DPR RI is responsible for enacting public information disclosure laws, it is important and interesting to conduct research in this area. Therefore, this study aims to analyze the implementation of the Public Information Disclosure Law in the Indonesian Parliament (DPR RI) (Rengganis & Subhan, 2024).

2. Literature review

The implementation of public information disclosure is crucial for realizing democratic and accountable governance in China. Transparency enables citizens to actively participate in public decision-making and to exercise social control over state institutions. Within the context of the Indonesian House of Representatives (DPR RI), public openness is a manifestation of its representative function, requiring reciprocal communication between elected officials and constituents (Dewi, 2022; Wahyudin, 2021). Legally, public information disclosure is regulated through multiple instruments such as the 1945 Constitution, Law No. 14/2008 on Public Information Disclosure (UU KIP), the MD3 Law, the Archival Law, and DPR's internal regulations. Nevertheless, previous research has highlighted suboptimal implementation across government bodies. Studies have been conducted by Taufiq. (2014) in Pesawaran Regency, (Indraswati, 2016) (2016) in the Indonesian Audit Board (BPK RI), Sjoraida (2015) in West Java Provincial Government, and Purnawansyah (2014) in Sidoarjo's local parliament all reported significant challenges, including weak institutional commitment, limited human resources, and inadequate infrastructure. Theoretically, Jurgen Habermas and Peter Dahlgren underscore the central role of information in cultivating a vibrant public sphere in which deliberative discourse can thrive. Transparency, in this sense, is not merely a right but a civic tool to strengthen institutional legitimacy and accountability. However, critical reports by civil society organizations such as the Indonesia Parliamentary Center (2017) and Transparency International Indonesia (Putri et al., 2021)

reveal the DPR's reluctance to disclose key legislative documents such as bill drafts and meeting transcripts.

Putra, Ahadiyat, and Keumalahayati (2023) reinforce these findings by identifying critical implementation barriers in the DPR related to policy resources, interorganizational communication, implementing agency characteristics, and socio-political conditions. Furthermore, the lack of integrated digital systems and certified personnel has led to varying interpretations of information management standards, especially regarding classified or exempt documents. Hence, a significant research gap remains regarding the implementation of UU KIP in the legislative sector, particularly at the national level. This study addresses this gap by employing the implementation model of Meter and Van Horn (1975), which includes six variables: policy standards and objectives, resources, communication, characteristics of implementing agencies, socio-economic conditions, and implementers' dispositions.

3. Method

This study used a case study method. The type of research is descriptive with a qualitative approach. The reason for using a qualitative approach in this study is that qualitative procedures have a more diverse approach to academic research than quantitative methods. The data sources for this study consisted of primary and secondary data. Primary data were obtained through field observations by directly observing and recording the process of public information services in the Indonesian Parliament (DPR RI). Primary data were also obtained through in-depth interviews with informants who understood the substance of the issues in this study. The key informants in this study are (1) the Main Information and Documentation Management Officer (PPID Utama) of DPR RI, who is responsible for the governance and provision of public information; (2) the Implementing/Assistant PPID (in each work unit/department/committee), who assists the Main PPID in the governance and provision of public information in the Indonesian Parliament; (3) individuals, groups, institutions, or civil society organizations (CSOs) as part of the public with an interest in public information in the Indonesian Parliament; and (4) academics from various universities.

The collected data were processed in two stages: data reduction and data categorization. The collected data were described in the form of themes or categories to facilitate the verification process, resulting in a qualitative dataset ready for analysis. Data validity was ensured by triangulating data sources, applying member checking, clarifying biases that may be brought into the research by the researcher, utilizing a relatively long time (prolonged time) in the field or research location, and engaging in question-and-answer sessions with fellow researchers (peer debriefing) to enhance the accuracy of the research results.

4. Result and discussion

4.1 Overview of the Information and Documentation Management Officer (PPID) of the Indonesian Parliament (DPR RI)

Through the Regulation of the Secretary General of the Indonesian Parliament (DPR RI), Number 6 of 2021, concerning the Organization and Work Procedures of the Secretary General of the Indonesian Parliament (DPR RI), information and documentation management falls under the scope of the Protocol and Public Relations Bureau. Therefore, all public relations functions, including public information services, are the responsibility of the Head of the Protocol and Public Relations Bureau of the DPR RI Secretariat General. Throughout 2021, all elements of the DPR RI Secretariat General's Information and Documentation Management Officer (PPID) made several breakthroughs in carrying out the management and public information services. Various innovations, collaborations, and initiatives have been implemented to continuously improve the performance of information transparency to support the realization of an Open Parliament.

4.2 Implementation of the Public Information Disclosure Act in the Indonesian Parliament

The implementation of public policies can be understood as the activity of resolving or carrying out a previously established public policy using available resources to achieve the policy objectives (Tachjan, 2016). The implementation of public policies can be defined as the activity of resolving or carrying out

a public policy that has been established/approved using means (tools) to achieve policy objectives (Lester, 2000). However, implementation is a complex phenomenon that can be understood as a process, output, or outcome (Mwesigwa et al., 2022; Winarno, 2011). In Indonesia, the right to information is regulated by Law Number 14 of 2008 concerning Public Information Disclosure (Public Information Disclosure Act). For the public, the Public Information Disclosure Act represents the recognition of their right to information and how that right should be fulfilled and protected by the state. For the government and other public bodies, the Public Information Disclosure Act serves as a legal guideline to fulfill and protect the public's right to information. This legal guideline aims to prevent violations of the public's right to information while ensuring that openness does not harm the interests of individuals and the state, which are protected by law (Subagiyo 2009).

To examine and analyze the implementation of the Public Information Disclosure policy in the Indonesian Parliament, the author uses several variables as a reference. These variables are integrated into the implementation model by Meter (1975) and include: 1) policy standards and targets, 2) resources, 3) communication and implementation activities, 4) characteristics of the implementing organization, 5) social, economic, and political conditions, and 6) implementers' disposition.

4.2.1 Policy Standards and Objectives

Policy standards and objectives articulate the overall goals of the policy decisions. Research findings indicate that policy standards and objectives in the implementation of Law Number 14 of 2008 on Public Information Transparency (Public Information Law) in the Indonesian People's Representative Council (DPR) are particularly complex, especially regarding the identification and measurement of information transparency performance. The policy standards and objectives for information transparency are stated in the Public Information Transparency Law. As stated in the first policy standard in Article 7, paragraph (1) of the Public Information Law, the DPR is obliged to provide, deliver, and/or publish Public Information under its authority to Public Information Applicants, except for information that is exempted according to the provisions of the law. This has been done, for example, through live coverage of parliamentary proceedings, which can be viewed through digital TV broadcasts or Internet live streaming. The public can also attend open meetings and gatherings to discuss the issue.

In the context of legislative information, documents or information produced by the DPR's supporting apparatus, such as draft laws, are published on its website. However, the published draft laws are not always updated, resulting in outdated information. In addition to technical issues in documentation, editing, sorting, and the time required for information publication, the latest discussion results on draft laws are usually not published because of the agreement of the leadership of the council. Meanwhile, documents such as discussion minutes, academic manuscripts, brief reports, problem filing lists (DIM), consensus results, and focus group discussions (FGD) must go through the public information request mechanism through the Public Information and Documentation Officer (PPID). The following is data on public information requests through the DPR's PPID related to legislation:

Table 1. Number of Public Information Requests (By Type of Information, 2017-2020 in the DPR)

No	Document	2017	2018	2019	2020
1	Minutes	1028	1140	1097	474
2	Academic Manuscripts	609	673	666	386
3	Report	—	151	97	34
4	Others	202	239	344	158

Source: DPR Public Information Service Report 2017-2020

Upon examination, the data above show a decrease in information demand in 2020. However, the legislative information published on the website of the Indonesian People's Consultative Assembly (DPR RI) in 2020 was also minimal; therefore, the decrease in the number of requests cannot be attributed to the openness of public information provided by the DPR RI. For example, of the 13 bills passed in 2020, none were accompanied by published minutes. The high demand for legislative information in recent years confirms the findings of a survey conducted by the Open Parliament

Initiative (OPI) of the Indonesian DPR RI in July-August 2020. The majority of respondents stated that the most important information to be disclosed by the DPR is information related to legislative programs (27.49%), followed by budget information (23.95%) and work plans (18.08%). Meanwhile, 12.95% wanted periodic work reports, 8.39% wanted information on facilities and public participation, 6.8% wanted information on members, and 51.96% wanted information on factions (OPI Survey, 2021).

However, not all information in the DPR RI is publicly accessible. Certain public information exemptions are defined in Article 17 of the Law on Public Information Transparency. The DPR's PPID stated in an interview that the excluded information falls under the categories specified in Article 17 of the Law on Public Information Transparency, and that they update the List of Exempted Public Information every year. Each working unit or council's supporting body inventories the information it possesses, including the information covered by Article 17 of the Law on Public Information Transparency. The excluded public information is broadly divided into categories such as state secrecy, confidentiality for fair competition, and confidentiality of personal rights. The second standard is that the DPR RI is obliged to provide accurate, correct, and non-misleading information. Research results indicate that no publicly questioned information has been found regarding the accuracy, particularly in the provision of official information releases through official sources from the DPR RI.

Nevertheless, there are some potential loopholes that can generate debates on the accuracy of information in society based on past events related to legislative information from the DPR. For example, academic texts on amendments to Law No. 4 of 2009 concerning Mineral and Coal Mining were not listed on the DPR website but were first published by a civil society organization. In such cases, the DPR's PPID is crucial for expediting the information service process, especially regarding information requests for material review submissions to the Constitutional Court. The third standard is that the DPR RI must establish and develop an information and documentation system to manage public information effectively and efficiently for easy access. Research results indicate that the DPR continues to make resource efficiency efforts while considering information transparency. The steps taken to achieve time and cost efficiency include using Internet platforms and social media, such as websites, YouTube, Facebook, Twitter, and Instagram, as means of public information openness. In particular, social media can be widely accessed by the public to absorb various types of information, including policies and developments related to the tasks and functions of the Indonesian DPR. The fourth standard is that the DPR is obligated to make written considerations for every policy to fulfill every individual's right to public information. The research results indicate that the intended written considerations are explained in writing by the DPR through the PPID regarding various considerations based on the Law on Public Information Transparency and other related laws regarding the requested public information. Thus, the basis for fulfilling or rejecting the provision of public information is clearly communicated to the requester.

The fifth standard is that the DPR, in making written considerations as mentioned earlier, must include political, economic, social, cultural, and/or defense and national security considerations. Research results indicate that this standard has been implemented by the Indonesian DPR, where in every fulfillment or rejection of providing public information, the DPR's PPID always refers to Article 17 of the Law on Public Information Transparency, which explains the information that is exempted from being provided to the public. The sixth standard is that the DPR must utilize electronic and non-electronic means and/or media to fulfill its obligations. As mentioned above, social media and the Internet are at the forefront of information openness in electronic media. In addition, Parliament TV regularly broadcasts live open meetings held by each commission and other supporting bodies. Several applications support the work of the DPR in delivering information. As for non-electronic means, there is the distribution of magazines, books, journals, and parliamentary bulletins managed by the DPR's Public Relations Team.

The objectives are almost similar to the policy standards, where the Law on Public Information Transparency is the main reference and includes targets for public information openness. The first objective is that the Indonesian DPR guarantees the right of citizens to know the plans for public policy-making, public policy programs, and the process of public decision-making, as well as the reasons

behind public decision-making. This process is carried out by opening the presence of the public in every meeting of the Supporting Body (AKD), such as commissions or boards. The second objective is to encourage public participation in public policymaking. Research results indicate that this participation takes the form of inviting the public to express various aspirations and conduct public consultations on draft laws, which the DPR accommodates through its Supporting Bodies and factions. However, interviews with civil society groups such as the Indonesia Parliamentary Center (IPC) (Center, 2017) and academics from UI, who are also former commissioners of the Central Information Commission of Indonesia, show that the DPR still needs to make further efforts to improve, expand, and accommodate diverse aspirations and public participation in the law-making process. In some cases, such as the revision of the Corruption Eradication Commission Law and the Job Creation Law, the involvement and aspirations of the public are considered not to be adequately accommodated, resulting in the objective of the Law on Public Information Transparency to encourage public participation in the process of public policy-making not being fully achieved.

The third objective is for the DPR to continue its efforts to enhance the active role of the public in public policymaking and good governance. Research results indicate that the DPR continues to create spaces for participants to enhance public engagement, such as conducting discussions, public consultations, Focus Group Discussions (FGD), or public seminars, including collaboration with factions in the Indonesian DPR. Furthermore, the active role of the public is being promoted through the dissemination of DPR information, which is included in the information that must be periodically available through the official websites of the DPR, as well as information that the public can obtain through the mechanism of requesting public information via the DPR's PPID. A recurring issue in the process of public information transparency is that the documents discussed by DPR members are classified as confidential. This affects the performance of the PPID in providing public information services. The PPID consists of individuals who are civil servants, which poses political and bureaucratic obstacles when attempting to collect information documents. According to Hanafi, the IPC chairman, civil society will try to obtain documents that are difficult to access through the PPID through informal means, such as through other civil society organizations, colleagues working as experts, or members of the DPR. The fourth objective is for the DPR to promote good governance, which includes transparency, effectiveness, efficiency, accountability, and social responsibility. Research results indicate that the DPR continues to collaborate with the Central Information Commission of the Republic of Indonesia to improve information transparency, effectiveness, efficiency, and accountability (Nairobi et al., 2021). This collaboration includes training provided by the Commissioners of the Central Information Commission to the Main and Implementing PPIDs, as well as joint meetings to discuss solutions to enhance information openness in the DPR. Additionally, the PPID, in collaboration with the IPC, holds an annual ranking of internal public information transparency within the DPR, which is participated by all commissions, bodies, and working units at the implementing PPID level. These findings indicate that these efforts have significantly increased the awareness of internal DPR employees regarding the existence of the Law on Public Information Transparency and its implementation practices.

The fifth objective is for the DPR to continuously provide a broader space for the public to understand the reasons behind public policies that affect the welfare of people. Research findings indicate that the DPR continues to strive to process information for the benefit of the public, particularly by expanding access to information. This helps the public access legislative information such as academic studies, meeting minutes, lists of issues, lists of members or teams involved in discussions, meeting records, and other important legislative information that the public needs to understand the reasons behind public policies that affect the welfare of the people. The expansion of information includes the establishment of a website for information requests, making it easier for the public to request information from the Indonesian DPR. The sixth objective is to develop knowledge and enhance the intellectual life of the nation. Research findings indicate that the DPR continues to make efforts to provide wider access to educational institutions and researchers to access the information it possesses and facilitate direct visits for research purposes or public outreach programs. This is done by increasing information that can be directly accessed by the public through the website without the need for information requests (periodic information), improving information management and services through internal coordination and consolidation, and collaborating with various universities on research and other areas. This is expected

to encourage equality of information between the DPR and the public, thereby promoting a diverse range of inputs from the public to the Indonesian DPR, particularly in terms of public information transparency.

The seventh objective is for the DPR to continuously improve the management and provision of information within the public body to deliver quality information service. In practice, this objective has been implemented through an integrated system via the Indonesian DPR's website and social media, especially through live broadcasts of meetings and accessible meeting outcomes for the public to view. For example, the public does not have to come in person to obtain the desired information through the PPID website. However, a criticism regarding this point, as conveyed by the Chairman of the IPC, is that public information displayed on the website sometimes lacks promptness in terms of timeliness. Based on the above explanations, it can be concluded that the policy standards and objectives related to the Law on Public Information Transparency, in the context of its implementation in the Indonesian DPR, are clear, and their implementation is ongoing. The measures are specified in the articles of the Law on Public Information Transparency, which are subsequently followed by the Indonesian DPR through the issuance of the Indonesian People's Consultative Assembly Regulation No. 1 of 2010 concerning Public Information Transparency in the Indonesian People's Consultative Assembly.

4.2.2 Policy Resources

The implementation of public information transparency in the Indonesian DPR essentially requires policy resources, including budget, infrastructure, human resources, and incentives. In terms of infrastructure, research findings indicate that the Indonesian DPR has been continuously improving various infrastructures, which are quite adequate. According to a documentation study conducted by researchers, the physical infrastructure at the Public Information and Documentation Center (PPID) of the General Secretariat of the Indonesian DPR is sufficient. Regarding digital infrastructure, the research found that there is a digital infrastructure in place to promote information transparency. For example, digital infrastructure enables the Indonesian DPR to connect networks on a larger scale and integrate large amounts of data into the system. The strengthening of the digital media website is accompanied by the reinforcement of various social media platforms, such as Facebook, YouTube, Twitter, and Instagram.

Although the infrastructure, especially related to social media, provides significant information to the public, the analysis of the DPR's social media platforms reveals that the information provided periodically is normative in nature, focusing on the activities of the leaders and some members of the Indonesian DPR. However, the public expects information on public issues, such as the legislative process, the List of Inventory of Problems (DIM) of a bill proposed by factions, meeting minutes, and others. In terms of human resources, the Indonesian DPR continues to strengthen its human resources to enhance information transparency. Research findings also indicate that the human resources of the Indonesian DPR collaborate with other agencies to provide training or technical guidance in the management of digital infrastructure, as well as guidance on the operationalization of information transparency by civil society organizations (CSOs) focused on parliamentary information transparency. Their aim was to improve or evaluate various information transparency practices carried out by the Indonesian DPR's PPID.

One issue that remains problematic for the DPR's PPID in managing and providing public information services is the lack of personnel dedicated to information management and services at the PPID implementation level, such as in various commissions or bodies within the Indonesian DPR itself. The number of public relations officers, computer technicians, and archivists mandated by the Law on Public Information Transparency and held by each PPID is still limited. This is due to the fact that the human resources assigned as PPID implementers have other significant workloads. In terms of budget policy, it supports the operational needs of infrastructure and human resources within the Indonesian DPR's PPID. Generally, budget policies, including incentives, follow the Presidential Regulation of the Republic of Indonesia Number 16 of 2020, regarding Performance Allowances for Employees in the Secretariat General of the Regional Representative Council. Research findings indicate that there is no distinct formula regarding incentive policies, and they are almost the same as those of other divisions

within the Indonesian DPR. This means that there are no additional incentives for each PPID team within the Indonesian DPR, despite their responsibilities. This somewhat affects the motivation of both the main and implementing PPID teams in fulfilling their functions as PPID according to the mandates of the Law on Public Information Transparency and DPR Regulation on Public Information Transparency.

4.2.3 Interorganizational Communication and Enforcement Activities

The effective implementation of information transparency policies requires clear standards and program objectives that should be understood by those responsible for achieving them. Therefore, it is essential to pay attention to the clarity of standards and objectives, the accuracy of communication with implementers, and consistency conveyed by various sources of information. Research findings indicate that there are communication issues between organizations regarding various substances from other institutions in the context of public information. However, these problems are technical/operational in nature and do not significantly disrupt the operationalization of information transparency in the Indonesian DPR. For example, if the DPR receives information or documents from other institutions, as long as the information is still current, the DPR's PPID can directly provide public information unless it is derived from a closed meeting. In such cases, the DPR's PPID usually directs the information requester to seek the information directly from the agency that generated it. One institutional mechanism and procedure that can be used to increase the likelihood that implementers will act consistently with policy standards and objectives is to grant higher authority (superiors) to oversee and monitor policy implementation. Research findings indicate that the authority or superior of the PPID is currently held by the Secretary-General of the Indonesian DPR. This position grants them various mechanisms of power and authority, such as deciding priorities in the implementation process of public information transparency in the DPR itself. Additionally, as a figure with high authority, the PPID's superior has control over the budget allocation of the subordinate units under their supervision, which can be increased or reduced in response to the organization's performance in implementing public information transparency, whether it is satisfactory or not. The Secretary-General of the Indonesian DPR, as the superior of the PPID, has the power to influence the behavior of policy implementers under their authority, namely the Main PPID and the Implementing PPID of the Indonesian DPR.

The Main PPID of the DPR and the PPID's superior regularly conduct internal evaluations of the implementation of the Law on Public Information Transparency (UU KIP) in commissions, bodies, and other entities that serve as implementing PPIDs. These evaluations involve collaboration between the Central Information Commission and civil society organizations as assessors. Internal evaluations are conducted in the form of competitions to rank the level of public information transparency within the DPR. This is done as part of the process of enforcing and fostering the implementation of public information transparency in the DPR. In the context of inter-organizational (or inter-governmental) relations, two types of enforcement or follow-up activities are the most important. First, advice and technical assistance can be provided. Higher-level officials often play a significant role in facilitating implementation by assisting subordinates in interpreting regulations and guidelines, developing responses to policy initiatives, and obtaining the necessary physical and technical resources to implement policies. Second, superiors can rely on various sanctions or rewards to enforce rules and policies.

Research findings indicate that, in the communication of information transparency policies, there have been no issues related to the accuracy of the information, both within the internal PPID of the Indonesian DPR and between the PPID of the Indonesian DPR and information requesters. The accuracy of data and information is crucial for implementing public information transparency, as it provides correct, accurate, up-to-date, and non-misleading information, which facilitates decision-making and strategic planning in accordance with the mandate of the Law on Public Information Transparency (UU KIP). There have been negative findings regarding data accuracy, but they are not related to the substance of the information; instead, they pertain to file naming in the archives, which the Main PPID of the Indonesian DPR considers an administrative oversight. Other findings indicate that the accuracy of the Indonesian DPR has not been fully maximized, especially in terms of how the DPR, as a political institution, provides data on debated issues. However, it sometimes falls short of meeting the

information needs of the public. In this regard, the DPR, as a political institution, is still not proactive enough in delivering information quickly and accurately to the public, such as in the processes and outcomes of legislative discussions.

The issue of information transparency in the Indonesian DPR is related to the accuracy and consistency of information. When examining the documentation, consistency issues were observed. Generally, the communication carried out is consistent, meaning that the data are in line with or valid. The researcher did not find any inconsistencies in the requested data; therefore, there was no discrepancy between what information requesters asked for and what the DPR's PPID provided. Based on the research findings, there have been no cases of inconsistent information, either within the internal PPID of the Indonesian DPR or between the PPID of the Indonesian DPR and the public.

4.2.4 The Characteristics of the Implementing Agencies

The characteristics of implementing organizations in this study adopt the model proposed by Meter (1975), in which the researchers summarize three relevant characteristics of information openness: competence, hierarchical level, and political resources. The Research findings indicate that competence is divided into two aspects: knowledge and skills. In terms of knowledge, both the Main PPID and Implementing PPIDs of the Indonesian DPR generally possess knowledge of the Law on Public Information Transparency (UU KIP) and its implementing regulations. This is mainly because the DPR's PPID regularly conducts seminars, socialization events, and training on public information transparency for all representatives of the Implementing PPIDs in each unit of work. This includes conducting routine evaluations through internal ranking to assess the extent to which UU KIP and DPR regulations on public information transparency are implemented in work units. Common problems arise when job rotations occur dynamically, resulting in a lack of knowledge among newly appointed officials regarding public information transparency. Furthermore, limited human resources, especially archivists and records managers in each unit of work, often face challenges in prioritizing the management of public information in accordance with the UU KIP, which is not their primary task. High workloads lead to some of them paying less attention to improving their knowledge and understanding of public-information management. Consequently, not all data and information are well documented because the units or departments have not thoroughly recorded various information and documents, especially those related to political decisions in the Indonesian DPR.

The research findings also indicate that, in general, PPIDs, especially the Main PPID, are skilled in managing and providing public information. They can document and classify which public information can be disclosed and which information is exempted or closed to the public. The Main PPID is also efficient in processing public information requests submitted by the public, whether through the website or in person at the DPR office. The main references in this policy are the UU KIP, the MD3 Law, and other relevant regulations, which include specific closed information, particularly in the discussion processes during meetings declared by the session chairperson as closed to the public. At the hierarchical level of information openness, the process occurs in a hierarchical manner, and this remains a challenge, as there are still areas of public uncertainty regarding the extent to which the documentation of public information has been processed by the Indonesian House of Representatives (DPR RI). Active data or data still under discussion are usually stored in work units such as commissions or bodies, whereas inactive data are kept in archives. The Main Public Information Officer (PPID Utama) receives 80-500 information requests every month, and the information is located under the responsibility of the Implementing PPIDs in the work units. The problem is that not all Implementing PPIDs respond quickly to information requests. Moreover, information requests related to non-active documents, especially those dating back to the early days of Indonesian independence, may still be stored in the archives or may not be found at all. Ultimately, this sometimes leads to suboptimal public information service.

In some cases, the public obtains public information or documents directly from members of the House of Representatives or requests them directly from relevant factions. This makes it difficult for the PPID to control which information or documents have been released and which have not been accessed by the public. Simultaneously, the PPID does not have the authority to regulate information that is also controlled by members of the House of Representatives and factions. Therefore, if there is a debate

outside the scope of information considered to originate from the DPR, the PPID tends to have difficulty addressing it. Moreover, the information circulating in society is usually diverse and has many versions because it is not obtained through official procedures or sources, resulting in doubts about its validity. A relevant example is the discussion surrounding the Omnibus Job Creation Law. This significantly disrupts the administrative hierarchy within the DPR's PPID.

Political resources are inherently strong. As an institution that represents the public, information openness is an important part of various operational activities of the Indonesian House of Representatives (DPR RI). However, in practice, various problems remain in terms of information openness, especially regarding politically sensitive activities. This means that not all operations or activities within the DPR can have their information accessed and distributed, such as information within factions and the detailed documentation of meetings, due to political considerations or risks if such information is disclosed. Within the DPR, there is an impression that if certain information that should be open does not align with the interests of members or factions within the DPR, there is a tendency to reduce transparency in their actions and engage in practices that are not in line with the policy of public information openness.

4.2.5 *Economic, Social, and Political Conditions*

The research findings indicate that there is complexity in budget utilization, both in terms of the amount and the division/department where it is managed. The details of the budget for public information services are as follows:

Table 2. Budget for Public Information Services

Account	Name	Ceiling	Realization
521211	Public Service Banquet	212.440.000	197.004.000
521811	Supplies	150.000.000	150.000.000
522151	Shopping for Professional Services	130.200.000	124.900.000
522191	Shopping for Other Services	197.070.000	197.065.000
522192	Shopping for Covid Swab Services	95.400.000	43.045.700
Total		785.110.000	712.014.000

Source: PPID, 2022.

Furthermore, this variable examines how prevailing economic and social conditions affect policy implementation. These two aspects are related to a person's position within an institution and their interactions with others, including their social environment, achievements, and rights and obligations concerning resources. The research results indicate that leaders have authority related to economic creation (including budgeting and approval) and creating social conditions in implementation, which includes assigning tasks and functions to employees based on their competence and abilities and aligning tasks with their respective roles and functions. Public opinion is also considered in relation to the implementation of information transparency. The research results show that, although the Indonesian House of Representatives (DPR RI) has a good reputation (moving towards being informative) in terms of compliance with the public information openness law, as stated in the release by the Central Information Commission of Indonesia in 2021, public opinion in various surveys tends to be negative, reflecting a strong negative perspective towards the DPR RI. This negative perspective is often influenced by DPR policies that are perceived as irrelevant to the hopes and desires of the public. However, this aspect is not directly correlated with public information openness.

From a political perspective, the research results show that political elites, including the leaders of the DPR RI, generally support the implementation of public information openness in the DPR. In essence, the Public Information Transparency Law (UU KIP) is part of the political support for the DPR. In the UU KIP, information is defined as data, facts, explanations, statements, ideas, and signs that contain value, meaning, and messages, presented in various packaging and formats according to the development of electronic and non-electronic information and communication technologies. Law No. 14 of 2008 concerning Public Information Transparency is a form of transparency and accountability

of public bodies towards the public as users of public information, aiming to achieve good governance. Thus, UU KIP was enacted to ensure good, transparent, effective, efficient, accountable, and responsible governance.

5. Conclusion

5.1 Findings

The implementation of the Public Information Disclosure Policy in the Indonesian House of Representatives (DPR RI) is still not optimal, particularly in terms of utilizing information disclosure media and resources. The findings indicate that information disclosure media still heavily rely on conventional website operations, where the Public Information and Documentation Officer (PPID) communicates data and information to the Information and Documentation Bureau (AKD) due to the absence of reliable internal Big Data. Additionally, there is no use of applications that provide real-time data processing for both applicants and within the internal structure of the DPR RI itself. Furthermore, the absence of personnel certification has resulted in differences in interpretation among implementing officials regarding the standards for managing and providing public information, especially exempted or classified information.

5.2 Recommendations

5.2.1 Theoretical Recommendation

The academic recommendation in this study is the need for more comprehensive research on the implementation of the Public Information Disclosure Act in the Indonesian House of Representatives (DPR RI) using multidisciplinary approaches, particularly in the areas of government management, government communication, organizational culture, and government history. This is necessary to obtain a comprehensive understanding of the implementation practices of the Public Information Disclosure Act in the DPR, so that any emerging issues can be explained and appropriate solutions found.

5.2.2 Practical Recommendation

Based on the conclusions of the above research, the practical recommendations of this study are as follows:

- a. The Secretariat General of the Indonesian House of Representatives (DPR RI) must develop a DPR RI application that not only focuses on digitalizing information but also provides real-time data and information services to the public.
- b. Members of the Indonesian House of Representatives (DPR RI) should be more open to providing political information related to various tasks and processes carried out by DPR members so that political information requests are not directed to the DPR Information and Documentation Management Officer (PPID DPR).
- c. The Central Information Commission should provide more intensive support to the PPID DPR RI to enhance information transparency, including responsiveness and compliance with laws and regulations.
- d. The Committees and Factions in the Indonesian House of Representatives (DPR RI) should actively contribute to providing public information to the PPID DPR, thereby improving the completeness and accessibility of the information database for applicants and the general public.

References

- Arifin, S. (2016). Study on the Implementation of Public Information Policy: Evaluation Study of Information Dissemination Program at the Department of Communication and Informatics of Bangkalan Regency, 2012-2015. Thesis. . (Surabaya: *Master's Program in Media & Communication, Airlangga University*).
- Center, I. P. (2017). Reforming Public Information Governance in the Indonesian House of Representatives: Starting from Documentation (Jakarta: Seminar Materials).
- Dewi, F. G. (2022). Mutations of position and performance of local government public officers: An experimental study. *Journal of Governance and Accountability Studies*, 2(2), 93-105.

- Ferdaus, F., & Zaimasuri, Z. (2023). Implementation of public information disclosure policy in the house of Representatives of the Republic of Indonesia. doi:<https://doi.org/10.35912/jgas.v3i1.1771>
- Ferdaus, F., & Zaimasuri, Z. (2023). Implementation of public information disclosure policy in the house of Representatives of the Republic of Indonesia. *Journal of Governance and Accountability Studies*, 3, 29-50. doi:10.35912/jgas.v3i1.1771
- Hardiman, F. B. (2010). Public Space: Tracing Democratic Participation from the Police to Cyberspace. (Yogyakarta: Kanisius).
- Huang, T. (2020). Freedom of Speech as a Right to Know. *U. Cin. L. Rev.*, 89, 106.
- Indraswati., B. (2016). Communication and Information Transparency in Public Agencies: A Study on the Implementation of Communication Policy of Law No. 14 of 2008 on Public Information Transparency in the Indonesian Supreme Audit Agency during 2010-2015. *Thesis. (Yogyakarta: Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Gadjah Mada University)*.
- Lester, J. P., & Joseph Stewart. (2000). Public Policy: An Evaluationary Approach. 2nd Edition. (Australia: Wadsworth).
- McKee, A. (2005). An Introduction to The Public Sphere. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Meter, D. v., & Carl E. Van Horn. (1975). The Policy Implementation Process: A Conceptual Framework." *Administration and Society*. 6(4).
- Mwesigwa, D., Bogere, M., & Ogwal, J. B. (2022). Local citizen participation in Uganda: Examining the political, administrative and financial aspects in Hoima district. *Journal of Governance and Accountability Studies*, 2(1), 49-63. doi:10.35912/jgas.v2i1.892
- Nairobi, N., Santi, N. R., & Afif, F. Y. (2021). The impact of the quality of democracy on the economic growth of provinces in Indonesia. *Journal of Governance and Accountability Studies*, 1(2), 121-132. doi:10.35912/jgas.v1i2.626
- Purnawansyah, D. (2014). Implementation of Law No. 14 of 2008 on Public Information Transparency in the Sidoarjo Regency Regional People's Representative Council. *Journal of KMP UM Sidoarjo*. 2 (1): 67-78.
- Putra, M. F., Ahadiyat, A., & Keumalahayati, K. (2023). The influence of leadership style on performance with motivation as mediation (Study on employees of Metro City trade services during pandemi). *Journal of Multidisciplinary Academic and Practice Studies*, 1(1), 69-82. doi:10.35912/jomaps.v1i1.1536
- Putri, I. P., Yustikaningrum, R. Y., & Devitasari, A. A. (2021). Implementasi Tax on Food dalam Tanggung Jawab Negara Terhadap Hak Pangan Berdasarkan Putusan Mahkamah Konstitusi 39/PUU-XIV/2016. *Jurnal Konstitusi*, 18(2), 294-320. doi:<https://doi.org/10.31078/jk1822>
- Rengganis, A., & Subhan, S. (2024). DPR Now Application: Public Information Openness in the Digital Governance Era in Public Service Accountability and Responsibility Efforts in Indonesia. *Available at SSRN 4782361*. doi:<https://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4782361>
- Santosa, M. A. (2001). Good Governance and Environmental Law, (Jakarta: ICEL).
- Sanudyanoro, T. M. (2014). Indonesia: How Applicants Can Exercise the Right to Information. (Jakarta: AJI).
- Sjoraida, D. F. (2015). Implementation of Public Information Transparency Policy in West Java Provincial Government. *Journal of Sosiohumaniora Unpad*. 17 (3): 212-219.
- Subagiyo, H., dkk. (2009). Annotations of Law No. 14 of 2008 on Public Information Transparency. First Edition. (Jakarta: Central Information Commission - ICEL).
- Tachjan. (2016). Policy Implementation. (Bandung: AIPI – Puslit KP2W Lemlit Unpad).
- Taufiq., I. (2014). Implementation of the Public Information Transparency Law in Pesawaran Regency Government. Thesis. (Yogyakarta: Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Gadjah Mada University).
- Triayuni, B. R. (2018). Implementation of Law Number 14 of 2008 Concerning Public Information Disclosure in Realizing Good Governance. *Indonesian State Law Review*, 1(1), 53-67. doi:<https://doi.org/10.15294/islrev.v1i1.22964>
- Wahyudin, A. (2021). The Role of Indonesia Parliamentary Television as Government Broadcasting to Enhance Public Trust. *Jurnal Penelitian Komunikasi*, 24(2). doi:<https://doi.org/10.20422/jpk.v24i2.822>
- Winarno, B. (2011). Public Policy: Theory, Process, and Case Studies. (Yogyakarta: CAPS).