

Implementation of public information disclosure policy in the house of Representatives of the Republic of Indonesia

Feri Ferdaus¹, Zaimasuri Zaimasuri²

University of Lampung, Lampung, Indonesia^{1,2}

feri.ferdaus@fisip.unila.ac.id¹, zaimasuri@fisip.unila.ac.id²



Article History

Received on 1 October 2023

1st Revision on 15 October 2023

2nd Revision on 28 October 2023

Accepted on 11 November 2023

Abstract

Purpose: This study aims to identify how the implementation of the public information disclosure policy in the House of Representatives (DPR) in 2019-2021 is going and to find the right strategies to be implemented so that the DPR can become an informative public body.

Research methodology: This research uses a qualitative descriptive method with a case study approach, where primary and secondary data are obtained through in-depth interviews with predetermined key informants, field observations, and literature studies relevant to the research topic.

Results: The findings show that the implementation of public information disclosure policy in Parliament is still not optimal due to various obstacles in the process of documenting, classifying, managing, and serving public information that are technical, administrative, bureaucratic, and political in nature. DPR needs to start building and developing an internal big data system that is connected to real time public information management and service applications. In addition, the active role of Members and factions in the House in providing public information is also important to support the successful implementation of public information disclosure in the House.

Keywords: *policy implementation, public information disclosure, PPID, DPR*

How to cite: 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(1), 29-50.

1. Introduction

The 1998 Reformasi marked a new era for the life of the Indonesian state. After President Soeharto and the New Order regime that ruled for 32 years fell, many changes occurred in Indonesia, especially in the political field. One of the significant things that reflected these changes was the amendment of the 1945 Constitution, which in the New Order era was perceived as something "sacred" and should not be changed. The provisions contained in the 1945 Constitution were considered to be one of the factors that caused many irregularities to occur during the New Order era, because they gave the President enormous authority without an adequate checks and balances mechanism (Mahfud MD, 2001). On the other hand, the amendments to the 1945 Constitution strengthened the role of the DPR as an institution holding legislative power as well as a watchdog for the running of the government. This strengthening is characterized by constitutional guarantees in the form of the right to immunity, the right to interpellation, the right of inquiry, and also the right to express an opinion. In short, the role of the DPR in the post-amendment political system has strengthened. The impression of being merely a "rubber stamp" for the government's interests during the New Order era is slowly disappearing. The strengthening of the DPR has led to high attention and expectations from the public towards this institution that carries out the functions of legislation, supervision and budgeting. This is because members of the DPR are mandate holders and represent the voice of the people who have

voted directly through general elections. The achievement of this mandate is possible when there is an ongoing relationship between the DPR and members of the DPR with the community as they carry out their duties and functions. In addition, they must also follow up, fight, and be morally and politically responsible to the people in their electoral districts or commonly known as the representation function. The function of representation can run effectively and have a real impact if DPR RI is open to the public. The transparency of the DPR covers at least two aspects, namely, first, transparency of implementation activities and sessions. The second is transparency of documents (Center, 2017).

Parliament needs to maintain its openness because there is a relationship between those who give the mandate and those who receive the mandate through the electoral process. This relationship must continue to be strengthened through the implementation of DPR's inherent duties and functions. This relationship is often referred to as a relationship of accountability, where there is a process of political accountability from those who receive the mandate to those who give the mandate. Mandate-givers will be able to assess whether the performance of their representatives in the DPR is satisfactory or not. If they are not satisfied, they can complain and the DPR as the recipient of the mandate is obliged to respond and improve in the future. The first requirement in this accountability relationship is transparency. Active participation of the public in policy formulation and evaluation, as well as active contribution to the work of their representatives in the DPR, is only possible if there is adequate information about elected representatives, their actions and how they are being implemented.

In the context of accountability, there are three steps that need to be taken: (1) The mandate recipient must convey complete information and data to the trustor. The information provided must be comprehensive; (2) There is discussion and integration in a legitimate and accountable public discussion forum. At this stage, the public has the freedom to ask questions about the information that has been received; (3) The public assesses the performance of the mandate recipient. Whether there are perceived benefits or not (Bovens, 2003). For example, in the legislative function, Parliament must ensure that all data and information related to the legislative process are openly accessible. This includes information on drafting teams, special committees, session schedules, problem lists, academic papers, draft bills, drafts of public input, bills that have not been, will be, and have been passed, as well as other relevant information. This is also the case with oversight and budgeting functions. If this information is not available, then opportunities for discussion between the DPR and the public and greater public involvement will inevitably be limited or hindered.

In fact, the legal basis that mandates that Parliament be open to the public is quite complete and strong. These range from the 1945 Constitution, specifically Article 28F, the MD3 Law, the P3 Law, the Archives Law, the Freedom of Information Law that was issued as a mandate from Article 28F, to internal regulations in the form of Parliament's own rules of procedure. The legal basis that has been strong enough to order the Parliament to be open, raises expectations for the public that the practice of information disclosure in parliament can be implemented optimally. This is because optimal implementation of information disclosure will enable citizens to be more actively involved in policy formulation and decision-making, as well as to criticize matters that are contrary to their wishes and aspirations. However, in reality, until now the commitment to public information disclosure in the House of Representatives has been doubted by many elements of society for several reasons: First, Parliament has never been categorized as an informative public body. Based on the results of the information disclosure audit assessment conducted by the Central Information Commission of the Republic of Indonesia (KI Pusat RI), which measures the level of information disclosure in public bodies, from 2012 to 2018, Parliament has never won the title of an informative public body.

Secondly, according to a report from the Indonesia Parliamentary Center (IPC), civil society still finds it quite difficult to access data, information or documents in the DPR. This is particularly the case for legislation with high political economy importance, such as bills on palm oil, coal and minerals, the KPK, labor copyrights, and others. Third, the level of public trust in the DPR is still low. Independent surveys conducted by Lembaga Polling Center (LPC) and Indonesia Corruption Watch (ICW) on the level of public trust in state institutions show that the DPR almost always ranks in the lowest or

bottom two. According to the survey, this is partly due to the closed access to public information in the DPR.

Fourth, the DPR is still not transparent and often does not follow procedures in the policymaking process. A viral example is the passing of the revision of Law No. 30/2002 on the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK Law) on September 17, 2019. According to Transparency International Indonesia (TII) and the Indonesian Legal Roundtable (ILR), the revision of the KPK Law tends to be done behind closed doors, ignores public participation, and also violates proper procedures. The DPR's commitment to information disclosure was also questioned when, in 2014, the DPR Secretariat General was sued by a citizen to the Central Information Commission (KI Pusat) because his request for information in the form of documents on work and budget plans, procurement, terms of reference, and others to the DPR was not answered or ignored. After a series of information dispute hearings by the Central Information Commission, both parties agreed to resolve the dispute through mediation. In the end, Parliament was willing to provide the information requested by the citizen.

Parliament is a public body that must comply with and implement all provisions of UU KIP and its derivative regulations. In fact, in addition to being a constitutional obligation, information disclosure is a moral obligation that must be fulfilled by Parliament as the institution that gave birth to the law. Parliament should be an example for other public bodies on how to be an open and informative public body. Therefore, from the overall description above, research on how the implementation of public information disclosure policy in the House of Representatives of the Republic of Indonesia in 2019 to 2021 is so important and urgent to be carried out.

2. Theoretical Framework

2.1 Previous Research

In the research process, it is important for a researcher to conduct a literature review of previous studies, especially those related to similar themes such as public policy and information disclosure. This literature review assists the researcher in understanding relevant theories and facilitates problem analysis. In addition, comparing previous research allows the identification of strengths and weaknesses as well as differences and similarities with the current research. From the literature search, it was found that many previous studies have discussed the topic of public policy, especially policy implementation. However, research that specifically examines the implementation of the public information disclosure policy in the House of Representatives of the Republic of Indonesia has yet to be found.

The first study was conducted by Taufiq (2014) with the title "Implementation of Public Information Disclosure Law in Pesawaran District Government". This research responds to the problem of the slow implementation of UU KIP in Pesawaran Regency, which was revealed through the audit results of the Lampung Provincial Information Commission in 2013. This research aims to understand the implementation of UU KIP in Pesawaran Regency by assessing institutional achievements, substantive achievements, constraints, and opportunities. Although the implementation concept used is relatively simple, involving only the provisions of UU KIP, constraints, and opportunities as measures of success, this study provides a clear picture of the implementation of UU KIP in Pesawaran District. However, this study lacks depth in considering factors such as the attitude and commitment of public agency leaders, bureaucratic structure, and internal communication aspects, which actually play an important role in the successful implementation of public policies.

The next research was conducted by Hasanah et al. (2023) This study responds to changes in the issuance of inspection reports that were previously published comprehensively but then controlled and moved to the Information and Communication Center room at the BPK office. The study aims to identify obstacles and causal factors in policy implementation, evaluate achievements, and examine coordination within the BPK organization. The research concept includes several implementation models involving the factors of policy content, communication, resources, openness, disposition, bureaucratic structure, and target group feedback or response. This approach creates an in-depth understanding of the implementation of UU KIP at the BPK, overcomes the shortcomings of the

implementation model by completing variables according to research needs, and provides a comprehensive picture of the implementation of public information disclosure policies at the institution.

Next is the research of Pembayun (2019) entitled "Implementation of Law No. 14 of 2008 concerning Public Information Disclosure by the Information Management and Documentation Officer (PPID) of Kemkominfo". This research was conducted because of the increasing public demand for transparency and accountability in post-reform government. Kemenkominfo, as an institution that handles government affairs in the field of communication and informatics, has a key role in providing understanding to the public regarding government policies. This research uses the concept of policy implementation developed by Edwards III, focusing on variables such as communication, resources, bureaucratic structure, and disposition. Through a descriptive qualitative approach, this study found that the implementation of UU KIP in Kemenkominfo has not reached an optimal level and is still faced with various obstacles. This research provides an in-depth insight into the obstacles faced by MOCI in implementing UU KIP, making it an important source of information for stakeholders dealing with transparency and public information disclosure at the Ministry of Communication and Informatics.

The next research from Raul Bejarno Romero, et al (2023) is entitled "Implementing a Decentralized Opioid Overdose Prevention Strategy in Mexico, a Pending Public Policy Issue." This research was conducted because of the public health crisis due to opioid overdose getting worse in the northern region of Mexico due to the entry of illegally produced fentanyl into the local drug supply. The focus of this research is on policy strategies to prevent opioid overdose cases that are considered not comprehensive by the Mexican government. The research findings show that policy implementation is still partial, just an anti-drug campaign without implementing preventive policies. There is currently only an anti-drug marketing strategy that is most likely insufficient to mitigate the growing epidemic. To address the growing opioid overdose crisis in the country, it is necessary to create and implement a decentralized prevention strategy, which includes naloxone distribution, expanding treatment services in areas of greatest need, and creating an active dialogue with community organizations that have implemented harm reduction measures. Decisive action must be taken by the Mexican government to ensure the health and well-being of Mexican citizens, especially those at high risk of opioid overdose.

The previous studies above overall concluded that the implementation of policies in general and the implementation of public information disclosure policies in particular in the public agencies studied were still not running optimally or even poorly, and some were already running well. Specifically related to the implementation of public information disclosure policies, UU KIP has been in effect since April 30, 2010, which means that it has been going on for quite a long time. This conclusion is one indication that the theories and methods used by several previous studies are quite capable of describing the achievements and obstacles faced by a policy implementation. However, there are *gaps* that can be filled in this research. Empirically, there is no research that has explored the implementation of public information disclosure policy in the House of Representatives. In a theoretical context, there is no research that has applied the model of analyzing public policy implementation in the DPR RI as proposed by experts, especially considering all dimensions contained in the model. Reflecting on the arguments above, this research is so important and urgent to be carried out.

2.2 Literature Review

2.2.1 Government Science

In government science literature, government science has been defined by a number of experts. For example, Taliziduhu Ndraha defines governance as a discipline that studies how to meet and maintain individual needs and demands for public and civil services in the context of government. The aim is to ensure that people's services and needs are properly met when they are needed. Ndraha examines governance from two perspectives: first, looking at how government should operate in a normative or ideal context (*das Sollen*), to ensure adequate services for the community. Second, analyzing the performance of government in practice to understand whether people's expectations of services are

met or not, in an empirical context or reality (das Sein) (Ndraha, 2011). Meanwhile, R. McIver expressed another view of government science. According to him, government science is a discipline that systematically examines the government of a country. This includes an understanding of the origin of government, the impact of various existing forms of government, the relationship between government and citizens, the internal mechanisms of government, leadership in the context of government, and the functions performed by government (Yist, 2008).

Rasyid (1998) states that governance means regulating, managing, and ruling in organizing government affairs for the benefit of the people. In line with Azimi (2021), governance is a scientific discipline that examines the relationship between citizens and the highest governing entity in the country (government) within the framework of authority and provision of public services. Suradinata, Kusworo, Lambelanova, and Thahir (2019) believes that governance can be categorized as a science and an art. As a science, governance is knowledge that studies the process of activity of public institutions in their function to realize state goals, universally applicable.

Based on the definitions presented by the experts above, it can be concluded that these definitions are part of the formal object in science. The object of form in science is a view or angle of highlighting that explains how symptoms, events, phenomena, and problems in a science are analyzed in depth. In other words, these definitions provide a conceptual framework or view of what is the focus or concern in government science, namely the relationship between government and citizens, authority, and the provision of public services. Material objects in the context of government science will include social and political phenomena observed within the framework of the formal objects that have been described.

2.2.2 Government and Governance

The government is an entity that has the authority to formulate and implement laws and regulations in a certain area. The government has the governing authority of the political entity, the power to regulate the political community, the administrative structure in charge of exercising authority, as well as the authority to make regulations, resolve conflicts, make administrative decisions, and have exclusive rights to legitimate power (Yuliana, 2020). According to Finer in Kuper, the term Government has at least four basic meanings. First, government is based on the process of governance, where power is implemented by those who have legitimate authority. Second, the term government refers to the location where the government operates, such as the use of the term central government for the national government located in the nation's capital, while local government refers to government entities that are within the jurisdiction of the central government. Thirdly, the government includes individuals who hold government positions as executors of power. Fourth, the term government can also refer to the dimensions of the structure, method, or system of government in society, including the organization and control of government institutions and the relationship between government and citizens (Labolo, 2011).

Meanwhile, governance refers to a broader phenomenon than the term government itself. Governance encompasses a wide range of power activities that take place within the public domain. It is not limited to government entities but also includes activities across a wide range of institutional contexts aimed at directing, controlling, and regulating aspects of the public domain, such as the public interest, voters, and workers. Governance is not limited to governments alone but also includes entities outside of government, such as companies, that use mechanisms to ensure accountability, legitimacy, and transparency in various sectors. This phenomenon is reflected in the establishment of rules and authority structures in various communities, which have a role in managing resources and maintaining social order.

2.2.3 Functions of Government

Rasyid (1998) outlines the functions of government into four categories, namely public services, development, empowerment, and regulation. In the words of Franklin D. Roosevelt quoted by Rasyid, the governance of a society can be reflected in the functions it carries out. The regulatory function, which is also often referred to as the policy function in its various forms, aims to create conditions

that support various activities and create a positive social order in society. The service function plays a role in ensuring justice in society. Meanwhile, the empowerment function promotes self-reliance, and the development function seeks to create prosperity in society. In other words, the tasks carried out by the government at any given time can be a reflection of the quality of the government itself. Soewargono & Djohan explained that one of the main functions of the government is to formulate public policy. The argument underlying this is that every citizen will always be involved in public policies formulated by the government because these policies are related to the interests of the wider community (Alamry, Al-Attar, & Salih, 2022). This is also relevant in the context of this research, namely, public policies that regulate public information, as regulated in Law No. 14/2008 on Public Information Disclosure.

2.2.4 Public Policy

Definitions of public policy vary in the political science and government science literature due to the different backgrounds and approaches of experts. The approaches and models used by these experts influence the way public policy is defined, for example, whether policy is seen as a series of government decisions or as actions with predictable impacts (Winarno, 2012). Dye, for example, explains that policy can be defined as anything that the government chooses or does not choose to do (Dye, 2011). In more detail, many authors try to formulate the concept or definition of public policy. For example, revealed that basically, government policy is the interaction between government units and their environment (Liviani & Rachman, 2021). Anderson defines public policy as various policies produced by government institutions or officials. In this view, Epstein (1987) emphasizes that public policy has a distinctive nature because it is related to government institutions, which Sunarti, Hafizah, Rusdinal, Ananda, and Gistituati (2022) refers to as "coercive legitimate power."

Anderson also suggests five effects of his conception of public policy. *First*, public policy is an action that focuses on certain goals. *Second*, public policy involves a series of actions taken over time. *Third*, public policy emerges as a response to the need to address certain issues. *Fourth*, public policy reflects real government activities, not just aspirations to be realized. *Fifth*, government policies can be active or passive actions when facing a problem. Based on the various perspectives on public policy above, it can be concluded that public policy is a series of actions outlined by the government and realized in the form of legal regulations as part of the implementation of state governance.

According to Hamdi (2002), the main characteristics of public policy are: 1) Every public policy always has a purpose, namely in order to solve public problems; 2) Each public policy is always manifested in a detailed pattern of action in programs and activities; 3) Every public policy is always regulated through positive law. In the context of this research, public policy refers to UU KIP. UU KIP has the main character as a public policy as described above. As a public policy, UU KIP has an objective as stated in Article 3 of UU KIP. Public bodies are required to manage and provide information by establishing a Public Information Management Officer (PPID) and developing information and communication systems. UU KIP has binding legal force, requiring compliance from all citizens and public bodies. If public bodies do not comply with the mechanisms of UU KIP, citizens can sue them to the Central or Regional Information Commission, with sanctions in the form of fines and/or imprisonment for violators, both public bodies and citizens as information requesters.

2.2.5 Public Information Disclosure Policy

The right to information is part of human rights that must be respected by the state. Information is a basic need of every individual, both for self-development and social interaction. In the context of communication, information is a key element that influences the communication process. According to Niklas Luhman, communication involves three main components: information, expression, and understanding. In the implementation of information disclosure policies, these three components become relevant in showing the extent to which an organization is willing to communicate with outsiders and comply with the demands of openness (Seidl & Becker, 2005).

Information has an important role in the public sphere, in accordance with Jurgen Habermas' theory, which describes the public sphere as a social arena where public opinion is formed. Access to public

space should be inclusive for everyone. Much of the public sphere is formed through conversations where individuals come together to form public opinion. However, to influence the views of the wider public, a means to disseminate information is required. Immanuel Kant defined "public" as an entity that values freedom of thought and the courage to voice open ideas to the community. In the context of public information disclosure, this idea refers to individuals or groups who have the freedom to think about information (Kadir, Kurnia, Ahmad, Khasanofa, & Albab, 2022). Therefore, the state is obliged to guarantee the freedom of its citizens to access public information, enabling citizens to play an active role in the governance process.

The active role of citizens in governance is a form of democratic government. Etymologically, the definition of "democracy" comes from the Greek language, where "*demos*" means "people" and "*kratos*" means "power" or "ruling". So, it can be interpreted that democracy means that power is in the hands of the people or the people are the ones who rule. In democracy, the people determine how the pattern of power and its implementation will be carried out (Arifin, 2016). The essence of the meaning of the elements of democracy is how the representation of the people's authority and power can be carried out and is present in every decision and policy made by the government, so in a democratic country the implementation of governance functions is known as *good governance*. Gambhir Bhatta (1996) formulated four fundamental elements of *good governance*, namely *accountability*, *transparency*, *openness*, and *rules of law* (Mirhadi, 2011). In short, *good governance* emphasizes the importance of inclusive governance as one of its foundations. In this context, freedom to obtain information (*public access to information*) is considered one of the necessary conditions to realize *open* government.

Open government refers to government operations that are transparent, accessible to the public, and involve public participation. The more open the state's operations are to public scrutiny, the easier it is to be held accountable for those actions (Agustina, Valeriani, & Yunita, 2021). Mas Achmad Santosa argues that open government requires guarantees on five aspects, namely: (i) the right to monitor the behavior of public officials in carrying out their public duties; (ii) the right to obtain information; (iii) the right to engage and participate in public policy-making; (iv) freedom of expression, including freedom of the press; and (v) the right to raise objections if the previous rights are denied. In the Indonesian context, the right to information has been recognized in the constitution Santosa (2001) of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia (UUD 1945) Article 28F which reads: "Every person has the right to communicate and obtain information to develop his or her personal and social environment, and has the right to seek, obtain, possess, store, process, and convey information by using all available channels."

Then, the fulfillment of the right to information is finally guaranteed and regulated more specifically through Law Number 14/2008 on Public Information Disclosure (UU KIP). For the public, UU KIP is a recognition of their right to access information, and how this right should be fulfilled and protected by the state. For the government and other public institutions, UU KIP is a legal reference that must be followed to ensure that the public's right to information is fulfilled and protected. This legal reference is used to prevent violations of the public's right to information and also as a guarantee that disclosure will not harm the interests of individuals or the interests of the state that are guaranteed by law (Febriani & Sa'adah, 2009).

2.2.6 Public Policy Process

The public policy-making process can be thought of as a series of steps or stages of activity. Although this sequence of steps is conceptually linear, in practice it is often more non-linear or iterative. Various public policy experts have various terms or groupings for these steps. However, in general, the public policy *formulation* process can be divided into these five phases: agenda *setting*, formulation of policy alternatives/*policy formulation*, policy determination/*policy legitimization*, *policy* implementation, and *policy evaluation* (Hamdi, 2002).

Agenda setting is a process undertaken to direct government attention to an issue so that the issue becomes part of the political agenda. Kraft and Furlong (2019) interpret agenda setting as the way

issues are seen, formulated, and prioritized so that they enter political attention. Then, policy formulation is a stage in governance that involves the preparation of various policy options or alternatives. They describe policy formulation as the process of designing and planning policy goals along with strategic steps to achieve these goals. Furthermore, policy setting or also known as policy legitimacy, according to Kraft and Furlong involves efforts to mobilize political support and formalize policy implementation, including the provision of rational reasons for policy action.

Meanwhile, policy implementation involves efforts to achieve the goals set out in a particular policy. Basically, this stage is related to the way the government carries out its duties or the process applied by the government to achieve results in accordance with the plan. Because the meaning and complexity of implementation can be seen from various perspectives this stage has its own significance. Finally, evaluation relates to the review of policy implementation. This phase focuses on recognizing the outcomes and consequences of policy implementation. With this focus, policy evaluation provides *feedback* that helps in making decisions about whether existing policies should be continued or stopped.

Based on the descriptions above, it can be understood that there are several stages in the public policy process. From a series of policy stages that have been mentioned, implementation, which is the main concern in this research, is clearly seen as part of a broader process in the formation of public policy. The public policy whose implementation is examined is the law on public information disclosure in the legislature as a public body. Implementation can be defined as: 1) Running or realizing; 2) Providing the means or tools necessary to carry out or realize; 3) Providing or equipping with equipment. So, implementation refers to the process of running or realizing something, providing the necessary means or tools, and providing equipment to achieve a goal or carry out an action (Amir, 2020).

If we look at policy implementation in a more general sense, it is the stage in the policy process that comes after the law is approved. Implementation in this context includes the execution of the law where various actors, organizations, procedures, and techniques work together to carry out the policy with the aim of achieving the objectives of the policy or its programs (Nwosu, Okafor, & Egbunike, 2022). On the other hand, implementation is a complex phenomenon that can be understood as a process, *output*, or *outcome*. Ripley and Franklin consider that implementation is the phase that takes place after a law is passed, which authorizes programs, policies, benefits, or tangible results. Implementation refers to the set of activities that follow the statement of program objectives and desired outcomes by government officials. It includes a wide range of actions, mainly carried out by bureaucrats, aimed at carrying out the program (Ripley & Franklin, 1982).

2.2.7 Policy Implementation Model

There are many models of public policy implementation put forward by experts. Each model has several variables that are considered the most influential in the implementation process depending on the framework of thinking of the model maker itself. But before that, Matland (1995) identified that the literature on policy implementation can generally be divided into two main groups, namely the group that adopts a top-down approach and the group that takes a bottom-up approach. The group that adopts the *top-down approach* considers policy designers as the central role in policy implementation. In addition, this group also focuses on factors that can be controlled at the central level or macro variables.

This model has been criticized for using the language of regulations as a starting point in analyzing and understanding the implementation process. It also considers implementation as a purely administrative process and as such, it has ignored, or tried to eliminate, the political aspects. The model is also criticized for focusing on policymakers who are considered to be the main players, whereas the level of discretion possessed by street-level bureaucrats is inevitable and therefore, it is unrealistic to expect policy designers to have the ability to control the activities of street-level bureaucrats. On the other hand, the bottom-up approach emphasizes two important aspects, namely the target group and the service provider. The bottom-up group argues that the emphasis on these two

aspects is based on the belief that policies are essentially created at the local level. Hence, the bottom-up approach focuses on micro factors. In this model, a proper understanding of implementation can only be obtained through the perspective of field implementers and policy target groups. While *top-down* adherents have a strong desire to provide prescriptive advice, *bottom-up* adherents place more emphasis on describing what factors cause difficulties in achieving stated goals. Such factors are generally at the local level and therefore, *bottom-up adherents* generally suggest adaptation to local difficulties and contextual factors.

Just like the *top-down* model, the *bottom-up* model, according to Matland (1995), is also criticized with regard to normative and methodological aspects. The normative critique states that in a democratic system, policy control should be exercised by actors whose power derives from their accountability to *sovereign* voters through their elected representatives. The authority of local service providers does not derive from such a power base. Decentralization should occur in the context of central control. A second criticism is that *bottom-up* methodologies overemphasize the level of local autonomy. Variations in actions can be explained by differences at the local level, although all actions will fall within a limited scope where boundaries are determined by centrally defined policies. While central actors do not act in detail or intervene in specific cases, they can structure the goals and strategies of active participants. Institutional structures, resource availability, and access to the implementation arena can be centrally organized, and these can have a significant influence on *policy outcomes*.

In policy implementation research, Matland observed that top-down and bottom-up approaches tend to choose to investigate different types of policies. *Top-down* researchers are more inclined to choose policies that are relatively clear and structured, while bottom-up researchers focus on policies with higher levels of uncertainty, which are often inherent in these policies. From these descriptions, the policy implementation model continues to develop, which is characterized by many experts who propose various dimensions or variables that are considered the most determinant of the success of policy implementation. One of the policy implementation models formulated by experts is the Donald S. Van Meter and Carl E. Van Horn (1975) model which looks at the dimensions of policy implementation based on *Policy Standards and Objectives*, *Policy Resources*, *Interorganizational Communication and Enforcement Activities*, *The Characteristics of the Implementing Agencies*, *Economic, Social, and Political Conditions*, and *The Disposition of Implementors*.

The Policy Standards and Objectives dimension is based on the main aspects that influence the determinants of policy performance. According to van Meter and van Horn, identifying performance indicators is an important step in analyzing policy implementation. These performance indicators are used to evaluate the extent to which policy standards and objectives have been achieved. These policy standards and objectives help detail and clarify the overall objectives of policy decisions. In setting policy standards and objectives, information can be obtained from the statements of policymakers as reflected in various documents such as regulations and program guidelines that describe policy performance evaluation criteria.

The Policy Resources dimension includes funds or other incentives that can encourage and facilitate effective implementation. In policy implementation practice, we often hear officials and implementers complain about the lack of funds available to support planned programs. Therefore, in some cases, the amount of funds available or not available can be a determining factor in the success of policy implementation. In addition, human resources and the availability of facilities or infrastructure are also important factors in the success of policy implementation.

The dimension of *Interorganizational Communication and Enforcement Activities* relates to the understanding of implementers who are responsible for implementing the policy on policy standards and objectives. With this understanding, implementers will know what is expected of them and know the steps to take. Therefore, it is important to pay great attention to the clarity of policy standards and objectives, accuracy in communication with implementers, and maintaining consistency or uniformity in policy standards and objectives conveyed through various sources of information.

The Characteristics of the Implementing Agencies dimension refers to attributes, norms, and patterns of relationships that recurrently occur within the executive organization that have a potential or real relationship with policy implementation. The components of this model include the formal features of the organizational structure as well as the non-formal aspects associated with the personnel within it. *The Economic, Social, and Political Conditions* dimension involves the economic resources available in the environment that can affect the success of policy implementation, the level of support provided by interest groups for policy implementation, the attitudes of participants who may support or oppose the policy, the public views available in the environment, and whether or not political elites support policy implementation. All of these factors can affect the implementation and outcome of a policy (Subarsono, 2005).

The Disposition of Implementors dimension relates to the views and perceptions of implementers towards a policy and its impact on their personal and organizational interests affecting their attitude or disposition in dealing with it. In the context of policy implementation, this implementor disposition can be broken down into three aspects: 1) Implementors' response to policies, which includes the extent to which they are willing to implement public policies. This can include whether they accept the policy favorably, remain neutral, or even refuse to implement it; 2) The condition of the implementers, including their level of knowledge and understanding of the content of the policy. This includes the extent to which they understand the policy and how it should be implemented; 3) The intensity of the implementor's disposition, which refers to the values, beliefs, and preferences held by policy implementers (Subarsono, 2005; Winarno, 2012).

The policy implementation model proposed by Van Meter and Van Horn will be used to dissect how the implementation of the public information disclosure law policy in the House of Representatives of the Republic of Indonesia in 2019-2021. The consideration of choosing the Donald S. Van Meter and Carl E. Van Horn (1975) policy implementation theory model is because basically, in the development of implementation models, no one outperforms or negates one model with another. This opinion is also in line with the view expressed by Nugroho in Fatih (2010), that there is no one policy model that can be used universally for all policy implementation. This is because each policy has its own unique characteristics. In other words, a policy implementation model will be effective when it fits the specific nature of the policy being analyzed, whether it is top-down or bottom-up oriented.

In addition, another consideration is that each policy implementation model basically has similar dimensions or variables that tend to be the same, however, it is important to note that most policy implementation models focus more on the organizational aspects of policy implementers. Therefore, the dimensions or variables used in these models focus more on analyzing policy implementation from the perspective of the organizational environment, not the social environment of the community without an organizational structure. Including the model used in this study, namely the van Meter and van Horn (1975) model, whose variables are more appropriate for dissecting implementation from the organizational environment, in accordance with the nature of the KIP Law policy which is implemented in the organization, in this case the DPR RI.

3. Methodology

This research applies the case study method, which is an empirical research approach that focuses on investigating contemporary phenomena in real-life contexts. In the opinion of Yin (2009), the case study method is an appropriate choice for use in research that has research questions related to "how" or "why," has limited time to control the events being studied, and the research focus is on current phenomena. This type of research is descriptive with a qualitative approach. The qualitative approach in this research is an investigative process that aims to understand social problems or human problems. This approach prioritizes the formation of a comprehensive holistic picture through the use of words, detailing the views of informants, and presenting them in a natural context (Creswell, 2003). The choice of a qualitative approach in this research is based on the realization that qualitative approaches offer a wider diversity of approaches in the context of academic research compared to quantitative methods.

The data sources of this research consist of primary data and secondary data. Primary data was obtained through in-depth interviews with key informants who had been determined using purposive sampling techniques. Meanwhile, secondary data was obtained through field observations and literature studies relevant to the research topic (Sugiyono, 2010). The key persons used as informants in this research came from (1) the Main Information and Documentation Management Officer (PPID Utama) Team of the House of Representatives as the party responsible for governance and public information services. (2) The PPID Implementing/Assistant Team (in each working unit/organization) as the party that assists the Main PPID in the governance and service of public information in the House of Representatives, (3) The civil society organization Indonesia Parliamentary Center (IPC) as part of the public with an interest in public information disclosure in the House of Representatives, and also (4) UI academics who are also former Commissioners of the Central Information Commission.

The data processing process in this study has gone through two stages, namely data reduction and data categorization. The data that has been collected is then selected, emphasized on simplification, abstraction, and transformation of raw data taken from various sources, such as field notes so that data relevant to the research is obtained (Miles & Huberman, 1992). Furthermore, the data were grouped into various themes or categories to facilitate the verification and analysis process. Data validity was guaranteed by triangulating data sources, applying member checking, clarifying biases that the researcher might bring into the research, utilizing a relatively long time at the research location, and debriefing with fellow researchers (peer debriefing) to improve the accuracy of the research results.

4. Results and Discussion

According to Law No. 14/2008 on Public Information Disclosure, an Information Documentation and Management Officer (PPID) is an official responsible for the storage, documentation, provision, and/or service of information in a public body. In DPR RI as a public body, through the Decree of the Secretary General of DPR RI No. 866/SEKJEN/2010, from 2010 until early 2021, the organizational structure responsible for the functions and duties of PPID is carried out by the Secretariat General of DPR RI through the News Bureau of the Secretariat General and Expertise Agency as the coordinator or Main PPID. Therefore, the functions and duties of PPID, such as documenting, storing, classifying, serving, and resolving information disputes within the House of Representatives, are attached to the News Bureau. However, in its implementation, the News Bureau is assisted by all Echelon III work units (Secretariat of Commission I-XI and expertise bodies) within the House of Representatives as PPID Assistants/Executors and is responsible to the PPID Supervisor, who is the Secretary General of the House of Representatives. Under UU KIP, as a public body, DPR RI has an obligation to provide public information under its authority to information requesters, except for exempted information, in accordance with the law. They must also record the applicant's data, the subject of the information, the format, and the way it is delivered. They must also manage and provide information in an accessible, fast, low-cost, and simple manner, and may use electronic or non-electronic media.

According to Van Meter and Van Horn (1975), to get an idea of the level of success of the implementation of public information disclosure policies in the DPR RI, it can be seen from six dimensions, namely, 1) policy standards and objectives, 2) resources, 3) Interorganizational Communication and Enforcement Activities, 4) characteristics of the implementing organization, 5) social, economic, political conditions, and 6) disposition of implementers. The following is an explanation of how the implementation of public information disclosure policies in the DPR RI is based on the six dimensions as stated by Van Meter and Van Horn.

4.1 Policy Standards and Objectives

Van Meter and Van Horn (1975) argued that *"The performance indicators assess the extent to which the policy's standards and objectives are realized."* This suggests that the concern in policy implementation relates to the factors that determine policy performance where the identification of performance indicators is an important stage in the analysis. Meanwhile, policy standards and objectives outline the overall objectives of the policy decision. In determining standards and objectives, an agency may refer to statements made by policymakers, which are often documented in

various documents such as regulations and program guidelines that detail the criteria for evaluating policy performance. However, in some situations, policy standards and objectives may have to be determined by independent researchers. In fact, agencies may choose to use policy performance evaluation criteria that have been provided by their stakeholder groups. In the implementation of the public information disclosure policy in DPR RI, the standards and objectives of the policy are clearly stated in UU KIP, especially Article 7 and Article 3. As explained in the following table:

Table 1. Policy Standards and Objectives in Law No. 14/2008 on Public Information Disclosure (UU KIP)

Standar Kebijakan Pasal 7 UU KIP	Tujuan Kebijakan Pasal 3 UU KIP
(1) Badan Publik wajib menyediakan, memberikan dan/atau menerbitkan Informasi Publik yang berada di bawah kewenangannya kepada Pemohon Informasi Publik, selain informasi yang dikecualikan sesuai dengan ketentuan. (2) Badan Publik wajib menyediakan Informasi Publik yang akurat, benar, dan tidak menyesatkan. (3) Untuk melaksanakan kewajiban sebagaimana dimaksud pada ayat (2), Badan Publik harus membangun dan mengembangkan sistem informasi dan dokumentasi untuk mengelola Informasi Publik secara baik dan efisien sehingga dapat diakses dengan mudah. (4) Badan Publik wajib membuat pertimbangan secara tertulis setiap kebijakan yang diambil untuk memenuhi hak setiap Orang atas Informasi Publik. (5) Pertimbangan sebagaimana dimaksud pada ayat (4) antara lain memuat pertimbangan politik, ekonomi, sosial, budaya, dan/atau pertahanan dan keamanan negara. (6) Dalam rangka memenuhi kewajiban sebagaimana dimaksud pada ayat (1) sampai dengan ayat (4) Badan Publik dapat memanfaatkan sarana dan/atau media elektronik dan nonelektronik.	a. Menjamin hak warga negara untuk mengetahui rencana pembuatan kebijakan publik, program kebijakan publik, dan proses pengambilan keputusan publik, serta alasan pengambilan suatu keputusan publik; b. Mendorong partisipasi masyarakat dalam proses pengambilan kebijakan publik; c. Meningkatkan peran aktif masyarakat dalam pengambilan kebijakan publik dan pengelolaan Badan Publik yang baik; d. Mewujudkan penyelenggaraan negara yang baik, yaitu yang transparan, efektif dan efisien, akuntabel serta dapat dipertanggungjawabkan; e. Mengetahui alasan kebijakan publik yang mempengaruhi hajat hidup orang banyak; f. Mengembangkan ilmu pengetahuan dan mencerdaskan kehidupan bangsa; dan/atau g. Meningkatkan pengelolaan dan pelayanan informasi di lingkungan Badan Publik untuk menghasilkan layanan informasi yang berkualitas.

In the **first** policy standard, Article 7 paragraph (1), this implementation has basically been carried out by DPR RI by enlarging the space for public information disclosure in various levels of DPR RI's operational tasks and functions through various information channels, such as live coverage of Parliament TV which can be watched both through digital TV broadcasts and *internet live streaming*. The public can also attend meetings that are open to the public through balconies in each meeting room. In the context of legislative information, for example, documents or information produced by the House Organs (AKD) such as draft laws, some of which are published through the DPR RI website. Unfortunately, the published bills are not always updated, so sometimes the information is not up-to-date. According to the DPR RI Main PPID Team, in addition to technical issues of documenting, editing and sorting, and publishing information that takes quite a while, updates on the latest discussion results of bills are usually not published by the PPID Team due to an agreement with the board leadership or waiting for approval from the board leadership. Meanwhile, documents on minutes of discussion, academic papers, brief reports, list of issues (DIM), results of consignments and FGDs, and the like must go through the mechanism of requesting public information through PPID. The following is data on requests for public information through PPID DPR RI related to legislation:

Table 2: Number of Public Information Requests
(Based on Type of Information 2017-2020 in DPR RI)

No	Dokumen	2017	2018	2019	2020
1	Risalah	1028	1140	1097	474
2	Naskah akademik	609	673	666	386
3	Laporan Singkat	–	151	97	34
4	Lain-lain	202	239	344	158

Sumber: Laporan Layanan Informasi Publik DPR RI Tahun 2017, 2018, 2019, dan 2020 (diolah)

When examined closely, the data above shows a decrease in information requests in 2020. However, legislative information published on the DPR RI website throughout 2020 was also minimal, so the decrease in the number of requests cannot be interpreted as due to the DPR RI's public information disclosure. For example, of the 13 bills passed in 2020, none were accompanied by published minutes. The high demand for information on legislation in recent years confirms the results of a survey conducted by the Open Parliament Indonesia (OPI) Secretariat at the DPR RI in July-August 2020. The survey found that the majority of respondents stated that the most important information to be disclosed by the DPR was information related to legislative programs (27.49% of respondents wanted it), followed by budget information (23.95%), and work plans (18.08%). In addition, around 12.95% of respondents would like to receive regular work reports, 8.39% are looking for information on facilities and public participation, 6.8% are interested in information on members of Parliament, and 51.96% of respondents expect information on factions in Parliament.

Not all information in DPR RI is accessible to the public. Some public information is exempt or may not be disclosed to the public as stipulated in Article 17 of UU KIP. In an interview, the PPID of DPR itself stated that every year they update the list of exempted public information (DIP). The following types of information are exempted under UU KIP:

Table 3. Exempt Public Information

PASAL 17 UU No 14 Th 2008		
KERAHASIAAN NEGARA	KERAHASIAAN UNTUK PERSAINGAN YANG SEHAT	KERAHASIAAN ATAS HAK PRIBADI
Pasal 17 a,c,d,e,f, i	Pasal 17 b	Pasal 17 g, h
a. Penegakan Hukum c. Pertahanan dan Keamanan d. Kekayaan alam Indonesia e. Ketahanan ekonomi nasional f. Hubungan internasional i. Surat-surat badan publik yang sifatnya rahasia, kecuali atas putusan Komisi Informasi dan Pengadilan.	b. Perlindungan Persaingan usaha yang sehat dan Perlindungan atas Kekayaan intelektual Pasal 18 ayat (2): Tidak termasuk informasi yang dikecualikan sebagaimana dimaksud dalam Pasal 17 huruf g dan huruf h, antara lain apabila : a. pihak yang rahasianya diungkap memberikan persetujuan tertulis; dan/atau b. pengungkapan berkaitan dengan posisi seseorang dalam jabatan/jabatan publik	g. Akta Otentik dan Wasiat Seseorang h. Informasi Pribadi (finansial, kapabilitas, riwayat hidup, kondisi fisik dan psikologis)

The second policy standard, Article 7 paragraph (2), in this context has not found any public information that is questioned for accuracy, especially in the delivery of information releases or documents through official DPR RI sources. PPID DPR RI continues to encourage public information to be not only accurate but also up-to-date in accordance with the needs and dynamics of information that occur in society. This is to ensure that there are no *hoaxes* or misunderstandings that occur between the public information conveyed by DPR and what is received and understood by the

public. However, there are some issues that have the potential to cause debate in the community regarding the accuracy of information. For example, an academic paper on an amendment to Law No. 4/2009 on Mineral and Coal Mining is not listed on DPR's website, but was first published by a non-governmental organization. These civil society organizations generally obtain information/documents directly from members of the House, factions, or acquaintances who work as DPR experts. This makes it difficult for PPID to control the flow of public information, causing information released officially by DPR to sometimes be considered different from the information already obtained by the public. PPID still needs to make more serious efforts to accelerate the release and service of information from official DPR sources and procedures.

The third policy standard, Article 7 paragraph (3), on this side PPID DPR RI continues to carry out various resource efficiencies while still paying attention to information disclosure. Steps taken as a time and cost efficiency effort are the use of internet platforms and social media such as websites, YouTube, Facebook, Twitter, Instagram and others as a means of public information disclosure. In terms of public information services, it is possible for the public to submit requests for public information through the DPR PPID website, via email, telephone, or coming directly to the DPR. What has not been optimized is the issue of inclusiveness for people with disabilities, both in terms of information/documents and services. Meanwhile, in terms of internal documentation and management of information produced by the House, digitization of documents and archives related to the duties and functions of the House has begun. However, this has not yet been maximized, because according to the PPID DPR, the human resources of the DPR Secretariat General in each work unit or organ of the House are still quite limited when compared to the workload that must be carried out.

The fourth policy standard, Article 7 paragraph (4), states that the PPID of the House of Representatives always provides written considerations in fulfilling or refusing to provide information requested by the public. This is evident from the report on access to public information disclosure (LAKIP) of PPID DPR RI in 2017-2021, which shows that every fulfillment or refusal of public information requested by the applicant is always accompanied by written considerations given to the applicant.

Fifth policy standard, Article 7 paragraph (5), PPID DPR includes social, economic, and political considerations in the process of managing and providing public information. Based on an interview with DPR's Main PPID Team, DPR RI considers the political impact of providing public information. Information that may affect the political situation and stability of the country may be subject to restrictions or exempted from disclosure under UU KIP. Economic considerations, in this case that DPR RI considers the economic impact of providing public information. Information that may affect economic stability or business confidentiality may be subject to restrictions or exemptions in accordance with UU KIP. Social considerations, in which DPR RI considers the social impact of providing public information. Information that may affect individual privacy or cause discomfort to the public may be exempted in accordance with UU KIP.

Although there are public information in DPR RI that can be exempted, it is not absolute. There is a principle in UU KIP known as MALE (*Maximum Access, Limited Exemption*). This means that any public information is open to the widest possible extent, must be obtained quickly, on time, at low cost, and in a simple manner. Even if there is exempt public information, there is a certain period of time until the information can be accessed by the public. This is regulated in Government Regulation No. 60/2010 on the Implementation of UU KIP. For example, information related to law enforcement can be disclosed to the public after 30 years. Information on national defense and security can be disclosed in accordance with the time period required for the protection of national defense and security.

The sixth policy standard, Article 7 paragraph (6), PPID DPR RI in terms of managing and serving public information has made various efforts such as utilizing online both internal and public systems such as social media, websites, Parliament TV, android applications, and others. While non-electronic is the distribution of magazines, books, journals, and parliamentaria bulletins managed by

the DPR RI public relations team. The parliamentaria magazine was started before the KIP Law was enacted in 2008. The House of Representatives also provides a public space for the public to obtain information or make complaints directly related to the work of the House of Representatives. In addition, the public can also follow the proceedings live in the public room provided by DPR RI.

As for *objectives*, it is almost the same as *policy standards* where Article 3 letters a to g of UU KIP is the main reference where there are objectives in public information disclosure. Basically, the goals or objectives of the public information disclosure policy are indirectly closely related to the policy standards as previously described. For example, related to the policy objectives in Article 3 letter a, to ensure this, the House of Representatives of the Republic of Indonesia opens the tap for public attendance in every meeting in the House Organs (AKD) such as in commissions or agencies. The public can also watch *live* through Parliament TV, although if there are several meetings or sessions in commissions or other AKDs that are held simultaneously, only one session can be watched *live*. The public can also access a wide range of information through official Parliamentary sources, although this is often criticized because the information published is not complete and up-to-date. However, this is related to the first (Article 7 paragraph 1) and sixth (Article 7 paragraph 6) policy standards, where the fulfillment of these standards will ultimately have a direct impact on the achievement of policy objectives.

Furthermore, the purpose of the KIP Law is to encourage and increase public participation in the DPR, IPC Director Mr. Hanafi and UI Academician Ms. Henny agreed that the DPR RI still has to make more serious efforts to improve, expand, and accommodate various aspirations and community participation. Because in several cases, such as in the process of revising the KPK Law and the Job Creation Law, community involvement and aspirations have not been accommodated so that the objectives of the KIP Law, namely encouraging the public in the public policy-making process, have not been maximally achieved. Meanwhile, to provide good governance, the DPR continues to cooperate with the Central Information Commission of the Republic of Indonesia in improving information transparency, effectiveness, efficiency and accountability. The cooperation includes training and mentoring for PPID Utama and PPID Pelaksana by the Commissioners of the Central Information Commission, as well as joint meetings to discuss solutions to improve information disclosure in the House. In addition, PPID together with the IPC annually organizes an internal public information disclosure meeting of the House, which is attended by all Echelon 3 units at the level of PPID implementers.

4.2 Policy Resources

According to Van Meter and Van Horn (1975), policy resources include various aspects such as human resources, infrastructure, and financial or other incentives that can be used in the program to encourage effective implementation. In the human resources dimension, it is known that DPR RI continues to strengthen its human resources in order to improve information disclosure. HR continues to improve its competence through trainings by inviting various experts including from the Central Information Commission. In practice, DPR RI's human resources ensure compliance with the information disclosure law as much as possible. One finding that remains a problem for PPIDs in implementing public information management and services is the lack of information management and service officers at the PPID Implementation level, namely in various organs such as commissions or bodies in the House of Representatives.

According to the DPR PPID Team, Ms. Dewi, although the main PPID has good human resource support, this is not the case in the realm of implementing PPIDs. Public relations officers, computers, and archivists mandated by UU KIP to be owned by each PPID are still quite limited in number. This is because the function of human resources assigned as PPID Implementers has a fairly high workload. Although this work overlaps, in some cases, especially when meetings and agendas are very busy, the function of the PPID Executive in managing, documenting, and providing information services is sometimes neglected. This tends to be an inhibiting factor for the Main PPID in providing excellent information services to the public who request information, because the control of information lies with the Executive PPID. Moreover, in DPR's organs, both commissions and bodies,

some are still honorary or contract employees.

In terms of infrastructure, PPID DPR RI has a very adequate infrastructure to support information disclosure within DPR RI. The results also show that the infrastructure is very helpful in implementing information disclosure. In addition to physical infrastructure, there is also digital infrastructure that greatly assists PPID DPR in carrying out its functions and duties. For example, digital infrastructure gives PPID DPR RI the ability to connect networks on a larger scale, and integrate large amounts of data into the system. The Digital Revolution has prompted DPR to move towards digitizing their operating tools and upholding a rapidly escalating transformation. However, the problem is that the data and information material to populate the system is still not optimally utilized due to the technical, administrative, bureaucratic, and political issues outlined earlier.

In addition, despite the support of digital infrastructure, such as social media and websites, these digital information channels tend to provide more normative information such as activities carried out by the leadership and some members of DPR RI. In fact, the public expects information on public issues such as an overview of the legislative process, the DIM (Problem Inventory List) of a bill, minutes of meetings, and others. There is still a gap between the information desired by the public and what is delivered by DPR through its social media channels. This makes the information shared by DPR through its digital media less relevant to the public interest. In fact, DPR's social media channels have a large number of followers, so it would be much more effective for the public to obtain information through social media rather than going through the bureaucratic mechanism of requesting information, which takes a long time, or going to DPR's website, which is not *user friendly*.

In the financial or budget aspect, in general, the budget policy is sufficient to meet the operational needs of PPID every year. Meanwhile, policies related to financial incentives follow the Presidential Regulation of the Republic of Indonesia Number 16 of 2020 concerning Employee Performance Allowances within the Secretariat General of the House of Regional Representatives. The results show that there is no differentiating formula in terms of allowance policy and it is almost the same as other divisions within the DPR RI. This means that with the task of implementing as PPID as an additional task in addition to the main task, there is no additional incentive for each DPR PPID team. This, in turn, affects the work motivation of both the main and acting PPIDs in performing their functions and duties as PPIDs as mandated by the UU KIP and the DPR Regulation on Public Information Disclosure.

4.3 Interorganizational Communication and Enforcement Activities

According to Van Meter and Van Horn, effective implementation of information disclosure requires the existence of program standards and objectives that must be understood by the people responsible for achieving them. Therefore, it is important to pay great attention to the clarity of standards and objectives, ensure the accuracy of their communication with implementers, and maintain consistency or uniformity of messages conveyed by various sources of information. The results show that within the internal organization, procedurally there is a clear and orderly unity of communication so that the substance of the communication of public information disclosure policy in DPR RI can run properly. Even before the effective implementation of UU KIP on June 1, 2010, PPID DPR has made various preparations to implement the law. This includes preparing human resources to spearhead the implementation of public information disclosure. To date, DPR has routinely updated and improved the knowledge, understanding, and skills of its human resources assigned as PPIDs. The DPR PPID also has a mechanism or standard operating procedure for processing requests and managing public information. This is also supported by communication and coordination processes between organizational units through technology such as electronic correspondence systems, *cloud sharing*, and *chat messenger groups*, which minimize the lack of clarity of information and coordination.

However, there is a problem in the inter-organizational communication aspect, which is related to various substances of information or documents from other institutions in the context of public information disclosure. These problems are technical in nature and do not interfere with the

operationalization of information disclosure in DPR RI. For example, when DPR receives information or documents from other institutions, if the information is still current enough, the PPID of DPR can immediately provide the public information as long as it is not generated from a closed meeting. If the information is produced in a closed meeting, PPID DPR will usually direct the requester to request the information directly from the agency that produced it. Van Meter and Van Horn reveal that successful implementation of public information disclosure requires clear and well-structured institutional mechanisms and procedures. This is important so that every party in the organization understands the objectives and standards of the policies that have been set, and has the responsibility and obligation to carry out their duties in a manner consistent with these policies. One of the institutional mechanisms and procedures that can be used to increase the likelihood that implementers will act in a manner consistent with policy standards and objectives is to provide higher authority (superiors) to oversee and monitor policy implementation. Higher authorities can supervise regularly and provide feedback or sanctions if needed. In addition, providing incentives or rewards for implementers who successfully comply with policy standards and objectives can also be an effective mechanism.

The research findings show that the PPID's superior is currently the Secretary General of the House of Representatives. This gives him/her various mechanisms of power and authority, such as deciding what to prioritize in the process of implementing public information disclosure in the DPR. In addition, as a higher authority, the PPID supervisor has control over the budget allocations of the work units under him, which can be increased or decreased in response to the organization's performance in implementing public information disclosure, whether satisfactory or not so good. The Secretary General of the DPR RI as the superior of the PPID has the power to influence the behavior of the implementers of public information disclosure policies under him, which in this case are the Main PPID and the Implementing PPID of the DPR RI. Moreover, the implementation of public information disclosure in DPR is routinely audited annually by the Central Information Commission of the Republic of Indonesia. From 2012 to 2020, the House of Representatives never once received the title of 'informative' public body, the highest achievement in terms of information disclosure implementation. In fact, in 2020 the DPR RI was only able to achieve the 'moderately informative' predicate (score 60-79), which is the 3rd category below the 'informative' (score 97-100) and 'towards informative' predicates (score 80-96).

DPR's main PPID and its superior PPID have routinely conducted internal evaluations of the implementation of UU KIP in commissions, agencies, and other implementing PPIDs every year by cooperating with the Central Information Commission and civil society organizations as assessors. The internal evaluation takes the form of a public information disclosure ranking competition within Parliament. This is done as part of the process of enforcing and fostering the implementation of public information disclosure within the House. It is quite effective in raising the awareness of PPID Implementers to improve the quality of public information management and services within their respective offices. As evidenced by the number of times it has been held, the public information disclosure score of each PPID Executor generally continues to increase every year. Especially PPID Implementers at the secretariat of Commission I DPR RI, which has always been the best every year. A problem that arises in the aspect of communication and implementation of public information disclosure is the accuracy of DPR RI's information. In particular, how DPR, as a political institution, provides data on issues that are debated is sometimes at odds with what the public actually needs. DPR as a political institution has not been pro-active enough in providing quick and accurate information to the public, such as on the process and results of the discussion of draft laws. One of them that has attracted public attention is the discussion of the Job Creation Bill or Law Number 11 of 2020 concerning Job Creation. The public has experienced difficulties in accessing various information regarding the bill. Meanwhile, the DPR's main PPID also cannot do much as it tends to follow the policies and directives of the leadership to be in line with the DPR's policies as a political institution.

4.4 Characteristics of Implementing Organizations

The characteristics of the implementing organization in this study adopt (Van Meter & Van Horn,

1975) where researchers summarize three characteristics that are relevant in information disclosure such as competence, hierarchical level, and political resources. The characteristics of competence are divided into two, namely knowledge and skills. In terms of knowledge, both the Main PPID and the Implementing PPID of DPR are generally knowledgeable about the UU KIP and its implementing regulations. This is mainly because PPID DPR regularly conducts seminars, socializations, and trainings on public information disclosure to all PPID Pelaksana representatives in each work unit. It also conducts regular evaluations through internal ratings to determine the extent to which UU KIP and DPR regulations on public information disclosure are implemented in work units. Problems generally arise when job transfers occur, which are sometimes quite dynamic, resulting in a lack of knowledge of public information disclosure among new officials. In addition, the limited number of human resources, especially for clerks and archivists in each work unit, often makes it difficult to prioritize the management of public information in accordance with UU KIP, which is not their main task. High basic workloads mean that some of them pay less attention to improving their knowledge and understanding of public information management. As a result, not all data and information is well-documented because the unit or field of work has not recapitulated in detail the various information and documents, especially those related to political decisions in the House of Representatives. Nonetheless, the research findings show that PPID continues to strive to provide public information to requesters when the information is available, clearly documented, and does not conflict with applicable laws.

At the hierarchical level, the process of implementing information disclosure takes place in tiers and this is still a homework for PPID DPR where there are still spaces of public uncertainty regarding the extent to which documentation and public information services have been processed. Data that is active or still under discussion is usually stored in work units such as commissions or bodies, while inactive data will be stored in the archives. Meanwhile, the Main PPID receives 80-500 requests for information every month, which are stored under echelon III work units as PPID Implementers. The problem is that not all Implementing PPIDs respond quickly when a request for information is received by the Main PPID. Alternatively, requests for information relate to inactive documents, especially those that are very old since Indonesia's independence, some of which are still stored in the archives or cannot even be found. In the end, this makes public information services not optimal. The political resources aspect is basically strong. In the sense that as an institution that represents the public, information disclosure is an important part of DPR RI's operational activities. However, in practice, there are still problems with information disclosure, especially in relation to closed political activities. This means that not all operations or activities in the House of Representatives can be accessed and distributed, such as information on factions and the results of meetings that are not necessarily documented in detail and clearly due to concerns from political interests or political risks if the information is disclosed. In the DPR itself, there is an impression that if information that should be disclosed is not in line with the interests of members or factions of political parties in the DPR, there is a tendency to reduce transparency in their actions and take actions that are not in line with public information disclosure policies.

4.5 Economic, Social and Political Conditions

Van Meter and Van Horn suggest that the impact of economic, social, and political conditions on public policy has been the focus of great attention over the past few decades. According to them, these factors may have a significant influence on the performance of implementing agencies. Economic factors, for example, they question *"Are the economic resources available within the implementing jurisdiction (or organization) sufficient to support successful implementation?"* In the context of this research, this question tends to lead to the extent to which the budget for public information disclosure can be sufficient and support successful implementation. The research findings show that there is complexity in the use of the budget both in terms of the amount and the location of which divisions/sections in its management. So far, there has been no specific budget allocated for the operational activities of PPIDs that carry out the main function of public information disclosure in each work unit. This is because PPID is an inherent function in the existing organizational structure of DPR RI. Here, the head of the DPR Secretariat General has the authority to create the economy (budgeting, including budget plans and approvals) and create social conditions

in the implementation, which is related to the appointment of employees to carry out their duties and functions in accordance with their competencies and abilities. So far, research findings show that the issue of the absence of additional incentives for teams that carry out PPID functions that are not their main duties is quite prominent. In the end, this also affects the social environment of work units where PPID work teams are slightly less motivated. However, the DPR's General Secretariat has tried to address this issue by creating a "competition" for public information disclosure performance between work units in the DPR and awarding the winners. This has helped to improve the performance of information disclosure, especially for PPID implementers in Echelon III work units.

On the political aspect, the results show that political elites, including the leadership of the House of Representatives, normatively support the implementation of public information disclosure in the House. For example, the launch of the Open Parliament Indonesia (OPI) movement in 2018 is an initiative that aims to realize a more modern and open parliament based on the values of transparency, participation, innovation and accountability. Although in practice, there is still a lot of information that is not easy to publish to the public when it comes to the political interests of factions in the DPR. In simple terms, UU KIP is part of the political support for the DPR itself. UU KIP reflects the commitment of public bodies to be more transparent and accountable to the public as users of public information in an effort to promote effective governance. Therefore, UU KIP was created with the aim of encouraging quality, transparent, efficient, effective, accountable, and accountable state administration.

4.6 Executor's Disposition

According to Van Meter and Van Horn, there are three factors that influence the ability and willingness of implementers in DPR RI in implementing public disclosure policies, namely their understanding of the policy, how they respond to the policy (accept, neutral, reject), and the intensity of the response. Implementers' understanding of the general and specific objectives of the policy is of high significance, especially for the Principal and Executive PPIDs in DPR. In addition, successful implementation of FOI policies can be jeopardized when officials do not realize that they are not fully complying with FOI policy provisions such as UU KIP and other relevant regulations. Overall, Implementing PPIDs in DPR work units have sufficient knowledge and understanding regarding the implementation of public information disclosure. They are aware of the regulations related to public information disclosure in DPR and also what their duties and functions are as PPID Executives.

In terms of the direction of the policy response, it is possible that implementers are not successful in implementing the policy because they reject or have different views on the objectives contained in the policy. The research findings show that both the PPID of DPR and the General Secretariat of DPR are generally very supportive of the implementation of DPR's public information disclosure. There may be various reasons why a policy objective may be rejected by implementers. This may be due to incompatibilities with the implementer's personal value system, loyalties given outside the organization, considerations of self-interest, or existing relationships maintained by the implementer. Alternatively, the difficulty in carrying out effective actions is due to the fact that they are not convinced or believe in these actions. However, as far as this research has been conducted, there have not been any reasons for rejecting UU KIP policies in the House of Representatives by PPID Implementers or employees of the General Secretariat that have hindered the implementation of public information disclosure.

The level of intensity of implementers' dispositions also has the potential to affect policy performance. Implementers who have strong negative preferences are likely to tend towards direct and open acts of defiance against the objectives of the program. The findings show that there is a fairly good intensity of response within PPID DPR RI in responding to requests. One of them is the response to the process of receiving requests for information received by them can be served well. The following is a survey of public satisfaction with DPR RI's PPID services released in 2022:

Table 4. Public Satisfaction Survey (SKM) of PPID DPR RI

No	Pertanyaan (unsur pelayanan)	Nilai SKM	Mutu
1.	Kemudahan Mekanisme, Sistem dan Prosedur	3,33	A
2.	Kemudahan Persyaratan	3,33	A
3.	Waktu Penyelsaian	3,40	A
4.	Kesesuaian Produk yang Diberikan	3,16	B
5.	Kompetensi Petugas/ Kejelasan dalam Memberikan Pelayanan	3,31	A
6.	Kompetensi Petugas/ Kecepatan dalam Merespon Pemohon Informasi	3,13	B
7.	Perilaku Petugas	3,42	A
8.	Sarana dan Prasarana/Tampilan Website	3,32	A

Sumber: SKM PPID, 2022.

Van Meter and Van Horn revealed that, the less intense disposition of policy implementers may encourage them to try to divert and avoid policy implementation quietly, which is a common pattern. In situations like this, it is important to consider the role of supervision and enforcement to explain differences in the level of implementation effectiveness. The results showed that DPR RI, through PPID, continues to make improvements in the completion time of data and information requests so that they can be served and fulfilled more quickly. For clarity, the following is a recapitulation of requests completed at the DPR RI Secretary General:

Table 5. Processing time of requests for information from PPID DPR RI

Year	Number of Information Requests	Completion Time		
		<10 days	10 days<n<17 days	>17 days
2017	729	93	1	202
2018	-	-	-	-
2019	-	-	-	-
2020	1052	754	4	6
2021	954	888	41	25

5. Conclusion

The implementation of the Public Information Disclosure Policy in DPR RI is still not optimal, especially in the utilization of information disclosure media and information resources. The findings show that information disclosure media is still limited to the website and its operation is conventional. The Principal PPID must constantly communicate data and information to work units due to the absence of reliable internal Big Data. There is no digital application that explains the process of information management and services in *real time*, both for information requesters and within DPR RI itself. In addition, the absence of human resource certification in the field of public information disclosure sometimes leads to differences in interpretation between implementing apparatus regarding the standards of public information management and services, especially those related to exempt or confidential information. An analysis of the implementation of the van Meter and van Horn model shows that Parliament has understood and attempted to implement the standards and objectives of the FOI policy, despite facing technical and bureaucratic obstacles. DPR has sufficient infrastructure and budgetary resources, but lacks specialized human resources such as archivists and computer administrators. Communication between DPR work units is good through training and the use of information technology. However, the implementation of information disclosure is dynamic, especially in relation to information controlled by members or leaders of the House and factions. Economic, social and political conditions affect policy implementation, including negative public

responses due to the difficulty of obtaining information on some sensitive policy discussions. Nevertheless, the executive apparatus in the DPR Secretariat General supports the implementation of public information disclosure through various initiatives, including the roadmap towards an open parliament.

5.1. Recommendations

5.1.1. Theoretical Recommendation

Academic suggestions in this study are that more comprehensive research is needed regarding the Implementation of the Public Information Disclosure Law in the House of Representatives of the Republic of Indonesia with a number of multidisciplinary approaches, especially in aspects of government management, government communication, organizational culture, and government sociology. In addition, the Van Meter & Van Horn policy implementation model has shortcomings in explaining how the government leadership factor is one of the aspects that determine the success of a policy implementation. Van Meter & Van Horn's *top-down* implementation model in its analysis variables as used in this study also does not take into account the role and participation of the community as one of the variables determining the success of policy implementation. This is because strong public participation can encourage innovation and produce better solutions and adaptations in policy implementation. All of this is needed to get a more comprehensive picture of the implementation of UU KIP in DPR RI so that any problems that arise can be explained and solutions found appropriately.

5.1.2. Practical Recommendation

1. DPR RI as a public body needs to immediately create DPR RI applications not only to digitize information, but also to provide *real-time* data and information services to the public.
2. Members of DPR RI should be more open in providing political information related to the various processes of implementing the duties of members of DPR RI so that requests for political information are not directed solely to the PPID of DPR RI.
3. The Central Information Commission should provide more intensive assistance to the PPID of DPR RI in order to improve information disclosure, including responsiveness and compliance with laws and regulations.
4. AKD and factions in the DPR RI to play an active role in providing public information to PPID in improving the information *database* so that information becomes more complete and easier to convey to the applicant / public.

References

- Agustina, S., Valeriani, D., & Yunita, A. (2021). Analysis the development of growth centers and hinterland areas in Bangka Regency, Indonesia. *Journal of Social, Humanity, and Education*, 2(1), 1-17.
- Alamry, S. J. M., Al-Attar, H. A., & Salih, A. S. (2022). The effect of using the Balanced Scorecard (BSC) on reducing the financial and administrative corruption in Iraqi Government Units. *International Journal of Financial, Accounting, and Management*, 4(1), 67-83.
- Amir, A. (2020). Public Policy Implementation: Study on Educational Budgeting of Palopo. *Journal La Sociale*, 1(1), 5-11.
- Arifin, S. (2016). Review of Public Information Policy Implementation: Evaluation Study of Information Dissemination Program at Dishubkominfo Bangkalan Regency in 2012-2015. *Surabaya: Master Program in Media & Communication, Universitas Airlangga*.
- Azimi, H. (2021). Investigating the relationship between knowledge management and social capital. *Annals of Management and Organization Research*, 3(1), 53-67.
- Bovens, M. (2003). Two concepts of accountability, Utrecht School of Governance. *Utrecht University, Dubnick*.
- Center, I. P. (2017). *Reforming Public Information Governance in DPR RI: Starting Upstream with Documentation*. (Jakarta: Seminar Materials).
- Creswell, J. (2003). W. Research Design, Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches: Jakarta: KIK Press.
- Dye, T. R. (2011). *Understanding Public Policy. 13thth Edition*. .

- Epstein, E. M. (1987). The corporate social policy process: Beyond business ethics, corporate social responsibility, and corporate social responsiveness. *California management review*, 29(3), 99-114.
- Fatih, A. (2010). *Policy Implementation and Community Empowerment*. (Bandung, Padjadjaran University Press).
- Febriani, F., & Sa'adah, N. (2009). The Effect of International Law on The Establishment of Public Information Disclosure Law in Indonesia.
- Hamdi, M. (2002). *Bunga rampai pemerintahan*: Yarsif Watampone.
- Hasanah, A., Najwa, H., Nurpadhilah, S., Ramadhani, G. I., Putriyani, R. A., & Sidharta, I. (2023). Improved compliance of individual taxpayers through tax audit (Study at one of the Primary Service Offices in Bandung). *International Journal of Financial, Accounting, and Management*, 4(4), 501-507.
- Kadir, A., Kurnia, F. A., Ahmad, D. N. F., Khasanofa, A., & Albab, U. (2022). Public Space Participation In Law Enforcement Against Serious Human Rights Violations In Discourse Perspective Jürgen Habermas. *Indonesian Journal of Law and Policy Studies*, 3(1), 89-106.
- Kraft, M. E., & Furlong, S. R. (2019). *Public policy: Politics, analysis, and alternatives*: Cq Press.
- Labolo, M. (2011). Understanding Government Science: A Study, Theory, Concept, and Development. (Jakarta: Rajawa Press).
- Liviani, R., & Rachman, Y. T. (2021). The influence of leverage, sales growth, and dividend policy on company value. *International Journal of Financial, Accounting, and Management*, 3(2), 165-178.
- Mahfud MD, M. (2001). The Basis and Structure of Indonesian State Administration. (Jakarta: Rineka Cipta).
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. (1992). *Qualitative Data Analysis. Translation: Rohidi*. Retrieved from
- Ndraha, T. (2011). Kybernology: The New Science of Government.
- Nwosu, K. C., Okafor, E. G., & Egbunike, C. F. (2022). Monetary policies and economic management: Evidence from Sub-Saharan Africa. *Studies in Economy and Public Policy*, 1(1), 15-26.
- Pembayun, D. A., et al. (2019). Implementation of Law No. 14 of 2008 concerning Public Information Disclosure by the Information and Documentation Management Officer (PPID) of Kemkominfo. *J. urnalisa UIN Alauddin*, 5(1), 106-120.
- Rasyid, R. (1998). A Government of Trust.
- Ripley, R. B., & Franklin, G. A. (1982). Bureaucracy and policy implementation. (No Title).
- Santosa, M. A. (2001). Good Governance and Environmental Law. *New York: ICEL*.
- Seidl, D., & Becker, K. (2005). The basic concepts of Luhmann's theory of social systems.
- Subarsono, A. (2005). Public policy analysis. *Yogyakarta: Student Library*.
- Sugiyono, S. (2010). Quantitative and qualitative research methods and R&D. *Bandung Alfabet*.
- Sunarti, V., Hafizah, H., Rusdinal, R., Ananda, A., & Gistituati, N. (2022). Comparison of Indonesian and Finnish Education Curriculum. *Journal of Social, Humanity, and Education*, 2(2), 141-152.
- Suradinata, E., Kusworo, K., Lambelanova, R., & Thahir, M. I. (2019). The Effect of Organizational Transformation, Compensation and Organizational Culture on Performance of Regional Government Bureaucracy in Sumedang Regency West Java Province. *Journal of Public Administration and Governance*, 9(1), 236-252.
- Taufiq, I. (2014). Implementation of Public Information Disclosure Law in Pesawaran Regency Government. .
- Van Meter, D. S., & Van Horn, C. E. (1975). The policy implementation process: A conceptual framework. *Administration & society*, 6(4), 445-488.
- Winarno, B. (2012). Public policy (Theory, process, and case studies). *Yogyakarta: Caps*.
- Yin, R. K. (2009). *Case study research: Design and methods 4th edition*. Paper presented at the United States: Library of congress cataloguing-in-publication data.
- Yist, F. V. (2008). Epistemology of Government Science. (Depok: UI).
- Yuliana, Y. (2020). The strategy in increasing creative economy during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism and Entrepreneurship*, 2(2), 109-118.