

Implementation Of Public Housing Management Policy: A Case Study In Rusunawa Of Cimahi, West Java, Indonesia

^a Deden Hadi Kushendar

^a College of Administrative Sciences, Bandung, Indonesia

ABSTRAK

Masih terdapat kekurangan dan keterjangkauan hunian sewa vertikal (rusunawa) sebagai opsi tempat tinggal sementara yang layak bagi individu berpendapatan rendah. Oleh karena itu, penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengeksplorasi implementasi kebijakan pengelolaan Rusunawa yang dikelola oleh pemerintah daerah di Indonesia. Kerangka teoritis yang digunakan untuk menganalisis implementasi kebijakan didasarkan pada konsep Kearns dan Lawson (2008), yang mengkaji empat faktor: 1) kebijakan itu sendiri, 2) lembaga pelaksana, 3) hubungan antarorganisasi, dan 4) faktor sosial dan politik. Penelitian ini mengadopsi pendekatan studi kasus kualitatif, dengan fokus pada tiga fasilitas Rusunawa yang dikelola oleh Pemerintah Kota Cimahi. Data dikumpulkan melalui wawancara dengan 18 informan menggunakan purposive sampling, dengan pertanyaan terbuka yang dilengkapi dengan observasi dan analisis dokumen terkait. Implikasi dari penelitian ini menyoroti perlunya kebijakan pengelolaan rusunawa umum untuk mempertimbangkan kriteria pendapatan calon penghuni, durasi periode sewa, alokasi anggaran untuk memperluas Unit Pelayanan Publik (PSU) Rusunawa, saluran komunikasi dan penyebaran informasi yang efektif, serta perbaikan praktik pengelolaan Rusunawa. Temuan penelitian menekankan faktor sosial-ekonomi yang mempengaruhi penerima manfaat kebijakan hunian sewa umum, bersamaan dengan persyaratan anggaran untuk memperluas PSU Rusunawa, mengoptimalkan saluran komunikasi dan informasi, serta meningkatkan pengelolaan keseluruhan fasilitas Rusunawa.

ABSTRACT

Insufficient and affordable vertical housing (rusunawa) availability is still emerging as an alternative option for temporary residence for low-income individuals. Therefore, this study purposes to explore the implementation of Rusunawa management policies managed by local governments in Indonesia. The theoretical framework used to analyze policy implementation is based on Kearns and Lawson's (2008) concept, which examines four factors: 1) the policy itself, 2) implementing agencies, 3) inter-organizational relations, and 4) social and political factors. This research adopts a qualitative case study approach, focusing on three Rusunawa (vertical housing) facilities managed by the Cimahi Government. The data were collected within interviews with 18 respondents using purposeful sampling, employing open-ended questions complemented by observation and analysis of relevant documents. The implications of this research highlight the requirement for public rental housing management policies to consider the income criteria of prospective residents, rental period duration, and budget allocation for expanding the Rusunawa Public Service Unit (PSU), effective communication and information dissemination channels, and improved Rusunawa management practices. The findings underscore the socio-economic factors influencing the beneficiaries of general rental housing policies, along with the budgetary requirements for expanding the Rusunawa PSU, optimizing communication and information channels, and enhancing the overall management of Rusunawa facilities.

ARTICLE HISTORY

Submitted: 20 06 2023

Revised: 03 07 2023

Accepted: 04 07 2023

Published: 13 07 2023

KATA KUNCI

Implementasi Kebijakan, tata kelola, rumah sewa publik

KEYWORDS

policy implementation, management, public rental housing

INTRODUCTION

Meeting the global requirement for adequate and proper housing has been a long-standing issue. Since 1948, Article 25, paragraph 1 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights has recognized the right of every individual to suitable living conditions for their health and well-being, especially concerning housing. In 1976, the international convention on Economic, social, and cultural rights, along with the United Nations Habitat (UN-Habitat) I conference held in Vancouver, Canada, initiated discussions on the right to adequate housing, particularly focusing on the protection of housing as an individual's privacy (UN-HABITAT, 2014). Sustainable housing is included as one of the 17 Sustainable Development Goals under Goal 11, which aims to achieve "Sustainable Cities and Communities." This commitment was reaffirmed at the United Nations Conference on Housing and Sustainable Urban Development during the UN-Habitat III conference held in Quito, Ecuador, from October 17 to 20, 2016 (Chiodelli, 2016; UN-HABITAT, 2017), with a shared objective to ensure adequate and affordable housing for people worldwide by 2030.

As an active member of the United Nations, the Indonesian government has played an active role in these conferences held every 20 years, starting from the UN-Habitat I conference in Vancouver, Canada, in 1976, followed by the UN-Habitat II conference in Istanbul, Turkey, in 1996, and the UN-Habitat III conference in Quito, Ecuador, in 2016. The Indonesian government's commitment to meeting housing needs aligns with the regulations outlined in the constitution of the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia. In particular, Article 28H of the 1945 Constitution of Indonesia, as well as Law (UU) Number 1 of 2011 concerning Housing and Settlements, highlights the government's awareness of the imbalanced regional growth and development in Indonesia, which fails to consider the interests of low-income communities. Consequently, affordable and decent housing becomes challenging for these communities to access. Furthermore, regarding housing services provided by the government, Law Number 23 of 2014 concerning Regional Government, Article 12, paragraph 1, letter d, emphasizes that Public Housing and Settlement Areas are essential aspects of basic services.

Data from the Directorate of Settlement and Housing (2015) indicates that the provision of housing to meet the needs of low-income households in Indonesia remains problematic due to a gap between the number of houses constructed and the actual demand within the community, known as the backlog. The annual housing demand ranges from 800 thousand to 1 million units, while the government's capacity, in collaboration with developers, only reaches 400 thousand units. Without improvements in the government's housing provision capabilities (Agus et al., 2002), the backlog will continue to grow. In this context, public rental vertical housing (Gilbert, 2015) can serve as a strategy to reduce the backlog (Rondinelli, 1990). Implementing vertical housing (Directorate of Settlement and Housing, 2015) addresses the limitations of land availability caused by population growth, increasing urbanization (Tunas & Peresthu, 2010; Bangsal, 2012), and the expansion of slum areas in major cities across Indonesia (Dewita et al., 2018; Hoffman et al., 1991; Prayitno et al., 2012). Additionally, soaring land prices in urban areas pose challenges for individuals, particularly those within the low-income segment, to own houses; Cimahi City is one such example.

The construction of low-cost apartments (Rusunawa) in Cimahi City serves several important reasons. Firstly, according to data from the Central Statistics Agency (BPS) of Cimahi City in 2020, the city has a population of 586,580 people with a growth rate of 1.31% in 2019. This indicates a significant population increase, leading to a higher demand for housing options. Secondly, Cimahi City has a limited land area of approximately 40.2 square kilometers, which results in high population density. The current population density is 14,592 people per square kilometer, and it is predicted to increase further in the future. The construction of Rusunawa provides a solution to the increasing housing demand in a limited space.

Furthermore, research on public housing policies emphasizes the requirement to align housing affordability with the economic capabilities of the community (Famuyima and Babawale, 2014; Nishi, Asami, and Shimizu, 2019; Tang, 2012). As this study focuses on the implementation of public housing management policies for low-income communities, it is necessary to consider these social-economic factors alongside the previously mentioned implementation factors.

This research focuses on the implementation of Cimahi City Regional Regulation (Perda) Number 12 of 2014, which serves as the foundation for managing Rusunawa (vertical rental housing) by the Cimahi City Government through the Housing and Settlement Service (DPKP) and the Technical Implementer Units (UPT) Rusunawa. The study specifically examines three Rusunawa facilities (*Rusunawa Cigugur*, *Rusunawa Cibeureum*, and *Rusunawa Leuwigajah*) that were constructed using the central government budget and subsequently handed over for management. Therefore, the research problem revolves around the management of MBR Rusunawa by UPT Rusunawa DPKP Cimahi City, which has not achieved its intended goals due to various implementation challenges. The research question aims to explore how Rusunawa management policies are implemented in Cimahi City.

Literature Review

To gain insights into the implementation of Rusunawa management policies and to analyze them empirically, several relevant concepts and theories are necessary. Researchers conducted a search using keywords such as "policy implementation," "housing policy," and "public rental housing." A total of 38 articles on policy implementation were found, which focused on policy implementation research as a review process and analytical framework (Alexander, 1985; Butler & Allen, 2008; Nakamura, 1987; PA Sabatier, 1986, 1991; P. Sabatier & Mazmanian, 1980; Schneider, 1982; TB Smith, 1973; Van Meter & Van Horn, 1975). Some articles reviewed different approaches to policy implementation (DeLeon & DeLeon, 2002; Elmore, 1979; Linder & Peters, 1987; Matland, 1995; Ryan, 1996; PA Sabatier, 1986; Saetren, 2014) and explored the involvement of actors in policy networks, policy communities, implementing level bureaucrats, and target groups (Allen, 2001; Elander, 1994; O'Toole, 1986; Rice, 2013; Spillane et al., 2002; Zhu, 2010).

Additionally, research delved into the implementation of policies related to organizational theory and leadership within an organization (Alexander, 1985; Butler & Allen, 2008; Crosby, 1996; HJERN & HULL, 1982; Lindquist, 2006; SABATIER, 1987). Other articles identified variables and models in policy implementation (Goggin, 1986; Lester et al., 1987; SABATIER, 1987; P. Sabatier & Mazmanian, 1980; TB Smith, 1973; Van Meter & Van Horn, 1975) and suggested further research agendas in policy implementation (Lester et al., 1987; O'Toole, 2004; Pitts, 2007; Schofield, 2001). Studies focusing on housing policy implementation were also explored (Deng et al., 2011; Elander, 1994; Kearns & Lawson, 2008; Mabile, 2012; Wistow, 1978; Zhu, 2010).

Additionally, 25 articles were found that specifically addressed housing policy, with a focus on research related to affordable housing (Gibb, 2011; Gopalan & Venkataraman, 2015; Olanrewaju & Woon, 2017) and housing quality (Chan et al., 2006; Croal et al., 2003; Ibem, 2012; Ibem & Amole, 2011). These articles explored various government projects and programs aimed at meeting the welfare needs of the MBR and urban poor in developing countries, including Indonesia (Nature, 2018; Candradewini et al., 2018; Chiodelli, 2016; Fahey & Norris, 2011; Helming, 2002; Kampamba et al., 2018; Kintrea, 2006; Newman, 2008; Pandelaki & Shiozaki, 2010; Fago, 2010; Pheng et al., 2010; Rachmawati et al., 2015; Roestamy, 2018; Rondinelli, 1990; Suryanto & Rusli, 2017; Tuna & Peresthu, 2010; Wilkinson, 1975).

Furthermore, 20 articles were discovered that focused on general rental housing, including research on tenant satisfaction with rental house quality, such as house features, tenure, location, and environment (De & Vupru, 2017; Dezhi et al., 2016; Gan et al., 2016; Huang & Du, 2015; Li et al., 2017; Mohit et al., 2010; Olowu et al., 2019; Zhang & Rasiah, 2016; Zhou & Musterd, 2018). There were also studies examining rental housing from an economic perspective, particularly in terms of rental house affordability (Famuyiwa & Babawale, 2014; Nishi et al., 2019; Tang, 2012). Additionally, the research drew on experiences from various countries in meeting the welfare needs of tenants and the urban poor (Gilbert, 2015; Ha, 2002; O'Flaherty, 2011; Sarioğlu-Erdoğan, 2015; Schuetz, 2009), including research specifically focused on rental housing in an Indonesian context (Hoffman et al., 1991; Nurdini & Harun, 2012).

The policy implementation approach has evolved through different generations, starting with the top-down approach (first generation), followed by the bottom-up approach (second generation), macro and micro implementation (third generation), and principal-agent theory (fourth generation) (Janssen & A. Wimmer, 2015). Furthermore, the concept of a third-generation framework, which combines top-down and bottom-up approaches, has been proposed as a synthesis approach (Dawoody, 2015), and the framework suggests three basic elements in policy implementation: actors, resources, and institutions. Another approach to policy implementation, known as the hybrid theory or synthesis approach, combines top-down and bottom-up approaches (Fischer et al., 2007). Additionally, a policy implementation framework proposed by Kearns & Lawson (2008) considers factors such as the policy itself, implementing agencies, relationships between organizations, and social and political factors.

It aligns with the policy implementation framework developed by Kearns and Lawson (2008) in their study on housing provision in Glasgow. In this study, the concept of implementation combines three approaches, which will be operationalized and examined. These approaches include: 1) Policy itself: a) Clarity and compatibility of objectives, b) Causal assumptions contained within the policy, c) Parameters for preferred outcomes, d) Logistics of implementation, e) Policy interactions over time; 2) Implementation agency: a) Skills and commitment of the implementation agency, b) Availability of resources, c) Arrangements to contain agency discretion; 3) Inter-organizational relations: a) Amount of support from interest groups and other key actors, b) Degree of respect and trust between key actors, c) Level of oversight or management of the policy network; and 4) Social and political factors: a) Effects of social and political changes, b) Political influences upon policy design and delivery.

According to Kearns and Lawson's (2008) perspective, which focuses on the four factors within the policy implementation framework for housing needs in Glasgow, there is one factor that has not been addressed in their work. This factor pertains to socio-economic considerations, as previously discussed and referenced from the research of Le Blanc (Yang and Chen, 2014:87) and Lowe (2004:79). Additionally, Chiodelli (2016) highlights the importance of policies that regulate the basic substance, procedural guidelines, and beneficiaries of the regulations.

RESEARCH METHODS

This research employs a qualitative approach, specifically a case study methodology (Creswell & Poth, 2018; Yin, 2016). The choice of this approach is motivated by its ability to thoroughly explore, investigate, and uncover the underlying meaning of rental house management by incorporating various sources of data and presenting it through detailed descriptions of the cases and their respective themes. The study

was conducted in Cimahi City, specifically in three Rusunawa locations (Rusunawa Cigugur, Rusunawa Cibeureum, and Rusunawa Leuwigajah), spanning from November 2019 to May 2020.

The respondents involved are categorized into 5 groups, including: 1) Representatives of the Rusunawa management, directly overseeing the three Rusunawa in Cimahi; 2) Authorities responsible for regulations and development planning; 3) Individuals related to Rusunawa management in Cimahi; 4) Representatives of the community; and 5) Representatives of the residents (tenants) using Rusunawa in Cimahi. The informants will be asked several questions, including: 1) Clarity of the existing policy regarding Rusunawa management; 2) Alignment of the policy with Rusunawa management; 3) Background of Rusunawa establishment; 4) Reasons for building Rusunawa; 5) Measurement of Rusunawa management success; 6) Implementation of success measurement for Rusunawa management; 7) Support provided by the Cimahi Government in Rusunawa management; 8) Support needed to implement Rusunawa management policy in Cimahi; 9) Adaptation of Rusunawa policy in Cimahi to new policies from the central and provincial government; 10) Interconnection of Rusunawa management policy in Cimahi with policies from the provincial and central government; 11) Skills of the implementing human resources; 12) Commitment of the implementing human resources; 13) Sufficiency of human resources; 14) Availability of budget for Rusunawa management; 15) Policies implemented but not included in the Rusunawa management policy; 16) Support provided by the relevant departments/agencies in the Cimahi Government for Rusunawa management; 17) Support from the surrounding community of Rusunawa; 18) Social relationships occurring in Rusunawa; 19) Social care taking place in Rusunawa; 20) Supervision in Rusunawa management; 21) Follow-up monitoring and evaluation; 22) Social conditions in Cimahi City that impact Rusunawa management; 23) Influence of leadership changes in the local government, as well as in the departments/agencies, affecting Rusunawa management; 24) Support from the Cimahi Council towards Rusunawa management; and 25) Support from the Cimahi Government for Rusunawa management.

Primary data sources were obtained through interviews with relevant informants, focusing on qualitative data. The interview technique involved engaging with individuals who were directly or indirectly involved in the implementation of Rusunawa management policies in Cimahi City, including the management department (DPKP Cimahi City) and the UPT Rusunawa. To ensure the credibility of the obtained data, the researcher followed several steps, including those outlined by Yin (2016): 1) Trust: The researcher established trust by expanding the research through field observations, fostering mutual trust between the researcher and the participants; 2) Triangulation. The researcher employed data triangulation, cross-referencing information obtained from interviews, direct observations, and relevant documents to validate and complement the research findings; and 3) Validity. The primary sources of data in this research, gathered through interview techniques, consist of 18 informants.

The researcher ensured validity by comparing and contrasting the interview results, particularly regarding the experiences and situations at the three Rusunawa locations in Cimahi City. Informant interviews lasted approximately 30 to 45 minutes, with the researcher initially seeking the informants' consent to be interviewed. By fostering a natural setting during the interviews, the hope was to obtain more comprehensive and accurate data for analysis. Through data collection and analysis, a comprehensive description of the studied cases was obtained. The researcher then focused on analyzing the main themes, aiming to understand the complexity of each case rather than generalizing the findings. By identifying the issues within each case, the researcher sought to derive overarching themes (Yin, 2016).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

The Policy

Cimahi City Regulation Number 12 of 2014 provides clear guidelines for the management of Rusunawa. The regulation includes the following provisions: 1) The Technical Implementation Unit (UPT) is responsible for the management of Rusunawa, as stated in Article 1, point 9; 2) Indonesian citizens who belong to the low-income group (MBR) and enter into a lease agreement with the manager are eligible to rent in Rusunawa, in accordance with the applicable regulations; 3) The rental rate is determined in a Mayor Regulation and represents a specific amount paid for renting a residential or non-residential unit for a certain period; 4) The management of Rusunawa aims to ensure that the housing needs of low-income individuals are met in a healthy, safe, harmonious, and sustainable environment, as part of an integrated housing and settlement management system; 5) The management of Rusunawa encompasses various aspects, including physical utilization and maintenance of the buildings (PSU), institutional management, financial administration, and housing management; 6) PSU repair is a mandatory activity for managers to improve the conditions and ensure the comfort and safety of the units based on community requirements.

Cimahi Regional Regulation Number 6 of 2016 establishes the formation and structure of the Cimahi City Regional Apparatus. This regulation serves as the basis for the regulations regarding the Regional Work Units (SKPD) responsible for managing Rusunawa in Cimahi City, specifically the DPKP Cimahi City, which is technically managed by UPT Rusunawa. Mayor Regulation (Perwal) of Cimahi City Number 36 of 2017 provides rules and procedures for occupancy, retribution, and collection, as well as standard operating procedures for Rusunawa. UPT Rusunawa follows this Perwal as a technical reference, which includes regulations on rules, procedures, retribution rates, and various standard operating procedures.

Regarding the rental period in Rusunawa, Cimahi Regulation Number 12 of 2014, Article 21, states that the rental period for Sarusunawa is a maximum period 2 years, extendable for an additional year. On the other hand, the Governor Regulation (Pergub) of West Java Province Number 50 of 2013, Article 21 sets the rental period for Sarusunawa at a maximum of 3 years, extendable for an additional period. This discrepancy should be addressed in the policy to provide clarity and consistency (Aigbavboa & Thwala, 2018; Chiodelli, 2016; Dye, 2013). Additionally, policies related to public rental housing should consider the economic capacity of the community, ensuring the affordability of rental housing prices (Famuyiwa & Babawale, 2014; Nishi et al., 2019; Tang, 2012).

The success of Rusunawa's existence and management is evaluated based on interviews with informants. The findings include: 1) Residents express reluctance to leave Rusunawa due to the comfort they experience, even though they have to relocate to another unit after 3 years; 2) Rental rates in Rusunawa are significantly cheaper compared to regular rental houses, making it more affordable for residents; 3) Rusunawa offers safety, cleanliness, and a strategic location close to workplaces and schools, with convenient transportation options. The success measures of Rusunawa management include 1) Adequate and affordable housing for low-income individuals; 2) A healthy, safe, harmonious, and sustainable environment within Rusunawa; 3) Integrated housing and settlement management, covering aspects such as physical utilization, institutional management, financial administration, and housing regulations (Deng et al., 2011; Elander, 1994; Kearns & Lawson, 2008; Mabile, 2012; Wistow, 1978; Zhu, 2010).

Comparative studies with neighboring countries (Malaysia and Bangladesh) and other districts/cities (Malang and Yogyakarta) indicate that Rusunawa management in Cimahi City is successful. The observations reveal full occupancy in all three Rusunawa buildings. According to informants, the success of Rusunawa management in Cimahi City is determined by smooth rental collection by the Cimahi City

Government and the enthusiasm of the community, as evidenced by full occupancy. Overall, the presence of Rusunawa in Cimahi City benefits low-income individuals, supported by the UPT Rusunawa DPKP and clear standard operating procedures outlined in Perwal Number 36/2017 and Perwal Number 47/2019. However, it is necessary to clarify the target group of residents (MBR) and specify the income range that qualifies individuals as MBR. This aligns with research on rental housing policies implemented after a government formulates housing provisions to support households unable to access the housing market and purchase their own homes (Yang & Chen, 2014).

Public Rental Housing Policy

The policy itself is governed by Cimahi City Regulation Number 12 of 2014, which outlines several key points. Firstly, it establishes the Technical Implementation Unit (UPT) as the responsible entity for managing Rusunawa, as stated in Article 1 Point 9. Secondly, the regulation specifies that Indonesian citizens who fall within the MBR group, as defined by relevant regulations, are eligible to rent in Rusunawa. They must enter into a lease agreement with the manager. Thirdly, the rental rate is determined as a specific amount or value for the rental of apartments and non-residential flats, and it will be further regulated in a Mayor's Regulation. The objective of Rusunawa management is to provide adequate and affordable housing for low-income individuals in a healthy, safe, harmonious, and sustainable environment. The management of Rusunawa encompasses physical utilization of the buildings, institutional aspects, financial administration, and housing-related matters. Additionally, the regulation highlights the mandatory activity of PSU repair, which aims to improve the conditions of the buildings.

Cimahi City Regional Regulation Number 6 of 2016 establishes the formation and structure of Cimahi City Regional Apparatus. This regulation serves as the basis for the management of Rusunawa in Cimahi City by the designated Regional Work Units (SKPD), specifically the DPKP Cimahi City, which is technically managed by UPT Rusunawa. The Mayor Regulation (Perwal) of Cimahi City Number 36 of 2017 provides rules and procedures for occupancy, retribution, and collection, as well as standard operating procedures for Rusunawa. This Perwal serves as a technical reference for UPT Rusunawa and governs regulations, procedures, retribution amounts, and various standard operating procedures.

Regarding the rental period, Cimahi City Regulation Number 12 of 2014 stipulates that the rental period for Sarusunawa is a maximum of two years, with the possibility of a one-year extension. However, it differs from the Governor Regulation (Pergub) of West Java Province Number 50 of 2013, which states that the rental period for Sarusunawa is a maximum of three years, extendable for one period. Furthermore, the rental period for Sarusunawa in Cimahi City Flats is three years. It is essential to address the inconsistency and provide clear regulations regarding the rental period in Cimahi City Flats, considering the varying rules from different governing bodies.

When measuring the success of Rusunawa's existence and management, feedback from informants provides valuable insights. Residents express their objection to leaving Rusunawa as they find it comfortable to live there, but they are saddened by the requirement to move out after three years. Additionally, the affordable rental prices in flats, compared to ordinary rented houses, are highly appreciated by residents. The safety, cleanliness, and strategic location of Rusunawa, which is close to workplaces and schools, also contribute to its success. The success measures of Rusunawa management include providing adequate and affordable housing for MBR (Yogyandaru & Mayasari, 2020), ensuring a healthy, safe, and harmonious environment, and managing flats through an integrated housing and settlement system. This entails the physical utilization of Rusunawa buildings, institutional aspects, financial administration, and housing-related considerations.

Comparative studies with neighboring countries such as Malaysia and Bangladesh, as well as districts/cities like Malang and Yogyakarta, demonstrate the success of Rusunawa management in Cimahi City. Observations indicate full occupancy in all three flats, and residents emphasize the importance of smooth rental levy collection for the Cimahi City Government. The enthusiasm of the community towards Rusunawa is evident from the high occupancy rate. Overall, the presence of Rusunawa in Cimahi City benefits the low-income population (Ramadhan, 2020), supported by the UPT Rusunawa DPKP and clear Standard Operating Procedures outlined in Perwal Number 36/2017 and Perwal Number 47/2019. However, further clarification is needed regarding the target group of residents, specifically the income range for individuals classified as MBR.

In conclusion, the establishment and management of Rusunawa in Cimahi City are governed by specific regulations and supported by institutional structures. The success of Rusunawa is measured by various factors, including its affordability, a healthy and safe environment, integrated housing management, and community satisfaction. Comparative studies and resident feedback highlight its positive impact. However, certain aspects, such as the rental period and income criteria for MBR, require clarification for effective implementation.

Implementing agencies

The responses regarding the skills and commitment of UPT Rusunawa DPKP, provided by key informants, particularly representatives of residents, indicate that the employees are highly skilled and dependable in managing Rusunawa. Their responses can be summarized as follows: 1) UPT Rusunawa employees perform their main tasks and functions in managing Rusunawa diligently; 2) They provide satisfactory services to residents, demonstrating a strong work commitment. For instance, they promptly respond to complaints regarding Rusunawa damages and ensure that necessary repairs are carried out. They also maintain cleanliness and security within Rusunawa, including the upkeep of facilities and supporting infrastructure.

Based on observations, the employees of UPT Rusunawa DPKP, responsible for managing the three Rusunawa, exhibit commendable abilities and commitment. This is evident in their efforts to maintain the cleanliness of the surroundings and the presence of guards who attend to the needs of residents and visitors entering and exiting Rusunawa in Cimahi City. Interviews with three informants, who represent residents of the three Rusunawa managed by UPT Rusunawa DPKP Cimahi City, confirm that the HR managers possess sufficient skills and a strong commitment to supporting the residents' desires and ensuring the success of Rusunawa management.

Regarding resources for Rusunawa management in Cimahi City, information is based on interviews, observations, and official documents, including laws and regulations governing Rusunawa management. These resources include 1) Funding sources, which comprise the budget allocated for THL employee salaries, maintenance materials for Rusunawa, and the procurement costs of supporting facilities such as prayer rooms, playgrounds, and educational or healthcare facilities essential to Rusunawa management; and 2) Human resources, consisting of UPT Rusunawa DPKP Cimahi City employees, including six civil servants and 62 individuals divided into three fields: technicians/technical operators, cleaners, and security personnel.

Inter-Organizational Relations

The informant explained the support from key actors in the management of Rusunawa, highlighting the coordination between UPT Rusunawa and several UPTs within the Department of Housing and Settlements of Cimahi City. The cooperation takes the following forms: 1) Weekly regular meetings held at the DPKP office to review the targets of each UPT; 2) Monthly monitoring and evaluation (money) of the population,

which assesses factors such as service quality and rental income, contributing to Cimahi City's regional income (PAD) exceeding 3 billion; 3) Biannual money on programs and projects, where the absorption of PAD and the realization of development proposals are evaluated by the DPRD to assess progress in the current year.

Referring to interviews with informants, researchers' observations, and supporting documents in Rusunawa management, it can be concluded that the existence of Rusunawa receives robust support. The annual budget allocated for maintenance, upkeep, THL employee salaries, and various departments, including cleanliness, security, and technical aspects, as well as proposals for PSU upgrades such as sports parks and children's playgrounds, consistently contributes to the management of the three Rusunawa in Cimahi City. Additionally, cooperation and coordination with fellow UPTs within the DPKP environment and various Offices/Agencies within the Cimahi City Government further strengthen this support.

Moreover, internal and external supervision of Rusunawa management is carried out by various parties involved. 1) Internal supervision is conducted by six civil servants at UPT Rusunawa, including the UPT Head, Subsection Heads, Revenue Finance Manager, Expenditure Finance Manager, and Coordinator of each Rusunawa. 2) DPKP conducts supervision every 2 to 3 months, typically involving the Secretary of the Service and the Head of the DPKP Program and Personnel Subdivision, through monitoring and evaluation visits to Rusunawa. In addition, members of the Cimahi City DPRD conduct inspections outside of working hours to ensure the accuracy of Rusunawa management reports. Ultimately, the proposed budget is subject to approval by the DPRD.

Regarding Rusunawa management in Cimahi City, the informant also mentioned the involvement of a BLUD (Public Service Agency) to ensure independence from the Regional Revenue and Expenditure Budget (APBD). While the UPT for clean water is already a BLUD, Rusunawa is currently being studied to determine its feasibility. The informant highlights that the management of Rusunawa with the BLUD system in Cimahi City has been successful thus far. Overall, these inter-organizational relations and collaborative efforts support the provision of affordable MBR housing in Cimahi City, aligning with the established objectives.

Social and Political Factors

Several political factors influence the management of Rusunawa in Cimahi City. These include: 1) Leadership changes at both the UPT Rusunawa and the DPKP Cimahi City; 2) Changes in leadership within the Cimahi City Government, including changes in the government administration itself; and 3) The presence of community organizations in the form of Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs).

Based on interviews with informants, several important findings have emerged. It appears that the presence of NGOs in the management of Rusunawa is not desired, as it makes the managers uncomfortable. Furthermore, changes in leadership, such as changes in the Mayor, the DPRD, the Head of DPKP, and the Head of UPT Rusunawa, have had an impact on the methods and decisions made.

The informant also revealed that changes in leadership, both at the DPKP Service and the UPT Rusunawa, can influence policies in Rusunawa management. For example, there may be changes in rental rates. It is crucial to emphasize the significant role of leadership changes in determining the success of achieving the Regional Original Income (PAD) derived from the monthly rent of the 845 units in the three Rusunawa in Cimahi City. The informant emphasized that one of the key achievements of Rusunawa management is meeting income targets from monthly rent in the housing sector.

CONCLUSIONS

The findings of this study highlight several key points. Firstly, the income regulations for prospective residents of Rusunawa are not clearly defined. There is inconsistency in selecting low-income individuals as prospective residents, and the income range for Rusunawa residents to be assigned to a specific Rusunawa building and floor is not regulated. Additionally, the amount of rent they need to pay should be clearly defined in the policy to ensure the affordability and suitability of housing for low-income individuals. Therefore, it is crucial to consider the socioeconomic status of prospective occupants. Secondly, it is important to recognize the significance of providing rental housing for the community. This relates to the implementation of rental housing policies after the government formulates a plan to provide housing for its citizens. For households that are unable to afford or access the housing market to purchase their own homes, the local government supports them by issuing provisions regarding housing rent subsidies. Thirdly, managing Rusunawa more effectively can be achieved through the implementation of the BLUD system. This system allows the manager to independently handle incoming finances and allocate them promptly for the maintenance, upkeep, and improvement of the residential units, adapting to the needs of the community. Lastly, leadership plays a crucial role in shaping the policies and management of Rusunawa. Changes in leadership, such as the Mayor and the DPRD, can have an impact on the overall management approach and decision-making process. In conclusion, this study emphasizes the importance of clearly defining income regulations, providing rental housing options, implementing the BLUD system for effective management, and considering the influence of leadership in Rusunawa's policy implementation and management.

REFERENCES

- Agus, MR, Doling, J., & Lee, D. (2002). *Housing Policy Systems in South and East Asia*. Palgrave MacMillan.
- Aigbavboa, C., & Thwala, W. (2018). *Occupancy Satisfaction and the Evolution of Housing Policy*. Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.
- Alexander, ER (1985). *From Idea To Action Note To Contingency Theory*.Pdf. In *Administration & Society* (pp. 403–426).
- Allen, C. (2001). "They don't live and breathe policy as we do...": Policy intentions and practice dilemmas in modern social policy and implementation networks. *Policy Studies*, 22(3–4), 149–166.
- Butler, MJR, & Allen, PM (2008). Understand the policy implementation process as a self-regulating system. *Public Management Review*, 10(3), 421–440.
- Candradewini, C., Rusli, B., & Muhtar, EA (2018). Linkages between organizations in implementing the self-help housing stimulant program. *International Journal of Engineering and Technology (UAE)*, 7(2), 36–39.
- Chan, APC, Wong, FKW, & Lam, PTI (2006). Assessing relationship quality in public housing: An empirical study. *International Journal of Quality & Reliability Management*, 23(8), 909–927.
- Chiodelli, F. (2016). International Housing Policy for the Urban Poor and Informal Cities in the Global South: A Non-Diachronic Overview. *Journal of International Development*, 168(10-13), 1–30.
- Creswell, JW, & Poth, CN (2018). *Qualitative Inquiry & Research Design: Choosing Among Five Approaches* (4th ed., Vol. 3, Number 1). SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Croal, G., Ogden, SM, & Grigg, NP (2003). Building quality housing services: A case study of improving the quality of local authority building services. *Property Management*, 21(4), 230–241.
- Crosby, BL (1996). Policy implementation: Organizational challenges. *World Development*, 24(9 SPEC. ISS.), 1403–1415.
- Dawoody, AR (2015). *Public Administration and Policy in the Middle East (AMEPPA Boo)*. Springer Science+Business Media.
- De, England, & Vupru, V. (2017). Location and environmental conditions for housing options and their

- rental values: An empirical examination of urban areas of Northeast India. *International Journal of Housing Markets and Analysis*, 10(4), 519–538.
- DeLeon, P., & DeLeon, L. (2002). What Happened to Policy Implementation? Alternative Approach. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 12(4), 467–492.
- Deng, L., Shen, Q., & Wang, L. (2011). An emerging housing policy framework in China. *Journal of Planning Literature*, 26(2), 168–183.
- Dewita, Y., Yen, BTH, & Burke, M. (2018). The effect of transportation costs on housing affordability: Experience from the Bandung Metropolitan Area, Indonesia. *Land Use Policy*, 79 (October 2017), 507–519.
- Dezhi, L., Yanchao, C., Hongxia, C., Kai, G., Chi-Man Hui, E., & Yang, J. (2016). Assessing the integrated sustainability of public rental housing projects from a complex ecosystem perspective. *Habitat International*, 53, 546–555.
- Directorate of Settlement and Housing. (2015). Provision of Decent Housing for Low-Income Communities (MBR) in the 2015-2019 National Mid-Term Development Plan.
- Dye, TR (2013). *Understanding Public Policy* (14th ed.). Pearson Education, Inc.
- Elander, I. (1994). Policy community, public housing and area improvement in Sweden. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 17(10), 1789–1823.
- Elmore, RF (1979). Mapping: Withdrawal and Implementation of Policy Decisions. *Political Science Quarterly*, 94(4), 601–616.
- Fahey, T., & Norris, M. (2011). Housing in the Welfare State: Rethinking the Conceptual Foundations of Comparative Housing Policy Analysis. *International Journal of Housing Policy*, 11(4), 439–452.
- Famuyiwa, F., & Babawale, GK (2014). Hedonic values of physical infrastructure in house rentals. *Journal of Facilities Management*, 12(3), 211–230.
- Fischer, F., Miller, GJ, & Sidney, MS (2007). *The Handbook of Public Policy Analysis: Theory, Politics, and Methods*. In *Psychiatric Services*. CRC Press Taylor & Francis Group.
- Gan, X., Zuo, J., Chang, R., Li, D., & Zillante, G. (2016). Exploring the determinants of migrant workers' housing tenure choices over public rental housing: A case study in Chongqing, China. *Habitat International*, 58(2016), 118–126.
- Gibb, K. (2011). Delivering affordable new housing in an era of austerity: Housing policy in Scotland. *International Journal of Housing Markets and Analysis*, 4(4), 357–368.
- Gilbert, A. (2015). Rental housing: International experience. *Habitat International*, 5, 1–9.
- Goggin, ML (1986). The Problem of “Too Few Cases/Too Many Variables” in Implementation Research. *Political Research Quarterly*, 39(2), 328–347.
- Gopalan, K., & Venkataraman, M. (2015). Affordable housing: Policy and practice in India. *IIMB Management Review*, 27(2), 129–140.
- Ha, SK (2002). The urban poor, rental accommodation, and housing policy in Korea. *City*, 19(3), 195–203.
- Helmsing, AHJ (2002). Decentralization, empowerment and local governance in low-income countries. *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy*, 20(3), 317–340.
- HJERN, B., & HULL, C. (1982). Implementation of Research as Empirical Constitutionalism. *European Journal of Political Research*, 10(2), 105–115.
- Hoffman, ML, Walker, C., Struyk, RJ, & Nelson, K. (1991). Rental housing in urban Indonesia. *Habitat International*, 15(12), 181–206.
- Huang, Z., & Du, X. (2015). Assessment and determinants of residential satisfaction with public housing in Hangzhou, China. *Habitat International*, 47, 218–230.
- Ibem, EO (2012). Citizens' perceptions of the quality of public housing in urban areas in Ogun State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Quality and Reliability Management*, 29(9), 1000–1018.
- Ibem, EO, & Amole, OO (2011). Qualitative adequacy assessment of newly built public housing in Ogun State, Nigeria. *Property Management*, 29(3), 285–304.

- Janssen, M., & A. Wimmer, M. (2015). *Policy Practice and Digital Science (Integrating Complex Systems, Social Simulation, and Public Administration in Policy Research)* (A. Deljoo (ed.)). Swiss Springer International Publishing.
- Kampamba, J., Kachepa, S., Nkwae, B., Matlhogoane, NG, & Outule, T. (2018). Housing delivery for low-income communities in Botswana. *International Journal of Housing Markets and Analysis*, 11(2), 356–385.
- Kearns, A., & Lawson, L. (2008). Transfer of housing shares in Glasgow - First five years: A study of policy implementation. *Housing Studies*, 23(6), 857–878.
- Kintrea, K. (2006). Have it all? Housing reform under devolution. *Housing Studies*, 21(2), 187-207.
- Lester, JP, Bowman, AOM, Goggin, ML, & O'Toole, LJ (1987). Public Policy Implementation: Field Evolution and Future Research Agenda. *Policy Research Review*, 7(1), 200–216.
- Li, J., Wang, CC, & Sun, J. (2017). Empirical analysis of tenants' intentions to leave the general rental housing unit based on the Theory of Planned Behavior – Case of Wuhan, China. *Habitat International*, 69, 27-36.
- Linder, SH, & Peters, BG (1987). DESIGN PERSPECTIVE ON POLICY IMPLEMENTATION: WRONG PRESCRIPTION MISTAKES. *Policy Review Studies*, 6(3), 459–475.
- Lindquist, E. (2006). Organizing for policy implementation: The emergence and role of implementing units in policy design and oversight. *Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis: Research and Practice*, 8(4), 311–324.
- Mabille, TE (2012). Implementation of Housing Policy in the Municipality of Ngaka Modiri District, Northwest Province. *Journal of Human Ecology*, 39(1), 61-72.
- Maitland, RE (1995). Synthesizing the implementation literature: An ambiguity-conflict policy implementation model. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 5(2), 145-174.
- Mohit, MA, Ibrahim, M., & Rasyid, YR (2010). Occupancy satisfaction assessment in newly designed public low-cost housing in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia. *Habitat International*, 34(1), 18–27.
- Nakamura, RT (1987). TEXTBOOK POLICY PROCESS AND IMPLEMENTATION RESEARCH. *Policy Review Studies*, 7(1), 142-154.
- Newman, SJ (2008). Is housing important for poor families? A critical summary of research and issues that remain to be resolved. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 27(4), 895–925.
- Nishi, H., Asami, Y., & Shimizu, C. (2019). Housing and rental features: estimating the microstructure of rental housing. *International Journal of Housing Markets and Analysis*, 12(2), 210-225.
- Nurdini, A., & Harun, IB (2012). The Spatial Bounded Choice Phenomenon: Student Behavior Related to Rental Housing in Bandung as a Case Study. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 36 (June 2011), 187–195.
- O'Flaherty, B. (2011). Rental Housing Assistance for the 21st Century. *Cityscape: A Journal of Policy Development and Research*, 13(2), 127–145.
- O'Toole, LJ (1986). Policy Recommendations for Multi-Actor Implementation: Field Study. *Journal of Public Policy*, 6(2), 181–210.
- O'Toole, LJ (2004). Theory-practice issues in policy implementation research. *Public Administration*, 82(2), 309–329.
- Olanrewaju, AL, & Woon, TC (2017). Explore the determinants of affordable housing options. *International Journal of Housing Markets and Analysis*, 10(5), 703-723.
- Olowu, FY, Jaiyeoba, EB, Agbabiaka, HI, Daramola, J., & Olawunmi. (2019). Spatial analysis of factors influencing housing quality for tenants in traditional Nigerian cities. *International Journal of Housing Markets and Analysis*, 12(2), 181–209.
- Pandelaki, EE, & Shiozaki, Y. (2010). The Concept of the Core House and Its Implementation in. *int. Journal of Housing Science*, 34(4), 233–248.
- Pheng, LS, Xiaopeng, D., & Lye, L. (2010). Communication management to improve public housing projects

- in Singapore. *Electronic Libraries*, 34(1), 1-5.
- Pitt, DW (2007). Implementation of diversity management programs in public organizations: Lessons from policy implementation research. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 30 (12-14), 1573-1590.
- Prayitno, B., Fenat, AS, & Paramita, M. (2012). People's Welfare on the Board. COORDINATOR OF THE MINISTRY OF PEOPLE'S WELFARE OF THE REPUBLIC OF INDONESIA.
- Rachmawati, F., Soemitro, RAA, Adi, TJW, & Susilawati, C. (2015). Implementation of the low-cost apartment program in the Surabaya metropolitan area. *Procedia Engineering*, 125, 75-82.
- Ramadhan, R. A. (2020). The Advocacy Coalition Framework Approach to Row House Policy in Tamansari, Bandung City. *Jurnal Manajemen Pelayanan Publik*, 3(2), 82.
- Rice, D. (2013). Street-level Bureaucrats and the Welfare State: Towards a Micro-Institutionalist Theory of Policy Implementation. *Administration and Society*, 45(9), 1038–1062.
- Roestamy, M. (2017). Provision of Affordable Housing for Low-Income Communities in Indonesia (Development of a Model of the Housing Law). *IJASOS- International E-journal of Advances in Social Sciences*, III(9), 1094-1103.
- Rondinelli, DA (1990). Housing for the Urban Poor. *American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, 49(3), 257–270.
- Ryan, N. (1996). Comparison of three program implementation approaches. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 9(4), 34–41.
- Sabatier, PA (1986). Top-Down and Bottom-Up Approaches to Implementation Research: Critical Analysis and Suggested Synthesis. *Journal of Public Policy*, 6(1), 21–48.
- Sabatier, PA (1991). Towards a Better Theory of Policy Processes. *Political and Political Science*, 24(2), 147-156.
- SABATIER, PA (1987). Knowledge, Policy-Oriented Learning, and Policy Change. In *Knowledge* (Vol. 8, Number 4).
- Sabatier, P., & Mazmanian, D. (1980). APPLICATION OF PUBLIC POLICY: ANALYSIS FRAMEWORK.
- Saetren, H. (2014). Applying the third generation research paradigm in policy implementation research: An empirical assessment. *Public Policy and Administration*, 29(2), 84–105.
- Sarioğlu-Erdoğan, GP (2015). Tenant welfare in Ankara: Empirical analysis. *Habitat International*, 48, 30–37.
- Schneider, AL (1982). Studying policy implementation: Conceptual Framework. *Evaluation Review*, 6(6), 715–730.
- Schofield, J. (2001). Time for awakening? Public policy implementation: A literature review and agenda for future research. *International Journal of Management Review*, 3(3), 245–263.
- Schuetz, J. (2009). No Tenants in my suburban backyard: Land use regulations and rental housing. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 28(2), 296–320.
- Smith, KB, & Larimer, CW (2009). *Primary Public Policy Theory*. Westview Press. www.westviewpress.com
- Smith, TB (1973). Policy implementation process. *Policy Science*, 4(2), 197–209.
- Spillane, JP, Reiser, BJ, & Reimer, T. (2002). Policy implementation and cognition: Reframing and refocusing implementation research. *Review of Educational Research*, 72(3), 387–431.
- Suryanto, & Rusli, B. (2017). Analysis of economic aspects in housing and settlement development policies in West Java, Indonesia. *International Journal of Global Trade and Markets*, 10(1), 91–98.
- Tang, CPY (2012). Measuring housing association rental affordability in the UK: A dual approach. *International Journal of Housing Markets and Analysis*, 5(3), 218-234.
- Tunas, D., & Peresthu, A. (2010). Self-help housing in Indonesia: The only option for the poor? *Habitat International*, 34(3), 315–322.
- UN-HABITAT. (2014). Right to Adequate Housing Human Rights Fact Sheet No. 21 (Rev. 1). At the United Nations.

- UN-HABITAT. (2017). New Urban Agenda. Union of countries. www.habitat3.org
- Van Meter, DS, & Van Horn, CE (1975). Policy Implementation Process: Conceptual Framework. *Administration & Society*, 6(4), 445–488.
- Ward, PM (2012). Housing policy in developing countries. In the *International Encyclopedia of Housing and Homes* (Vol. 3). Elsevier Ltd.
- Wilkinson, RK (1975). Economic Aspects of Low-Income Housing Policy in the Urban Economy. *International Journal of Social Economics*, 2(2), 74-86.
- Wistow, G. (1978). Managing Housing Policy—Policy Implementation in the Owner's Residential Sector. *Local Government Studies*, 4(4), 53–66.
- WJPDM. (2013). Initial Concept of Greater Bandung Metropolitan Development.
- Yang, Z., & Chen, J. (2014). Housing affordability and housing policy in urban China. Springer Singapore Heidelberg New York Dordrecht London.
- Yin, RK (2016). *Qualitative Research from Beginning to End* (2nd ed.). Guilford Press. www.guilford.com
- Ramadhan, R. A. (2020). The Advocacy Coalition Framework Approach to Row House Policy in Tamansari, Bandung City. *Jurnal Manajemen Pelayanan Publik*, 3(2), 82. <https://doi.org/10.24198/jmpp.v3i2.25734>
- Yogyandaru, S. W., & Mayasari, I. (2020). Analysis of Fees Exemption Policy of Land and Building Rights Acquisition in Jakarta. *Jurnal Manajemen Pelayanan Publik*, 4(1), 35.
- Zhang, M., & Rasiah, R. (2016). State policy localization: Shandong's experience in financing Low-Rent Housing in urban China. *Habitat International*, 56, 1–10.
- Zhou, J., & Musterd, S. (2018). Housing preferences and access to general rental housing among migrants in Chongqing, China. *Habitat International*, 79 (June), 42–50.
- Zhu, Y. (2010). Target group views and policy implementation: Lessons from the guiyang housing monetization reform. *Politics and Policy*, 38(4), 817–841.