

COORDINATION STRATEGY OF GOVERNMENT AGENCIES IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF BORDER AREA IN MOROTAI ISLAND REGENCY FISHERIES AND TOURISM SECTOR 2015-2019

¹FADLI ABDULLAH, ²SINTA NINGRUM, ³MUDIYATI RAHMATUNNISA, ⁴RAHMAN MULYAWAN

¹Doctoral Candidate in Government Science, Universitas Padjadjaran, Bandung, Indonesia
fadlyabdullah@gmail.com

²Department of Public Administration, Universitas Padjadjaran, Bandung, Indonesia
sinta.ningrum@unpad.ac.id

³Department of Political Science, Universitas Padjadjaran, Bandung, Indonesia
Mudiyati.rahmatunnisa@unpad.ac.id

⁴Department of Government Science, Universitas Padjadjaran, Bandung, Indonesia
Rahman.mulyawan@unpad.ac.id

Abstract- *The poverty rate for the people of Morotai Island Regency from 2015 to 2019 has increased. In addition, the poverty depth and poverty indices have increased indicating that the poverty condition of the people in Morotai Island Regency is getting worse. This study discusses the issue of coordination mechanisms in the development of borders in Morotai Island Regency in the leading sectors, namely the fisheries and tourism sectors carried out by the KKP and the Ministry of Tourism and Creative Economy in 2015 - 2019 within the BNPP container as well as between the Tourism Office and DKP and BPPD in the Regions as well as functionally between ministries with Technical OPD and Coordination between BNPP and BPPD. This research was conducted qualitatively where data sources were obtained from observation, interviews, documentation, and visual materials. In determining informants, they were selected purposively to obtain in-depth information from one informant and then move on to other informants. Meanwhile, researchers conducted a literature review and searched other documents to collect supporting data, and were evaluated using the data reduction method. Research shows that the formulation of the strategy needed to overcome the problem of coordinating the development of border areas in Morotai Island Regency in the fisheries and tourism sectors in 2015 - 2019 consists of Anticipatory Coordination, Adaptive Coordination, Cultural Strategy, Communicative Strategy, Functional Strategy, Cooperation Strategy, Informational Strategy, Control Strategy, Structural Strategy, Political Strategy.*

Keywords: *Morotai Island District, Public Policy, Institutional Coordination, Border Studies*

INTRODUCTION

Since the reform era, the government's attention to border management has increased by using a comprehensive approach. The national border management approach involves various actors and sectors, both ministries/agencies and local governments working together in a complex coordination network mechanism. To align and synchronize the work of *stakeholders* in the management of national borders, the government has equipped it with special regulations and made the border area a special area that provides wider space for the involvement of various sectors and actors and gets special treatment from the government. In addition, the government also accommodates this coordination model into the BNPP and BPP institutions to coordinate the involvement of the parties so that border management is more synergistic and integrated.

During the reign of Joko Widodo - Jusuf Kalla (2015 - 2019) the government's attention to border management increased by placing border management as one of the priority programs in the *Nawa Cita*. This attention can be seen from the development carried out at the border, including in Morotai Island Regency. To accelerate the development of border areas in Morotai Island Regency,



the government designated all sub-districts in Morotai Island Regency as border areas and priority locations (lokpri), in addition, Daruba (Capital City of Morotai Island Regency) was designated as the National Strategic Area Center (PKSN) and District Morotai Island as a Special Economic Zone (SEZ). To support development in the border area of Morotai Island Regency, the central government from 2015 to 2019 has allocated a budget of more than one trillion rupiahs which is spread across programs and activities of ministries/agencies.

Development within the framework of the welfare approach is directed at the development of sectors that are the superior potential owned by Morotai Island Regency. This is in line with the prosperity approach as described in the grand design of border management and state border management, the welfare approach in principle encourages the development of border community economic activities based on superior sectors or potential to improve welfare. Thus the development of the border area in Morotai Island Regency focuses on the development of the fisheries and tourism sectors which have enormous potential.

Changing the approach to a more comprehensive direction and the development that has been carried out has not been able to overcome the problems of community welfare at the state border, including in Morotai Island Regency. The poverty rate for the people of Morotai Island Regency from 2015 to 2019 has increased. In addition, the index of depth and severity of poverty has increased indicating that the poverty condition of the people in Morotai Island Regency is getting worse.

This problem conceptually shows that there are problems with the coordination mechanism in the development of border areas in Morotai Island Regency in the superior sectors, namely the fisheries and tourism sectors carried out by the KKP and the Ministry of Tourism and Creative Economy in 2015 - 2019 within the BNPP container as well as between the Tourism Office and DKP and BPPD in the Regions as well as functionally between the ministry and Technical OPD and Coordination between BNPP and BPPD. This is assumed to occur because the implementation of coordination does not pay attention to the following factors,

1. Effective leadership;
2. Flexibility and wisdom;
3. Building on common goals;
4. Citizen participation;
5. Culture of bureaucratic pragmatism;
6. Negotiation and mediation skills;
7. Minimizing political distractions;
8. Small membership.

To overcome this problem, coordination strategies are needed in the time dimension and media dimension consisting of Anticipatory Coordination, Adaptive Coordination, Cultural Strategy, Communicative Strategy, Functional Strategy, Cooperative Strategy, Informational Strategy, Control Strategy, and Structural Strategy.

According to Srikant & Purnam (2010), there are two general coordination strategies to unite the parties involved in the coordination network, namely; (1) redesign tasks to reduce/simplify interdependencies and control standard procedures to achieve coordination. (2) Create opportunities for broad communication among interdependent actors so that they reach mutual agreements.

A comprehensive explanation of the coordination strategy was conveyed by Alexander (1995) that there is a coordination strategy based on the time dimension and the medium dimension. Coordination based on the time dimension consists of Anticipatory Coordination which is based on planning, while Adaptive Coordination is based on implementation, monitoring, feedback, and control. Coordination based on the time dimension is intended to encourage the parties to synchronize the period before implementation (in this case when planning) and when the program or activity is being implemented. In addition to the time-based strategy, there is also a coordination strategy based on the medium/media dimension that is used to encourage effective coordination. The coordination strategy based on the medium is divided into seven strategies,



namely Cultural Strategy, Communicative Strategy, Functional Strategy, Cooperative Strategy, Informational Strategy, Control Strategy, and Structural Strategy.

Cultural Strategy is a strategy whose implementation depends on the compatibility between organizational goals and organizational arrangements or adjusting actions to achieve organizational goals, this strategy uses influence, public relations, and co-optation as an example is securing coordination support between organizations by carrying out professional values that have been set, as well as affirmation of expectations of the existence of norms that take place among members of the organizational network. This strategy is also carried out by creating a mandated hierarchical framework based on organizational recognition from the authorities (cooptation).

Communicative Strategies are actions that depend on a shared awareness of interdependent interests and common interests, an example of this coordination strategy is negotiation, namely by making a list and resolving conflicting requests from members in an activity. The keywords in this strategy are the exchange of information, negotiation, and networking.

Functional Strategy is a reciprocal/reciprocal exchange effort or power relationship between members of an inter-organizational system. For example, forming coalitions or cooperation between strong organizations and less powerful organizations to increase their interests in coordinating the system, the keywords of this strategy are coalition building, inclusion or exclusion, and repositioning or possession.

Cooperative Strategy is voluntary interaction and collaboration between organizations. Similarly, where co-optation is a popular coordinating strategy, one may use patronage (agreement together to purchase goods or services), and membership in an informal consulting body to assist. The keywords for this strategy are bargaining, exchange of resources, and patronage.

Informational Strategy is a strategy that includes persuasion and building consensus. Persuasion can call for common values based on shared ideology or partiality and allegiance, but in the context of a broad scope of issues, it can create problems involving transaction costs in delayed decisions and actions.

Control Strategy aims to coordinate organizational behaviors by customizing their decisions to produce actions that otherwise would not have occurred. Of course, there is a gray area between control strategies and cooperative strategies. That area is dependent on strategic influence (some form of persuasion) that suggests potential but not actual threats or incentives. This control strategy can result in sanctions based on how to exercise force or threats to hide critically needed resources. This strategy is called a financial strategy.

Structural Strategy includes institutional changes related to the structure of relationships within the organization. This strategy is carried out to improve the organizational framework and patterns of interaction between parties that have been institutionalized to produce better management of programs and activities.

Based on a search of previous research on the complexity of problems at the border which are highlighted from various perspectives or points of view to examine issues of State borders. These studies are grouped into several perspectives, including defense and security, politics, law, economics, social culture, and government management. Research from the perspective of government management highlights government activities in border management which the authors map into several themes, namely, border management policies, implementation of border management policies, and inter-agency relationships in border management.

The theme of border management policies was raised in Joao Muni's research (2019). The research findings show that the relevance of decentralization is weakened due to the lack of synergy in border management in governance. Therefore, the definition of decentralization must refer to international standards in the context of Timor Leste. Furthermore, Muldoko (2014) discusses Policy and Scenario Planning for the Management of Border Areas in Indonesia (Case Study of Land Borders in Kalimantan). This study found that in the policy aspect, there are overlapping policies, from the implementation aspect it shows a lack of integration and coordination between ministries/agencies which is the root of the problem of ineffective border management. Raharjo (2013) researched the Management Policy of the Indonesia-Malaysia Land Border Area (Evaluative Study in the Entikong



sub-district). The findings of the study contained five problems, namely lack of infrastructure, economic dependence on Malaysia, low level of education, threatened nationalism, and lack of coordination between departments.

The themes regarding the implementation of border management policies by Edi Akhyari (2019) examine the Implementation of Sea Transportation Policies in the Border Areas of the Riau Archipelago Province. The results of the study show that the performance of the implementation of sea transportation policies has not resulted in the provision of adequate sea transportation facilities and can answer the accessibility needs of the people on the outer islands or the border areas of the State. Hasyim As'ari (2017) researched the Implementation of the Outermost Small Islands Management Policy in the Riau Archipelago Province. The results of the study illustrate that the implementation of management policies for the outermost Small Islands has not yet synergized between government agencies at the central and regional levels. Rahman Mulyawan (2012) examined the Implementation of Development Policy in the Defense Sector in the Border Areas Between Countries in the Context of Regional Autonomy (Case Study in the Border Areas of Indonesia and Timor Leste). The findings of this study indicate that the policy implementation model proposed by Cheema and Rondinelli has been implemented by the Belu District government. However, this implementation model is not appropriate when applied in border areas because this model does not prioritize coordination aspects. Researchers argue that the implementation model of Cheema and Rondinelli can be realized more optimally if it is equipped with coordination aspects.

The next theme is related to the relationship between institutions in border management, one of which is researched by Saiman (2016) on the relationship between the center and the regions in the post-reform Indonesia-Malaysia border infrastructure development. The findings in this study are that there are sectoral egos between ministries/agencies in BNPP and *power interplay* with local governments so BNPP is not effective, besides that there are different interests that cause different development priorities between the central government and local governments. Imam Edy Mulyono (2018) on Coordination Patterns of Government Institutions in Management of Borders and Outermost Small Islands (Study on Miangas Island, Talaud Regency). The finding is that the coordination of border management and outermost small islands from the dimension of regional security and regional development by government agencies shows varying results. Specifically, it was revealed that coordination can be carried out effectively only by government agencies under one control and the same entity (vertical agency).

A review of the studies that the researchers described above shows that aspects of integration and harmony between stakeholders in border management are one of the findings in the research. However, how the coordination mechanism between the parties involved so that policies and programs are not aligned and integrated is a theme that has not been studied much from the perspective of government management, especially relations between government agencies. There is a study related to border management coordination conducted by Imam Edy Mulyono (2018) as described above, but the locus of this research is different from this research. In addition, the studies conducted have focused more on defense and security aspects, while this research is more specifically related to development coordination on welfare aspects related to the fisheries and tourism sectors.

METHOD

This study was designed using qualitative research. The qualitative method was chosen because this study did not measure the influence in the relationship between variables but instead tried to see and describe a social problem, namely the coordination mechanism in the development of border areas in Morotai Island Regency in the fisheries and tourism sectors in the period 2015 to 2019 identify the factors that cause coordination not to run optimally and what strategies are used to overcome these problems. Thus this study examines processes not results, so it is more appropriate to use qualitative methods as explained by Creswell (2015) that qualitative research emphasizes processes, not results.



Data collection was obtained by conducting interviews with informants, focus group discussions, and field observations. Informants were selected by snowball technique, where the informants were individuals who were directly related to the context of the topic being studied, such as:

1. Head of Legal, Organizational and Personnel Bureau at BNPP
2. Coordinator of the Small Islands Group from the Ministry of Maritime Affairs and Fisheries (KKP)
3. Director of Destination Development II, Ministry of Tourism and Creative Economy
4. Head of Border Section of Morotai Island Regency
5. Secretary of the DKP
6. Head of the Destinations and Tourism Industry Division of the Morotai Island Regency Tourism Office
7. KKP Small Islands Group Coordinator and SKPT Executor
8. Head of Bappeda Morotai Island Regency

DISCUSSION

The coordination strategy conceptually described by Alexander (1995) is the basis for formulating the strategy needed to overcome the problem of coordination of the development of border areas in Morotai Island Regency in the fisheries and tourism sectors in 2015 - 2019. In the author's study and analysis of the coordination mechanism and factors The factors that caused the coordination of the development of the border area of Morotai Island Regency in the fisheries and tourism sectors did not go well, the authors believe that it is necessary to add a political strategy as a step to create effective coordination.

A political strategy is needed because special attention to border areas which is focused on technical and management aspects through the allocation of programs and development budgets for border areas has not been able to encourage ministries/agencies to seriously build proper coordination to produce integrated development. For this reason, the author proposes a political strategy as a complement to the existing strategies.

Thus the border area development coordination strategy consists of Anticipatory Coordination, Adaptive Coordination, Cultural Strategy, Communicative Strategy, Functional Strategy, Cooperation Strategy, Informational Strategy, Control Strategy, Structural Strategy, and Political Strategy.

ANTICIPATORY COORDINATION

An anticipatory strategy is carried out by improving the process of preparation and content of border area development planning documents as well as encouraging alignment of border area development planning documents with development planning documents in ministries/agencies and local governments.

Improvements to the process of drafting the Master Plan for the Management of State Borders were carried out by involving ministries/agencies, local governments, academics, and community groups in border areas. The preparation of documents made by the consultant is too technocratic based on the scientific analysis it ignores the conditions in the field. The master plan preparation model can follow the model for preparing the RPJMN. The process for preparing the master plan and RPJMN can be carried out simultaneously or together. This is possible because the master plan has the same period as the RPJMN and the material contained in the master plan must be aligned with the RPJMN in other words the development program of the master plan is a derivative of the RPJMN. This process was initiated by an in-depth discussion between BNPP and Bappenas to harmonize perceptions about the process to be followed in preparing the Master Plan and RPJMN.

The steps currently being taken by BNPP by increasing the legal product of Master Plans at the level of Presidential Regulations (Perpres) in the 2020 - 2024 Master Plans have the advantage but are not automatically complied with by ministries/agencies because the linkage of document contents does not automatically occur just because the Master Plan is established with the Presidential Decree, but what is more important is to make the Master Plan a reference legal product in every



program planning and development budget for border areas by ministries/agencies. Steps to link the Master Plan with ministry/agency planning can be done if the evaluation of the Ministry/agency Strategic Plan (Renstra) and Work Plan (Renja) by Bappenas and the Ministry of Finance also involve BNPP to evaluate the conformity of the border area development program prepared by the ministry/agency with Master plan and assess the integration of programs and budgets between ministries/agencies. This encourages the ministries/agencies to pay attention to aspects of harmony and harmony in the planning of border area development programs.

Planning at the regional level that has border areas is then encouraged by the Ministry of Home Affairs and Bappenas to make the RPJMN and Master Plan as guidelines in the preparation of the RPJMD and development plans for special border areas. The OPD-OPD then adjusted the border development program into their respective programs and activities following their main tasks and functions.

An anticipatory strategy is also carried out by improving the process and content of the Action Plan (Action Plan). The process of preparing an action plan every year must be based on the master plan, not just a recapitulation or collection of border area programs submitted by ministries/agencies. The process of preparing the Action Plan is carried out jointly with the Renja of ministries/agencies through discussion forums involving Bappenas, the Ministry of Finance, BNPP, and technical ministries/institutions. All programs and budgets for the development of border areas contained in the action plans and work plans of ministries/agencies go through a process of discussion with the parties in the forum. Meanwhile, improvements to the contents of the Action Plan are carried out by using the Master Plan and the evaluation results of the previous year's development as material for the preparation of the program and annual budget for the development of border areas.

To strengthen the development of leading fisheries and tourism sectors, special planning documents for the development of SKPT and KSPN for Morotai Island Regency must be prepared in an integrated manner. The document was not only prepared sectorally by the KKP and the Ministry of Tourism and Creative Economy but was prepared by BNPP involving relevant ministries/agencies and local governments so that it became one of the border area development planning documents. So far it has been stated that the development of border areas must be carried out in an integrated manner between the center and the regions, but no document formulates this integration in sectors that are development priorities. For this reason, the action plan and master plan governing border area planning are generally reduced to the Development Plan for SKPT/Fisheries and KSPN/Tourism in Morotai Island Regency in an integrated cross-ministry and cross-OPD coordinated by BNPP and BPPD or the Border Management Section.

ADAPTIVE COORDINATION

Adaptive coordination is carried out after the border area development program is implemented in the form of supervision and performance appraisal. Supervision is carried out to ensure that the ongoing program remains in line with the plan that has been set both in the action plan and the ministry/agency work plan. So far, the supervision of border area development programs has not had its model within the institutional framework of BNPP and BPPD and the Border Management Section, each ministry/institution oversees development in border areas without the involvement of BNPP as the manager of border area development, while BPPD and the Border Management Section do not have monitoring instruments.

The monitoring model for the development of border areas must be developed within the organizational framework of BNPP and BPPD or the Border Management Section with the involvement of ministries/agencies. Supervision of the implementation of border area development which is the responsibility of ministries/agencies can be decentralized to technical OPDs in the regions, while supervision of the linkages between the implementation of development programs and action plans can be decentralized by BNPP to BPPD or Border Management Units in the regions. Ministries/agencies and BNPP can directly supervise if there are problems that must be handled specifically.



In addition to the monitoring model, BNPP must design a model for evaluating the performance of ministries/agencies and evaluating OPD performance by BPPD or the Border Management Section in the development of border areas. The evaluation model must have clear measurements and be jointly prepared between the BNPP and the ministries/agencies and regions stipulated in regulations that have binding power for ministries/agencies and OPD. Furthermore, this measure is used by BNPP and BPPD or the Border Management Section to evaluate the level of achievement of ministry/agency programs.

CULTURAL STRATEGY

In carrying out the development of border areas in the fisheries and tourism sectors, the Ministry of Tourism and Creative Economy has carried out its duties accordingly. Attention to the development of border areas is carried out with strategic steps to adjust policies and programs through SKPT and KSPN in Morotai Island Regency. This effort is a cultural strategy carried out by adjusting the program activities of ministries/agencies so that they are aligned to accelerate the development of border areas.

The steps of KKP and Kemenparekraf are internal adjustment steps by each BNPP member but have not been able to encourage a change in the work system from being professionally isolated by each ministry/agency to working together or coordinated across ministries/agencies. Adjustments within the scope of KKP and the Ministry of Labor have only been able to encourage organizational adjustments with common goals but have not been able to encourage adjustments to coordinated work systems to adapt to common goals.

The step that needs to be taken by BNPP is to make SKPT and KSPN the locus and focus of the superior sector development program in the border area of Morotai Island Regency. The SKPT and KSPN programs were upgraded from ministry/agency programs to joint ministry/agency programs coordinated by BNPP. After improving the SKPT and KSPN programs as a joint program, the next step is to develop a coordinated work system between ministries/agencies as outlined in regulations that bind all ministries/agencies.

COMMUNICATIVE COORDINATION STRATEGY

BNPP as an organization that carries out coordination mostly uses the facilities of coordination meetings and official meetings to encourage understanding and harmony of border area development programs including the KKP and Kemenparef in Morotai Island Regency. Meanwhile, coordination between horizontally connected institutions requires more formal and informal communication to harmonize understanding before entering into development program negotiations so that the parties involved are in harmony. Several attempts were made to anticipate problems in the development of border areas through informal communication but have not been able to create integration and harmony.

To encourage understanding and mutual understanding, BNPP must develop a communication strategy in the form of joint activities such as *Gathering* and *Outbound* or other forms of activity that bring together BNPP members in a familiar and warm atmosphere. Activities with members outside the room can be filled with an introduction to the scope of duties and functions of the BNPP and the interrelationships of the duties and functions of members within the BNPP. In addition to outdoor activities, BNPP can socialize institutions, duties, and functions as well as working relationships with members through available communication media including social media.

Another communication strategy that needs to be done is to intensify communication informally by officials of the BNPP Permanent Secretariat with KKP and Kemenparekraf. This is done to fill the lack of formal communication that is rigid and has a period that has been set periodically. Informal communication can be carried out through available communication facilities to discuss issues in the development of border areas or simply create strong personal relationships between officials at BNPP and officials in ministries/agencies.



FUNCTIONAL STRATEGY

The functional coordination strategy has been developed in a limited way for the development of the border area of the Morotai Island district. This can be seen from the tourism development cooperation in the KSPN by the central government and outside the KSPN by the local government. The development of the tourism sector requires large resources while a large budget allocation is in the central government while local governments have a limited budget so a functional strategy is needed through central and regional cooperation. In this strategy, both parties benefit in that the local government gets the development budget while the central government's programs can be implemented more effectively and efficiently.

The functional strategy was developed by the Ministry of Tourism and Creative Economy in the form of a special allocation fund, the central government with a large budget submits a portion of the development budget to be implemented by the regional government in the KSPN of Morotai Island Regency based on technical instructions and implementation instructions issued by the Ministry of Tourism and Creative Economy. However, the functional strategy has not yet reached a coalition that eliminates organizational barriers because there is a clear division of tasks and functions between the central government and local governments in managing special allocation funds.

Functional strategies in the form of special allocation funds must be developed by ministries/agencies in the development of SKPT and KSPN with the consideration that the location of border areas is remote and difficult to reach causing ministries/agencies to have problems if they carry out development directly, program and budget decentralization is needed to accelerate the development of border areas. The functional strategy model for the fisheries and tourism sector can also be developed between the Provincial Government of North Maluku and the Regency Government of Morotai Island in the framework of funding the development of the fisheries and tourism sectors because both of them make the fisheries and tourism sectors as leading sectors.

What needs to be considered in this strategy is the dominance of the strong over the weak, namely the domination of the central government over regional governments which is manifested in the form of technical guidelines and implementation instructions that are too rigid so that it is difficult to make adjustments to problems that arise in the regions, for this reason, flexibility is needed. for regions that receive special allocation funds, make adjustments to development programs according to conditions in the region. In addition, the existence of the central government which has a large budget often encourages local governments to use all means to obtain special allocation funds, one of which is by giving bribes to officials in ministries/agencies.

COOPERATION STRATEGY

The strategy of cooperation is the basis of the formation of BNPP, which seeks to encourage ministries/agencies and local governments to work together to develop border areas. Cooperation has been regulated in policies, but the implementation of cooperation often not following established policies.

BNPP can develop a development cooperation strategy in border areas and can adopt the *Pentahelix* model by involving elements of government, academia, the private sector or business actors, the media, and the civil society community so that models and forms of development cooperation can synergize not only between government agencies but also with all parties involved in the development of border areas.

Penta helix collaboration is carried out by BNPP in the aspects of planning, implementing, and supervising border area development programs. With the *Penta helix* cooperation model, all development programs are open and known to the public, this helps BNPP in monitoring programs and activities. Broad public involvement also creates a shared awareness to maintain or safeguard development objects so that they are not damaged by irresponsible elements.

Special cooperation strategies for the fisheries and tourism sectors in Morotai Island Regency can also be developed in terms of inter-regional cooperation and even cooperation with other countries for the benefit of selling fish outside the Morotai Island Regency area and tourism promotion.



Cooperation can be carried out by the central government or regional governments under their authority.

INFORMATIONAL STRATEGY

Many organizations were formed with the name of a coordinating body or agency and policies were issued to encourage coordination but these did not go well because they were not followed by a strong awareness of the members involved in the organization. Efforts to build awareness of the members involved in the working model of coordination are an important aspect of the informational strategy.

BNPP must be able to internalize the government's enthusiasm and alignment with border areas into the minds of officials in ministries/agencies. The development of border areas including the fisheries and tourism sectors is not solely viewed from an economic aspect but is a matter of sovereignty and national pride in the presence of other countries. This awareness must be continuously instilled by BNPP to BNPP members including KKP and Kemenparekraf as well as to the public so that the public can pressure ministries/agencies to focus on developing border areas.

Massive socialization also needs to be carried out internally to BNPP members through various means including social media to arouse awareness and a spirit of nationalism among officials to pay attention to the border area as Indonesia's front porch. The BPPD can also do the same thing by massively promoting fisheries and tourism as leading sectors so that all OPDs and the public in Morotai Island Regency place fisheries and tourism on the discussion agenda both at the local government level and in offline and online discussion forums in the media social.

Control Strategy

Control strategies can be carried out on aspects of planning and aspects of the implementation of activities. In the planning aspect, control is carried out to ensure alignment of ministry/agency planning documents with the master plan and action plan, while control in the implementation aspect is carried out to ensure alignment between the programs being carried out and the planning. Control strategies in planning can be pursued through cooperation with Bappenas and the Ministry of Finance to ensure that development programs for border areas in the fisheries and tourism sectors are contained in master plans and action plans contained in ministry/agency planning and budgeting. BNPP can take persuasive methods up to the proposed sanctions given by the President to Ministers/Heads of State Institutions and Governors if the ministries/provincial government agencies do not comply with the Master Plan and Action Plan documents. Control on implementation is carried out by decentralization of supervision to BPPD or the Border Management Section and OPD in the regions.

To strengthen the control effect, it can be proposed that the President give awards to those who have a high commitment to the development of border areas and impose sanctions on those who have a low commitment to the development of border areas.

STRUCTURAL STRATEGY

The structural strategy includes organizational changes and working relationships between the parties involved in the coordination relationship. Efforts to change the structure have been made through Presidential Regulation Number 44 of 2017 concerning Amendments to Presidential Regulation Number 12 of 2010 concerning the National Border Management Agency, but these changes were made only to accommodate ministries/agencies that were not yet members of BNPP. Based on the description in the previous chapter, it shows that the current BNPP organizational model is not effective in carrying out the tasks and functions of border management and building coordination relationships with ministries/agencies because the Minister of Home Affairs holds the position *ex officio*. For this reason, organizational change is needed through two models by the analysis of problems that occur in organizational aspects and work relations, namely developing the organization into an independent management institution in the form of a Non-Ministry Government Institution (LPNK) or placing it only as a coordinating institution that is integrated into government



institutions which definitively carries out the coordinating function, namely the Coordinating Ministry.

Non-Ministry Government Institutions (LPNK) are State Institutions formed to carry out certain governmental tasks from the President, the Head of LPNK is responsible to the President through the Minister or Minister-level officials. In the LPNK model, BNPP is more independent because it is no longer a collection of people or officials like a Coordinating Team or Committee, which has prevented the organization from carrying out its duties and functions properly. These changes are described as follows:

1. The BNPP organization is an independent organization apart from the Ministry of Home Affairs;
2. The Head of BNPP is no longer held *ex officio* by the Minister of Home Affairs but is an official appointed by the President who works full-time at BNPP;
3. BNPP members consisting of Ministers/Heads of State Institutions and Governors were removed, meanwhile, all structures in the BNPP Permanent Secretariat were included in the BNPP organizational structure;
4. There is an additional Main Inspectorate element in the BNPP organization that acts as a supervisor for the implementation of border area development;
5. There is authority to execute or implement programs and technical activities in border areas;
6. BNPP coordination relations with ministries/agencies and local governments are regulated separately through a Presidential Regulation on Coordination of Management of State Borders;
7. BPPD is part of the BNPP vertical agency;
8. BPPD in the regions as BNPP representatives to supervise program integration between the center and regions in border areas and manage PLBN;
9. Coordination of planning and budgeting for the development of border areas is carried out by Bappeda and the Regional Financial Management Agency;
10. Coordination and synchronization of development plans for border areas between the central and regional governments are carried out by BPPD.

These changes led to the readjustment of the current organizational structure through changes in policies regarding BNPP institutions and work procedures.

The second model of organizational change and working relations restores border development within the framework of the main tasks and functions of each ministry/agency. The tasks and functions of coordination to accelerate the development of border areas and the resolution of issues on national boundaries are assigned to the Coordinating Ministry by forming deputies in each coordinating ministry who handle borders so that coordination tasks are not siding tasks carried out by Teams and Committees outside of the main tasks and ministries/institutions functions but become one of the main tasks. The organizational model is described as follows:

1. Formation of deputies in the four coordinating ministries that specifically coordinate the management of national borders and development in border areas
2. The preparation of the Grand Design, Master Plan, and Action Plan is the responsibility of Bappenas;
3. The deputies in the coordinating ministry only coordinate implementation and supervise and evaluate the harmony of border management carried out by ministries/agencies and local governments;
4. Coordination of the implementation of the development of border areas in the regions is carried out by the Governor as the representative of the central government in the regions.
5. Coordination of planning for the development of border areas at the district/city level is handled by one of the divisions in Bappeda.



POLITICAL STRATEGY

The political strategy begins with a clear rearrangement of the authority of the central government and regional governments to manage or develop border areas. This authority is then passed down to the ministries/agencies and OPD tasks and functions that are specifically related to the development of border areas. After development affairs are divided between ministries/agencies at the center and between OPDs in the regions, technical management issues will then be regulated in the form of border area development programs and budgets.

Special treatment for border areas currently only relies on the status of border areas which allows program and activity interventions, but the duties and functions of ministries/agencies and OPDs related to the development of border areas are not clearly described so that they can be followed up in the form of different treatment in border areas. This is consistent with the views of informants from the KKP and the Ministry of Tourism and Creative Economy described in the previous chapter that development in border areas is applied the same as in other regions because there are no specific policies related to what matters are carried out by ministries/agencies that must be carried out in the border area.


After setting the authorities, tasks, and functions, the next step is to encourage Ministers/Heads of Institutions, Governors, and Regents in border areas to sit together to build an understanding of implementing these powers, duties, and functions into an integrated development program. This is important because there are political actors who have different party backgrounds in both ministries and regions, so it is undeniable that each actor has an interest in trying to maximize development programs for the benefit of power politics. Therefore, concrete steps are needed to build an understanding of the interests of national politics rather than the interests of parties, political actors, or interest groups.


CONCLUSION

Based on the discussion that has been described previously, it can be concluded that referring to the coordination strategy formulated based on Alexander's concept (1995) but in the study of the coordination mechanism and the factors that lead to successful coordination the authors find the need for a political strategy. For this reason, the formulation of a strategy to overcome the problem of coordination of border area development in Morotai Island Regency in the fisheries and tourism sectors in 2015 - 2019 consists of Anticipatory Coordination, Adaptive Coordination, Cultural Strategy, Communicative Strategy, Functional Strategy, Cooperation Strategy, Informational Strategy, Control Strategy, Structural Strategy, Political Strategy.

REFERENCES

- [1] Adesina, O. S. (2019). Conceptualizing borders and borderlands in a globalizing world. *African Journal For The Psychological Study of Social Issues*, 22.
- [2] Alexander, E. R. (1995). *How Organizations Act Together Interorganizational Coordination in Theory and Practice* (1st ed.). Gordon and Breach Publisher.
- [3] Anggara, S., & Sumantri, I. (2016). *Administrasi Pembangunan, Teori dan Praktek* (I). CV. Pustaka Setia.
- [4] Ansell, C., & Gash, A. (2008). Collaborative governance in theory and practice. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 18(4), 543-571. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/mum032>
- [5] Arifin, S. (2013). Cross Border Approach Sebagai Alternatif Model Kebijakan Pembangunan Kawasan Perbatasan. *Jurnal Hukum Ius Quia Iustum*, 20(1), 37-58. <https://doi.org/10.20885/iustum.vol20.iss1.art3>
- [6] Bangun, B. H. (2017). Konsepsi dan Pengelolaan Wilayah Perbatasan Negara: Perspektif Hukum Internasional. *Tanjungpura Law Journal*, 1(1), 52-63. <https://jurnal.untan.ac.id/index.php/tlj/article/view/18331#:~:text=Dari perspektif hukum internasional%2C wilayah,yang harus diatur melalui perjanjian.>
- [7] Bappenas. (2016). *Laporan Akhir Pemantauan Pembangunan Daerah Tertinggal dan Kawasan Perbatasan dalam Lingkup RPJMD 2015 - 2019*.

- 
- [8] Bappenas. (2019). *Evaluasi Akhir RPJMN 2015-2019*.
- [9] Baud, M., & Van Schendel, W. (1997). Toward a comparative history of borderlands. *Journal of World History*, 8(2), 211-242. <https://doi.org/10.1353/jwh.2005.0061>
- [10] Bell, S., & Andrew Hindmoor. (2009). Rethinking Governance The Centrality of the State in Modern Society. In *Syria Studies* (Vol. 7, Issue 1). Cambridge University Press. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/269107473_What_is_governance/link/548173090cf22525dcb61443/download%0Ahttp://www.econ.upf.edu/~reynal/Civilwars_12December2010.pdf%0Ahttps://think-asia.org/handle/11540/8282%0Ahttps://www.jstor.org/stable/41857625
- [11] BNPP. (2011). *Grand Design Pengelolaan Batas Wilayah Negara dan Kawasan Perbatasan Tahun 2011-2025*. 1-66.
- [12] Bouckaert, G., Peters, B. G., & Verhoest, K. (2010). The Coordination of Public Sektor Organizations. In *The Coordination of Public Sektor Organizations*. ALGRAVE MACMILLAN. <https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230275256>
- [13] Calabro, A. (2008). Governance Structures and Mechanisms in Public Service Organizations: Theories, Evidence and Future Directions. In *icclab.Nl*. Springer Heidelberg Dordrecht London New York. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-7908-2750-7>
- [14] Cheema, S. G., & Rondinelli, D. A. (2007). Decentralizing Governance Emerging Concepts and Practices. In *DC: Brookings Institution Press*.
- [15] Christensen, T., & Lægreid, P. (2008). The Challenge of Coordination in Central Government Organizations: The Norwegian Case. *Public Organization Review*, 8(2), 97-116. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11115-008-0058-3>
- [16] Creswell, J. W. (2010). *Research Design: Pendekatan Kualitatif, Kuantitatif dan Mixed*. Pustaka Pelajar.
- [17] Creswell, J. W. (2015). *Penelitian Kualitatif & Desain Riset*. Pustaka Pelajar.
- [18] Daniell, K. A., & Kay, A. (2017). Multi-level Governance: An Introduction. In K. A. Daniell & Adrian Kay (Eds.), *Multi-level Governance Conceptual Challenges and Case Studies From Australia* (pp. 3-32). Australia National University Press.
- [19] Dietrich, P. (2007). Coordination Strategies in Organizational Development Programs. In *Methods*. Helsinki University of Technology.
- [20] Donahue, J. D., & Zeckhauser, R. J. (2011). *Collaborative Governance: Private Roles for Public Goals in Turbulent Times*. Princeton University Press.
- [21] Emerson, K., & Nabatchi, T. (2015). *Collaborative Governance Regimes*. Georgetown University Press.
- [22] Emerson, K., Nabatchi, T., & Balogh, S. (2012). An integrative framework for collaborative governance. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 22(1), 1-29. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/mur011>
- [23] Gao, X., Song, Y., & Zhu, X. (2013). Integration and Coordination: Advancing China's Fragmented E-Government to Holistic Governance. *Government Information Quarterly*, 30(2), 173-181. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2012.12.003>
- [24] Grandori, A. (1997). Governance Structures, Coordination Mechanisms and Cognitive Models. *The Journal of Management and Governance*, 1, 29-47. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1009977627870>
- [25] Greenberg, G. D. (1976). The Coordinating Roles of Management: A Typology for Analysis. *The American Review of Public Administration*, 10(2), 67-76. <https://doi.org/10.1177/027507407601000202>
- [26] Griffin, R. W. (2004). *Manajemen* (7th ed.). Erlangga.
- [27] Guy Peters, B. (1998). Managing Horizontal Government: The Politics of Co-ordination. *Public Administration*, 76(2), 295-311. <http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/1467-9299.00102>
- [28] Handyaningrat, S. (1985). *Pengantar Studi Ilmu Administrasi Dan Manajemen*. PT Gunung Agung.
- [29] Hasibuan, M. S. . (2014). *Manajemen: Dasar, Pengertian, dan Masalah*. PT Bumi Aksara.
- [30] J. Koliba, C., Meek, J. W., Zia, A., & Mills, R. W. (2019). *Governance Networks in Public Administration and Public Policy* (2nd ed.). Routledge.

- 
- [31] Jacobs, J., & Van Assche, K. (2014). Understanding Empirical Boundaries: A Systems-Theoretical Avenue in Border Studies. *Geopolitics*, 19(1), 182-205. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14650045.2013.830106>
- [32] Kartasasmita, G. (1997). *Administrasi Pembangunan : Perkembangan Pemikiran dan Praktiknya di Indonesia*. LP3ES.
- [33] Keast, Robyn. (2013). Network Theory Tracks and Trajectories. In Robert Keast, M. Madell, & R. Agranoff (Eds.), *Network Theory in the Public Sektor: Building New Theoretical Frameworks* (pp. 15-30). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203752562>
- [34] Keban, Y. T. (2009). *Enam Dimensi Strategis Administrasi Publik Konsep Teori dan Isu* (Edisi Revi). Penerbit Gava Media.
- [35] Kettl, D. F. (2000). The transformation of governance: Globalization, devolution, and the role of government. *Public Administration Review*, 60(6), 488-497. <https://doi.org/10.1111/0033-3352.00112>
- [36] Keuangan, B. P. (2018). *Ihtisan Laporan hasil Pemeriksaan (IHSP) Semester II Tahun 2017*.
- [37] Klijn, E. H., & Koppenjan, J. (2016). *Governance Networks in The Public Sektor* (1st ed.). Routledge.
- [38] Kraak, A. (2011). Horizontal Coordination , Government Performance and National Planning : The Possibilities and Limits of the South African State. *Politikon*, 38, 343-365. <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02589346.2011.623834>
- [39] Kristof, L. K. D. (1959). The nature of frontiers and boundaries. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 49(3), 269-282. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8306.1959.tb01613.x>
- [40] Labolo, M. (2007). *Memahami Ilmu Pemerintahan (Suatu Kajian Teori, Konsep dan Pengembangannya)* (Revisi). PT. Raja Grafindo Persada.
- [41] Lam, W. F. (2005). Coordinating The Government Bureaucracy in Hong Kong: An Institutional Analysis. *Governance*, 18(4), 633-654. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0491.2005.00295.x>
- [42] Makahingide, R. (2021). Upaya Pemerintah Indonesia Dalam Menangani Persoalan Di Wilayah Perbatasan Antara Pulau Marore Dan Philipina Selatan. *Jurnal Politico*, 10(2), 19-37.
- [43] Malone, T. W., & Crowston, K. (1994). The Interdisciplinary Study of Coordination. *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)*, 26(1), 87-119. <https://doi.org/10.1145/174666.174668>
- [44] Manullang, M. (2005). *Dasar-Dasar Manajemen* (18th ed.). Gadjah Mada University Press.
- [45] Marks, G. (1993). Structural Policy and Multilevel Governance in the EC. In A. W. Cafruny & G. G. Rosenthal (Eds.), *The State of the European Community Vol 2; Maastricht Debates And Beyond* (pp. 391-410). Longman, Harlow.
- [46] Marks, G., & Hooghe, L. (2004). Contrasting Visions of Multi-level Governance. In I. Bache & M. Flinders (Eds.), *Multi Level Governance* (pp. 15-30). Oxvord University Press. 1
- [47] Martinez, J. I., & Jarillo, J. C. (1989). The Evolution of Research on Coordination Mechanisms in Multinational Corporations. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 20, 489-514. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.jibs.8490370>
- [48] Marume, S. B. M., & Jaricha, E. (2016). Coordination As An Essential Part of Public Administration. *Journal of Research in Humanities and Social Science*, 4(6), 6-9. <http://www.questjournals.org/>
- [49] Melin, U., & Axelsson, K. (2005). Understanding Organizational Coordination and Information Systems - Mintzberg's Coordination Mechanisms Revisited and Evaluated. *European Conference on Information Systems*.
- [50] Mintzberg, H. (1996). Mananging Government, Governing Management. *Harvard Business Review*.
- [51] Moekijat. (1994). *Koordinasi : suatu tinjauan teoritis*. Mandar Maju.
- [52] Morse, R. S., & Stephens, J. B. (2012). Teaching Collaborative Governance: Phases, Competencies, and Case-Based Learning. *Journal of Public Affairs Education*, 18(3), 565-583. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15236803.2012.12001700>
- [53] Muradi. (2017). Pengelolaan Pengamanan Perbatasan Indonesia. *CosmoGov*, 1(1), 25. <https://doi.org/10.24198/cosmogov.v1i1.11859>
- [54] Ndraha, T. (2003). *Kybernology, Ilmu Pemerintahan Baru 1*. PT Rineka Cipta.
- [55] Novianti. (2019). Permasalahan Hukum Pengelolaan Wilayah Perbatasan dari Perspektif Hukum

- Internasional. In Suhariyono Ar. (Ed.), *Permasalahan dan Penegakan Hukum di Wilayah Perbatasan*. Yayasan Obor Indonesia.
- [56]O'Dowd, L. (2001). Analysing Europe's Borders. *Boundary and Security Bulletin*, 9(2), 67-79. www.dur.ac.uk/ibru/publications/view/?id=189
- [57]O'Leary, R., & Bingham, L. B. (Eds.). (2009). *The collaborative public manager: New ideas for the twenty-first century*. Georgetown University Press. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt2tt4xg>
- [58]O'Toole, L. J. (1997). Treating Networks Seriously: Practical and Research-Based Agendas in Public Administration. *Public Administration Review*, 57(1), 45. <https://doi.org/10.2307/976691>
- [59]Okhuysen, G. A., & Bechky, B. A. (2009). Coordination in Organizations: An Integrative Perspective. *The Academy of Management Annals*, 3(1), 463-502. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19416520903047533>
- [60]Osborne, D., & Gaebler, T. (2003). *Mewirau Sahakan Birokrasi*. PPM.
- [61]Osifo, O. C. (2013). The Effects of Coordination on Organizational Performance : An Intra and Inter Perspective. *Asian Journal of Business and Management*, 01(04), 149-162.
- [62]Painter, M. (1981). Central Agencies and the Coordination Principle. *Australian Journal of Public Administration*, 40(4), 265-280. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8500.1981.tb00519.x>
- [63]Per Lægheid, & Verhoest, K. (2010). *Governance and Public Sektor Organizations (Proliferation, Autonomy and Performance)* (P. L. and K. Verhoest (Ed.)). International Institute Of Administrative Science (IIAS). <http://iias-iiisa.org>
- [64]Permatasari, A. (2014). Otonomi Khusus Daerah Perbatasan, Alternatif Solusi Penyelesaian Masalah Perbatasan di Indonesia. *Jurnal Media Hukum*, 21(2), 226-240.
- [65]Peters, B. G. (2005). *The search for coordination and coherence in public policy: return to the center?*
- [66]Raharjo, S. N. I. (2013). Kebijakan Pengelolaan Kawasan Perbatasan Darat Indonesia-Malaysia (Studi Evaluatif di Kecamatan Entikong). *Jurnal Lembaga Ilmu Pengetahuan Indonesia*, 16(1), 73-80.
- [67]Rasyid, R. (1998). *Pemerintahan yang Amanah*. Binarena Pariwara.
- [68]Rondinelli, D. A. (Ed.). (2006). *Public Administration and Democratic Governance : Governments Serving Citizens*. A United Nations Publication.
- [69]Senninger, R., Finke, D., & Blom-hansen, J. (2020). Coordination Inside Government Administrations: Lessons from the EU Commission. *Governance*, July 2019, 1-20. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gove.12525>
- [70]Serrano, R. (2003). *What Makes Inter-Agency Coordination Work? Insights from the Literature and Two Case Studies* (Issue August). https://publications.iadb.org/bitstream/handle/11319/3745/What_Makes_Inter-Agency_Coordination_Work%3F%3A_Insights_from_the_Literature_and_Two_Case_Studies.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y
- [71]Siagian, S. P. (1993). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia*. Bumi Aksara.
- [72]Siagian, S. P. (1994). *Administrasi Pembangunan*. Gunung Agung.
- [73]Sørensen, E. (2013). The Democratic Potentials of Governance Networks in Intergovernmental Decision Making. In Robyn Keast, M. Mandell, & and R. Agranoff (Eds.), *Network Theory in the Public Sektor: Building New Theoretical Frameworks* (pp. 68-83). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203752562>
- [74]Srikant, K., & Purnam, P. (2010). The Effect of Firm Compensation Structures on the Mobility and Entrepreneurship of Extreme Performers. *Strategic Management Journal*, 920(October), 1-43. <https://doi.org/10.1002/smj>
- [75]Stoner, J. A. F., & Wankel, C. (1986). *Management* (3rd ed.). Prentice-Hall International, Inc.
- [76]Sugandha, D. (1991). *Koordinasi Alat Pemersatu Gerak Administrasi*. Intermedia.
- [77]Supriyanto, B. (2009). *Manajemen Pemerintahan, Plus Dua Belas Langkah Strategis*. Media Brilian.
- [78]Suryadinata, E. (1996). *Sistem Informasi Manajemen dan Proses Pengambilan Keputusan*. CV. Ramdan.
- [79]Syafiie, I. K. (2017). *Ilmu Administrasi*. Pustaka Pelajar.
- [80]Syafudin, A. (1976). *Pengaturan Koordinasi Pemerintahan di Daerah*. Tarsito.
- [81]Tjokroamidjoyo, B. (1984). *Pengantar Administrasi Pembangunan*. LP3ES.



- [82]Utomo, T. W. W. (2005). Kondisi Umum Kawasan Perbatasan dan Strategi Alternatif Pengembangan Wilayah Kalimantan Utara. *Jurnal Ilmu Administrasi*, 2, 297-312.
<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.31113/jia.v2i3.461>
- [83]Wasistiono, S. (2002). *Kapita Selekta Penyelenggaraan Pemerintahan Daerah* (2nd ed.). Fokusmedia.
- [84]Zealand Government, S. S. C. N. (2008). Factors for Successful Coordination - A Framework to Help State Agencies Coordinate Effectively. In *State Services Comission New Zeland Government*.