

Maintaining Sustainable Collaboration in Building Disclosure at Local Public Bodies between Public Information Commission of West Kalimantan and Civil Society Organizations

Hasymi Rinaldi Politeknik Negeri Pontianak, Indonesia
Januardi M. Dyah Politeknik Negeri Pontianak, Indonesia
Agus Eko Tejo Sasongko Politeknik Negeri Pontianak, Indonesia

Abstract

The resistance of public institutions to share and disseminate public information, and the limited authority of the Public Information Commission of West Kalimantan, may cause the lack of transparency of public institution. To overcome it, innovative efforts and active involvement of many stakeholders including civil society organizations are needed. In 2017-2018, many innovative products to overcome the lack of transparency of public institutions were produced by Public Information Commission of West Kalimantan and local civil society organizations. In the same year, the local government was awarded as the most transparent provincial government. The main question is how the collaboration between the Public Information Commission of West Kalimantan and local civil society organizations can be maintained to be sustainable, because each actor has the same purposes. The research purposes are to identify the needs for collaboration and the opportunity for sustainable collaboration. The results showed that the opportunity is possible with some requirements to build and maintain sustainable collaboration.

Keywords

Civil Society Organization; Collaboration; Cooperation; Public Institution; Public Information Commission; Transparency

INTRODUCTION

The issuance of Law No. 14 of 2008 on Public Information Disclosure does not automatically guarantee people for public information. Many cases show the resistance of public bodies to share information. This is exacerbated by the fact that many people do not realize the right to public information.

The drive for transparency of public bodies stems from the public's need for the information available there. The interaction between public bodies and the public in public information transactions, if there is a dispute, becomes the domain of the Information Commission. The problem is that people who have the ability to access, manage, and make use of public information are needed, or what is often referred to as an information literate society.

Since the establishment of the West Kalimantan Provincial Public Information

Commission (KIP) in 2015 to October 2018, there have been 38 public information disputes handled by the Provincial Public Information Commission of West Kalimantan. Previously, when KIP of West Kalimantan had not been formed, 25 information disputes in there were handled by Central Information Commission (KI) in 2013-2015.

This figure is likely to be greater if it is assumed that there are still many people who do not understand the right to public information, as the closure of public bodies is then considered a natural thing. Even among those who understand, some do not always follow up this closure in the realm of law. Even though until now there has been no research that identifies the extent of public understanding, or how many people understand the right to public information in West Kalimantan, the length of the information dispute process which can last for about 3-6

months has resulted in a lower level of need for information. Not to mention the possibility that the request for information submitted by the public could not be obtained due to the victory of the respondent (the public body) by the court. This condition results in a relatively small number of registered disputes.

To encourage openness at the local level, the Public Information Commission (KIP) of West Kalimantan involves other parties, namely Civil Society Organizations/Non-Government Organizations (CSO). This collaboration became more intense in 2017 and succeeded in producing innovative things such as (1) Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) of Post-Verdict Dispute Resolution, (2) Circular letters for public bodies regarding public information disclosure, (3) Ranking of public bodies in West Kalimantan. In fact, that year a Caucus of Information Disclosure in Kalimantan was formed which was initiated by the KIP-CSO coalition in West Kalimantan. One of the recommendations from that meeting was to accelerate the formation of KIP in North Kalimantan. As a result, in 2018, the North Kalimantan KIP was successfully formed. Another achievement was that the West Kalimantan Provincial Government was also named the most transparent Provincial Public Agency in Indonesia in 2017, from previously being ranked 7th in 2016.

The various products established through the collaboration between the West Kalimantan KIP and CSOs are considered capable of accelerating the openness of public agencies at the local level. In this case, the limited authority possessed by West Kalimantan KIP does not automatically limit the space for it to accelerate the openness of public agencies. There are many other things

that can be dealt with legally constitutional by involving many parties to jointly encourage this disclosure.

The problem is, the cooperation and collaboration only last more than a year. Collaboration with CSOs that occurred during 2017-2018 can be considered as a form of fairly systematic collaboration between parties in encouraging the disclosure of public bodies. It is considered systematic when the collaboration has a specific goal consisting of many series of activities. The outputs of these activities are synergistic with each other in building a disclosure system at the local level. Prior to 2017, the cooperation that was built tended to be incidental and of short duration.

Responding to the many achievements that were made during the collaboration, it is important to identify opportunities between parties (West Kalimantan KIP and CSOs) in creating and maintaining collaboration in supporting the disclosure of public bodies in West Kalimantan. The results of this study are expected to be able to provide a formula for creating opportunities to build sustainable collaboration between parties, as well as the efforts needed from each party to preserve the continuity of the collaboration.

METHODS

This study aims to identify interactions between parties, as well as opportunities and challenges that occurred during the 2017-2018 collaboration between KIP and CSOs. In addition, this study also analyzes the characteristics of the parties to support the realization of sustainable collaboration. In practice, data was collected in 3 ways, namely in-depth interviews, observation, and documentation study. After the required data

was obtained, the reduction of the data was carried out. It was then presented and concluded.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Interaction History of West Kalimantan KIP and Local CSOs

The discourse of public information disclosure in West Kalimantan had existed long before the issuance of Law No. 14 of 2008. In 2005, West Kalimantan issued Local Regulation No. 4 of 2005 on Transparency of West Kalimantan Provincial Government Administration, although it is not implemented in practice. The issuance of Law No. 14 of 2008 resulted in the annulment of Local Regulation No. 4 of 2005. Even though the law guarantees the public's right to public information, the transparency of public bodies cannot automatically be enforced. Basic instruments are needed, both in the form of derivative regulations and institutional instruments, to realize the objectives of the law. Some of these tools include service mechanisms, the fulfillment of rights, disputes, as well as the availability of Information and Documentation Management Officers (PPID) and Public Information Lists (DIP) at each public agency, as well as the Information Commission as the key institution implementing the Law.

At the national level, the Information Commission (KI) was only formed in May 2009. To accelerate the realization of the transparency of public bodies in each region, the Decree of the Chairman of the Central Information Commission No. 02/KEP/KIP/X/2009 on Guidelines for the Implementation of Selection and Determination of Members of the Provincial Information

Commission and Regency/City Information Commission was issued. This decision could hopefully become a reference for the formation of an information commission in each region. In West Kalimantan, the West Kalimantan Provincial Information Commission (KIP) was formed in 2015. At least 6 years after the issuance of the Decree of the Chairman of KI No. 02/KEP/KIP/X/2009. In fact, this is problematic, as Law No. 14 of 2008 article 60 requires that the provincial information commission should have been formed no later than 2010, or 2 years after the issuance of the Law.

The Regional Government (executive) actually responded directly to this opportunity by forming a Selection Committee through the West Kalimantan Governor Decree No. 351/Dishubkominfo/2010 on July 30, 2010. The results pointed out 5 names of KIP commissioner candidates for a fit and proper test by the Provincial People's Representative Assembly (DPRD) of West Kalimantan. The problem is, DPRD rejected the election results and returned the candidate commissioner files to the Governor because they were considered to violate statutory regulations. The files submitted should have 10 names, but only 5 names were submitted for a fit and proper test. This condition yielded in the lengthy process of forming the West Kalimantan KIP.

This resulted in 21 Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) in West Kalimantan forming a Coalition for Public Information Disclosure with the main agenda of accelerating the formation of KIP. Driven by 3 local CSOs, namely Independent Civil Society Organization for Development Transparency and Accountability (JARI) Indonesia of West Borneo, Regional Institute for the Assessment

and Study of Information Flow (LPSAIR), and Titian Foundation with the support of resources by The Asia Foundation (TAF), they consolidated the urgency of forming the West Kalimantan KIP, which had been ignored since 2010. As a result, the selection results conducted in 2010 were sent back to the DPRD by the Governor of West Kalimantan as many as 10 names in February 2014 for a fit and proper test. Eventually, 5 names were elected as commissioners of the West Kalimantan KIP through DPRD Announcement Letter No. 162/139/DPRD-D Dated 21 August 2014.

Although 5 commissioners had been elected by the Provincial DPRD of West Kalimantan, however, until November 2014, the elected commissioners had not yet been appointed. It was feared that the governor would neglect the needs of the West Kalimantan KIP. The CSOs coalition then submitted a position paper on November 14, 2014 to the Governor of West Kalimantan. The time gap until the inauguration of KIP Kalbar in March 2015 was also utilized by consolidating with the elected commissioners.

After its inauguration in March 2015, the West Kalimantan KIP continued to work as scheduled in the consolidation. CSOs went on to request public information/access tests and socialized the right to public information to people. Meanwhile, KIP did not only dispute information on access tests conducted by CSOs or the public, but also encouraged the formation of PPIDs and other public information service tools in each Regional Apparatus Organization (OPD). Joint activities between KIP and CSOs were carried out on National Information Disclosure Day which has been running since 2016. The annual event

was organized by West Kalimantan KIP and supported by several local CSOs who have the same issue, namely encouraging the disclosure of public bodies.

During the joint work between these two parties, in 2017 the West Kalimantan KIP succeeded in producing 2 innovative products, or 3 of the 5 agreed programs in encouraging the disclosure of public bodies at the local level. The five targeted products were (1) SOP for Post-IP Decision Implementation, (2) Circular on Open Public Information, (3) Consultation forums regarding public information disclosure in the mass media, (4) Encouraging transparency of Village Public Bodies, and (5) Village level public information services. This period was examined as the first longest collaboration between the West Kalimantan KIP and CSOs, which lasted almost 2 years after the formation of the West Kalimantan KIP. Of the four products, the collaboration was only able to achieve two products.

The two products (SOP of Implementation Post-Decision of Information Commission, and Circular Letter on Public Information Disclosure) are the work of the West Kalimantan KIP and JARI Indonesia of West Borneo, with the support from TAF. They are considered innovative because both products are KIP products that are not explicitly mandated by laws and regulations, but also do not violate existing provisions. Even if it refers to article 23 of Law No. 14 of 2008, KIP is allowed to establish standard technical guidelines for public information services.

Besides, the two products were presented without waiting for instructions from the Central KI, and it can be said as the first in Indonesia for SOP of Implementation Post-Information Commission (KI) Decisions, and

the second after KIP of Riau for a Circular Letter on Public Information Disclosure. Apart from these two products, there is one other product that also involved JARI in working together with the West Kalimantan KIP, namely the assessment of the transparency of public bodies which has become the annual agenda of the West Kalimantan KIP.

The issuance of the SOP for Post-Judgment Dispute Resolution was caused by the neglect of the KIP decision by the respondent (a public body). This condition had occurred in 2016 where the KIP decision won the applicant's favor, and the respondent did not object to the KI decision and did not file an appeal. However, until the deadline for submission as stated in the KIP decision, the respondent did not comply. Meanwhile, KIP did not have the authority to force the respondent to implement the result of the decision.

Meanwhile, the issuance of a circular letter on public information that must be disclosed was due to the fact that many cases handled by KIP were the same cases as several previous disputes. Apart from the types of information in dispute were the same as before, some were public bodies that had also been complained about. As a result, the results of the decisions taken by KIP were the same as the previous decisions. In this case, KIP took the initiative to issue a circular regarding the type of information that is open and must be available at all times.

In addition to these two products, the West Kalimantan KIP and JARI initiated the formation of a KIP-CSOs coalition throughout Kalimantan through a declaration involving both throughout Kalimantan which was carried out in mid-April 2018. One of the agendas was to accelerate the formation of the North

Kalimantan KIP. This collaboration was performed with the support of TAF which also had an agenda of encouraging transparency in governance throughout Indonesia. Through local CSOs, cooperation was proposed to KIP by offering several agendas to be mutually agreed upon.

The initiative to collaborate came from JARI. JARI's consideration to involve KIP was due to the program's theme being held under KIP's main duties and functions. Besides, KIP is a legal institution mandated by law to encourage disclosure of public agencies. The legal authority in the context of encouraging the openness of public bodies owned by KIP is considered strategic in achieving JARI's goals, considering that KIP was also formed for the same purpose under Law No. 14 of 2008. Even the sustainability of the results depends on KIP.

With support from TAF, JARI took the initiative to offer the program to KIP in early 2017 to work on together. Because it was considered beneficial for both parties, or at least the parties' wishes could be accommodated by the success of the proposed program, the parties agreed to carry out the joint work. Referring to many theories, the collaboration between KIP and CSOs only occurred around 2017-2018. Whereas in the previous period, it had a form of cooperation or coordination.

Morris and Stevens (2016, hal. 5-9) explained several criteria in understanding collaboration, namely (1) collaboration is always developing, (2) collaboration can be understood as a process and organizational structure, (3) not all collaboration is equal, and (4) a cross-disciplinary approach to understanding organizations is very useful.

As a result, the terms coordination, cooperation, and collaboration are often used interchangeably (Williams, 2016; Leifer & Meinel, 2018; Harley & Blismas, 2010). Many practitioners use different terms for the same activity, and vice versa, the same term for different activities (Morris & Stevens, 2016: 7).

McNamara stated that there are 3 levels of interaction, namely (1) cooperation, (2) coordination, and (3) collaboration (Williams 2016: 32). Referring to this level, Mc Namara placed collaboration as the highest form of interaction carried out by more than one unit/group/person.

Collaboration occurs when there is a synergistic relationship of various differences between the parties involved (Buckup, 2012: 82). Leifer and Menel (2018: 3) added that collaboration is a process of two or more units working together to achieve goals. Harley and Blismas (2010: 18) pointed out that collaboration forms a new structure, requiring comprehensive planning, and mature communication channels.

Opportunities and Challenges in Sustainable Collaboration between KIP and CSOs

To identify the relationship between KIP and CSOS in 2017, the framework used was the Essential Elements of Collaboration (Harley & Blismas, 2010), namely (1) communication, (2) trust and respect, (3) equality and power, (4) strategic alliances, (5) incentives and values, (6) negotiation, and (7) knowledge sharing.

Communication

In intra-organizational communication, the party sending and receiving messages is

the organization. In communication, the existence of individuals represents the interests of the organization. Communication that takes place during collaboration tends to have the same pattern. In this case, JARI is the communicator, and KIP is the communicant. However, every time the communication occurred, it couldn't be mapped which party sending messages, as well as which party receiving ones.

The tendency of JARI as a communicator was a consequence of the initial agreement, in which JARI was the party maintaining the implementation of activities in accordance with the initial plan. To facilitate communication, it was agreed that each person in charge of KIP activities based on 4 output targets. Each commissioner was responsible for 1 target output. Meanwhile, from JARI, 1 person was entrusted as a liaison who was responsible for the successful implementation of the output.

The intensity of communication that occurred in achieving the target depends on the implementation of each activity. The intensity was getting higher ahead of the technical implementation, and the content discussed was about achieving the activity targets. Sometimes the substance of the program was discussed again during the evaluation of activities, which was carried out after its implementation. Interpersonal communication between parties (individuals at JARI and KIP) outside the context of the program, even outside the issue of disclosure to public bodies, was quite rare.

In this case, the interaction between parties was still limited to achieving the objectives of the activity, which was agreed upon in the beginning. As a result, there were very few fundamental changes to the planned

program design. The options available in responding to the possibility of change were whether the program was implemented or not, or changing the schedule for implementing activities. The idea of changing the form and target of program achievement occurred very rarely, and if any was usually not formally conveyed in joint meetings. It was only limited to light and unsystematic conversations between individuals.

Many communication media were used to facilitate coordination. In fact, the most frequent interaction was via cellphone or rather using the WhatsApp (WA) application. It was agreed that to facilitate communication-related to program implementation, the WA group was formed. That online group was a media that relied on the distribution of messages to each individual involved. However, when referring to the speed of response, the preferred medium was to make telephone calls directly to the individual concerned. Another medium used was email distributed to each individual. Compared to the use of these communication media, face-to-face communication was quite rare. In a planned manner, this communication was generally done before the activity (technical planning formulation), and also after the activity (evaluation).

Communication is considered a key factor in successful collaboration, because it is able to encourage the creation of an ideal collaborative process. Thus, communication failures can result in ineffective collaboration. Even though, when referring to communication elements, the ongoing communication process does not have serious problems, the collaboration process that occurs is not fully effective due to many other factors, such as limited openness between parties and the

need to build communication. As stated by Reina and Reina (2006: 34), communication and trust influence each other and have a very close relationship. This resulted in not fully met the information needs of each party.

The content and context of communication were still limited to the technicalities of implementing the activities. Meanwhile, efforts to build communication outside of program content and context were rare. As a result, efforts to improve relations between organizations were just limited to the importance of the program.

Even though direct communication in collaboration is not substantial yet considered important as stated by Emerson, Nabatchi and Balogh (2012). However, direct communication is examined as an absolute necessity when collaboration is prone to conflict, and shared values are difficult to create.

Referring to the results of research conducted by Sambodo and Pribadi (2016) direct communication by multi parties can build trust from each party involved in the collaboration. Limited direct communication has an impact on the limited trust and respect.

Trust and Respect

Trust and respect are quite important in maintaining relationships between the parties involved. Several times the collaboration process was interrupted due to prejudice between parties. Several things possessing an impact on trust and respect include (1) prejudice, and (2) role distribution.

In the context of the collaboration between KIP and JARI, prejudice arose due to the presence of asymmetric information. The agenda carried by JARI received resource

support from TAF to operationalize the implementation of activities. For this support, JARI invited KIP which also had a similar agenda to achieve common goals. In this case, JARI had complete information about the resources available for implementing activities. Efforts to avoid prejudice are attempted by disseminating this information to all parties, that is, each individual involved gets information about the state of the resource.

The problem was that there had been many changes in the use of resources. This was because (1) not all activities could be implemented as stated in the target, and (2) the use of resources was inconsistent with planning. As a result, changes were quite intense and rapid in the use of these resources, resulting in a lack of information that could be shared equally.

Meanwhile, the distribution of roles refers to the characteristics of the organization. Before the agreement was reached, the distribution of roles was identified and approved by two parties. Even though the collaboration was institutional, KIP is a group of individuals (commissioners) who are functionally equal with different responsibilities, yet structurally there is a hierarchy. There is a tendency for the perception that the organizational structure does not reflect the role of collaboration. Each commissioner is responsible for each different output. This resulted in the perception that the person in charge of output (PIC) has full authority over all activities related to achieving that output. The authority over these outputs could not be intervened structurally in KIP. This condition reinforced the existence of prejudice, when the commissioner felt that there were complaints about the collaboration that had occurred. The

confusion that often came was whether the problem was resolved structurally at KIP, or was it functional in collaboration. The lack of clarity on these problems created problems in every effort to solve it, often resulting in dissatisfaction of individuals involved in the collaboration.

In the context of collaboration, Reina and Reina (2006) called it transactional trust, which is a mutualistic, reciprocal exchange, and changes gradually. This stage changes through three types, namely contractual trust, communication trust, and competence trust

The collaboration between KIP and JARI is at the level of contractual trust. Information was only provided upon request, and there had been no effort to provide other information voluntarily that might be useful in improving the quality of the results of collaboration, as in the concept of communication trust. In contractual trust, each party should be able to consistently maintain the contract and behave under the agreement. Contractual trust arises when each party automatically moves based on a joint commitment. In many cases, this condition actually came up rarely, although there are inconsistencies in the implementation of the agreement. The parties involved had a commitment to achieving these common goals, even though this commitment was understood differently by each party, even individuals in the same organization.

Contractual trust does not automatically build when an agreement is formed. At the beginning of the collaboration, there were still no clear boundaries regarding the roles and responsibilities of each individual involved. For example, in KIP, at the beginning of the program, there was confusion between the organizational structure and the functional

roles of collaboration. Thus, actions taken in collaboration were often considered to violate the structural provisions of KIP. In fact, there were accusations of inconsistency in implementing the role of JARI, which necessitated clarification from TAF. Although suspicions often occurred at the beginning, gradually the problem could be resolved. However, its nature is still limited to contractual trust.

Equality and Power

The agreement to build collaboration was preceded by the distribution of roles between parties. JARI acts as a support for the implementation of activities facilitating the need for the activity implementation, and KIP acts as the party appearing on the surface. This division resulted in inequality in each activity implementation process. Several changes happened due to the need to adjust to the time availability of KIP. This was regarding differences in the level of importance of achieving goals, causing different levels of dependence on one another.

Although, as stated by Susanti and Juwono (2019) dependence can trigger each party to collaborate, in this case, the dependence of each party was not in an equal state referring to the consequences of failure to achieve common goals.

Both parties are parties who shared an interest in achieving goals. The problem was that the consequences received by each party were not felt the same when the desired goals were not achieved. This condition has resulted in a tendency to inequality in the implementation of activities.

Although there was a risk due to the failure of the implementation of activities, the

level of risk for each party was not at the same level. Institutionally, KIP does not have too high a risk when the achievement of these activities fails, because this achievement is an added value to the existence of KIP in carrying out its functions. Meanwhile, for JARI, failure to carry out activities would put other programs at risk.

Both parties actually have the position that can directly influence the success of achieving common goals, but the imbalance of interests eventually resulted in an inequality of power. Balanced power occurs when individually, several commissioners have the same level of importance as JARI in achieving results of interests, such as reputation, pride, commitment, and other incentives that possess a direct impact on the individual concerned.

Strategic Alliance

The collaboration between KIP and JARI is very strategic because both organizations have the same goals and targets. Both parties are not competitors, and can complement each other in terms of efficiency and effectiveness in achieving targets. JARI needs KIP because KIP is a state tool whose existence is legitimized by law in the manifestation of the openness of public bodies. Meanwhile, JARI, as a civil society organization, has relationships with many other civil society organizations. One of the main functions of KIP is the resolution of information disputes, depending on how much people are aware of their rights to public information and have the desire to obtain information when there are efforts from public bodies preventing the community from obtaining their rights.

This condition encourages both parties to strive to maintain the alliance, because they could meet each other's needs. However, in

the context of strategic alliances, JARI is not the only civil society organization that also has an agenda of encouraging the openness of public agencies in West Kalimantan, while KIP is the only state apparatus at the local level that specifically has the authority to fulfill society rights for public information.

Besides JARI, KIP, or other civil society organizations, several other actors influence the fulfillment of civil society's right to public information, namely public bodies, PPID, PTUN, Ombudsman, Mass Media, and others. So that the collaboration between JARI and KIP always involves many other parties in achieving common goals. Even though every time the implementation of activities implicates many other parties, the involvement of these other parties is not as intense as the relationship between JARI and KIP because it is built on mutual agreement and commitment.

There are at least 3 characteristics in a strategic alliance, namely (1) organizational participation in achieving common goals and remaining independent even though the alliance has been formed, (2) each party shares the benefits of the alliance and mutual control over the performance of the parties, and (3) the organizations involved continue to contribute in strategic areas (Harley & Blismas, 2010: 22).

Incentive and Value

In the collaboration between KIP and JARI, the common goal to be achieved is the disclosure of public bodies at the local level. The results of the achievement of these goals, ideally, have an impact on the fulfillment of public rights guaranteed by the constitution. The achievement of these common goals does not exceed the perceived value of the

incentives that will be obtained by each collaborating party.

In the organizations involved, the direct incentive that results from achieving these results is the organization's reputation for the issues raised. The success of achieving this incentive also depends on its value for each individual involved. In this case, the vitality of the existence of individuals involved in representing the interests of the organization matters. When the existence of the individual concerned is difficult or irreplaceable, the dependence of the organization on the existence of a particular individual is quite high. This can inflict in a high value for the incentive received by the individual in the organization, especially voluntary organizations. The incentives can take many forms, such as recognition, popularity, financial, and other things that are tangible or not. However, incentive is not the only factor that influences individual behavior in organizations. Commitment to an organization's reputation tends to outperform the incentives offered.

In this case, the motivation of each individual who is involved in collaboration is not the same. Although some of the individuals involved have different ratings of the incentives obtained, commitment to ideas is the main thing. So, what often disrupts the collaboration process is not only due to the value of the incentives that are threatened, but also because of the organization's recognition of the individuals involved, having an impact on the individual's commitment to the organization.

Negotiation

Negotiations came about throughout the collaborative process, although negotiations

between two organizations are quite intense during the initial planning of the program. In planning, negotiations were held referring to the availability of resources to each party, as well as the strategic steps needed to achieve common goals. JARI offered a series of programs to be implemented together with KIP. Meanwhile, KIP also had a different agenda, although the desired goal could actually be achieved through the JARI's offer. Thus, it was agreed that a series of activities to achieve the goal, by including one of KIP's routine activities, namely the assessment of public bodies as one of the common agendas. The rest was the agenda JARI offered to KIP. In the first negotiation, to build trust with KIP, JARI engaged TAF to be involved in the negotiations. At the very least, TAF could clarify the availability of financial resources to support the implementation of the program, along with the rules for using this support.

Apart from planning, negotiations were also carried out regarding the technicalities of the implementation of activities, while the substance of the program was no longer being discussed because it had been agreed upon in the planning section. Negotiation regarding technical implementation referred to the limited time and energy in KIP. There was an opinion from the commissioners that the collaboration carried out was not the obligation of KIP, and tended to be seen as disrupting the commissioner's routine. There was an unequal position referring to the perceptions between parties of the impact resulting from the successful implementation of activities. This generated a tendency for JARI to be weak in its bargaining position, and ultimately adjusting the commissioners' time and energy availability.

Knowledge Sharing

Knowledge sharing depends on openness between parties and effective means of communication in the distribution and exchange of information. Although the availability and affordability of information technology could be accessed by each party, the available information media were not used effectively. For example, a database about programs that could bridge between parties was only done through the WhatsApp group and email which are incidental and not systematically classified. Fulfillment of information needs was done by asking or asking directly from and to one of the parties. Even the basic information required was not available all the time, and it generally took time to collect and process data.

In this case, each party has important information related to the successful implementation of the program. For example, JARI had data and information on the results of studies or research under the program themes that JARI had carried out and its network, while KIP had data and information regarding the readiness of public bodies in opening public information, or lists of disputes and results of dispute decisions. The problem was, each party did not systematically package the data and information so that it could be accessed and used collectively at any time.

Characteristics in Building Sustainable Collaboration

Ideally, JARI's choice to collaborate with KIP refers to the consideration of KIP's strategic position in achieving organizational goals, namely the fulfillment of the people's right to public information as regulated in the constitution and Law No. 14 of 2008. In terms

of achieving these goals, there are at least two main actors, namely the public as the party entitled to information, and the public bodies as the holder of public information.

KIP and JARI have different positions and can support each other in achieving the same organizational goals, namely the fulfillment of the public's right to public information. The main problems identified in the realization of these ideals are (1) the resistance of public bodies in sharing public information, and (2) people who do not realize the importance of information in developing the quality of life.

Even the availability of information technology tools, which should facilitate interaction between government and society, did not turn out as expected. The use of information technology in public information services is still limited to formality. For example, the existence of the official local government websites, tends to ignore the existence of the community as users of information. The available space and discourse are still dominated by local governments (Rinaldi & Yuardani, 2015).

Pointing to this problem, previously JARI approached the two parties, namely the public and public bodies. In society, JARI tried to escalate community intelligence to understand the right to public information and how public information has a direct impact on people's lives in survival and self-development. JARI's relationship with the community directly has been going on for a long time. Since its establishment in 2001 in West Kalimantan, JARI has made many capacity-building efforts for the community. This is in line with the fulfillment of JARI's vision, namely "The development of a community movement to exercise supervisory rights over the entire

development process that is transparent and accountable. The communities that are assisted by JARI are spread across many villages in two districts, namely Mempawah Regency and Kubu Raya Regency.

JARI has made an effort to approach public bodies in the policy advocacy agenda. Efforts to influence public policy have also been performed since 2001. In the context of fulfilling the public's right to public information, efforts to influence public bodies are carried out using two approaches, namely (1) encouragement from outside through tests of access to public information, and (2) assistance from public bodies to fulfill the basic tools of public information service. In the access test, JARI encourages the public and provides assistance to the community in submitting requests and disputes over obstacles to fulfilling their right.

The existence of the access test is considered strategic enough considering that one of the incentives for public bodies to be willing to share public information also depends on the degree to which the public cares about the information. When community apathy comes about, it will further strengthen the government's belief that information is not the main need of the community (Rinaldi, Jaya, & Diah, 2018).

Meanwhile, assistance to public bodies is constrained by resistance to them. This resistance is due to the absence of legal authority from JARI in "forcing" public bodies to comply with Law No. 14 of 2008. Around 2012-2013, JARI was one of the parties that pushed for the emergence of a Regent Regulation on SOP of PPID which requires each Regional Work Units (SKPD) to form a PPID through Regent Decree No.

299/SETDA/2013. In addition, JARI also facilitated SKPD in compiling a list of public information, as regulated in Law No. 14 of 2008. The problem is that many public bodies ignore the offer, even though workshops, training and other matters have been carried out related to public information services. As a result, the formation of KIP and other instruments to support public information services does not automatically result in the fulfillment of the public's right to public information. Throughout 2016, there were 21 submissions of information disputes at the Provincial Information Commission of West Kalimantan. Until the end of 2017, KIP had successfully resolved 34 public information disputes. This number is considered quite a lot considering that the West Kalimantan KIP was only formed in March 2015.

Due to the resistance from these public bodies, JARI requires parties outside the public bodies, but have the legal authority to influence them. The existence of KIP is an institution that is examined appropriately in achieving these goals. Moreover, KIP is also mandated by law to fulfill the public's right to public information. With the power given by law, KIP has the power to give impacts on public bodies in fulfilling community rights. As regulated in Article 26 of Law No. 14 of 2008, the three tasks of KIP are (1) to resolve information disputes, (2) to establish general policies for public information services, and (3) to determine implementation and technical instructions. Based on the tasks mandated by the law, the West Kalimantan KIP is considered to have a strategic role considering that both parties have advantages and disadvantages that can complement each other.

On the other hand, although KIP has the legal authority in handling information disputes and issues policies and technical guidelines in terms of public information services, it still has limitations in encouraging the public to understand the guarantee of the right to public information, and the use of information to improve their quality of life. In this case, CSOs are seen as parties with sufficient experience in advocating for community rights. Information disputes that are carried out will not occur when the public does not understand the right to public information. However, the absence of a dispute cannot be used as a measure that there has been information disclosure to public bodies. Many things are possible due to the absence of disputes, in addition to the possibility of fulfilling the public's right to public information, allowing disputes not to happen due to the pragmatic attitude and apathy of the community towards the role of information in everyday life.

Another limitation that KIP has is the limited funding and other facilities to carry out existing tasks and functions. KIP financing in the Regional Revenue and Expenditure Budget (APBD) is not channeled institutionally, as is the case with OPD in West Kalimantan, but is channeled through the Department of Transportation, Communication, and Information (Dishubkominfo) of West Kalimantan. Even for facilities to hold public information dispute hearings, KIP must "ride" in the spaces available at OPD in the ranks of the West Kalimantan Provincial Government. However, the "dependence" on facilities from the Provincial Government does not result in the decision and attitude of the commissioners to support the disclosure of public bodies at the local level. The many limitations that the

West Kalimantan KIP has in carrying out its main duties and functions require support from many parties. CSOs are considered as strategic parties because their “proximity” to the community is able to help the improvement of the quality of the community, and CSO's “closeness” with a network of other institutions that are willing to support in terms of financing activities is considerably high. Moreover, the history of the establishment of the West Kalimantan KIP cannot be separated from the interference of CSOs.

CONCLUSION

CSOs have an important role in encouraging the formation of the West Kalimantan KIP in March 2015. Through the Coalition for the Public Information Disclosure, consisting of 21 local CSOs, they succeeded in urging the provincial government of West Kalimantan to form and strengthen the West Kalimantan KIP as soon as possible, as a follow-up to Law No. 14 of 2008. After its formation, cooperation was still carried out between the West Kalimantan KIP and local CSOs, though the cooperation was only temporary and tended to be incidental, such as the socialization of the right to public information, or the celebration of Information Disclosure Day on 28th of September. In many of these activities, each party involved contributes both materially, such as costs, t-shirts, souvenirs, or immaterial contributions, such as as a moderator, jury, or other things.

In 2017-2018, a fairly intense collaboration took place between the West Kalimantan KIP and JARI with support from The Asia Foundation. In this collaboration, using the Essential Elements of Collaboration framework (Harley & Blismas, 2010), it was identified that

there were problems in the 6 available elements. Excellence only occurs in strategic alliances, due to the common goal and organizationally being open to building cooperation. Even though the 6 existing elements indicate problems, they can be covered by the advantages of each existing element, except in (1) equality and power, and (2) knowledge sharing. Meanwhile, in terms of the characteristics between parties, ideally both parties have the opportunity to build collaboration. A mutualistic relationship comes about because each party can complement the shortcomings with the advantages possessed by each other. However, the sustainability of the collaboration built depends on the ability of each party to maintain the essential elements of collaboration.

REFERENCES

- Buckup, S. (2012). *Building Successful Partnerships: A Production Theory of Global Multi-Stakeholder Collaboration*. Geneva: Springer.
- Emerson, K., Nabatchi, T., & Balogh, S. (2012). An Integrative Framework for Collaborative Governance. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 22*(1), 1-29.
- Harley, J., & Blismas, N. (2010). An Anatomy of Collaboration Within the Online Environment. In M. Anandarajan, & A. Anandarajan (Eds.), *e-Research Collaboration: Theory, Techniques, and Challenges* (pp. 15-34). Springer.
- Leifer, L., & Meinel, C. (2018). Introduction: Reflections on Working Together—Through and Beyond Design Thinking. In C. Meinel, & L. Leifer (Eds.), *Design Thinking Research (Making Distinctions:*

- Collaboration versus Cooperation*) (pp. 1-12). Springer.
- McNamara, M. W. (2016). Unraveling the Characteristics of Mandated Collaboration. In J. C. Morris, & K. M. Stevens (Eds.), *Advancing Collaboration Theory: Models, Typologies, and Evidence* (pp. 65-85). New York: Routledge.
- Morris, J. C., & Stevens, K. M. (2016). The State of Knowledge in Collaboration. In J. C. Morris, & K. M. Stevens (Eds.), *Advancing Collaboration Theory: Models, Typologies, and Evidence* (pp. 3-12). New York: Routledge.
- Reina, D. S., & Reina, M. L. (2006). *Trust & Betrayal in the Workplace (Building Effective Relationships in Your Organization)*. San Francisco, California: Berrett-Koehler Publishers, Inc.
- Rinaldi, H., & Yuardani, A. M. (2015). Analisis Peluang Transformasi "E-Government" menjadi "E-Democracy". *Mimbar*, 31(1), 103-112.
- Rinaldi, H., Jaya, M., & Diah, J. M. (2018). Analisis Prilaku Kepemimpinan Transformasional dan Transaksional dalam Penyelenggaraan Pemerintahan Desa. *Jurnal Transformasi Pemerintahan*, 10(2), 99-110.
- Sambodo, G. T., & Pribadi, U. (2016). Pelaksanaan Collaborative Governance di Desa Budaya Brosot, Galur, Kulonprogo, DI. Yogyakarta. *Journal of Governance and Public Policy*, 3(1), 94-123.
- Susanti, S. O., & Juwono, V. (2019). Collaborative Governance: Proyek Penyelenggaraan Jaringan Tulang Punggung Serat Optik Palapa Ring di Indonesia Tahun 2016-2019. *Jurnal Ilmu Administrasi*, 8(1), 12-23.
- Williams, A. P. (2016). The Development of Collaboration Theory: Typologies and Systems Approaches. In J. C. Morris, & K. M. Stevens (Eds.), *Advancing Collaboration Theory: Models, Typologies, and Evidence* (pp. 14-42). New York: Routledge.