

# Collaborative Governance in the Management of Integrated Community Shelters Post Disaster (ICS) in the City of Palu

**Daswati** Universitas Tadulako, Indonesia

**Muhammad Ahsan Samad** Universitas Tadulako, Indonesia

**Ismail Suardi Wekke** Sekolah Tinggi Agama Islam Negeri Sorong, Indonesia

## Abstract

This article tells the involvement of humanitarian organizations in the post-war reconstruction process of disaster in the city of Palu, Sigi and Donggala Regencies. The presence of humanitarian organizations is urgently needed to help the process of acceleration of reconstruction. In carrying out its humanitarian mission, it is expected that these institutions are coordinated by the authority of the government/state. Management of Integrated Community Shelter expected able to help the process of reconstruction post disaster apparently also still constrained in the pattern of coordination. Coordination pattern which is less likely to occur in delivering open and funneling aid to victims. this paper found that the existence of the weakness of the State in controlling and embody the humanitarian agency's involvement in the process of reconstructions. Collaborative approach to governance in the management of Integrated Community Shelter appears as an alternative solution in the answer to these problems.

## Keywords

Collaborative Governance; Integrated Community Shelter; Coordination

## INTRODUCTION

A week after the disaster struck the cities of Palu, Sigi, and Donggala (28/09/2019), it still leaves deep sorrow

for the community, most of the survivors still choose to live in refugee tents due to the reason that they are still traumatized and along with the occurrence of small earthquakes often. In addition, the people also suffered severe trauma, this is due to the fact that they were hit by the continuous aftershocks that were intensified by roaring sounds from the underground of the earth which many feared that the city of Palu would collapse to the seabed (Wekke et al., 2019). When the emergency phase has begun to gradually recover, post-disaster recovery is immediately carried out. Humanitarian agencies both national

---

Daswati is a lecturer at the Public Administration Program, Universitas Tadulako, Indonesia. His research focus on public administration. Email: [daswatisahar@gmail.com](mailto:daswatisahar@gmail.com).

Muhammad Ahsan Samad is a lecturer at the Public Administration Program, Universitas Tadulako, Indonesia. His research foci on public policy, disaster management, disaster governance and human security. Email: [ahsansamad@untad.ac.id](mailto:ahsansamad@untad.ac.id).

Ismail Suardi Wekke is a lecturer at the Sekolah Tinggi Agama Islam Negeri Sorong, Indonesia. Email: [iswekke@gmail.com](mailto:iswekke@gmail.com).

I am thankful for participants at the Prodipol International Symposium on Indonesian Politics June 2019 hosted by Universitas Negeri Semarang, Indonesia for their valuable comments on the early draft of this paper.

and international take turns to help the disaster recovery process in the city of Palu.

The government in responding to disaster relief efforts requires support from aid organizations, as stated by [Helsloot and Ruitenbergh \(2004\)](#), that the government where a disaster occurs may not be able to respond to all aspects of disaster response and recovery efforts alone. Disaster response and recovery efforts are not only carried out by the government, but are also responded to by Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs), companies, private institutions and institutions, military, community organizations, and communities from other areas ([Tolentino Jr., 2007](#))

A world conference on Natural Disaster Reduction was held in Yokohama, Japan. This conference emphasized that every country has the main sovereignty and responsibility to protect its citizens, infrastructure and national interests, social or economic assets from the impact of natural disasters. The Yokohama Conference then formulated a strategy and action plan for a safer world. The basis of the strategy is awareness and recognition that natural disasters continue to strike and increase in magnitude, complexity, frequency, and economic impact ([Permana, 2007](#)).

Yokohama Strategy and Action Plan for a Safer World, Hyogo Framework for Action 2005-2015 (HFA) and Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030 (SFDRR). It aims to highlight changes in the way the international framework relates to the local level as a pathway for increasing the effectiveness

of DRR action plans. Focus on the international discourse developed around DRR, and not on the implementation of a DRR strategy; while the latter has been the topic of many research articles and official reports heretofore ([de la Poterie & Baudoin, 2015](#)).

Adopted in 1994, the Yokohama Strategy and Plan of Action for a Safer World (Yokohama Strategy) was previously a reference point for disaster reduction, comprising various commitments and identifying specific activities that have since served as international blueprints in the field. The Yokohama Strategy enacts guidelines for disaster risk prevention, preparedness for disasters and mitigation, based on a set of principles that emphasize the importance of risk assessment, disaster prevention, and preparedness, vulnerability reduction, early warning as well as political responsibility to develop and implement disaster reduction policies ([Briceño, 2004](#)).

Numerous collaborations between stakeholders in government administration are also carried out as an effort and the government's response in handling public problems. The need for partners and assistance shows the urgency for good governance that is integrated with a collaborative governance approach. Collaborative governance emphasizes cooperation between related actors whose emphasis is on dialogue and the sustainability of coordination and cooperation ([Novita, 2018](#)). The term cooperation between stakeholders that involves the

government, private sector, and society can be interpreted as collaborative governance. Collaborative governance likewise requires reform by synergizing distinct perspectives of stakeholders, being closer to the community, and expanding cooperation with other parties to meet resource needs and recruitment of human resources (Irawan, 2017).

Law No. 24 of 2007, concerning Disaster Management, commands the government as the main organizer responsible for implementing post-disaster reconstruction activities including the housing sector. Nonetheless, given its limitations, it is necessary to encourage the participation of various parties, such as non-governmental organizations, the private sector, foreign aid agencies, and donors, thus recovery assistance can be implemented effectively. On the other hand, people affected by disasters have limitations to restore their conditions in light of the fact that they have limited resources (Sagala, Situngkir & Wimbardana, 2019).

The involvement of humanitarian agencies in post-disaster management in Palu City certainly helped the government in the reconstruction process. Several humanitarian agencies took turns coming to Palu City, Sigi Regency, and Donggala Regency, both national scale humanitarian agencies to international humanitarian organizations.

Several international organizations directly sent assistance (necessities or in other objects) which they had prepared long before the disaster occurred (some

of them have preparedness programs for emergency response) for both the clean water and sanitation, food, settlement, and health services programs. Each of these sectors has a standard program implementation. The standards used have the aim of ensuring the quality and quantity of services so that further disasters do not occur, for example, diarrhea outbreaks which result in death due to consuming unclean water or conflict due to unequal assistance (Setiyargo, 2020).

The Canadian Red Cross (CRC) and the Indonesian Red Cross (PMI) have adopted a community disaster risk reduction approach. By means of an integrated approach, in the form of combining all aspects of the disaster cycle, starting with the processes of disaster response, recovery, and prevention. This approach aims to reduce disaster risk to the community. Addressing numerous hazards, coordinating with stakeholders, and integrating disaster risk reduction activities into national development work plans (Kafle, 2010).

Since 2012, Aksi Cepat Tanggap (ACT) has transformed itself into a global humanitarian organization, with a wider range of activities. On a local scale, ACT develops networks to all provinces, both in the form of volunteer networks in the Indonesian Volunteer Society (MRI) forum and in the form of a network of ACT branch offices. The scope of program activities has now reached 30 provinces and 100 districts/cities all over Indonesia.

On a global scale, ACT has developed a network in the form of

representative persons to set up ACT offices overseas. The scope of global program activities has reached 22 countries in Southeast Asia, South Asia, Indochina, the Middle East, Africa, Indochina, and Eastern Europe. ACT's work area on a global scale begins with its involvement in every human tragedy in numerous parts of the world along the lines of natural disasters, famine and drought, conflicts, and wars, including the oppression of minority groups in numerous countries.

With the spirit of humanitarian collaboration, ACT invites all elements of society and humanitarian organizations to get involved together. Supported with decades of experience in the world of humanity, we conduct joint education, open for a global partnership network that becomes a means of togetherness. All ACT global programs are a means of uniting partnerships of numerous *amil zakat* institutions, caring communities, artists, and public figures who have the same vision for humanity.

2014 was the beginning for ACT to establish a world humanitarian collaboration, along with a new vision: to become a professional global humanitarian institution, based on generosity and volunteerism for the global community, we want to create a better world civilization. Presenting a world that is comfortable for mankind, a civilized world, and has a noble civilization under the auspices of divine light. These ideals will become real with the involvement of all parties. We have full confidence, help us to make it happen together ([Aksi Cepat Tanggap, 2015](#)).

Integrated Community Shelter (ICS) or an integrated recovery area is a program of one of the national-scale humanitarian organizations, the humanitarian ACT. In its humanitarian mission, ACT then built an integrated recovery area in Central Sulawesi. Shelters have now been built in around 5 locations spread across Palu City, Donggala Regency, and Sigi Regency.

One of the shelters in the city of Palu is located in a field and consists of 96 building units. Nevertheless, in the implementation process, several obstacles are still found, moreover in the collaboration pattern, whether the collaboration between ACT and the local government, or collaboration between ACT and other humanitarian organizations.

In order to plan and build safer communities, we need to understand our communities and their vulnerability to natural jeopardies. The community-based disaster management program offers a practical set of steps, combining various approaches to endangerment identification and vulnerability assessment, problem finding and solution development, basic response training, and disaster scenario training, and public awareness and education to help communities reduce their vulnerability to natural jeopardies and to effectively respond to emergencies.

Through community-based disaster management programs, individuals and communities can not only protect themselves and their property from the risk of natural jeopardies instead of relying on external support, but also, can create a better place to live, protect

the natural environment, increase resistance to disasters, enhance business opportunities, manage growth, and preserve history, culture, and other community attributes for future residents (Chen, Liu & Chan, 2006).

Collaborative governance can be defined as an arrangement that regulates one or more public institutions that are directly involved with non-public stakeholders in a formal, consensus-oriented, and deliberative collective decision-making process that aims to create or implement public policies or manage public programs or assets (Febrian, 2016). The foundation for collaborative governance theory is integrative in several ways. The definition for collaborative governance is broader than what is commonly seen in the literature, by controlling and applying theories and concepts from various fields such as public administration, conflict resolution, and environmental management, etc. (Emerson, Nabatchi & Balogh, 2011).

In general, it is explained that collaborative governance is a process in which various stakeholders are involved in carrying out the interests of each agency in achieving common goals (Cordery, 2004)

The definition of collaborative governance according to Ansell and Gash (2008) is an arrangement that regulates one or more public institutions that are directly involved with non-public stakeholders in a formal, consensus-oriented, and deliberative collective decision-making process that aims to create or implement public

policies or manage programs or public assets.

This definition can be formulated in several keywords that emphasize six characteristics, including:

1. The forum is initiated or implemented by public institutions and actors in public institutions.
2. Participants in the forum also include non-public actors.
3. Participants are directly involved in decision making and decisions do not have to stop to public actors.
4. Forums are formally organized and meetings are held together.
5. The forum aims to make decisions based on mutual agreement, in other words, the forum is consensus-oriented.
6. Collaboration focuses on public policy and public management.

This definition can be interpreted that the forum exists in a formal relationship, hence it is stated that it only revolves around cooperation between public institutions, public actors, and non-public actors. Contradictory the case with the definition of collaborative governance described by Agrawal and Lemos (2007), the definition of collaborative governance is not only limited to stakeholders consisting of government and non-government but also formed by the existence of "multipart governance. "Which includes the private sector, community, and civil society and is built on the synergy of the roles of stakeholders and the formulation of plans that are hybrids such as public-

private and social-private cooperation (Febrian, 2016).

During the last two decades, a new strategy of governance named collaborative governance (bureaucracy) has been developed. This bureaucracy model brings together many stakeholders in a forum with public institutions to engage in consensus-oriented decision-making. A bureaucracy to describe a general model of collaborative governance.

The main objective of collaborative governance is to develop a contingency approach to collaboration which focuses on the conditions for collaborative governance which will be more or less effective as an approach to policymaking and public management (Ansell & Gash, 2008).

As part of governance, collaborative governance emphasizes the importance of collaboration between various actors and parties in the development and governance process. According to Ansell and Gash (2008) in collaborative governance, there are several prerequisites, processes, and important points in the collaborative governance model, namely the starting conditions; collaborative process; institutional design; facilitative leadership, and expected outcome. Starting conditions are a process to analyze whether there is asymmetric power, resources, knowledge or a very high gap in power and strength, resources, or knowledge between the various parties that will collaborate. This includes whether there is history, either in a context that supports or hinders collaboration. This is in light of the fact that if there is a gap

that is too wide, the starting conditions for carrying out the collaboration process will not run optimally. The next step is that the collaborative process itself is important to carry out the face-to-face dialogue thus the same trust and understanding are built with all stakeholders. Institutional design that supports collaborative processes is also an important thing needed to encourage participation and transparency in the collaborative process. In addition, facilitative and democratic leadership is also needed in the collaborative process, hence in the end the expected results can also be achieved (Newman et al., 2004).

This paper tries to analyze collaborative governance in the management of the ICS after the disaster in the city of Palu.

## RESEARCH METHOD

The study was conducted at one of the ICS locations, specifically in Lolu Village, Sigi Biromaru District, Sigi Regency. The method used in this paper is the qualitative descriptive approach that describes priority and strategic issues of collaborative governance in terms of ICS management, while the data collection techniques are carried out by an inventory of primary and secondary data. Primary data is obtained based on field empirical data through in-depth interviews and non-participant observation and focus group discussions.

While secondary data includes tracing numerous sources and literature both from government documents and news media in print and electronic media, journals, and books related to

collaborative governance and policy innovation. Furthermore, the collected data is analyzed by qualitative analysis, with the interactive model of Miles and Huberman (Sururi, 2018).

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### Cooperation between Humanitarian Institutions and the Lolu Community

The earthquake, tsunami, and liquefaction that struck Palu City, Donggala Regency, and Sigi Regency on September 28, 2018, left deep sorrow for the victims. One of the villages that were affected by the disaster was Lolu Village in Sigi Regency. An earthquake measuring 7,4 S. R. thrived in destroying residential areas. Casualties and material losses were inevitable.

Acceleration of disaster recovery continues to be intensified, particularly in fulfilling the basic needs of refugees, medical services, improving basic infrastructure, and settling communities' lives (Wekke et al., 2019).

After six months, the trauma experienced by the villagers is still felt. According to field observations, Lolu Village received aids from several humanitarian agencies such as the ACT, regional owned enterprises, Kompas, NU Peduli, Rotation, Islamic Relief, and Dompot Dhuafa. In addition, the party that works fully with the people of Lolu Village is the ACT Humanitarian Organization. ACT built shelters that had contracts for three years and also provided food packages to communities for 3 months. In Lolu Village there are 5 hamlets, the location of the shelters built by ACT is in hamlet 2. The shelter was

built 2 months after the disaster struck Pasigala.

The coming of humanitarian agencies into Lolu Village cannot be separated from the supervision of the village government. Every humanitarian organization that will come to Lolu Village is obliged to ask permission from the village authorities. In spite of the fact that some parties do not carry out permits, the result will still return to the village government. This is due to the fact that in the end the incoming aids will be recorded by the village itself.

The humanitarian agency ACT, which is fully responsible for the shelters built in Lolu village, cannot be separated from the cooperation carried out with village officials. Starting from permits to build shelters, to collecting data on who has the right to occupy the shelters. There are five specifications for residents who are entitled to receive shelters. Particularly, having small children, serious housing damage, minor housing damage, pregnant people, and the elderly. The purpose of building shelters is not only to provide material aids to communities but also to awaken and empower the economy of the people in Lolu village.

### Humanitarian Institution Aksi Cepat Tanggap

One of the humanitarian organizations that has a big role in helping people in the cities of Palu, Donggala, and Sigi is the humanitarian agency ACT. ACT started to come into Palu City on September 29-30 2018 along with volunteers from Makassar,

Gorontalo, and West Sulawesi. There are several programs carried out by this humanitarian agency. One of the programs is building shelters. ACT has built at least 10 shelter points while volunteering for Pasigala. The shelter points are Palu City, Lolu Village, Wani Village, Sumari Village, Buluri Ulu Jadi Village, Sidera Village, Lagaleso Village, Sibalaya Village, Lolove Village, and Fabilester Village.

Initially, ACT only collaborated with the local village government to build a temporary shelter. Nonetheless, at the present, in order to build temporary shelters, ACT must receive an instruction letter from the related Mayor and Regent. In providing logistics, ACT collaborates with other humanitarian agencies such as sub-lapsters from local to overseas, and BWJ from Japan in collaboration with BKPU.

In addition, the global humanitarian agency ACT Central Sulawesi is collaborating with the Sigi Regency Government and the Central Sulawesi Provincial Government to build food security in areas affected by the 2018 earthquake and liquefaction.

Accelerating the recovery of the agricultural sector and the recovery of farmers for areas affected by the earthquake and liquefaction has become one of the works focuses of ACT, related to the initial planting of lowland rice using *jarwo super* transplanter technology, with new superior varieties, in Pakuli Utara village, Gumbasa District, Sigi.

ACT Central Sulawesi supports the government's efforts to increase the productivity of agricultural potential,

moreover lowland rice, in order to build food security, post-earthquake disasters, and Sigi liquefaction. This support is by providing aids in the form of fertilizers for farmers to increase rice productivity from 4-6 tonnes per hectare to 11 tonnes per hectare/per planting.

The aids were given by ACT to farmers who are members of the farmer groups. ACT provides fertilizer and medicine for rice plants. Fertilizer for 30 farmers in Pakuli Utara Village, Gumbasa District. Recovery of the agricultural sector, increasing the productivity of agricultural potential, and accelerating the recovery of post-disaster farmers.

Therefore, ACT Central Sulawesi will expand the working area, not only in North Pakuli Village but also in other villages in Sigi, in which agricultural land has been irrigated by water from irrigation. In addition to providing aid, ACT will also provide aid for capacity building, in order to support the efforts in order to increase the productivity of lowland rice farming potential. ACT will also provide aid for the productivity of lowland rice farming. Thus, it can have an impact on the rice program for Santri, give compensation for underprivileged families, free food operations, and other programs related to agriculture. ACT will also try to help farmers through access to capital, markets, and technology.

Therefore, ACT tries to maximize farmer empowerment in the hope that it can support farmers' capital in farming activities. These programs will work along with the cooperation between the Central Sulawesi Provincial



Government and the Sigi Regency Government (Masrafi, 2020).

### **A collaborative governance approach in managing the Integrated Community Shelter**

#### *Commitment to a common purpose*

The collaboration that happens is based on the same goals, vision, and mission, related to the commitment of each stakeholder. In its application in the field, international humanitarian agencies seem to only provide aid without good research and coordination with stakeholders, in this case, the local government authorities. As the result, it can be seen that some of the shelters built by other humanitarian organizations tend to be neglected and not used by disaster-affected communities. This is in light of the fact that one of the locations of the shelters is far from the center of community activities.

In the continuity of accelerated recovery after the earthquake that hit Palu, Donggala, and Sigi, Central Sulawesi, ACT collaborated with the humanitarian organization Peace Winds Japan (PWJ). This collaboration aims to build an ICS in Tondo Village, Mantikulore District, Palu City, Central Sulawesi (Reisha, 2019).

The director of the PWJ Overseas Program, Rika Yamamoto, also stated that the PWJ agency was called to help residents in Pasigala through ACT. This is due to the fact that seeing the disaster conditions experienced in this area is almost the same as those experienced by Japan in 2011 ago.

#### *Trust among the participants*

Related to the trust in information or data from each stakeholder in the management collaboration of the ICS. The local government based on the results of the research has not provided valid information regarding the number of victims after the disaster, in the end, the distribution of logistics and aids from humanitarian agencies has not been evenly distributed, there was even a case of Wani village, the original residents of the village were not recorded by the local government authorities as one victim of the disaster, and in the end, the family did not get the right to occupy one of the temporary shelters built by humanitarian agencies in the village.

A total of 71 Palu disaster survivors in Hamlet IV, Mpanau village, Biromaru District, Sigi, Central Sulawesi are now starting a better day. They already have a place to live in the ICS which was built by ACT in collaboration with the Asia Pacific Alliance for Disaster Management (A-PAD). The construction of the complex, which began construction on January 25, was directly led by A-PAD Korea. ICS is the outcome of generosity from the Korea International Cooperation Agency (KOICA) and the Community Chest of Korea (CCK) (Aksi Cepat Tanggap, 2019).

This goal was immediately implemented into the construction of an Integrated Pleasant Residential complex. According to Amir, the Biromaru area was chosen due to the reason that there are still many local survivors who do not have proper

housing. "Many people have limited economic situation. The only abundance, the house, when the earthquake happened, it was gone. That's where we listened to the voices from the public that there are still many needs to accommodate their housing needs," explained Amir. Selecting the location was also inseparable from the coordination of the Sigi government and ACT Central Sulawesi (Central Sulawesi) Branch.

#### *Clarity in Governance*

In terms of the clarity of ICT governance, it can be seen that between stakeholders and humanitarian agencies have clear rules, such as clear agreements or cooperation contracts on the length of time for ICT land use, this can be seen from the acknowledgment of ICT managers that between them and local government authorities to today can still coordinate well regarding land use permits.

Self-determination or freedom to determine how collaboration will be implemented and who is allowed to see the collaboration that has been realized is proved by the freedom of humanitarian agencies both at the national and international to collaborate with local policymakers. Network management or support for all members without disagreement and conflict in achieving goals has not been seen maximally, as proved by some indigenous people whose locations were affected by the disaster, they have not received attention in the form of the establishment of shelters thus sometimes it creates internal conflicts

between residents hence the collaboration does not meet the clarity of governance.

Disasters are not just a matter of suffering. Another more urgent thing is how to recover the victims to normal conditions as before (bounce back). This is in light of the fact that when a disaster occurs, almost the entire order of life changes 180 degrees. Physically and psychologically, people can no longer do things as usual. At this point, people think about how to build disaster resilience (Ni'am & Ardianto, 2013).

The A-PAD Korea along with ACT has built 71 ICS for Palu disaster survivors in Mpanau Village, Biromaru District, Sigi Regency, Central Sulawesi.

Global Philanthropy Network (GPN)-ACT Team Amir Firdaus stated that the collaboration between ACT and A-PAD in housing development was formed for the reason of the same vision. A-PAD is an international organization that likewise focuses on disaster management.

Collaborative governance is a process in which numerous stakeholders are bound to carry out the interests of each agency in achieving common goals. Meanwhile, Ansell and Gash (2008) define collaborative governance as an arrangement that regulates one or more public institutions to directly engage with non-public stakeholders in a formal, consensus-oriented, and deliberative collective decision-making process that aims to create or implement public policies or manage programs. or public assets (Agustina, 2017).

### *Access to authority*

Access to authority is the availability of clear procedural measures that are widely accepted. The government and humanitarian institutions already have certain standards related to the handling of disaster victims in accordance with the duties and functions stipulated in Law Number 24 of 2007 concerning Disaster Management. Article 1 paragraph 12 states that Reconstruction is the reconstruction of all infrastructure and facilities, institutions in post-disaster areas, both at the government and community levels with the main objective of growing and developing economic, social, and cultural activities, upholding law and order, and awakening community participation. in all aspects of social life in post-disaster areas. Therefore, access to authority has been fully implemented by both parties.

Collaborative governance is expected to be a platform for understanding the characteristics of each stakeholder in handling disasters. The application of shared principles can be seen by expressing the interests of each humanitarian agency involved. ACT, one of the humanitarian organizations with the main motive of carrying out the collaborative process with a sense of humanity. Along with this motive, the city government of Palu, in particular, gave a positive response by implementing collaborative disaster management. The two parties agreed on a fast and efficient mechanism for this process. This is done to create a principle of collaboration for humanity and

accelerate the process of assistance to disaster victims.

Disasters that damage economically, physically, and socially should be reduced collectively by utilizing technology, knowledge, information, and human resources, as written by Lucas & Kibler (2016). Emphasis on the pre-disaster, emergency response, and post-disaster stages is important in implementing disaster management actions. The results cannot be achieved in a short time; Proactive, planned, and collaborative action between the central government, local governments, government agencies, business entities, and residents must be emphasized in the long term for this kind of accomplishment.

In Palu City disaster management, collaboration is stipulated by first, selecting the status of disaster management. Second, the establishment of a disaster management working group. The stipulation of disaster status is set with an emergency response period of the first period from 29 September to 12 October 2018 with the Decree of the Mayor of Palu No 800/04/02/WK/2018.

Then the second period of emergency response period 13 October 2018 until 26 October 2018 with the Decree of the Mayor of Palu No 800/027/WK/2018.

During the emergency transition to recovery period 27 October 2018 to 25 December 2018 with the decision of the Mayor of Palu number 800/059.a/2018.

Furthermore, an emergency transition period to recovery for the

second period of 26 December 2018 to 23 February 2019 was set with the decision of the Mayor of Palu number 360/0153.a/BPBD/2018.

Eventually, the emergency transition period to the third recovery period was set from 24 February to 24 April 2019 with the decision of the mayor of Palu Number 360/252/BPPD/2019.

## CONCLUSION

Based on the analysis carried out in the previous section, this study provides four conclusions that can be given regarding collaborative governance in the management of post-disaster ICS in the city of Palu.

First, commitment to goals, in carrying out their commitments, several humanitarian agencies still lack coordination with local government stakeholders, moreover International humanitarian agencies. Based on the results of the researcher's analysis, this incident was a result of the local city government not being responsive to disasters.

Second, the trust among the participants, information from several disaster victims informed that they had not received any compensation at all until a week after the disaster, this can be concluded by the researchers that the government was also not alert in providing accurate data on victims and the locations of their respective refugees. Thus, logistics allocation seems uneven.

Third, certainty in governance, in the management of ICT, it can be seen that one of the National humanitarian agencies, in this case, ACT, has shown

clear rules and coordination with government officials where the ICT location is built, but in terms of cooperation among humanitarian agencies, there is still a lack of coordination. This is proved by observations in the field, those other humanitarian organizations cannot distribute aid to the ICT inhabitants built by the humanitarian organization ACT.

Fourth, access to the authorities, government, and national humanitarian agencies, in this case, ACT seems to have clearly understood each other's flow and procedures. It can be seen that between the village governments where the ICT is located, to this day there has not been any weakness/problem in terms of laws and other positive regulations.

## REFERENCES

- Agrawal, A., & Lemos, M. C. (2007). A greener revolution in the making?: Environmental governance in the 21st century. *Environment: Science and Policy for Sustainable Development*, 49(5), 36-45. [Crossref](#) | [Google Scholar](#)
- Agustina, D. (2017). Kolaborasi Antara Aparatur Birokrasi Pemerintah Daerah Istimewa Yogyakarta dan Forum Pengurangan Risiko Bencana (FPRB) DIY Dalam Penyelenggaraan Penanggulangan Bencana di Daerah Istimewa Yogyakarta. *Transparansi: Jurnal Ilmiah Ilmu Administrasi*, 9(1), 87-103. [Crossref](#) | [Google Scholar](#)
- Aksi Cepat Tanggap. (2015). Aksi Cepat Tanggap-Lembaga Kemanusiaan.

- Retrieved from ACT: <https://act.id/tentang/sejarah>.
- Aksi Cepat Tanggap. (2019). Kolaborasi Kedermawanan A-PAD dan ACT untuk Penyintas Bencana Palu. Retrieved from ACT News: <https://news.act.id/berita/kolaborasi-kedermawanan-a-pad-dan-act-untuk-penyintas-bencana-palu>.
- Ansell, C., & Gash, A. (2008). Collaborative governance in theory and practice. *Journal of public administration research and theory*, 18(4), 543-571. [Crossref](#) | [Google Scholar](#)
- Briceño, S. (2004). Building disaster-resilient communities: The road to the second World Conference on Disaster Reduction, January 2005, Kobe, Hyogo, Japan. *Natural Resources Forum*, 28(3), 234-236. Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishing Ltd. [Crossref](#) | [Google Scholar](#)
- Chen, L. C., Liu, Y. C., & Chan, K. C. (2006). Integrated community-based disaster management program in Taiwan: a case study of Shang-An village. *Natural Hazards*, 37(1-2), 209. [Crossref](#) | [Google Scholar](#)
- Cordery, J. (2004). Another case of the Emperor's new clothes? *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 77, 481-484. [Crossref](#) | [Google Scholar](#)
- de la Poterie, A. T., & Baudoin, M. A. (2015). From Yokohama to Sendai: Approaches to participation in international disaster risk reduction frameworks. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Science*, 6(2), 128-139. [Crossref](#) | [Google Scholar](#)
- Emerson, K., Nabatchi, T., & Balogh, S. (2012). An integrative framework for collaborative governance. *Journal of public administration research and theory*, 22(1), 1-29. [Crossref](#) | [Google Scholar](#)
- Febrian, R. A. (2016). Collaborative Governance dalam Pembangunan Kawasan Perdesaan (Tinjauan Konsep dan Regulasi). *Wedana: Jurnal Kajian Pemerintahan, Politik dan Birokrasi*, 2(2), 200-208. [Google Scholar](#)
- Helsloot, I., & Ruitenbergh, A. (2004). Citizen response to disasters: a survey of literature and some practical implications. *Journal of Contingencies and Crisis Management*, 12(3), 98-111. [Crossref](#) | [Google Scholar](#)
- Irawan, D. (2017). Collaborative Governance (Studi Deskriptif Proses Pemerintahan Kolaboratif dalam Pengendalian Pencemaran Udara di Kota Surabaya). *Kebijakan dan Manajemen Publik*, 5(3), 1-12. [Google Scholar](#)
- Kafle, S. K. (2010). Integrated community based risk reduction: an approach to building disaster resilient communities. In *Annual International Workshop & Expo on Sumatra Tsunami Disaster & Recovery*, 1-20. [Google Scholar](#)
- Lucas, A. M. L., & Kibler, K. M. (2016). Integrated Flood Management in developing countries: balancing flood risk, sustainable livelihoods, and ecosystem services. *International Journal of River Basin Management*, 14(1), 19-31. [Crossref](#) | [Google Scholar](#)

- Masrafi, L. (Ed). (2020). ACT Sulteng kerja sama Pemkab Sigi bangun ketahanan pangan. Retrieved from Antara News: <https://sulteng.antaranews.com/berita/136330/act-sulteng-kerja-sama-pemkab-sigi-bangun-ketahanan-pangan>.
- Newman, J., Barnes, M., Sullivan, H., & Knops, A. (2004). Public participation and collaborative governance. *Journal of social policy*, 33(2), 203-223. [Crossref](#) | [Google Scholar](#)
- Ni'am, L., & Ardianto, H. T. (2013). Kolaborasi Menuju Resiliensi: Pengalaman Pemuda Ende dalam Pengurangan Risiko Bencana. *Jurnal Studi Pemuda*, 2(1), 1-14. [Crossref](#) | [Google Scholar](#)
- Novita, A. A. (2018). Collaborative Governance dan Pengelolaan Lingkungan Hidup di Kawasan Pertambangan. *Jurnal Ilmiah Administrasi Publik*, 4(1), 27-35. [Crossref](#) | [Google Scholar](#)
- Permana, R. (2007). Mengubah Paradigma Penanganan Bencana di Indonesia. *Paper, West Java Disaster Reduction Studies Center*. [Google Scholar](#)
- Reisha, T. (2019). ACT dan Peace Winds Japan Resmikan 160 Unit Shelter di Palu. Retrieved from Detik News: <https://news.detik.com/berita/d-4528171/act-dan-peace-winds-japan-resmikan-160-unit-shelter-di-palu>.
- Sagala, S. A. H., Situngkir, F., & Wimbardana, R. (2013). Interaksi Aktor dalam rekonstruksi rumah pasca bencana gempa bumi. *MIMBAR: Jurnal Sosial dan Pembangunan*, 29(2), 217-226. [Crossref](#) | [Google Scholar](#)
- Setiyargo, A. (2020). Peran Lembaga Kemanusiaan Berhadapan dengan Kearifan Lokal dalam Program Tanggap Darurat Bancana Alam. Retrieved from Karinakas: <http://www.karinakas.or.id/index.php/id/berita/199-peran-lembaga-kemanusiaan-berhadapan-dengan-kearifan-lokal-dalam-program-tanggap-darurat-bancana-alam>.
- Sururi, A. (2018). Collaborative Governance sebagai Inovasi Kebijakan Strategis (Studi Revitalisasi Kawasan Wisata Cagar Budaya Banten Lama). *Humanika*, 25(1), 24-37. [Crossref](#) | [Google Scholar](#)
- Tolentino Jr., A. S. (2007). The Challenges of Tsunami Disaster Response Planning and Management. *International Review for Environmental Strategies*, 7(1), 1476-154. [Google Scholar](#)
- Wekke, I. S., Rajindra, R., Pushpalal, D., Samad, M. A., Yani, A., & Umam, R. (2019). Educational Institution on Responding Disasters in Palu of Indonesia. [Crossref](#) | [Google Scholar](#)
- Wekke, I. S., Sabara, Z., Samad, M. A., Yani, A., Abbas, T., & Umam, R. (2019). Earthquake, tsunami, and society cooperation: Early findings in palu of indonesia post disaster. [Crossref](#) | [Google Scholar](#)