



International Conference on Law and Social Science

Editorial Office: postgraduate at Riau Islamic University, Universitas Islam Riau, Pekanbaru, Indonesia.

Phone: +62 85234073707, +62 85329106484

E-mail: law_s3@uir.ac.id

Website : <https://pps.uir.ac.id/icls2024/>

Policy Transformation on the Implementation of Public Services in Sub-districts

Firdaus^a, Ahmad Fitra Yuza^b

^a Master of Government Studies Program, Postgraduate Program, Riau Islamic University

Email Address : fitra.ip@soc.uir.ac.id

^b Master of Government Studies Program, Postgraduate Program, Riau Islamic University

Email Address : firdausdprd@yahoo.co.id

Abstract:

Sub-districts are an important key to community services at the regional level. The problem of public services in Indonesia occurred in several periods of government administration starting during the new order period until the reformation. The new order reflected the greatest power in the hands of the state, including in the affairs of public services so that socio-political forces and small market forces had a significant influence on public policy, even in its implementation. While the reform era, public services are reviewed in accordance with the context by utilizing decentralization through the authority given by the central government to local governments so that they must be able to provide an increase in the quality of good public services. Policy transformation characterized by changes in regulations from time to time is quite significant. The sub-district, which is one of the frontlines in the delivery of public services aimed at cutting the bureaucracy, still has weaknesses where the delegation of government duties to the limited sub-district head makes the quality of public services not maximized, making them hesitant to innovate to support basic services. Meanwhile, transformation is needed to overcome modern challenges by utilizing innovation and adaptation that can create efficiency and good public services. Nevertheless, the achievement of the main objectives of bureaucratic reform is carried out as a form of public service transformation in the sub-district is also carried out through electronic-based public services (e-service), strengthening community supervision of public service performance, strengthening the innovation ecosystem, and strengthening integrated services.

Keywords: Sub-district, Public Service, Transformation

I. Introduction

Talking about governance reform, transformation in public services is one of the demands that must be met in accordance with the times. Especially the transformation from a traditional public service system to a more modern system, with the hope that the public services provided can answer the demands of

the community as well as the challenges of the times. Community demands affect service changes, which are preceded by changes in the social system that occur in society itself. As a result, it has an impact on the system or governance of public services. In other words, public service transformation not only has the ability to improve the internal efficiency of institutions but also to

provide satisfaction to the community as an external party through excellent public services.

Therefore amidst complex changes in the social, political, and economic environment, transformation in public service delivery is becoming an increasingly important issue. So it requires efforts to overcome modern challenges by utilizing innovation and adaptation to create efficiency and good public services.

One important indicator to measure government performance is the quality of public services.¹ Improving the quality of public services can result in many benefits for society, such as improved welfare, smaller social gaps, and increased community involvement in development. However, in practice, public service delivery still faces many problems, including complicated bureaucracy, corruption, and lack of public participation in decision-making.²

Complex bureaucracy often causes the public service process to be slow and inefficient. In 2021, a survey from the Indonesian Political Indicator said that 48.3% of respondents thought the bureaucracy in Indonesia was still too complex and needed reform. In addition, corruption is also one of the factors inhibiting the provision of quality and efficient public services. It can be seen from the 2021 Corruption Perception Index data that Indonesia is ranked 102nd out of 180 countries with a score of 30 (0-100).³

Then another factor that often hinders the creation of good public service delivery is the low level of community participation in

decision making. With the lack of participation, the policies decided are not in accordance with the needs of the community. In 2019, the results of a survey by the Central Statistics Agency showed that only 32.1% of people had ever been involved in public decision making.⁴ So that with the low level of community participation in decision making, the policies made are not always in accordance with the needs of the community.

At present, according to the ombudsman, local government is the level of government that has a large public service case from other institutions. While this is not in line with what is stated in Law Number 23 of 2014 concerning Regional Government that the implementation of regional government is directed to accelerate the realization of community welfare through improved services, empowerment and community participation. Therefore, local governments as public service providers are responsible and continue to strive for innovation to provide quality services to the community.

The sub-district is an important key to community services at the regional level, because many community administrative matters are provided in the sub-district, such as the process of registering residents, issuing administrative documents, and handling various population affairs. With a relatively smaller area when compared to the district/city, the sub-district performs its function as a bridge between the district/city government and the community at the village level. So that the sub-district becomes an administrative unit of government that has a central role in organizing government at the

¹ Ristiani, I. Y. (2020). Manajemen Pelayanan Publik Pada Mall Pelayanan Publik di Kabupaten Sumedang Provinsi Jawa Barat. *Coopetition: Jurnal Ilmiah Manajemn*, 11(2).

² Wakhid, A. A. (2017). Reformasi Pelayanan Publik Di Indonesia. *Jurnal TAPIs*, 01(14).

³ Pratama, I. N., Darmansyah, D., & Subandi, A. (2023, March). Transformasi Good Governance dalam

Peningkatan Kualitas Pelayanan Publik di Kota Mataram. In *SEMINAR NASIONAL LPPM UMMAT* (Vol. 2, pp. 1-13).

⁴ Pratama, I. N., & Mutiarin, D. (2019). Formulasi Kebijakan Tax Amnesty Undang-Undang Nomor 11 Tahun 2016. *Journal of Governance and Local Politics*, 1(1), 29-48.

local level. In addition, in implementing national and regional development programs, the sub-district collaborates with other agencies. With direct involvement in these aspects, the sub-district is at the forefront of providing public services that are responsive and in accordance with the needs of the community at the local level.

II. Methods

The method used in this research is a quantitative method with a descriptive approach, namely research that tries to describe the object or subject under study in accordance with what it is, and explain the variables studied. In obtaining the necessary data and information, the author uses primary data, namely data obtained through observations and interviews, and secondary data, namely data obtained through the collection or processing of data in the nature of documentation studies such as references or regulations related to policy transformation regarding the implementation of public services in the sub-district.

III. Result and Discussion

Sub-districts in Decentralized Indonesia

After the Dutch changed the Dutch East Indies government system from centralized to decentralized, the regulation of sub-districts in Indonesia began. In 1903, the Dutch issued the *Wet houdende Decentralisatie van het Bestuur in Nederlandsch-Indie*, also known as the decentralization wet, which authorized regions or parts of regions to own financial resources and finance activities governed by the council (*dewan*) of the region.⁵ Although

the decentralization law of 1922 was amended, it was able to give the *regentschap* and *stads-gemeente* more autonomy, albeit imperfectly and was only considered an act of ethical political pressure at the time. Sub-districts at the time were referred to as *onderdistricts*, headed by a *Camat* or *Assistant Wedana*, who assisted the *Wedana* in a very limited area (JPP UGM).⁶

During the independence period of 1945-1974, the role of the sub-district was unstable due to the political conditions and pressures on the independence process and the stability of the fledgling state. Law No. 1 of 1945 was the first law made by Indonesia at that time, which regulated local government and showed the importance of local government in Indonesia. In the non-comprehensive law, it stated that three types of regions, namely *Keresidenan*, *Kota*, and *Kabupaten*, each had the authority to manage their own domestic affairs.⁷ At that time, sub-districts followed the autonomy and authority of regencies and cities because sub-districts were the level of government below cities and regencies.

Not long after, regional arrangements were further refined with Law No. 1 of 1957, which divided regions into many groups with complex and multilevel mechanisms for coordination and accountability. Regions were divided into provinces, prefectures, regencies, cities/*kotapraja*, *kawedanan*, and *kecamatan*. The government enacted Law No. 18/1965, which elevated the *kecamatan* to one of the three tiers of local government. Provinces (*kotaraya*) function as level I regions, regencies (*kotamadya*) function as level II regions, and sub-districts (*kotapraja*) function as level III regions in the regional

⁵ Gie, The Liang. 1993. *Pertumbuhan pemerintahan daerah di negara Republik Indonesia* Jilid I. Liberty Yogyakarta

⁶ Riwukaho Josef. 2001. *Prospek otonomi daerah di negara Republik Indonesia* cetakan kelima. Rajawali Press.

⁷ Gie, The Liang. 1994. *Pertumbuhan pemerintahan daerah di negara Republik Indonesia*, Jilid II. Liberty Yogyakarta.

government structure.⁸ In a solid regional logic, the sub-district has a real function. However, there were no significant directives or efforts to implement the three tiers of local government until the new laws created after the New Order came to power.

The sub-district has a strategic position according to Law No. 5/1974 because it is the center of community services and the place where the principle of deconcentration is lowest. In 1984, after ten years, the Minister of Home Affairs felt the need to make specific laws related to subdistricts. These two specific rules were very important: firstly, a kecamatan is a government working environment consisting of several sub-districts or villages, and secondly, a camat leads the affairs in the kecamatan area. This means that at that time, the camat was responsible to the regent for the kecamatan area consisting of several sub-districts or villages.⁹ All government affairs, development, and community development in the sub-district area were managed by the camat.

The regulation of sub-districts underwent major changes after reformasi. Law 22/1999 places many limitations on the camat, in contrast to previous regulations. At the provincial level, the principle of deconcentration is accomplished by the regent or mayor, not the head of the region that carries out this principle from the central government. Since the government administrative regions stipulated in Law No. 5/1974 have been abolished, the camat is no longer the head of the region. The only responsibility of the camat is the sub-district area (Wasistiono, 2002).¹⁰ In accordance with Law No. 22/1999, the sub-district arrangement in Law No. 32/2004 maintains

the same structure, namely that the camat is no longer the head of the region but is positioned as equivalent to the Regional Work Unit (SKPD) in the sectoral agencies as stipulated in PP 41/2007.

Further changes occurred after Local Government Law No. 32/2004 was replaced by Local Government Law No. 23/2014. Among the changes that occurred was that the working relationship between the Lurah and the Camat changed from coordination to a superior and subordinate relationship, with the Camat becoming the direct superior of the Lurah. This is due to the change in the position of the Kelurahan from a regional apparatus to a sub-district apparatus, which also has implications for changes in sub-district and kelurahan budgeting. Furthermore, the system of supervision and assessment of the Lurah changed from being carried out by the Mayor to the responsibility of the Camat.

Policy transformation characterized by changes in regulations from time to time is quite significant. As in Law Number 5 Year 1974, the camat who was appointed as the head of the region was given attributive authority so that everyone who was appointed as the head of the region was automatically given the authority stipulated in the article. However, Article 66 paragraph (4) of Law No. 22/1999 states that the authority of the camat is delegative. This means that the camat can only take over power if the regent or mayor actively delegates some governmental authority to him. Meanwhile, in Law No. 23/2014, the authority is given through the delegation of the authority of the regent and mayor, which is carried out on the basis of mapping public services in accordance with the

⁸ Gie, The Liang. 1995. *Pertumbuhan pemerintahan daerah di negara Republik Indonesia*, Jilid III. Liberty Yogyakarta. p.258

⁹ *Ibid*, p.235

¹⁰ Wasistiono, Sadu. 2002. *Pola pendelegasian kewenangan dan hubungan kelembagaan organisasi pemerintah kecamatan*, dalam *Menata ulang kelembagaan kecamatan*, pusat kajian pemerintahan STPDN.

characteristics and needs of the community in the sub-district.¹¹

Law No. 32/2004 on Regional Government previously did not provide for this provision. Therefore, taking into account the differences that exist in each region, this provision makes it easier for District/City Governments to provide services to the community. Regent/Mayor regulations no longer stipulate the delegation of certain authorities to the Sub-District Head but rather through Regent/Mayor decisions.

Public Service Policy in the Sub-district

The problem of public services in Indonesia if traced can be seen through the perspective of several periods of government administration, such as starting from the new order period to reform. The policies made and implemented by the government are the result of changes in the political climate which have implications for a paradigm shift in public services. During the New Order period, public services in Indonesia were characterized by domination by the state in various aspects of the nation's life so that Indonesia was known as a strong state or autonomous state paradigm, where socio-political forces and small market forces had a significant influence on public policy, even in its implementation.¹²

Meanwhile, public services were implemented using a half-hearted deregulation paradigm, which means that the government's focus is not on achieving the efficiency of public services but the government chooses certain sectors to deregulate, the main purpose of which is business security between state officials and big businessmen. After that, the paradigm of

public service reform emerged with the aim of reassessing the role of government and redefining it according to its context. Although political reform in Indonesia has been ongoing for about ten years since President Suharto stepped down in 1998, there are still some problems in public service delivery. Nonetheless, the government has made many efforts to improve public services, such as the reformulation of the Law on Regional Government, which actually provides expanded authority to local governments and the central government. With decentralization, regions must be able to provide services and exercise various authorities previously held by the central government.¹³

The government has been doing a lot to improve services for a long time. Some examples include Decree of the Minister of Administrative Reform No. 81/1993 on Guidelines for Public Service Management, Presidential Instruction No. 1/1995 on improving and enhancing the quality of government apparatus services to the public, and Decree of the Minister of Administrative Reform No. 63/KEP/M.PAN/7/2003 on General Guidelines for the Implementation of Public Services. Apart from policies, improving the quality of public services is also done through structural training in various activities.¹⁴

In various government efforts to improve public service delivery, there are still some weaknesses that are still visible. Improving the quality of the service itself is a major issue at the moment. Albrecht and Zemke say that many factors contribute to the quality of public services, such as service

¹¹ Yuza, A. F., & Zainal, Z. (2019). Policy Dynamics on Subdistricts and Various Post-Reformation Implications. In *The National Conference On Local Government And Development* (pp. 25-26).

¹² Mahsyar, A. (2011). Masalah pelayanan publik di Indonesia dalam perspektif administrasi

publik. *Otoritas: Jurnal Ilmu Pemerintahan*, 1(2). p.84

¹³ Ibid, p.85

¹⁴ Loc.cit

systems, human resources of service providers, strategies, and customers.¹⁵ However, the quality of service depends on the pattern of organization, human resource support, and institutions that manage the service.

Meanwhile, when assessed in terms of the pattern of implementation, Indonesia's public services still have several weaknesses, including lack of responsiveness, lack of information, lack of accessibility and coordination, bureaucratism, unwillingness to hear complaints, suggestions, or aspirations of the community, and inefficiency. In terms of human resources, the main weaknesses are ethics, professionalism, competence and empathy. Most of the current apparatus still uses the classic bureaucratic model with a closed system, formal legalism, and structured and hierarchical work patterns. In addition, there are some opinions that say that the human resources of the government apparatus have weaknesses in providing services due to unfair and low compensation systems. The institutional side of public services also has weaknesses. The main weakness lies in the design of organizations that are not designed to provide services to the public and are full of hierarchy, which causes services to be uncoordinated and convoluted (bureaucratic). The government continues to perform two functions at once, namely the regulatory function and the organizing function, which causes inefficient public services.¹⁶

Most people think of "transformation" as a change of form or transformation towards something new.

However, governance transformation is the shift of government from authoritarian to democratic or vice versa (Sahdan, 2022).¹⁷ According to Samuel P. Huntington, countries in Latin America, Southern Europe, and Asia are experiencing a wave of democratization where this change is associated with a transitional change from an authoritarian government regime to a democratic government that shows the transformation of government itself.¹⁸

The issuance of Law Number 25 of 2009 concerning Public Services in order to meet the service needs of every citizen and resident for goods, services, or administrative services organized by public service providers. While the General Guidelines for the Implementation of Public Services, which are stipulated through the Decree of the Minister of Administrative Reform Number 63/KEP/M.PAN/7/2003, refers to all service activities provided by public service providers in an effort to meet the needs of service recipients and to fulfill the provisions of laws and regulations. Based on the above understanding, it is clear that the purpose of public service is to provide excellent service to the community as part of the responsibility of the state apparatus to serve the community.

Furthermore, Article 40 of Government Regulation Number 96 of 2012 concerning the implementation of Law Number 25 of 2009 concerning Public Services states that organizers are obliged to involve the community in the delivery of public services as an effort to create a system to oversee the delivery of fair, honest and accountable services. As stipulated in Article

¹⁵ Albrecht, K., & Zemke. (1990). *American Service: Doing Business in the Service*. Economy. Homewood: Dow Jones-Irwin.

¹⁶ Op.cit. p.85

¹⁷ Sahdan, G. (2022). Transformasi Penyelenggaraan Pemerintahan Desa. *Governabilitas (Jurnal Ilmu Pemerintahan Semesta)*, 3(2), 116-131.

¹⁸ Huntington, S.P. 1991. *Gelombang Demokrasi Ketiga*. Terjemahan dari *The Third Wave: Democratization in the Late Twentieth Century*. Jakarta: Pustaka Utama Grafiti.

41, the entire process of organizing public services which includes the preparation of public service policies, service standards, supervision and evaluation of public services and awarding must involve the community. This participation is conveyed in the form of input, responses, reports, or complaints to the organizer or related parties in accordance with the laws and regulations.¹⁹

However, so far the attention has only focused on the responsibility of the government as a state organizer in providing the best public services. As a result, the public's right to participate, which can help the government make policies and standards for public services, has become invisible. In addition, the law stipulates the duties of the Ombudsman of the Republic of Indonesia to handle public complaints and aspirations for public services, as well as to oversee the implementation of public services throughout Indonesia, both at the central and regional levels. So it is hoped that the rights of the community and the obligations of organizers in public services will be balanced. After that, there can be synergy and the desired reform in the aspect of bureaucracy and public services.²⁰

As an autonomous regional apparatus, the sub-district is expected to make a significant contribution in providing services to the community. Wasistiono (2009: 51) states that "The delegation of authority is not just about legalizing authority to the sub-district head, but is directed at efforts to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of services to the community." In addition, the sub-district area must be able to function as the center of Regency / City government to carry out service tasks and

functions.²¹ Therefore, the sub-district apparatus must have apparatus that are professional, highly committed, and have technical and managerial abilities to optimize the services provided to the community.

The Minister of Home Affairs Regulation No. 4/2010 on Guidelines for Sub-district Integrated Administrative Services (PATEN) was issued to fulfill the needs of the community to obtain easy, fast, and precise services, and to support the smooth service process at the sub-district level. The Sub-district Integrated Administrative Services (PATEN) program covers licensing and non-licensing services with the aim of realizing the sub-district as a service center not only for the community but also a service center for integrated service offices/agencies in the Regency/City. In order to have the ability to organize Sub-district Integrated Administrative Services and obtain support from the district/city government, each sub-district strives to meet substantial, administrative, and technical requirements.

The Camat plays a strategic role in the administration of government, public services, and community empowerment as a leader in part of the district/city area. This applies more strategically in islands, remote, border areas, and geographical locations that are difficult to reach. As an OPD, the Camat has a number of strategic attributive and delegative duties to support development and basic services in the sub-district area. Among his responsibilities as Camat are organizing community empowerment, ensuring the maintenance of public service infrastructure and facilities, and supervising village activities. The sub-district government

¹⁹ Hasjimzum, Y. (2014). Model demokrasi dalam peningkatan kualitas pelayanan publik (Studi otonomi daerah dalam peningkatan kesejahteraan masyarakat pasca reformasi). *Jurnal dinamika hukum*, 14(3), 445-457.

²⁰ Hamdillah, H. (2023). Inovasi Pelayanan Publik dan Transformasi Birokrasi. *Resolusi: Jurnal Sosial Politik*, 6(2), 91-102.

²¹ Wasistiono, Sadu. 2009. Perkembangan Organisasi Kecamatan Dari Masa. Ke Masa. Fokus Media: Bandung. p.51

functions as a sub-district apparatus in the OPD context, so the sub-district has a strategic role in the development and basic services of the sub-district. In PP No. 17/2018 concerning Sub-districts, especially in administering the sub-district government, the sub-district government must prioritize the implementation of mandatory basic service affairs in carrying out its roles and duties based on Minimum Service Standards (MSS) set by the central government. Basic services are public services that meet the basic needs of citizens such as education, health, public works and spatial planning, public housing and residential areas, peace, public order, and community and social protection.

However, PP No. 17/2018 on Sub-districts as a derivative regulation was issued too late because it was issued 4 years after Law No. 23/2014 on Regional Government. Until now, there is no ministerial regulation that explains how to delegate part of the authority of the regent or mayor to the sub-district head to carry out several government affairs that fall under the authority of the regency or city, as well as evaluating the performance of the sub-district. Meanwhile, this partial delegation of authority is very important because it shortens the span of public services.

The authority given to the camat is unclear due to delays or the absence of derivative regulations. Sub-district governments have failed to improve the quality and achievement of health, education and civil registration targets, despite being at the forefront of basic service delivery. There is insufficient authority and resources for sub-district governments to regulate and oversee basic service delivery in their areas. For example, the Health Office considers all health services to be highly technical and non-delegable. As a result, the delegation of authority to provide health services to sub-district governments is often inadequate. In

addition, the education office often assigns education provision to school supervisors and regional education rather than sub-district governments, leading to a lack of delegation of authority. As the education office no longer owns the UPTD and schools, school supervisors conduct evaluations of school performance, including the quality of the education process. The education office is only responsible for the placement of teachers and principals while the sub-district government has the regional authority to ensure that all school-age students are accommodated. Lacking the necessary tasks and budgets to do so, sub-district governments cannot be involved in monitoring the use of school operational costs (BOS) and evaluating schools' fulfillment of SPM. However, research shows that when kecamatan governments pay greater attention to directly reviewing and investigating how BOS funds are used in schools, community perceptions of kecamatan government performance improve. In other words, the policy of kecamatan government involvement in education programs should be supported.

The lack of clarity about the authority of the camat has led to many opinions about how to carry out the functions of the sub-district government, including how to assess its performance. The issue of the role of the sub-district has more to do with perspective than regulation. There are perspectives that preclude the distinction between administrative-structural and functional authority. In addition, the lack of effort by local governments to make breakthroughs in the implementation of various laws and regulations is due to the absence or delay in issuing derivative regulations. LGs often leave the sub-district government alone or take it as "business as usual". Too many or too strict rules can also hinder innovation, but in this case the sub-district government is hampered to innovate due to budget

constraints and unclear space of authority that can be used to implement innovations. The limited delegation of government tasks to sub-district heads makes them hesitant to innovate to support basic services.

In addition, a limited budget causes services to be not maximized. Actually, there are many sources of financing that can be used to organize basic services and development in the sub-district area. These include the APBN, Provincial APBD, Regency APBD, DAK, APBDes, and other legal and non-binding sources of financing, of course, while still paying attention to the allocation of financing in accordance with their authority. In addition, in accordance with applicable statutory provisions, financing opportunities from development partners such as donor agencies, multilateral institutions, and business actors can be sought. However, currently, regions face limited fiscal space, which causes the budget to be poorly allocated to support sub-district development activity programs. The budget allocated to sub-districts is very limited. The budget is mostly allocated for salaries and office operations by the sub-district. As a result, sub-districts do not have sufficient resources to implement initiatives to improve service accountability at the sub-district level.

The limited authority also prevents the sub-district from holding coordination meetings in urgent situations, requesting reports on the implementation of basic services from basic service delivery units, or conducting field visits to find out how people can get services in the village. In fact, regional heads often ask kecamatan governments about the operation of basic services, especially if there are problems with their operation. In the future, a stronger role

for sub-district governments is needed to synergize budgeting for basic service programs and village development in the sub-district area. This role is needed to ensure that the budget is allocated for poverty alleviation, social protection, gender equity affirmation programs, and social welfare programs.

To support basic services, the sub-district government and service units conduct joint planning meetings. These planning meetings are conducted independently of the Musrenbang Kecamatan. The sub-district survey conducted in 2021 in 41 sub-districts showed that 96 percent of them conducted planning meetings with health service units (such as Puskesmas and Posyandu), 96 percent with education service units (such as schools, PAUD, and ATS), 76 percent with population administration units, and 60 percent with economic service units.²²

Therefore, in terms of basic services, the sub-district government functions as the center and harmonizer of district, city, and village coordination relationships. This is stated in Article 221 paragraph (1) of Law Number 23 Year 2014. While on the other hand, sectoral regional apparatus have not seen the urgency of the sub-district government's function as a center and harmonizer. So that there are many services that are not coordinated with the sub-district, starting from service data, service activities, and community assistance activities. With this, strengthening institutional structures and mechanisms, along with adequate human resource support, is needed to continue the function of the sub-district government as a center and harmonizer.

The achievement of the main objectives of bureaucratic reform is carried out as a form of transformation of public

²² Muslim E. S. (2017). Catatan Kebijakan: Memperkuat Kecamatan dalam Meningkatkan Akses dan Kualitas Pelayanan Dasar. Jakarta, Indonesia: Yayasan AKATIGA dan RTI International bekerja

sama dengan Badan Perencanaan Pembangunan Nasional (BAPPENAS) dan Kolaborasi Masyarakat dan Pelayanan untuk Kesejahteraan (KOMPAK).

services in the sub-districts is also carried out through electronic-based public services (e-service), strengthening public supervision of public service performance, strengthening the innovation ecosystem, and strengthening integrated services.

IV. Conclusion and Suggestion

It is very important for communities and civil society to participate in determining the type and value of good and quality services. The community is not only the object but also the subject (in the co-creation process) of various kinds of services, especially those related to basic services. One of the main objectives of the agenda for implementing bureaucratic reform is to improve the quality and quality of public services. To accelerate basic services and village development, sub-districts can function as nodes and harmonizers between districts and cities, as well as systems and subsystems of coordinative relationships.

Legislation is needed that supports sub-district planning and budgeting in accordance with the duties and functions assigned. In addition, adequate budget support from various sources, especially for sub-district programs and activities that are needed to improve services. There is no difference between the duties of urban and rural sub-districts, although the position, roles and responsibilities of the camat have evolved and expanded over almost two decades.

References

- Darmawan, D. D., Anjanarko, T. S., & Masithoh, N. M. (2023). Transformasi Pelayanan Publik: Memahami Peran Kompetensi Pegawai Kecamatan Dan Teknologi Informasi Dalam Meningkatkan Kepuasan Publik. *Jurnal Ilmiah Satyagraha*, 6(2), 262-275.
- Hadi, K., Asworo, L., & Taqwa, I. (2020). Inovasi Dialogis: Menuju Transformasi Pelayanan Publik Yang Partisipatif (Kajian Sistem Pelayanan Malang Online). *Journal of Government and Civil Society*, 4(1), 115-129.
- Hamdillah, H. (2023). Inovasi Pelayanan Publik dan Transformasi Birokrasi. *Resolusi: Jurnal Sosial Politik*, 6(2), 91-102.
- Haryati, E., & Ferriswara, D. (2020, November). Kebijakan Responsif Sebagai Instrumen Transformasi Pelayanan Publik Pada Masa Pandemi Covid-19. In *Prosiding Seminar Nasional Penelitian dan Pengabdian kepada Masyarakat* (Vol. 1, No. 1, pp. 259-270).
- Hasjimzum, Y. (2014). Model demokrasi dalam peningkatan kualitas pelayanan publik (Studi otonomi daerah dalam peningkatan kesejahteraan masyarakat pasca reformasi). *Jurnal dinamika hukum*, 14(3), 445-457.
- Isa, R. (2009). Efektivitas Organisasi Kecamatan Dalam Pelayanan Publik Setelah Menjadi Perangkat Daerah. *Jurnal Inovasi*, 6(04).
- Kurniadi, B. D. (2010). Pengaturan Kecamatan di Indonesia pasca Desentralisasi. *Laporan Hasil Penelitian*.
- Mahsyar, A. (2011). Masalah pelayanan publik di Indonesia dalam perspektif administrasi publik. *Otoritas: Jurnal Ilmu Pemerintahan*, 1(2).
- Muslim E. S. (2017). Catatan Kebijakan: Memperkuat Kecamatan dalam Meningkatkan Akses dan Kualitas Pelayanan Dasar. Jakarta, Indonesia: Yayasan AKATIGA dan RTI International bekerja sama dengan Badan Perencanaan Pembangunan Nasional (BAPPENAS) dan Kolaborasi Masyarakat dan Pelayanan untuk Kesejahteraan (KOMPAK).
- Pamungkas, B., & Yusuf, M. (2022). Transformasi Pelayanan Publik Kota Di Era Metaverse. *Jurnal Konferensi Nasional Ilmu Administrasi*, 6(1), 175-180.
- Posangi, H. A., Lengkong, F., & Dengo, S. (2020). Komunikasi Dalam Implementasi Kebijakan Pelayanan Administrasi Kependudukan Dilakukan Di Dinas Kependudukan Dan Catatan Sipil

- Kabupaten Bolaang Mongondow. *Jurnal Administrasi Publik*, 6(94).
- Posangi, H. A., Lengkong, F., & Dengo, S. (2020). Komunikasi Dalam Implementasi Kebijakan Pelayanan Administrasi Kependudukan Dilakukan Di Dinas Kependudukan Dan Catatan Sipil Kabupaten Bolaang Mongondow. *Jurnal Administrasi Publik*, 6(94).
- Pratama, I. N., Darmansyah, D., & Subandi, A. (2023, March). Transformasi Good Governance dalam Peningkatan Kualitas Pelayanan Publik di Kota Mataram. In *SEMINAR NASIONAL LPPM UMMAT* (Vol. 2, pp. 1-13).
- Putra, F. P., & Nangameka, T. I. (2018). Implementasi Kebijakan Pelayanan Administrasi Terpadu Kecamatan (Paten) Di Kecamatan Jatinangor Kabupaten Sumedang Provinsi Jawa Barat. *TRANSFORMASI: Jurnal Manajemen Pemerintahan*, 41-58.
- Ristiani, I. Y. (2020). Manajemen Pelayanan Publik Pada Mall Pelayanan Publik di Kabupaten Sumedang Provinsi Jawa Barat. *Coopetition: Jurnal Ilmiah Manajemn*, 11(2).
- Sahdan, G. (2022). Transformasi Penyelenggaraan Pemerintahan Desa. *Governabilitas (Jurnal Ilmu Pemerintahan Semesta)*, 3(2), 116-131.
- Sebayang, R. A. B., & Hartati, H. (2021). Peran Ombudsman Sebagai Lembaga Pengawas Pelayanan Publik Di Indonesia. *Mendapo: Journal of Administrative Law*, 2(2), 63-75.
- Sumardi, S., Nawir, A., & Mukhlis, S. (2021). Analisis Transformasi Birokrasi Melalui Pengembangan e-Government di Indonesia. *Journal of Government Insight*, 1(2), 84-91.
- Suranto, S., Darumurti, A., Eldo, D. H. A. P., & Habibullah, A. (2021). Potret Kebijakan Inovasi Pelayanan Publik di Indonesia Tahun 2020. *Jurnal Public Policy*, 7(2), 97-102.
- Tasyah, A., Septiya, S., Putri, S. J., Fernanda, R. A., & Azani, P. C. (2021). Best practice kebijakan e-government dalam mengimplementasikan pelayanan publik di era new normal. *Jurnal Studi Ilmu Sosial dan Politik*, 1(1), 21-33.
- Utami, P. (2023). Transformasi Administrasi Publik: Inovasi Dan Adaptasi Menuju Efisiensi Dan Pelayanan Publik Berkualitas. *Papatung: Jurnal Ilmu Administrasi Publik, Pemerintahan dan Politik*, 6(2), 1-9.
- Wakhid, A. A. (2017). Reformasi Pelayanan Publik Di Indonesia. *Jurnal TAPIs*, 01(14).
- Yani, Y., & Syahyuri, S. (2023). Analisis Kualitas Pelayanan Publik Pada Kantor Kecamatan Sukatani Kabupaten Bekasi. *Transparansi: Jurnal Ilmiah Ilmu Administrasi*, 6(2), 249-256.
- Zsazsa, C. S. K. M., & Nasution, R. (2023). Transformasi Birokrasi di Indonesia. *All Fields of Science Journal Liaison Academia and Society*, 3(2), 260-267.