

# Multi Level Governance in Fulfilling the Basic Needs of the Community in the Border Areas in Nunukan District, North Kalimantan Province

Taufik Hidayat<sup>1</sup>, Muh. Akmal Ibrahim<sup>2</sup>, Sukri<sup>3</sup>, Muhammad Yunus<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Doctoral Student of Public Administration, Faculty of Social and Political Science, Hasanuddin University, Makassar, Indonesia.

<sup>2</sup>Department of Administrative Science, Faculty of Social and Political Science, Hasanuddin University, Makassar, Indonesia.

<sup>3</sup>Department of Political Science, Faculty of Social and Political Science, Hasanuddin University, Makassar, Indonesia.

---

## Abstract

This study aims to analyze and formulate Multi Level Governance in fulfilling the basic needs of the community in the border area in Nunukan Regency, North Kalimantan Province. The method used is a qualitative approach. Informants include stakeholders from various levels, namely central, provincial and district/city who play a role in fulfilling the basic needs of the community in the border area. Data collection is carried out through observation, in-depth interviews, and documentation studies. Data analysis techniques consist of data collection, data reduction, data presentation, and drawing conclusions. The results of the study indicate that Multi-level governance has not been implemented optimally. The Decentralization Dimension shows that the relationship between governments at various levels (central, provincial and district) is hierarchical, so that the authority of provincial and district governments in fulfilling basic needs is limited. Provincial and district governments are unable to maximize the potential of decentralization in fulfilling basic needs. The Spatial Suitability Dimension (jurisdiction) shows that there is a need for increased synergy and coordination between various levels of government (central, provincial and district) in policies and programs to fulfill basic needs in border areas. Basic needs fulfillment programs implemented by governments at various levels tend to be partial where each works alone. The participation dimension shows that participation from community organizations, the private sector and citizens is limited. Therefore, it is important to create a multi-level governance model to increase the success of basic needs fulfillment programs in border areas by considering elements of regulation, coordination and empowerment.

**Keywords:** Multi Level Governance, Fulfillment of Basic Needs, Border Areas.

## 1. Introduction

The Indonesian government is faced with problems in fulfilling basic needs, especially in border areas, thus efforts to equalize community income need to be carried out continuously through

various areas of community life, so that those who are classified as "poor" at least have the ability to fulfill their basic needs. Basic needs are meant as basic human needs, namely needs that are very important for human survival, both concerning individual consumption needs (food, housing, clothing), and certain social service needs (drinking water, sanitation, transportation, health and education). In this regard, Radwan and Alfthan (1978) stated that without reducing the concept of basic needs, the minimum needs of an individual or household are: food, clothing, housing, health, education, water and sanitation, transportation and participation.

The program to fulfill the basic needs of the community is part of the process of developing the trade sector which is one of the strategic steps in the development of the border area, especially in the Nunukan Regency area. Therefore, the government is committed to paying great attention and giving top priority to maintaining the fulfillment of the basic needs of the community, especially in the border area in Nunukan Regency.

In fulfilling basic needs in the border areas of Nunukan Regency, the local government is committed to paying great attention and giving top priority to maintaining the fulfillment of basic needs, especially in the border areas of North Kalimantan Province. Fulfillment of basic needs focuses on the need for food, food needs are the basic needs of the community in maintaining a decent life, so they must be met. Because it is mandatory, it must be met, especially for food needs.

Collaboration is the essence in the perspective of governance because in governance there are three main pillars that work together, namely government, private sector and society. In the perspective of governance, one of them is the multi-level governance approach.

Multi-Level Governance is a governance approach that is identical to the European Union government system that began in the early 1990s (Marks, 1993). An important keyword of the theory and approach of multi-level governance is collaboration (Sibarani, 2017). Bache and Flinders (2004) use the concept of multi-level governance to understand the dynamic reciprocal relationships within and between different levels of government (Kern and Alber 2009).

Multi-Level Governance can also be understood as a polycentric system of government, meaning a system of government in which each part involved does not see the system as a challenge, but as an innovation, a learning process, and a mix of technologies to support policy instruments.

As a new approach to more effective governance, multi-level governance is considered an approach that is able to explain the reality of complex phenomena that not only involve the private sector and society, but also government elements involving cross-country governments and at various levels of government from central to regional. This approach is very relevant to use in analyzing cross-country programs or policies (country/state). Three multi-level governance factors that drive the effectiveness of policy implementation, namely decentralization, spatial fit, and participation are deepened by Gollata and Newig (2017) so that they can become an analytical framework that is able to assess how well a policy is implemented.

Three factors multi-level governance which drives the effectiveness of policy implementation, namely decentralization, spatial fit, and participation, are deepened by Gollata and Newig (2017)

so that they can become an analytical framework capable of assessing how well a policy is implemented.

First, the element of decentralization where one of the reasons for the EU to use MLG in policy implementation is to delegate governance tasks to the local level. It is argued that the more local decisions are, the more effective they are in taking into account local conditions and utilizing local knowledge (see the argument on participation below) and thus producing more effective policy decisions (Larson and Ribot 2004; Newig and Fritsch 2009). As part of the MLG implementation system, local decision-making is embedded in a higher regulatory framework as emphasized by Ostrom (2010).

Second, Spatial Conformity (Jurisdiction), this element is territorially bound and often does not correspond to the phenomenon to be regulated. This is certainly the case with natural resources such as water and air. To increase 'spatial congruence' (Kok and Veldkamp 2011; Moss 2012; Young 2002), spatially adjusted governance scales – such as river basins or airsheds – have been proposed to internalize spatial spillover effects across boundaries. Referred to as Type II MLGs (Hooghe and Marks 2003), these levels of governance are functionally specific and more flexible than territorial jurisdictions.

Third, the element of participation where governance, unlike government, implies the opening of decision-making to non-state actors – the state-society axis in Piattoni's (2010) MLG model. Information, consultation and participation of non-state actors are expected to improve the quality of (local) decision-making by incorporating (local) knowledge and achieving greater buy-in from participants (e.g., Brody et al. 2003; Newig and Fritsch 2009; Newig and Koontz 2014).

The problem of multi-level governance in fulfilling basic needs in the border areas of Nunukan Regency, North Kalimantan Province shows that the decentralization policy has indeed provided space for local governments to fulfill basic needs in border areas. The existing regulations at the national level have so far been considered not concrete in resolving the problem of fulfilling basic needs in border areas, especially in Nunukan Regency.

At the regional level, it has been referring to the 2021-2026 Nunukan Regency Medium-Term Development Plan (RPJMD) which includes a program to fulfill basic needs. Decentralization does give the government authority to create programs to fulfill basic needs in border areas, but its budget and capabilities are limited.

Problems related to spatial conformity in terms of jurisdiction show that there are no regulations that regulate and provide authority to regions and related agencies to build foreign cooperation considering that fulfilling basic needs in border areas requires building synergy with border countries so that the fulfillment of basic needs can be carried out optimally considering the geographical conditions in border areas that are difficult to reach, in addition to the unavailability of supporting infrastructure for the provision of basic necessities and important materials for people domiciled in the border area of Nunukan Regency, North Kalimantan Province.

The problem of participation is also an obstacle in fulfilling basic needs, where actors from various levels of government who play an important role are the Ministry of Transportation, the

Governor of North Kalimantan Province and the Regent of Nunukan, but the synergy and coordination carried out at various levels have not been effective.

This study aims to analyze and offer a multi-level governance model in fulfilling basic needs in the border area of Nunuka Regency, North Kalimantan Province. The theoretical novelty in this study includes regulation, coordination and empowerment. In addition, this study will produce a multi-level governance model in fulfilling basic needs in the border area of Nunukan Regency, North Kalimantan Province.

## **2. Methods**

In this study, the research phenomenon is the fulfillment of basic needs of the community in the border area of Nunukan Regency, North Kalimantan Province. The research strategy used is a case study. The use of case studies aims to obtain a comprehensive explanation relating to various aspects of organizations, programs, groups or community conditions related to the phenomenon. fulfillment of basic needs of the community in the border area of Nunukan Regency, North Kalimantan Province. In case studies there are three types of research, namely exploratory, descriptive and explanatory types (Yin, 2008). The types of research used are descriptive and exploratory types.

This research was conducted in North Kalimantan Province, especially in the border area of Nunukan Regency, namely Krayan and Lumbis Pansiangan Districts. The location was chosen based on the consideration that the two districts directly border Malaysia. It is known that Krayan District is one of the districts in Nunukan Regency located in the western part. The journey to reach this district from Nunukan District must be taken by air transportation only via flights from Nunukan Airport to Perintis Long Bawan Airport. Meanwhile, Lumbis Pansiangan District can only be reached by air and sea access. The two districts directly border Malaysia.

Data collection techniques include observation, in-depth interviews and documentation studies. Data analysis uses analysis consisting of data reduction, data presentation, drawing conclusions (Miles and Huberman, 1992).

## **3. Results and Discussion**

### **Dimensions of Decentralization in Multi-level Governance**

One of the reasons for multi-level governance in policy implementation is by delegating governance tasks to the regional level. The more local decisions are, the more effective they are in considering local conditions and utilizing local knowledge, resulting in more effective policy decisions (Larson and Ribot 2004; Newig and Fritsch 2009). As part of the multi-level governance implementation system, decision-making at the local level is incorporated into a higher regulatory framework (Ostrom, 2010).

Decentralization in this case is related to the role of decentralization and regional autonomy in encouraging the fulfillment of community needs in border areas. In addition, it explains the

ability and capacity of local governments in meeting the basic needs of communities in border areas in Nunukan Regency, North Kalimantan Province through the Goods and Passenger Transportation Cost Subsidy (SOA) program.

Based on field findings, it shows that the relationship between the government at various levels, namely the central government, provincial government and district government is hierarchical so that the authority of the provincial and district governments in fulfilling basic needs is limited. The decentralization process is still being implemented with applicable regulations and authorities so that the authority in the regional area is still very limited. Regulations that must be followed up, especially regarding foreign cooperation relations, are still carried out by the provincial government and for some things must be implemented or discussed at the central government level.

Meanwhile, since 2021 and as stated in Law Number 23 of 2014, the authority of the North Kalimantan Provincial Government regarding air transportation modes no longer exists so that it cannot do further and is limited to matters related to air transportation modes. The North Kalimantan Provincial Government also does not have authority over inter-district transportation in the border area because this is the authority of the Nunukan Regency Government.

In addition, the Nunukan Regency Government has constraints in terms of regulation and authority where ship permits that support the implementation of the Transportation Cost Subsidy (SOA) are not the authority of the regional government, but rather the authority of the center which is transferred to the Harbor Master so that it is limited and constrained by ship permits that are quite difficult. This also has an impact on ships in border areas still having illegal status because permits are quite difficult to access from the central government, namely the Harbor Master. Then several regulations related to exports and imports are the authority at the central government level so that the district government is limited regarding this authority.

#### Dimensions of Spatial Suitability (Jurisdiction) in Multi-level Governance

Jurisdiction is related to the inconsistency of the phenomena to be regulated in the context of multi-level governance (Gollata and Newig, 2017). In relation to the fulfillment of basic needs of the community in the border area of Nunukan Regency, spatial conformity (jurisdiction) is interpreted as overlapping policies between governments at various levels (district, province, central). Furthermore, what was successfully identified was the overlapping coordination carried out between various levels of the central, provincial and district governments.

Based on the spatial suitability (jurisdiction) stated (Gollata and Newig, 2017), it explains that the inconsistency with the phenomenon to be regulated. From the results of the interview above, which was conducted with the Head of the Mode of Transportation Development Section and the Head of the LLASDP Section of the North Kalimantan Provincial Transportation Service, the Head of the Transportation Division of the Nunukan Regency Transportation Service, there are obstacles related to the lack of cooperation between the Directorate General of Aviation and the Directorate General of Land Transportation in loading goods from the airport to be distributed to the regions. Meanwhile, the Directorate General of Sea and the Directorate General of Land have collaborated to load goods to be distributed to the regions. Then, the return load is often empty. The provincial government has proposed a route, but the central government has

requested the potential for return transport. Here there is an overlap between the provincial government and the central government to overcome empty return loads. Furthermore, the implementation of authority in the district, provincial and central governments regarding the determination of river classes which are divided into 3 classes. Class 1 is the authority of the central government, class 2 is the authority of the provincial government and class 3 is the authority of the district government. However, there has been no determination of ships that can be included in the class category, so it has not been implemented. Considering that when obstacles occur, it is not yet known which level is responsible for the authority. This is because there are criteria specified in Ministerial Regulation Number 52 of 2012 concerning River and Lake Flows. The Department of Industry, Trade, Cooperatives and UMKM explained that there is a need for improvement for the sustainability and continuity of meeting basic needs, through routine coordination and evaluation of regulations and providing input to adjust field conditions and the needs of each region.

Based on the results of the interview and the findings of the researcher, it is explained that in the implementation of the Transportation Cost Subsidy Program (SOA) from the provincial government, it does not contribute much to services in the sub-district area, because of the limitations of authority stated in the legislation. So that all forms of Transportation Cost Subsidy (SOA) services become the authority of the district. Furthermore, the obstacles faced by the district government that are in line with the provincial government are the regulation of authority, especially on ships. In the implementation of the Transportation Cost Subsidy (SOA) for ships, letters for business permits become the authority of the center. Meanwhile, for the permits from the office, but for the office in Nunukan Regency, it only has one officer, of course this cannot cover all areas in Nunukan Regency. Due to the obstacles faced, there is a transfer of authority from the office to the Harbor Master and Port Authority Office (KSOP). With this transfer of authority, what was initially easy becomes more difficult. So that most of the speedboats that operate/sail are categorized as illegal. Speedboat owners want to complete the sailing permit documents, but because of the overlapping and complicated process of managing permits, the speedboat owners end up sailing without a permit.

#### Dimensions of Participation in Multi Level Governance

Participation is related to stakeholders involved from various elements and levels of government and how the form of participation, role and contribution of each stakeholder in fulfilling basic needs through the Goods Transportation Subsidy (SOA) program. It was identified that in the implementation of fulfilling basic needs, there was still a lack of participation from non-government actors.

The third dimension put forward by (Gollata and Newig, 2017), namely the importance of the involvement of various elements and levels of government. Based on findings in the field that there has been no cooperation carried out together with Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) and government levels. Seeing this, there needs to be increased cooperation because it can help in fulfilling the availability of stock for basic needs. The importance of involving cooperation and participation from the government and private sector is to help in overcoming issues related to the availability of stock needs. So that it can help in maintaining the stability of actual prices and also their security.

#### 4. Discussion

Based on the results of research on decentralization in multi-level governance in the fulfillment of basic needs in border areas, it shows that the authority held by the regional government is limited, considering that various regulations and permits related to fulfillment are not fully the authority of the regional government, both provincial and district. At the regional level, the government does not yet have regulations related to the fulfillment of needs. In addition, regional governments have not been able to maximize the authority they have in resolving the problem of fulfilling basic needs in border areas.

Decentralization is closely related to the relationship between governments at one level and another. This term refers to the delegation of central government authority to the lower government resulting in regional autonomy (Saleh, 2017). Autonomy in this case is in the political aspect and decentralization in the administrative aspect. Decentralization increases the power of sub-national authorities and integrates institutions within jurisdictions that produce inter-governmental networks, and is an important part of implementing good governance to achieve democracy and prosperity (Benz & Eberlein, 1999; Said, 2015; Saleh, 2017). There is a difference in the paradigm of decentralization between unitary and federal states. Federal states, such as several European Union countries and Australia, realize decentralization in the form of councils and committees that handle policies within and between jurisdictions. Inter-governmental relations are mostly decentralized in nature which gives rise to formal inter-governmental networks that require coordination in policy making (Kay, 2017; Allain-Dupre & Mello, 2015). Unlike federal states, unitary states only apply decentralization to executive authority. In addition, a unitary state also does not divide sovereignty to the regions so that legislative power is only located in the center. Meanwhile, regional representative institutions only have the power to form regional regulations that do not conflict with the products of the legislative institutions above them, so that the President has the right to cancel the conflicting regulations (Saleh, 2017).

Decentralization is an important feature in Multi Level Governance, but sometimes it becomes an obstacle to policy implementation because it burdens local governments. Kuhlmann (2015) found that the delegation of authority to local governments burdens them in terms of budget. A study in China by Hensengerth (2015) showed that local governments contributed greatly to the difficulty of policy implementation due to local conservatism and cultural norms, as well as the lack of human resources and views from local policy management institutions. Suryawati (2015) saw that the existence of policy management institutions at the regional level actually hindered policy implementation because of differences in interests of agencies at each level and sectoral egos that blunted coordination efforts. Sibarani (2017) also saw problems in the operation of regional management institutions due to poor coordination between governments, inconsistent planning, weak political commitment from the government, and limited human resource competency in the regions.

There are different ways of viewing decentralization from the Multi Level Governance framework and the concept that is developing in Indonesia. In the Multi Level Governance perspective, decentralization can increase the effectiveness of policy implementation because of the involvement of local authorities in policy planning and execution which sometimes gives rise

to creativity and innovation (Gollata & Newig, 2017; Kuhlmann, 2015). However, studies of policy implementation in Indonesia actually make decentralization an obstacle (Gregorio, et.al., 2019; Sibarani, 2017; Suryawati, 2015). Poor coordination between institutions accompanied by conflicting interests makes one party alienated in policy formulation. In addition, national actors still dominate in policy formulation, and local actors only act as implementers of the central government's power and are not fully equal to national actors (Gregorio, et.al., 2019; Sutiyono, Pramusinto, & Prasajo, 2018).

The difference in views also made Sibarani (2017) compare decentralization with Multi-Level Governance, whereas Gollata and Newig (2017) considered decentralization as a driver of successful policy implementation. If we examine public policy from a Multi-Level Governance perspective, it is necessary to consider how big the role of local governments is in policy planning and implementation. Although Indonesia has implemented the principle of deconcentration, the central government remains the dominant actor in the government and public service system (Sutiyono, et al., 2018). There is a gap between expectations and the current reality. Therefore, the Multi-Level Governance approach plays an important role in seeing the development of the application of the principle of decentralization in Indonesia and how consistent the planning and implementation of policies are between governments (Saleh, 2017).

Based on the findings regarding spatial suitability in fulfilling basic needs, where this study focuses on the SOA Goods and Passengers program, it shows the need to increase synergy and coordination between governments at various levels and encourage program interventions that are no longer partial to each other but are intervened together in a program so that the SOA Goods and Passengers program can be implemented optimally.

In the context of multi-level governance, spatial suitability (Jurisdiction) becomes the main topic in categorizing forms of multi-level governance (MLG) in various countries in the world. Hooghse & Marks (2002) see the absence of boundaries regarding jurisdiction. Both see MLG as referring to the distribution of authority from the central government to the supra-national level, down to sub-national jurisdictions, and sideways to public/private networks so that negotiations take place continuously. They then divide MLG into two types that generally differ in terms of their definition of jurisdiction. When jurisdiction in type I is limited to territorial, type II actually sees jurisdiction from the perspective of specific tasks so that each jurisdiction can intersect at various levels (Hooghse & Marks, 2002).

Referring to the view of Hooghse and Marks (2002), Indonesia as a unitary state is the opposite of federalism. The implementation of government in a unitary state is centered on the central government and the authority of regional governments is limited by the corridor of national policy so that relations between governments are hierarchical (Saleh, 2017). Similar to China, whose jurisdiction is determined by a certain geographical scale (Hensengerth, 2015). This is different from a federal state that divides sovereignty into each region so that relations between governments are equal so that negotiation becomes an important process in decision-making (Hooghse & Marks, 2002). MLG in the Indonesian context is implemented in the shadow of hierarchy (Sutiyono, Pramusinto, & Prasajo, 2018).



However, Bruszt (2017, in Hensengerth, 2015) has a different view from Hooghe and Marks regarding the ideal form of government. The form of government is divided into four, namely centralized-hierarchical with partial decentralization, centralized-inclusive, and networked. Indonesia is included in a hierarchical country with partial decentralization. Stubbs (2005) also criticized the general view of MLG which he said had problems, namely premature normativism, abstract modeling, and reviving neopluralism. Two concepts that need to be added to MLG are complex forms of policy transfer and a critical understanding of scale (Stubbs, 2005). Both concepts can help us understand the process of delegating authority from the center to the regions in the context of Indonesia as a unitary state.

The existence of an independent institution tasked with dividing tasks into regions according to their respective capabilities is needed to create more effective coordination and cooperation (Sutiyono et al., 2018). Instead of involving local actors in policy formulation, the government prefers to use a mandatory approach that ultimately makes decentralization a source of problems. If the government uses a task-specific approach in jurisdiction, coordination problems will be easier to overcome. This approach will encourage the actors involved to compete to come up with the best ideas in the planning stage so that the resulting policies will be more in line with what the grassroots need and expect.

Jurisdiction in a policy can be seen from the government layers in the policy (Gollata & Newig, 2017). When the policy still uses general jurisdiction (one jurisdiction for many needs), the problem that may be seen is who has greater power. However, when the policy uses task-specific jurisdiction, the problem that may be seen is who has what tasks and to what extent. Policy implementation is assessed from cross-level cooperation and government institutions vertically and horizontally (Gollata & Newig, 2017). In the Indonesian context, spatial fit analysis shows how much impact the policy jurisdiction has on solving the problem of fulfilling basic needs in the border area of Nunukan Regency, North Kalimantan Province.

Research findings on the participation element show that participation from non-government actors such as business actors and communities in formulating and implementing basic needs fulfillment programs in border areas. Whereas their input and suggestions are very important considering that they are the target objects and affected communities in the basic needs fulfillment program.

Participation of non-government actors is a special characteristic of multi-level governance (MLG). Forms of participation can be found at all levels of government, creating an arena for the struggle of government interests with community coalitions (Newig & Koontz, 2013; Piattoni, 2010; Hooghse & Marks, 2002). Participation brings community interests to the policy negotiation table, creating creative, innovative decisions, and having strong legitimacy in implementation (Dugdale, 2017; Piattoni, 2010; Piattoni, 2009). However, a study by Dugdale (2017) in Australia showed that there was no tendency for MLG to encourage a more creative government. According to Tortola (2016), the view that MLG requires the participation of non-government actors is quite problematic. The weakening of state power in territorial aspects and civil society reform need to be linked, whether this is a common cause, a specific dynamic, or something else (Tortola, 2016).

Overall, the implementation of multi-level governance in meeting basic needs in the border areas of Nunukan Regency, North Kalimantan Province can help create a system that is more responsive and adaptive to community needs. By involving various levels of government and stakeholders, MLG can create the synergy needed to overcome existing challenges.

Increasing resource efficiency where with good coordination between levels of government and stakeholders, resource use can be done more efficiently. This is especially important in the border areas of Nunukan Regency which often have limitations in terms of budget and infrastructure that make accessibility and distribution of basic necessities very difficult.

Adaptability to change, this is important because border areas often experience rapid changes, both in terms of social, economic, and environmental. MLG allows the government to adapt more quickly to these changes by involving various parties in the decision-making process.

While MLG offers many benefits, challenges in coordination across levels of government and stakeholders remain. Differences in interests, cultures, and capacities between different parties can hinder effective collaboration.

To properly implement MLG in meeting basic needs, accurate data and information are needed regarding the needs of communities in border areas. Limitations in data collection and analysis can be an obstacle in formulating appropriate policies. In the context of meeting basic needs in border areas, building a strong network of cooperation between the government, communities, and the private sector is essential for the success of MLG. Results require time and effort to build trust and mutual understanding between all parties involved.

MLG is also important to encourage communities to be empowered through education and awareness raising about their rights and how to participate in decision-making processes. This will strengthen their role in the planning and implementation of basic needs fulfillment programs and ensure that their needs are well accommodated.

Thus, multi-level governance can be an effective tool in meeting basic needs in the border areas of Nunukan Regency, provided that the challenges outlined above can be addressed properly. This approach will not only improve the quality of life of people in the border areas, but also strengthen social and economic integration nationally.

Based on the results of the study, it shows that there are various problems and weaknesses in the implementation of the fulfillment of basic needs in the border area of Nunukan Regency, North Kalimantan Province, especially related to the multi-level governance approach, where various problems and weaknesses found are related to the elements of decentralization, spatial suitability (jurisdiction) and participation. Where researchers offer regulation, coordination and empowerment as elements that are considered important to support the success of multi-level governance in fulfilling basic needs in the border area of Nunukan Regency, North Kalimantan Province.

## 5. Conclusion

Based on the research results, the research conclusions regarding Multi Level Governance in fulfilling basic needs in the Border area of Nunukan Regency, North Kalimantan Province are as follows.

Decentralization shows that the relationship between governments at various levels (central, provincial and district) is hierarchical so that the authority of provincial and district governments in fulfilling basic needs is limited. Provincial and district governments are unable to maximize the potential of decentralization in fulfilling basic needs. At the regional level, there are no regulations (regional regulations and their derivatives) that regulate the fulfillment of basic needs, especially SOA Goods and Passengers. Decentralization gives regional governments the authority to manage their regions autonomously, but its implementation is not effective because regional governments are often constrained by existing government regulations.

Spatial (jurisdictional) conformity requires increased synergy and coordination between various levels of government (central, provincial and district) in policies and programs to fulfill basic needs in border areas. The issuance of sailing permits for ships, especially for ships used for the SOA program, is still the domain of the central government, previously the authority of the Regency Transportation Service. Basic needs fulfillment programs implemented by governments at various levels tend to be partial, where each works alone. Thus, it is very important to build synergy and coordination between governments at various levels.

The participation of community organizations, the private sector and citizens is limited, therefore there is a need to increase the participation of non-government actors to increase the success of the program to fulfill basic needs in border areas.

It is important to create a multi-level governance model by considering the attributes of regulation, coordination and empowerment to increase the success of meeting basic needs in border areas.

## WORKS CITED

- 
- Allain-Dupre, D., & Mello, L. d. (2015). Preface. In E. Ongaro, *Multi-Level Governance : The Missing Linkage* (pp. xv-xviii). Bingley, UK: Emerald Group Publishing Limited
- Bache, I., & Flinders, M. (2004). Multi-level governance and the study of the British state. *Public policy and administration*, 19(1), 31-51.
- Benz, A., & Eberlein, B. (1999). The Europeanization of regional policies: patterns of multi-level governance. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 6(2), 329-348
- Dugdale, P. (2017). Multi-level Governmentality. In KA Daniell, & A. Kay, *Multi-Level Governance : Conceptual Challenges and Case Studies from Australia* (pp. 101-120). Australia: ANU Press
- Gollata, J. AM, & Newig, Jens (2017): Policy implementation through multi-level governance: analyzing practical implementation of EU air quality directives in Germany, *Journal of European Public Policy*, DOI: 10.1080/13501763.2017.1314539
- Gregorio, MD, & al, e. (2019). Multi-level governance and power in climate change policy network. *Global Environmental Change*, 54, 64-77.
- Hensengerth, O. (2015). Multi-level Governance of Hydropower in China? The Problem of Transplanting a Western Concept into the Chinese Governance Context. In E. Ongaro, *Multi-Level Governance : The Missing Linkage* (pp. 295-320). Bingley, United Kingdom: Emerald Group Publishing Limited

- Hooghhe, L., & Marks, G. (2002). Types of Multi-Level Governance. *Les Cahiers européens de Sciences Po*, n° 03, Paris: Center d'études européennes
- Hooghhe, L., & Marks, G. (2003). Unraveling the central state, but how? Types of multi-level governance. *American Political Science Review* 97(2), 233–243.
- Kay, A. (2017). Multi-level Governance and the Study of Australian Federalism. In KA Daniell, & A. Kay, *MultiLevel Governance : Conceptual Challenges and Case Studies from Australia* (pp. 33-56). Australia: ANU Press.
- Kern, K., & Alber, G. (2009). Governing climate change in cities: modes of urban climate governance in multi-level systems. In *The international conference on Competitive Cities and Climate Change*, Milan, Italy, 9-10 October, 2009 (pp. 171-196).
- Kok, Kasper and Veldkamp, A., 2001, Evaluating the impact of spatial scales on land use pattern analysis in Central America, *Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment* 85 (2001) 205–221.
- Kuhlmann, S. (2015). Administrative Reforms in the Intergovernmental Setting: Impacts on Multi-level Governance from a Comparative Perspective. In E. Ongaro, *Multi-Level Governance : The Missing Linkage* (pp. 183-216). Bingley, United Kingdom: Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
- Marks, G. 2003. "Structural policy and multi-level governance in the EC". in *The State of the European Community vol. 2: The Maastricht Debates and Beyond*, Cafruny AW, Rosenthal G (eds). Lynne Reiner: Boulder, CO.
- Miles, MB & Huberman, M. (1992). *Qualitative Data Analysis*. Jakarta: Universitas Indonesia Publisher
- Newig, J., Fritsch, O., 2009b. Environmental governance: participatory, multi-level– and effective? *Environmental Policy and Governance* 19(3), 197–214.
- Newig, J., & Koontz, T. M. (2013). Multi-level Governance, Policy Implementation and Participation: The EU's Mandated Participatory Planning Approach to Implementing Environmental Policy. *Journal of European Public Policy*. doi:10.1080/13501763.2013.834070
- Marks, G. 2003. "Structural policy and multi-level governance in the EC". in *The State of the European Community vol. 2: The Maastricht Debates and Beyond*, Cafruny AW, Rosenthal G (eds). Lynne Reiner: Boulder, CO.
- Miles, MB & Huberman, M. (1992). *Qualitative Data Analysis*. Jakarta: Universitas Indonesia Publisher
- Ostrom, E. 2009 A general framework for analyzing the sustainability of socialecological systems. *Science* 325: 419–422.
- Piattoni, S. (2010). *The Theory of Multi-level Governance: Conceptual, Empirical, and Normative Challenges*. Oxford, United Kingdom: Oxford Scholarship Online.
- Radwan, S., & Alfthan, T. (1978). Household surveys for basic needs: some issues. *Int'l Lab. Rev.*, 117, 197.
- Said, AR (2015). *Fiat Justisia Journal of Legal Studies*, 9(4), 577-602
- Saleh, K. a. (2017). Managing Effective and Efficient Relations Between Central Government and Regional Government in Decentralization Politics. *Journal of Science and Culture*, 40(55), 6289-6304
- Sibarani, R. (2017). Challenges of climate change policy governance in Indonesia (case study: comparison between the implementation of decentralization and multi-level governance). *Indonesian Journal of Environmental Law*, 4(1), 61-86.
- Stubbs, P. (2005). Stretching Concepts Too Far? Multi-Level Governance, Policy Transfer and the Politics of Scale in South East Europe. *Southeast European Politics*, 6(2), 66-87
- Suryawati, N. (2016). Strengthening Regional Autonomy Complicates Effective Coordination between Institutions. *National Seminar on Analysis of Legal Politics Policy in Law Enforcement Efforts in Indonesia Facing the MEA Era*, 211-216
- Sutiyono, W., Pramusinto, A., & Prasojo, E. (2018). Introduction to the mini special issue: understanding governance in Indonesia. *Policy Studies*, 39(6), 581- 588. doi:10.1080/01442872.2018.1530416
- Tortola, P.D. (2016). Clarifying multilevel governance. *European Journal of Political Research*. doi:10.1111/1475- 6765.12180
- Yin, RK (2008). "Case Study, Design and Method", Translator Mudzakir, Raja Grafindo Persada, Jakarta.