



Implementation of the Uninhabitable House Repair Program in Surabaya Case Study at Nginden Jangkungan Village

Muhammad Sidik Alfauzi¹, Fahad Latif², Lily Aisyah Putri³, Nabila Farhah⁴, Santi Suhasti Ratu⁵, Gading Gamaputra⁶, Achmad Aufa Anggarda⁷

¹State Administration Applied Bachelor Study Program, Faculty of Vocational Studies, Surabaya State University

²State Administration Applied Bachelor Study Program, Faculty of Vocational Studies, Surabaya State University

Email: gadinggamaputra@unesa.ac.id

³State Administration Applied Bachelor Study Program, Faculty of Vocational Studies, Surabaya State University

⁴State Administration Applied Bachelor Study Program, Faculty of Vocational Studies, Surabaya State University

⁵State Administration Applied Bachelor Study Program, Faculty of Vocational Studies, Surabaya State University

⁶State Administration Applied Bachelor Study Program, Faculty of Vocational Studies, Surabaya State University

⁷State Administration Applied Bachelor Study Program, Faculty of Vocational Studies, Surabaya State University

Abstract. The limitations of underprivileged people to realize having a livable, healthy and safe home is a complex problem. To deal with it, the Surabaya City Government through the Public Housing Office and the Surabaya City Social Service, issued Mayor's Regulation No. 9 of 2022 and has been updated by Surabaya Mayor's Regulation No. 35 of 2022 concerning social rehabilitation of uninhabitable houses with the Repair of Uninhabitable Houses (Rutilahu) program. This research aims to find out the policy implementation process. The method used is qualitative descriptive approach with Edward III theory which includes communication, resources, disposition and bureaucratic structure. This research applies interview methods and documentation studies in accordance with the research focus. Where data collection techniques through interviews, observations, literature studies, and documentation and data analysis techniques that use the miles and Huberman model. The results of this study indicate that the implementation has not been maximized and the socialization of this program is not running well. It is evident from the problems that exist in the implementation of the Rutilahu program in nginden village, namely communication, resources, disposition, and bureaucratic structure

Keywords: Uninhabitable House, Poor society, public policy

1. Introduction

The 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia in articles 28 A and 28 H mandates that all individuals have the right to live a life of physical and emotional well-being, have a decent place to live, and get a good and healthy living environment. However, in reality, since the government stepped in to realize this mandate by formulating the Decree of the Minister of Settlement and Regional Infrastructure No. 403/ KPTS/ M/ Healthy Living Environment: 403 / KPTS / M / 2002 regarding technical guidelines for the construction of simple healthy houses and Decree of the Minister of Settlements and Regional Infrastructure No : 24/KPTS/M/2003 on the Procurement of Housing and Settlements with the Support of Housing Subsidy Facilities, the government housing program is still something that is difficult to reach by the community because there are still many people with irregular income with income below the requirements, limited employment opportunities and the low level of skills possessed by the community are factors that cause their inability to fulfill basic rights, including the need for housing.

The limitations of the underprivileged to realize having a livable, healthy and safe home is a complex problem. Low per capita income and limited employment opportunities are the main factors that determine the high level of poverty. The definition of poverty is not only limited to the economic aspect, but includes a person's inability to fulfill basic needs including clothing, food, and shelter properly. This involves constraints in obtaining food, clothing, shelter, and also limited access to employment opportunities (Nisa & Setyadharma, 2020).

Table 1. Development of poor people in Indonesia



This is evidenced by data on the development of the number of poor people in Indonesia as of May 2023 according to the Central Bureau of Statistics of 25.90 million, while the population in East Java according to the Central Bureau of Statistics as of May 2023 reached 4188.81 thousand. Thereby also Surabaya City,

the poor population in this hero city amounted to 136.37 thousand people with a Poverty Line (Rp / Cap / Month) reaching 718,370 people's average income

Table 2. Number of Poor People Based on Central Bureau of Statistics in

City	Number of Poor People Based on Central Bureau of Statistics in East Java (Thousand)		
	2021	2022	2023
Madiun City	9,06	8,49	8,46
Surabaya City	152,49	138,21	136,37
Batu City	8,63	8,05	7,10

Source : Surabaya City Social Service, 2023

To respond to the same problem between the central government and local governments to help Low-Income Communities in Indonesia, especially in fulfilling basic needs, namely housing needs. One of the main problems that often occurs in people's lives in Indonesia is the condition of inadequate housing. Although healthy and safe housing is a basic need, the poor must continue to survive even with a house that is less livable or even does not have a house at all, it is because of the high price of land and the high cost of building materials and home repairs.

Law No. 01/2011 on Housing and Settlement Areas emphasizes the right of every citizen to have a decent home as a protection for the family, by ensuring that the facilities, infrastructure, and utilities in the house are fulfilled as a basic right. A house that meets the standards is a vital element in the lives of those who live in it (Wulansari & Ma'ani, 2021). To overcome poverty, especially related to uninhabitable housing conditions, the Ministry of Social Affairs of the Republic of Indonesia, which has authority in social rehabilitation, developed a program to improve Uninhabitable Houses, better known as the Rutilahu program.

This is regulated in the Regulation of the Minister of Social Affairs of the Republic of Indonesia Number 20 of 2017 concerning Social Rehabilitation of Uninhabitable Houses and Environmental Infrastructure. The purpose of this policy is to help ease the burden on the poor in fulfilling their basic right to a habitable home. Therefore, the Rutilahu program is a manifestation of the government's commitment to provide support to citizens so that they can enjoy a healthy and adequate residential environment.

In accordance with the Law of the Republic of Indonesia No. 23 of 2013 concerning local government, which emphasizes the concept of regional autonomy as the rights, obligations, and authorities, of an autonomous region to manage its government affairs and fulfill the interests of the people in its territory, the Surabaya City Government implements the principle of autonomy. This is

manifested in Surabaya Mayor Regulation No. 9 of 2022 which was later updated to Surabaya Mayor Regulation No. 35 of 2022 concerning social rehabilitation of uninhabitable houses in Surabaya City.

Based on this regulation, the Surabaya Government established an assistance program for uninhabitable houses, known as Rutilahu. Rutilahu refers to a dwelling house that does not meet health, safety, and social requirements, and will receive a repair program. The process of repairing uninhabitable houses aims to restore the social function of the poor by improving the condition of the house, either partially or totally. The goal is to create decent housing conditions as a basic need for housing, by improving the quality of housing to become a livable, safe, and healthy home. This process is carried out with the spirit of togetherness, mutual cooperation, self-help, and the value of community social solidarity. This is in line with the principles of regional autonomy and the Surabaya local government's efforts to provide support to its citizens to have an adequate and quality living environment.

The Rutilahu repair program in Surabaya, hereinafter referred to as the "Dandan Omah" program in 2023, has several stages that must be fulfilled so that the program is carried out properly. Based on the mayor's regulation number 9 of 2022 in Surabaya regarding the social rehabilitation of uninhabitable houses in Surabaya, the stages are divided into 9 stages, starting with the socialization stage of the activity, the data collection stage of the proposed policy beneficiaries, the KRPR Home Improvement Plan Agreement deliberation, the activity planning stage, the activity preparation stage, the activity implementation stage, the activity supervision stage, the activity reporting and accountability stage, and the activity results submission stage.

Based on data from the Surabaya City Social Service that Rutilahu beneficiaries from 2017 to July 2023, the Rutilahu assistance program reached 6,200 units while this program was running. and in July 2023 this reached 1,200 units of repair and in the future the Surabaya government will continue to run this program.

Table 3. Development Realization of RUTILAHU

Year	Development Realization
2017	1444 units
2018	1038 units
2019	679 units
2020	416 units
2021	623 units
2022	800 units
2023	1,200 units

Source: Surabaya City Social Service, 2023

Based on data from Nginden village, the number of Low-Income Communities (MBR) is 62 households and 40 units have been realized since the program was first implemented in 2017, indicating that the Rutilahu assistance program has reached 64% of the target achievement. However, in its implementation, researchers still encountered several obstacles in the field, especially related to the inconsistency of program implementation with Mayor's Regulation No. 9 of 2022 which has been improved in Mayor's Regulation No. 35 of 2022, one of which is explaining that houses affected by natural disasters are a top priority and become emergency treatments that cannot be delayed to carry out repairs to Rutilahu program houses. Rutilahu repairs due to natural disasters will also be handled directly by the Dinas. Meanwhile, researchers found inconsistencies in the implementation of what was written in the Mayor's Regulation No. 9 of 2022 because in the implementation of Kelurahan Nginden Jangkungan, if there is a resident's house that has experienced a disaster that makes the resident's house unfit for habitation again, applying for the Rutilahu assistance program is not a priority scale. Instead, the housing units that experienced the disaster had to wait for the queue in the following year so that people who experienced the disaster were difficult to get assistance as stated in the guidelines.

In addition, researchers found inconsistencies with the guidelines, which explain that the lurah held a KRPR deliberation that resulted in the Minutes of the deliberation as well as a list of community beneficiaries that had been agreed upon and signed by the Head of the LPMK, KTPR and lurah. The Rutilahu program in Kelurahan Nginden faces serious obstacles regarding the transparency of beneficiaries. Without the KRPR deliberation, community complaints arose because there was no deliberation in determining and agreeing on the list of beneficiaries. This situation led to dissatisfaction and increased tensions among residents. Immediate steps are needed to improve transparency, including involving residents in KRPR deliberations and providing clearer information on the selection process. It is hoped that these improvements can build community trust and ensure fairness in the implementation of housing programs. In this deliberation, the kelurahan should invite several related parties such as the Social Service, LPMK, KTPR, RT/RW, community leaders and religious leaders as KRPR Deliberation Participants. But in reality, this KRPR deliberation was not carried out in the Nginden jangkungan urban village.

Inconsistencies also occurred on the part of the implementers of Rutilahu repairs against the Perwali guidelines article 12 related to the preparation process for Rutilahu repairs regarding planning meetings to compile the Budget Plan Cost (RAB) and other supporting documents. The house construction technical group (KTPR) team experienced obstacles because they did not hold a planning meeting that should have discussed the draft cost budget plan (RAB) and working drawings but instead was carried out by the city government. This leads to misunderstandings in communication between the KTPR and the builders, who coordinate directly with them instead of the city government. These errors can hinder adequate understanding of the project design, potentially affecting the final project outcome. Immediate corrective measures, including the organization of planning meetings and

improved communication mechanisms, are needed to avoid similar problems in the future.

In addition to this, the researcher found that the implementer's actions were inconsistent with the guidelines of Mayor's Regulation No. 9 of 2022, which had been improved in Mayor's Regulation No. 35 of 2022, such as the lack of supervision from the relevant agencies, which should be the duties and responsibilities of the agency as stated in articles 19 and 20 which state that the agency has full responsibility for supervision, but in reality the supervision carried out by the agency was lacking according to KTPR. The absence of adequate supervision from the City Government (Pemkot) regarding project planning programs has a number of significant consequences. First of all, clarity regarding development priorities can be compromised, leading to inefficient allocation of resources that do not meet the immediate needs of the community. In addition, the potential for misuse of funds becomes higher without careful monitoring, opening the door to corruption risks. Lack of supervision can also result in a decline in the quality of project outcomes due to the absence of clear quality standards. Uncoordinated project implementation processes can create uncertainty in implementation schedules and target fulfillment, while community dissatisfaction may arise because projects do not meet expectations or do not deliver the promised benefits. To address these consequences, prompt action by the municipal government, such as strengthening supervision, organizing delayed planning meetings, and improving communication mechanisms, is needed to ensure project sustainability and the achievement of desired development goals.

In accordance with the meaning and objectives of the program, namely Social Rehabilitation of Uninhabitable Houses in Surabaya City to improve the quality of housing through partial and / or complete improvement of housing conditions to become livable, healthy and safe homes by using the spirit of togetherness, mutual cooperation, self-help and the value of community social solidarity. Although the program guidelines target the goal of self-help, the reality is that the surrounding community is considered to have no competence related to the program. This raises questions about the empowerment and capacity building strategies that have been undertaken. Have there been training or mentoring efforts to improve community skills? If not, capacity building measures need to be considered. In addition, it needs to be explained whether there has been effective collaboration with the community in program planning and implementation. Subsequent program evaluations should detail the reasons for community incompetence and identify concrete steps to improve their competencies. With the right approach, it is hoped that the program can have a positive impact and encourage the independence of local communities.

2. Research Methods

This research on the Implementation of the Uninhabitable House Repair Program in Nginden Jangkungan Village uses a qualitative descriptive method to systematically describe facts, situations, and relationships between phenomena. The study focuses on the implementation stages of the program based on Mayor Regulation Number 9 of 2022 on Housing Rehabilitation in Surabaya.

Two data sources were utilized: primary and secondary. Primary data were obtained through direct observation, interviews with key informants (using purposive sampling), and documentation. Secondary data came from relevant literature and existing program documents. Data collection methods included observation, interviews (following Sugiyono's 2020 framework), literature review, and documentation of program-related materials such as budget plans and house designs.

Data analysis followed the Miles and Huberman model, involving data reduction, presentation, and conclusion drawing. Data reduction simplified information through coding, while data presentation helped summarize and draw conclusions from the research findings

3. Results and Discussion

The implementation element of the Rutilahu program is expected to encourage local community participation to help each other and work together. That way the environment in the community will be more positive because there is interaction to help each other. The implementation of the Rutilahu Repair Program is also required to meet the 8 principles listed in the guidelines. All of these principles have their respective objectives so that the Rutilahu repair program can be implemented properly.

According to Edward III, in studying policy implementation Edward asks at least 2 questions to find out how far the policy implementation goes, namely: (1) What are the important things to do so that a policy implementation is declared successful? (2) What obstacles have an impact so that policy implementation fails? in these 2 questions Edward tries to answer by describing several aspects that affect the implementation of a policy. aspects that affect policy implementation are communication, resources, disposition, and bureaucratic structure. Based on the results of interviews, observations, and documentation that researchers conducted in the Nginden village, Sukolilo sub-district. Based on the analysis of policy implementation according to Edward III, the implementation of the Rutilahu program improvement is obtained as follows:

a. Communication Aspects

Communication determines the level of success in implementing policies. Effective implementation occurs when implementors know what they are doing. One of the success factors of policy implementation according to Edward III is communication. According to Edward III's theory, communication is defined as the process of conveying information from communicators to communicants. There are three communication indicators including Transmission, Consistency and Clarity. The problem that often occurs in a policy implementation is a mismatch in the delivery of information, this is because information is often conveyed through many communicators and each communicator must have their own views and perceptions so that information is often not conveyed properly. Therefore, the process of delivering information from policy organizers must be communicated properly, clearly and consistently to all stakeholders, so that each

stakeholder involved can receive this information clearly and wisely and not misunderstand.

In the implementation of the Rutilahu program in Nginden urban village, Sukolilo sub- district, the transmission of information provided by the City Government to the urban village which then becomes the person in charge of the policy in the urban village area but is still under supervision and monitoring by the city government has been carried out properly to provide implementation orders related to the Rutilahu program as well as cover letters and other policy support matters. In addition to giving orders to the kelurahan, the City Government also participates in the planning process which includes formulating low-income communities as beneficiaries, formulating Budget Cost Plans (RAB), Development Plans, and others. However, it is different with the process of delivering information from the kelurahan to the implementation team that it formed, namely KTPR. The inconsistency of the kelurahan towards the Perwali guidelines which explain that the kelurahan must hold a KRPR deliberation which results in the Minutes of the implementation of the deliberation as well as a list of beneficiaries that have been agreed upon and signed by the Lurah, Chairperson of the LPMK and KTPR. in this deliberation the kelurahan must invite several related parties such as the Social Service, LPMK, KTPR, RT / RW, community leaders and religious leaders as KRPR Deliberation Participants. In the implementation of this program, especially in Nginden urban village, which is the focus of this research, 40 units have been realized during the beginning of this program in 2017 until the end of 2023. this number indicates that 64% of low-income people in Nginden urban village have received KRPR.

In The kelurahan nginden has been successfully submitted by the kelurahan and approved by the city government even though the results of the list of beneficiaries were decided one-sidedly by the Kelurahan without any KRPR deliberation. The Kelurahan only requests data related to the community that is deemed to meet the requirements to get Rutilahu assistance to the KTPR team without any joint deliberation first. The KRPR deliberation should have been useful for exchanging opinions between all parties involved in the implementation of this policy, especially the RT who is closer to the community who should be a source of information regarding the proposed prospective beneficiaries, but based on the results of the interview, the RT head was not even involved in this deliberation.

In addition to the transmission aspect according to George C. Edward III in Widodo (2010: 97) also states that in the process of conveying information between communicators and communicants it must be conveyed clearly and easily understood and avoid errors in the views of policy implementers that are carried out continuously. This aspect of clarity is important because it aims to make the policies transmitted between all parties involved both to the recipient and between fellow implementers clearly conveyed so that each of them knows what the goals, objectives, objectives and substance of the policy are and they can prepare what needs to be done so that the goals and objectives can be carried out properly. and also Policy implementation will be successful if there is a consistent and sustainable approach. the consistency aspect is that all p o l i c y implementers must communicate information consistently regarding rules, and

directions in accordance with the guidelines. From the results of interviews and observations, researchers found that the implementers did not carry out socialization at the village level, which socialized the budget to beneficiaries, which was not carried out in a clearly consistent manner, but the implementers were inconsistent with the guidelines of Mayor Regulation No. 9 of 2022 which had been improved in Mayor Regulation No. 35 of 2022 Article 3 which explains that the principle of implementing this policy is one of them is transparent, which means providing as much access as possible to the public to obtain information related to the implementation of activities.

As a result of an interview with one of the community members who mentioned that the beneficiaries did not know the budget, pictures of the construction plan, and the progress that occurred, so that there was wild speculation from the community regarding the implementers who often said that this program was thick with Corruption practices.

So it can be concluded that in the implementation of the Rutilahu program policy implementation, there are still some inconsistencies in the implementation of the implementing party against the regulations that serve as guidelines so that there are imbalances in the communication aspect where there is uncertainty and inconsistency of the implementing party to convey information to related parties and also the non-implementation of the deliberation process which should be an important factor in formulating a decision.

b. Resource Aspect

Resources are one of the most important factors in policy implementation. Edward said several resources that must be considered in implementing a policy. Starting from staff, budget resources, and facilities. Edward explained that the large quantity of staff does not have a definite effect on policy implementation, in fact, many staff / implementors can become obstacles if the implementors do not have good competence. But on the other hand, staff is also very important in policy implementation, therefore too few staff in implementation will also hamper the program. So it can be concluded that in addition to the importance of the competence of the staff, a sufficient quantity of staff/implementors (no less and no more) needs to be considered so that implementation can run well.

According to Edward III, the limited budget also affects the success of the policy and causes the quality of services that should be provided to the community to be limited. In addition, to improve the quality of implementation, adequate equipment/facilities resources are also needed. Edward said that the existence of qualified staff in competence and quantity is not enough to achieve good implementation. Equipment/facilities resources are needed as support to achieve good policy implementation as well.

In the Perwali guidelines at the planning meeting stage, the cost budget plan and planning documents will be prepared by the KTPR team and will be approved by the Commitment Making Officer (PPK). The KTPR team consists of 4 people who double as members to carry out the KTPR team's duties, namely preparation, implementation and supervision. Based on the results of interviews and observations of the planning process, researchers found that there was a discrepancy between the facts in the field and the Perwali guidelines. Although the KTPR chairperson has said that the 4 people who make up the KTPR team are

sufficient and in accordance with the Perwali guidelines, researchers found discrepancies that occurred. Researchers found inconsistencies in the implementation of the Perwali guidelines article 12 which states that the preparation team in each village conducts an activity planning meeting where the planning meeting discusses the preparation of the Cost Budget Plan (RAB), work plan drawings, technical specifications, activity implementation schedule, photos of existing conditions, the implementation process with TIm KTPR opening a special account for the distribution of funds related to rutilahu, but in reality in the field the planning meeting was not held and even to formulate the RAB, work plan drawings, etc. it was entirely the responsibility of the agency while the KTPR Team did not take part in carrying out the preparation of the design. The KTPR team does not have the competence to be a reason why planning documents, RAB, etc. are carried out directly by the agency.

The Rutilahu program has a budget of 35 million for each uninhabitable house to be repaired. The budget includes all facilities that must be met in the policy including the salaries of builders as dismantlers and construction of Rutilahu. However, the facts in the field are that the 35 million budget is insufficient to meet the needs of repairing uninhabitable houses because the price of building materials has increased, which is not sufficient to meet the needs of the community.

Continuously every year. The implementation of the Rutilahu repair policy also requires qualified building materials so that the houses that get repairs can achieve the objectives of the Rutilahu repair program in terms of safety and comfort. After the results of interviews and observations conducted by researchers, it can be concluded that the building materials used as Rutilahu repairs are obtained from nearby local shops with fairly good quality.



The picture above is one proof of the fulfillment of facilities for the repair of Rutilahu. Starting from the need for cement, ceramics, glass, roof tiles, doors, and small things like door hinges.

So from some of these explanations it can be concluded that although the number of KTPR team members is in accordance with the provisions in the

guidelines, namely 4 members including the chairman, secretary, treasurer, and members, the competence of the KTPR team staff is still not qualified in accordance with the duties and responsibilities listed in the guidelines of Mayor's Regulation No. 9 of 2022 which has been improved in Mayor's Regulation No. 35 of 2022, one of which is preparing a Cost Budget Plan (RAB), work plan drawings, technical specifications, activity implementation schedule, and others. In accordance with the results of research in the field in Nginden urban village, it was found that the formulation of the Cost Budget Plan (RAB), work plan drawings, technical specifications, activity implementation schedule, etc. was entirely the responsibility of the agency, not the KTPR team in accordance with the Guidelines. The reason is because the KTPR team in Nginden kelurahan is not qualified to formulate some of these things, so it is left entirely to the agency.

4. Aspects of Disposition

n policy implementation, according to Edward, implementers must not only know what to do but also have the willingness to carry out the policy. Disposition, or the attitude of implementers, is crucial and can hinder policy implementation if not aligned with the policy's legal basis. A lack of willingness can obstruct the process, while strong willingness enhances policy success. Edward suggests two ways to increase this willingness: bureaucratic appointments and incentives.

In Nginden Jangkungan, a KTPR team is formed to handle the Uninhabitable House Repair (Rutilahu) program. The team's formation is based on local consensus, considering candidates' competencies in organizational understanding, policy knowledge, and experience. The program has been running for 7 years, benefiting 40 out of 62 low-income recipients by the end of 2023.

The repair process, including demolition and construction, is completed within 20 days by selected builders. However, this short timeframe poses challenges due to the scale of work. To maintain builders' performance, incentives are crucial. In Nginden, builders and helpers are compensated with a total of 10.5 million IDR per house, improving their motivation and efficiency during repairs.

				JUMLAH	Rp	2,262,245.69
VI PEKERJAAN PENGECATAN						
1	Pengecatan Dinding	m2	82.84	Rp	16,570.00	Rp 1,372,648.30
2	Pengecatan Plafon	m2	20.50	Rp	16,570.00	Rp 339,671.74
				JUMLAH	Rp	1,712,320.04
VII PEKERJAAN MEP						
1	Pemasangan Pintu PVC	Buah	1.00	Rp	250,000.00	Rp 250,000.00
2	Pemasangan Talang U-PVC	m1	2.67	Rp	32,250.00	Rp 86,107.50
				JUMLAH	Rp	336,107.50
VIII UPAH TENAGA KERJA						
1	Upah Tukang (1 unit x 2 org)	OH	2.00	Rp	3,000,000.00	Rp 6,000,000.00
2	Upah Pembantu Tukang (1 unit x 2 org)	OH	2.00	Rp	2,250,000.00	Rp 4,500,000.00
				JUMLAH	Rp	10,500,000.00
				JUMLAH	Rp	35,000,000.00
				PEMBULATAN	Rp	35,000,000.00

Source: RAB for Rutilahu repair in Nginden urban village, Sukolilo sub-district

The photo illustrates the RAB, one of which is the salary of builders and helpers of 10.5 million. The KTPR team also received incentives/additional

money for every 1 unit of Rutilahu repaired. The incentive was given to the KTPR team, which was divided into 4 people as a reward for carrying out Rutilahu repairs. Although the KTPR team can run well in its implementation, the incentive of 200 thousand is very insufficient considering the duties and obligations of the KTPR team which are quite important in implementing the Rutilahu repair policy.

Based on this explanation, the researcher can conclude that the provision of incentives and salaries is an important thing to do in the implementation of the rutilahu repair program. Although not entirely perfect, the provision of incentives has more impact so that the tukang, helper builders, and KTPR team carry out the repair of Rutilahu properly. This relates to what is written in Edward III's theory which explains that incentives are one way to increase the willingness of implementers to implement policies. So that the provision of incentives to the implementers of Rutilahu repairs is in accordance with what is explained by Edward III.

5. Aspects of Bureaucratic Structure

Even though the policy implementers know what they want to do and have a high willingness to implement and are supported by existing resources, if the implementation process does not have a good bureaucratic structure, the process of implementing a policy may be hampered. Bureaucracy is one of the elements in policy implementation. According to Edward III in Hessel (2003), there are two main characteristics in the bureaucracy that can influence the implementation process of a policy, namely standard work procedures Standard Operating Procedures (SOP) and Fragmentation. The existence of Standard Operating Procedures is expected to be able to provide guidelines on what to do and avoid and what implementers should not do. Fragmentation is the distribution of responsibilities in the implementation of implementation that involves parties from outside the agency.

In the Mayor's Regulation No. 9 of 2022 which has been improved in the Mayor's Regulation No. 35 of 2022 article 3 concerning the implementation of the Rutilahu repair program, it is written that this program must be based on 8 principles that must be met in the hope that the Rutilahu repair program can run well for all actors involved. Based on the guidelines for implementing this program, it must prioritize principles such as:

- a. Acceptable, which means that all actors involved must be based on mutual agreement;
- b. Transparency, which means that the public has the right to access the widest possible information related to policy implementation;
- c. Accountable, This means that every stage of the activity must be explained and accounted for in accordance with applicable legal provisions.
- d. Integration, which means that every organizing process must integrate all aspects so that the organizing process runs and is well coordinated;
- e. Partnership, which means that the implementation of this program is a partnership between the local government as the person in charge of activities and the community as a partner of the local government in dealing with social problems in community life;

- f. Solidarity, which means that the implementation of this policy must prioritize care and empathy among others;
- g. Benefit, which means that the program must have benefits to improve the quality of life of the community; and
- h. Participation, which means that in implementing this policy, all components of society must be involved.

In addition, the Perwali guidelines also mention 9 stages that must be fulfilled in a structured and planned manner that must be fulfilled during the implementation process so that there are no obstacles or obstacles that occur when the program is implemented. the stages include



Source: <https://erutilahu-dprkpp.surabaya.go.id/login>

1. The socialization stage at the kelurahan level where the implementers socialize to the community about the amount of budget ceiling, stages of implementation, mechanisms, and timeframes related to the Rutilahu program policy;
2. Stage The process of collecting proposals for prospective beneficiaries involving the City Government or social services whose role is to verify the MBR data status of the community and determine the number of beneficiary quotas per village in accordance with the regional budget ceiling, as well as playing a role in conducting physical field surveys to determine priority scales, development needs, and development needs. development planning. Furthermore, in the stages of the process of collecting proposals for prospective beneficiaries, it also involves the kelurahan where the party is responsible for proposing a list of names of people who have fulfilled all the requirements to be verified by the social service, which then when a list of prospective proposals has been published that has been verified by the social service, the next role of the kelurahan is to hold KRPR deliberations;

3. The KRPR deliberation stage is a stage carried out at the kelurahan level which aims to determine who is entitled to get this program assistance in accordance with the MBR status of the community that has been verified by the agency and adjusted to the number of quotas determined by the agency. Where in the deliberation that produces the minutes of the list of prospective recipients of the proposal that has been mutually agreed upon and has been signed by the Lurah, the Chairperson of the LPMK and KTPR;
4. Activity Planning Stage, This is the stage that involves the inauguration of the KTPR Team by the village head, making a contract with PPK, forming the preparation, implementation, and supervisory teams by the KTPR chairperson;
5. The preparation stage of the activity where in this stage the preparation team conducts a planning meeting to discuss the Budget Plan Cost (RAB), Work planning drawings, Implementation schedule, which is then submitted to the agency for verification;
6. The activity implementation stage, is the stage where the construction process of repairing parts of the beneficiary's house, including the completeness of aspects of costs, equipment, labor, and others, is fully under the responsibility of the KTPR team;
7. In this stage, the supervision team under KTPR is responsible for administrative, technical and financial supervision and reports to the KTPR chairperson;
8. The accountability report stage, at this stage the KTPR team submits reports related to the implementation of activities containing physical documentation, purchase notes and receipts, physical progress reports, and so on in the form of preliminary and final reports; and
9. Stage Submission of results, in this stage the implementation team through KTPR submits the results of reporting to the PPK in the form of Berita Acara Serah Terima Pekerjaan with the knowledge of the Lurah which is then submitted to the PA before the handover of the house between the agency and the beneficiaries.

The Fragmentation aspect according to Edward III refers to the division of responsibility and implementation of a policy to several different bodies or institutions. This means that a policy or program is not only carried out by one party, but is divided among several agencies that have their respective roles and responsibilities. This certainly requires good coordination between each related agency or institution so that policies can be carried out effectively and effectively.

Fragmentation can occur in various stages of the program, such as socialization, beneficiary determination, material procurement, and field implementation and reporting processes. Each party has its own tasks and authorities, but without good coordination, the risk of incompatibility, lack of clarity, and inefficiency can arise.

The Fragmentation aspect explains the distribution of responsibilities of a policy to several agencies that require coordination. The responsibilities of each implementer are contained in the Mayor's Regulation No. 9 of 2022 article 20 regarding duties and responsibilities as follows, The tasks and responsibilities in implementing the Rutilahu program in Kelurahan Nginden are clearly divided to

ensure the efficiency and success of the program. In the details of these duties and responsibilities, each entity has a specific role in running this program.

The Dinas is responsible for several key aspects of the program, such as conducting socialization on Rutilahu repairs, providing coaching and mentoring to KTPR, and establishing KTPR teams and beneficiary quotas. This task involves the initial planning and overall coordination of the program.

The PPK has an important role in overseeing and managing the program. His duties include requesting regular reporting on progress from the supervisory team and KTPR management, determining planning documents, conducting evaluations, providing direction, and having the right to propose a change of KTPR management. The PPK functions as a quality control and guarantor of smooth program implementation.

KTPR, as the main implementer of the Rutilahu program, is responsible for overseeing the entire repair process, including forming supervisory teams, preparing essential documents, managing material procurement, and reporting progress to the agency. The Lurah, as the local administrative leader, manages KTPR appointments, verifies beneficiary data, and submits proposals for ineligible beneficiaries. Verified data is further discussed in KRPR deliberations, and the Lurah monitors and evaluates the program's implementation. Effective coordination between KTPR, the Lurah, and other parties is crucial for the program's success in benefiting the community.

With careful and dedicated implementation based on the guidelines of Mayor Regulation No. 9 of 2022, the Rutilahu repair program has been successfully implemented and has had a significant positive impact on the community. The involvement of all relevant parties in the implementation of the Rutilahu repair program has taken place based on the principles of acceptability, transparency, and accountability. The integrated and well-coordinated process illustrates the cohesiveness that is highly valued in the implementation of this policy.

The close partnership between the local government and the community as loyal partners has been a key pillar in this success. Solidarity and mutual care have been the hallmarks of the program, creating a strong bond within the community. The positive benefits of the program are evident in the improvement of the community's quality of life. The usefulness of the program is evident through substantial improvements at various levels of society, providing a broader impact than expected.

The full participation of all components of the community has given color and diversity to the implementation of the program. Thus, the Rutilahu repair program is not just a policy, but also a symbol of togetherness and joint progress in building a better society. The success of this program is not only a reflection of the local government's efforts, but also the result of a solid collaboration between the government and the community. The Rutilahu repair program has proven that, by putting forward the basic principles contained in the Perwali guidelines, we can create positive and sustainable changes in community life.

Acceptability is one of the principles that need to be met in running the Rutilahu repair program. This principle indicates that whatever happens in the implementation of the program must be based on mutual agreement or related parties. However, although the Rutilahu repair program has had a significant

positive impact, the research found several problems that need serious attention. One of the main challenges lies in the process of determining the beneficiary community, which should involve the deliberation of the KRPR (Plan Agreement Home Improvement). It was noted that the results of the list of beneficiaries were decided by the Kelurahan without any KRPR deliberation.

This process suggests that decisions were made by one party without involving all relevant actors, especially the RT who has in-depth knowledge of the local community. Although the Kelurahan requested data on eligible communities, the involvement of the KTPR team without prior collective consultation may undermine the importance of the KRPR deliberation.

The KRPR deliberation should be a useful forum for exchanging opinions between all relevant parties, especially the RT who are closer to the community. However, the interviews showed that even the head of the RT was not involved in this deliberation. This shows that there are inconsistencies in the application of the principle of acceptability at this stage. This results in a lack of complete and accurate representation of information about the proposed beneficiary candidates and without agreement by many parties.

Therefore, it is important to revisit the decision-making mechanism and ensure that the KRPR deliberation is properly implemented, involving all relevant parties. This will ensure that the Rutilahu improvement program remains in line with the desired principles.

The implementation of the Rutilahu program in Nginden village was tested against the stages outlined in the guidelines. The results showed that although the program generally followed the guidelines and stages, researchers found several discrepancies between field activities and the guidelines. Some of these discrepancies include the lack of comprehensive socialization to the community, the non-implementation of deliberations, and the existence of several limitations in the implementation of duties and responsibilities by the implementers.

In-depth analysis revealed that the implementation of socialization was not carried out thoroughly, which could have an impact on the community's lack of understanding of the Rutilahu program. The success of this program should involve the active participation of the community, which can be influenced by the extent to which information and understanding are well conveyed.

Furthermore, the non-implementation of deliberations in determining beneficiaries through KRPR is a significant note. Deliberations have a crucial role in determining potential beneficiaries and creating mutual agreements. Failure in carrying out deliberations can jeopardize community involvement and transparency of program implementation.

In addition, some of the tasks and responsibilities of the implementers were not in accordance with the established guidelines. These include a lack of coordination in the implementation of socialization, inappropriate citizen engagement policies, and a lack of active supervision and coaching on the part of the city government.

Thus, while the overall implementation of the Rutilahu program has followed the prescribed stages, this research underscores the importance of ensuring consistency and congruence between field activities and official guidelines. Improvements to aspects found to be non-conforming will increase the

effectiveness and success of the program, while ensuring greater community engagement and trust.

6. Conclusions

Based on research conducted in Nginden Jangkungan Village regarding the implementation of the Uninhabitable House Repair Program, the following conclusions were made:

1. Communication Aspects: Inconsistencies were found in implementing regulations, with unclear information delivery and the absence of required KRPR deliberations.
2. Resource Aspects: Sufficient staff is essential for effective implementation, but the KTPR team lacked the qualifications to prepare the necessary cost budget plan (RAB) and planning documents. Additionally, the budget of 35 million per house was insufficient due to rising building material costs.
3. Disposition Aspects: The implementers displayed good performance, with 62% of eligible low-income residents receiving assistance. However, the incentives for the KTPR team were insufficient given their responsibilities.
4. Bureaucratic Structure Aspects: While some procedures were followed according to guidelines, discrepancies were noted, such as incomplete socialization, the lack of KRPR deliberations, and insufficient supervision from the city government

7. Advice

Based on the results of research conducted by researchers on the implementation of the Rutilahu program in Nginden Jangkungan Village, there are several obstacles that need to be improved. The results showed that the Rutilahu program experienced problems in the aspects of communication, resources, disposition, and bureaucratic structure. Therefore, researchers provide suggestions to improve the effectiveness of the implementation of the Rutilahu program. The suggestions from researchers are

1. Conduct socialization in accordance with the guidelines set by the government. This can be done by holding regular meetings with the community, socializing through social media, and involving community leaders in delivering information. In addition, the information provided must be clear and easily understood by the community.
2. Conduct training and competency development for staff (KTPR team) for the preparation of RAB and planning documents to be able to manage the program properly.
3. Searching for information in accordance with technological advances that develop without having to ask the KTPR team manually by the kelurahan
4. All implementing parties must carry out their duties according to their fields and duties.

Acknowledgments. I would like to express my deepest gratitude to all those who have supported and contributed to the completion of this article. First and

foremost, my heartfelt thanks go to the local government of Surabaya, especially the Surabaya Housing and Settlement Service, for their cooperation and valuable data that has made this study possible. I would also like to extend my appreciation to the residents of Nginden Jangkungan Village, Surabaya, for their willingness to share their experiences and insights regarding the Uninhabitable House Repair Program. Their openness and participation were crucial in providing a clear understanding of the program's implementation. Special thanks to my academic supervisors, colleagues, and friends who have provided constructive feedback, encouragement, and support throughout the research and writing process. Lastly, I am forever grateful to my family for their unwavering patience and support during the preparation of this article

Disclosure of Interests. The authors have no competing interests to declare that are relevant to the content of this article

References

- [1] Adi, K. K. A., & Shobaruddin, M. (2022). "Coordination of Social Rehabilitation Services for Uninhabitable Houses in Surabaya City." *Scientific Journal of Public Administration*, Vol 8, No 3, pp 282-287.
- [2] Anggraini, B. L., Kurniawan, B. (2021). "Evaluation of the Rehabilitation Program for Non-Habitable Houses (RTLH) in Tuban Regency." *Publika*, Vol. 9 Number 2
- [3] Decree of the Minister of Settlement and Regional Infrastructure Number: 403/KPTS/M/2002 concerning
- [4] Decree of the minister of settlements and regional infrastructure number: 24/ts/M/2003 on the procurement of housing and settlements with the support of housing subsidy facilities.
- [5] George C, Edwards III. 1980. *Implementing Public Policy*. Washington D.C: Congressional Quarterly Inc.
- [6] Mayor's Regulation No. 9 of 2022 on Uninhabitable Houses
- [7] Sari, N. N., Murti, I., & Rahmadanik, D. (2022). "Implementation of the Tahu Panas (Fearless of Rain and Fearless of Heat) Program to Rehabilitate Uninhabitable Houses in Surabaya City." *Journal of Administrative Applications*. Vol. 25 No. 1
- [8] Setyawan, D., Priantono, A., & Firdausi, F. (2021). "Edward III Model: Implementation of Regulation Regional Regulation No. 2/2018 on Smokefree Areas in Malang City." *Journal of Politics*. , Vol. 3, No. 2
- [9] Swastyayana, I. A., & Kurniawan, B. (2021). "Community Empowerment through the Social Rehabilitation of Slum Areas (RSDK) in Tambaksari Village, Surabaya City." *Publika*. Vol. 9 Number 3
- [10] Tangkilisan, H. N. S. (2003). "Public Policy Implementation: The Transformation of George Edwards' Thought." Yogyakarta: Lukman Offset

- [11] Technical Guidelines for the Construction of Healthy Simple Houses (Healthy RS) Minister of Settlement and Regional Infrastructure
- [12] THE 1945 CONSTITUTION OF THE REPUBLIC OF INDONESIA.

Open Access This chapter is licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>), which permits any noncommercial use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license and indicate if changes were made.

The images or other third party material in this chapter are included in the chapter's Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the chapter's Creative Commons license and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder.

