

## **Model of Organizational Structuring of Local Government in Indonesia (Case Study of Organizational Structuring in Local Government of Cianjur Regency, West Java Province)**

Fernandes Simangunsong and Imelda Hutasoit  
Governmental Institute of Home Affairs-Ministry of Home Affairs of Indonesia,  
Jl. Raya Bandung-Sumedang km. 20, Jatinangor, Indonesia

**Abstract:** Government organizational structuring is directed more on rightsizing which means simplification of government bureaucracy in order to have more proportional and transparent organization. Therefore, it is expected that local agency organizations would be slimmer according to the spirit of government reinventing in order to realize good governance. In the practice of public administration, organizational structuring had been oftenly interpreted as development or increasing of existing structure. In accord with it leaders of organizations had always tried to develop existing units of organization to achieve their goals. This point of view should be reconsidered, since, organizational structuring is not always identical with the addition to existing units. Organizational structuring can be interpreted as rearrangement of roles and functions without any addition of new units. Sometimes, existing ineffective and inefficient units can even be dismissed. Clarity in the implementation of authorities in local government would be the basic capital for policy making in organizational development of local government. It doesn't mean that every authorities requires specific unit in order to implement it, thus, it should be considered to have some authorities implemented by single organization in term that development of organization should always hold on to principle of "right structure, right function". Departing from concept above, local government organizations in Indonesia need to be assessed and reformulated, so that, 524 regencies/cities in Indonesia would have standard in organizational structuring and same naming pattern for local agency organizations between regencies/cities in entire region of Indonesia from Sabang to Merauke. The formulation for this organizational structuring would be carried out with model of case study to local government of Cianjur Regency, West Java Province by using quantitative method and with simple descriptive statistic approach.

**Key words:** Decentralization, local government, local agency organizations, Indonesia, organization, government

---

### **INTRODUCTION**

Phenomenon of decentralization and regional autonomy in Indonesia is not only normative response to all issues in strengthening of public administration but also bigger and full with romance and problems unresolvable by national government. This phenomenon of decentralization and regional autonomy was manifested by enactment of several acts such as Law No. 22 of 1999 replaced by Law No. 32 of 2004 replaced by Law No. 23 of 2014 on Local Government by which the implementation was in fact not simple.

As description on one of the implementation of Law No. 32 of 2004 is the enactment of Government Regulation No. 38 of 2007 on distribution of governmental affairs between the central government, provincial government

and regency/city government and Government Regulation No. 41 of 2007 on organization of local agency. Operationalization of these government regulations was formulated by one of them regulation of Minister of Home Affairs No. 57 of 2007 on Technical Guidelines for Organizational Structuring of Local Agencies (provincial, regency/city). It was furthermore operationalized in (one or more) regional regulation (provincial/regency/city) as well as the implementing regulations such as governor or regent or mayor regulation.

Discourse on model of bureaucratic reform emerged in relation with government management reform. Classical approach of public administration put government institutions as the dominant actor in public administration. The urgency for government management reform had been increased by the need to anticipate unpredictable,

quick changes within political system. These changes occurred at global, national and even local level. At global level, significant changes occurred in line with the need to increase the capacity of capital accumulation (Robbins, 1995).

Principle of liberalism linked with capitalism of global economics becomes the foundation for political struggle by capitalist countries to encourage changes of administrative construction in developing countries. The aim is to provide more space for public and on the other hand, decrease government's role. Thus, space for process of capital accumulation would be greater. In essence, global power demands that through changes at national level national power could serve dynamics of global interest. Therefore, issues of governance that provide more space for public participation such as good governance, civil society, empowerment, democratization, public accountability, decentralization, autonomy and so on began to be developed, so that, in essence there would be control on government to mitigate practices of abuse of power that eventually endanger market mechanism. (James and Gibson, 1997).

Decentralization policy in Indonesia nowadays is the normative foundation for local governance including change of authorities either at the level of central, provincial or regency/city government. As the consequence of the enactment of Government Regulation No. 38 of 2007 on Distribution of Governmental Affairs between the Central Government, Provincial Government and Regency/City government and Government Regulation No. 41 of 2007 on Organization of Local Agency, change of duties and structure occurred in the implementing organization of governmental affairs that in turn would demand for organizational structuring of local government.

Organizational structuring of local agencies is the consequence of authorities that is none other than a form of organizational development. The direction is to restructure organization of local agencies according to authorities they have in mobilization of the organizations. Organizations of local government in the implementation of their authorities should have objectives that involve public interest by utilizing all natural resources, human resources and other potentials they have (Miftah, 2001).

In addition to inefficient use of resources, excessive organization of local agencies also have impact to the widening range of control and less integrated services which are instead of by one unit as they should be handled by several units. This condition potentially creates conflicts between local agencies where struggle for duties and functions would cause public services become neglected. In other words, organizational

condition of local agencies is still not in line with the meaning, aim and purpose of regional autonomy policy (Mardiasmo, 2002).

In addition, with regional autonomy, local agencies are expected to be well-established organization in the implementation of administrative functions and also interaction process between government and other local institutions and community optimally. Thereby, proportional, effective and efficient structure of local agencies based on organizational principles would be realized.

Government organizational structuring is directed more on rightsizing which means simplification of government bureaucracy in order to have more proportional and transparent organization. Therefore, it is expected that local agency organizations would be slimmer according to the spirit of government reinventing in order to realize good governance (Numberi, 2000).

In the practice of public administration, organizational structuring had been oftenly interpreted as development or increasing of existing structure. In accord with it leaders of organizations had always tried to develop existing units of organization to achieve their goals. This point of view should be reconsidered since organizational structuring is not always identical with the addition to existing units. Organizational structuring can be interpreted as rearrangement of roles and functions without any addition of new units. Sometimes, existing ineffective and inefficient units can even be dismissed. Clarity in the implementation of authorities in local government would be the basic capital for policy making in organizational development of local government. It doesn't mean that every authorities requires specific unit in order to implement it, thus, it should be considered to have some authorities implemented by single organization in term that development of organization should always hold on to principle of "right structure, right function".

One of the problems faced in the context of local administration is the excessive organizational structure thus, it is very likely to cause overbudgeting. In fact, sometimes there are some organizational structure of local agencies inappropriate with its regional requirement that have impact on the ineffectiveness and inefficiency of government in the aspect of development. Government Regulation No. 41 of 2007 on Organization of Local Agency has two spirits. First, the spirit to overcome disorder in nomenclature, main duties and functions and range of control of organization and second, the spirit to limit as well as to uniform the number of local agencies.

As time passes, Law No. 23 of 2014 was enacted replacing Law No. 32 of 2004 on Local Government. The

enactment of the law has significant impact on the running of government, especially of local government that implement local governmental affairs, either mandatory or optional. Distribution of Governmental Affairs in Law No. 23 of 2014 is actually almost as same as Law No. 32 of 2004. But in Law No. 23 of there are several changes in the distribution (Law No. 23 of 2014). In accord with it central government with the help of academicians has revised Government Regulation No. 41 of 2007 on Organization of Local Agency which is expected to conform with and support the implementation of the more recently Law No. 23 of 2014 on Local Government, thus, the enactment of the law and revision of government regulation would have impact on the organizational restructuring of local agencies.

From explanation above, we try to establish a model to support the success of the revision of government regulation in organizational structuring of local agencies in the future by case study in Cianjur Regency. Rules and regulations in organizational structuring as set in Law No. 23 of 2004 become an early conclusion to carry out study on "Model of Organizational Structuring of Local Government in Indonesia (case study of organizational structuring in local government of Cianjur Regency, West Java Province)".

**Problem statement:** Question on problem asked here was how will the model of organizational structuring of local government in Indonesia (case study of organizational structuring in local government of Cianjur Regency) according to the regional potential be in the future?

**Aim and purpose of study:** This study was aimed to examine and formulate organizational model of local agencies according to potential of the region in order to improve and increase the organizational performance effectively and efficiently.

The purpose of this study was to produce organizational model of local agencies of Cianjur Regency according potential of the region for the future in order to support the enactment of Academic Draft Substituting Government Regulation No. 41 of 2007 on Organizational Structuring of Local Agency.

**Significance of study:** This study is expected to provide contribution conceptionally and operationally: as consideration for development and evaluation in organizational structuring of local agencies in the future. As technical guidelines for organizational structuring of local agencies in improving the capacity of local government, especially, related to organizational capacity of local agency to support governance effectively, efficiently and accountably.

**Frame of reference:** Local agency is organization of local government established according to principle of self renewing system, regulated discretely to conform with public demands (Wastiono, 2003).

The organization of local government is established to carry out mission of providing public services and regulate interests in the implementation of authority possessed by local government. Organizational structuring of local government should first be preceded by statement of authority to be implemented in certain period of time that is stated in regional regulation, since, this statement of authority is the primary basis that affect the organization size, number of personnel, budgets and number and kinds of public services provided.

In accordance with it organization of local agency is established based on consideration on authority of local government, characteristics, potential and needs of the region (stated in vision and mission of region), financial capacity, availability of personnel resource and development of cooperation between regions and/or with third parties.

Regulation on distribution of governmental affairs as the consequence of regional autonomy needs to be followed by organizational structuring. Institutions in context of local government, consisting of staff functional institutionality within local secretariat and other functional institutionalities namely autonomous offices and technical agencies within local government. Institutional structuring of local government should apply principle of management back to basic: based on theoretical framework, formation of organization consists of 5 elements, namely strategic apex (local leader) middle line (local secretary), operating core (local office), technostructure (supporting board/function) and supporting staff. Thereby, local office as the operating core is the one that implement operational technical duties according to the field of governmental affair given to local, both mandatory and optional affairs. Local board as technostructure is the one that implement supporting functions in implementing local governmental affairs including planning, control, financial, staffing, research and development, training and other functions according to rules and regulations.

Organizational structuring can be interpreted as an effort to create a more proportional posture of organization according to vision and mission, thus, increase the effectiveness, efficiency and productivity of the officers. By organizational structuring, formation of unnecessary organization can be avoided, thus, budgeting can be focused more on public needs. Any excessive structure of organization can result in increasing cost for personnel, logistics and events/activities.

Policy of organizational structuring of local agency should consider potential and capability of the region that would have effect on financing, personnel and equipment fully and comprehensively. Therefore, organizational structuring of local government may differ from each other depending on the typical characteristic and diversity of the region and potentials possessed by local community.

Regional capability, either in financial and human resource can also have effect of organizational structuring of local government. In essence, organizational structuring is arrangement of personnel resource in running the institution and management of financing capability in implementing the functions. This also should be balanced by regional capability to discover revenue potential in its region by developing economic capability of community, developing real sector business and developing cooperation between regions and/or with other parties to develop economic potential.

Wasistiono (2003) suggested that organizational size of government is affected by variables of object managed (related with need of service), subject who manage it professionally and financing capability of the local government.

## **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

This study was an application of policy model aimed to find institutional model or organization of local agency conforming with prevailing formal jurisdictional regulations. Analysis used here was descriptive-quantitative analysis and model application of institutional establishment based on Academic Draft Substituting Government Regulation No. 41 of 2007. Using of qualitative data was in accordance with the characteristics. Qualitative method was selected for this study because it emphasizes more on description of problems as is according to reality happened on site.

Data necessary for this study was secondary and primary data as needed to focus on institutional structuring of local agency: primary data, acquired through field observation by seeing, observing, recording and having discussion directly with political officials, local agency personnel and other target groups. Secondary data, acquired to supplement primary data, available in Cianjur Regency government that has information related with the topic. It was acquired by study on documents, reports, brochures, newspapers and other literatures. As for data collection technique selected for field research were: questionnaire, collecting data with form of data to be filled out based on preset criteria and variable. Interview, collecting data through direct communication based on preset structure or outline with

authorized and competent parties on problem studied. Literature study, collecting data by inspecting, examining and analyzing literatures, documents, rules and other references relevant with problem studied.

Operationally, steps in institutional structuring of local agency in Cianjur regency were as follow: calculate variables of general factors and technical factors of governmental affairs under authority of local government. Organizational establishment of local agency according to governmental affairs under authority of local government. Organizational structure establishment of local agency according to governmental affairs under authority of local government.

As for steps in using techniques in the study were as follow: data processing stage one data processing started by examining data collected from multiple sources: observation, interview, literature study and archives and selecting data needed. Then, data was made into abstract for brief summary and analyzed consistently and repetitively. During analysis stage one there wasn't any observation or interview. After first analysis, observation and interview was carried out with more focused, narrowed and thorough manner. Data clarification data clarification was classified by thought, intuition and opinion. Data then was placed into each category accordingly. Method used in the analysis was comparison with data acquired from informants and documents.

Data analysis was done in two steps, the first was qualitative-descriptive analysis by describing data acquired qualitatively from interview and documentation. Second step was data analysis by model of institutional establishment according to Academic Draft Substituting Government Regulation No. 41 of 2007, specifically on institutional model of office and board.

Data analysis was based on calculation according to criteria of organizational size of office and board that determine the type of the office and board in accordance to variable of general factors and technical factors. Variable of general factors includes of:

- Population size
- Area size
- Amount of local budgets
- Number of subordinating regions

Variable of technical factors includes availability of human resources and supporting facilities and infrastructures, scope of duties, potential growth and development rate according to regional potential and characteristics.

According to calculation based on variables of technical and general factors above, total score set for the type of office and board was as follow:

- Office type A and board type A is established if total score of the variables is more than 800
- Office type B and board type B is established if total score of the variables between 601-800
- Office type C and board type C is established if total score of the variables between 400-600
- If total score is <400, office/board can't be established

As for calculation of total score, it is defined as follow:

- General factors and technical factors have scale interval of value from 200-1,000
- Percentage for general factors is 40% and for technical factors is 60%
- If total score is <400, then office/board can't be established
- If total score is between 401-600, then office/board type C can be established
- If total score is between 601-800, then office/board type B can be established
- If total score is more than 800, then office/board type A can be established

As for formation of Public Procurement Unit (Unit Layanan Pengadaan Barang dan Jasa) (ULP) with the enactment of Law No. 23 of 2014 on Local Government and Government Regulation No. 41 of 2007 on Organization of Local Agency, formulation of criteria for formation of ULP in Local Government according to Academic Draft Substituting Government Regulation No. 41 of 2007 on organization of local agency was as follow:

- If total score is <500, then in local government, independent work unit can't be established and its function should be merged with other work unit handling similar kind of affairs
- If total score is between 500-700, then in local government, board type C can be established
- If total score is between 700-800, then in local government, board type B can be established
- If total score is more than 800, then in local government, board type A can be established

Calculation of score above was based on Academic Draft Substituting Government Regulation No. 41 of 2007 only for technical factors of public procurement with total weight of 60% while the rest 40% was determined by general factors, both for provincial and regency/city.

According to Regulation of Minister of Home Affairs No. 99 of 2014 on Guidelines on Formation of Public

Procurement Unit in Provincial and Regency/City Government, criteria for formation of ULP of Regency/City is set as follow:

- ULP type A can be established if total score of the variable is between 700-1,000
- ULP type B can be established if total score of the variable is up to 700

ULP type A is located on local secretariat while ULP type B is on subdivision in local secretariat.

## **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

Organization of local agency (Organisasi Perangkat Daerah) (OPD) of Cianjur Regency is a local agency (SKPD) formed and established based on Regional Regulation No. 07 of 2008 on Organization of Local Government and Formation of Organization of Local Agency of Cianjur Regency as amended by Regional Regulation No. 09 of 2013 on Third Amendment on Cianjur Regency Government Regulation No. 07 of 2008 on Organization of Local Government and Formation of Organization of Local Agency of Cianjur Regency. In accordance with the regional regulation, local agencies as the operating organization of local governance consists of: Local secretariat; secretariat of regional parliament (dprd); local inspectorate; regional development planning board; local technical agencies including.

Agencies including: local civil service, training and education agency; family planning and women empowerment agency; national unity and political agency; integrated licensing services and investment agency; public procurement agency; local food security agency; local archive office and library; local hospital including; local public hospital class b; c; d; local offices including; office of education; health office; office of public works; office of spatial planning and human settlements; office of water resources and mines; office of agriculture, crops and horticulture; office of livestock, fisheries and marine affairs; office of forestry and plantation; demography and civil registry office; social, manpower and transmigration office; office of transportation, communication and informatics; tourism and culture office; office for cooperative, micro, small and medium enterprises; industry and commerce office; local tax office; local financial and asset management office; office of cleaning and landscaping service.

Districts including: Agrabinta; Bojongpicung; Cianjur; Cibeber; Cilaku; Ciranjang; Cugenang; Cikalongkulon; Campaka; Cibirong; Cidaun; Campakamulya; Cikadu; Cijati; Cipanas; Gekbrong;

Haurwangi; Karangtengah; Kadupandak; Leles; Mande; Naringgul; Pacet; Pagelaran; Pasirkuda; Sukaluyu; Sukaresmi; Sukanagara; Sindangbarang; Takokak; Tanggeung; Warungkondang.

Subdistricts including: Bojongherang; Muka; Sawahgede; Solokpandan; Sayang; Pamoyanan; Other institutions: local disaster management agency; civil service police unit; secretariat of management board of KORPRI.

In accordance to Academic Draft Subtituting Government Regulation No. 41 of 2007 on Organization of Local Agency, it is explained that organizational structure of local agency of regency/city are.

**Local secretariat:** Local secretariat is headed by local secretary acting under and responsible to regent/mayor. Local secretariat has duties and obligations to help regent/mayor in establishing policies and coordinating the duty implementation by local agencies, implementing other governmental duties and providing administrative services. Local secretariat in implementation of its duties and obligations has functions of:

- Establishing policies of local government
- Coordinating duty implementation of local agencies
- Monitoring and evaluating the implementation of local government policies
- Implementing other governmental duties
- Providing administrative services
- Implementing other duties assigned by regent/mayor in accordance with duties and functions

**Secretariat of Regional Parliament (DPRD):** Secretariat of DPRD is headed by secretary of DPRD acting operationally under and responsible to DPRD speaker and administratively under and responsible to regent/mayor through local secretariat. Secretariat of DPRD serves the duty to implement secretarial administration and financial administration, to support the implementation of duties and functions of DPRD, to provide and coordinate with experts as needed by DPRD. Secretariat of DPRD in its duty has functions in:

- Implementation of secretarial administration of DPRD
- Implementation of financial administration of DPRD
- Organizing of DPRD meetings
- Providing and coordinating with experts as needed by DPRD

**Local offices:** Local office is headed by head of office acting under and responsible to regent/mayor through local secretary. Local office serve the duty to help

regent/mayor in the implementation of governmental affairs delegated by regional leader. Local offices in their duties have functions in:

- Formulation of technical policies according to scope of the duty
- Implementation of governmental affairs according to scope of the duty
- Development of implementation of governmental affairs according to scope of the duty
- Implementation of other duties as assigned by regent/mayor according to duties and functions

In local offices, technical implementation units can be formed to implement operational technical practices and/or supporting technical practices within a working area or several districts. Formation of technical implementation units is regulated by regulation of regent/mayor under approval of minister. Governmental affairs related with basic services include: education; health; environment; public works; food security; demography and civil registry; family planning; social manpower; human settlements; public safety and order and security (note: related to civil service police unit); child protection

Governmental affairs not related with basic services include: spatial planning; land affairs; transportation; communication and informatics; cooperatives, small and medium enterprises; investment; youth affairs and sport; village community empowerment; women empowerment; statistics; coding; culture; library; archiving; fisheries and marine affairs; tourism; agriculture; forestry; energy and mineral resources; commerce; industry; transmigration; local revenue.

Each governmental affair above is handled under an office. Merging of several affairs within an office is determined by principle of conformity and/or similarity in function. Certain affair can also be under local secretariat. Local office can be established in 3 types. This typology is based on criteria and variable with rules as follow:

- Office type A is established to accomodate local governmental affairs with heavy workload
- Office type B is established to accomodate local governmental affairs with medium workload
- Office type C is established to accomodate local governmental affairs with light workload

**Local boards:** Local board is headed by head of board under and responsible to regent/mayor through local secretariat. Local boards serve the duty to help

regent/mayor in implementing the supporting functions of local governmental affairs. Local boards in their duties have functions in:

- Formulation of policies according to scope of the duties
- Implementation of supporting functions of local governmental affairs according to scope of the duties
- Implementation of other duties as assigned by regent/mayor according to duties and functions

In local boards, technical implementation units can be formed to implement operational technical practices and/or supporting technical practices within a working area or several districts. Formation of technical implementation units is regulated by regulation of regent/mayor under regulation of regent/mayor. The local boards related with: planning; supervision; financial; civil service affairs; research and development; education and training; other functions according rules and regulations. Local board as stated in Article 1 can be established in 3 types. The typology is based on rules as follow:

- Board type A is established to accomodate implementation of functions with heavy workload
- Board type B is established to accomodate implementation of functions with medium workload
- Board type C is established to accomodate implementation of functions with light workload

**Local implementation units:** Local implementation unit is headed by a head (or other equal terms) under and responsible to regent/mayor through local secretary. Local implementation units serve the duty to help regent/mayor in providing specific public services. Local implementation units in their duties have functions in:

- Formulation of policies according to scope of the duties
- Providing specific public services according to scope of the duties
- Development of specific public services according to scope of the duties and
- mplementation of other duties as assigned by regent/mayor according to duties and functins

**Other institutions:** Other institutions are headed by a head (or other equal terms) under and responsible to regent/mayor through local secretary. Other institutions serve the duty to help governmental affairs as delegated in rules and regulations. Other institutions in their duties have functions in:

- Formulation of technical policies according scope of the duties
- Implementation of governmental affairs as delegated in rules and regulations
- Development of the implementation of governmental affais as delegated in rules and regulations
- Implementation of other duties as assigned by regent/mayor according to duties and functions

These other institutions can be independent or part of a local agency according to the need, financial capability and local potential and characteristics.

**Districts:** District is headed by a head referred to as camat under and responsible to regent/mayor through local secretary. Districts serve the duty to:

- Implement general governmental affairs
- Coordinate community empowerment activities
- Coordinate the implementation of public safety and order
- Coordinate the enactment and enforcement of regional regulations and regent/mayor regulations
- Coordinate the maintenance of public facilities and infrastructures
- Coordinate the implementation of governmental activities carried out by local agencies at district level
- Develop and control the implementation of activities of villages and or subdistricts
- Implement governmental affairs under authority of regency/city outside of the responsibility of regency/city government implementation units at district level and
- Implement other duties as assigned in rules and regulations

In addition to implement duties, districts are delegated with some of authorities by regent/mayor to serve some local governmental affairs of regency/city. The delegation is meant for public services according to characteristics and public needs of each district. The delegation is regulated by regent/city regulation by referring to government regulation. Guidelines of district organization is regulated in minister regulation after given consideration from minister of administrative affairs of state apparatus efficiency.

As subdistrict (Keluarahan) not local government agency (SKPD) anymore it is district agency. Subdistrict is established by regional regulation referring to government regulation. Subdistrict is headed by a head referred to as lurah as district agency under and responsible to camat. Lurah is appointed from a qualified

civil servant by regent/mayor with recommendation from local secretary. Lurah serves the duty to help Camat in:

- Implementation of subdistrict administrative activities
- Implementation of public empowerment
- Providing public services
- Maintenance of public safety and order
- Maintenance of public facilities and infrastructures
- Implementation of other duties as assigned by Camat
- Implementation of other duties as assigned in rules and regulations

The implementation of duties and functions of staff, administrative services as well as other general governmental affairs outside of duties and functions of offices, boards, local implementation units and other institutions is responsibility of local secretariat.

Regulation for institutional establishment of the organization of local agency of regency/city according to Academic Draft Substituting Government Regulation No. 41 of 2007 states that office is established to implement local governmental affairs under this rule:

- Office type A is established to accommodate local governmental affairs with heavy workload
- Office type B is established to accommodate local governmental affairs with medium workload
- Office type C is established to accommodate local governmental affairs with light workload

This rule also applies to establishment of board type A, B and C to accommodate implementation of supporting functions on local governmental affairs. Typology of the offices and boards is based on score calculation of general and technical factors according to explanation in Academic Draft Substituting Government Regulation No. 41 of 2007.

According to the change planning of organizational guidelines of local agency, every offices would be established into 3 types: office type A, office type B and office type C and also every boards into 3 types, board type A, board type B and board type C. Typology of offices and boards is based on total score of variable of workload. Variable of workload itself includes variable of general factors and variable of technical factors. Variable of general factors includes population size, area size, amount of local budgets and number of subordinating regions. Every variable weighs 10% each, thus, total weight for variable of general factors is 40%.

As for variable of technical factors, it includes availability of human resources (personnel) and

supporting facilities and infrastructures, scope of duties, potential growth and development rate according to regional potential and characteristic with total weight of 60%. On each variable, both of general and technical factors there are 5 intervals with value scale from 200-1,000.

Based on score calculation according to variable of technical and general factors above, total score for typology of offices and boards is as follow:

- Office type A and board type A is established if total score of the variables is more than 800
- Office type B and board type B is established if total score of the variables between 601-800
- Office type C and board type C is established if total score of the variables between 400-600
- If total score is <400, office/board can't be established

As for the calculation of total score, it is defined as follow:

- General factors and technical factors have scale interval of value from 200-1,000
- Percentage for general factors is 40% and for technical factors is 60%
- If total score is <400 then office/board can't be established
- If total score is between 401-600 then office/board type C can be established
- If total score is between 601-800 then office/board type B can be established
- If total score is more than 800 then office/board type A can be established

For formation of Public Procurement Unit (Unit Layanan Pengadaan Barang dan Jasa) (ULP) with the Enactment of Law No. 23 of 2014 on Local Government in Lieu of Law No. 32 of 2004 on Local Government there are two criteria according to Academic Draft Substituting Government Regulation No. 41 of 2007 on Organization of Local Agency, thus, formulation of criteria for formation of ULP in local government of regency/city is as follow:

- If total score is <500, then in local government, independent work unit can't be established and its function should be merged with other work unit handling similar kind of affairs
- If total score is between 500-700, then in local government, board type C can be established
- If total score is between 700-800, then in local government, board type B can be established



- If total score is more than 800, then in local government, board type A can be established

Calculation of score above was based on academic draft substituting government regulation 41 of 2007 only for technical factors of public procurement with total weight of 60% while the rest 40% was determined by general factors both for provincial and regency/city study by LKPP. According to Regulation of Minister of Home Affairs No. 99 of 2014 on Guidelines on Kormation of Public Procurement Unit in Provincial and Regency/city Government, criteria for formation of ULP of Regency/city is set as follow: ULP type A can be established if total score of the variable is between 700-1,000. ULP tye B can be established if total score of the variable is up 700-1,000. ULP type A is located on local secretariat while ULP type B is on subdivision in local secretariat.

According to Academic Draft Subtituting Government Regulation No. 41 of 2007 on Organization of Local Agency, organizational structure of local agency of regency/city is as follow.

**Local secretariat and secretariat of DPRD:** Local secretariat consists of 3 assistants, each assistant has at most 4 divisions and each division has at most 3 subdivisions. Secretariat of DPRD consists of at most 4 divisions and each division has 3 subdivisions.

**Local agencies:** Office type A consists of a secretariat and at most 5 divisions the secretariat has 3 subdivisions and each divisions has at most 3 sections. Office type B consists of a secretariat and at most 3 divisions, secretariat has 2 subdivisions and each divisions has at most 2 sections. Office type C consists of a subdivision of administration affairs and at most 3 sections. Technical implementation unit in office consists of a subdivision of administration affairs and a group of functional officers.

**Local boards:** Board type A consists of a secretariat and at most 4 divisions, secretariat has 3 subdivisions and each division has at most 3 subdivisions. Board type B consists of a secretariat and at most 3 divisions, secretariat has 2 subdivisions and each division has at most 2 subdivisions. Board type C consists of a subdivision of administration affairs and at most 3 subdivisions. Technical implementation unit in board consists of a subdivision of administration affairs and a group of functional officers.

**Districts and subdistricts:** District consists of a secretariat, at most 5 sections and secretariat has at most 3 subdivisions. Subdistrict consists of a secretariat and at most 4 sections.

**Merging of affairs:** Office and board that accomodate and hold the merging of several governmental affairs and certain functions consists of at most 7 sectors.

Data processing of score calculation according to Revision of Academic Draft Subtituting Government Regulation No. 41 of 2007 results in typology of office and board in Cianjur Regency based on the local government affairs as follow.

Based on Table 1, out of 35 governmental affairs, offices classified into type A (score >800) are 18 offices, type B (score of 600-800) are 16 offices and 1 office classified into type C (score of 400-600). As for the typology of board in Cianjur Regency according governmental supporting functions shows in Table 1.

Based on Table 2, out of 7 affairs/functions, boards classified into type A (score >800) are 3 boards, type B (score of 600-800) are 3 boards and none classified into type C (score of 400-600). Meanwhile, supporting function of public procurement, according to both Academic Draft Subtituting Government Regulation No. 41 of 2007 and Regulation of Minister of Home Affairs No. 99 of 2014 is categorized into type B.

Table 1: Typology of office in Cianjur Regency based on local governmental affairs year 2015

Affairs	Total scores	Typology
Education	698	Office type B
Health	616	Office type B
Environment	952	Office type A
Public works	820	Office type A
Food security	820	Office type A
Demography and civil registry	880	Office type A
Family planning	970	Office type A
Social	898	Office type A
Manpower	864	Office type A
Human settlements	754	Office type B
Public order and safety	850	Office type A
Child protection	800	Office type B
Spatial planning	586	Office type C
Land affairs	752	Office type B
Transportation	682	Office type B
Communication and informatics	954	Office type A
Cooperative, small and medium enterprises	902	Office type A
Investment	696	Office type B
Youth affairs and sport	960	Office type A
Village community empowerment	784	Office type B
Women empowerment	788	Office type B
Statistics	608	Office type B
Coding	738	Office type B
Culture	880	Office type A
Library	828	Office type A
Archiving	952	Office type A
Marine affairs and fisheries	838	Office type A
Tourism	732	Office type B
Pertanian	909	Office type A
Forestry	964	Office type A
Energy and mineral resources	760	Office type B
Commerce	688	Office type B
Industry	660	Office type B
Transmigration	632	Office type B
Local revenue	910	Office type A

Table 2: Typology of board in Cianjur Regency based on supporting functions of local government year 2015

Functions	Total scores	Categories
Planning	630	Board type B
Control	841	Board type A
Financial	930	Board type A
Staffing	792	Board type B
Research and development	888	Board type A
Education and training	715	Board type B
Public Procurement (according to Academic Draft Substituting Government Regulation No. 41 of 2007	715	Board type B
Public Procurement (Regulation of Minister of Home Affairs No. 99 of 2014)	315	Type B
Data processing in 2015		

In accordance with explanation on result of scoring above, according to Academic Draft Substituting Government Regulation No. 41 of 2007 then the mapping of institutional model of local agency in Cianjur Regency in Table 3.

Institutional Structuring of local government Agency (SKPD) of Regency/city according to Government Regulation No. 41 of 2007 on Guidelines on Organization of Local Agency and other sectoral rules and regulatins that drive local government to form more local agencies had resulted in a likely excessive structure of local

Table 3: Mapping of institutional structure in Cianjur Regency based on scoring and typology of organization of local agency according to Academic Draft Substituting Government Regulation 41/2007

Affairs/Functions	Alternative for institutional establishment	Scores	Typology of Offices/Boards
Education	Separated office	698	Office type B
	Office (merger of educational affairs and youth affairs and sports	829	Office type A
	Office (merger of educational affairs and cultural affairs)	789	Office type B
	Office (merger of educational affairs, cultural affairs and youth affairs and sports)	787	Office type B
Health	Separated office	616	Office type B
Environment	Separated office	952	Office type A
Public works	Separated office	820	Office type A
	Office (merger of public works affairs and human settlements affairs)	787	Office type B
	Office (merger of public works affairs and spatial planning affairs)	703	Office type B
	Office (merger of public works affairs and transportation affairs)	751	Office type B
	Office (merger of public works affairs, human settlement affairs and spatial planning affairs)	720	Office type B
	Office (merger of public works affairs, human settlements affairs, spatial planning affairs and transportation affairs)	711	Office type B
	Food security	Separated office	820
	Office (merger of food security affairs and agricultural affairs)	865	Office type A
Demography and civil registry	Separated office	880	Office type A
	Family planning	Separated office	970
	Office (merger of family planning affairs, women empowerment affairs and child protection affairs)	853	Office type A
Social	Separated office	898	Office type A
	Office (merger of social affairs, manpower affairs and transmigration affairs)	798	Office type B
Manpower	Separated office	864	Office type A
	Office (merger of manpower affairs and social affairs)	881	Office type A
	Office (merger of manpower affairs and transmigration affairs)	748	Office type B
	Office (merger of manpower affairs, social affairs and transmigration affairs)	798	Office type B
Human settlements	Separated office	754	Office type B
	Office (merger of human settlements and spatial planning affairs)	670	Office type B
Public order and safety	Separated office (including Civil Service Police Unit)	850	Office type A
	Child protection	Separated office	800
	Office (merger of child protection affairs and women empowerment affairs)	794	Office type B
	Office (merger of child protection affairs, family planning affairs and women empowerment affairs)	853	Office type A
Spatial planning	Separated office	586	Office type C
	Office (merger of spatial planning affairs and human settlements affairs)	670	Office type C
Land	Separated office	752	Office type B
	Division/Subdivision in local secretariat		
Transportation	Separated office	682	Office type B
	Office (merger of transportation affairs and communication and informatics affairs)	818	Office type A
Communication and informatics	Separated office	954	Office type A
	Office (merger of transportation and communication and informatics affairs)	818	Office type A
Cooperatives, small and medium enterprises (KUKM)	Separated office	902	Office type A
	Office (merger of KUKM affairs and commerce affairs)	795	Office type B
	Office (merger of KUKM affairs and industrial affairs)	781	Office type B
	Office (merger of KUKM affairs, commerce affairs and industrial affairs)	743	Office type B
	Investment	Separated office	696

Table 3: Continue

Affairs/Functions	Alternative for institutional establishment	Scores	Typology of Offices/Boards
Youth affairs and sports	Separated office	960	Office type A
	Office (merger of youth affairs and educational affairs)	829	Office type A
Village community empowerment	Separated office	784	Office type B
Women empowerment	Separated office	788	Office type B
	Office (merger of women empowerment affairs and family planning affairs)	879	Office type A
	Office (merger of women empowerment affairs and child protection affairs)	794	Office type B
	Office (merger of women empowerment affairs, family planning and child protection affair)	853	Office type A
Statistics	Separated office	608	Office type B
	Board (merger of statistics affairs, planning function and research and development function)	708	Board type B
Coding	Separated office	738	Office type B
	Division/Subdivision in Local Secretariat		
Cultural	Separated office	880	Office type A
	Office (merger of cultural affairs and tourism affairs)	808	Office type A
	Office (merger of cultural affairs, educational affairs and youth affairs and sports)	846	Office type A
Library	Separated office	828	Office type A
	Office (merger of library affairs and archiving affairs)	890	Office type A
Archiving	Separated office	952	Office type A
	Office (merger of library affairs and archiving affairs)	890	Office type A
Fisheries and marine affairs	Separated office	838	Office type A
	Office (merger of fisheries and marine affairs and agricultural affairs)	873	Office type A
Tourism	Separated office	732	Office type B
	Office (merger of tourism affairs and cultural affairs)	808	Office type A
Agricultural	Separated office	909	Office type A
	Office (merger of agricultural affairs and food security affairs)	864	Office type A
	Office (merger of agricultural affairs and forestry affairs)	936	Office type A
	Office (merger of fisheries and marine affairs and agricultural affairs)	873	Office type A
Forestry	Separated office	964	Office type A
	Office (merger of agricultural affairs and forestry affairs)	936	Office type A
Energy and Mineral resources (ESDM)	Separated office	760	Office type B
	Office (merger of ESDM affairs and public works affairs)	790	Office type B
Commerce	Separated office	688	Office type B
	Office (merger of commerce affairs and industry affairs)	674	Office type B
	Office (merger of commerce affairs, industry affairs and KUKM affairs)	743	Office type B
	Separated office	660	Office type B
Industry	Office (merger of commerce affairs and industry affairs)	674	Office type B
	Office (merger of commerce affairs, industry affairs and KUKM affairs)	743	Office type B
	Separated office	632	Office type B
	Office (merger of social affairs, manpower affairs and transmigration affairs)	798	Office type B
Local revenue Planning	Separated office	910	Office type A
	Separated board	630	Board type B
	Board (merger of statistics affairs, planning affairs and research and development affairs)	708	Board type B
Control Financial	Separated board	841	Board type A
	Separated board	930	Board type A
Staffing	Office (merger of local revenue affairs and financial function)	920	Office type A
	Separated board	792	Board type B
	Board (merger of staffing affairs and education and training affairs)	753	Board type B
Research and development	Separated board	888	Board type A
	Board (merger of statistics affairs, planning function and research and development function)	759	Board type B
Education and training	Separated board	715	Board type B
	Board (merger of staffing function and education and training function)	753	Board type B
Public procurement (according to Academic Draft Substituting Government Regulation No. 41 of 2007)	Separated board	715	Board type B
	Subdivision in local secretariat	315	Type B

Score of affairs/function: calculation according to Academic Draft Substituting Government Regulation No. 41 of 2007 (appendix); Score of merger of affairs/function: total score of merged affairs/function divided with number of affairs/function merged; Typology of Office/Board: type A-800; type B-601-800; type C-400-600; Structure of organization: provisions of Academic Draft Substituting Government Regulation No. 41 of 2007 Article 31-35

agencies with various forms, sizes, contents and nomenclatures in each region, thus, resulted in many problems. With regard to it then in institutional structuring of SKPD in the future it is expected to have directive guideline for local government in determining the more efficient and simple form, size, content and nomenclature of SKPDs.

Institutional design of SKPD according to Academic Draft Substituting Government Regulation No. 41 of 2007 has opened the chance to accommodate each affairs and supporting functions within a separated office/board. But from the result of study on this regency/city institutional model it is shown that merger of several similar affairs/supporting functions within single office/board would still be an alternative despite the big score those affairs/supporting functions had from the scoring due to consideration of efficiency and easiness of coordination. With regard to it, Academic Draft Substituting Government Regulation No. 41 of 2007 need to provide direction regarding which affairs/supporting functions should be accommodated within specific separated local agency. Yet, it is still necessary to set a clear corridor, so that, the merger of various affairs within single local agency in a region compared to other regions wouldn't be varied too widely. On the other hand, since, agriculture and public works affairs have extensive range of scope then it is very likely to be accommodated within more than one office.

Model of institutional structuring of local agency according to result of scoring based on Academic Draft Substituting Government Regulation No. 41 of 2007 resulted in Typology of Organization of Local Agency in Cianjur Regency of Type A, B and C as mentioned above. Then, Cianjur Regency government should immediately implement the institutional structuring of local agency in Cianjur Regency according to result of the scoring.

Formation of public procurement unit if following revision of Government Regulation No. 41 of 2007 would

be accommodated in a board of type B. But if following new rule of score calculation from Regulation of Minister of Home Affairs No. 99 of 2014 then public procurement unit would be categorized into type B and accommodated in form of subdivision in local secretariat.

## **CONCLUSION**

This formulation is expected to be reference for other countries that are in effort to develop and strengthen the decentralization pattern, especially in the strengthening of organization in local government.

## **REFERENCES**

- James, L. and D.K.K. Gibson, 1997. [Organization and Management: Behavior, Structure and Process]. Erlangga, Jakarta, Indonesia, (In Indonesian).
- Mardiasmo, 2002. [Organization and Management: Behavior, Structure and Process]. Andi Publisher, Yogyakarta, Indonesia, (In Indonesian).
- Miftah, T., 2001. [Organizational Behavior Basic Concepts and Applications]. RajaGrafindo Persada, Jakarta, Indonesia, (In Indonesian).
- Numberi, F.R., 2000. Organisasi dan Administrasi Pemerintah Nasional Seminar on Professionalization of Bureaucracy and Improvement of Public Service Performance. Gadjah Mada University, Yogyakarta, Indonesia,.
- Robbins, S.P., 1995. [Theory of Organization, Structure, Design and Application]. 3rd Edn., Penerbit Arcon, Jakarta, Indonesia, (In Indonesian).
- Wasistiono, S., 2003. Peraturan Pemerintah 8-2003: Dilema Upaya Efisiensi Birokrasi Daerah Makalah: Delivered in Roundtable Discussion, Critical Inquiry of Government Regulation No. 8 of 2003 at 11 June 2003. Center for Local Government Innovation, Jakarta, Indonesia,.