

Stakeholder Partnership in Minapolitan Policy Implementation to Produce Sustainable Development in Gresik Regency of Indonesia

M. Rozikin¹⁾, Agus Suryono²⁾, Bambang Supriyono³⁾, Andy Fefta Wijaya⁴⁾

1) Student Doctoral Program of the State Administration of Administrative Sciences UB Malang State

2) Professor Doctoral Program in Public Administration Faculty of the State Administration of Brawijaya

3) Professor Doctoral Program in Public Administration Faculty of the State Administration of Brawijaya

4) Lecturer Doctoral Program in Public Administration Public Administration Faculty of the State Administration of Brawijaya

Abstract. Research is aimed to describe, to analyze and to interpret the implementation of Minapolitan Policy in Gresik Regency. Research method is using qualitative approach suggested by Denscombe (2007:3), McNabb (2002:267), and Sinuff et al (2007:105). Research focus is based on the findings of Strange and Bayley (2008), Bogdan & Taylor (1992), and Lofland & Lofland (1984:25-26). Data analysis is qualitative in accordance with Denscombe (2007:288). Data validation technique is using Lincoln & Guba (1985:301-327) and Denscombe (2007:135). Result of research is revealing that the disposition (commitment) of the implementer is still low because there is lacking of consistency (*istiqomah*) between what has been planned/expected in master plan (the substance of intention) and the willingness to achieve the goals and targets of Minapolitan Area Development. Indeed, Minapolitan Area Development is organized by Work Force Team consisting of SKPD elements with specific functional main task but it binds SKPD itself only to accomplish performance as higher as possible rather than to maximize the action in favor of Minapolitan. Consequently, the engagement of Work Force Team is not total and thus, the expected performance of Minapolitan is not achieved. Low commitment may influence communication, resource and bureaucratic structure aspects. Stakeholder partnership is taken place naturally and not designed to succeed Minapolitan Program, and thus, Minapolitan Area Development does not show what so called sustainable development.

Keywords: Partnership, Stakeholder, Implementation, Policy, Minapolitan, and Sustainable Development

I. Introduction

Indonesia is the widest archipelagic state in the world with 17,504 islands and 104,000 km coastline length. Sea wide total of Indonesia is around 3.544 km² or 70% of Indonesia territory. As shown by the data of the Ministry of Marine and Fishery (KKP, 2014), the productivity of cultivated fishery in 2014 is 14.5 millions tons. The follow-up targets will be 17.9 millions tons (2015), 19.43 millions tons (2016), 22.79 millions tons (2017), 26.72 millions tons (2018), and 31.32 millions tons (2019). The development at fishery sector is the main concern for the government. This concern is aimed to increase community welfare, especially fishery community, and also to enforce the conservation of fish resource and its environment. It is expected that the impact of policy will increasingly contribute to several aspects of fishery sector, including job supply, export, and Non-Tax Revenue (PNBP).

As exposed by FAO *Statistic Division* (2012:19), the cultivated fishery productivity in 2007 is ranked as fourth with average increment of production reaching 8.79 % per year. It positions Indonesia as the biggest fishery producer in the world.

Fishery is one of important resources for community wellbeing and also a potential *prime mover* of national economic. This reflects several facts. *First* is that Indonesian fishery is potentially large if reviewed from quantity and diversity. *Second* is that fishery sector is interdependent with other sectors and can develop the welfare of immediate communities. Third is that Indonesian fishery has higher *comparative advantage* (Daryanto, 2007).

By considering as important for fishery potentials and also for higher marketing opportunity of fishery sector, the government decides to make a policy for fishery sector development. Through the Ministry of Fishery and Marine, the government has released the Decree of the Ministry of Fishery and Marine No.12/2010 about Minapolitan. In pursuance of the Decree of the Ministry of Fishery and Marine No.35/2013 about the Amendment to the Decree of the Ministry of Fishery and Marine No.KEP 32/MEN/2010 about The Establishment of Minapolitan Area, thereby, several regencies/cities are assigned as Minapolitan Area comprising of 202 locations. The locations are divided into Cultivate Minapolitan in 145 regencies/cities and Capture Minapolitan in 57 regencies/cities.

Based on the Decree of the Ministry of Marine and Fishery of Indonesian Republic No. 18/2011 about the General Manual of Minapolitan Area, there is a statement about Blue Revolution, which is a strategic policy to change mindset and orientation of the development from land to marine in fundamentally fast ways. Technically, Blue Revolution is manifested into Minapolitan. There are four pillars of Blue Revolution, which are: (1) changing the mindset and orientation of the development from land to marine, (2) sustainable development, (3) improving the productivity of marine and fishery, and (4) increasing community income in manners of just, redistributive and fairness.

A regency applying minapolitan policy is Gresik Regency, particularly in Sidayu District (Gresik Regency Master Plan of Minapolitan Area, 2011). Minapolitan Program has been implemented at Sidayu District since 2010. Although it lacks of significant development, it brings positive contribution to the economic of community and locality. Gresik Regent, Mr. Sambari Halim, says that “Minapolitan Program can increase fish production for 19,000 tons in 2011 and develop home industry among embankment farmers that absorb workforce” (Kabar Bisnis, 2011).

The implementation of Minapolitan Policy must need integration and synergy of various actors such as the government internals, community, college and private (entrepreneur); the existence of domestic and international markets; and technology and capital supply. Integration and synergy across actors to implement Minapolitan Policy is packaged into stakeholder partnership (General Secretary to the Ministry of Marine and Fishery, 2013). The complexity of field problem cannot be resolved by the government as *single actor*. Related to intellectual resource for area development, the government always has limited knowledge about it. If market network is considered, non-governmental actors (private) seem having quite higher competence. Financially, governmental finance is always scarce. The limited capacity of the government to be the caretaker of the development has forced the government to play role as the facilitator, the regulator and the catalyst of the development at various levels to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of development. In Gresik Regency Master Plan of Minapolitan Area, partnership is considered as important because it helps to justify the joint management to exploit fishery potentials between government and private.

Partnership is a process to create cooperation with mutualism of trust, need, benefit and responsibility. In Islam perspective, partnership is important in undergoing the life path to create kindness. It is expressed in Al-Qur'an, Al Maidah Epistle Verse 2:

Share the help between you for kindness and piety, and do not share the help for sin and deviation. Be pious to God because God can incur heavy sanction.

The verse is only mentioned once in Al-Qur'an, and therefore, this verse must be understood in general context. It means that the target is general and the kindness is also general. It is consistent to the character of Islam with universal message because fundamental essence of Islam is for the favor of universe (*Rahmatan lil Alamin*). By considering Islam As *Rahmatan lil Alamin* religion, the verse can be signified as that every human is required to have a partnership in kindness, including implementing the development without harming the environment. If it harms the environment, the nature of religion as the gift for the universe has been violated. As said by Sunoto (2009:08), the manifestation of sustainable development at Minapolitan Area in Sidayu District of Gresik Regency is requiring the involvement of various actors and development sectors. It is implemented with integration, efficiency, quality and high acceleration. Not any singular sector can individually achieve sustainable development concept. The responsibility will remain under *multi-stakeholder* by which any single party cannot act unilaterally against the term of responsibility determined in contracts. Multi-stakeholder partnership is attempting to achieve mutual vision, to maintain and to support problem solving in mutual manner.

Partnership across stakeholders (*stakeholder partnership*) means that all stakeholders will be given chance to have active participation into management. It helps to warrant their commitment and participation because stakeholders feel that their knowledge, aspiration and experience of management are being accommodated. Role division in different management depends on specific condition of each developed area. In some cases, authority may be more given to community institution, but in other cases, authority is greatly held by governmental institution. Benefit that may be accepted is that the non-government sector may take benefit from their participation in determining or deciding the management which influences their welfare, and that the government is relieved from its great work load.

Stakeholder partnership in the implementation of sustainable development policy has specific character. As reported by the Division for Sustainable Development (2005), stakeholder partnership is not the substitute for governmental responsibility. Partnership is aimed to empower the implementation of sustainable development policy by involving all parties who contribute to sustainable development. In other perspective, the word “partnership” is designed to show the initiative taken by stakeholders, including the government and non-governmental organizations which concern with giving contribution to the implementation of sustainable development (Hemmati and Whitfield, 2003:2).

As revealed in Gresik Regency Master Plan of Minapolitan Area (2011), the parties involved in *forward linkage* and *backward linkage* in the Minapolitan Development are fishery farmer community, fisher, fish broker or collector merchant, fishery cooperative, fishery entrepreneur/ private, fish consumer, supplier industry for fish cultivation (feed, seedling, medicine), provider industry for post-harvest/capture activities (salt, oxygen, energy/ LPG), finance/capital agency, transportation service, telecommunication service, and related governmental official (The Official of Marine, Fishery and Animal Husbandry).

Syahrir (2004) asserts that each actor in partnership, including private sector, community and government, plays different role. In life environment perspective, the government plays role and function related to the management and supervision over environmental condition. In this matter, environmental management must be the important step which includes the prevention and mitigation against environmental damage and pollution, and also the recovery of environmental quality (Hanafie, 2010:23). The government takes action by developing sets of policy, program and activity supported by a system that also aids other environmental management. Such system has covered a stability of organization, human resource and environmental partnership.

Law No.23/1997 has explained that in managing life environment, the government has general function as the maker of policy, regulation, and permission which defends the interest of community. The localities also settle on the cooperation to control over the partnership in order to achieve the principles of transparency and accountability.

Minapolitan Area in Gresik Regency, as briefly examined by the author, is showing less significant change or not much different than before the launching of Minapolitan Area by Gresik Regent and the Ministry of Marine and Fishery despite the available infrastructures such as road around embankment area and river dredging for the access of embankment water. However, the community is not feeling the impact of Minapolitan Program in their area. Instead, the supporting capacity of embankment cultivation is not changing at all. Embankment fertility is still persistent. The cultivation is also environmental friendly such that the sustainability is conserved. The partnership is not greatly changing because there is no change in the mutual interest between embankment farmer and fish trader who naturally need one to another.

By taking account the expectancy, potential, regulation and theory that underlay the issue above, therefore, the author takes a title “STAKEHOLDER PARTNERSHIP IN MINAPOLITAN POLICY IMPLEMENTATION TO CREATE SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT” in attempting to understand the linkage of conceptual aspects in factual condition.

By making reference to the background above, research problem is “How is stakeholder partnership in Minapolitan Policy implementation to create sustainable development in Gresik Regency?” The objective of research is to describe, to analyze and to interpret Minapolitan Policy implementation to create sustainable development in Gresik Regency.

Theoretical benefits of this research are related to the scientific contribution to determine “*state of the art*” (scientific apparatus, procedures, processes or techniques) to resolve the problems related to sustainable Minapolitan Policy implementation and stakeholder partnership. Result of this research is expected to give important addition to the existing insight and review of Minapolitan Policy implementation and stakeholder partnership practice to create sustainable development in Indonesia. Research may contribute to the thought of Minapolitan Policy implementation based on partnership and sustainable development in order to create welfare for fishery community. *Practically*, Minapolitan Policy is the asset for the government of Gresik Regency to optimize fishery potential and to increase community welfare, and to improve Local Genuine Income of Gresik Regency. Therefore, all stakeholders must be involved to escort the sustainability of Minapolitan Policy. To ensure the sustainability of Minapolitan Policy, hereby the government of Gresik Regency must increase the quantity and quality of their coordination and communication with the community in socializing Minapolitan Policy, among other through less formal approach or by adjusting governmental method to the culture of embankment farmer community. Result of research is also expected to be useful for building a synergy between government, community, and business sector in implementing Minapolitan Development Policy in sustainable manner.

II. Method Of Research

Research method is using qualitative approach suggested by Denscombe (2007:3), McNabb (2002:267), and Sinuff et al (2007:105). Research focus is pursuant to the findings of Strange and Bayley (2008), Bogdan & Taylor (1992), and Lofland & Lofland (1984:25-26). Data analysis is qualitative in accordance with Denscombe (2007:288). Data validation technique is using Lincoln & Guba (1985:301-327) and Denscombe (2007:135).

III. Result And Discussion

Stakeholder Partnership in Minapolitan Policy Implementation in Gresik Regency

Partnership is one important element to execute public policy. The making of public policy is not only organized by one actor, and therefore, the government is not anymore the singular actor who dominates the making of public policy because government capacity is always limited. When public administration is reviewed, the government is required to share the role with stakeholders or at least to build partnership with the public in stakeholder partnership to develop the nation. Partnership may go well if there is participation from the public or other stakeholders. Great participation helps to achieve the expectancy of a nation. Great participation also facilitates policy implementation, and thus, a space is needed for role sharing across stakeholders to achieve mutual goals. Through the implementation of Minapolitan Policy, partnership is understood through two (2) sides, which are the urgency of partnership and the type of partnership.

The Urgency of Partnership to Implement Minapolitan Pilot Project Program in Sidayu District

A question is asked to embankment farmer communities, which is whether is possible to manage the embankment without the participation of others, including during the preparation of embankment for fish or shrimp, the maintenance and monitoring of fish and shrimp growth, the harvest, and the selling of harvest to market. Mr. H.M Sokeh, a milkfish cultivator, has said that:

“Embankment work cannot stand alone. I use to be rice farmer. In 1980s, I change to be embankment farmer. Rice field is converted to embankment. For converting into embankment, I need two things. First is deepening the field, and second is ensuring that the embankment can accommodate water for milkfish cultivation. I learn this from the successful group in managing their embankment. After the embankment is ready, I buy fish seedlings from the supplier in Bunga and Manyar Markets. For feed, fertilizer and medicine, I get these in Sidayu Market. I still consult with my friends about how to deal with the problem with milkfish disease. After harvest, I do not sell to market because some buyers come directly to embankment location”. (Interview, 13 March 2014, at 10.00 am in the House of Mr. Sokeh)

The statement from Mr. H. Sokeh shows that any activities by human or community cannot stand alone but need help of others regardless profession and rank. Mr. H. Sokeh is the former rice farmer but now becoming milkfish embankment farmer. During the conversion, the help of others is needed. Mr. H. Sokeh must learn embankment business from the successful group, buy the seedling (nener) from the supplier in Bunga and Manyar Markets, buy embankment materials in Sedayu Market, must consult with other embankment farmer about fish problem, and meet with buyers during harvest.

According to Mr. H. Sokeh, the harvest of embankment is not merely a consequence from the relationship between the embankment producer and the fish trader who buys embankment output. Environmental aspect also matters. If water used to irrigate the embankment is taken from polluted river or contaminated groundwater, it will harm the life of fish/shrimp, and finally influence the harvest. Mr. H. Sokeh explains that:

“From the story and experience of the intensive embankment farmer who rent the embankment in this location, they have done big effort to construct deep wells to eject the salt water. They have huge harvest and shrimp price is quite expensive. But, not for long, they collapse. Their embankment is not fertile and even destructive to other embankment. As experienced by me and other embankment farmers, the water from polluted river may harm fish and shrimp, and the harvest can fail or loss. We must keep embankment water cleaned, either that from river or bore well, and also maintain the cleanliness of harvest discharge to the stream to avoid the river from being polluted because the discharge may contain residuals of fertilizer and medicine for fish and shrimp. Preserving the environment is the obligation of all individuals and peoples because river must flow into the embankment, and therefore, all embankment farmers must preserve the stream of the river”. (Interview, 13 March 2014, in the House of Mr. H. Sokeh)

The goal of human activity is only achievable through the help of others, either by individuals or organizations. Embankment farmers must cooperate with other factors for the success and sustainability of embankment. As said by Mr. H. Suparlan that:

“I come from Lamongan. Since 1976, I settle in Purwodadi Village. My experience is simple, which is that embankment farmers always need support or help from others. Earlier, I rent embankment, and now, the size grows. The successful change cannot escape from my hard work and the support and trust of others. I use to be Head of Village, and now, I am the agent for the growing of Vanamie Shrimp seedling, the distributor of feed for fish and shrimp, the managing board of Muhammadiyah, and the representative of agency for the religious travel of Hajji and Umroh. All these positions are derived from the trustable mutualism. I must be smart in making relation and the key is trust. Being the agent and the distributor of feed for fish and shrimp, I have a partnership with feed factory, and my marketing covers up Sidayu, Bunga, Dukun and Ujungpangkah Districts. Such development is not suddenly emerging, but involving hard work and trust from others.” (Interview, 18 January 2014, at 08.00 am in the house)

Reviewing from the life journey and experience of Mr. H. Suparlan, it can be said that the function and role of a person are achievable if there is a relationship with other parties underlined with trust value. Relationship among personals/individuals or among organizations always involves the implementation of function and role to achieve certain goals, but this achievement must need cooperation from others. By cooperating with others, we are helped to achieve the goals, to learn something about the capacity, and to consult with others in solving the problem. This represents the dynamic of every human, and the activity of a human will always involve others. In other words, having a partnership with others, either across individuals or across organizations, is inevitable in human life. Furthermore, Mr. H. Suparlan explains that:

“My experience in embankment cultivation is developed when I open myself to others. Embankment farmers and fish traders are accommodated into the group (Pokdakan). My embankment is not standing alone in Purwodadi village, but staying close to another embankment. It means that we take water from similar river, or even share similar dike. If we do not have good relation with other embankment farmers, is it possible to manage our embankment alone? The answer is no. All embankment farmers must maintain the environment and keep it from pollution. As a Moslem, I realize that perfect life is coming from good relationship with others. Based on the stipulation from God, a key for successful life is through a relationship or cooperation. Being an embankment farmer, good harvest is not possible if not supported by other embankment farmers or other related parties”. (Interview, 18 January 2014, at 08.00 am in the house)

Human is only a creature created by God and the nature of human existence always needs others. Human community implements their function and role with relation, cooperation, support and participation of others. God, Mighty Creator, has stated that human perfection is propped by other human, meaning that relation, cooperation, and partnership are the character of human life. The avoidance of this matter will distort the function of life. The biggest function of human is determined by God, that human is a leader on the earth who supposes to manage the earth for the prosperity of earth without harming the earth (polluting the environment) because the harm is related to God curse.

The importance of partnership to implement public policy is requiring good participation among stakeholders. The implementation of participation public policy is very complex. Therefore, participation must be followed by the responsibility of each participant actor. Sidayu District is assigned as the site of Minapolitan Pilot Project in Gresik Regency since 2011. Partnership is an important matter in the implementation of Minapolitan Concept and Policy. The effort to develop fishery and marine potentials is manifested into Minapolitan Policy, and by Minapolitan Policy, it is expected that the goals of fishery and marine development policies can be achieved. Strategic steps, therefore, are required such as building cooperation and organizing a meeting with college, school, non-governmental organization (NGO), and business association. It is consistent to the Decree of the Ministry of Fishery and Marine which states that:

“To achieve the objective of development policy at fishery and marine sector, hereby, Minapolitan Concept is implemented through Minapolitan Development and also by marine and fishery production. By this development, it is expected that objectives and targets can be achieved in accelerated way through strategic steps, such as national campaign and cooperation involving all governmental agencies at provincial, regency and city levels to give full support to infrastructure development, capital grant, and sector-based policy that favors Minapolitan Development. Such cooperation can be created by organizing the major session with college, school, non-government organization (NGO), and business association”. (the Decree of the Ministry of Fishery and Marine No. Kep.18/Men/2011)

The importance of partnership to implement public policy is also consistent to local autonomy which requires the participation of various actors to implement the development. The spirit of local autonomy is emphasizing on participation and bottom-up development which requires good partnership between government, community and private sector in developing fishery potential as expected within Minapolitan Policy. Economic development process through increasing embankment productivity may need strategic steps such as the capitalization, the superior seed, and the supportive structure and infrastructure. It is stated in Gresik Regency Master Plan of Minapolitan Area:

“In the era of local autonomy with bottom-up economic development policy, every natural resource and fishery commodity in the planning area must be developed and managed properly by community, together with government and private. Extensification of cultivation can be achieved through the cooperation with the private the private in some issues such as the capitalization, the supply of superior variety seed, and the procurement of other production structure (Gresik Regency Master Plan of Minapolitan Area, 2011:V-27).

Referring to the Decree of the Ministry of Fishery and Marine about Minapolitan, it can be understood that partnership is very important to implement Minapolitan Policy. Partnership is one way to implement Minapolitan Policy in proper way and it also helps the achievement of goal of fishery potential development. However, the reality found in Sidayu District of Gresik Regency as the location of Minapolitan Pilot Project is still away from the expectation because the implementation of Minapolitan Policy is not good as should be. If pursuant to the Document of Middle-Term Investment Program Planning (RPIJM) for Minapolitan Area in

Gresik Regency for 2011-2015, there are many plans to support the development of Minapolitan Area in Sidayu District such as the construction of water gate in the estuary of Lengok River, the training on fish seed, the procurement of fish waste processing technology, the training on diversification technology for fish-based modern product, the training on how to improve marketing technology and cooperation system, and others. However, until 2014, the realization of RPIJM is still low. Therefore, the establishment of Minapolitan Area in Sidayu District since 2011 cannot give positive contribution to the increase of cultivation productivity and the income of embankment farmer in Sidayu District. Lower positive contribution at Minapolitan Area to community welfare in Sidayu District, as observed by the author, is caused by several factors. The establishment of Minapolitan Area is considered not proper because several items are lacking of review and consideration by the government before master plan is made. A concept of ideal area is also less understood. The misunderstanding about a certain concept will have systematic impact on the sustainability of a policy. It is uncovered by Mr. Zainul as the Director of PT. Kelola Mina Laut who explains that:

“Minapolitan Concept shall be understood as the development of a certain area. Therefore, the achievement of goals must involve the cooperation of all parties, meaning that there is a professional team-work to manage in full time. Reliable infrastructure is needed to realize this cooperation, so is adequate capital. I can see that Minapolitan Area in Sidayu District, Gresik, is different. Small works, such as dredging the river for canal normalization and building the roads to improve the access to harvest transportation, immediately stop due to limited budget. Once again, the management of area cannot be partial, must be focus, and shall have multi-effects”. (Interview, 10 March 2014, at 14.00 pm in the working room)

If reviewed from the aspect of embankment ownership in Sidayu District, most of embankments are owned by Sidayu people. Cultivation is implemented through a rent system at five years schedule. Rent system motivates the tenant to obtain as huge as possible profits such that economic aspect is more dominant than environment aspect, and also that the productivity is forced to achieve the target. If this is happening continuously, it will threaten the fertility of embankment area in Sidayu District and the wellbeing of Minapolitan Policy itself. It is corroborated by Mr. Yusak by stating that:

“Most embankment farmers (80%) in Srowo are the outsider, or those from Sedagaran and Purwodadi. Most of them are tenant who work on traditional embankment or traditional-plus cultivation. They want good fish, and therefore, they use commercial feed and sometimes fertilizers. If they are asked whether it will harm embankment (reducing its fertility), they answer that it is possible so in long term but now, they just want a fast growing fish. They understand that embankment environment (water and river) must be health, but in practice, they do in unhealthy way. All embankment farmers say so, and therefore, mindset change is needed. Mutual initiation is needed because unilateral action is not enough”. (Interview, 24 October 2014, non-formal FGD in Minapolitan Post of Srowo)

In consistent to the above statement, Mr. Zainul criticizes the establishment of Sidayu District as the Pilot Project Site for Minapolitan Area because this District does not have a capacity to support embankment land due to its fertility decrement. It is said that:

“Governmental decision to assign Sidayu District as Minapolitan Area is possibly mistaken because the District is not proper for cultivation and many lands in this District are not fertile. Most embankment farmers in Sidayu District do not have embankment land themselves and most of them are tenant. Their production is to be forced in such away that they do not even thin about sustainability and environmental conservation”. (Interview, 10 March 2014, in the working room)

Based on the reality of Minapolitan implementation in Sidayu District, many programs are not walking properly and not aligned with Minapolitan Policy. Several factors are constraining government, community and private to implement Minapolitan Policy in Sidayu District. Minapolitan Policy in Sidayu District may not be implemented well because stakeholder partnership is not organized properly. A good partnership can be developed if there is a reliable socialization and fair role assignment between government, community and private. However, the socialization process about Minapolitan in Minapolis Village is not involving embankment farmers, and even the village officer and BPD are excluded. Mr. Yusak as the secretary of Srowo Village explains that:

“In Srowo Village, there is indeed Minapolitan Area. However, the village government does not know much about this. Since 2011, Srowo Village is assigned as Minapolitan Area but there is no socialization about this assignment. In Srowo Village, there is a board labeled Minapolitan Area but I, as the secretary of village and other village officers, do not feel involved with this issue. There is no forward letter whatsoever sent upon me although the construction of production road has begun”. (Interview, 20 January 2014, at 14.00 pm in the house)

The explanation of Mr. Yusak is supported by Mr. Muslikh as the Chair of Podakan who must understand the implementation and the problem of embankment farmers. The local government never involves embankment farmers into Minapolitan implementation in Srowo Village such that the community does not

understand this program although the program is actually executed in the village. The following is interview quote:

“Minapolitan Program is not well socialized although the poster is already installed. I do not understand the target of Minapolitan Program because most of embankment farmers are standing alone. When we lack of fertilizers or when the fishes are dead, the Official is not helping. I am also the member of Pokdakan, this program shall involve me because the program is closely related with the activity of embankment farmers. Now, I begin to feel being ignored”. (Interview, 18 January 2014, at 12.00 pm in the house of Mr. H. Muslikh)

Besides the fact that embankment farmers do not understand Minapolitan Program and also do not feel involved into the decision making of Minapolitan Policy, the worse is that the suppliers as the private actors are not involved in the implementation of Minapolitan Program. Suppliers are those who touch and cooperate with embankment farmers in fishery cultivation, and it is not surprising if they want to be consulted into Minapolitan Policy as the effort to develop fishery potential. Although the private sector understands Minapolitan Program but the government of Gresik Regency does not give certain efforts for socialization and cooperation. Therefore, Minapolitan Program in Sidayu District has excluded the private either in the policy making and the implementation. Mr. H. Suparlan as the provider of vanamie shrimp and also the distributor of fish/shrimp has explained that:

“In Sidayu District, there is a Minapolitan Area but I, as the supplier, never receive direct information about this project from the government. I know Minapolitan Area from community talks. I do not see governmental collaboration in Minapolitan policy-making. We shall be consulted because the suppliers also help embankment farmers in cultivating the embankment or in finding the seedling to breed”. (Interview, 18 January 2014, at 08.00 am in the house).

Low participation from privates and embankment farmer communities into the implementation of Minapolitan Policy may justify that the presence of Minapolitan Area in Sidayu District still fails to change the partnership pattern between government, community and private sector. The partnership between government, community and private sector related to the development of fishery potential must also change when Minapolitan Policy is released. A partnership shall change after the implementation of Minapolitan Policy because before this policy is executed in certain locality, the local government must prepare a master plan as one condition to establish Minapolitan Area. The master plan shall be implemented through the managerial plan and the action plan. The process to prepare master plan is performed by the local government under cooperation or partnership with community, private sector, college and other institutions of interest. This partnership is needed to accommodate inputs from related stakeholders. It is made pursuant to the Decree of the Ministry of Fishery and Marine No.Per.12/MEN/2010 about Minapolitan, in Section 9 Verse 2 which states that:

“Master Plan is made, based on Verse (1), by the government of regencies/towns in pursuance of their authority to cooperate with community, business world, college and other institutions of interest.

Master plan contains of a comprehensive review about main aspects of Minapolitan Area Development. One of such aspects is the chance to cooperate with other interest parties. It is explained in Section 10 Verse 2 and 3 which states that:

“Master Plan in Verse 1 at least explains about (a) a comprehensive review about all main aspects related to Minapolitan Area Development to produce the basic data; and (b) the projection of direction, the scenario and the middle-term development stage of Minapolitan Area.

What so called a comprehensive review about all main aspects related to Minapolitan Area Development to produce the basic data is, based on Verse 2 letter a, consisting of the identification about:

- a. The potential of Minapolitan Area which comprises of (1) natural resource in the area and around; (2) the presence of production, processing and/or marketing units in the area; (3) human resource and related organization in the management of area development; and (4) the structure and infrastructure to support area development.
- b. The policy of development on the sector and area to produce synchronization, integration and policy interdependence.
- c. The structure and the pattern of spatial usage which is consistent to the application of RTRW and/or RZWP-3-K.
- d. The constraining factor and opportunity factor; and
- e. The opportunity to cooperate with the interest parties.

Partnership to implement Minapolitan Program is not only required in the Decree of the Ministry of Fishery and Marine but also has been stated in Gresik Regency Master Plan of Minapolitan Area. It is expressed in Master Plan that a process to improve fishery production needs the establishment of partnership network between stakeholders of interest such as local government, private, and community. This partnership can be reviewed from interdependence context between commodity sector and regional context. Such consideration is also revealed in Gresik Regency Master Plan of Minapolitan Area through statement:

“Recalling that there is a natural resource that is potentially supporting fishery, then by encouraging the openness and enhancing the marketing distribution, it is expected that it will improve the competing ability of fishery sector in Gresik Regency and the immediate area. Such improvement is achieved by building partnership network across parties, such as community, local government officer and privates including large, medium and small enterprises. Partnership network can be understood from the interdependence context across commodity sectors and the regional context (Gresik Regency Master Plan of Minapolitan Area, 2011:IV–13).

As explained in Ministerial Decree and Gresik Regency Master Plan of Minapolitan Area, the presence of Minapolitan Area in Gresik Regency brings a change in the partnership across stakeholders. No partnership found in the implementation of Minapolitan Policy in Gresik Regency means that the character of governmental communication is top-down. The government plays dominant role in implementing Minapolitan Policy. Before the implementation of Minapolitan Policy, initial step to be taken is making a master plan to develop Minapolitan Area. The master plan contains the description of fishery potential in Gresik Regency, the plan for the development of fishery area and fishery cultivation, the analysis over Minapolitan Area Development, and the plan of Minapolitan Area Development. Master Plan for Minapolitan Area Development is an important planning document and becoming the guide to implement Minapolitan Policy in Gresik Regency.

However, during the preparation of master plan, local government does not involve embankment farmer communities in Sidayu District. The embankment farmers in Sidayu District are assigned into 12 fish cultivator groups (Pokdakan). All groups in Sidayu District are not been consulted in the preparation of master plan for Minapolitan Area Development in Gresik Regency. Mr. H. Suparlan as the Chair of Pokdakan Bandeng Raya at Purwodadi Village explains that:

“In Sidayu District, there are 12 fish cultivator groups. All groups are not consulted by the government during the preparation of master plan for Minapolitan Area Development. Embankment farmer communities at Purwodadi Village, and also the member of the group, are not approached or even invited to the communication with the government about Minapolitan Area. Many members of community are not playing a functional role to manage Minapolitan Area because they really do not know if such area exists. If the master plan as the planning document is made to involve the community, then embankment farmers or group members can play significant role to implement the program”. (Interview, 18 January 2014, at 08.00 am in the house)

What has been said by Mr. Suparlan as the Chair of Pokdakan at Purwodadi Village is also consistent to Mr. Muslikh as the Chair of Pokdakan Mina Raya at Srowo Village. Embankment farmer communities have never been consulted during planning and implementation of Minapolitan Program. Although some billboards about Minapolitan Area are already put in Srowo Village, but the community does not understand Minapolitan Program because the government never intends to communicate such program. Less surprisingly, no significant role is played by embankment farmer communities, especially in Srowo Village. As explained by Mr. Muslikh:

“Most of embankment farmer communities in Srowo Village do not understand because Minapolitan Area because the government never communicate this area to them. Billboards are failed to represent the message of Minapolitan Area. However, they are shocked by sudden construction of production road and river dredging. They just do not know that these activities are the part of Minapolitan Program”. (Interview, 18 January 2014, at 12.00 pm in the house)

The Chair of Pokdakan asserts that the community is not involved in the preparation of master plan, and the government agrees with this statement. Embankment farmer communities are not being engaged into master plan preparation because the assignment of Gresik Regency as the Pilot Project Site for Minapolitan Program is considered as too sudden. This sudden appointment of Gresik Regency as the Pilot Project Site for Minapolitan Program may force the local government into a panic and unready position because the interval between the Decree of the Ministry of Fishery and Marine about General Manual of Minapolitan Area and the decision to establish Minapolitan Area is too short or almost simultaneous. Ministerial Decree has explained that before the locality is assigned as Minapolitan Area, it must meet some criteria. The government of Gresik Regency itself never applies for the assignment of Minapolitan Area to the central government, and therefore, the government of Gresik Regency itself is astonishing to such assignment. Indeed, the government is rushing with the time to complete the documents needed, and one of such documents is Master Plan for Minapolitan Area Development. As explained by Mr. Samsul Arifin:

“Gresik Regency in 2010 has been assigned as Minapolitan Area and this fact is surprising the Official of Marine, Fishery and Animal Husbandry. It seems that this assignment is released almost simultaneously with the Decree of the Ministry of Fishery and Marine. There are strict administrative requirements to be met to become Minapolitan Area, but the government of Gresik Regency never applies for such assignment. The sudden arrival of Minister Decree that assigns Gresik Regency as Minapolitan Area is very horrific”. (Interview, 10 June 2013, at 10.00 am in the office)

Although the assignment of Minapolitan Area in Gresik Regency is considered as too fast and the local government seems not ready with this, it does not mean that the local government is allowed to exclude the embankment farmer communities from communication. Dealing with such unready position, the local

government then appoints directly a representative of embankment farmers, which is Mr. Hakam. This appointment is made because Mr. Hakam is considered as a potential human resource with readiness to implement Minapolitan Policy in Sidayu District. In addition, Mr. Hakam also organizes NGO “Hakam” with quite plenty memberships. During the implementation of Minapolitan Policy, the local government walks out communication and socialization with embankment farmer communities chaired by Mr. Hakam. As explained by Mr. Samsul Arifin:

“The local government, represented by the Official of Marine, Fishery and Animal Husbandry, is not ready with the assignment of Gresik Regency as Minapolitan Area despite its huge fishery potential, but it does not mean that the local government must stand alone in policy implementation. Mr. Hakam is appointed as the representative of embankment farmer communities. The communication is made with Mr. Hakam during the implementation of Minapolitan Policy. A motive behind this appointment is that Mr. Hakam is trustable because the community recognizes him as potential human resource with readiness because he organizes fishery training center and provides facilitation service”. (Interview, 10 June 2013 in the office)

The embankment farmer communities in fish cultivator group (Pokdakan) are not consulted by the government during the preparation of Master Plan for Minapolitan Area Development in Gresik Regency. Direct appointment to select community representative only shows that the government is still dominant in the implementation of Minapolitan Policy. It means that the government has poor communication with stakeholders such as embankment farmers and private sector. Such poor communication between government, community and private sector may impact on partnership. Community and private sector play minor role in Minapolitan Policy implementation. Such dominancy of the government has forced embankment-related stakeholders to rely greatly on the government if something is happening in the development of fishery potentials. The Report of Minapolitan Implementation in Gresik Regency in 2014 has explained that a problem in Minapolitan Policy implementation is the lacking of supportive capacity from non-government organization. Some communal organizations for cultivated fishery, such as the Association of Fish/Shrimp Cultivator (HPIU), Fish Cultivator Group (Pokdakan), Development Service Unit (UPP) of Cultivated Fishery, Autonomous Training Center for Marine and Fishery Communities (P2MKP) about Cultivated Fishery, are not optimum in solving the problems on field because they still depend greatly on governmental role (Minapolitan Implementation Profile, 2014:VIII-5).

The role of embankment farmer communities, individually or organizationally, through fish cultivator group (Pokdakan) and the role of private sector are low, and it is a consequence of poor partnership built by the government. Poor communication and top-down character are the reason why community and private sector do not play actively in Minapolitan Policy implementation. Top-down communication by the government is shown by directly appointing the representative of embankment farmer communities as the target of Minapolitan Policy. This appointment is made without communication or not involving fish cultivator group (Pokdakan), either entirely or only structurally. The group does not have information at all about Minapolitan Policy from the government. Indeed, the government shall communicate to fish cultivator group that there is Minapolitan Program in Sidayu District. As explained by Mr. H. Suparlan as the member of Pokdakan managing board:

“Many embankment farmer communities, and also Pokdakan, are ignorant about Minapolitan Program. Either entirely or structurally, they do not know if Minapolitan Program exists, and the government never inform them. The government must introduce Minapolitan Program to fish cultivator group (Pokdakan) or at least, have a consultation with the group. We are the target of Minapolitan Program, and the government shall be our partner. We feel only used as the merely object”. (Interview, 18 January 2014, in the house)

The lacking of communication with Pokdakan before appointing community representative into Minapolitan Program has impacted on the quality of Minapolitan Program implementation because most of program implementers are not embankment farmer. The chair of implementer group does not have background as embankment farmer. The selected group chair is never experiencing daily work on embankment. Although the chair has embankment, on-field work on embankment is rarely done. The group chair has embankment business, but it is not successful, and therefore, the chair does not have successful experience in managing embankment. Therefore, the appointment of the group chair without the background of resilience and successful embankment farmer must be not right. As stated by Mr. Suparlan:

“Mr. Hakam’s background is not right. He is not embankment farmer. He just has embankment but never jumps into the mud. He is wealthy person because he already has edible nest business. He tries embankment business, but it does not work with him. Indeed, once he has embankment for training plot, but it is already sold to Gresik Industrial Region”. (Interview, 18 January 2014, in the house)

Mr. Suparlan’s explanation is supported by Pokdakan members. The government seems establishing its own embankment farmer group rather than selecting from embankment farmer communities. The government group is not embankment farmer. The experienced embankment farmer is not involved into Minapolitan Program and not given information about it. Therefore, many embankment farmer communities do not know

about Minapolitan Policy. Although the government has organized a training session on cultivated fishery, the participants are selected by the government. Mr. Muslikh says that:

“Groups are divided into Pokdakan and government-selected group. The later is supported by the Official/ the government but they are not embankment farmer. The original embankment farmer is already there, but they are neglected by the government. They are not invited into training or not given socialization about Minapolitan Policy. Knowledge is derived only from learning by experience. Along ago, groups are gathered for training, but these groups are selected by the Official.” (Interview, 18 January 2014, in the house)

Before the implementation of Minapolitan Policy, the government has socialized the policy to the community and has informed that the Official of Marine, Fishery and Animal Husbandry of Gresik Regency will be the supporter of Minapolitan Program. The government must motivate the community to increase fish production through embankment cultivation, to be autonomous, and to develop embankment cultivation by attending the training center. Mr. Samsul Arifin confirms that:

“The government has actually provided socialization and training. I disseminate the program to members around me and then motivate them. They perform autonomously. Training center is aimed to develop autonomy either in technical matter or in dealing with issue related to fish cultivation”. (Interview, 20 January 2014, in the office)

Mr. Samsul’s explanation aligns with Mr. Hakam as the chair of the group trained by the Official. It is said that the government has rejuvenated infrastructures and organized training session. The training is enthusiastically welcomed by the community proved by the attendant of 120 persons. All participants get new understanding about fishery cultivation. Mr. Hakam asserts that:

“The government has renewed the existing infrastructures, such as by normalizing the river along embankment area, constructing the production road, and giving training for the cultivator. Since the launching of Minapolitan Program, there are 6 training sessions held by the government and the implementer institution such as B2MKP. The training is attended by more or less than 120 persons”. (Interview, 1 July 2013, in the house)

The fact that there is training session on fishery cultivation organized by the government for the group chaired by Mr. Hakam is underscored by Mr. Suparlan. Fish cultivator group led by Mr. Hakam is a group founded and appointed by the government. Most members of this group do not have background as embankment farmer such that they are not familiar with fishery. The participant seems only desiring to obtain transport fee for Rp. 500,000 for each head. Minapolitan Program is actually a program to develop fishery potential. Therefore, human resource is developed through training session. However, this training session is given to the persons who are not embankment farmer. It is explained by Mr. Suparlan by stating that:

“Recently, a fostering session has been organized by the Official/the government. The participants are from Purwodadi, but they do not know fishery things. The participant group is belongs to Mr. Hakam. They just look for the money which counts for Rp. 500,000 for each head. It seems not on-target because the participant only searches for quick money. Minapolitan Program is good program because it develops human resource. However, the training is not attended by the proper participants because they are selected only by Mr. Hakam”. (Interview, 18 January 2014, in the house)

According to one personage figure among embankment farmer communities at Srowo Village, Sidayu District, Mr. Budi Subianto, the appointment of Mr. Hakam as the representative of the community to implement Minapolitan Policy is because he has deep access to the Ministry of Fishery and Marine. This access helps Mr. Hakam to have easy contact with the Official in Gresik Regency. This contact allows Mr. Hakam to be trusted by the local government to implement Minapolitan Program in Sidayu District as community representative. As noted by Mr. Budi Subianto:

“I am one of the attendants in the opening ceremony of Minapolitan Program in Sidayu District. I have submitted Mr. Tamam as the chair but his human resource is lacking of capacity. Mr. Hakam is then the alternative. The appointment of Mr. Hakam as community representative is because he has a lobby and access to ministerial staffs. Peoples from the Official also trust Mr. Hakam. In other hand, he is the readiest Sidayu person either on the capacity of human resource or organizational resource (through his NGO) because both are the requirements for the assignment of Minapolitan Area”. (Interview, 19 July 2014, in the house)

Furthermore, Mr. Budi explains that during the implementation of Minapolitan Program in Sidayu District, Mr. Hakam never makes good relationship with embankment farmer communities. In various activities of Minapolitan Policy implementation, such as socialization and training for Minapolitan Program, he excludes fish cultivator group (Pokdakan). In training held by the staffs from the Ministry of Fishery and Marine, he only invites his relatives and his trusted people. Therefore, many embankment farmer communities do not understand what Minapolitan Policy is. As quoted by Mr. Budi:

“Initially, Mr. Hakam is good person with strong capacity of human resource to implement Minapolitan Policy as the representative for the community. However, after appointment by the Official, he avoids to contact embankment farmer communities. In the training, the participants are always his family members and his trusted peoples whose occupancy is not being embankment farmer. The real embankment

farmer is excluded from Minapolitan activities. The principals of Pokdakan, such as Mr. Parlan and Mr. Muslikh, are not invited, and thus, they do not know about Minapolitan progress. I disappoint against Mr. Hakam". (Interview, 19 March 2014, at 10.00 am in the house)

Based on this overview, it is said that partnership across stakeholders is important in public policy implementation. Partnership itself is also a way to achieve the goals of Minapolitan Policy. However, since the launching of Minapolitan Policy in Gresik Regency on 2011, the result of this implementation until 2014 is not significant. Minapolitan Policy shall change the current pattern of stakeholder partnership. During Minapolitan Policy implementation, the government is very dominant and the communication is always top-down. Therefore, the participation of community and private sector is often minor.

According to Mr. Untung Saritomo (PPL Sidayu), partnership is absolutely important to be constructed by the Official in Minapolitan Policy implementation because the existing cooperation among embankment farmer communities is not adequate to implement Minapolitan Program. Indeed, Minapolitan Program is very complex with diversity of stakeholders. Therefore, the Official is required to engineer a type/form of partnership to implement Minapolitan Policy to produce better difference between before and after implementation. Mr. Untung says that:

"I am fishery elucidator who knows about Minapolitan Policy but I never have been invited into formulating problems challenging Minapolitan Area. The Official must prepare good planning by involving actors who are related with Minapolitan Policy. Their involvement must be important because the goal of Minapolitan Policy is to improve the welfare of embankment farmer through fishery production. Embankment farmer cannot work alone, and the elucidator (PPL) also needs the support/participation of others. It is apparent that partnership and mutualism across actors or parties are absolutely needed. If a certain program is not planned by the Official, it means that the program does not exist. The distinguishing character of Minapolitan Program is governmental initiative to invite other parties for participation. However, new partnership is still not found and only the existing currently is apparent". (Interview, 14 March 2014, in the office)

In consistent to Mr. Untung's statement, the Official justifies Mr. Samsul Arifin's words by stating that:

"Partnership across actors or stakeholders in Minapolitan Implementation is required to achieve faster Minapolitan Goals. Without partnership, good cooperation across stakeholders may not be produced and thus, Minapolitan Goals cannot be achieved. The government realizes that it cannot walk alone due to limited budget and lacking of staffs. The coverage of Minapolitan Area is for Gresik Regency, not only in Sidayu Minapolis. The Decree of Regent about Work Group has involved various SKPD and it means that the responsibility for Minapolitan Implementation remains not only in the Official of Marine, Fishery and Animal Husbandry. Honestly, we do not have partnership in Minapolitan Area but we plan to construct such partnership while doing our task because our issue is not only Minapolitan Area. Ideally, a special team is assigned for partnership issue". (Interview, 10 June 2013, in the office)

Red lines can be drawn from this overview:

- (a) Embankment farmers and other stakeholders understand that partnership is a very urgent condition and it is inevitable in all human life activities. Partnership may involve fulfillment of various necessities from simple to complex, including embankment cultivation.
- (b) Preserving environmental health for the sustainability of cultivation work is mandatory for every individual, and therefore, the polluted water, for instance, becomes a collective responsibility. Therefore, togetherness in preserving the environment is inseparable from embankment cultivation. However, in field, sustainable preservation for embankment is now rarely seen among embankment farmers.
- (c) Stakeholders of Minapolitan Area consider as important a partnership process for the wellbeing of Minapolitan Program. Partnership is signified as relationship, cooperation, participation, and involvement of any parties in embankment cultivation process which is characterized by interdependence, mutualism and trust.
- (d) Natural partnership, rather than engineered partnership, must be developed by the government as a treatment to implement Minapolitan Program.

Based on the field findings above, First Minor Proposition (Minor Proposition 1) can be stated that the urgency of partnership is constructed in form of partnership across stakeholders who are interdependent, mutualism and responsible to each other for each role in order to achieve Minapolitan Policy Implementation toward sustainable development.

Communication Aspect in Minapolitan Policy Implementation in Gresik Regency

Communication is one influential factor to the implementation of policy, and it is widely discussed. Various communication strategies play important role for operational success of policy implementation, either in agenda setting, implementation or evaluation. Communication is not only a device to deliver information about what instruction to implement, who is the implementer, and on what target, but also can be optimized into

a mediator structure between government and community to implement policy in reciprocal manner such that policy implementation will be effective, efficient and mutual. In this matter, Edward III (1980:9-12) asserts that: “the first requirement for effective policy implementation is that those who are to implement a decision must know what they are supposed to do”.

Pursuant to the argumentation of Edward III, it can be said that a policy is only said as well implemented if its absolute prerequisite is met, precisely that there is mutual understanding clearly and intensively between policy implementer and target community about what they have to do. Decisions, policies and instructions can be forwarded to the precise persons and must be communicated clearly to be understood by implementer and policy target. Specifically, Edward III explains that policy communication has several dimensions such as transmission, clarity and consistency.

Transmission dimension expects that public policy is not only informed to policy implementer, but also disseminated to policy target and interest parties, either directly or indirectly. *Clarity* dimension expects that policy must be transmitted to implementer, target group and interest parties in clearly way such that they will understand purpose, objective, target and substance of public policy. Each of them will acknowledge what thing shall be prepared and organized to make the policy successful, effective, and efficient. *Consistency* dimension expects that policy must not wander around because it may confuse implementer, group target and interest parties.

Because effective implementation is only achievable if policy maker, implementer and target groups have understood what they must do, it is then said that such understanding is only developed by good and measurable quality of communication between policy maker and community. As top-down policy, the important aspect to consider and to implement at Minapolitan Policy in Sidayu District of Gresik Regency is communication aspect which can afford policy target in the most bottom layer. Successful or unsuccessful policy treatment depends on how communication occurs between policy maker and policy target community.

According to Edward III, communication in public policy implementation is not only delivering information to policy implementer. More than that, communication is not only made with policy implementer, but also with policy target and other stakeholders who are related to the policy. This dimension is very important for policy implementation. If policy target or related stakeholders do not get information about the implemented policy, it impacts on the implementation of policy or it will minimize the support from various stakeholders.

In relative with the implementation of Minapolitan Policy in Sidayu District, a communication process in early stage is to give information about policy to policy implementer, precisely Local Development Planning Agency (BAPPEDA) and the Official of Marine, Fishery and Animal Husbandry, especially to help the preparation of Master Plan of Minapolitan Area in Sidayu District. Both implementers are very important in policy communication because policy is well implemented if policy implementer understands clearly the policy.

The dissemination of policy information is not only given to policy implementer, but also target group or other group related to Minapolitan Policy. The effort made by the government of Gresik Regency is to provide information to Head of Village who becomes the place of Minapolitan Implementation and fish cultivator group. The dissemination of information to policy target is not only with formal socialization, mainly through the Official of Marine, Fishery and Animal Husbandry, but also with non-formal method by visiting embankment farmers.

The governmental effort to produce good communication with target group also involves establishing fish cultivator group which the member is embankment farmer communities. The government also appoints group coordinator, Mr. Hakam. The reason behind this appointment is that Mr. Hakam has adequate human resource, also been a leader of the group, and has a training center for fish cultivation. Therefore, the government appoints Mr. Hakam as the coordinator and also the leader to implement Minapolitan Policy.

The government to deliver the information of policy is not limited to informal or non-formal communication, but also supported by various resources, including budget. In 2012, the local government has budgeted Rp. 100,000,000 for the Socialization and Fostering of Minapolitan Area through Bappeda, and this budget is realized for 100 %. The government also builds Minapolitan Information Media to facilitate community to acknowledge the area assigned as Minapolitan Area. Coordination and communication by the government of Gresik Regency are showing governmental commitment and understanding that communication aspect is very important to produce uniform understanding of all stakeholders.

Although Gresik Regency has done some efforts to produce good communication between policy implementer and policy target, however, the result of research has found that almost all target groups are not familiar with Minapolitan Policy. It is said so because the government does not optimally involve the stakeholders into Minapolitan Policy. Number of embankment farmers who understands about Minapolitan Policy is quite few. Most of them do not acknowledge the purpose and objective of Minapolitan Area existence. Ironically, village officers where their occupation remains in Minapolitan Area, such as Srowo, Sedagaran and Purwodadi Villages, do not know comprehensively about Minapolitan Policy.

It implies on the minimal engagement of local government to support Minapolitan Policy because village officers are not functionally and optimally organized to support village community; intensive socialization from government to community is minimum, and community or private is not involved in policy formulation or the preparation of master plan of Sidayu District as Minapolitan Area. The formulation of policy as stated in Minapolitan Master Plan is more meaningful if target community is involved in the formulation such that policy draft can be collectively accountable. Suharto (2010:91) says that policy draft is a tool of communication and also decision making with characteristics of application, problem-oriented and value-driven. Policy draft is formulated by giving comprehensive and persuasive arguments to justify recommendations, options or actions in preparing policy draft. The function of policy draft is to be a tool of decision making and persuasion for policy target/audience to make an action. The formulation of policy to assign Sidayu District as Minapolitan Area has underlined the fact that academic norm of participation is neglected because there is no effort to collect various arguments and views from the community.

It is also felt by fish cultivator group (Pokdakan) for being excluded from Minapolitan Area issue. Minapolitan Policy may be dilemmatic because successful fishery policy is determined by actors and parties who concern with the issue and problem that becomes the focus of review. Fishery community around policy location feels that so. Minapolitan Policy, therefore, cannot escape from the participation of embankment farmer who join Pokdakan. Communication factor is very influential to the acceptance of policy by target group such that poor communication will be the weak point to achieve the effectiveness of Minapolitan Policy implementation in Sidayu District. The dissemination of policy content through good communication process will influence policy implementation effectiveness. Therefore, communication media used to disseminate policy content to target group will play very important role.

Communication and coordination between village officer, local government and Mr. Hajam, are still not optimally happening despite its informal communication to farmers and embankment farmers such as by visiting coffee shops, sitting and chatting in relax. This method is still unable to improve the understanding of embankment farmers. There is no explanation about how is the implementation of the policy and related strategies for current and future interest in manner of collective and sustainable. Based on this review, it means that transmission, clarity and consistency dimensions of communication aspect suggested by Edward III is disrespected by Mr. Hakam though he is technical coordinator for Minapolitan Policy implementation in Sidayu District.

The appointment of Mr. Hakam and his group as the implementer coordinator of Minapolitan Program in Sidayu District, which is to disseminate information and operational understanding to the community, and also as the direct speaker of the government, is still questionable because Mr. Hakam is not informative and lacking of efforts to disseminate and to socialize Minapolitan Policy to target community. The community, including Pokdakan, is not involved into coordination, socialization and implementation of Minapolitan Policy. Only Mr. Hakam's group is registered into training and activity related with Minapolitan Policy, and it is very ironic because this group remains far away from Minapolitan Area in Sidayu District.

Therefore, the appointment of Mr. Hakam as the technical coordinator is not right because he is not coming from background of embankment farmer with basic knowledge about embankment cultivation in Sidayu District. He is only the director of NGO moving in fishery cultivation business. The participants are not embankment farmers or not the member of Pokdakan, but only the supporters of Mr. Hakam. Worse, they are not even the owner and the cultivator of embankment. Being the coordinator for Minapolitan Policy from 2011 to 2013, Mr. Hakam is often introvert and unable to produce intensive communication with community and village officers. The success of a certain policy is greatly determined by the quality of communication and participation of community as the object or the subject of policy and development.

Since the launching of Minapolitan Policy determined by Gresik Regency from 2011 to 2013, Mr. Hakam is not responding the substance and essence of Minapolitan Policy to produce fishery industrialization and to accelerate the production toward people empowerment. It shall be noted to embankment farmer communities in Sidayu District, but the fact is not. In 2014, there is improvement. His personal interest is calmer and he begins to produce good communication and intensive interaction with village officer and Pokdakan, although it may be related to his campaign for general election. In 2014, Mr. Hakam is running for candidate of DPRD of Gresik Regency in 2014-2019 from Partai Bulan Bintang (PBB). He undergoes periodic meeting and "political safari" during which he offers training that can be attended by Pokdakan to achieve Minapolitan Goals. It seems that Mr. Hakam has acted on behalf of community interest by using Minapolitan Program in Sidayu District. Moreover, the appointment of Mr. Hakam may have bigger political stakes at regency level because Minapolitan Area is the victory base of Regent candidate. Minapolitan Area status is given to Sidayu District because it is where the success team of the Regent has their base camp.

Poor communication is also experienced by private sector, as in this case represented by PT. Kelola Mina Laut. The company is a global industry moving in fishery cultivation and processing sector in Gresik Regency. This company feels excluded from communication and *forum group discussion* (FGD) for the

preparation and implementation of Minapolitan Policy in Sidayu District. Private sector that is involved into coordination and policy implementation can provide necessary inputs to the government, such as good idea, technology and capital, which help Minapolitan Policy to be achievable.

Recently, complexity paradigm for joint management is emerging consistently to the development of *governance* approach. The government, however, still underestimates and never involves private sector in preparing master plan. This exclusion seems prominent although the Regent of Gresik Regency starts to show positive and open intentions and attempting to attract investment into Sidayu District. By this opening posture, Sidayu District may change into industrial area following most places in Gresik Regency. Minapolitan Area may vanish. If private sector is involved into Minapolitan Area socialization, possibly giving significant role in policy formulation, there may be mutual respect and understanding among parties for successful Minapolitan Area in Sidayu District. Private sector may also be responsive and accountable, and the government can ask private sector for help related to resource and capital. Minapolitan Area, thus, can be created with the support of industries related to fishery cultivation and processing by using environmental friendly technology.

By referring to this review, it can be said communication, coordination and socialization of Minapolitan Policy in Sidayu District seem neglecting the substance of Minapolitan Goals. The community selected as participant is not the real target because they are not the beneficiary of project in Minapolitan Policy. Lacking of participation from community and private sector is caused by less optimum governmental effort to inform development entities in Sidayu District, especially village efforts and Pokdakan. It is exacerbated by clumsy motivation given by implementer coordinator or information dissemination actor selected by the government although they actually fail to become the activator of embankment farmer communities in Minapolitan Area. The community is not the passive object as the acceptor of governmental policy benefit, but they are the actor or the active subject that determines policy. Target community is expected to have engagement into public issue and to give contribution to public arena issues.

Based on previous exposition, Second Minor Proposition (Minor Proposition 2) is arranged: If communication process (target, message and media) is properly selected such that there is reliable community participation, thereby the implementation of Minapolitan Policy may succeed.

Resource Aspect in Minapolitan Policy Implementation in Gresik Regency

Resource is an important thing to implement a policy. According to Edward III (1980:54), *“Implementation orders may be accurately transmitted, clear and consistent, but if implementer lacks the resources necessary to carry out policies, implementation is likely to be effective”*.

It means that resource is important factor to keep policy implementation to be functional in helping the interest parties to implement Minapolitan Program effectively. It is called as effective because policy goals are aligned with planning. Made (2002) says that effective means that the achieved target has conformed to the main task and function of the government as the establisher and the implementer of policy. Not only effectiveness is needed in Minapolitan development, but also efficiency (to exploit resources based on demand).

Without resource, the formulated policy is only the plan on sheet without realization whatsoever. Resource that may support policy effectiveness can be staffs with reliable skill and adequate authority level, information and facility. Financial and time resources are framed under effective coordination and it may help program implementation to be adjusted with the objective of policy itself.

Capital resource (financial) and human resource (HR) play very important role in Minapolitan Policy implementation in Sidayu District. It is caused by problem overlapping when both resources are lacking. In field, the existing infrastructures do not support Minapolitan activity, technology support is declining, marketing network is less developed, and training/empowerment is low. Other things still need financial and human resources. Furthermore, adequate authority given to policy implementer is also needed to ensure well implemented policy.

After developing Minapolitan Area in Gresik Regency, there are only 14 Districts with fishery potential. The government has given budget allocation to this area from National Budget, Local Budget of East Java Province, and Local Budget of Gresik Regency. However, the allocation for Sidayu District as pilot project becomes very low because the budget is aimed to cover Minapolitan Area throughout Gresik Regency.

The supporting capacity of financial resource for the implementation of Minapolitan Policy in Sidayu District can be explained as follows.

First, production road infrastructure toward embankment area has been improved and river is deepened with dredging. However, production road to access embankment cannot be said as reliable and river starts to show superficiality. The government has solidified production road but it does not cover whole road lengths. River dredging is useful to retain water needed for embankment circulation, but the depth is less than the demand, and the length of dredging area is not compatible with the demanded length.

Why the government cannot complete the work? A classic reason is limited fund. The availability of fund/budget and the demand to be satisfied are not balancing. Therefore, the government of Gresik Regency

must be smart to exploit alternative funding source to support the funding for Minapolitan Area Development. Looking for the partner for financing the business or economic work is easy task, but the government must be clever, creative and innovative enough to interpret business opportunity in Minapolitan Area.

Along with the limited budget and the increasing allocation for Minapolitan Area, the existence of human resource in Work Group Team is not yet showing the expected performance because they still emphasize on SKPD's standard main task and function. The participation of Work Group Team is only by Regent Decree and not from self-initiative to succeed Minapolitan Program. It is worsened by the fact that the number of officers from the Official of Marine, Fishery and Animal Husbandry, and their skill capacity are not compatible with their work range which covers up Gresik Regency. Therefore, they cannot maximize their support to develop Minapolitan Area in Sidayu District.

Common sense says that the position of *man behind the gun*, or human resource, is very central in organizational activity. This human must have competence, moral integrity and vision. The disregard against these characters only overloads the organization. Indeed, within organizational life, the authority must balance with the task to help for goal achievement.

In other hand, human resource of embankment farmer, especially embankment worker, is mostly the outsider. The regeneration from embankment farmer itself is very slow and this trend is worrying them. The government, through its partnership organization, provides training, but the participant is not embankment farmer from Minapolitan Area. If it is left idly without concrete anticipative actions, the sustainability of the policy to develop Minapolitan Area is under stakes. Moreover, the income of traditional embankment farmers starts to deteriorate in the future. Gresik industrialization has developed dramatically leading to strict competition for workers.

Field observation shows that some problems constrain the implementation of Minapolitan Policy. There is no specific capital aid for Minapolitan Area Development. Technological support remains low for the improvement of fishery cultivation, especially to deal with the sick/dead fishes. The consequence of capitalization absence is minimal usage of technology and minimal development of infrastructure to support Minapolitan Area. New fish market is never built such that the existing market before and after Minapolitan Policy does not show significant change either in physic or management.

The management of fish market needs specific skills from stakeholders, mainly in marketing and related fields such that the market can perform well and the target stated in Minapolitan Development Plan can be achieved with community support. The implementation of Minapolitan Policy is still partial and not entirely supported by resource, including the support from human resource.

The core of Minapolitan Area problems in Sidayu District is around two, which are budget/capital resource and human resource. Indeed, human resource development is a proper choice because without human resource with good competence and moral integrity, it is difficult to conduct the management of budget and also Minapolitan Area based on community interest. The absence of adequate budget/capital may prohibit Minapolitan Area Development but human resource empowerment can still bring significant impact on Minapolitan Area Development because the empowered human may have capacity to look for budget/capital sources for managing natural resource and others.

Problems above are not consistent to Grindle (1991) who explains that policy implementation must attend to the fact that human resource, technique, materials and financial resource must be allocated and prepared properly. External resources can satisfy only parts of what is needed. The collection of adequate resource can also fulfill the demand.

The failed policy implementation is also caused by the less capacity of the government to distribute the resource based on new priority such that program or project is hard to be implemented. Main task of the government is to accumulate resource, to secure initial funding, and to warrant budget allocation to support policy implementation.

It can be understood that one reason of the failed implementation of Minapolitan Policy in Gresik Regency is the lacking of attention of stakeholders to resource development. The implementation of Minapolitan Policy is requiring the government to plan resource availability and this is important aspect. It is because the success of a policy, especially Minapolitan Policy, depends on the availability of main and supportive resources.

Main resource is the support from embankment human resource, mainly embankment farmers and Pokdakan, through their good participation, and the capacity of government to facilitate the availability of budget and seed resources expected indeed by embankment farmers. However, the government only disregards the issues, and no concrete and strategic measures are taken by the government to support capital and seed supplies demanded by embankment farmers. Successful policy implementation depends on how far is the ability of stakeholders to use the available resources.

As said by Parsons (2005), successful policy implementation depends on the ability to use the existing resources. Human is the most important resource to determine the successful implementation. The certain stages and the whole implementation process will require the qualified human resource to perform the work that set by

politically determined policy. If neither such competence nor capability exist, favorable performance of public policy is hard to produce. Besides human resource, other resource that must be considered is human resource and timing resource. When human resource with expected competence and capability is available, but funding is not allocated in the budget, hereby the realization of public policy goals will be problematic. Timing resource is becoming narrow.

Different from Parsons, Edward III in his review describes that resource plays important role in policy implementation. The role is related with authority. Indeed, adequate authority in certain institution to make a decision will influence the institution itself in implementing a policy. Authority becomes so important when a problem must be resolved and requires a decision to be made for this resolution. Therefore, main actor of the policy must have adequate authority to make a decision in order to implement the policy.

The importance of authority resource in Minapolitan Policy implementation as suggested by Edward III has been understood by the government of Gresik Regency in Minapolitan Policy implementation. The government, in this case is Regent, bestows authority to governmental officer, NGO and community representative that makes up the Work Group for Minapolitan Program Planning and Development to implement Minapolitan Policy in proper way to achieve Minapolitan Goals.

In reality, the authority is not enough to achieve Minapolitan Goals. It is said so because human resource of the teams in Work Group is lacking of understanding of concept and technique, and has a limited authority to develop Minapolitan Policy. This authority is a base for field implementer to monopolize Minapolitan Policy Development in Minapolitan Area. Somehow, Minapolitan Policy has been used for personal interest or group interest and thus, it denies the presence of embankment farmer and Pokdakan considered as not supportive to field implementer. The neglected Pokdakan then assumes that Minapolitan Policy is not giving significant impact on the farmer. Minimal understanding of Pokdakan on the policy is due to the fact that only the group managed by field partners stays dominant and monopolizes governmental activities such as policy socialization and training implementation. Pokdakan is excluded in every activity.

To follow-up the commitment to implement Minapolitan Policy in Gresik Regency, and also in pursuance of the authority given by central government, through the Ministry of Fishery and Marine, in 2011, hereby, local government, provincial government and central government from 2011 to 2013 have planned the program and allocated the budget for infrastructure development. Throughout 2011 to 2013, the government of Gresik Regency has allocated the budget of sixty millions for infrastructure development and human resource improvement in order to support the acceleration of achievement of Minapolitan Goals in Gresik Regency.

However, the implementation of program and the allocation of budget from government are very low. It may because budget allocation is not merely given for Minapolitan Area Development, but also for the development of embankment cultivation in Gresik Regency. It may not be consistent the master plan because the development of Minapolitan Area is only centered in Sidayu District and its supporting immediate area such as Bungah District, Dukun District, Ujung Pangkah District and Panceng District. Principally, the development is not for entire Gresik Regency.

In addition to budget resource, authority resource and technological resource, main support also comes from officer resource, either from number, competence, and quality. All these aspects of human resource support must be proportional, meaning that there must be good planning to appoint and to place the qualified governmental officers based on field demand. A thing out of notice is that the implementation of policies is not only managing finance or budget but the usage must be accountable. The sustainability of a project is usually constrained by the abuse of budget utilization, either related to usage post or nominal. Therefore, the moral quality of the officers who support policy implementation is very important.

Based on this review, Third Minor Proposition (Minor Proposition 3) is suggested as follows: If human resource competence is supported by favorable moral quality and adequate budget that is well managed based on the authority provided, then Minapolitan Policy will be also well implemented.

Pursuant to Minor Propositions previously made, hereby Major Proposition is suggested. Strong commitment from stakeholders, supported by precise communication, professional bureaucratic structure, and reliable resource, framed into equal, effective, efficient and productive partnership pattern, which applies sustainable development aspect, will help the implementation of Minapolitan Policy in sustainable manner.

IV. Conclusion

Based on the result of discussion about stakeholder partnership in Minapolitan Policy implementation to achieve sustainable development in Gresik Regency, it can be concluded that stakeholder partnership in Minapolitan Policy implementation at Minapolitan Area in Sidayu District of Gresik Regency is not like what is expected such that the purpose and target of Minapolitan Area Development are not easily achieved. Such condition is caused by low disposition (commitment) among implementers as shown by less consistency

(istiqamah) between what has been planned/expected in *master plan* (the substance of intention) and the willingness to achieve the goals and targets of Minapolitan Area Development. Indeed, Minapolitan Area Development is only organized by Work Force Team consisting of SKPD elements with specific functional main task but it binds SKPD itself only to accomplish performance as higher as possible rather than to maximize the action in favor of Minapolitan. Consequently, Work Force Team cannot give total accomplishment and thus, the expected performance of Minapolitan is not achieved. Low commitment may influence several aspects such as communication, resource and bureaucratic structure. Communication is not on target. Communication in field is very dull and introvert. Since the assignment of Gresik Regency as Minapolitan Area until the preparation of master plan and the establishment of Minapolitan Area, the government never communicates and involves community personage, Pokdakan and immediate local officers. Information media seem very minimally available to show and to explain the existence of Minapolitan Policy in Minapolitan Area. The acceptor target group (object) and also the main actor in Minapolitan Policy are the embankment farmer communities and thus, they shall be the target of communication. Communication process on the field does not involve embankment farmer communities as program target, and does not use Pokdakan as the communication batch for embankment farmer communities. Other group with certain access to central or local governments is appointed as governmental partner on field. During the implementation of program, governmental partner also does not involve embankment farmer communities although these communities are the program target. It is not surprising if the communities do not understand the existence of Minapolitan Program and finally, are not participating into the activities related to Minapolitan Program Implementation.

Pursuant to these conclusions, the suggestions are made as follows. (1) The existence of Minapolitan Area in Sidayu District needs to be reviewed by attending to the issue of the dynamic of north coastal region in Gresik Regency, especially RTRW of Gresik Regency. The north coastal region has been planned for industrialization. Therefore, industrial waste which pollutes and reduces the supporting capacity of the environment is inevitable. The sustainability of Sidayu District as Minapolitan Area needs strong commitment across stakeholders of Gresik Regency to improve communication pattern, to enlarge budget support, and to manage the area professionally. (2) Policy implementation must not only be a merely jargon or symbol of political policy made by the government to develop the popularity and image of local leaders. It shall involve strong and sustainable commitment from the government to develop Minapolitan Area by initiating and approaching stakeholders to create cooperation and partnership. It must be important because the government always has a limited capacity in several aspects such as finance, concept and professional human resource.

References

Books

- [1]. Bogdan, Robert C. Dan Steven J. Taylor, 1992. Introduction to Qualitative Research Methods : A Phenomenological Approach in the Social Sciences, Translated by Arief Furchan, John Wiley & Sons, Surabaya, Usaha Nasional.
- [2]. Denscombe, Martyn, 2007. The Good Research Guide: for Small-Scale Social Research Project. Third Edition, Open University Press, New York, USA.
- [3]. Edwards III, George C. 1980. Implementing Public Policy, Washington D.C. Congressional Quarterly Inc. (edited), 1984. Public Policy Implementing, Jai Press Inc, London England.
- [4]. Grindle, Merilees, 1980. Politics and Policy Implementation In The Thirld World. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- [5]. Hanafie, Rita, 2410. Introduction of Agriculture Economic. Yogyakarta: Andi
- [6]. Hemmati, Minu and Robert Whitfield, 2003. Sustainable Development Partnerships In the Follow-up to Johannesburg Stakeholder, Forum for Our Common Future.
- [7]. McNabb, D. E, 2002. Research Methods in Public Administration and Nonprofit Management: Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches. Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe.
- [8]. Parsons, Wayney. 2005. Public Policy : Introduction of Theory and Practice of Policy Analysis. Translation. Jakarta: Prenada Media