

Intergovernmental Relations and Dilemma of the Cooperation

Irawanto^{1*}, Bambang Supriyono², M.R.K. Muluk², Irwan Noor²

¹Doctoral Program in Administration Studies, Faculty of Administration Science,
University of Brawijaya, Malang, Indonesia

²Faculty of Administration Science, University of Brawijaya, Malang, Indonesia

Received: April 4, 2015

Accepted: June 28, 2015

ABSTRACT

Intergovernmental relation is a form of relationship mainly between the central government and the local governments or among the local governments. The form of the relationships has changed in line with the dynamic developments, both internal and external changes, of one country. In terms of the quality of these relationships, it can be seen from various aspects such as the role of government, the interactions of public officials, the sustainability of communications, the role of administrator and focus attention on the policy. Such well-established intergovernmental relations may facilitate an inter-regional cooperation, since the main purpose of such cooperation is for mutual benefit or advantage, by distributing the loads, roles and risks to each section or area of the cooperation.

Since the implementation of the Law (UU) No. 32 of 2004 on Local Government in Indonesia, the implementation of the cooperation among local governments on one hand emphasizes egalitarian attitudes, decentralization and democracy. On the other hand, however, this cooperation among local government is such autonomy which is also interpreted by some regions as full authority in conducting regional development, which eventually led to the attitude of the ego of regionalism. The attitude has led to a dilemma and conflict conditions in the inter-regional cooperation to address issues that cross jurisdictions of each region.

KEY WORDS: Intergovernmental relation, central and local government relations.

INTRODUCTION

In order to improve the welfare of the people, despite the fact that the reformation of regional autonomy has been conducted since 2001 in Indonesia, it has not yet achieved the expected results. The regional autonomy and decentralization are by some regions interpreted more as leading to dominantly administrative issues as well as political issues, and it tends to override other aspects as economic decentralization as an effort to improve the welfare of the community. The regional autonomy and decentralization are also by some local governments interpreted as full authority to carry out the construction in their area independently without having to cooperate with other regions. This condition is certainly contrary and backstabbing to the concept of globalization, which was said by Ohmae [1] that the current state boundary are fading (becoming borderless world) and with globalization has been the creation of relations between countries is increasingly open, so that the dependence between countries and between regions increases.

Conlan and Posner [2] reveal that the advancement of the technological as well as globalization and demographic changes may result in changes in the system of intergovernmental relations and, of course, will lead to various new challenges for the government, not excepting what is in Indonesia as it is affected by both external and internal changes. One of the challenges to be faced by the Indonesian government in the current global era in relation to inter-regional cooperation, especially in the metropolitan area, is the weakening of regional coordination and the emergence of regional egocentrism so that the attention of the local government in the cooperation related to developmental issues among the local government is separated. The declining role of the provincial government as the representative of the central government may continuously result into the degrading of the intensity of the regional management coordination. The role of provincial government as the coordinator of development in inter-regional area declines because of the *strengthening* role of regional autonomy at the local government level. As the result, the interregional development issues have not been handled effectively. Each local government believes that they could and should do everything as they want without any coordination or assistance or reviews from the other local government who are as their neighbors. Further implications are that many potential problems in the regional developments were not dealt appropriately. Hence, it resulted in the inefficiency and declining quality and productivity of the local development.

Debate and tension between the central and local governments in the implementation of the development have been becoming heated topic for discussion and study. Edward [3] shows the importance of the role of local government, who stated that "the local government plays an important role in service delivery and development and should be running in the proper role in intergovernmental relations". Without the full support of the local governments in cooperation which involve either national or provincial governments, it will be very difficult to implement an inter-regional cooperation. However, other opinion is countered by the Agranoff [4] that supports the role of national governments should exceed the local

*Corresponding Author: Irawanto, Doctoral Program in Administration Studies, Faculty of Administration Science, University of Brawijaya, Malang, Indonesia

governments' interests. The position in intergovernmental relations for federal state system or center-regional relations for the unity of the country is to produce a better and strong performance or programs with lower costs. The relationship is becoming tool to achieve final results, not an absolute requirement. Two studies between Edward and Agranoff have generated continuous clashes of ideas in relation to relations between central and local government.

The form of collaboration or cooperation among the regions in intergovernmental relations is strongly influenced by the prevailing administrative system and governance system adopted in the country as well as the political consensus between the interests of the stakeholders. The collaboration or cooperation should become the needs and desires of local government, as it is stated by McGuire [5], "That is, because the collaboration is the new form of governance, it follows that collaboration in and of itself must be desirable".

For the intergovernmental relations in a metropolitan area consisting of several districts or cities require good governance so that the local governments may work together in the implementation of developmental programs. This is consistent with the idea expressed by Salet [6] who said about the importance of governance and coordination of cooperation in the metropolitan region. Local conditions in the metropolitan landscape usually show strong differences and inequalities in social and economic composition and these might hamper inter-municipal cooperation. On the other hand more regional coordination and cooperation is needed in the face of increasing competition between economic regions at the international scale. Accordingly, Lina [7] stated, to overcome the problems that occurred in metropolitan areas such as Jakarta, Bogor, Depok and Bekasi takes the form of management and governance approach. One of the governance approaches to the metropolitan area is intermunicipal cooperation (IMC), the approach is one of the solutions for improvement metropolitan area.

The study began by investigating intergovernmental relations at the levels of the central government, provincial government and district / city government, which are involved in the implementation of interregional cooperation in the metropolitan area of Banjar Bakula in the development and management of the final disposal of garbage (regional landfill). Intergovernmental relations have been observed from some dimensions including the role of government, the interactions of public officials, the sustainability of communications, the role of administrator and focus attention on the policy. In addition, this research also studied the dilemma faced by the local governments as they should run the planned cooperation scheme of provincial governments in the development and management of regional landfill. The study took place in the metropolitan area of Banjar Bakula in three of the five districts / cities in the metropolitan area of Banjar Bakula.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The research was qualitative by nature and it was conducted in late 2014 to early 2015 in the metropolitan area of Banjar Bakula in South Kalimantan, Indonesia. There were some units for the analysis namely the government officials associated with the interregional cooperation in the construction and management of the regional landfill. The government officials consists of three posts, namely secretary of district / city, head of cleaning department, and the head of department whose authority is in technical and operational units of each landfill. The focus of the research was the intergovernmental cooperation relations in the construction and management of regional landfill. In this study, the intergovernmental relations are analyzed through some dimensions on how the role of government, the interactions of public officials, the sustainability of communications, the role of administrator and focus attention on the policy. The key informant was executive coordinator of interregional cooperation in the metropolitan area of Banjar Bakula. The sampling technique employed in this study was purposive sampling by considering the strategic role of the institution. The data analysis method by Miles & Huberman was used in this study.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Dimension of Intergovernmental Relations

Metropolitan area of Bakula Banjar is one of the more developed and developing areas in province of South Kalimantan. This area consists of two cities of Banjarmasin and Banjarbaru, and three districts of Banjar, Tanah Laut and Barito Kuala. The development center of this metropolitan is located in the city of Banjarmasin; as the center of regional development, City of Banjarmasin has to cooperate with the other districts around it, because the activity of the city is not independent rather interconnected with other systems of the surrounding areas. The situation will give lead to a variety of challenges and potential conflicts that may arise. As Crouch [8], the economic and demographic growth has increased the potential for conflict between governments. To the anticipation of potential conflicts that may occur can be anticipated by way of interregional cooperation in various development activities.

In order to manage the coordination among the local governments in relation to developing the metropolitan area of Banjar Bakula, the Governor of South Kalimantan Province has issued Decree Number 188.44/0295/KUM/2012 dated on June 18th, 2012, on the Establishment of Coordinating Agency for Development Cooperation of Metropolitan Area of Banjar Bakula. This coordinating agency is that will deal with a variety of development undertaken and regulate the duties and functions of each district / city to carry out such cooperation.

The key factor to the success in the development in one area needs such harmonious mutual relationship among the area, and removes the egocentric attitude of each region. Therefore, local governments need to share the table to coordinate and cooperate together of their development plan. According to Malan [9], the success in achieving the development goals will depend on the system of effective relations among area and the extent to which government agencies share mutual trust and good faith in the harmony of the institution.

According to David [10], model of intergovernmental relations can be divided into two main categories, namely governmental competition and cooperation. Each model has both advantages and drawbacks. Tiebout [11] said that in the competition model, local governments may compete in providing the best services. However Minkoff [12] does not agree with the model of competition as he suggested that intergovernmental relations in the form of cooperation is better as the cooperation model will provide a more positive effect for the two parties in order to achieve the desired goal, while the competition model will tend to provide negative effects for either one of the parties involved in that competition. The cooperation will lead to a more effective communication based on mutual help, more friendly, better coordination and other positive outcomes. Therefore, at this time, is more widely common to use cooperation model among the local governments in various countries, as it is justified by Zhou and Wu [13] that the relations between areas (regional government) at this time is more likely that is collaboration, and the cooperation, based on Minkoff, allows the city government may reduce some of the risks and, on the other side, it will potentially do more with less resources.

Intergovernmental relations, according to Fox and Meyer [14], are to cover all the complex and interdependence relationships between different areas of government such as the coordination of public policy (including sustainable development policy) between the central, provincial, and local government through the reporting requirements of the grant aid program, planning and process budget and informal communication between officials. In addition to that, Anderson [15] stated that intergovernmental relations are important interactions that occur among government agencies in all types and levels.

The implementation of the Intergovernmental relations has various obstacles and challenges. According to Peter and Savoie [16] and Boland [17], the external constraint is the globalization that may cause local governments becoming less loyal to the central government which might weaken the unity of the nation, while the internal obstacles and challenges are laws and regulations that apply in a country. As it is expressed by Malan [18], the first is the issue of synergy in the implementation process of planning in various areas of government. Second is to build and identify the relevant body or institution to launch major policy and institutional reforms. Third is the human factor in relation to intergovernmental relations.

Intergovernmental relations become the key to the implementation of interregional cooperation, therefore it needs to be assessed on how intergovernmental relations that occur in Indonesia after the introduction of Law of Republic of Indonesia Number 32 of 2004 on Regional Government. Research conducted by Tjahnulin [19] indicates changes in the pattern of interregional cooperation and authority since decentralization and autonomy system, it is found several obstacles among the relations, one of which is related to distrust and excessive expectations from the involved parties. While research by Füglistler [20], however, showed that the interregional cooperation may improve the efficiency and effectiveness.

According to Patterson [21] intergovernmental cooperation is “an arrangement between two or more Governments for accomplishing common goals, providing a service or a mutual problem solving”, therefore, the local governments with different economic cooperation and sociopolitical conditions need for coordination. The cooperation is now the key to the implementation of regional development because each region may not have sufficient resources to meet the needs of the community. As stated by Kurtz [22] there are some considerations such as the interdependence, economic problems and the effectiveness of its overall development, intergovernmental cooperation is becoming imminent key to the success of regional development.

Cooperation among regions in Indonesia have been formally granted and justified by legal protection through Law of Republic of Indonesia Number 32/2004 Article 195 on Local Government which mentions the cooperation can be conducted between regions and/or between the central and local government in order to improve the welfare of the society. One region may conduct such collaboration with other regions by considering the efficiency and effectiveness of public services, synergy, and mutual benefits. Therefore, the region should take the initiative to manage the existing potential to conduct interregional cooperation as well as with third parties (non-government or private sector). According to Solihin and Semendawai [23] interregional cooperation is very important and contains both comparative and competitive advantages, which means through the cooperation there should be exchanging resources within the region and mutual competition in facing the globalization era; therefore, to achieve these objectives is strongly recommended to hold possible regional cooperation with various parties for the sake of the improvement of public service delivery and improved quality of care by taking into account the principles of good governance.

In addition, another legal justification upon regional cooperation is stated in Law of Republic of Indonesia Number 32 of 2004 Article 196 to confirm the need for cooperation in public services: (1) Implementation of government affairs that may result in cross-regional impact should be managed jointly by the relevant or involved regions; (2) In order to create efficiency, the region should administer public services together with the surrounding regions for the benefit of society; (3)

In order to manage the cooperation referred to in paragraph (1) and paragraph (2), the regional joint cooperation should establish cooperating body; and (4) If the region does not conduct regional cooperation as referred to in paragraph (1) and paragraph (2), the management of public services can be implemented by the government.

Intergovernmental Relations in Metropolitan Area of Banjar Bakula

To examine and discuss how the intergovernmental relations that have been running in the metropolitan area of Banjar Bakula, it refers to the five key elements in determining the relationships expressed by Wright [24] as it can be seen in the following explanation.

First, the Role of Government

The role of the central government in terms of the acceleration of regional development is quite significant, as it is shown through the Law of Republic of Indonesia Number 25 of 2004 on National Development Planning System and the National Medium-Term Development Plan (RPJMN) from 2015 to 2019. In addition to that, the central government also has master plan for the Acceleration and Expansion of Indonesian Economic Development (MP3EI) that encourages the development in Kalimantan, especially in the Province of South Kalimantan. The program has been conducted by the central government in accordance with its authority in conducting the national development. However, in relation to cooperation in the mMetropolitan area of Banjar Bakula, the central government does not involve into the operational level, both in the preparation of regulations and facilitation of the cooperation, especially in the development and management of regional landfill in this region, which is an area across the districts or cities in the Province of South Kalimantan. While at the provincial level, the role of government is very significant through the feasible studies in determining the strategic site for the provision of regional landfill in this area. For the next stage, the provincial government hands over the operations to one of the districts / cities that is considered to meet the requirements to serve as regional landfill, while the city (local) government approves such limited role and facilitates the planning that has been made by the provincial government based on the memorandum of understanding which has been agreed together.

Second, the Interactions of Public Officials

The interactions of public officials in relation to interregional cooperation are important because it will determine the sustainability of the cooperation. The interactions are observed through four sub-elements, namely, attitudes, trusts, perceptions, and preferences of the personnel involved. The description of the four sub-elements is as follows:

- a. In terms of **behavior**, the central government has a very wide scope of the work and examines the problems in general way, and often tends to generalize the problems; this may lead into less responsive behavior from the central government. While the behavior of provincial government officials that have an interest in the cross-district / city development show such behavior which tends to be more responsive as they understand that this is part of the duty and authority as the coordinator of the interregional cooperation. While the behavior of district / municipal governments tend to be less responsive and passive of which is due to the difference in the level of interests among district / city governments in the construction of regional landfill, and nuanced understanding of the meaning of the importance of cooperation in the provision of the infrastructure.
- b. In terms of **trust**, the central government has low trusts in the regions where the central government often considers the regionals tend to be passive and lacking in terms of initiative. While the provincial government tends to lack trust in the central government due to fears of disruption of the provincial jurisdiction as the presence of central government intervention in the regional level; therefore, the provincial government may expect more the intervention from the central government in terms of financing and technical assistance rather than in policy and authority. Provincial government's trust in the district / city government is very low as well because the behavior of the district / city governments, in facing of various problems, often directly relies on the central government. On the other hand, the trust from the district / city government in the provincial governments is low as well, as it is visible from their assumption that the provincial government has not been able to represent their interests.
- c. In terms of **perception**, the central government considers the interregional cooperation as a solution to reduce the load of the regions, and it becomes the solution to the problems among the regions. While perceptions of local government in relation to the variety of interregional cooperation are addressed differently. City Government of Banjarmasin sees the cooperation to the management of regional landfill is very helpful in dealing with the waste problem in the region because the City of Banjarmasin has swampy soil conditions so that waste management cannot be handled well. City Government of Banjarbaru considers this cooperation will add more burden to them in relation to air cleanliness like "bad smell" and damages on the streets in that city. District Government of Banjar is not affected by the presence of the regional landfill as they have been able already to deal with the problems related to waste management.
- d. In terms of policy **preference**, which includes the issue of public interest and development, it should have been handled better by the government. Issue like regional landfill in the metropolitan area of Banjar Bakula at the level of central government seems merely a formality, and responded through the issuance of Law of Republic of Indonesia Number 18 of 2008 on Waste Management. The implementation of this law has not been going efficient. At the provincial level, the

cooperation in the development and management of regional landfill has not been a top priority; it is based on the costs which are not allocated to the expansion of regional landfill construction in Banjarbaru. At the level of district / city government, the preference for interregional cooperation is still weak; local governments tend to be having inferior attitude and become unresponsive addressing this issue. It is obvious from the City Government of Banjarbaru that there is not any certain budget allocated to the purchase of additional land for the expansion of the regional landfill.

Third, the sustainability communication

Communication between local officials in terms of interregional cooperation becomes very fundamental. The sustainable communication indicates the occurrence of regular interaction between officials representing each of their regional jurisdiction and government units involved in the cooperation. Sub elements of ongoing communication can be seen from several things, namely contact frequency from day to day, running and working relationship that is built up a cumulative pattern.

Regular communication among the governments at central, provincial, and district / city levels in realizing the regional landfill in the metropolitan area of Banjar Bakula is relatively rare, and there is not particular agenda set for the discussion of the construction and management of regional landfill. Communication forums are usually carried out by the provincial government in the development forum which discusses various development issues, and there is not any determined focus on the issues related to regional landfill. Various meetings that have been held so far have not reached such agreement, and frequently led into deadlocks. This is because, in one side, City Government of Banjarbaru who was appointed as the location is of regional landfill often demands commitment from the provincial government to provide funds for land acquisition for the expansion of the regional site, while on the other side, the provincial government does not allocate specific funds for the expansion of the regional landfill.

The working relationship between the central government with the provincial and local governments has only been limited to the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) which determined City of Banjarbaru as the location of regional landfill of the metropolitan area of Banjar Bakula.

The cumulative pattern by the Provincial Government of South Kalimantan with the district / city governments in the metropolitan area of Banjar Bakula has not been getting good results because there is still deadlock inside the communications from the region determined as the location of regional landfill, and at the time this study was conducted, there was refusal from the local government of Banjarbaru as the location of regional landfill sites.

Fourth, the role of administrators

Intergovernmental relations emphasize on the important role played by all public officials involved in the cooperation, be it politicians or administrators. In this case, it is extended to which range of the involvement of all public officials who have a political impact on the policies and programs. The administrators are the elected public officials, both in terms of legislative, judicial, and executive, and public officials appointed both from the public authorities and the authorities with special functions / professional.

Basically the influence of legislative both at the central, provincial and district / city in the process of interregional cooperation are very important because, in the government system in Indonesia, both budgeting and regulatory functions are under the authority of the legislature. At the central level, the liveliness of legislators is basically associated with the aspirations whose they represent and the needs for the increased electability. Related to the duties and functions of legislative members often bring the issue to the central level and fight for the budgeting process, the issue is addressed the government with funds from the state budget (APBN). The struggle of legislators may alter the budget planning that has been done by the executive.

At the level of provincial and district / city governments, the involvement of the Regional Representatives Council (DPRD) is politically very necessary in holding interregional cooperation because when the Parliament is not involved in the cooperation process, it may affect the difficulty on the part of the executive in determining budget activities in regional budgeting. The role of the legislature in the region, both provincial and district / city government, in relation to cooperation among regions is a real dilemma. On one side, the role of the legislature, especially in terms of budgeting and regulatory approval, is very large; on the other hand, however, there is not maximum understanding from the legislatures in the emergence of interregional cooperation, thus at the end it might hinder the executive in fighting in budget allocation for interregional cooperation.

In addition to that, from the point of view of the executive, the role of the executive in the interregional cooperation also has the same constraints. The role of executive at the level of central government is obviously very important, but there is not particular party who is in charge so far, however, in controlling the implementation of interregional cooperation in the Metropolitan area of Banjar Bakula in the province of South Kalimantan, particularly in the implementation of the regional landfill. It has been complained by the stakeholders in the involved regions that it does need to be formulated clearly in terms of the duties and obligations of all parties involved, especially at the level of central government. These considerations may affect the commitment of the central government in prioritizing policy in relation to the development in the provinces in Indonesia, especially in South Kalimantan. The understanding of interregional cooperation and its

implementation at the levels of central and provincial governments has different point of view related to who should take full responsibility for such cooperation. In the Metropolitan area of Banjar Bakula, the implementation of construction of regional landfill is handled by two ministries, which are Ministry of Public Works and the Ministry of Interior.

The executive at the provincial level has not been able to encourage the district / city government to focus on a more effective interregional cooperation to solve the issues related to regional landfill. While at the district / city level, the executive has faced difficulties since the early phase that there are difference interests among the districts / cities. The different interests in understanding and exclusive behavioral attitude from the local government may bring obstacles in the process of interregional agreement.

Fifth, focus attention on the policy

This focus will see how far the attention from the government towards the cooperation undertaken may influence on the general policies, especially in terms of fiscal policy. In this case, there should be in-depth concern on the impact on the local budgets, particularly from the sub-elements like financial issues (budget capacity), political support, and the impact on other policy areas.

The policy taken by the central government, provincial government and district / city government related to the construction and management of regional landfill in the Metropolitan area of Banjar Bakula will affect other policies, including budgetary policies and the condition of government's fiscal in general. Unfortunately, as it is seen in terms of the impact, the policy taken by the central government in relation to the Metropolitan area of Banjar Bakula is never followed up in terms of technical or operational policy, including the budget as a consequence of the policy. This may lead to cooperation of the construction and management of regional landfill does not run optimally because of lack of technical support, including the budget.

Provincial government considers that the funding of the provincial government of South Kalimantan in conducting their programs should be allocated in the national budget. In fact, however, the allocation of funds to districts / city governments in the Metropolitan area of Banjar Bakula in the implementation of construction and management of regional landfill in region is not efficiently executed. The technical rules that should follow a more operational policy are in the spotlight concern. Supposedly, the technical policies that relates to the fiscal interests especially among regions should be covered by other operational policy, which is considered as macro policy.

Based on what has been stated previously that the collaborative relationships among the governmental institutions are such effort to achieve a common goal through various institutions within their respective jurisdictions governance through interactions and communications of the officials and the support from public official administrators and the concern on the fiscal capabilities. As these elements are met, then it will become influential key factor in achieving such cooperation.

The results of research conducted by Lina [7] indicates the need for burden-sharing in implementing intermunicipal cooperation within Metropolitan Region is Commensurate Authority Model or authority model which distributes evenly the authority to intergovernmental in central, provincial and regency/city level.

Dilemma of Interregional government relations

City of Banjarmasin as one of the economic growth centers in the province of South Kalimantan is inseparable from the support of the existing potentials in the surrounding regions. Therefore, the city should be in synergy with other regions in conducting development programs to become an advanced metropolitan area. The development of the City of Banjarmasin has been happened for a long time, seen from the efforts taken by city of Banjarmasin as well as the surrounding regions named as the "Greater Banjarmasin" and even the surrounding regions and districts of the city of Banjarmasin are prioritized into the Metropolitan area. (South Kalimantan Governor Decree Number 188.44/0295/KUM/2012 dated on June 18th, 2012 on the Establishment of Coordinating Agency for Development Cooperation for Metropolitan Area of Banjar Bakula)

The activities of interregional cooperation are inseparable from the concept of decentralization that has been applied in Indonesia since 2004, which the interregional relationship between is stipulated in Law of Republic of Indonesia Number 32 of 2004. However, since decentralization has been applied, National Development Planning Agency (Bappenas) [25] stated that there have been various problems found in the implementation, which mostly technical issues and also issues are concerning with the community. Those problems include the following:

- a. The unclear of distribution of authority between the central government and the local governments. There are many authorities of local government which have not been decentralized as the sectorial rules and regulations that have not been adapted to the regulations of the local government.
- b. The process of decentralization is not optimal, and the regional autonomy that might be caused by different perceptions towards the actor of the development program to the policy of decentralization and the regional autonomy.
- c. There is still lack of cooperation among the local governments. The lack cooperation is particularly noticeable in the provision of public services in remote areas, border area between the regions, and regions with high level of urbanization and economic growth, as well as in shared river management, water resources, forests, mining, and minerals and marine resources which are located in some adjacent areas, and in some aspects like trade, education, health, agriculture and

fisheries, including the distribution of those aspects.

- d. The implementation of the regional government institutions has not been effective. The structure of local governance is too big and complex, which may cause overlapping authorities among the stakeholders within the structure. In addition to that, the limited facilities and infrastructure in the implementation of minimum standard for public services especially at the sub district level. There is also concern with the relationship among government agencies in the districts, be it the executive or legislative, as well as the relations between the public and non-government agencies that is not optimal.
- e. The limited capacity of local government officials which may influence the lack of professionalism of the officials, disproportionate distribution of officials, and the officials with low welfare may also cause lower level of public services. It is characterized by the slow performance of the services by the officials, not transparent and less responsive to what is needed by the community.
- f. The limited capacity of local government financing condition. This is characterized by limited effectiveness, efficiency, and optimizing the utilization of prospective sources for the local revenue, inefficient allocation priority and proportionately for regional spending, and the limited management capabilities, including in implementing the principles of transparency and accountability, and professionalism in managing financial sector.
- g. The establishment of new autonomous regions (expansion region) which are still not settled in terms of purpose, namely the plan and management for the welfare of society.

Since the promulgation of Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 22 of 1999, and replaced by Law of Republic of Indonesia Number 32 of 2004 on Regional Government, there have been changes in the interpretation of the intergovernmental relation pattern. Before the law was enacted, the centralization of government system was really obvious in the relationships between central and local governments. Planning and implementation of development were to tend to the central government's initiative and desires. The pattern of relations between central and local governments was more hierarchical, based on the nature of a formal legal relationship.

But in the case of determining the location of regional landfill in the Metropolitan area of Banjar Bakula, such egalitarian and horizontal relation patterns are yet to be done. The determining of location of landfill in City of Banjarbaru as regional landfill of the metropolitan area was based on a feasibility study conducted by the provincial government, and it was refused by the City of Government of Banjarbaru. This condition may indicate that centralization pattern still occurs. Although Pratikno [26] said that since the promulgation of Law of Republic of Indonesia Number 22 of 1999, and replaced by Law of Republic of Indonesia Number 32 of 2004 on Regional Government, there has been a shift in the pattern of relations in the process of cooperation among local governments, from the pattern that relies on dimensional coercive, top-down relationship (hierarchical) through legal-formal rules relations towards the pattern where the interregional cooperation is more equal (egalitarian). Pratikno's opinion mentioned above is supported by Gillette [27] as well as he said that decentralization and interregional cooperation are fundamental in addressing regional prosperity because such cooperation will cope well with the diverse needs of local governments in order to serve the society, not through a centralized national policy.

For that, a more democratic relationship pattern needs to be held in the interregional cooperation so that the interests from the regional development can be realized without harming the development of each region. As expressed by Muluk [28] that the needs for the third development approach that combines administrative and political interests in the relations between central and local governments. With this approach, it is expected the existing development in the region is a form of synergy of development by both the provincial and district / city governments.

The patterns of intergovernmental relations in a process of cooperation become the pattern of distribution of burdens, roles, and risks of each region involved in the cooperation. Due to the cooperation, in addition to that, the region may receive more incomes and revenues from the results of such cooperation. The local government has a role in accordance with the duties and functions in accordance with the agreement that has been agreed upon by the related parties, as well as the risks that will be accepted due to any failure in such cooperation. According to Yudhoyono [29] interregional cooperation is very beneficial because of the sharing of experience with other regions, so that one region area does not need to experience the mistakes of other regions, sharing of profits and the sharing of burdens, where cooperation can bear jointly operating costs and the burden could be held together.

The spirit of decentralization and regional autonomy with the enactment of Law of Republic of Indonesia of Indonesia Number 22 of 1999, and replaced by Law of Republic of Indonesia of Indonesia Number 32 of 2004 on Regional Government, has also led to the perception and the spirit of narrow and varied autonomy from district / city governments in conducting development and management their potentials. This condition has been described by Wagino [30] and Pratikno [26] who said that the perceptions and attitudes of narrow autonomy has led to regionalism which then might increase the ego of each region, so that the local governments only think the success of regional development without considering the regional frameworks which involve other regions around. This condition could be seen from the cooperation program which will be carried out in the Metropolitan area of Banjar Bakula in relation to the construction and management of regional landfill.

Based on the results of the study and assessment carried out by the Ministry of Public Works, Directorate General of

Human Settlements and PT Arkonin Engineering Mangala Primary in 2010 upon the three landfills in the three districts / cities (District of Banjar, City of Banjarbaru and City of Banjarmasin), then Hutan Panjang Landfill located in Banjarbaru has the highest level as to become the regional landfill, while Basirih Landfill located in Banjarmasin and Karang Intan Landfill located in District of Banjar are less representative to be the regional landfill. The other factor like strategic place is considered to select Hutan Panjang Landfill as the regional landfill. The determination of Hutan Panjang Landfill became the regional landfill subjects to expand the area of the site up to 30 Ha from the existing site today.

However the site area of Hutan Panjang Landfill designated as the regional landfill in Metropolitan area of Banjar Bakula cannot be expanded as the City Government of Banjarbaru in which the regional landfill is located does not have adequate funds to purchase the land that will be used the expansion of the standardized regional landfill. City Government of Banjarbaru considers that the additional funds for the purchase of additional land Banjarbaru municipal landfill should be accommodated by the provincial government of South Kalimantan, while the Provincial Government of South Kalimantan considers this issues as the responsibility of the city government where the landfill is located, which is Banjarbaru. The debate upon this issue has been occurred since the agreement, and there is not resolution upon the construction of the regional landfill.

According to Law of Republic of Indonesia Number 32 Article 12 of 2004 on Regional Government, it is stated that such affairs under the authority of the provincial government should have provincial scale impact. What is meant by the provincial scale affair is that if infrastructure is built and used for several areas and across jurisdictions of some regency. The regional landfill in Metropolitan area of Banjar Bakula is expected to be utilized by the District of Banjar, City of Banjarmasin and City of Banjarbaru. Therefore, the City Government of Banjarbaru has demanded the provincial government to provide fund the land expansion required for the regional landfill, while the provincial government does not allocate funds for the purchase of additional land for the expansion of regional landfill. As the completion of the financing problems is not achieved, it has led to rejection from the City Government of Banjarbaru as to be chosen as the regional landfill, with the following are some of the reasons for the refusal:

- a. City Government of Banjarbaru does not receive any support from the Ministry of Public Works after the establishment of the regional landfill Banjarbaru because the regional landfill should receive direct assistance from the central government if the status of the landfill has become a regional landfill, whereas City Government Banjarbaru does not get funding for the management of the landfill.
- b. City Government of Banjarbaru does not want to receive any impacts and damages on the streets due to the trucks transporting garbage from various areas in the metropolitan area.
- c. City Government of Banjarbaru does not want to accept the impact like smells from waste transportation from various districts / cities involved in this regional cooperation.
- d. City Government of Banjarbaru does not receive any support like fund for land acquisition for the expansion of the regional landfill.

This is the difference in understanding of the basic tasks and functions of each level of governments so that occurred dilemma of interregional governments relations. Provincial government as a subsystem of the national governments in this regard has not been able to hold good coordination among the regions, guidance and supervision, so there is concern from the district / city government towards the capability of the provincial governments to hold regional coordination. This condition is described by Zuhro [31] who said it seems that each region runs as their own ways, and in some cases there is some "little kingdom" in the region. The phenomenon shows the implementation of regional autonomy that was clearly referring to the constitution and the Indonesian Homeland that tends to be interpreted differently by each region. Opinion by Zuhro is justified by Edward [32] ... stated in their findings in the status quo report on intergovernmental relations concerning local governments that intergovernmental relations are failing to facilitate effective co-operation of district and local municipalities to coordinate their constitutional mandates and to achieve effective service delivery.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

There are three patterns of intergovernmental relations that occur in the joint construction and management of the regional landfill in the Metropolitan area of Banjar Bakula. First, active role undertaken by the provincial government of South Kalimantan, passive role performed by the district / city governments, and minimal role performed by the central government. These conditions are based on some aspects namely the role of government, the interactions of public officials, the sustainability of communications, the role of the administrator and the impact of policies that may result in the implementation of cooperation of construction and management of the regional landfill becomes less than maximum. Therefore there should be active participation and involvement of the main stakeholders especially city government of Banjarmasin which does not have environmentally friendly landfill. The presence of harmonious intergovernmental relations and the commitment to avoid selfish attitude of each region and the existence of effective relationships, mutual trust and good faith is the key to the success of regional development, so this would encourage public participation,

strengthening the autonomy development of each region, social transformation and equitable distribution of the benefits of development.

Governor as the coordinator upon the guidance and supervision of the implementation of district / city government is in accordance with Law of Indonesia Number 32 of 2004 Article 222 Chapter 2 has not been able to provide sufficient guidance like conducting coordination and provide guidelines and standardized procedures in the planning, the implementation of governance, funding, quality, control and supervision, in particular to the construction and management of regional landfill in the Metropolitan area of Banjar Bakula.

Practical recommendations given to solve this problem is that both central and provincial governments must hold cross-sectorial and interregional coordination, then arrange the schedule and framework in realizing the regional landfill, identified the problems that become obstacles ranging from the role of governments involved, communications, interactions, the role of the administrators and the focus of the government in realizing the plan. For the theoretical recommendation from this study is that future studies should be directed in an attempt to find a balance between central and local governments. The scope of the research includes the balance of duties and responsibilities of the provincial and district / city governments.

REFERENCES

1. Ohmae, Kenichi, 1991, *The Borderless world, Power and Strategy in the interlinked economy*, Harper Business, New YorkPage :32
2. Conlan, Timothy J and Posner, Paul L, 2008, *Intergovernmental Management for 21st Century*, The Brooking Institution, Washington D.C, pp 213
3. Edwards, T. 2008. Key challenges of improving intergovernmental relations at local sphere: a capacity building perspective. *Journal of Public Administration: SAAPAM Conference Proceedings: Special Issue 3, Volume 43*: pp. 89-98.
4. Agranoff, R, 2011 *Federalist No 44: What Is the Role of Intergovernmental Relation in Federalis?* PAR December. Special Issue
5. McGuire, Michael. 2003. "Collaborative Public Management: Assessing What We Know and How We Know It. Blackwell Publishing Limited: pp 33-40.
6. Salet, Willem; Thornley, Andy; Kreukels, Anton. 2003. *Metropolitan Governance and Spatial Planning Comparative Case Studies of European City-Regions*. Spon Press Taylor & Francis Group. London.
7. Lina Marlia, Z.A Achmady, A. Yuli Andi Gani, Andi Fefta Wijaya, 2014 *Intergovernmental Relations in Greater Jakarta Metropolitan Area (JABODETABEKPUNJUR) Case Study: Public Transportation Management*, *J. Basic. Appl. Sci. Res.*, 4(6)168-173
8. Crouch, Winston W, 1965, *Conflict and Co-Operation among Local Governments in the Metropolis*, *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, Vol. 359, *Intergovernmental Relations in the United States* (May, 1965), pp. 60-70
9. Malan, LP, 2012, *Intergovernmental Relations In South Africa; a revised policy approach to co-operative government*, *African Journal of Public Affairs*, Volume 5 No 3 December 2012
10. David, Nina P, 2008, *Why Cooperate? An evaluation of the formation and persistence of voluntary regional land use cooperative arrangements in Michigan*, Dissertation, University of Michigan
11. Tiebout, Charles M. 1956. A pure theory of local expenditures. *Journal of Political Economy* 64:416-424.
12. Minkoff, Scott L, 2011, *The Proximate Polity: Exit, Voice, And Space In Local Development Politics*. Thesis, University of Colorado
13. Zhou, Ling, and Wu Jiang, 2013, *Intergovernmental Cooperation in Ceng-Yu Economic Zone: A Case Study on Chinese Regional Collaboration under Synergy Governance*, *Journal Canadian Social Science* Vol. 9. No 3 pp. 15-23.
14. Fox, W. and Meyer, I. H. 1995. *Public administration dictionary*. Kenwyn: Juta. Pp. 66
15. Anderson, W. 1960. *Intergovernmental relations in review*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press. Pp. 3
16. Peter, B., G and Savoie, D, J (2000) *Governance in the Twenty first century, Revitalizing the public service*, Canadian Centre for Management, pp. 61
17. Boland, P., 2007, *Unpacking the theory-policy interface of local economic development; An analysis of Cardiff and Liverpool*, *Urban Studies* Vol 44.nos.5/6,1019-1039, May
18. Malan, LP, 2012, *Intergovernmental Relations In South Africa; a revised policy approach to co-operative government*, *African Journal of Public Affairs*, Volume 5 No 3 December.
19. Tjahjanulin, 2011, *Interregional Cooperation Policy in Sound Governance Perspective*, *Journal Advances in Natural and Applied Sciences*, 5(3): 235-241.
20. Füglistner, K, 2012, *where does learning take place? The role of intergovernmental cooperation in policy diffusion*. *European Journal of Political Research* 51: 316–349

21. Patterson, D.A, 2008, Intergovernmental Cooperation, James A. Coon Local Government Technical Series, New York State Department of State Division of Local government Services. Page: 1
22. Kurtz, Thomas S. 2006. Intergovernmental Cooperation Handbook. Sixth Edition. Governor's Center for Local Government Services Department of Community and Economic Development. Pennsylvania, pp:1.
23. Solihin, Dadang dan Semendawai, Radjab, 2013, Optimalisasi Otonomi Daerah, kebijakan, Strategi dan Upaya, Yayasan Empat Sembilan, Jakartapp. 75
24. Wright, D. S. 1974, Intergovernmental Relations: An Analytical Overview, Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, Vol. 416.
25. <http://www.bappenas.go.id/files/2113/5230/0886/bab-13-revitalisasi-proses-desentralisasi-dan-otonomi-daerah.pdf>
26. Pratikno (ed) 2007. "Kerjasama antar daerah: Kompleksitas dan tawaran format kelembagaan Program S2. PLOD, UGM, Yogyakarta. Pp. 41
27. Gillette, Clayton P, 2001, Regionalization and Interlocal Bargains;. New York University Law Review Vol. 76:190 part, I
28. Muluk, M.R. Khairul, 2012, Effectiveness and Dilemma of Local Bureaucracy Creation J. Basic. Appl. Sci. Res., 2(4)3797-3804.
29. Yudhoyono, S.B, dalam Azhari, Idham Ibtu et.al (ed.) 2003, Good Governance dan Otonomi Daerah Menyongsong AFTA Tahun 2003, Forkoma MAP Yogyakarta.
30. Wagino, 2011, Unggul, kerjasama Antar Daerah di Jateng dan DIY, (<http://cilacapmedia.com/index.php/lintas-banyumas/1522-unggul-kerjasama-antar-daerah-di-jateng-dan-diy.html>)
31. Zuhro, Siti, 2014 Benang Kusut Relasi Pusat-Daerah Media Indonesia - 22 September <http://news.metrotvnews.com/read/2014/09/22/294799/benang-kusut-relasi-pusat-daerah>
32. Edwards, T., 2008, Key challenges of improving intergovernmental relations at local sphere : a capacity building perspective, Journal of Public Administration : SAAPAM Conference Proceedings : Special Issue 3 Vol. 43, 89-98