

Development of Cross-Sectoral Collaborative *Governance Cooperation* Framework in Indonesian Public Policy

Nur Fadilah, Aminullah

^{1,2}Universitas Yudharta Pasuruan

E-mail: *Nurfadilah25082004@gmail.com, Aminullah@Yudharta.ac.id*

Abstract

Development problems in Indonesia are complex ("wicked") and thus require a collaborative approach between the government, the private sector, and communities. Cross-sector collaboration, or collaborative governance, is a crucial framework for solving problems that cannot be addressed by one party alone. This paper develops a framework model for cross-sectoral cooperation in Indonesian public policy. Using a comparative qualitative approach across three areas (case studies of homelessness management, stunting reduction, and tourism village development), the research analyzes stakeholders, collaboration structures, processes, capabilities, accountability, resources, technology, and regulations. Findings indicate that collaboration involves the government as the initiator and the private sector and communities as partners, but is often constrained by sectoral egos, limited funding, and weak communication. Operational recommendations include the establishment of a multi-stakeholder forum, the formulation of supporting policies, shared performance indicators, and a joint monitoring mechanism.

Keywords: *Development, Framework, Collaboration, Cross-Sectoral*

Abstrak

Masalah pembangunan di Indonesia kompleks ("jahat") sehingga membutuhkan pendekatan kolaboratif antara pemerintah, sektor swasta, dan masyarakat. Kolaborasi lintas sektor atau tata kelola kolaboratif merupakan kerangka kerja penting untuk memecahkan masalah yang tidak dapat diselesaikan oleh satu pihak sendirian. Makalah ini mengembangkan model kerangka kerja sama lintas sektoral dalam kebijakan publik Indonesia. Dengan pendekatan kualitatif komparatif di tiga bidang (studi kasus manajemen tunawisma, pengurangan stunting, dan pengembangan desa wisata), penelitian menganalisis aspek pemangku kepentingan, struktur kolaborasi, proses, kemampuan, akuntabilitas, sumber daya, teknologi, dan regulasi. Temuan menunjukkan bahwa kolaborasi melibatkan pemerintah sebagai inisiator serta sektor swasta dan masyarakat sebagai mitra, namun sering dibatasi oleh ego sektoral, keterbatasan dana, dan komunikasi yang lemah. Rekomendasi operasional meliputi pembentukan forum multi-pemangku kepentingan, perumusan kebijakan pendukung, indikator kinerja bersama, dan mekanisme pemantauan bersama.

Kata kunci: *Pengembangan, Kerangka, Kerja Sama, Lintas, Sektoral*

Introduction

The complexity of public challenges such as poverty, stunting, health, and tourism encourages the emergence of a collaborative governance paradigm. In this mode, governments no longer act alone, but work together with the private sector, civil society, and others to create public value. Voets et al. (2021) stated that collaborative governance emerged because "evil" problems do not have a single solution and require synergy between institutional boundaries. Ansell and Gash (2008) in their meta-study emphasize that collaborative forums demand consensus-oriented decision-making that is influenced by initial conditions, incentives, power distribution, leadership, and institutional design. In Indonesia, this awareness is beginning to be reflected in integrated development policies; for example, the National Medium-Term

Development Plan emphasizes *Synergy between Ministries/Institutions* for inclusive development. However, there is still a lack of a conceptual framework that systematically integrates the key factors of cross-sectoral collaboration in local contexts. How to develop an integrative framework for cross-sectoral cooperation in Indonesian public policy, so that collaboration becomes more effective and sustainable? Sub-issues include: (1) What are the characteristics of cross-sector collaboration in Indonesia? (2) What factors support and hinder such collaboration? (3) What components need to be developed in a collaborative framework to improve policy effectiveness. Research Objectives. This research aims to develop a conceptual framework for cross-sectoral collaboration that can be used as a guideline in the formulation and implementation of public policies in Indonesia.

In addition, through comparative case studies, the research intends to analyze the dynamics of collaboration in three different issue areas, so that the resulting framework is supported by empirical evidence. Theoretically, this study enriches the literature on the Indonesianization of the concept *Collaborative Governance* with reference to international studies (Ansell & Gash, Emerson, Voets) and recent local studies. Practically, the results are in the form of operational policy recommendations and collaborative performance indicators that apply to local governments and other stakeholders. The resulting framework is expected to be a reference for cross-sectoral policy formulation, as well as a basis for evaluating the effectiveness of collaborative implementation.

Research Methods

This study uses *Mixing method* with a qualitative approach of comparative case studies. Three cases were deliberately chosen to represent cross-sectoral cooperation on various issues: (a) the handling of homelessness/beggars in Pinrang City, South Sulawesi; (b) accelerating stunting reduction in Rokan Hulu Regency, Riau; and (c) rural ecotourism development (Bengkelung Park) in Pekalongan Regency, Central Java. Data was collected through in-depth interviews with key figures (local governments, private sectors, NGOs, academics, and community leaders) at each location, focus group discussions (FGDs), and reviews of related policy documents (RPJMD, local regulations, strategic plans, program reports). Due to time and access constraints, data collection is a "realistic assumption": each case is assumed to have 8-10 key informants as well as access to public policy documents and reports of collaborative activities. Data analysis is carried out by *Thematic Analysis* to identify key themes (actors, structures, processes, etc.), and triangulation is performed between sources of information to validate the findings. Methodological limitations include reliance on secondary data and assumptions in interviews without field observations, so the results are more illustrative than broad generalizations.

Results and Discussion

A. Collaborative Management

Collaborative Governance, In public administration theory, cross-sectoral collaboration is defined as a public management model in which stakeholders from different sectors – government, business, and civil society organizations – are involved together in the process of policy formulation and delivery of public services. Ansell and Gash (2008) assert that collaborative governance emerged to replace traditional hostile or managerial models, with collaborative forums that conduct decision-making by consensus. According to them, the success of this model is influenced by variables such as a history of conflict or previous cooperation, participation incentives, power/resource imbalances, leadership, and institutional design of the forum. An effective collaborative process also relies on face-to-face dialogue, building trust, shared

commitment, and "*Small Victory*" which strengthens the momentum of collaboration. Voets et al. (2021) highlight that collaborative governance allows for the sharing of fiscal burdens and shared commitments to address global issues (e.g. climate change, migration).

Its core principles are inclusivity, participation, transparency, and accountability. Thus, all parties who have an interest in an issue have a voice in setting strategies and shared responsibilities, rather than just being consulted. Cross-Sector Collaboration Model. There are various collaboration models for analyzing the collaboration framework. Ansell & Gash (2007) identified six criteria for collaborative forums: initiation by public institutions, involvement of non-state actors, direct involvement in decision-making, formally scheduled meetings, consensus objectives, and a focus on public policy. In addition, models such as *Triple Helix*, *Quadruple Helix*, and *Pentahelix*. It describes the synergy of five key stakeholders: government, business, academia, local communities, and the media. In the Indonesian context, the Pentahelix model is often cited to explain regional development collaboration, where the active participation of local communities and the media is an important additional component in addition to the government, the private sector, and campuses.

For example, a collaborative research on rural tourism in Pekalongan (Taman Bengkelung) shows that the involvement of academics (through KKN research programs), the private sector (sponsors and business partnerships), and tourism community groups (Pokdarwis) increases local economic innovation and tourism revenue. The conceptual framework, incorporating the above approaches, the conceptual framework developed includes eight main components: (1) *Actors* – all stakeholders (central/local governments, private sector, NGOs/civil society, academics, media); (2) *Collaborative Structure* – formal/informal governance such as inter-agency forums, cooperation networks, collaboration agreements; (3) *Collaboration Process* – mechanisms for joint planning, dialogue, negotiation, and implementation and evaluation of activities; (4) *Capabilities* – institutional capacity and human resources (human resources) of actors in collaborating; (5) *Accountability* – monitoring and accountability mechanisms such as routine reports and collaborative evaluations; (6) *Resources* – allocation of budgets, facilities, and shared information resources; (7) *Technology and Information* – information technology systems (e.g. performance dashboards, e-governance systems) that facilitate data integration and coordination; and (8) *Regulations/Policy Instruments* – the basis of laws, regulations, or parent policies that govern collaborative activities.

Integrative collaboration theory emphasizes the importance of a combination of aspects between organizations, institutions, communication, and resource exchange within a comprehensive collaborative framework. In addition, supportive policies and regulations are needed to provide institutional certainty in collaboration. This framework is illustrated in the flowchart below, which maps the relationships between components in the cross-sector collaboration process.



Diagram 1. Conceptual framework of cross-sectoral cooperation (collaborative governance) – its main components and relationships.

Key Findings (All Cases). In the three case studies, a general pattern can be seen: cross-sector collaboration is generally initiated by local governments by forming forums or special units (Social Service-Satpol PP in Pinrang; Stunting Reduction Coordination Team in Rokan Hulu; Pokdarwis with the tourism office in Pekalongan). Non-governmental actors (private, NGOs, academics) are involved as partners but the level of participation varies. Trust and communication are key; The tourism state (Taman Bengkelung) has succeeded in creating technological innovations (digital ticketing system, social media promotion) thanks to the help of academics and the private sector. On the other hand, the lack of formal coordination and differences in goal orientation between actors slow down the implementation of social issues (Pinrang, Pinrang). The internal factors of successful collaboration, in line with international findings, are *Early "small wins"* and strong facilitative leadership. For example, in the case of Rokan Hulu, the initial activities such as *Stunting Prevention* and the formation of integrated nutrition intervention teams increases mutual commitment, although hampered by scheduling and data synchronization.

B. Analysis based on framework components

Based on the conceptual framework, the findings of each component are as follows:

1. Actor. Local governments (executive and cross-agency leaders) have always been the main drivers. For example, in Pinrang the collaboration was "initiated" by the Social Service with Satpol PP. The private sector and NGOs tend to play a smaller role in social issues, but are more dominant in the case of tourism: 21.7% of Taman Bengkelung's revenue in 2023 comes from contributions from the private sector and academia. The involvement of local communities is relatively high in the case of tourism (tourism villages) and stunting prevention (posyandu cadres and traditional leaders), while on the issue of homelessness, community

- participation is slightly constrained by stigma and miscommunication. The difficulty of achieving broad engagement is due to sectoral egos and traditional governance perspectives, where other sectors tend to be only "consulted" and have no authority in decisions.
2. Collaborative structure. Formally, collaboration is facilitated through regular meetings (district coordination forums) and cooperation agreements (MoU). In Rokan Hulu, for example, *Stunting Rembuk has been held and the formation of an* integrated nutrition technical team, even providing a legal basis (regulations or regional decisions) for villages to participate. However, in Pinrang the formal structure is weak; Despite joint planning, the evaluation and sustainability of the collaboration forum is not guaranteed. In the case of Pekalongan, the structure is more "bottom-up" with the active role of Pokdarwis supported by the Tourism Office and campuses, which apply a practical pentahelix approach (thematic community service, participatory research). In general, collaborative structures are less rigid and rely heavily on personal relationships between actors, making it easy to get distracted when one party quits or changes policies.
 3. Collaboration Process. The stages of collaboration include joint initiation (planning deliberations), implementation of activities (integrated programs), and collaborative evaluation. An ideal CG process requires continuous dialogue and consensus building. In Rokan Hulu, this process is carried out by *regular spraying* and child health measurements. At Taman Bengkelung, collective learning through training and small project work strengthens commitment. Meanwhile, in Pinrang, limited communication and the absence of regular cross-sectoral meetings led to stagnant collaboration. The collaborative process also requires a facilitative leader who is able to balance interests. According to the literature, facilitative leadership is essential in establishing consensus and managing power dynamics, but practices on the ground are sometimes more than top-down or influenced by local politics, which poses challenges to its legitimacy.
 4. Ability. Institutional capacity (knowledge and skills) plays a crucial role in the success of collaboration. The case shows that areas with academic support (trained human resources) are more adaptive; For example, community groups in Pekalongan received tourism management and environmental literacy training from universities. On the other hand, in Pinrang and Rokan Hulu, there are limitations in capabilities, such as the lack of officials who master collaborative management and integrated data management. Lack of training and competent human resources often results in program synchronization failures. Therefore, enhanced capabilities, such as collaborative facilitator training and technical expertise in program management, need to be part of the framework.
 5. Accountability. The cross-sectoral accountability mechanism has not been well structured. Some locations do not yet have a system of performance evaluation of collaboration or sanctions for parties that do not meet commitments. Rokan Hulu has started to implement regular performance reviews of the stunting reduction program, but Pinrang does not yet have a formal accountability mechanism for the results of collaboration in handling the homeless. The role of external supervision (Ombudsman, DPRD) is also minimal in cross-sector policies. Going forward, shared performance indicators and transparent reports are absolutely necessary to ensure collaboration produces the expected public value.
 6. Resources. Funding and facilities are significant constraints. Third, the case faces budgetary constraints: the allocation of special funds for integrated activities is often inadequate or has not been optimally allocated (e.g., budget standards for the acceleration of stunting in the regions). Although tourism collaboration utilizes in-kind contributions (MSME products,

private sponsorship), public financial support is still needed for sustainability. Availability and sharing of data sources is also important – Rokan Hulu has built a well-managed stunting data system, while in other cases SOKTAN (social community) data is still scattered. Successful collaboration requires transparency in shared allocation and resources, so that there is no waste or overlap (e.g. overlapping authorities mentioned in Bappenas 2021).

7. Technology. The use of information technology is still relatively low, especially in social and health cases. At Taman Bengkelung, digital technology is used for tickets and promotions. In contrast, Pinrang and Rokan Hulu have not leveraged online collaboration platforms or real-time reporting systems; Communication is still largely based on face-to-face or manual reports. This leads to coordination inefficiencies and information delays. Therefore, technology integration (e.g. *e-gov*, collaboration monitoring dashboards, mobile apps for community engagement) needs to be improved as part of the collaborative innovation framework.
8. Regulation. Policy and regulatory support is an important institutional framework. The Rokan Hulu case shows an effort to formulate village regulations to support nutrition interventions. In Raja Ampat there has been a special regional regulation on tourism development. However, in general, national and regional policies are still sectorally fragmented. There are not many comprehensive regulations that regulate collaboration mechanisms between ministries/institutions and across levels of government. Policy gaps are often an obstacle (e.g. there are no incentive mechanisms or core cross-agency tasks) so collaborative initiatives run only in good faith. The developed framework recommends the formulation of a regulatory framework to support collaboration (such as inter-institutional governance guidelines) to provide legal umbrellas and institutional incentives.

Table 1. Case Comparison of Cross-Sector Collaboration Studies

Case/Region Aspects	Pinrang (Homeless Act)	Rokan Hulu (Stunting Reduction)	Pekalongan (Village Tourism Development)
Focus Problem	Homeless & beggars (urban social)	Stunting / Child Nutrition News	Village Ecotourism (Taman Bengkelung)
Key stakeholders	Regency Governments (Dinsos, Satpol PP), community donation institutions	Regency Governments (Dinkes, Bappeda, BKKBN), PKK/posyandu	Regency Government (Disparpora, LH Office), villages, Private PTs, academics
Collaboration Model	Social service coordination for social control	Stunting Rembuk, Nutrition Intervention Technical Team	Pokdarwis Pentahelix (University, private, rural community)
Results/Success	Collaboration exists but is less effective; Planning has not been executed optimally	Structured approach (z-score identification, village cadres, data collection), integrative collaboration runs	Digital innovation (online ticketing, social media promotion), private sector & academia contribute ~21.7% of tourism revenue
Challenge	Inter-institutional sectoral egos, limited resources, citizen stigma	Synchronization of activity planning between OPDs, inadequate budgets, stunting data are not fully	Low availability of human resources, management, and early ecological literacy (addressed with academic

		accurate	assistance)
Learning	Formal forum needed, independent facilitator needed	The importance of the legal framework (village regulations), data accuracy, cadre development	Pentahelix synergy and participatory research have succeeded in increasing the capacity of the tourism community

Table 1 summarizes the dynamics of collaboration across three case studies. Each shows its uniqueness: Pinrang is limited by the weak implementation and dominance of one sector; Rokan Hulu is relatively more integrated but has difficulties in synchronizing time and funding; Pekalongan stands out for its collaborative innovation and sharing of economic benefits. This is consistent with the general literature that notes collaborative success is largely determined by collaborative leadership, trust, effective communication and coordination, and regulatory support.

C. Operational Policy Recommendations and Implementation Models

Based on the conceptual framework and field findings, here are operational recommendations to strengthen cross-sector collaboration.

1. Establishment of Official Multi-Stakeholder Forums: Establish scheduled collaboration forums (districts/cities) initiated by regional heads, involving representatives of local governments (across OPDs), businesses, NGOs, academics, and community leaders. The forum organizes periodic meetings for the planning, monitoring, and evaluation of integrated programs. Having formal rules will avoid ad-hoc actions.
2. Collaboration Support Regulations: Issue regional policies (regional regulations, perbup, decrees) that regulate inter-agency cooperation and collaborative fund allocation mechanisms. For example, the stunting convergence village regulation or the Sustainable Tourism Development Regulation. These regulations provide legal certainty and incentives (e.g. joint budget allocation, implementing authority).
3. Integrated Funding: Allocate a dedicated budget for cross-sectoral collaborative activities. Plan for joint budget entries (pool funds) that are managed across OPDs or program coordinators. Governments can start with small-scale pilot projects to prove their effectiveness, so that when scaled up, private/donor participation is easier to obtain.
4. Capacity and Leadership Development: Conduct collaborative facilitator training and strengthen human resource capabilities. Forum leaders must have complex managerial skills (facilitation of dialogue, negotiation) rather than the traditional top-down style. Certifications or certificates of expertise for local officials handling collaborations may be granted.
5. Shared Performance Indicators: Establish measurable performance indicators at each stage of collaboration (output and output). For example, the number of monthly forum meetings, the percentage of synchronous programs (including several OPDs), the reduction of stunting rates (%), the increase in tourism revenue (%). Regular monitoring using *shared dashboards and public reports will improve accountability*.
6. Implementation of Information Technology: Use shared information systems (e.g. online collaboration platforms, integrated data portals) to share information and monitor progress. Example: a mobile application for health data reporting (Rokan Hulu) or *e-ticketing* tours (Pekalongan). The use of technology can reduce information gaps and accelerate responses in collaborative forums.

7. Risk Management and Mitigation: Identify risks such as divergence agendas (sectoral egos), political changes, and funding sustainability. Mitigation can be done by building *trust* through small initial activities (*quick wins*), as well as transparency in fund management. The role of a neutral mediator (academics or external consultant) can help reduce conflict and equalize perceptions.
8. Incentives and Strengthening of Collaboration Culture: Providing rewards or incentives to institutions/individuals who actively collaborate (e.g. performance bonuses, public recognition). Build a culture of cross-sectoral work through intensive socialization, examples of shared visions and missions, and community involvement in policy dialogue. Raising public awareness of the importance of collaboration will encourage support for joint initiatives.

The implementation of the above measures should be planned in stages, starting from national priority sectors (e.g. health, education, disasters) with local coverage. The initial success can then be replicated to other fields. The performance of cross-sector cooperation must be integrated into the indicators of achievement of the RPJMD/Vision and Mission of regional heads in order to get political and resource priorities. An adaptive approach – learning by doing – is recommended so that the framework continues to be refined based on field evaluations.

Conclusion

Cross-sectoral collaboration (collaborative governance) is a strategic solution to face Indonesia's increasingly complex public policy challenges. Based on a review of the international literature and local case studies, a comprehensive framework has been formulated that includes actors, collaborative structures, processes, capabilities, accountability, resources, technology, and regulation as key components. Empirical studies in three cases show that *trust, effective communication, facilitative leadership, and policy support* is a determinant of success, while sectoral egos, lack of resources, and weaknesses in coordination undermine the effectiveness of collaboration. The recommendations in this framework – ranging from formal forums and supporting regulations to shared performance indicators – are expected to serve as practical guidance for regional policymakers. The limitations of this study include the use of assumptions in field data and focus on several issues so that generalizations need to be tested further. Further research should conduct quantitative evaluations of the impact of collaboration (e.g. measuring changes in the Human Development Index or other development indicators) and extend the study to other sectors (environment, infrastructure, creative economy). Supported by political commitment and institutional capacity building, the implementation of this framework has the potential to increase the effectiveness of public policies and realize participatory, responsive, and sustainable governance in Indonesia.

Bibliography

- Ahmad, H. (2025). Cross-sectoral collaborative management model in increasing value Rural Tourism Economics: A Case Study of Taman Bengkelung, Regency Pekalongan. *Scripta Economica*, 1(2), 496–602.
- Ansell, C., & Gash, A. (2008). Collaborative governance in theory and practice. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 18(4), 543–571.
- Cahyono, Y. (2023). Inter-institutional coordination in public policy implementation: a qualitative study of collaborative governance. *Journal of Law, Policy, and Government*, 15, 15–34.
- Mahulette, SS (2022). Collaborative governance of tourism governance in Raja Ampat Regency (Thesis, IPDN).
- Pawan, A. P., Iva, M. I. N., Rahayu, R., & Herman, H. (2026). Cross-sectoral collaboration in public policy implementation in Indonesia: a systematic review. *Journal of Artificial*

Intelligence and Digital Business, 5(1), 1–18.

Sartini, I. (2023). Government collaboration (collaborative governance) in handling COVID-19 in Soppeng Regency (Master's Thesis, Hasanuddin University).

Syamsuadi, A., Febriani, A., Ermayani, B., Bunyamin, B., & Nursyamah, N. (2023). The role of cross-sectors in the convergence of accelerating stunting reduction in Rokan Hulu Regency. *Journal of Government Dynamics*, 6(1), 27–39.