

**CHALLENGES OF INTER-LOCAL COOPERATION
IN INDONESIA'S DECENTRALIZED GOVERNANCE:
THE CASE OF KARTAMANTUL, JOGJA PROVINCE**

Wahyudi Kumorotomo

1. Background

For most Indonesian people, the tumultuous political change in late 1990s has given an important lesson about the danger of having an authoritarian regime for a long time. Economic crisis that led to the downfall of the New Order regime was followed by multi-dimensional changes that resulted in political instability and hardship among the common people. Only after the success of an experiment with democracy in 2004 that Indonesians could foresee a more stable national politics and better living. The new multi-party system, direct presidential elections, decentralization policy and all the variables that indicate more opened political system, were considered as big steps towards a more democratic government in Indonesia. Nevertheless, the wave for democratization has created unprecedented challenge that was not applied in the past. It is becoming more difficult to settle disputes in the government. Unlike in the past authoritarian and centralistic system under the New Order where convergence could easily be attained, the public policy process is now more fragmented and sometimes proven to be ineffective.

Today, political setting in Indonesia is equipped with almost all of the basic characteristics of democracy. As a young democracy, however, many of the strategic policy makers in the country have not ready for “substantive democracy” given the past experience of authoritarian system. Democracy ensures participatory decision-making and hence promises greater legitimacy for any policies that are being made. Yet, democracy calls for decision makers to be ready for long-dwindling process, to utilize negotiations skills, and to accept a compromise with other stake-holders. It is because democratic policy process tends to entail divergence rather than convergence systems. Evidence from current comparative studies suggest such divergence proposition (Hill, 2005:105).

The similar can be said with regards to decentralization. Although international experts hailed the initial success of “the big bang” decentralization policy in Indonesia as it did not cause chaotic consequences, the objective of decentralization to create more responsible local governments and better public services have ended up with disappointment. Many observers found that the performance of decentralization policy is still fall short. On the part of central government, many sectoral ministries are reluctant to cede their power to local government authorities. It is not easy to convince those who had enjoyed privileges and powers in the past to give more power to the local officials. Meanwhile, contrary to theoretical postulates that decentralization would create “good local government” (Smith, 1985; Manor, 1999), it turned out that most local government authorities do not use their assumed power to improve the quality of public services.

Under decentralized governance, local authorities should have more leeway in response to the local needs. They should also have more rooms to explore creative policies in order to improve people's welfare. It is unfortunate, however, that local elites do not use the new opportunities under decentralized governance to do their best for the people. Instead, they tend to compete for their own vested interests. Although decentralization policy has been able to prevent further breakup and separatisms after the lost of East Timor province, vertical conflicts between the central and provincial and local governments are perpetuated. Meanwhile, horizontal conflicts among the provincial and/or local government authorities are more frequently occurred after decentralization. Inter-local cooperation becomes an important issue under decentralized administration system. This paper aims to explore issues in inter-local cooperation after decentralization policy in Indonesia. After explaining the theories of inter-local development and the reasons for its failures in Indonesia, the paper shall explain the case of Kartamantul as one of the best practice in inter-local cooperation. The case might not be the ideal for cooperation initiatives among local government officials, but it could be something that offer a lesson for the local authorities.

2. On Decentralization and Inter-Local Development Cooperation

As an archipelagic country, geographical conditions in Indonesia give more than enough reasons to decentralize. It has sheer size (4.8 million km), many islands (13,667) and big population (235 million in 2007). In terms of social fabric, Indonesia has more than 300 ethnics with their diverse dialects. There is also a problem of population imbalances as 61.7 percent of the population is resided in Java, which constitutes only 7% of the Indonesian area. As such, national development and economic distribution can only be assured if the country is administered under democracy and decentralized system. This follows from a general theoretical assumption that decentralization will bring public services closer to the people.

However, having been embarked on democracy and implemented decentralization policy since 2001, there are still mixed conclusions about what has changed Indonesia. On the one hand, there are experts who contended that despite the introduction of free and fair elections and the devolutions of political authority, old political elites are able to maintain their political and administrative positions at all levels (Hadiz and Robison, 2004). A descriptive study concludes with the notion that democratization in Indonesia is being "captured" or "hijacked" by political elites (Priyono, et al, 2007). On the other hand, some indicates an important progress in reforming Indonesia's framework of government since 1998 and that "while there are concerns about the slow pace in progress, public commitment to democracy remains solid" (McLeod and MacIntyre, 2007). Another study argues that "while old elites indeed remain in power, the new institutional environment has reshuffled the cards for political elites" (Michael Buehler, in Erb and Sulistiyanto, 2009:101).

In any case, there is no question that whatever the nature of political changes it would certainly impact on the process of public policy. Among the local policy makers, it is almost impossible to exclude political factors when they make strategic decisions. In fact, the capacity of local government authorities to materialize their reform initiatives would be dependent upon their ability to secure both a solid political coalition and a wider network of public support. And when it comes to political coalition, it is critical for the local authorities to consider political party constellation at the local level. Together with the *reformasi*, Indonesian politics is opened for everybody to form a political party. The national politics are colored by multi-party systems since the fall of the New Order authoritarian regime.¹

The foregoing explanation shows that development challenges and opportunities can be managed better through various schemes of inter-local cooperation. Before discussing further about inter-local cooperation in Indonesia, it is worth to note that cooperative development efforts have been carried out in many countries. Some of the efforts have been successful but some others have not successful and in fact aggravated the problems of local development. The followings are the international experience of such inter-local cooperation initiatives.

SALGA (South African Local Government Association) is established in Cape Town and is initially meant to voice local interests vis-a-vis the central government. This organization is stated in the South African constitution in 1997, which aimed at accelerating democratic transformation among the local governments and improving public services. SALGA has many programs that are generally categorized into three: strengthening the roles of local governments, supporting and improving local capacities, and managing information and knowledge.

Under the category of strengthening the roles of local governments, SALGA works in the area of local policy formulation, advocacy, negotiation, regulatory improvement, and community representativeness. In order to support local government capacities, SALGA initiates training programs on needs analysis for capacity building, coordinative improvements, working relations in the organization, and performance management. Then, under the category of managing information and knowledge, it supports the local governments with research and information gathering, publishing the government reports, and disseminating information to the public.

Although SAGA is initiated by the central government according to the constitutional mandate, it has been functioning quite well in representing the voice of the local governments. As SAGA has a clear and definite regulation for its members, it has also proved to be an effective power in enforcing the participation of the members. If a local government failed to pay the annual fee or infringe the SAGA regulation, its membership in SAGA could be suspended or frozen upon the approval of the National Executive Committee.

¹ While elections during the New Order were mostly contested by three parties, the elections in 1999, 2004 and 2009 were contested by 48 parties, 24 parties and 38 parties respectively.

Therefore, SALGA is very powerful in institutionalizing inter-local cooperation, especially in terms of coordination, monitoring, and evaluation.

In the United States of America, generally there are two concepts of inter-local cooperation, namely: intergovernmental relations (IGR) and intergovernmental management (IGM). In the IGR, the pattern of relationships among its members are limited in communicating and coordinating things when they want to increase their bargaining power against the federal government. Therefore, the associations under IGR constitute "public interest groups" since their functions are mainly to give inputs to the federal government with regards to the use of federal funds in the states or counties. The associations provides local government forums without much power on its members governments.

The IGM, on the other hands, is designed to manage certain development issue that is shared by the local governments. The associations are established as there is a common needs in particular development issue and its members believe that they could gain better efficiency and effectiveness if it is carried out collectively. An example of IGM in Washington is the Sound Transit, an organization that is focused on public transport cooperation. The area of cooperation includes East King County, Snohomish County, South King County, North King County, and Pierce County, all of which located in Seattle. Sound Transit manages High Capacity Transportation (HCT), including railway and bus, terminals, parking areas and special lanes for public transports.

Sound Transit is established according to the Washington State Constitution, which give possibilities to manage inter-local public utilities upon the legislative's approval. As an agency under the Department of Transportation, Sound Transit is a quasi-executive organization that also have regulatory functions. Therefore, Sound Transit is very strong in the field of public transportation. It can issue a regulation, enforce the regulation and resolve internal conflicts at the local level administration. Sound Transit also has a financial power as it is entitled to get a certain portion of local taxes that are levied in the county members. Sound Transit is an example of separate organization that is administered by the states, counties and districts.

LAA (Local Autonomy Act) is a local government association that is formed by the central government in South Korea. The LAA actually reflects the weak power of local governments against the central government. In general, South Korea is a centrally administered country in which the power of local governments are weak and the local councils' power are not equal to those of the executives. The local government association under the LAA is only temporary set up according to the needs. However, the association can be effective when the roles of local governments are required to undertake certain projects.

In order to protect common interests among the local governments, the LAA sought to make decisions and manage conflict among local governments as it is created to intervene local autonomy in South Korea. The activities that have been carried out under the LAA auspices were: formulation of long-term

plans for urban facilities, intermediating conflicts on the Nakdong River pollution, cooperative efforts on transports and commodity prices, etc. Given its centralistic nature and its dependence on the policy of Ministry of Home Affairs, the effectiveness of LAA to address common problems are still in doubt.

The Leagues of Cities in the Philippines (LCP) has 117 members and is founded according to the Local Government Code of Autonomy 1991. Initially, the association was called League of City Mayors in which local politicians organized themselves as a form of solidarity. The enactment of Local Autonomy Act has changed the nature of its activities from a merely administrative or supporting to a professional organization that gives technical supports and involves in policy formulation process.

Aside from a shift in its characteristics, from political association to functional inter-local cooperation, the LCP members also changed from involving politicians exclusively to an institution that is more professional and addresses concrete issues. The LCP also helps to formulate local autonomy policies in order to improve people's welfare. As such, the LCP has been able to facilitate collective actions of the urban local governments vis-a-vis the national government.

From the experience of inter-local cooperation in various countries, it can be concluded that the concept of inter-governmental management is aimed at addressing development issues across jurisdictional boundaries. It would be beneficial if it is based on mutual respect and is aimed at specific problem such as the case of public transport in Washington State. The main problem in inter-governmental cooperation is how to coordinate actions and to accommodate various interests in the area of cooperation. There are three general patterns of intergovernmental cooperation; first, the association of interest groups among the local governments with the objective of increasing bargaining power against the central government; second, an extension of central government's effort to control development policies at the local level; and third, the collective effort of local governments to tackle common problems at the local level, especially those that need cross-boundary cooperation.

3. Too Many Ideas, Too Little Realization

As explained earlier, decentralization policy has created opportunities for inter-local cooperation in Indonesia. In fact, Law No.32/2004, especially articles no.195 and no.196, has encouraged authorities at the local level to find new ways of managing development that are based on local people's aspirations. There are also other government regulations that stipulate the need for inter-local or inter-provincial cooperations. The *Peraturan Pemerintah* (Government Regulation) No.50/2007 on Procedures for Inter-Regional Development Cooperation has laid out basic principles for development cooperation and what are the ideal objectives of such cooperation. The Ministry of Home Affairs (MoHA) has also made further follow-ups by issuing *Surat Edaran* (Circular Letters) No.120/1730/SJ on the Regional Cooperation, and MoHA Decree No.69/2007 on Urban Development Cooperation.

At the sub-national levels, there are also initiatives to create inter-regional cooperation based on the perceived main issues at each level. In the province of Central Java, for example, there have been various schemes of cooperation among the districts and cities since the implementation of decentralization policy. Compared to other provinces in Indonesia, scheme for cooperation in Central Java is the most ambitious in terms of its number. Therefore, these schemes merit further discussion in order to understand the impetus and nature of these cooperation initiatives in Indonesia.

Regional cooperation in the province of Central Java was initially designed according to geographical clustering and the financial resources in the districts and cities. The province consists of 29 districts (*kabupaten*) and 6 cities (*kota*). Based on the *Peraturan Daerah* (Regional Regulation) No.21/2003, the Central Java provincial government designed cooperative development network in the districts and came up with eight schemes as follows:

1. Barlingmascakeb, consists of the district of Banjarnegara, Purbalingga, Banyumas, Cilacap and Kebumen.
2. Purwomanggung, consists of Purworejo, Wonosobo, Magelang and Temanggung.
3. Subosukowonosraten, consists of Surakarta, Boyolali, Sukoharjo, Karanganyar, Wonogiri, Sragen and Klaten.
4. Banglor, consists of Rembang and Blora.
5. Wanarakuti, consists of Juwana, Jepara, Kudus, and Pati.
6. Kedungsapur, consists of Kendal, Demak, Ungaran, Salatiga, Semarang, and Purwodadi.
7. Tangkallangka, consists of Batang, Pekalongan, Pemalang and Kajen.
8. Bargas, consists of Brebes, Tegal, and Slawi.

Aside from delineating the schemes for inter-local cooperation, the *Bappeda* (Regional Development Planning Board) assigned the so-called REDSP (Regional Economic Development Strategic Plan) that is aimed at developing economic resources based on regional characteristics and prominent product in each districts. The Bappeda worked together with the GTZ, a German quasi-government donor, which helped in socializing the programs and giving technical advice.

It turned out that not all the schemes for inter-local cooperation worked out according to the plan. From the eight schemes for cooperation, there were only three (Barlingmascakeb, Subosukawonosraten, and Kedungsapur) that could be developed into inter-local cooperation. Many experts even stated that there was only one scheme, that is the Barlingmascakeb, that could meet the expected results. One could point out that the failure of the inter-local cooperation schemes was caused by economic disparity among the districts. The Tangkallangka scheme, for example, failed to materialize the MoU for cooperative efforts into real action because the district of Pekalongan was disinterested to follow up the scheme as the authorities felt that they would not be able to get benefit from it and instead would bear the cost of development in the poorer districts of Batang and Pemalang.

The other factor that cause the failure is the fact that it is not easy to attain an agreement on common interests among the districts. Each districts has its own interests vis-a-vis the central government. At the same time, many MoU for cooperation frequently end up in a discourse rather than a real action that would result in concrete benefit for all the districts. The pattern and characteristics of the four schemes for inter-local cooperation in Central Java can be summarized in Table 1.

Table 1. Institutional Comparison of Inter-Local Cooperation in Central Java

	Barlingmascakeb	Subosuka-wonosraten	Sampan	Kedungsepur
Concept	Regional Management (RM)	Regional Management	Regional Management	Coordinative, aimed at RM
Focus	Regional marketing	Regional marketing	Regional marketing	Macro policy (multi-purpose)
Law enforcement	Initiated with Regional Regulation (Perda) on Spatial Planning	Initiated with the Perda on Spatial Planning	No formal agreement on cooperation	Initiated with the Perda on Spatial Planning
Cost-sharing	Equal for members: Rp 150 million per annum	Equal for members: Rp 100 million per annum	Equal for members: Rp 100 million per annum	Unequal: between Rp 150 to 250 million per annum
Joint venture unit	None	One unit: PT.Solo Raya Promosi, dissolved after 2 years	None	None
Issues	Disagreements between the management and the district authorities. No executing agency for marketing.	Local governments distrust with the venture unit management. Most district did not believe in mutual benefits, except the city of Surakarta.	Limited "brand image" in the region. Unsound concept on marketing and local products.	Loosing focus on cooperation. Limited concrete benefits, which discourage authorities in the districts.

Source: Warsono, 2008.

There have been different characteristics and dynamics of the schemes for inter-local cooperation in Central Java. In general, the complexity of managing the cooperation initiatives might related to political, economic, as well as administrative issues.

4. Kartamantul Solid-Waste Management: Best Practice, So Far

Kartamantul is a form of inter-local cooperation among three out of the five districts in the province of Jogjakarta at the central part of Java island. Kartamantul is actually an acronym stems from the three cooperating districts, i.e. Karta (from the city of Jogja-karta), Man (the district of Sleman), and Tul (the district of Bantul). It is quite common in Indonesia that an agreement for

joint planning is formalized by creating an acronym to represent the name of the districts. The idea for inter-local cooperation was initiated in 2003. However, as also frequently occurred in other schemes of cooperation, it takes time before authorities in the three districts could come into concrete actions.

The mayor of Jogja city was concerned with the problems caused by urban development and demanding aspiration of its inhabitants. From a city with less than 250,000 population in the 1970s, Jogja has become an urban agglomeration with a population of 1.2 million. The city has spilled over onto the neighboring regencies, five sub-districts in Sleman and three sub-districts in Bantul. In the past, urban infrastructure management in the three local governments forming Jogjakarta metropolitan was coordinated and handled by the provincial government. Under centralized and authoritarian New Order government, the provincial government could easily coordinate development in the three districts since the governor, by law, was the representative of central government. However, this is not the case under the new laws on decentralization (Law 22/1999, that has been amended into Law 32/2004). As there is no hierarchical relationship between the provincial and the local governments, the Kartamantul was critical for integrating the management of urban infrastructures that frequently requires cross-border coordination.

Therefore, the three heads of regions, i.e. mayor of Jogja city, regent of Sleman district and regent of Bantul agreed to form the so-called *Sekretariat Bersama* (joint secretariat) of Kartamantul. Later on, the idea of joint secretariat was proven to be an important step to materialize cross-border development initiatives that have been on discourse for quite a long time. It should be noted, however, that the joint secretariat could only be established when all the regional authorities acknowledged the importance of having a shared vision and a common interest in urban management. As explained earlier, under decentralized governance when many local authorities seek for local identities and compete each other, it becomes difficult to formulate a shared vision and common interest among the local decision-making elites.

In the case of Kartamantul authorities, it happened that many factors have contributed to cooperation rather than competition. The province of Jogjakarta is a special region that inherit a sultanate kingdom back to the 18th century. Unlike most of other provinces that have more than ten districts, the province of Jogjakarta only consists of one city and four districts under its jurisdiction. Historically, the districts in Jogjakarta province governments are accustomed to work together closely, coordinated by the provincial government. Opened discussions among the policy makers have been conducted frequently before the idea of Kartamantul's joint secretariat was put forward. The integrated approach has also been applied for tackling various issues. For example, since early 1990s the provincial government of Jogjakarta has conducted the so-called IUIDP (Integrated Urban Infrastructure Development Program), an inter-governmental forum that was promoted by the central government and funded by the Asian Development Bank.

The characteristics of the three cooperating districts shall be explained in detail in order to understand the dynamics of development in the

Kartamantul area. The district of Sleman is located in the upper-stream area of central Jogjakarta province. It has a contrast topography of the 2,999 meter Merapi volcano in the north to less than 100 meter above the sea level in the south. With much fertile land and abundant water for irrigation, the district of Sleman is ideal for agricultural activities. But there are also fast growing small-scale sites of industries and services in the urban areas. Sleman covers an area of 574.82 km² and the number of population is 859,327. Although Sleman is considered as the most developed regency in the province aside from the Jogja city, the rate of economic growth is still moderate among the best performing regencies in Indonesia. As an upper-stream district, Sleman constitutes a watershed area that has to maintain the environment due to its function as the recharged area. The issue of environmental conservation is alarming given the fact that every year about 253 hectares of agricultural lands have been converted into non-agricultural utilizations, either for small-scale industries or for housing facilities. This have happened over the last ten years. At the same time, urban activities in Sleman have substantially increased the volume of waste disposals that has tremendous impacts to the down-stream districts in the south.

The city of Jogja, as the central part of the Jogjakarta Metropolitan area is the locomotive of economic activities in the region. The area covers 32,5 km² with the population of 493.903. Jogja is re-known for *Kota Pelajar* (the city of students) as nearly 70 percent of its population are students. Although the city is small and is not comparable to other big cities in Indonesia such as Jakarta, Surabaya, and Medan, it still attract many students from other parts of Indonesia. The first established university in Indonesia, Gadjah Mada University, is located in Jogja. Also, as there are many historical sites in Jogja, many international as well as national tourists keen on visiting the city on vacation. However, as urban facilities are sprawling while its carrying capacity is limited, Jogja has no more space for fulfilling the need of disposal. This is becoming more problematic as most of waste management is still depended on open-dumping.

The regency of Bantul, located at the lower part, is deemed as the best part for disposal. On the other hand, it also needs good environment that is influenced by what is done at the upper stream area that is the city and regency of Sleman. Given their diverse interests, it seems very unlikely that these districts have something in common. However, with organized effort it can be orchestrated as coherent pieces of interests, which are intertwining.

In 2001, the authorities in the three districts agreed to initiate a concerted effort on solid waste management. The establishment of Kartamantul joint secretariat is aimed at harmonizing management and development of urban infrastructure in the three local governments. The authorities agreed to enhance the coordination in planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of urban infrastructure covering urban agglomeration of Yogyakarta. In addition, it is also to achieve efficient usage of three local governments' resources and the optimizing of development toward a better of people's welfare in the metropolitan area. One way to achieve the objectives is by improving the process of planning, implementation, and controlling of development activities in the adjacent area.

Joint secretariat structure consists of three tiers of management level. The highest tier members are the true decision making actors, they are the Mayor of Jogja, the Head of Sleman Regency and the Head of Bantul Regency. At the second tier, the management level consists of high rank bureaucrats such as the Secretary of the local government, the Head of the Planning Board, The Head of the Treasury Department, and the Head of other relevant technical units of the Local Government. This middle tier formulates follow-ups that are ready to be decided at the upper tier. The inputs for the second level are detailed conclusion that has been thoroughly discussed at the lower tier. This lower level consists of lower rank of bureaucrats who work at either implementation or technical level.

Initially, the scheme for cooperative agreement among the three districts of Kartamantul consists of seven areas of cooperation, namely:

1. Spatial Integrated Planning
2. Transportation Road management
3. Drainage
4. Water resource management
5. Solid waste management
6. Sewerage system.

As it turned out, there are only two areas of cooperation that proved to be effective under the Kartamantul management; the transport management and the solid waste management. The transport management is relatively successful as it could contribute to solve the problem of air pollution and traffic congestions due to the increasing number of private cars and motor-cycles. The initiative to establish Trans Jogja, a semi-governmental institution for managing public buses in the city, is hailed by most of the stake-holders and the public. Although Trans Jogja buses are not comparable to public bus facilities in developed countries, it turned out to be successful in providing public buses that can accommodate more passengers with more comfortable and convenient facilities.

The Kartamantul joint secretariat has been able to facilitate the authorities in the three districts to reach an agreement that the financial burden of the solid waste management is shared according to the volume of the disposed waste. As Jogja city produces almost 80 percent of the total waste, for example, the city government of Jogja also commits to allocate 80 percent of the operational costs. Accordingly, the remaining operational costs are shared by Sleman district government (14 percent) and Bantul district government (6 percent). Table 2 shows the share of operational costs among the districts in the last ten years. As the volume of solid waste continues to increase, the operational costs are also increasing substantially. While in 2001 the operational cost was only Rp 742.9 million (US\$ 81,630), in 2009 it has increased to Rp 2,602 million (US\$ 286,032).

Table 2. The Share of Operational and Maintenance Costs (million rupiah)

TAHUN	JOGJA	SLEMAN	BANTUL	TOTAL
2001	599.5	100.9	42.6	742.9
2002	738.7	124.4	52.5	915.7
2003	895.3	150.8	74.9	1,120.9
2004	1,035.6	174.4	86.6	1,296.7
2005	1,281.3	215.8	107.2	1,604.3
2006	1,571.6	264.6	131.4	1,967.7
2007	1,789.1	301.3	149.6	2,240.1
2008	1,853.1	355.3	153.6	2,362.0
2009	1,934.1	547.6	121.2	2,602.9

Source: Kartamantul Joint Secretariat, 2010

Nevertheless, although the case of Kartamantul is considered a best practice of inter-local cooperation in Indonesia and has even praised by the Ministry of Home Affairs, there were also some weaknesses and un-success story. One of the weaknesses is the fact that Kartamantul joint secretariat has lack of support from the legislatures. Most of the initiatives for cooperation come from the executives rather than the legislatives. The political commitment could have been stronger if it is supported by the DPRD (local councils). This problem is not only faced by the Kartamantul management but also by other inter-local development cooperation in other provinces.

In 2005, the Kartamantul joint secretariat had signed an memorandum of understanding (MoU) with PT. Global Waste Solusi to process solid waste and utilize the energy to generate electricity. It was considered that processing waste to generate electricity was an excellent alternative for two reasons. First, it would process the solid waste more quickly so that then needs for sanitary landfill or open dumping can be reduced. Second, the additional electricity energy would definitely useful for the urban infrastructure management. Unfortunately, it appeared that the investor (PT. Global Waste

Solusi) could not fulfill its promises on pre-operating activities and feasibility studies. In November 2006 the MoU was cancelled.

A more important challenge for the entire solid management in Greater Jogjakarta, and probably in most of the cities in Indonesia, is the people's awareness and discipline with regards to waste disposal. Most of the urban population do not voluntarily participate in the process of reducing the waste and assisting the efficient waste management. While the capacity of government officials are limited in terms of financial, personnel, and technology, there are still illegal dumping sites used by the people. In 2006, Kartamantul joint secretariat indicated that there were at least 16 illegal dumping sites in the border lines between the district of Sleman, Jogja, and Bantul. The Kartamantul initiated a concerted action involving various stakeholders, including the Agency for Environment (Dinas Lingkungan Hidup) of Jogja, Agency for Public Works (Dinas Pekerjaan Umum) of Bantul, the sub-district head of Banguntapan, and the sub-district head of Purbayan, and elements of non-governmental activists to evacuate illegal dumping site in Singosaren. Eight dumping trucks were deployed for clearing the illegal dumping site. It was successful in convincing the nearby communities not to dump their waste in the illegal sites. However, it was not followed up with consistent effort to the other illegal dumping sites. Although local government officials repeatedly campaigns on the important of using appropriate waste disposal containers, ignorance and unawareness remain.

5. Conclusions

The democratization and decentralization policy in Indonesia has given more opportunities for managing development based on the people's aspirations and the objective needs of the local people. The inter-local cooperation is one of the development managerial breakthrough that is gaining popularity in the country. Yet the case of Kartamantul joint-secretariat shows that effective inter-local cooperations are still in the making. Many aspects of such cooperation need to be reconsidered and fine-tuned so that the people can get the best benefit from it. The international experience also suggests that most of the schemes of inter-local cooperation are shackled by political factors that make them difficult to attain the ultimate goal, that is to improve public services.

There are still political, economic, and administrative constraints that have to be faced along the way. Although there have been regulatory frameworks for inter-local development cooperation, there is still limited case of successful cooperation. Many actors at the central government are still skeptical of the effective inter-local cooperation, some worry about their tendency to become exclusive regionalism, and some others worry about turning its objective into powerful interest groups. At the local level, support from the legislatures is generally limited as they perceive that such inter-local cooperation would not be able to give tangible results.

However, the case of Kartamantul solid waste management has proved that there is a very good prospect for successful inter-local

cooperation. There are at least three factors to be considered for the success of such cooperation. First, there should be a sincere commitment on the part of local government authorities to cooperate each other. Mutual understanding and trust are very important before any agreement can proceed. Second, the willingness to share costs, experience, benefits and risks are critical for inter-local cooperation. All the local government authorities must understand that there would be no benefit that can be obtained without costs and risks. Third, transparency, accountability and fairness in all the steps of inter-local cooperation that is focused on problem solving. All the local government members should try to achieve a win-win solution for the concrete problems that are faced by each local governments.

Finally, although Kartamantul is considered as one of the best practice of inter-local cooperation in Indonesia, many challenges remain. It should be noted that long-term institutional capacity building has to be incorporated in the Kartamantul joint-secretariat. With regards to solid waste management, there are still uphill challenges to change the behavior among the local people. Therefore, public campaign for reduce, reuse, and recycle solid waste is a long-term program that has to be seriously considered. Moreover, given the limited capacity of conventional method of waste open-dumping, the Kartamantul must consider the use of modern technologies. For example, the use of incinerator, the conversion process of waste into bio-gas or bio-electricity, are some of the technology that can be adopted in the near future.

REFERENCE

- Anonymous (2005). *Delivering the Goods: Building Local Government Capacity to Achieve the Millenium Development Goals*, New York: United Nations Capital Development Funds.
- Anonymous (2006). *Bersama Mengelola Perkotaan: Kerjasama Antar-Daerah Kartamantul*, Sekber Kartamantul & GTZ Urban Quality.
- Astuti, P. (2004). *Kinerja Sekber Kartamantul: Studi Kasus pada TPA Sampah Piyungan, Kabupaten Bantul*. Gadjah Mada University, Yogyakarta: Unpublished Master Thesis
- Colfer, C.J.P & Capistrano, D. (2006). *Politik Desentralisasi: Hutan, Kekuasaan dan Rakyat*. Jakarta: CIFOR.
- Firman, T. (2010). "Multi local-government under Indonesia's Decentralization Reform: The Case of Kartamantul (The Greater Yogyakarta)", *Habitat International*, Vol.34, Issue 4, October 2010, forthcoming, pp.400-405.
- Heckscher, C. & Donnellon, A. (1994). *The Post Bureaucratic Organization: New Perspective on Organization Change*. Sage Publication, Thousand Oaks, CA.
- Manuputty, T.H. (2008). *Penyelenggaraan Pelayanan Publik Lintas Batas: Studi Kasus Pengelolaan Sampah Bersama Antara Kota Yogyakarta,*

Kabupaten Sleman, Kabupaten Bantul Melalui Skema Kartamantul. Gadjah Mada University, Yogyakarta: Unpublished Master Thesis.

Markusen, A. (1987). *Alternative Approaches to the Study of Regions and Regionalism*. Totowa, N.J.: Rowman & Little Field.

McGuire, M. (2006). "Intergovernmental Management: A View from the Bottom", *Public Administration Review*, 66(5) pp.677-679, September-October 2006.

Nugroho I. & Dahuri R. (2004). *Pembangunan Wilayah, Perspektif Ekonomi, Sosial dan Lingkungan*. Jakarta: LP3ES.

O'Toole, L.J. & Meier, K.J. (2004). "Intergovernmental Management". *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 01 October 2004.

Pratikno (2007). *Kerjasama Antar-Daerah: Kompleksitas dan Tawaran Format Kelembagaaan*. Jogjakarta: Jogja Global Media.

Sellers, J.M & Lindstrom, A. (2007). "Decentralization, Local Government, and the Welfare State, *Governance: An International Journal of Policy, Administration, and Institution*, Vol.20(4), October 2007, pp.609-632.

Warsono, H. (2009). *Regionalisasi dan Manajemen Kerjasama Antar Daerah: Studi Kasus Dinamika Kerjasama Antar Daerah yang Berdekatan di Jawa Tengah*. Gadjah Mada University, Unpublished PhD Disertation.

Weichhart, P. (2002). "Globalization die Globalisierung und Ihre Auswirkungen auf die Regionen" in Dachs H. & Floimair R., *Salzburger Jahrbuck fur Politik*. Salzburg: Schritenreihe des Landespresseburos, Sunderpublikationen.