

Policy Process of Child-Friendly Integrated Public Space in Jakarta: Formulation and Implementation

Putri Dwinatalis Baeha

Keywords: policy process, policy formulation, policy implementation, multiple streams framework, ambiguity conflict model, RPTRA

Various theoretical frameworks have been created in an attempt to explain the process of policy formulation and implementation. Some that gained prominence are Multiple Streams Framework (MSF) for formulation and Ambiguity-Conflict Model (ACM) for implementation. However, there are conceptual limitations in applying these frameworks due to them being developed mainly in the global north with limited empirical examination on the variety of policy fields. This study then applies the frameworks in a developing country case through analysis of Child-Friendly Integrated Public Space (RPTRA) in Jakarta to find out aspects on which the frameworks can be further improved. It is a qualitative research that combines interview with key actors in the policy community alongside reviews of recent literature developments to describe factors that influence policy formulation and implementation process of RPTRA while at the same time scrutinizing MSF and ACM in a local context.

In utilizing MSF to understand RPTRA's formulation, the findings suggest that the framework possess high explanatory value but its policy entrepreneur concept needs development to enable broader application. There is a need to differentiate policy entrepreneur as an actor with entrepreneurship behaviors because policy entrepreneurs can also be part of the policy making system itself instead of being considered as a separate entity from policy makers. Therefore they can act upon opportunities, not waiting for it to open passively. Transfer of entrepreneurship qualities is also necessary in countries with volatile political condition to maintain salience of an idea or keep its implementation sustainable. On the other hand, ACM is also applicable to explain RPTRA's implementation, but even though it possesses low implementation conflict, its ambiguity level is uncertain. RPTRA policy means are not ambiguous yet its goals are highly ambiguous which makes the policy eligible to belong to two classifications at the same time: administrative implementation and experimental implementation. Thus an emphasis on distinction between policy means and policy goals under ACM's ambiguity variable needs to be made to critically assess a policy's shortcomings.