
COLLABORATIVE GOVERNANCE IN CORRUPTION ALLEVIATION: HANDLING PUBLIC REPORTS IN SOUTH SUMATRA LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Ferry Harahap*, Kiagus Muhammad Sobri, Raniasa Putra, Abdul Najib
Universitas Sriwijaya, Indonesia
Email: harahapferry884@gmail.com*, kmsobri@gmail.com, raniasaputra@yahoo.com,
anadjib.salatti@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The cooperation agreement (MoU) between the Ministry of Home Affairs (Kemendagri), the Criminal Investigation Branch of the National Police, and the Attorney General's Office (Kejagung) aims to conduct investigative audits on indications of corruption. The results of the audit by APIP found that the overpayment must be returned to the state treasury, which has the potential to stop the investigation of corruption cases. However, the option of replacement within 60 days does not provide a deterrent effect to the perpetrator. This study analyzes the collaboration in the implementation of the agreement policy in South Sumatra, using the theory of Good Governance and a collaborative governance approach. The methods used include interviews, observations, and documentation. The findings show that the implementation of policies to overcome public reports about corruption in the South Sumatra Regional Government has not been effective. Although there are no problems in the Collaborative Governance aspect, the effectiveness of implementation is hampered by the process and the impact of policies. Therefore, the Collaborative Governance model in handling corruption can only achieve effective results if all dimensions of policy implementation are met and synergy, transparency, integrity, and accountability between collaborating institutions are built.

KEYWORDS *Corruption, Public Policy Implementation and Collaborative Governance*



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International

Article Info:

Submitted: 16-10-2024

Final Revised:
09-05-2025

Accepted: 13-05-2025

Published: 20-05-2025

INTRODUCTION

Corruption cases in Indonesia have produced various negative impacts that not only harm the state, but also other aspects, such as the potential of natural resources and the socio-cultural aspects of the community (Abd. Rahman Shaleh & Fawaid, 2022; Abiansyah, 2019; Lestari, 2017; Suherry, 2017). The Hambalang

How to cite:

E-ISSN:

Published by:

Harahap, F., Sobri, K. M., Putra, R., & Najib, A. (2025). Collaborative Governance in Corruption Alleviation: Handling Public Reports in South Sumatra Local Government. *Journal Eduvest*. 5(5): 4793-4811.

2775-3727

<https://greenpublisher.id/>

case is one example that shows how corruption finally has a very significant negative impact on the country. In addition to material losses, other problems, such as environmental damage, are present due to development efforts without clear outputs and the emergence of abandoned buildings that cannot be used.

If you look at the graph above, corruption cases and the number of suspects in Indonesia can be said to have decreased from 2015 to 2020. In 2015, the number of corruption cases reached 550, while the number of suspects also reached 1124. The number of cases and suspects in 2015 became the highest after 2017; that year, there were 576 cases and 1298 suspects. In 2019, the number decreased drastically; the number of cases was only 271, and the number of suspects was 580. Although in the following year it increased (444 cases and 875 suspects), the figure was still lower than in 2015-2018.

Regional heads are among the highest contributors in corruption cases per position (2004-2022). Cases from the Mayor/Regent until 2022, at the time this data was processed, at least reached 155 cases, and the Governor was at 23 cases. Although the highest cases are in the private sector (373 cases) and members of the House of Representatives or DPRD (343 cases), the number of corruption crimes in the case of regional heads is still very high. The latest cases in South Sumatra Province also show how regional officials, even at the lowest level (villages), have corruption problems that have not been solved until now. Data from the KPK shows that several village officials in South Sumatra Province are also affected by corruption cases, where the biggest corruption problem in the village is the misappropriation of Village Fund Allocation (ADD).

Eradication of corruption can no longer be done in ordinary ways but is required by extraordinary means (extraordinary enforcement). A different step from the existing approach is needed to increase the deterrent effect. The punishment or sanction given should also consider the social, economic, and environmental damage caused by each case (Abbas, 2021; Agustino et al., 2021; Hutabarat et al., 2022; Kamal & Arifin, 2019; Mahardika Hariadi & Luqman Wicaksono, 2013; Sukmaren et al., 2018). Moreover, corruption cases have a domino effect in development activities, where the case presents new problems that are very detrimental to the country, as some of the examples explained earlier show.

In addition, law enforcement must also improve integrity and carry out institutional arrangements to increase their independence and the commitment of their human resources. The role of law enforcement officials, especially the Indonesian National Police (Polri) and the Attorney General's Office (Kejagung) as state judges, takes part in carrying out the eradication of corruption, which also requires cooperation with the Government Internal Supervision Apparatus (APIP), in this case the Ministry of Home Affairs (Kemendagri) to eradicate corruption to the regions. The high number of corruption cases committed by regional heads invites the government to find a way out. As previously explained, regional heads should be important in handling corruption in collaborative governance.

The role of law enforcement officials up to the regional level becomes very important in efforts to handle corruption. Law enforcement must then play a greater role in solving corruption problems in Indonesia, especially in areas such as South Sumatra, which has many corruption cases. To increase these efforts, on February

28, 2018, a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) was signed between the Ministry of Home Affairs, the Indonesian National Police, and the Attorney General's Office, related to the handling of public reports on alleged corruption in local governments. This cooperation agreement was signed by the Inspector General of the Ministry of Home Affairs, Sri Wahyuningsih, the Head of the Criminal Investigation Department of the Komjen Ari Dono Sukmanto, and the Deputy Attorney General for Special Crimes, Adi Toegarisman. On this occasion, Ari Dono hopes for cooperation between APIP (Government Internal Supervisory Apparatus) and APH (Law Enforcement Apparatus) in handling corruption.

The cooperation agreement or Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) carried out by the Inspectorate General of the Ministry of Home Affairs with the Criminal Investigation Branch of the National Police and the Attorney General's Office is not to protect corruptors. However, the goal to be achieved is to restore state losses. In this case, this MoU is a mandate from Article 385 of Law Number 23 of 2014 concerning Regional Government, to determine whether the material of the community complaint report indicates corruption or administration.

It is known that the three Ministries or Institutions have agreed on a cooperation agreement on coordination between APIP (Government Internal Supervision Apparatus) and APH (Law Enforcement Apparatus) in handling reports or complaints from the public that are indicated for corruption in local government. With the cooperation agreement, APH does not directly follow up on every report from the community. APIP will first examine the case. The goal is to ascertain whether the report is related to alleged corruption crimes or is limited to administrative error cases.

Of course, with the option to replace the nominal amount that is corrupted within 60 days, it will not have a deterrent effect on corrupt perpetrators, and this has also been proven from the existence of several cases of the implementation of the content of the cooperation agreement carried out by the Ministry of Home Affairs of the Republic of Indonesia with the Prosecutor's Office of the Republic of Indonesia and the Indonesian Police, one of which occurred at the Ogan Komering Ilir Regency PUPR Office with allegations of corruption the project to make a river bank retaining fund for the 2017 APBD of 6 billion rupiah, after the completion of this case by returning state losses, the PUPR Office of Ogan Komering Ilir Regency was again hit by allegations of corruption in other projects.

Data from Indonesia Corruption Watch (ICW) also shows that state compensation funds or money do not significantly impact the recovery of state financial losses. Still, the same data shows that in 2020, corruption losses reached 56 trillion rupiah in Indonesia, while the reimbursement received was only 19.6 trillion rupiah. The policy of reimbursement in accordance with the nominal amount in question then raises the question of the extent to which the return impacts the state. The impact on this case is not only on the return of state losses directly due to corruption, but also the effectiveness of the regulation to provide a deterrent effect on suspects in corruption cases in Indonesia. In addition, there are still several things in the cooperation agreement that the researcher sees that need to be studied in depth to show the effectiveness of cooperation between each state institution in solving corruption problems in Indonesia.

Previous research has shown how collaboration between government institutions in handling corruption can positively impact solving these problems in several directions. Corruption occurs at various levels in government, ranging from the smallest regions (villages) to the central level; collaboration is then needed at each of these levels to suppress corruption cases (Jannah, 2017; Lynch, 2021; Vanclay, 2021). The KPK as an institution formed to solve corruption problems in Indonesia can collaborate with various levels of government to reduce the number of corruption in Indonesia.

Collaborative governance is an approach that is considered effective in solving state problems with high complexity (Fricke, 2022; Hanssen, 2021; Maag, 2022). Collaborative governance can certainly facilitate the implementation of government work, especially in meeting public needs. Collaborative governance is defined as participatory governance and involves not only one government agency in the implementation of activities, but also, more than that, and even in some cases, collaborative governance also involves the non-government sector (Lynch, 2021; Maag, 2022).

The collaboration between these agencies will not only solve one problem or objective, but also solve several problems at once because of the involvement of various government parties who also have various goals in carrying out their duties (Jannah, 2017). The collaborative governance approach emphasizes that although each agency/institution has its own goals, there are interrelated wedges between each agency/institution, so this model is considered a very efficient approach in governance (Killias, 2021; Lynch, 2021).

Research that has been carried out by several people, such as Sudarmanto (2021) which understands the authority of the prosecutor's office in preventing corruption and government maladministration (Pratama, 2021), which focuses more on coordination barriers, Subekti & Yayat, 2021, which provides more literature review in the field of law, and Guslan (2018) aims to determine the boundaries between the actions of government agencies or officials (*bestuurshandelingen*) that are detrimental to the state's finances, such as maladministration, or constitute a criminal act of corruption. Basically, no one has raised the issue of Collaborative Governance in Handling Corruption in South Sumatra. Based on the above background, the author is interested in conducting research titled: Collaborative Governance in Handling Corruption in South Sumatra (Implementation of Corruption Eradication Cooperation Agreement Policy in Handling Reports or Community Complaints Indicating Corruption Crimes in the Implementation of Local Government).

RESEARCH METHOD

This research was conducted in South Sumatra Province. Cooperation agreements between several government agencies (the Ministry of Home Affairs, the Prosecutor's Office, and the Police) are the focus of this research. The researcher interviewed several parties directly involved in solving corruption problems and implementing cooperation agreements between three agencies that are the focus of this research (the Ministry of Home Affairs, the Prosecutor's Office, and the Police).

In addition to interviews, researchers also use observation data collection methods and research documentation.

The data analysis technique adopted in this study follows Saldana's (2014) model, involving three stages: data condensation, data display, and drawing and verifying conclusions. Data from interviews and documentation were transcribed, coded thematically, and grouped according to emerging categories relevant to inter-agency cooperation and anti-corruption efforts.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Implementation of the policy of cooperation agreement on corruption alleviation in handling public reports indicating corruption in the implementation of the South Sumatra Regional Government

As stated earlier, the implementation of the policy of the Corruption Eradication Cooperation Agreement in the handling of public reports indicating corruption crimes in the implementation of the South Sumatra Regional Government uses a theory/implementation model consisting of 4 dimensions, namely: 1) communication; 2) resources; 3) disposition; and 4) bureaucratic structure. The Communication Dimension consists of Transmission: the right communication distribution can give birth to good implementation and clarity. Communication activities between policy implementers (street-level bureaucrats) must be clear.

From the description in front of this communication dimension consists of 3 aspects, which include Transmission: the right communication distribution can give birth to good implementation, clarity; Communication activities between policy implementers (street-level bureaucrats) must be clear and precise; Communication activities between policy implementers (street-level bureaucrats) must be clear. The phenomenon found in the field is that the three institutions that cooperate in the implementation of the policy of cooperation agreement on corruption alleviation in handling public reports that indicate corruption crimes in the implementation of the South Sumatra Regional Government, namely the South Sumatra Police, the South Sumatra High Prosecutor's Office and the South Sumatra Provincial Government have carried out almost all aspects in the communication dimension well, All aspects of communication, namely Transmission: the right communication distribution can give birth to good implementation, Clarity; Communication activities between policy implementers (street-level bureaucrats) must be clear and precise; Communication activities between policy implementers (street-level bureaucrats) must be implemented by these three institutions properly.

The resource dimension consists of 4 aspects: Staff: How can competent staff/human resources be available? Understanding Policy Objectives, Authority: must be formal, and Facilities: completeness of facilities and infrastructure. Of the 4 existing aspects, three of them are Staff: How is the availability of competent staff/human resources, Understanding the Purpose of Policies and Facilities: the completeness of facilities and infrastructure has been implemented by the institution of the South Sumatra Police, the South Sumatra High Prosecutor's Office and the South Sumatra Provincial Government well. As for the Authority aspect, it must be formal; the three institutions that work together provide different

statements. Each agency that cooperates in the implementation of the policy of the Corruption Alleviation Cooperation Agreement in handling public reports that indicate corruption crimes uses a different legal basis than the one used in their institution as a basis for acting in exercising authority to handle actions that indicate abuse of authority/loss. This means that no actions are mutually agreed upon when dealing with actions reported by the community that indicate criminal corruption.

Furthermore, the Disposition in the Implementation of the policy of the Corruption Alleviation Cooperation Agreement in the handling of community reports that indicate corruption crimes in the implementation of the South Sumatra Regional Government consists of 3 aspects which include the dedication of the Implementor: the selection of people who are highly dedicated to a policy, staffing the bureaucracy and Providing Stimulus: the available incentives affect the behavior of the implementor. The phenomenon found in the field is that the three institutions that cooperate in the implementation of the policy of the cooperation agreement on corruption alleviation in handling public reports that indicate corruption crimes in the implementation of the South Sumatra Regional Government, namely the South Sumatra Police, the South Sumatra High Prosecutor's Office and the South Sumatra Provincial Government have carried out all aspects in the disposition dimension well, All aspects of the disposition, namely the dedication of the Implementor: the selection of people who are highly dedicated to a policy, staffing the bureaucracy and providing stimulus: the incentives available to influence the behavior of implementers have been well implemented by these three institutions.

Finally, the dimension of the organizational structure in the implementation of the policy of the cooperation agreement on corruption alleviation in the handling of public reports indicating corruption crimes in the implementation of the South Sumatra Regional Government consists of 2 aspects which include Forming Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) that are more flexible, and Carrying out fragmentation: aiming to provide responsibility in various activities. The phenomenon described in the data description, 2 existing aspects, one of which is Fragmentation: aiming to provide responsibility in various activities that have been carried out by the institution of the South Sumatra Police, the South Sumatra High Prosecutor's Office, and the South Sumatra Provincial Government. As for forming standard operating procedures (SOPs), which are more flexible, the three institutions that work together provide different statements. Each agency that cooperates in the implementation of the policy of the Corruption Eradication Cooperation Agreement in handling public reports that indicate corruption crimes uses different Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) as used in their institutions as an operating system in carrying out implementation to handle actions that indicate abuse of authority/loss. This means that no actions are mutually agreed upon when dealing with actions reported by the community that indicate criminal corruption.

Based on the description above, it can be inventoried that the problems contained in the implementation of the policy of the Corruption Eradication Cooperation Agreement in the handling of community reports indicating corruption crimes in the implementation of the South Sumatra Regional Government, are problems in the resource dimension, namely in the aspect of the aspect of authority:

which must be formal and in the dimension of organizational structure, namely in the aspect of Forming Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) which is more flexible.

Authority issue: This must be formal, or no authority must be mutually agreed upon in handling actions reported by the community that indicate corruption. According to Sugeng Haryono, there are those who think that the coordination between APIP and APH is contrary to the Law (UU), and this is the desire of APIP in taking authority from APH. This coordination is a mandate of the law, and through this coordination, APIP and APH synergize and support each other to accelerate the law enforcement process. In addition, continued Sugeng Haryono, this coordination also aims to avoid feelings of worry or hesitation from local government organizers in acting, for fear of making administrative mistakes that can then be criminalized.

The problem of Forming Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) that are more flexible in the implementation of the policy of cooperation agreements to alleviate corruption in the handling of public reports indicating corruption crimes in the implementation of the South Sumatra Regional Government is still a problem because it is caused by several factors, such as lack of coordination between institutions, differences in standard operational procedures, or lack of awareness of the importance of SOPs in handling cases corruption.

Furthermore, according to Sugeng, the coordination between APIP and APH is not to protect crime, cover up criminal acts, or protect corruptors. The coordination of APIP and APH is also not a place for collusion or malicious consensus, obscuring criminal acts committed by the local government. It is hoped that criminal law enforcement will be the last act in assessing the actions of government administration, so that national development can run effectively. "From these several mechanisms, the main thing must be emphasized that there is not a single article in Law Number 23 of 2014 that observes that it is as if all public complaints must be handled first by APIP. However, what should be an arrangement between APIP and APH to coordinate in handling public complaints that are indicated to be corrupt" (<https://www.bpkp.go.id/bali/berita/read/16122/110/Difasilitasi-KPK-Seluruh-APIP-dan-APH-Merapat-ke-Perwakilan-BPKP-Prov.-Bali.bpkp>).

In handling public reports that indicate corruption crimes, it is important to develop clear and coordinated SOPs between institutions to ensure that the handling of corruption cases is carried out effectively, consistently, and transparently. This can help ensure compliance with regulations and operational practices and document how mandatory tasks are completed within the organization.

These are some reasons why there may not be Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) used together in handling public reports that indicate corruption in the implementation of the Sumatra Regional Government can be varied and complex. Some possibilities include:

1) Institutional Conditions:

There may not be an institution or unit specifically responsible for handling public reports related to corruption. The lack of this special institution can make it difficult to develop coordinated SOPs.

- 2) Lack of Awareness or Care:
The parties involved may be less aware of the urgency or importance of clear SOPs for handling corruption reports. These interests and awareness may vary among the officials or institutions involved.
- 3) Legal Constraints:
Legal or administrative obstacles, such as complex legal and regulatory processes, can hinder the development and implementation of SOPs.
- 4) Resource Limitations:
Limited resources, both in terms of finance and personnel, can be an obstacle in designing and implementing effective SOPs.
- 5) Politics and Personal Interests:
The existence of political factors and personal interests from the parties involved can be a barrier to reaching consensus in making SOPs together.
- 6) Equity Stakeholder Engagement:
There may be inequalities or imbalances in the involvement of important stakeholders in this process. Some parties may not be well-informed about designing SOPs.
- 7) Scope Ambiguity:
There may be ambiguity regarding the scope of SOPs, such as what reports can be considered as indications of corruption, making it difficult to agree on the right guidelines.

To overcome this challenge, good coordination between local governments, law enforcement agencies, and other stakeholders must occur. In addition, awareness of the urgency and positive impact of good SOPs needs to be increased. It is also important to pay attention to the legal and financial aspects and involve all relevant parties in formulating the SOPs.

Collaborative Governance in the Implementation of Corruption Eradication Cooperation Agreement Policy in Handling Public Reports Indicating Corruption Crimes in the Implementation of the South Sumatra Regional Government

Collaborative Governance is a process and structure of decision-making and public policy management that involves people constructively. This does not mean it is initiated by public/government actors only, but it does not exclude informal arrangements. Meanwhile, the implementation of collaborative governance can be seen in the following ways: 1) Consensus Orientation, 2) Collective Leadership, 3) Multidirectional Communication, and 4) Resource Sharing.

The phenomena in the field that have been described above can be inventoried in the Dimension of Collaborative Governance in the Implementation of the policy of cooperation agreements to alleviate corruption in the handling of community reports that indicate corruption crimes in the Government of South Sumatra Province, as described as follows:

- 1) Consensus Orientation: the four institutions that cooperate, namely the South Sumatra Police, the South Sumatra High Prosecutor's Office and the South Sumatra Provincial Government in the form of alleviating corruption in the handling of public reports that indicate corruption crimes in the implementation

of the South Sumatra Regional Government, it can be said that they have carried out all aspects of the commitment shown by all parties in realizing the unity of promises and commitments based on each other auspicious. Thus, it is concluded that the collaboration of the three institutions has implemented the policy of cooperation agreement in handling community reports that indicate corruption in the implementation of the South Sumatra Regional Government, based on consensus orientation.

- 2) **Collective Leadership:** the four institutions that cooperate, namely the South Sumatra Police, the South Sumatra High Prosecutor's Office and the South Sumatra Provincial Government in the form of alleviation of corruption in the handling of public reports that indicate corruption crimes in the implementation of the South Sumatra Regional Government, it was found that the phenomenon that has done 3 aspects well, namely the aspect of the coordination system Policy implementation, the leadership aspect collectively carried out by all actors who carry out cooperation and aspects of power distribution in policy implementation. Thus, it is concluded that the collaboration of the three institutions in the implementation of the policy of the cooperation agreement on corruption alleviation in handling community reports indicating corruption crimes in the implementation of the South Sumatra Regional Government has been implemented based on collective leadership.
- 3) **Multidirectional Communication:** The four institutions that cooperate, namely the South Sumatra Police, the South Sumatra High Prosecutor's Office and the South Sumatra Provincial Government in the form of alleviating corruption in the handling of public reports indicating corruption crimes in the implementation of the South Sumatra Regional Government, it can be said that all aspects of multi-directional communication have been implemented, namely the response aspect of one party who responds to information from another party who works Similarly, Feedback/Responses that take place by involving one party with another party who collaborate and content that is a message related to brainstorming and various information has been implemented well. Thus, it is concluded that the collaboration of the three institutions in the implementation of the policy of the Corruption Eradication Cooperation Agreement in handling public reports indicating corruption crimes in the implementation of the South Sumatra Regional Government has been carried out well, based on multi-directional communication.

Resource Sharing: the four institutions that cooperate, namely the South Sumatra Police, the South Sumatra High Prosecutor's Office and the South Sumatra Provincial Government in the form of alleviating corruption in the handling of community reports that indicate corruption crimes in the implementation of the South Sumatra Regional Government, it can be said that all aspects of resource sharing have been implemented, namely the aspect of cooperation, mutual reinforcement of resources from all parties and cooperation can be mutually to cover the shortcomings of all parties. Thus, it is concluded that the collaboration of these three institutions has implemented the policy of cooperation agreement on corruption alleviation in handling public reports indicating corruption crimes in the

implementation of the South Sumatra Regional Government, based on sharing resources.

Results/Outputs of Collaboration Implementation of Corruption Eradication Cooperation Agreement Policy in Handling Community Reports Indicating Corruption Crimes in South Sumatra

Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between the Ministry of Home Affairs, the Indonesian National Police, and the Attorney General's Office, This cooperation agreement was signed on February 28, 2018 by the Inspector General of the Ministry of Home Affairs Sri Wahyuningsih, the Head of Criminal Investigation Komjen Ari Dono Sukmanto, and the Deputy Attorney General for Special Crimes Adi Toegarisman related to the handling of public reports on alleged corruption in local governments. On this occasion, Ari Dono hopes for cooperation between APIP (Government Internal Supervisory Apparatus) and APH (Law Enforcement Apparatus) in handling corruption.

The cooperation agreement or Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) carried out by the Inspectorate General of the Ministry of Home Affairs with the Criminal Investigation Branch of the National Police and the Attorney General's Office, is not to protect corruptors, but the goal to be achieved is to restore state losses and in this case this MoU is a mandate from Article 385 of Law Number 23 of 2014 concerning Regional Government. With the cooperation agreement, APH does not directly follow up on every report from the community. The case will be examined by APIP first. The goal is to ascertain whether the report is related to alleged corruption crimes, or is only limited to administrative error cases.

The cooperation agreement between APIP and APH has considerably impacted the handling of follow-up from community reports on alleged corruption in local governments. Based on data collected by researchers from social media publications, until June 2023, 500 reports of alleged corruption cases were unclear at the High Prosecutor's Office in South Sumatra. As stated by the DPW BPI KPNPA RI Chairman, Feriyandi said, "Almost a year ago, around 500 reports about alleged corruption cases were made, but there was no clarity in the South Sumatra District Attorney's Office. " We have reported corruption cases, especially in Kasi C in Intelligence, reports of alleged road corruption cases, and others. However, there is no clarity or clarification at all".

An anti-corruption activist also conveyed it from SIRA, Rahmat Sandi Iqbal said:

....from 2021 – 2023 about stagnant reports in the Intelligence Division C at the South Sumatra District Attorney's Office. The follow-up was that the agencies that we have reported on have been summoned and examined by the Head of the South Sumatra District Attorney's Office, but we, as reporters, especially BPI, SIRA, MAKI, and PST, did not get the report from the South Sumatra District Attorney's Office at all. For 2022 from SIRA 83 reports are not yet known to the extent of the report. There is no news, review, or return at all. Meanwhile, PST said: "81 reports reported to the South Sumatra District Attorney's Office until this second, there is no follow-up where the report has been reviewed by the South Sumatra District Attorney's Office.

The data was obtained from the results of a publication on social media (29/4/2023). In response to the same condition, hundreds of members of the South Sumatra Anti-Corruption Movement (GRANSI) held a peaceful action in front of the South Sumatra High Prosecutor's Office on Monday. The action was intended to question the follow-up of several reports and complaints submitted by the NGO GRANSI to the South Sumatra District Attorney's Office. Supriyadi, Chairman of GRANSI, said that his party's purpose was to visit the South Sumatra District Attorney's Office to question the Complaint Report which had been missing an answer from the District Attorney's Office for approximately one year. The action we held today is intended to question the progress of the complaint report submitted to the South Sumatra District Attorney's Office for more than a year. We question several cases of reports which we submitted when we demonstrated one year ago, and until now have not received a notification letter from the South Sumatra District Attorney's Office".

Supriyadi further stated that the report in question was also related to several District Attorney's Offices that his party reported to the South Sumatra District Attorney's Office, including the Musi Banyuasin District Attorney's Office, Banyuasin District Attorney's Office and the OKI District Attorney's Office regarding the handling of cases of alleged indications of corruption reported by NGOs which until today have not been running. "For that, that is why NGO friends from the region invited us to rally at the South Sumatra District Attorney's Office to evaluate the performance of the Musi Banyuasin Prosecutor's Office, Banyuasin District Attorney's Office, and the OKI District Attorney's Office," said Supriyadi.

This situation is related to the collaboration carried out between APH and APIP. This desired situation is most likely because the complaints reported by the public as an act indicating corruption have been resolved by APIP by ordering the deposit of state losses into the state treasury. The existence of state compensation carried out by those reported resulted in actions that indicated corruption reported by the community above could not be followed up by Law Enforcement Officials, either by the Prosecutor's Office or by the Police Agency.

Then, in terms of fund income in the government treasury on the proceeds of state compensation money, there is also an increase. Data from Indonesia Corruption Watch (ICW). The return of state financial losses in corruption cases in 2020 reached 56 trillion rupiah, while in 2021 it reached Rp 62.9 trillion. However, in the records of Indonesia Corruption Watch or ICW, the effect of state losses due to corruption crimes is still undefined, only around 2.2 percent, or equivalent to 19.6 trillion rupiah. This shows that the state compensation fund or money does not significantly impact the recovery of state financial losses.

Furthermore, in addition to the fact that there has been no impact when viewed from the results of the return of state losses to the amount of state losses due to acts indicated by corruption, the cooperation of APH and APIP has not been effective in creating a deterrent effect for acts that have been imposed in the return of state losses. From the data obtained, the effectiveness of the collaboration between APH and APIP to provide a deterrent effect on the return of compensation/suspects has not been achieved properly. Several incidents obtained by the researcher show that there are still several cases where the perpetrator has

returned state losses as ordered by APIP, then in the same place, position, there is a repetition or carrying out the same act after some time.

The following is explained data on the handling of alleged corruption cases handled through the APIP (Inspectorate) mechanism with administrative sanctions, namely refunds of state losses, but it does not cause a deterrent effect so that corruption acts are repeated in the same work unit and place:

- 1) The Pali Regency PUPR Office is handled by the Pali Police South Sumatra Police Investigation of alleged corruption cases in the construction of the Suka Damai village road (Bulu-Kuring) in the new Talang Ubu City village worth Rp.4,997,250,000 and the road to the Pagu Patat bridge worth Rp.4,997,349,000 Pali Regency APBD FY.2016 Pali Regency PUPR Office on August 14, 2017 this case was stopped due to the process of recovering state losses through the APIP Mechanism, However, it again occurred at the PUPR Office of Pali regency on July 29, 2021, the Pali Police again investigated the alleged corruption case of the construction of the Pali DPRD building phase 2 of the FY 2021 APBD worth Rp.35,995,559,794.14
- 2) Pali Regency The investigation of alleged corruption cases by the Pali Police of the South Sumatra Police on December 3, 2020 against the use of Village Funds phases 1 and 2 and the allocation of village funds in 2020 by the Head of Sinar Dewa Kec Talang Ubi Mr. Supardin the case was stopped due to the refund of state losses through the APIP Mechanism, but it occurred again on August 16, 2022, the case of alleged corruption in the 2022 Village Fund Allocation by the Head of Sinar Dewa District, Mr. Supardin.
- 3) Lahat Regency February 17, 2021 The South Sumatra Regional Lahat Police Investigation of the alleged irregularities of the 2019 Village Fund in Gunung Kerto village, East Kikim district, worth Rp 780,716,000 was stopped. The investigation case was stopped due to the return of state losses through the APIP mechanism, but on July 21, 2022, there was another alleged case of corruption of Gunung Megang village funds, Jarai District, FY.2019, allegedly carried out by the Head of Village Head, Mr. Hepi Hajarol Akbar

From the description of the outputs or results of Collaborative Governance in the implementation of the policy of cooperation agreements on corruption alleviation in the handling of public reports indicating corruption crimes in the implementation of the South Sumatra Regional Government, it can be concluded that in general, corruption cases that occur in the South Sumatra regional government show a declining trend. This data can be seen from the number of community reports that have been followed up on legally by APH, especially from the South Sumatra High Prosecutor's Office, many of which have not been followed up on. This shows that it is possible for many cases and community reports indicating corruption to be resolved through administrative actions by APIP by directing the return of state losses.

However, in terms of effectiveness, the success of administrative actions completed through the return of state losses has a recurring impact. This means that several cases are resolved administratively by APIP with the return of state finances of officials, and with the same position performing the same actions at different times or after committing actions that indicate corruption at a previous time.

With the option to replace the amount that is corrupted within 60 days, it will not have a deterrent effect on perpetrators who have abused state finances. This shows that the administrative inaction imposed on them does not make them stop doing their mistakes. From the existence of some of the cases above, it shows that the implementation of the content of the cooperation agreement carried out by the Ministry of Home Affairs of the Republic of Indonesia with the Republic of Indonesia and the Republic of Police has not guaranteed that there will be no repetition of corrupt acts from officials who have been administratively acted upon.

Collaborative Governance Model in the Implementation of Corruption Eradication Cooperation Agreement Policy in Handling Community Reports Indicative of Corruption Crimes in the Implementation of the South Sumatra Regional Government

As outlined in the discussion, the problem that exists in the implementation of the policy of the Corruption Eradication Cooperation Agreement in the handling of public reports indicating corruption crimes in the implementation of the South Sumatra Regional Government, is a problem in the resource dimension, namely in the aspect of authority: which must be formal and in the dimension of organizational structure, namely in the aspect of Forming Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) that are more flexible.

Furthermore, in this dimension of resources, there is still a phenomenon where the authority must be formal, or there is no authority that is mutually agreed upon in handling actions reported by the community that indicate corruption. For this reason, what is needed is the necessary effort to increase agreement together in dealing with actions reported by the community that indicate criminal corruption.

Cooperation between the Government Internal Supervisory Apparatus (APIP) and the Law Enforcement Apparatus (APH) is very important in handling public complaints indicating corruption. The two institutions have different roles but complement each other in efforts to prevent and crack down on corruption. The following is the authority of cooperation between APIP and APH in this regard:

1. APIP:

- a) APIP has the authority to supervise government institutions internally. It is responsible for gathering information and detecting indications of corruption in the government's internal environment.
- b) APIP can conduct investigations related to alleged corruption found through internal supervision. They can collect evidence and compile a report related to the findings.
- c) APIP can recommend improvements to relevant agencies' processes and policies that are vulnerable to corrupt practices.

2. APH:

- a) APH has law enforcement authority and is tasked with handling violations of the law, including corruption. They investigate and prosecute corruption cases in government agencies.
- b) APH can investigate, search, detain, and prosecute corrupt perpetrators.
- c) APH also collaborates with APIP to obtain information related to indications of corruption found through internal supervision. They can use APIP's reports and findings as a basis for investigation and prosecution.

Cooperation between APIP and APH is crucial to ensuring the effective handling of corruption cases. By working together, the two can support each other in efforts to eradicate corruption and create clean governance.

According to Burhanuddin, the Memorandum of Understanding in Cooperation between APIP and APH is very important to ensure the effectiveness of handling corruption cases as stated: "Synergy, coordination, and collaboration are the key words in the implementation of the duties and functions of each party in handling reports or complaints in the implementation of local governments. The main goal is to provide legal certainty in the settlement of reports or complaints quickly and measurably," (<https://www.hukumonline.com/berita/a/mendagri--kepolisian--dan-kejaksaan-mou-penanganan-aduan-penyelenggaraan-pemda-lt63d77db9f2709/>)

In more detail, Burhanuddin stated as follows:

First, synergy, coordination, and collaboration between APIP and APH should be increased when handling reports or complaints about local government implementation. Thus, a common view will be created when determining the solution mechanism.

Second, pay attention to the time limit for completing reports or complaints based on the results of the investigative examination. With a record of prioritizing administrative settlement before taking the criminal route.

Third, carry out optimal monitoring and supervision related to regional administration. Based on the General Principles of Good Government, this effort aims to minimize the potential for abuse of power that could harm the state.

Fourth, if the losses are insignificant and become administrative errors, not the wishes of bureaucratic officials, then a discretionary attitude will be taken.

Then from the dimension of the organizational structure, it has not yet been formed and agreed on Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) that are more flexible in the implementation of the policy of the cooperation agreement on corruption alleviation in the handling of public reports that indicate corruption crimes in the implementation of the South Sumatra Regional Government. Therefore, what is needed in unifying mutually agreed SOPs and more flexible Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) that are more flexible in the implementation of the policy of cooperation agreements to alleviate corruption in the handling of public reports that indicate corruption crimes in the implementation of the South Sumatra Regional Government.

SOP (Standard Operating Procedure) cooperation between the Government Internal Supervision Apparatus (APIP) and Law Enforcement Apparatus (APH) in handling public complaints indicating corruption can involve the following steps:

- 1) Receipt of Complaints: When the public reports indications of corruption, APIP is responsible for receiving the complaint. Complaints can be received through established mechanisms, such as written complaints, emails, or online complaint channels.
- 2) Initial Investigation: Once a complaint is received, APIP will conduct a preliminary investigation to gather relevant evidence and information related to alleged corruption. They can also interview whistleblowers and other related parties.
- 3) Coordination with APH: APIP will coordinate and communicate with APH to report complaints that have the potential to deviate from criminal law. They can meet with investigators or officials responsible for handling the case.
- 4) Follow-up Investigation: After APIP reports the complaint to APH, APH investigators will conduct a follow-up investigation based on the information and evidence collected by APIP. They can conduct interrogations, document checks, and other investigative actions.
- 5) Legal Review and Analysis: APIP and APH will conduct a joint legal review and analysis to determine the next action. They will consider the legal aspects, existing evidence, and the public interest in bringing the case to the right legal track.
- 6) Ongoing Complaints: If an investigation reveals indications of other violations unrelated to corruption, APIP may proceed the complaint to other mechanisms or government agencies appropriate to their jurisdiction.
- 7) Reporting and Follow-up: After the investigation is completed, APIP and APH will communicate regularly regarding the development of the case and the investigation's results. They will create a final report based on the findings and recommend further actions, such as prosecution or disciplinary action.

These SOPs may vary depending on the regulations, policies, and legal frameworks that apply in the region. It is important to ensure transparency, integrity, and accountability in this cooperation process to effectively handle public complaints indicating corruption. Transparency, integrity, and accountability are very important in cooperation between the Government Internal Supervisory Apparatus (APIP) and Law Enforcement Officers (APH) in handling public complaints indicating corruption. Here is an explanation of why this is necessary:

- 1) Transparency: Transparency ensures the complaint handling process is conducted openly and clearly. With transparency, the public can see how APIP and APH work together in handling corruption cases, including the steps taken, the results of investigations, and the legal actions taken. Transparency can also encourage further compliance and reduce loopholes for abuse of power.
- 2) Integrity: Integrity is an important moral and ethical principle in handling corruption cases. Both APIP and APH must maintain integrity when carrying out their duties. Cooperation based on integrity ensures that actions taken to deal with alleged corruption are carried out honestly, fairly, and without particular personal or group interests. Public trust can be built when APIP and APH show integrity in their actions.
- 3) Accountability: Accountability emphasizes responsibility and accountability. APIP and APH must be responsible for handling public complaints indicating

corruption. With accountability, the process of handling corruption cases can be continuously monitored and evaluated to ensure that appropriate procedures have been followed and proper law enforcement is implemented. Accountability can also be a learning tool to improve the effectiveness of handling complaints in the future.

In conclusion, transparency, integrity, and accountability are important principles that must be upheld in cooperation between APIP and APH in handling public complaints indicating corruption. By prioritizing these principles, it is hoped that handling corruption cases can be more effective, public trust can be restored, and better corruption prevention efforts can be realized.

Furthermore, based on the above discussion, it can be inventoried that the overall description of the phenomenon of Collaborative Governance from the implementation of the policy of cooperation agreement on corruption alleviation in the handling of community reports indicating corruption crimes in the implementation of the South Sumatra Regional Government above can be explained that no problems were found. All aspects contained in the Collaborative Governance dimension of the implementation of the policy of the Corruption Eradication Cooperation Agreement in the handling of community reports indicating corruption crimes in the implementation of the South Sumatra Regional Government consist of consensus orientation, collective leadership, multi-directional communication and resource sharing, all of which show good achievements.

Then based on the discussion of the results or outputs obtained from Collaborative Governance in the implementation of the policy of cooperation agreements to alleviate corruption in the handling of community reports that indicate corruption crimes in the implementation of the South Sumatra Regional Government, in general, corruption cases that occur in the South Sumatra regional government show a declining trend. Early data is seen from the number of community reports followed up legally by APH, especially from the South Sumatra High Prosecutor's Office, many of which have not been followed up on. This shows that it is possible for many cases and community reports indicating corruption to be resolved through administrative actions by APIP by directing the return of state losses.

However, in terms of effectiveness, the success of administrative actions completed through the return of state losses has a recurring impact. This means that several cases have been administratively resolved by APIP with the return of state finances of officials, and with the same position performing the same actions at different times or after committing actions that indicate corruption at a previous time.

The collaboration between the local government (APIP), the state police agency, and the prosecutor's office (APH) is not intended to protect crime or corruption or limit APH in law enforcement. However, this approach prioritizes administrative law, so that criminal sanctions are an ultimatum solution or a last resort to administrative problems faced by local governments, as stated by the Minister of Home Affairs, Tjahyo Kumolo, as follows:

The cooperation between APIP and APH is not aimed at protecting crime, protecting corruptors, or limiting APH in law enforcement. However, the approach is to prioritize administrative law so that criminal handling is an ultimate remedy or a final effort in a problem of local government administration.

Therefore, the cooperation agreement between APH and APIP in eradicating actions that indicate corruption must be implemented clearly and accurately. Is the action only an administrative violation, or has it entered the criminal realm? If all the settlements are carried out administratively which requires the return of state losses only, then only as a relief that will make the crime of corruption more mitigated in terms of law can hit Article 3 of Law Number 31 of 1999 concerning the Eradication of Corruption Crimes which in the article reads: "Everyone to benefit themselves or others, abusing authority that can harm the state, can be punished".

According to Jannah (2017) The losses experienced by the state are not only as large as the material losses, but also include many other things. Several potential problems in the cooperation agreement are still unclear (where, at that time, this MoU was still under discussion and had not been agreed upon). Each institution takes action in accordance with its respective identity of corruption eradication. Therefore, collaboration is difficult to establish when agencies do not have the same fighting identity. The interests of the Prosecutor's Office and the Police may also be influenced by the intervention. Improvements in the scope of control, Career development, and the improvement of a transparent and accountable recruitment system need to be made to address these problems.

CONCLUSION

The implementation of the cooperation agreement policy for corruption alleviation in handling community reports indicating corruption within the South Sumatra Regional Government has not been fully optimized, particularly due to unfulfilled elements such as a formalized agreement on authority in terms of resource dimensions and inconsistency with Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) in organizational structural dimensions. However, based on the perspective of collaborative governance, no significant issues were found in aspects such as consensus orientation, collective leadership, multi-directional communication, and resource sharing, which were all implemented effectively. The application of this governance model has facilitated the resolution of various corruption-indicated community reports through administrative mechanisms aimed at restoring state losses. Nonetheless, the recurrence of similar violations by the same officials reflects a gap in deterrence, signaling the need for more robust preventive and punitive mechanisms. Future research should further explore how institutional capacity-building, digital oversight systems, and continuous inter-agency coordination could reinforce collaboration-based anti-corruption frameworks' long-term sustainability and effectiveness. Moreover, studies that compare implementation outcomes across other regional governments may offer valuable insights to generalize best practices and formulate standardized policy recommendations for national-scale implementation.

REFERENCES

- Abbas, K. (2021). Corruption Crime Eradication by Corruption Eradication Commission Through Red-handed Catch Operation on Bribery Action. *Jurnal Bina Praja*, 13(2). <https://doi.org/10.21787/jbp.13.2021.319-329>
- Abd. Rahman Shaleh, & Fawaid, I. (2022). Karakter Hukum Korupsi Politik Di Indonesia Dan Amerika Serikat. *Al-Hukmi : Jurnal Hukum Ekonomi Syariah Dan Keluarga Islam*, 3(2). <https://doi.org/10.35316/alhukmi.v3i2.2327>
- Abiansyah, J. (2019). Akar Historis dalam Fenomena Budaya Korupsi Politik di Pemerintahan Republik Indonesia pasca Orde Baru. In *ResearchGate*. <https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.27340.36489>
- Agustino, L., Fitriani, I., Wicaksana, H. H., & Daelami, A. (2021). Corruption Eradication in Indonesia: The Experience of The Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK). *Journal of Governance*, 6(2). <https://doi.org/10.31506/jog.v6i2.12126>
- Fricke, S. (2022). Indigenous nations at the confluence: Water governance networks and system transformation in the Klamath Basin. *Ecology and Society*, 27(4). <https://doi.org/10.5751/ES-12942-270404>
- Guslan, O. F. (2018). Batasan Antara Perbuatan Maladministrasi Dengan Tindak Pidana Korupsi. *Riau Law Journal*, 2(2), 138–158. <http://dx.doi.org/10.30652/rj.v2i2.4942>
- Hanssen, G. S. (2021). Polycentric urban climate governance: Creating synergies between integrative and interactive governance in Oslo. *Environmental Policy and Governance*, 31(4), 347–360. <https://doi.org/10.1002/eet.1935>
- Hutabarat, D. T. H., Delardi, E., Irwansyah, A., Bascara, D., Ansori, B., Tanjung, F., Sinaga, S. J., Tuah, M., Adrian, R., Budi, A., Tanjung, A. R., Nurcahaya, N., Mahvira, D. A., Sari, V. M., & Silitonga, A. H. (2022). The Eradication Of Corruption And The Enforcement Of The Law In Indonesia As Seen Through The Lens Of Legal Philosophy. *Policy, Law, Notary And Regulatory Issues (POLRI)*, 1(2). <https://doi.org/10.55047/polri.v1i2.74>
- Jannah, L. M. (2017). Collaborative Governance in Eradicating Corruption in Indonesia: Challenges and Opportunities. *ICAS-PGS and ICBAP 2017 Proceedings*. <https://doi.org/10.2991/icaspgs-icbap-17.2017.21>
- Kamal, M., & Arifin, M. Y. (2019). The Community Role in Prevention and Eradication of Corruption. *Varia Justicia*, 15(2). <https://doi.org/10.31603/variajusticia.v15i2.2484>
- Killias, M. (2021). Public sector reforms and their impact on the level of corruption: A systematic review. *Campbell Systematic Reviews*, 17(2). <https://doi.org/10.1002/cl2.1173>
- Lestari, Y. S. (2017). Kartel Politik dan Korupsi Politik di Indonesia. *Pandecta*, 12(1).
- Lynch, C. A. (2021). Opening the policy blackbox: Unravelling the process for changing national diagnostic and treatment guidelines for vivax malaria in seven countries. *Malaria Journal*, 20(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12936-021-03959-w>
- Maag, S. (2022). Actors in forums: Work input and different types of benefits. *Journal of Public Policy*, 42(3), 573–592. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0143814X22000022>
- Mahardika Hariadi, T., & Luqman Wicaksono, H. (2013). Perbandingan Penanganan Tindak Pidana Korupsi di Negara Singapura dan Indonesia. *Recidive*, 2(3).
- Saldana, J. (2014). *Qualitative Data Analysis: A Methods Sourcebook* (3rd ed.). Sage Publications.
- Sudarmanto, K. (2021). Reposisi Kewenangan Kejaksaan Dalam Melakukan Penegakan Tindak Pidana Korupsi Dan Maladministrasi Pemerintahan. *Jurnal USM Law Review*, 4(2), 651–662. <http://dx.doi.org/10.26623/julr.v4i2.4248>

- Suherri, S. (2017). Politik Pemberantasan Korupsi di Indonesia. *Otoritas : Jurnal Ilmu Pemerintahan*, 7(1). <https://doi.org/10.26618/ojip.v7i1.417>
- Sukmareni, Danil, E., Ismansyah, & Daulay, Z. (2018). Implication of regulation authorities on the efforts to accelerate the eradication of corruption. *Hasanuddin Law Review*, 4(3). <https://doi.org/10.20956/halrev.v4i3.1078>
- Vanclay, F. (2021). The mechanism of disaster capitalism and the failure to build community resilience: Learning from the 2009 earthquake in L'Aquila, Italy. *Disasters*, 45(3), 555–576. <https://doi.org/10.1111/disa.12431>