Available online at http://e-journal.upstegal.ac.id/index.php/IGJ

Indonesian Governance Journal
(Kajian Politik – Pemerintahan)
ISSN: 2721-1991
https://doi.org/10.24905/igj.6.1.2023.37-44
Volume: 06 No: 01 2023

EVALUATION OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT CAPACITY IN SUPPORTING SMART GOVERNMENT ASPECTS (SAMARINDA CITY CASE STUDY)

Rizky Arif Nugroho[1]
Andi Atikah Melinda Septiana[2]

[1,2] *Institut Teknologi Kalimantan, Indonesia*
Corresponding Author: arif.rizky@lecturer.itk.ac.id

Article Info

Keyword:
Capacity;
Evaluation;
Local Government.

Abstract: Samarinda City, according to Samarinda Long Term Planning, was directed to be a sustainable city with a smart city as its foundation. The plan was in line with the Movement to 100 Smart Cities in Indonesia. Therefore, Samarinda City compiled Masterplan of Samarinda Smart City 2017-2002 to support the movement. The local government's capacity to support the smart government concept had to be addressed by evaluating variables for enhancing the capacity using the scoring method. As stated in the Internal Affair Minister's presentation on Smart City Development, the sample populations are government bodies. Regarding scoring analysis using each collected respondent response, Samarinda City scored point accounted for 2.1 meaning MEDIUM.

Article History: Received 17-October-2022, Revised 26-April-2023, Accepted: 21-June-2023

INTRODUCTION

The concept of *e-government* or *smart* government is the implementation of an information technology system by the government to improve its services to the public by providing easy access to information (Ida Farida et al., 2020). Access to information is a form of government accountability, so the absence of the variable indicates an unaccountable government (Huda & Yunas, 2016). The policy for the application of the concept is contained in Inpres Nomor 3 Tahun 2003 tentang Kebijakan dan Strategi Nasional Pengembangan *E-Government*. On that basis, socialization about *e-government* must be delivered consistently and continuously so that the public understands the benefits (Dinoroy Marganda Aritonang, 2017). The application of *e-government* in Indonesia is only limited to certain ministries or agencies spread across several local governments (Lola Oktavia, 2020).

Based on the opinions of Indrajit (2013) in Alfiyah (2019), There are 3 elements to succeed the development of *e-Government* , namely support, capacity, and value. One of these elements is capacity which is related to the ability of local governments to implement *e-government* concepts such as financial capabilities, the existence of information technology infrastructure, the availability of human resources, and other skills needed so that the results can bring benefits. The use of information technology will not run optimally if the capacity of government apparatus resources does not have the required capabilities (Wismanu et al., 2018), Thus, the capacity of

regional movers needs to be evaluated before implementing the *smart city* concept. Because in the end, the function of government is to provide public services and public services must meet the needs of the community so that they can improve their welfare (Setyaji et al., 2022).

Samarinda City which is the capital of East Kalimantan Province in various activities such as industry, trade and services as well as environmentally friendly settlements has a strategic position. These are attractions that encourage population growth every year (Nastiti Novia Ayuningtyas et al., 2019). In the Long-Term Development Plan of Samarinda City 2005-2025, Samarinda City will be developed into a sustainable Samarinda City with a *smart city* foundation. With the selection of Samarinda City in the program Gerakan Menuju 100 Smart City di Indonesia also support the plan. Following up on this, the Masterplan Samarinda *Smart City* Year 2017-2025 was prepared. The realization of quality, transparency, accountability, and corruption-free public services through the implementation of the *Smart Government* dimension is stated in the document. Therefore, it is necessary to evaluate the capacity of local governments in realizing smart *government* aspects in order to support the *smart city* concept. The implementation of the *smart city* concept in Samarinda City was realized with the launch of services *Go Digital* by Disdukcapil Kota Samarinda. This service is related to the management of community administration documents via application WhatsApp, So that people do not need to come to again to Disdukcapil (Syaharie Jaang, *personal communication*, 2020). The locus of this research is in Samarinda City.

The Smart City concept is a city that has a development concept by utilizing the application of Information and Communication Technology (ICT) smartly and efficiently, especially in the use of resources (Boyd Cohen, 2014). Thereare six components in *a smart city*, namely smart economy, smart mobility, smart *government*, smart *people*, smart living, and *smart* environment (I. P. A. E. Pratama, 2014). *Smart* city planning needs to be supported by smart government aspects as the spearhead because without *smart government* planning , it is impossible to realize the entire smart *city* concept (Annisah, 2018). In the Jakarta *Smart City Masterplan*, one of the important aspects of *smart* government is through the use of ICT for government services, realizing data openness and transparency, and formulating policies by taking into account the needs of the community. In the application of smart *city*, the basic principles of *smart government* are as follows (Bappenas, 2015):

1. Involving all levels of society, collaborating, and involving all levels of society.
2. Increasing efficiency by improving operations.
3. Improving resource, organizational, and infrastructure management.
4. Creating a database system that is widely accessible.
5. Processing the latest data information (real time).
6. Using an up-to-date method.
7. There is coordination among *the stakeholders* involved.

The realization of *smart* government can also be seen in public participation in decision making, public and social services, and transparent government (Rudolf Giffinger et al., 2007). In addition, realizing the *smart* government dimension is not only limited to providing computer devices and internet networks for the government but there are things that need to be considered, namely (Subekti & Gustomy, 2018):

1. *Publish*
2. *Interact*
3. *Transact*

Capacity is the ability to identify, understand, point out problems, learn based on experience, and learn to face the future (Leidel et al., 2012). An employee must be able to make a real contribution to the development of himself, the company, and society so that his capacity can develop (Dwihastari & Marom, 2017). Increasing the capacity of regional devices, there are significant influencing factors, for instances (Soeprapto, 2003):

1. Shared commitment
   The influence of commitment is very large in capacity building because this is the basis of all activities to be achieved.
2. Conducive leadership
   Conducive leadership is dynamic leadership and provides capacity building opportunities for all elements of the organization.

3. Regulatory reform
   Regulatory reform aims to create a characteristic, integrated, and high-performing professional government bureaucracy.
4. Increased strengths and weaknesses
   All elements of the organization must be able to understand and explain the strengths and weaknesses of the organization.

In addition, there are also requirements for government capacity building, namely participation, innovation, access to information, accountability, and leadership (Yuwono, 2003). Innovation is an important aspect because with innovation, there are alternatives and variations in development methods (Ulum, 2018).

Based on similar research with the title Pengembangan Kapasitas (*capacity building*) Kelembagaan Pada Badan Kepegawaian Daerah Kabupaten Jombang, obtained the results of supporting factors which include leadership and mutual commitment (Ratnasari et al., 2013). As well as an inhibiting factor, namely regulatory inconsistencies, where there are regulations that often change so that it is difficult to complete the main task. Meanwhile, in this study, only evaluate the variables of increasing the capacity of local governments to support *smart government* aspects. Based on the results of the study, the variables to be measured in this study are:

1. Community participation
2. Data disclosure
3. Policy implementation
4. Quality of public services
5. ICT Utilization
6. Leadership
7. Regulatory reform
8. Innovation

Research is important to do because Samarinda City will apply the *Smart City* concept and the *Smart Government* aspect spearheads its implementation in terms of governance. Therefore, in order for its implementation to run effectively, it is necessary to assess the variables that will support the concept.

RESEARCH METHODS

Based on opinion (Creswell & Creswell, 2018), A population is a group of individuals who have certain characteristics in common and are determined by researchers to be identified and studied, then conclusions can be drawn. In this study, the population is the entire Regional Apparatus Organization in Samarinda City. The population becomes the basis for sampling where the sample is a part or representative of the population to be studied (Arikunto, 2011). Based on the presentation of the Ministry of Home Affairs entitled Arah Kebijakan Pengembangan Kota Cerdas (Smart City) Sebagai Upaya Mendorong Transformasi Digital Pada Pemerintah Daerah Provinsi dan Kabupaten/Kota, Then the samples in this study are:

1. Bappeda Kota Samarinda
2. Dinas Pekerjaan Umum dan Penataan Ruang Kota Samarinda
3. Dinas Pertanahan Kota Samarinda
4. Dinas Kependudukan dan Pencatatan Sipil Kota Samarinda
5. Dinas Komunikasi dan Informatika Kota Samarinda
6. Dinas Penanaman Modal dan Pelayanan Terpadu Satu Pintu Kota Samarinda
7. Dinas Perpustakaan Kota Samarinda
8. Badan Pusat Statistik Kota Samarinda

Each related agency will be determined by its representative through the suitability of the objectives of each field in the relevant service, so that the information obtained accurately and accurately describes the actual conditions faced.

In this study, data was obtained through interviews where the interview process was carried out by preparing questions in advance in an arranged manner which were then asked to respondents (Sugiyono, 2015). Primary data were obtained through questionnaires distributed to research respondents. As for evaluating the variables of increasing the capacity of local governments to support *aspects of smart government*, a scoring method is used. This method is

carried out as part of quantitative data analysis techniques by assigning scores or values to each variable characteristic with the aim of calculating values and determining their rank (Imam Gunawan, 2013). The score interval used is a score of 1 with a low indicator, a score of 2 with a medium indicator, and a score of 3 with a high indicator (Nasir & Sikumbang, 1998). Furthermore, the assessment results that have been obtained from each respondent will be calculated the average value of each variable by dividing the number of assessments of all respondents on each variable by the number of respondents. Finally, the total assessment score will be calculated on average so that the capacity of the Samarinda City Government to support the smart government concept can be obtained based on the score results of each variable. Then the results will be categorized into assessment classes as follows:

Low : 1-1,6
Medium : 1,7-2,3
High : 2,4-3

Here are the variable scoring parameters based on each predefined score:

Table 1. Variable Assessment Criteria

Variable	Assessment Parameters	Score
Community Participation	The amount of community involvement >75% of the activities carried out	3; High
	The amount of community involvement between 45-74% of the activities carried out	2; Medium
	The amount of community involvement < 45% of the activities carried out	1; Low
Data Disclosure	There are >3 media that inform development plans and cooperation as well as government performance	3; High
	There are between 1-2 media that inform development plans and cooperation as well as government performance	2; Medium
	There is no media to inform development plans and cooperation and government performance	1; Low
Quality of Public Services	The time to resolve public complaints that can be resolved is <7 days	3; High
	The time to resolve public complaints that can be resolved is between 8-15 days	2; Medium
	The time to resolve public complaints that can be resolved is > 15 days	1; Low
Policy Implementation	There are > 66% of plans or policies realized	3; High
	There are between 33-65% of plans or policies realized	2; Medium
	There are < 33% of plans or policies realized	1; Low
Leadership	There are internal activities with the theme of Leadership and motivation >1 times a year	3; High
	There are internal activities with the theme of Leadership and motivation only1 time a year	2; Medium
	There are no internal activities with the theme of Leadership and motivation	1; Low
Regulatory Reform	There is a *reward* and *punishment* system	3; High
	There is a *reward* or *punishment* system	2; Medium
	Absence of *reward* and *punishment* system	1; Low
Innovation	HR has the motivation to produce change and innovation	3; High
	HR lacks motivation to produce change and innovation	2; Medium
	HR is not motivated to produce change and innovation	1; Low

ICT Utilization	There are >3 common applications or software that are used daily.	3; High
	There are between 1-2 common applications or software that are used daily.	2; Medium
	There is no common applications or software that are used daily.	1; Low

Source: Analysis Results, 2021

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

As for this analysis stage, there are several partieswho arerespondents (R) in this study, including Bappeda Kota Samarinda (R1), Dinas Komunikasi dan Informatika Kota Samarinda (R2), Dinas Pertanahan Kota Samarinda (R3), Dinas Kependudukan dan Catatan Sipil Kota Samarinda (R4), Dinas Perpustakaan Kota Samarinda (R5), Dinas Penanaman Modal dan Pelayanan Terpadu Satu Pintu Kota Samarinda (R6), BPS Kota Samarinda (R7), dan Dinas Pekerjaan Umum dan Perumahan Rakyat Kota Samarinda (R8). The following is a table of respondents' assessment of research variables:

Table 2. Respondent Assessment

Variable	Respondent Score								Average
	R1	R2	R3	R4	R5	R6	R7	R8	
Community participation	1	2	1	1	2	1	2	1	1.4
Data disclosure	3	3	2	3	2	2	2	2	2.4
Policy implementation	2	3	1	3	1	3	3	2	2.3
Quality of public services	2	3	2	2	2	3	3	2	2.4
Leadership	1	3	2	3	2	1	2	3	2.1
Regulatory reform	1	3	1	3	2	2	2	2	2.0
Innovation	2	3	2	3	1	2	2	2	2.0
ICT Utilization	2	3	1	3	1	2	3	3	2.3
Average									**2.1**

Source: Analysis Results, 2021

Based on the assessment results in the table above, each variablecan be explained as follows:

a. Community Participation
   The Community Participation variable has an average score of 1. 4 or indicate that the level of community participation measured by the number of community attendance at each activity carried out by respondents is in the **low** classification. One of them can be shown through the number of community attendance at activities carried out by Dinas Pekerjaan Umum dan Perumahan Rakyat Kota Samarinda, where the number of people present is only 40% of the number of invitations prepared. This low community involvement can affect the policy formulation process, where policies are formulated based on community needs, but in the process community participation in these activities is still lacking. It is known that there is low public interest because they have not realized their essential position in development and lack of appreciation for their involvement.
b. Data Disclosure
   The Data Openness variable is known to have an average score of 2. 4 or is in the **High** classification. It is known that the average agency that was a respondent in this study provided > 3 media that can be accessed by the wider community to find out information related to development plans and cooperation carried out by these agencies. In this case, Bappeda Kota Samarinda; Dinas Komunikasi dan Informatika Kota Samarinda; dan Dinas

Kependudukan dan Catatan Sipi; Samarinda City has a high score on the variable Data Disclosure because they provide information not only from *websites*, but also from various *platforms* or social media such as Facebook, Instagram. This certainly can make it easier for the public to access related information easily because it is available in various media.

c. Policy Implementation
The Policy Implementation variable has an average score of 2. 3 or are in the **medium** classification. Overall, the agencies that were respondents to the study have realized their development plans or policies as much as >33%-66%, of which only 2 agencies still have policy realization of <33%, namely Dinas Pertanahan Kota Samarinda dan Dinas Perpustakaan Kota Samarinda.

d. Quality of Public Services
In the Public Service Quality variable has an average score of 2. 4 or is in the **high** classification. The average time needed to resolve community complaints is 7-15 days due to the completeness of requirements or incomplete files and the many stages that need to be passed. However, Dinas Komunikasi dan Informatika Kota Samarinda, Dinas Penanaman Modal dan Pelayanan Terpadu Satu Pintu Kota Samarinda, dan BPS Kota Samarinda have successfully completed the service in less than 7 days.

e. Leadership
In the Leadership variable, it is measured by the influence of leadership on member performance by carrying out internal activities, namely motivational activities 1 time a month. The average score of the variable is 2. 1 or is in **the medium** classification. This happens because leaders have not been able to provide a forum or space for providing motivation and human resource development in their respective agencies.

f. Regulatory Reform
In the variable of Regulatory Reform aimed at supporting action in carrying out capacity building, this can be measured by the existence of *a reward* and/or *punishment* system in related agencies. Where based on table 2 it is known that the average score on the Regulatory Reform variable is 2 or **medium** classification. Based on existing conditions, currently Bappeda Kota Samarinda dan Dinas Pertanahan Kota Samarinda do not yet have a *reward* and *punishment* system.

g. Innovation
The innovation variable can be measured by the influence of Human Resources (HR) who have the motivation to produce change or innovation. Based on the average score, it is known that the Innovation variable has an average score of 2. 0 or classified as **a medium** score. As shown, one of them is on Dinas Perpustakaan Kota Samarinda who have a score of 1 or a low score, where it is known that it is influenced by more employees over the age of 50 years. This age affects the lack of motivation to produce change and tends to work on work patterns statically.

h. ICT Utilization
The ICT Utilization variable has an average score of 2. 3 or are in **the medium** classification. This is because there are still agencies that in serving the public have not utilized technology optimally due to lack of resources who have expertise in technology. The use of ICT will be very useful to facilitate work if utilized properly.

i. Samarinda City Government's Capacity to Support *Smart Government*
Based on the results of the calculation of the capacity score on each respondent, it was found that as many as 1 variable had a **low** level of capacity, as many as 5 variables had a **medium** level of capacity, and only two variables had a **high** level of capacity. After calculating the average score of each variable, Samarinda City has a capacity level of 2.1 which means it is in the **medium** classification.

The results obtained by the Samarinda City Government show that in implementing the *Smart Government* concept, its performance still needs to be improved, especially the Community Participation variable which still receives a low rating. This is very important because the community is not only the object of planning but must be viewed as a subject where the

aspirations, they convey must be considered in the development process. Thus, the implementation of *Smart Government* can be done even better.

CONCLUSION

Based on the calculation of the variable evaluation score of increasing the capacity of local governments to support smart *government* aspects that have been carried out, it is known that Samarinda City has a capacity level of 2.1 which means it is in the **medium** classification. This happens because not all variables are classified as variables with high capacity, there is even one variable that has a low score. Efforts need to be made to further encourage the variable of community participation in order to achieve a better level of capacity.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alfiyah, N. I. (2019). Pengaruh Penerapan e-Government Pada Pembangunan Smart City di Kabupaten Sumenep. *Jurnal Inovasi Ilmu Sosial Dan Politik*, *1*(2), 88. https://doi.org/10.33474/jisop.v1i2.4800

Annisah, A. (2018). USULAN PERENCANAAN SMART CITY: SMART GOVERNANCE PEMERINTAH DAERAH KABUPATEN MUKOMUKO*. *Masyarakat Telematika Dan Informasi : Jurnal Penelitian Teknologi Informasi Dan Komunikasi*, *8*(1), 59. https://doi.org/10.17933/mti.v8i1.103

Arikunto, S. (2011). *Prosedur Penelitian Suatu Pendekatan dan Praktik* (6th ed.). Rineka Cipta.

Bappenas. (2015). *Konsep Pengembangan Kota Cerdas Yang Berdaya Saing*.

Boyd Cohen. (2014). *Smart City Index Master Indicators Survey*. Smart Cities Council. http://smartcitiescouncil. com/resources/smart-city-index-masterindicators-survey

Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (Fifth edition). SAGE.

Dinoroy Marganda Aritonang. (2017). The Impact of E-Government System on Public Service Quality in Indonesia. *European Scientific Journal*, *13*(35), 99–111.

Dwihastari, S., & Marom, A. (2017). Analisis Pengembangan Kapasitas Kelembagaan Pada Badan Kepegawaian, Pendidikan, dan Pelatihan Kota Semarang. *Journal of Public Policy and Management Review*, *6*(2), 215–225.

Huda, M., & Yunas, N. (2016). The Development of e-Government System in Indonesia. *Jurnal Bina Praja*, *08*(01), 97–108. https://doi.org/10.21787/JBP.08.2016.97-108

I. P. A. E. Pratama. (2014). *Smart City Beserta Cloud Computing dan Teknologi-Teknologi Pendukung*. Informatika.

Ida Farida, Refly Setiawan, Anastasia Sri Maryatmi, & Masayu Nila Juwita. (2020). The Implementation of E-Government in The Industrial Revolution Era 4.0 in Indonesia. *International Journal of Progressive Sciences and Technologies*, *22*(2), 340–346.

Imam Gunawan. (2013). *Metode Penelitian Kualitatif: Teori & Praktik*. Bumi Aksara.

Leidel, M., Niemann, S., & Hagemann, N. (2012). Capacity development as a key factor for integrated water resources management (IWRM): Improving water management in the Western Bug River Basin, Ukraine. *Environmental Earth Sciences*, *65*(5), 1415–1426. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12665-011-1223-5

Lola Oktavia. (2020). Penilaian Penerimaan E-Government Di Indonesia. *Jurnal CoreIT: Jurnal Hasil Penelitian Ilmu Komputer Dan Teknologi Informasi*, *6*(1), 15–21.

Nasir, M., & Sikumbang, R. (1998). *Metode Penelitian*. Ghalia Indonesia.

Nastiti Novia Ayuningtyas, Arfiah Busairi, & Andriawan Kustiawan. (2019). Pengaruh Inflasi dan Pertumbuhan Penduduk Terhadap Tingkat Pengangguran Di Kota Samarinda. *Jurnal Ilmu Ekonomi Mulawarman (JIEM)*, *3*(4).

Ratnasari, J. D., Makmur, M., & Ribawanto, H. (2013). Pengembangan Kapasitas Kelembagaan Pada Badan Kepegawaian Daerah Kabupaten Jombang. *Jurnal Administrasi Publik*, *1*(3), 103–110.

Rudolf Giffinger, Christian Fertner, Hans Kramar, & Evert Meijers. (2007). City-Ranking of European Medium-Sized Cities. *Cent. Reg. Sci. Vienna UT*, 1–12.

Setyaji, A. P., Dwimawanti, I. H., & Harsono. (2022). Kualitas Pelayanan Publik dalam Pengurusan Akta Pencatatan Sipil pada Dinas Kependudukan dan Pencatatan Sipil Kota Tegal. *Indonesian Governance Journal (Kajian Politik - Pemerintahan)*, *5*(2), 142–149. https://doi.org/10.24905/igj.5.2.2022.142-149

Soeprapto, R. (2003). Capacity Building of Local Government Towards Good Governance. *Jurnal Ilmiah Administrasi Publik FIA Universitas Brawijaya*, *4*.

Subekti, T., & Gustomy, R. (2018). Menguji Sistem E-Government Kota Malang Menuju Smart City. *Interaktif: Jurnal Ilmu-Ilmu Sosial*, *10*(1).

Sugiyono. (2015). *Metode Penelitian dan Pengembangan*. Alfabeta.

Syaharie Jaang. (2020). *Warga Samarinda Tak Perlu Lagi ke Disdukcapil, Cukup Via WhatsApp* [Kaltim Today].

Ulum, C. (2018). Manajemen E-Government dalam Rangka Capacity Building Birokrasi di Indonesia. *BISMA (Bisnis Dan Manajemen)*, *2*(2), 167. https://doi.org/10.26740/bisma.v2n2.p167-172

Wismanu, R. E., Nuh, M., Widodo, N., & Aziz, N. A. (2018). Model Inovasi Pemerintah Daerah Bidang Pelayanan Perizinan dalam Mewujudkan Smart City (Studi Pendekatan Sistem Dinamik pada Pemerintah Kabupaten Sragen). *Jurnal Ilmiah Administrasi Publik*, *4*(4), 369–376. https://doi.org/10.21776/ub.jiap.2018.004.04.12

Yuwono, T. (2003, January 7). *Capacity Building in the Local Government: Concept and Analysis*. Seminar Intemasional Democracy and Local Politics, Yogyakarta.