



Croatian
International
Relations
Review

—
CIRR

—
XXVIII (90) 2022,
117-134

—
DOI 10.2478/
CIRR-2022-0029

—
UDC 327 (4-6
EU:73:55)

Development of Local Government Capacity in Managing Indonesia-Malaysia Border Area (Study on Sebatik Island)

Hadi Prabowo

IPDN, Jl. Ir. Sukarno Km.20, Sumedang, West Java, Indonesia

Email: hadiprabowo@ipdn.ac.id

Etin Indrayani

IPDN, Jl. Ir. Sukarno Km.20, Sumedang, West Java, Indonesia

Email: etin.indrayani@ipdn.ac.id

Yudi Rusfiana

IPDN, Jl. Ir. Sukarno Km.20, Sumedang, West Java, Indonesia

Email: yudirusfiana@ipdn.ac.id

Obsatar Sinaga

Padjadjaran University, Bandung, West Java, Indonesia

Email: Obsatar.sinaga@unpad.ac.id

Abstract

Key words:

Development of capacity building, local government, management of border area, border management.

It is not simple to control the border between Indonesia and Malaysia. Through the National Border Management Agency, the central government has managed the border regions (BNPP). Still, the agency's performance has not effectively met the needs of the border regions notably for the district's/small city's outermost islands. The local governments of Indonesia and Malaysia face difficulties in managing the border. The study aims to assess the provincial government's capacities and develop a conceptual model of government capacity building in border management. This study employs a mixed-methods design that combines quantitative and qualitative approaches. The evaluation instruments included document analysis, FGD, PROSE, and OCAT. Due to a lack of institutional commitment and systematic policies, the research reveals that the local government has adopted occasional efforts to manage the border areas, with sporadic success. Local government capacity-building methods are sustainable and integrated into a cycle that begins with outlining the concerns and necessary actions to consider in the capacity. The construction procedure and guidance on essential tools and techniques. The primary levels assess ability, strategy, plan, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation. These findings are limited to the North Kalimantan Province border region and cannot be applied to other areas. Even though the study contributes to the proposal of a model for border areas administered by the central government in collaboration with local governments, it is not comprehensive.

Introduction

The administration of national borders, especially about small outer islands, involves the participation of all parties. Following the spirit of implementing regional autonomy following Law Number 23 of 2014 Regarding Local Government, Local Government has a close relationship with empowering the small outermost islands as a highly strategic territorial border point. This fact is intimately connected to the challenges of security, order, and integrity in NKRI and the welfare of the people in border regions. The National Border Management Agency has managed border regions on behalf of the federal government (BNPP). Still, the agency's performance has not effectively met the needs of the border regions notably for the district's/small city's outermost islands. This fact merits the attention of the Central Government to propose remedies by reviving the capacity of Local Governments in border regions, particularly the outer islands. The revitalization will positively affect the development of border regions in general, including fulfilling community expectations for the Regional Government to improve the quality of its actions and services in all sectors (Faozan, 2008). Sebatik Island is one of the most remote islands bordering Malaysia. The Nunukan District, which contains Sebatik Island, is divided into five subdistricts. Five sub-districts comprise the expansion: Sebatik Parent Sub-district, West Sebatik, North Sebatik, Central Sebatik, and East Sebatik.

According to a prior study, the reality of limited local government ability in the Sebatik Nunukan District of North Kalimantan Province is reflected in the low quality of public services and the weak educational background of the local government apparatus in the region. Also, one of the causes of diminished service quality and a significant impediment to its ability to provide service. Similarly, because it is a separate island, many bureaucracies do not require field and performance for reasons unrelated to the oversight of the Nunukan District government and other machinery. The average paved road infrastructure exacerbates this issue, and others that connect settlements remain unpaved. The power source is restricted to the West Sebatik District due to its limited capacity. Except for Tawau in the Malaysian state of Sabah, which has long been cohesive with Indonesian territory Sebatik, limited infrastructures such as housing facilities and infrastructure, water supply networks, drainage networks, transportation, and telecommunications facilities and infrastructure result in low accessibility and isolation from neighboring regions. Visiting the region has become prohibitively expensive due to the many infrastructure constraints in the region's border regions. This is a result of the relatively low quality of public services today (Saputra et al., 2013). In addition, the program and performance resulted from repeated organizational changes. Development is hindered in border regions, and planning for growth in border regions, particularly in Sebatik, is partial and incomplete.

In contrast, central government strategy may include the possibility of rapid infrastructure development, particularly in border regions. The disparity in the development of border regions with Malaysia has caused vulnerabilities in the country's socioeconomic, security, and sovereignty up to this point, as there are significant variations between the border region of Malaysia and the nation. Given that the management of border areas demands comprehension, insight, and performance integrity, the above circumstances motivate scholars to investigate local government ability further. Then, it is vital to evaluate how each level of government, both central and local, carries out its tasks and authority to establish a regional government with a sustainable capacity for governance so that social welfare can be accomplished effectively and efficiently.

Literature Review

Aspects of capacity building include human resource development (people), institutional development (local government system), and the overall policy environment. Capacity development refers, simply and widely, to actions that enhance people's knowledge, talents, skills, and behavior. It can also help determine the optimal allocation and utilization of human resources (Vincent, 2015). Capacity building is a key obligation for all nations. Sebatik Island is one of the most remote islands adjacent to Malaysia. The Nunukan District, which contains Sebatik Island, is divided into five subdistricts. Sebatik Parent Subdistrict, West Sebatik, North Sebatik, Central Sebatik, and East Sebatik are the expansion's five subdistricts. According to prior research, the reality of limited local

government ability in the Sebatik Nunukan District of North Kalimantan Province is reflected in the region's poor quality of public services and its insufficient educational background of local government apparatus. In addition, one of the elements contributes to lower service quality and substantially impacts its capacity to deliver service. Likewise, because it is a separate island, numerous bureaucracies do not require the field and performance for reasons unrelated to the oversight of the government of Nunukan District and other apparatus.

This issue is exacerbated by the average paved road infrastructure and the dirt roads connecting villages. The electricity source is limited and can only reach the West Sebatik District. Except for Tawau, the Malaysian state of Sabah, which has long been cohesive with Indonesian territory Sebatik, has limited infrastructure, including housing facilities and infrastructure, water supply networks, drainage networks, transportation, and telecommunications facilities and infrastructure, resulting in low accessibility and isolation from neighboring areas. Visiting the region has become prohibitively expensive due to the infrastructure constraints of the region's border areas. This is a consequence of the comparatively subpar quality of public services ([Saputra et al., 2013](#)). In addition, the program and success resulted from numerous organizational changes. Development in border regions is hampered, as is planning for development, particularly in Sebatik, which is still incomplete and insufficient. In contrast, the central government has the policy option of accelerating infrastructure development, particularly in the border region. The disparity in the development of border regions with Malaysia has caused vulnerabilities in the country's socioeconomic, security, and sovereignty due to stark discrepancies with Malaysia's border region. If they are to accomplish their growth goals. No development is possible without capacity ([Grauwe, 2009](#)).

However, capacity development efforts have not always had the desired effect on capacity. While they have regularly enhanced the skills of individuals, they have only rarely transformed the organizations to which these individuals belong. It is vital to study the reasons behind this relative failure and to offer creative, pertinent policies and solutions ([Forti, 2013](#); [Grauwe, 2009](#)). According to [Morgan \(2006\)](#), capacity is a component of institutional practice, with its existence attributable to human, organizational, and environmental growth. In municipal government, the term capacity is used to characterize measures to increase efficiency that stem from institutional economics. Thus, capacity-building refers to the rules, practices, and inputs that determine the efficacy of any development initiative ([Bahadoer et al., 2021](#)). Because local government capacity is a multidimensional subject that includes human capacity (individual), institutional capacity, and environmental capacity, all of which can be integrated to produce optimal local government capacity to fulfill its purposes and mandates, this description may lead to confusion or misunderstanding. Individual-level dimensions include individual potentials and skills, occupation grouping, and personal job motivations in

the organization. Organization-level dimensions include organization structure, job procedure and mechanism, organization selection, facility and infrastructure management, organization relationship, and networking. In the context of municipal governments, capacity building refers to the ability of an individual or group to carry out their tasks (Bhagavathula, Brundiers, Stauffacher, & Kay, 2021).

The development of human and institutional capacity for long-term change should be facilitated by linking capacity building to larger work settings so that capacity building training is not a one-time activity but rather promotes human and institutional capacity development. According to Brown et al. (2001), most capacity-building instruments are intended to evaluate organizational capability. The majority of the sixteen instruments are data collection devices. Some of them combine qualitative and quantitative approaches. Most of them are executed using the self-assessment method, while three others use a combination of self-assessment and external evaluation. Self-evaluation instruments contribute more effectively to capability assessment. Nevertheless, some approaches measure capacity perception, which may lead to short-term dependability. Some tools for assessing capacity have been designed to be monitored and reviewed, while others have been validated for the same purpose. Utilizing self-assessment as part of a capacity improvement intervention could pose a challenge for monitoring and evaluation. Local government capacity assessment can be accomplished through a combination of external and self-evaluation, representing a substantial variance in the assessment process, regardless of whether an adviser, moderator, external consultant or merely the staff is involved. Gillen (2011) argues that a model must examine the economic and social assumptions behind the current capacity-building approach. It is not enough to enhance infrastructure and access to technology to overcome the developmental divide. Nonetheless, one must also empower individuals to utilize technology in a manner that satisfies their self-identified social, environmental, and developmental requirements. Meanwhile, Ndou and Sebola analyzed a conceptual model of capacity building in a South African provincial administration (2015). This research investigates Competency-Based Training (CBT) as a model for enhancing workforce abilities (capacity building).

Research Methodology

This study used a mixed-methods design. This research employs the mixed research method since it generates both quantitative and qualitative data. According to Creswell (2014), mixed methods research is a research strategy that blends or links qualitative and quantitative forms. Each qualitative and quantitative approaches have its benefits and drawbacks. Creswell (2014) asserts, "Qualitative research is a way for investigating and comprehending the meaning that some individuals or groups attribute to social or humanitarian situations." The technique utilized for data analysis is descriptive quantitative, and qualitative data analysis. Brown et

al. (2001) suggest that capacity measurement incorporates quantitative and qualitative measures. Measurement and analysis are used descriptively to assess capacity and evaluate capacity development initiatives, particularly in the first stages of an organization's growth and development. Monitoring changes in capacity over time is limited. Documentation of the numerous phases and activities of field-level capacity building is required to enhance knowledge of the relationship between capacity and performance and measurement. The assessment tools utilized at each capacity level are outlined in [Table 1](#) below.

Table 1. Capacity Level and Assessment Tool Used

No	Assessment Level	Assessment Tools
1.	System Level	a) Document Analysis b) FGD
2,	Organization Level	a) Document Analysis b) FGD c) Participatory Organizational Assessment,PROSE d) OCAT
3.	Individual Level	a) Document Analysis b) Training Needs Analysis/TNA c) FGD

Resource: W. Booth, R. Ebrahim., R. and Morin 2001

Categorization assessment provides meaning or interpretation for relevant scale scores. Scale categorization is performed using descriptive statistics derived from the distribution of group score data, which includes the number of subjects in the group, the mean score of the Scale, the standard deviation of the scale score and variance, the minimum and maximum scores, and the standard error of the scale score ([Azwar, 2013](#)). These data descriptions will provide an overview of the distribution of scale scores among the measured participants and act as a source of information regarding the issue's status in the researched aspects/variables. In this study, there are three levels of categorization:

- ✓ Low Level ($X \leq (\bar{X} - 1\sigma)$)
 - ✓ Middle Level/Moderate or sufficient level ($(\bar{X} - 1\sigma) < X \leq (\bar{X} + 1\sigma)$)
 - ✓ Height Level ($X > (\bar{X} + 1\sigma)$)
- \bar{X} = mean; σ = standard deviation

Results and Discussion

The mix technique, which refers to the creation of specified issues, is used to investigate the phenomenon of local government capacities, including person level, institutional system, and regulatory system. Following the implementation of a decentralization system, in which the government grants extensive authority to local governments to organize various

government affairs, efforts are made to develop the administrative capacity of local governments by improving their human resource capacities. The objective is to establish regional governments with a sustained capacity for governance so that societal well-being can be improved effectively and efficiently. However, the capacity of individual apparatus resources in the local government of Nunukan Regency/District, particularly those located in the Border Country Area in Sebatik, is not yet optimal. According to one of the informants from the element of the district in the Sebatik Region, there are still apparatus resources in the sub-district who have graduated from high school or its equivalent, as well as some apparatus in five sub-districts, many of whom have not attended various training and upgrading related to the development of the border area, both in terms of service, economy, and other factors that can stimulate growth in the border area. As can be observed in [Table 2](#), this is consistent with the findings of the research conducted through questionnaires about Local Government Capacity Measurement at the Individual Staff Level and Individuals Society in Border Area Management.

Table 2. Measurement of Local Government Capacity at Individual Level/Staff in Border Area Management

No	Statement	Measurement Scale					Scores
		VI	NA	F	A	VA	
1.	Adequacy of Training Materials	2	6	3	4	0	39
2	The Number of Training Materials	1	2	4	5	3	52
3	The Number of Training Sessions	4	3	4	2	2	40
4	Percentage of Material	3	4	3	4	1	41
5	The Number of Trainer and Trained Cadres	2	4	7	2	0	39
6	The Number of Trained Staff	2	2	4	5	2	48
7	The Number of Trained Managers /Supervisors	0	2	5	5	3	54
8	Percentage of Competent Training Participants	2	3	4	4	2	46
9	Percentage of Number of Training Participants Applying the Skills Learned	0	2	6	5	2	52
Score Total		16	28	40	36	15	411

Sources: Processing by the Authors; Note: 1. Very Inadequate (VI); 2. Not Adequate (NA); 3. Fair / Moderate (F), 4. Adequate (A), and 5. Very Adequate (VA)

From [table 2](#) above obtained the results of the calculation score of 411 (= $411/675 = 60.89\%$) or Middle Level ($(\bar{x} - 1\sigma) < X \leq (\bar{x} + 1\sigma)$ / $315 < X \leq 495$).

The results are then classified as mild or sufficient. It is acknowledged that achieving expected results in the capacity building of individual

staff/officers (apparatus) is not yet managed effectively. This is indicated, among other things, by the observations that it is still difficult to change the way of thinking (mindset) and the workings of the apparatus, there is still a lack of discipline and employee ethics, and the career system has not been entirely based on work performance, recruitment has not been based on required educational qualifications, education and training (training) have not been able to improve performance fully. There is a lack of oversight and auditing of the organization.

The national government is responsible for managing the border region, but the local government must be involved in its implementation. Local government entities are vital to speeding the management of the nation's border regions. Based on FGD assessment results with Participatory, Results-Oriented Self-Evaluation (PROSE) and the Organizational Capability Assessment Tool (OCAT) tools, the following describes the organizational capacity of local government organizations.

Table 3. Recapitulation of Response Answers About Organizational Practices in 6 Sub Areas of Organizational Capacity Using the PROSE Method

No	Sub Area of OrganizationCapacity	VI	NA	F	A	VA	Score
1.	Human Resource Management	0	63	63	50	49	760
2.	Financial Resource Management	2	19	18	37	14	312
3.	Service Delivery	20	36	56	97	46	878
4.	External Relations	4	11	16	34	10	260
5.	Organizational Learning	13	18	24	56	24	465
6.	Strategic Management	19	28	37	59	37	607
Score Total		58	175	214	333	180	3282


Sources: Processing by the Authors; Note: 1. Very Inadequate (VI); 2. Not Adequate (NA); 3. Fair / Moderate (F), 4. Adequate (A), and 5. Very Adequate (VA)

As with any other instrument, the PROSE technique is dependent on perceived capacity and does not currently include processes for measuring externally observable performance in different areas of capacity (although this is being considered). This is distinctive due to the usage of consensus scoring. Consensus Ratings serve as an analysis of perceived organizational capabilities as stated by individual members. It also assists in identifying areas of capacity that require immediate attention, as agreed upon by all participants. Moreover, the organizational capacity assessment tool is another instrument utilized in organizational capacity measurement (OCAT). OCAT is intended to determine an organization's relative strengths and weaknesses, thereby providing the knowledge necessary to implement capacity-building initiatives. It can also track progress over time, be standardized, and be used enterprise-wide. OCAT is distinguished from PROSE primarily by its assessment team (i.e., organization member plus

outsider choice) and its use of several data sources for evaluation. OCAT assigns each capacity area a numerical rating.

Additionally, the organization explains the location of its capability in terms of its developmental stage. This information may be given visually or orally. OCAT assesses an organization's strengths and shortcomings and monitors their evolution from measurement period to measurement period. OCAT employs an assessment team that performs research before filling up assessment sheets and relies on evidence to supplement staff members' perceptions during the exam. The OCAT data gathering step permits cross-verification of the perceived capability of systematic actual or observable facts. The examination of the organization's capacity using the OCAT instrument revealed the following: a)—governance; b)—management practices; c)—human resources; d)—financial sources and management; e)—service delivery, and f)—external relations.

Figure 1. Recapitulation Percentage of Assessment Score in Each Area Statement on Sub Area Organizational Capacity with OCAT Method



Sources: Processing by the Authors

Based on the results of the assessment of 6 Sub Area Organizational Capacity using the OCAT method, it can be seen that 0.96%, 0.48%, and 11.96%, or approximately 13.40%, indicated that the organizational capacity in 6 sub-areas requires immediate attention, significant improvements, and extensive repairs. In six sub-areas, 86.60% of respondents said that organizational capacity needed strengthening in only limited ways. Sufficient organizational capacity exists in these six sub-areas but requires revision and upkeep. Based on the measurement of the

aforementioned administrative capacities using the PROSE and OCAT techniques, strategic decisions (e.g., regarding Work Procedures, field activities, etc.) can be made within the context of border area management. The government of Nunukan District has never published a policy relating to the management of specific areas of limitation, even though there are only local regulations governing sub-districts separation in 2012. The results of observations and interviews conducted with informants derived from local government, district assembly, sub-district heads, and community leaders indicate that this is the case.

The inefficiency of services is primarily attributable to lengthy service delivery business processes. This is evident in certain services that must pass through numerous tables/counters, lengthening the service process (red tape). This issue also indicates the ineffectiveness of the service provided in some establishments, as the service requirements that must be met are not specified and made plain. The community of service recipients is frequently perplexed by their different needs, which are sometimes judged irrelevant to the provision of the services to be gained. Even in terms of cost, and the magnitude required in certain instances, there is a remarkable disparity between the official price and the actual amount paid. In providing certain services, authority is abused (abuse of power). The lack of clarity triggers this condition in terms of service and the absence of a written SOP containing the service guarantee, duration of service, and fees to be paid by the general public. The Investment Coordinating Board and Integrated Licensing in Nunukan District have prepared SOPs, business licensing services, and investments for several agencies.

Nonetheless, the information has not been well shared with the user group. In other instances, this is compounded by service providers' lack of service spirit. The concept that the bureaucratic organization is obligated to serve society and not to be done has not been tied to the bureaucracy's performance, resulting in inaction, complex service, and frequently not that the local bureaucracy promises. Administrative implementation in Sebatik This shortcoming is caused by more than just bureaucratic causes. During the FGDs conducted by the researchers, some community leaders indicated that the unclear authority and domination of the Nunukan regency government on Sebatik Island is an inevitable consequence of the bureaucracy's inadequate role in public service. A difficult obstacle must be overcome to boost the administration's standing in the Sebatik Island region: the perception of subpar service from government entities. Some facts regarding this region's low quality of public services must be addressed gradually but without fail. Less competent and professional apparatus is available to support the services offered. Even if the majority of bureaucrats stationed in the Sebatik area are relatively new employees, the low competency of the instrument frequently exacerbates the unprofessional complaints about public services from the majority of the people in the Sebatik Region. In turn, this condition has repercussions on the delivery of public services. [Table 4](#) displays the Local Government Capacity Measurement findings at the System Level for Sebatik Island-

Border Area Management. Based on the calculated scores derived from the perceptions of respondents, the organizational capacity at the system level can be categorized as follows:

The results are then classified as moderate or adequate. The accomplishment of expected outcomes in Measurement of Local Government Capacity at System Level in Sebatik Island -Border Area Management is deemed sufficient and manageable. The regulatory structure of the central and local governments for managing and administering the small outlying islands in the country's border region, particularly Sebatik Island, Nunukan Regency, is also well classified. Achieved and supported by a systematic policy is the government's, local governments, and specific communities' dedication to the administration of the small outermost islands in a border region. However, the accomplishments made through the commitment and the policy are deemed insufficient as long as they are inadequate to increase progress and community welfare in border regions. The issues mentioned above need the federal government to give remedies through reviving local governments' ability in border regions, particularly the outer islands. The revitalization will significantly affect the development of border regions in general, including fulfilling community demands for increasing the quality of local government action and services in all disciplines (Faozan, 2008).

Meanwhile, local government capacity assessment can be conducted by external evaluation and self-assessment, representing the most significant variation in the assessment process, whether advisers, moderators, external consultants, or merely personnel are involved. The assessment of the Capacity Building (EBC) model has become a growing topic in evaluation activities and studies, according to Preskill (2008). Multiple organizations have implemented various techniques to aid members in acquiring an assessment culture, enhancing the understanding of evaluation principles and processes across stakeholders.

Figure 2 depicts the conceptual model ((DFID), 2010) proposed for capacity building of local governments in the management of integrated and sustainable border areas so that it is a continuous cycle within the framework of capacity building that regularly engages in constant improvement following the requirements and needs of development. The local government capacity-building plan for managing border areas and remote islands on Sebatik Island, Nunukan District, North Borneo Province, is sustainable and integrated. The model design begins by describing the essential concerns and steps to address in the capacity-building process and providing advice on the most valuable tools and methodologies. The methodology employs four levels of consideration based on the learning cycle. The primary processes include capacity assessment, strategy and plan, implementation, and monitoring and evaluation.


Table 4. Measurement of Local Government Capacity at System Level in Sebatik Island - Border Area Management

No	Statement	Measurement Scale					Score
		VI	NA	F	A	VA	
1.	Employee per-population ratio in the border area	2	4	7	2	0	39
2.	The budget ratio allocated to coordination and collaboration activities with related sectors	2	7	4	2	0	36
3.	% Budget management of border areas financed by the central government	0	5	8	2	0	42
4.	Coordination meeting on border and management issues	0	3	5	5	2	51
5.	Coordination meetings on the administration of population, cross-border activities, and strengthening the defense and security to reduce illegal activities	0	0	4	5	6	62
6.	Coordination meeting on integrated area development to improve the quality of socioeconomic life of border communities.	2	2	5	3	3	48
7.	Coordination meeting on improving the quality of regional infrastructure to reduce isolation and encourage local economic activity	2	0	5	5	3	52
8.	Coordination meeting on strengthening the role of central and local government in handling the boundary area and the development of border areas	1	0	2	8	4	59
9.	Collaboration and synchronization arrangements between related sectors in border area management	0	2	4	6	3	55
10.	Number of multi-sector meetings held	1	2	3	5	4	54
11.	Number of collaboration projects initiated by the center	0	2	3	5	5	58
12.	The existence of national standards for employee qualification	1	1	3	5	5	57
13.	The existence of guidelines for the preparation of the Long-Term Development Plan (LTDP) Border Area	0	3	4	3	5	55
14.	The existence of guidelines for the preparation of the Medium-Term Development Plan (MTDP) Border Area	2	1	3	4	5	54

Sources: Processing by the Authors; Note: 1. Very Inadequate (VI); 2. Not Adequate (NA); 3. Fair / Moderate (F), 4. Adequate (A), and 5. Very Adequate (VA)

From [table 4](#) above obtained the results of the calculation of the score of 1396 $(1396/2015) \times 100\% = 69,28\%$ or Middle Level $((\frac{2}{5} - 1\frac{2}{5}) < X \leq (\frac{2}{5} + 1\frac{2}{5}) / 403 < X \leq 1477.67)$.

Figure 2. Capacity Building Model of Local Government in the Management of Border Area



Conclusion

Achieved and supported by a systematic policy is the government's, local governments, and specific communities' dedication to the administration of the small outermost islands in a border region. However, the accomplishments acquired through the commitment and strategy are deemed insufficient as long as they are inadequate to increase progress and community welfare in border regions. The local government capacity-building plan for managing border areas and remote islands on Sebatik Island, Nunukan District, North Borneo Province, is sustainable and integrated. The model design begins by describing the essential concerns and steps to address in the capacity-building process and providing advice on the most valuable tools and methodologies. The methodology employs four levels of consideration based on the learning cycle. The primary techniques include capacity assessment, strategy and plan, execution and monitoring, and evaluation. The personal level the government apparatus of the Nunukan District's resources Conducted a Need Assessment for the device that would govern the Region's Border Area; Increased Local government training, and the inclusion of human resource personnel in training at various levels at the central, regional, and border levels. Provide possibilities for formal border area management education to the human resources apparatus through learning tasks or learning permits.

At the institutional level of the regional government, there is a review to revise the regional apparatus in the form of the Regional Body so that it corresponds with the Regional Regions. By exempting Regional Devices from Government Regulation No. 11 of 2017, Propose to the federal government that some border area management responsibilities be transferred to the local government through the redefinition of concurrent principles. At the regulatory level, the Regional Government may issue a Regional Regulation delegating a portion of the authority related to the scope of control to the district government in the Sebatik area; Local Governments issue special regulations as an expression of central government policy to expedite the development of border areas and to preserve local knowledge in border areas.

Implementations

Theoretical Implications

The theoretical ramifications of this work are relevant to the body of knowledge because previous studies had not addressed this subject field in the context of border control. Indeed, border management is a crucial duty; nevertheless, this study contributes to the body of knowledge by supplying necessary information on border management with local government assistance. In earlier studies, the function of local government concerning border management was not examined, but forces and central government were considered for border management. In this sense, the study provides substantial evidence that the local government's approach to border control is also beneficial. This contribution to the body of knowledge will boost the comprehension of future research to strengthen the border control capability. In addition, the development of local government capacity would assist the government in formulating appropriate policies to administrate the international boundary between Malaysia and Indonesia. This literature would aid future studies in considering the local government's capacity as an essential determinant for border region decision-making. The outcomes of this study contribute to the advancement of theory by introducing a more understandable idea of the function of local government.

Practical Implications

This study's conclusions are also intended to have substantial practical consequences for enhancing the functionality of local government in border management areas. Recognizing that border management can be improved with additional checks and balances with local government assistance is crucial. Thus, the role of local government should be strengthened, and local government officials should focus on efficiently executing border control plans. The study demonstrates that border management is not an easy task for the local government; consequently, according to the findings of this study, the government machinery should support the local government, and visa and passport policies should be

developed following modern advancements to ensure the successful implementation of these strategies. This study's findings demonstrate that local government capacity-building methods are integrated and sustained in a cycle that begins with identifying challenges and essential steps to address the capacity. The construction procedure and guidance on necessary tools and techniques. The primary levels assess ability, strategy, plan, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation. Therefore, strategic border management is essential for the greater good of society and the state's service level.

Future Directions

Even though the border management of Indonesia and Malaysia has been explored in this study. It is not simple to control the border between Indonesia and Malaysia. The federal government administers border regions through the National Border Management Agency (BNPP). Future research should explore the function of central government support in border control. Second, in future border management studies, the role of public support should be examined. Thirdly, future research should explore the significance of local government resources in border management.

References

- (DFID), D. F. I. D. (2010). How to Note: Capacity Building in Research. *A DFID Practice Paper*.
- A Dugdale, S. C., Tennant-Wood, and Turner M. (2012). "Developing and Testing a Tool for Measuring Capacity Building." Australian Center for International Agricultural Research (ACIAR: Research developing countries and Australia). 39. Retrieved from <https://www.aciar.gov.au/sites/default/files/legacy/node/14664/ias079>
- Amri, A. S. a. S. (2009). Development of Apparatus Resources as an Effort to Improve Performance: Study at the Regional Secretariat Office of Sumbawa Regency. *Wacana*, 12(3).
- Anni Dugdale, C. S., Robin Tennant-Wood, and Mark Turner. (2012). Developing and Testing a Tool for Measuring Capacity Building. *Aciar Impact Assessment Series. University of Canberra*. Retrieved from <https://www.aciar.gov.au/sites/default/files/legacy/node/14664/ias079>
- Azwar. (2013). Membangun Sistem Otomasi Perpustakaan Dengan *Slims*. Retrieved from <https://demo.dspacedirect.org/handle/10673/1974>
- Bahadoer, R. R., Dijkstra, E. A., van Etten, B., Marijnen, C. A. M., Putter, H., Kranenbarg, E. M.-K., . . . Silveira, M. L. (2021). Short-course radiotherapy followed by chemotherapy before total mesorectal excision (TME) versus preoperative chemoradiotherapy, TME, and optional adjuvant chemotherapy in locally advanced rectal cancer

- (RAPIDO): a randomised, open-label, phase 3 trial. *The Lancet Oncology*, 22(1), 29-42. doi:[https://doi.org/10.1016/S1470-2045\(20\)30555-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1470-2045(20)30555-6)
- Bank, W. (2010). Science, Technology, and Innovation: Capacity Building Partnerships for Sustainable Development. *Washington*.
- Bhagavathula, S., Brundiers, K., Stauffacher, M., & Kay, B. (2021). Fostering collaboration in city governments' sustainability, emergency management and resilience work through competency-based capacity building. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*, 63, 102408. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdr.2021.102408>
- Brown, L. (2003). A Guide to Monitoring and Evaluation of Capacity-Building Interventions in The Health Center in Developing Countries. *Measures evaluation Manual Serie(7)*, 1-10. Retrieved from <https://www.data4impactproject.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/ms-03-07-1.pdf>
- Brown, L., Anne LaFond, and Kate Macintyre. (2021). Measuring Capacity Building. *Measure Evaluation*. , Carolina Population Center. *The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill*.
- Chen, K. H.-J. (2017). Contextual influence on evaluation capacity building in a rapidly changing environment under new governmental policies. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 65, 1-11. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.evalprogplan.2017.06.001>
- Colquitt, J. A., Jeffery A. LePine & Michael J. Wesson. (2009). *Organizational Behavior: Improving Performance and Commitment in the Workplace*, New York: McGraw-Hill- Irwin.
- Cousins, J. B., Goh, S. C., Elliott, C., Aubry, T., & Gilbert, N. (2014). Government and voluntary sector differences in organizational capacity to do and use evaluation. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 44, 1-13. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.evalprogplan.2013.12.001>
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. (2014). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and mixed methods approach*. Fourth Edition. Sage Publication. *Inc*.
- Development, D. F. I. (2010). *How to Note : Capacity Building In Research*. *Department For International Development*.
- Eger, C., Miller, G., & Scarles, C. (2018). Gender and capacity building: A multi-layered study of empowerment. *World Development*, 106, 207-219. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2018.01.024>
- Enemark, S. (2006). Capacity Building for Institutional Development in Surveying and Land Management, paper presented in the Promoting Land Administration and Good Governance. *5th FIG Regional Conference Accra, Ghana, March 8-11*. Retrieved from <https://vbn.aau.dk/en/publications/capacity>
- Faozan, H. (2008). Penguatan Kapasitas Kelembagaan Pemerintah Daerah Sebagai Agenda Utama Optimalisasi Pengelolaan Daerah Perbatasan. *Pusat Kajian Kinerja Kelembagaan, LAN RI*, 23-35. doi:<https://doi.org/10.24258/jba.v2i2.19>
- Forti, M., & Yazbak, K. (2013). Building Capacity to Measure and Manage Performance. *The Bridgespan Group*, 1-22. Retrieved from <https://www.nonprofitmaine.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/03>

- Forti, M., and Kathleen Yazbak. (2013). Building Capacity to Measure and Manage Performance. *The Bridgespan Group*. Retrieved from <https://www.nonprofitmaine.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/03>
- Gillen, M. (2011). Bringing the Globe into Globalization : Models of Capacity Building and Technology Transfer. 2(2), 1-24. Retrieved from <https://ejlt.org/index.php/ejlt/article/view/69>
- Grauwe, A. D. (2009). Without capacity, There is no Development. *Rethinking Capacity Development. Unesco-International Institute For Educational Planning, France*.
- Ika, L. A., & Donnelly, J. (2017). Success conditions for international development capacity building projects. *International Journal of Project Management*, 35(1), 44-63. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijproman.2016.10.005>
- Lei, P., Tian, X., Huang, Q., & He, D. (2017). Firm size, government capacity, and regional environmental regulation: Theoretical analysis and empirical evidence from China. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 164, 524-533. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2017.06.166>
- Lempert, D. (2015). A Quick Indicator of Effectiveness of 'Capacity Building' Initiatives of NGOs and International Organizations. *European Journal of Government and Economics* 4(2), 155-196. Retrieved from <https://www.ejge.org/index.php/ejge/article/view/63>
- Millar, P., & Doherty, A. (2016). Capacity building in nonprofit sport organizations: Development of a process model. *Sport Management Review*, 19(4), 365-377. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.smr.2016.01.002>
- Misener, K., & Doherty, A. (2013). Understanding capacity through the processes and outcomes of interorganizational relationships in nonprofit community sport organizations. *Sport Management Review*, 16(2), 135-147. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.smr.2012.07.003>
- Moeldoko. (2010). Border Management Complexity (Overview from the Perspective of Indonesian Border Management Policy). *Jakarta*.
- Mohamad, N. H., Kesavan, P., Razzaq, A. R. A., Hamzah, A., & Khalifah, Z. (2013). Capacity Building: Enabling Learning in Rural Community through Partnership. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 93, 1845-1849. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.10.128>
- Mohd Zain, S. N., & Basáñez, M.-G. (2018). Collaborate or Collapse: Capacity Building in Zoonotic and Neglected Tropical Disease Modelling. *Trends in Parasitology*, 34(5), 356-358. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pt.2017.12.009>
- Moloney, S., & Fünfgeld, H. (2015). Emergent processes of adaptive capacity building: Local government climate change alliances and networks in Melbourne. *Urban Climate*, 14, 30-40. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.uclim.2015.06.009>
- Moreno, J. M., Noguchi, L. M., & Harder, M. K. (2017). Understanding the Process of Community Capacity-Building: A Case Study of Two Programs in Yunnan Province, China. *World Development*, 97, 122-137. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2017.04.005>

- Ndou, S. D., & Sebola, M. P. (2015). Capacity building in Local Government : An analysis for application of competency-based training in South Africa University of Limpopo , South Africa. *The Business and Management Review*, 6(5), 90–100.
- Ndou, S. D., and Mokoko P Sebola. (2015). Capacity Building in Local Government: An Analysis for Application of Competency-Based Training in South Africa University of Limpopo, South Africa. *The Business and Management Review* 6(5), 90–100. Retrieved from https://ijhem.com/cdn/article_file/i-4_c-34.pdf
- Nefas, S., Valickas, A., & Pilkauskaitė-Valickienė, R. (2015). Capacity Building of Parliamentarians: Problems and Perspectives in Lithuania. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 191, 402-406. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.04.272>
- Preskill, H., & Boyle, S. (2008). A Multidisciplinary Model of Evaluation Capacity Building. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 29(4), 443-459. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1098214008324182>
- Ruiz-Rivera, N., & Melgarejo-Rodríguez, C. R. (2017). Political inequality and local government capacity for Disaster Risk Reduction: Evidence from Mexico. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*, 24, 38-45. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdrr.2017.05.024>
- Saputra, E., Muhammad, S., Sun, H., Ang, H.-M., Tadé, M. O., & Wang, S. (2013). Manganese oxides at different oxidation states for heterogeneous activation of peroxydisulfate for phenol degradation in aqueous solutions. *Applied Catalysis B: Environmental*, 142-143, 729-735. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apcatb.2013.06.004>
- Service, C., and Americorps State. (2012a). National Performance Measures Instructions (Goal 3 Capacity Building Measures). *Corporation for National & Community Service*.
- Service, C., and Americorps State. (2012b). National Performance Measures Instructions (Goal 3 Capacity Building Measures). *Corporation for National & Community Service*.
- Ta'i, B. (2000). Challenges of local government capacity building initiatives: experiences of an UNDP nationally executed programme in Thailand. *Habitat International*, 24(4), 403-416. doi:[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0197-3975\(00\)00006-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0197-3975(00)00006-0)
- UNDP. (2010). Capacity Development: Measuring Capacity. Capacity Development Group, Bureau for Development Policy. NY.
- Vincent, C., & Stephen, C. (2015). Local Government Capacity Building and Development: Lessons, Challenges and Opportunities. *Journal of Political Sciences & Public Af*, 3(1), 1-5. doi:<https://doi.org/10.4172/2332-0761.1000149>
- Yazbak, M. F. K. (2012). Building Capacity to Measure and Manage Performance. Retrieved from <https://www.nonprofitmaine.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/03>