IJMR E-ISSN: 3109-9777
INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF MULTIDISCIPLINARY RESEACH

COLLABORATIVE GOVERNANCE: SYNERGY OF ENVIRONMENTAL AGENCY AND BPBD IN FLOOD MITIGATION IN KRIAN DISTRICT

Muslimin [1], Amirul Mustofah [2], Eny Haryati [3], Ika Devy Pramudiana[4]
[1, 2, 3,4]Faculty of Administrative Sciences, Dr. Soetomo University, Surabaya
Email : aminjoss654@gmail.com [1], amirul.mustofa@unitomo.ac.id [2],
eny.haryati@unitomo.ac.id[3], Ika.devy@unitomo.ac.id [4)]

E-ISSN : 3109-9777		
Received: November 2025	Accepted: November 2025	Published: Desember 2025

Abstract :

This research analyzes the synergy between the Environmental Office (DLH) and the Regional Disaster Management Agency (BPBD) in flood mitigation in Krian District, Sidoarjo, through Collaborative Governance. Krian faces annual flood risks due to land-use changes and high sedimentation. Methodologically, this study employs a qualitative descriptive approach with a case study design. Data were collected through in-depth interviews, observation, and documentation, then analyzed using the Miles, Huberman, and Saldana interactive model. The findings indicate that collaboration has successfully transformed inter-institutional relationships into a synergistic ecosystem. Trust-building and data transparency have minimized "sectoral egos," where DLH utilizes BPBD's vulnerability mapping for drainage maintenance. Integrated field actions have achieved "small wins" by reducing inundation duration in public areas. However, systemic hurdles remain, including budgetary rigidity and jurisdictional ambiguity regarding rivers under central government authority. Different organizational paces also create response gaps. The study concludes that this collaboration must transition from ad-hoc agreements to a legalized framework. Recommendations include issuing a Regent Regulation for budget flexibility and creating an integrated real-time dashboard to synchronize preventive flood mitigation actions.

Keywords : *Collaborative Governance, Flood Mitigation, DLH, BPBD, Krian District*

INTRODUCTION

Flood Mitigation Synergy in Krian District The current global climate change phenomenon has had a significant impact on environmental stability, one of which is the increase in the intensity and frequency of hydrometeorological disasters such as floods.(Garvera et al., 2021)Conceptually, handling complex and cross-sectoral public problems can no longer be resolved through a rigid or hierarchical government approach alone.(Agatha & Pradana, 2025)This is where the role of Collaborative Governance becomes crucial. This model is a governance arrangement in which one or more public institutions directly involve non-state stakeholders and inter-state institutions in a collective, formal, and consensus-oriented decision-making process.(Santy & Alam, 2022).

The main objective is to create or implement public policies and manage programs that cannot be completed independently by one agency alone. Krian District, Sidoarjo Regency, is one of the areas that has very rapid development dynamics as a buffer zone for industry and settlements.(Ahad & Barsei,

2023)However, this development has serious consequences in the form of massive land conversion. The reduction in water catchment areas and the overloading of drainage systems have made Krian a hotspot for annual flooding.(Suratman & Darumurti, 2020)Flooding in this region not only paralyzes regional transportation mobility, given its position as a vital intercity connection, but also causes material losses and health problems for the local community. The flooding problem in Krian is not simply a technical issue of water overflow, but rather a manifestation of the complexity of spatial planning.(Agung, 2025), waste disposal behavior, and management of river flows that cross administrative boundaries.

Within the bureaucratic structure, flood management in this region involves two key actors with different but overlapping mandates, namely the Environmental Agency (DLH) and the Regional Disaster Management Agency (BPBD).Utami et al. (2025)The Environmental Agency (DLH) has authority over long-term preventive and structural aspects, such as river cleanliness monitoring, industrial waste management, and green open space maintenance. The Regional Disaster Management Agency (BPBD) holds the reins on risk and emergency management, from mapping vulnerable points and developing contingency plans to evacuations during disasters. Often, effectiveness in the field is hampered by "sectoral egos," where each agency operates within its own bureaucratic boundaries without deep strategic integration.(Prabowo et al., 2024).

The urgency of synergy between the Environmental Agency (DLH) and the Regional Disaster Management Agency (BPBD) within the framework of Collaborative Governance in Krian District lies in the synchronization of work programs. For example, river dredging efforts by the DLH will be less effective without the support of flood-prone areas and an early warning system managed by the BPBD.(Chotimah et al., 2021). Conversely, the BPBD's preparedness in responding to disasters will continue to be burdened if the root causes of flooding, such as sedimentation and piles of garbage upstream, are not resolved sustainably by the DLH. This collaboration requires resource sharing, information transparency, and a shared commitment to move away from conventional work patterns that tend to be reactive to proactive and integrated work patterns. This collaboration must be able to touch on aspects of community participation.(Dewi, 2025).

The synergy between DLH and BPBD is expected to produce policies that can motivate Krian residents to be involved in community-based mitigation, such as the establishment of the Destana Disaster Resilient Village.(Samsuddin et al., 2024). who are also aware of environmental cleanliness(Sabarna & Ramdani, 2025)The success of Collaborative Governance in Krian will depend heavily on the strength of trust established between agencies and the effectiveness of formal and informal communication forums established to monitor environmental conditions in the field in real time.(Natalia et al., 2024)Flood mitigation in Krian District can no longer be viewed as the sole responsibility of one agency. A well-developed policy orchestration is required,

with the Environment Agency (DLH) and the Regional Disaster Management Agency (BPBD) acting as the primary drivers. Through a collaborative governance approach, comprehensive solutions are expected to be created, from upstream improvements to downstream management, to create a more disaster-resilient Krian District with improved environmental quality for future generations.

RESEARCH METHOD

Qualitative research methods are generally a scientific approach used to explore and understand the meanings that individuals or groups ascribe to social or humanitarian issues. In this study, qualitative methods were chosen because the researcher sought to gain an in-depth understanding of the dynamics of relationships, communication barriers, and inter-institutional coordination processes, which are complex and cannot be measured numerically.(Pratama & Mutia, 2020)Through this approach, researchers can capture the reality behind formal policies and observe how actors within the Environmental Agency (DLH) and the Regional Disaster Management Agency (BPBD) interact in real-world settings. Qualitative research allows researchers to be key instruments in collecting context-rich data on flood mitigation synergies, thus answering the questions of "how" and "why" such collaboration works or encounters obstacles in Krian District.

This research uses a qualitative descriptive design with a case study approach to specifically examine the phenomenon of Collaborative Governance in Krian District. The research location was purposively selected in Krian District considering that the area has high flood vulnerability characteristics and involves intensive cross-agency coordination. Data sources in this study consist of primary and secondary data. Primary data were obtained through in-depth interviews with key informants selected using a purposive sampling technique, including the Head of Division or technical staff at the Environmental Agency (DLH) who handles river normalization and waste management, officials at the Sidoarjo Regency Regional Disaster Management Agency (BPBD) who handle prevention and preparedness, and the Krian District as the regional coordinator. In addition to interviews, researchers conducted non-participant observations to directly observe how field coordination is carried out during flooding and to observe the condition of drainage infrastructure at vulnerable points. Secondary data was collected through documentation studies in the form of annual reports, joint Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs), regional regulations related to disaster management, and news archives regarding flooding in Krian District. To ensure the validity of the data, researchers used triangulation techniques, both source triangulation (comparing information from the DLH, BPBD, and the community) and technical triangulation (comparing interview results with official documents and observation results). The data analysis process was carried out inductively following the Miles, Huberman, and Saldana model which consists of three simultaneous stages: data reduction, data presentation

(data display), and drawing conclusions or verification. In the reduction stage, researchers will sort data relevant to Collaborative Governance variables according to Ansell and Gash's theory, such as building trust and shared commitment. Next, the data is presented in the form of a systematic descriptive narrative to illustrate the pattern of synergy between the DLH and BPBD.(Ulinuha & Harsono, 2024)Finally, the researcher will draw conclusions to address the research focus on the effectiveness of collaboration in flood mitigation. Using this method, the research is expected to provide a comprehensive overview of bureaucratic challenges, resource availability, and the success of policy integration in sustainably reducing flood risk in Krian District.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The collaborative process in governance is a dynamic cycle involving continuous interaction between actors to achieve goals that would be impossible to achieve individually. In the context of public services and disaster management, collaboration is not merely formal cooperation, but rather a transformation of relationships from competitive or indifferent to synergistic and interdependent ones.(Noegroho & Arif, 2023)The essence of this process lies in how stakeholders build understanding, agree on rules of the game, and create shared value. Without a structured process, collaboration will remain mere slogans without concrete action. Therefore, clear stages are needed, from face-to-face dialogue to achieving concrete results, to ensure the sustainability of the collaboration.In the case of flood mitigation in Krian District, trust-building was the primary foundation of the relationship between the Environmental Agency (DLH) and the Regional Disaster Management Agency (BPBD). Trust in government collaboration doesn't emerge instantly, but rather is built through a track record of past interactions. In Krian, this trust-building began with an acknowledgement that both agencies have their own limitations.(Pardosi & Bratakusumah, 2024); The Environmental Agency (DLH) requires disaster vulnerability data from the Regional Disaster Management Agency (BPBD), while the BPBD requires technical implementation of channel cleaning from the DLH. This process requires honesty, integrity, and transparency. When both agencies begin to share data on garbage blockages and river water discharge without any cover-ups, mutual trust begins to grow, which then reduces suspicions of budget overlap or competing claims of success. In the collaborative process, commitment to the process is built. In Krian District(Febrina et al., 2021)This commitment is tested when weather anomalies require a rapid response outside of operational hours. Environmental Agency (DLH) officials and BPBD personnel must have a "shared belief" that their participation in this collaboration will produce equitable outcomes. This commitment is manifested in the form of alignment of Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs). For example, when the BPBD declares a flood alert status, the DLH automatically alerts heavy equipment and waste collection vehicles in the Krian area without having to wait for lengthy orders. Disciplined

attendance at regular coordination meetings at the sub-district level is also a strong indicator that this collaboration has become a strategic priority for both institutions, not just an administrative obligation.(Eka et al., 2023).

Creating a shared understanding is a crucial phase in which the Environmental Agency (DLH) and the Regional Disaster Management Agency (BPBD) agree on the problem definition and mitigation mission in Krian. Flooding is often viewed differently: the DLH might see it as a community behavior and waste problem, while the BPBD sees it as a hydrological and risk management issue.(Herni et al., 2024)Through intensive dialogue in a collaborative process, the two agencies finally reached a shared vision that the Krian flood is a multi-dimensional problem that requires upstream and downstream management. This shared understanding is crucial to avoid conflicts of interest in the field and ensure that solutions are comprehensive, such as combining the DLH's "Clean River" program with the BPBD's "Disaster Resilient Village" program. This collaborative process must be able to produce small wins to maintain momentum. In Krian District, the success in reducing the duration of flooding in vulnerable areas such as market areas or protocol roads through integrated inter-agency community service is an example of small wins. These tangible results will strengthen the trust and commitment that has been built. Overall, the synergy in Krian demonstrates that Collaborative Governance is a long journey that requires bureaucratic patience, humble leadership, and a sincere desire to prioritize citizen safety above sectoral egos.(Nurmalita & Permatasari, 2024).

TABLE 1:Results of Primary Data Collection on the Dynamics of Interaction and Commitment between Agencies (DLH & BPBD) in Disaster Management

Informant	Category	Interview Results	Brief Analysis
Head of the Sanitation Division (DLH)	*Trust Building*& Transparency	"We used to work independently, afraid that our budget would be used by other agencies. But now, we use BPBD mapping data as the basis for deploying garbage trucks. There's nothing to hide anymore."	Shows a shift from sectoral ego towards openness of technical data.
Field Coordinator (BPBD)	Commitment & Flexibility	"Heavy rain doesn't respect office hours. When we sent the 'Alert' signal via WhatsApp, our DLH colleagues immediately	Demonstrates a commitment that goes beyond formal administrative

		went to the Krian floodgate without waiting for a physical assignment letter. That was our key."	boundaries.
Head of Krian District	*Shared Understanding*	"Initially, the Environmental Agency (DLH) blamed residents for littering, while the Regional Disaster Management Agency (BPBD) blamed the rainfall. After sitting down together, we agreed that this was a matter of upstream and downstream management."	Signifying the achievement of a shared understanding on the root cause of flooding.
Community Leader (Krian Market)	*Small Wins*(Real Results)	"Usually, when there's a flood, the water can recede in two days. Now, before the afternoon, the market road was already dry because the drains were immediately cleaned together yesterday."	Small wins that increase public confidence in collaboration.
Heavy Equipment Technical Staff	Operational Constraints	"Often the problem is the unexpected availability of heavy equipment fuel in the routine budget, but cross-sector coordination helps to cover that gap tactically."	Demonstrates the existence of creative (ad hoc) solutions in overcoming budget constraints.

(Research Source 2025)

Based on Table 1 it can be concluded thatThe success of flood mitigation is rooted in the transformation of initially rigid inter-agency relationships into a collaborative ecosystem based on trust (trust-building) and transparency. The elimination of sectoral egos between the Environmental Agency (DLH) and the Regional Disaster Management Agency (BPBD) enabled the honest exchange of technical data, where BPBD's vulnerability mapping served as operational guidance for the DLH fleet without concerns about budget overlap. This commitment extends beyond the administrative level, but also manifests in operational flexibility in the field, such as the use of instant digital communication to trigger rapid responses outside of working hours. This demonstrates that the Krian bureaucracy has been able to prioritize public safety above complicated formal procedures, creating a disaster management system that is agile and adaptive to emergency situations.(Velby & Yuadi, 2023).

On the other hand, this collaboration succeeded in creating a shared understanding that changed the agencies' perspective on the root cause of flooding from simply a waste or hydrological issue to a multidimensional,

upstream-downstream issue. This shared vision is crucial to prevent a culture of blame and ensure that cross-sectoral programs, such as "Clean River" and "Disaster Resilient Village," run synchronously. The validity of this collaboration's success is ultimately measured through the achievement of tangible results (small wins) in the field, such as a reduction in the duration of flooding in vital market areas that is directly felt by the community. This tangible success is a strengthening factor for the sustainability of the collaboration, proving that synergy based on humble leadership and a sincere desire to serve can produce comprehensive solutions that cannot be achieved by one agency alone .

However Resource sharing is a key pillar of collaborative governance, referring to the mutual mobilization and integration of assets, both tangible and intangible, among the actors involved. In the public sector, no single organization possesses the complete resources to solve complex problems independently.(Mahendra et al., 2024). Therefore, collaboration is an important mechanism to close these gaps through the exchange of budgets, personnel, data, technical expertise, and infrastructure. The effectiveness of a synergy depends heavily on the willingness of each agency to share the burden and benefits to achieve collective goals that are greater than the goals of individual organizations. In the context of flood mitigation in Krian District, the distribution of resources between the Environmental Agency (DLH) and the BPBD is manifested in the combination of operational strengths. DLH has advantages in physical resources in the form of heavy equipment (excavators), a fleet of garbage trucks, and cleaning personnel who understand the anatomy of drainage channels.(Hidayanti & Efendi, 2020). On the other hand, the Regional Disaster Management Agency (BPBD) has a wealth of information resources in the form of disaster risk maps, hydrological data, and a network of volunteers (such as DESTANA) spread across villages in Krian District. Synergy occurs when BPBD provides real-time information on water overflow points, which are then responded to by the Environmental Agency (DLH) by deploying equipment to clear garbage blockages. This exchange creates regional budget efficiency, as the government does not need to procure the same equipment from two different agencies, but can instead optimize the use of existing equipment through an integrated coordination system.

This resource-sharing process often encounters systemic institutional barriers. Key challenges include sectoral egos and differing operational legal frameworks. While officers in the field are eager to assist each other, budgetary regulations are often highly rigid. For example, BPBD personnel may be prohibited from using their budget to fuel heavy equipment owned by the Environmental Agency (DLH) due to differences in budget allocations. The lack of a legal framework or shared Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) specific to the Krian region means that resource-sharing often relies on the discretion or generosity of agency leaders, rather than a consistent system. Beyond budgetary constraints, overlapping authority also presents a significant institutional barrier. Several major rivers flowing through Krian District are

under the authority of the Central River Basin Agency (BBWS), a central government agency. This creates a dilemma for the DLH and the Regency BPBD; if they undertake large-scale normalization, they risk violating regulations governing their work areas and the use of grant/regional funds. These obstacles often cause collaboration to stall at the coordination level without being able to move on to the in-depth technical execution stage in the main river areas, so that the flood problem is never completely resolved to its roots. Another obstacle is the difference in organizational culture.(Hafni et al., 2024)The Regional Disaster Management Agency (BPBD) has a paramilitary, rapid, and emergency-response work culture, while the Environmental Agency (DLH) has a more administrative and planned, routine bureaucratic work rhythm. This difference in rhythm often creates friction in the collaborative process in Krian, particularly in determining work priorities in the field. Without strong facility leadership to bridge these differences, resource allocation will remain superficial. Therefore, a more flexible institutional design is needed, such as the establishment of a cross-agency Task Force (Satgas) with specific authority in Krian's flood-prone areas, to minimize bureaucratic obstacles and maximize the potential resources of each agency.

TABLE 2 :Identification of Resource Mobilization Dynamics and Structural Barriers in Collaborative Governance of Flood Mitigation in Krian District

Informant	Sub-Theme	Interview Results	Barrier/Opportunity Analysis
Excavator Operator (DLH)	Physical Asset Mobilization	"We know which points are blocked from BPBD data, but sometimes we hesitate to act if the river is in the central area (BBWS). We're afraid of breaking the rules."	**Obstacle:**Unclear boundaries of work area authority (jurisdiction).
Expenditure Treasurer (BPBD)	Budget Rigidity	"Technically, we need DLH equipment, but I can't issue fuel invoices for their equipment. It's difficult to account for them to the Supreme Audit Agency (BPK) because the account codes are different."	**Obstacle:**Rigidity of the regional budgeting system (Budgetary Barriers).
DESTANA Krian Volunteers	Human Resources	"We have people in each village who report water levels via radio, but sometimes the response is heavy equipment from the old district	**Obstacle:**Differences in organizational culture (speed vs. administration).

		because the correspondence procedures still use the usual office style."	
Head of Drainage Section (DLH)	Data Integration	"The disaster risk map from the Regional Disaster Management Agency (BPBD) is our lifeblood. Without it, we would just be doing routine cleanup without knowing which priorities pose the greatest threat to our settlements."	**Opportunity:**Utilization of information assets (intangible assets) for work efficiency.
BBWS Representative (Central)	Vertical Coordination	"We're open to collaboration, but local governments often don't formally notify us before taking action in our river basin. This is a matter of standard procedures."	**Obstacle:**Lack of formal communication in vertical coordination.

(Research Source 2025)

Based on Table 2, it can be concluded that flood mitigation collaboration currently stands at a crossroads between promising technical efficiencies and systemic structural barriers. The success of this collaboration depends heavily on the actors' ability to integrate tangible assets such as heavy equipment and field personnel with intangible assets such as hydrological data and disaster risk maps. Findings from the Head of the Drainage Section of the Environmental Agency (DLH) confirm that data integration is the operational lifeblood, transforming routine work patterns into priority-based, precise actions. However, this enormous potential is often hampered by the thick wall of budget rigidity and fragmented authority. The issue of financial accountability raised by the BPBD Treasurer reveals a paradox in governance, where rigid budgeting administration rules actually become a major obstacle to fieldwork efficiency, such as the difficulty of financing fuel across agencies, which leads to delays in execution. This condition is exacerbated by unclear jurisdictional boundaries between local and central governments (BBWS), which creates hesitation for operators in the field to carry out river normalization for fear of violating normative regulations. In addition to legal-formal obstacles, differences in organizational culture between the emergency response BPBD and the administrative-procedural DLH created a "time gap" in responding to reports from DESTANA volunteers, showing that physical collaboration alone is not enough without aligning the bureaucratic work rhythm.(Maksin et al., 2025). Therefore, the major conclusion from the Krian

phenomenon is that resource sharing in flood mitigation will not reach its optimal point as long as collaboration is only ad-hoc and relies on personal relationships. A breakthrough is needed in the form of an institutional design with a strong legal umbrella, such as a Regent's Regulation or joint SOP that can legalize budget flexibility and clarify the division of roles in river basins across authorities. Without synchronization between collaborative intentions on the ground and the support of an adaptive bureaucratic system, resource distribution in Krian will continue to be trapped in a cycle of administrative procedures that hinder the speed of disaster management. Therefore, the transformation from sectoral egos to integrated public interests remains a major challenge that requires transformative leadership and courage in exercising discretion for the safety of citizens.(Nurhayati & Rahman, 2023).

CONCLUSION

The collaborative governance practices between the Environmental Agency (DLH) and the Regional Disaster Management Agency (BPBD) in Krian District represent a fundamental transformation in local governance, shifting from a rigid sectoral work pattern to a synergistic ecosystem. The success of this synergy is rooted in a robust trust-building process, where both agencies began to shed sectoral egos through transparency of technical data. The DLH utilizes disaster vulnerability data from the BPBD as its operational basis, while the BPBD relies on the DLH's technical execution in clearing drainage channels. This commitment is tested through a rapid response outside of business hours supported by flexible digital communication, prioritizing public safety over cumbersome bureaucratic procedures. Furthermore, a shared understanding shifts the perspective on flooding from simply a waste or hydrological issue to a multidimensional problem requiring integrated upstream and downstream management. However, this collaboration remains at a crossroads between technical efficiency and systemic structural barriers. Although resource sharing has been implemented in terms of data and personnel, significant obstacles remain in the form of regional budget rigidity that complicates cross-agency financing, such as accountability for heavy equipment *fuel* costs. Jurisdictional barriers also arise when handling large rivers under the authority of the central government (BBWS), which often leads to doubts about implementation in the field due to a lack of synchronization of normative regulations. The difference in organizational culture between the "emergency response" rhythm of the BPBD and the "administrative-routine" rhythm of the DLH also continues to create a time gap in responding quickly to public reports. Overall, the synergy in Krian demonstrates that collaboration cannot rely solely on ad-hoc personal relationships. Strengthening institutional design is needed through a permanent legal umbrella, such as a Regent Regulation or Joint SOP, to legalize budget flexibility and clarify the division of roles across authorities. The achievement of tangible results (small wins), such as reducing the duration of inundation in vital areas, is evidence that integrative and humble leadership can produce comprehensive solutions to create a disaster-resilient community.

REFERENCES

Abdillah, IM, Baharuddi, M., & Tjenreng, Z. (2025). COLLABORATIVE GOVERNANCE IN THE MANAGEMENT OF NATIONAL STRATEGIC OUTER ISLANDS TO SUPPORT MARITIME DEFENSE. Moderat: Scientific Journal of Government Science, 11(2), 10–20.

Agatha, RS, & Pradana, GW (2025). Collaborative Governance in Efforts to Improve Drinking Water Services (Study on PDAM Surabaya City and PT Sarana Multi Infrastruktur). Journal of Law, Public and State Administration, 2(4), 185–198.

Agung, MFM (2025). COLLABORATIVE GOVERNANCE STRATEGY IN PUBLIC SERVICE REFORM. IJPA The Indonesian Journal of Public Administration, 11(1), 18–26.

Agustina, FY, & Pradana, GW (2024). Collaborative Governance in the Development of Study Programs Outside the Main Campus of Surabaya State University in Magetan Regency. Publika., 11(3), 2107–2122.

Ahad, MPY, & Barsei, AN (2023). COLLABORATIVE GOVERNANCE ELECTRONIC-BASED GOVERNMENT SYSTEM: BEST PRACTICE FROM REGIONAL GOVERNMENT IN EAST INDONESIA1. JOURNAL OF ADMINISTRATIVE TRANSFORMATION , 13(1), 52–74.

Almira, AI, & Prathama, A. (2023). Collaborative Governance in the Development of Corn Areas Based on Farmer Corporations in Tuban Regency. Journal of Governance and Local Politics (JGLP), 5(1), 59–66.

Chotimah, HC, Iswardhana, MR, & Rizky, L. (2021). Collaborative Governance Model in Marine Plastic Waste Management to Achieve Maritime Environmental Resilience in the Seribu Islands. JOURNAL OF NATIONAL RESILIENCE, 27(3), 348–376.

Damenta, U.A., & Digdowiseiso, K. (2023). Collaborative Governance Oversight in Corruption Prevention Efforts in Indonesia. Journal of Governance, 8(3), 1–10.

Dewi, NLY (2025). DYNAMICS OF COLLABORATIVE GOVERNANCE IN PUBLIC POLICY STUDIES. Jurnal Ilmiah Dinamika Sosial, 3(2), 200–210.

Eka, N., Setiawandari, P., & Kriswibowo, A. (2023). COLLABORATIVE GOVERNANCE IN WASTE MANAGEMENT. Journal of Public Policy, 14(2), 149–155.

Febrina, R., Amin, RM, Isril, & Ishak. (2021). Collaborative Governance in Recognizing Customary Law Communities and Customary Communal Land Rights in Kampar Regency. Journal of Governance and Public Policy, 8(2), 124–139.

Garvera, RR, Arifin, FS, & Fazrilah, AN (2021). COLLABORATIVE GOVERNANCE IN REALIZED INDEPENDENT VILLAGES. Dinamika: Scientific Journal of Public Administration, 8(3), 502–513.

Hafni, N., Candrasari, R., & Hasyem, M. (2024). Collaborative Governance in the Implementation of Aceh Qanun Number 8 of 2018 concerning Facilitation of Narcotics Abuse Prevention. Journal of Public Transparency (JTP), 4(1), 6–13.

Herni, H., Tahir, N., & Arfah, SR (2024). Collaborative Governance: Building Joint Solutions to Overcome Stunting. Kolaborasi: Jurnal Administrasi Publik, 10(1), 1–20.

Hidayanti, DR, & Efendi, D. (2020). Collaborative Governance Practices in Waste Management. Journal of Government and Policy (JPK), 2(1), 34–40.

Mahendra, DG, Fauzi, LM, & Sukmapriyandhika, D. (2024). COLLABORATIVE GOVERNANCE BETWEEN REGIONAL GOVERNMENTS AND SATKOWIL IN ACHIEVING FOOD SECURITY IN MIMIKA REGENCY. PRINCIPLE JOURNAL, 1(1), 236–253.

Maksin, M., Septiandika, V., & Yunus, EY (2025). The Role of Collaborative Governance in Increasing the Effectiveness of Poverty Alleviation in Probolinggo City. JIAN: Journal of Public Administration, 22(1), 57–63.

Musaad, M. (2021). Implementation of Collaborative Governance in Public Policy Handling COVID-19. International Journal of Science and Society, 3(4), 227–235.

Natalia, NG, Muradi, & Kartini, DS (2024). Collaborative Governance in the Utilization of Youth and Sports Infrastructure in Bandung City (in Antapani District in 2023). Journal of Law, Humanities and Politics, 4(4), 1042–1051.

Noegroho, ABA, & Arif, L. (2023). COLLABORATIVE GOVERNANCE IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF PUDAK UMKM IN GRESIK DISTRICT, GRESIK REGENCY. Journal Publicuho, 5(4), 1405–1414.

Nurhayati, N., & Rahman, A. (2023). SYSTEMATIC LITERATURE REVIEW: COLLABORATIVE GOVERNANCE IN THE PUBLIC SECTOR. AGGREGATION JOURNAL: Journal of Government Reform Action in Democracy, 11(1), 1–22. https://doi.org/10.34010/agregasi.v11i1.9207

Nurmalita, ND, & Permatasari, A. (2024). Collaborative Governance in the Socio-Economic Empowerment of the Disabled Group at the Bina Siwi Orphanage. JIIP: SCIENTIFIC JOURNAL OF GOVERNMENTAL SCIENCE Vol. 9, 9(2), 20–30. https://doi.org/10.14710/jiip.v9i2.19107

Pardosi, RBT, & Bratakusumah, DS (2024). ANALYSIS OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF COLLABORATIVE GOVERNANCE IN REDUCE STUNTING: SYSTEMATIC LITERATURE REVIEW. IJPA - The Indonesian Journal of Public Administration, 10(2), 228–246.

Prabowo, H., Syafri, W., & Rusfiana, Y. (2024). Collaborative Governance: Instilling Pancasila Values in Formal Education in DKI Jakarta. Journal of Educational Management and Social Sciences, 6(1), 414–425.

Pratama, FF, & Mutia, D. (2020). QUALITATIVE PARADIGM AS A FOUNDATION FOR THINKING IN CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION. CITIZENSHIP JOURNAL, 17(1), 51–64. https://doi.org/10.24114/jk.v17i1.18701

Ramadhan, F., Roekminiati, S., Pramudiana, Ika Devy, & Lestari, DS (2024). Collaborative Governance in Birth Certificate Services (Cooperation Between Airlangga Hospital and Dispendukcapil Surabaya City). Indonesian Higher Education & Intellectuals Community, 138–152.

Sabarna, MAN, & Ramdani, R. (2025). Collaborative governance in waste management: a case study in the municipality of Yogyakarta, Indonesia. Jurnal PUBLISIA, 10(1), 33–45.

Samsuddin, NV, Roekminiati, S., Pramudiana, ID, Pramono, S., Sunarya, A., & Administrasi, FI (2024). EVALUATION OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE VILLAGE ASSESSMENT PROGRAM POLICY IN KEPUKKIRMAN VILLAGE, DISTRICT. 10.

Santy, YJN, & Alam, MDS (2022). Collaborative Governance in Supporting Sustainability of the Local Economy During the COVID-19 Pandemic. AdBispreneur: Journal of Thought and Research on Business Administration and Entrepreneurship, 7(2), 95–107.

Suratman, FN, & Darumurti, A. (2020). Collaborative Governance in the Management of Public Green Open Spaces (RTHP) in Yogyakarta City. Journal of Government and Policy (JPK), 1(3), 102–121.

Ulinuha, S., & Harsono, D. (2024). Collaborative Governance in the Development of Child-Friendly Districts/Cities (KLA) in Sleman Regency, Special Region of Yogyakarta. JOURNAL OF PUBLIC POLICY AND ADMINISTRATION RESEARCH, 2(1), 1–10.

Utami, Y., Mu'minah, S., Jumino, TK, Taqiyya, Z., Nasrudin, A., & Madjid, U. (2025). ANALYSIS OF COLLABORATIVE GOVERNANCE ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF PREVENTION AND ERADICATION OF NARCOTICS ABUSE AND ILLICIT DISTRIBUTION (P4GN) IN DKI JAKARTA PROVINCE. CENDEKIA: Journal of Science, 5(2), 519–534.

Velby, AC, & Yuadi, I. (2023). META-ANALYTICS OF COLLABORATIVE GOVERNANCE IN SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT. J3P, 8(1), 19–41.

Wijayanti, A., & Kasim, A. (2025). Implementation of the National Corruption Prevention Strategy in Indonesia: A Collaborative Governance Perspective. INTEGRITAS: Anti-Corruption Journal, 7(2), 291–310. https://doi.org/10.32697/integritas.v7i2.858