



## IMPLEMENTATION OF ILLEGAL PARKING HANDLING POLICIES IN JAYAPURA CITY

Corry Yapen<sup>1</sup>, Yoshepine Ohoiwutun<sup>2</sup>, Nur Aeda<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Master of Public Policy, Cenderawasih University, Indonesia

<sup>2</sup> Master of Public Policy, Cenderawasih University, Indonesia

<sup>3</sup> Master of Public Policy, Cenderawasih University, Indonesia

Email: [cori.yapen@gil.com](mailto:cori.yapen@gil.com), [yossi\\_ohoiwutun@yahoo.co.id](mailto:yossi_ohoiwutun@yahoo.co.id), [nuraedah\\_2403@yahoo.com](mailto:nuraedah_2403@yahoo.com)

E-ISSN : 3109-9777

Received: April 2026

Accepted: April 2026

Published: April 2026

### Abstract :

*This study aims to analyze the implementation of illegal parking management policies in Jayapura City and its impact on Regional Original Revenue (PAD). The main problem lies in the increasing number of vehicles that are not balanced with the availability of parking facilities, thus triggering illegal parking practices and regional levy leakage. This study uses a descriptive qualitative approach with data collection techniques through interviews, observations, and documentation. The analysis was conducted using the perspective of George C. Edward III's policy implementation theory and Michael Lipsky's street-level bureaucracy concept. The results of the study show that policy implementation has not been optimal. From Edward III's perspective, weaknesses can be seen in ineffective communication aspects, limited resources, weak implementation dispositions, and bureaucratic structures that are not synergistic. Meanwhile, Lipsky's perspective shows that the high use of discretion by field officials is a mechanism for adapting to limitations, but it also causes inconsistencies, legal uncertainties, and potential injustices. In addition, the practice of prioritization, simplification of tasks, and a compromising approach in interactions with the community widens the gap between formal policies and practices in the field. Therefore, it is necessary to strengthen institutional capacity, improve coordination between agencies, and prepare clear operational guidelines to balance flexibility and standardization. Thus, policy implementation is expected to be more effective, accountable, and able to increase contributions to PAD.*

**Keywords:** Policy implementation, Illegal parking, Street-level Bureaucracy, Discretion, PAD

### INTRODUCTION

Urban transportation is one of the important aspects in supporting community mobility, economic activities, and the effectiveness of public services in urban areas. In the transportation system, parking management has a strategic role because it is directly related to the use of street space, smooth traffic, and contribution to Regional Original Revenue (PAD). Parking that is managed in an orderly manner can increase the efficiency of the transportation system, reduce conflicts in the use of public space, and become a source of regional revenue through levies. On the other hand, suboptimal parking management has the potential to cause congestion, traffic irregularities, and leakage of regional revenue as stated by Tamin (2000).

Specifically, Jayapura City as the capital of Papua Province is a center of government, trade, and services that has a high level of community mobility.



The growth of economic activity in this region has had an impact on a significant increase in the number of motor vehicles in recent years. Data from the Central Statistics Agency shows that the number of vehicles in Jayapura City increased from around 272,000 units in 2020 to around 313,000 units in 2024. This increase reflects the increasing pressure on road capacity and the availability of parking facilities in urban areas.

However, the increase in the number of vehicles is not balanced by the provision of adequate parking facilities. The limited parking space, especially in strategic areas such as trade centers, offices, and markets, triggers the emergence of illegal parking practices that utilize road bodies and sidewalks. This phenomenon can be found on various main roads such as Jalan Ahmad Yani, Jalan Sam Ratulangi, Entrop, Abepura, and Hamadi areas. The existence of illegal parking causes the narrowing of the road body, disrupts the smooth flow of traffic, and increases the potential for congestion. In addition, illegal parking is generally managed by unofficial parking attendants who are not registered in the local government system, so they do not contribute to the receipt of parking levies.

Normatively, local governments have established regulations related to parking management, including regional regulations regarding parking levies on public roadsides and operational standards for illegal parking control procedures. This policy should be able to create an orderly parking system and increase PAD. However, in practice, the implementation of the policy has not been optimal. This can be seen from the still rampant illegal parking and ineffective supervision in the field. In addition, the achievement of parking levy revenue also shows that there is a gap between the target and the realization. In 2022, the target of IDR 3.5 billion was only realized at around IDR 2.4 billion, while in 2023 the target of IDR 4 billion was only achieved at around IDR 2.9 billion. In fact, estimates show that there are around 80 illegal parking points with potential revenues of up to IDR 8.7 billion per year, much larger than the official revenue which only ranges from IDR 1.6 to IDR 2.2 billion. This condition indicates a significant PAD leak.

These problems show that there is a gap between ideal conditions and the reality of policy implementation in the field. Ideally, parking management policies should be able to create order, improve traffic flow, and optimize regional revenue. However, in reality, weak supervision, limited resources, and low compliance of implementers and the community cause policies to not run effectively. From the perspective of policy implementation theory, this condition can be analyzed through George C. Edward III's approach which emphasizes four main factors for successful implementation, namely communication, resources, disposition, and bureaucratic structure. Meanwhile, Michael Lipsky through the concept of street-level bureaucracy emphasizes the importance of the role of field actors in determining the effectiveness of policies through their discretion.

Although various studies have examined parking problems and the implementation of public policies, most of them still focus on the technical

aspects of parking management or policy evaluation in general. Studies that specifically relate the implementation of illegal parking management policies to PAD leaks and the role of field actors in the context of Jayapura City are still relatively limited. Thus, there are research gaps that need to be filled through a more comprehensive policy implementation approach. Therefore, this research is important to be conducted to understand in depth how the implementation of illegal parking management policies in Jayapura City takes place, as well as the factors that affect its success. This research is expected to make a theoretical contribution to the development of public policy implementation studies as well as practical contributions for local governments in improving the effectiveness of parking management and PAD optimization.

Based on this description, this study aims to analyze the implementation of illegal parking management policies in Jayapura City using the perspective of policy implementation theory, especially in identifying factors that affect the effectiveness of policies and their impact on regional revenues.

## **RESEARCH METHODS**

This study uses a descriptive qualitative approach to deeply understand the interaction of actors in handling illegal parking in Jayapura City. The focus of the research is on the implementation of parking levy policies in improving PAD, with reference to aspects of communication, resources, disposition, and bureaucratic structure as well as the role of field actors. The location of the study is in areas prone to illegal parking. Informants were selected purposively from the government, parking attendants, and the community. Data were collected through interviews, observations, and documentation, then analyzed with interactive models. The validity of the data was ensured through triangulation, member check, and sufficiency of references.

## **LITERATURE REVIEW**

This research is built on the theory of policy implementation between George C. Edward III and Michael Lipsky, which is compiled into five main points that are integrated with each other, namely differences in levels of analysis, implementation approaches, focus of studies, key determinants of success, and nature of policy implementation. These five points not only show the differences in the characteristics of the two theories, but also affirm how they can be used in a complementary manner to understand the complexity of policy implementation, especially in the context of handling illegal parking in Jayapura City.

### **1. Level of analysis**

Edward III and Lipsky's theories are on two distinct but interrelated levels. Edward III operates at a structural or organizational level, where policy implementation is seen as a process that takes place within a bureaucratic system. The focus of the analysis is directed at how government organizations

manage policies through structured administrative mechanisms. In this case, implementation is understood as an institutional effort to translate policies into operational programs and activities. Instead, Lipsky places implementation at the operational or field level, where policies are realized through direct interaction between policy implementers and society. At this level, implementation is no longer abstract or normative, but becomes a real practice influenced by empirical conditions on the ground. Thus, these differences in levels of analysis suggest that policy implementation does not only occur in the bureaucratic space, but also in the social space in which policies are implemented.

## 2. Approach Aspects

From the aspect of the approach, George Edward III uses a top-down approach that emphasizes the importance of policy design and bureaucratic control in determining the success of implementation. In this approach, policies are considered as instruments formulated by policymakers and then executed by bureaucratic apparatus in accordance with established rules. Successful implementation depends largely on the extent to which the policy can be communicated, supported by adequate resources, and executed in an effective organizational structure. In contrast, Lipsky uses a bottom-up approach that places policy implementers at the field level as the main actors in determining policy outcomes. In this approach, implementation is not seen as a linear process from top to bottom, but as a process that involves interpretation, negotiation, and adjustment by implementers on the ground. Thus, this approach emphasizes that policies are not only "derived", but also "reshaped" in everyday practice.

## 3. Study Focus

Edward III emphasized the bureaucratic system as the main factor in policy implementation. This focus includes aspects of policy communication, resource availability, disposition or attitude of implementers, and the bureaucratic structure that governs policy implementation. In this framework, implementation is understood as a process that is highly dependent on the effectiveness of organizational management. Meanwhile, Lipsky focuses more on the behavior of actors at the field level, especially how they respond to situational pressures, limited resources, and community demands. This focus highlights that policy implementers are not just passive implementers, but active actors who have a role in shaping policy outcomes. This difference in focus shows that policy implementation is not only influenced by the formal system, but also by the behavioral dynamics of individuals involved in policy implementation.

## 4. Successful Implementation

The main determinant of successful implementation, Edward III emphasized institutional capacity as a key factor. Successful implementation is determined by the extent to which the organization is able to provide sufficient resources, establish effective communication, maintain implementation commitments, and create a supportive bureaucratic structure. In this

perspective, implementation failures are often caused by weaknesses in the organization's internal systems, such as lack of coordination or limited resources. On the other hand, Lipsky emphasizes that successful implementation is greatly influenced by the discretion of implementers at the field level. This discretion is the space of freedom that implementers have to make decisions in situations that are not fully governed by formal policies. Discretion can be a positive factor when used to adapt policies to real-world conditions, but it can also be a source of problems when used inappropriately. Therefore, in Lipsky's perspective, successful implementation is highly dependent on how policy implementers use discretion in practice.

#### 5. Nature of Implementation

In terms of the nature of implementation, Edward III sees implementation as a formal, structured, and controllable process through organizational mechanisms. Implementation in this perspective tends to follow established procedures and relies on compliance with rules as the basis for policy implementation. In contrast, Lipsky sees implementation as an adaptive, contextual, and dynamic process. In this perspective, implementation does not always proceed according to formal procedures, but adjusts to often complex and unpredictable field conditions. This adaptive nature suggests that policy implementation cannot be completely controlled by a formal system, but is influenced by social interactions and empirical conditions faced by policy implementers.

The five grouping points show that Edward III and Lipsky's theories have fundamental differences, but at the same time they complement each other in explaining policy implementation. Edward III provides an understanding of how policies should be implemented through an effective bureaucratic system, while Lipsky explains how they are actually implemented in practice by implementers on the ground. By combining these two perspectives, policy implementation can be understood more comprehensively, not only as an administrative process, but also as a social process that involves interaction between actors and adaptation to real conditions.

In the context of handling illegal parking, this grouping is very relevant because the problems that occur reflect the gap between policy design and practice in the field. From a structural perspective, weaknesses can be seen in the aspects of policy communication, resource limitations, and coordination between agencies. Meanwhile, from the operational side, practices in the field show the use of discretion by policy implementers that are not always in line with policy objectives. Therefore, understanding policy implementation through these five grouping points allows research to analyze in more depth the factors that influence the success or failure of policies.

The grouping of Edward III and Lipsky's theories in these five main points provides a systematic and comprehensive analytical framework for examining policy implementation. This approach not only helps to identify the factors that influence implementation, but also explains the relationship between these factors in shaping policy dynamics on the ground. Ultimately, the integration of

these two theories confirms that policy implementation is a complex process, requiring a balance between structural order and operational flexibility in order for policies to achieve their intended goals.

#### 6. The Gap between Policy Design and Field Practice in Urban Parking Management

Several academic records regarding policy implementation and parking management show a relatively uniform pattern of problems, namely the implementation of policies in the field has not been optimal. The study of Riyanto et al. (2024) in Cirebon City found that the control of illegal parking is still constrained by limited human resources, weak supervision, and low community compliance. A similar finding was put forward by Yuliana et al. (2025) in Palembang City which highlighted the existence of obstacles not only from the technical aspects of the policy, but also from the socio-economic factors of the community. Research by Tamma et al. (2025) in West Bandung Regency also emphasized that weak coordination between agencies and limited resources are the causes of the high practice of informal parking.

In addition, Rahman (2023) in Tasikmalaya City shows that the implementation of ineffective parking policies has an impact on not achieving the levy target, thus having direct implications for Regional Original Revenue (PAD). This is strengthened by Arma and Syahfitri (2023) in Medan City who found that limited facilities, the number of apparatus, and low public awareness are the main inhibiting factors. On the other hand, Sari and Nugroho (2022) in the city of Surabaya emphasize the importance of innovation and the use of technology in increasing the effectiveness of parking management. Meanwhile, Putra and Handayani (2022) in Yogyakarta City show that the success of policies is greatly influenced by coordination between actors and community participation. Primary research (2021) in Makassar City highlighted structural factors in the form of limited parking spaces as triggers for the emergence of illegal parking, while Widodo and Kurniawan (2021) in Semarang City and Hidayat (2020) in Jakarta emphasized that weak supervision and regulatory support are the main obstacles to the implementation of parking policies.

In general, these studies show that the problems of implementing parking policies are influenced by institutional factors, limited resources, weak supervision, and low community compliance. However, most of the studies still focus on technical and administrative aspects, and have not studied the role of implementing actors at the field level. In addition, studies that link the implementation of parking policies with PAD optimization are still limited, and research in Eastern Indonesia such as Jayapura City is still rare.

Based on these conditions, the state-of-the-art of this research lies in an integrative approach that combines the perspectives of George C. Edward III, and Michael Lipsky to comprehensively analyze policy implementation. This study not only examines institutional aspects, but also the context of implementation and the behavior of actors in the field, and relates it to the optimization of parking levy receipts as part of the PAD. Thus, this research

makes a new contribution in enriching the study of public policy implementation, especially in the context of handling illegal parking in the Eastern Indonesia region.

## **FINDING AND DISCUSSION**

The implementation of the policy on handling illegal parking in Jayapura City shows complex dynamics, especially when analyzed through the theoretical framework of George C. Edward III's policy implementation theory and the street-level bureaucracy perspective of Michael Lipsky. In general, policy implementation is not only influenced by the design of the policy itself, but also by the quality of interaction between actors, limited resources, and the ability of implementers to interpret and adapt policies to the reality on the ground. The record of the implementation of the illegal parking policy in Jayapura City captured through implementation theory according to George Edward III and Lipsky shows very complex dynamics.

### **1. Communication Aspects**

In the aspect of policy communication, the findings show that the process of formally conveying information has been carried out through various channels, such as internal coordination, socialization to the community, and the use of conventional information media. In Edward III's perspective, this indicates that the transmission dimension has been met. However, the effectiveness of communication is still limited due to the weak clarity of the messages received by the community. Many parking service users do not fully understand the applicable rules, including official parking locations and the amount of tariffs. This condition reflects the gap between the message conveyed and understood, so that communication has not resulted in uniformity of perception. In addition, inconsistency of communication between agencies shows weak horizontal coordination, which has an impact on differences in interpretation and actions in the field. Communication patterns that tend to be one-way also reinforce low public participation, resulting in weak compliance with policies. In the context of Lipsky, this weak communication also encourages the emergence of executive discretion, especially in determining tariffs and enforcing rules, which has implications for potential leakage of regional levies.

### **2. From the resource side**

Limited capacity is the main obstacle in policy implementation. The number of personnel that is not proportional to the area of supervision causes parking control to not run optimally. In addition, the availability of facilities such as uneven signs and markings causes ambiguity in understanding the rules in the field. Technological limitations also show that parking management is still manual, making it difficult to carry out systematic and transparent supervision. In the framework of Edward III, this condition confirms that resources are a crucial factor that determines the success of implementation. Meanwhile, in Lipsky's perspective, these limitations encourage implementers to prioritize and simplify tasks, which ultimately leads to selective and uneven

policy implementation. As a result, the potential regional revenue from the parking sector cannot be optimally optimized.

### **3. Aspects of the executor's disposition**

Normatively, there is a commitment from the apparatus to carry out their duties, but in practice there are still inconsistencies and indecisiveness in the enforcement of rules. Social pressure, public resistance, and complex field conditions encourage implementers to take a more compromising approach. In addition, the existence of permissive attitudes towards violations shows that informal norms are beginning to replace formal rules as a reference for behavior. In some cases, the low integrity of implementers is also a serious inhibiting factor, as it opens up space for deviations. In Edward III's perspective, this shows the weak disposition of implementers, while in Lipsky's framework, the phenomenon can be understood as a consequence of the work pressure and system limitations faced by field bureaucrats.

### **4. On the aspect of bureaucratic structure**

Formally, there has been a clear division of duties between agencies, but its effectiveness is still constrained by weak coordination and synergy. The implementation of incidental control shows that the work mechanism has not been systematically institutionalized. In addition, the overlap of authority and inconsistency in the implementation of SOPs shows that there is a gap between formal rules and practices in the field. From the perspective of policy implementation, this condition reflects the implementation gap that hinders the achievement of policy objectives optimally. Weak bureaucratic structures also have an impact on low accountability and declining public trust in the government.

Analysis based on the perspective of street-level bureaucracy shows that discretion is a crucial element in policy implementation at the field level. Discretion allows officials to adapt decisions to real conditions that are often not fully covered by formal rules. In situations of limited resources, work pressure, and social complexity, policymakers tend to use subjective considerations to determine the most rational and contextual actions. However, the use of high discretion also has the potential to cause inconsistencies in the application of rules, legal uncertainty, and differences in treatment of the community, so it needs to be balanced with clear operational guidelines and effective oversight mechanisms.

#### **a. Discretion**

Field officials from various agencies, such as the Transportation Service, Satpol PP, Bapenda, and the Police, actively use discretion to adjust policies to real conditions. This discretion can be seen in the form of location prioritization, persuasive approaches, and selective law enforcement. In Lipsky's framework, this practice is a form of coping mechanism to deal with limited resources and work pressure. However, the use of high discretion also has consequences in the form of inconsistencies, legal uncertainty, and potential injustice in law enforcement.

#### **b. Limited Resources, Routines and Task Simplification (Routinization)**

Resource constraints further reinforce adaptive and selective implementation patterns. Authorities are unable to reach all areas, so the focus is directed to points that are considered priorities. This creates a "tolerance zone" for violations in specific locations, which indirectly weakens the effectiveness of the policy. In addition, a simplified work routine through prioritization and risk mitigation shows that policies are not implemented comprehensively, but rather tailored to the available capacity. In this case, policies are reinterpreted at the field level, so implementation practices are not always in line with the initial design.

c. Direct Interaction between Apparatus and the Community

Direct interaction between the authorities and the community also shows that policy implementation takes place in a complex social arena. Negotiation, compromise, and tolerance are part of the implementation process, especially in the face of economic and social pressure from the community. In this situation, the apparatus not only plays the role of law enforcer, but also as a social mediator who must maintain a balance between legal compliance and social stability. However, the dominance of a compromising approach has the potential to reduce the legitimacy of policies, as rules are considered negotiable.

d. Multidimensional Work Pressure

The demands for increasing PAD, the need to maintain order, and public expectations further complicate the implementation process. Officials must make decisions in dilemma-filled conditions, so a pragmatic approach is the first choice. While this approach helps maintain social stability, it also creates a gap between formal policy and empirical practice.

Overall, the effectiveness of the implementation of the parking policy in Jayapura City has not been optimal. Weaknesses in communication, limited resources, weak implementation disposition, and lack of effective bureaucratic structure are the main factors that hinder the success of the policy. On the other hand, the characteristics of street-level bureaucracy show that flexibility and discretion are an integral part of policy implementation in the field. Therefore, efforts are needed to balance flexibility and standardization through strengthening institutional capacity, improving coordination, and drafting clear operational guidelines. Thus, parking policies can be implemented more consistently, accountably, and responsive to the social dynamics of the community, while being able to increase their contribution to Regional Original Income.

## **CONCLUSION**

The conclusion of this study shows that the implementation of the illegal parking management policy in Jayapura City has not been running optimally because it is influenced by a combination of structural factors and implementing behavior in the field. From the perspective of George C. Edward III's theory, the main weakness lies in the aspects of communication that is not effective (lack of clarity of information and inconsistency between agencies), limited resources (human resources, facilities, technology, and budget), weak

implementation disposition (indecisiveness, permissive attitude, and inconsistent integrity), and bureaucratic structure that is not synergistic and has not been systematically institutionalized.

Meanwhile, in Michael Lipsky's perspective, policy implementation is greatly influenced by the dynamics of street-level bureaucracy, where discretion is the main mechanism for officials to deal with limitations and work pressures. Discretion, prioritization, and persuasive approaches allow policies to continue to run adaptively, but at the same time create inconsistencies, legal uncertainties, and potential injustices. The practice of simplifying tasks, the emergence of tolerance zones, and the dominance of compromise in interactions with the public further widens the gap between formal policies and practices in the field.

The low effectiveness of policies is not only caused by weak institutional design and capacity, but also by high dependence on executive discretion. Therefore, it is necessary to strengthen communication, resources, institutional coordination, and standardization of the use of discretion so that policy implementation can run more consistently, accountably, and be able to optimize contributions to Regional Original Revenue.

### **Recommendations**

- a. Strengthening the capacity and policy implementation system, local governments need to improve the quality of policy communication through clearer, interactive, and sustainable socialization, as well as utilizing digital media. In addition, it is necessary to strengthen resources, both in terms of adding personnel, providing facilities (signs, markings), and implementing technology-based parking systems to increase the effectiveness of supervision and transparency in levy management.
- b. To increase the integrity and professionalism of policy implementers, it is necessary to coach, supervise, and enforce stricter discipline for implementing officials to strengthen disposition, commitment, and integrity. The use of discretion needs to be directed through clear operational guidelines so that it remains adaptive but does not cause deviations, inconsistencies, or injustices in law enforcement.
- c. To strengthen coordination and reform of institutional governance, the government needs to improve coordination across agencies (Dishub, Satpol PP, Police, and Bapenda) through structured, scheduled, and integrated work mechanisms. Affirmation of authority, consistency in the implementation of SOPs, and increased accountability are key to reducing overlapping tasks and closing the gap between formal policies and practices in the field, so that policy implementation is more consistent and has an optimal impact on PAD.

### **BIBLIOGRAPHY**

- Arma, D., & Syahfitri, L. (2023). Analysis of parking management and its contribution to PAD in Medan City. *Journal of Public Economics*, 11(1), 88-102.

- Central Statistics Agency. (2024). Jayapura City transportation statistics 2020–2024. Jayapura: BPS.
- Edward III, G. C. (1980). *Implementing public policy*. Washington, DC: Congressional Quarterly Press.
- Hidayat, R. (2020). Supervision of parking policy in the city of Jakarta. *Journal of Indonesian Public Administration*, 7(1), 15–28.
- Lipsky, M. (1980). *Street-level bureaucracy: Dilemmas of the individual in public services*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Pratama, I. (2021). Limited parking spaces and their impact on illegal parking in Makassar City. *Urban Journal*, 8(1), 33–47.
- Putra, D., & Handayani, R. (2022). The role of actor collaboration in parking policy in Yogyakarta City. *Journal of State Administration*, 10(3), 200–215.
- Rahman, F. (2023). The effectiveness of parking policies on increasing PAD in Tasikmalaya City. *Journal of Regional Finance*, 9(2), 55–70.
- Riyanto, A., et al. (2024). Implementation of illegal parking control policies in Cirebon City. *Journal of Public Administration*, 12(1), 45–60.
- Sari, M., & Nugroho, A. (2022). Technology-based parking management innovation in the city of Surabaya. *Journal of Smart City*, 5(2), 120–134.
- Tamma, R., et al. (2025). Informal parking management in West Bandung Regency. *Journal of Government Science*, 13(1), 77–90.
- Tamin, O. Z. (2000). *Transportation planning and modeling*. Bandung: ITB Press.
- Widodo, S., & Kurniawan, B. (2021). Evaluation of parking policy in Semarang City. *Journal of Public Policy and Management*, 6(2), 90–105.
- Yuliana, S., et al. (2025). Analysis of illegal parking policy in Palembang City. *Journal of Public Policy*, 14(2), 101–115.