

No. 86

**DEVELOPMENTS IN URBAN ENVIRONMENTAL
PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT IN INDONESIA:
THE SECONDARY CITIES OF SULAWESI**

Adrian Atkinson
January 1998

Working Paper No. 86

**DEVELOPMENTS IN URBAN ENVIRONMENTAL
PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT IN INDONESIA:
THE SECONDARY CITIES OF SULAWESI**

Adrian Atkinson*

January 1998

***Dr Adrian Atkinson
Development Planning Unit
University College London
9 Endsleigh Gardens
London WC1H 0ED**

**Tel: 00 44 171 388 7581 Fax: 00 44 171 387 4541
E.Mail: dpu@ucl.ac.uk**

**DEVELOPMENTS IN URBAN ENVIRONMENTAL
PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT IN INDONESIA:
THE SECONDARY CITIES OF SULAWESI**

CONTENTS

	SUMMARY	1
1	INTRODUCTION	1
2	PREAMBLE	1
3	INDONESIAN GOVERNMENT RESPONSIBILITIES IN UPM	3
4	STATUTORY URBAN PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES	4
5	THE INTEGRATED URBAN INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME	5
6	IUIDP IN SMALL AND MEDIUM CITIES IN SULAWESI	8
7	ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL PROBLEMS OF SMALL AND MEDIUM CITIES IN SULAWESI	9
8	REFOCUSING THE UEPM PROCESS IN INDONESIA	11
	REFERENCES	14
	NOTES	16

DEVELOPMENTS IN URBAN ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT IN INDONESIA: THE SECONDARY CITIES OF SULAWESI

SUMMARY

This article analyses the acclaimed Indonesian "Integrated Urban Infrastructure Development Programme" (IUIDP). The main aim of this programme has been to initiate a process of decentralisation of responsibilities for urban planning and management to the lower levels of government. This article presents the recent case of the IUIDP programme for 18 towns on the island of Sulawesi. It notes that the decentralisation aims of the programme are only being partially addressed. Looking in some detail at the social and environmental problems that persist within these towns, the article suggests steps that can be taken to remedy these via a more thoroughgoing involvement of users in the urban management system.

1 INTRODUCTION

With rapid urbanisation a fact of life in the developing world, in recent years many national initiatives have been taken up, particularly with the support of international and bilateral aid agencies, to improve the quality of urban management in order to ameliorate poor social and environmental conditions in the growing cities. Although urban *environmental* issues cannot really be separated from urban planning and management (UPM) more generally - in the past one of the main intentions of urban planning and management, stated or otherwise, was indeed to improve environmental conditions - nevertheless, in recent years, "environmentalism" has brought new dimensions to the UPM process. This paper aims to discuss the implications of these new dimensions in the context of evolving urban environmental planning and management (UEPM) practice in Indonesia.

The structure of the paper is as follows. A preamble, following this Introduction, considers some general issues of interest regarding the interpretation of the concept of "urban planning and management" in the present context; there has been considerable recent debate on the meaning of "urban management" and its proper relationship with "urban planning" and it is necessary to establish a position in this debate.

The next section of the paper discusses the various components of official mechanisms of urban planning and management in Indonesia and how these have been evolving in recent years. The section which follows looks specifically at the Integrated Urban Infrastructure Development Programme (IUIDP) as representing a major intervention in urban development in Indonesia, with extensive support from international and bilateral aid agencies. This is followed by a discussion of the recently completed IUIDP project concerned with secondary cities and towns on the island of Sulawesi. The final section discusses possible initiatives to refocus the UEPM process in Indonesia in the light of government policies and the new dimensions discussed in the Preamble.

2 PREAMBLE

In recent years there has been a rather muted, but nevertheless ideologically deeply rooted controversy between those who see "environment" as a new but subsidiary dimension of urban planning and management, and those who see it as an altogether new approach to urban - and indeed development - planning and management. There are more or less long traditions of UPM that have their roots in the movements and mechanisms that arose to combat the problems accompanying the urbanisation processes of the industrial world in the 19th century. These went on to develop elaborate theoretical and technical discourses, complex professional procedures and elaborate institutions. Whilst the planning and management of cities in the developing world has, particularly in recent years, adopted procedures adapted more to the specific problematic of these cities, the overall ideology underpinning these initiatives has its roots in the traditions of UPM, and the technocratic, professionalised procedures that characterise these fields in the industrialised countries.

On the other hand, starting already in the early 1980s, but given considerable impetus by processes leading up to and following the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED), with its massive "Agenda 21" laying out a whole new development process

aimed at achieving environmental sustainability, a new focus and approach to UPM has been emerging. Unlike traditional approaches which centre on professional expertise and on technical and management mechanisms, the "environmentalist" approach to UPM starts from a concern on the one hand with environmental and resource issues rather than specific techniques, and on the other hand, in a determination to start the planning and management process from popular consensus and participation rather than out of the presumptions of bureaucratic and professional expertise¹.

The environmentalist perspective, whilst developing rapidly, has not so far made a great impact. Furthermore, it has tended so far to develop as a separate set of initiatives in parallel with "conventional" urban planning and management whilst often overlapping and coming together around certain specific problems and issues. The approach taken to dealing with this in this paper is to review developments generally in the area of UPM in Indonesia, focusing, however, on environmental aspects of this, and then to apply the environmentalist perspective to the developing situation.

Traditionally "planning" and "management" are seen as different functions, with planning encompassing activities that provide a framework (and therefore are prior to) urban management activities. Classically urban planning has meant land use or comprehensive planning wherein the spatial development of cities has been planned and then, in theory, the installation of infrastructure and development of the built environment has followed the plan. In reality - and especially in the cities of developing countries - development and management following the drawing up of land use plans has borne relatively little relation to those plans. The financial planning process has had its own priorities that ended up disregarding land use plans, the private sector was able to push through its own priorities often, even usually, in contradiction to formal plans and, finally, much of the development has been "informal" and hence outside *any* planning framework, being brought into the urban management process only *after* development has taken place.

This reality has been increasingly recognised and more flexible approaches have been taken to planning as an adjunct to urban management, rather than being conceived of as over and above the management process (Stolte, 1990). Urban Planning is seen as a *process* integral to the

management *process*; for instance, the aims of the recent review of the Jabotabek (Jakarta Region) Metropolitan Plan (JMDPR) were stated as being to: "update the Metropolitan Plan for Jabotabek" and "formulate a package of proposals to improve the capacity of DKI Jakarta and the (surrounding) Botabek local authorities *to manage and implement the planning process* throughout the region" (Culpin, 1993).

Whilst the concept of "urban management" has in recent years gained in status (particularly in relation to "planning") it is in itself a rather diffuse term which has been defined in many, quite disparate ways (Devas and Rakodi 1993). Perhaps it is worth noting that in initiating a broad research and development programme for new approaches to urban management - the Urban Management Programme - the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) in conjunction with the World Bank and HABITAT (UNCHS) initially saw this as being composed of three components: municipal finance, urban land management and urban infrastructure provision. Of course these components were treated broadly, with municipal finance encompassing more general administrative questions and land management addressing issues of land use planning.

As the programme progressed, two new themes were added: urban environment and urban poverty alleviation - with the latter potentially opening up the area of urban economic development (which in any case was seen from the outset by the World Bank as an important contextual issue to the whole exercise (Cohen, 1991)). These were immediately interpreted as "cross-cutting issues", rather than components of urban management in themselves, being subjects that should come into consideration in relation to all three of the original components. In practice, however, there has been a tendency in the activities of the UMP to collapse the latter two subjects into separate components.

It might, on the other hand, be argued - and this does in fact become an important issue towards the end of this paper - that environment and poverty alleviation are neither components of urban management nor "cross-cutting issues". The UMP, and the concept of urban planning and management seen conventionally, tends to short-circuit the *reason* why we should want to be planning and managing cities in the first place: there is a propensity to act as if "we know" the problems and the solutions as bureaucrats and professionals and that the job is now to get the

latter applied in an efficient and effective manner. The question of *goals and objectives* and the way in which these are determined, is subsumed into the activities of professionals and bureaucrats and de facto decided long before the *real and actual* urban people and environments have been encountered.

The strategic point is that the inhabitants of cities are looking for a congenial (read: socially harmonious - and hence requiring a reasonable degree of equitability) and pleasant living and working environment. Tactically this is something that the inhabitants themselves are most likely to be able to define, albeit with assistance of (which is not the same as "determined by") people with appropriate technical knowledge. In other words while municipal finance, land and infrastructure might be conceived of as variables with a large component of technique, environment and poverty alleviation are more operational variables involving information and values which inform the strategic decision-making process.

UPM discourse amongst practitioners in recent years has certainly introduced discussion of the need for participatory initiative in urban management and more generally the need for decentralisation of powers and responsibilities with a view to increased responsiveness to dealing with actual local problems (see in particular Cheema (1991)). However, it is not merely the well-known political resistance to power-sharing on the part of the central government which has confounded earlier initiatives aimed at introducing decentralisation and participation to the UPM agenda (Rondinelli et al, 1984; Simon, 1990). Bureaucratic and to a significant degree also professional inertias of the conventional UPM agenda determine that there are always urgent administrative and technical tasks to be dealt with that leave no time to listen to - let alone to start from - the needs of the recipients of urban projects and programmes. We might say that the "culture" of the traditional UPM agenda has actually contributed to the failure to solve the problems of poor urban social and environmental conditions.

3INDONESIAN GOVERNMENT RESPONSIBILITIES IN UPM

Urban affairs in Indonesia, in so far as they are the responsibility of government, are, as in most developing countries, dominated by the activities of central government agencies. Indeed, "local" government officials and officers down to the level of the village or township are civil servants, accountable to the central agencies which employ

them and in no way to the citizens whom they govern; there are no elected mayors or councillors. However, the cities and towns possess a significant independent formal commercial and somewhat weaker industrial sector. Furthermore, a substantial proportion of urban development - in terms of housing and economic activity - is of an informal nature upon which the government has a relatively tenuous, albeit in recent years growing but by no means necessarily beneficial, impact (Jellinek,1991).

Whilst the formal private and informal sectors make a significant contribution to the creation of the environment and of environmental problems in urban Indonesia, to which further reference will be made as this paper unfolds, the following exposition focuses attention first upon the structure and activities of the government. Throughout the huge and culturally diverse archipelago of Indonesia, the form and function of government is extremely uniform. There are five levels of government: central, provincial, district (rural *Kabupatens* and urban *Kotamadyas*), subdistrict (*Kecamatan*) and village (*Desa*) or township (*Kelurahan*). In addition, citizens within given blocks are required to form (via a procedure of deliberation and consensus - "*musyawarah-mufakat*" - rather than popular election) a neighbourhood association (*Rukun Tetangga* - known generally as *RT*); several of these form a neighbourhood (*Rukun Warga* - *RW*), whose head is elected from amongst the heads of the *RT*.

At the central level, two agencies have an important strategic role to play in urban affairs. The National Economic Planning Agency, *BAPPENAS*, establishes urban policy both within the overall structure of the national five years plans (*REPELITA*) and through a special urban unit, the Coordination Team for Urban Development (*TKPP*)ⁱⁱ which has the task of ensuring that the activities of all agencies involved in urban development are working along the same lines. The other important agency at this level is the Ministry of Finance (*MoF*), which, given the dominance of national funds in urban development, can and does have a significant effect on what does and what does not get funded at the local level.

However, beneath the national level, the Ministry of Home Affairs (*MoHA*) plays the chief role in creating and maintaining the overall structure and function of provincial and local government, appointing governors, mayors, village and township heads, and employing all key staff of the local government apparatus. Nevertheless, in its

own way, the Ministry of Public Works (MoPW) has an equally powerful influence on local affairs in that it is responsible for the development of all major infrastructure including roads, water supply and drainage, sanitation and solid waste disposal, and key local facilities. Other Ministries, however, also have responsibilities for urban development, including the Ministry of Education - schools and higher education establishments - the Ministry of Health - health centres and hospitals - the National Housing Agency (PERUMNAS) and a number of other Ministries and state agencies having direct or indirect influence over aspects of urban development.

At the provincial and district levels - known as Tingkat I and II (TK I and Tk II) respectivelyⁱⁱⁱ - each central agency has its own division responsible for executing projects and programmes at that level (Kanwil). The provincial and district governments also have their own sectoral offices, some of which parallel those of the line agencies (Dinas). At both provincial and district levels, certain aspects of planning, together with coordination of projects and programmes is accomplished by planning organisations (BAPPEDA) similar in function to BAPPENAS at the national level but in practice accountable to the MoHA. Figure 1 comprises the basic organigram of the government structures outlined above.

So where does "environment" appear in all of this? On the one hand it should be clear that in so far as the line agencies do their job, the urban environment should be largely looked after: drainage will be built and maintained, solid waste will be collected and disposed of, traffic will be managed and factory pollution will be controlled. Of course we are all aware that the great world-wide growth in concern for the environment in recent years has much to do with the fact that responsible agencies have not been able to avoid serious urban environmental problems from arising and in certain instances have actually been seen to be the cause of some of these problems. Indonesia is no exception to this and a set of institutional measures have been taken in efforts to confront environmental problems.

The Indonesian Ministry of the Environment (MoE) was formed in the mid 1970s as a "coordinating" ministry, meaning that it had - and still has - a small budget and restricted powers. Over time, however, it succeeded in convincing more powerful agencies that they should control the environmental impact of their own activities. This has resulted in a highly elaborate

environmental impact assessment (EIA) system which applies to all significant private and public projects. Whilst more will be said below concerning this system in relation to urban infrastructure provision, here it should be noted that the huge amount of documentation which this has produced has not been matched by a consistent and conscientious implementation of the recommended measures (Dick and Bailey, 1992; Crooks and Foley, 1994).

In the early 1980s, provincial environment offices were established through an agreement between the MoE and the MoHA but these have had little influence. Then in 1990 a national environmental protection agency, BAPEDAL, was formed at arms length, but under the MoE, with greater enforcement powers but still few resources. Attempts were made in the early 1990s to establish environmental line agencies at provincial level. These were not successful. However, in 1995 agreement was reached with the MoHA such that from early 1996 there will be a progressive establishment first of provincial and then of district BAPEDALs.

Besides administering the EIA system and attempting to influence the development of improved industrial pollution control, a number of ad hoc programmes started by the Ministry have been pursued by BAPEDAL. These include the Clean Rivers Programme (PROKASIH) aimed at mounting campaigns to improve river water quality, and the Clean Cities Campaign (ADIPURA) which awards prizes to local governments which demonstrate their capability to achieve a certain level of cleanliness. Both of these programmes, although carried out with minimal funding, have made an impact at least in the public imagination, albeit urban rivers and streets remain heavily polluted.

4 STATUTORY URBAN PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES

From the foregoing discussion of the institutional responsibilities for urban development, it must be clear that there are many agencies active at the urban level. The following discussion does not attempt to be comprehensive in analysing the activities of all of these, but outlines the main programmes and mechanisms.

Local development planning and budgeting is arranged according to an elaborate sequence of events known as "bottom-up - top-down" planning. The general idea of such an approach

originated in the Local Government Law No.5/1974 which refined the present system of provincial and local government. The mechanics of the present system of financial planning was set out in MoHA Regulation No.9/1982. The fact is that, as already noted, most funding for local works and activities comes from the central government and is allocated to particular central agencies in accordance with the overall national and regional five year plans and then in accordance with bids made by these agencies for funds to cover their own detailed programmes and projects. The intention of the "bottom-up - top-down" system is to introduce local needs into the planning process, ostensibly operating according to the following format.

The top-down part of the procedure comprises the long and medium-term planning respectively of the national, provincial and district planning boards, and the short term programmes of the various national government agencies and their provincial and district line agencies. The bottom-up part of the process unfolds on an annual cycle, ideally as follows.

A meeting at Desa/Kelurahan level takes place in March or April. This is convened by the village or township development council (LKMD) which is generally chaired by the (appointed) chief at that level (Kepala Desa or Lurah). The RW heads and other local notables sit on this council and during this meeting - which is generally also attended by officials from the subdistrict - they put forward projects they would like to see included in the budget for the year in question. These are then screened by the village council, or by the Lurah in urban areas that have no such council, and a subset of projects is passed up to the subdistrict. Here the projects are discussed, together with projects proposed by government agencies, and a further screening is undertaken to determine which projects should be funded and if so from what source: the possibilities include self-help and general funds allocated to the local level, in which case Desa and Kelurahan are advised to undertake them themselves; but other projects are sent onwards as requests for funding directly by the central government. Meetings are then held at district (May/June), provincial (July/August) and, following regional development consultations, at national (December) levels. The budget is then allocated, and the Desa/Kelurahans find out whether they have obtained funding for their projects in their subdistrict meeting the following year (Figure 2).

There has been some commentary and assessment

of this procedure that has been undertaken and the following remarks are pertinent to the purposes of this paper. What is considered to be "bottom" in this system is still a fairly substantial area and population unit and might therefore not be considered to be very sensitive to very local needs (Fritschi et al, 1991). An appraisal of the process as it operated in Sukabumi, West Java in 1987 (Haskoning-Lidesco, 1988) noted that it appeared that projects were put forward by the head of the council or a few other notable people. The local meetings were then short, with little discussion of the proposals. In the event, the proposals appeared as a random selection of items. In other words there was no process of issue-raising and no framework for informing even those favoured with a place in the decision-making process of what issues and possibilities *might* be considered as local priorities. What must also be noted is that by the time these local requests reach the national level, they comprise just a small proportion of the budget that will eventually be allocated for local activities. The point here is that the various government agencies at each level have their own programmes and projects which are devised and implemented with no reference to any participatory process.

Indeed, at the time of the Haskoning assessment, there was some discussion in the press of the results of a government commission looking into the shortcomings of the bottom-up planning process (Kompas, 1987). This confirmed the lack of ability at the Desa/Kelurahan level to participate effectively and also that scheduling problems often led to local requests failing to be properly considered. It was admitted that the Desa/Kelurahan heads are not free agents and that any clash of priorities between local wishes and the plans of central agencies resolves itself in favour of the latter. At the other end, line agencies, being confident that they would be allocated budget from the centre for their projects, failed even to inform the provincial meetings of their proposals.

To put this discussion into further perspective, a good indicator of the lack of autonomy of local government staff is the discretion which they have over government money spent in the local government area. In 1990/1991, provincial and district authorities only raised about 15% of locally spent revenues; a further 8½% comprised local discretionary funds from the central government. 28% of locally spent money came in the form of tied and earmarked funds and the rest - almost half - was spent directly by central government line agencies (Lanti, 1995, Table 2).

Turning now briefly to land use planning, it might be supposed that, in so far as plans are produced, these might provide a framework for the local development process with scope for local input and some power to bring otherwise independent agency proposals into some sort of coordinated order. There has certainly been considerable activity in physical plan-making in Indonesia in recent years with both the MoHA and the MoPW active in such plan-making. Indeed there is a bewildering array of plan types from regional and city structure and master plans to urban technical and local plans^{iv}. All of these plans are produced by central agencies or (more usually) their consultants. There is as yet no local plan making or even plan administering capability and no attempt to "popularise" or even consult locally as part of the plan-making process. In addition to the extensive informal development which occurs outside any planning framework, because of the lack of local capacity or commitment to administer the plans, these have been a poor means of controlling even formal land-use changes or determining the form and direction of new urban developments.

On its part, the MoPW has instituted its own form of urban planning and management framework, aimed at a measure of decentralisation of decisions with specific regard to the development of urban infrastructure. This system, known as the Integrated Urban Infrastructure Programme (IUIDP) can be considered to be the most concerted attempt to systematise the urban development process focusing on the level of the individual city or town. It has been widely discussed as an approach in general and specifically with respect to its effectiveness in improving the coordination of urban development in Indonesian cities (Sidabutar et al, 1991; Dimitriou, 1991; van der Hoff and Steinberg, 1992; Suselo et al, 1995). The rest of this paper focuses particular attention on aspects of this programme.

However, before moving on to an analysis of IUIDP, it should be noted that, unlike an increasing number of developing countries^v, as yet there are no generalised forms of urban environmental planning and management in Indonesia. The thrust of environmental legislation and the activity of the Ministry has so far been on "defensive" measures, such as EIA, and on campaigns aimed at influencing others to plan and manage the use of the environment better. It was the introduction of some form of general environmental planning and management framework which Dick and Bailey (1992),

commenting on the results of long-term Canadian support of the activities of the Environment Ministry, saw as being necessary to advance environmental improvements.

5 THE INTEGRATED URBAN INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME

The IUIDP was introduced in 1985. Although in the early 1990s steps were taken to extend this to rural areas - as the Integrated Kabupaten Infrastructure Development Programme (IKIDP) - it has remained a predominantly urban programme with more than 150 cities and towns now following the procedures. The origins of the programme lie in the slum upgrading exercises which were initiated already before the second World War, albeit taking on their present form in the early 1970s as the Kampung Improvement Programme (KIP). This programme has, over the years, introduced packages of water supply, drainage, pathways and related improvements into many informal settlements throughout urban Indonesia.

The aim of IUIDP was to use a similar "package" technique to devolve responsibility for planning, implementation and operation and maintenance of urban infrastructure to the level of urban authorities. In fact the intention was that eventually the programme - as simply the Integrated Urban Development Programme (IUDP) - would encompass all local authority functions, creating truly decentralised government entities. Initially it was possible to make a start in the main areas of infrastructure provision, where the MoPW had sole responsibility and so could implement the process without having to rely too much on the cooperation other agencies.

The general procedure of the IUIDP is as follows. Local authorities first prepare an IUIDP Development Assessment Plan (IDAP) as a long-term spatial reference for the financial planning process. A multi-year (generally five year) investment plan (PJM) is then prepared. This is a relatively complex document which analyses the future economic and spatial development of the city (this should coincide with the existing spatial plans) and then sets out a series of investments to be undertaken in the following areas:

- water supply
- sewerage and human waste
- solid waste management
- drainage and flood control

- urban roads
- market infrastructure improvement
- housing, including KIP and any other public housing responsibilities

The result is then subject to three other considerations. An environmental - encompassing also social - impact assessment study, including mitigation and management plans must be made on the investment proposals. An action plan for institutional development (LIDAP) to cope with the management of the local programme is produced. And finally, a report has to be made on the means available to improve the local revenue base (RIAP) in other words to increase local financial self-reliance.

Although from the outset there were various resistances to introducing the system (Suselo and Taylor, 1995: 16-18), the Directorate General of Human Settlements of the Ministry of Public Works (Cipta Karya) was able to initiate the programme and considerable support came from bi- and multilateral agencies. The World Bank and Asian Development Bank accepted this structure as the basis for lending for urban programmes. In addition, UNCHS and a number of bilateral agencies supported the development of local PJM activities in some cities and Dutch assistance was provided to devise and implement a major training programme. Although the intention was that eventually local governments would generate their own programmes, it was initially deemed necessary to hire foreign consultants to assist the local governments in putting the programmes and documentation together. The training programme, starting already in 1986, aimed to generate the skills at national, provincial and local level to transfer the planning process to government staff (Sidabutar et al, 1991; Davidson and Watson, 1995). By the mid 1990s a central training unit had been established in Jakarta, servicing the needs of provincial trainers, responsible for local courses, and well over 6,000 government staff had been through some aspect of the training.

In assessing progress in the implementation and institutionalisation of IUIDP, the various contributors to a recent book on the subject had the following to say (Suselo, et al, 1995 - see in particular Kosasih and Sutmuller (Chapter 2) and the final Chapter by the main authors). There is some concern that the need for urban infrastructure is growing faster than the ability of the system to cope and that, on the other hand, the IUIDP system is slow and cumbersome, taking up to five years to get under way and requiring

constant attention from central government and consultants.

The orientation is very heavily hardware-oriented, with the banks interested primarily in achieving "bankable project packages" and the personnel involved in devising and implementing the financial plans being sectorally and engineering oriented, with their training and experience making up the "dominant culture" of the whole programme. The PJM is not tied into other aspects of local government responsibility. This is true even of the annual financial planning cycle. There is also no substantial link into social policies and programmes so that the social impacts, like the environmental impacts, are reviewed only post hoc, rather than being considered at the outset or during the planning exercise as the *source* of goals and objectives for the programme.

One significant contributor to these problems is the continuing weak cooperation between various national agencies that continue to pursue their own programmes more or less independent of this local financial planning exercise. The resulting lack of a truly local strategic view of the problems of urban development as a whole and hence the need to integrate infrastructure development firmly into other aspects of local policy and practice is evident in the results of the programme.

A second problem area that relates closely to the first concerns the way in which local government has not yet identified the IUIDP process as its own. This might be seen as a failure of the training programme to instill the procedures and motivate the staff adequately. However, the elaborate and constantly changing conditions for the generation of PJMs, as expressed in the very weighty PJM production manual, might be seen as placing over-exacting requirements in terms of capacities and time upon local staff; whether these requirements are appropriate, particularly for the administrations of smaller cities and towns is questionable.

Furthermore, local governments are not left alone to produce and administer their own affairs, but are subject to constant intervention from the provincial and national level, maintaining the "command culture" and inhibiting a more autonomous frame of mind and mode of working within local government. Finally, the initial heavy reliance of the IUIDP system - and indeed the generation of all manner of local plans and projects - on technical work carried out by the central government and consultants hired and

supervised by them has yet to be relinquished. There has been little chance for local government staff to use any technical training they might have received in a creative way, even to monitor and supervise consultants.

This lack of encouragement for local government officers to take initiative then extends beyond local government and on to the recipients of the government's programmes, namely the urban citizens as individuals and in terms of their organisations and interests^{vi}. Although there is a general requirement that the needs of citizens be taken into account in the generation of PJMs, and whilst some foreign donors in supporting these activities have been more mindful of the need for consultation than others, the standard procedure goes no further than carrying out "real demand surveys" (RDS). These are simple pre-formatted sample household surveys designed to elicit information that will indicate the degree to which services - toilets, drainage, solid waste disposal, etc. - are underprovided. The results can be used as a basis to calculate requirements to be provided under the IUIDP. Whilst these surveys may include questions that enable those surveyed to state their priorities, this can hardly be deemed to be a very effective consultation process.

Outside the framework of the IUIDP, there has, in fact, been a considerable amount of experimentation with participatory modes of planning and development in certain government programmes in Indonesia, under the general headings of "community participation" (CP) and "community-based development" (CBD). In the case of CP, as understood in the Indonesian context, projects are generally planned, designed and implemented by government with communities participating in the construction, operation and maintenance. In the case of CBD, the community is involved already from the planning stage. There are quite well-elaborated national policies in this area with respect to water supply and sanitation (PT Indah Karya, 1989) and the concept of IKIDP explicitly incorporates a commitment to CP and CBD as central pillars of the implementation process.

The direct input of private resources into community activities is a well-established practice in Indonesia under the headings of "swardaya" (community self-help) and "gotong royong" (community service). The LKMD and RW have proved to be useful vehicles for the mobilisation of community self-activity and the local womens' organisations (PKK) - which operate in parallel with, and are participants in, the LKMD at

Desa/Kelurahan level - have been a very effective vehicle in the carrying out of public health campaigns throughout the country. These, and other non-government organisations possess significant potential to take on certain well-defined - and potentially growing - responsibilities in urban development and management. The success of some rural water supply projects has been notable in developing the self-confidence of local communities to take on further functions. On the other hand, attempts to establish community revolving funds for the construction of sanitary facilities in accordance with the national sanitation plan have ended in some early failures (LP3ES, 1990; Williams, 1990) which is not to say that with further development such mechanisms cannot be successfully introduced.

In the case of the IKIDP, an evaluation was carried out on two projects, one in West Java and one in Aceh to establish - albeit in the early stages of these projects - what approach might be most appropriately institutionalised (Oey-Gardiner, 1991). It was noted that the current "bottom-up - top-down" financial planning exercise and in general the approach to planning and the determination of urban investment priorities, starting as they do at the level of the Desa/Kelurahan, was at too high a level (in any case, officials at Desa/Kelurahan level are appointed and hence not genuine community representatives). The decision-making process requires a significant degree of devolution, to at least the RW and in many cases the RT level, if it is really to involve the community effectively.

It was noted that where the community is involved in planning and, for instance, in the choice and supervision of contractors undertaking local works, then better use is made of public funding; this also becomes a means to generate a sense of ownership and hence commitment to maintaining infrastructure on the part of the community. To institute such arrangements effectively would, however, require community extension workers who would both assist in community organisation and liaise with authorities who could ensure that communities received information needed to participate effectively in all stages of the development process. The study concluded that whilst CP is a realistic way forward at this stage, CBD *can* work if it is supported by the bureaucracy^{vii}.

It is worth noting in parentheses that the general experience world-wide is for the bureaucracy to be reasonably happy to devolve operation and maintenance functions to communities, but are

considerably less happy to devolve powers and resources for the community to plan and execute projects and programmes on their own (Batley, 1993: 202-204). The crude assumption is that bureaucrats will lose their job if locals do things for themselves. However, the reality is more likely to be one where "facilitation" of local efforts by central government will continue to be needed for a long time to come. This requires of bureaucrats a different kind of skill and culture from the "command structure" approach of the present bureaucracy.

6 IUIDP IN SMALL AND MEDIUM CITIES IN SULAWESI

Indonesia is a very large country, with several hundred cities and towns appropriate to the introduction of IUIDP or, depending on size, some variant. It has therefore been deemed necessary to introduce the IUIDP system in "batches", dealing with cities of different size in different parts of the country under different consultancy contracts. "Sulawesi IUIDP Batch II", for the smaller cities and larger towns of Sulawesi started in early 1994 with the intention of producing PJMs by the spring of 1995. Sulawesi is a large, strangely articulated island considered to be the gateway to the (undeveloped) east of Indonesia, but is in fact located in the north of the country, immediately south of the Philippines; it is made up of four provinces. With around 15 million people, the island is relatively modestly populated by Indonesian standards and with the exception of the cities of Ujung Pandang in the south and Manado in the north, urban settlements are relatively modest in size. The contract in question, which was financed by the World Bank, was concerned with 18 cities and towns ranging from 20,000 to 100,000 in population, scattered throughout the island.

The intention of the project was for the local authorities to produce the PJMs, based largely on upon existing information (in many of the towns consultants hired by Cipta Karya had already produced reports on water supply, drainage, solid waste disposal and/or other urban development topics), using training already received, and with assistance in the first instance from the provincial authorities. However, a project consultancy team was hired, made up of foreign experts (most of whom spoke Indonesian and knew the bureaucratic system), together with Indonesian consultants to assist the local authorities as required, to produce the necessary documentation. These teams included engineers

and financial analysts, with lesser inputs from urban planners, economists and environmental and institutional experts.

Towards the end of 1994, it became evident that in spite of the advice, encouragement and technical inputs of the consultants, including the production of spacial reference plans and the organisation of real demand surveys, the local government staff were not going to be able to produce the complex documentation required and the project consultants changed direction, with the main goal being to produce PJMs as rapidly as possible in order that the anticipated World Bank loan could be processed. Consultation with the local and provincial authorities continued, but many of the decisions with regard to content emerged within the framework of internal discussions amongst the consultants. The project had to be extended, but the documentation was produced by the mid-summer of 1995.

As already noted, according to the PJM manual, the environmental input to PJMs is restricted to carrying out an environmental impact assessment of the proposed infrastructure projects. This means that it comes at the end of the PJM formulation exercise. In the case of the project in question, the reorganisation of the project meant that the environmental experts were present at an earlier stage of the process. A decision was therefore taken, and endorsed by the client, to interpret environmental (and to a certain extent social) inputs more broadly.

Whilst certain aspects of infrastructure installation may have significant negative environmental and social (eg displacement) impacts, on the whole, the purpose of most urban infrastructure projects is precisely to mitigate environmental problems. However, infrastructure designed without adequate analysis of the *overall* environmental and social processes unfolding in the urban subregion may turn out to be an answer to the wrong question. On the one hand this can easily lead to the proposed infrastructure being suboptimal in addressing only part of the problem which it could be addressing. On the other hand, urbanisation processes only indirectly associated with infrastructure may have negative impacts upon the effectiveness of the infrastructure. Environmental analysis which only looks at the direct impact of the infrastructure post hoc is unlikely to identify such problems.

In short, what is required is an environmental and social audit *at the outset* of the PJM exercise that would create a context from which appropriate

infrastructure plans and programmes can be derived. It should be immediately added that this does not necessarily mean more work or more complication but it does mean a different way of proceeding which is outlined in more detail in the final section of this paper. Because of the change in programme of the Sulawesi Batch II cities project, it became possible to proceed in part on this basis.

Expert teams visited each of the towns for several days, discussing with local authority staff and investigating the problems faced by the towns and cities. The environmental experts looked not only at such problems as water supply, sanitation and waste disposal, but also at such subregional issues as settlement, mineral resource exploitation, and agricultural and forestry practices and problems. Although this was far short of even a "rapid appraisal"^{viii}, it nevertheless enabled environmental issues to be discussed in conjunction with the physical planning and economic development framework and as input to the decisions concerning appropriate infrastructure investments. The "environmental appraisal" section of the PJMs then consisted not simply of an assessment of the impact of the infrastructure proposals and how these might be mitigated and managed. "Residual environmental and social problems" that could not be solved within the framework of the infrastructure proposals were also identified and mitigation and management measures proposed also for these.

Before discussing ways in which such an approach might be extended to reform the IUIDP process, with a view to increasing public participation and achieving the decentralisation that has so far eluded the programme, it is useful to get a better feel for the environmental and social problems which towns in the programme are actually facing.

7 ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL PROBLEMS OF SMALL AND MEDIUM CITIES IN SULAWESI

Besides producing environmental appraisals for each of the cities in the programme, the environmental experts were required by the World Bank to produce a "Regional (urban) Environmental Assessment" (Louis Berger International, 1995). The following remarks summarise the highlights from this assessment.

It is worth noting at the outset that there have already been considerable achievements in urban

management even in small towns in Sulawesi. On the whole the main road network is well-built, including sidewalks and often including planters or trees; sometimes the standard design, rigidly applied, cannot be properly fitted into the context, and the results are generally poorly maintained, but the roads and paths are there and are serviceable. Most towns also have a fairly extensive water supply system with even informal settlements served and metered; again, there are sometimes severe leakage and other technical problems, but the basic system is there and it works. There are nevertheless more or less ubiquitous problems as follows.

Solid waste management: Most towns have solid waste dumped at random along roadsides and in rivers and drainage channels to the point of blocking these, exacerbating the tendency to flooding. This is sometimes posed as a problem of lack of hardware and the truth is that trucks are often out of action. In fact, a standard "simplified" system of solid waste management has been devised by Cipta Karya and applied throughout urban Indonesia and every city and town shows signs of this system. The problems are overwhelmingly ones relating to the execution and operation of the system. Handcarts are supplied for local collection. There are then temporary collection points in each neighbourhood (TPS) and finally there is a landfill site beyond the built-up area (TPA).

Firstly, many households clearly lack motivation to ensure proper management of their waste. Secondly, although the handcarts are often in evidence, they are rarely used as intended, being relegated to a "handcart graveyard" or purloined by individuals for their own use or left at roadsides and attracting fly-tipping. Thirdly, the design and placing of TPSs often makes them difficult to access and/or service and they accumulate rubbish. Fourthly, the choice of site and management of TPAs is often very poor such that they are frequently underused (personnel simply dump the waste along the roadside on the way to the site) and in any case pollute the neighbourhood through poor management.

Drainage and flooding: Sulawesi is subject to seasonal monsoon rains and during this period parts of practically all the cities and towns are, for more or less brief periods, inundated. In most cases this could be altogether eliminated - often with minimal investment - by appropriate drainage measures. In fact most road construction comes together with the construction of drains. As these are built to a standard design, however,

they are not sized according to actual volumes expected and do not add up to a coherent drainage system. Furthermore, individual householders experiencing problems often construct their own measures which add to the problems of their neighbours and water supply and even electricity connections are sometimes built across drains, constricting the storm water flows. Finally, drains are universally poorly managed, often becoming completely blocked with solid waste, building materials and/or silt.

An interesting sub-set of the drainage problem is to be found in coastal areas. The traditional coastal dwelling in Sulawesi is on stilts, in a small area cleared from the mangrove swamp. All solid and human wastes are simply tipped from the house onto the swamp floor and are washed away with the tide. Urbanisation increases densities and with these also the density of wastes. The mangroves are eventually completely cleared and in very recent years, roads have been built between the houses and the open sea. The practice of dumping wastes (including both perishables and non perishables) continues, now into stagnant water under the houses. This situation is extremely insanitary; the local authorities are aware of this but to date no coherent approach (specific form of KIP) has been devised to confront the problem.

Meanwhile, reclamation of the mangroves is seen as possessing great commercial potential and many local authorities in the coastal towns of Sulawesi have been very ambitious and spent much of their scarce resources on major reclamation schemes. Apart from the ecological damage, including the damage to fishing (reducing fish reproduction and hence the income of the fishermen), reclaimed areas are difficult to drain without expensive mechanical assistance and the experience has indeed been that even areas previously not subject to flooding are suffering regular inundation.

Sanitation: The Real Demand Surveys indicated consistently that improved sanitation is not seen as a priority. The truth is that although the campaigns of the Ministry of Health have been a notable success in instilling basic sanitary practices with respect, for instance, to the pollution of well water, spending significant amounts of money to reduce the health dangers of human waste is as yet not widespread in the towns and small cities of Sulawesi. Personal pit latrines are becoming more widespread, but there is no system for maintaining these and seepage results in local drains taking some sewage as well

as sullage.

Markets: Traditionally, towns in Sulawesi, as elsewhere around the world, have formed around the market place. The conditions and changing organisation of the markets in the towns in this programme highlight many of both the environmental and social problems emerging in these small cities. Whilst the local authorities generally include a department exclusively responsible for market affairs, with a market supervisor on site, responsible for all aspects of organisation (but especially concerned with fees and finance), most markets remain poorly managed and many are highly insanitary. Drainage is generally blocked by putrescibles dumped by market vendors; toilets are poorly maintained and sometimes water is not available; and solid waste piles up, in places being grazed by goats and cows as the only means of reducing its volume.

The "solution" which the local authorities in many cities see to this, is to remove the market to the outskirts of the city and to sell the site to "modern" developers who erect shop-houses and, increasingly, supermarkets and department stores. In one town where the old market had been replaced by a new structure, the design was so antithetical to the needs of the vendors that these continued to squat on the periphery while the building itself remained largely vacant. In another town, even though a new fish market was built in the suburbs, the fishermen refused to move, as their clientele was inclined to continue to shop in the town centre.

What this reveals is a set of attitudes in the local authority that is more inclined to push the traditional vendors out of the town rather than enter into a complex process that would involve at once educating the vendors in sanitary behaviour (and, indeed, improve their own management performance) and accepting suggestions from the vendors on what might best serve their needs in terms of market arrangements. The process appears to involve the pursuit of an image of the "modern" city. But the practical result is to favour the interests of a rather small "modern" segment of the population and to discriminate against the majority who, for cultural and/or economic reasons, continue to pursue traditional lifestyles.

Social issues: It should already be abundantly clear that environmental and social issues are indissoluble. A poor sanitary environment is a social risk and requires social education and improved management as well as new hardware.

The market problematic also highlights this interaction. At the strategic level, where the environmental "green agenda" comes to the fore, there is also evidence of a need to focus on social issues as follows.

It is not only in the redevelopment of markets that local authorities are discriminating against the poor. In several of the towns and cities, for differing reasons, redevelopment of the town or city centre is displacing the traditional population. These are fishermen or port workers whose livelihood derives from their location in the urban centre. There has been some recognition that some gesture should be made when the poor are asked to leave, but on the whole compensation, whilst it might loom large at the moment it is provided, is soon spent, usually leaving the relocated families in a situation where their livelihoods have become considerably more precarious. In so far as new sites are found for these families (in some towns numbering in the thousands) these are inconvenient - no longer within walking distance of work and services - and practically without infrastructure.

In fact the World Bank is now taking up this issue and in the Sulawesi Batch II project is requiring the local authorities to justify relocations and to undertake Resettlement Action Plans to ensure that adequate relocation assistance is provided, even when the relocations are not a direct consequence of the Bank-financed infrastructure proposals themselves. Whilst this might provide redress in particular instances, what is not yet confronted is the process as a whole and the negative social and environmental consequences thereof.

In fact, not only is there a general move to create a "modern" image in the centre of these towns and cities, at the same time there is a fever of speculation in the surrounding areas. Thus, the relocation of the poor often some way into the countryside is par for the course where new middle class and government housing is also being decanted up to several kilometres from the city centre, together with new government facilities and the occasional factory. Whilst much of the intervening land remains vacant (and subject to fly tipping, mining of soil and building materials and incidental horticulture) the spread of the cities requires a much higher level of motorised transport and generally significantly increases resources and environmental impacts. The poor, whose traditional lifestyles made relatively little environmental impact, are forced to participate in the new urban regime and to

degrade the environment whilst living a more precarious life where poverty becomes more pronounced not least because more money is required to live at the same level of existence.

8REFOCUSING THE UEPM PROCESS IN INDONESIA

The intention in this final section is no more than to make some remarks concerning possible reform first concerning the IUIDP system and then looking wider to the UEPM process in Indonesia as a whole.

The principle of increased decentralisation has been written into various laws regarding the organisation of government functions in Indonesia (Kosasih and Sutmuller, 1995) and, as outlined above, the 'top-down - bottom-up' method of financial planning, together with the IUIDP system are intended to put this principle into practice. The decentralisation principle rests on concrete evidence that greater sensitivity to local conditions and needs and greater responsibility taken for local affairs at the local level would improve the quality and efficiency of local investment and services and lighten the burden on scarce, centrally-provided resources. The approaches to decentralisation applied so far have been very strongly weighted towards a notion that what is required in order to make decentralisation a reality is more professionalism in the local bureaucracy. Very little weight has been given to the raising of commitment and capacity amongst the population as a whole to take on these responsibilities.

In the first instance, there would seem, *prima facie*, to be a need for local people to be given the opportunity to define the goals and objectives of urban development for themselves and for these to become the framework within which the UPM process is structured; this would encourage local people to feel a sense of ownership of the resulting urban development. However, in the case of much of the population, the ability to participate meaningfully in such a process is very limited. Much of the population is in process of becoming urbanised for the first time. Their villages are becoming towns, with all the problems of densification and hence demand for changes in lifestyle which this brings. Alternatively they are opting to move to urban or urbanising areas where the same demands for modifications in values and lifestyles are put upon them. In the first instance, there is a need for induction into urban culture in a structured manner before this

element of the population can contribute very effectively to the decision-making process or even to practical environmental management activities.

On the other hand, there are families and more or less organised interests who have made the urban transition in previous generations and who are able to participate more consciously in the development process. This is not to say that they have an immediate orientation towards participating in a strategic decision-making process concerning the best way to organise the urban development process. On the contrary, as things stand, their exclusion from the decision-making process encourages selfish thinking and action that is in many ways antithetical to the creation of congenial pleasant - and ultimately sustainable - cities.

From this point of view, one might say that the UIIDP training should not, perhaps, have focused exclusively on training bureaucrats in procedure but rather have been a process designed in the main to bring the nature of urban environmental and social issues into perspective for both bureaucrats and the population at large. There is certainly scope, continuing along the line pioneered by the Ministry of Health, to educate the population as a whole, using existing organisational structures, including the LKMD and PKK, but also down to the level of the RW and RT.

However, pushing information out is generally recognised as a poor way to elicit commitment: the concept of 'education' in its root form is one that involves 'drawing out' the potential of people to take responsibility through the use of effective information. Campaigns, employing 'user-friendly' media and where knowledge is instilled in the context of activities, is generally recognised as a more effective approach to developing social responsibility than attempting to direct what people should do in a situation where they are averse to the directive and not involved in the reasons for the decision. Whilst the principles of deliberation and consensus - 'musyawarah-mufakat' - are held to be the basis of local decision-making fora, criticism has nevertheless been levelled at the unrepresentative nature, certainly at the Desa/Kelurahan level, of the existing political structures and there would seem to be scope for opening these up so that they are more accountable and to strengthen the voice of ordinary citizens and particularly of women in the decision-making process (Oey-Gardiner, 1991).

The 'Local Agenda 21' process suggested amongst

the international agreements at the Rio Earth Summit and referred to at the outset of this paper, might provide a guide to ways in which such local reform might be organised. This calls for a process of consensus to be achieved across all the key interests in the local authority area as the basis for a new planning and management initiative aimed at sustainable development. A project organised by the Thai government with technical assistance from the German Government (GTZ) might provide some indications of how such a process might be approached in the Indonesian context (GTZ, 1993, 1994; Atkinson and Vorratnchaiphan, 1994^{ix}).

It has been recognised (World Bank, 1995) that besides the general broadening of education and decision-making in the urban development process, there is a need for more targeted arrangements concerning specific issues. The Sulawesi II Regional Environmental Assessment (REA) (Louis Berger International, 1995) suggested four such targeted initiatives as being relevant for the towns and cities in that programme as follows:

- *Solid waste management:* A new approach needs to be taken which provides local government staff and local communities with various models for organisation and for technologies (with an emphasis on waste reduction and recycling), rather than the current arrangement of one national model. Rather than as at present, where consultants adapt (often quite inappropriately) the national model and the local authority is then responsible for operating it, the local authority should discuss the possible models with the community and together they should decide which to adopt and who should be responsible for operating the various parts of it. Assistance should be provided by the province in the form of advice and subsequently of finance. User-friendly guidelines concerning technology and procedure are required and training in both these aspects is necessary, targeted at the various participant groups.
- *Sanitation:* The very successful campaigns organised by the Health Ministry and its provincial and local agencies need to be extended to cover sewage and waste water disposal; they might also be extended to cover sanitation in markets. The REA suggested that local Community Environmental Sanitation Programmes (CESP) be initiated in each town, coordinated by a forum that would include representatives of concerned agencies and the

communities. This would allow two-way communication of problems and potential solutions. The principles of what needs to be done in terms of technical and organisational options can be found in the National Sanitation Strategy (PT Indah Karya, 1989), but this needs to be operationalised at the level of the town and local community. The CESP's would therefore entail education, planning and execution in the format of CBD. As with the development of solid waste management systems, provincially based training and advice, using appropriate user-friendly training materials would be needed.

- *Markets:* In spite of local agencies being responsible for the proper management of local markets there are, as outlined above, serious problems of poor sanitation and socially questionable reorganisation schemes in progress. The REA proposed a broadening of the forum for considering how to improve the markets. Besides the responsible government officers, this should include representatives of the vendors (both the small stall-keepers and the farmers and fishermen who sell their wares directly) and representatives of the communities who can speak on behalf of customers. Such a Market Forum would be responsible for improving sanitation - hence have an educational function - possibly in conjunction with the CESP - and also concern itself with any infrastructural improvements from new drains through more major rebuilding and reorganisation to relocation. Once again, user-friendly guidelines - for instance in the form of a number of pamphlets - outlining technical and organisational options should be available, supported by the provincial administration.
- *Low-income housing:* This is a complex issue that was not dealt with in any detail in the REA but which is a very serious problem in the rapidly growing towns and cities of Indonesia - and indeed throughout the developing world. It became evident that in the housing section of the PJMs, not too much could be said about the provision of local infrastructure to much of the anticipated new housing, because if this is developed as it has generally been developed in the past, then it will occur informally. It will then be either 'relocated' or it will be serviced post hoc by some future KIP programme. As discussed earlier in this paper, in the Sulawesi II programme, the World Bank took upon itself to challenge the

local authorities in the casual way in which they are used to evicting the poor when these become an inconvenience. But this addressed only a small part of the issue, taken as a whole, of the organised provision of urban housing and related infrastructure.

There are increasing examples, pioneered through local NGOs ('development consultants' such as LBS, LP3ES and TRIACO) supported by such international NGOs as the Asian Coalition for Housing Rights, in which local decision-making fora have been organised to focus on the problematic of housing needs for the poor and how these might be catered for. This clearly requires some responsibility being taken for the allocation of land for the poor and thence mechanisms for self-help housing and ensuring that the local authority provides services to satisfy the basic needs of this segment of the population just as it serves the needs of the more affluent and articulate. Whilst this would certainly appear to be politically very difficult to achieve, the establishment of local 'community development agencies' - once again incorporating both educational and decision-fora - could be affective not only in achieving socially more just urban development, but also considerably more efficient in so far as provision of infrastructure post hoc, as in the case of KIP, is considerably more costly than provision integral to the initial development of land.

These suggestions are not seen as exclusively correct ways of dealing with the problems in question. Rather they are intended to provide examples of a general model of UPM that is more assertively "bottom-up" - and hence in line with Indonesian government policy - whilst at the same time acknowledging certain core arrangements. Nevertheless, there are certain framework issues that also need to be raised. On the whole this is doing no more than reiterating some of the central points raised in the existing literature concerning ways and means to improve the IUIDP process, but they need to be reiterated here to emphasis that greater cooperation between local authority and local communities will not wring great changes without affirmative action at the provincial and especially at the national level.

Firstly, articles analysing the Indonesian urban development policy process point to the need to streamline and simplify the procedures (van der Hoff and Steinberg, 1992; Suselo et al, 1995). This is a problem that requires both the agencies of the national government and the multilateral banks to acknowledge the massive disincentive in the

current red tape - including both the cumbersome "bottom-up - top-down" planning procedures and the over-elaborate format of the PJM. Essentially, much greater institutional faith has to be placed in local government. They should be placed in a position of needing to administer only relatively simple planning mechanisms, that indicate to the provincial and central authorities what projects and programmes they aim to undertake or support. They should, however, be able to demonstrate the ways in which their projects and programmes are responding to local needs arrived at with the participation of local community interests.

Obviously a crucial issues here is the question of discretion over budgets locally spent. Kosasih and Sutmuller (1995) went so far as to conclude that "...local government will never be able to improve unless it gets greater control over two essential resources: money and manpower." Whilst it is surely clear that this author believes there are other important issues at stake, nevertheless, the question of local discretion over budgets currently spent by central agencies or on projects determined by these agencies, rather than through local decisions, is also of great importance. Law No.45/1992 makes a useful contribution in promising greater freedom for local authorities to manage their own affairs where they demonstrate greater responsibility in terms of local improved revenue raising and management ability. But there needs to be a very clear process of incentives for local authorities to improve their performance that is linked to a system of local approval of their performance as well as criteria determined for the centre.

Finally there is an issue of who, at the centre, should be responsible for what in relation to further decentralisation and improved environmental management. There can be little doubt that the main actor must, in the end, be the Ministry of Home Affairs. There is clearly a worry on the part of other agencies that if they simplify the procedures for allocation of budgets to local authorities, this can be understood as de facto handing money over to the MoHA and hence relinquishing power and authority to this agency. Certainly if the MoHA does not itself relinquish more power and authority to local government, allowing greater freedom and autonomy to develop their own programmes and initiatives, then other agencies might be justified in their fears. In other words, it will be necessary for there to be a general agreement taken at the highest level (BAPPENAS and the President's office) for all agencies to change their attitude and

practices with respect to local government.

As already noted, this is not likely to mean redundancy for central agency staff. However, it will mean a substantial reorientation in the job which central staff should be carrying out. This is generally referred to as a shift from government as a command structure to government as a facilitator (Shah, 1995). This clearly requires political will amongst those in charge at the centre to rethink their own role as well as that of their subordinates which has so far been a relatively painless exercise. It will also require considerable retraining of bureaucrats at all levels to undertake their new role. However, the pay off is not only in terms of life for the poor in provincial cities being improved or for the cities themselves to present a more pleasant environment. The educational process itself, and being party to the results in terms of a shared experience between bureaucrats and the population at large, can be presented as incentives in themselves.

REFERENCES

- Atkinson, A. and Vorratnchaiphan, C P. "Urban Environmental Management in a Changing Development Context: The Case of Thailand." *Third World Planning Review*, Vol.16, No.2, 1994.
- Batley, R. *Political Control of Urban Planning and Management*. Devas and Rakodi (1993a), Chapter 7, 1995.
- Blowers, A. (Ed) *Planning for a Sustainable Environment*. London, Earthscan, 1993.
- Cadman, D. and Payne, G. *The Living City: Towards a Sustainable Future*. London, Routledge, 1990.
- Cheema, G S. *Cities, People and Poverty: Urban Development Co-operation for the 1990s*. New York, United Nations Development Programme, 1991.
- Cohen, M A. *Urban Policy and Economic Development: An Agenda for the 1990s*. Washington DC, World Bank, 1991.
- Crooks, R. and Foley, S. *Review of Environmental Impact Assessment and Management Experience in Indonesia*. Jakarta, World Bank, 1994.
- Culpin Planning Ltd. *Jabotabek Metropolitan Development Plan Review: Final Report*. Jakarta, Directorate General of Human Settlements, Ministry of Public Works, 1993.
- Davidson, F. and Watson, D. *Training for IUIDP: Ideas, Integration and Implementation*. Suselo et al (1995), Chapter 5, 1995.
- Devas, N. and Rokodi, C. "Planning and Managing Urban Development." Devas and Rakodi (1993a), Chapter 2, 1993.
- Devas, N. and Rakodi, C. *Managing Fast Growing Cities: New Approaches to Urban Planning and Management in Developing Countries*. London, Longman Scientific and Technical, 1993a.
- Dick, J. and Bailey, L. *Indonesia's Environmental Impact Assessment Process (AMDAL): Progress, Problems and a Suggested Blueprint for Improvement*. Jakarta, EMDI, Ministry of the Environment, 1992.
- Dimitriou, H T. "An Integrated Approach to Urban Infrastructure Development: A Review of the Indonesian Experience." *Cities*, Vol.8, No.3, 1991.
- Elkin, T., McLaren, D. and Hillman, M. *Revising the City: Towards Sustainable Urban Development*. London, Friends of the Earth, 1991.
- Fritschi, B., Kristyani, A T. and Steinberg, F. *Community Participation and the Integrated Urban Infrastructure Development Programme: Experiences and Potentials*. Jakarta, Directorate General of Human Settlements, Ministry of Public Works, 1991.
- GTZ *Manual for Urban Environmental Management*. Eschborn, Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit, 1993.
- GTZ *Urban Environmental Management Guidelines for Thailand*. Eschborn, Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit, 1994.
- Haskoning-Lidesco. *Bottom-up Planning in Kabupaten and Kotamadya Sukabumi*. Jakarta, Directorate General of Human Settlements, Ministry of Public Works, 1988.
- Jellinek, L. *The Wheel of Fortune: The History of a Poor Community in Jakarta*. Sydney, Allen and Unwin, 1991.
- Kompas. *Perencanaan "Bottom up" Sering Diartikan "Mboten up"*. 2nd September, 1987.
- Kosasih, K. and Sutmuller, P. *Local Government Experience with the Integrated Urban Infrastructure Development Programme (IUIDP)*. Suselo et al (1995), Chapter 2, 1995.
- Lanti, A. *The Experiences of the Integrated Urban Infrastructure Development Programme (IUIDP) in Indonesia*. Mimeo, Jakarta, Directorate General of Human Settlements, Ministry of Public Works, 1995.
- Leitmann, J. *Rapid Urban Environmental Assessment: Lessons from Cities in the Developing World*. Urban Management Discussion Paper No.14, Washington DC, World Bank, 1993.
- Louis Berger International Inc. *Consultancy Assistance for IUIDP Sulawesi II Project Preparation: Regional Environmental Assessment*. Jakarta, Directorate General of Human Settlements, Ministry of Public Works, 1995.
- LP3ES. *Small Towns Urban Development Project*

- Impact Evaluation Study, Central Java: Sanitation Improvement Project.* Jakarta, Directorate General of Human Settlements, Ministry of Public Works, 1990.
- Oey-Gardiner, M. *Community Participation, Community Based Development and the Role of Women in Integrated Kabupaten Infrastructure Development Projects (IKIDP) in West Java and D I Aceh.* Jakarta, Monitoring Mission on the Netherlands Supported IUIDP/IKIDP Projects, 1991.
- PT Indah Karya. *Preparation of National Strategic Plan for Human Waste and Waste Water Disposal Sub-Sector for Urban Areas - Final Report.* Jakarta, Directorate General of Human Settlements, Ministry of Public Works, 1989.
- Quarrie, Joyce. (Ed). *Earth Summit '92: The United Nations Conference on Environment and Development, Rio de Janeiro 1992.* London, The Regent Press, 1992.
- Rondinelli, D A, Nellis, J R. and Cheema, G S. *Decentralisation in Developing Countries: A Review of Recent Experience.* World Bank Staff Working Paper No.581, Washington DC, World Bank, 1984.
- Scoones, I. and Thompson, J. (Eds) *Beyond Farmer First: Rural People's Knowledge, Agricultural Research and Extension Practices.* London, Intermediate Technology Publications, 1994.
- Shah, A A. "Comments from the Asian Development Bank Experience." Suselo et al (1995), Chapter 6, 1995.
- Sidabutar, P., Rukmana, N., van der Hoff, R. and Steinberg, F. "Development of Urban Management Capacities: Training for Integrated Urban Infrastructure Development in Indonesia." *Cities*, Vol.8, No.2, 1991.
- Simon, D. (Ed) *Third World Regional Development: A Reappraisal.* London, Paul Chapman Publishing, 1990.
- Stolte, W. *Infrastructure Planning and Implementation in Urban and Regional Centre in Indonesia: Experiences and the Relation with Dynamic Urban Planning.* Denpasar, Workshop on Urban Management in Indonesia, October 1990.
- Stren, R., Whitney, J. and White, R. *Sustainable Cities: Urbanisation and the Environment in International Perspective.* Boulder, Westview Press, 1992.
- Suselo, H. and Taylor, J L. *Overview of IUIDP in Indonesia.* Suselo et al (1995), Chapter 1, 1995.
- Suselo, H., Taylor, J L. and Wegelin, E A. (Eds) *Indonesia's Urban Infrastructure Development Experience: Critical Lessons of Good Practice.* Jakarta, United Nations Centre for Human Settlements, 1995.
- van der Hoff, R. and Steinberg, F. (Eds) *Innovative Approaches to Urban Management: The Integrated Urban Infrastructure Programme in Indonesia.* Aldershot, Avebury, 1992.
- White, R. *Urban Environmental Management: Environmental Change and Urban Design.* Chichester, John Wiley, 1994.
- Williams, R. Project Coordinator of the Jakarta Sewerage and Sanitation Project, in interview with the author, 22nd May, 1990.
- World Bank *Aide Memoire - Sulawesi Towns Assistance and Development Project: Pre-appraisal Mission, March/April 1995.* Washington DC, World Bank, 1995.

NOTES

- i. Agenda 21 deems enhanced local action to be crucial to the achievement of sustainable development. 'Local Agenda 21' which is that part of Agenda 21 (Quarrie, 1992) which deals with the preferred approach to local planning and management is concerned solely with establishing the principles of participation and networking (horizontal information flow and cooperation) as the basis for any legitimate local planning and management initiative. The literature of 'sustainable urban development' is not yet very substantial; see, however: Cadman and Payne (1990), Elkin et al (1991), Stren et al (1992), Blowers (1993) and White (1994).
- ii. Originally established by the MoF as the Institute for Urban Policy Analysis (IUPA).
- iii. Indonesian government has arguably a greater number of acronyms and abbreviations than any other country; the official glossary put out by the IUIDP training unit extends to over 50 pages amounting to some 730 entries!
- iv. The glossary of terms and abbreviations referred to in the last footnote lists 12 different kinds of land use plans.
- v. In Thailand, for instance, the 1993 Environmental Quality Promotion Act requires environmental plans to be produced at provincial level with a substantial Environment Fund available to finance projects called for in these plans.
- vi. Whilst the set of essays edited by van der Hoff and Steinberg (1991) does include one which is concerned with community participation in IUIDP, there is very little mention of the public or community amongst the essays edited by Suselo et al (1995), albeit the few references (eg pages 213, 241 and 280) generally speak favourably concerning the need for greater community involvement in the form of 'Community-based Development' (CBD) as well as 'Community Participation' (CP) (see further discussion below). The 'statism' that pervades these essays is, indeed, very characteristic of the 'IUIDP culture'.
- vii. In a recent paper (Lanti, 1995), the Acting Director of Programme Development of the Directorate General of Human Settlements noted: "The growing interest in 'community-based development' implies that local communities should also be able to provide certain services for themselves."
- viii. The techniques of 'Rapid Rural Appraisal' (Scoones and Thompson, 1994) have become convention practice in rural development work. Whilst under discussion with respect to the urban context (Leitmann, 1993), it has not yet developed into a widespread practice.
- ix. The GTZ references are available from: Section 425, GTZ, Dag-Hammarskjöld-weg 1-2, Postfach 5180, D-65726 Eschborn, Germany.