

Implementation of The Right to Initiate The Formation of Regional Regulations

Goinpeace Handerson Tumbel ^{a, 1*}, Fitri Mamonto ^{a, 2}, Brain Fransisco Supit ^{a, 3}, Buli ^{a, 4}

^a Universitas Negeri Manado, Indonesia

¹ goinpeacetumbel@unima.ac.id*

*korespondensi penulis

Informasi artikel

Received: 2 Desember 2024;

Revised: 14 Desember 2024;

Accepted: 20 April 2025.

Keywords:

Implementation;
Right of Initiative;
Regional Regulation;
Public Welfare.

ABSTRAK

This study aims to analyze the implementation of the right of initiative by the Regional People's Representative Council (DPRD) of Mamasa Regency and the factors influencing it in proposing regional regulations. Using a qualitative method, the study examines issues related to the legislative function during the 2014–2019 period. It highlights the unique challenges faced by Mamasa Regency, including procedural inefficiencies, minimal public participation, and limited legislative capacity. The findings reveal that during the 2014–2019 period, only 3 out of 59 regional regulations originated from the initiative of the DPRD. This is attributed to the lack of understanding among DPRD members regarding legislative procedures, budget constraints, and the limited legal education background of its members. Public participation is also restricted due to limited access to information regarding legislative session schedules. Additionally, internal coordination within the DPRD and the commitment of its members to fulfilling their legislative functions remain suboptimal, indicating a reliance on executive-proposed regulations. These findings underscore the need to enhance legislative capacity and public engagement to promote participatory and effective regional regulations.

ABSTRACT

Kata-kata kunci:

Implementasi;
Hak Inisiatif;
Peraturan Daerah;
Kesejahteraan Masyarakat.

Implementasi Hak Mengajukan Prakarsa dalam Pembentukan Peraturan Daerah. Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk menganalisis implementasi hak inisiatif Dewan Perwakilan Rakyat Daerah (DPRD) Kabupaten Mamasa dan faktor-faktor yang mempengaruhinya dalam Pengajuan Rancangan Peraturan Daerah. Penelitian ini menggunakan metode kualitatif, untuk menganalisis permasalahan yang terkait dengan Fungsi Legislasi 2014-2019. Penelitian ini menyoroti tantangan unik yang dihadapi oleh Kabupaten Mamasa, termasuk inefisiensi prosedural, keterlibatan publik yang minimal, dan kapasitas legislatif yang terbatas. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa pelaksanaan hak inisiatif Dewan Perwakilan Rakyat Daerah Kabupaten Mamasa dalam pembentukan peraturan daerah periode 2014–2019, hanya 3 dari 59 perda yang berasal dari inisiatif DPRD. Penyebabnya adalah kurangnya pemahaman anggota DPRD terhadap prosedur legislasi, keterbatasan anggaran, serta minimnya latar belakang pendidikan hukum di antara anggota. Partisipasi masyarakat juga terbatas akibat kurangnya akses informasi terkait jadwal sidang. Selain itu, koordinasi internal DPRD dan komitmen anggota dalam menjalankan fungsi legislasi masih belum optimal, memperlihatkan ketergantungan pada rancangan perda yang diajukan eksekutif. Hal ini menunjukkan perlunya peningkatan kapasitas legislasi dan keterlibatan masyarakat untuk mewujudkan peraturan daerah yang partisipatif dan efektif.

Copyright © 2025 (Goinpeace Handerson Tumbel, dkk). All Right Reserved

How to Cite : Tumbel, G. H., Mamonto, F., Supit, B. F., & Buli, B. (2025). Implementation of The Right to Initiate The Formation of Regional Regulations. *Jurnal Moral Kemasyarakatan*, 10(1), 124–134. <https://doi.org/10.21067/jmk.v10i1.11011>



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/). Allows readers to read, download, copy, distribute, print, search, or link to the full texts of its articles and allow readers to use them for any other lawful purpose. The journal hold the copyright.

Introduction

The Legislature is one of the institutions playing the most important role in the formation of local regulations as a product of public policy, regarding the legal formulation within the Regional Government framework (Arliman, 2017). This indicates that the Regional People Representative Council is a government body responsible for initiating, processing, and legalizing local regulations. It also possesses a complete team known as the Regional Regulation Formation Body, which collaborates with the Executive to prioritize and determine the formation of relevant policies (Palulungan et al., 2017). Based on Article 149 of Law Number 23 of 2014 concerning Regional Government, the Regency/City People Representative Council had various functions, including local regulations formulation, budget analysis, and supervisory activities (Indonesia, 2014). These functions represent the role of the Regional People Legislative Assembly as community delegates, expressing and addressing various community aspirations, needs, and urgent concerns through relevant proposed policies for public discussion. As representatives of the people, the Regency Regional House of Representatives needs to be well-informed about community issues, to establish solutions through draft Local Regulations submitted by the Legislature.

Law number 12 of 2011 concerning the Establishment of Legislation also stated that Regency/City Regional Regulations were formed by the The Regional People Representative Council (DPRD) with the joint approval of the Regent (Indonesia, 2011). In this context, every draft regional regulation is evaluated by the Legislative Assembly through the approval of the Regent. This emphasizes the need for the Assembly to be capable of proposing local policies, with the DPRD serving as a direct representation of the community. In recent years, the majority of draft policies also originated from the executive branch or local government. This is due to the absence of the regional regulations initiated by the DPRD until 2017, indicating a deficiency in the performance emphasizing the independent formulation of relevant laws. Although the entire number of the regulations generated by various Regencies increased annually, its predominant existence under the control of the executive is still emphasized, including Governors and Regents (Palulungan et al., 2017).

The performance of the Regional People Representative Assembly leads to many questions irrespective of presently having a very strategic function in local government, specifically in formulating suitable regulations. This performance emphasizes the extent to which the DPRD carries out the tasks assigned by the constitution, regarding legislative functions. The DPRD, representing the community, is also expected to initiate regional regulations due to having a deeper understanding of the region needs and desires. However, many Regency DPRDs are yet to realistically realize the legislative function. Mamasa Regency, located in West Sulawesi, is also an autonomous region regarding Law number 23 of 2014 on Regional Government. This proves that the region is a legally defined community with territorial boundaries empowered to regulate and manage government affairs. It also addresses the interests of the local society proactively, emphasizing the aspirations of the people within the framework of the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia.

The Initiative Right prioritized in submitting the Draft Regional Regulation subsequently belongs to the DPRD regarding the performance of the duties related to the present Research Locus. This proves that the rights of the Mamasa Regency DPRD from 2014-2019 are governed by the Rules of Procedure, specifically, in Article 6, Paragraph (1). In this context, various members, commissions, or Bapemperda, under Bapemperda coordination, are capable of

proposing the draft regional regulations originating from the DPRD (Kabupaten Mamasa, 2018). Several previous reports at the Mamasa Regency Regional People Legislative Council also found problems in the field, where the granting of initiative rights by the Constitution to the legal assembly was yet to be optimally implemented. This showed that the local and draft regulations were far from expectations in recent years, accompanied by the incomplete implementation of the role and legislative functions prioritizing the Council of Mamasa Regency. Based on the interviews with various informants, only approximately 1-3 policies originating from the initiative of the Mamasa Regency DPRD were observed in 2014-2019 within the Regional People Legislative Assembly emphasizing the relevant draft local regulations.

Studies on the legislative function of regional councils reveal persistent challenges in exercising the right of initiative. Asapa et al. (2023) emphasizes the DPRD's critical role in local regulation formation but highlights a lack of capacity among members to initiate policies independently (Asapa et al., 2023). Similarly, Lasatu (2020) stated the dominance of executive-initiated regulations in various regions, attributing this to inadequate legislative expertise and procedural knowledge within the DPRD (Lasatu, 2020). Further, Handayani et al. (2017) investigate the implementation of legislative initiatives in Central Java, concluding that limited public participation and weak internal coordination hinder the effectiveness of DPRD-initiated regulations (Handayani et al., 2017). These studies collectively demonstrate that the DPRD's legislative function is constrained by structural, procedural, and capacity-related issues.

In contrast to these studies, this research focuses on the specific legislative performance of the Mamasa Regency DPRD from 2014-2019, providing a detailed examination of its use of the right of initiative. By addressing gaps in prior research, this study highlights the unique challenges faced by Mamasa Regency, including procedural inefficiencies, minimal public involvement, and limited legislative capacity. The findings aim to contribute to broader discussions on strengthening DPRD autonomy in local regulation formation.

The majority of the evaluated draft regional regulations also originated from the executive branch during 2014-2019, specifically from the regents and the dominant agencies emphasizing significant submission to the DPRD. This indicated that the Regional People Representative Council of Mamasa Regency primarily played a role in the discussion and approval process. Therefore, this study aimed to explore the Implementation of the Right to Initiative Formation of Local Regulations in the Regional People Legislative Council of Mamasa Regency from 2014-2019. The formulation of the experimental problem also includes, 1) How effective is the Initiative Right to Establish Local Regulations in the Regional People Representative Council of Mamasa Regency during 2014-2019? and 2) What are the factors influencing the application of the Rights in 2014-2019? The experimental objectives also emphasize the following, 1) describing, analyzing, and interpreting the implementation of the Right to Initiative Formation of Regional Regulations in the Regional People Legislative Council of Mamasa Regency in 2014-2019, and 2) determining the factors influencing the application of the Initiative Rights in 2014-2019.

The legislative performance of the DPRD is vital to ensuring that local regulations reflect community needs and aspirations. In Mamasa Regency, the limited exercise of the right of initiative by the DPRD has hindered its ability to address pressing local issues effectively. With only 1-3 initiative-based regulations produced between 2014-2019, there is a critical need to understand the underlying factors that restrict legislative productivity. Furthermore, as an autonomous region under Law Number 23 of 2014, Mamasa Regency is expected to be proactive

in addressing local societal interests within the framework of the Republic of Indonesia. Strengthening the DPRD's legislative function is urgent to enhance the formulation of participatory and responsive regional policies. By investigating the specific challenges faced by the Mamasa Regency DPRD, this study seeks to provide actionable recommendations for improving legislative performance and fostering greater community involvement.

Method

A descriptive qualitative approach was used to analyze written and verbal data collected from participants. This method focused on understanding attitudes and behaviors in the context of legislative processes, specifically regarding the implementation of the Right to Initiative Formation of Local Regulations. The study was conducted at the Mamasa Regency Regional People Legislative Council Office, chosen due to its relevance and the researcher's familiarity with the location. Research Steps consisted of data collection, data validation, and data analysis. Primary data were gathered through interviews with DPRD members, legislative staff, and local government representatives. Observations of legislative meetings were conducted to capture the dynamics of discussions. Secondary data included documents such as meeting minutes, draft regulations, and procedural guidelines to provide additional context. Data Validation: Triangulation was performed by cross-checking data from interviews, observations, and document reviews. Expert consultation ensured the reliability of findings. Legislative processes were observed directly at the DPRD office, and semi-structured interviews allowed flexibility to explore key issues. The data were analyzed using the interactive model of Miles and Huberman (1994): data reduction, data display, conclusions (Miles & Huberman, 1994). Findings were compared with laws, such as Law No. 23 of 2014 and Law No. 12 of 2011, to identify gaps or deviations in practice. Conclusion: Patterns and factors affecting legislative performance were identified, validated through member checking, and synthesized into recommendations. This approach provided a clear analysis of challenges and opportunities in the legislative function of the Mamasa Regency DPRD.

Result and Discussion

The Regional People Representative Council was a representation of the public interest, supporting the executive expressions and policies emphasizing the improvement of people welfare. To achieve this role, the DPRD possessed an inherent legislative function, including the initiative right to propose Regional Regulation Drafts. The regulations governing the rights were also stipulated in Mamasa Regency DPRD Regulation Number 1 of 2018, specifically in Article 6, Paragraph 1. This policy stated that "Draft Regional Regulations were submitted by members of the DPRD, Commissions, or Bapemperda, under the coordination of Bapemperda." Paragraph 2 also confirmed that "the proposed regulations should be submitted in written form to the DPRD leadership, accompanied by: (a) An explanation, statement, and/or an academic paper, and (b) A list emphasizing the names and signatures of the applicants."

Based on Article 9 paragraph 1, the draft regional regulations originating from the DPRD and the Regent were evaluated to obtain mutual approval. Paragraph 2 also stated that the evaluation of the regulation was carried out through Levels I and II assessments. In this case, the DPRD initiative right was implemented to propose draft laws or regional policies. The right was also owned by DPRD members to carry out legislative duties within the framework of local governance, regarding the provisions of Law Number 9 of 2015 concerning Regional Government. This law governed and supervised government affairs due to the principles of

autonomy and co-administration, facilitating the achievement of social welfare through enhancement, service, empowerment, and community engagement. It also enhanced regional competitiveness and upheld the concepts of democracy, equity, justice, and privileges (Halawa et al., 2022). Despite the existing policy regulating the initiative rights of the Regional People Legislative Assembly for the formulation and submission of local draft regulations, the implementation of the Mamasa Regency DPRD realistically remained suboptimal. Regarding the data obtained, the inadequate implementation of the DPRD initiative rights in the formation of local laws from 2014-2019 was observed, with Table 1 presenting the number of Mamasa Regency Regional Regulations during the period.

Table 1. Number of Regional Regulations of Mamasa Regency 2014 – 2019

Year	Initiative Executive	Initiative DPRD
2014	23	-
2015	9	-
2016	8	-
2017	7	-
2018	5	-
2019	4	3

Source: DPRD Mamasa Regency

Table 2. Name of Regional Regulation of Mamasa Regency 2014 - 2019

No	Name of Regional Regulation	Year
1	Supervision and Control emphasizing the Distribution of Alcoholic Drinks (DPRD Initiative)	2019
2	Protection of Sustainable Food Agricultural Land (DPRD Initiative)	2019
3	Indigenous People of Mamasa Regency (DPRD Initiative)	2019

Source: DPRD Mamasa Regency

Based on the results, the Mamasa Regency Regional People Representative Council primarily initiated three (3) regional policies during 2014-2019, to conduct relevant legislative functions. These policies included (1) Regional Regulation No. 1 of 2019 concerning the Oversight and Regulation of Alcoholic Beverage Distribution, (2) Regional Regulation No. 2 of 2019 regarding the Protection of Sustainable Agricultural Land for Food Production, and (3) A local law prioritizing the indigenous people of Mamasa Regency. In contrast, most other local laws predominantly originated from the executive branch, focusing on the normative regulations mandated annually. The results also indicated a connection between the legislative function and the roles of the DPRD, emphasizing the ineffectiveness of the relationship. Furthermore, a clear difference was found in the quantity of proposals for Draft Regional Regulations originating from the Mamasa Regency DPRD and the Executive or government. This proved that the Regency DPRD execution of its Initiative Rights was non-optimal in submitting the 2014-2019 draft regional regulations.

According to the results, the following procedures were carried out for Submission of Draft regional regulations Initiative DPRD Mamasa Regency (Regulation of Orders of DPRD Mamasa Regency Number 1 of 2018) (Kabupaten Mamasa, 2018): a) The draft regional regulation was orthographically submitted by members of the DPRD (Commission/Joint Commission) to the Leadership, accompanied by an explanation, statement, and or academic paper. b) The regulations were submitted to Bapemperda for review. c) The results were conveyed by the DPRD leadership to members (at least 7 days) before the plenary meeting. d) The leadership

also presented the outcomes in a plenary meeting. e) In the Plenary Session, the proposer explained, with the faction and other members disseminating their perspectives. f) The proponent produced answers to the opinions of the faction and other DPRD members. g) The actual and modification approvals or rejection of the results were emphasized. h) The DPRD assigned the Actual and Joint Commissions or Bapemperda to improve the draft regional regulations when approved with amendments. i) The DPRD-based regulations were submitted with a letter from the leadership of the Regional People Representative Council to the Regent.

These descriptions showed that several DPRD members did not understand the flow of the Initiative Raperda Submission Procedure despite its clarity in the Standing Orders of the Mamasa Regency Regional People Legislative Assembly. From the results, the 3 Regional Parliament Initiative Draft Regional Regulations did not possess Academic Papers when demanded by the study professionals, prioritizing only explanations or statements. Furthermore, the 2014-2019 Mamasa Regency Initiative Draft Local Regulations emphasizing the DPRD Rules were carried out as follows:

Level I Process: 1) Explanation of single and joint commission, Bapemperda, or special committee leaders at a plenary meeting on draft regional regulations. 2) Opinion of the district head on the regulations. 3) The faction responses and answers to the regent perspective. 4) Discussion in commission meetings, joint commissions, or special committees carried out together with the regent or an executive-appointed official. 5) Submission of the faction final opinion was conducted at the end of the discussion between the DPRD and the regent in the plenary meeting.

Level II Process: 1) Submission of a report containing the discussion process, faction opinions, and the outcomes of the Level I evaluations by the Single and Joint Commissions Leaders, or Special Committee Head. 2) Request verbal approval from the chairman to members in a plenary meeting. 3) The final opinion of the regent.

In the procedures described above, the field implementation was still encountering challenges. These challenges focused on the inquiries emphasizing the arrangement level of the procedures with the Bylaws. According to the informants, the steps were yet to be fully executed due to the unfamiliarity with the Initiative regional regulation in the Mamasa Regency DPRD.

Informant A, a member of the Mamasa Regency DPRD, stated, "We are still facing challenges in understanding and implementing this initiative regulation. Many members have not received specific training related to the drafting procedures that differ from executive regulations." This highlights that the lack of socialization and training is a major obstacle in the process.

For example, the initial discussions of the draft of regional regulation tended to resemble the drafting procedures for regulations originating from the executive, with an emphasis on repeated explanations from the Regent. Informant B, a staff member of the DPRD secretariat, explained, "The initial discussions mostly involved listening to explanations from the executive rather than in-depth deliberations by DPRD members. As a result, substantial input from the DPRD was often less than optimal."

Furthermore, one of the eight factions was absent during the deliberation of the three Initiative the draft of regional regulation, namely the Gerindra faction. Informant C, a representative of the faction, explained the reason for their absence: "At that time, we were dealing with some internal party agendas that could not be postponed. However, we recognize

that our absence impacted the diversity of perspectives in the evaluation of the Raperda." This indicates that internal party factors also influenced the effectiveness of deliberations.

The results also showed that the Procedures for Submitting and Discussing the 2014-2019 Mamasa Regency DPRD Initiative Draft Regional Regulations were not fully implemented as stipulated in the appropriate Standing Orders. However, the foundation of each DPRD activity should be guided by the agreed Rules of Procedure. The existence of steps within the Standing Orders was subsequently not a sudden development. This was because the Orders were the culmination of various higher policies, including Government Regulation No. 12 of 2018 concerning the Preparation of Standing Orders for Provincial and City DPRDs. In this case, a specific practice was considered a procedural policy deficiency when the stipulations within the Rules were not supported. Furthermore, the three regional regulations proposed by the DPRD lacked academic content. This was observed even when the regulations were expected to be supported by scientific studies, to provide insights into the potential benefits and impacts of policy implementation. From this context, strategic preparations were enabled to facilitate the achievement of policy objectives, specifically within regional laws. Moreover, the Implementor inability to understand policy directives significantly hindered successful implementation. This emphasized the need for the effective functions of DPRD, by thoroughly comprehending the provisions stated in the code of conduct. The similarities of the decision-making processes to the established rules were also ensured, preventing any potential maladministration.

Communication was very influential in the successful implementation of a policy because the usage orders need to be conveyed clearly, accurately, and consistently to intelligent people, according to Edwards III. When the messages and policy levels provided by lawmakers were unclear and unspecified, a misunderstanding was likely to occur at the phase of the appointed implementor (Putra & Khaidir, 2019).

The analysis of communication also showed that several Regional People Legislative Assembly members lacked a solid understanding of the content stated in the Mamasa Regency DPRD Rules of Procedure. This was specifically observed in the policies governing DPRD functions within the legislative domain. In this case, issues were often observed in the policy framework for submitting regional regulation initiatives. Based on the discussion phase, the Mamasa Regency DPRD Rules were reviewed in a joint commission meeting attended only by representatives of political factions. This limited the engagement and comprehensive knowledge of the DPRD-based members regarding the laws. Public participation in expressing aspirations or perspectives on draft regional regulations also encountered challenges due to insufficient information dissemination concerning the plenary session schedule.

Communication was subsequently one of the very important factors influencing a policy, emphasizing the Implementation model developed by Jan Merse in Baharuddin et al (2021). This analysis indicated that the availability of information significantly influenced the application of regulations. When policy-related information reached the implementer, successful implementation was more likely achieved. However, the regulation did not support the intended goal when the implementer lacked access to the information (Baharuddin et al., 2021). These results confirmed that one of the challenges encountered by the Mamasa Regency DPRD in submitting initiative draft regional regulations was non-optimal communication with council members concerning relevant applicable policies.

According to Edwards III, an important resource consisted of relevant staff with the required expertise. This indicated the need for adequate and relevant information on policy

implementation, regulation implementers role adjustments, and the authority to ensure compliance for specific objectives (Tamami & Suryawati, 2022). In this case, the resources emphasizing equipment and finances were appropriately supported. Accurate legal instructions were also unable to guarantee effective implementation when the responsible individuals lacked necessary resources (Putra & Khaidir, 2019). Besides the formal education of DPRD members, Dayanto (2017) subsequently stated that the experience encountered before joining the faction served as the foundation for understanding the performance patterns within local government institutions with legislative functions (Dayanto, 2017).

Based on the results, the challenges in submitting the draft regional regulations to the Mamasa Regency DPRD from 2014-2019 were primarily caused by the limited educational background of its human resources, specifically in the field of law. This indicated that only 4 of the 30 members of the DPRD possessed a legal education background, emphasizing a significant deficiency in lawful drafting skills within the Regional People Legislative Assembly. The leadership of the Mamasa Regency DPRD also stated that the problem prioritizing the lack of initiative bylaws was due to inadequate financial resources. This led to the primary allocation of DPRD-based funds for developing the regional regulations prioritizing the immediate discussion requirements in various regions. The results were supported by BPK (Financial Audit Board) data, where the Mamasa Regency DPRD operated on a significant limited budget. Moreover, the ongoing budget deficit in the city directly impacted the annual inflow of funds into the Regional People Legislative Assembly. The knowledge level of each DPRD member, regarding the proposal for the draft regional regulation initiative, was also very inadequate, causing the production of a few rules by the faction from 2014-2019.

The research findings demonstrate the critical role of resources in the success of policy implementation, aligning with the resource dependency perspective in the policy implementation paradigm. In this context, the Mamasa Regency DPRD faced significant resource shortages, particularly in financial resources and the capacity of its members to comprehend the regulatory framework supporting their legislative functions. These deficits hindered the optimal execution of DPRD's legislative roles, particularly in the formulation of Regional Initiative Regulations. As supported by Edwards III's policy implementation model, resource availability is pivotal. The absence of sufficient resources often leads to suboptimal implementation outcomes, as regulations are applied without prioritizing quality.

Edwards III emphasizes the disposition or attitude of policy implementers as a determinant of successful implementation. The findings highlight that the 2014-2019 Mamasa Regency DPRD exhibited a non-committal disposition towards maximizing its right of initiative. This was evident in the prioritization of draft policies from the executive branch over initiating its legislative agenda. The negligence of certain factions, particularly the Gerindra faction's absence in critical deliberations, further exemplifies this issue. As Putra and Khaidir (2019) noted, negative attitudes and ineffective coordination can lead to suboptimal policy outcomes, which was evident in the limited frequency of community engagement and the underrepresentation of societal aspirations in legislative discussions. Consequently, the non-committal attitude of DPRD members hindered both the quantity and quality of Initiative Regional Regulations.

The bureaucratic structure within the Mamasa Regency DPRD also played a central role in shaping policy outcomes. According to Edwards III, the bureaucratic structure impacts policy implementation through its influence on coordination, standard operating procedures (SOPs),

and fragmentation. Despite frequent coordination attempts during the 2014–2019 period, the overall commitment to submitting regulation initiatives remained inadequate. The findings reveal that divergent political perspectives among DPRD members often led to disputes, undermining the collective effort required for drafting and initiating local laws. This aligns with Ripley and Franklin's (1986) assertion that bureaucratic compliance is critical to effective policy implementation.

Additionally, the absence of a well-defined leadership structure within the DPRD contributed to minimal enthusiasm among members in proposing Initiative Regional Regulations. The complexity and hierarchical nature of regulations further exacerbated this issue, as members often hesitated to submit proposals due to limited understanding of procedural and substantive requirements. This reflects Satibi and Rochaeni's (2023) findings, which highlight how inefficient bureaucratic structures can negate the sufficiency of resources in regulatory compliance and implementation.

The research underscores the importance of resources and capabilities in achieving effective policy implementation, as outlined in Edwards III's model. The Mamasa Regency DPRD's inability to overcome resource constraints and inefficiencies in its bureaucratic structure significantly impeded the formulation of Initiative Regional Regulations. Furthermore, Azizah et al. (2023) emphasized that effective policy implementation requires collaboration among multiple actors, facilitated by robust SOPs and clear bureaucratic leadership. When the bureaucratic structure was not in line with existing regulations, various resources were considered ineffective and hindered law application (Matte, 2017). The findings illustrate that the absence of these elements led to fragmented coordination and reduced enthusiasm among DPRD members, further weakening the legislative process.

The study highlights the interplay between resources, implementer attitudes, and bureaucratic structures in policy implementation within the Mamasa Regency DPRD. It provides empirical evidence supporting the theoretical models proposed by Edwards III and Ripley and Franklin, demonstrating that inadequate resources, negative implementer attitudes, and inefficient bureaucratic structures collectively hindered the legislative output. Future policies should prioritize capacity building, resource allocation, and structural reforms to ensure the optimal application of Initiative Rights and improve the legislative performance of regional councils.

Conclusion

The implementation of the right to initiate local regulations by the Mamasa Regency DPRD from 2014–2019 was ineffective, with only 3 of 59 regulations originating from DPRD initiatives. These included policies on controlling alcoholic beverage distribution, protecting agricultural land, and addressing indigenous people's issues. The lack of effective implementation was due to several factors, including inadequate understanding of legislative procedures, insufficient academic support for policy proposals, and limited legal expertise among DPRD members. Many members were unfamiliar with the proper procedures for submitting initiatives, and only a few had legal education backgrounds. Additionally, coordination within the DPRD was weak, as political differences hindered the submission of draft regulations. Community engagement was also minimal, with limited access to information about plenary meetings. The DPRD's role was largely reactive, waiting for executive proposals rather than initiating policies. To improve, the Mamasa DPRD needs to strengthen its legislative

capacity, enhance community involvement, and ensure better internal coordination and understanding of legal processes.

References

- Arliman, L. (2017). Partisipasi Masyarakat Dalam Pembentukan Perundang-Undangan Untuk Mewujudkan Negara Kesejahteraan Indonesia. *Jurnal Politik Pemerintahan Dharma Praja*, 59–72. <https://doi.org/10.33701/jppdp.v10i1.379>
- Asapa, A. A. F., Rahman, S., & Gadjong, A. A. (2023). Pelaksanaan Fungsi Legislasi Dewan Perwakilan Rakyat Daerah Dalam Pembentukan Peraturan Daerah. *Journal of Lex Philosophy (JLP)*, 4(2), 333–348. <https://pasca-umi.ac.id/index.php/jlp/article/view/1591>
- Azizah, L. N., Nawawi, J., & Rusli, A. M. (2023). Implementasi Kebijakan Pemerintah Daerah dalam Program One Village One Product di Kabupaten Gowa. *Journal of Governance and Local Politics (JGLP)*, 5(2), 310–321. <https://doi.org/10.47650/jglp.v5i2.917>
- Baharuddin, S., Aneta, A., Aneta, Y., & Abdussamad, J. (2021). Strategy For Implementing PAMSIMAS Policy Using Jan Merse Model to Elevate Public Health Service Quality (A Case Study in Gorontalo District). *Turkish Journal of Computer and Mathematics Education (TURCOMAT)*, 12(14), 2576–2582. <https://doi.org/10.17762/turcomat.v12i14.10700>
- Dayanto, D. (2017). Pendayagunaan Hak Inisiatif Anggota DPRD Dalam Pembentukan Peraturan Daerah (Studi Yuridis Sosiologis Di DPRD Sulawesi Selatan). *TAHKIM*, 10(2). <https://doi.org/10.33477/thk.v10i2.56>
- Halawa, Y., Siburian, K., & Siregar, H. (2022). Hak Inisiatif Dewan Perwakilan Rakyat Daerah dalam Proses Pembentukan Peraturan Daerah. *Nommensen Journal of Constitutional and Administrative Law*, 1(1), 35–44. https://ejournal.uhn.ac.id/index.php/administrative_law
- Handayani, I., Rachmi, G. A. K., Glaser, H., Palil, M. R., & Najicha, F. U. (2017). The Regulatory Formulations Of Central Java And East Java Watershed: Strengthening Local Government In Legislative Drafting Practices Towards Green Legislation. *International Journal of Business, Economics and Law*, 14, 225–229. <https://ijbel.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/01/IJBEL14-K23-302.pdf>
- Indonesia, R. (2011). Undang-Undang Nomor 12 Tahun 2011 tentang Pembentukan Peraturan Perundang-Undangan. In *Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia*. Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia.
- Indonesia, R. (2014). *Undang-Undang Nomor 23 Tahun 2014 tentang Pemerintahan Daerah*. Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia.
- Kabupaten Mamasa, P. (2018). *Peraturan Tata Tertib DPRD Kabupaten Mamasa Nomor 1 tahun 2018 tentang Tata Tertib Dewan Perwakilan Rakyat Daerah*. Pemerintah Daerah Kabupaten Mamasa.
- Lasatu, A. (2020). Urgensi Peraturan Daerah Tentang Program Pembentukan Peraturan Daerah Terhadap Kinerja DPRD. *Jurnal Ilmiah Kebijakan Hukum*, 14(2), 201–222. <http://dx.doi.org/10.30641/kebijakan.2020.V14.201-222>
- Matte, R. (2017). Bureaucratic structures and organizational performance: A comparative study of Kampala capital city authority and national planning authority. *Journal of Public Administration and Policy Research*, 9(1), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.5897/JAPAR2016.0377>
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook*. sage.
- Palulungan, Lusia; Ghufuran, M.; Yunus, Yudha; Hidayat, Taufan; Yanti, P. R. (2017). *Panduan Penyusunan Peraturan Daerah Inisiatif DPRD Secara Partisipatif dan Responsif Gender*. Yayasan Bakti. <https://studylib.net/doc/25261741/buku-panduan-penyusunan-peraturan-daerah-inisiatif-dprd-s...>
- Putra, R. H., & Khaidir, A. (2019). Concept of George C. Edwards III on implementation of regional regulations No. 12 of 2017 concerning youth in granting youth service in West Sumatera. *International Journal of Progressive Sciences and Technologies (IJPSAT)*, 15(1), 236–242. <https://ijpsat.org/index.php/ijpsat/article/view/1012>

- Ripley, R. B., & Franklin, G. A. (1986). Public Implementation and Bureaucracy. *Homewood: Dorcy*.
- Satibi, I., & Rochaeni, A. (2023). Implementation of Village Government Capacity Building Policies in Indonesia. *Tec Empresarial*, 18(2), 479-493. <http://repository.unpas.ac.id/id/eprint/65111>
- Setyawan, D., Priantono, A., & Firdausi, F. (2021). George Edward III Model. *Publicio: Jurnal Ilmiah Politik, Kebijakan Dan Sosial*, 3(2), 9-19. <https://doi.org/10.51747/publicio.v3i2.774>
- Tamami, T., & Suryawati, D. (2022). Implementation of Protection Policy and Fulfillment of The Rights of People With Disabilities Perspective In G. Edward III (1980). *Regional Dynamic: Journal of Policy and Business Science*, 2(1), 29-38. <https://doi.org/10.19184/rdjpbs.v2i1.26539>