



JURNAL LITERATIA CENDEKIA (LICE)

Vol. 2, No. 1, Desember 2025, pp. 32–41

ISSN (Print): - | ISSN (Online): -

URL: <https://literatiacendekia.com/index.php/lice>

PUBLIC POLICY EVALUATION (AN EVALUATION STUDY OF DEVELOPMENT PLANNING DELIBERATION PROCESS IN BANDUNG CITY)

Rahmat Rafinzar¹, Sri Yunita Simanjuntak², Afrizza Wahyu Arham Azizi³

Department of Public Administration, Sriwijaya University¹, Office Administration Education Study Program, Makassar State University², Sultan Fatah University³

Corresponding author: rahmatrafinzar@fisip.unsri.ac.id

Article history:

Article Send: 21 November 2025

Revision Recieved: 12 Desember 2025

Article Recieved: 20 Januari 2026

Article Publish: 29 Januari 2026

Abstract

Development Planning Conference (Musrenbang) is a government program that aims to capture aspirations of people related to development program of an area. This study aims to evaluate suitability of implementation of musrenbang with Perda No. 5 of 2009 and assessed results of implementation of subdistrict musrenbang in city of Bandung. This research uses descriptive research method with a qualitative approach. data analysis model used by researchers is Miles and Huberman data analysis model. results of this study are 1). implementation of subdistrict musrenbang is based on Peda Kota Bandung No. 05 of 2009 is quite good but still has obstacles in terms of reporting and realization of proposed results of musrenbang. 2). An evaluation of results of implementation of subdistrict musrenbang in city of Bandung, shows that submission of proposals in musrenbang that is more transparent, balanced and evenly distributed must be carried out in each sector.

Keywords: Evaluation, Implementation, Development Plan.

1. Introduction

The Development Planning Conference (Musrenbang) is an annual government program implemented in stages from village/sub-district level to provincial level, culminating in National Musrenbang. purpose of Musrenbang is to formulate various development programs in Indonesia through a bottom-up approach. According to data released by UNDP (2013), Indonesia's human development index falls within Medium Human Development Index, ranking 121st, on par with South Africa, Timor-Leste, Palestine, and Iraq. Indonesia's Human Development Index (HDI) is considered suboptimal, necessitating a strategic approach to improving quality of Indonesian human resources. Planning is one step that can be used as a focused, measurable, and planned effort in human resource development process as a framework for resolving various issues that arise in society. Communication within community is a crucial part of development planning process. According to Soekanto (2006), individuals within a community group are considered part of entire community. Azhar (2015) expressed a similar opinion, stating that involvement of individuals in community is essential for effective planning. approach taken can be assessed as representing or being a representation in measuring effectiveness of musrenbang through level of participation which can be measured by level of frequency and intensity of communication of individual members of community within group.

To increase public participation in targeted and effective development planning programs to improve community welfare, regulations must be aligned with Law No. 25 of 2004. To achieve targeted development planning, Regional Government Work Plan (RKPD) plays a crucial role in regional development planning, incorporating strategic development plans and annual budgeting. process of drafting Regional

Development Work Plan (RKPD) is carried out through coordination between government agencies and involvement of all stakeholders involved in development process. This process is then referred to as Development Planning Conference (Musrenbang). One of functions of Musrenbang is to serve as a forum for gathering public aspirations regarding matters related to impacts of development on community. Musrenbang is conducted as a step to identify problems, community needs, challenges, and potential within community, as well as how to address these issues. Bandung City has Regional Regulation Number 07 of 2008 as amended by Bandung City Regional Regulation Number 05 of 2009, concerning Stages, Procedures for Preparation, Control, and Evaluation of Implementation of Development Plans and Musrenbang. implementation of Musrenbang where Bappeda has main task of carrying out preparation and implementation of regional policies in field of regional development planning and investment. In process of preparing RKPD, Bandung City is required to hold a Development Planning Deliberation Forum (Musrenbang) in stages, starting from Village/Sub-district, Sub-district to Regency level, including implementation of SKPD Forum and/or Joint SKPD Forum. Sub-district Musrenbang is a forum for deliberation of Sub-district stakeholders to obtain input on priority activities from Village/Sub-district and cross-district activities in preparing Regency Regional Apparatus Work Plan for following year. Three areas are proposed during sub-district development planning (Musrenbang): Economics and Investment, Infrastructure and Regional Development, and Government, Social, and Cultural Affairs. Based on Minister of Home Affairs Regulation Number 54 of 2010 concerning Implementation of Government Regulation Number 8 of 2008 concerning Stages, Procedures for Preparation, Control, and Evaluation of Implementation of Regional

Development Plans, Musrenbang for Regency/City Regional Development Plan (RKPD) in sub-district is held to refine, align, clarify, and agree on proposed village/sub-district development plans, which are integrated with regional development priorities within sub-district.

The proposed activities are more or less same, with only location differing. implementation of Sub-district Development Planning Meeting (Musrenbang) has not been optimal due to ongoing challenges, numerous unaccommodated activities, and a lack of community participation. Evaluation of Implementation of Sub-district Development Planning Meeting (Musrenbang) in Bandung City. purpose of this research is to determine implementation of Sub-district Development Planning Meeting (Musrenbang) in Bandung City. To determine factors that hinder implementation of Sub-district Development Planning Meeting (Musrenbang) in Bandung City.

2. Literature Review

1. Public Policy

Anderson, in Winarno (2007:16), defines public policy as a purposeful course of action determined by an actor or group of actors to address a problem or issue. Meanwhile, according to Dye (in Nugroho (2009:23), public policy is what government does, why it does it, and what difference it makes. Public policy is what government does, why it takes that action, and what consequences of that action are. Another definition, according to Chandler and Plano (in Keban (2008:60), states that public policy is strategic use of existing resources to solve public or government problems. Suwitri, in Suaedi and Wardiyanto (2010:138), defines public policy as a series of actions consisting of choices to do or not do something in order to

achieve state goals that are in public interest, taking into account available input, based on proposals from individuals or groups within or outside government. Policy Implementation

Policy implementation is a crucial stage in determining success of a policy. According to Pasolong (2019: 67), no matter how well-developed a plan, it will be useless if it is not implemented properly and correctly. A simple definition, as provided by Nugroho (2004: 158), states that policy implementation is, in principle, a way for a policy to achieve its predetermined objectives. In her journal (Anggraeni: 2011), she states that policy implementation is considered a crucial stage because it is at this stage that policy is implemented and extent to which it is performing as expected and achieving desired policy objectives is measured.

2. Policy Evaluation

Evaluation is also viewed as a functional activity, meaning that evaluation is not limited to final stage but rather throughout entire policy process. According to Government Regulation No. 39 of 2006, evaluation is a series of activities comparing realization of inputs, outputs, and outcomes against plans and standards (Constansia: 2019). According to Muhadjir's definition of public policy evaluation, as cited in Widodo (2008:112), policy evaluation is a process for assessing extent to which a public policy has yielded results, namely by comparing results obtained with stated objectives or targets of public policy. Based on definitions put forward by these experts, it can be concluded that evaluation is an activity comparing initial plan of an activity with implementation process by examining each stage of activity.

3. Public Policy Evaluation Theory

Public policy evaluation is assessment of success or failure of a policy based on predetermined indicators. Indicators for evaluating policies

typically cover two aspects: process and outcome. Anderson (in Nugroho, 2004:198) defines policy evaluation as focusing on estimation, assessment, and prediction of policy implementation and consequences. Suchman (in Winarno, 2012:169) defines policy evaluation as a process-based evaluation. identified six steps in policy evaluation, namely:

- 1) Identifying objectives of program to be evaluated
- 2) Problem analysis
- 3) Activity description and standardization
- 4) Measuring level of change that occurs
- 5) Determining whether observed change is a result of activity or due to other causes.
- 6) Establishing several indicators to determine existence of an impact. To assess success of a policy, it is necessary to develop several indicators, as using a single indicator is dangerous, meaning that research results can be biased from actual results.

Policy Evaluation Indicators according to Dunn (2012):

- 1) Effectiveness: Have desired results been achieved?
- 2) Adequacy: To what extent have achieved results solved problem?
- 3) Equity: Are costs and benefits distributed equitably across different community groups?
- 4) Responsiveness: Do policy outcomes reflect group's preferences/values and satisfy them?
- 5) Accuracy: Are achieved results useful?

3. Methodology

This research is a qualitative descriptive study. Bogdan and Taylor, in Moelong (2007: 4), define qualitative methodology as a research procedure that produces descriptive data in form of written or spoken words from observable data.

In this study, researchers used a documentation study or literature review. Data sources are data obtained and collected through literature review of documents related to implementation of Musrenbang, which can include reference books, documentation, archives, and laws and regulations. research location was Bandung City Regional Development Planning Agency (BAPPEDA), which handles and is responsible for regional development planning meetings at sub-district level. data validity testing technique used in this study was data triangulation, which compared collected data, both primary and secondary. data analysis model used by researchers was Miles and Huberman data analysis model in Sugiyono (2010: 20), which consists of data collection, data reduction, data presentation, and conclusion drawing.

4. Discussion

1) Implementation of Musrenbang in Bandung City

1. Musrenbang Data

Based on research results obtained through field data, it was concluded that clarity regarding location, timing, and participants of Musrenbang is generally quite effective in supporting Musrenbang implementation. following is a summary of Musrenbang data by sub-district in Bandung City:

No.	Kecamatan	Total Usulan	Usulan diakomodir	Usulan tidak diakomodir	Persentase usulan diakomodir
1	Sukasari	72	19	53	26.38%
2	Coblong	85	33	52	38.82%
3	Babakan Ciparay	53	26	27	49.05%
4	Bojongloa Kaler	94	56	38	59.57%
5	Andir	160	118	42	73.75%
6	Cicendo	145	70	75	48.27%
7	Sukajadi	234	92	142	39.31%
8	Cidadap	115	42	73	36.52%
9	Bandung Wetan	27	7	20	25.92%
10	Astana Anyar	206	139	67	67.47%
11	Regol	147	60	87	40.81%
12	Batununggal	179	65	114	36.31%
13	Lengkong	119	52	67	43.69%
14	Cibeuying Kidul	247	62	185	25.10%
15	Bandung Kulon	134	59	75	44.02%
16	Kiaracondong	250	104	146	41.6%
17	Bojongloa Kidul	270	134	136	49.62%
18	Cibeuying Kaler	88	30	58	34.09%
19	Sumur Bandung	89	73	16	82.02%
20	Antapani	56	33	23	58.92%
21	Bandung Kidul	137	48	89	35.03%
22	Buah Batu	173	56	117	32.36%
23	Rancasari	258	87	171	33.72%
24	Arcamanik	119	53	86	27.73%
25	Cibiru	909	297	612	32.67%
26	Ujung Berung	215	117	98	54.41%
27	Gedebage	131	52	79	39.69%
28	Panyileukan	235	88	167	28.93%
29	Cinambo	50	13	37	26%
30	Mandalajati	63	26	37	41.26%

Source : Data.go.id

The data above is musrenbang data derived from all musrenbang results based on 30 sub-districts in Bandung City. From this data, there are around 6 sub-districts that have a percentage of proposals accommodated less than 30% of all proposals submitted in sub-district musrenbang, namely in order from lowest to lowest are Cibeuying Kidul (25.10%), Bandung Wetan (25.92%), Cinambo (26%), Sukasari (26.38%), Arcamanik (27.73%), and finally, Panyileukan (28.93%). data also demonstrates level of public participation in submitting proposals to Musrenbang (Residential Development Planning Forum) held by City of Bandung. Of 30 sub-districts recorded, Bandung Wetan had fewest proposals submitted and also significantly fewer proposals accepted compared to other 29 sub-districts, with only 7 of 20 proposals accepted. When searching for data from each sub-district on data.go.id website, not all sites compiled detailed data on Musrenbang results. Only 9 sub-districts had accessible data: Sukasari, Regol, Cibiru, Batununggal, Rancasari, Lengkong, Ujung Berung, Kiara Condong, and Panyileukan, out of 30 sub-districts that held Musrenbang in Bandung City. This also indicates that not all sub-districts reported their Musrenbang results. search results also included a summary of

Musrenbang results based on respective areas of concern. data obtained are as follows:

No.	Bidang Urusan	Usulan diakomodir	Usulan tidak diakomodir	Dana yang diusulkan
1	Pendidikan	80	198	63.696.808.000
2	Kesehatan	143	101	59.259.075.750
3	Pekerjaan umum	560	2026	1.041.536.943.162
4	Perumahan	395	28	329.634.340.202
5	Penataan Ruang	0	1	400.000.000
6	Perhubungan	59	31	4.222.700.000
7	Lingkungan Hidup	262	240	204.590.100.000
8	Pertanahan	65	52	754.822.500.000
9	Kependudukan dan catatan sipil.	15	1	765.000.000
10	Pemberdayaan perempuan dan perlindungan anak	12	3	274.600.000
11	Keluarga berencana dan keluarga sejahtera	36	13	1.548.235.000
12	Sosial	39	10	1.287.200.000
13	Ketenagakerjaan	42	41	3.074.000.000
14	Koperasi dan Usaha Kecil Menengah	82	20	3.569.500.000
15	Kebudayaan	20	40	153.386.500.000
16	Keperumudaan dan Olahraga	151	28	10.609.745.000
17	Kesatuan Bangsa dan Politik Dalam Negeri	27	30	4.957.250.000
18	Otonomi daerah, pemerintahan umum, administrasi keuangan, perangkat daerah, kepegawaian dan persandian.	4	8	7.000.000.000
19	Ketahanan Pangan	6	6	350.000.000
20	Pemberdayaan Masyarakat dan Desa	8	42	1.790.658.325
21	Kearsipan	0	1	5.000.000
22	Komunikasi dan Informatika	11	9	871.725.000
23	Perpustakaan	10	2	367.000.000
24	Pertanian	18	3	690.000.000
25	Pariwisata	6	1	275.000.000
26	Kelautan dan Perikanan	1	0	550.000
27	Perdagangan	2	0	105.000.000
28	Industri	10	0	219.200.000
29	Pariwisata	0	3	930.000.000
30	Kelautan dan Perikanan	10	1	405.000.000
31	Perdagangan	2	2	66.350.000
32	Industri	2	0	20.000.000

Source : Data.go.id

The data obtained revealed several issues, including an imbalance between amount of funding allocated and proposals accommodated. As can be seen in table, in spatial planning, archives, and tourism sectors, data clearly states that no proposals were accommodated, yet funding proposals for these sectors were still submitted. For archives sector, proposed funding was 5 million rupiah, and for spatial planning and tourism sectors, combined proposed funds reached nearly 2 billion rupiah. Furthermore, there is an imbalance in funding allocation

across several strategic sectors, resulting in some vital sectors receiving fewer funds and proposals than others. Table shows that education, health, community and village empowerment, food security, and agriculture sectors have an average proposed budget that is much lower than that of government development sectors such as housing, land, and public works. As we know, agriculture, food security, education, and even health sectors are vital sectors that are often subject of controversy in efforts to improve public welfare. Further data analysis and investigation revealed data duplication in several sectors without explanation of function of duplication, including number of proposals and budgets, leading to indications of invalid data from Musrenbang results.

2. Musrenbang Preparation

Based on research findings presented, it was found that Musrenbang Organizing Team has been formed based on appropriate competencies and qualifications and is based in Bandung City. This team will be responsible for distributing invitations and information to Musrenbang participants, as well as preparing Musrenbang schedule and agenda in accordance with established Musrenbang regulations.

3. Musrenbang Implementation

Based on data presented above, it can be concluded that during implementation of Musrenbang, Bandung City provided information to participants in form of invitations to sub-district-level Musrenbang, involvement of stakeholders such as Regional Development Planning Agency (BAPPEDA) and Regional People's Representative Council (DPRD), and facilitators must possess organizational and analytical skills, as well as a broad perspective.

4. Post-Musrenbang

Based on research results presented by author, it is concluded that post-Musrenbang stage

involves documenting Musrenbang in form of photographs during Musrenbang, preparing a report on Musrenbang results and submitting it to Regional Development Planning Agency (BAPPEDA), and monitoring and evaluating implementation of subsequent Musrenbangs.

2) Evaluation of Implementation of Sub-district Development Planning Meeting (Musrenbang) in Bandung City

1. Effectiveness

In terms of effectiveness, implementation of sub-district Musrenbang can be said to be still not running as intended. This activity is often carried out as a routine annual activity and considered a mere formality. Efforts are made during Sub-district Musrenbang to accommodate community aspirations and proposals, but in reality, many proposals remain unrealized. Consequently, it does not meet stated objectives and has not had a significant impact.

2. Adequacy

From adequacy standard, sub-district Musrenbang in Bogor City is not optimal. There are still obstacles in implementation, so it has not reached adequacy point. One obstacle to adequacy point is that development programs/activities are still dominated by government and political interests, as evidenced by small budget allocation for people's economy, poverty alleviation, and education sectors.

3. Equity

Equity in implementation of development planning in sub-districts is still not optimal. Although stakeholders, including sub-district and Regional Development Planning Agency (BAPPEDA), have benefited from implementation of sub-district development planning (Musrenbang) in preparing Regional Medium-Term Development Plan (RPJMD),

benefits have not yet been fully felt by all levels of society.

4. Responsiveness

Differing opinions regarding responsiveness of sub-district development planning (Musrenbang) were expressed by several community leaders, as seen through their responses to implementation of sub-district development planning (Musrenbang) in Bandung City. implementation of sub-district development planning (Musrenbang) in Bandung City has not fully met community needs, with only a small portion experiencing any benefits from development process.

5. Accuracy

The accuracy criteria for sub-district development planning (Musrenbang) in Bandung City are considered sub-optimal. Although benefits have been felt, there are still obstacles during implementation of sub-district development planning (Musrenbang), including a lack of knowledge and systematic implementation within sub-district itself, a lack of preparedness of proposals from villages, and a lack of understanding of proposed areas.

3) Supporting and Inhibiting Factors in Implementation of Sub-district Musrenbang in Bandung City

Based on data processing and literature review, it can be concluded that several inhibiting factors often occur internally in implementation of Sub-district Musrenbang. These include personnel involved in Musrenbang process, sometimes lacking a clear understanding of directions and policies to be adopted, and a lack of coordination between relevant parties.

Externally, poor network connectivity results in delays in data entry for Musrenbang results.

Implementers lack mastery of Musrenbang materials, resulting in failure to capture all submitted proposals due to inconsistencies with Sub-district Center, limited budget availability, and a lack of reporting from implementing party on Musrenbang results. Reporting and uploading Musrenbang results are crucial because they relate to accountability and transparency of each sub-district's Musrenbang results to public. This can, of course, lead to delays in validation and evaluation of Musrenbang results by Regional Development Planning Agency (BAPPEDA). Furthermore, frequent changes to implementation schedule at city level require Musrenbang Organizing Team to re-arrange schedule, distribute notification letters, and redistribute invitations. This also impacts effectiveness of Musrenbang implementation and community participation.

Supporting factors are essential for optimal results in implementing sub-district Musrenbang. Based on previous data analysis, supporting factors for sub-district Musrenbang are as follows: 1) Providing opportunities for community participation in development planning. 2) Improving coordination between regional and central government agencies. 3) Providing a secure institutional framework for integrated and tiered planning. Law Number 25 of 2004 concerning National Development Planning System stipulates that each region must hold a Development Planning Conference (Musrenbang) at its appropriate level.

5. Conclusion

The purpose of the Regional Regulation Number 05 of 2009 is to support coordination between regional development stakeholders; Ensure the creation of integration and synergy between space, time, and regional government affairs; Ensure the creation of integration, synchronization, and synergy between regional

governments and village/sub-district governments, city/district governments, provincial governments, and the government; Ensure the linkage and consistency between planning, budgeting, implementation, and supervision; Optimize community participation, and ensure the achievement of efficient, effective, equitable, and sustainable use of resources. Since the implementation of Regional Regulation Number 05 of 2009 until now, the implementation of Musrenbang in Bandung City still has problems, so it has not run optimally. Based on the results of research and discussions that have been described by the author previously, the author can draw conclusions from the evaluation of the implementation of Musrenbang as follows: 1. Lack of knowledge and coordination between parties involved in the implementation of the Sub-district Musrenbang. Both from the Village, Sub-district, and BAPPEDA 2. Public awareness of the importance of the implementation of the Sub-district Musrenbang is still uneven. 3. The budget allocation for education, health, and food is still low because the government only focuses on visible physical development. The researcher's suggestion is that in order for the implementation of the Sub-district Musrenbang in the following year to run optimally, there needs to be clear socialization from the Bandung City government, and there needs to be an improvement in the quality of the government's role, so that it is able to explore every problem cross-sectorally. It is hoped that the Musrenbang will involve all components of government agencies as a whole and also the community. The community is actively involved in the implementation of the Musrenbang. In addition, the local government should create policies or regulations regarding the control of budget funds in the Musrenbang listed in the APBD to be discussed through the Musrenbang. The importance of legislative involvement in the implementation of the Musrenbang. This is

related to the steps that need to be taken is to formulate the participation of the legislative in Musrenbang activities. Improving the quality of the community in the implementation of the Musrenbang can be done through counseling and providing information related to procedures, methods, programs and all matters related to the mechanisms of the Sub-district Musrenbang and regional development planning.

References

- Duun, William. (2012), Analisis Kebijakan Publik, Gajah Mada University Press, Yogyakarta
- Keban, Yermias T. (2008) Enam Dimensi Strategis Administrasi Publik: Konsep, Teori, dan Isu, Edisi Kedua. Cetakan Pertama. Yogyakarta, Penerbit Gaya Media.
- Moloeng, lexy. (2007). *Metode Penelitian Kualitatif*. Bandung: PT. Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Nugroho, Riant, (2009), Public Policy, Elex Media Komputindo, Jakarta.
- Nugroho, D. Riant. 2004. Kebijakan Publik Formulasi, Implementasi, dan Evaluasi, Jakarta: Elex Media Komputindo.
- Pasolong, Harbani. (2019) Teori Administrasi Publik. Bandung, Alfabeta.
- Soekanto, S. (2006). *Sosiologi suatu Pengantar*. Jakarta: Rajagrafindo Persada.
- Suaedi, Falih dan Bintoro Wardiyanto. (2010) Revitalisasi Administrasi Negara, Reformasi Birokrasi dan e-Governance. Yogyakarta, Graha Ilmu.
- Sugiyono. (2010). *Metode Penelitian Admnistrasi*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Widodo, Joko. (2008) Analisis Kebijakan Publik. Jakarta, Bayumedia.
- Winarno, Budi. (2007) Teori dan Proses Kebijakan Publik. Yogyakarta, Media Pressindo.
- Winarno, Budi, (2012), Kebijakan Publik Teori Proses Dan Studi Kasus, CAPS, Yogyakarta
- Anggraeni, R., Zauhar, S., & Siswidiyanto. (2011). Evaluasi Kebijakan Publik. *Evaluasi Kebijakan Publik (Evaluasi Terhadap Proses Pengadaan Anjungan Mandiri Kepegawaian Berdasarkan Perpres No. 504 Tahun 2010 Kepegawaian Daerah Kota Malang)*.
- Azhar, F. (2015). Partisipasi Masyarakat Dalam Musyawarah Perencanaan Pembangunan (MUSRENBANG) di Kelurahan Pegirian Kecamatan Semampir Kota Surabaya. *Kebijakan Dan Manajemen Publik*.
- Wulen, Yuliana Constansia (2019), Evaluasi Pelaksanaan Musyawarah Perencanaan Pembangunan (Musrenbang) Kecamatan di Kecamatan Samarinda Seberang. E-Journal Administrasi Negara Volume 7 Nomor 1.
- Undang – Undang Nomor 25 Tahun 2004 Tentang Sistem Perencanaan Pembangunan Nasional
- Peraturan Daerah Kabupaten Banjarnegara Nomor 15 Tahun 2010 Tentang Tahapan, Tata Cara Penyusunan, Pengendalian Dan Evaluasi Pelaksanaan Rencana Pembangunan Daerah
- Peraturan Menteri Dalam Negeri Nomor 54 Tahun 2010 Tentang Pelaksanaan Peraturan Pemerintah Nomor 8 Tahun 2008 Tentang Tahapan, Tatacara Penyusunan Pengendalian, Dan Evaluasi Pelaksanaan Rencana Pembangunan Daerah
- Human Development Report 2013 | UNDP*. (n.d.). Retrieved June 15, 2020, from <https://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/librarypage/hdr/human-development-report-2013.html>
- Pradana, S. A., Astuti, R. S., Ningsih, T. Y., & Afrizal, T. (2020). E-Participation in Semarang Smart City. *Jurnal ilmiah Administrasi Publik*, 6(3), 380-386.
- Rekapitulasi Musrenbang Berdasarkan Bidang Urusan - Rekapitulasi Musrenbang Bidang Urusan Tahun 2017 - Portal Satu Data Indonesia*. (n.d.). Retrieved June 15, 2020, from <https://data.go.id/dataset/rekapitulasi-musrenbang-berdasarkan-bidang-urusan/resource/d1d0807f-e395-4738-bc06-b4410c344cc1>
- Rekapitulasi Musrenbang Berdasarkan Kecamatan - Rekapitulasi Musrenbang Kecamatan Tahun 2017 - Portal Satu Data Indonesia*. (n.d.). Retrieved June 15, 2020,

from <https://data.go.id/dataset/rekapitulasi-musrenbang-berdasarkan-kecamatan/resource/e348be12-a751-4f1a-8c93-1c9775bdc735>