



SMERU RESEARCH REPORT NO. 4/2024

THEMATIC STUDY ON THE VILLAGE LAW: DEVISING FACILITATION STRATEGIES AND SCENARIOS IN VILLAGES

Palmira Permata Bachtiar, Asep Kurniawan, Rendy Adriyan Diningrat, Gema Satria Mayang Sedyadi, Ruhmaniyati

SMERU RESEARCH REPORT NO. 4/2024

THEMATIC STUDY ON THE VILLAGE LAW: DEVisING FACILITATION STRATEGIES AND SCENARIOS IN VILLAGES

Palmira Permata Bachtiar
Asep Kurniawan
Rendy Adriyan Diningrat
Gema Satria Mayang Sedyadi
Ruhmaniyati

Editors

Wiwin Purbaningrum
Liza Hadiz

The SMERU Research Institute

October 2024

Thematic Study on the Village Law: Devising Facilitation Strategies and Scenarios in Villages

Authors: Palmira Permata Bachtiar, Asep Kurniawan, Rendy Adriyan Diningrat, Gema Satria Mayang Sedyadi, and Ruhmaniyati

Editors: Wiwin Purbaningrum and Liza Hadiz

Cover photo: Palmira Permata Bachtiar

The SMERU Research Institute Cataloging in Publication Data

Palmira Permata Bachtiar.

SMERU RESEARCH REPORT: Thematic Study on the Village Law: Devising Facilitation Strategies and Scenarios in Villages/ written by Palmira Permata Bachtiar, Asep Kurniawan, Rendy Adriyan Diningrat, Gema Satria Mayang Sedyadi, Ruhmaniyati. vii, 65p.; 29cm.

ISBN 978-602-7901-98-8

1. village facilitation 2. village planning 3. community empowerment 4. Village Law.

I. Title

362 --ddc22

Published by:

The SMERU Research Institute

Jl. Cikini Raya No.10A

Jakarta 10330

Indonesia

First published in October 2024

Suggested citation:

Bachtiar, Palmira Permata, Asep Kurniawan, Rendy Adriyan Diningrat, Gema Satria Mayang Sedyadi, and Ruhmaniyati (2024) 'Thematic Study on the Village Law: Devising Facilitation Strategies and Scenarios in Villages.' SMERU Research Report No. 4. Jakarta: The SMERU Research Institute <URL> [access date].



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License.

SMERU's content may be copied or distributed for noncommercial use provided that it is appropriately attributed to The SMERU Research Institute. In the absence of institutional arrangements, PDF formats of SMERU's publications may not be uploaded online and online content may only be published via a link to SMERU's website.

The findings, views, and interpretations published in this report are those of the authors and should not be attributed to any of the agencies providing financial support to The SMERU Research Institute.

A significant part of the research in this publication uses interviews and focus group discussions. All relevant information is recorded and stored at the SMERU office.

For further information on SMERU's publications, please contact us on 62-21-31936336 (phone), 62-21-31930850 (fax), or smeru@smeru.or.id (e-mail); or visit www.smeru.or.id.

Research Team

SMERU Researchers

Palmira Permata Bachtiar
Asep Kurniawan
Rendy Adriyan Diningrat
Gema Satria Mayang Sedyadi
Ruhmaniyati

Regional Researchers

Akhmad Fadli
Asmorowati
Edelbertus Witu
Nuzul Iskandar
Ridwan Muzir

Advisors

Syaikhu Usman
Widjajanti Isdijoso

Acknowledgements

Firstly, we would like to extend our sincere gratitude to Local Solutions to Poverty-World Bank (LSP-WB) for providing funding for and supervising this research. LSP-WB provided input and advice from the planning to the completion of this report. Our deepest appreciation goes to the field researchers for their hard work and persistence in supporting the whole process of this study. They were the ones who collected the data for this research. They also wrote the *kabupaten* (district) report which served as the material for the analysis in this national-level report. We would also like to thank our informants—village heads and officials, *kecamatan* (subdistrict) officials, leaders and staff of various agencies, and field extension workers—for taking the time for interviews as well as providing data and information for the analysis. Lastly, we would like to thank Aulia Rizky, Baiq Wardiana Qudsiah, and Mawaddah for their assistance in data analysis. They played an important role in the completion of this report.

Abstract

Thematic Study on the Village Law: Devising Facilitation Strategies and Scenarios in Villages

Palmira Permata Bachtiar, Asep Kurniawan, Rendy Adriyan Diningrat, Gema Satria Mayang Sedyadi, Ruhmaniyati

This qualitative study investigates the supply and demand for village facilitation by identifying villages' needs for facilitation as well as examining to what extent the supply of facilitators at the supravillage levels can meet those needs. The supply and demand were matched up by comparing the village medium-term development plan (RPJM Desa) to the *kabupaten* (district) medium-term development plan (RPJMD Kabupaten). It was also conducted by comparing village heads' dreams to the availability of facilitators at the *kabupaten*. In general, this study finds substantial unmet demand for facilitation in villages. On the supply side, no clear facilitation strategies are devised for both villages and villagers. Community empowerment programs at the *kabupaten* level are still dominated by distribution of assistances and development activities which are not necessarily relevant to the villages' needs. Moreover, the facilitators are still limited in quantity and quality, especially those to meet the needs "determined" by the supravillage governments, such as the facilitators for village-owned enterprises (BUM Desa). On the demand side, the technocratic capability of village governments needs special attention, as it will determine development strategies to improve villagers' welfare. Synergy and coordination are critical in bridging supply and demand. Both synergy and coordination in fact take place when facilitators participate in the village planning, which is the most important stage in village development. Being involved in this planning, facilitators can provide information on programs and facilitation services available at local government organizations (OPD) as well as how to access them. At the same time, facilitators will also gain better understanding on specific needs of the village.

Keywords: village facilitation, village planning, community empowerment, Village Law

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|------|
| Acknowledgements | i |
| Abstract | ii |
| Table of Contents | iii |
| List of Tables | iv |
| List of Boxes | iv |
| List of Appendices | iv |
| List of Abbreviations | v |
| Executive Summary | viii |
| I. Introduction | 1 |
| 1.1 Background | 1 |
| 1.2 Research Objectives and Questions | 2 |
| 1.3 Research Scope | 2 |
| 1.4 Methodology | 3 |
| II. Review of Village Development Planning Documents | 4 |
| 2.1 Villages in the Regional Planning | 4 |
| 2.2 RPJM Desa and Its Alignment with the Regional Planning | 10 |
| III. Village Dreams | 12 |
| 3.1 Overview of Village Dreams | 12 |
| 3.2 Village Dream Analysis | 15 |
| IV. Map of Facilitators' Availability | 24 |
| 4.1 Available Facilitators | 24 |
| 4.2 Ways of Accessing Facilitators | 36 |
| V. Factors Influencing Fulfillment of Facilitation Needs in Villages | 38 |
| 5.1 The Need for Facilitation and Its Fulfillment | 38 |
| 5.2 Several Important Issues in Fulfilling Facilitation Needs | 47 |
| 5.3 Alternative Strategies in Fulfilling Facilitation Needs | 48 |
| VI. Lessons Learned | 51 |
| List of References | 54 |
| Appendices | 56 |

List of Tables

- Table 1. Research Locations | 3
- Table 2. Examples of Programs Based on the Missions that Target Villages | 5
- Table 3. Spatial Development Planning in the Study Locations Based on RTRW Kabupaten | 8
- Table 4. Summary of Village Dream Category | 13
- Table 5. Village Dreams under Tourism Theme | 14
- Table 6. Examples of Village Dreams with Normative Goals | 17
- Table 7. Village Dreams Which Are Intrinsic Tasks of the Village Government | 18
- Table 8. Village Dreams with Pragmatic Goals | 20
- Table 9. Analysis of Village Heads' Technocratic Capacity | 21
- Table 10. Proportion of Facilitators Compared to the Number of Villages | 32
- Table 11. Facilitation Needs and Their Fulfillment As Perceived by Heads of Ten Villages | 38
- Table 12. Factors Influencing Fulfillment of Facilitation Needs | 47

List of Boxes

- Box 1. Facilitation on the Pelangi Desa/Pelangi Kawasan Program in Kabupaten Ngada | 6
- Box 2. Achieving Dreams Does Not Always Need Facilitation | 18
- Box 3. Patriarchal Aspects in Women Empowerment Dream | 20
- Box 4. Example of a Village Head with Technocratic Capacity | 21
- Box 5. The New "One Hole, One Seed" Planting System: It Is Not Easy to Make People Change | 35
- Box 6. Successful Farmers Were More Trusted to Become Training Facilitators | 40
- Box 7. Village Facilitators in Desa Jembatan Rajo: Problems with Facilitators' Quality | 41
- Box 8. Hope for BUM Desa and Tourism Village | 45
- Box 9. Village Land Grabbing by Production Forest Management | 46
- Box 10. Factors that Motivated Professional Facilitators to Be More Active | 48
- Box 11. Regulations that Hamper Fulfillment of the Need for Facilitators | 49

List of Appendices

- Appendix 1. Table A1. List of Village Dreams | 57
- Appendix 2. Table A2. Availability of Facilitators | 61

List of Abbreviations

| | | |
|----------------------|---|--|
| ADD | Alokasi Dana Desa | Village Fund Allocation |
| Anggur Merah | Anggaran untuk Rakyat Menuju Sejahtera | Budget for People's Prosperity |
| APBD | Anggaran Pendapatan dan Belanja Daerah | regional budget |
| APB Desa | Anggaran Pendapatan dan Belanja Desa | village budget |
| Balatkop | Balai Pelatihan Koperasi | cooperatives training center |
| Bappeda | Badan Perencanaan Pembangunan Daerah | Regional Development Planning Agency |
| BKK Desa | Bantuan Keuangan Khusus Desa | Special Financial Assistance for Villages |
| BLK | <i>balai latihan kerja</i> | vocational training center |
| BPP | <i>balai penyuluhan pertanian</i> | agricultural training center |
| BUM Desa | Badan Usaha Milik Desa | village-owned enterprises |
| DPMD | Dinas Pemberdayaan Masyarakat dan Desa | community and village empowerment agency |
| DPRD | Dewan Perwakilan Rakyat Daerah | Regional House of Representatives |
| Kemendes PDDT | Kementerian Desa, Pembangunan Daerah Tertinggal, dan Transmigrasi | Ministry of Villages, Development of Disadvantaged Regions, and Transmigration |
| KKN | <i>kuliah kerja nyata</i> | community service program |
| KPMD | <i>kader pemberdayaan masyarakat desa</i> | village community empowerment cadres |
| Kube | Kelompok Usaha Bersama | joint business group |
| LSP-WB | | Local Solutions to Poverty-World Bank |
| MSME | | micro-, small-, and medium-scale enterprise |
| NGO | | nongovernmental organization |
| NTT | Nusa Tenggara Timur | East Nusa Tenggara |
| OPD | <i>organisasi perangkat daerah</i> | local government organization |
| PAUD | <i>pendidikan anak usia dini</i> | early childhood education |

| | | |
|------------------------|--|--|
| Pamsimas | Penyediaan Air Minum dan Sanitasi Berbasis Masyarakat | Community-Based Drinking Water Supply and Sanitation program |
| PD TI | <i>pendamping desa teknik infrastruktur</i> | village facilitators of infrastructure engineering |
| PKBM | <i>pusat kegiatan belajar masyarakat</i> | community study center |
| PKH | Program Keluarga Harapan | Family of Hope Program |
| PKL | <i>pusat kegiatan lokal</i> | local activity center |
| PLKB | <i>petugas lapangan Keluarga Berencana</i> | family planning field officers |
| PLUT | <i>pusat layanan usaha terpadu</i> | integrated business service center |
| PNPM | Program Nasional Pemberdayaan Masyarakat | National Program for Community Empowerment |
| PNPM-MP | Program Nasional Pemberdayaan Masyarakat-Mandiri Perdesaan | National Program for Community Empowerment for Rural Communities |
| <i>posyandu</i> | <i>pos pelayanan terpadu</i> | integrated service post |
| PPL | <i>petugas penyuluh lapangan</i> | field extension worker |
| PPKL | <i>petugas penyuluh koperasi lapangan</i> | field cooperative facilitator |
| RAB | <i>rencana anggaran biaya</i> | budget plan |
| RKP Desa | <i>rencana kerja pemerintah desa</i> | village government work plan |
| RPJM Desa | Rencana Pembangunan Jangka Menengah Desa | Village Medium-Term Development Plan |
| RPJMD | Rencana Pembangunan Jangka Menengah Daerah | Regional Medium-Term Development Plan |
| RTLH | <i>rumah tidak layak huni</i> | uninhabitable houses |
| RTRW | <i>rencana tata ruang wilayah</i> | spatial plan |
| RW | <i>rukun warga</i> | a unit of local administration consisting of several RT (neighborhood units) |
| SKB | <i>sanggar kegiatan belajar</i> | learning activity studio |
| SOTK | <i>susunan organisasi dan tata kerja</i> | organizational structure and work procedures |
| STKIP | Sekolah Tinggi Keguruan dan Ilmu Pendidikan | Institute of Teacher Training and Education |
| TA ID | <i>tenaga ahli infrastruktur desa</i> | village infrastructure expert |
| <i>tagana</i> | <i>taruna siaga bencana</i> | disaster alert cadre |

| | | |
|-------------|--|---|
| TKM | <i>tenaga kerja mandiri</i> | independent labor |
| TKS | <i>tenaga kerja sukarela</i> | voluntary labor |
| TKSK | <i>tenaga kesejahteraan sosial kecamatan</i> | <i>kecamatan</i> social welfare officer |
| UPTD | <i>unit pelaksana teknis dinas</i> | (agency) technical implementation unit |
| VF | Dana Desa | Village Fund |

Executive Summary

Background

As a key element in the achievement of village development goals, facilitation is not merely the task of professional facilitators recruited by the government. As part of empowerment strategies, facilitation is also the responsibility of government officials, especially local government organizations (OPD) of *kabupaten/kota* (district/city). Such responsibility is stated in Article 128 of Government Regulation No. 43 of 2014 on the Implementing Regulation for Law No. 6 of 2014 on Villages (Village Law), which was amended with Government Regulation No. 47 of 2015 on the Amendment of Government Regulation No. 43 of 2014 on the Implementing Regulation for Village Law.

With regard to this regulation, several OPD officials are in fact tasked to conduct facilitation, such as field extension workers (PPL) from the agriculture agency or public health improvement facilitators from the health agency. However, for almost three years since the implementation of Village Law, not much synergy has been seen between facilitators from OPD and villages in carrying out development in the village.

Considering the above context, The SMERU Research Institute collaborated with Local Solutions to Poverty-World Bank (LSP-WB) to conduct a thematic study on Village Law titled, "Devising Facilitation Strategies and Scenarios in Villages".

Research Objectives and Questions

This study aims to

- a) explore needs for village development facilitation;
- b) map the availability and capacity of facilitators provided by OPD, including village professional facilitators that comprise experts, village facilitators, and local village facilitatorsⁱ; and
- c) identify factors influencing fulfillment of needs for village development facilitation.

Based on the above objectives, the research questions of this study are formulated as follows.

- a) What kinds of facilitation are needed by village governments?
- b) What facilitation resources (persons, programs, or physical facilities) are available at the village, *kecamatan* (subdistrict), and *kabupaten* levels to support village development? How is the capacity and availability of those resources?

ⁱLocal village facilitators (PLD) are mainly residents of the local village and/or residents of villages bordering the village where they are assigned, while village facilitators (PD) are mainly residents of villages in the local *kecamatan* (subdistrict) and/or residents of villages in other *kecamatan* bordering the subdistrict where they are assigned.

- c) How are the various facilitation resources available at the *kabupaten* utilized in supporting village development? What are the factors that support/hamper the utilization (capacity, quantity, duties and functions, etc.) of these resources?

Research Scope

This research is part of the Village Governance and Community Empowerment Study in Village Law Implementation (the Village Law Study) that had been conducted since September 2015. This research was conducted between June and November 2018 at the same locations as the Village Law Study, namely ten villages in nine *kecamatan*, five *kabupaten*, and three provinces.

Methodology

This study specifically identifies villages' needs in terms of facilitation and explores the extent to which the availability of facilitators at the supravillage levels can meet those needs. First, the exploration began with comparing activities in the village medium-term development plan (RPJM Desa) of the study villages to programs in the *kabupaten* medium-term development plan (RPJMD Kabupaten). If the two documents match, it is likely that villages will have a chance of fulfilling facilitation needs stated in RPJM Desa through the programs in RPJMD Kabupaten. Second, facilitation needs were identified from village heads' dreams on the future of their villages. At the *kabupaten* level, the availability of facilitators from OPD was mapped. The need to realize those dreams is treated as the demand side, while the facilitators provided by the supravillage governments are treated as the supply side of facilitation. Village heads were also asked to give their opinions on whether the need for facilitation to realize their dreams was already fulfilled, not fulfilled, or difficult to fulfill. Their opinions would then be matched to the mapping of available facilitators at the supravillage levels.

This qualitative study gathered secondary data (on RPJMD Kabupaten and RPJM Desa in each study location) and primary data through in-depth interviews with various informants at the village, *kecamatan*, and *kabupaten* levels. Observation was also conducted on the activities of OPD facilitators during facilitation processes in the study villages.

Research Findings

Villages in Regional Planning

Development programs at the *kabupaten* aimed at villages only position villages as an activity locus. This can be seen from the types and implementation mechanisms of the programs, which are dominated by provision of assistances (seeds, fertilizers, and so forth) and works performed by third parties (not involving villagers). Besides that, no facilitation strategies for both village governments and villagers were found.

Positioning villages only as an activity locus shows that the *kabupaten* government has not yet adopted the spirit of Village Law, which recognizes villages as

development subjects. This happened despite the fact that RPJMD of three *kabupaten* (Ngada, Wonogiri, and Merangin) was enacted after Village Law came into effect. Among the three study *kabupaten*, only Wonogiri had included Village Law as one of the legal considerations in formulating regional regulations on RPJMD.

All study *kabupaten* have regional regulations that govern spatial plans (RTRW), but these documents were not cited much in the drafting of RPJMD. This is because (i) the master plan for the development of each region had not been completed yet; (ii) no specific strategies for each region can be used as a reference in the program; and (iii) the program formulation put more emphasis on the elected heads of *kabupaten's* visions, which were their political promises during the campaign.

RPJM Desa and Its Alignment with Regional Planning

Alignment of RPJM Desa with the *kabupaten's* development plan, as mandated by Village Law and regulated by the Regulation of the Minister for Home Affairs No. 114 of 2014 on Village Development Guidelines, had not yet proceeded. In drafting RPJM Desa, village governments never received adequate information about RPJMD Kabupaten nor RTRW. As a result, some village development plans, as stated in RPJM Desa, are not in line with the spatial arrangement stated in the *kabupaten's* RTRW. Similarities between RPJMD Desa and RPJMD Kabupaten are found to be coincidental, not the result of systemic efforts.

The absence of efforts to align RPJM Desa with RPJMD Kabupaten is worsened by the perception that RPJM Desa is just a formality to fulfill administrative requirements. Many villages drafted their development planning documents with minimum efforts and did not fully go through the planning process, which includes collecting ideas and aspirations from villagers (bottom-up) as regulated by Regulation of the Minister for Home Affairs No. 114 of 2014. They were also found to just copy other documents and handed over the task of formulating a development plan to only one or two village officials.

The alignment of the two documents must be carried out, but it will only be effective if it can create synergy between programs/activities of the *kabupaten* and those of the villages. Such alignment will allow villages to access *kabupaten's* programs/activities. It may also provide feedback for the *kabupaten* government to design programs/activities that suit the needs of targeted villages/groups.

Village Dreams

Village heads' dreams were explored to discover more about their capacity in envisioning the future of their villages. This was carried out because of the poor quality of village development planning documents, such as RPJM Desa and village government work plan (RKP Desa). Drafting those documents requires a strong technocratic capability. However, the fact that cases of document plagiarism were found in the field indicates that village heads have a limited technocratic capability. Besides, there was an impression that village

planning documents lack good ideas, as they only contain a list of villagers' needs and revolve around the same and repeated physical/construction activities.

Ten village heads at the study villages conveyed their 62 dreams, which can be divided into three main categories: (i) economic development and community empowerment, (ii) infrastructure, and (iii) village governance. Around 66% of the dreams belong to the first category, which can be divided further into six themes: (i) empowerment, (ii) agriculture, (iii) village-owned enterprises (BUM Desa), (iv) tourism, (v) regional development, and (vi) cooperatives and micro-, small-, and medium- scale enterprises (MSMEs). It is interesting to note that, although many of the dreams conveyed by the village heads were economic development and community empowerment, activities stated in the formal documents, such as RPJM Desa and RKP Desa, were mostly infrastructure activities. This indicates that many nonphysical dreams were reduced during the formal planning process in the village.

In terms of their quality, village dreams can be categorized into three patterns: (i) normative, (ii) administrative, and (iii) pragmatic. These three patterns indicate the need for more intensive facilitation to enable villages to better formulate their dreams.

There were also technocratic issues in formulating village dreams. Even though several village heads were able to translate their big dreams into more concrete strategies, most of the other village heads were not yet able to elaborate their dreams into more achievable operational steps. Their strategies to achieve their dreams were either not too relevant or hard to measure. There was even a village head who had a big dream but was unable to formulate strategies to achieve it. This example indicates the needs for facilitation in drafting development planning documents.

The Map of Facilitator Availability

Capability in designing and/or realizing dreams varied between villages; this indicates the importance of facilitation. The result of the mapping of available facilitators shows that most facilitators in the study *kabupaten* came from government institutions, especially the *kabupaten* government. There were also facilitators from nongovernmental institutions, such as nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), universities, and companies/individuals. Based on their scope of work, facilitators can be divided into three groups: (i) facilitators of economic development and empowerment, (ii) facilitators of infrastructure and basic services, and (iii) facilitators of village governance. Villages can access them either through formal procedures (official letters) or informal procedures (phone calls, text messages, WhatsApp messages, and in-person meetings). Villages seemed to prefer the latter, as they were deemed more practical and could speed up facilitation services for the villagers.

In carrying out their tasks, facilitators faced both internal and external challenges. The internal challenges include problems with the quantity and quality of facilitators. The low quality of facilitators is due to (i) facilitators' low educational background and/or mismatch between their educational background and their field of work, and (ii) the absence of capacity building systems for facilitators to upgrade their skills.

The external challenges include (i) limited supporting facility, infrastructure, and budget for facilitation; (ii) policies that constantly change and/or place much burden on the facilitators, causing them to focus too much on administrative matters; and (iii) villagers' apathy toward changes. If these challenges are left unsolved, facilitators will keep having difficulties in helping villages realize their dreams.

Factors Influencing Fulfillment of Facilitation Needs in Villages

Facilitation needs were identified by village heads based on their dream and its derivatives. The village heads would then assess if those needs were already fulfilled, partly fulfilled, or unfulfilled. Next, based on these fulfillment levels, factors influencing fulfillment of facilitation needs were explored.

In the village heads' and facilitators' opinion, the needs for infrastructure, agriculture, and village governance facilitation services could be fulfilled because village governments had access to the facilitators. Infrastructure facilitation needs were the most fulfilled ones. Besides being able to access professional facilitators, public works agency staff, and independent consultants, village governments generally had enough experience in building simple infrastructure. They even learned about it by themselves from the internet. The close relationship between village governments and PPL was a factor influencing the fulfillment of needs for agriculture facilitators. Also, village governments could hire successful local farmers as a resource person in training on farming. Some village governance facilitation services were provided by the staff of *kecamatan*-level OPD.

Empowerment, BUM Desa, and Tourism Village program are among the fields where facilitation needs were partly fulfilled. This was largely influenced by the availability of facilitators. The quality of the facilitators was also below expectation because their facilitation services were carried out without follow-up plans to ensure its sustainability. This led village heads to think that their facilitation needs had not been completely fulfilled even though they had been already carried out.

Next, facilitation needs not yet fulfilled or difficult to fulfill were influenced by the availability and quality of facilitators. The need for particular types of facilitators arising simultaneously was a factor that put pressure on the supply side (availability of facilitators). There was also a need for very specific facilitators, such as facilitators for spatial development. In fact, some experts had been specifically assigned by the Ministry of Village, Development of Disadvantaged Regions, and Transmigration (Kemendes PDTT) to carry out this function, but village governments were not informed about it and thus did not know how to access the facilitators.

On the demand side (village governments' requests and needs for facilitators), village heads' technocratic and leadership capabilities are two important factors influencing the optimal use of facilitators, besides their knowledge on how to access them. On the supply side, there were synergy and coordination problems that occurred horizontally between OPD facilitators and vertically between provinces, *kabupaten*, and *kecamatan*. Meanwhile, on both the supply and demand sides, there were synergy and coordination problems

between facilitators and villages—as the user of facilitation services—which could be solved through village deliberation meetings.

Several strategies were employed by villages in dealing with the lack of facilitators. First, villages conducted independent learning, such as through the internet, or learned from other parties, such as by becoming an intern in another village. Second, villages leveraged experienced villagers, village community empowerment cadres (KPMD), or highly skilled construction workers. Third, villages requested assistance from other parties, such as NGOs, universities, or the private sector.

Lessons Learned

In general, this study concludes that not all facilitation needs can be fulfilled by the available facilitators. This study draws two conclusions. First, facilitation is highly needed from the planning stage, which is the most fundamental stage in determining directions of village development. Facilitators need to improve village heads' technocratic capability to solve problems of quality in village development planning which so far appears merely as a list of villagers' needs and is sporadic in nature. With improved technocratic capabilities, village heads are expected to be able to align village and *kabupaten* development plans.

Second, fulfillment of villages' facilitation needs faces issues of quantity and quality, synergy, and coordination. Even though their expertise covers many fields, the facilitators could not cover all areas nor necessarily fulfill villages' specific needs yet. While facilitators from OPD generally worked strictly in accordance with their role in the assigned program, villages did not involve them in many of their activities because they did not have much information on facilitators they could access.

This study proposes recommendations related to fulfillment of needs for facilitators for villages in four different states.

- a) First, for villages not yet able to identify their facilitation needs, they must be assisted in translating their dreams into strategies and the needs for facilitators at the operational level.
- b) Second, for villages already able to map their facilitation needs but do not know how to access facilitators, they must be assisted by a third party that performs a channeling function.
- c) Third, for villages already able to map their facilitation needs and know how to access facilitators but are faced with an inadequate number of facilitators, there needs to be an improvement in the quality and quantity of facilitators.
- d) Fourth, for villages with very specific needs for facilitators that are not available at all, they need to search for facilitators from outside of the *kabupaten*.

Lastly, it needs to be underlined that in the Village Law era, both the central and regional governments must position villages as the subject of development. This means that supravillage governments must facilitate and assist villages to allow them to exercise their authority, including to innovate.

I. Introduction

1.1 Background

Law No. 6 of 2014 on Villages (Village Law) positions village facilitation as a key element in achieving village development goals, namely improving the quality of villagers' life and reducing poverty. Facilitation is an integral part of the empowerment strategy that seeks to develop the autonomy of villagers by improving their knowledge, attitude, behavior, awareness, and skills in utilizing resources which suit the local core problems and need priorities.

Since the end of 2015, the central government, through the Ministry of Villages, Development of Disadvantaged Regions, and Transmigration (Kemendes PDTT), has recruited a number of village professional facilitators that include experts, village facilitators, and local village facilitators¹. However, results of monitoring conducted by The SMERU Research Institute found a number of limitations in the facilitators' ability to implement their task. One of them is that professional facilitators were still trapped in facilitation for administrative works. It has not been directed toward developing villagers' knowledge, creativity, and critical thinking in carrying out development to help them realize their "dreams".

On the other hand, referring to Government Regulation No. 43 of 2014 on the Implementing Regulation for Law No. 6 of 2014 on Villages, which was amended with Government Regulation No. 47 of 2015 on the Amendment of Government Regulation No. 43 of 2014 on the Implementing Regulation for Village Law, professional facilitators are not the only ones responsible for village facilitation. Article 128 of this regulation states that village facilitation shall technically be carried out by local government organizations (OPD) of *kabupaten/kota* (districts/cities). Officials from various OPD with facilitation functions, such as field extension workers (PPL) from the agriculture agency or facilitators from the health agency, are actually responsible for empowering villages.

For almost three years since the implementation of Village Law, there has not been much evidence suggesting that facilitators from OPD were successful in supporting village development planning. Meanwhile, village governments did not always explicitly show the need for facilitation in their development planning when they could actually collaborate with facilitators from OPD to achieve development goals in line with their programs and activities.

The large number of parties who are supposed to perform facilitation functions also leads to the question of how far synergy and coordination have been carried out. Regulation of the Minister for Villages, Development of Disadvantaged Regions, and Transmigration No.

¹Local village facilitators (PLD) are mainly residents of the local village and/or residents of villages bordering the village where they are assigned, while village facilitators (PD) are mainly residents of villages in the local *kecamatan* (subdistrict) and/or residents of villages in other *kecamatan* bordering the subdistrict where they are assigned.

3 of 2015 on Village Facilitation states that one of the objectives of facilitation is to improve the synergy between cross-sectorial village development programs. For these reasons, SMERU collaborated with Local Solutions to Poverty-World Bank (LSP-WB) to conduct a thematic study on Village Law titled "Devising Facilitation Strategies and Scenarios in Villages".

1.2 Research Objectives and Questions

The fulfillment of facilitation need has to consider a combination of the village's needs, the interests of *kabupaten/kota* in its development strategy (especially in rural spatial development), and the availability of human resources at every level. Therefore, this study aims to

- a) explore needs for village development facilitation;
- b) map the availability and capacity of facilitation resources provided by OPD, including village professional facilitators that comprise experts, village facilitators, and local village facilitators; and
- c) identify factors influencing fulfillment of needs for village development facilitation.

Based on the above objectives, the research questions in this study are formulated as follows.

- a) What kinds of facilitation are needed by village governments?
- b) What facilitation resources (persons, programs, or physical facilities) are available at the village, *kecamatan* (subdistrict), and *kabupaten* levels to support village development? How is the capacity and supply of those resources?
- c) How are the various facilitation resources available at the *kabupaten* level utilized to support village development? What factors support/hamper the utilization (capacity, quantity, duties and functions, etc.) of these resources?

1.3 Research Scope

The study on village facilitation is part of the Village Governance and Community Empowerment Study in Village Law Implementation (the Village Law Study), which commenced in September 2015. Issues of facilitations, especially the ones provided by OPD at the *kabupaten/kota*, need to be specifically explored because Village Law requires that village development be in line with the *kabupaten/kota*'s development. In addition, the increased authority and funds that villages currently hold will not yield maximum results without effective facilitation.

This study was conducted between June and November 2018 in the same locations as those of the Village Law Study, namely ten villages in nine *kecamatan*, five *kabupaten*, and three provinces (Table 1).

Table 1. Research Locations

| Provinces | Kabupaten | Village Pseudonyms | Village Initials |
|--------------------------|------------|--------------------|------------------|
| East Nusa Tenggara (NTT) | Ngada | Ndona | NDO |
| | | Lekosoro | LKS |
| Central Java | Wonogiri | Kalikromo | KLK |
| | | Beral | BRL |
| | Banyumas | Deling | DLG |
| | | Karya Mukti | KYM |
| Jambi | Batanghari | Kelok Sungai Besar | KSB |
| | | Tiang Berajo | TBJ |
| | Merangin | Jembatan Rajo | JRJ |
| | | Sungai Seberang | SSB |

1.4 Methodology

This study used a qualitative approach with data collection using the following methods.

- a) Secondary data collection: documents of the *kabupaten* medium-term development plan (RPJMD Kabupaten) and village medium-term development plan (RPJM Desa) from each study location.
- b) In-depth interviews with various informants: village heads and village governments, heads of *kecamatan*, and section heads of the village governments. At the *kabupaten* level, interviews were conducted with the local development planning agency (Bappeda) and OPD which had extension workers to conduct facilitation in villages. Interviews were also conducted with nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), universities, and alumni of the National Program for Community Empowerment (PNPM).
- c) Observations to see how facilitators perform facilitation services, including their behavior and attitudes toward villagers and village officials.

In this study, data processing began with an analysis of *kabupaten* and village planning documents. Issues, programs, and activities listed on the documents were sorted and categorized. Results of the categorization were then used to compare development planning of the *kabupaten* with that of the villages to determine which information needed to be explored further through interviews and field activities. After field activities were completed, data analysis was carried out followed by systematic writing of field notes, discussions on the analysis results to check whether the data and information collected needed improvement, and so on.

In the next stage, the research team conducted discussions to draw conclusions for each study *kabupaten*. The conclusions were discussed further by looking at the pattern found in each *kabupaten* according to the research questions. Lastly, the research team drew conclusions aimed at answering all research questions.

II. Review of Village Development Planning Documents

In drafting their development planning documents, villages need to use the *kabupaten/kota* development planning as a reference.² In the context of RPJM Desa, Regulation of the Minister for Home Affairs No. 114 of 2014 on Village Development Guidelines refers to it as the alignment of policy directions, namely integrating *kabupaten/kota*'s development programs and activities with village development. Such alignment is carried out by the village by listing and sorting out *kabupaten/kota*'s development program and activity plans to be implemented in the village. These program and activity plans are then categorized under four areas of village authority.³

Results of the development planning document reviews show that the *kabupaten* still regards villages as an activity locus; thus its programs have not been complemented with facilitation strategies for village governments. On the other hand, the monitoring results show that the *kabupaten* development planning was not disseminated properly. Lacking dissemination and facilitation, RPJMD Kabupaten was never referred to by villages in drafting their RPJM Desa. The lack of facilitation has also resulted in villages' failure to optimally draft their RPJM Desa. In fact, there is an impression that RPJM Desa is a mere formality to fulfill an administrative requirement for the disbursement of village development funds, whereas actually it is drafted as a manifestation of authority, technocracy, and accountability of the village (Kurniawan, 2018a).

2.1 Villages in the Regional Planning

2.1.1 Villages in RPJMD Kabupaten

RPJMD Kabupaten needs to be explored to examine the planning of the government of the study *kabupaten* for their villages. This review is important because, based on the data from each *kabupaten*, 85%–95% of its administrative territory consists of villages. The results of the RPJMD Kabupaten review show that *kabupaten* governments still position villages only as a locus of activities. This can be seen from the missions and programs compiled in the each RPJMD Kabupaten.

This study generally finds that, in all study *kabupaten*, several missions are directed toward village development. In this regard, at least three issues in all *kabupaten* are explicitly referred to as the missions that position villages as the locus of activities. These three missions are (i) rural infrastructure development, (ii) community economic empowerment, and (iii) village governance capacity building.

²Article 79 of Village Law

³Based on Article 10 of the Regulation of the Minister for Home Affairs No. 114 of 2014, in order to conduct the alignment, the information that the *kabupaten/kota* need to disseminate to villages must at least include (i) RPJMD Kabupaten/Kota, (ii) strategic plans of the regional government work unit, (iii) general spatial plan of the *kabupaten/kota*, (iv) detailed spatial plan of the *kabupaten/kota*, and (v) rural spatial development plan.

The programs in all *kabupaten* that are derived from the above missions share similarities. The rural infrastructure development mission, for example, targets the improvement of basic service facilities and infrastructure. Meanwhile, the community economic empowerment mission relies on the agricultural sector and the medium-, small-, and micro-scale enterprises (MSMEs). Finally, village governments are directed toward the development of good governance. Examples of these programs can be seen in Table 2.

Table 2. Examples of Programs Based on Their Missions That Target Villages

| Infrastructure Development | Economic Development | Governance |
|---|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction of village roads • Construction and management of irrigation networks • Construction of clean water facilities • Healthy housing environments | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provision of seeds, fertilizers, and agricultural tools • Improvement of facilities and infrastructure • Application of technology • Improvement of agricultural produce marketing • Improvement of human resources and farmers' institutions | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improvement of village officials' capacity • Coaching and facilitation on village financial management |

Along with the above programs, programs aimed at increasing the participation and empowerment of village community are also found in all RPJMD Kabupaten. Such programs are placed under different missions in each *kabupaten*, indicating different interests among *kabupaten* in the participation and empowerment of village community. In Kabupaten Banyumas and Kabupaten Ngada, for example, these programs are part of the infrastructure development mission specifically designed to reduce the gap between rural and urban areas. Meanwhile, in Kabupaten Wonogiri and Kabupaten Merangin, empowerment programs belong to the economic development mission. In Kabupaten Batanghari, the programs fall within the mission to improve governance. However, regardless of these differences, activities derived from such programs do not mention any facilitation strategies to increase community empoweredness. Only Kabupaten Ngada implements the strategies under the Pelangi Desa/Pelangi Kawasan program, which was aimed at infrastructure development in the village (Box 1).

Box 1

Facilitation in the Pelangi Desa/Pelangi Kawasan Program in Kabupaten Ngada

Since 2011, Kabupaten Ngada Government has implemented the Pelangi Desa program. This program was held to complement the National Program for Community Empowerment for Rural Communities (PNPM-MP) to address the jealousy of villages which failed to get a "portion" of development activities, as they lost competitions at the *kecamatan* level. Through this program, the Government of Kabupaten Ngada provided facilitators for villages to facilitate the program management processes that precisely adopted the PNPM-MP mechanism.

After Village Law came into effect, the program was integrated into the Village Fund Allocation (ADD). Its name was also changed to Pelangi Kawasan. Despite the change, this program is still directed toward addressing the same problem, namely improving basic service infrastructure in the village. Existing facilitators were also maintained to facilitate the village.

Village officials acknowledged the benefits brought by the facilitators. They admitted that they more frequently consulted with Pelangi Desa facilitators than with village facilitators or local village facilitators. With facilitators serving for years, a trusting relationship was established between the village governments and the Pelangi Desa/ Pelangi Kawasan facilitators.

In the village infrastructure development program, activities are generally arranged to be carried out by a third party. Many instances of such practice are found in Kabupaten Banyumas where village infrastructure activities were implemented as Special Financial Assistance for Villages (BKK Desa). Although the budget for the program was administratively included in the village budget (APB Desa), villages were not involved at all in the program implementation because it was designed to be carried out by a third party.⁴ As they were implemented by a third party, villages only served as program recipients. In other words, community participation did not occur.

In the village community economic development program, activities are dominated by provision of assistances, such as seeds, fertilizers, or agricultural tools. Furthermore, the assistances were provided incidentally, unevenly, and unsustainably. In Kabupaten Merangin, for example, no community empowerment took place because the program was merely an activity that distributes plant seeds. Meanwhile, the community still identified extension workers as a mere doorway to seed assistance. The two situations were interwoven, making empowerment only a program on paper.

These activities were also scattered in various OPD and they often did not coordinate with either another OPD or relevant *kecamatan* and village governments. An example of this occurred in the provision of livestock assistance from one of the central government programs in Batanghari managed by the local social affairs agency. The local animal husbandry agency, which was not involved in the coordination process, only found out about this activity after some villagers asked for help because the livestock they received

⁴For further explanation on BKK Desa, see the Study on the Implementation of Law No. 6 of 2014 on Villages: Baseline Report.

fell ill. Most heads of *kecamatan* in all study locations expressed similar complaints. They found it difficult to coordinate with facilitators from the OPD tasked in their area, when in fact, based on Law No. 23 of 2014 on Village Government, they assume the duty and authority to coordinate community empowerment activities in their respective area.

As for the issue of village governance capacity building, the most commonly held activity was short training sessions (frequently called technical guidance) for village heads and/or officials. However, this activity seemed to be designed merely to make the village administration more effective. There was barely any coaching held by the supravillage governments to ensure that the training contents could be properly practiced by the participants. When a coaching was organized, it was usually an individual initiative, as what the village facilitators and *kecamatan* officials in Batanghari had done. The fact that the activity is directed only toward tidying up the village administration indicates that improvements in the village heads' and officials' capacity only served the need for upward accountability. Meanwhile, efforts to improve the village capacity as a self-governing community, such as promoting the participation of and their accountability to the community and other institutions in the village, had yet to be planned and undertaken.

The absence of the *kabupaten's* strategies to provide facilitation to villages gives a strong impression that so far villages are only positioned as a program/activity locus. *Kabupaten* governments do not seem to have adopted the spirit of the law, which recognizes villages as the subject of development in the development planning. For example, the governments of Kabupaten Ngada, Kabupaten Wonogiri, and Kabupaten Merangin had in fact drafted their RPJMD after Village Law came into effect, but their RPJMD do not reflect this spirit. In terms of the considerations referred to in their RPJMD, only Kabupaten Wonogiri included Law No. 6 of 2014 as one of the legal considerations. However, it is only a mere citation because the document does not stipulate that facilitation strategies shall be provided. Kabupaten Ngada was relatively better; even though it did not include Village Law as a consideration in drafting its RPJMD, it actually implemented the Pelangi Desa/Pelangi Kawasan program, which is in line with the spirit of Village Law.

2.1.2 Villages in the Spatial Development Planning

In addition to RPJMD Kabupaten, spatial planning documents need to be reviewed. Reviewing the spatial plan (RTRW) document is expected to allow us to measure how the *kabupaten* government develops projections of the areas under its authority and to see whether the plan was referred to by the villages in planning their development. In this case, all *kabupaten* governments in the study locations already have the regional government regulation regarding RTRW, i.e., the RTRW regional government regulation, they use as the basis for their spatial development (Table 3). In this regional government regulation, each area within the *kabupaten* has been designated as a particular development area. The area may be in either one *kecamatan* or a group of several *kecamatan*.

Table 3. Spatial Development Planning in the Study Locations Based on the RTRW of the *Kabupaten*

| <i>Kabupaten</i> | RTRW Regional Government Regulations | Regional Planning of Study Locations |
|------------------|--|--|
| Ngada | Regional Regulation of Kabupaten Ngada No. 3 of 2012 | Spatial service center (PPK) of Kecamatan A Main activities: agropolitan area and water transportation Supporting activities: industries, trade and services, agrotourism, cultural tourism, agro-industries, fisheries, and education (Kecamatan B, Kecamatan C, and Kecamatan D) |
| Wonogiri | Regional Regulation of Kabupaten Wonogiri No. 9 of 2011 | Kecamatan E: beach tourism, geological nature reserves, dryland food crops agriculture, southern sea catch fisheries, and small industries Kecamatan F: forests, small reservoirs, geological nature reserves, wetland food crops agriculture, horticulture, reservoir/river catch fisheries, and large-, medium-, and small-scale industries |
| Banyumas | Regional Regulation of Kabupaten Banyumas No. 10 of 2011 | Kecamatan G: agropolitan area Kecamatan H: minapolitan area |
| Batanghari | Regional Regulation of Kabupaten Batanghari No. 16 of 2013 | Kecamatan I: agriculture, forestry, industries (palm oil industries), and Batanghari River water tourism |
| Merangin | Regional Regulation of Kabupaten Merangin No. 4 of 2014 | Kecamatan J: rafting tourism (Desa Air Batu), Geopark natural tourism park, production forests, and oil palm and rubber plantations Kecamatan K: natural tourism (caves), production forests, oil palm and rubber plantations, and development of local activity centers (PKL) |

Although each *kabupaten* had set its development areas through the RTRW regional government regulation, they have not fully implemented the regulation and used it as a reference for its regional development planning. Some factors contributed to this. First, the development master plan for each area established in the RTRW regional government regulation has not been completed. Our study finds that only Kabupaten Banyumas has already done so. Even then, only the master plan for the development of the minapolitan area (fisheries) has been established through Regulation of the *Kabupaten* Head (*Bupati*) of Banyumas No. 39 of 2012 on Minapolitan Area Development Master Plan and covers ten *kecamatan*. Although the master plan had long been set, its implementation was slow. According to Bappeda of Kabupaten Banyumas, the execution was only at the pilot stage

of the development. In one study *kecamatan*, only one village had been used as a pilot location for hatching and rearing gourami and catfish.

Second, because no master plan is in place yet, the spatial development was never designed through specific strategies and programs. The implementation of the spatial development was handed over to each OPD tasked only to focus on the spatial zoning when designing and carrying out the program. An informant from Bappeda of Kabupaten Banyumas mentioned the *Desa Usaha Mandiri* (village of autonomous enterprises) program from the trade, cooperative, and small- and medium-scale enterprise agency (Disperindagkop UKM) as an example. The program was implemented differently between *kecamatan* designated as minapolitan areas and those as tourism areas.

Meanwhile, in Kabupaten Merangin, RTRW serves as a reference in RPJMD without being preceded by any master plan. One of the programs planned to be started in 2018 is the development of PKL at four points, all of which are the crossing areas traversed by both the national and provincial roads. The government of one of the study *kabupaten* allocated 400 million rupiah for the construction of ten types of market facilities and infrastructure at the *kecamatan* traversed by the provincial road, i.e., the Bangko–Kerinci lane.

Third, the vision of the head of *kabupaten*, as their political promise during the campaign, was prioritized. This is the case of Kabupaten Ngada and Kabupaten Wonogiri. The Head of Kabupaten Ngada, who was serving his second term, concentrated on overcoming infrastructure problems. Therefore, most of the regional budget (APBD) was allocated for the construction of roads and clean water and electricity facilities. For example, in the 2017 APBD, these sectors absorbed 66.67% of the development spending. This is similar to Kabupaten Wonogiri, which prioritized the Panca Program. The development initiatives set by the head of *kabupaten* consisted of programs in infrastructure (*alus dalane*/good roads), economy (*rame pasare*/crowded market), health (*sehat wargane*/healthy citizens), education (*pinter rakyat*/smart people), and agriculture (*sukses petanine*/successful farmers). Among the five priority programs that he promised, improving road infrastructure in the *kabupaten* was the most prioritized. This prioritization was termed the “*satu ruas tuntas*” (one complete segment) program. In Kabupaten Ngada and Kabupaten Wonogiri, the prioritization of infrastructure development, which was the head of *kabupaten*'s attempt to prove his political promise, had led to the budget cuts for some OPD unrelated to infrastructure.

Aside from the poor planning of regional development of each *kabupaten*, relevant information on that matter was not disseminated to the villages. As a result, the *kabupaten*'s development planning clashed with that of the villages. For example, in one of the study locations, a village's development planning focusing on the plantation sector clashed with the *kabupaten*'s plan which had projected its *kecamatan* area for agricultural development. In addition, another village had projected their area to be a center for developing crop seeds, but the *kecamatan* area where the village is located had been set by the *kabupaten* government to be the center of the minapolitan area development.

2.2 RPJM Desa and Its Alignment with the Regional Planning

The village governments in all study villages admitted that they had never directly read and used the RPJMD Kabupaten document as a reference in formulating the village development planning. This document was indeed disseminated especially to villages which just elected a new village head and was planning to draft the RPJM Desa. However, the one-way lecture method used in the dissemination made it difficult for the villages to understand its contents. In addition, village officials who participated in the dissemination activity did not transfer the knowledge to their colleagues, as the case in one of the villages in Kabupaten Wonogiri. Also, villages that seemed to have read the RPJMD Kabupaten only copied some of its contents, as the case in one of the villages in Kabupaten Merangin.

Similar contents between RPJM Desa and RPJMD Kabupaten are often incidental, rather than a result of a systemic effort. The most obvious similarity between the two documents is the priority given to infrastructure development. This indicates that both the village and *kabupaten* governments shared the same interest, namely to fulfill the need for basic infrastructure, such as roads, bridges, and retaining walls/gabions as well as clean water, educational, and basic health facilities. Many programs in infrastructure development at the *kabupaten* level correspond to the problems faced and activities designed by the villages.

Another similarity is in how agricultural-economic problems are addressed. However, activities designed by villages to solve agricultural issues had little to do with increasing farmers' capacity or production. Most of the activities listed in the RPJM Desa still revolve around the need for assistances such as seeds, medicines, and production facilities, despite the fact that some of the *kabupaten's* programs are directed at improving capacities in the management and marketing of agricultural products. Regarding village economic empowerment, the plan to establish village-owned enterprises (BUM Desa) overlaps with the village economic institution development program in the RPJMD Kabupaten.

Looking at the situation above, it is safe to say that the alignment between RPJM Desa and the *kabupaten's* development planning as mandated by Village Law and regulated in the Regulation of the Minister for Home Affairs No. 114 of 2014 did not take place. On the one hand, *kabupaten* governments did not seem to make serious efforts to facilitate the villages in aligning RPJM Desa with RPJMD Kabupaten. On the other hand, the *kabupaten* government actually had more or less the same problem; its RPJMD was not consistently aligned with the longer-term planning, such as RTRW.

This is worsened by an assumption that RPJM Desa is a mere formality to fulfill an administrative requirement. This assumption exists at both the village and *kabupaten* levels. *Kabupaten* governments almost never provided facilitation services in the process of drafting and monitoring the contents of RPJM Desa. Only Kabupaten Batanghari and Kabupaten Ngada asked villages to revise their RPJM Desa to correspond to RPJMD

Kabupaten, which was drafted based on the newly elected head of *kabupaten's* vision and mission. However, the villages were not informed about the changes they had to make.

Considered only as a formality, RPJM Desa was made carelessly in most of the study villages. The document only consists of a "list of as many proposed activities as possible" with no relevance to the village head's vision and missions nor the *kabupaten's* program. In some study villages, the drafting of RPJM Desa was not preceded by an exploration of ideas at the *dusun*⁵ level. In some other villages, recapitulation and prioritization of ideas went through deliberation meetings at the *dusun* level, not at the village level. In Kabupaten Wonogiri, for example, the *dusun* heads were only asked to submit a list of proposed activities from the *dusun*-level meetings to the village secretary.

In addition, the drafting of RPJM Desa was only done by one or two village officials. In fact, in one of the study villages in Kabupaten Banyumas, the village head admitted that he did not fully comprehend the content of the RPJM Desa because the drafting was fully handed over to the village secretary. Meanwhile, in one of the study villages in Kabupaten Merangin, the RPJM Desa drafted by the village secretary seemed to be a perfect copy of the RPJMD Kabupaten. This can be seen from the five village's missions which are exactly the same as missions 1–5 of the RPJMD Kabupaten. Activities derived from the missions were written in exactly the same sentences as those in the RPJMD Kabupaten.

The above conditions leave the question of how the alignment of development planning documents should be done. Besides being mandated by Village Law, alignment is needed to avoid overlaps between the *kabupaten's* and the village's planning. For an instance, an infrastructure development activity in one of the study villages had also been planned by the *kabupaten* government. As a result, the infrastructure already built by the village was eventually destroyed and rebuilt using the *kabupaten's* budget (Kurniawan, 2018b).

On top of the overlapping issue, alignment will only be effective if it can synergize the *kabupaten's* programs/activities and those of the villages. The synergy provides an opportunity for the villages to access the *kabupaten's* programs/activities. It also provides good input for the *kabupaten* government to allow the designed programs/activities to target the right recipients. So far, the lack of dissemination has caused disconnection between the *kabupaten's* and the village's programs.

⁵A *dusun* is an administrative area within a village, consisting of a number of RT (neighborhood units).

III. Village Dreams

Various village activity plans are stated in RPJM Desa and village government work plan (RKP Desa). Both documents are the most formal guidelines for village governments in carrying out their tasks and implementing development and empowerment activities. Under Regulation of the Minister for Home Affairs No. 114 of 2014, the drafting of village planning is required to take into consideration its conformity to the supravillage governments' policy direction and the village's objective condition. Therefore, the drafting of RPJM Desa and RKP Desa ideally requires a strong technocratic capability to allow villages' characters and aspirations to be comprehensively captured.

The problem is that village governments still need facilitation and capacity building to produce ideal planning documents. First, it is proven that villages' capacity in translating the supravillage governments' policy direction was highly limited, as discussed in Chapter II. There was even a case where a village copied the contents of the RPJMD Kabupaten when drafting their RPJM Desa. Second, village governments' capacity in determining development plans based on people's ideas was still limited. RPJM Desa was often considered as a formal document consisting of a list of people's aspirations made to fulfill an administrative requirement. It is highly likely that good "dreams" or ideas are not well captured in RPJM Desa because of the village head's limited technocratic capability and leadership skills. As such, the quality of the village development planning is not optimal.

This chapter looks further into villages' dreams not included in RPJM Desa to discover the village heads' capacity to envision the village's future. This capacity is important in the context of facilitation, as it serves as the foundation to determine the adequacy of available support. The villages' vision about their future is explored from the perspective of the village heads through in-depth interviews.

3.1 Overview of Village Dreams

The dreams captured from interviews with village heads can be mapped in three main categories, namely (i) economic development and community empowerment, (ii) infrastructure, and (iii) village governance. The economic development and community empowerment category is further divided into six themes, namely empowerment, agriculture, BUM Desa, tourism, spatial development, as well as cooperatives and MSMEs. Meanwhile, the infrastructure and village governance categories are not divided into specific themes. Table 4 shows village dreams under three categories and more specific themes.

3.1.1 Category 1: Economic Development and Community Empowerment

Among the three categories, the economic development and community empowerment is the largest, comprising 41 (66%) out of 62 dreams.

Table 4. Summary of Village Dreams Categories⁶

| Dream Categories and Themes | Total | Villages | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------|----------|---|---|---|---|----|---|---|---|---|
| | | N | L | B | K | D | K | T | K | J | S |
| | | D | K | R | L | L | Y | B | S | R | S |
| | | O | S | L | K | G | M | J | B | J | B |
| A. Category 1: Economic Development and Community Empowerment (n = 41) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Empowerment | 20 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 5 | - | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| Agriculture | 9 | - | 2 | - | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | - |
| BUM Desa | 5 | 1 | - | - | 1 | 1 | 1 | - | 1 | - | - |
| Tourism | 4 | 1 | - | 1 | - | 1 | - | - | - | - | 1 |
| Spatial Development | 2 | - | - | - | - | 1 | - | - | - | - | 1 |
| Cooperatives and MSMEs | 1 | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| B. Category 2: Infrastructure (n = 15) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Infrastructure | 15 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| C. Category 3: Village Governance (n = 6) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Governance | 6 | 1 | - | - | 1 | - | 4 | - | - | - | - |
| Total | 62 | 8 | 6 | 5 | 6 | 8 | 12 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 6 |

a) Empowerment

Empowerment is a big theme consisting of twenty dreams (Table 4), ranging from business development to social life improvement to poverty eradication and to environmental improvement. Regarding the business development dream, village heads hoped for the village community to have alternative sources of livelihood from local potentials, such as processing of agricultural products, production of handicrafts, and improvement in personal skills, such as teaching the Quran. Furthermore, the social life improvement dreams are generally related to shaping the community based on principles of mutual cooperation and solidarity.

Although villages were generally concerned about poverty, only Desa Karya Mukti explicitly dreamed of poverty eradication. This dream is quite comprehensive because it covers the fulfillment of several basic needs, such as adequate housing and healthy toilets, handling of the poor, and business empowerment. The limited poverty eradication dreams show that villages still need facilitation to use their resources to reach out to the poor. Another village with a distinct empowerment dream was Desa Deling. The dream was to improve the environment by building a waste recycling system to allow the village community to reuse the recycled waste.

⁶A complete table that contains all village dreams is presented in Appendix 2.

b) Agriculture

Dreams under the agriculture theme generally revolve around strengthening the position of farmers in the produce market through agricultural diversification or development. In Desa Kalikromo and Desa Tiang Berajo, the village heads dreamed that their community not only grow on-trend crops to reduce intermediaries’ influence on crop prices. Meanwhile, the head of Desa Lekosoro dreamed that the community could diversify their crops to include secondary crops, vegetables, cocoa, and nutmeg. The village heads also dreamed of a profit-sharing mechanism in the livestock management.

c) BUM Desa

Villages that have not had BUM Desa wished to start preparing for its organizational governance. This dream was then translated into a potential business to develop the economic resources in the village. Villages with this kind of dream were Desa Ndonga in Kabupaten Ngada, Desa Deling and Desa Karya Mukti in Kabupaten Banyumas, and Desa Kelok Sungai Besar in Kabupaten Batanghari. Desa Lekosoro also had the same dream, but it was hampered by limited quality of their human resources.

d) Others: Tourism, Spatial Development, and Cooperatives and MSMEs

Other dreams were found in small numbers and based on the village’s specific conditions. First, all village heads dreaming of tourism development based their aspiration on the local unique location (Table 5). Second, spatial development-themed dreams were based on the attempt to optimize the local conditions. For example, Desa Deling, Kabupaten Banyumas, dreamed of developing agriculture and plantation businesses as well as minapolitan area in every RW⁷, while Desa Sungai Seberang, Kabupaten Merangin, dreamed of restoring the village area that had been encroached by the production forest administrator. Third, cooperative and MSME improvement dream was only found in Desa Ndonga, Kabupaten Ngada, as there was a case of nonperforming loan in savings and loan activities in the village financial management unit (UPKD).

Table 5. Village Dreams under Tourism Theme

| Villages | Dreams |
|------------------------|---|
| Deling | Development of village treasury land for cultural tourism, education, and fishing ponds |
| Sungai Seberang | Development of cave and waterfall locations as tourist attractions |
| Beral | Development of economic potential of Nampu Beach |
| Ndonga | Development of customary village tourism |

⁷RW is a unit of local administration consisting of several RT (neighborhood units).

3.1.2 Category 2: Infrastructure

The number of dreams in this category is the second highest, i.e., around 24%. All villages had dreams about infrastructure. This includes basic infrastructure, such as road, water, and electricity, and infrastructure that supports community's economy, such as farm roads and irrigation networks. In this category, road construction was the most common dream among village heads. This is because of the large variety of roads that can be built: village road, inter-*dusun* road, neighborhood road, farm road, and plantation road.

As a dream, the construction of basic infrastructure and infrastructure for supporting the community's economy (neighborhood roads, bridges, clean water supply lines, and retaining walls) can be said as the dream directed toward solving problems. However, not all infrastructure dreams are meant to solve problems, some infrastructure-related dreams are also intended to support the village potentials. Land expansion and irrigation network construction dreams, for example, were meant to develop villages' agricultural potential.

3.1.3 Category 3: Village Governance

About 10% of village dreams belong to this category. Four village heads dreamed of improving their village governance. First, the head of Desa Ndona, Kabupaten Ngada, dreamed of improving the village's administrative system. In addition, the village's information and archiving system was considered important to be improved. Such an improvement will allow an orderly administration in planning, monitoring, and accountability of the village development.

Next, the heads of Desa Kalikromo, Kabupaten Wonogiri, and Desa Karya Mukti, Kabupaten Banyumas, dreamed of improving transparency in village planning and budgeting. Transparency is considered important to prevent conflicts, as resources available in the village can be managed without raising suspicion from the community.

Finally, the head of Desa Karya Mukti—the most disciplined village head—also dreamed of providing professional, fast, and excellent services. All village officials, including *dusun* heads, are required to be present at the office during office hours. He also held a briefing every day and obliged all officials to join the assembly every Monday at the village office yard.

3.2 Village Dream Analysis

Villages' capacity—as represented by the village head's capacity—is of high importance in elaborating their vision/mission into strategies. In addition to being mandated by Article 6 of Regulation of the Minister for Home Affairs No. 114 of 2014, this capacity is needed to allow a more strategic management of villages' resources to achieve village community's welfare. However, in Case Study Report on Village Law: Exploring the Benefits of Village Fund Spending, Bachtiar et al. (2019) found that village heads have a limited capacity in formulating strategies to achieve their vision and missions. This study also finds that RPJM Desa and RKP Desa only comprise a list of dreams which, upon further investigation, only

revolve around physical activities/development, are mostly problem-oriented, and do not include the village's long-term potentials.

However, interviews with village heads (see Subchapter 3.1) brought up an interesting finding, which was different from both the previous study's finding and what were stated in RPJM Desa.⁸ Quite many dreams are actually related to the needs other than physical development. This means that village heads had difficulties in discussing empowerment-related activities during the formal development planning process and incorporating them into the planning documents, such as RPJM Desa and/or RKP Desa.

3.2.1 Quality of Village Dreams

It is important to look at the quality of dreams expressed by village heads. This will provide information on their technocratic capability, namely the ability to translate the village's dreams into strategies to achieve them.

The quality of the village's dreams was assessed by looking at the goals and content described by the village heads. The background situation that prompted the village heads to convey those dreams could also be used to understand them more comprehensively.

From the 62 village dreams, three patterns of dreams surfaced: (i) dreams with normative goals, (ii) dreams with administrative goals, and (iii) dreams with pragmatic goals. In the facilitation context, these patterns need special attention especially for preparing facilitators which suit the needs of the village.

a) Dreams with Normative Goals

Dreams with normative goals are generally related to village heads' wish to improve the character and culture of the village community. This kind of dream consists of ideal yet abstract goals; thus they take a long time to achieve and are difficult to measure. Achieving this kind of dream also requires facilitators with special qualifications. A closer look at village heads' dreams reveals that at least four of them (Table 6) are utter "cliché" dreams.

⁸The Case Study Report on Village Law : Exploring the Benefits of Village Spending (Bachtiar et al., 2019) finds that government administration and physical development absorbed 90% of the spending allocation, while only 10% of it was used for community empowerment and development activities.

Table 6. Examples of Village Dreams with Normative Goals

| Villages | Dreams | Themes |
|-----------------|---|-------------|
| Deling | Shaping harmonious and peaceful lives for happy villagers who are ready for <i>gotong royong</i> (mutual cooperation) at any time | Empowerment |
| Karya Mukti | Improving community's participation/mutual cooperation | Empowerment |
| Beral | Building community's capacity | Empowerment |
| Kalikromo | Preserving harmonious life and mutual cooperation among villagers | Empowerment |
| Sungai Seberang | Building solidarity and togetherness among community members | Empowerment |

Dreams of a decent social condition and harmony in the community were found in Desa Deling and Desa Karya Mukti, Kabupaten Banyumas. The heads of both villages considered these dreams important because they are the foundation of life in the village community. As a matter of fact, the social harmony and mutual cooperation among the community members were still well-maintained in both villages. This could be seen from the community's high participation in mutual cooperation in the villages. Both village heads only aimed to prevent it from declining because there was an assumption among village community that the village government could work without them with more funding coming into the village treasury.

To realize those dreams, facilitation needs defined by the village heads became very specific. Desa Karya Mukti, for example, expected a facilitator who is knowledgeable about community life and mutual cooperation. Similarly, based on the notes from the field observers, the head of Desa Deling expected a facilitator who could convince the community that helping each other is akin to an act of worship. It is important to note that measuring the competence of the needed facilitators was difficult.

Meanwhile, the head of Desa Beral, Kabupaten Wonogiri, dreamed of a community with more innovative ideas. This dream was driven by the fact that many underprivileged community members operated their family businesses traditionally and this makes them vulnerable to changes. Besides, their participation in the village governance did not generate many innovative ideas. This made it difficult for the village government to add more activities aimed at improving the quality of human resources because village activities are determined through deliberation meetings. To reach an ideal condition, the head of Desa Beral just thought of conducting dissemination and motivating the people about the importance of creating innovations. However, he did not describe any specific facilitation needs. Finally, as normative as it might look, this kind of dream is feasible but still requires careful and serious facilitation.

Box 2

Achieving Dreams Does Not Always Need Facilitation

One of the dreams conveyed by this village head is the preservation of harmony and mutual cooperation culture. He said that this dream was important because the spirit of the village community lies in communality and mutual cooperation. He explained that this dream aims at making the village community maintain the “many hands make light work” principle in the future in facing any trouble. This is an ideal situation he wanted to achieve in the future.

This dream emerged from his concern regarding the community’s mutual cooperation issue. It has been a trend recently for those who cannot participate in communal work, such as civil servants and businesspeople for being too busy, to pay someone from another *dusun* to work in their place. He is worried that this would become a common habit. In the long run, more people will be too busy and cannot participate in the communal work due to their job or business, making the mutual cooperation culture transform into paying and receiving practices. This means that participation in the mutual cooperation will be replaced by the ability to pay someone to work in their stead, whereas the essence of communality and mutual cooperation is togetherness and participation which the village community consider important.

Interestingly, the village head firmly stated that this dream did not need facilitation. He believed that the community was the only one who knew how to maintain communality and mutual cooperation. He opined that facilitators from outside of the village would find it difficult to understand the details and characters of the villagers deeply. In his opinion, village organizations and local figures were more capable of facilitating the villagers intensively. However, the village head did not have any clear plans yet to realize this dream.

b) Dreams with Administrative Goals

Another problem arising is that some dreams conveyed by village heads are actually the basic/intrinsic tasks of the village government. This problem was found in the dreams of two village heads, namely the head of Desa Karya Mukti, Kabupaten Banyumas, and the head of Desa Kalikromo, Kabupaten Wonogiri (Table 7). These dreams implicitly show that there are needs for a fundamental improvement in the village governance even though Village Law has been implemented for three years.

Table 7. Village Dreams Which Are Intrinsic Tasks of the Village Government

| Villages | Dreams | Themes |
|-------------|---|--------------------|
| Karya Mukti | Improvement in the village officials’ internal capacity | Village governance |
| Karya Mukti | Fast services | |
| Karya Mukti | Transparency on village budget (APB Desa) | |
| Kalikromo | Improvement in village government’s transparency | |

The head of Desa Karya Mukti, Kabupaten Banyumas, mentioned three dreams which can be identified as having this pattern. The first dream is to make the village staff professional and disciplined in providing services for the villagers. By being professional and disciplined, the village head means for the village staff to be on time and regularly present at the village office. To achieve this dream, the village head believed that the required facilitation should only include work motivation, explanation on village government regulations, and innovations in the working procedure.

The second dream is ensuring fast services for the people who come to the village office. However, this dream is merely an enforcement of obligations to provide services without delays. In the village head's opinion, the enforcement of the "CTM-Cepat, Tepat, Manfaat (fast, accurate, beneficial)" service motto to the village officials had successfully brought them closer to achieving his dream. Therefore, facilitation can then be directed toward the development of an advanced administrative service system, such as an archiving application using information technology.

The third dream is transparency in APB Desa to allow the community to be more informed about it and provide input. This dream is similar to the second dream in that it does not require specific facilitation.

The head of Desa Kalikromo, Kabupaten Wonogiri, dreamed of improving administrative accountability and transparency to minimize potential political conflicts at the village level and to eliminate negative assumptions about profit grabbing by the village head from village activities. In the village head's opinion, this dream was aimed at eliminating slanders and suspicions that the village head grabbed profit from the existing development. Besides, administrative accountability and transparency was an instruction from the central government that must be carried out. The community started to assume that the village had much more financial resources since the implementation of Village Fund (VF). The village head did not mention specific facilitation needs other than regular coordination with professional facilitators to achieve this dream.

c) Dreams with Pragmatic Goals

The next problem is that some dreams are pragmatic and generally lack long-term impacts (Table 8). These dreams are fixated on solving problems in sight, rather than on optimizing long-term potentials. The village heads' dreams are stuck on this kind of problem and leave an impression that they only conduct activities merely to fulfill their obligations.

Desa Karya Mukti, Kabupaten Banyumas, and Desa Kelok Sungai Besar, Kabupaten Batanghari, dreamed of empowerment activities in the form of skill training. When examined further, the head of Desa Karya Mukti only listed old ideas in the form of those training programs with neither significant effect nor sustainability. The explanation of ideas in this dream is also too abstract and less concrete, such as "encouraging community's businesses". In the monitoring report, the secretary of Desa Karya Mukti stated that this happened because the human resources in the village government were not capable enough of designing comprehensive and sustainable training programs.

Information on a similar matter was also revealed by the head of Desa Kelok Sungai Besar. In terms of empowerment, the village head could only mention dreams about skill training but did not know the right contents for the training. However, he managed to connect his dreams to the need for facilitation to overcome such a problem. This information basically shows that villages still need to be facilitated in formulating and designing empowerment activities.

Table 8. Village Dreams with Pragmatic Goals

| Villages | Dreams | Themes |
|--------------------|---|-------------|
| Karya Mukti | Skill training | Empowerment |
| Kelok Sungai Besar | Sustainable empowerment training | Empowerment |
| Jembatan Rajo | Empowerment of the marginalized group (the poor and disabled) | Empowerment |
| Sungai Seberang | Reviving activities for mothers and youths in the village | Empowerment |

Desa Jembatan Rajo, Kabupaten Merangin, did dream of empowerment for farmers and the poor. However, further exploration showed that the said dream is merely social assistance. This dream is clearly problematic for it only shows that the village head is not visionary.

**Box 3
Patriarchal Aspects in Women Empowerment Dream**

The head of Desa Kalikromo expressed a dream of empowering women in his village. He assumed that women, especially homemakers, had enough time to contribute to increasing family income. Based on monitoring notes, the village head assumed that homemakers in the village only spent their time on taking care of their children and family. It means that despite having performed unpaid care work, such as taking care of children and the house, they are also expected to be able to do some economically productive activities. Taking this assumption into consideration, the village head dreamed of women empowerment activities for homemakers to spend their spare time for productive activities, such as making saleable food products and handicrafts.

Desa Sungai Seberang, Kabupaten Merangin, also expressed a dream of empowering women (mothers) and youths through the family welfare and empowerment (PKK) group and *karang taruna* (youth organization). These two village community organizations (LKD) hardly had any activity, but a new team has been formed now and is expected to initiate new activities. However, the monitoring finds that this dream did not originally come from the village or the village head; rather it was encouraged by the *kecamatan*.

3.2.2 Village Heads' Technocratic Capacity

In the process of exploring information about village dreams, village heads were asked to elaborate one of their primary dreams into more detailed strategies or measurable steps to support the achievement of their dreams. These elaborated strategies/smaller dreams serve as an indicator of the village heads' technocratic capability.

Box 4

Example of a Village Head with Technocratic Capacity

The head of Desa Deling is an example of a village head who could translate their primary dream into measurable strategic steps. Their approach is forward-looking, as it pays attention to the availability of facility and infrastructure, such as water and laboratory; postproduction facilities, such as traditional markets; and spatial advantages. Approaches to their derivative dreams have been thought comprehensively. Moreover, in determining their primary dream, they embarked from the village's potentials and, thus, could be said as forward-looking. As a result, the elaboration of derivative dreams leaves a concrete impression, which eventually strengthens the indication of the village's needs for facilitation.

Village heads' ability in transforming their dreams into detailed strategies is varied. The head of Desa Ndonga, Kabupaten Ngada, was able to elaborate his 4 dreams into 13 fairly concrete strategies. Meanwhile, the village heads with the most limited technocratic capacity were the heads of Desa Jembatan Rajo and Desa Sungai Seberang in Kabupaten Merangin. Both were not yet able to translate their primary dreams into strategic steps. Interestingly, only the head of Desa Deling, Kabupaten Banyumas, could elaborate his strategies further into more detailed activities.

Furthermore, the technocratic capacity of village heads needs to be explored further by comparing their primary dreams with their derivatives, i.e., the strategies to achieve them. Several aspects are used in this analysis, i.e., (i) village heads' ability to formulate their primary dreams clearly, (ii) village heads' ability to elaborate their primary dreams into relevant derivative dreams, (iii) the derivative dreams being concrete and measurable, (iv) the duration to achieve the primary dreams, and (v) the background of the primary dreams (for example, whether it is based on problems to be solved or potentials to be developed). A more complete analysis can be seen in Table 9. Both villages in Kabupaten Merangin are not included in Table 9 because their village heads could not elaborate their primary dreams into relevant strategies.

Table 9. Analysis of Village Heads' Technocratic Capacity

| Villages | Primary Dream and Its Derivatives | Analysis |
|----------|--|---|
| NDO | Establishment and development of BUM Desa - BUM Desa organizational governance - Savings and loan unit | The primary dream is formulated based on the village's potential. Its derivatives are formulated concretely and are measurable, and |

| Villages | Primary Dream and Its Derivatives | Analysis |
|----------|---|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Customary village tourism destination unit - Fruit commodity unit - Commodity trading unit | <p>relevant in supporting the achievement of the primary dream. The village head has technocratic capacity.</p> |
| LKS | <p>Infrastructure development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Farm road construction - Irrigation network construction - Paddy field expansion | <p>The primary dream is more problem based rather than potential based, with a short-term approach. Such a formulation of dream is relatively common. Despite its relevant elaboration, it looks more like a "shopping list" in many villages.</p> |
| KLK | <p>BUM Desa development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Improvement of BUM Desa management by using a kinship approach - Continuing and improving the existing concrete mixer renting business - Dissemination to the community about the sand mining business unit to be managed by BUM Desa - Sales of agricultural production tools and facilities - Agricultural product storage business - Photocopy business | <p>The primary dream is formulated based on the village's potential. Its derivatives are formulated concretely, are measurable, and are relevant in supporting the achievement of the primary dream. This village head has a technocratic capacity.</p> |
| BRL | <p>Village infrastructure development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Evenly allocating infrastructure budget for every <i>dusun</i> - Proportional budgeting for each <i>dusun</i> - Proposal submission to supravillage governments | <p>The primary dream is more problem based rather than potential based, with a short-term approach. Its derivatives has no clear correlation with the achievement of the primary dream.</p> |
| DLG | <p>Plant nursery business development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Building a laboratory for plant nursery development - Cultivation of durian, coconut, and vanilla on village treasury land and people's yards - Market expansions to sell more seedlings - Encouraging BUM Desa to provide financial access and open a market - Water infrastructure construction | <p>The primary dream is formulated based on the village's potential. Its derivatives are formulated concretely, and are measurable, and are relevant in supporting the achievement of the primary dream. The village head has a technocratic capacity.</p> |
| KYM | Poverty reduction | |

| Villages | Primary Dream and Its Derivatives | Analysis |
|----------|--|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Construction of roads, bridges, a drainage system, irrigation networks, etc. <hr/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Group empowerment <hr/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Handling of the poor (helping the sick and hungry ones, providing nursing homes, giving assistance for [renovation of] uninhabitable houses [RTLH], implementing the Healthy Toilet program, etc.) <hr/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Skill training for the poor <hr/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Business development | <p>The primary dream is more problem based rather than potential based.</p> <p>The strategies elaborated from it are too broad. Some of its derivatives directly support the primary dream and some others do not. Some derivative dreams, such as group empowerment, are too abstract and difficult to measure.</p> <p>Some other derivative dreams are more pragmatic, such as skill training for the poor.</p> |
| TBJ | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rice farming development <hr/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Creating new paddy fields (on peatlands of 25 hectares wide) <hr/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Improvement in the irrigation network and installing pumping system <hr/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increasing community's awareness | <p>The primary dream is long term and formulated based on the village's potential. Its derivatives are quite supportive of the achievement of the primary dream. However, some of them are too abstract and difficult to measure.</p> |
| KSB | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development of BUM Desa <hr/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Asking for guidance from facilitators, <i>kecamatan</i>, the community and village empowerment agency (DPMD), as well as the trade and industry agency on how to establish a BUM Desa <hr/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Recruiting high-quality managers and facilitators for the BUM Desa | <p>The elaboration of the primary dream into relevant strategies is highly limited. Strategies to achieve the primary dream are short term and seem more like activities than strategies.</p> |

The analysis in Table 9 also shows a balanced number of villages whose dreams are potential based and problem based. Some villages base their dreams on their local potentials, while others embark from the problems they want to solve.

The heads of the eight study villages generally can elaborate their primary dream into its derivatives (Table 9). However, not all of them have the ability to determine which derivatives are truly relevant, interconnected, and supportive of the achievement of the primary dream. Besides, fairly many derivative dreams are not yet formulated in a concrete and measurable manner. Three village heads are considered as having a technocratic capacity; they are from Desa Ndonga, Kabupaten Ngada; Desa Kalikromo, Kabupaten Wonogiri; and Desa Deling, Kabupaten Banyumas.

IV. Map of Facilitators' Availability

The various village dreams explained in Chapter 3 show that basically villages, in this case village heads, have a hope or vision for their village advancement in the future. Facilitation becomes important, especially as the villages' ability to carry out development varies. In this regard, this chapter attempts to map the types and capacity of available facilitators as well as the challenges they face. This chapter also discusses villages' experience in accessing facilitators. All of these are meant to provide an overview of the possibility to fulfill the village needs to realize their envisioned dreams.

4.1 Available Facilitators

The available facilitators were mapped by referring to the dreams described by the village head in each study location. Researchers, in this case the field researchers, identified and ensured the existence of facilitators, either those who had been or were potentially accessed by the village. The term facilitators here comprise not only village professional facilitators (village facilitators or local village facilitators), but also those from the government and nongovernmental institutions in the study *kabupaten*. A detailed map of the available facilitators in each study *kabupaten* is presented in Appendix 2.

Based on the map, most of the identified facilitators are from government institutions, both program facilitators and nonprogram facilitators, such as staff of ministries/agencies/government institutions. Almost all of them work under the authority of the *kabupaten* government. Only a few of them are from the provincial government and the central government (ministries). They are generally from the program carried out in the *kabupaten*.⁹

Meanwhile, nongovernmental facilitators come from NGOs, universities, private companies, and communities. At least a few NGOs are identified to have conducted facilitation in Kabupaten Ngada, Kabupaten Banyumas, and Kabupaten Merangin. Facilitation provided by universities was found only in the study *kabupaten* on the Java Island; these universities were Jenderal Sudirman University (Kabupaten Banyumas) and Sebelas Maret University (Kabupaten Wonogiri). In Kabupaten Wonogiri, a private company conducted facilitation by providing tobacco management extension workers. Despite the limited scale, facilitators from nongovernmental institutions had the potential to help villages achieve their dreams.

Still referring to Appendix 2, by their scope of work, facilitators can be divided into three categories, namely economic development and empowerment facilitators, basic infrastructure and service facilitators, and village governance facilitators.

⁹In this study, facilitators from government institutions, including the central government (except village professional facilitators), are also called OPD facilitators. This is because they generally carry out their tasks by coordinating directly with the *kabupaten* or provincial government.

4.1.1 Economic Development and Community Empowerment Facilitators

Facilitators in the economic development and community empowerment category are those who directly or indirectly help villages generate and increase community's income. Some of them are from the agriculture-related institutions (including plantation, husbandry, fishery, and forestry), cooperatives and MSMEs, community empowerment, and rural spatial development.

a) Agriculture

Facilitators in the agriculture field are tasked to facilitate village community in the introduction and application of technology, disease prevention, cultivation, post-harvest management, and improvement in the quality of human resources and institutions to increase their income and welfare, either through regular extension or mentoring. Facilitators serving this function are PPL, including PPL for agriculture, plantation, husbandry, fishery, and forestry. Included in this type of facilitators are the staff at research institutes/the centers of agricultural management, such as pest analysts, and the staff of center for seedling in Kabupaten Banyumas.

At the village level, the PPL, especially those from the agriculture agency in all study *kabupaten* (except Kabupaten Merangin and Kabupaten Ngada) and those from the marine affairs, fisheries, and husbandry agency in Kabupaten Wonogiri, are also supported by independent extension workers. These workers work voluntarily and are usually local villagers—generally local public figures—who are appointed based on a decree of related officers (heads of agencies). However, not every independent facilitator is active or has the initiative in carrying out their tasks in the village. They usually help facilitators only when a program/project is carried out in the village. They sometimes receive transportation/operational reimbursement from the program/project.

Regarding PPL's work, since 2017, the authority to manage PPL's personnel administration and coordinate their duty implementation have been transferred from the agricultural training center (BPP) to the respective agency. This was due to the policy on OPD structural simplification following the enactment of the regional regulation about changes in organizational structure and work procedures (SOTK) of the regional government.¹⁰ These changes brought considerable consequences on the work pattern of the PPL in the field.

First, since the transfer of coordination authority, PPL no longer managed the budget to fund the operating costs of the BPP office (electricity, stationery, honorarium for office guards, and so on) or their facilitation, i.e., providing extension for farmers. The absence of budget had forced them to look for a way to pay for such costs. For example, a PPL coordinator in the study *kecamatan* in Kabupaten Batanghari used his own money to pay for the honorarium of the office guard who was not paid for several months. Similarly, PPL in Banyumas sold the harvest collected around the BPP office to pay for office electricity and other bills.

¹⁰These changes are the embodiment of the mandate of Law No. 23 of 2014 on Regional Government and Government Regulation No. 18 of 2016 on the Regional Officials.

Second, since PPL began to work under the authority of extension department of their respective technical agency, coordination between PPL and the department did not run smoothly. This led to the absence of monitoring toward their performance. In fact, many PPL did not actively work and came to the BPP office just to have their attendance checked so that they would keep receiving honorarium/salary. One of the PPL coordinators in Kabupaten Batanghari revealed that 60% of the PPL in the *kabupaten* were not working; and out of the 40% of the working ones, only 20% made reports. This means that only two out of nine PPL actively worked and made reports. In addition to contradicting the direction of the *kabupaten* or village development which prioritized the agriculture sector as the driving force of the regional economy, this policy undermined the role of PPL.

Furthermore, in 2017, the authority over the plantation and forestry PPL was transferred from the *kabupaten* government to the province, with their office being located at the provincial plantation/forestry agency. This also applies to the fishery PPL, who were transferred to work under the authority of the central government (even though the office was still located at the *kabupaten*). This policy posed challenges to the *kabupaten* to fulfill their people's needs for plantation-, forestry-, and fishery-related matters because they could no longer directly access these facilitators. For example, a PPL coordinator in a *kecamatan* in Kabupaten Batanghari we interviewed said it was difficult to help people deal with problems in rubber or oil palm plantations—which are the primary job sector there—because the only available facilitators in the field were agriculture PPL.

b) Cooperatives and MSMEs

Facilitators in this field consist of, among others, cooperative and MSME facilitators and industry and trade facilitators in Kabupaten Merangin, as well as facilitators of voluntary labor (TKS) and independent labor (TKM), and facilitators of an integrated business service center (PLUT) in Kabupaten Banyumas. Some MSME facilitators also served as implementers of the central/regional government's program. Some of them were the facilitators of Anggur Merah (Budget for People's Prosperity) program in Kabupaten Ngada and facilitators of Kube (joint business group) program¹¹ in Kabupaten Batanghari and Kabupaten Wonogiri. Similar facilitation was also conducted by NGOs in Kabupaten Merangin.

Generally, cooperative facilitators were in charge of conducting extension related to cooperatives, including its planning, establishment, and licensing, as well as coaching and training on it. Meanwhile, MSME facilitators were tasked to collect data, guide, and facilitate the fulfillment of needs to improve production and marketing, especially for small- and medium-scale industry players.

Cooperative and MSME facilitators in Kabupaten Banyumas performed more specific tasks, namely mentoring cooperatives and MSMEs that had received training from the cooperatives training center (Balatkop) and MSMEs of the Central Java Province and

¹¹a program from the Ministry of Social Affairs

providing recommendations of what they need to further develop to Balatkop. This would allow them to have sustainable improvement in their business. This is also the case with TKS-TKM facilitators in two recipient villages of TKM¹² program in Kabupaten Banyumas. In 2017, two packages of TKM training were organized. However, this training could not be accessed by residents of other villages.

Also, the PLUT in Kabupaten Banyumas is responsible for encouraging capacity building for cooperatives and MSMEs through nonfinancial services, such as improvements in production, marketing, access to funding, and human resources. At this center, some consultants are assigned to provide consultation services in various fields, such as information technology, marketing, institutional matters, human resources, and production for the community.

Related to the government's program, facilitators of the Anggur Merah program in Kabupaten Ngada—funded by the East Nusa Tenggara (NTT) province government—provided facilitation in business management with their financing/capital derived from the program. Similarly, facilitators of the Kube program, who were working under the authority of the Ministry of Social Affairs, were also tasked to mentor local business groups established by the program. However, based on an interview with one of the facilitators, some facilitators still had a low capacity and some were involved in other programs, such as the Family of Hope Program (PKH), at the same time.¹³

Not too different from these facilitators from government programs, facilitators from NGOs in Kabupaten Merangin also conducted facilitation in the marketing of the community's flagship commodity especially in two *kecamatan*. Besides economic development facilitation, they provided facilitation in optimizing the sustainable management of natural resources, such as developing village electricity from alternative energy resources, achieving food self-sufficiency, and facilitating the community's capacity building in various forms, and so forth.

c) Community Empowerment

In this field, two institutions provided instructors for knowledge and skill development, namely the vocational training center (BLK) in Kabupaten Banyumas and learning activity studio (SKB) in Kabupaten Banyumas, Kabupaten Batanghari, and Kabupaten Wonogiri. In addition, some empowerers were also village professional facilitators tasked to monitor the implementation of Village Law. They were experts, village facilitators, local village facilitators, and KPMD¹⁴ as well as the *kabupaten* government program facilitators, such as ADD facilitators in Kabupaten Ngada.

In Kabupaten Banyumas, the BLK had six civil servant instructors with good qualifications; they had already accumulated up to 900 teaching hours (instructors of sewing,

¹²from the Directorate General of Labor Improvement Coaching and Work Opportunity Expansion of the Ministry of Labor

¹³They usually have an educational background in the social science field but have no knowledge about facilitating the locals' business.

¹⁴village community empowerment cadres

automotive, electricity, and welding).¹⁵ Although these instructors had tight teaching schedules and rarely taught outside of the BLK, external parties, including villages, could still access their services by coordinating with the BLK's management. This BLK offered two automotive training packages, two sewing training packages, one agricultural product processing package, and one bridal make-up training package.

Meanwhile, SKB could only be found in Kabupaten Batanghari, Kabupaten Wonogiri, and Kabupaten Banyumas. In Kabupaten Banyumas and Kabupaten Wonogiri, both SKB and its instructors were still quite active in providing training in various fields, such as computer, sewing, and culinary art, for the local community. On the contrary, SKB in Kabupaten Batanghari had been inactive in the last five years. Since 2017, the position of SKB head had been vacant and only two employees were left.¹⁶

In the community empowerment field, some professional facilitators (experts, village facilitators, and local village facilitators) specifically mentored villages in the implementation of Village Law. However, this kind of facilitation was not seriously conducted because (i) villages generally still focused on infrastructure development, (ii) facilitators' capacity greatly varied, and (iii) many facilitators did not yet understand their role in empowering the community.

For facilitators who also served as program implementers, in Kabupaten Ngada for example, there were ADD facilitators (*kabupaten* and empowerment facilitators). These ADD facilitators were the implementers of the Kabupaten Ngada Government's program tasked to manage the ADD. Most of them were former PNPM-MP facilitators who had the capacity to mentor the community. In the beginning of Village Law implementation (in 2015), before village professional facilitators existed, it was these facilitators who conducted facilitation of the VF management in villages in Kabupaten Ngada.

There were also facilitators or experts in rural spatial development who served as the implementers of the Rural Spatial Development pilot program of the Kemendes PDTT since 2017.¹⁷ This program could be found in four study locations, namely Kabupaten Ngada, Kabupaten Banyumas, Kabupaten Wonogiri, and Kabupaten Merangin. It targeted the community in several villages in one or two *kecamatan* with different development focuses in every *kabupaten*, depending on the potential of each region. In Kabupaten Banyumas, the development was focused on tourism area; in Kabupaten Wonogiri on agriculture; and in Kabupaten Merangin and Kabupaten Ngada on coffee processing ecotourism. When this study was conducted (in July 2017), this program was still in the process of recruiting experts.

¹⁵Information about BLK in other *kabupaten* (Wonogiri and Batanghari) could not be obtained by the field researchers.

¹⁶This change in human resources took place after changes were made to the regional government's SOTK policy. In three study *kabupaten* (Batanghari, Wonogiri, and Banyumas), the policy changed the SKB's institutional status from a technical implementation unit (UPTD) to a nonformal educational unit under the *kabupaten* education agency.

¹⁷with the Directorate General of Rural Spatial Development serving as the executor

4.1.2 Basic Infrastructure and Service Facilitators

Facilitators in the basic infrastructure and service category conducted facilitation that supports the fulfillment of basic needs of the community. This section elaborates the two types of facilitation in this category: (i) basic infrastructure and (ii) social affairs and demography.¹⁸

a) Basic Infrastructure

The fact that infrastructure development in villages was still dominant made facilitation of basic infrastructure important. Like other facilitators, some basic infrastructure facilitators were also functional officials under the regional government's authority or regional governments/central government/NGOs program implementers. The basic infrastructure facilitators provided by *kabupaten* governments and identified in almost all study *kabupaten* were, among others, employees of the public works agency or its UPTD. Especially in Kabupaten Banyumas, a verification team was established for the Operational Work Plan of the Special Financial Assistance for Villages (RKO-BKK Desa). Meanwhile, in Kabupaten Wonogiri, an officer was appointed to provide irrigation facilitation in coordination with the water-using farmers' association (P3A) in the village.

The main task of the verification team in Kabupaten Banyumas was to verify the proposed activities to be funded from BKK Desa. The team could also provide consultation services in infrastructure development for the villages, if necessary. The team consisted of eight working groups whose members were from OPD, including the public works agency and the housing and settlements agency of Kabupaten Banyumas.¹⁹

Meanwhile, regional governments/central government/NGOs program facilitators generally provided intensive facilitation, starting from the program's planning, implementation, monitoring, to reporting. Some of the facilitators identified in this research also served as the facilitators of the Community-Based Water Supply and Sanitation program/Pamsimas (of Kabupaten Banyumas, Kabupaten Batanghari, and Kabupaten Merangin), ADD facilitators (of Kabupaten Ngada), as well as NGO facilitators (of Kabupaten Banyumas). Village professional facilitators consisted of experts of basic infrastructure (TA ID) and village facilitators of infrastructure engineering (PD TI); all these facilitators were found in all *kabupaten*.

The Pamsimas program had been implemented in three sample *kabupaten*, namely Kabupaten Banyumas and Kabupaten Batanghari since 2010 and Kabupaten Merangin since 2017. Through this program, the central government provided clean water and sanitation and cleaned up slum areas by providing facilitators from the *kabupaten* and *kecamatan*. However, these facilitators could only be accessed by recipient villages of the program. Other villages wishing to receive the program must follow the program's

¹⁸Based on information in Table A2 (Appendix 2), besides these two facilitators, there are other facilitators, namely facilitators of education and health.

¹⁹This working group was formed based on the Decree of the *Kabupaten* Head of Banyumas No. 900/248/2017 on the Verification Team of the Operational Work Plan of the Special Financial Assistance for Villages Sourced from the APBD of Kabupaten Banyumas.

procedure—submit a proposal and an official letter, participate in the village forum, go through proposal verification processes, and so on—as well as go through verification stages first.

Village professional facilitators comprise not only empowerment facilitators (experts and village facilitators), but also infrastructure facilitators, i.e., TA ID and PD TI. Likewise, the ADD program in Kabupaten Ngada also had technical facilitators. Both played an important role in village infrastructure development, especially during the planning (making a budget plan [RAB]) and in carrying out the development.

Meanwhile, NGOs in Kabupaten Banyumas assisted villages in building infrastructure and governing internet-based information. They provided villages with facilitation of making and managing their website. In one of the study villages in Kabupaten Banyumas, an individual mentor provided similar services given by those NGOs.

b) Social Affairs and Demography

The social affairs facilitators found in the study *kabupaten* were mostly from the central government's program. Some of them were PKH facilitators, *kecamatan* social welfare officers (TKSK), and disaster alert cadets (*tagana*) who worked under the Ministry of Social Affairs' authority. Only a few facilitators in Kabupaten Banyumas had no ties with the government's program. Such facilitators provided consultation services for families.

Facilitation services provided by the social affairs facilitators were generally for community members who went through social problems, such as poverty, violence against children and women, and disasters. In this case, they were asked to actively report to the facilitator if they experienced such social problems or witnessed another community member suffering from them.

For demography issues, family planning field officers (PLKB) were found in all study *kabupaten*. In Kabupaten Merangin particularly, these field officers were also found at the village and *dusun* levels. In general, these family planning facilitators worked to increase family participation and empower the community in the family planning program as part of an effort to control population.

4.1.3 Village Governance Facilitators

Facilitators in this category are responsible for the realization of village good governance, which is characterized by a participatory, transparent, accountable, well-ordered, and disciplined administration of the village. This is especially related to the village administration and financial management as well as the capacity building of the village officials. Facilitators that were close enough to realizing good governance in the village were the *kecamatan* apparatus and village professional facilitators (experts, village facilitators, and local village facilitators).

In the context of Village Law implementation, the *kecamatan* government became an extension of the *kabupaten* government in facilitating the villages through coaching and monitoring. The facilitation was given in the form of (i) conducting dissemination of

village-related policies, either through meetings or activities at the *kecamatan*/village level; (ii) facilitating the drafting of village documents (RPJM Desa, RKP Desa, and APB Desa), including those documents required for VF disbursement, and forwarding these documents to the *kabupaten*; (iii) verifying the VF disbursement documents (in Kabupaten Batanghari and Kabupaten Banyumas); and (iv) coordinating the implementation of routine activities at the *kecamatan* office (Syukri, 2018). However, the *kecamatan* did not have enough understanding and experience in undertaking those tasks. As a result, the village often directly consulted the *kabupaten*.

Especially in Kabupaten Banyumas, since 2016, the *kecamatan* has been required to play a more strategic role.²⁰ Besides functioning as a government entity and public service administrator, the *kecamatan* was required to play a role in the village and *kelurahan* community empowerment. In other words, there is a demand for improving the capacity of *kecamatan* governments, which tend to deal more with administrative matters.

4.1.4 Obstacles Faced by Facilitators

Facilitators are essentially tasked to conduct empowerment by improving community's knowledge, attitude, skill, behavior, ability, awareness, and resource utilization to build their independence and increase their welfare as mandated by Village Law.²¹ However, in carrying out this task, they face a lot of obstacles, both from the internal side (from the facilitators themselves) and the external side (influenced by other factors/parties).

a) Internal Obstacles

Internal obstacles cover problems with the quantity and quality of facilitators. Both have a fairly significant impact on the services provided by facilitators for the community.

²⁰based on the Regulation of the *Kabupaten* Head of Banyumas No. 75 of 2016 on the Positions, Organizational Structure, Duties and Functions, and Work Procedures in the *Kecamatan* and *Kelurahan* in Kabupaten Banyumas

²¹Article 6 of Village Law

Table 10. Proportion of Facilitators Compared to the Number of Villages

| Types of Facilitation Services | | Facilitator to Village Ratio | | | | |
|--|---|------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|------|
| | | NGA | BNY | WON | BTH | MER |
| A. Economic Development and Community Empowerment | | | | | | |
| a. Agriculture | Agriculture PPL | 0.84 | 0.61 | 0.65 | 0.93 | 1.06 |
| | Other PPL | 0.15 | 0.08 | 0.28 | 0.08 | 0.27 |
| b. Cooperative-MSME | Cooperative-MSME facilitators | 0.02 | 0.01 | - | 0.03 | 0.06 |
| c. Empowerment | BLK instructors | n.a. | 0.02 | 0.08 | n.a. | 0.01 |
| | SKB instructors | - | 0.02 | 0.04 | 0 | - |
| | Experts (except for basic infrastructure) | 0.04 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.05 | 0.02 |
| | Village empowerment facilitators | 0.11 | 0.124 | 0.10 | 0.10 | 0.15 |
| | Local village facilitators | 0.18 | 0.07 | 0.09 | 0.16 | 0.22 |
| d. Spatial Development | Spatial development experts | - | 0.01 | 0.01 | - | 0.01 |
| B. Basic Infrastructure and Services | | | | | | |
| Basic Infrastructure | Pamsimas facilitators | - | 0.06 | - | 0.05 | 0.07 |
| | Officers of public works UPTD | n.a. | 0.23 | 0.07 | 0.03 | 0.05 |
| | TA ID | 0.01 | - | 0.004 | 0.009 | - |
| | PD TI | 0.06 | 0.04 | 0.02 | 0.03 | 0.02 |
| C. Governance | | | | | | |
| Governance | <i>Kecamatan</i> government | | | | | |
| | Study <i>kecamatan</i> 1 | n.a. | 0.3 | 2.0 | n.a. | 0.58 |
| | Study <i>kecamatan</i> 2 | n.a. | 0.83 | 0.87 | n.a. | 0.50 |
| Average number | | 0.30 | 0.27 | 0.31 | 0.23 | 0.24 |

Source: related agencies/institutions in each *kabupaten*

In terms of quantity, as admitted by most facilitators interviewed, the number of available facilitators for villages was inadequate. Table 10 shows that on average the ratio of available facilitators to villages was relatively small, between 0.2–0.3. In other words, every facilitator must handle two to three villages. This disproportionate ratio hampered their work, and the geographical challenges in several study locations (Kabupaten Merangin, Kabupaten Batanghari, and Kabupaten Wonogiri) only made it worse. As a result, facilitators did not perform their duty well (e.g., rarely came to the village and so on).

However, a few types of facilitators were found in a high ratio, such as agriculture PPL—there was at least one PPL in every village. Even so, the distribution of available facilitators in every village was sometimes unequal, with most facilitators being concentrated in the urban area. This was revealed by, among others, a PPL in Kabupaten Batanghari who said that the number of agriculture PPL in Kabupaten Batanghari was higher in the *kecamatan* located near the urban area (Kota Jambi) than those located in the rural area.

Furthermore, several facilitators had quite a wide area coverage. Many of them were not from the village or *kecamatan* they were assigned to; some of them even lived quite far away from it. This sometimes affected the quality and intensity of their facilitation services. As admitted by a village facilitator in Kabupaten Merangin, some village facilitators and local village facilitators found it difficult to conduct full time facilitation because they lived far away from the assigned village or *kecamatan*.

In terms of facilitation quality, the relatively limited capacity of the facilitators became a crucial problem in facilitation. Several causes are behind this problem. First, facilitators' educational background was either poor and/or did not match the work they performed. This was found by the UPTD of the public works agency in one of the *kecamatan* in Kabupaten Banyumas, which was in need for more qualified human resources. Only 2 out of the 13 staff members could carry out their main duty, i.e., verifying the program design of infrastructure development. The rest only acted as supporting staff. Almost all of them (12) were high school graduates and only one had an undergraduate degree. With such a limited capacity, most of the staff could not finish their job quickly, and most of the work was eventually handled by only a few of them.

Teachers at the early childhood education (PAUD) institution in one of the study villages in Kabupaten Merangin also experienced a similar condition. Even though most of the teachers had an undergraduate degree, only a few of them majored in PAUD. This problem received a particular attention from the Government of Kabupaten Marangin, which attempted to work with the Institute of Teacher Training and Education (STKIP) of Bangko. In 2017, STKIP Bangko established the PAUD department, and soon it was flooded with a large number of people interested in becoming PAUD teachers.

Second, facilitators' capacity was limited and never improved. This problem is closely associated with the absence of a capacity building system for facilitators. Regarding this matter, one of the village professional facilitators in Kabupaten Batanghari said that many facilitators still did not understand the regulation and had a low capacity in conducting community empowerment. Several agriculture PPL and pest analysts or technical officers at the laboratory also said that their capacity was inadequate, while problems in the field were becoming more complex. As a result, they could not carry out their duties optimally. Third, some facilitators neared the retirement age. This would especially affect the motivation and mobility of functional facilitators who worked in the field.

b) External Obstacles

The external obstacles below are encountered by facilitators.

(1) Limited Facilitation Supporting Facility/Infrastructure and Budget

Limited facilitation supporting facility and infrastructure, such as tools, electricity, and water supply, were still found in all study locations. This problem could be seen from, among other things, the limited agricultural machines and tools in almost all study *kabupaten*, both at the agricultural agencies and BPP. As a result, farmers had to take turns using the tools or even rent them from other parties. One of the agriculture PPL in Kabupaten Merangin also said that the villages, where he provided facilitation, had no electricity, making it difficult for him to give explanation to the locals using visual aids. In Desa Tiang Berajo (Kabupaten Batanghari), the lack of electricity and water at the official house/village maternity center (*polindes*) had discourage village midwives to stay in the village, rendering the health services they provided less optimal.

Having no permanent office also posed an obstacle to facilitators. Facilitators in a study *kecamatan* in Kabupaten Batanghari, for example, had difficulties in conducting internal coordination among themselves because they had no permanent office. They found it hard to prepare a monthly or yearly report, while they were reluctant to keep on borrowing rooms or tables from the *kecamatan* office. Unlike them, facilitators in other *kabupaten*, such as Kabupaten Wonogiri and Kabupaten Ngada, had their own office or room in the *kecamatan* (provided by the *kabupaten* or *kecamatan*). At least, the challenges encountered by facilitators in Kabupaten Batanghari did not occur in these two *kabupaten*.

In addition to facility and infrastructure issues, the weak budget support, especially for honorarium and work operation costs, affected the facilitator's performance. This is especially the case with contract facilitators who were bigger in number than civil servant ones. Not only receiving low honorarium, they were also often had its payment delayed. For example, the social affairs agency in Kabupaten Merangin only gave PKH facilitators transportation allowance of Rp50,000 per month and it was only paid once every six months and sometimes late. This allowance was not enough to fulfill their work-related needs, especially because of their relatively wide work area, with *dusun* and villages being located far apart.²²

(2) Problems Related to Regulation/Policy at the *Kabupaten*/Central Level

Based on the result of problem mapping in the field, several problems were related to the regulation that affected facilitators' performance. First, the changes in the regional government's SOTK led to the transfer of authority for coordinating agriculture, plantation, fishery, and/or forestry PPL from BPP to their related technical agency. This caused the loss of budget, which was initially managed by BPP. Facilitators experienced difficulties in conducting facilitation because they no longer had the budget to provide meeting snacks and transportation allowance for farmers, while farmers themselves rarely held a meeting on their own. The PPL coordinator in BPP also had to independently pay honorarium for the office guards, electricity bills, stationery expenses, and BPP supplies, as the case in Kabupaten Banyumas and Kabupaten Batanghari.

²²According to PKH facilitators, the Government of Kabupaten Merangin should have allocated at least 5% of the General Allocation Fund (DAU) for PKH operation. However, the government only allocated less than 1% of it.

Second, some facilitators were confused with the work mechanism. This led to poor facilitation performance. As revealed by a fishery PPL in Kabupaten Merangin, since the transfer of authority over fishery PPL's work from the *kabupaten* government to the central government in 2017, the related ministries had not yet issued a technical regulation concerning this matter. As a result, the PPL experienced difficulties in performing their job and conducting field coordination.

Third, facilitators were still burdened with administrative tasks or other tasks irrelevant to their main duty and function. Although these tasks were meant to make facilitators' work accountable, they made the facilitators lose their focus on conducting facilitation. One of the facilitators in Kabupaten Batanghari complained that there were at least 11 reports they had to make in a year. These administrative tasks consumed the time they could have otherwise allocated for empowerment facilitation in the village. Facilitators in Kabupaten Wonogiri also complained that the requests to collect data from the ministries or provincial or *kabupaten* agencies were too much. He even jokingly said that those who serve as PD, which stands for *pendamping desa* or village facilitators, are not actually village facilitators but *pengumpul data* or data collectors due to the frequent requests for them to collect data.

Fourth, facilitators tended to focus on their own program performance. They neglected the coordination and communication with facilitators from other agencies/institutions even though they worked at the same location and for the same target. This indirectly slowed down the process of improving the welfare of the targeted community.

(3) Problems Related to Awareness, Mindset, and Perspectives toward Changes

Facilitators were basically tasked to empower the community to have better awareness, mindset, and perspectives for their own advancement. However, they were sometimes faced with the community's apathy toward new methods or technology. For this reason, attempting this change was challenging for facilitators. For example, facilitators in Kabupaten Ngada had to continuously recommend people to keep their livestock in their pen and not let them roam around. This recommendation was meant to prevent the loss of livestock, which had happened several times in the past.

Box 5

The New "One Hole, One Seed" Planting System: It Is Not Easy to Make People Change

In Kabupaten Ngada, agriculture PPL often faced rejections from the community when introducing new technology. One of the examples was the implementation of a new corn planting system, which is one seed for one hole spaced about 20 cm apart and using rows. The community argued that the system would take a long time and cost more compared to the old way (planting 3–4 seeds per hole and not having to apply any planting distance) they had been accustomed to. Meanwhile, according to the agriculture PPL, the new system would improve corn productivity.

The old system would only produce 3–4 tons of corn per hectare, while the new system could produce 7–8 tons of corns per hectare. One of the reasons why the community did not know in detail about the advantages of the new system was because they often missed the dissemination.

Another problem, which was also a challenge for facilitators, is that the community tended to view facilitation as equal to assistance. They attended the extension because they thought that they would receive assistance and tended to ignore what the extension was about.

Some of the people's habits are difficult to change. In Kabupaten Merangin, for example, many left farming and plantation and chose to work in illegal gold mining, which caused damage to the surrounding land and water. The illegal mining was very often done at their own farmland. The agriculture PPL experienced difficulties in persuading them to go back to farming or at least to stop damaging the environment. In Kabupaten Batanghari, many also abandoned rice farming and chose to plant oil palms/rubber, which was considered more practical and profitable. In the health sector, many in Kabupaten Merangin preferred going to shamans to seeing midwives. Considering the importance of changing people's mindset and habits in facilitation, it was imperative that facilitators put greater effort into it.

4.2 Ways of Accessing Facilitators

Based on the interviews with facilitators and several informants in the sample villages, villages could access facilitators either formally or informally. There were at least two conditions under which villages could formally access facilitation services by submitting an official letter. The first condition was the institutional procedure, such as needs for consultation; requests for a training resource person; and management of official documents, such as trading business licenses (SIUP) and certificates of BUM Desa/cooperative establishment. The second condition was the requirements to receive assistance/program. For example, any village wishing to be the recipient of the Pamsimas program had to follow the program's procedure, starting from attending the program dissemination, submitting a letter of interest and proposal to the *kabupaten*, and so on.

For some facilitators, submitting an official letter as the formal way to access facilitators is deemed positive, as they could obtain credit points for their facilitation performance. Even though villages could contact facilitators via phone calls or by visiting their office at the *kecamatan*, a forestry PPL recommended villages to submit a formal letter because it can be used as a supporting document to increase their credit points.

Meanwhile, villages could access facilitators informally through face-to-face meetings at their office or when they visited the village or even at their home and via electronic communication, such as phone calls, text messages, and WhatsApp messages. Between the two methods, villagers seemed to favor the latter, as they already had a close relationship with facilitators. They also considered it more practical and able to expedite facilitation services for villagers.

This, however, does not necessarily mean that villagers had no obstacles in accessing facilitators. Some of these obstacles, as elaborated earlier (such as facilitators' capacity, etc.), hindered this access. For example, one of the villages in Kabupaten Banyumas hired a person from another village as a resource person for nursery training instead of inviting an agriculture PPL. In addition to rarely visiting the village, the agriculture PPL was deemed not having the necessary skills to deliver the training content.

Furthermore, many villages did not know that there were actually facilitators who could help them achieve their dreams. Two villages in Kabupaten Banyumas, for example, were not aware of the services provided by PLUT even though it had long held consultation for individuals and groups, such as university students who were participating in the community service program (KKN). The PLUT staff said that their services could be accessed by villagers either individually or in groups. Many students participating in KKN program had consulted the PLUT staff and even requested them to become a resource person. In addition, the PLUT could connect their service users with other parties deemed competent in certain fields.

V. Factors Influencing the Fulfillment of Facilitation Needs in Villages

This chapter summarizes various factors which support and hamper the utilization of facilitators. The fulfillment of needs is presented in the analysis of supply (availability of facilitators) and demand (requests and needs for facilitation from village governments). The last part of this chapter provides an explanation on the alternative strategies used by village governments to fulfill their facilitation needs.

5.1 The Need for Facilitation and Its Fulfillment

Village heads identified their facilitation needs based on their primary dream and its derivatives. More dreams and derivatives mean more needs for facilitation. After identifying their needs, village heads were asked to give their perception on whether their needs were potentially/completely fulfilled, partly fulfilled, or hard to fulfill/unfulfilled (Table 11).

Table 11. Facilitation Needs and Their Fulfillment as Perceived by Heads of Ten Villages

| Category of Facilitation Needs | | Perceived Fulfillment of Facilitation Needs (%) | | |
|--|--------------------------------|---|---------------------|------------------------------------|
| | | Completely/ Potentially Fulfilled | Partly Fulfilled | Unfulfilled/ Hard to Fulfill |
| Economic development and community empowerment | Empowerment (n = 19) | - | 15.8 | 84.2 |
| | Agriculture (n = 10) | 20.0 | - | 80.0 |
| | BUM Desa (n = 5) | - | 20.0 | 80.0 |
| | Cooperatives and MSMEs (n = 1) | - | - | 100.0 |
| | Tourism (n = 4) | - | 25.0 | 75.0 |
| | Spatial development (n = 2) | - | - | 100.0 |
| Infrastructure development | Infrastructure (n = 15) | 40.0 | - | 60.0 |
| Governance improvement | Governance (n = 6) | 66.7 | - | 33.3 |

Factors influencing the fulfillment of these needs are elaborated based on the degree of the fulfillment, namely completely fulfilled, partly fulfilled, or unfulfilled as perceived by the village heads. Since some dreams were not realized yet and still merely wishes, their facilitations were predicted by village heads: whether they are potentially fulfilled or hard to fulfill.

5.1.1 Completely/Potentially Fulfilled Facilitation Needs

Three fulfilled facilitation needs of all village heads' dreams were infrastructure development, agricultural development, and village governance. The fulfillment of facilitation needs was generally influenced by the availability of facilitators, namely professional facilitators, PPL, OPD staff, and private parties as well as the villagers themselves. Another important factor is the village government's access to these facilitators.

a) Facilitation in Infrastructure Construction

As the second most common need, the need for infrastructure facilitation was found in all villages and was fairly fulfilled, especially for simple infrastructure, such as farm roads, drainage systems, and waterways. Compared to other needs, the need for infrastructure facilitation was fairly fulfilled. One of the driving factors was the ability of villages. Villages in Kabupaten Ngada, for example, managed to accumulate knowledge of and experience in infrastructure construction during the PNPM era. Villages in Kabupaten Wonogiri and Kabupaten Banyumas could fulfill their needs by consulting various parties, such as the public works agency staff and other village residents, as well as utilizing the internet. Similarly, villages in Kabupaten Batanghari could fulfill their infrastructure facilitation needs with the help of professional facilitators. Meanwhile, in Kabupaten Merangin, the village governments usually requested assistance from an independent consultant in making RAB and technical designs of buildings.

b) Facilitation in Agriculture

The third most common need is facilitation in agriculture. In almost all villages, the village head dreamed of developing the agriculture in their village. However, villages were still heavily dependent on assistance from the agriculture agency although they had received VF. The head of BPP in one of the study *kecamatan* complained about villages which dreamed of developing their agriculture yet were reluctant to allocate the budget for agriculture sector.

The village only cares about building roads. They've never thought about building a *pantek* (shallow) well that can be used for horticulture plants, when it is inexpensive to drill a well. Don't be surprised that the VF has not yet brought any impact to the people's welfare. (PPL, female, 50s)

Villages dreaming of developing agriculture also hoped for more proactive PPL. A close relationship with PPL is a factor influencing the degree of fulfillment of agriculture facilitation needs. In Desa Tiang Berajo, for example, such a close relationship was proven helpful. According to the village head, the agriculture PPL facilitated the village in opening new paddy fields on wetland, encouraging the government to provide seed assistance for farmers, procuring farming tools and technology, and visiting farmers. The village head was quite satisfied with the PPL's performance. In Desa Lekosoro, the need for agriculture facilitation was fulfilled because the PPL happened to be the local resident of the village.

Box 6

Successful Farmers Were More Trusted to Become Training Facilitators

Plant grafting training in Desa Deling invited a local resident to be the trainer. The event organizer did not invite an agriculture or forestry PPL as the trainer. Instead, they requested a successful farmer to share his knowledge in grafting. According to the head of the event organizer, selecting trainers is about trust. The organizer did not ask the agriculture PPL to be the trainer because they did not put their knowledge into practice. The agriculture PPL in the *kecamatan* did not have grafting technical skills. This is an important note for facilitators in fulfilling villages' needs.

The need for facilitation needs for tobacco farmers in Desa Kalikromo was fulfilled by the PPL specifically selected by a tobacco supplier in Surabaya. Despite the absence of direct coordination with the PPL, the village government was quite satisfied with their facilitation service in improving tobacco farmers' welfare.

c) Facilitation of Village Governance

Facilitation to improve village governance was also common among the village heads. This kind of facilitation is directed at improving villages' administration, participation, and transparency.

Professional facilitators and independent consultants were deemed capable of helping with facilitation aimed at improving villages' transparency. Meanwhile, the facilitators for village government's administration system and capacity building were OPD and *kecamatan* staff. Desa Karya Mukti stood out in its administrative services by enforcing tight discipline to its village officials. Despite the villagers' satisfaction with the village government's services, the village head still dreamed of better and faster services through facilitation by information technology experts, such as facilitators from the Ministry of Communications and Information Technology, NGOs, or commercial information technology agencies.

5.1.2 Partly Fulfilled Facilitation Needs

Some facilitation needs were partly fulfilled (Table 11). The factors influencing this level of fulfillment were the limited number and quality of the available facilitators. Nevertheless, the close relationships between village governments and facilitators could resolve this issue.

a) Facilitation in Empowerment

In empowerment activities, such as sewing and culinary art training, facilitators were usually people known well by the organizers. The organizers and trainers would then work together in designing empowerment activities. The needs for empowerment facilitation that the village heads thought were partly fulfilled include the empowerment of the poor in the form of renovations of RTLH, in addition to acquiring healthy toilet which was partly fulfilled by the social affairs agency. Besides that, some elderly poor people were assisted

by the *kecamatan* voluntary workers to live in nursing homes because they no longer had family members to take care of them.

The effect of the limited number of facilitators in empowerment was strongly felt in Kabupaten Batanghari in the early implementation of Village Law. In this *kabupaten*, villages were obligated to allocate 20% of their budget for empowerment activities. As a matter of fact, a study *kecamatan*, which covers 17 villages in total, only had 2 empowerment facilitators and 1 local village facilitator. Other *kecamatan* were also faced with the same problem. In addition to the insufficient number of facilitators, their low quality was also another issue. The observation during a training session in Kabupaten Batanghari showed that facilitators and local village facilitators only focused on administrative matters, such as checking accountability reports. They did not participate in designing the training contents.

Box 7

Village Facilitators in Desa Jembatan Rajo: Problems with Facilitators' Quality

The secretary of Desa Jembatan Rajo complained about the village facilitator and local village facilitator who rarely came to the village. The local village facilitator came a few times to the village, yet it was only for signing forms, rather than for supporting village activities. The secretary also complained about the confusing instructions from the village facilitator on the drafting of 2016 APB Desa. The instruction was different from that of the *kecamatan*. As a result, villages must revise the 2016 APB Desa several times. According to the secretary, both facilitators did not have a thorough understanding about village regulations. This was proven in a training session for village officials in 2016. When the local village facilitator was asked for their opinion, they did not say anything. This is proof that the local village facilitator did not understand the substance of RPJM Desa, RKP Desa, and APB Desa.

In Kabupaten Ngada, training on post-harvest product processing, such as making cashew wine and banana chips, had been conducted for several times, even before Village Law was implemented. However, the quality of the training was low and thus its continuity was never considered. After the training sessions, various tools were kept in the village's warehouse and became rusty. The participants, in this case the villagers, were too busy or did not have enough time to practice the knowledge they had obtained from the training.

b) Facilitation in BUM Desa and Tourism Village Establishment

According to the village head, among the five villages dreaming of establishing BUM Desa, only in Desa Deling had the facilitation been partly fulfilled. The facilitation had been carried out since the BUM Desa was established by a local company based in one of the study *kecamatan*.²³ Since 2017, the BUM Desa in Desa Deling has become a limited liability company. The close relationship between the village government and the local company was the factor influencing the fulfillment of the need for BUM Desa facilitation.

²³The local company was formerly an activity management unit (UPK) during the PNPM which later changed into a limited liability company.

Meanwhile, in terms of developing a tourism village, the village head viewed that empowerment experts had carried out some facilitation activities, one of which was the cleaning up of the customary village which would later be turned into a tourist destination. However, no follow-up activities were performed to the said facilitation, meaning that there are still problems in the sustainability of the facilitation service.

5.1.3 Unfulfilled/Hard-to-Fulfill Facilitation Needs

Table 11 shows that unfulfilled/hard-to-fulfill facilitation needs are found in all dream categories, except for village governance. The influencing factors include unavailable facilitators due to the mismatch between facilitators' placement and the village's need or the village's need being too specific. Another problem was that some facilitators were still deemed not qualified; they only trained but not yet empowered villages. The Simultaneous emergence of village needs for a particular type of facilitation was also a factor that put pressure on the supply side.

a) Facilitation in Empowerment

Empowerment-related dreams are dominant among all dreams (30%). These dreams include a large variety of empowerment activities, ranging from awareness-raising activities to business empowerment to local product processing to skill improvement, including the provision of assistance for the poor. As a result, the need for its facilitation is the highest.

These various empowerment dreams were never brought up at a deliberation meeting and remained only the hope of village heads. So far, the deliberation meetings only discussed *dusun's* proposals which almost always focused on infrastructure. This shows that villages did not prioritize empowerment. This can be associated with village heads' perception on the fact that these empowerment needs were not fulfilled yet or hard to fulfill. They felt that none of the empowerment needs were fulfilled at all.

The mostly needed, yet difficult to fulfill economic empowerment facilitation are agricultural product processing (e.g., coconut sugar production) and improvement of villagers' skills (e.g., waste management). In this case, empowerment should not be understood merely as providing training, but also including the whole process up to the improvement in the people's welfare. The current facilitation pattern was still far from expectation. Meanwhile, an example of specific and hard-to-find facilitators in this economic empowerment facilitation is facilitators for the trading of agricultural commodities.

Activities such as group business empowerment and the production of processed products, including their packaging and marketing, were the unfulfilled needs for Desa Karya Mukti. The village government was apparently unaware of the existence of either PLUT under the authority of the Central Java cooperative and MSME agency or the one under the authority of the Kabupaten Banyumas trade and industry agency.

It was even more difficult to find noneconomic empowerment facilitators for village governments. The head of Desa Kalikromo, for example, hoped for facilitators to produce famous young artists and athletes. However, the tourism, youth, and sport agency at the *kabupaten* had no functional staff for this particular need. Another example was that the head of Desa Tiang Berajo needed facilitators who could change their people's mindset.

b) Facilitation in Infrastructure Development

In the early years of Village Law implementation, village development was still focused on basic infrastructure that village governments and the villagers themselves could design. However, villages also needed more complex infrastructure, such as irrigation systems and new paddy fields. Therefore, they needed both PD TI and staff from the public works agency. The simultaneous emergence of this kind of facilitation needs from almost all villages had caused an inadequate supply of facilitators.

On the other hand, the number of professional facilitators was also insufficient. For example, villages in Kabupaten Batanghari (110 villages in total) were only handled by three PD TI and one TA ID. This is also the case with other villages. Kabupaten Banyumas even did not have infrastructure experts, and villages at one of the study *kecamatan* did not have infrastructure facilitators. There was also a quality problem. For example, the on-duty infrastructure facilitators were often not in the office. As a result, villages had to wait for quite a long time to obtain facilitation services.

c) Facilitation in Agriculture

The need for facilitators in agriculture was unfulfilled yet either. Despite their availability, the farmers' needs might not correspond to the agriculture PPL's specialization. For example, Desa Ndonga had planned to develop nutmeg cultivation, but the agriculture PPL had never provided extension about it. Similarly, the pest problems affecting cocoa plants in Desa Ndonga and Desa Lekosoro had not been addressed by the PPL.

PPL placement could also be a factor that influenced the fulfillment of needs. No plantation PPL was allocated for Desa Kelok Sungai Besar even though the village head dreamed of developing plantations for crop cultivation. This happened because plantation PPL were no longer available on a regular basis in the field since the plantation authority was transferred to the province government; as a result, the villages no longer received intensive facilitation.

Unlike Kabupaten Ngada and Kabupaten Batanghari governments, *kabupaten* governments in Central Java Province had no close ties with PPL. In Kabupaten Wonogiri, for example, the village governments had no idea of the PPL assigned to their village. They also rarely visited the village office and usually came to farmers directly. This is also one of the factors that influenced whether facilitation needs were fulfilled; facilitators were available, but villages did not know how to access them.

d) Facilitation in BUM Desa

Except in Desa Deling, no BUM Desa facilitation in all study villages had been provided. The factor influencing it was the highly specific criteria of the facilitators needed. Every village is unique in terms of its natural resources, human resources, and the physical, social, and financial conditions. This means every village must be analyzed separately to allow facilitators to assist the whole process and provide objective recommendations regarding BUM Desa.

On the supply side, the number of facilitators needed also increased substantially since establishing BUM Desa was prioritized as mandated by the Regulation of the Minister for Villages, Development of Disadvantaged Regions, and Transmigration No. 19 of 2017 on Prioritization of the 2018 Village Fund Use. If every village is required to establish and run BUM Desa, the number of facilitators must also be sufficient. Such an imbalance between supply and demand made it difficult to fulfill this facilitation need.

Village heads hoped that those who would facilitate their village have the necessary capability and experience in business and marketing management and understand the regulations regarding BUM Desa. They should be able to identify potential business units to make their input and recommendations factually beneficial for the village. However, village heads generally doubt the capacity of professional facilitators.

The ones most suitable to facilitate the village in establishing BUM Desa are village facilitators because they can be accessed for free. However, they are not yet able to provide guidance on matters related to production and marketing. We need another personnel. The agency suits the facilitation better in the form of training to be resource persons. (In-depth interview, the head of Desa Karya Mukti)

e) Facilitation in Tourism Village

The driving factor of the unfulfilled facilitation for these four tourism village dreams was the need for highly specific facilitators. In establishing a tourism village, facilitators needed to have a good grasp of the village heads' dreams, analyze them, guide the village throughout the process, and provide objective recommendations. Examples of such analysis include whether the tourism potential is supported by adequate infrastructure, how the locals prepare food and beverages for tourists, as well as the amount of the retribution and how to distribute it to the locals.

The development of beach tourism in Desa Beral, for example, needs facilitation from someone who understands the complexity of the beach land conflict between the locals and a private company. Similarly, Desa Sungai Seberang has cave and waterfall tourism potentials but is faced with the territorial conflicts between the locals and the production forest management as well as limited infrastructure. Likewise, in its attempt to develop its customary village tourism potential, Desa Ndonga must think about building infrastructure that supports such potential in order to attract tourists. Lastly, Desa Deling has a village treasury land they can utilize as a fruit plantation. It is located near Kota Purwokerto and the infrastructure is already adequate.

From the supply side, the local tourism agency does not have civil servant functional staff or noncivil servant/contract staff who can provide intensive facilitation for villages. The tourism, youth, and sport agency of Kabupaten Wonogiri believed that facilitation for villages was impossible due to limited budget and human resources. On the other hand, in Kabupaten Ngada, the tourism agency encouraged villages to look for private consultants using the VF. However, so far, the village governments had not yet worked on this idea, other than conducting dissemination for *dusun* residents.

Box 8

Hope for BUM Desa and Tourism Village

To develop BUM Desa and tourism villages, an economic development expert in Kabupaten Wonogiri examined the village potential and the cost for developing it. The expert believed that villages in Southern Wonogiri would not manage to develop if they only relied on food crops. However, the expert was concerned that BUM Desa and tourism villages might only be parasites on APB Desa. This could happen when all villages were flocking to establish BUM Desa without clear directions. In the expert's opinion, BUM Desa would suffer the same fate as the people's kiosks in the villages if they were established massively. This would also be the case with villages that were flocking to develop tourism villages.

f) Facilitation in Spatial Development

Specifically, several villages wished to divide their regions and develop them into specific areas. For example, Desa Deling needed RW-based spatial planning facilitators to develop its agricultural cultivation based on the area potentials. This spatial development would later be associated with empowerment of farmers' groups.

Meanwhile, the head of Desa Sungai Seberang dreamed of developing the forestry area around the production forest which was also the border of the village area. All this time, farmers in the village often did not receive plant seed assistance because they were deemed managing illegal plantations. This spatial development was also expected to help villages realize their dreams of managing the cave and waterfall tourism.

However, those dreams were extremely hard to realize because the areas to be developed were under the control of the production forest management. Since mid-1980s, the production forest management had grabbed some of the village areas. Therefore, the village government needed facilitators who could help them take back their land.

Box 9

Village Land Grabbing by Production Forest Management

One of the dreams of the head of Desa Sungai Seberang was to solve the village border dispute with the production forest management, who was suspected to have moved the village's border, causing the village to suffer a loss. To restore it to its ideal condition, the village needs a maximum facilitation.

This issue was already reported by the head of Desa Sungai Seberang and two other village heads in the same *kecamatan* to the Regional House of Representatives (DPRD) in Kabupaten Merangin in March 2017. The DPRD asked the villages to send a letter to the Government of Kabupaten Merangin. Despite their promise to oversee this case, the DPRD did not take any follow-up actions yet.

An expert in Kabupaten Merangin believed that there are three alternatives to solving this problem. First, the grabbed land area should be transformed into a customary forest. Second, the villages negotiate directly with the company managing the production forest. This alternative is considered difficult since the company will demand a huge compensation and it will be hard for the villages to fulfill it. Third, villagers can forcibly take back the grabbed land. This problem was left unsolved, as not every village head responded to the expert's effort to hold a meeting with the villages.

These needs for very specific facilitators were unfulfilled because, from the supply side, only agriculture and forestry PPL were available. Furthermore, it was difficult for village governments to rely on them. Additionally, in terms of quality, it was possible for new problems to appear because the PPL might not necessarily be capable enough of formulating concrete steps for spatial development.

On the other hand, several spatial development experts were indeed tasked by Kemendes PDDT to handle one *kabupaten*. Even though they were assigned to work in certain villages in one or two pilot *kecamatan*, other villages could also consult the expert. However, villages were not informed about it and did not know how to access them. This is also a factor influencing the fulfillment of these facilitation needs.

g) Facilitation in Cooperatives and MSMEs

Another unfulfilled/hard-to-fulfill need was the need for cooperative and MSME facilitators. Desa Ndonga, for example, wanted to be assisted in solving the nonperforming loan problem in the savings and credit group. The village government would have the capital to invest in the BUM Desa provided that the debt was repaid. The cooperative agency in Kabupaten Ngada suggested that no field staff, i.e., field cooperative facilitator (PPKL), was specifically assigned in villages. The facilitation services provided were limited to the dissemination on and assistance in establishing a cooperative. The PPKL only helped establish cooperatives, not in other matters such as collecting debts.

5.2 Several Important Issues in Fulfilling Facilitation Needs

In the supply-demand relationship framework, the fulfillment of facilitation needs can be summarized in the following table.

Table 12. Factors Influencing the Fulfillment of Facilitation Needs

| Facilitation Fulfillment | Supply | Demand |
|----------------------------------|---|---|
| Completely/potentially fulfilled | Facilitators are available | Villages know how to access facilitators |
| Partly fulfilled | Facilitators are inadequate, both in quality and quantity | Villages know how to access facilitators |
| Unfulfilled/hard to fulfill | Facilitators are unavailable | Villages' needs are too specific |
| | Facilitators are available | Villages do not know how to access facilitators |

The bottom row of Table 12 on unfulfilled/hard-to-fulfill needs has room for urgent improvement. Despite their availability, facilitators could not be utilized by villages just because they did not know how to access them. Village governments in the study locations complained about unavailable information on these facilitators. For example, villages in Kabupaten Banyumas and Kabupaten Wonogiri did not know that they could utilize the UPTD and PLUT services for cooperatives and MSMEs provided by the Government of Central Java Province. Villages did not know either about the existence of spatial development experts who could help them realize their dreams. Even the *kecamatan* governments did not know about this information either. Village governments in Kabupaten Ngada compared this condition to that during the implementation of the PNPM where data on both facilitators and their competencies were available.

From the demand side, two factors contributed to the fulfillment of the needs for facilitators. First, village heads must be able to dream and have the technocratic capacity to translate the dream into well-planned activities. Strong leadership and support from the well-qualified village officials would lead to optimal use of available facilitators by the village. Second, VF will enable villages to “pay” for the fulfillment of facilitation needs provided that the village heads know how to access facilitators. Both factors can be improved so that facilitation needs can be fulfilled. Both village heads and officials could be trained to have technocratic capacity. In addition, budgeting needs to be optimized to allow villages to pay their facilitators.

Meanwhile, two problems lie on the supply side. First, some issues were related to horizontal synergy and coordination among various facilitators from different OPD. Many of the village needs were cross-sectorial. For example, the spatial development dream in Desa Deling involved not only agriculture PPL, but also empowerment facilitators. Similarly, economic empowerment and poverty eradication dreams in Desa Beral needed facilitation not only by PPL, but also by professional facilitators, PKH facilitators, as well as

facilitators from the cooperative and trade agency. It is this synergy among OPD that will enable an optimal facilitation because its sustainability can be designed since the beginning.

Second, some synergy and coordination issues are vertical in nature between the province, *kabupaten*, and *kecamatan* governments. An example of this is the transfer of authority of the plantation and forestry PPL from the *kabupaten* to the province. This made it difficult for the *kabupaten* plantation and forestry agency to place facilitators based on the village's needs. A coordination issue also emerged between the *kecamatan* government and the facilitators operating in the *kecamatan* area. For example, the head of a *kecamatan* in Kabupaten Banyumas complained that the facilitators never reported the condition of agriculture, fishery, and forestry to the *kecamatan*. Similarly, the head of Kecamatan I said that facilitators of PKH, Kube, *tagana* from the Ministry of Social Affairs, and family planning only came to the *kecamatan* when funds were disbursed or data were changed. They also rarely participated in the village deliberation meetings and did not understand the condition of the village.

Box 10

Factors that Motivated Professional Facilitators to Be More Active

The presence of professional facilitators recruited specifically to help villages is underlined as a factor that supports the availability of facilitators. Good relationships between the supravillage governments and professional facilitators in Kabupaten Wonogiri and Kabupaten Batanghari made professional facilitators more active in helping villages. In Kabupaten Wonogiri, the village facilitators became more active since the regional secretariat of the village government merged with the DPMD. Merging these two institutions increased the solidarity between the *kabupaten* and professional facilitators. The professional facilitators would even be more motivated in supporting villages if they were provided with an office space and supplies at the *kecamatan*. However, these facilities may not necessarily be available in other *kecamatan*.

Finally, from both the supply and demand sides, synergy and coordination issues existed between facilitators and villages. Generally, the beneficiaries of activities conducted by extension workers and OPD facilitators were villagers. Therefore, facilitators had an interest in synergizing with villages. OPD facilitators should be invited to the village planning meetings to allow them to provide substantial input. Their attendance at the meeting could help them better understand about the village's priorities. They could also give information about the facilitation provided by the OPD. This means that village meetings can provide a room for facilitators and villages to match the supply and demand.

5.3 Alternative Strategies in Fulfilling Facilitation Needs

5.3.1 Self-Learning or Learning from Others

This attempt was taken by several villages when they were short on facilitators. Some villages learned from other nearby villages. Village treasurers in one *kecamatan* also

taught and learned about APB Desa and the village financial system (Siskeudes) from one another. Villages could also learn from the internet where they could access a lot of information on how to make RAB and drawing designs. They could also learn via social media, such as the WhatsApp group of village development movement (GDM) in Kabupaten Banyumas. According to the section head of the village planning of Desa Deling, he learned a lot about APB Desa from that group.

The study villages also improved their knowledge about BUM Desa through internships in other villages. For example, Desa Ndonga had planned to study in other villages in Kabupaten Ngada or Kabupaten Flores Timur whose BUM Desa had already been successful. The village government was also interested in solving the nonperforming loan problem by planning to learn from successful cooperatives, such as Sangosay, Boawae, and Sehati, about how those cooperatives solved the problem.

5.3.2 Leveraging Experienced Villagers

The government of Desa Ndonga put some villagers to good use in making RAB and designing the village rehabilitation hall. Desa Lekosoro utilized technical KPMD who were PNPM alumni. They excelled at conducting surveys before making RAB and drawing designs.

In Kabupaten Batanghari, in 2016, the activity implementation team (TPK) learned how to make RAB and drawing designs from experienced construction workers. No infrastructure facilitators were around at that time. The skills of these workers could be upgraded to serve as village technical cadres. Thus, the need for infrastructure facilitators could be fulfilled by the villagers themselves.

Box 11

Regulations that Hamper the Fulfillment of the Need for Facilitators

Many farmers in Desa Kelok Sungai Besar have expertise in the cultivation of rice, ginger, chili, *kencur* (aromatic ginger), and so on. They had the potential to conduct facilitation and even present their knowledge in ginger and chili planting training in the village. However, the regulation in Kabupaten Batanghari required trainers for such activities to be official facilitators, not common villagers. The village were reluctant to speculate, thus they chose to comply with the regulation.

5.3.3 Requesting Assistance from Others: NGOs, Universities, and the Private Sector

The local companies experienced in establishing BUM Desa played a crucial role in helping villages in one of the study *kecamatan*. The facilitation services provided ranged from making SOP to restructuring the village credit agency. For Desa Deling, requesting such assistance was easier because an employee of that company lived in the village.

NGOs could also provide facilitation for villagers. For example, Desa Ndong received facilitation from an NGO in developing its cultivation of cocoa, including its pest control. In Kabupaten Banyumas, an NGO provided facilitation to help improve village governance.

Universities were also an alternative provider of facilitation services. Final-year university students can take part in KKN in villages. However, the preparation of KKN agenda should involve the village to enable students' involvement in the village to be directed at fulfilling facilitation needs. This way, the benefits of KKN can be enjoyed not only by the students, but also by villagers.

Lastly, the private sector can also play a role in fulfilling facilitation needs. For example, the association of rubber farmers' groups in Desa Tiang Berajo sent a letter to a company in the neighboring *kabupaten* requesting training on how to properly harvest rubber. Likewise, since the implementation of Village Law, villages in Kabupaten Merangin had asked many independent consultants to help them make RAB and drawing designs. Recently, there was a tendency that independent consultants were accessed simultaneously by villages in one *kecamatan* through the coordination of the village heads forum at the *kecamatan* level. These independent consultants, be it with or without a legal entity, are available.

VI. Lessons Learned

In general, this study concludes that not every village facilitation need can be fulfilled by the available facilitators. In the Village Law era, both the central and regional governments must position villages as the subject, rather than merely a locus of development. This means that the supravillage governments need to prepare facilitation strategies to allow villages to exercise their authority, including creating innovation.

First, facilitation is highly needed in the village planning because it is the most important stage in setting the direction of village development. Facilitators need to overcome some challenges in the quality of the village planning, such as (i) the process that only produces a list of suggestions (a shopping list), (ii) sporadic activity plans, and (iii) weak synergy between villages' and *kabupaten's* development plans.

To overcome those challenges, the central and regional governments need to conduct facilitation aimed at improving villages' technocratic capacity to draft planning documents. Almost all village governments could set the big goal of their development, such as improving the people's welfare, providing best services, or developing village economy. However, most of them still find it hard to elaborate their goal into more detailed and systematic strategies.

It is imperative for villages to have the technocratic capacity to enable them to identify strategic issues and available resources as well as formulate their mid-term development strategies, including identifying the facilitation resources needed. This way, RPJM Desa can be restored to its original function as a guideline for village development, rather than a mere document to fulfill administrative requirements.

Second, despite the various fields covered by facilitators' function, it does not necessarily mean that all facilitation needs can be fulfilled, as challenges in quantity, quality, synergy, and coordination remain. In terms of quantity, the number of available facilitators is inadequate to support all villages/work areas. This is also related to the inadequacy of time, additional workload, and limited operational budget. In terms of quality, the current technical capacity of facilitators cannot meet all villages' specific needs.

The synergy and coordination factors can be explored from both the facilitator and village sides. Facilitators, especially those from OPD, usually work in a strict manner, i.e., they only perform their role in a program. Meanwhile, instead of providing empowerment facilitation, professional facilitators are frequently burdened with administrative tasks.

Therefore, the role of facilitators needs to be expanded. They must not only play their assigned role in a program, but also serve as a bridge and provider of information on how to access other facilitation services needed.

From the village side, facilitators from OPD had not been involved in the village planning. Even if the village government wanted to involve them, they were not informed in which facilitators would be fit to be invited, which institution they are from, and how they can be

accessed. The absence of a coordinator of facilitation functions also makes it difficult to fulfill facilitation needs.

While many obstacles are in the way of fulfilling facilitation needs in villages, this does not mean things cannot improve. The commitment of village governments and the availability of VF are considered the two factors that can support this improvement effort. Furthermore, since the implementation of Village Law, villages have greater room to develop their regions based on the local context and their own dreams. This study provides some recommendations related to facilitation strategies in villages based on their potential needs (Figure 1).

Figure 1. Analysis of Village Facilitation Needs, Availability, and Recommendations²⁴



First, any village incapable of identifying their facilitation needs must be assisted in elaborating their dreams into strategies and facilitation needs in a more operational way. Villages in this category are the least developed ones. The central and regional governments need to equip professional facilitators with high creativity to help villages formulate their dreams and identify their facilitation needs to achieve those dreams.

This study finds a tendency that villages with economic development dreams generally need more technical and varied facilitators. They range from economic institution governance (BUM Desa) to production improvement to diversification to land management to development of production facility and infrastructure to marketing of agricultural products. Meanwhile, in several villages, the needs for facilitators to construct basic infrastructure were fulfilled by the villages themselves, especially for administrative matters such as making RAB, technical designs (the construction of walkways and farm roads), and letter of accountability (SPJ).

Second, any village already capable of mapping their facilitation needs but do not know how to access facilitators must be assisted by a liaison (channeling). This study views the *kecamatan* as a potential liaison that can connect facilitators with villages. With

²⁴In this study, no villages were unable to identify their facilitation needs. The bottom block was included to represent a more complete analysis of the needs for facilitators and their availability as well as the recommendations.

most facilitators from agencies having an office located in the *kecamatan* area, the channeling function can be performed by the *kecamatan*. From the perspective of villages, *kecamatan* has been a place for consultation in implementing Village Law.

To carry out this recommendation, *kabupaten* governments need to assign the *kecamatan* with this channeling function and to develop both formal and informal work mechanisms; this is to prevent the facilitation services from being provided separately. As an illustration, village facilitators/local village facilitators can be tasked to gather information on village needs and submit it to the *kecamatan*. The *kecamatan* can then inform facilitation needs to facilitators based on their expertise. *Kabupaten* governments also need to build a database, like “Yellow Pages”, that can provide information for villages on who, where, and how to access facilitators from OPD and other institutions.

Third, for villages that are capable of mapping their facilitation needs and knowing how to access facilitators but are faced with the problem of a limited number of facilitators, improvement needs to be made to the quality and quantity of facilitators. In terms of quality, the regional government can organize training for facilitators which is preceded by needs assessments. Facilitating facilitators with technology at a certain level can also help them collect the information needed by villages. Also, the regional government needs to design a mechanism for transfer of knowledge among facilitators. In terms of quantity, the regional government can initiate a collaboration with nongovernmental practitioners to help fulfill villages’ needs for facilitators.

Fourth, when villages have highly specific needs but no facilitators are available at all, they need to look for the right facilitators from outside of the *kabupaten*. To access facilitators with specific expertise, villages need to consider the high cost, especially if the number of such facilitators is highly limited. Therefore, the central and regional governments need to guarantee their availability. An extreme example is the need for BUM Desa facilitators. Fulfilling this need is urgent because establishing BUM Desa has been a priority in the use of VF. In addition, the central and regional governments can inventory and disseminate the information on various good practices adopted by other villages related to those specific needs.

To conclude, village facilitation must be able to lift villages out of poor planning. If village heads can envision the future of their village based on the identified problems and potentials, and discuss it with all village stakeholders in a deliberation meeting, it will be the basis for formulating a long-term policy from which clear and systematic strategies can be derived. This long-term policy will certainly aim for the improvement in the welfare of villagers, a goal mandated by Village Law. This policy and its strategies are macro in nature and serve as a guideline to determine priority activities in RKP Desa. It means that micro suggestions from villagers submitted to the village head are the elaboration of those policy and strategies. From these micro suggestions, villages can then map their facilitation needs. This kind of planning will lead villages to more measurable goals and strategies in accordance with the goal of Village Law.

List of References

- Bachtiar, Palmira Permata, Asep Kurniawan, Rendy Adriyan Diningrat, Gema Satria Mayang Sedyadi, and Ruhmaniyati (2019) 'Menelusuri Manfaat Belanja Desa' [Case Study Report on Village Law: Exploring the Benefits of Village Fund Spending]. Report [online] <<http://smeru.or.id/id/content/laporan-studi-kasus-undang-undang-desa-menelusuri-manfaat-belanja-desa>> [4 April 2019].
- Kurniawan, Asep (2018a) 'Memfungsikan Kembali RPJM Desa' [Reviving the Function of Village Medium-Term Development Plan]. SMERU Policy Note, Series UU Desa No. 6/Des/2018 [online] <https://smeru.or.id/sites/default/files/publication/desa_rpjmfungsipb_id.pdf> [4 April 2019].
- Kurniawan, Asep (2018b) 'Menyederhanakan RPJM Desa' [Simplifying Village Medium-Term Development Plan (RPJM Desa)]. SMERU Policy Note, Series UU Desa No. 7/Des/2018 [online] <https://smeru.or.id/sites/default/files/publication/desarpm_sederhanapb_id.pdf> [4 April 2019].
- Syukri, Muhammad (2018) 'Peran Kecamatan dalam Pelaksanaan UU Desa' [The Role of *Kecamatan* in Village Law Implementation]. SMERU Policy Note, Series UU Desa No. 1/Des/2015 [online] <http://smeru.or.id/sites/default/files/publication/uudesa_pb_ind.pdf> [4 April 2019].

Government Laws and Regulations

- Decree of the *Kabupaten* Head of Banyumas No. 900/248/2017 on the Verification Team of the Operational Work Plan of the Special Financial Assistance for Villages Sourced from the APBD of Kabupaten Banyumas [Surat Keputusan Bupati Banyumas No. 900/248 Tahun 2017 tentang Tim Verifikasi Rencana Kerja Operasional (RKO) Bantuan Keuangan Khusus kepada Pemerintah Desa Yang Bersumber dari APBD Kabupaten Banyumas].
- Government Regulation No. 43 of 2014 on the Implementing Regulations Law No. 6 of 2014 on Villages [Peraturan Pemerintah No. 43 Tahun 2014 tentang Peraturan Pelaksanaan Undang-Undang No. 6 Tahun 2014 tentang Desa].
- Government Regulation No. 47 of 2015 on the Amendment of Government Regulation No. 43 of 2014 on the Implementing Regulation for Village Law [Peraturan Pemerintah No. 47 Tahun 2015 tentang Perubahan Peraturan Pemerintah No. 43 Tahun 2014 tentang Peraturan Pelaksanaan Undang-Undang Desa].
- Government Regulation No. 18 of 2016 on Regional Officials [Peraturan Pemerintah No. 18 Tahun 2016 tentang Perangkat Daerah].
- Law No. 6 of 2014 on Villages [Undang-Undang No. 6 Tahun 2014 tentang Desa].

- Law No. 23 of 2014 on Regional Government [Undang-Undang No. 23 Tahun 2014 tentang Pemerintah Daerah].
- Regional Regulation of Kabupaten Banyumas No. 10 of 2011 on Kabupaten Banyumas Spatial Plan 2011–2031 [Peraturan Daerah Kabupaten Banyumas No. 10 Tahun 2011 tentang Rencana Tata Ruang Wilayah Kabupaten Banyumas Tahun 2011–2031].
- Regional Regulation of Kabupaten Batanghari No. 16 of 2013 on Kabupaten Batanghari Spatial Plan 2011–2031 [Peraturan Daerah Kabupaten Batanghari No. 16 Tahun 2013 tentang Rencana Tata Ruang Wilayah Kabupaten Batanghari Tahun 2011–2031].
- Regional Regulation of Kabupaten Merangin No. 4 of 2014 on Kabupaten Merangin Spatial Plan 2014–2034 [Peraturan Daerah Kabupaten Merangin No. 4 Tahun 2014 tentang Rencana Tata Ruang Wilayah Kabupaten Merangin Tahun 2014–2034].
- Regional Regulation of Kabupaten Ngada No. 3 of 2012 on Kabupaten Ngada Spatial Plan 2012–2032 [Peraturan Daerah Kabupaten Ngada No. 3 Tahun 2012 tentang Rencana Tata Ruang Wilayah Kabupaten Ngada Tahun 2012–2032].
- Regional Regulation of Kabupaten Wonogiri No. 9 of 2011 on Kabupaten Wonogiri Spatial Plan 2011–2031 [Peraturan Daerah Kabupaten Wonogiri No. 9 Tahun 2011 tentang Rencana Tata Ruang Wilayah Kabupaten Wonogiri Tahun 2011–2031].
- Regulation of the *Kabupaten* Head of Banyumas No. 39 of 2012 on Minapolitan Area Development Master Plan [Peraturan Bupati Banyumas No. 39 Tahun 2012 tentang Rencana Induk Pengembangan Kawasan Minapolitan].
- Regulation the *Kabupaten* Head of Banyumas No. 75 of 2016 on Position, Organizational Structure, Duties and Functions, and Work Procedures in *Kecamatan* and *Kelurahan* in Kabupaten Banyumas [Peraturan Bupati Banyumas No. 75 Tahun 2016 tentang Kedudukan, Susunan Organisasi, Tugas dan Fungsi, serta Tata Kerja di Kecamatan dan Kelurahan di Kabupaten Banyumas].
- Regulation of the Minister for Home Affairs No. 114 of 2014 on Village Development Guidelines [Peraturan Menteri Dalam Negeri No. 114 Tahun 2014 tentang Pedoman Pembangunan Desa].
- Regulation of the Minister for Villages, Development of Disadvantaged Regions, and Transmigration No. 3 of 2015 on Village Facilitation [Peraturan Menteri Desa, Pembangunan Daerah Tertinggal, dan Transmigrasi No. 3 Tahun 2015 tentang Pendampingan Desa].
- Regulation of the Minister for Villages, Development of Disadvantaged Regions, and Transmigration No. 19 of 2017 on Prioritization of the 2018 Village Fund Use [Peraturan Menteri Desa, Pembangunan Daerah Tertinggal, dan Transmigrasi No. 19 Tahun 2017 tentang Penetapan Prioritas Penggunaan Dana Desa Tahun 2018].

Appendices

Appendix 1
Table A1. List of Village Dreams

| Village | Dream/Dream Derivative | Remarks | Theme Classification |
|------------|---|--|------------------------|
| NDO | Institutional Development of BUM Desa | Institutional Development of BUM Desa | BUM Desa |
| NDO | Development of savings and loan unit | Development of savings and loan units | Cooperatives and MSMEs |
| NDO | Development of customary village tourism | Development of customary village tourism | Tourism |
| NDO | Development of fruit commodity units | Development of fruit commodity units | Empowerment |
| NDO | Development of agricultural commodity trade units | Development of agricultural commodity trade units | Empowerment |
| NDO | Village administrative system governance | Fast and orderly formulation of planning documents, activity management, monitoring system, reporting and accountability system, as well as information and archiving system | Governance |
| NDO | Development of basic infrastructure | Provision of roads, water, and electricity | Infrastructure |
| NDO | Development of agriculture and livestock-based businesses | Development of agriculture and livestock-based businesses | Empowerment |
| LKS | Development of farm roads | Development of farm roads | Infrastructure |
| LKS | Development of irrigation systems | Development of irrigation systems | Infrastructure |
| LKS | Expansion of paddy fields | Expansion of paddy fields | Infrastructure |
| LKS | Development of cocoa and nutmeg crop cultivation | Development of cocoa and nutmeg crop cultivation | Agriculture |
| LKS | Development of cattle, pig, and goat farming | Development of cattle, pig, and goat farming | Agriculture |
| LKS | Post-harvest management | Post-harvest management | Empowerment |
| KLK | Development of BUM Desa | Establishment of BUM Desa to accommodate various village enterprises | BUM Desa |
| KLK | Women's economic empowerment | Women can fill their "leisure time" by doing business, which is preceded by attending training | Empowerment |

| Village | Dream/Dream Derivative | Remarks | Theme Classification |
|------------|---|--|----------------------|
| KLK | Infrastructure improvement | Fulfillment of needs for road infrastructure | Infrastructure |
| KLK | Improvement in agricultural yields | Diversification of farm produce from only rice, corn, and tobacco to chilli, red onion, and fruits to anticipate the drop in tobacco's price | Agriculture |
| KLK | Improvement in transparency of village government | Officials and the community are aware of village planning and budgeting | Governance |
| KLK | Youth capacity building through art and sports | Organizing cultural and sports activities to improve youth's confidence | Empowerment |
| BRL | Village infrastructure improvement | Equitable village infrastructure: roads between <i>dusun</i> , inside <i>dusun</i> , and <i>talud</i> | Infrastructure |
| BRL | Capacity building for villagers | Community becomes more innovative, and not just carrying out tradition | Empowerment |
| BRL | Economic empowerment and poverty eradication | Utilizing the local potential of nonagricultural food to improve economy. This is done by cooperating with herbal medicine enterprises. | Empowerment |
| BRL | Development of village-scale tourism | Utilizing the economic potential of Nampu Beach | Tourism |
| BRL | Clean water distribution | Providing clean water networks to villagers' homes | Infrastructure |
| DLG | Plant nursery business development | Strengthening nursery businesses in the village using several types of approach (internal-external) | Agriculture |
| DLG | RW-based economic regional development | Some RW have started fruit plantation businesses (durian, coconut, vanilla), while other RW have started to develop farming and fishery businesses | Region |
| DLG | BUM Desa as the driving force of village economy | BUM Desa can facilitate various businesses of the community | BUM Desa |
| DLG | Women being empowered economically | Female farm workers can also own a small-scale nursery business | Empowerment |
| DLG | Utilization of village treasury land for fruit plantations and village tourism | Village treasury land can be used for cultural tourism and education, as well as to make a pond | Tourism |
| DLG | Development of infrastructure: an irrigation system, farm roads, plantation access, a BUM Desa building | Infrastructure that supports the village economy is 100% built | Infrastructure |

| Village | Dream/Dream Derivative | Remarks | Theme Classification |
|------------|---|---|----------------------|
| DLG | Waste management for healthy environment and clean rivers | Healthy environment and clean rivers | Empowerment |
| DLG | Peaceful and harmonious lives, happy villagers, ready to help each other | Stronger tradition of communal work | Empowerment |
| KYM | Capacity building for village officials | Village officials work professionally and with discipline | Governance |
| KYM | Fast services | Fast services (10–15 minutes) | Governance |
| KYM | Transparency in APB Desa | People are informed about the budget and provide input | Governance |
| KYM | Increase villagers' participation/communal work | People work together and participate in communal work | Governance |
| KYM | Agricultural development | Agriculture becomes the mainstay of village economy, farmers' groups become active, water management is handed to the village, water reservoir is built, cocoa farming is developed | Agriculture |
| KYM | Development of coconut sugar and local processed food products | Prices of sugar are higher and local food products are developed | Empowerment |
| KYM | Development of BUM Desa | BUM Desa increases village revenue and absorbs labor | BUM Desa |
| KYM | Development of roads, bridges, drainage and irrigation systems, etc. | Development of roads, bridges, drainage and irrigation systems, etc. | Infrastructure |
| KYM | Group empowerment | Group empowerment | Empowerment |
| KYM | Handling of the poor: helping those who are sick and hungry, providing nursing homes, giving assistance for the renovation of RTLH, implementing Healthy Toilet program, etc. | Handling of the poor: helping those who are sick and hungry, providing nursing homes, giving assistance for the renovation of RTLH, implementing Healthy Toilet program, etc. | Empowerment |
| KYM | Skills training | Skills training | Empowerment |
| KYM | Development of businesses | Development of businesses | Empowerment |
| TBJ | Rice farming development | Reviving rice farming | Agriculture |
| TBJ | Development of oil palm, rubber, and fruit cultivation | Strengthening plantation businesses; productivity must be improved | Agriculture |
| TBJ | Infrastructure development | Prioritizing farm road development | Infrastructure |

| Village | Dream/Dream Derivative | Remarks | Theme Classification |
|------------|--|---|----------------------|
| KSB | Infrastructure development | Equitable development occurs for the entire village even though it covers an area of 126 km ² | Infrastructure |
| KSB | Sustainable empowerment training | Organizing more serious training sessions with follow-up activity plans | Empowerment |
| KSB | Oil palm and rubber plantation sector development | More serious management of the plantations with the right knowledge about planting | Agriculture |
| KSB | BUM Desa | BUM Desa supports all lines in the plantation business (transportation of the harvest, provision of seeds and fertilizers, business to business relations with factories) | BUM Desa |
| JRJ | Plantation road development | Easier access to the plantations, and the road is passable by vehicles | Infrastructure |
| JRJ | Neighborhood road development | Building neighborhood roads | Infrastructure |
| JRJ | Community empowerment in agriculture and plantation | Seed/fertilizer assistance, not facilitation activities | Agriculture |
| JRJ | Empowerment of marginalized groups (the poor and people with disability) | Providing direct assistance, encouraging their participation in development, making them Koran teachers | Empowerment |
| SSB | Potential tourism development | Transforming caves and waterfalls into tourist attractions | Tourism |
| SSB | Basic infrastructure development | Fulfilling village infrastructure needs (neighborhood and plantation roads, bridges) | Infrastructure |
| SSB | Normalization of land previously used as illegal mining sites | Restoring damaged land so that it can be replanted | Infrastructure |
| SSB | Reviving mothers' and youths' activities | Forming a committee, sending a team to participate in <i>kecamatan</i> -level competitions | Pemberdayaan |
| SSB | Building solidarity and togetherness between community members | Building and preserving harmony through village-level sports competitions, especially for the youths | Empowerment |
| SSB | Moving the border of the production forest area | Moving back the border of the production forest area that has encroached into the village's land | Region |

Appendix 2

Table A2. Availability of Facilitators

| Sector | Institution | Program/ Nonprogram | Kabupaten | | | | |
|--|------------------------------|------------------------|--|--|--|---|--|
| | | | Ngada | Banyumas | Wonogiri | Batanghari | Merangin |
| A. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND COMMUNITY EMPOWERMENT | | | | | | | |
| a. Agriculture | Kabupaten government | Nonprogram | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agriculture PPL workers • Livestock PPL | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agriculture PPL workers • Fishery PPL | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agriculture PPL workers • Marine affairs, fishery and livestock agency (Dislapernak) officers | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agriculture PPL workers • Livestock extension technical workers (PTPL) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agriculture PPL workers • Livestock and plantation PPL • Fishery PPL |
| | Provincial government | Nonprogram | - | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Forestry PPL • Pest analysts • Staff of Balai Benih (the seed center) | - | - | Forestry PPL |
| | Non-governmental institution | Private sector/NGOs | - | - | - | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Private company facilitators | - |
| b. Cooperatives and MSMEs | Kabupaten government | Nonprogram | Cooperatives facilitators | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cooperatives and MSMEs facilitators • PLUT • An activity management unit/a local company | - | Field cooperatives facilitators (PPKL) | Facilitators from the industry and trade agency |

| Sector | Institution | Program/ Nonprogram | Kabupaten | | | | |
|----------------|------------------------------|------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Ngada | Banyumas | Wonogiri | Batanghari | Merangin |
| | Provincial government | Program | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Anggur Merah Program facilitators • Kube facilitators | - | - | - | - |
| | Central government | Program | - | - | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kube facilitators for coastal communities | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kube facilitators | - |
| | Non-governmental institution | Private sector/NGOs | - | - | - | | NGO-SSS Pundi Sumatra |
| c. Empowerment | <i>Kabupaten</i> government | Nonprogram | - | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BLK instructors • SKB instructors | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BLK instructors • SKB instructors | BLK instructors | - |
| | Central government | Nonprogram | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Experts (except TA ID) • Village empowerment facilitators • Local village facilitators • KPMD cadres | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Experts (except TA ID) • Village empowerment facilitators • Local village facilitators • KPMD cadres | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Experts (except TA ID) • Village empowerment facilitators • Local village facilitators • KPMD cadres | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Experts (except TA ID) • Village empowerment facilitators • Local village facilitators • KPMD cadres | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Experts (except TA ID) • Village empowerment facilitators • KPMD cadres |
| | <i>Kabupaten</i> government | Program | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ADD facilitators-<i>kabupaten</i> facilitators • ADD facilitators-<i>kecamatan</i> empowerment facilitators | - | - | - | - |

| Sector | Institution | Program/ Nonprogram | Kabupaten | | | | |
|-------------------------|-------------|------------------------|-----------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|------------|---|
| | | | Ngada | Banyumas | Wonogiri | Batanghari | Merangin |
| d. Regional development | Government | Program | - | Rural region development experts | Rural region development experts | - | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rural region development experts • Rural region development facilitators |

B. BASIC INFRASTRUCTURE AND SERVICES

| | | | | | | | |
|-------------------|-----------------------|------------|---|---|--|--|--|
| a. Infrastructure | Kabupaten government | Nonprogram | | Officers of the public works UPTD | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Officers of the public works UPTD • Irrigation officers | Officers of the public works UPTD | Officers of the public works UPTD |
| | Central government | Nonprogram | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TA ID • PD TI | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TA ID • PD TI | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TA ID • PD TI | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TA ID • PD TI | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TA ID • PD TI |
| | Kabupaten government | Program | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community Housing and Sanitation Program facilitators • ADD facilitators | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Village BKK verification working group | - | - | - |
| | Provincial government | Program | - | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Facilitators of Sejuta Domain (One Million Domains) | - | - | - |
| | Central government | Program | - | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pamsimas facilitators | - | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pamsimas facilitators | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pamsimas facilitators |

| Sector | Institution | Program/ Nonprogram | Kabupaten | | | | |
|--------------|------------------------------|------------------------|--|---|--|--|--|
| | | | Ngada | Banyumas | Wonogiri | Batanghari | Merangin |
| | Non-governmental institution | Private sector/NGOs | - | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local NGOs Communities Individuals (reporter) | - | - | - |
| b. Health | <i>Kabupaten</i> government | Nonprogram | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Village midwives Integrated service post (<i>posyandu</i>) cadres | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Village midwives <i>Posyandu</i> cadres | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Village midwives <i>Posyandu</i> cadres | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Village midwives <i>Posyandu</i> cadres | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Village midwives <i>Posyandu</i> cadres |
| | Non-governmental institution | Program | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Education and health facilitators | - | - | - | - |
| c. Education | <i>Kabupaten</i> government | Nonprogram | - | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SKB instructors | - | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SKB instructors | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SKB instructors |
| | <i>Kabupaten</i> government | Program | - | - | - | - | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bunda (mothers of) PAUD |
| | Non-governmental institution | Private/NGO | Education and health facilitators | - | - | - | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrators of the community study center (PKBM) Administrators of the course and training institute (LKP) |
| d. Social | <i>Kabupaten</i> government | Nonprogram | - | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Family consultancy agency | - | - | - |

| Sector | Institution | Program/ Nonprogram | Kabupaten | | | | |
|----------------------|----------------------|------------------------|---|---|---|--|---|
| | | | Ngada | Banyumas | Wonogiri | Batanghari | Merangin |
| | Central government | Program | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PKH facilitators • TSKK officers | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PKH facilitators • TSKK officers | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PKH facilitators • TSKK officers | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PKH facilitators • Integrated service and reference system (SLRT) <u>officers</u> • Social Workers Devotion Unit (Sakti Peksos) facilitators • <i>Tagana</i> facilitators | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PKH facilitators • TSKK officers • <i>Tagana</i> facilitators |
| e. Demography | Kabupaten government | Nonprogram | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PLKB officers | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PLKB officers | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PLKB officers | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PLKB officers |
| C. GOVERNANCE | | | | | | | |
| Governance | Kabupaten government | Nonprogram | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Kecamatan</i> employees | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Kecamatan</i> employees | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Kecamatan</i> employees | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Kecamatan</i> employees | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Kecamatan</i> employees |
| | Central government | Nonprogram | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Professional experts • Professional village facilitators • Local village facilitators | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Professional experts • Professional village facilitators • Local village facilitators | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Professional experts • Professional village facilitators • Local village facilitators | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Professional experts • Professional village facilitators • Local village facilitators | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Professional experts • Professional village facilitators • Local village facilitators |



 Jl. Cikini Raya No. 10A
Jakarta 10330 Indonesia

 +62 21 3193 6336

 +62 21 3193 0850

 smeru@smeru.or.id

 smeru.or.id

   The SMERU Research Institute

 @SMERUInstitute

 @smeru.institute