

Analysis of Public Sector Coordination Implementation in Patuha 2 Geothermal Power Plant According To Public Private Partnerships (PPP) Framework

Dedi Agus Purwanto, S.H., M.AP¹, Prof. Dr. H.M Didi Turmudzi, M.Si.², Prof. Dr. Bambang Heru Purwanto, M.S.³

¹ Doctoral Candidate, Public Administration Science, Pasundan University

² Senior Lecturer, Public Administration Science, Pasundan University

³ Senior Lecturer, Public Administration Science, Pasundan University

Abstract

The development of national electricity infrastructure has become one of the national strategic programs, one of which is the construction of the Patuha 2 geothermal power plant conducted by PT. Geodipa Energi (GDE). The Patuha 2 project is implemented using the Public Private Partnership (PPP) scheme. The implementation of public sector coordination in the Patuha 2 project is an important element to supporting project success. Initial research data shows that there are problems in the implementation of public sector coordination in the Patuha 2 project. This study attempts to analyze how the implementation of public sector coordination in the Patuha 2 project within the PPP framework. This study uses a descriptive-qualitative method with the interview method as a means of data collection. The results of the study indicate that the implementation of public sector coordination is still not running effectively and optimally.

Keywords: Public Sector Coordination, Public-Private Partnerships

1. Introduction

The development of the Patuha 2 is part of the national policy and strategy to meet the increasing electricity needs of the community and the business world. The paradigm of the government regarding the phenomenon of the Patuha 2 development, simultaneously becomes the interest of the government and the wider community. From the community side, Patuha 2 is an important program in order to support electricity supply needs, while from the government side, Patuha 2 is needed in order to provide public services and increase government revenue posts.

Patuha 2 development is carried out by PT. GDE, a joint venture founded by PT. Pertamina and PT. PLN. PT. GDE has completed the Patuha 1 geothermal power plant construction project in its status as a private company that received work from PT. PLN as the institution in charge of providing national electricity infrastructure.

Patuha 2 is part of the implementation of public policies set by the government to meet the needs of the community's electricity resources. In general, in Presidential Regulation Number 4 year 2016 concerning the Acceleration of Electricity Infrastructure Development, it is stated that the Electricity Infrastructure Development (PIK) is carried out by PT. PLN. This project included in the Electricity Supply Business Plan (RUPTL) of PT. PLN year 2019-2028 and aims to develop new renewable energy-based power plants, through geothermal energy.

PT. PLN as the organizer of PIK, in practice can organize PIK in accordance with the provisions of Article 4 paragraph (2) of Presidential Regulation No. 4 year 2016 through 2 methods, namely self-management and cooperation in the supply of electricity. In the Patuha 2 construction project, PT. PLN uses the cooperative method of providing electricity by cooperating with PT. GDE as Power Generation Developer (PPL). In Article 1 point 9 of Presidential Regulation No. 4 year 2016 stated that PPL is a business entity that provides

electricity. PPL can be in the form of state-owned enterprises, regional-owned enterprises, cooperatives, and the private sector.

PT. GDE as PPL which provides electricity through the construction of Patuha 2 for PT. PLN, can be positioned as a third party in the procurement of PIK. Within the framework of public policy, this pattern of cooperation is known as the Public Private Partnership (PPP) pattern. Even though PT. GDE holds the status as a State-Owned Enterprise (SOE), in the context of cooperation between the government (public) and business entities (private), it is considered as a partner for the government. In Article 1 point 4 of Presidential Regulation No. 67 year 2005 concerning Government Cooperation with Business Entities in the Provision of Infrastructure, it is stated that which includes business entities are private business entities in the form of state-owned enterprises, BUMD, and cooperatives.

The Patuha 2 development project involves several stakeholders, starting from the Ministry of Finance, PT. PLN, Perhutani, to the Ministry of Energy and Mineral Resources. Sharing means implementing and ensuring coordination between institutions or institutions involved in the Patuha 2 project continues to run well. The implementation of coordination is a must so that the project runs smoothly and can meet the implementation target and the expected output. The implementation of effective coordination will align and direct all the efforts of each element and/or stakeholder towards the direction and targets that have been set (Terry, 2006).

Implementation of coordination is actually a common thing in the implementation of government projects. Inter-organizational relationships and coordination within government have become commonplace in project implementation. In the Patuha 2 project the coordination conditions are different, because it is carried out within the PPP framework. In addition, in the Patuha 2 project, PT. PLN as a representative of the government is not the main institution in charge of the implementation and development of Patuha 2, where the responsibility should remain with the government. The responsibility for development and development is entirely in the hands of PT. GDE. Thus, PT. GDE is the lead sector in the implementation of public sector coordination in the Patuha 2 PLTP project.

Initial data shows that the implementation of coordination carried out by PT. GDE with stakeholders is still not running optimally. One example of coordination that is not optimal is in the case of applying for a Borrowing-to-Use Forest Area Permit (IPPKH). In order to build supporting facilities and infrastructure, PT. GDE needs to obtain IPPKH so that it can carry out development in areas whose status is included in the forest area. The IPPKH application in the Patuha area has been submitted since the process of building and developing the Patuha 1 geothermal power plant, but the IPPKH will only be issued in 2021, after going through a process of many years.

The IPPKH which has been owned by PT. GDE does not necessarily make PT. GDE is able to use Perhutani land which is included in the well pad development plan. Based on the results of the assessment, it is known that PT. GDE still does not have access to install gas and geothermal distribution pipes from drilling results in areas that are included in the Perum Perhutani area. Access that is not owned by PT. The GDE on Perhutani's land shows that there is a problem in terms of coordination. Lack of good coordination can hinder the policy implementation process.

The construction of the Patuha 2 is carried out with the PPP mechanism, therefore, the implementation of public sector coordination in the Patuha 2 development must also be analyzed within the PPP framework. To analyze the implementation of public sector coordination using the PPP framework, it is necessary to first know the important elements in the implementation of PPP.

Grimsey and Lewis (2004) have determined 5 elements as the most important elements in the implementation of Public Private Partnership (PPP). These five elements can be used as benchmarks to explain how a PPP policy is implemented in a country. In this study, these 5 elements are used as benchmarks to explain how the implementation of public sector coordination through the PPP mechanism in the Patuha 2 project.

Implementation of coordination between the government and PT. GDE in the development of Patuha 2 can be explained through the elements of relationship and sharing. Grimsey and Lewis (2004) explain that the relationship element contains sustainability and the relationship between the government and the private sector. Meanwhile, the sharing element shows the sharing of responsibilities, risks, and results of PPP between the government and the private sector. Coordination is about the relationship between the government and the private sector, it is sustainable. Coordination also shows the division of responsibilities between the government and the private sector in the implementation of Public Private Partnership (PPP).

Coordination variable is an important variable in the implementation of Public Private Partnership (PPP). In a study conducted by Mahalingham, et.al (2011), it is known that the high involvement of coordinating agencies in project sustainability or ensuring the ability of government institutions to understand and supervise PPP projects, is a necessary factor to ensure the real benefits of PPP projects can be channeled to stakeholders. An ineffective coordination process will result in longer time and additional costs in the process of implementing development projects.

The problem of coordination in the implementation of PPP projects cannot only be seen from the perspective of the organization, but as stated by Kouwenhaven (in Kooiman, 1993), must be viewed from a structural aspect and a dynamic process. Previous research on coordination issues only looked at the organizational aspect, but did not look at the structural aspects and dynamic processes that occur in project implementation (PPP).

2. Literature Review

2.1. Public Sector Coordination

Coordination is a synchronous and regular effort to provide the right amount and time, and direct the implementation to produce a uniform and harmonious action on a predetermined target (Terry, 2006). Bouckaret, Peter, & Verhoest (2010) stated that there are 5 stages in analyzing public sector coordination, which are: 1) mapping the 'initial'; 2) mapping coordination instruments; 3) presenting changes over time; 4) analysing changes in coordination mechanisms over time; 5) summarizing trajectories of specialization and coordination.

Coordination is carried out according to certain principles. In this case, experts convey various principles of coordination. From the overall opinion of experts, according to Sugandha (2011), there are at least 10 principles of coordination that can be accepted, namely:

- 1) Unity of direction and purpose.
- 2) Agreement on activities or actions that must be carried out by each party, including targets and schedules.
- 3) Obedience and loyalty.
- 4) Exchange of information on activities, results achieved and problems encountered.
- 5) Mutual respect, trust and help each other.
- 6) Professionalism.
- 7) Mutual trust.
- 8) Accurate use of coordination tools.
- 9) Efficiency
- 10) There is a coordinator or leader who moves and monitors the entire implementation of cooperation within the organization and understands and is able to solve the problems encountered.

2.2. Public Private Partnersip (PPP)

Grimsey and Lewis (2004) state that a Public Private Partnership (PPP) is an arrangement in which the private sector participates in, or provides support for, the government in a cooperation contract with the government in the provision of public infrastructure or basic infrastructure needs. According to Grimsey and Lewis (2004:13) there are 5 important elements that must be considered in the implementation of PPP, namely:

- 1) Participants. A PPP fairly obviously involves two (or more) parties, and at least one of them has to be a public body. Each, however, needs to be a principal, capable of negotiating and contracting on its own behalf. All parties must make an organizational commitment to the partnership.
- 2) Relationship. Partnerships need to be enduring and relational. Governments buy goods and services, they give grants, and they impose fines and taxes. None of these transactions implies any real continuity of behaviour. Even if a public sector body were to use the same supplier year after year, this pattern would not be regarded as a partnership. A government department ordering sandwiches each day for lunch from the same catering firm does not create a partnership. (Kelly, 2000, p. 10).
- 3) Resourcing. Each of the participants must bring something of value to the partnership. PPPs seek to draw on the best available skills, knowledge and resources, whether they are in the public or the private sector, and deliver value for money in the provision of public infrastructure services. For this

to happen, each partner must transfer resources (money, property, authority, reputation) to the arrangement.

- 4) Sharing. PPPs involve a sharing of responsibility and risk for outcomes (whether financial, economic, environmental or social) in a collaborative framework. This mutual responsibility contrasts with relationships between the public and private sectors in which the public body retains control over policy decisions after getting the advice of private sector entities. It also contrasts with relationships between the public and private sectors that are primarily contractual in nature and involve essentially command relationships. In these cases, the private sector bodies are not partners in any real sense. There has to be a mutual interest and unified commitment.
- 5) Continuity. Underpinning the partnership will be a framework contract, which sets out the 'rules of the game' and provides the partners with some certainty. Its existence enables the parties involved to make decisions without having to start from scratch each time and develop from first principles the rules that govern these interactions. While the PPP contract provides the basic architecture of the arrangement, it is necessarily 'incomplete' and does not (and cannot) specify all.

The implementation of PPPs is highly dependent on the contract management process. PPP contract management involves monitoring and implementing the terms of the PPP contract, and managing the relationship between government and private partners. The contract management phase lasts for the duration of the PPP agreement, starting from the effective date of the contract until the end of the contract period (World Bank, 2014).

The characteristics of the PPP pattern of cooperation involve two or more parties, one of which is the Government, the cooperation includes a long-term cooperative relationship between the parties by interacting continuously. Each actor in the collaboration contributes material and non-material to the relationship so that they are each responsible for the output of each activity carried out. There are four characteristics in PPP (Anderson, 2004), namely:

- 1) Cooperation includes two or more parties, including the government and the private sector.
- 2) Public and private cooperation requires cooperation partners who are able to play a role in accordance with their capacities.
- 3) Relationships that have ongoing trust. This can be seen in the cooperation contract as a basis for negotiation.
- 4) The parties must invest material and non-material resources in the cooperation. Each part of the organizational structure will define objects, tasks, finances and responsibilities.

3. Methodology

This research is a qualitative descriptive study. The focus is a comprehensive description of the implementation of public sector coordination in the implementation of the Patuha 2 PLTP PPP project. This is in line with the opinion of Bogdan and Taylor (1975) in Moleong (2002) which states that "a qualitative approach" is a research procedure that produces descriptive data in the form of words-written or spoken words of people and observable behavior.

The description of the implementation of public sector coordination is carried out based on the analysis of the informants' answers to interview questions derived from the components of the implementation of public sector coordination. This study uses 5 components of the implementation of public sector coordination proposed by Bouckaret, Peter, & Verhoest (2010).

The data was obtained by using the interview method to informants who are representatives of stakeholders in the Patuha 2 development project. The selection of informants in qualitative research is entirely determined by the researcher, so Patton (2002) calls it purposeful sampling, namely choosing information-rich cases, based on the strategies and objectives set by the researcher, the amount of which depends on the objectives and resources of the study. According to Patton (2002), there are 16 types of informant selection techniques with the purposeful sampling technique.

From the sixteen techniques for determining informants, this study used a Theory based sampling technique or Operational construct sampling or Theoretical sampling, namely the determination of research informants with the aim of knowing the manifestation of the theoretical construction of the problems raised so that elaboration and testing of the construct and its variations can be carried out. Based on these techniques, the researchers determined the informants in this study, namely:

- 1) Management of PT. GDE;

- 2) Representative of Perum Perhutani;
- 3) Representatives of PT. PLN;
- 4) PTPN representatives;
- 5) ADB representative.

4. Finding and Discussion

Analysis of the implementation of public sector coordination is carried out using 5 stages of coordination analysis (Bouckaret, Peter, & Verhoest: 2010) as an indicator of the implementation of public sector coordination in the Patuha 2 project. Based on the research analysis, the following results are obtained:

4.1. Mapping the initial

This component consists of 2 indicators, the first is the relationship between institutions in government. The results of interviews with all informants stated that there was a relationship with government institutions. The type of relationship that occurs on average is coordinating. There is one other type of relationship, namely a directive relationship that occurs between PT. PLN with the Ministry of BUMN and ESDM.

The second indicator is the direct relationship between the central and local governments. The results of interviews with all informants showed that 3 informants stated that there was a relationship between the center and the regions, and 2 informants stated that there was no relationship between the center and the regions in the implementation of the Patuha 2 project. Informants from ADB as the lender have no interest whatsoever with local government organizations, because ADB's relationship is only with the Ministry of Finance as a guarantor whose position is a government organization at the central level. Furthermore, research informants from PLN who stated that they had no relationship with local government organizations, explained that this was because the Patuha 2 project had only PT. PLN Central under the EDP division.

These facts show that coordination in the regions is only carried out when government and private organizations in the regions have the authority or relationship with the implementation of the Patuha 2 project. directly with government and private organizations at the central level.

Within the PPP framework, mapping the structure and components of the institutions involved in the PPP project, is carried out to understand which part of each project participant is responsible for project activities, including those responsible for the coordination process. Grimsey and Lewis (2004) state that each party must take part in commitments and responsibilities. This will not be fulfilled properly if the mapping and understanding of the structure and components of the institution does not go well. Furthermore, this will have an impact on how the elements of sharing are in the implementation of PPP.

The results showed that the mapping component of the structure and institutional components did not work well. Every indicator studied on this component is not formed perfectly. Thus, referring to the PPP implementation framework, the division of responsibilities in the implementation of the Patuha 2 PLTP project will not work properly when this component has not been fully fulfilled.

4.2. Mapping coordination instruments

The researcher uses 5 indicators to describe how these components are fulfilled in the implementation of public sector coordination in the Patuha 2 PLTP project. The first indicator is the preparation of coordination instruments that have been set by the government. The results of interviews with all informants showed that 3 informants stated that there was no coordination instrument set based on government regulations, while 2 informants stated that there were coordination instruments made based on government regulations. ADB and PT. GDE makes coordination instruments based on documents stipulated by ADB and does not make other coordination instruments other than that. Meanwhile, Perhutani stated that no coordination instrument had been made because the coordination activities had already been completed.

The absence of coordination instruments in accordance with government regulations is one of the inhibiting factors for the implementation of public sector coordination. This fact is an important finding in an effort to encourage the creation of better public sector coordination.

The second indicator is the mapping of all components of coordination. The results of interviews with all informants showed that 2 informants did not clearly state that there was a mapping of the coordination component, while the other 3 informants stated firmly that there was a mapping of the coordination component. ADB's failure to answer this question is understood by the authors as an attempt by ADB to emphasize its position outside the PPP cooperation mechanism in the Patuha 2 project. Meanwhile, PT.

GDE, which did not clearly state that there was a mapping of coordination components, was more due to obstacles in the preparation of various supporting documents for coordination activities.

The third indicator is preparing a coordination strategy. The results of interviews with all informants showed that 4 informants stated that there was a coordination strategy, while 1 informant stated that they did not have a coordination strategy. The fact that PTPN does not have a coordination strategy can explain why there were obstacles in the PTPN land use process.

The fourth indicator is to prepare balanced related policy proposals. The results of interviews with all informants showed that 2 informants stated that there were policy proposals, while 3 informants stated that there were no policy proposals. The lack of policy proposals is an indication that public sector coordination carried out by the parties in the Patuha 2 project has not been running optimally. This could be due to an inappropriate coordination strategy.

The fifth indicator is to prepare representatives agencies and institutions to conduct negotiations. The results of interviews with all informants showed that 2 informants stated that they did not have negotiating representatives, while 3 informants stated that they had negotiating representatives. The existence of an institution that does not yet have a special representative to carry out negotiations can hinder the coordination process between institutions involved in the Patuha 2 project.

Grimsey and Lewis (2004) explain that any results obtained from the PPP cooperation mechanism must be shared proportionally with the responsibilities and risks among the participants involved. This division of responsibility and risk requires clear and effective coordination among the participants.

Mapping of coordination instruments was carried out to see the extent to which the participants were able to carry out effective coordination in order to carry out the proportional distribution of responsibilities and risks. The results of the study indicate that the five indicators that make up this component have not been completely fulfilled. This fact can hinder the implementation process of implementing responsibility and fulfilling risks among the participants involved in the Patuha 2 development project.

4.3. Presenting changes overtime

Creating change over time is a condition that shows that the public coordination process is going well. Changes arise because of the development of the situation and the stages of work that are known and negotiated through a coordination process. This study uses 3 indicators to describe whether this component is running well or not.

The first indicator is to study the course of history and compare it with current conditions. The results of interviews with all informants showed that 4 informants stated that they took lessons from the history of the Patuha 2 development, while 1 informant did not answer this question.

The second indicator is studying the level of specialization. Knowledge of the levels of specialization will provide an overview of how the coordination process is carried out by each level. On the other hand, this knowledge is also useful for coordinating actions at each level of specialization.

The results of interviews with all informants showed that 2 informants stated that there was a process of studying the level of specialization, 2 informants stated that they were not aware of the process of studying the level of specialization, and 1 informant did not answer the question. These results indicate that this indicator is not fulfilled properly. The impact will hinder the coordination process carried out at the level of specialization.

The third indicator is the level or position of the new specialization. The emergence of new specialization levels or positions indicates developments in the process of coordination and negotiation. In the implementation of a PPP project, including the long-term Patuha 2 project, there will always be a need for new specializations at every stage of its development.

The results of research interviews showed that 2 informants stated that there was a new specialization, 2 other informants stated that there was no new specialization, and 1 other informant did not answer the question. Similar to the previous indicator, based on the answers of research informants, it can be said that this indicator has not been fulfilled properly. In addition, the absence of new specialization in some parties, indicates a lack of coordination processes in the organization.

Changes in each stage of PPP implementation are measured by the ability of participants to make decisions by referring to the basic PPP arrangements without having to make a special arrangement. The implementation of this is the formation of new levels or specializations in the organizational structure of each participant that appears in accordance with the needs of the stages of PPP implementation. Grimsey

and Lewis (2004) explain this in terms of sustainability elements, where sustainability can be seen from the ability of participants to respond to new needs at each stage of PPP cooperation without having to change the basic PPP arrangements.

The results showed that the three indicators in this component were not fulfilled perfectly. There are several participants who have not been able to fulfill the three indicators in this component. This fact shows that not all participants in the Patuha 2 project have the ability to implement the basic arrangements for cooperation in the form of forming new levels or specializations within the organization.

In terms of the implementation of public sector coordination, this means that a new development in the development stage of the Patuha 2, will not be able to be optimally responded by every involved participant. On the other hand, in the perspective of PPP implementation, this means that the sustainability of the Patuha 2 project implementation can be hampered, so that the project implementation time target cannot be met.

4.4. Analysing changes in coordination mechanisms over time

A coordination mechanism can change over time. These changes can be influenced by several things, for example the emergence of new needs, new specializations, regulatory changes, and others. Analysis of changes in the coordination mechanism will provide input for the process of determining a more effective coordination strategy in the future. This study uses 4 indicators to describe how this component works.

The first indicator is to study the shifts and emergence of new instruments. Learning new shifts and instruments is closely linked to the emergence of new barriers. Every new obstacle that arises must be prepared for the anticipation. Knowledge of the barriers to coordination will be useful in realizing more effective coordination in the future.

The results of interviews with all informants showed that 3 informants stated that there were no obstacles, 1 other informant stated that there were obstacles, and 1 other informant gave unclear answers. Barriers were found on the PT. GDE, namely the barriers to coordination with the community. Even though these obstacles exist, PT. GDE has prepared anticipatory steps against these obstacles.

The second indicator refers to the coordination mechanism. Every coordination carried out must refer to the coordination mechanism that has been determined, as a derivative of the coordination strategy. By referring to the existing coordination mechanism, it is hoped that coordination can run effectively.

The results of interviews with all informants showed that 3 informants stated that they referred to the coordination mechanism, 1 other informant stated that they did not refer to the standard coordination mechanism, and 1 other informant gave unclear answers. The coordination mechanism that is the reference, based on the answers of research informants, is the coordination mechanism that has been stipulated in the cooperation contract or cooperation agreement.

The third indicator is the use of a strategic management system. The use of strategic management systems in an organization is something that is commonplace. Meanwhile, the implementation of a strategic management system in coordinating activities can help make coordination activities more effective.

The results of interviews with all informants showed that 2 informants stated that they had implemented a strategic management system, 2 other informants stated that they did not apply, and 1 other informant did not answer. These results indicate that the implementation of strategic management has not been considered important in supporting coordination activities. In practice, the strategic management system in the Patuha 2 project can be replaced by monitoring and evaluation activities.

The fourth indicator is cultural coordination through senior executive services. Cultural coordination is one of the options for implementing coordination that is adapted to local wisdom. This coordination is optional and depends on the needs.

The results of interviews with all informants showed that 1 informant stated that cultural coordination was carried out, 1 other informant stated that cultural coordination was not carried out, 2 other informants gave unclear answers, and 1 other informant did not answer questions. These results indicate that cultural coordination has not been an option for the majority of parties involved in the Patuha 2 project.

Changes in the coordination mechanism in the PPP perspective are related to relationship elements. Grimsey and Lewis (2004) explain that in a PPP partnership, there is no fixed or standard pattern of interaction. The relationship between the participants will develop dynamically according to the needs that develop at each stage while still referring to the basic PPP arrangements that have been established.

The implementation of public sector coordination in the PPP perspective, can be seen from how the participants coordinate between them and at the same time, adapt to changes driven by developments and needs that arise at each stage of cooperation.

The majority of informants in the study stated that in carrying out coordination, they referred to the established coordination mechanism. By referring to the coordination mechanism established by each, the participants can carry out coordination more effectively and measurably. However, there were 2 informants who stated that in coordinating, they did not refer to the coordination mechanism, causing coordination barriers to arise.

Regarding the obstacles that arise, as a result of changing conditions (external), as well as the result of organizational incompetence (internal), the majority of informants stated that they have been able to adapt to changes and obstacles that arise. Thus, even though these components are not perfectly formed, the coordination can still be optimized.

4.5. Summarizing trajectories of specialization and coordination

This last component can only be formed if the other components have been formed and running. This study uses 3 indicators to describe how these components are formed and run.

The first indicator is to prepare for organizational proliferation. This activity is closely related to the emergence of new specializations or positions in the organization as a response to developments that occur. The results of interviews with all informants showed that 2 informants stated that organizational proliferation was carried out, 2 other informants stated that organizational proliferation was not carried out, and 1 other informant did not provide answers. Based on the answers of the informants who stated that organizational proliferation was carried out, the form of proliferation was closely related to the need for special skills and technical personnel.

The second indicator is the strengthening of corrective coordination. By strengthening corrective coordination, the organization will not only encourage more effective coordination activities, but also support monitoring and evaluation activities.

The results of interviews with all informants showed that 4 informants stated that corrective coordination was strengthened, while 1 other informant stated that they did not strengthen corrective coordination. These results indicate that this indicator is running well. In addition, with the strengthening of corrective coordination, monitoring and evaluation activities also run well.

The third indicator is the comparison of conditions from one time to another. The results of interviews with all informants showed that all informants stated that a comparison of conditions was carried out. The form of this activity is a term evaluation activity with a varied and different time period between the parties involved in the Patuha 2 project.

This last component, within the PPP framework, relates to the element of continuity. As previously explained, this element of sustainability is highly dependent on the ability of each participant to adapt to change. Its manifestation is specification adjustment and coordination mechanism change. The results showed that the adjustment of specifications in the form of organizational proliferation was not yet fully formed. On the other hand, strengthening coordination and evaluating experiences has gone well.

5. Conclusion

Based on the results of the study, it can be concluded several things as follows:

- 1) Implementation of public sector coordination organized by PT. GDE is generally in accordance with the elements and stages of coordination.
- 2) Implementation of public sector coordination organized by PT. GDE, in the PPP framework, has not run effectively and optimally. This can be seen from the indicators of the components that make up the coordination of the public sector which are not running perfectly.
- 3) Barriers to effective public sector coordination can be stated as follows:
 - a. There is no joint coordination strategy among stakeholders.
 - b. Barriers in terms of administration in government organizations.
 - c. The absence of "good will", especially from the government to encourage the implementation of effective public sector coordination.

Refference

1. Anderson., 2004, *Teori dan Proses Kebijakan Publik*, Yogyakarta: Medpress
2. Bouckaert, G., Peters, B. G., & Verhoest, K., 2010, *The coordination of public sector organizations: Shifting patterns of public management*. UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
3. Grimsey, D. and Lewis, M.K., 2004, *Public Private Partnerships the Worldwide Revolution in Infrastructure Provision and Project Finance*, Edward Elgar Publishing Limited. Cheltenham.
4. Kooiman, J. (ed), 2019, *Modern Governance: New Government-Society Interactions*, London: Sane Publications.
5. Mahalingam, Ashwin, Ganesh A. Devkar and Satyanarayana N. Kalidindi, 2011, A Comparative Analysis of Public- Private Partnership (PPP) Coordination Agencies in India: What Works and What Doesn't. *Public Works Management & Policy* 16(4). Pp. 341– 372.
6. Moleong, Lexy, 2002, *Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif*, Bandung: PT. remaja Rosdakarya.
7. Terry, George, 2006, *Principles of Management*, Illinois: Homewood.
8. Sugandha, Dann. 2011. *Koordinasi, Alat Pemersatu Gerakan Administrasi*. Jakarta: Intermedia
9. World Bank., 2014, *Public-Private Partnership: Reference Guide version 2.0*. New York: World Bank.