

Develop Papua with Flakes of Spirit: Special Autonomy Authority

Akbar Silo
Cenderawasih University, Indonesia
assilo708@gmail.com

Abstract: A decade of development Papua special autonomy authority, it still spawned numerous ripples of dissatisfaction. The authority should be implemented optimally, faced with various obstacles, both internal within the government and the people of Papua, as well as external mainly from the Central Government. However, there is no denying behind the dissatisfaction, the fact that there is success and progress that will benefit the government and the people of Papua. Dissatisfaction that arises only because the treatment of the special autonomy is half-hearted and inconsistent, so the degree of achievement of development should be more meaningful again. This study is considered very important to give meaning to the success of development inspired by the values of special autonomy in its rules implementation. Besides being one of the chain of the management cycle of development, is also a mandate of Act No. 21 of 2001. In connection with that, as product policies, its review refers to the policy dimensions of implementation and performance policy.

Keywords: *Special autonomy, authority, policy implementation, development program*

1. Introduction

In the framework of the development process in Papua oriented to spirit of the Special Autonomy, they have a number of authorities in the management of local development, but they also cause various difficult problems. Special Autonomy is still reaping the wave of pros and cons for the Papuans themselves. According Suebu (2003), *it must be acknowledged that during this time the basic rights of the people of Papua have not been met, resulting in prolonged social problems. Social issues in question, is the high poverty that causes social inequalities between regions, the low quality of human resources, and low incomes.* Meanwhile, Djojosoekarto (2008) states explicitly that *the granting of special autonomy policy notice on the enforcement of the fundamental rights of the people in Papua should be supported fully by the Papuan elite in response to the .Related to poverty; development must be geared to eliminate the negative impacts. However, at this time we can see the emergence of the phenomenon of concern, namely the occurrence of environmental damage to marginalizing the rights of native people. This condition was further compounded by the lack of government policies that favor the development of the village community.*

In this context, it is worth considering the views Bratic (2010), in his article entitled *Local Self-Government in Central and Eastern Europe - A Strong and Independent Local-Level Management Tool or Just a Paper Tiger?* Straightly stated that *the main difference between the European countries consists in different structures of the local government, which may include 1-3 level. Functions and activities of public administration bodies of the local government (in Indonesia: District/City) has undergone constant change. While the role of the intermediate level (in Indonesia: Province) is a major issue in most new member countries of the European Union (i.e. the Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland). In Slovenia, the level of government has not even been introduced. A considerable difference between local government units on the size, strength and financial and economic development. It needs to introduce equalization fiscal mechanisms to support disadvantaged areas or special areas. Equalization of financial transfers from the central government does not depend on political criteria. In addition, so far, property owned by local autonomous governments in the region has not been adequate. Therefore it is necessary to develop a regional asset management administration more efficient in order to increase the income of local budgets.*

Thus, the presence of a special autonomy law for Papua Province, is seen to have important implications for the progress of development in Papua, this law has led towards the creation of a "special" governance in

Papua, which is different from the other provinces. Of course, it means that there are more references diversity of local governance in Indonesia, having previously been present and known: Special Capital Region of Jakarta Raya, Yogyakarta and Aceh Special Region (or current NAD). Furthermore, Ghandhi (2013) said that *institutional autonomy greater emphasis on: (a) the freedom to achieve excellence, and (b) the freedom to manage the institution through its own settings. However, autonomy as it is today: (1) too many links with the political power of the state, and (2) it is constrained by financial limitations.* Hence, important consequences that can be read are: *First, Aspects of Local Governance. Governments must adapt national policies treatments that are tailored to the format governance Papua Province. Papua province is the only province in Indonesia that has the institution People's Assembly as cultural representation. The whole basis of considerations of national policy: governance, development, empowerment, and public services should accommodate aspects of socio-culture and customs of the people of Papua as optimally as possible. Second, aspects of payload legislation as policy product, leads to: (a) Rationalization of Government Authority conducted fairly as possible. General authority and special authority should be further elaborated so that it became clear the limits of authority of each: the Government, the Government of Papua Province, and District/cities in Papua.(b) A review of the regulation of profit sharing between the Government and the Provincial Government of Papua which is more aligned to the people of Papua, as encouraged by this law.(c) Preparation Commitment Implementation Guidelines (technical regulations operation) both at the central government level and at the level of Papua Province.(d) The real recognition toward the existence of local society that span the 'hierarchy in the form of various development policies after the enactment of this legislation, so that all citizens of this nation can read an indication of the progress of each year until at the end of the validity, which truly reflect the achievements of the condition of society Papua were "prosperous independent".*

Thus, independence is an option of the conditions to achieve the welfare of a public entity. These conditions are specific and interconnection to the universe. Interconnection between the people of Papua in Indonesia's national governing structure, want to preserve the identity of specialization within the framework of the process of adaptation to changes in the direction of well-being. In addition, the quality of interconnection in question, require maturation in relation to the quality of the governance environment. Therefore, government translation into segments of authority becomes essential. Therefore, the fight for independence without the breadth of authority can mean the identity of personality stops without meaning. Although the need to be aware of warning Sutherland, Raben, and Locher-Scolten (2002) which states that *should be emphasized that 'regionalism' cannot be not seen as a political or administrative issues exclusively, but as the complexity of sustainability, which needs a change of attitude and strategy. Regardless of the loyalty of the region, many other forces that influence the attitudes and horizons of society, such as class, occupation, religion, and identity groups.* Despite the warning, it must be admitted that the identity of the community have encouraged the growth of solidarity which encourage accumulation of motivation effective in development. Respect for the realization of the potential of the people who grow and develop, the social capital in a very significant development. It is appropriate to lift the views Ife and Tesoriero (2008) that *social capital can be seen as the 'glue' that holds society together - human relationships, people do what he did against each other because of their social obligation and reciprocity, social solidarity and the community.* To that end, be aware of the balance between the need to strengthen national unity by conducting needs decentralization. As the comparison, in line with Lee (2010), in her study of dependence and autonomy - Taiwan Entrepreneurs and local governments of China showed that *since the beginning, the central government-local Taiwanese investors are not planning to use for strategic purposes. Increase occurred solely due to changes in cross-strait relations and the consolidation of democracy in Taiwan. Then gradually the central government offer more privileges to Taiwanese investors in response to these changes. The Chinese government chose a pattern of interaction with Taiwan the most suitable business interests at the time.*

Decentralized governance is essentially has authority on the implications of political and administrative authority of the relevant norms of authority: (a) Special, which was given to the Government of Papua Province and Regency/City. Details of *certain authorities* in other fields, which are not submitted by the Central Government to the Province of Papua, including: macro policy planning and national development control, financial balance, the system of state administration and institutions the country's economy, development and empowerment of human resources, utilization of natural resources, and strategic high technology, as well as the conservation and national standardization. (b) General, submitted by the central government to the Government of Papua province, except in matters of foreign policy, defense and security,

monetary and fiscal, religion, justice, and certain authorities in other fields established in accordance with statutory regulations.

Meanwhile, the public authority for the District/City Government held under the law No. 32 of 2004 which has been replaced by Act No. 23 of 2014. Thus, there is the prevailing dualism of autonomous systems at the same time. At the provincial government level, the implementation of the rule of law of special autonomy, while at the Regency / City refers to the laws that apply equally to district/cities in Indonesia. The implication is: *First*, the translation is more than the authority of the central government (certain authorities in other fields), it is clearly demarcated. *Second*, integration and synchronization policies between ministries needed to avoid overlapping and contradictory. *Third*, the existence of disagreement within formulation and implementation of the policy of the central government against government positions at the provincial and district / city, *Fourth* Follow-up formulation of a special authority in various special regional regulation. *Fifth*, the existence of the rationalization of the relationship of authority in the provincial and district/ city governments. *Sixth*, integration and synchronization policy between the regional work units at the provincial and district/city.

2. Methodology

The design of this study is evaluative research focused on government policy. Function explanation used in photographing reality the implementation of Special Autonomy policy and generalized the generalizations about patterns of relationships between the various dimensions of reality. From the side of the government authorities, the compliance function is used to browse the suitability of the attitudes and actions of the actors with the standards and procedures set. Thus, the research design can be described in the following schemes: This study uses the unit of analysis "individual", with a characterized population, but it cannot be known in number, so that the determination of the sample with a combination of techniques Cluster Sampling and Snow Ball Sampling. Thus obtained samples of four districts in the province of Papua (Jayapura, Jayapura district, Jayawijaya, Merauke), and West Papua Province (Manokwari and Bintuni Bay), the number of respondents as many as 36 government officials and 62 members of the public. The data used consist of primary data and secondary data. Primary data is mainly in the form of *perceptions and responses* collected through *focus group discussions, in-depth interviews, and observation of the field* directly. Secondary data obtained from government documents and public gathered from various sources, such as: product legislation, development planning documents and reports development, public article about the autonomy of the media. All data collected is processed and analyzed by qualitative content analysis, *domain analysis*, and structural analysis.

3. Discussion

Government Policy Treatments: Entering the decade of the enactment of the Special Autonomy Law for Papua Province, the role of government escorts did not seem optimal. The approach is not *comprehensive-integral*. By law it just as it is sufficient as a solution. Some of the provisions cannot be implemented without substantial follow-up from the Government. Its implementing regulations are inadequate, causing new frictions in the society of the seriousness of the government. In fact, implementing provisions specifically autonomy is hampered. Obscurity towards implementation is caused by the emergence of different interpretations toward the context "in accordance with prevailing regulations". As a result, policies districts/cities are often at odds with provincial policy, for example relating to the use of foreign aid and authority over natural resource management. One of the central government officials interviewed, clarified that:

Indeed, there is a delay in the government to follow up some of the rules implementing the Special Autonomy law. The argument is in the form of the rules of procedure only takes a long time let alone the process of drafting and publication. Many things must be considered, including the initiative of the Provincial Government of Papua is still sluggish.

The basic framework of regional government under the laws of Papua Autonomy based on authority Papuan People's Assembly, the Legislative and the Executive. Some types of authority, remain the responsibility of the Government, while the special authority for the Province of Papua, are not explicitly stamped so that still

require further implementation regulations. Most of the Government authorities have not clearly formulated as for example regarding: the authority of the empowerment of human resources, conservation and national standardization, it can be intervened by the central government policies or rules. In the implementation, into the second decade of its entry into force, limits the authority of the Government of Papua Province looks still vague, particularly associated with the authority vested in the district/city. This is caused by the formation Provincial Regulation and Regulation Special Area representative does not exist yet. Particularly with regard to special authority for the Government of Papua Province, often become the focus of public and political elite in Papua. Some summary of public opinion in Papua is expressed as follows:

What is the function of special autonomy law, if there is no clear regulation on special authority? Precisely it is essential identity of this law that should be implemented. Do not think that they will be happy with the amount of funds that go to Papua. A lot of money but no clear authority, it will cause abuse and corruption.

Meanwhile, one of the elite Papua commented:

There must be people do not trust the government because of a lot of money that it looks just like "candy politics" only to make people happy. Much more important than that is how this province can carry out the authorities in particular in accordance with their specialization within the framework of regional leaders of Indonesia. Several district / city do not want to know the province. Governor is not more than just as a symbol for them. No coordination of government to the province, everything is oriented directly to the ministry.

Thus some implications follow from this condition is *the First*, the unclear towards the implementation of government functions development and public services as required by the law of special autonomy, for example, there is confusion execution of public authority, especially with respect to natural resource management, and taxation. *Secondly*, by authority at Regency / City completely still based on Law No. 32 of 2004 (Article 14), has not been encouraged by Act No. 21 of 2001 Article 4: 4-5), then there is a conflict of norms in the exercise of authority in the District / City, including authority the use of special autonomy funds. *Thirdly*, yet explained the boundaries of the district authorities delegated authority because it has not carried out consistently by the district / city.

Government Policy Inconsistency: Indeed, from the beginning has been created an agreement that the implementation of Law No. 21 of 2001 in Papua which is pure and consistent is the barometer of a solution to the issue of Papua. Of course it is highly dependent on the commitment and consistency of the Central Government and Local Government (provincial and district / city). In this case, the central government showed their inconsistency in supporting the implementation of Law No. 21 of 2001. The formation of West Irian Jaya province only with Instruction is considered controversial because it is not done on the basis of considerations as provided for in Article 76. Although controversial, but its governance and completeness continue to be addressed so as to continue to exist until today. In political reality in Papua, it has raised the situation pros and cons widespread that leads towards conflict interest and became one of the main factors that drive the emergence of the idea of the return of a special autonomy to the central government. In a chance interview with officials of the Government of Papua Province revealed that:

The Papua provincial government urged the central government to immediately solve the issue of special autonomy for Papua. Until now, Papua do not have a clear future because of the existence of some legislation that is incompatible and conflicting. Law No. Special Autonomy for Papua Province, which is seen as the best way in solving problems in Papua, became useless with the issuance of Presidential Instruction on the Acceleration Expansion of Papua, which is based on Law No. 45 of 1999.

A very popular religious leader in the community said that:

... Any model of autonomy, including special autonomy in Papua, did not correlate significantly with the increasing of welfare. The implementation of special autonomy is expected to be accelerated and equitable development throughout Papua to resolve the fundamental problems.

Inconsistent policies can also be traced through the observation of the sharing arrangement. In Act No. 21 of 2001 Article 34 has been set that 70 percent of her income into the local treasury, and the remaining 30 percent paid to the Government. This is contradictory to the Act on Financial Balance so that the Papua Province as owner and producer of natural resources only received part of 30 percent, while the Government "enjoyed" the most part, that: 70 percent. Here there is a conflict of authority between the Government and the Provincial Government which is still not finished. In an interview with an official of the Government of Papua Province, revealed a picture that:

Problems handover of authority to the Provincial Government of Papua on resource management is inconsistent and half-hearted. Although it was realized that the handover of authority on the orders of the law, not an easy thing. In many ways this Government (relevant ministries) is not yet mentally prepared to cede authority accordingly. Even push-pull between the Government and Local Government happen. On the other hand, the capacity of governments in Papua, still need improvement in order to be adequately prepared to receive and to exercise that authority.

The mechanism of the accountability report part 2% of the total funds of the National DAU. The fund is translated as "special autonomy fund", which should be justified by the Government of Papua Province in particular, based on the special autonomy law. In reality, the governor always has to account for the appropriate mechanisms of the country's financial system. Though, the funds are spent specifically for the development and empowerment of indigenous people of Papua. In the case of *treatment* of government policy on development in Papua, it appears not to be comprehensive, but rather partial inter-ministerial. Each ministry implements policies and programs on their own without a well-coordinated.

Observing the behavior of the phenomenon of policy officials in various ministries, not only confusing but at the same time has no reason autonomy. Yet all know that it must be treated Papua specially. The policies and programs should directed to it are not treated the same as other provinces. In addition, the policies are often colliding with each other. Make the government and the people of Papua so confused. Whereas existing at the central level institution tasked to handle the affairs of special autonomy, but not affected.

Relevance and Coherence Policy: The general policy direction of development as stated in the National Development Plan, RPJMD Papua Province, and RPJMD various districts / municipalities in Papua, has explicitly reflect the relevance and coherence policies which are adequate. However, in practice it is often found "bias" that leads to contradictory conditions. In many ways, the various ministries at the central level policy is still lacking nuance accommodate the importance of protection of the rights of indigenous Papuans, for example in terms of natural resource management. Also less expensive aspects of local community involvement in the management process of development in the region, so that the dimensions of empowerment missed lift. The summary of local government official's opinion in the district/city expressed as follows.

National programs in Papua, designed by each ministry which is segmented without including the aspirations of local communities in Papua. There is strong impression that each ministry as if vying set a target program in Papua without coordination with each other. What will happen? People's confusion on the behavior of government policies that are actually implemented without answering the real needs of society.

It is similar with policy and program development in the province of Papua. Relevance and coherence are also questionable. With special autonomy funds are managed, it is deemed not sufficiently help to increase community empowerment to the area of remote villages. The number of programs designed Papua province and executed on behalf of a special autonomy law, without preceded by the identification of the real needs of society. **Musrenbang/ the meeting/coordination** mechanism is always done every year appears to be merely a formality. Cargo only terms favorable to the interests of government officials only, because it is less accommodate the needs of the community. There are also many development programs that have been carried out impartially to the indigenous people of Papua. This is related to the approach used, namely: is institutionalization. Program targets are institutions both public and private. Though these institutions manage the society as a whole (the Papuan people and society is not Papua). Thus, it is common *treatments*, whereas the use of *special autonomy funds*. This is clearly traceable to priority programs in education, health, and economic. At least there are four (4) categories proposed as a material assessment, namely: (1) aspects of the success of special autonomy embodies the spirit of the good; (2) the implementation of those aspects that are not optimal; (3) aspects of special autonomy which cannot be realized at all; and (4) development of community dynamics that have not been accommodated.

a. Aspects of the successful implementation of special autonomy: In general, it can be argued some aspects of the success of this special autonomy, among others are: *First*, able to dampen volatility and reduce the degree of escalation of the struggle for independence; *Second*, able to form a positive image of the government in the formation of opinions internationally towards treatment of the Government towards indigenous Papuans; *Third*, on a limited scale, there are processes for the growth of a new awareness of the

political elite-government to the struggle increases the dignity of the people in line with the global community. A number of clauses in the Special Autonomy Law have been implemented well, with regard to: (a) Form and composition of government. The spirit of the special autonomy has represented the institutional image. The presence of the Papuan People's Assembly and the Papuan Legislative Council is an important indication of this. (b) Development of a religious. Although this is a matter for central government, but the Government of Papua Province and Regency / City has contributed to creating a "Papua land of peace" through religion approach towards religious harmony created increasingly quality. (c) The role of the governor to coordinate in terms of: local police, Attorney General, and the judicial power. Where every time the central government transferring or further development policy, always invite the Governor of Papua to discuss and decide.(d) The implementation of functional supervision. Government supervision and development in Papua have been implemented over the years, for the purpose of obtaining an efficient and effective performance.

b. Aspects of the special autonomy implementation that is not optimal: At the level of *stakeholders* still pose a different appreciation. The difference lies in the perception of performance achievements. There is variety appreciation of the benefits of this special autonomy. In various fields of development priorities such as education, health, community economy, and infrastructure facilities, are generally not explicitly distinguish the source budget. Help direct cost to society is still very limited, except through RESPEK (developing a Strategic Plan for Village Economic) and now converted into PROSPEK (Strategic Program Development and Institutional Economics Village).In the area of governance, regional divisions of government (Province / District / District / Village), intended to improve public services and bring a range of development control. However, it raises new problems, because it turns out expansion policy: (1) has not been supported by adequate governmental infrastructure. Almost all the central region of the division does not have adequate public services. (2) Delegation of Authority to the districts and villages are not yet complete.(3) Support personnel and inadequate financing.(4) Status villages and districts was symbolic, since the title of the village into the village and sub district to district, was not accompanied by changes in governance mechanisms and the appropriate spirit of special autonomy law. Provincial and Regency / City Development contributed to instability for structuring the area permanently.

Proposals for the division are generally not discussed more thoroughly in advance in MRP but submitted directly to the Central Government through House of People Representatives, Regional Representatives Council, and the Ministry of the Interior. In fact, in the closing provisions of the Act, it is mentioned that the division of Papua Province into provinces shall be done with the approval of the MRP and the DPRP after considering seriously the social cultural unity, readiness of human resources and the economic capacity and development in the future. Indeed it is a form of denial of the spirit of autonomy, as is often done outside the context of the spirit. Meanwhile, a synergistic relationship in order to build understanding between the parties in the province of Papua, West Papua, and the central government (DPR Papua DPRD Papua, MRP, Home Affairs, DPR, DPD and stakeholders on this matter, has achieved some basic agreement but still vague. The follow up is unclear. Therefore, there is no doubt among the public that expansion policy is not purely for the purpose of improving public services.

Just for the benefit of the elite than the improvement of public services. The fact, the more expansion, the more hidden conflict happen. Relationship Papua and West Papua so far have not been harmonized. The burden even more severe due to expansion both in terms of provision of resources mess government and community service.

A different view emerged in the discussion forum centered in Merauke. Government leaders and community leaders involved in the discussion forum, as do the "choir" support the establishment of several provincial plans again in South Papua, Middle Papua and in the Gulf of Paradise. The arguments put forward in line with the will focuses on improving public services that can reach more welfare society with the strategy to control range of governance and development. It is, to be addressed by the various parties in the city of Jayapura, Jayapura district, Jayawijaya regency Manokwari and Bintuni Bay for the future:

There needs to be a cross agreement components of society and government about the "grand strategy" expansion .the result used as input for the establishment of the regulation in the context of special autonomy which does not leave national interest.

Regional divisions of government, it is believed will be able to improve public services and bring a range of development control. However, in reality it raises new problems, because: *First*, is not supported by sufficient governmental infrastructure to the village level. Almost all the villages do not have a service center (office/village hall). For those who are elected as village heads should make his home as a community service center; *Second*, the Delegation of Authority to the District unfinished. Until now, the Government has not been able to finalize the manuscript Regional Regulation on the delegation of authority to the District are encouraged by Act No. 21 of 2001; *Third*, (3) Village and District still be symbolic, just at the level of change nomenclature, there is no special adaptation meaning in the reality of people's lives.

c. Aspects of special autonomy which cannot be realized: Act No. 21 of 2001, also contains provisions that are not necessarily enforceable, because they hit on the rules of other laws. Example: Article 28mengatur on Political Parties. Practically this article cannot be executed because it is not regulated in legislation politics Party. The stronger public pressure on the establishment of a local political party inspired by Act No. 21 of 2001 Article 28: 1-4 explicitly provide opportunities to communities in Papua to assist Parties: "Papua Province can form political parties, according to the rules and regulations and obtain the approval of the Papuan People's Assembly to prioritize the recruitment pattern of the Papuan people". This article cannot be implemented because it is still hampered by political arguments that have not volunteered for accommodation of local political parties. In addition, the exception granted by the Government to the NAD Province, has sparked a growing insistence on *special treatments* in Papua. Thus, the community will form a political party cannot be realized. Opinion summary of elite political public figures illustrated that: *Formation of Political Parties as mandated by Article 28 cannot be realized because it is considered as a dead article. It is still difficult to materialize although the spirit Special Autonomy coloring all aspects of society. Feared this can significantly influence people's political participation.*

d. The dynamics of the community who have not accommodated: Recognized the charge law No. 21 of 2001 has covered a lot of things but, yet flexible enough to accommodate the dynamics of the development of society in the future. In this case, summarized proposals to accommodate matters relating to: labor relations MRP, DPRP and the Governor; The assertion of authority relationship between the District/Town and Province; Government Transparency and Accountability; The arrangement of the village government system; and public access to development information.

Policy and Program Development: Implementation of policies in the form of development programs, the government district / city, just based on technical guidelines issued by the Provincial Government of Papua every budget year, such as: the Memorandum of Understanding between the Governor of Papua with Regent / Mayor, Definitive Plan Use of SAF, covering the areas of: Education, Health, People's Economic Empowerment, Infrastructure, and Others; Technical guidelines for the funding allocation policy of special autonomy.

a. Education programs: It is recognized that education policy regencies / cities (for example in the city of Jayapura, Jayapura district, Merauke, Jayawijaya, and Bintuni Bay) aimed at improving the equity and quality of education services, especially for the success of *Fair 9 years* to make optimum use of infrastructure and physical facilities / nonphysical and increase the number and quality of teachers. In the implementation, the special autonomy fund provided by the regional government to be managed by relevant authorities, not according to the needs and it is still less transparent. Trimming occurs allotment or transfer of financing in other areas, especially infrastructure. There are still doubts from the public, if there is seriousness of the Government to implement a development policy that education has been scheduled. The skepticism is reasonable to examine how the proposed indicative argument: *First*, during one decade of implementation of special autonomy, quality education at all levels, lines and types of education generally can only be enjoyed by indigenous Papuans who live in urban and surrounding areas. While they were in villages that are difficult to access from the capital of the district/city have not received adequate educational services; *Second*, a location of scholarships to be very limited and not smooth. Whereas the laws of the Special Autonomy Article 56, paragraph 3, and the explanation has mandated the need for the allocation of financing all or part of the costs of education for the sons and daughters of indigenous Papuans at all levels of the education community is hoping that with honesty, the Government may waive the school children up to the level of Higher Education , the appearance of *Perdasi* Papua Province No. 5 of 2006 on the development of education in the province of

Papua, is expected to be the main foundation for the successful implementation of special autonomy in education. Thus, the allocation of funds for the education of at least 30% which has not been run properly can soon be realized.

From the aspect of equalization, a teacher at Sentani stated that: *"Not all schools to feel the benefits of special autonomy thereafter for five years."* The allocation of financing all or part of the costs of education for the sons and daughters of indigenous Papuans in all levels of education (Explanation of Article 56 paragraph 3) , translated Jayapura Regency Government by providing tuition assistance and subsidies SPP replacement fund. This is supported by the opinion of a religious figure:

There is indeed special autonomy fund assistance in the form of scholarships to students each USD. 300.000, - and high school kids can Rp. 150.000, - do not know how many children can; elementary school children are given 1 million. "Furthermore, People Youth fairly educated said that: The passing rate children in our village, getting better from year to year and the absorption of children for each subject already well. Average achievement scores very satisfactory grade parents.

Interesting listening, over the last 3 years in Jayawijaya, the authority for granting scholarships to children of Papua precisely handled by Bappeda Jayawijaya, when the Department of Education and which has data about students. In this case of course there has been a deviation *duties* which may result in the target bias. In the city of Jayapura, scholarship assistance is routinely given to children's original *Port Numbay* a limited scale but continuous, conducted by the Department of Education and the Teaching and Social Service. While in Jayapura and Merauke conducted by the Department of Education and Teaching.

b. Health Program: Special autonomy fund allocation for health development approximately 15% is not significant enough to help improve health services a society of Papua. Targeted use of funds is not focused on real efforts to improve health status of society directly. Health services for people with loads as low as society is still far from expectations. This is particularly felt by people far from urban areas. Health services in hospitals is still considered expensive, especially the purchase of medicines. The participation of non-governmental organizations in health care, especially of religious institutions has been accomplished so far, especially to people in remote and isolated areas. There are also non-governmental organizations involved in health care but are still minimal. While the business world is very minimal involvement in health care efforts. Government policies Regency / City of evaluation targets, the implementation of special autonomy in the health sector aimed at improving the range / equity and quality of health services. The benefits are already being felt by the people portrayed by the FD statement (Community leaders in Jayapura), that:

Society is very grateful because no specific policy for the poor to free medical treatment (evidenced by a certificate from the head of the village). One thing that made me sad is the doctors are never in place. Doctors only on the day of the market. That people want to be there during the doctor can perform the task of service 1 x 24 hours per day. Society reports that there are still drugs purchased with the help of special autonomy funds packs of 2002 are today traded by persons who are not responsible.

c. Economic Democracy Program: Populist economic development in the district / city evaluation targets are generally formulated in a summary of the policy directives as follows: Improved capabilities of traditional community economic commodity; The establishment and improvement of the people's economy and production center for the community; The creation of a unified people's economic circulation; Training and apprenticeship economic improvement of the people; Improved behavior-oriented productive enterprise; Increased income and purchasing power. The economic empowerment of the people aiming to increase community participation in various activities, especially in the areas of economic development, improving the quality of human resources in order to be able to process natural resources efficiently and sustainably to increase the income and welfare. To realize this, it is in line with the spirit and philosophy of the special autonomy law; district / city governments have attempted to translate it into various forms of programs in all sectors of the economy in cities and in villages. But in the field of community economy, people still require intensive training and socialization. It is as stated by the Community leaders in Jayapura that:

The government must work together with the foundation is there to accompany people conduct business and there should be training for the community to manage the business well. It should also be sustainable government guidance, not just once and then leave it alone.

One of the FGD participants in Jayawijaya, hoping that in the future policy of the use of special autonomy funds are prioritized in the social economy. Given that the economic living conditions of the people in the mountainous region is still very alarming.

Better populist economic empowerment program which protrudes from the other programs. If the community has been able to economically, then by itself can pay for education, health, and other necessities of life. Thus, the government of Papua does not have to follow the priorities set technically special autonomy program in each district / city. Let districts / cities organize themselves according to the needs of each.

d. Basic Infrastructure Program: Program infrastructure geared towards the provision of infrastructure, including infrastructure and social facilities economy, which supports the improvement of public services, particularly local communities in remote areas, in order to accelerate economic progress, rural, giving a chance to make, create jobs, facilitate the flow of goods and services and guarantee provide food and local ingredients at affordable prices, equitable growth of incomes. In addition, it is also aimed at improving basic services with the development priorities of clean water network, electric lighting, and public housing. The usage policy by the government's special autonomy funds of district/city in the context of infrastructure development in general lack alignments to small communities. The substance of the program more absorbed for program maintenance of roads and bridges in urban areas. While the road infrastructure that can connect economic centers in the villages people still tend to be neglected. Although road construction *Ombrop-SP II* in Jayapura (as an example), intended to facilitate the production of marketing channels "cocoa", but in reality the economic development of the cocoa farmers still hampered by the high cost of transportation. Correspondingly, the critical comments that had raised in the discussion forum, as put forward by government leaders in Jayawijaya that:

After 5 years held a special autonomy program, village road conditions do not change much. There is no progress to sustain the needs of the community. Most governments are simply repairing existing roads in cities. Problem systems as easy and cheap as well as electric lighting in villages are less attention.

In general, concluded that it is important to direct the development of infrastructure to villages and remote areas in order to be able to open the economic centers of the people so that they have easy access and smooth to the city. If the infrastructure development coupled with the concept of empowerment, the use of materials and local workers should take precedence, since this means that infrastructure development can add value to the economic improvement of the community. As we know that there are many local workers who are unemployed and have not been used effectively by the Government. In this case, questioned the commitment of the government policy to build new economic centers in the districts and villages.

4. Conclusion

However special autonomy presented in honor and recognition of Papuan identity to form a special system of governance which can be set on the basis of life in Papua based on their unique culture and customs. Special autonomy is a manifestation of the rationalization of the division of authority between the government and the provincial government of Papua, so that special arrangements can be done in the areas of education, health, economy which can provide greater benefits to the indigenous people of Papua. Not optimal implementation of special autonomy, characterized by: (a) the commitment of the central government which is sufficient but still very weak in implementation; (b) the unavailability of adequate regulation device to regulate the implementation instructions (including the authority and funding), (c) the limited allocation of special autonomy funds in the district / city, making it less able to develop programs relating directly to community empowerment; (d) the existence of *double standards* applied by the Government in the policy division of the province and district / city.

In terms of development policy, appear to have to accommodate the philosophy and spirit of autonomy, both in the National Development Plan, as well as inside RPJMD and RPJMD of Provincial and Regency/City. However, the implementation of the policy descriptions in the form of programs/activities tends to be biased and not targeted. Within the framework of its implementation, there are three types of assessment that refers to the classification: the articles that have been successfully implemented properly; Articles are not optimally done; and clauses that cannot be implemented. Therefore it is necessary to: (1) deep and continuous

socialization to the whole society up to the villages and in the apparatus of government from the central level down to the village. It was considered important as efforts to reduce the opinions of society and apparatus are still not in line with the spirit and philosophy of special autonomy. (2) Re-orient the planning process so that the charge accommodating the needs of people clearly illustrated in the planning documents that have adequate power implementable. To that end, it is necessary for the facilitation and advocacy of the Government in an integrated manner. (3) to distinguish the use of sources of income derived from other sources such as: DAU, DAK, and others, it is deemed necessary to regulate by laws of its own regarding accountability mechanisms Financial sourced from special autonomy funds. (4) The grand strategy of the division of the province and district / city agreed to by all components of society and government as well as specify in a binding rule.

References

- Bratic, V. (2010). Local Self-Government in Central and Eastern Europe - A Strong and Independent Local-Level Management Tool or Just a Paper Tiger? Review Article. Institute of Public Finance, Zagreb UDC 352(4-11)
- Djojosoekarto, A. (2008). Kinerja Otonomi Khusus Papua. Kemitraan bagi Pembaruan Tata Pemerintahan. Jakarta.
- Gandhi, M. M. (2013). Autonomy and Accountability in Higher Education an Indian Perspective.
- Ife, J. & Tesoriero, F. (2008). Alternatif Pengembangan masyarakat di Era Globalisasi Community Development. Pustaka Pelajar. Yogyakarta.
- IOSR Journal of Research & Method in Education (IOSR-JRME) e-ISSN: 2320-7388, p-ISSN: 2320-737X 3(5) (Nov. -Dec. 2013), 33-37.
- Lee, C. Y. (2010). Between Dependency and Autonomy -Taiwanese Entrepreneurs and Local Chinese Governments.
- Ministry of National Development Planning /BAPPENAS. (2008). Evaluasi Tiga Tahun Pelaksanaan RPJMN Bersama Menata Perubahan.
- Papua Provincial Government. Peraturan Daerah Provinsi Papua Nomor 10 Tahun 2006 Tentang RencanaPembangunan Jangka Menengah Daerah (RPJMD) Provinsi Papua Tahun 2006-2011.
- Sutherland, H., Raben, R. & Lochre-Scholten, E. (2002). Rethinking Regionalism : Changing Horizon in Indonesia 1950s-2000s in Nordholt, Henk Schulte dan Irwan Abdullah. (ed). 2002. Indonesia in Search of Transition. Pustaka Pelajar. Yogyakarta.
- Suebu, B. (2003). Otonomi Khusus Papua, Masalah dan Prospek. Article. Submitted in "study group" East-West Center Project on the Dynamics and Management of Internal Conflicts in Asia in Denpasar Bali on August 15, 2003.