

Elektronik Musyawarah Perencanaan

By Fierda Nurany

**ELEKTRONIK MUSYAWARAH PERENCANAAN
PEMBANGUNAAN (E-MUSRENBANG): SEBAGAI TEKNIK
GOVERNMENTALITY**

***ELECTRONIC SYSTEM FOR REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT
PLANNING FORUMS: GOVERNMENTALITY TECHNIQUE***

Fierda Nurany¹, Lutfia Nurul Hidayati²

¹Department of Public Administration, Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Universitas Bhayangkara
Surabaya

²Department of Public Administration, Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Universitas Wijaya Putera
email:fierdanurany@ubhara.ac.id

Abstrak

Tujuan dari penelitian ini adalah untuk mengetahui pemerintahan yang dilakukan oleh Pemerintah Kota Surabaya dalam melaksanakan Musyawarah Rencana Pembangunan secara elektronik. Hal ini didasarkan pada pelaksanaan pemerintahan kota Surabaya yang menyebabkan masyarakat menjadi apatis. Teori yang digunakan adalah teknik pemerintahan yang menjelaskan bahwa pemerintahan dibangun di atas tiga landasan, yaitu 1) Pemerintahan daerah, 2) masyarakat regulasi, dan 3) Pembentukan subjek. Metode penelitian menggunakan pendekatan kualitatif deskriptif. Metode pengumpulan data dilakukan melalui wawancara mendalam, data sekunder, dan observasi lapangan. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa teknik pemerintahan daerah dilakukan dengan paradigma pembangunan dimana masyarakat sebagai aktor utama pembangunan sehingga Musyawarah Rencana Pembangunan e-tingkat asosiasi warga dapat memutuskan usulan-usulan pembangunan. Teknik regulasi komunitas dibentuk melalui interaksi sosial antara perwakilan masyarakat dan kepala desa dalam membahas prioritas usulan perencanaan pembangunan. Sedangkan pembentukan mata pelajaran dilakukan oleh kepala desa dengan memberikan pengetahuan usulan agar usulan tersebut sesuai dengan roadmap pembangunan kota. Kesimpulannya, penyelenggaraan pemerintahan yang dilakukan oleh Pemerintah Kota Surabaya berdampak baik dan buruk bagi perencanaan pembangunan. Dampaknya baik, masyarakat menjadi lebih waspada terhadap usulan rencana pembangunan di kota surabaya, sedangkan dampak merugikan masyarakat apatis karena kecewa dengan usulan yang sering tidak disetujui.

Kata Kunci: Governmentality; E-musenbang; Surabaya

Abstract

The objectives of research were to find out the governmentality carried out by the Surabaya city government in implementing electronic system for Regional Development Planning Forum (Indonesian: *Musyawarah Perencanaan Pembangunan Elektronik* or *E-Musrenbang*). This was based on the Surabaya city government implementing governmentality that caused people to become apathetic. The theory used is the governmentality technique explaining that governmentality builds

on three bases: 1) Governmentalized localities, 2) regulatory communities, and 3) Subject formation. The research method was a descriptive qualitative approach. Data collection methods used were in-depth interviews, secondary data, and field observations. The results showed that the technique of governmentalized localities is carried out by means of a development paradigm that the community is the main actor of development so that E- Regional Development Planning Forum at citizen association level can decide on development proposals. Regulatory community techniques are formed through social interaction between community representatives and village head in discussing the priorities of development planning proposals. Meanwhile, the formation of subjects is carried out by the village head by giving knowledge proposals so that the proposals are in accordance with the city development roadmap. In conclusion, the governmentality carried out by the Surabaya city government has had a good and bad impact on development planning. The impact is good because the community becomes more aware of the proposed development planning in the city of Surabaya, while the adverse effect is related to the apathetic community because they are disappointed with their proposals which are often not approved.

Keywords: Governmentality; E-Regional Development Planning Forum; Surabaya

Introduction

Technology is a form of development. Even in this century, the use of technology is increasingly widespread throughout the world and all classes of society. Internet technology is now being used in various fields, in the fields of business, government, health, education and so forth. In governmental field, the use of internet technology is known as electronic government (e-government).

E-government is, according to Henman (2010), important because politicians use e-government as a medium to achieve a political vision. Politicians use e-government to show that they are modern, progressive and reformed, and that they (politicians) are ready with time and as leaders of change. Public administrators also see e-government as a vehicle to define themselves as modern administrators, in addition to efficiency and operational functions. Thus, e-government is new and current knowledge used widely by the political elites as a vehicle to maintain power.


As a result, communities use e-government obediently. Although the true development of technology and culture of the people, especially in Indonesia, is not ready to use e-government, this can be seen in the EGDI (E-Government Development Index) ranking based on the 2018 survey as follows:

Based on figure 1, the average EGDI in Indonesia in 2018 is still below that in the Southeast Asian region. Indonesia stands at 0.5258 while the EGDI average in the Southeast Asia region is 0.5555. Indonesia ranked 107th EGDI, up to 9th place compared to that in 2016 ranking 116th position. Indonesia's ranking is still far below other ASEAN countries such as Singapore, Malaysia, Brunei Darussalam, Thailand, Philippines, and Vietnam.

In 2009, the Surabaya City Development Planning Agency (*Indonesian: Badan Perencanaan Pembangunan Kota/Bappeko*) initiated the electronic system for Regional Development

Planning Forum or e-Regional Development Planning Forum. This e-Regional Development Planning Forum was created to help plan the development of Surabaya city which referring to Law No. 25 of 2004 concerning the national development planning system. E-Regional Development Planning Forum is innovation in the context of public policy to help the process of running the Regional Development Planning Forum to be more controlled, more participatory, accountable and transparent to the community. The e-Regional Development Planning Forum is carried out to build and to improve each and every region according to different needs. The proposal can be in the form of physical or non-physical proposals, later the impact of which can be felt by many people. There will be proposals submitted to Bappeko through online registration, which will be cross-checked annually. All proposals that have also been screened at each stage, of course, will be filtered again by Bappeko Surabaya.

Figure 1.
EGDI Level (E-Government Development Index) based on survey at 2018



Source : Dyah Puspito Dewi Widowati (2018)

Although e- Regional Development Planning Forum (Electronic Regional Development Planning Forum) is a breakthrough in the use of e-government it turns out that the application of e- Regional Development Planning Forum is still inseparable from some skeptics. Each of citizen associations has been given access to submit proposals directly to the e- Regional Development Planning Forum, but community meetings are still ongoing to determine what proposals will be included in the e- Regional Development Planning Forum. This implies that even though it has used 'e' in the Regional Development

Planning Forum, the process still uses the conventional Regional Development Planning Forum system. In addition, e-government in e-Regional Development Planning Forum is still limited, not to produce a complete virtual public space. E-Regional Development Planning Forum is only paperless but not more participatory. In the e-Regional Development Planning process, community participation has indeed increased as shown with the number of proposals because there is no limit in proposals but also has decreased in quantity due to the existence of budget ceiling provisions. This can be seen in table 1. In addition, the long process and the screening of proposals in the e-Regional Development Planning process resulted in the reluctance within community to prepare many proposals.

Table 1.

The total average of proposals in e-Regional Development Planning Forum in each sub-district at 2015-2018

No	Sub-District	No. of <i>Kelurahans</i>	Average				Total Average
			2015	2016	2017	2018	
1.	Asemrowo	3	10	30	22	29	91
2.	Benowo	4	20	17	14	40	91
3.	Bubutan	5	19	22	23	22	86
4.	Bulak	4	24	22	17	34	97
5.	Dukuh Pakis	4	11	19	22	16	68
6.	Gayungan	4	9	24	21	11	65
7.	Genteng	5	7	16	33	9	65
8.	Gubeng	6	12	24	18	16	70
9.	Gunung Anyar	4	13	35	25	32	105
10.	Jambangan	4	11	22	32	13	78
11.	Karang Pilang	4	21	19	31	17	88
12.	Kenjeran	4	13	29	23	29	94
13.	Krembangan	5	16	12	16	21	65
14.	Lakar Santri	6	7	23	17	16	63

15.	Mulyorejo	6	12	15	22	14	63
16.	Pabean Cantian	5	15	14	18	11	58
17.	Pakal	4	11	24	23	45	103
18.	Rungkut	6	19	27	27	32	105
19.	Sambikerep	4	12	20	18	10	60
20.	Sawahan	6	11	15	22	16	64
21.	Semampir	5	17	24	28	23	92
22.	Simokerto	5	13	9	20	18	60
23.	Sukolilo	7	8	20	17	19	64
24.	Sukomanunggal	6	14	16	16	14	60
25.	Tambaksari	8	15	21	23	15	75
26.	Tandes	6	14	16	23	18	71
27.	Tegalsari	5	16	18	20	11	65
28.	Tenggilis Mejoyo	4	7	20	22	17	66
29.	Wiyung	4	9	12	14	34	69
30.	Wonocolo	5	16	17	19	13	65
31.	Wonokromo	6	18	23	27	29	97

Source: (Bappeko, 2019)

Table 1 shows that the highest average number of proposals can be found in Gunung Anyar and Rungkut sub-districts while the smallest number of proposals in Wiyung District. Although Gununganyar has the highest number of proposals, the number of proposals has increased and decreased in three years. In 2015, there were only 13 proposals. Then it increased to 35 proposals in 2016 but subsequently decreased by 10 proposals in 2017. Thus, residents of Gununganyar sub-district submit many proposals reluctantly. It is in contrast to the case in Wiyung District, in which although the average number of proposals is the smallest, the number of proposals continues to increase every year.

The skepticism about the practice of e-Regional Development Planning Forum implies that the Surabaya City Government seems to 'force' the community to use e-Regional Development

Planning Forum because it does not want to be left behind in the digital arena. This is seen based on the practice of e-Regional Development Planning Forum which is not much different from conventional Regional Development Planning Forum. E-Regional Development Planning Forum still utilizes neighborhood-level meetings to determine any proposals then meetings at the political district administration level to determine the prioritized proposals. In addition, the existence of a budget ceiling limitation also makes it difficult for the community to determine prioritized proposals and even tend to occur. In other words, e-Regional Development Planning Forum is more utilized in paperless manner. Whereas the purpose of e-Regional Development Planning Forum is to propose the development online and to help the Development Planning process more participatory, transparent and accountable. Nevertheless, the community continues to use e-Development Planning Forum until today in development planning in accordance with the instructions of the Surabaya city government. Therefore, e-Regional Development Planning Forum is interesting to study by researchers from Foucault's governmentality perspective. The purpose of this research is to find out the implementation of e-Regional Development Planning Forum in the governmentality viewpoint.

Methods

This research used a descriptive qualitative approach. Thirty informants were employed, coming from 4 *kelurahans* (political districts administered by a Village Head) in Gunung anyar sub-district consisting of government officials, community leaders, and local residents. Methods of collecting data used were in-depth interviews, secondary data, and field observations. To analyze the data, the author used Miles, Huberman, and Saldana's (2014) interactive analysis consisting of four activity lines: data collection, data reduction, data presentation, and conclusion.

Result and Discussion

The implementation e-government in E-Regional Development Planning Forum in Surabaya City

E-government is the use of information and communication technology in government transformation, primarily aimed at increasing accessibility, effectiveness and responsibility. This is based on the dissemination of information and the development of informative policies. E-government is to increase citizen participation and the development of citizens who influence actively the democratic mechanisms. In short, e-government is more commonly used to show certain modes of government administration aiming to increase citizen participation and to influence democratic systems Spirakis, Spiraki, and Nikolopoulos (2010). Thus, the importance of e-government includes 1) encouraging governance that is responsive to people's needs and aspirations; 2) encouraging the utilization of information disclosure; and 3) encouraging the level of public participation in the governance system.

In the Servitude research (Panganiban (2019) entitled E-governance in agriculture: digital tools enable Filipino farmers utilizing e-government more effectively to improve the current medium of communication between farmers and government. E-learning is a very useful resource to farmers or even ordinary citizens to learn farming techniques at their own pace and level. Furthermore, social media platforms have also emerged as promising alternatives to information dissemination especially during emergencies such as natural disasters or pest/disease outbreaks. Also, it offers other channels for the government to receive and to respond to feedback from citizens. Thus, farmers can now be considered as partners in development because they are the ones who must know and manage information affecting them.

E-Regional Development Planning Forum is to build a Bottom-Up planning. Because of planning from below, the community is the subject of development. The implementation of E-Regional Development Planning Forum in the Surabaya city has been running since 2009 with village-based system. Proposals from residents through the heads of citizen association and neighborhood association were sent to the *kelurahan* to be included into the e-Regional Development Planning Forum website by the staff of *kelurahan* later. Since 2012, the *kelurahan*-based e-Regional Development Planning Forum was later changed into citizen association –based one. Thus, the chairman of citizen association has the obligation to include the proposed development plan by utilizing the citizen association's username and password given. In addition, with citizen association-based communities, they can directly monitor the progress or progress of each proposal submitted by the community through the e-Regional Development Planning Forum website.

Normatively, the implementation of e-government in e-Regional Development Planning Forum starts with citizen association that includes proposals into the e-Regional Development Planning Forum website. Before the inclusion, the proposals should have been approved by the heads of neighborhood associations through community meetings. After all proposals have been submitted by the heads of citizen association, the next step is to hold a Regional Development Planning Forum at the *kelurahan* level. The Regional Development Planning Forum the *kelurahan* level was attended by the heads of citizen association heads in each of *kelurahans* in Gunung anyar Sub-District and community leaders who were the leaders of groups in each of *kelurahan*, like PKK (Family Empowerment Program), youth, farmer groups and so on. In Regional Development Planning Forum at *kelurahan*, all proposals having been included into the website are re-discussed and verified with the village head as a facilitator who provides space and other needs. After agreeing with jointly agreed proposals, the next step is to hold a Development

Planning Forum at the sub-district level. At this stage, what happens is the process of verifying proposal conducted by the sub-district.

With the existence of e-Development Planning Forum technology, the Gununganyar sub-district community can convey problems, propose and control the course of the Development Planning Forum more discretionarily. This community's convenience and discretion in providing proposals through the e-Regional Development Planning Forum website has encouraged the community to participate more actively. This can be seen from the increase in the number of proposals submitted by the Gununganyar sub-district, 139 proposals in 2017, or 35 proposals on average. As such, e-Regional Development Planning Forum is in line with the objectives of e-government. That e-Regional Development Planning Forum has encouraged community participation in development planning.


Figure 2.
E-Regional Development Planning Forum of Surabaya, 2019



Source: (Bappeko, 2019)

In the implementation of e-government, Layne, K., & Lee (2001) divided the implementation of E-Government into 4 steps: Firstly, the step of catalog is to create a website, making government information and services online. Secondly, the Transaction step is a step that the community interacts with the government electronically. Thirdly, the Vertical step is to focus on integration found on several levels. Fourthly, horizontal integration step is to focus on the integration of government services for various functions both horizontally and vertically.

Figure 3.
Step of e-government



Source : Layne, K., & Lee (2001)

In Gunung anyar sub-district there are 29 citizen associations and 182 neighborhood associations. In its process, e-Regional Development Planning Forum began with community consultations at the neighborhood association level. In the meeting, the chairman of neighborhood association gathered his citizens to discuss issues to be proposed urgently in the development process. Usually, citizen input is accommodated through informal meetings or also through social media from residents to the head of neighborhood associations, and the proposal is used as material for the citizen association meeting.

After the meeting at the neighborhood association level, the citizens association had an obligation to hold a meeting at the citizen association level. In the meetings at the citizen association level, arguments tended to occur in the process of determining prioritized proposals. Representatives of neighborhood association submitted proposals to be included into the proposed development plan. At this stage, the village head is the mediator whose task is to be mediator when an argument does not reach the meeting point. After reaching an agreement at the citizen association level, the leader of citizen associations immediately submitted a proposal on the e-Regional Development Planning Forum website in Surabaya.

So, the implementation of e-government in e-Regional Development Planning Forum is still at the transaction stage, the steps by which the community interacts with the government electronically. Interactions occurring can be seen from the community through citizens association uploading the development proposals and then the Surabaya city

government verifying the proposal by approving or declining the proposals. Even when they are declined, the Surabaya city government would explain why the proposals are declined. The community can also provide feedback on verification or proposals on the e-Regional Development Planning Forum website.

Actually the internet, according to Supelli (2010), allows people not only to see the world but also to inhabit and act in it. From this view, virtual communities and virtual spaces also appear to represent physical spaces. Meanwhile, Heim (1994) argues that in the virtual world, people immerse themselves in an interactive environment built by computers. Heim believes that late cyberspace is no longer distinguished from the real world. However, Heim's opinion does not necessarily become relevant when compared with the implementation of the e-Regional Development Planning Forum. Because, in the e-Regional Development Planning Forum of the city of Surabaya, the virtual world is still limited to being positioned as a media that bridges physical activities preexisting and giving rise to several consequences (e.g. excessive use of paper, low level of participation, non-transparency and length of time needed to communicate various aspirations).

Thus, the implementation of the e-government in e-Regional Development Planning Forum is still limited to the interaction between the community and the government. E-government in the implementation of e-Regional Development Planning Forum is still limited to reducing excessive use of paper and so as not to lag behind the digital arena. However, with e-government in e-Regional Development Planning Forum, the level of community participation has been higher than before.

The implementation of e-Regional Development Planning Forum in Foucault's Governmentality Perspective

E-Regional Development Planning Forum is an online-based development planning process with the community making entries into the e-Regional Development Planning Forum website. This is intended to provide certainty to the citizens of the proposed development plan. The advantages of e-Regional Development Planning Forum are that from the beginning the community has the opportunity to conduct deliberations and to reach consensus on the prioritized development proposals for citizen association and neighborhood association environments. The community is also given the authority to choose the priority of development proposals that are really very necessary to its citizens. Through the e-Regional Development Planning Forum website, the community can monitor the extent to which the development proposals have been included into the e-Regional Development Planning Forum, and if they are declined, they can find out the reasons.

Through e-Regional Development Planning Forum, the community thinks that the development proposals submitted to the Surabaya City Government were valued and

responded to, even though they were adjusted to the integrated system of the activities of the local government organizations (OPD). It can be seen from table 1 that there are 130 proposals approved in Gunung Anyar Subdistrict. The most proposals are found in *Kelurahan* Gunung Anyar. Meanwhile, the smallest urban village that filed was the *Kelurahan* Rungkut Menanggal.

Table 2.

The number of proposals in sub-district of Gunung anyar 2018

No	<i>Kelurahans</i>	Number of proposals approved
.		
1.	Gunung Anyar	56
2.	Gunung Anyar Tambak	39
3.	Rungkut Tengah	21
4.	Rungkut Menanggal	14
	Total	130

Source : (Bappeko, 2019)

Based on the results of the research, it can be concluded that in the implementation of e-Regional Development Planning Forum there is a budget ceiling of 1 billion to 1.5 billion rupiahs per village in accordance with the number of population and the area of discharge due to Surabaya City's Limited Budget. This causes many development proposals equally urgent cannot be proposed because of the limited budget ceiling. However, for development between sub-districts or between *kelurahans* and its macro nature, it directly goes into the planning of the Surabaya city government, such as repairing road, making box culvert channels starting from the village to the primary channel.

In addition, from interviews with community leaders and residents in Gununganyar sub-district, it can be summarized that most of them want to participate in conveying their aspirations of the proposed development. The proposal is, on average, related to physical development such as repairing paving roads, widening the channel, building the citizen association hall and gate, repairing mosques and constructing sport fields. However, there are proposals that should not be proposed such as channel proposals. This is because the channel construction must be stimulant and interconnected between village channels and tertiary, secondary and primary channels. It is not permissible to construct a channel partially. Therefore, the channel development process will be carried out by the Surabaya city government by building a primary channel first, a secondary channel, and then a new

tertiary channel of the village channel so that the channel will be connected directly from the village to the sea.

In addition to channels not permitted to be proposed, the construction of citizen association gates and halls is also not permitted. This is because the gate is only monumental and it does not benefit the public interest. Meanwhile, the citizen association office is considered as not urgent. The Surabaya city government focuses more on public facilities like roads, canals and other facilities such as sports fields, reading corner useful to improve the skills and quality of community resources. The limitation of proposals specified by the Surabaya city government regarding the types of proposals that can or cannot be submitted through e-Regional Development Planning Forum and some arguments submitted imply the existence of coercive proposal priority determination.

This phenomenon is, according to Foucault (1991), referred to as governmentality. Governmentality is a method or methods of 'governing of men'. Governmentality aims to uncover the mask of power by showing the hidden goals of the discourse of knowledge. Governmentality is the best way to explain the governing relationship of the self (subject) to the others (politics and state/sovereignty).


The concept of Governmentality is not always hierarchical or top-down, or with a clear command line. Power is actually created through consensus but not as understood by the theoretical social contract where each person feels responsible and takes part in the game. Foucault actually wants to say about micro power ideology, the power that is subtle and "compelling" every subject to take an ethical attitude from every discourse of knowledge and power, becomes a fellow discourse of power. Within this framework, according to Kelly (2009), power is understood more as games of strategy. Thus, governmentality is a political strategy aiming to form a new space where power can be practiced. In relation to government and community relations, there are three governmentality technologies built by Foucault (1991):

1. Governmentalized localities, namely the establishment of a new decision making center at the local level to represent the relationship between the state and locality.
2. Regulatory communities, namely new spaces in the locality where social interaction takes shape.
3. The Making subjects, namely the formation of individual entities to have a new way of thinking and acting in relation to the domain controlled by the state.

The three techniques above are used by the state to control its citizens

Figure 4.

Triangle Technology Governmentality



Source : Foucault (1991)

In a research by Boelens, R., Hoogesteger, J., & Baud (2015) entitled Water reform governmentality in Ecuador: Neoliberalism, centralization, and the restraining of polycentric authority and community rulemaking that government regulation in water management in Ecuador is fundamentally reproducing existing practices. The point of the difference is that, instead of relying on a bazaar model, he sought to build a cathedral model centered on an authoritarian (and hybrid) country to collectively engage water users and society in general. Residents try to create new water management practices but the government regulates water management with a cathedral model. The government which has more legitimacy applies the interest to the citizens in managing water.

Described in the governmentality technology triangle, it can be explained that sovereignty in development planning means that the community serve as the main actor of development. The government no longer serves as a provider and an executor but as a facilitator and a catalyst for the dynamics of development, so that from planning to implementation, the community has the right to be involved, to provide input, and to make decisions in development. Then government management/biopower is carried out through 1) governmentalized localities through citizen representatives by developing a development plan proposal at the citizen association level, and 2) regulatory community through social interaction between representatives of the community and the village heads in determining proposals that can or cannot be submitted to e-Regional Development Planning Forum. Meanwhile, the Surabaya city government disciplines with making subjects through limiting proposals focusing on public road facilities, training, and resource skills, and building parks and facilities for kindergarten.

Table 3.

E-Regional Development Planning Forum implementation Surabaya city in
 Perspective of Governmentality Foucault

Governmentalized Localities	Regulatory Community	The Making Subject
<p>The community at the Citizen Association (RW) level as the new center has the right to be involved, to prepare proposals and to make decisions regarding development planning. This is due to the current development paradigm positioning people as the main actors of development.</p>	<p>In the implementation of e-Regional Development Planning Forum, there was a new space involving community leaders, religious leaders, representatives of women, youth representatives or youth organizations, citizen association representatives attended by the Management of Village Community Empowerment Institutions (LPMK), Noncommissioned law enforcement officer posted in the village (<i>Bintara Pembina Desai</i> or Babinsa), Community Police Officer (<i>Bhayangkara Pembina Keamanan dan Ketertiban Masyarakat</i> or Babin Kamtibmas) led by the <i>kelurahan</i> from the research conducted, a number of citizen representatives, although not all of them, tended to distrust the credibility of the village head in Gungunganyar sub-district. The head of the RW 8 in Kelurahan Gununganyar considers that the local village head often serves as an excessive mediator by encouraging the proposals submitted not to be proposed for physical development with an excuse that the budget of 1 billion rupiahs can be enjoyed by all citizens association. The same thing was done by the Head of Kelurahan Rungkut Tengah in a meeting of citizens discussing development proposals that often</p>	<p>Representatives of the citizens involved in the process of prioritizing proposals also neither make coercion nor feel being compelled, whether or not to submit a proposal. Conversely, there are quite sharp differences of opinion and arguments; they will accelerate healthily even though sometimes the debate is quite fierce. Some of the residents' representatives often objected because their proposals were declined or could not be accommodated. However, there is always a rational explanation from the village head, so that in the end the representatives of residents can accept the explanation. As stated by the head of citizens association 4, Kelurahan Rungkut Tengah, that the efforts to share understanding were realized when the proposal was rejected. That is, in this process, there is the formation of individual entities to have a new way of thinking and acting, namely through the process of exchanging knowledge between the village heads.</p>

encouraged proposals to be submitted as much as possible compared with the proposals were physical development in nature. However, the argument was raised not because of the available budget ceiling but to avoid the jealousy that could trigger conflict in the community.

Source: processed by researchers

Thus, the power tactic in the governmentality perspective on the implementation of e-Regional Development Planning Forum in Surabaya is e-Regional Development Planning Forum based on citizens association in Gununganyar District. In addition, another tactic is the limitation of proposals specified by the Surabaya city government adapting to the integrated system of activities of local government organizations. Therefore, the heads of village and the governor of Surabaya city government encouraged the community to propose the appropriate ceiling and city development roadmap so that all proposals could be approved by the Surabaya city government.

Conclusion

E-government is a government activity using information and communication technology to make public services better for the community. However, in the implementation of e-Regional Development Planning Forum, e-government is still limited to the interaction between the community and the government. E-government in the implementation of e-Regional Development Planning Forum is still limited to reducing excessive use of paper and so as not to lag behind the digital arena. Nevertheless, e-government has become a political vehicle for the government. As a result, the public must inevitably utilize e-government for urban development planning.

In the governmentality perspective, the implementation of e-Regional Development Planning Forum in Surabaya city has changed from *kelurahan*-based e-Regional Development Planning Forum to RW-based e-Regional Development Planning Forum. This research was conducted on e-Regional Development Planning Forum implemented in Gunung anyar District. Government management/biopower is carried out through 1) governmentalized localities through citizen representatives by making citizens association development plan proposals, and 2) regulatory community through social interaction between representatives of the community and the village head in determining proposals that can or cannot be submitted to e-Regional Development Planning Forum. Meanwhile, the Surabaya city government disciplines with making subjects through limiting proposals focusing on public road facilities, training, and resource skills, building parks and facilities for kindergarten / PAUD. Even though e-government in e-Regional Development Planning Forum shows transparency and accountability, in reality the community cannot yet propose development planning discretionarily. This has a negative impact because the

community became apathetic to propose a development planning for Surabaya city. But it also has a good impact, that is, the community will understand better the direction of Surabaya's city development.

References

- Bappeko. (2019). *Musrenbang* 2019. <https://bappeko.surabaya.go.id/musrenbang2019/index.php>
- Boelens, R., Hoogesteger, J., & Baud, M. (2015). Water reform governmentality in Ecuador: Neoliberalism, centralization, and the restraining of polycentric authority and community rule-making. *Geoforum*, 64, 281–291.
- Dyah Puspito Dewi Widowati. (2018). *Survei PBB 2018: Peringkat E-Government Indonesia*. <https://bpptik.kominfo.go.id/2018/08/23/5938/survei-pbb-2018-peringkat-e-government-indonesia/>
- Foucault, M. (1991). *Governmentality*. In *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality with Two Lectures by and an Interview with Michel Foucault* (and P. M. edited by G. Burchell, C. Gordon (ed.)). Chicago University Press.
- Henman, P. (2010). Governing Electronically; E-government and the Reconfiguration of Public Administration, Policy and Power. In *Palgrave Macmillan*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kelly, M. . (2009). *The Political Philosophy of Michael Foucault*. Routledge.
- Layne, K., & Lee, J. (2001). Developing Fully Functional e-Government: A Four Stage Model. *Government Information Quarterly*, 18(2), 122–136.
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldana, J. (2014). Qualitative data analysis: A method sourcebook. *CA, US: Sage Publications*.
- Panganiban, G. G. F. (2019). E-governance in agriculture: digital tools enabling Filipino farmers. *Journal of Asian Public Policy*, 12(1), 51–70. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17516234.2018.1499479>
- Spirakis, G., Spiraki, C., & Nikolopoulos, K. (2010). The impact of electronic government on democracy: e-democracy through e-participation. *Electronic Government, an International Journal*, 7(1), 75. <https://doi.org/10.1504/EG.2010.029892>

Elektronik Musyawarah Perencanaan

ORIGINALITY REPORT

0%

SIMILARITY INDEX

PRIMARY SOURCES

EXCLUDE QUOTES ON

EXCLUDE MATCHES OFF

EXCLUDE BIBLIOGRAPHY ON