

Policy Recommendations on the Implementation of Village Autonomy in Deli Serdang Regency

Mohammad Ridwan Rangkuti and Nicholas Marpaung

*Department of Business Administration, Faculty of Social and Political Science, Universitas Sumatera Utara,
Jalan Dr, Mansyur, Medan, Indonesia*

Keywords: Village Autonomy, Village Head, BPD, District, Regency, Abuse of Village Funds, Policy Recommendations.

Abstract : This study was conducted in Deli Serdang Regency, with the aim of obtaining appropriate and useful recommendations in the use of Village Funds in the context of implementing Village Autonomy, specifically in Deli Serdang Regency. Using qualitative descriptive methods, data collection is done through interviews and discussions with the Village Head/Village Official, BPD, and Village Community Leaders. Data collection also uses the study of literature, documents and observations. The results of the study are as follows: 1. There is a strong indication of abuse of the Village Fund in Deli Serdang Regency. The old patterns, project fees, the administrative violations, 2. Abuse of Village Funds has taken place since the Planning, Disbursement, Implementation, and Accountability Report (LPJ), 3. Abuse of Village Funds due to economic, socio-cultural and policy reasons, 4. Abuse of Village Funds has had an impact on Village Autonomy, both Village Infrastructure, Village Public Services, and Village Economy. The results of this study provide recommendations to prevent administrative violations in the use of Village Funds. Also, the need for a revision of the Permendes PDPTT on Prioritization of Village Funds.

1 INTRODUCTION

This study aims to analyze the continued impact of the indications of some initial findings in a study conducted in 2017 ago. This study is related to the implementation of Law No. 6 of 2014 concerning Villages in Deli Serdang Regency. It is also expected to provide new policy recommendations and in accordance with the needs of the Village Government and Deli Serdang Regency Government in particular, and village government and regency government in Indonesia in general.

Based on the results of Ridwan and Husnul's) research (2017) on the Implementation of Village Autonomy in Deli Serdang Regency, there are several important findings in the implementation of Village Autonomy: First, there are horizontal and vertical conflicts in the Village. Horizontally, there is a conflict of authority between neighboring villages, especially in the village boundary area. Meanwhile, vertically, there is a conflict of authority between the village and the regency in the village area. Like, the management of traditional markets, village tourism area. Also, the conflict between the village

government and the community in general, specifically related to land acquisition (ex HGU PTPN) by a number of parties (companies). Second, the problem of the number and quality of village officials. Village financial management requires a good quality Village apparatus. Most of the villages in Deli Serdang Regency do not yet have a village apparatus that is able to develop initiatives and breakthroughs to create quality village programs. Village officials must learn a lot about managing village development planning and managing village funds. Besides, quality problems, Villages in Deli Serdang Regency still lack personnel. Village Apparatus which so far only amounted to 8 people. This much personnel is still lacking. Existing village officials often feel overwhelmed in carrying out their main tasks and functions. Third, the emergence of Village Fund corruption cases. In 2015, Saentis Village, Percut Sei Tuan District received a Village Fund of Rp 2.5 billion. Meanwhile, Mbelin Village, Namorambe District only received Rp. 548 million. Each village in Deli Serdang District receives Village Funds from three sources: APBN, Village Fund Allocation (ADD), and PADes. Village Funds

sourced from The APBN is transferred to the Village through the Village account book, and entered into the APBDes. Cases of corruption related to the Village Fund also occurred in Deli Serdang Regency. Some cases are still being investigated by the police. Some other cases have even reached the Court's verdict. These corruption cases start from falsifying signatures, implementing fictitious projects, and fictitious accountability reports. These corruption cases involved the Village Head and BPD members.

The above findings are an early indication of the many problems in the implementation of Village Autonomy in Deli Serdang Regency. Some of these indications need to be further elaborated through a more in-depth and ongoing study. Thus, the results of this follow-up research can benefit the emergence of new policy recommendations and that are more relevant to the needs of the Village Government and Deli Serdang Regency Government in particular, and generally in Indonesia.

2 RESEARCH METHODS

This study was conducted in Deli Serdang Regency, North Sumatra Province. The method used was descriptive qualitative. Data collection methods used are in-depth interviews, discussions with Village Heads/Village apparatus, Village Consultative Body (BPD), and Village community leaders. In addition, the data collection method also use literature, documents and observations. The data analysis method used were a qualitative data analysis technique.

3 ABUSE OF VILLAGE FUNDS: POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on online reporting the results of discussions and in-depth interviews with a number of informants from the Village Head/Village Apparatus, BPD, as well as community leaders in Deli Serdang Regency, obtained the following results; first, there are strong indications of abuse of Village Funds in Deli Serdang Regency. The involvement of Village heads/Village officials in conventional abuse of Village Funds is usually in the form of fictitious projects. In addition, the misuse of the Village Fund is also in the form of a project fee, in which the Village Head submits the implementation of work to a third party. and, abuse of the Village Fund is an administrative violation. Where

the village head is required to return the project money to the village treasury. In addition to the three types of abuse of the Village Fund, some are included in the category of Village government administrative service cases. Like, the management of village documents/documents. Legal cases involving village letter/document management are usually through sting operation (OTT) by the Police. The police conduct OTT to the village head/village official who receives money from someone who manages the documents/documents at the village head's office. Even though the amount is only a small amount, Rp. 20,000, for example. The village head/village official is at risk of being subject to OTT by the police. The administration of village administration documents/documents should not need to have illegal levies, because there is an allocation of Village Funds for village public services such as the management of village documents/documents. Abuse of Village Funds is related to procedures for implementing projects that are not in accordance with SOP. The Village Head hands over the implementation of the project to a third party. The Village Head gets a fee of a percentage of the project value. In terms of compliance with the SOP, project implementation is through the formation of the TPK (Implementor Team). The TPK is chaired by the Heads of Village Affairs, Development Unit, Government Unit, and Finance Unit. Meanwhile, the Village Secretary as the Program Manager. And the Village Head performs the function project supervision. Submission of the project to a third party or consultant has actually begun since the planning of the project, namely the preparation of the RAPBDes. Consultant who prepared RAPBDes. Next, the planning consultant who carried out the project. The Village Head considers the Consultant to be a party who understands the project. The consultant has a certificate of expertise. If there are problems in planning and implementing the project, the Consultant will be responsible. Meanwhile, misuse of Village Funds falls into the category of administrative errors, as can be seen from the existence of public complaints to the Deli Serdang Regency Inspectorate for alleged abuse of Village Funds by a number of Village Heads in Deli Serdang Regency. Deli Serdang Regency Inspectorate assessed that several Village Heads had committed administrative violations and were required to carry out compensation claims. The village head is required to return Rp. 100 million more. The money returned goes to the Village Treasury. According to the Head of Deli Serdang Regency Inspectorate, many Village Heads lacked understanding of the use of Village Funds. Example of

RAP drainage budgeted with a cost of 20 cm thickness. However, it was only carried out 15 cm.

The weakness of the Village Head in understanding the management of the Village Fund should be overcome by the presence of Village Facilitators. Where the Village Facilitator by the Kemendes (Ministry of Villages) functions as a village facilitator or village head in managing village funds. So that the management of the Village Fund can run effectively and efficiently. However, as acknowledged by a Village Head in Deli Serdang Regency, the Village Assistant only prepared a Report. And, often even the Village Companion Report is prepared by the Village Head.

"The village facilitator is finally only a report administrator. We make their reports. So, they were not involved in dynamics of the village government. This homework is also the same as the Ministry of Villages. If in this Patumbak, sometimes they come once a month asking for the signature of the Village Head to make a report. He asked their work reports from time to time to ask for APBDes and realization reports. But, dynamic process is zero. We walk behind them, behind this. If we wait, it won't work. Yes, we will just walk. He wants to come along too, okay? We hope this assistant (village) will want to interact with the community. In BUMDes, for example, he participated in dynamic BUMDes. There are obstacles he can find a solution. His name is Village Companion. This was not created. He sometimes becomes an administrator, becomes an instructor, just become a Report Collector". (Interview with Head of Marendal 2 Village, Patumbak District, Deli Serdang Regency, July 11, 2019)

In the midst of the still large number of Village Heads/Village Officials and BPD who do not understand the process of using the Village Fund, it is necessary to compile a training module book and a practical guide on managing the Village Fund. The books are arranged in a simple way so that they are easily understood and understood by the Village Head/Village Apparatus and BPD.

Second, the abuse of Village Funds is believed to be strong in all Village Fund management processes. Starting from the Planning, Disbursement, Implementation, and Liability Report (LPJ) stages. Planning is the stage of discussion and ratification of the RAPBDes. BPD Namo Tualang Village, Biru-Biru District, Deli Serdang Regency, believes that there is a strong indication that abuse of Village Funds takes place at all stages of the project activities. Starting from the planning, disbursement, implementation, and the Liability Report (LPJ).

"There is a possibility at the planning stage. Because, in the framework of the Village Fund planning process the determination of development objects in the Village Fund in the initial stages is based on consultation with the community plus the BPD along with the elements of the community in the Village, there is a high probability that there will be nuances of interest in the development process or the determination of development objects that are exist in the village by parties who may have an interest in development. Say, for example, roads or irrigation that may indeed be in contact with individual interests. In disbursement stage. This corruption gap might later relate to the authority of the Sub-district parties. Disbursement directly to the village account. It's just that there might be an unwritten rule that part of the Deli Serdang Regency or District has been prepared. For example, in the form of evaluating financial statements or accountability reports for village heads. So, in the mechanism of the accountability report, usually the Village collects its LPJ to the District to be corrected. The term corrected may be the costs later there. So, maybe the abuse of authority at the District level. If the project is implemented, it certainly happens. Because, community involvement might also be minimized. Price of ingredients. So, there are all kinds of things. Not to mention the workforce that may not be in accordance with the process in the field. For example, say building a 1 KM village road, in the RAB they have manipulated in quotation marks the number of workers in the implementation process. In the RAB they could have made 20 people, but the actual realization in the field was 10 people. In terms of materials in terms of price maybe not. But, if the amount is biased too. For example, cement should have been made for 25. Maybe, the indicative models might be there". (Interview with BPD Namo Tualang Village, Biru-Biru District, Deli Serdang Regency, July 18, 2019)

Third, abuse of Village Funds has had an impact on the implementation of Village Autonomy. Both in the field of public services, village infrastructure, village economy, and the environment of the village. Village Infrastructure. For example, village roads, village bridges, village irrigation channels (tertiary channels), etc. Poor village infrastructure will affect the village economy. The flow of transportation from villages to other villages, or from villages to cities has been disrupted. The Village Fund has had an impact on the implementation of Village Autonomy. Village infrastructure is disrupted. Such as, village roads, village bridges, village irrigation (tertiary irrigation), etc. As a result, transportation of villages to cities or other villages has been disrupted. The village economy is hampered due to poor village infrastructure. In addition, the misuse of village funds

has disrupted village public services. Village offices cannot be repaired, if possible they cannot be built new. Including, replacement of stationery and furniture office Village. In addition to the aforementioned objectives, the Village Fund is expected to improve the community's economy through the establishment of BUMDes. Where BUMDes can facilitate farmers' products to be sold in villages or cities. However, with the misuse of the BUMDes Village Fund it cannot run optimally. As a result, the production of farmers, especially during the harvest season, the price dropped sharply.

Sampali Village Secretary, Percut Sei Tuan District, Deli Serdang Regency, acknowledged that the impact of abuse of Village Funds was quite large. Both in the fields of infrastructure, public services, and community empowerment. And all fields are related to one another.

"The impact of corruption is huge. ... I see interlocking. For example, corruption occurs in infrastructure. That is, the infrastructure is hampered, public services are hampered, community empowerment is also unused. Because, the concept of this Government in the implementation of the Village Fund, the implementation of activities carried out by the community. Hence, there arose jobs for the community. So, if there is corruption the connection is wide. Empowering people, the infrastructure is not working, public services are disrupted". (Interview with Sampali Village Secretary, Percut Sei Tuan District, Deli Serdang Regency, July 16, 2019)

Fourth, abuse of Village Funds is caused by various reasons. Like, Economy, Culture, and Policy. The reason for the policy relates to the existence of the District and Regency authority in the guidance and supervision (binwas) in the management of the Village Fund. This authority is vulnerable to abuse by the District and Regency. The policy regulated through this Bupati Regulation is an implementation provision of Permendes PD TT No. 19 of 2017. This Permendes PD TT is inconsistent, and even contradicts Law No. 23 on Regional Government, and Law No. 6 of 2014 concerning Villages. Thus, this Permendes PD TT can hamper the achievement of Village Autonomy. Socio-cultural reasons refer to the custom of the Village Head/Village Apparatus to abuse Village Funds. The Village Head considers it normal to receive fee from a project. And the community was permissive towards the attitude of the Village Head. Because, indeed everywhere an ordinary official receives a project fee. Meanwhile, economic reasons are always associated with the receipt and expenditure of the Village Head. Village Head's income of Rp. 3,600,000 per month. Village

Chief has a lot of expenses. The Village Head is considered a prestigious position, but earning a little is spending a lot. Starting from spending when participating in the Village Head Election (Pilkades) to spending when elected as Village Head. The number of reception invitations that must be attended every week. NGOs, mass organizations (mass organizations), journalists who always come to the Village Office asking for help.

Specifically about journalists who always come to the Village Office, causing the village public services to be disrupted. The service hours are reduced, because the Village Office is only open until midday. The Chairman of PAC NU of Tanjung Morawa District revealed the village head's complaint, which was always visited by unscrupulous journalists. Reporters almost every day come to the Village Office. As a result, village heads rarely enter village government offices. Public services are limited to 12 noon.

"The village head talked to me as if the Village Fund indeed had to be spent on everything. For example, reporters. That's why the leak started from there. Almost all of the village heads in Tanjung Morawa. It is rarely the village head in his office. Why? Because, being visited by reporters continued to get dizzy. Public service until twelve o'clock. The reason is because it can't stand it. Indeed, reporters many times. Reporters without newspapers, reporters are shitty." (Interview with Chairman of PAC NU, Tanjung Morawa District, Deli Serdang Regency, July 19, 2019)

Seeing the minimum income of a village head, only Rp 3,600,000,-, this includes Rp 600,000,- occupational benefits, the government had a chance to increase the Village Head's income to the level of ASN group II. The government has prepared PP (Government Regulation). BPD Namo Tualang, Biru-Biru District, suggested that to address the problem of the minimum salary of a Village Head, the salary of the Village Head should be based on economic values prevailing in their respective Regions.

"In terms of the revenue of the Village Government Apparatus. Here that can indeed also be a gap. This means, because it is possible that the salary of the Village Head is only how much, in fact this is the one who should go forward to be re-evaluated. That is, referring to the level of economic needs because in each region it is different. It is not impossible that the village head's salary is based on economic values in his respective regions. For example, in villages in East Java or in Yogya, for example, the culture is indeed cheap compared to Pekanbaru. This is so far the difference and not enough. So, this should be standardized based on economic values in the midst of society." (Interview with BPD Namo

Tualang Village, Biru-Biru District, Deli Serdang Regency, July 18, 2019)

Furthermore, in terms of policy. There is a policy that implicitly gives room to abuse the Village Fund. Policies can be in the form of Laws, PP, Ministerial Regulations (Permen), Regional Government Regulations (Perda), or Regents' Regulations (Perbup). BPD Namo Tualang, Biru-Biru District, Deli Serdang Regency, revealed that Deli Serdang Regents' Regulations (Perbup) are vulnerable to abuse by the District authorities. Where the District has the authority to examine the Village Head's Accountability Report (LPJ). This Perbup is the operational guidelines (Petunjuk Pelaksanaan) and Technical Guidelines (Petunjuk Teknis) for the examination of Village Head LPJ.

"In terms of regulations, it's likely rather difficult for us to prove it. For example, there was a policy from the Bupati in order to make uniform corrections to the Village Head's accountability report at the end of the year through the Kecamatan before being sent to the Regency. As if this is a good goal, but it could be an opportunity/opportunity the District parties to take the power of abuse his authority. So as well as possible in the process of policy regulation, both at the Regency and Ministry level, the indicators should be clearer, more concrete in the future. In particular, it is indeed the BPD in this case who conducts supervision more endeavored to have the ability and understanding of what forms of prevention. So, the mentality of the BPD and the Village Government Apparatus must indeed be addressed." (Interview with BPD Namo Tualang Village, Biru-Biru District, Deli Serdang Regency, July 18, 2019)

Deli Serdang Regency Regents' (Peraturan Bupati (Perbup)), as stated by BPD Namo Tualang, refer to: Deli Serdang Regent Regulation No.254 of 2017; Deli Serdang Regent Regulation No. 004 2018; Deli Serdang Regent Regulation No. 005 of 2018. This Regent Regulation (Perbup) is actually an implementation provision of the Minister of Village Regulation and PDTT No. 19 of 2017 concerning Determination of Village Fund Priorities, Monitoring Mechanisms, Guidance, Reporting, and Community Participation in Village Funds. Specifically in Chapters V, VI, and VII regulates the Guidance and Supervision, Reporting, and Community Participation. According to the PDTT Permendes, Villages are required to report prioritization of the use of Village Funds to the Regent. Documents attached, such as: Village Regulation (Perdes) concerning Village Authority, Village RKP, and APBDes. Also, documents on the Report on the Realization of the Use of Village Funds. The Regency Government fosters and oversees the determination of priorities for

the use of the Village budget. To carry out the fostering and supervision functions, the Regional Government provides assistance and facilitation carried out by the Village Administration Organization (OPD). In the context of fostering and supervising, the Regent conducts monitoring and evaluation of the Village Fund. The monitoring and evaluation of Village Funds can be delegated to the District Government OPD. Meanwhile, the Camat conducts training and supervision in setting priorities for the use of Village Funds through the preparation of participatory development plans and village community empowerment programs. The Village Government and BPD carry out the task of monitoring and evaluating the use of Village Funds discussed in the Village Conference (Musdes), in accordance with the format of the Village Periodic Report. Furthermore, the results of monitoring and evaluation are carried out by the District Government OPD and submitted to the Regent. Permendes PDTT that give the authority to the Camat in carrying out the fostering and supervision functions (binwas) to the Village in the use of Village Funds, are actually contrary to Law No. 23 of 2014 concerning Regional Government, and Law No. 6 of 2014 concerning Villages. According to Law No. 23 on Regional Government, the position of the District is OPD, where the Camat is the Chairperson of OPD. The Sub-district is no longer positioned as a regional apparatus, but rather is a Regional District apparatus. Similar to other DPOs in the Regency Government. Therefore, the relationship between Kecamatan and Desa is no longer a deconcentrated relationship. Therefore, the Camat does not have supervision and guidance authority. The position of the District as an apparatus of the Regency Area can be understood, so that the Village can become an Autonomous or Independent. Because there is an assumption, that Village Autonomy will not be possible if the Village Government is still positioned as an apparatus of the District area. Likewise, Law No. 6 of 2014 concerning Villages. According to this law, in the context of Village Autonomy, there is no relationship between the deconcentration of the Village and the Districts. Therefore, the District does not have the function of guiding and supervising the Village. In connection with the conflict in principle with the Permendes Law No. 23 of 2014 and Law No. 6 of 2014, it is necessary to revise the Permendes No. 19 of 2017 concerning Priority Determination of Village Funds. Specifically, in Chapters V, VI, and VII (Articles 14-18). Before the revision, it is necessary to do an academic study to get the Academic Paper

for the revision of the Permendes containing problem identification, analysis, and policy recommendations.

<http://merdeka.com/2017/10/21/selewengkan-dana-desa-ratusan-juta-kades-detained-kejari-deliserdang>

4 CONCLUSIONS

First, there are strong indications of abuse of the Village Fund in Deli Serdang Regency. The involvement of Village Heads/Village Officials in abusing Village Funds. The conventional methods, project fees, and the administrative violations.

Second, the abuse of Village Funds is believed to be strong in all Village Fund management processes. Planning, Disbursement, Implementation, and Responsibility Report (LPJ) Phase.

Third, abuse of Village Funds has had an impact on the implementation of Village Autonomy. Both in the field of public services, village infrastructure, village economy, and the environment of the village.

Fourth, abuse of Village Funds is caused by various reasons. Economic, Cultural and Policy Reasons. For social/cultural reasons, the Village Head follows the habits in his community. Economic reasons concern the receipt and expenditure of the Village Head. The Village Head receives a fixed income and a Position Allowance of Rp. 3. 600,000,-/month. The Village Chief's extra expenditure is quite large. The policy relates to the existence of District and Regency authority in the guidance and supervision (binwas) in the management of the Village Fund. This authority is vulnerable to abuse by the District and Regency. This policy is regulated through Regents' Regulations. And is a provision for the implementation of Permendes PDTT No. 19 of 2017. This Permendes PDTT is inconsistent, and even contradicts Law No. 23 on Regional Government, and Law No. 6 of 2014 concerning Villages. This Permendes PDTT can hamper the achievement of Village Autonomy.

REFERENCES

- Rangkuti, M.R., Harahap, H.I., 2017. Village autonomy design model based on law No. 6 of 2014 concerning villages in Deli Serdang Regency, North Sumatra Province. DRPM Kemenristekdikti.
<http://medan.tribunnews.com/2016/4/25/divonis-3-tahun-kepala-desa-paya-itik-merasa-dizolimi>
<http://medan.tribunnews.com/2018/8/8/banyak-dugaan-abuse-dana-desa-ini-hasil-l-reports-ke-inspektorat-deliserdang>
<http://gosumut.com/2017/12/7/terelait-penyelenggaraanbudget-dana-desa-kades-kotadatar-yang-arogan-ini-d-Call-poldasu>