

Regulations on The Distribution of Special Autonomy Funds

Regulasi Pembagian Dana Otonomi Khusus

Samuel Saflessa^{1*}, Baharullah Akbar², Irawan³, Petrus Polyando⁴

Institut Pemerintahan Dalam Negeri, Cilandak, Jakarta, Indonesia^{1,2,3,4}

samysauf1984@gmail.com¹

ABSTRACT

Twelve years since the enactment of Law Number 21 of 2001 concerning special autonomy for the Province of Papua and specifically the Province of West Papua since 2008 based on Law Number 35 of 2008 (State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia Number 4151) which has been amended into Law Number 35 of 2008 Number 112, Supplement to the State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia Number 4884, it turns out that it has not been able to prosper the people of West Papua. In fact, with abundant natural resources, Papua should be able to improve the economy and welfare of its people. Since the 2008-2019 period, the provision of special autonomy funds for the Province of West Papua which has reached IDR 30.27 trillion has not made a significant change for the people. With a reality like this, if the government does not take appropriate anticipatory steps to improve the economy and welfare of the people of West Papua, it will greatly open up opportunities for the people of Papua and West Papua to sue the government as a result of the unsuccessful implementation of the special autonomy that has been enforced in the easternmost province of Indonesia. that.

Keywords: Regulation, Distribution of Funds, Special Autonomy, West Papua

ABSTRAK

Dua belas tahun sejak di berlakukannya Undang-Undang Nomor 21 tahun 2001 tentang otonomi khusus bagi Provinsi Papua dan secara khusus Provinsi Papua Barat sejak tahun 2008 berdasarkan Undang-Undang Nomor 35 tahun 2008 (Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Nomor 4151) yang telah diubah menjadi Undang-Undang Nomor 35 Tahun 2008 Nomor 112, Tambahan Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Nomor 4884 ternyata masih belum mampu mensejahterakan masyarakat Papua Barat. Padahal, dengan sumber kekayaan alam yang melimpah, seharusnya Papua mampu untuk meningkatkan perekonomian dan kesejahteraan bagi masyarakatnya. Sejak kurun waktu tahun 2008-2019, pemberian dana otonomi khusus bagi Provinsi Papua Barat yang sudah mencapai Rp.30,27 Triliun belum memberikan perubahan yang signifikan bagi masyarakatnya. Dengan kenyataan seperti ini apabila pemerintah tidak mengambil langkah antisipasi yang tepat bagi peningkatan perekonomian dan kesejahteraan masyarakat Papua Barat, maka akan sangat membuka peluang bagi masyarakat Papua dan Papua Barat untuk menuntut Pemerintah akibat dari ketidakberhasilan implementasi otonomi khusus yang telah diberlakukan di provinsi paling timur di Indonesia itu.

Kata Kunci : Regulasi, Pembagian Dana, Otonomi Khusus, Papua Barat

1. Introduction

Indonesia is one of the countries in the world that adheres to a unitary state as stipulated in the 1945 Constitution Article 1 Paragraph 1 where the structure and procedures for administering regional government are regulated in the Act. In order to accelerate the process of national development, the government of the Republic of Indonesia has issued various policies to increase effectiveness, efficiency and responsibility for the development of the nation and state, one of which is the implementation of special autonomy (Jalil et al., 2019).

West Papua is a province in Indonesia which is located on the western tip of New Guinea Island. The capital city is Manokwari. The previous name of this province was West Irian Jaya which

was stipulated in Law Number 45 of 1999. Papua was the last province to receive international recognition as part of the State of Indonesia after the United Nations (UN) handed over Papua to the Indonesian State on May 1, 1963.

The development carried out by the Indonesian government was assessed by the people of Papua at that time as development that had not been successful. One of the indicators is the integration turmoil in this region which is suspected to have been driven by several separatist groups. Another indicator that strengthens this assessment is the emergence of a large movement from the people of Papua as an area with special attention from the Government of Indonesia. Papua became the most volatile region after the reforms in 1998 (Agung Djojosoekarto, 2008; Ali 2019).

The development carried out by the Indonesian government was considered by the people of Papua at that time as development that had not been successful. One of the indicators is the integration turmoil in this region which is allegedly driven by several separatist groups. Another indicator that strengthens this assessment is the emergence of a large movement from the people of Papua as an area that receives special attention from the Government of Indonesia. Papua became the most volatile region after the 1998 reform (Agung Djojosoekarto, 2008)

Since officially joining the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia, Papua has been in a poor condition and has lagged behind other regions in general, especially when compared to Java Island. This is what makes the people of Papua feel very disappointed with the system and development plans implemented by the centralized central government. This disappointment was vented by separatist movements that came from various parts of the Land of Papua. For Papua, Special Autonomy for Papua is one way to catch up. Although until now Special Autonomy has not been able to answer the existing problems.

The conflicts that occurred in Papua and West Papua were rooted in an injustice originating from the unequal distribution of the results of economic development carried out by the New Order regime which was highly authoritarian and centralized. The process of inequality in the results of natural resources and economic development that is more focused on the interests of the central government as a source of strength for development funds. During the 32 years of the New Order era led by President Soeharto, there was a lot of injustice and violence as well as practices of corruption, collusion and nepotism that occurred on the land of West Papua.

When the new order regime ended in 1998, the outbreak of reform driven by students urged President Soeharto to step down from office. This is a good momentum for the people of West Papua to separate themselves from the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia (NKRI) or become independent (Prabowo et al., 2020). The existence of a very strong desire of the Papuan people to separate themselves from the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia has made the central government try to find solutions to the conflict resolution that occurred in West Papua. The urge to separate from the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia did not only come from the Papuan people, even the international community also influenced the Indonesian government's political policies towards West Papua at that time (Abrar et al., 2020).

Autonomy is the granting of special or special rights to communities that usually claim certain areas as an inheritance from their ancestors and have special characteristics and are comparable to the majority. Autonomy comes from the Greek, *autos* meaning "self" and *"noumos"* meaning "law" or regulation. Autonomy is the right or authority and obligation of an autonomous region to regulate and manage its own governmental affairs and the interests of the local community within the system of the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia. Article (1) number 6 law No. 23 of 2014.

Special autonomy for the province of Papua is a special authority that is recognized and given to the province of Papua to regulate and manage the interests of the local community, according to its own initiative based on the aspirations and basic rights of the Papuan people. With this special autonomy, the Province of Papua has broader authority and is also accompanied by greater responsibility for the province and the people of Papua. To organize the government and regulate the utilization of natural resources in the Province of Papua for the maximum benefit of the Papuan people as part of the Indonesian people in accordance with statutory regulations.

This authority also means the authority to empower the socio-cultural and economic potential of the Papuan people, including providing wide space for indigenous Papuans through representatives of adat, religion and women. The role played is to participate in formulating regional policies and determining development strategies. The political decision to unite Papua to become part of the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia contains lofty ideals. However, in reality, various government administration and development policies are very centralized, do not fully fulfill the sense of justice, do not fully fulfill the welfare of the Papuan people, do not fully support law enforcement, and do not fully respect human rights (HAM) in the province. Papuan.

These conditions resulted in disparities that occur in all sectors of life, especially in the fields of education, health, economy, culture and socio-politics. Human rights violations, neglect of the basic rights of indigenous people and differences of opinion regarding the history of the unification of Papua into the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia are problems that need to be resolved. Efforts to resolve these problems are seen as not having touched on various problems and aspirations of the Papuan people, giving rise to various forms of disappointment and dissatisfaction.

Law Number 35 of 2008 concerning special autonomy for the province, the stipulation of a government regulation in lieu of law Number 21 of 2001 concerning special autonomy for the province of West Papua is the basis for the implementation of special autonomy. Article 34 paragraph (3) letter c states that special revenue in the context of implementing special autonomy is equal to 2% of the National General Allocation Fund (DAU) ceiling, which is primarily aimed at financing education and health, each of which is at least 30% (thirty percent) and 15%. In addition, an additional infrastructure fund (DTI) was also allocated which was agreed between the government and the DPR and its use for infrastructure development.

The West Papua special autonomy law is a rule or policy given by the central government in an effort to increase development in various aspects with four main priorities, namely the economy, education, health, empowering indigenous Papuans and infrastructure. As a step to increase the degree of indigenous Papuans in the same position as other Indonesian citizens. Based on the problems mentioned above, there are several problems related to the problem of the special autonomy funds for the Province of West Papua, namely: 1) There is no government regulation (PP) as a legal basis for the receipt, distribution, management and accountability of the special autonomy funds for the Province of West Papua; 2) There is no Minister of Finance Regulation that specifically regulates the receipt, distribution, management and accountability of special autonomy funds for West Papua Province; 3) There is no special regional regulation (Perdasi) for West Papua Province which regulates the receipt, distribution, management and accountability of special autonomy funds and their conditions and sanctions; 4) There is no special planning (Master plan) regarding programs and activities of special autonomy funds in West Papua Province; 5) There is no transparency in the special autonomy funds for the people of West Papua as the main objective of the enactment of Law No. 35 of 2008 concerning special autonomy for the Province of West Papua; 6) Lack of coordination, guidance and supervision by the central government in the use of special

autonomy funds in West Papua Province; 7) Human Resources for government administrators who are still low in planning programs and activities related to special autonomy funds (Iqbal 2019; Kabullah et al., 2021; Wibawa & Susanti 2020).

The term autonomy comes from the Greek, *autonomos* or *autonomia*, which means "self-ruling". Autonomy can contain several meanings as follows: 1) Autonomy is a condition or characteristic of not being controlled by other parties or outside forces; 2) Autonomy is a form of "self-government", namely the right to rule or self-determination; 3) Self-government that is respected, recognized and guaranteed that there is no control by other parties over regional functions (local or internal affairs) or over a nation's minorities; 4) Autonomous government has sufficient income to determine self-determination, fulfill life welfare and achieve life goals fairly (Andi, 2007; Iskandar 2017).

There are often differences in interpretation in the analysis of regional autonomy studies among experts, both the meaning of autonomy itself and the principles in the implementation of regional autonomy. Regional autonomy is the essence of implementing a decentralized government, but in the development of regional autonomy, apart from connoting *zelfwetgeving* (making regional regulations), it also includes *zelfbestuur* (self-government) (Andi, 2007; Agustinus 2013)

Van der Pot cited by (Andi, 2007; Bertrand, 2019) understands the concept of regional autonomy as *eigen huishouding* (running one's own household). Autonomy is the granting of rights to regions to manage their own area. Regions have freedom of initiative in administering households and governance in the region. In addition, it can be interpreted as freedom and independence (*vrijheid* and *zelfstandigheid*) of lower government units to regulate and manage some government affairs. Government affairs that are allowed to be regulated and managed freely and independently are the responsibility of lower government units. Freedom and independence are the essence of the content of autonomy.

The portion of regional autonomy according to Laica Marzuki in (Andi, 2007) is not enough in the form of broad and responsible regional autonomy, but must be realized in the widest possible regional autonomy format. The widest possible format of autonomy is subject to debate among experts. On the one hand, the concept of regional autonomy as wide as possible has the connotation of building the image of the emergence of the idea of states within a federation (federal states), while the other side considers that this is justified because by realizing regional autonomy as wide as possible, people tend to no longer imagine a federal state.

The concept of the broadest possible autonomous government is an attempt to avoid the idea of a federal state. Even though the idea of a federal state cannot be viewed a priori, it is something that is taboo in building the life of a nation-state for many people in Indonesia. The widest possible scope of autonomy means surrendering as many affairs as possible to the regions to become their own household affairs (Harsono & Yuanjaya, 2020; Mesak, 2016). On the other hand, (Soehino, 2007) is of the view that the widest possible scope of autonomy means handing over as many affairs as possible to the regions to become their own household affairs.

The principle of regional autonomy in the history of constitutional development in Indonesia is based on different legal foundations. During the reign of Ir. Soekarno (Old Order) was different from the Suharto era (New Order), as well as during the reign of B.J Habibie, Abdurrahman Wahid, Megawati Soekarnoputri, and the current President Jokowi. The concept of thinking about Regional Autonomy contains the meaning of the existence of autonomy in the implementation of regional government. The first thought, that the principle of regional autonomy by using the principle of autonomy as wide as possible. This broadest meaning implies that the region is given

the authority to make regional policies, to provide services, increase participation, initiate and empower the community which aims to improve people's welfare.

The second thought, that the principle of regional autonomy by using the principle of real and responsible autonomy. The principle of real autonomy is a principle that to handle government affairs is carried out based on duties, authorities and obligations that actually already exist, and have the potential to grow, live and develop in accordance with the potential and uniqueness of the region. Thus, the content and type of autonomy for each region is not always the same as for other regions. Responsible autonomy is autonomy which in its implementation must be truly in line with the goals and intent of granting autonomy, which is basically to empower the region including improving people's welfare which is the main part of national goals (Sunarno, 2006).

Basically, the principle of regional autonomy must reflect three things, namely it must be compatible with political development and national unity; can guarantee a harmonious relationship between the central and regional governments on the basis of the integrity of the unitary state; must be able to guarantee regional development and development (Andi, 2007). In line with the above principles, the implementation of regional autonomy must always be oriented towards improving the welfare of the community by always paying attention to the interests and aspirations that grow in society. The implementation of regional autonomy must also guarantee harmonious relations between regions with one another. That is, being able to build inter-regional cooperation to improve shared welfare and prevent inter-regional disparities. Regional autonomy must also be able to guarantee harmonious relations between regions and the government. That is, it must be able to maintain and maintain the territorial integrity of the country and the upholding of the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia in order to realize the goals of the State.

According to Scott A. Bolles (2001) in (Muttaqin, 2007) Regional autonomy has advantages or benefits in a heterogeneous society. Through autonomy, minorities can be actively involved in politics, offering prospects for minorities to maintain their culture and join inter-ethnic coalitions. It also provides broad opportunities for countries that are potentially divided to find a way out of the conflict constitutionally. But autonomy can also encounter resistance and produce negative impacts, including fears that special autonomy may become a springboard for secession (Setiawan, 2022). (Pramusinto, 2010; Mussad, 2022) offers another typological division by adding one other consideration, namely the implementation of asymmetric decentralization, namely the consideration of diversity between regions both based on ethnicity, religion and demographics. This shows that there are two main reasons for choosing asymmetric decentralization, namely based on political considerations and administrative needs. Meanwhile, the asymmetric substance will be seen from the authority given which is reflected in the institution and funding (Agustinus 2015).

Meanwhile, in Indonesia itself, the asymmetrical model is applied in the implementation of its decentralization. According to (Jaweng, 2011), asymmetrical decentralization in Indonesia is realized in three variants, namely: 1) Special Autonomy for Papua and West Papua; 2) Nanggroe Aceh Darussalam; 3) Special Region of Yogyakarta

The regional autonomy system allows regions to have rights and obligations to manage their own regions. However, in implementing autonomy, the regions are still controlled by the central government and in accordance with the law. In *Fundamentals of Political Science* (2009), Miriam Budiardjo (2009) and Iek & Blesia (2019) explains that the central government has the authority to hand over some of its powers to the regions based on autonomy rights. The handover of some of that power is because Indonesia is a unitary state with a decentralized system. However, in the last stage supreme power remains in the hands of the central government.

2. Methods

The research method is a scientific way that is carried out by researchers as an effort to be able to collect data and information in making efforts to process the data obtained with a specific purpose. The research method is carried out with the intention of finding the required information properly and competently to be able to answer the questions that have been set forth in the problem formulation.

Research Design is one way to get good results from problems using the scientific method. Research design is a picture of a plan that is used to solve research problems with the aim of getting the best answers to the problems faced in research. The existence of a research design can make it easier for researchers to be directly involved in events that occur in the field, so that researchers can easily observe, record and analyze problems that occur in accordance with real conditions in the field.

3. Results and Discussion

Distribution of Special Autonomy Funds in West Papua Province

The amount of the Papua Special Autonomy Fund is 2% of the National General Allocation Fund (DAU) ceiling. In addition to the Special Autonomy Fund and DTI, the Provinces of Papua and West Papua also receive tax revenue sharing, natural resources (SDA) revenue sharing, 70% natural oil revenue sharing, and 70% natural gas balance.

Based on Minister of Finance Regulation Number 161/PMK.07/2009 concerning Allocation of Special Autonomy Funds for Papua and West Papua Provinces and Additional Infrastructure Funds for Papua and West Papua Provinces for Fiscal Year 2010, it is stipulated that the Central Government divides the Papua Special Autonomy Fund with a ratio of 70:30, where 70% for Papua Province and 30% for West Papua Province.

West Papua Provincial Government, in 2009-2011 the portion for the Regency/City was 70% and the portion for the Province was 30% and continued until 2013. Each is based on existing legal basis. Then the government of the Papua Province, the newly elected governor, Lukas Enembe, adopted a policy, then the portion changed. The portion for the Regency/City is 80% and the portion for the Province is 20%. These changes have been implemented or implemented in 2014.

Meanwhile for West Papua Province, districts/cities receive a higher proportion of allocations than districts/cities in Papua province. The distribution of special autonomy funds in West Papua Province is 70% for the Province and 30% for the Regency/City Government. This division refers to the Regulation of the Governor of West Papua Province Number 41 of 2009.

The balance of allocations between Provinces and Regencies/Cities so far is felt by various parties to be less than ideal considering that 60% of the special autonomy funds are allocated to Regencies/Cities, the allocations received by Regencies/Cities are considered ideal. In addition, there is no clear basis for consideration in determining the proportion. Meski otonomi khusus merupakan otonomi bagi Provinsi, namun jelas sasarannya tersebar diberbagai Kabupaten/Kota.

For this reason, various opinions emerged regarding the balance of special autonomy funds between Provinces and Regencies/Cities. Some parties want an 80% distribution for the Regency/City and 20% for the Province, some others so that the management is entirely handed over to the Regency/City. Broadly speaking, the use of special autonomy funds is used for development in the Province of Papua and distributed to districts/cities. Among the funds channeled

to Regencies/Cities are in the form of fresh funds, the use of which is entirely handed over to Regencies/Cities to fund activities in accordance with regional needs.

There is a special note related to the fresh funds. From various examples of the use of fresh funds, it appears that the use of these fresh funds which should have been earmarked for strategic programs with priorities in the education, health, people's economic empowerment and infrastructure sectors, was found to be allocated that was not in accordance with these priorities. For example, we found the use of fresh funds for a project to build a sub-district official's house in one of the regencies or to build a government agency office.

Problems Occurring In The Regulations For Distribution Of Special Autonomy Funds In West Papua Province

From the interview data and documents that the researchers collected and managed, the failure of Special Autonomy stems from at least five points, as follows: First, the implementation of special autonomy is not balanced with efforts to resolve political conflicts peacefully. This resulted in the "politicization" of the implementation of special autonomy both by the central government and by groups within the people of Papua and West Papua. Special autonomy has shifted into political issues, not a real program to improve the standard of living and respect for the basic rights of the Papuan people according to the background of the special autonomy policy itself.

This was obtained by researchers from interviews conducted by researchers with the head of the special autonomy faction, Mr. Siors Dedaeda, who stated that: "After nearly 12 years of running this special authority program, there are still problems with several issues that hinder the passage of Papua's special autonomy, the most pressing of which are political issues or the secession of the land of Papua which may still be ongoing today.

The central government still uses a security approach that runs counter to the special autonomy objective of increasing respect for human rights. Second, this security approach at the same time shows that in the implementation of special autonomy, the basic values that have been set are uprooted, namely protection and respect for ethics and morals, the basic rights of indigenous people, human rights, rule of law, democracy, pluralism, as well as equality of position, rights and obligations as citizens. "We all know the situation and security conditions that are happening in Papua recently, even though only some are experiencing political conflict, the security approach taken by the center has actually really protected us from continuing to increase and maximize this special autonomy fund."

The prevalence of violence and human rights violations, the absence of a legal process, the absence of a human rights court, the truth and reconciliation commission, and the absence of a traditional court indicate that Special Autonomy has only been partially implemented. For certain matters there is still distrust of the government in the people of Papua to carry out special autonomy.

On the part of the central government, the priority is for the land of Papua to remain within the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia. On the other hand, the people of West Papua also have the same hopes because they see the experience of regions that separated themselves from the Republic of Indonesia, it is difficult to develop, like the example of the state of Timor Leste, but these hopes are accompanied by protection of human rights and equality as citizens of the Republic of Indonesia. "If we are better off remaining NKRI because we don't want to be like the country of Timor Leste which separates itself from NKRI but we see the reality is not better in terms of development and eradicating the poverty of its people, but we ask the central government to always protect us in equal position as Indonesian citizens".

Third, there is a tendency to undermine the special autonomy granted by reinforcing the centralized pattern of government. This can be seen from the issuance of Presidential Instruction Number 21 of 2003 concerning the implementation of Law Number 45 of 1999 concerning the expansion of the Papua Province, which actually substantively contradicts Law Number 21 of 2001. Undermining the special autonomy of Papua has also occurred in the form of various decentralization policies that do not refer to Law Number 21 of 2001 which places the emphasis on autonomy in the province, but uses Law Number 32 of 2004 which emphasizes autonomy at the district and city levels, causing conflicts between regional government units.

Fourth, there is still a lack of institutional capacity needed to carry out special autonomy, both because of the formal legal status and because of the special political conditions. An example is the existence of 10 MRP which are cultural representations that have not been able to color policies and control the implementation of government. Apart from that, to accommodate the aspirations of the Papuan people, local political party infrastructure is needed which is made possible in Law Number 21 of 2001. However, until now it has not been seen that this provision will be implemented immediately.

On the part of the central government, the priority of Papua's land remains within the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia. On the other hand, the people of West Papua also have the same hope because they see the experience of areas that broke away from the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia as difficult to develop, such as the example of the state of Timor Leste, but this hope is accompanied by the protection of human rights and equality as citizens of the Republic of Indonesia. "It's better for us to remain the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia because we don't want to be like the country of Timor Leste which separated itself from the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia but we can see that the reality is that it is not better in terms of development and alleviating the poverty of its people, but we ask the central government to always protect us in an equal position as citizens. Indonesian country".

Third, there is a tendency to weaken the special autonomy granted by strengthening the centralized pattern of government. This can be seen from the issuance of Presidential Instruction Number 21 of 2003 concerning the implementation of Law Number 45 of 1999 concerning the Expansion of the Papua Province, which actually substantively contradicts Law Number 21 of 2001. Papua's Special Autonomy has also been undermined. in the form of various decentralization policies that do not refer to Law Number 21 of 2001 which emphasizes autonomy to the province, but instead uses Law Number 32 of 2004 which emphasizes autonomy at the district and city levels, causing conflicts between regional government units.

Fourth, there is still a lack of institutional capacity needed to implement special autonomy, both because of its formal legal status and because of the special political conditions. An example is the existence of 10 MRP which are cultural representations that have not been able to color policies and control governance. Apart from that, to accommodate the aspirations of the Papuan people, local political party infrastructure is needed which is made possible in Law Number 21 of 2001. However, until now it has not been seen that this provision will be implemented immediately.

Even in financial management, there are still fundamental problems. Until now, the distribution and management of the receipt of the Special Autonomy funds has only been regulated by a Governor's Regulation. Meanwhile, districts and cities do not have technical references and instructions in managing the special autonomy funds. And this opens up opportunities for the special autonomy funds to be misused. In line with this matter, the Ministry of National Development Planning recommends that the regional governments of Papua and West Papua

immediately draw up a regional regulation that regulates the corridor for the allocation of special autonomy funds (Otsus) whose value reaches IDR 40 trillion per year.

Almost 17 years since the special regional autonomy for Papua has been running, not only have the advantages been gained, but the disadvantages are still being faced by this system. Some of the following problems are still homework: 1) Welfare of the people who are still low is not in line with the objectives of implementing regional autonomy. Even though the special regional autonomy fund of 11 trillion is not directly proportional to the welfare conditions of the Papuan people. Starting from malnutrition to education which is still not evenly distributed to remote areas; 2) The high level of fraud makes large funds not run well. Some power holders actually take advantage of the abundance of funds to enrich themselves or their group. With the existence of special regional autonomy, the center cannot supervise in detail what is happening in the regions; 3) Not only are funds being misused, but the public interest which should be a priority is actually inferior to the interests of a handful of local elites. The number of regional leaders who were elected because they had closeness or had family ties with the previous rulers made power filled with local Eli dynasty politics. This is the reason why problems in Papua have not been resolved until now; 4) Special regional autonomy should be able to implement policies and enforce the law as fairly as possible according to the principles of regional autonomy. However, on the ground, the distrust between the Papuan people and their local government is getting stronger. This is because many developments actually create conflict. And the settlement method carried out by the local government is through repressive measures.

Based on the Financial Report of the State General Treasurer (BUN) of the Ministry of Finance for the 2018 Fiscal Year and the results of interviews with the Government of Papua and West Papua Provinces, there are problems with the Additional Infrastructure Fund (DTI) in the Provinces of Papua and West Papua. The problem is the determination of DTI which has no clear basis.

Program Planning and Activities Using Special Autonomy Funds in West Papua Province

The programs that have been made by the regional government of Papua Province, starting from the village development strategic plan program (Respect) and the village economic institutional development strategic plan program (Prospect). Through the Respect program, the provincial government allocates Rp. 100,000,000; (100 million) for one village in one year and also Rp. 100,000,000; (100 million) allocated from the Regency regional government, then through Prospects or better known as Village Funds (DD) from the Province and Regency prepare funds of Rp. 1 billion to 1 billion more for one village in one year. However, the implementation of these funds was not on target and management was not transparent or clear.

The district/city government's Special Autonomy Fund is divided into 6 sectors with different portions. The distribution of these funds is carried out after the funds have been deducted by financing for prospects and strategic programs across districts/cities such as the programs currently being implemented, namely: 1) Healthy Papua Card; 2) Housing; 3) Human Resources (including the Scholarship program); 4) Gates of Mas & 5) Proud of Papua.

4. Conclusion

In general, this study concludes that the performance of Special Autonomy during the five years of implementation has not yet achieved the expected performance from the elucidation of the Special Authority Regulations in West Papua Province but has not shown maximum results as expected by all parties, giving rise to the impression that the central and provincial governments

and districts/cities and all their staff including the TNI and Polri apparatus have not shown a strong commitment to consistently carry out the mandate of the Special Autonomy Law in an effective, honest and comprehensive manner.

Several central government policies are considered to have denied the results of this compromise. If the government and state administrators including provinces and districts/cities really show seriousness in carrying out the mandate of the Special Autonomy law, there will be significant changes towards progress and improvement in the quality of life for the Papuan people in various aspects of life towards achieving an atmosphere of shared life. that is safe, peaceful, prosperous and just. as mandated by the Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia and will also make a significant contribution to the integration of the nation and state which is increasingly prominent

References :

- Abrar, M., Juanda, B., Firdaus, M., & Hakim, D. B. (2020). The Impact of Special Autonomy Funds on Poverty of Human Development and Unemployment in Aceh. *International Journal of Innovation, Creativity and Change*, 12(10), 713-734.
- Agustinus, J. (2013). Phenomelogical Study on the Financial Performance and Accountability of Special Autonomy Fund Management in Education Sector at Papua Province. *IOSR Journal of Business and Management*, 6(6), 30-40.
- Agustinus, J. (2015). Accountability perspective: Implementation and reporting on spending fund of Papua special autonomy. *Information Management and Business Review*, 7(2), 79-86.
- Ali, S. Z. (2019). The management model of Aceh's special autonomy fund. *Jurnal Bina Praja: Journal of Home Affairs Governance*, 11(2), 159-170.
- Bertrand, J. (2014). Autonomy and Stability: The Perils of Implementation and "Divide-and-Rule" Tactics in Papua, Indonesia. *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics*, 20(2), 174-199.
- Budiarjo, Miriam. (2009). *Dasar-dasar Ilmu Politik*. Jakarta : PT Gramedia Pustaka Utama.
- Harsono, D., & Yuanjaya, P. (2020, November). Special autonomy and poverty in special region of Yogyakarta. In *The Proceedings of the 4th International Conference of Social Science and Education, ICSSSED 2020, August 4-5 2020, Yogyakarta, Indonesia*.
- Iek, M., & Blesia, J. U. (2019). Development inequalities in autonomous regions: A study pre-and post-special autonomy in Indonesia's most eastern provinces. *The Journal of Asian Finance, Economics and Business*, 6(1), 303-314.
- Iskandar, I. (2017). Effect of human development index fund on economic growth through a special autonomy. *Jurnal Ekonomi Pembangunan: Kajian Masalah Ekonomi dan Pembangunan*, 18(1), 40-49.
- Iqbal, M. (2019, October). Accountability in the Management of Papua's Special Autonomy Funds in Asmat Regency In the 2015-2018 Period. In *Third International Conference on Sustainable Innovation 2019–Humanity, Education and Social Sciences (IcoSIHESS 2019)* (pp. 195-201). Atlantis Press.
- Jaweng, Endi Robert. (2011). Kritik Terhadap Desentralisasi Asimetris di Indonesia (Artikel). *Analisis CSIS*. 40(2) : 160 – 161.
- Kabullah, M. I., Fahmi, K., Amsari, F., & Fajri, M. N. (2021, April). Beyond the tsunami effect: Towards an understanding of the special autonomy budget policy in reducing poverty in Aceh. In *IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science* (Vol. 708, No. 1, p. 012084). IOP Publishing.

- Jalil, H., Yani, T. A., & Kurniawan, A. (2019). Optimization of Special Autonomy Funds Allocation to Alleviate Poverty in Aceh (A Case Study in Districts/Cities). *Optimization*, 9(4), 93-108.
- Mesak, I. E. K. (2016). A Study of Participation Rate, Transparency and Accountability of Special Autonomy Funds Management in Jayapura. *Journal of Social and Development Sciences*, 7(1), 18-30.
- Mussad, M. (2022). Implementation of the Papua Province Special Autonomy Policy in a Public Policy Perspective. *ijd-demos*, 4(2), 780-788.
- Muttaqin, Azmi. (2007). Otonomi Khusus Papua, Suatu Upaya Merespon Konflik Dan Aspirasi Kemerdekaan Papua. *Jurnal Ilmu Politik*. 4(1).
- Prabowo, P. A., Supriyono, B., Noor, I., & Muluk, M. K. (2020). Special autonomy policy evaluation to improve community welfare in Papua province Indonesia. *International Journal of Excellence in Government*, 2(1), 24-40.
- Setiawan, H. (2022). Rethinking Patterns Development of Aceh's Socio-Economic Welfare After Two Decades of Implementing Asymmetric Autonomy" Special Autonomy". *Journal of Government and Political Issues*, 2(1), 8-21.
- Soehino. (2007). *Ilmu Negara*. Yogyakarta : Liberty.
- Wibawa, K. C. S., & Susanto, S. N. (2020). Establishing a special autonomy model in Bali as a means of preserving hindu balinese culture and space. *International Journal of Scientific and Technology Research*, 9(4), 1609-1614.