



RESEARCH ARTICLE

Evidence Of Local Government Policies And The Challenges Faced (A Study Of The Legal Affairs Bureau Of The Lampung Provincial Government)

Eko Budi Sulistio^{a,1,*}, Simon Sumanjoyo Hutagalung^{a,2}, Ita Prihantika^{a,3}

^a Public Administration Department, Lampung University, Lampung, Bandar Lampung 35145, Indonesia

¹ ekobudi.sulistio@fisip.unila.ac.id; ² simon.sumanjoyo@fisip.unila.ac.id; ³ itaprihantika@fisip.unila.ac.id

* *corresponding author*

ARTICLE INFO

Article history

Received 20-04-2026

Revised 19-05-2026

Accepted 28-05-2026

Keywords

Public Policy Evaluation

Regional Development

Policy Recommendations

ABSTRACT

Evaluation phase is one of the most critically underexamined stages within the public policy cycle, which not only receives insufficient scholarly and practical attention but is also seldom systematically executed by governmental bodies. This stage is, nevertheless, of paramount academic and administrative significance, given its fundamental capacity to assess the extent to which a policy has succeeded or failed in achieving its intended objectives during the implementation process. The Provincial Government of Lampung bears an institutional obligation to conduct rigorous and comprehensive evaluations of each policy enacted within its jurisdiction, with the explicit purpose of measuring policy performance, encompassing both resultant outcomes and broader societal impacts, in relation to the effective resolution of multifaceted problems confronting the population of Lampung Province. Employing a descriptive research design within a qualitative methodological framework, data were systematically collected through in-depth interviews and comprehensive documentary analysis. The collected data were subsequently subjected to a rigorous analytical process comprising data reduction, structured data presentation, and member-checked data verification. The empirical findings of this study indicate that public policies embodied in the Regional Regulations (Peraturan Daerah/Perda) of Lampung Province for the fiscal period of 2023–2024 were subjected exclusively to formal evaluative procedures specifically, a centrally administered review conducted by the national government to ascertain whether the provisions of said regulations contravene superordinate legislative instruments. Substantive public policy evaluation remains an indispensable mechanism for ascertaining policy outcomes and impacts, whilst generating evidence-based recommendations to guide subsequent policy cycles.

This is an open access article under the [CC-BY-SA](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/) license.



Introduction

Every policy formulated and implemented by the government is fundamentally directed toward addressing public problems, which the issues encountered and experienced by the society. The government, by virtue of its extensive and far-reaching authority, bears an institutional obligation to resolve the multitude of problems that arise within society. Numerous policies have accordingly been formulated and enacted to enhance the overall quality of life of the citizen. To ascertain the effectiveness of government-adopted policies, systematic evaluation of such policies is imperative, with the overarching purpose of assessing their relative success or failure in addressing prevailing societal problems.

A well-structured public policy ought to follow a sequential process comprising: (1) formulation, (2) implementation, and (3) evaluation. The formulation process is carried out by political actors and/or governmental bodies, whereas the implementation process is executed exclusively by governmental actors within the executive apparatus. Policy evaluation, by contrast, is generally conducted by governmental institutions and/or professional practitioners. Evaluations undertaken by governmental institutions tend to be internal in nature and are primarily concerned with administrative dimensions, while evaluations conducted by professional practitioners constitute external assessments that are substantive and theoretical in character.

Both internal and external evaluations play an indispensable role in efforts to enhance the quality of public policy in the future. Nevertheless, evaluative activities of this nature remain considerably infrequent, whether conducted by internal governmental bodies or external parties. In a study conducted Joysurahman et al., (2021) several challenges identified in the evaluation of education policy include: (1) inadequate human resource capacity among policy evaluators; (2) political resistance from vested interest groups; (3) insufficient availability of data and information pertaining to the relevant policies; (4) limited budgetary allocations for policy evaluation activities; and (5) psychological barriers between evaluators and the entities being evaluated, arising from emotional and professional proximities.

Governmental performance is generally assessed through the Government Agency Performance Report (*Laporan Kinerja Instansi Pemerintah/LKIP*). However, such reports predominantly evaluate budgetary utilization and the attainment of predetermined performance targets and objectives, thereby failing to provide specific information regarding the evaluative outcomes of particular public policies implemented. Consequently, they are unable to furnish the requisite alternatives for improvement or evidence-based policy recommendations. In practice, policy evaluation activities are most commonly conducted by independent parties for academic and knowledge development purposes, such as undergraduate theses, master's dissertations, or doctoral dissertations. Ideally, every public policy issued by the government should be subjected to rigorous evaluation following the completion of its implementation process. It is therefore imperative that further in-depth investigation be undertaken into the constraints encountered by both governmental bodies and evaluators in conducting public policy evaluations.

A policy must take into account the feedback received by policymakers regarding their decisions, including manifestations in the form of political shifts and fluctuations in public trust. These realities indicate that every policy, once enacted, must eventually be re-examined in light of the changes that occur over time. In the view of leading scholars, including Dunn (1994), such re-examination as an evaluative process constitutes an inescapable necessity (Hendarman, 2025). Hendarman further asserts that a policy is neither stagnant nor static, given that the policy environment evolves dynamically over time. Such changes may transpire within both the internal and external policy environments. These transformations may exert considerable influence upon the policy in question, generating either intended or unintended impacts. They may likewise give rise to consequences that carry significant implications for the potential emergence of new problems, thereby compelling policymakers and relevant stakeholders to deliberate upon anticipatory measures or viable solutions.

In Lampung Province, beyond the routine conduct of governmental performance evaluations, systematic evaluative activities directed at the diverse array of public policies that have been promulgated remain largely absent. No documented data exist regarding the number of public policies that have undergone substantive in-depth evaluation to assess their relative successes and/or failures. This study is therefore intended to conduct a comprehensive analytical inquiry into the prevailing constraints that impede the conduct of public policy evaluation within the Provincial Government of Lampung.

The research problems addressed in this study are as follows: (1) Have the public policies formulated by the Provincial Government of Lampung been subjected to specific and dedicated evaluation for each respective policy? And (2) What constraints are encountered in the conduct of public policy evaluation activities by the Provincial Government of Lampung? In relation to these research problems, the objectives of this study are to describe and analyze the public policy evaluation activities undertaken by the Provincial Government of Lampung, as well as to describe and analyze the constraints confronted in the conduct of public policy evaluation by the Provincial Government of Lampung.

The urgency of this research lies in its capacity to provide a comprehensive account of public policy evaluation activities as conducted by governmental institutions. It is well established that policy evaluation constitutes an indispensable process for measuring and assessing the success or failure of a given policy, as well as for determining its broader societal impacts. The findings of this study are anticipated to assist relevant stakeholders including regional and central government authorities in addressing the constraints associated with public policy evaluation, thereby ensuring that every public policy formulated and implemented can be rigorously assessed and that the resulting policy recommendations are firmly grounded in empirical evidence gathered from field realities.

Public policy constitutes both a process undertaken and a product generated by governmental authorities in response to the problems confronted by society. As a process, every public policy necessarily traverses at least three distinct stages, namely: formulation, implementation, and evaluation. As a product, on the other hand, public policy may take the form of governmental decrees and legislative regulations that have been formally ratified and promulgated by the relevant authorities. As a legislative product, Dwiyanto contends that public policy ought to be intrinsically relevant to the interests and welfare of the broader society; it is for this reason that public policy inherently encompasses a deliberate process of selecting and prioritizing among the most viable alternatives available for the resolution of particular problems within the societal domain (Muhiddin, 2017).

Policy evaluation is defined as an analytical and appraisal activity directed at examining the implementation of a policy, whether conducted during the course of its operation or upon its conclusion, with the explicit purpose of determining whether the policy in question warrants continuation, continuation with requisite modifications, or termination (Warman et al., 2023). Public policy evaluation, more broadly, constitutes a systematic activity of assessing the performance of public policies. Such evaluative activity is fundamentally oriented toward the generation of value premises necessary for producing comprehensive information regarding policy performance (Dunn 2003). In its most distilled form, policy evaluation seeks to answer the fundamental question: "What difference has it made?" (Handoyo, 2012).

Among the three stages of the public policy process outlined above, scholarly inquiry pertaining to policy evaluation remains notably infrequent. To ascertain that a policy or program has attained its highest possible level of performance, it is insufficient to demonstrate merely that the policy has generated valued outcomes for certain individuals, groups, or communities; such demonstration must additionally be substantiated by empirical evidence confirming that the policy constitutes an actual consequence of the actions undertaken to resolve the identified problem, (Handoyo, 2012). According to Harberger, policy evaluation must be conducted on a continuous and iterative basis in order to assess the substantive content of its various policy components (Hanberger, 2001).

The evaluation of policy is of considerable importance for several reasons, not least of which is its capacity to counter the prevailing perception that policies are merely reflections of the desires and interests of the elite, devoid of meaningful absorption of public aspirations. According to Wibawa (2011), the elite may normatively encompass political leaders, their immediate families, business figures with proximate ties to those in power, and military commanders. In numerous cases, elitism has been observed to inhibit the pace of policy change and renewal, owing to the pronounced tendency for policies to be disproportionately determined by the interpretive values of such elite actors. As a consequence of elite influence, policies are frequently revised yet seldom fundamentally transformed. Substantive policy change tends to occur only in response to events that pose a direct threat to the prevailing political system, and even then, such changes are undertaken primarily to preserve and protect the structural position of the elite (Hendarman, 2025).

Policies necessitate evaluation in order to assess the extent to which predetermined targets have been achieved, to identify the dimensions requiring improvement or preservation, and ultimately to generate more beneficial policy outcomes in the future (Warman et al., 2023). Evaluative activities are of critical importance in the execution of any program or initiative, in practice, such activities are

frequently foregone for a variety of reasons, chief among which are the absence of adequate multi-stakeholder support and the pervasive limitation of resources, both budgetary and human, possessing the requisite competencies. Public policy evaluation constitutes an indispensable process for assessing the effectiveness, efficiency, and broader impacts of implemented policies (Melati & Asmorowati, 2023).

The failure to achieve policy objectives is frequently attributable to a deficiency in the anticipatory capacity of policymakers. Given that the government, as the principal architect of policy, is inherently invested in the successful realization of policy objectives, the conduct of policy evaluation is an institutional imperative. Policy evaluation is of critical urgency insofar as it serves to enhance the quality of public policy in subsequent cycles. Through the systematic conduct of policy evaluation, at minimum five substantive dimensions may be ascertained (Melati & Asmorowati, 2023):

1. **Policy Effectiveness.**
Effectiveness constitutes an evaluative criterion that examines the extent to which a policy has successfully achieved its predetermined objectives.
2. **Efficiency.**
This criterion appraises the utilization of resources in the implementation of a policy, specifically whether the policy has been executed in a resource-prudent manner through the efficient deployment of available resources.
3. **Equity.**
This criterion considers the extent to which a policy adheres to the principles of justice and equitable distribution. Equity encompasses the question of whether a policy mitigates socioeconomic disparities and ensures fair treatment for all parties affected by its implementation.
4. **Public Satisfaction.**
Public satisfaction constitutes an evaluative criterion involving an assessment of the degree of satisfaction and the responses of the general populace toward the implemented policy, including whether the policy has garnered adequate support and approval from the affected communities.
5. **Policy Impact.**
The long-term impact criterion evaluates the enduring consequences of a policy over an extended temporal horizon, including whether the policy produces sustained positive impacts and is capable of generating significant and meaningful social transformation.

Policy evaluation, therefore, extends considerably beyond the mere determination of whether predetermined goals and targets have been achieved as planned; it encompasses, at minimum, the five dimensions enumerated above. In the absence of public policy evaluation, several significant consequences may materialize (Seputar Birokrasi, 2025):

1. **Resource Wastage**
In the absence of rigorous evaluation, ineffective or underperforming policies may continue to be implemented despite their failure to generate meaningful societal benefits, resulting in the wasteful expenditure of budgetary allocations and resources that could otherwise be directed toward more efficacious policy alternatives.
2. **Compromised Policy Sustainability**
The absence of systematic evaluation renders implemented policies incapable of being refined or updated in accordance with evolving societal needs. Without adequate feedback mechanisms, policies persist without necessary adjustments, ultimately rendering them irrelevant or potentially detrimental to public welfare.
3. **Erosion of Public Trust**
Where policy evaluation is inadequately conducted or its findings lack transparency, public confidence in governmental institutions is inevitably undermined. The government's incapacity to assess and rectify existing policies may engender widespread suspicion that such policies disproportionately serve the interests of particular groups, without due regard for the broader needs of society.
4. **Absence of Institutional Learning**
Policy evaluation serves as a critical mechanism through which governments derive lessons from prior experience. In the absence of evaluation, policymakers remain unable to distinguish between what has succeeded and what has failed, thereby perpetuating the risk of recurring errors in future policy cycles. Evaluation further enables institutional innovation in the design of more effective and responsive policies.

Briggs & Fenton, 2023 as cited in (Hendarman, 2025) assert that normatively, and irrespective of preference, every policy must be subjected to thorough and meticulous evaluation with careful and detailed consideration to ensure its genuine alignment with the public interest and collective welfare. This is manifested through the systematic and objective scrutiny of budgetary allocations and societal benefits, as well as through the pursuit of more efficient resource distribution.

Policy evaluation is, in essence, an activity undertaken by seasoned professionals that is, individuals possessing specialized expertise in the domain of policy evaluation and a thorough comprehension of the substantive content of the policies under review. While the primary actor in policy evaluation is the government, independent entities such as research institutions and universities also engage in evaluative activities, with the objective of identifying and exposing the gaps that emerge in the course of ongoing policy implementation (Dilapanga & Rantung, 2022, dalam Warman et al., 2023).

A policy evaluator must possess the requisite competencies and specialized expertise demanded by the evaluative role. An evaluator — whether an individual or a team — occupies a critical position in furnishing information regarding the success of a given endeavor or process. A policy evaluator in the field of education, for instance, is expected to demonstrate the following core competencies (Nasution et al., 2023):

- 1) Managerial Competency, defined as the capacity to organize and administer a program in a manner that enables its effective and efficient evaluation,
- 2) Technical Competency, referring to the evaluator's proficiency in executing each successive stage of the evaluative process, from initial planning through to final completion,
- 3) Conceptual Competency, encompassing the evaluator's ability to critically analyze a program and generate viable alternative solutions to identified programmatic challenges,
- 4) Disciplinary Competency, denoting the evaluator's possession of adequate knowledge and skills pertaining to the substantive domain of the educational program under evaluation.

The term "evaluator" designates the agent of evaluation in relation to the program or activity being assessed. The findings generated by evaluators may be employed to develop improved operational frameworks for future policy cycles. According to Miftahul Fikri et al., a program evaluator (an individual or a team) bears full professional responsibility for the outcomes of the assessment conducted on the program under review. It is, however, critical to note that program evaluators do not possess the authority to make binding decisions; rather, their role is strictly confined to furnishing recommendations to decision-makers as substantive considerations in the formulation of forthcoming policy determinations (Fikri, Hastuti, & Wahyuningsih, 2019 dalam Nasution et al., 2023).

Evaluators may be classified into two distinct categories based on their positional relationship to the program under evaluation (Nasution et al., 2023):

1. Internal evaluators are individuals embedded within the program itself, those who possess intimate and comprehensive knowledge of all aspects of the program being evaluated, including its functions, objectives, inherent problems, strengths, and weaknesses. Internal evaluators simultaneously serve as members or officers of the implementing team of the program subject to evaluation.
2. External evaluators are individuals positioned outside the program under evaluation, a circumstance that affords them a considerably clearer and more objective perspective. By virtue of their independence from the program's implementation, the evaluative findings produced by external evaluators are free from subjective bias. External evaluators are individuals who bear no binding ties to either the policy or the implementation of the program being assessed; they are engaged by decision-making authorities from outside the organizational structure to evaluate the success of a program or the implementation of an enacted policy.

Evaluation serves as an indispensable instrument for stakeholders in characterizing and assessing the degree of achievement of implemented policies. It also functions as a mechanism for analyzing data, disseminating findings, and ensuring that evaluative outcomes are of practical utility to policymakers. The fundamental purpose of evaluation is to assess the extent to which a formulated policy has succeeded in resolving prevailing problems or in delivering tangible benefits to the individuals or groups engaged in its implementation (Harianto, 2020)

Public policy evaluation generates a broad spectrum of valuable information pertaining to the effectiveness, efficiency, and relevance of a given policy, as well as providing the evidentiary basis for improvement recommendations:

1. Policy Effectiveness pertains to the degree to which a policy has succeeded in attaining its predetermined goals or targets. The effectiveness of a policy is conceptualized not merely as the achievement of specific policy targets, but more substantively as the creation of an action framework capable of shaping a coherent set of policy responses (Peters et al., 2018)
2. Policy Efficiency pertains to the comparative assessment of inputs, the resources deployed, against the outputs, or the results achieved through their utilization.
3. Foundation for New Policy Formulation: evaluative findings serve as an empirical and experiential foundation upon which more robust, evidence-based, and field-informed public policies may be designed and formulated. The outcomes of policy evaluation yield a range of alternative policy recommendations aimed at improving policy performance in subsequent cycles. Such recommendations present alternative policy options deemed most appropriate for the resolution of identified problems (Ambarwati et al., 2024)

Method

This study employs a descriptive research design within a qualitative methodological framework. The adoption of this approach is premised upon the necessity of acquiring an in-depth understanding of the phenomenon pertaining to the public policy evaluation process as it occurs within the administrative environment of the Provincial Government of Lampung, with particular reference to the Legal Bureau of the Regional Secretariat of Lampung Province. In order to mitigate the risk of bias in the data collection process, the research focus was delineated as follows: the activities undertaken and evaluative reports produced in relation to policy evaluation, as conducted by both the Provincial Government of Lampung and other parties designated with the responsibility of evaluating the policies of the Provincial Government of Lampung; and the constraints encountered in the conduct of policy evaluation within Lampung Province. The analytical process employed in this study adheres to the interactive analysis model, wherein the constituent components of data analysis encompass data collection, data reduction, data presentation, and conclusion drawing. The validity of the data generated in this study was assessed against four criteria as prescribed by (Moleong, 2021) namely: the credibility test; the transferability test, the dependability test, and the confirmability test.

Results and Discussion

In the process of implementing regional autonomy, provincial governments bear the obligation to formulate policies capable of accommodating the interests of the populace while simultaneously adapting to the distinctive characteristics of their respective territories. Regional autonomy itself constitutes a manifestation of the partial devolution of governmental authority from the central government to regional administrations, undertaken with the overarching purpose of advancing equitable development, narrowing inter-regional disparities, and improving the quality of public services. The principal legal instruments employed by provincial governments in the exercise of such authority are the Governor's Regulation (*Peraturan Gubernur/Pergub*) and the Regional Regulation (*Peraturan Daerah/Perda*). The Governor's Regulation is formulated by the Governor as a more detailed implementing regulation derived from the Perda, or as a follow-up measure in response to mandates set forth in higher-order legislation. The Governor's Regulation performs a strategic function in elaborating the technical and procedural dimensions of policy, thereby ensuring the effective implementation of the provisions enshrined in the Regional Regulation. Within the legal hierarchy, the Pergub constitutes a delegative legislative instrument, meaning that its existence is predicated upon a mandate or directive from superordinate regulations. The Regional Regulation, on the other hand, is a legal product jointly enacted by the Provincial Legislative Council (*Dewan Perwakilan Rakyat Daerah/DPRD*) and the Governor, serving as the foundational instrument for regulating governmental affairs falling within the jurisdiction of the province and applicable within its territorial boundaries. The formulation of a Regional Regulation is intended to accommodate public aspirations while simultaneously adapting to the specific characteristics of the region. Within the hierarchy of legislative instruments, the legal standing of the Perda is governed by Law Number 12 of 2011, as amended by Law Number 15 of 2019 concerning the Formation of Legislative Regulations, as well as Law Number 23 of 2014 concerning Regional Government. Accordingly, the success of regional autonomy implementation at the provincial level is contingent upon the effective synergy between the Provincial DPRD and the Governor in enacting Regional Regulations, as well as upon the Governor's consistency in formulating

Governor's Regulations that are in conformity with prevailing legal provisions and the genuine needs of the populace.

Pursuant to Law Number 23 of 2014, the functions and roles of Regional Regulations are of considerable significance, as they encompass the governance of governmental affairs pertaining to the administration of a region and its population. Four principal functions and roles of Regional Regulations may be identified, as follows:

1. Regional Regulations serves as the primary instrument for the implementation of regional autonomy, providing the legal foundation upon which regional governments may regulate and administer governmental affairs within their jurisdiction. Through the Regional Regulation, regional governments are empowered to establish directed and measurable policies in the management of both natural and human resources, the provision and enhancement of public service quality, the maintenance of public order, and the improvement of societal welfare in accordance with the needs and characteristics of the region.
2. Regional Regulations functions as a legal instrument for regulating various dimensions of community life within the region, encompassing the sectors of health, education, development, local economic advancement, environmental conservation, and the protection and preservation of regional cultural heritage. The formulation of a Regional Regulation is conducted on the basis of an identification of community needs, with due consideration of geographical, social, and economic conditions, and with reference to locally embedded values of wisdom, thereby ensuring that the resulting policies are both relevant and effective.
3. Regional Regulations provides a robust legal foundation for the enforcement of law at the regional level. By virtue of the Regional Regulation, regional governments possess formal legitimacy to conduct supervision, guidance, and enforcement measures against regulatory violations within their territorial jurisdiction, thereby fostering the establishment of public order, legal certainty, and an enhanced awareness of the rule of law among the populace.
4. Regional Regulations performs a strategic role as a catalyst for regional development through the articulation of clear regulatory provisions pertaining to short, medium, and long-term development planning, spatial arrangement, environmental management, and the strengthening of the local economic sector. Through the Regional Regulation, the trajectory of regional development becomes more planned, participatory, sustainable, and aligned with the inherent potential and distinctive characteristics of each respective region.

The legal basis for the formulation of Regional Regulations is established under Law Number 15 of 2019. The procedural stages prescribed therein must be observed by all actors involved, including the DPRD, the Regional Head, and members of the regional government. The stages of Regional Regulation formulation are as follows:

1. Planning Stage: At this stage, the relevant actors compile a list of priority issues constituting the focal points of the draft Regional Regulation, as jointly determined by the DPRD and the regional government.
2. Proposal Stage: The preparation of an initial concept and the articulation of the objectives of the draft Regional Regulation that has been formulated.
3. Academic Manuscript and Draft Preparation Stage: The preparation of an academic manuscript (*naskah akademik*) and the drafting of the substantive articles of the Regional Regulation in a systematic and academically rigorous manner.
4. Deliberation Stage: At this stage, a deliberative process is conducted by the DPRD and the regional government to discuss and harmonize the substantive content of the draft regulation.
5. Enactment Stage: Upon the completion of the preceding stages, the draft Regional Regulation is jointly approved and formally promulgated by the Regional Head for implementation within the territorial jurisdiction of the region.
6. Promulgation Stage: The Regional Regulation that has been formally enacted must be promulgated in the Regional Gazette (*Lembaran Daerah*) and publicly announced to the populace.
7. Monitoring and Evaluation Stage: At this stage, every Regional Regulation that has been implemented is subject to review and evaluation in order to assess the effectiveness and efficiency of the enacted regulation, as well as to examine the performance of the regional government in its implementation.

Pursuant to Law Number 15 of 2019, the final and most critical stage resides in monitoring and evaluation. Through the evaluative process, the successes, failures, strengths, and weaknesses of the regulation may be examined, along with the constraints encountered during implementation. According to Suharsimi Arikunto (Putri AS, 2021) evaluation is an activity directed at obtaining and compiling information regarding the manner in which a given undertaking operates, with the information gathered serving as a basis for alternative courses of action in future decision-making processes. Evaluation performs the function of assessing the extent to which a regulation has generated meaningful impacts upon the populace, and may serve as a benchmark for policymakers in the formulation of policies for subsequent periods.

In the context of administering regional governmental affairs in Lampung, the regional government, together with the Governor and the House of Representative, enacts Regional Regulations governing various dimensions of public life with the purpose of rendering Lampung Province a safe and conducive environment. The following presents the Regional Regulations currently in force in Lampung Province along with their respective evaluation status

Table 1. Regional Regulations of Lampung Province and Evaluation Status

Regional Regulations of Lampung Province and Evaluation Status			
No	Name of Regional Regulation	Subject Matter	Evaluation Status
1	Regional Regulation No. 14 of 2023	Regional Spatial Planning of Lampung Province 2023–2024	None
2	Regional Regulation No. 13 of 2023	Regional Revenue and Expenditure Budget of Lampung Province for Fiscal Year 2024	None
3	Regional Regulation No. 11 of 2023	Settlement of Regional Loss Claims Against Non-Treasurer Civil Servants or Other Officials	A Government Agency Performance Accountability System (SAKIP) evaluation was conducted, attended by the Regional Secretary and regional apparatus of Lampung Province; however, the evaluation findings were not publicly disclosed
4	Regional Regulation No. 10 of 2023	Prevention of Child Marriage	None
5	Regional Regulation No. 8 of 2023	Amendment to the Regional Revenue and Expenditure Budget of Lampung Province for Fiscal Year 2023	None
6	Regional Regulation No. 7 of 2023	Management and Development of the Regional Domestic Wastewater System	None
7	Regional Regulation No. 4 of 2023	Proceeds from the Management of Separated Regional Assets and Other Legitimate Regional Own-Source Revenue	None
8	Regional Regulation No. 3 of 2023	Accountability Report on the Implementation of the Regional Revenue and Expenditure Budget of Lampung Province for Fiscal Year 2022	Evaluation findings are recorded in Governor of Lampung Decree Number G/564/VI.02/HK2023
9	Regional Regulation No. 2 of 2023	Administration of Business Licensing in the Region	None
10	Regional Regulation No. 1 of 2023	Second Amendment to Regional Regulation of Lampung Province Number 2 of 2009 concerning the Establishment of Regional Government-Owned Enterprise (BUMD) in the Form of a Limited Liability Company (PT) Lampung Jasa Utama	None
11	Regional Regulation No. 20 of 2024	Management of Legal Documentation and Information Networks	None
12	Regional Regulation No. 19 of 2024	Regional Revenue and Expenditure Budget of Lampung Province for Fiscal Year 2025	None

Regional Regulations of Lampung Province and Evaluation Status			
No	Name of Regional Regulation	Subject Matter	Evaluation Status
13	Regional Regulation No. 18 of 2024	Amendment to Regional Regulation of Lampung Province Number 4 of 2018 concerning the Implementation of Family Resilience Development	None
14	Regional Regulation No. 17 of 2024	Regional Long-Term Development Plan 2025–2045	None
15	Regional Regulation No. 16 of 2024	Administration of Islamic Boarding Schools (<i>Pesantren</i>)	None
16	Regional Regulation No. 25 of 2024	Amendment to the Regional Revenue and Expenditure Budget of Lampung Province for Fiscal Year 2024	None
17	Regional Regulation No. 12 of 2024	Administration of Road Traffic and Transportation	None
18	Regional Regulation No. 11 of 2024	Strengthening and Advancement of Lampung Culture	None
19	Regional Regulation No. 10 of 2024	Administration of Electronic-Based Transportation Services	None
20	Regional Regulation No. 7 of 2024	Public Information Services	None
21	Regional Regulation No. 4 of 2024	Regional Taxes and Levies	None
22	Regional Regulation No. 2 of 2024	Administration of Libraries and Electronic Archives	None
23	Regional Regulation No. 12 of 2021	Regional Medium-Term Development Plan (RPJMD) 2019–2024	Evaluation conducted by the Head of the Regional Development Planning Agency (Bappeda) of Lampung Province pursuant to the mandate of Minister of Home Affairs Regulation Number 86 of 2017 and Minister of Home Affairs Instruction Number 2 of 2025; however, the evaluation findings were not publicly disclosed. But, not written the result of evaluation.

Based on the preceding table, it is evident that the policy evaluation process pertaining to Regional Regulations in Lampung Province has not been carried out on a systematic and routine basis. The majority of Regional Regulations that have been formulated and implemented are left without any subsequent evaluative activity, rendering it impossible to ascertain the degree of success and alignment of these regulatory products with the aspirations of the populace. In point of fact, policy evaluation constitutes a crucial stage within the public policy cycle, the purpose of which is to assess the degree of success in policy implementation against the predetermined objectives, targets, and performance indicators.

At the regional level, policy evaluation serves not merely as a performance indicator for development program implementation, but equally as a tangible manifestation of public accountability and as an indispensable reference for evidence-based policy refinement in subsequent periods. In Lampung Province, the Regional Development Planning Agency (*Badan Perencanaan Pembangunan Daerah/Bappeda*) occupies a strategically pivotal role in evaluating the Regional Regulations that serve as the foundational legal basis for the formulation of the Regional Medium-Term Development Plan (*Rencana Pembangunan Jangka Menengah Daerah/RPJMD*). This evaluative process is formally executed through centrally prescribed mechanisms, including the Government Agency Performance Accountability Report (*Laporan Akuntabilitas Kinerja Instansi Pemerintah/LAKIP*), the Government Agency Performance Accountability System (*Sistem Akuntabilitas Kinerja Instansi Pemerintah/SAKIP*), and the Regional Government Administration Report (*Laporan Penyelenggaraan Pemerintahan Daerah/LPPD*). Such evaluations are, however, narrowly focused

upon the attainment of output targets and the proper utilization of budgetary allocations, rendering them fundamentally administrative in character with a pronounced and limiting orientation toward procedural compliance rather than substantive policy assessment..

In practice, the Provincial Government of Lampung has demonstrably failed to conduct comprehensive and substantive policy evaluations. Evaluative activities are undertaken merely as procedural formalities in observance of the mandate stipulated in Minister of Home Affairs Regulation Number 86 of 2017 and Minister of Home Affairs Instruction Number 2 of 2025, rather than as genuine exercises in evidence-based governance. Based on empirical data gathered in the course of this study, systematic internal evaluation by governmental apparatus has never been conducted, owing principally to the chronic absence of human resources possessing the requisite specialized competencies for evaluative undertakings. Moreover, regional apparatus units have never been provided with substantive institutional guidance regarding the critical importance of policy evaluation as an instrument of effective governance.

To date, academic evaluation, defined as the systematic assessment directed at measuring the extent to which policies have generated tangible outcomes and broader societal impacts, has yet to be conducted in a systematic or institutionalized manner at the level of the provincial government. In other words, substantive evaluation aimed at critically examining the causal effects of policies upon social development, economic progress, and overall societal welfare has not been incorporated as an integral component of Bappeda's routine institutional procedures. This structural deficiency carries significant governance implications, as it may engender adverse public perceptions and give rise to well-founded suspicions that regulatory instruments are formulated predominantly in the interests of the political elite, without adequate consideration of the genuine aspirations and multifaceted needs of the broader populace

Furthermore, external evaluations have been conducted on select occasions, most notably in the form of academic scholarship such as undergraduate and postgraduate theses and peer-reviewed scientific studies examining Lampung's development policies. Such external evaluations have generally yielded substantive recommendations for policy improvement across the dimensions of planning, implementation, and monitoring. However, based on extensive documentary review and in-depth interview data, a considerable proportion of the recommendations generated by these studies have not been translated into concrete policy action, resulting in a conspicuous absence of measurable outputs or institutionalized follow-up mechanisms. This condition is indicative of a systemic governance gap: although Lampung Province has nominally established formal policy evaluation mechanisms, significant deficiencies persist with respect to both the analytical depth of evaluations conducted and the practical utilization of evaluative findings for policy improvement. Existing evaluations demonstrate a persistent tendency to terminate at the stage of administrative reporting, unaccompanied by measurable, systematic, and sustainable corrective interventions. There accordingly exists an urgent and compelling institutional imperative to integrate formal, academic, and external evaluation into a coherent, mutually reinforcing system, so that evaluative findings may genuinely and substantively serve as the empirical foundation for effective, evidence-based policy decision-making..

Constraints Encountered in the Implementation of Public Policy Evaluation by the Provincial Government of Lampung

Public policy evaluation of Regional Regulations is fundamentally intended to examine and rigorously assess whether such regulations are in substantive conformity with the prevailing legislative framework governing governmental affairs, and to critically analyze whether their provisions contravene the broader public interest, thereby serving as an objective benchmark for the success of regulatory implementation. Pursuant to Minister of Home Affairs Regulation Number 86 of 2017 and Minister of Home Affairs Instruction Number 2 of 2025, Regional Regulations, as primary products of the regional legislative drafting process, are legally mandated to be subjected to systematic evaluation in order to assess their conformity with superordinate legislation and their alignment with the general interests of the populace. In the course of this evaluative process, the Governor is directed to engage in formal consultations with the Ministry of Home Affairs, effectuated through the issuance of a Governor's Decree, for the purpose of conducting a comprehensive substantive review of the Regional Regulation under examination.

Based on the empirical data obtained in the course of this investigation, the Provincial Government of Lampung has demonstrably failed to conduct policy evaluations on a systematic and routine basis. This condition is directly attributable to a constellation of institutional constraints that collectively impede the effective and efficient discharge of governmental functions, as elaborated below:

1. Inadequate human resource capacity for evaluative functions. The human resources presently available within the regional governmental apparatus do not possess the requisite competencies to conduct policy evaluations in a rigorous and methodologically sound manner. This constitutes a particularly acute institutional deficit, given that the considerable numerical size of the governmental bureaucracy has not been accompanied by the cultivation of the specialized knowledge and evaluative competencies indispensable for conducting substantive policy assessments.
2. Institutional resistance to critical scrutiny. Government officials demonstrate a marked disinclination toward external accountability and tend to regard their enacted policies as inherently beyond reproach. A substantial volume of public aspirations remains systematically unheeded, with policy formulation driven predominantly by the interests of incumbent officials rather than by the evidenced needs of the populace. The data obtained reveal that, within the domain of development-related Regional Regulations, the overwhelming majority of enacted policies are oriented toward budgetary and fiscal matters, with conspicuously limited attention directed toward the substantive socioeconomic needs of the community.
3. Coordination complexity and budgetary constraints. The conduct of a substantive evaluative review necessitates extensive consultation and multi-stakeholder coordination involving entities with direct institutional interests, including the Ministry of Home Affairs, the Provincial House of Representative, the Regional Government, the National Law Development Agency (*Badan Pembinaan Hukum Nasional/BPHN*), and other relevant governmental bodies. Such coordination demands considerably greater operational budgetary allocations than are typically available. As a direct consequence, regional governments default to conducting exclusively internal evaluations that exclude external parties, effectively reducing such evaluations to procedural formalities devoid of substantive analytical rigor.
4. Absence of institutionalized follow-up mechanisms for external evaluation recommendations. A pervasive pattern has been observed whereby evaluations of Regional Regulations are predominantly conducted by external actors, most notably academic scholars. While these evaluations generate substantive policy recommendations directed at the regional government, no meaningful institutional response or receptive engagement with such inputs has been forthcoming from the regional governmental apparatus, thereby systematically precluding the identification and remediation of structural weaknesses in regional governance.

An administrative orientation that disproportionately prioritizes the fulfillment of central government reporting obligations over substantive policy inquiry constitutes an additional and pervasive structural constraint. In the course of evaluative activities, the government's attention is not directed toward the assessment of policy impacts upon the intended beneficiaries of Regional Regulations; rather, it is confined to measuring the extent of formal regulatory compliance and calculating implementation expenditures for the purposes of upward reporting to the central government.

The implementation of policy evaluation in Lampung Province continues to be severely constrained by a complex array of interrelated institutional impediments, encompassing the critically limited availability of competent human resources, entrenched bureaucratic resistance to critical accountability, chronic budgetary inadequacies, the systemic absence of meaningful follow-up mechanisms for external evaluation recommendations, and a deeply embedded evaluative orientation that privileges administrative compliance over substantive policy analysis. As a compounded consequence, the evaluation of Regional Regulations persistently assumes a perfunctory character and demonstrably fails to generate the meaningful and measurable policy improvements that the public interest demands. It is therefore unequivocally imperative that the regional government demonstrate a resolute and sustained institutional commitment to the comprehensive reform of its evaluative mechanisms through the systematic enhancement of human resource competencies, the structured and meaningful engagement of relevant multi-stakeholder actors, the provision of adequate and dedicated budgetary resources, and a fundamental paradigmatic transformation of the bureaucratic apparatus toward a governance model characterized by greater transparency, participatory accountability, and genuine responsiveness to the multifaceted and evolving needs of the populace

Conclusions and Recommendations

The evaluation of public policies pertaining to Regional Regulations (*Peraturan Daerah/Perda*) in Lampung Province remains predominantly perfunctory in character and has yet to be optimally implemented in accordance with the foundational principles of good governance. Notwithstanding the formal availability of established evaluative mechanisms such as SAKIP, LAKIP, and LPPD, their implementation is more substantially oriented toward the fulfillment of administrative reporting obligations to the central government than toward rigorous substantive policy analysis. The overwhelming majority of Regional Regulations enacted during the 2023–2024 period have never been subjected to comprehensive evaluation, neither with respect to the effectiveness of objective attainment nor in terms of their broader impacts upon the populace.

The principal constraints encountered encompass the critically limited availability of human resources possessing specialized competencies in policy evaluation, entrenched resistance among policymakers to critical external scrutiny, chronic budgetary inadequacies, the systematic absence of institutionalized follow-up mechanisms for recommendations generated by external parties, and the persistently low level of meaningful stakeholder engagement. As a consequential outcome of these compounding constraints, recommendations emanating from academic or external evaluations are frequently left unimplemented, thereby precluding the realization of the policy improvement potential that such evaluations are designed to generate. These findings unequivocally affirm the critical imperative of a fundamental paradigmatic shift in the approach to policy evaluation from a narrowly administrative exercise to a substantively rigorous process genuinely oriented toward the attainment of measurable outcomes and tangible societal impacts. To this end, the cultivation of robust political and managerial commitment on the part of the regional government is indispensable, directed toward the systematic strengthening of human resource capacities, the meaningful broadening of multi-stakeholder engagement, the provision of adequate and dedicated budgetary allocations, and the institutionalization of evaluative recommendation follow-up as an integral and non-negotiable component of the public policy cycle. Through the concerted pursuit of these imperatives, the evaluation of Regional Regulations may be transformed into a strategic institutional instrument for the realization of policies that are effective, participatory, and genuinely responsive to the multifaceted and evolving needs of the people of Lampung.

References

- Ambarwati, P., Fathurrohman, N., & Fauzi, A. (2024). Perumusan Masalah Kebijakan, Alternatif Kebijakan, dan Rekomendasi Kebijakan dalam Mempengaruhi Perkembangan Kurikulum Pendidikan. *Jurnal Syntax Admiration*, 5(5), 1598–1605. <https://doi.org/10.46799/jsa.v5i5.1139>
- Hanberger, A. (2001). What is the Policy Problem? *Evaluation*, 7(1), 45–62. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13563890122209513>
- Handoyo, E. (2012). *Kebijakan Publik* (Mustrose (ed.)). FISIP UNS dan Widya Karya Semarang.
- Hariato, F. A. (2020). Efektivitas, Efisiensi, Dan Responsivitas Kebijakan Regrouping Sekolah Di Wilayah Jakarta Selatan. *Prosiding Samasta : Seminar Nasional Bahasa Dan Sastra Indonesia*, 1–6.
- Hendarman. (2025). Evaluasi Kebijakan Bukan Keniscayaan? *Sindonews.Com*. <https://nasional.sindonews.com/read/1557605/18/evaluasi-kebijakan-bukan-keniscayaan-1745215480>
- Joysurahman, R. A., Supandi, M., Tedi Wardani, M., Puthaen, M., & Setiawan, F. (2021). Problematika Dalam Evaluasi Kebijakan Pendidikan Di Indonesia. *BINTANG : Jurnal Pendidikan Dan Sains*, 3(2), 215–227. <https://ejournal.stitpn.ac.id/index.php/bintang>
- Melati, T., & Asmorowati, S. (2023). Evaluasi Kebijakan Publik Dalam Mendorong Inklusi Sosial: Tinjauan Dari Prespektif Kebijakan Publik. *Jurnal Darma Agung*, 31(3), 257. <https://doi.org/10.46930/ojsuda.v31i3.3453>
- Moleong, L. J. (2021). *Metodologi penelitian kualitatif* (40th ed.). Remaja Rosda Karya.
- Muhiddin, A. (2017). Evaluasi Kebijakan Publik (Studi Kesiapan Desa Menerima Dana Desa di Kabupaten Gowa). *Universitas Negeri Makassar*, 1–339. http://eprints.unm.ac.id/4365/1/AMIR_MUHIDDIN.pdf

- Nasution, I., Monalisa, F. N., Fadla, S. L., Wildyani, E. P., Aulia, P. F., & Wijaya, A. R. H. (2023). Kompetensi Evaluator Dalam Pelaksanaan Evaluasi Program Pendidikan. *Jurnal Jendela Pendidikan*, 3(02), 193–202. <https://doi.org/10.57008/jjp.v3i02.437>
- Peters, B. G., Capano, G., Howlett, M., Mukherjee, I., Chou, M.-H., & Ravinet, P. (2018). *Designing For Policy Effectiveness* (1st ed.). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108555081>
- Seputar Birokrasi. (2025). Penyebab Evaluasi Kebijakan Publik Sering Terabaikan. <https://seputarbirokrasi.com/penyebab-evaluasi-kebijakan-publik-sering-terabaikan/>
- Warman, W., Komariyah, L., & Kaltsum, K. F. U. (2023). Konsep Umum Evaluasi Kebijakan. *Jurnal Ilmu Manajemen Dan Pendidikan*, 3, 25–32. <https://doi.org/10.30872/jimpian.v3ise.2912>