

The Policy Implementation of Simplification Bureaucracy for Performance Improvement in the Ministry of Administrative and Bureaucratic Reform

Naptalina Sipayung¹, Nyoman Sumaryadi², Dahyar Daraba³, Sampara Lukman⁴

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

naftalina_sipayung@yahoo.com

Abstract

This research aims to know The Policy Implementation of Simplification Bureaucracy For Performance Improvement in The Ministry of Administrative and Bureaucratic Reform and whats is the problems that opportunities and challenges the policy implementation of Simplification bureaucracy for Performance Improvement and what is the ideal model for Bureaucratic Simplification and then find what is the ideal models for optimize policy implementation. Data is obtained by using interview, observation and documentation study from 35 informen. Primer data that obtained by interview and processed with analisys on theory Policy Implementation by Edwards George III 1980, Theory and Simplification Bureaucracy with Guollart & Kelly with Development Organization Theory and for increasing performance using Cascio Theory1992. All primer data especially from interview put in to coding with each informan as formulation regulator (Echelon I), implementor (echelon II) and target group (functional from eselon 3 dan 4), but cause of the covid situation, part of officers work from home, I do less observation but do in deep interview via zoom. The result finds that the implementation policy of simplification bureaucracy has not optimize yet in accordance with the goals and objectives or has not brought significant changes especially in increasing performance. To do implementation for this policy needs another policy (lack of policy) especially for reward and punishment, performance appraisal, work mechanism) and changed culture organization (mindset and culture set). Researcher recommend, for optimize implementation of simplification bureaucratic reform, based on Edwards III theory in structure bueraucracy with Team Work and for ideal model work (AGILE Squad Team). Beside that to accelerate the implementation of policy based on Edwards III theory, it is to add organizational culture factors through changes organization culture in mindset and culture set.

Keywords

policy implementation;
 simplification bureaucracy;
 organization performance



I. Introduction

The progress of a country cannot be separated from the important role of a country's bureaucracy. If there are problems in the development of the country, it can be said that there are still problems in the bureaucracy. Bureaucracy is the key to answer public dissatisfaction

with service and poor bureaucracy by a government. Therefore, to ensure the implementation of development in accordance with the demands of the community, it is necessary to carry out Bureaucratic Reform to realize good and clean governance .

The implementation of bureaucratic reform is a process of continuous change and improvement. The need for change is inevitable given the demands for change from society as well as the development of information technology, globalization and increasing the nation's competitiveness . Bureaucratic Reform is an important instrument in modern society whose presence is bound to happen . The existence of this bureaucracy is a logical consequence of the main task of the state (government) to organize social welfare.

Bureaucratic reform must have a direct impact on improvements in the bureaucratic environment. Therefore, Bureaucratic Reform is a necessity that needs to be fulfilled in order to ensure the creation of improvements

governance. Good governance is the main prerequisite for national development. The better the governance of a country, the faster the wheels of national development will turn which is marked by increased public trust in the government caused by a government that upholds integrity, is clean and free from corruption, collusion and nepotism and provides good services to the community.

In order to ensure that bureaucratic reform is managed effectively, the government needs to establish planning and governance of bureaucratic reform in a planning program that can be understood and implemented by all interested parties. In this regard, the Government has stipulated Presidential Regulation Number 81 of 2010 concerning the Grand Design of Bureaucratic Reform 2010–2025 which aims to create a professional government with characteristics, integrity, high performance, free from KKN, able to serve the public, neutral, prosperous, dedicated, and uphold the basic values and code of ethics of the state apparatus. Likewise with the policies set forth in Presidential Regulation Number 17 of 2007 concerning the National Long-Term Development Plan of 2005 – 2025 which states that "the development of the apparatus is carried out through bureaucratic reform to increase the professionalism of the state apparatus and good governance and clean government apparatus at the center, and regions, in order to be able to support the success of development in other fields" (Bappenas 2007:3)

In the process of running reform since the National Reform program was established in 2010 until the implementation of bureaucratic reform at the end of 2019 assessment, it has experienced a gradual increase as indicated by an increase in the bureaucratic reform index, especially in Ministries and Institutions, but nationally it is still considered slow. This can be demonstrated by the difficulty of boosting Indonesia's competitiveness . Indonesia's competitiveness has dropped from 45th in 2018 to 50th in 2019. Likewise, the ease of doing business in Indonesia remains at 73rd in the Doing Business 2020 report released by the World Bank on Thursday. (24/10/2019). However, although the ranking remains, Indonesia recorded an increase in its score on the index from 67.96 last year to 69.60. Likewise, the achievement of the government 's effectiveness index (Government Effectiveness Index)/IEP has a score of more than 80 (>80) with a minimum rank of 35. The World Bank noted that in 2018, the Indonesian Government Effectiveness Index was ranked 95. This shows that Indonesia has progressed by 26 levels or an increase in the score of 8.81 Government Effectiveness Index in the last 3 years, where in 2016 Indonesia's IEP was in position/ranked 121 with a score of 46, in 2017 ranked 98 with a score of 53.37 to rank 95 with a score of 54.81 in 2018. The increase in the IEP is part of the implementation of the basic values, code of ethics and ASN code of conduct and ASN neutrality as well as the application of a merit system in ASN management. (Source: KASN Annual Report, 2018).

Based on the background described above, there are several problems regarding the implementation of the Bureaucracy Simplification policy at the PANRB Ministry as follows:

1. The Bureaucratic Simplification Policy is a direct direction from the President, which is top-down in nature, the formulation of the policy has not been studied in depth on the impact of the policy.

Restricting the Problem

Based on the identification of the problem and looking at the very varied problems, researchers need to limit the problem to the focus, locus to be studied. The focus of this research is the implementation of bureaucratic simplification policies in improving the performance of only 141 echelon 3 and 4 structural officials who become functional officials, consisting of 52 Intermediate functional officials and 89 Junior functional officials. Assuming the official has worked for 2 years since his inauguration on February 11, 2020, his performance can be assessed.

The research locus was carried out within the Ministry of Administrative Reform and Bureaucratic Reform. The reason why the researchers chose the research locus was because the Ministry of Administrative Reform and Bureaucratic Reform was a pilot project for implementing the Bureaucratic Simplification policy. In addition, the Ministry of State Apparatus Empowerment and Bureaucratic Reform has a function as a policy maker as well as an implementer of the policy. Furthermore, the Ministry of PANRB is an institution that becomes a prototype and becomes an engine of reform from the implementation of the bureaucratic reform program. The Ministry of PANRB is a barometer of the success of implementing policies to simplify the bureaucracy in accordance with the Presidential Directive on Bureaucratic Reform, namely Structural Reform. Therefore, the implementation of the bureaucratic simplification policy within the PANRB Ministry is an illustration and benchmark for the success or failure of the implementation of the Bureaucratic Reform Policy, especially the Bureaucratic Simplification policy.

The purpose of the research is to describe, analyze and find out the implementation of bureaucratic simplification policies in the Ministry of PANRB

These benefits are Academic/Theoretical Benefits, namely providing concepts, ideas that will be used as references in enriching the repertoire of knowledge, especially those related to policy implementation research on bureaucratic simplification. The results of this research will be used as a scientific basis for the development of government science.

II. Research Methods

2.1 Research Design

This study aims to describe the implementation of bureaucratic simplification policies in improving performance within the Ministry of Administrative Reform and Bureaucratic Reform. Therefore, to obtain comprehensive results, the design of this study was a qualitative research design. Creswell said that "qualitative research is a complex picture, examines words, reports detailed views of respondents and conducts studies in natural situations".

While the type of research used is descriptive research. This type of research is used because the nature and purpose of the research is to find or build a hypothesis, not to test a hypothesis, but to try to get a comprehensive picture of the implementation of bureaucratic simplification policies in improving performance in the Ministry of Administrative Reform and Bureaucratic Reform.

According to Surahmad that research with descriptive methods aims to solve problems in the present including research with narrative, analysis and classification, so this method is usually called the analytical method (Winarno, 1980).

The implementation of the method is not limited to data collection and compilation, but also includes analysis and interpretation of the data.

The qualitative descriptive method according to Sukmadinata is intended to describe or describe existing phenomena, both natural phenomena and human engineering.

Furthermore, according to Sukmadinata that "understanding is obtained through the analysis of various interrelationships from the participants and through the decomposition, meaning of situations and events. Participants' meaning includes the feelings, beliefs, ideas, thoughts and activities of the participants (Sukmadinata, 2003).

Qualitative descriptive method according to Bogdan and Taylor quoted by Moleong, is defined as "a research procedure that produces descriptive data in the form of written/oral words from people and observable behaviour (Bogdan, 1998).

Furthermore, qualitative research is aimed at understanding social phenomena from the participant's point of view or perspective by looking at various symptoms from information, information, events from the results of the implementation of bureaucratic simplification policies that will be revealed and presented in words and disclosed in depth with the latest or updated data.

The selection of descriptive research methods is due to the symptoms of information, phenomena, descriptions, events which are social situations and events in the implementation of bureaucratic simplification policies at the PANRB Ministry, so that it will be more appropriate if expressed in words that are presented in depth and actually with the latest data and information. (up to date), so that it emphasizes more on the meaning that actually occurs during the implementation of the simplification policy as well as analyzing and solving existing problems.

2.2 Data Analysis Techniques

Data analysis in this study refers to the qualitative data analysis model. Bogdan in Sugiyono states that data analysis is the process of systematically searching and compiling data obtained from interviews, field notes, and other materials, so that they can be easily understood and the findings can be informed to others (Sugiyono, 2011).

Furthermore, Sugiyono stated that data analysis in qualitative research was carried out during data collection and after data collection was completed within a certain period.

III. Discussion

3.1 Implementation of Bureaucratic Simplification Policy within the Ministry of PANRB

The Ministry of PANRB as the formulator of the National Policy on Empowerment of State Apparatus and Bureaucratic Reform should be a barometer successful implementation of the implementation of Bureaucratic Reform nationally. Referring to President Jokowi's directives on Bureaucratic Reform, namely Structural Reform, which was followed up by the direction of the PANRB Minister Tjahjo Kumolo, who set the Ministry of PAN and RB as a pilot project for the implementation of Bureaucratic Simplification by transferring structural positions to functional officials, as shown in the table below:

Table 1. Number of Echelon III and Echelon IV Structural Positions who Becomes a Functional Officer

NO.	JABATAN STRUKTURAL	STRUKTUR		DIALIHKAN KE FUNGSIONAL
		LAMA	BARU*	
1	Administrator (Eselon III)	53	1	Ahli Madya: 52 pejabat
2	Pengawas (Eselon IV)	91	2	Ahli Muda: 89 pejabat
Total		144 pejabat	3	141

Keterangan *):

1. Bagian Tata Usaha dan Layanan Pengadaan
2. Subbagian Protokol
3. Subbagian Rumah Tangga

Source: Presentation of the Deputy for Institutional and Management of the Ministry of PAN and RB, on November 5, 2019 and the HRU Bureau of the KemPANRB, on February 11, 2020

In this study, the theoretical basis used by the researcher is based on applied theory by using the theory of George C Edwards III 1980, in Subarsono the theory of Policy Implementation. Research on the Implementation of Bureaucratic Simplification Policies in the Ministry of PAN and Bureaucratic Reform with a 4 Factor approach, namely

1. Communication with the Dimensions of Transmission, Clarity and Consistency
2. Resources with dimensions of Finance, Human Resources, Authority and Infrastructure
3. Disposition with dimensions of Attitude and Incentive pelaksana
4. Bureaucratic Structure with dimensions of Relationships between Organizations, Standard Operating Procedures (SOP) and Fragmented.

3.2 Communication Analysis

the process of implementing the Bureaucracy simplification policy within the Ministry of PANRB , it is still not optimal, marked by various phenomena of problems that arise, in connection with this an analysis will be carried out based on applied theory uses the Edwards III (1980) Model Theory in Subarsono, namely Policy Implementation with 4 factors including 1 Communication 2. Resources 3. Disposition 4. Bureaucracy Structure can be described by the approach of 1) Communication Factors with the dimensions of Transmission, Clarity and Consistency; 2) Resource factor with dimensions of Finance, Human and Authority; 3) Disposition factor with dimensions of clarity of orders, accuracy and certainty of follow-up; and 4) Bureaucratic Structure Factors with dimensions of Relationships between Organizations, Standard Operating Procedures and Fragmented.

The advantages of the model, the Edwards III Policy Implementation Model (emphasizing the importance of communication, that communication is the main capital in policy implementation, namely the human element in policy implementation becomes dominant, as is the case with the disposition and structure of the bureaucracy, requiring effective communication.

The Ministry of PANRB as a policy maker and also as a pilot project of the policy must be a barometer of the successful implementation of the Bureaucratic Simplification. As Formulator _ The Bureaucratic Simplification Policy is committed and consistent so that the implementation of the Bureaucratic Simplification policy is immediately implemented in accordance with the aims and objectives of the bureaucratic simplification policy. However, as policy makers by the leadership of echelon 1 units in this case the Deputy and Secretary of

the Ministry and several officials within the Deputy for Institutional and Management as the unit that is directly responsible for formulating the Bureaucratic Simplification Policy in carrying out the policy formulation process in a very immediate and not timely manner. through in-depth analysis/study because it is a direct directive of the president which is a top down even though the policy is not yet formally in the form of a presidential regulation.

The Bureaucratic Simplification Policy stipulated by the PANRB Ministerial Regulation Number 28 of 2019 and which has been refined by the PANRB Ministerial Regulation Number 17 of 2021 concerning Equalization of Administrative Positions into Functional Positions and the PANRB Ministerial Regulation Number 25 of 2021 concerning the Bureaucratic Simplification Policy has been implemented within the Ministry PANRB. The implementation of the Bureaucratic Simplification Policy begins with data collection for echelon 3 and 4 officials through the Circular Letter of the PANRB Minister No. 384 of 2019. Furthermore, the implementation of the Ministerial Regulation on Bureaucracy Simplification and various policy instruments to become the basis for the implementation of the Bureaucratic Simplification.

According to the PANRB Ministerial Regulation Number 25 of 2021, the definition of Bureaucracy Simplification is part of the bureaucratic restructuring process to make the government administration system more effective and efficient through simplifying organizational structures, equalizing positions, and adjusting work systems. Meanwhile, Simplification of Organizational Structure is the streamlining of organizational units of Administrative Positions in Government Agencies to reduce the level of organizational units. Equalization of Administrative Positions into Functional Positions, hereinafter referred to as Equalization of Positions, is the appointment of Administrative Officers to Functional Positions through adjustment/ inpassing to equivalent Functional Positions.

Based on the Regulation of the Minister of PANRB Number 25 of 2021, it can be described that the simplification of the organizational structure is different from the organizational arrangement in general. Simplification in this case it is more to simplify the position (administration) to functional positions.

In relation to the implementation of the bureaucratic simplification policy, the communication factor will determine the success of the policy in accordance with the aims and objectives of the policy formulation. For this reason, the human resource factor that will communicate as an implementer of the policy targets / targets, namely functional officials, must have competence in understanding the policy and be able to communicate in accordance with the aims and objectives of the policy. Effective communication is essential for all organizations. Organizational communication is satisfaction of organizational member toward several communication aspects occurs within organization (Syakur, 2020). Communication is the process of delivering accurate, clear, consistent, and comprehensive information as well as coordination between relevant agencies in the implementation process (Mahendra, 2021). Communication management is one of the important aspects in implementing a program or policy (Irma, 2020). However, to find out the extent of success in implementing the policy, which is described in accordance with the simple goal of bureaucratic simplification , agile and adaptive and effective organizations must have clear and measurable measures or indicators of success .

Furthermore, what is in line with the statement regarding the understanding of the target group on the policy of bureaucratic simplification so that it can be implemented properly in accordance with the aims and objectives of the bureaucratic simplification policy, it is necessary to understand not only at the implementor level but also at the target group in this case functional officials who are transitioning from structural. The need for understanding from the target group of the intent and purpose of the policy as well as the clarity of the

substance of the policy, so that the target group knows what must be prepared and done and implemented for the success of the policy effectively and efficiently.

Based on the information from the informants above, according to the communication factor with the dimensions of transmission/ transmission and the dimensions of clarity/ clarity have not described the clarity of the indicators of success called agile, simple, effective and efficient in the absence of a performance measurement system (building the measurement system), so that the communication factor with the dimensions of clarity on the simplification policy cannot be understood and implemented because there are no indicators of the success of the bureaucratic simplification policy.

3.3 Resource Analysis

Edwards III in Widodo argues that resource factors have an important role in policy implementation and states that these resources include: a. Human resources, b. budget resources, c. resource equipment / facilities and infrastructure and d. authority resources.

3.4 Supporting and Inhibiting Factors in the Implementation of the Bureaucracy Simplification Policy of the Ministry of PANRB

Furthermore, in the process of implementing the Bureaucracy simplification policy within the PANRB ministry, it is still not optimal, marked by various phenomena of problems that arise, in connection with this an analysis will be carried out based on applied theory using Edwards III (1980) Policy Implementation with 4 factors including 1) Communication 2. Resources 3. Disposition 4. Structure can be described by the approach of 1) Communication Dimensions with indicators of Transmission, Clarity and Consistency; 2) Dimensions of Resources with indicators of Finance, Human and Authority; 3) Disposition Dimension with Indicator Clarity of orders, accuracy and certainty of follow-up; and 4) Dimensions of Bureaucratic Structure with Indicators of Division of Authority, Relationships between Organizations, Standard Operating Procedures and Fragmented.

The advantages of the model, the Edwards III Policy Implementation Model (emphasizing the importance of communication, that communication is the main capital in policy implementation, namely the human element in policy implementation becomes dominant, as is the case with the disposition and structure of the bureaucracy, requiring effective communication.

3.5 Communication Analysis

a. Supporting Factors of Communication Dimension

As Edwards III's policy implementation theory uses a communication approach with the dimensions of transmission, clarity and consistency. Communication is the main requirement for policy implementers (implementors) to the target group, namely policy implementers must know what they have to do, to whom the policy must be channeled so that the policy will be implemented to be clear and consistent to continue to be implemented. According to Edwards III, communication and policy implementation consist of 3 (three) indicators, namely transmission, clarity and consistency. In the implementation of the Bureaucratic Simplification Policy, communication support is needed and this is an important factor so that the policy can be implemented by making clear communication through communication and socialization of the Bureaucratic Simplification policy.

Based on the information from some of the informants above, it can be said that the supporting factors for the implementation of the policy of simplifying the bureaucracy in the communication dimension are supported by the socialization activities carried out by the HR bureau and the consistency in applying the work model over the past few years in line with

efforts to improve the working mechanism that is arranged to increase achievements in accordance with the aim of simplifying the bureaucracy.

A policy program is socialized in order to have the desired goal or effect. Socialization is seen as a process of interaction between a set of implementers, actions and goals that can achieve policy goals, where in the socialization of policies actors, organizations, procedures, and techniques are used together.

b. Inhibiting Factors of Communication Dimension

Since the stipulation of the Bureaucratic Simplification Policy with PANRB Ministerial Regulation Number 28 of 2019 which was later refined by PANRB Ministerial Regulation Number 17 of 2021 concerning Equalization of Administrative Positions into Functional Positions and regulating Resources Human resources as a transition from echelon 3 and echelon 4. Furthermore, the regulation of the organizational structure has been stipulated in the Regulation of the Minister of PANRB Number 25 of 2021 concerning Simplification of the Organizational structure in Government agencies for Simplification of the Bureaucracy.

The regulation states that the definition of Bureaucracy Simplification is part of the bureaucratic restructuring process to realize a more effective and efficient government administration system through simplifying organizational structures, equalizing positions, and adjusting work systems.

Simplification of Organizational Structure is the streamlining of organizational units of Administrative Positions in Government Agencies to reduce the level of organizational units. Equalization of Administrative Positions into Functional Positions, hereinafter referred to as Equalization of Positions, is the appointment of Administrative Officers into Functional Positions through adjustment/ inpassing to equivalent Functional Positions. Meanwhile, the definition of Work System Adjustment is the improvement and development of work mechanisms and business processes of State Civil Apparatus Employees by utilizing an electronic-based government system.

In the implementation of the Bureaucracy Simplification policy at the PANRB Ministry, communication was carried out through socialization to all employees in early April 2020 and specifically to echelon 3 and 4 officials who would be functionalized through direct communication through interviews with experiences, skills and daily tasks handled as a basis. the placement of structural officials is placed in functional positions. However, the socialization was only once and did not fully discuss the policy until it fully understood the goals and objectives of the policy, the understanding was only general in nature and did not discuss in detail the entire policy, so sometimes it is still confusing especially when you see that the regulation is not supported by policies that others to accelerate the implementation of the Bureaucratic Simplification policy,

Policy analyst is a functional position in the organization of the Ministry of PANRB which has a strategic position. As stated in the Regulation of the Minister of PANRB No. 45 of 2013 concerning the Functional Position of Policy Analyst and its Credit Score that "The Functional Position of Policy Analyst is a certain functional position that has the scope of duties, responsibilities, and authority to carry out policy studies and analysis within the Central and Regional agencies. Policy Analysts are Civil Servants who are given the task, responsibility, and authority to carry out policy studies and analysis within the Central and Regional agencies. Policy Review and Analysis is the activity of reviewing and analyzing policies by applying the principles of professionalism, accountability, integrity, efficiency and effectiveness to achieve certain goals and/or resolve public problems."

It is also stated in the PANRB Ministerial Regulation that "the Functional Position of Policy Analyst is included in the management clump. Domiciled as functional executor in the

field of policy studies and analysis at central and regional agencies. Policy Analyst is also a career position, with the main task of carrying out policy studies and analysis.

Table 2. The Lowest Number of Cumulative Credit Scores for Appointment and Promotion of Position/Policy Analyst Rank with Undergraduate Education (S1)

OF POSITION/LEVEL, ANALYST RANK WITH UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION (S1)												
No.	Element		Percentage	Position Level/Space Class and Credit Score								
				First		Young		middle			Main	
				III/a	III/b	III/c	III/d	IV/a	IV/b	IV/c	IV/d	IV/e
1	Main											
	a.	Education 1) Formal		100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
	b.	2) Education and Training										
	c.	Policy Studies and Analysis	80%	-	40	80	160	240	360	480	600	760
		Professional Development										
2.	Support											
		Analytical Task Support	20%	-	10	20	40	60	90	120	150	190
AMOUNT				100	150	200	300	400	550	700	850	1050

Source: PANRB Regulation No. 45 of 2013

Table 3. The Lowest Number of Cumulative Credit Scores for Appointment and Promotion of Position/Policy Analyst Rank with Masters Education (S2)

No.	Element		Percentage	Position Level/Space Class and Credit Score								
				First		Young		middle			Main	
				III/b	III/c	III/d	IV/a	IV/b	IV/c	IV/d	IV/e	
1	Main											
	a.	Education 1) Formal		150	150	150	150	150	150	150	150	
	b.	2) Education and Training	80%	-	40	120	200	320	440	560	720	
	c.	Policy Studies and Analysis										
		Professional Development										
2.	Support Analytical Task Support		20%	-	10	30	50	80	110	140	180	
AMOUNT				150	200	300	400	550	700	850	1050	

Source: PANRB Regulation No. 45 of 2013

Table 4. The Lowest Number of Cumulative Credit Scores for Appointment and Promotion of Position/Policy Analyst with Doctoral Education (S3)

No.	Element		Percentage	Position Level/Space Class and Credit Score						
				Young		middle			Main	
				III/c	III/d	IV/a	IV/b	IV/c	IV/d	IV/e
1	Main									
	a.	Education 1) Formal		200	200	200	200	200	200	200
	b.	2) Education and Training	80%	-	80	160	280	400	520	680
	c.	Policy Studies and Analysis								
		Professional Development								
2.	Support Analytical Task Support		20%	-	20	40	70	100	130	170
AMOUNT				200	300	400	550	700	850	1050

Source: PANRB Regulation No. 45 of 2013

Then, based on the information from some of the informants above, it can be said that in the perspective of communication analysis in the implementation of bureaucratic simplification policies, it can be stated that the obstacles include the intensity of communication being less intense, the apparatus' understanding of policies is still weak, and the void of regulations supporting bureaucratic simplification policies. Thus, all of these inhibiting factors lead to non-fluency in the communication process which can hinder the implementation of this bureaucratic simplification policy.

The importance of smooth communication in policy implementation is based on the premise that policy implementation is influenced by communication where the success of policy implementation requires the implementor to know what to do, where the goals and objectives of the policy must be transmitted to the target group (target). Likewise, the communication process that is hampered due to the intensity of the transmission of a policy that is less intense causes the implementation of an order to be hampered or there is a delay, as it is said that the transmission of communication can affect the implementation of a policy. Before an official can implement a policy, he or she must be aware that a decision has been made and an order for its implementation has been issued.

The importance of transmission in policy communication, as it is also stated that the more carefully the decisions and implementation orders are forwarded to those who have to carry them out, the higher the probability that the policy decisions and implementation orders will be carried out. Transmission in communication has a strategic position so that a standard and policy objectives can be communicated clearly, because the standards and policy objectives must be clear and measurable so that they can be realized. If the standards and policy objectives are not clear, there will be multiple interpretations and it is easy to cause conflict between implementing agents.

Likewise, it is said that the success factor of implementation also depends on the clarity of program objectives at the consensus level at the level of consensus between implementers of these goals.

Then it is related to the void of regulations supporting the Simplification of Bureaucracy policies which is one of the obstacles in the communication dimension as it is said that policy standards and objectives: namely the details of the overall policy decision objectives in the form of regulatory documents towards the determination of specific and concrete standards to assess program performance. So that if there are no regulations to support clearer standards and concrete specifications to be able to assess the performance of the course of a policy, it is difficult to assess the success of a program and it is difficult to stick to the policy direction that has been set.

Policy supporting regulations also function to clarify a policy starting from planning, as it is said that good policy planning will play a role in determining good results. The concept (which is supported by future data and information) contributes around 60 percent to the success of the policy and about 40 percent to the implementation that must be consistent with the concept.

IV. Conclusion

Based on the description of the results of the research and discussion, the researcher then conveys the conclusion that the implementation of the bureaucratic simplification policy at the PANRB Ministry has not gone well and optimally according to the objectives of the Bureaucratic Simplification policy. The implementation of the Bureaucratic Simplification policy which is associated with improving performance at the PANRB Ministry has not gone well and has not shown any improvement in performance. The researcher found a simplification model of the bureaucracy associated with improving performance, namely: AGILE Teamwork Model (Agile Squad Team) AGILE is an acronym for Adaptive, Group Working, Initiative, Learning, and Effectiveness aspects. The model is considered to be in accordance with the conditions and dynamics as well as the character of functional officials who in carrying out their duties must be agile, work in teams, have initiative, continue to learn relentlessly and be efficient and efficient in carrying out performance according to the objectives of bureaucratic simplification. Meanwhile, the Policy Implementation Model in improving performance developed the Edwards III policy implementation model by adding the bureaucratic structure factor, namely the Work Model dimension and the Disposition factor adding the organizational culture dimension (thinking pattern and work culture).

References

- Adul Wahab, Solichin. 1997. Policy Analysis: from Formulation to Implementation of State Policy. Jakarta: Earth Literacy.
- Albrow, Martin. 1989. Bureaucracy, translation. M. Rusli Karim and Toto Daryanto. Yogyakarta: Tiara Wacana.
- Albreecht, Karl, 1985. Organizational Development: A holistic systems approach to achieve positive change in every organization Effort. Bandung: Space
- Burns, J.P. 2003. "Governance and Public Sector Reform in the People,s Republic of China," dalam Cheung & Scott, Governance and Public Sector Reform in Asia; Paradigm shift or business as usual ?, London : Routledge Curzon.
- Bennis, Warren G, Changing Organizations, dalam W.G. Bennis, KD. Benne dan R.Chin, Eds, The Planning of Change, New York, Holt.Rinehart and Winston, 1969.

- Blau, Peters and Meyers, Marshall W.1987, Birokrasi Dalam Masyarakat Modern. Jakarta: Universitas Indonesia.
- Becker, B.E, Huselid, M.A, Ulrich, D.2001. The Human Resources Scorecard: Linking People, Strategy, and performance. Boston, Massachusetts, USA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Bacal Robert alih Bahasa Surya Dharma, cet 2, 2002, Performance Management, Jakarta, Gramedia Pustaka Umum.
- Caiden, G.E.2009:"A Parabolic Theory of Bureaucracy Max Weber Through The Looking Glass"dalam Farazmand A.(Ed), Bureaucracy and Administration. Boca Raton, FL: Taylor& Francis Group.
- Caiden, Gerald E.1969, Administratitive Reform. Chicago, Illinois: Aldine Publishing Company.
- Creswell, JW (1994). Research Design: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE
- Caiden, Gerald. 1982. Public Administration, Second Edition. Palisade Publisher.
- Callahan, K.2007, Elements of Effective Governance: Measurement, Accountability and Participation. Boca Raton, London & New York: Taylor & Francis Group.
- Dwiyanto, Agus et.al. 2006. Reform of the Public Bureaucracy in Indonesia. Yogyakarta: Gajah Mada University Press.
- Dwiyanto, Agus. 2008. Realizing good governance through public services in Indonesia. Gajah Mada University Press. Yogyakarta:
- Dwiyanto, Agus. 2011. Restoring Public Trust through Bureaucratic Reform. Jakarta: PT. Main Library Gramedia.
- Daraba, Dahyar. 2019. Bureaucratic Reform & Public Service. Jakarta: Leisyah Press.
- Daraba, Dahyar 2019, Das Sollen and Public Service, Makassar State University.
- Denhardt, JV and Denhardt, RBV 2003. The New Public Service: Serving Not Steering. .ME Sharpe Inc. New York.
- Denhardt, RB (2008). Theories of Public Organizations. California: Thomson Wadsworth.
- Dunn, William N. 1994. Public Policy Analysis: An Introduction. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall International.
- Dunn, William N. 2003. Public Policy Analysis, analytical framework and problem formulation procedures, University of Pitsburg. The publisher, Hanindita Graha Widya.
- Dye, Thomas R. 1981. Understanding Public Policy. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Edwards III, George C. 1980. Implementing Public Policy. Washington: Congressional Quarterly Press.
- Effendy, Khassan, 2010. Organizational Development. Bandung: CV. Indra Prahasta.
- Ekotama, Suryono, 2010. Easy Ways to Make Standard Operating Procedure Editor, Yopi Jalu Paksi, Yogyakarta: Media Pressindo.
- Farazmand, Ali (ed), 1999, Bureaucracy and Administration, Florida: CRC Press. Blackman. Urban Policy in Practice.
- Finer, Herman, 1949, The Theory and Practice of Modern Government (Revised Edition). New York: Henry Holt and Company.
- Fayol, Hendri, 1994, Organization Theory, Key to the World, Mg. Grawhill, New York.
- Goullart & Kelly in Girot 1995/2001, Transforming the Organization. The Free, New York.
- Grindle, Merilee S. 1980. Politics and Policy Implementation in the Third World. New Jersey, Princeton University Press Princeton.
- Googin, Robert E. 2008. Innovating Democracy: Democratic Theory and Practice after the Deliberative Turns. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Gering Supriyadi and Triguno 2006, Work Culture of Government Organizations: Class III Pre-service Education and Training Module (Jakarta: State Administration Institute.

- Hadisuwanto, Ruminta, 2001. Looking for Participatory Public Service Solutions. Yappika, Jakarta.
- Husaini, Usman. 2008. Social Research Methodology. Bandung: Earth Literacy.
- Hasan M. Iqbal, 2002. Main subject of research methodology and its application, Bogor Ghalia Indonesia.
- Irma, A., Hatta, M., and Kholil, S. (2020). Communication Management of Islamic Sharia Agency in Applying Women's Islamic Fashion in Banda Aceh. Budapest International Research and Critics Institute-Journal (BIRCI-Journal) Vol 3 (1): 576-587.
- Mahendra, Isnaini, and Sinaga, R.S. (2021). The Implementation of Langkat Regent Regulation Number 19 of 2019 Concerning Procedures for Procurement of Goods and Services in Village (Study in the Village of Stabat Baru). Budapest International Research and Critics Institute-Journal (BIRCI-Journal) Vol 4 (3): 3473-3484.
- Syakur, A., et.al. (2020). Sustainability of Communication, Organizational Culture, Cooperation, Trust and Leadership Style for Lecturer Commitments in Higher Education. Budapest International Research and Critics Institute-Journal (BIRCI-Journal) Vol 3 (2): 1325-1335.