

Collaborative Decision Making Process in Vertical Collaborative Governance Towards Improving the Quality of Public Services

Virna Museliza¹, Muammar Alkadafi², Sitti Rahmah³, Devi Deswimar⁴,
Fitria Rahmadani⁵

^{1,2,3,4,5} Fakultas Ekonomi dan Ilmu Sosia, Universitas Islam Negeri Sultan Syarif Kasim Riau, Pekanbaru, Indonesia

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received, Nov 16, 2023

Revised, Dec 15, 2023

Accepted, Dec 22, 2023

Keywords:

Decision Making, Vertical Collaborative Governance, Quality Public Services, Public Services Mall



This is an open access article under the [CC BY-SA](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/) license.
Copyright © 2023 by Author.
Published by UIN Suska Riau

ABSTRACT

This paper was prepared using the "literature review" method which focuses on analyzing the collaborative decision-making process using vertical collaborative governance in the case of the establishment of public service malls (MPP) in Regencies/Cities in Indonesia. The research results conclude that the collaborative decision making (CDM) model offered by Zarate, et al. (2013) is effective for dealing with complex and complex problems involving many institutions, public sector organizations. The CDM process includes pre-decision phase, decision phase, and post-decision phase which are relevant in the decision-making process for establishing public service malls (MPP) in Indonesia. CDM vertical collaboration governance in the MPP process is built by consensus. Consensus is a process of democratization of decision making. MPP creates public service work in a collective and integrated manner between central and regional agencies, BUMN, BUMD and the private sector. As a result, MPP succeeded in increasing community satisfaction in obtaining licensing and non-licensing services.

*Corresponding author.

E-mail: muamar@uin-suska.ac.id

INTRODUCTION

Improving the quality of public services in Indonesia is a reform agenda that has not been completed to date. The problems in terms of public services in Indonesia that are most often discussed are: First, abuse of ASN authority in the form of KKN. Second, long, convoluted bureaucracy, overlapping duties and authority. Third, discrimination by public service officers in providing services, there are many illegal levies (extortion) in providing services. Fourth, the procedural system, completion time, cost standards are uncertain. Fifth, the level of community satisfaction is low, Sedarmayanti (2013). Public service officers are less responsive, less informative, less accessible, less coordinated and very bureaucratic (seems complicated). Rochmah, (2013). Meanwhile, Eko (2009), said that the root of the problem with public services so far is the mindset of bureaucrats as "rulers" and not as providers of good services, making it difficult to make changes to the quality of public services.

The government's planning to accelerate the implementation of public service reform, the government issued Presidential Regulation number 81 of 2010 concerning the Grand Design of Bureaucratic Reform 2010-2025. Bureaucratic reform is basically an effort to improve bureaucratic performance, by improving the quality of service to the community. The 2020-2024 bureaucratic reform road map to achieve the vision and mission of Indonesia 2045 is; First. Substantive, namely prioritizing the impact of bureaucratic reform rather than formal aspects. Second. Implementation, bureaucratic reform must reach organizational work units that directly deal with society so that the impact can be felt. Third, inclusive and collaborative, namely involving various stakeholders in government but also stakeholders in the private sector, academics, media and NGOs. According to Dwiyanto (2017) collaborative public service management is the right way to improve the quality of public services. Collaboration is important, because the government is experiencing an inability to meet the needs of its citizens which tend to increase both qualitatively and quantitatively. The government's resources are very limited, while the needs of its citizens are increasing and cannot be met by the government alone. In the context of regional government administration reform, the main objective of administrative decentralization is for regional governments to function in providing quality public services to realize good local governance. In fact, according to Dwiyanto, et al (2006) in their research, "although the implementation of regional autonomy does not worsen the quality of public services, in general the practice of providing public services is still far from the principles of good governance.

The Collaborative Decision Making (CDM) process includes the pre-decision stage, decision stage and post-decision stage which are relevant in the decision-making process for establishing Public Service Malls (MPP) in Indonesia. The governance of vertical collaborative decision making (CDM) in the process of establishing Public Service Malls (MPP) is built contextually, to eliminate discrimination carried out by public service officers in providing services, because there are many illegal levies (extortion) in providing services.

The strategy carried out by the government to realize improvements in public services is to form an "integrated" and "integrated" service system between regional and central organizations (ministries, institutions, BUMN, BUMD, private sector in one location in the form of MPP. So, the MPP concept is a form of cooperation vertically between central and regional government organizations as well as BUMN, BUMD and the private sector.

The fact that the quality of public services in the regions is still low requires the involvement of the central government as a supervisor and supervisor of regional governments to play a more real role in accelerating the increase in the quality of public services in the regions. The Ministry of State Apparatus Empowerment, Bureaucratic Reform (Kemenpan RB) as a central government agency/institution is the leading sector or driving force in the field of bureaucratic reform, issued Ministerial Regulation Number 23 of 2017 concerning the implementation of Public Service Malls. Then, it was strengthened by the issuance of Presidential Regulation Number 89 of 2021 concerning the Implementation of Public Service Malls (MPP). As a basis for consideration, the MPP was formed so that government administration can improve the quality of public services to the community quickly, easily, affordably, comfortably and safely. The strategy carried out by the government to realize improvements in public services is by forming an "integrated" and "integrated" service system between regional and central organizations (ministries, institutions, BUMN, BUMD, private sector in one location in the form of MPP. So, the MPP concept is a form of collaboration vertical central and regional government organizations as well as BUMN, BUMD and private sector organizations. The manifestation of vertical collaborative governance through the MPP concept. From 2017 - 2022 there are 56 MPPs, throughout Indonesia which have been inaugurated by the Republic of Indonesia Ministry of Administrative and Bureaucratic Reform, and have functioned to provide services to the community in each region

Table 1. Collaboration between the Central Government and Regional Governments in Establishing Public Service Malls (MPP)

No	Regency/City (MPP)	Province
1	MPP DKI Jakarta	DKI Jakarta
2	MPP Kota Surabaya	East Java
3	MPP Kab. Banyuwangi	East Java
4	MPP Kab. Probolinggo	East Java
5	MPP Kab. Kulon Progo	DIY
6	MPP Kab. Banyumas	Central Java
7	MPP Kab. Sidoarjo	East Java
8	MPP Kab. Sleman	DIY
9	MPP Kota Bogor	West Java
10	MPP Kab. Sumedang	West Java
11	MPP Kab Magetan	East Java
12	MPP Kab. Bojonegoro	East Java
13	MPP Kab. Gresik	East Java
14	MPP Kota Tangerang Selatan	Banten
15	MPP Kab. Kendal	Central Java
16	MPP Kab. Kebumen	Central Java
17	MPP Kab. Batang	Central Java
18	MPP Kota Surakarta	Central Java
19	MPP Kab. Padeglang	Banten
20	MPP Kab. Jepara	Central Java
21	MPP Kab. Purwakarta	West Java
22	MPP Kab. Pati	Central Java
23	MPP Kab. Lamongan	East Java

24	MPP Kota Bekasi	West Java
25	MPP Kota Salatiga	Central Java
26	MPP Kab. Blora	Central Java
27	MPP Kab. Karawang	West Java
28	MPP Kab. Bekasi	West Java
29	MPP Kab. Madiun	East Java
30	MPP Kab. Bandung	West Java
31	MPP Kab. Tuban	East Java
32	MPP Kab. Karanganyar	Central Java
33	MPP Kota Magelang	Central Java
34	MPP Kota Mojokerto	East Java
35	MPP Kota Tomohon	North Sulawesi
36	MPP Kota Palu	Central Sulawesi
37	MPP Kota Palopo	South Sulawesi
38	MPP Kab. Barru	South Sulawesi
39	MPP Kab. Bone Bolango	Gorontalo
40	MPP Kab. Bombana	Southeast Sulawesi
41	MPP Kab. Kep. Selayar	South Sulawesi
42	MPP Kab. Tabalong	South Kalimantan
43	MPP Kota Samarinda	East Kalimantan
44	MPP Kota Banjarbaru	South Kalimantan
45	MPP Kota Singkawang	West Kalimantan
46	MPP Kota Batam	Riau Islands
47	MPP Kota Padang	West Sumatera
48	MPP Kota Pekanbaru	Riau
49	MPP Kota Banda Aceh	NAD
50	MPP Kota Payakumbuh	West Sumatera
51	MPP Kab. Tulang Bawang	Lampung
52	MPP Kota Palembang	South Sumatera
53	MPP Kota Tebing Tinggi	North Sumatera
54	MPP Kota Denpasar	Bali
55	MPP Kab. Karangasem	Bali
56	MPP Kab. Badung	Bali

Based on 2023 data, 134 MPPs have been formed in Indonesia. Judging from the scope and process of establishing public service malls (MPP) in districts/cities as regulated in Ministerial Regulations and Presidential Regulations, it involves many institutions, including regional government organizations, ministries, LPNK, BUMN, BUMD and the private sector. Thus, the decision-making process for establishing MPP involves organizational leaders to produce collaborative decisions. This paper focuses on analyzing how the collaborative decision-making process in establishing MPP improves the quality of public services in the region?

THEORETICAL REVIEW

Decision is "the process of tracing a problem starting from the background of the problem, identifying the problem, to forming conclusions or recommendations". Fahmi (2016). "Decision making" is an assessment and making a choice. The decision is made after several calculations and considerations of a number of alternatives. Haudi (2021). Decision making is a dynamic process that begins with the accumulation of evidence and ends with the adjustment of beliefs. Each step itself is subject to a number of dynamic processes, such as planning, information search and evaluation. Marius U. et al (2013). Meanwhile, Fausto Pedro G. M. et al (2019) said that decision making is a method for selecting an option into a set. The method can be exact or not, quantitative/qualitative, and so on, so the choice can be optimal or not.

The concept of collaborative governance is a new work culture for public sector organizations, which is used to resolve or overcome problems in the world of government, development and public services which are complex, complicated, multisectoral and multidimensional which are almost impossible to solve by one government agency alone. . So, public decision makers need to collaborate with many parties in an intensive, programmed, structured, consensus and fair manner, which is called collaborative decision making (CDM). Collaborative decision making is the main basis for implementing CG which wants to build a teamwork culture in achieving success for programs and projects or overcoming problems they are facing together. In context, there are at least 2 (two) forms of government collaboration levels, according to Rubado (2019), namely; horizontal intergovernmental collaboration (horizontal collaboration between government institutions) and vertical intergovernmental collaboration (vertical collaboration between government institutions). Vertical government collaboration refers to the existence of various types or types of cooperation and interaction between government institutions that are hierarchically at different levels (Car et al, 2009; Garber & Loh, 2015) in (Choirul & Imam, 2020) said that existing government institutions at the district/city government level, collaborating with one of the government institutions at the provincial level or at the national level.

Experts such as (Longueville, 2003; Shim & Warkentin et al, 2002; Zare, 2005) as quoted in (Choirul & Imam, 2020), call collaborative decision making (CDM), essentially a representation of decision making taken collectively involving a number of individuals or institutions in order to improve their abilities in the decision-making process. In addition, collaborative decision-making activity patterns must be pursued by consensus. Because consensus is the best way to solve problems or to achieve targeted organizational goals and objectives.

The collaborative decision making process is seen from the scientific side of public administration. First, introduce the framework first to get suggestions or input from collaboration participants. At this stage, the collaboration framework is discussed, whether it needs to be modified or not. If it is modified, the results of the modification are then used to analyze the collaborative policy that will be implemented. Second, as a further step, after the framework for decision making has received "consensus" approval from the various parties involved, is to develop the phases or stages of the decision making process. According to Owen (2015) in (Choirul and Imam, 2020) there are 4 (four) stages in the collaborative decision making process

1. A collaborative frame/framework is a collaboration frame or framework that has been

- recognized or accepted by all members and participants after they have received and reviewed various collaboration frames or frameworks proposed by each individual.
2. Alternative collaboration (collaborative alternatives), namely various alternative collaborations which represent various differences which show that there are many perspectives that are worthy of consideration by an organization or by a team of decision makers, related to how a job/problem must be resolved.
 3. Collaborative understanding, that is, each decision maker asks the members whether they agree with a number of selected alternatives, both in relation to value and risks that might arise from the collaborative alternative that has been proposed to them. When all members have agreed or rejected, the decision maker informs all group members and serves as a collaborative understanding.
 4. Collaborative relationships, namely based on the understanding of collaboration received, which is then used as the basis for building/developing new collaborations. Several other forms of collaboration that are considered appropriate to the new collaboration pattern can be combined so that a combined strategy emerges that is considered more appropriate and more useful than the alternative collaboration that has been previously determined.

According to Zarate, Konae and Camilleri (2003), the collaborative decision making process consists of 3 (three) stages

1. Stage before decision making (pre-decision making)
At this stage, the collaboration members involved are given the opportunity to work together to share their understanding of the problems they face and determine the targets or goals they want to achieve.
2. Decision making stage (decision phase)
At this stage, according to Zarate et al, 2013, there are four phases used as decision-making steps. First, each decision-making party issues ideas in the form of alternative solutions. These various ideas are discussed together to determine which ideas are relevant, combining interrelated ideas to produce ideas that are representative, applicable and reliable to be used to overcome problems or achieve predetermined targets. Second, this stage is organizing the ideas that were agreed upon in the first stage. This stage aims to maximize understanding between members involved in the collaborative decision-making process, increase solution ideas to be used, consolidate between members, determine the equipment needed to facilitate the use of solution ideas in implementing the decisions that have been determined. Third, the assessment stage of alternative actions. Solution ideas that emerge from various members are re-evaluated, so that the decision to be taken is truly the best decision. Fourth, the process stage of the concrete form of agreement between members and the selected solution which will be published as a final decision. However, at this stage, negotiations are still needed between the members involved. An exchange of ideas and thoughts is needed regarding the decisions to be taken. This includes carrying out careful calculations regarding the various elements needed in decision making (decision goals and targets, obstacles to be faced, criteria, resources needed, and so on). All these calculations are understood by all members in detail in the decision-making process.

3. Post-decision phase (post-decision phase)

This stage is very important because it is the decision execution and monitoring phase after a decision has been made and implemented. The purpose of monitoring decisions here is to monitor how the realization of these decisions is used as a basis for planning the planning of a program, project and is used to see the effectiveness of the decisions that have been taken when implemented to overcome the problems faced or achieve the goals or objectives that have been set or targeted. The findings from monitoring the implementation of decisions provide an overview of the benefits obtained by the organization, advantages, obstacles that arise and so on to be used as feedback in the collaborative decision making process in the future

Arch is system literature review (SLR), which is a research method used by reviewing and summarizing the results of research that has been carried out (primary research) to present more complete facts (Siswanto, 2012). Based on search data using keywords and criteria in the database or Google Scholar above, the total is 30 journals.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The use of the term "mall" in the public sector is adopted from the shopping center building model in the business sector, which takes the form of "tenants" which have an attraction, providing many types of goods that people need. The word "mall" in the KBBI means "a building or group of buildings containing various shops connected by alleys (connecting roads)". The word "mall" was adopted by the government, and has become popular today, because it is used as a model for public sector services to improve the quality of public services, because the concept of "mall" provides a sense of comfort, security and provides various types of community needs. It is on this basis that the central government, through the Ministry of Administrative and Bureaucratic Reform, has begun to initiate and encourage regional governments to form public service malls since 2007 in several regions, starting in the National Capital City of DKI Jakarta. The establishment of public service malls is regulated in Permenpan RB No. 23/2017 concerning the implementation of public service malls, which is further regulated in Presidential Decree no. 89/2021 implementation of public service malls.



Figure 1. Exampel Of A Public Services Mall Office (MPP)

The concept of a public service mall is to integrate public services from many organizations into one organization. According to Burhan (2020) the concept of public service malls is a form of third generation public service. MPP is a development of the previous concept. The first generation concept was one-stop integrated service (PTSA), then changed to one-stop integrated service (PTSP), referred to as the second generation. So, MPP is an extension of the PTSA and PTSP concepts. The aim of MPP is to provide convenience, speed, affordability, security and comfort to the public in obtaining services, and to increase global competitiveness in providing ease of doing business in Indonesia. Meanwhile, the principles for implementing MPP are integration, efficiency, coordination, accountability, accessibility and comfort.

The formation of the MPP was through a process of collectively forming various organizations, namely regional apparatus organizations (departments, agencies, regional technical institutions), vertical organizations (central government organs in the regions), BUMN, BUMD and business sector organizations (private). So the MPP formation model can be called a vertical collaborative decision-making process of collaborative governance. The decision-making process actors involve many organizational leaders, and are led by regional heads (Regents/Mayors). The formation of the MPP at the assessment stage has aligned the objectives of the stakeholders. The formation process through deliberation was effective, showing the commitment to cooperation as articulated in the Memorandum of Understanding. The Public Service Mall Implementation Phase as a whole has gone well, because it facilitates licensing and non-licensing services for the local community, (Alim et al., 2022).

The procedure for forming an MPP is as regulated in Presidential Decree no. 89/2021 was proposed by the regional government to the minister (Menpan RB). The proposal process goes through an inter-institutional collaborative decision making process, which is technically facilitated by the One Stop Investment and Integrated Services Service (DPMPTSP) as ex-officio for implementing MPP in district/city regional governments. DPMPTSP as the coordinator of the collaborative decision-making process for implementing MPP, is obliged to make joint agreements with ministries/institutions/regional governments of BUMN, BUMD/Private which are outlined in a memorandum of understanding (MOU). The Memorandum of Understanding as referred to is followed up with a Cooperation Agreement between the parties regarding the use and utilization of resources, including the use of space in the building and infrastructure/facilities.

Table 2. Organizations Involved in MPP

Local Regency/City	Government	Ministry/Institution
1. PTSP Kab/Kota		1. Minsitry Of Finance
2. PTSP Provinsi		a. Director General Of Taxes
3. Disdukcapil		b. Director General Of Customs And Excise
4. Bapenda		2. Ministry Of Law And Human Rights
5. Kecamatan		a. Director General Of Immigration
6. OPD lainnya		
BUMN		

1. Jasa Raharja	b. Director General Of General
2. BPJS Ketenagakerjaan	Legal Adminisrtation
3. BPJS Kesehatan	3. Ministry ATR/BPN
4. PT. PLN (Persero)	4. Capital Investment Coordinating
5. PT. POS	Board RI
BUMD	5. National Police Of The Republic Of
1. PDAM	Indonesia
2. BANK DAERAH	6. State High Prosecutor's Office
Swasta	7. Other Institutional Ministries
1. Perbankan	
2. Food Station	
3. Asosiasi Usaha	
4. Layanan Lainnya	

Collaborative organizations in the MPP scope include all types of licensing and non-licensing services, be it the Government, Provincial/Regency/City Government, BUMN/BUMD/private sector. For example, at MPP DKI Jakarta, there are 328 types of services. 269 provided by regional organizations, 59 by central organizations). MPP Surabaya has 205 types of services; 194 provided by regional organizations, 11 provided by central organizations. MPP Banyuwangi, there are 132 types of services. 99 provided by regional organizations, 33 provided by central organizations. MPP Denpasar, there are 229 types of services. 187 provided by regional organizations, 42 provided by central organizations. MPP Bekasi, there are 29 types of services. 18 provided by regional organizations, 11 provided by central organizations. MPP Badung, there are 121 types of services. 63 provided by regional and central government, 58 provided by BUMN/BUMD). MPP Batam, there are 427 types of services. 406 provided by regional organizations, 21 provided by central organizations. This data shows that the collaborative decision-making process in MPP takes the form of vertical collaborative governance. The collaborative decision making process is also reflected in the process of establishing the MPP.

1. Coordinate the types of services from integrated central, regional, BUMN/BUMD, private organizations. This stage is a forum for equalizing perceptions between collaborating institutions, forming commitment, drafting regent/mayor regulations (PERBUP/PERWAKO) in the implementation of MPP, forming an MPP technical team.
2. Institutional Arrangements, Working Mechanisms between Agencies & MPP Business Processes Preparation of draft MoU (Memorandum of Understanding), draft cooperation agreement (PKS), preparation of service standards (SP), preparation of standard operating procedures (SOP) and preparation of MPP rules and regulations.
3. Signing Of The MOU and PKS
4. Preparation of MPP Facilities & Infrastructure
Preparing the building and the infrastructure needed to implement the MPP, arranging the service and processing space (Front Office and Back Office), structuring the service queue system, developing information systems and data bases (Software & Hardware), providing electricity and Internet networks, procuring facilities & infrastructure other supporters. Apart from that, at this stage data integration and

information systems are also carried out, including; synchronizing SOPs, synchronizing SPs, utilizing single data, strengthening information technology-based services (E-Service) to create service efficiency.

5. Arrangement of HR for MPP Services

HR Structuring MPP services consist of analyzing HR needs, recruitment mechanisms and structuring MPP staffing, preparing HR development strategies, Training Services Excellence for Front Office officers and preparing reward & punishment mechanisms.

6. Socialization and Publication (Launching) of MPP

preparation of socialization & publication strategies, procurement of publication media, Soft Launching and Grand Launching

7. Inauguration of the MPP by the Menpan RB

From the stages of the decision-making process in forming the MPP, seen from the theoretical perspective of the collaborative decision-making process expressed by Owen (2015), Panzarasa et al (2002), Zarate et al (2013) in Chairul & Imam (2020) it is not exactly the same. The collaborative decision-making process in forming MPP, is classified as CDM for complex and complicated problems involving many agencies, institutions or public sector organizations. The collaborative decision-making process scheme in the MPP case is led and managed by agency leaders, administrators and collaborators together. Conceptually, Collaborative Decision Making (CDM) in MPP has shown that each party has worked collectively in determining the best options from various existing alternative options to serve as the basis for a joint decision-making process based on consensus. Regional, central, state-owned enterprises, state-owned enterprises and the private sector, as the data has described, truly carry out a consensus in achieving a common goal or overcoming the public service problems they face. So CDM in the MPP was realized because each central and regional agency/institution had the desire to carry out a joint consensus in the process of making/making decisions on the formation of the MPP.

Although the policy of establishing MPPs in Regencies/Cities is an order from the central government based on Permenpan RB No. 23/2017 Perpres No. 89/2021 concerning the Implementation of Public Service Malls. However, its implementation requires a collaborative decision-making process involving organizational leaders across agencies (horizontal and vertical). The key to the success of collaborative governance in MPP refers to what Choirul & Imam (2020) said, there are several factors that influence the implementation of CG, including; resources, institutions, missions and plans. Meanwhile, measures of success, Choirul & Imam (2020), citing the opinion of DeSeve (2007) in Sudarmo (2011), said that measures of collaboration success include; type of network structure, commitment to goals, mutual trust between actors/participants connected in the network, governance, access to power, distributive accountability/responsibility, various information, and access to resources.

Meanwhile, in the context of the success of the Collaborative Decision Making Process in forming the MPP, there is consensus in the decision making process. Soheil, B & Jacek, M (2010) said that consensus is a process of democratizing decision making. Soheil & Jacek quote (Bender and Simonovic, 1997, Massam, 1993). The success of sustainable development depends on the ability of organizational leaders to build consensus to ensure that the best decision alternatives are deemed acceptable by

stakeholders. Furthermore, Soheil & Jacek said that researchers used consensus as a measurement method in decision analysis and multi-criteria decision making. Soheil & Jacek citing Bender and Simonovic (1997) argue that the level of consensus can be used as a sustainability metric for planning and development projects, describing the degree of satisfaction of decision makers with the group's solution. Kayser, T. A, (2011) said there are several techniques for building consensus. First, team members must commit that each stage of a consensus decision is a learning opportunity for the enrichment of collaborative relationships. Second, consensus walks on the path of trust. Consensus is built by people who communicate openly and honestly with each other, showing respect for each other. Building consensus, like building trust, requires all parties involved to collaborate rather than compete, judge, or blame. Third, consensus views each other as a team of collaborative partners who as opposed to a collection of self-serving individuals, consensus for the greater good of the team can be achieved.

CDM Vertical Collaborative Governance in MPP based on research findings shows that the MPP which has been formed in Indonesia as a form of collaboration in public service innovation, if viewed from the theory of excellent service, has been proven to have increased public satisfaction. Collaborative Governance in MPP has succeeded in increasing the competency of human resource personnel, seen from the indicators that service officers at MPP have the skills, knowledge and experience in accompanying residents who visit MPP Jakarta City, Ridoni D & Suraya M (2021). This research is strengthened by the results of research by Mansur et al (2022) which states that the majority of people who have visited the Jakarta City MPP to process licensing and non-licensing documents give a positive perception of service officers at the Jakarta City MPP. Apart from Jakarta City, Suryana (2019), from the results of his research, said that service users at MPP Batam City, based on IKM indicators, expressed satisfaction with the services at MPP Batam City. The implementation of dynamic governance in the implementation of MPP in Batam City has been able to be said to be dynamic in the governance of government work. (Ikhsan et al., 2020).

Other evidence of the effectiveness of improving the quality of public services through collaborative MPP, from a study (Hadi P.A et al., 2021), states that the competency of service officers at MPP Banyuwangi Regency, both "hard skills" and "soft skills" competencies, each have a positive and significant effect. towards improving the quality of service at MPP Banyuwangi Regency. The quality of public services at MPP is good quality in Nganjuk Regency, (Salma, S.A & Nawangsari, R.E, 2021). MPP in Sumedang Regency has succeeded in organizing a responsive government, thereby improving the quality of public services. (Muliawaty & Hendryawan, 2020). The existence of MPP in Bekasi City is able to make its citizens more satisfied and trust the local government (Nur, I.M. 2023). MPP has provided excellent service, with changes in aspects of bureaucratic structure and procedures, changes in bureaucratic behavior and attitudes that lead to the New Public Service (NPS) paradigm which is oriented towards providing quality services to the community, (Puryatama & Haryani, 2020) . Regarding the performance of MPPs, the study (Rahayu et al., 2022) said that 11 MPPs in Indonesia showed that the quality of public services obtained optimal results. Research results (Rejeki, W. A. & Andari, N. R. 2022) conclude that the quality of public services in regional governments that have MPP is much better than regional governments that do not have MPP. Factors to improve the quality of public services in local governments in Indonesia are service policies

CONCLUSIONS

Collaborative decision making (CDM) has become a new work culture in collaborative government governance. Conceptually, CDM is the collective work of individuals or organizations in determining the best choice from various existing alternative options to serve as a basis for a joint decision-making process by consensus. Consensus is the key to CDM to achieve goals or solve problems faced together. Theoretically and practically, CDM has developed rapidly and widely by sharing models offered by academics. One CDM model that is relevant and suitable for analyzing the CDM process in MPP to improve the quality of public services is the model offered by Zarate, Konate and Camilleri (2013), which includes three stages, namely; the stage before decision making (pre-decision phase), the decision making stage (decision phase), and the post-decision making stage (post-decision phase). The CDM vertical collaboration governance process in the case of establishing Public Service Management (MPP) is effective in overcoming common problems, namely complex public service problems. CDM vertical collaboration governance in the MPP process is built by consensus, and creates collective public service work between central and regional agencies (vertical and horizontal) and involves business entities (BUMN/BUMD and private). As a result, several study results show that MPP in several districts/cities in Indonesia has positively succeeded in increasing community satisfaction in obtaining licensing and non-licensing services

REFERENCES

- Alim, I., Taufik, A., & Nurdin, N. (2022). Collaborative Governance through Public Service Malls in Barru Regency. *Journal of Government and Political Issues*, 2(3), 167–174. <https://doi.org/10.53341/jgpi.v2i3.89>
- Borouhaki, S., & Malczewski, J. (2010). Measuring consensus for collaborative decision-making: A GIS-based approach. *Computers, Environment and Urban Systems*, 34(4), 322–332. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compenvurbsys.2010.02.006>
- Burhan Muhammad (2020) <https://ombudsman.go.id/artikel/r/artikel--mal-pelayanan-publik-dan-maladministrasi>. 02 Desember 2020. Diakses 20 Mei 2022
- Chairul, S. Imam H. (2020) *Kolaborasi Pemerintahan*. Tangerang Selatan. Universitas Terbuka.
- Dwiyanto, Agus, dkk., (2006). *Reformasi Birokrasi Publik di Indonesia*. Yogyakarta: UGM press.
- Dwiyanto, Agus. (2017) *Manajemen Pelayanan Publik : Peduli Inklusif dan Kolaborasi*. Gajah Mada University Press. Yogyakarta. Bulaksumur.
- Daniel, R., & Mansur, S. (2021). Service of Excellence of DKI Jakarta Public Service Mall and Customer Satisfaction. <https://doi.org/10.4108/eai.28-9-2020.2307368>
- Fahmi Irham. (2016). *Teori dan Teknik Pengambilan Keputusan: Kualitatif dan Kuantitatif*. Jakarta. Rajawali Pers

- Haud, J. (2009). Teknik Pengambilan Keputusan. Insan Cendikia Mandiri. Solok-Sumbar
- Ismu Iskandar. (2021). Workshop Penyelenggaraan Pelayanan Publik (MPP). Makalah Urgensi dan Tahapan Penyelenggaraan Pelayanan Publik. Dinas Penanaman Modal dan PTSP Provinsi Sulawesi Selatan. 24 Juni 2021 (<https://dpmpstps.sulselprov.go.id/publik-read-agenda?id=5236#>)
- Ikhsan, K., Samin, R., Akhyary, E., Negara, I. A., Maritim, U., Ali, R., Publik, M. P., Ahead, T., Again, T., & Across, T. (2020). Implementasi Dynamic Governance Dalam Penyelenggaraan Mal Pelayanan Publik Kota Batam. *Dinamika: Jurnal Ilmiah Ilmu Administrasi Negara*, 7(e-ISSN 2614-2945), 385–401. <https://jurnal.unigal.ac.id/index.php/dinamika/article/view/3561/pdf>
- Imanuddin Muhammad, (2018). Penyelenggaraan Mal Pelayanan Publik Dalam Rangka Percepatan Peningkatan Kualitas Pelayanan Publik. Asisten Deputi Perumusan Kebijakan dan Pengelolaan Sistem Informasi Pelayanan Publik Kemenpan-RB. Seminar Nasional Penguatan Regulasi Mal Pelayanan Publik. 16 Januari 2018. Jakarta
- Kayser, T. A. (2011). *Building Team Power How to Unleash the Collaborative Genius of Teams for Increased Engagement, Productivity, and Results* Second Edition.
- Kementerian Pendayagunaan Aparatur Negara dan Reformasi Birokrasi (2018). Paparan Materi Mal Pelayanan Publik (MPP). Jakarta, 07 Februari 2018.
- Mansur, S., Yuliawati, E., Saragih, N., Daniel, R., Susilo, A., & Endri, E. (2022). PUBLIC PERCEPTION ON THE QUALITY OF ONE STOP PUBLIC SERVICE MALL. *Journal of Management Information and Decision Sciences*, 25, 1-10. Retrieved from <https://www.proquest.com/scholarly-journals/public-perception-on-quality-one-stop-service/docview/2604073065/se-2?accountid=62722>
- Muliawaty, L., & Hendryawan, S. (2020). Peranan e-government dalam pelayanan publik (studi kasus: Mal pelayanan publik Kabupaten Sumedang). *Kebijakan: Jurnal Ilmu ...*, 11, 101–112. <https://www.journal.unpas.ac.id/index.php/kebijakan/article/view/2898><https://www.journal.unpas.ac.id/index.php/kebijakan/article/download/2898/1285>
- Nur, M. I. (2023). Mal Pelayanan Publik Sebagai Praktik Inovasi Pemerintah Daerah Di Wilayah Provinsi Jawa Barat. *Sawala : Jurnal Administrasi Negara*, 11(1), 97–116. <https://doi.org/10.30656/sawala.v11i1.6601>
- Prosojo, Eko, 2009, *Reformasi Kedua Melanjutkan Estafet Reformasi*. Jakarta. Salemba Humanika.
- Papaelias, M. (2019). *Decision Making*. IntechOpen eBook (PDF). London, United Kingdom.
- Puryatama, A. F., & Haryani, T. N. (2020). PELAYANAN PRIMA MELALUI PENYELENGGARAAN MAL PELAYANAN PUBLIK DI INDONESIA. *Kybernan: Jurnal Studi Kepemerintahan*, 3(1), 40–54. <https://doi.org/10.35326/kybernan.v1i1.580>
- Priyono, A. H., Widagdo, S., & Handayani, Y. I. (2021). The Effect of Hard Skill and Soft Skill Competency on Improving the Quality of Services in Public Services Malls at Banyuwangi Regency. *International Journal of Innovative Science and Research Technology*, Volume 6(9), 325–329.
- Rochmah Siti, (2013). Analisis Reformasi Pelayanan Publik Di Indonesia. Sumenep. Proceeding Call For Paper Universitas Wiraraja Sumenep.

- Rahayu, A. Y. S., Puji Rahmayanti, K., Mahendra, W., & Amania Afra, S. (2022). Performance Evaluation of Public Service Mall (Mall Pelayanan Publik) in Indonesia using the Balanced Scorecard. *Policy & Governance Review*, 6(2), 123. <https://doi.org/10.30589/pgr.v6i2.570>
- Rejeki, W. A. Andari, N. R. (2022). Public Service Malls As A Solution In Improving The Quality Of Public Services In Indonesia. *Jurnal Ilmu Administrasi*. 19(2), 215–225.
- Sedarmayanti. (2013). Reformasi Administrasi Publik, Reformasi Birokrasi, dan Kepemimpinan Masa Depan (Mewujudkan Pelayanan Prima dan Pemerintahan yang Baik. Bandung. Refika Aditama.
- Suryana, O. (2019). Analysis Of Public Satisfaction Survey In The Public Service Mal (MPP) At Batam City. *Jurnal Transformasi Administrasi*, 9(1), 56-70. Retrieved from http://jta.lan.go.id/index.php/jta/article/view/jta-vol-9-1_05-Ohan-Suryana
- Usher, M., Tsetsos, K., Yu, E., & Lagnado, D. A. (n.d.). Dynamics of decision making: from evidence to preference and belief | *Frontiers Research Topic*. <https://doi.org/10.3389/978-2-88919-270-0>
- <https://www.menpan.go.id/site/pelayanan-publik/mal-pelayanan-publik-mpp-yang-telah-beroperasi-di-indonesia>. 24 Jun 2020. Diakses, 18 Mei 2022