

## Collaborative Governance and Public Participation in Urban Green Open Space Management: A Study in Metro City

Ari Gusnita<sup>1\*</sup>, Bartoven Vivit Nurdin<sup>2</sup>, Dedy Hermawan<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Doctoral Student of Development Studies, Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Universitas Lampung

<sup>2</sup> Department of Sociology, Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Universitas Lampung

<sup>3</sup> Department of Public Administration, Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Universitas Lampung

**Corresponding Author:** Ari Gustina [ariegusnita17@gmail.com](mailto:ariegusnita17@gmail.com)

---

### ARTICLE INFO

*Keywords:* collaborative governance, green open space, community participation, inter-agency coordination, Metro City

*Received :* 09, April

*Revised :* 12, May

*Accepted:* 19, June

©2026 Gusnita, Nurdin, Hermawan :

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the

[Creative Commons Atribusi 4.0 Internasional](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/).



### ABSTRACT

This study examines the collaborative governance of Urban Green Open Space (RTH) management in Metro City, Lampung Province, in two dimensions, namely: community participation patterns and inter-agency coordination between Regional Work Units (OPD). This research used a qualitative descriptive approach through in-depth interviews, focus group discussion, field observation and documentation. The results showed that the community participation in RTH management is still passive and limited to the implementation of decisions that have been made by the government, not at the policy planning stage. Additionally, the lack of specific regulation on cross-sector RTH integration further lowers the effectiveness of existing governance arrangements. The study recommends the setting up of a permanent and institutionally binding multi-actor collaborative forum, the strengthening of local regulations to enable cross-sector RTH co-production and the formal recognition of community-based initiatives as an integral part of the city's RTH governance system.

---

## **INTRODUCTION**

Green open space (RTH) management in small Indonesian cities is a structural rather than incidental challenge. The scarcity of land and limited local budget combine with the regulatory requirement of a minimum of 30% green space proportion of the total city area under Law Number 26 of 2007 concerning Spatial Planning (Republik Indonesia, 2007). The 30% threshold consists of two components: 20% public RTH and 10% commercial RTH. This distinction has direct repercussions on the distribution of provision and maintenance obligations among different players by local governments. The pressure in Kota Metro, Lampung Province, is very high. This is the smallest city in the province, with a total area of 73.21 km<sup>2</sup> consisting of five sub-districts, namely Metro Pusat, Metro Utara, Metro Barat, Metro Timur and Metro Selatan. All of them are increasingly experiencing pressure from residential settlements and growing economic activity (BPS Kota Metro, 2023).

However, the 30% RTH requirement is still not commonly met in Indonesian cities and governance inefficiencies are among the major structural constraints behind the gap, particularly in smaller cities which have neither the fiscal resources nor the technical expertise to close the gap (Rahmanto, 2025). Kota Metro has a Green Space Master Plan 2013-2033 and Regional Regulation Number 5 of 2016 on RTH provision and administration, however the objective of 30% is still not realized and much of the current RTH does not perform well either as environmental infrastructure or as functional public space. The two main obstacles are the high cost of land acquisition and the persistent limitation of regional finances, factors that are more difficult for smaller cities such as Kota Metro to counteract through other fiscal mechanisms (Yusuf et al., 2023). Furthermore, deficiencies in upkeep have been compounded by inadequate law enforcement, poor inter-agency cooperation, and little community engagement across RTH sites, leaving existing protected green spaces underfunded, even where land tenure is already secured.

Land and budget factors certainly contribute to the deficit in green open space but institutional fragmentation among Regional Work Units (OPD) managing green open space means structural impediments no less large. In managing the green open space of Metro City, there are four OPD involved with their respective roles: Bappeda as the strategic planner, Environmental Agency (DLH) as the field maintenance implementer, Public Works and Spatial Planning Agency (PUPR) as the manager of physical infrastructure, and Youth, Sports, and Tourism Agency (Dispora) as the manager of public activities. Each OPD works in its own corridor of tasks and functions without a substantial and regular coordination mechanism, a circumstance that makes integrated RTH management integrating all players, including the community, in one unified planning platform yet to be realized.

Collaborative governance provides an appropriate framework to bridge these fundamental gaps. The concept allows all players, government bodies, communities and the business sector to be in equal and active roles in public decision-making, and not only in formal vertical coordination (Ansell & Gash, 2008). The use of collaborative governance for RTH management involves not

merely allocating duties to OPDs but involving true community participation in all stages of the policy cycle, from planning to evaluation. This standard has not been achieved in the field settings of Kota Metro and the gap is the first point of this investigation.

This research will be conducted in three sequential stages: (1) Patterns of community participation in RTH management in Kota Metro; (2) Coordination mechanisms between OPDs and the gaps observed in actual field practice; and (3) The conditions that enable the development of community-based initiatives like Pasar Payungi to be more effective than top-down programs. Together, these three lines of study are intended to map out where collaborative governance works in Kota Metro, where it stops at formality, and what would need to be changed for RTH management to be more inclusive and sustainable.

## **THEORETICAL REVIEW**

In a number of earlier studies the subject of RTH management has been studied from several points of view and the disagreement in their results shows that it is a multifaceted problem which cannot be solved with a single variable. Pratama et al. (2016) found that in their study of dynamic modeling of RTH demand in Kota Malang, a combination of several interventions is needed to meet the 30% target namely controlling urbanization rates, controlling built-area expansion, controlling population growth, and adding both public and private RTH simultaneously. No single measure is self-sufficient. The study clearly illustrates the systemic structure of the RTH problem, but does not discuss the governance conditions which decide whether any combination of those treatments can actually be coordinated and sustained across different actors.

Closer to that governance dimension is the study of Lestari (2014) who examined the development of RTH in Nganjuk Regency. The results of the study show that the progress toward a sustainable city depends on the organization's capacity, quality of human resources, coordination among stakeholders, and the alignment of the interests of different actors. The paper recommends the establishment of RTH based on agriculture and more environmental supervision with more responsibility for regional governments. The institutional picture is more obvious here than by Pratama et al. Lestari et al., however, tended to focus more on formal structural arrangements than on the actual interaction of players in shaping management results on the ground.

Suryani et al. (2021) studied the factors affecting the ability of community-based green space managers in Jakarta. They found that community participation always happens in a top-down model; the government sets the agenda and the community implements what is decided at a higher level. The scenario recorded in Jakarta is similar to the condition in Kota Metro, where community participation in the management of RTH rarely goes beyond the implementation of the program given by the government. However, the study was conducted in a large metropolitan setting and does not examine how initiatives that are outside the formal government arrangements, such as Pasar Payungi, can generate their own logic of governance and provide a viable alternative when top-down arrangements fail to deliver on the ground.

Ratoe et al. (2023) researched the response of Nginden Surabaya residents to the development of RTH and found that most people are actively involved in the use of space and the environmental function of the space, but their involvement in the decision-making processes of space management remains limited. The study's recommendations hinted to increased accessibility and wider engagement, but failed to describe what processes would need to change to enable citizens to move from passive users to active decision-makers, or what structural conditions now prevent that shift from happening. The disconnect between community presence and community agency over RTH decisions is established, but not its structural production and sustenance.

Taken together, these studies leave a specific analytical gap. The technical literature establishes what combinations of interventions RTH management requires; the institutional literature describes how formal structures should be organized; and the participation literature documents the pattern of limited community engagement. None of them examine how institutional fragmentation across multiple OPDs and the emergence of independent community initiatives interact within the same governance space, and none do so in the context of a small city where budget and land constraints make formal coordination even harder to sustain. This research addresses that gap by bringing those dimensions together in a single collaborative governance framework, using Kota Metro as the analytical site and Pasar Payungi as the case through which an alternative governance model can be examined.

### ***Collaborative Governance: Conceptual Framework and Basic Principles***

Ansell & Gash (2008) define collaborative governance as a governance arrangement in which one or more public institutions directly engage non-state stakeholders in decision-making processes that are collective, formal, consensus-based, and deliberative. These four elements are not merely descriptive features of the concept; they are conditions that must be present at the same time if collaborative governance is to produce substantive change rather than procedural appearance. Each of these is a necessary condition. Without any one of them, so-called collaborative governance is in fact normal formal coordination without influencing the real allocation of decision rights.

Ansell and Gash (2008) suggest that the emergence of collaborative governance is contingent on four antecedent conditions: the history of conflict or cooperation between relevant actors, the incentives for each party to participate, the distribution of power and resources across actors, and the presence of facilitative leadership to build trust across institutional lines. There is no leadership mechanism to bring together the OPDs in charge of RTH management in Kota Metro spread across multiple bureaucratic hierarchies with distinct lines of authority in a common planning process. Thus coordination depends on individuals, not institutions. It occurs when one or more individuals with adequate positional power want it to occur and it does not occur when no one with adequate positional power wants it to occur. This tendency is consistent with the studies in the four research areas in Kota Metro.

Purwanti (2016) provides an argument that cuts straight through the Kota Metro situation: when a program is reliant on resources, networks, and local knowledge that exist outside of the bureaucracy, government cannot support it only on internal capacity. The implication is palpable. Partnerships with communities and the private sector are not an add-on to the work; they are part of what makes the work possible. To treat community actors as implementers who carry out decisions made elsewhere defeats the purpose before any program gets off the ground. Green space quality over time in RTH management is about the quality of community investment that comes from citizens who have a hand in creating what the space is for and who it serves. Programs that reach communities only at the implementation stage, after priorities have already been set inside the bureaucracy, do not generate that investment, which is why several RTH sites in Kota Metro maintain physical infrastructure on paper while the social function of those spaces remains thin in practice.

### ***Community Participation: Dimensions and Implications for RTH Governance***

In urban environmental management, public participation can take different forms, reflecting different levels of engagement in the policy process. Sastropetro (1988) states that there are five major forms namely participation through ideas and thinking, participation through physical labor, participation through skills, participation through material or financial contribution and social participation. Of the five, participation by way of ideas and thinking carries the most substance as it directly affects the direction and content of the policy decisions. One is involved in physical labor only at the stage of implementation. It adds effort to decisions made by others, but does not determine their content.

In RTH management, the difference between substantive and ceremonial participation produces consequences that are measurable on the ground. Where communities are brought in only to execute programs the government has already designed, without room to challenge priorities or question the assumptions behind them, the result is low sense of ownership over the RTH sites they are supposed to be part of managing. Low ownership produces less maintenance pressure from below and less community monitoring of site conditions, and over time both the physical quality and the ecological function of the space quietly deteriorate. The cycle compounds in a specific direction: communities disinvested from a space they had no hand in shaping become less likely to maintain it, which produces visible deterioration, which then reinforces the institutional assumption that communities cannot be trusted as governance partners, which in turn justifies keeping them at the implementation stage of the next program. In Kota Metro, there are a number of RTH sites exhibiting precisely this pattern, officially the responsibility of the government but in practice supported by nobody.

The participation gap in Kota Metro, as looked at in the four research areas, is a problem of design, not a matter of community ability. More than half a century ago, Arnstein (1969) made this distinction: participation that does not include the redistribution of decision-making power leaves communities as informed of conclusions rather than involved in the reaching of them, and the

label consultation is applied to processes that result in the first but claim to result in the second.

The same logic is followed by Wibawa (2019) in the Indonesian environmental governance specifically, finding that government practice has reduced community involvement to information dissemination and outreach, formats that move knowledge from government to community without any channel in the opposite direction. What the Kota Metro fieldwork adds is the specific institutional form this takes in the management of RTH. The Musrenbang process procedurally includes residents, Bappeda plans with technical staff, DLH executes with community labor, and the chain between those stages has no point at which resident priorities can actually enter the planning logic and change it. The evidence raises the question not of whether Kota Metro inhabitants are capable of substantial involvement, but of whether any of the systems to which they are currently invited are constructed to register their engagement as anything other than attendance.

### *Institutional Fragmentation as a Structural Barrier*

Again and again, studies on RTH governance in Indonesia return to the same finding: related responsibilities are distributed across agencies that each operate within their own mandate, without a coordination mechanism capable of keeping their programs aligned over any sustained period (Rahmanto, 2025; Yusuf et al., 2023). The problem is not that agencies don't do their work. Each OPD usually does what it is mandated to do. The difficulty is mandates were built around sectoral functions, and not around the combined demands of administering a single type of space spanning planning, maintenance, infrastructure and public programming simultaneously.

This configuration was documented by Syafriyani et al., (2026) in Sumenep, where Bappeda worked from spatial planning documents and strategic frameworks, PUPR through physical infrastructure assessments and site suitability reviews, and DLH through day-to-day implementation and maintenance on the ground, each agency working independently on its work rather than feeding into a shared governance logic.

However, same setup is seen in the four OPDs taking care of RTH in Kota Metro. The strategic document is the planning horizon of Bappeda. So the field condition is the reference point for DLH. The frame is the physical structure of PUPR. No agency is mandated to hold all three together and this is the reason why official policies and plans in Kota Metro fail to generate coordinated action at the site level frequently, even if they are formally in place.

The coordination gap is further widened when each OPD maintains its own records on RTH area, location and physical condition, without a single platform to keep those figures synced across agencies. In practice, agencies arrive at coordination discussions working from different factual baselines, and sorting out which figure to use takes up the space that should be going toward substantive planning. Coordinated, evidence-based management of RTH in Kota Metro remains structurally out of reach until the data problem is treated as a governance problem rather than a technical one (Syafriyani et al., 2026).

## METHODOLOGY

This research takes a descriptive qualitative approach within a constructivist paradigm. A qualitative design is appropriate here because the research questions cannot be answered through measurement alone: understanding how formal governance arrangements, community practices, and local institutional conditions interact in a context as specific as Kota Metro requires engaging participants in their own settings and building interpretation from what emerges, which is precisely what Creswell & Poth (2018) describe as the core logic of qualitative inquiry.

Fieldwork took place in Kota Metro, Lampung Province, across several sites: the Bappeda Kota Metro office, DLH, DPRD Commission III, and RTH locations and community-based spaces including Pasar Payungi and Pa'de Manis. Informants were selected purposively based on the direct relevance of their roles to RTH management, covering Bappeda staff, DPRD Commission III members, the managers of Pasar Payungi and Pa'de Manis, UMKM actors across several sub-districts, and residents who regularly use RTH sites in Kota Metro. Data collection drew on in-depth interviews, focus group discussions, direct site observation at RTH locations, and documentary analysis of: Regional Regulation Number 5 of 2016, the RTH Master Plan 2013-2033, Bappeda planning documents, and DPRD Commission III meeting records related to RTH oversight.

The analysis was conducted in three interrelated phases: data reduction to identify material relevant to the research objective, analytical narrative presentation to connect findings to the theoretical framework, and source triangulation to validate the validity of interpretations. Additional validity was established through member verification with key informants and technique triangulation across interview data, field observation and documentation sources.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### *Community Participation Patterns: The Dominance of Passive Involvement*

Passive patterns of community participation in RTH management were found to dominate in fieldwork in Kota Metro. Most citizens consider RTH to be a government recreation area and hence are not very involved in its design or evaluation. Where involvement does occur, it is in a consistent form: people serve as technical implementers of government-designed activities, such as the tree-planting projects managed by DLH, rather than as collaborators with any real influence in influencing policy direction.

This pattern came through directly in interviews at Bappeda Kota Metro. Ibu Rahma, a Bappeda staff member, explained that development programs do not always involve communities from the planning stage, because technical implementation typically sits with a different agency, with DLH engaging communities directly when tree-planting or similar activities are running. Her account reveals the actual mechanism: planning is centralized within Bappeda, technical execution is handed to DLH or other OPDs, and the chain between

those two stages leaves no substantive space for community input to reach the planning table.

The Development Planning Forum (Musrenbang) is a procedural approach of involving community in the process, but has never created space for RTH issues in any real sense. RTH runs over all regional development priorities at once, and tends to get pushed aside by infrastructure projects that come with clearer deliverables and data that are easier to report upward. Community complaints regarding RTH reach the Musrenbang table but do not go farther, absorbed into a multi-sectoral agenda in which physical infrastructure always registers as more vital.

In contrast to the five-form participation framework developed by Sastropoetro (1988), the people of Kota Metro now only contribute to RTH management at the level of physical labor, on a periodic basis, within the context of certain government programs, and without any connection to the stages when planning directions are really determined. The ideas dimension, which is where the community input comes to influence the what and the for whom, has no actual entry point in the existing procedure. The effects are visible on the ground: RTH sites around Kota Metro become undermaintained not because inhabitants are apathetic to the spaces, but because no governance framework gives them an incentive to invest in areas that they had no hand in designing and no standing to shape going ahead.

This tendency is directly driven by the top-down structure of RTH policy formation in Kota Metro. The planning process is closed off for bottom-up input before there is any chance for community actors to present their own priorities. about the community side, poor access to information about RTH policies and programs, and low familiarity with how spatial planning procedures function and where choices are actually made, adds to the problem. Enhancing the quality of participation in Kota Metro involves changing the processes themselves. It is not merely about extending outreach to people who know that something is occurring, but have no genuine opportunity to participate.

### ***Inter-OPD Coordination: Formal on Paper, Fragmented in Practice***

The management of RTH in Kota Metro formally involving numerous institutional parties with separate but interconnected duties. The Regional Development Planning Agency (Bappeda) prepares strategic plans and coordinates the preparation of important planning documents, namely the Regional Long-Term Development Plan (RPJPD), the Regional Medium-Term Development Plan (RPJMD) and the Regional Government Work Plan (RKPD) which are policy references for all Regional Government Agencies (OPD) in carrying out development programs. DLH maintains RTH and the greening of the field including direct community engagement through tree planting projects. The Agency for Public Works and Spatial Planning (PUPR) is responsible for the physical infrastructure and construction and repair of facilities at all RTH sites. DLH dan PUPR are under the supervision of DPRD Komisi III that covers infrastructure development, environmental concerns, and spatial planning.

As soon as viewed from a planning document the distribution of duties reads logical. The mandate structure is formally clear, but there is no mechanism to actually hold the agencies together in practice. This was confirmed by Bapak Hadi from the DPRD Commission III who was contacted during fieldwork in Kota Metro, who confirmed that there is no specific legislation that governs the development of RTH in an integrated cross-sectoral manner in the city. Each OPD adheres to its own mission delineations; coordination occurs only when actively pursued, rather than being a systemic necessity. Furthermore, there is no consistent integrative forum endowed with institutional authority to establish alignment between agencies as a normative expectation rather than an infrequent result. The operative regulatory framework remains Regional Regulation (Perda) Number 5 of 2016, which covers the technical dimensions of RTH provision, utilization, maintenance, and violation sanctions. The regulation says nothing about how OPDs are expected to coordinate with one another, and nothing about how government and community might function as partners in a shared management arrangement.

Perda Number 5 of 2016 states that the minimum RTH provision aim is 30% of the total city area consisting of 20% public RTH and 10% private RTH in accordance with Law Number 26 of 2007. The regulation also describes types of RTH, namely: city parks, city forests, sports fields, cemetery gardens, and green corridors, and forbids any damage to public RTH function, with administrative punishments and fines of up to Rp50 million. Perwali Number 23 of 2021 on the regulation of the Mayor provides technical provisions on the procedures of permits to cut down trees in RTH areas. And yet, across this whole regulatory terrain, there is not one item that describes how different OPDs could work together on a common RTH planning platform, let alone how communities might be brought in as active governance partners.

The interagency coordination that occurs when a pressing need arises is ad hoc, as each OPD operates within its own task boundaries, rather than as a regular structured arrangement. The Alas Puri example is a useful illustration. A legislative effort to create a nature tourism region based on RTH with real ecological potential, complete tree cover and relatively undisturbed natural forest, lost steam and quietly disappeared as the initial momentum from DPRD Commission III waned. When the main force stepped back, there was no cross-OPD coordinating mechanism to carry the effort forward. There was ecological promise and legal purpose, but not the institutional infrastructure to turn that potential and aim into a sustained program.

In addition the data issue makes it even more dire. Each OPD in Kota Metro has its own data on RTH area, location and physical condition, and those values are not always consistent between agencies. During field work, Bapak Hadi of DPRD Commission III, which is responsible for RTH maintenance and development, verified that his commission does not have access to integrated RTH data from the OPDs it controls. In the absence of a common factual baseline, oversight is likely to detect issues after they have already evolved rather than when they are still manageable, thereby limiting the practical efficacy of

Commission III's inspection, however active individual members may be in pursuing it.

### ***Community-Based Initiatives as an Instructive Anomaly***

The development of Pasar Payungi was not due to a government program creating the circumstances for it. It began with a small group of people who just kept coming, for about seven years, until the organization grew to the size it is today. All internal governance, membership, and a working routine were developed completely within the community, with no external coordination or ongoing program funding to support it.

*"Communities need to be empowered, and empowerment takes time. Here, for example, I started with just a few people, and now Payungi has the number of members it has today. It began with one, two people and gradually grew into many. And that was not easy, it takes consistency and commitment. I do believe, though, that community is where the real strength lies. Why? Because if we only rely on the government, I do not think programs that bring together large numbers of people with different educational backgrounds and experiences can build their own working routines that way. You cannot just claim that as yours, because those results came from the Payungi program itself."* - Darma, Manager of Pasar Payungi.

Two things that are worth keeping separate in Bapak Darma's account. Government support did not make Payungi durable. What made Payungi durable was the kind of internal discipline that government programs rarely build into their design: consistency of commitment, internal accountability, and a shared orientation toward the long term rather than toward the next program cycle. The second is more acid. His comment about credit cuts to a real and recurring problem in Kota Metro: the government has at times attached its name to outcomes that the community built, and the community has continued to do the actual work of sustaining the initiative without the resources or recognition that formal partnership would imply. The credit flows in one direction. The work is not for you.

Bapak Darma also observed during the fieldwork that the government's engagement with Payungi has never gone beyond something structurally sustainable. Over seven years, Payungi has constructed a working organizational model with observable results in community-based RTH management. However, there has been no government program created that formally incorporates or extends their work. The city's formal government system and a successful community initiative exist in the same physical place, but are institutionally disconnected. That disparity is not because of a lack of information from the government. The initiative is apparent, the track record is public and the management strategy is not complicated. The gap remains because there is nothing in the current regulatory or coordination structure that establishes a responsibility or an incentive for the formal system to respond to what works at the community level, by constructing policy around it.

The same method is repeated in a more recent and smaller form in the Pa'de Manis which was founded on 12 August 2023, with approximately 18 starting vendors and funded exclusively by community donations without

external budget support. The active role of the local Lurah in the community association creates a superficial sense of government-community partnership but the drive behind Pa'de Manis remains the dedication of the locals themselves to communal economic activities and mutual support. The program was aimed from the start at three objectives which the community itself had recognized as its urgent needs: job creation, raising household income and reducing unemployment in the neighboring area. None of these aims was thought up under a city policy agenda or government established program. In operational terms, Pa'de Manis employs open public space and operates on RTH principles as a community-managed public space, but is not formally incorporated into Kota Metro's RTH governance framework.

Both projects indicate the same fundamental dynamic. Good community-based public space management at the ground level in Kota Metro is not acknowledged and encouraged in the formal governing system in the city. The practices are real, the community investment is continuous and the social and economic consequences are obvious. The formal system just does not view them as part of the governing picture. The most direct entry point for building more substantial collaborative governance in Kota Metro is to bridge this gap, between what actually occurs at community level and what the formal system acknowledges and supports. Any attempt at reform that begins from institutional design rather than from engaging what works on the ground risks creating governing structures over communities rather than with them.

### *Implications for Collaborative Governance and Structural Recommendations*

The three conclusions reported in the previous sections are not independent of each other. The patterns of passive participation, reactive and sectorally fragmented coordination between OPDs, and the community-based RTH management that functions independently of formal structures, together describe a single governance configuration: a formal system that is internally fragmented and externally closed, operating in parallel with a capable and self-sustaining community layer that is institutionally invisible. RTH governance in Kota Metro is mapped against Ansell and Gash's (2008) criteria for effective collaborative governance which needs inclusive stakeholder involvement, consensus-based dialogue and trust created through repeated and open contact. It fails to meet all three dimensions at the same time. Community involvement remains a matter of implementation and infrequent participation, rather than deliberation and ongoing engagement. Inter-OPD coordination is reactive and event-driven, rather than based on shared planning cycles. There has been no forum for frequent interaction between government and community on equal terms therefore the prerequisites for trust between government and community have not established. This is not a one dimensional gap that can be solved by tweaking one policy lever. It is a structure that is self-replicating in all three dimensions at once.

The Payungi and Pa'de Manis cases add something analytically concrete to the picture from the preceding sections: collaborative governance in Kota Metro does not need to be assembled from nothing. Both projects have

community organizational capacity, management experience, and social trust among participants. Community readiness is not the missing piece. It is the willingness of governments to consider these efforts not as programme recipients who happen to be constructively using public space, but as governance players with genuine standing. Bapak Darma's narration of the credit conflict indicates the precise institutional stance that must change. The municipal government's existing stance with regard to Payunggu's accomplishments is post hoc; it attaches itself to outcomes it did not generate and did not maintain. Getting to collaborative governance implies the government is in the partnership sooner and differently, as the party that sets up the conditions for community-led management to be able to sustain itself, not the party that shows up after the work is done to put its name on the outcomes. Nor does such reorientation come through one policy change alone. It needs adjustment at three structural levels at once.

The most direct entry point for reform at regulatory level is the gap in *Perda* Number 5 of 2016. There is no mechanism for cross-OPD collaboration or for community partnerships. The existing regulatory structure deliberately forecloses the coordination it ought to be allowing. Kota Metro requires a permanent, institutionally binding multi-actor collaborative forum with: relevant OPDs, community leaders including established initiatives such as Payungi and Pa'de Manis, and commercial sector actors when relevant. This forum cannot be a consultative body for agencies to consult and then ignore. If it is to impact RTH program priorities and budget allocations across OPDs, it needs genuine authority. Otherwise it creates documentation rather than choices and reproduces the same ceremonial pattern of involvement at the community level.

At the data level, the OPD data fragmentation reported makes coordinated planning structurally challenging to be performed prior to any policy discussion. An integrated RTH information system, available to all relevant OPDs and updated on a shared timetable, is required for evidence-based decision-making. The same system must also be applied to DPRD Commission III, which has formal oversight responsibility over RTH, but today works without integrated data access from the agencies that it oversees, a situation that hinders the quality of legislative oversight regardless of how committed individual members such as Bapak Hadi may be.

At the community level, Pasar Payungi and Pa'de Manis are not informal activities that just happen to make good use of public space, but need to be formally acknowledged as an integral part of the RTH governance system of the Kota Metro. Such formal recognition should be matched by commensurate and sustained government support in three practical dimensions: legal standing within the RTH management framework; inclusion in RTH planning consultations with real influence on outcomes; and access to resources commensurate to the governance functions these communities are already carrying out without institutional backing. Having a partnership claim that has no official standing and no funding supports the government's program narrative but leaves the community to continue the activity itself. That is not a

partnership in any real sense, and the collaborative governance framework that Kota Metro needs cannot be formed on that basis.

## **CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

The collaborative governance deficit of RTH management in Kota Metro is caused by two mutually reinforcing factors, i.e. community participation which is still passive and inter-OPD coordination which is still fragmented. The formal governance structure in the form of Perda Number 5 of 2016 and the Musrenbang mechanism have not led to substantive multi-actor involvement because neither instrument was designed to enable cross-sectoral RTH co-production. Inter-OPD coordination is still sectorally organized and reactive, without an integrative platform that can bring Bappeda, DLH, PUPR, and DPRD Commission III into a common planning cycle. Community initiatives like Pasar Payungi and Pa'de Manis show that regular, self-sustaining community administration results in more productive and lasting public space than the formal system alone has created. That demonstrated capacity has not been met with equivalent recognition or structural support by the city's governance framework. That is, the official system and the community layer still operate in parallel without a common arrangement.

Theoretically, these data imply that collaborative governance in the urban RTH environment should not be assessed on the basis of formal inter-OPD coordination. Its assessment must be against the quality of community involvement throughout the whole policy cycle from planning to evaluation and whether the structures in place allow communities to be decision-making partners rather than technical implementers. There is another implication of the Pasar Payungi case: that independent community initiative, once it has developed organizational capacity and a sustained track record, can provide the basis for more substantive collaborative governance, if government is willing to recognize and formally support that initiative rather than associate itself with outcomes that it did not produce.

In practical terms, Kota Metro needs four structural changes in parallel: a permanent, institutionally binding multi-actor collaborative forum covering relevant OPDs, established community initiatives and private sector actors; regional regulation that is strengthened to explicitly create space for cross-sectoral RTH co-production beyond what Perda Number 5 of 2016 currently enables; an integrated RTH information system that provides all relevant agencies with access to consistent, synchronized data as a precondition to coordinated planning; and formal recognition of community-based initiatives like Pasar Payungi as integral components of the city's RTH governance system, with proportional and sustained government support rather than symbolic partnership claims that carry no resources and no institutional standing.

## **FURTHER STUDY**

Future research is recommended to expand the scope of collaborative governance studies in urban green open space management by involving a wider range of stakeholders and comparing different urban contexts. Longitudinal studies could provide deeper insights into the sustainability of collaborative

arrangements and the long-term impact of public participation on environmental quality, community well-being, and policy effectiveness. Additionally, future studies may integrate quantitative and mixed-method approaches to measure the effectiveness of collaboration mechanisms and identify factors that strengthen stakeholder engagement in urban green space governance.

Furthermore, future scholars may examine the role of digital technologies, such as e-participation platforms, geographic information systems (GIS), and social media, in enhancing collaboration and citizen involvement in urban green space management. Comparative studies across cities with different governance capacities and socio-economic conditions would also contribute to a more comprehensive understanding of how institutional, cultural, and technological factors influence the success of collaborative governance initiatives. Such investigations could provide practical recommendations for policymakers seeking to improve urban environmental sustainability through inclusive governance approaches.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The authors would like to express their sincere gratitude to all stakeholders who contributed to this study, including government officials, community representatives, environmental organizations, and residents of Metro City who generously shared their experiences and perspectives. Appreciation is also extended to the academic institutions and colleagues who provided valuable support, constructive feedback, and guidance throughout the research process. Their contributions were essential to the successful completion of this study.

The authors also acknowledge the support of local government agencies and community groups involved in the management of green open spaces in Metro City. Their willingness to participate in interviews, discussions, and data collection activities greatly enriched the findings of this research. The authors are grateful for the collaborative spirit demonstrated by all participants, which reflects the importance of collective action in achieving sustainable urban environmental management.

## REFERENCES

- Ansell, C., & Gash, A. (2008). Collaborative governance in theory and practice. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 18(4), 543–571. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/mum032>
- Arnstein, S. R. (1969). A Ladder of Citizen Participation. *Journal of the American Institute of Planners*, 35(4), 216–224. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01944366908977225>
- BPS Kota Metro. (2023). Kota Metro dalam Angka 2023. Badan Pusat Statistik Kota Metro.
- Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing Among Five Approaches* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.

- Lestari, S. P. (2014). Pengembangan Ruang Terbuka Hijau Dalam Upaya Mewujudkan Sustainable City (Studi Pada Masterplan Pengembangan RTH Tahun 2012-2032). *Jurnal Administrasi Publik Mahasiswa Universitas Brawijaya*, 2(3), 381–387.
- Pratama, M. R., Rachmansyah, A., & Usman, F. (2016). Pemodelan Dinamis Kebutuhan Ruang Terbuka Hijau Kota Malang. *Indonesian Green Technology Journal*, 5(1), 7–15.
- Purwanti, N. D. (2016). Collaborative Governance: Kebijakan Publik dan Pemerintahan Kolaboratif, Isu-Isu Kontemporer. Center for Policy and Management Studies, FISIPOL UGM.
- Rahmanto, M. A. (2025). Exploring Network Governance as an Alternative Model for Green Open Space (RTH) Management in Indonesia: A Systematic Literature Review. *Enrichment: Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Development*, 3(3), 616–626. <https://doi.org/10.55324/enrichment.v3i3.382>
- Ratoe, T. E., Mustofa, A., & Haryati, E. (2023). Evaluasi Tingkat Responsivitas Masyarakat Kampung Herbal Terhadap Ruang Terbuka Hijau di Nginden Surabaya. *Journal Publicuho*, 6(3), 892–907. <https://doi.org/10.35817/publicuho.v6i3.214>
- Republik Indonesia. (2007). Undang-Undang Nomor 26 Tahun 2007 tentang Penataan Ruang. Sekretariat Negara.
- Sastropoetro, R. A. S. (1988). Partisipasi, Komunikasi, Persuasi dan Disiplin dalam Pembangunan Nasional. Alumni.
- Suryani, Muljono, P., Susanto, D., & Harijati, S. (2021). Factors Affecting the Capacity of Green Gang Managers in the Utilization of Yards for Green Open Space in Jakarta. *ENDLESS: INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF FUTURE STUDIES*, 4(2), 149–162. <https://doi.org/10.54783/endllessjournal.v4i2.285>
- Syafriyani, I., Abrar, U., & Rasaili, W. (2026). Multistakeholder Collaboration in Green Open Space Policy Partnership Perspective Study in Sumenep. *Ilomata International Journal of Social Science*, 7(2), 680–688. <https://doi.org/10.61194/ijss.v7i2.1966>
- Wibawa, K. C. S. (2019). Mengembangkan Partisipasi Masyarakat Dalam Perlindungan dan Pengelolaan Lingkungan Hidup Untuk Pembangunan Berkelanjutan. *Administrative Law and Governance Journal*, 2(1), 79–92. <https://doi.org/10.14710/alj.v2i1.79-92>
- Yusuf, M., Kurniasih, D., & Saputra, A. S. (2023). Governing green open space in indonesia: Barriers and opportunities to enhancing enviromental quality.

Otoritas : Jurnal Ilmu Pemerintahan, 13(3), 424-439.  
<https://doi.org/10.26618/ojip.v13i3.11685>