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Abstract

The purpose of this study was to determine and analyze the level of success of the implementation of the Sustainable Food House Area (KRPL) activity program in the Katingan Regency based on the content of the policy and environmental aspects of policy implementation (context of implementation). This study uses a quantitative descriptive research approach. The data collection approach is quantitative in the form of questionnaires and observations and the presentation is in the form of systematic numbers. The research was conducted at the Department of Agriculture, Food, and Fisheries, which is located at Jalan MT. Haryono, Regional Government Office Complex of Kereng Humbang, Kasongan, Katingan Hilir, Katingan Regency, by taking 60 samples of KWT members. The data analysis used the calculation of the percentage of the respondents’ answers, which then determined the answer interval scale to determine the categories of the research variables and indicators. The results showed that the implementation of the KRPL program in the Katingan Regency based on the dimensions of policy content and environmental aspects of policy implementation was quite good. Indicators of policy implementation that have a high category are aspects of the location of decision making and aspects of the resources involved. Medium category policy implementation indicators are the aspects of the interest of the target group, the aspects of implementing the policy, the aspects of power, interests, and strategies that are owned, and aspects of the level of compliance and responsiveness of the target group. Indicators of policy implementation that have a low category are aspects of the type of benefits, aspects of the degree of change desired, and aspects of the characteristics of institutions and regimes.
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INTRODUCTION

Securing food security is one of the targets of the national economic development of the Government of Indonesia. This shows how important the role of food security is in realizing a strong and resilient national resilience. The development of food security in Indonesia is affirmed by Food Law Number 18 of 2012 concerning food sovereignty and self-sufficiency. This Food Law emphasizes meeting food needs at the individual level by utilizing the potential of natural, human, social, economic resources, and local wisdom. The implementation of food diversification or diversification is in line with the concept of realizing food security [1]. The idea of food diversification is not new. The slogan of food diversification has even been launched since 1970, but the New Order government emphasized the importance of self-sufficiency in rice, which has now become the staple food consumption of the majority of Indonesians [2].

Fears of a food crisis in the future due to the dependence of the Indonesian people on rice as the sole food consumption can be likened to a time bomb that could explode at any time. To answer this problem, the government has launched a program for the Acceleration of Diversification of Food Consumption (P2KP) which is an implementation of the strategic plan of the Ministry of Agriculture. According to the draft P2KP implementation guidelines released by the Ministry of Agriculture, the P2KP program mechanism is implemented through various activities, namely: (1) Optimizing Yard Utilization through the concept of Sustainable Home Food Areas (KRPL), (2) Local Staple Food Development Model (MP3L), and (3) P2KP Socialization and Promotion. Through these three major activities, it is hoped that it can improve the quality of people's food consumption to form a good food consumption pattern.
Katingan Regency in 2018 received government assistance, namely the Sustainable Food House Area (KRPL) activity program, which amounted to 22 Women's Farmer Groups (KWT) [6] describe that a farmer group is defined as a group of farmers who are bound informally based on harmony and mutual interest in farming. Farmer groups were formed to solve problems faced by farmers that cannot be solved individually [3]. The problem that arises in the implementation of the Sustainable Food House Area (KRPL) program in the Katingan Regency at this time is the lack of optimal implementation of the program. This can be seen from the number of registered KWTs of 22 KWT, but currently, only 5 KWT are still active. This is due to several constraints such as seasonal factors, limited area of potential cultivated land owned by each KWT member, some KWT members do not own land and yards, and the lack of knowledge of KWT members on the importance of the Sustainable Food Home Area (KRPL) program. This problem becomes the main obstacle in the implementation of the sustainable food house area (KRPL) program, in which Katingan Regency is a very potential area for the implementation of the program so that it can provide optimal benefits for the community. The measurement of the implementation of the sustainable food house area (KRPL) program is very important to see the description of the success rate of the program. So that it can make it easier for program implementers to evaluate and improve program implementation to provide maximum benefits. The implementation of the sustainable food house area program (KRPL) is measured based on the aspect of the content of the policy, which refers to the interests of the target group, the types of benefits, the degree of change desired, the location of the decision making, the policy implementer, and the resources involved. Whereas the environmental aspect of policy implementation (context of implementation) refers to the power, interests, and strategies that are owned, the characteristics of the institutions and regime in power, as well as the level of compliance and responsiveness of the target group [4]. Based on the descriptions above, the researcher feels it is necessary and important to research the success rate of implementing the Sustainable Food House Area (KRPL) program in the Katingan Regency, Central Kalimantan.

RESEARCH METHODS

This study uses a quantitative approach. Researchers use a quantitative approach to obtain accurate data based on empirical and measurable phenomena [5]. This research was conducted at the Department of Agriculture, Food, and Fisheries, which is located at Jalan MT. Haryono, Regional Government Office Complex of Kereng Humbang, Kasongan, Katingan Hilir, Katingan Regency, Central Kalimantan. The population in this study were all members of the Women Farmers Group (KWT) in Katingan Regency in 2019 as many as 150 people. The sample in this study was obtained from a population that was taken randomly and ignored the strata that exist in the population or also called Simple Random Sampling. The sample in this study was 60 people. The data collection techniques in this study were questionnaires and observations which were presented in the form of systematic numbers. The questionnaire is a data collection technique that is done by giving a set of questions or written statements to the respondent. The answer score is determined based on a Likert scale. Observation is a data collection technique by observing the object that is the research material in the Women Farmers Group (KWT) in Katingan Regency. The data analysis technique used in this research is descriptive research data.

RESEARCH RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Implementation of Sustainable Food House Area (KRPL) activities in Katingan Regency based on content of policy aspects

1. Based on the interests of the target group

The results of the calculation of the score on the content dimension of the policy content of the Sustainable Food House Area (KRPL) implementation program based on the indicators of the interests of the target groups can be seen in Table 1 as follows;
Table-1: Target Group Interest Indicators

| No | Questions                                                                 | Rating result | Total Score |
|----|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|-------------|
|    |                                                                           | Weight | F | %  |               |
| 1  | How do you understand the socialization of the KRPL program?              | 5      | 7 | 11.67 | 180          |
|    |                                                                           | 4      | 16| 26.67 |
|    |                                                                           | 3      | 16| 26.67 |
|    |                                                                           | 2      | 12| 20.00 |
|    |                                                                           | 1      | 9 | 15.00 |
| 2  | How do you understand the activities carried out in the KRPL program?     | 5      | 7 | 11.67 | 184          |
|    |                                                                           | 4      | 14| 23.33 |
|    |                                                                           | 3      | 23| 38.33 |
|    |                                                                           | 2      | 8 | 13.33 |
|    |                                                                           | 1      | 8 | 13.33 |
| 3  | How do you support the implementation of the KRPL program in the village? | 5      | 9 | 15.00 | 194          |
|    |                                                                           | 4      | 19| 31.67 |
|    |                                                                           | 3      | 16| 26.67 |
|    |                                                                           | 2      | 9 | 15.00 |
|    |                                                                           | 1      | 7 | 11.67 |

Cumulative Score of Three Questions: 558

Source: Data Processing, 2020

Based on Table 1 shows that the cumulative score is 558 and most of the respondents understand the implementation of the KRPL program being socialized. This shows that according to the respondents the content of the policy on the implementation program for Sustainable Food Home Areas (KRPL) in Katingan Regency based on the interests of the target group has a fairly successful category. The implementation of the KRPL program will be very successful if training and program socialization are held. This is very helpful for members of the Women Farmers Group (KWT) to increase their understanding of the implementation of the program and activities during the program so that it is hoped that it will increase their support in implementing the program. This training and outreach are very much needed considering that most of the KWT members learned to plant independently. This is of course a separate obstacle that must be faced in the success of policy implementation.

2. Types of Benefits

The results of the calculation of the score on the content dimensions of the policy for the implementation of Sustainable Food House Area (KRPL) based on the type of benefit indicator can be seen in Table-2 as follows;

Table-2: Indicators of Benefit Type

| No | Questions                                                                 | Rating result | Total Score |
|----|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|-------------|
|    |                                                                           | Weight | F | %  |               |
| 1  | What are the benefits of implementing the KRPL Program for KWT members in owning arable land? | 5      | 1 | 1.67 | 154          |
|    |                                                                           | 4      | 1 | 1.67 |
|    |                                                                           | 3      | 30| 50.00 |
|    |                                                                           | 2      | 27| 45.00 |
|    |                                                                           | 1      | 1 | 1.67 |
| 2  | What are the benefits of implementing the KRPL Program for KWT members in improving welfare? | 5      | 1 | 1.67 | 148          |
|    |                                                                           | 4      | 2 | 3.33 |
|    |                                                                           | 3      | 28| 46.67 |
|    |                                                                           | 2      | 22| 36.67 |
|    |                                                                           | 1      | 7 | 11.67 |
| 3  | What are the benefits of implementing the KRPL Program for KWT members in community social activities? | 5      | 1 | 1.67 | 154          |
|    |                                                                           | 4      | 2 | 3.33 |
|    |                                                                           | 3      | 31| 51.67 |
|    |                                                                           | 2      | 22| 36.67 |
|    |                                                                           | 1      | 4 | 6.67 |

Cumulative Score of Three Questions: 456

Source: Data Processing, 2020

Based on Table-2, shows that the cumulative score is 456. This shows that according to the respondents the content of the policy on the implementation of the Sustainable Food Home Area (KRPL) program in Katingan Regency based on the type of benefits has a less successful category. This is
because the implementation of the program has not been able to provide maximum benefits to members of the women farmer groups in owning arable land, increasing welfare, and social activities. In general, KWT members have not been able to receive direct benefits from the implementation of the KRPL program considering the process and stages of land processing to provide immediate and gradual results.

### 3. Desired Degree of Change

The results of the calculation of the score on the content dimension of the policy for the implementation of Sustainable Food House Area (KRPL) based on the indicator of the degree of change desired can be seen in Table-3 as follows:

**Table-3: Indicators of the Desired Degree of Change**

| No | Questions                                                                 | Rating result | Total Score |
|----|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|-------------|
|    |                                                                           | Weight | F | %     |           |
| 1  | How do KWT members earn for implementing the KRPL program?                | 5      | 3 | 5,00  | 119       |
|    |                                                                           | 4      | 2 | 3,33  |           |
|    |                                                                           | 3      | 6 | 10,00 |           |
|    |                                                                           | 2      | 29| 48,33 |           |
|    |                                                                           | 1      | 20| 33,33 |           |
| 2  | How is the purchasing power of KWT members after the implementation of the KRPL program? | 5      | 7 | 11,67 | 159       |
|    |                                                                           | 4      | 5 | 8,33  |           |
|    |                                                                           | 3      | 15| 25,00 |           |
|    |                                                                           | 2      | 26| 43,33 |           |
|    |                                                                           | 1      | 7 | 11,67 |           |
| 3  | What is the active role of KWT members in community activities after the implementation of the KRPL program? | 5      | 11| 18,33 | 186       |
|    |                                                                           | 4      | 9 | 15,00 |           |
|    |                                                                           | 3      | 19| 31,67 |           |
|    |                                                                           | 2      | 17| 28,33 |           |
|    |                                                                           | 1      | 4 | 6,67  |           |

Cumulative Score of Three Questions: 464

Based on Table-3, it shows that the cumulative score is 464. This shows that according to the respondents the content of the policy on the implementation of the Sustainable Food House Area (KRPL) program in Katingan Regency based on the degree of change desired was in the less successful category. This is because the program has not been able to increase the income of KWT members and the purchasing power of KWT members and the active role of KWT members is still low.

### 4. Decision Making Location

The results of the calculation of the score on the content dimension of the policy content of the Sustainable Food House Area (KRPL) implementation program based on the indicator of the location of the decision making can be seen in Table-4 as follows:

**Table-4: Indicators of Location of Decision Making**

| No | Questions                                                                 | Rating result | Total Score |
|----|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|-------------|
|    |                                                                           | Weight | F | %     |           |
| 1  | Is the implementation of the KRPL Program appropriate in your village area? | 5      | 12| 20,00 | 223       |
|    |                                                                           | 4      | 29| 48,33 |           |
|    |                                                                           | 3      | 11| 18,33 |           |
|    |                                                                           | 2      | 6 | 10,00 |           |
|    |                                                                           | 1      | 2 | 3,33  |           |
| 2  | Is the implementation of the KRPL Program in accordance with the level of development of your village community? | 5      | 7 | 11,67 | 206       |
|    |                                                                           | 4      | 20| 33,33 |           |
|    |                                                                           | 3      | 26| 43,33 |           |
|    |                                                                           | 2      | 6 | 10,00 |           |
|    |                                                                           | 1      | 1 | 1,67  |           |
| 3  | Is the implementation of the KRPL Program in accordance with the empowerment needs of your village community? | 5      | 10| 16,67 | 190       |
|    |                                                                           | 4      | 14| 23,33 |           |
|    |                                                                           | 3      | 16| 26,67 |           |
|    |                                                                           | 2      | 16| 26,67 |           |
|    |                                                                           | 1      | 4 | 6,67  |           |

Cumulative Score of Three Questions: 619

Source: Data Processing, 2020
Based on Table-4, shows that the cumulative score is 619. This shows that according to the respondents the content of the policy on the implementation of the Sustainable Food Home Area (KRPL) program in Katingan Regency based on the location of the decision making has a successful category. This is because the implementation of the program has been adjusted to the village area, the level of development of the village community, and the level of empowerment needs of the village community.

**Policy Implementation**

The results of the calculation of the score on the content dimension of the policy content of the Sustainable Food House Area (KRPL) implementation program based on the indicators of implementing the policy can be seen in Table-5 as follows;

| No | Questions                                                                 | Rating result | Total Score |
|----|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|-------------|
|    |                                                                           | Weight | F   | %   |                |
| 1  | What is the competence of KRPL program implementers in the field?         | 5      | 7   | 11.67 | 174           |
|    |                                                                           | 4      | 9   | 15.00 |
|    |                                                                           | 3      | 16  | 26.67 |
|    |                                                                           | 2      | 27  | 45.00 |
|    |                                                                           | 1      | 1   | 1.67  |
| 2  | How is the socialization carried out by the KRPL program implementers to the village community? | 5      | 9   | 15.00 | 180           |
|    |                                                                           | 4      | 11  | 18.33 |
|    |                                                                           | 3      | 14  | 23.33 |
|    |                                                                           | 2      | 23  | 38.33 |
|    |                                                                           | 1      | 3   | 5.00  |
| 3  | How is the monitoring carried out by the KRPL program implementers?       | 5      | 8   | 13.33 | 189           |
|    |                                                                           | 4      | 16  | 26.67 |
|    |                                                                           | 3      | 18  | 30.00 |
|    |                                                                           | 2      | 13  | 21.67 |
|    |                                                                           | 1      | 5   | 8.33  |

Cumulative Score of Three Questions

Source: Data Processing, 2020

Based on Table-5, shows that the cumulative score is 543. This shows that according to the respondents the content of the policy for the implementation of Sustainable Food Home Area (KRPL) in the Katingan Regency based on the policy implementer was quite successful. This is because in the implementation of the program there is the competence of implementing the KRPL program in the field as well as the socialization and monitoring of the KRPL program implementers in the village community by the P2KP Extension Coordinator of the Agriculture, Food and Fisheries Office of Katingan Regency.

5. **Resources Involved**

The results of the calculation of the score on the content dimension of the policy for the implementation of Sustainable Food Home Area (KRPL) based on the indicators of the resources involved can be seen in Table-6 as follows;

| No | Questions                              | Rating result | Total Score |
|----|----------------------------------------|---------------|-------------|
|    |                                        | Weight | F    | %    |                |
| 1  | How is the district government support for the implementation of the KRPL program? | 5      | 5    | 8.33 | 193           |
|    |                                        | 4      | 14   | 23.33 |
|    |                                        | 3      | 31   | 51.67 |
|    |                                        | 2      | 9    | 15.00 |
|    |                                        | 1      | 1    | 1.67  |
| 2  | How is the support of the village government in providing facilities for implementing the KRPL program? | 5      | 24   | 40.00 | 231           |
|    |                                        | 4      | 16   | 26.67 |
|    |                                        | 3      | 9    | 15.00 |
|    |                                        | 2      | 9    | 15.00 |
|    |                                        | 1      | 2    | 3.33  |
| 3  | What is the attitude of the community leaders regarding the implementation of the KRPL program? | 5      | 13   | 21.67 | 219           |
|    |                                        | 4      | 22   | 36.67 |
|    |                                        | 3      | 18   | 30.00 |
|    |                                        | 2      | 5    | 8.33  |
|    |                                        | 1      | 2    | 3.33  |

Cumulative Score of Three Questions

Source: Data Processing, 2020
Based on Table-6 shows that the cumulative score is 643. This shows that according to the respondents the content of the policy on the implementation of the Sustainable Food Home Area (KRPL) in Katingan Regency based on the resources involved has a successful category. This is due to the high support given by the district government, village administration, and community leaders for the implementation of the program.

Environment for Implementing Sustainable Food House Area Implementation Policies (KRPL)

6. Powers, Interests and Owned Strategies

The results of the calculation of the score on the environmental dimension of the implementation of the Sustainable Food House Area (KRPL) implementation program based on the indicators of power, interests, and strategies that are owned can be seen in Table-7 as follows;

Table-7: Indicators of Power, Interests and Owned Strategies

| No | Questions                                                                 | Rating result | Total Score |
|----|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|-------------|
|    |                                                                           | Weight | F | %        |
| 1  | Is Katingan District Government the highest policy holder in implementing community welfare improvement programs? | 5      | 17 | 28.33    | 216       |
|    |                                                                          | 4      | 13 | 21.67    |
|    |                                                                          | 3      | 20 | 33.33    |
|    |                                                                          | 2      | 9  | 15.00    |
|    |                                                                          | 1      | 1  | 1.67     |
| 2  | The Department of Agriculture, Food and Fisheries of Katingan Regency is an institution that directly handles the implementation of work programs to increase food self-sufficiency for rural communities? | 5      | 8  | 13.33    | 205       |
|    |                                                                          | 4      | 24 | 40.00    |
|    |                                                                          | 3      | 15 | 25.00    |
|    |                                                                          | 2      | 11 | 18.33    |
|    |                                                                          | 1      | 2  | 3.33     |
| 3  | The District Government identifies groups of women farmers in each village for the implementation of the Sustainable Food House Area (KPRL)? | 5      | 3  | 5.00     | 180       |
|    |                                                                          | 4      | 13 | 21.67    |
|    |                                                                          | 3      | 27 | 45.00    |
|    |                                                                          | 2      | 15 | 25.00    |
|    |                                                                          | 1      | 2  | 3.33     |
| 4  | The Village Government is a direct facilitator in the field in implementing the Sustainable Food House Area (KPRL) through the women farmer groups that you own? | 5      | 13 | 21.67    | 191       |
|    |                                                                          | 4      | 13 | 21.67    |
|    |                                                                          | 3      | 14 | 23.33    |
|    |                                                                          | 2      | 12 | 20.00    |
|    |                                                                          | 1      | 8  | 13.33    |

Cumulative Score of Four Questions 792

Based on Table-7, shows that the cumulative score is 792. This shows that according to the respondents the implementation of the policy implementation program for Sustainable Food Home Areas (KRPL) in the Katingan Regency based on their power, interests, and strategies is quite successful, although not yet comprehensive. This is because the Katingan Regency Government as the highest policyholder in implementing the community welfare improvement program has not yet identified the women farmer groups in each village as a whole so that the direct facilitator functions in the field in implementing the Sustainable Food House Area (KPRL) through the women farmer groups cannot be implemented evenly among all villagers who need the implementation of the program.

7. Characteristics of Ruling Institutions and Regimes

The results of the calculation of the score on the environmental dimension of the implementation of the Sustainable Food House Area (KRPL) policy implementation program based on the indicators of the characteristics of the institution and the ruling regime can be seen in Table 8 as follows;
Table-8: Indicators of Characteristics of Institutions and Regimes in Power

| No | Questions                                                                 | Rating result | Total Score |
|----|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|-------------|
|    |                                                                          | Weight | F  | % |                  |
| 1  | The Katingan Regency Government determines the expenditure budget for implementing community welfare programs? | 5      | 1  | 1,67 | 154             |
|    |                                                                          | 4      | 2  | 3,33 |                  |
|    |                                                                          | 3      | 37 | 61,67|                  |
|    |                                                                          | 2      | 10 | 16,67|                  |
|    |                                                                          | 1      | 10 | 16,67|                  |
| 2  | The Department of Agriculture, Food and Fisheries of Katingan Regency has a main strategic plan in increasing food self-sufficiency in all village communities? | 5      | 2  | 3,33 | 154             |
|    |                                                                          | 4      | 5  | 8,33 |                  |
|    |                                                                          | 3      | 31 | 51,67|                  |
|    |                                                                          | 2      | 9  | 15,00|                  |
|    |                                                                          | 1      | 13 | 21,67|                  |
| 3  | How is the support from the District Government in the implementation of the Sustainable Home Food Area (KPRL) program? | 5      | 1  | 1,67 | 152             |
|    |                                                                          | 4      | 2  | 3,33 |                  |
|    |                                                                          | 3      | 35 | 58,33|                  |
|    |                                                                          | 2      | 12 | 20,00|                  |
|    |                                                                          | 1      | 10 | 16,67|                  |
| 4  | How are the efforts of the Village Government in increasing food self-sufficiency in all village communities? | 5      | 4  | 6,67 | 157             |
|    |                                                                          | 4      | 6  | 10,00|                  |
|    |                                                                          | 3      | 18 | 30,00|                  |
|    |                                                                          | 2      | 27 | 45,00|                  |
|    |                                                                          | 1      | 5  | 8,33 |                  |
|    | Cumulative Score of Four Questions                                       |          |   | 617   |                 |

Source: Data Processing, 2020

Based on Table 8, shows that the cumulative score is 617. This shows that according to respondents the implementation of the policy implementation program for Sustainable Food Home Areas (KRPL) in the Katingan Regency based on the characteristics of the institutions and the ruling regime was less successful. This occurs because the available facilities are insufficient for the implementation of the KRPL Program, such as a lack of nurseries, demonstration plots, fish ponds, and the absence of wells or flowing water sources for program activities. Although in the implementation of the KRPL program the funds provided were sufficient or adequate.

8. Level of Compliance and Responsiveness of the Target Group

The results of the calculation of the score on the environmental dimension of the implementation of the KRPL program policy based on the indicators of the level of compliance and responsiveness of the target groups are in Table 9 as follows.

Table-9: Indicators of Compliance Level and Target Group Responsiveness

| No | Questions                                                                 | Rating result | Total Score |
|----|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|-------------|
|    |                                                                          | Weight | F  | % |                  |
| 1  | How is the implementation of the KRPL program for the Women Farmers Group in your place? | 5      | 5  | 8,33 | 191             |
|    |                                                                          | 4      | 20 | 33,33|                  |
|    |                                                                          | 3      | 20 | 33,33|                  |
|    |                                                                          | 2      | 11 | 18,33|                  |
|    |                                                                          | 1      | 4  | 6,67 |                  |
| 2  | How do members of the Women's Farmers Group respond to the KRPL program?   | 5      | 3  | 5,00 | 167             |
|    |                                                                          | 4      | 14 | 23,33|                  |
|    |                                                                          | 3      | 16 | 26,67|                  |
|    |                                                                          | 2      | 21 | 35,00|                  |
|    |                                                                          | 1      | 6  | 10,00|                  |
| 3  | How are members of the Women's Farmers Group in the KRPL program?         | 5      | 1  | 1,67 | 135             |
|    |                                                                          | 4      | 6  | 10,00|                  |
|    |                                                                          | 3      | 15 | 25,00|                  |
|    |                                                                          | 2      | 23 | 38,33|                  |
|    |                                                                          | 1      | 13 | 25,00|                  |
|    | Cumulative Score of Three Questions                                       |          |   | 493   |                 |

Source: Data Processing, 2020
Based on Table 9, shows that the cumulative score is 493. This shows that according to the respondents the implementation of the policy for the implementation of the Sustainable Food House Area (KRPL) in the Katingan Regency based on the level of compliance and responsiveness of the target group was quite successful even though it was still not optimal. The Katingan Regency Government needs to improve the continuity of the implementation of the KRPL program in the Women Farmers Group, increase the response of members of the Women Farmers Group in implementing the KRPL program so that members of the Women Farmers Group in the KRPL program can develop themselves.

Overall the results of the study indicate that there is a continuous increase in the Sustainable Food House Area (KRPL) program. This can be seen from the participation of women farmer groups who play an active role in the maximum participation of members. In addition to having economic value, the development of this program also has the impact and benefit of increasing new knowledge, especially the cultivation of food plants throughout the village community, making the living environment cool and comfortable and creating aesthetics, and so on. The Katingan District Government needs to implement policies on program implementation which are socialized to all levels of government through government bureaucratic instructions as the main support in implementing the KRPL program. Meanwhile, field implementers will intensify direct monitoring of program implementation by holding training. The training that was held, both from the Agriculture, Food and Fisheries Office of Katingan Regency and from the PPL assisting the KRPL group was rarely carried out. This has an impact on the lack of information they get.

CONCLUSION

The success rate of implementing the Sustainable Food House Area (KRPL) program in Katingan Regency is good. But it is still not optimal, so that the hopes / goals are not in accordance with the actual situation. Based on the aspect of policy content (content of policy) has a successful category on the indicator of the location of decision making and the resources involved, the quite successful category is the indicators of the interests of the target group and policy implementers, while the less successful indicators are the categories of types of benefits and the degree of change desired.

The success rate of implementing the Sustainable Food House Area (KRPL) program in Katingan Regency based on the environmental aspects of policy implementation (context of implementation) has a fairly successful category on indicators of power, interests, and strategies, and levels of compliance and responsiveness of target groups. The less successful category is the indicator of the characteristics of the institution and the regime that is in power.
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