The implementation of sustainable community-based environmental sanitation development policy (SLBM) in Tebo Regency
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Abstract. As it is a very necessary in daily life, the problems of sanitation are categorized as very basic problems in health sector. However, the pollution process cause of sanitation takes very long time; therefore, many people tend to ignore the dangerous posed to their health. Geographically, the residents in Tebo Regency are mostly located on the riverbank, with inadequate sanitation facilities. Some of these sanitation facilities were built through the SLBM program, but they do not work optimally. This research was conducted to determine the factors of un-optimal SLBM program and to manage the future strategies for better SLBM. This study used a qualitative descriptive approach. The data were collected using survey methods, questionnaires, and interviews communities and local governments. The results showed that the implementation of the SLBM Sustainable Development Policy in Tebo Regency was not optimal yet, due to several factors, including: lack of training / guidance, non-functioning CBOs, lack of trigger for healthy lifestyle, lack of socialization, lack of supporting facilities, inconsistent standards, lack of synergy between stakeholders, and lack of human resources. To improve sanitation access through the SLBM program, it requires commitment among stakeholders, support local governments to equip CBOs with training, Improve Socialization, and invite communities in the SLBM program.

1. Introduction

Tebo is one of regencies in Jambi Province. This regency is usually known as a village, it is located at the riverbank. Because of this geographical factor, there are a lot of rivers used as the resources of life, such as Batang Hari River, Batang Tebo River, Jujuhan River, Batang Merangin River, and other small rivers.

Due to the traditional lifestyle, the rivers become a prior need for local people. They do many activities in the rivers, such as taking shower, washing and using rivers as toilets. Not only that, river is also the source of clean water for them. Long time ago, they can do all these activities safely without any problems. However, time flies, as people changes, the needs are increased more highly, and it creates an unbalanced nature in Tebo.

Sanitation is an essential aspect and can be categorized as a basic problem in life. It is the structural and social action that has been done by the government or the stakeholder and government institution. This sanitation is an important work for the government; it is started by the central Government which doing the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) program, followed by the Sustainable
Developmen
t Goals (SDGs), and then Tebo Regency is determined as one of implementers of Fasten Community-based Sanitation Development program (PSSP) based on the law number: 648-607/Kep/BANGDA/2012 on September 12th 2012, with Teamwork of Sanitation (PokjaSanitasi) as the following up from this law, this teamwork is created based on the Governor’s decision number: 212 year 2013 on April 1st 2013.

The implementation of sustainable community-based environmental sanitation development policy (SanitasiLingkunganBerbasisMasyarakat – SLBM in Indonesian language) in TeboRegency is not running very well because some facilities are not working. Besides that, there are some habits, traditions, and cultures of the society which do not support this program. Furthermore, the government’s policy does not reach the target yet. Therefore, we need to expose the main factor of this case and to find the strategies to make the implementation of sustainable community-based environmental sanitation development policy (SLBM) in Tebo Regency runs well.

2. Literature Review

Sanitation, as a construction project, can be defined as an action which has the limited time determined by the natural resources and human resources to reach the target of quality and criteria [1].

The implementation of policy is an action as a law, a command, and a decision by an individual/group or government/non-government to solve a problem [2].

There are three factors that can influence the implementation of policy, such as types of problem included the level of problem, the criteria of policy contains clarity/accuracy fund/support, theory/access of the policy and the variable of environment with the culture/economic/support public/skill of implementer [3].

Sustainable development is the process of development principled to fulfill the current needs without scarifying the next generation needs [4], with paying attention the natural resources, human resources, and science and technology.

Sanitation in Indonesia is defined as a way to sort the domestic waste and domestic rubbish to guarantee the cleanliness and the health of the environment, whether at home or neighborhood. Sanitation is divided to be three categories; they are wastewater, rubbish/waste, and drainage [5]. The purpose of DAK SLBM program is to increase the service of sanitation in term of location and skill, especially in managing the waste water and rubbish communally to increase the health and to fulfill the standard of minimum service in providing the sanitation in sensitive sanitation area [6] by following these steps:

1. Planning: Socializing, choosing and deciding the field facilitator (TFL) and location, encouraging the people to have clean and healthy behaviour and lifestyle (PHBS), creating self-help community (Kelompok Swadaya Masyarakat), and creating job planning for citizen (RKM).
2. Action and observation of the construction: Using the natural resources (SDA), preparing the human resources (SDM), providing the things and services.
3. Operational and maintenance: Doing take and give of infestation, creating an organization, and making the report.

As the first step of this research, the researcher collected some references related to the implementation of sustainable community-based environmental sanitation development policy. The sources are books, journals, reports, and other media related to this research. The government of Tebo has the secondary data in books forms, such as Buku Putih Sanitasi/BPS (Pokja Sanitasi, Buku Putih Sanitasi (BPS), 2013), Buku Strategi Sanitasi Kabupaten/SSK (Pokja Sanitasi, Strategi Sanitasi Kabupaten (SSK), 2013) and Buku Memorandum Program Sanitasi/MPS (Pokja Sanitasi, Memorandum Program Sanitasi (MPS), 2014)

3. Research Method

This research used a descriptive method. This method describes the current condition of research target; a group of people, an object, a setting, a system, or a phenomenon [7].
This descriptive research aims to show the description or image systematically, factually, and precisely of facts, characteristics, and relationship between the investigated phenomena. This research also used qualitative approach. This new approach is also known as an artistic method, because it is characterized as an art (without a precise pattern), and it is named as interpretative method, because the result mostly based on interpretation of the data found in the research site [8].

The primary data were gained from the local government’s study (Buku Putih Sanitasi, Strategi Sanitasi Kabupaten dan Memorandum Program Sanitasi) while the additional data were gained from the archives and all data related to the implementation of sustainable community-based environmental sanitation development policy (SLBM).

To obtain the valid and real data, it has to be done by using the right ethic. In this research, the researcher used the following data collection method:

1. Observation (Existing and Sustainable Development)
   The survey was done through observing the sanitation areas directly. From 46 areas where sanitation has been built, 8 areas were selected randomly as the observation areas for existing facilities and the sustainable development. From those 8 areas, 3 of them represented 7 sanitation facilities with MCK +++, 2 represented 5 sanitation facilities with IPAL komunal, and 3 represented 34 sanitation facilities with Septictank komunal. The observation was done by non-participant method; it did not involve any participant. In other words, this research was carried out through observing, analyzing, and making conclusion based on the data analysis.

2. Interview (Questionnaire and Interview the Experts)
   Before giving the questionnaire and conducting the interview, the researcher reviewed the literature and did the pilot survey to build the questions. The interview was conducted with the structural interview; it was conducted by using an interview protocol. 80 questionnaires were spread to 8 locations. In each location, 3 questionnaires were answered by the government stakeholders (PPK, PPTK, technical staff), 2 questionnaires were filled by facilitator stakeholders (technical facilitator and empowerment facilitator), one village official, a group of self-help community, and 3 people as the representatives of the local citizens. And then, the interview involved 2 experts in this field. The questionnaires and interview were conducted in April till May 2018.

The data from observation and interview were analyzed based on finding in observation, interview and the references. This analysis was done by the following steps:

1. Determine the qualified alternative answer from each item of questionnaire. 3 points for “good”, 2 points for “enough”, and 1 point for “less”.
2. Analyze data by transferring the qualitative data into quantitative based on criteria of chosen answers by participants.
3. Determine the percentage calculation category as guideline for data interpretation. By finding the maximum score, average, standard deviation, Z scores for area 34.13% to determine category “enough”. And then, determine “good” category with the range more than “enough” category, while the range is lower than “enough” is categorized as “not enough”.
4. Results and Discussion

4.1 Existing observation results

The existing observation results from 8 research areas were collected by using the observation sheets.

Table 1. Existing sanitation facilities

| Location            | Sanitation Infrastructure (jamban/latrine) | Sanitation support Infrastructure (Clean water, drainage, dustbin) | Self-Help Group (KSM) | OP/renovation | Trigger of PHBS | Local Government Fund |
|---------------------|--------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|---------------|-----------------|------------------------|
| MCK*** Pasar Sarinah | 6 work                                     | Exist                                                           | Work Optimally        | Done          | Exist           | 10% of physical        |
| MCK***Muara Tebo    | 10 work                                    | Exist                                                           | Does not work optimally | Almost done   | Exist           | 10% of physical        |
| MCK***Sumay         | 10 work                                    | Exist                                                           | Does not work optimally | Done          | Exist           | 10% of physical        |
| IPAL Komunal Sungai Keruh | 45 work 5 do not work | Does not exist                                                  | Does not work         | Done (cooperation) | Does not exist | 10% of physical        |
| IPAL Komunal Mangunjayo | 35 work 15 do not work                  | Does not exist                                                  | Does not work         | Not done      | Does not exist | 10% of physical        |
| Septicktank Dusun Tuo | 4 work 1 does not work   | Does not exist                                                  | Does not work         | Done (cooperation) | Exist          | 10% of physical        |
| Septicktank Pulau Temiang | 6 work 4 do not work | Does not exist                                                  | Does not exist        | Not done      | Does not exist | 10% of physical        |
| Septicktank Bedaro Rampak | 3 work 2 do not work   | Does not exist                                                  | Does not work         | Done (cooperation) | Does not exist | 10% of physical        |

Table 1 shows that the existing sanitation facilities are in good condition. From the total, only 18% (25 out of 141) of Jamban (toilets/latrine) is not working, but they do not have good sanitation support infrastructure (clean water, drainage, and dustbin). Out of 8 locations, only 3 locations have this sanitation support facilities. Besides that, some of self-help groups (Kelompok Swadaya Masyarakat) do not work in some locations, only 3 out of 8 locations where the self-help groups work optimally. This case makes the operational of facilities maintenance does not work regularly and continuously. The data also showed that the government’s commitment of sanitation is still less, it is shown only 10% of physical funds as the additional for getting DAK sanitation, therefore the implementation of socialization to trigger the community towards clean and healthy life behavior (PHBS) is not suitable as the physical development of sanitation infrastructure.

4.2 Sustainable development observations

Before carrying out the sustainable development observations, a benchmark is carried out based on factors that influence sustainable development, as shown in Figure 1 below.
Based on Figure 1, we can see that there are several indicators of achieving sustainable development. From these indicators, there are some very low percentage indicators which significantly affect the achievement of the planned program. The indicators order can be described as follows, starting from the lowest percentage are Skill of the community / CBO (SDM2), public awareness to pay the contributions (SDM7), providing the economic input to the community (SDM6), improving public health (SDM1), the emergence of new sanitation facilities in the environment SLBM (SDM6), increased communication skills (IPT1), and understanding the importance of a healthy environment (IPT5).

4.3 Questionnaire

After collecting the data by distributing questionnaires to 80 respondents, it was found that the Implementation of Community-Based Environmental Sanitation Program (SLBM) Policy in Tebo encountered several challenges to be success. Mazmanian and Sabatier (1983) in their pioneer study discussed the factors that influence the success of the implementation of Community-Based Environmental Sanitation Development Policy (SLBM).

Based on the characteristic of problem, some factors influence the implementation of Community-Based Environmental Sanitation Development Policy in Tebo can be seen in Figure 2.
Moreover, based on the characteristics of policy, the factors that influence the Implementation of the Community-Based Environmental Sanitation Development Policy (SLBM) in Tebo Regency can be seen in Figure 3.

Figure 3. The percentage of policy characteristics

Meanwhile, based on the environmental variables, some factors that influence the Implementation of Community-Based Environmental Sanitation Development Policy (SLBM) in Tebo Regency can be seen in Figure 4.

Figure 4. Percentage of environment variable
Figure 2, 3 and 4 above show us 15 important factors greatly influence the Implementation of Community-Based Environmental Sanitation Development Policy (SLBM) in Tebo which need to be considered to make the implementation better, including:

1. Training/coaching to the recipient community of the Community Based Environmental Sanitation (SLBM) program.
2. Assistance for the implementation of Community Based Environmental Sanitation (SLBM) programs, in addition to government agencies.
3. Indirectly socialization by the government to give the information of Community-Based Environmental Sanitation (SLBM) programs.
4. Periodic meetings conducted by the government with local community leaders to succeed in the Community-Based Environmental Sanitation (SLBM) program.
5. Special assistance from the central government and agencies in the implementation of Community Based Environmental Sanitation (SLBM) programs.
6. Availability of supporting facilities (ex: clean water, drainage, and garbage) owned by the community at the location of the implementation of Community Based Environmental Sanitation (SLBM) program.
7. Collection of contributions for the operation and maintenance of sanitation facilities through the Community-Based Environmental Sanitation (SLBM) program.
8. Support and availability of funds in the implementation of Community Based Environmental Sanitation (SLBM) programs.
9. Socialization conducted by the government to the community regarding the Community-Based Environmental Sanitation (SLBM) program.
10. Human Resources (HR) at the location to support the programs.
11. Providing special incentives for the programs.
12. Availability of facility units to be built in the Community Based Environmental Sanitation (SLBM) program.
13. Establishment of Community Self-Help Groups (KSM) utilising to run and maintain the Community Based Environmental Sanitation (SLBM) programs.
14. Involvement of stakeholders in knowing and disseminating Community Based Environmental Sanitation (SLBM) programs.
15. Participation of stakeholders succeeds in the Community-Based Environment (SLBM) Sanitation program policy.

4.4 Result of interview
Based on the interview conducted with the stakeholders of Commitment Making Officers (PPK) of Tebo Regency Public Works and Spatial Planning Office and the chief of self-supporting community, the challenges of Implementation of Community-Based Environmental Sanitation (SLBM) in Tebo Regency can be described as; lack of local government fund for Sanitation, Socialization was not conducted very well, the supporting facilities of sanitation is inadequate (Clean water, drainage, and waste), lack of human resources (TFL, KSM, and Community), impact of the culture of society, Lack of Coordination among the stakeholders, the fund does not reach the standard, KSM does not work optimally, and the community awareness is low.

4.5 Factors affect the implementation of SLBM policies
Based on the observation of fields, sustainable development observation, questionnaire, and interview, it was found that there are some critical factors affect the implementation of the sustainable development policy on community-based environment (SLBM) in the District, the first factor is the availability of fund which affects the implementation of training/coaching, CBO functions, triggers of having healthy life behavior, socialization, facilities, incentives, synergy among the stakeholders, availability of human resources. The second factor is related to the culture of the recipient community who still using the floating toilet, the lack of PHBS habit, the character of the community, the economy is very low, desire to get the full help, lack of willingness to take care/maintain.
4.6 Strategy to improve the effectiveness of SLBM
The strategy that can be applied to improve the effectiveness of the Implementation of the Community-Based Environmental Sanitation Sustainable Development Policy (SLBM) in Tebo is a turnaround strategy. The turnaround strategy is the strategy that can be used by leaders who face many obstacles, but they still have enough time and enough resources to get the solutions. In 2017, the Government of Tebo had done many ways to solve this problem, such as making the commitment to increase the fund for sanitation between the stakeholders, the socialization was done before the deadline, the improvement of synergy between stakeholders, coaching/training on KSMs, Pilot villages, evaluating previous SLBM Implementation and making routine reports.

5. Conclusions and Suggestions
Based on the analysis and discussion of this study, we can conclude that:
1. The recipient community do not get training and coaching
2. KSM Utilization is not functioning
3. The trigger of PHBS (healthy lifestyle) is still very less.
4. Lack of socialization by the Government towards SLBM programs.
5. Availability of facilities to support the sanitation is even less.
6. The incentives do not find the standards.
7. Poor synergy between stakeholders (Government, TFL, KSM, and Community).
8. Lack of human resources.

In order to make the Implementation of the Community-Based Environment (SLBM) Sanitation Sustainable Development Policy in the District become more effective and efficient, the writer suggests these following suggestions:
1. Conduct the training and supply for the community receiving the SLBM Program.
2. Evaluate/monitor the presence of CBOs so that the SDGs aim.
3. Improve the synergy between Stakeholders and adjust the community trigger of PHBS (healthy lifestyle).
4. Sharpen the socialisation to give the community more knowledge and to get the interest from them.
5. The local government should have a serious commitment to allocate proper infrastructure, supporting facilities and incentives which fulfil the standards.
6. Approach the leaders in the community to get the total of participants increased.
7. Need indicator of quality/quality of sanitation system that built.
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