



Factors Affecting Government Agency Performance Reports

Yuli Iriani Sitorus ¹, Fitriani ^{2*}, Nur Jalal ³

¹ Universitas Musamus, Merauke, Papua, Indonesia

² Universitas Musamus, Merauke, Papua, Indonesia

³ Universitas Musamus, Merauke, Papua, Indonesia

Abstract

This study aims to analyze the factors influencing the performance of the South Papua Provincial Government based on work quality, work quantity, time utilization, and collaboration. The main issues identified in this study include the misalignment of Key Performance Indicators (KPI) between the province and regional agencies, delays in data collection, and a lack of coordination and socialization regarding KPI implementation. This research employs a qualitative method with a case study approach. The study involved 12 informants, consisting of officials and staff from regional agencies responsible for KPI implementation. Data collection techniques included in-depth interviews, observations, and document analysis. The data were analyzed using the interactive data analysis method, which consists of data collection, data reduction, data presentation, and conclusion drawing. The findings indicate that a lack of understanding of KPI, minimal involvement of regional agencies in its formulation, and weak inter-agency coordination are the primary factors affecting performance. Additionally, delays in data collection are caused by an unintegrated reporting system. To improve performance, it is necessary to synchronize KPIs between the province and regional agencies, strengthen technology-based data management systems, and enhance coordination and socialization through a more structured mechanism.

Keywords: performance ; instance ; government

Abstrak

Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk menganalisis faktor-faktor yang mempengaruhi kinerja Pemerintah Provinsi Papua Selatan berdasarkan aspek kualitas kerja, kuantitas kerja, penggunaan waktu, dan kerjasama. Permasalahan utama yang ditemukan dalam penelitian ini mencakup ketidaksesuaian Indikator Kinerja Utama (IKU) antara provinsi dan perangkat daerah, keterlambatan pengumpulan data, serta kurangnya koordinasi dan sosialisasi terkait pelaksanaan IKU. Penelitian ini menggunakan metode kualitatif dengan pendekatan studi kasus. Informan penelitian berjumlah 12 orang, terdiri dari pejabat dan staf perangkat daerah yang berperan dalam implementasi IKU. Teknik pengumpulan data dilakukan melalui wawancara mendalam, observasi, dan analisis dokumen. Data yang diperoleh dianalisis menggunakan metode analisis data interaktif, yang meliputi tahapan pengumpulan data, reduksi data, penyajian data, dan penarikan kesimpulan. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa rendahnya pemahaman perangkat daerah terhadap IKU, minimnya keterlibatan dalam penyusunannya, serta lemahnya koordinasi antar instansi menjadi faktor utama yang mempengaruhi kinerja. Selain itu, keterlambatan pengumpulan data disebabkan oleh sistem pelaporan yang belum terintegrasi secara efektif. Untuk meningkatkan kinerja, diperlukan sinkronisasi IKU antara provinsi dan perangkat daerah, penguatan sistem manajemen data berbasis teknologi, serta peningkatan koordinasi dan sosialisasi melalui mekanisme yang lebih terstruktur.

Kata Kunci: kinerja ; instansi ; pemerintah

1. Pendahuluan

A clean government free from Collusion, Corruption and Nepotism (KKN) as well as fulfilling public demands for government performance accountability can be realized by implementing the Government Agency Performance Accountability System (SAKIP) which has been in effect since the issuance of Presidential Instruction Number 7 of 1999 which was updated with Government Regulation Number 8 of 2006 concerning Financial Reporting and Performance of Government Agencies. As stated in Presidential Regulation Number 29 of 2014, the implementation of SAKIP includes 6 (six) elements, namely strategic plans, performance agreements, performance measurement, performance data management, performance reporting, and performance review and evaluation with the following targets:

- a) the realization of transparency of government agencies;
- b) the realization of community participation in the implementation of national development;
- c) the maintenance of community trust in local government.

The Government Agency Performance Accountability System (SAKIP) is what then produces the Government Agency Performance Report (LKjIP) as its output and as the final goal of performance-based reporting so that future decision-making can be carried out better. The Government Agency Performance Report is the material for monitoring and evaluating the performance accountability system in government agencies which is carried out at the end of each budget year. LKjIP is prepared for accountability for the success and failure of the implementation of the organization's mission in achieving the targets and objectives that have been set. LKjIP will be submitted to the Governor who will then be forwarded to the Minister of State Apparatus Empowerment and Bureaucratic Reform of the Republic of Indonesia as material for evaluation and guidance of regional government administration by the central government.

The requirement to prepare this LKjIP encourages the regional government of South Papua province to make improvements to the performance and performance displayed in providing public services because LKjIP requires a performance-based government management system. This performance measurement is considered important because with this, the government can be accountable for its performance in managing State Resources and making policies for the implementation of state activities. The current government's performance accountability is considered to have more public accountability with the existence of the LKjIP. The ultimate goal of this performance-based reporting is so that future decision-making can be carried out more wisely, effectively, and efficiently.

To provide a clear basis, the preparation of the LKjIP for South Papua Province refers to and is guided by the following legal basis; (1) Undang-Undang Nomor 28 Tahun 1999 tentang Penyelenggaraan Negara yang Bersih dan Bebas Korupsi, Kolusi, dan Nepotisme; (2) Undang-Undang Nomor 23 Tahun 2014 tentang Pemerintahan Daerah (Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 2014 Nomor 224, Tambahan Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia nomor 5587), Sebagaimana telah beberapa kali diubah, terakhir dengan Undang-Undang Nomor 9 Tahun 2015 tentang perubahan kedua atas Undang-Undang nomor 23 Tahun 2014 tentang Pemerintahan Daerah (Lembaran Negara Indonesia Tahun 2014 Nomor 28); (3) Undang-Undang Nomor 14 Tahun 2022 tentang Pembentukan Provinsi Papua Selatan (Lembar Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 2022 Nomor 15); (4) Peraturan Presiden Nomor 29 tahun 2014 tentang sistem akuntabilitas kinerja instansi pemerintah (Lembar Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 2014 Nomor 80); (6) Peraturan Menteri Pendayagunaan Aparatur Negara dan Reformasi Birokrasi Nomor 53 Tahun 2014 Tentang Petunjuk Teknis Perjanjian Kinerja, Pelaporan Kinerja dan Tata Cara Reviu Atas Laporan Kinerja Instansi Pemerintah; (7) Peraturan Gubernur Provinsi Papua Selatan Nomor 18 Tahun 2023 tentang Petunjuk Teknis Perjanjian Kinerja, Pelaporan Kinerja dan Tata Cara Reviu Atas Laporan Kinerja Instansi Pemerintahan (Berita Daerah Provinsi Papua Selatan Tahun 2022 Nomor 18).

The implementation of the preparation of LKjIP was not optimal due to several problems that emerged. These problems are as follows; (1) Data collection carried out by regional apparatus does not match the targets, realizations and performance achievements that have been set; (2) There is no conformity between the Provincial Main Performance Indicators and the Regional Apparatus Main Performance Indicators; (3) The time for data collection required by regional apparatus does not match the time limit that has been determined; (4) The Regional Apparatus IKU (Main Performance Indicators) do not match the Provincial IKU; (5) Regional Apparatus is not directly involved in the Preparation of the Main Performance Indicators (IKU) which results in the Regional Apparatus IKU and the Provincial IKU not connecting; (6) Lack of Socialization of the Main Performance Indicators (IKU) of South Papua Province.

The process of data collection and data processing from Regional Apparatus greatly influences the level of success in the preparation of the Provincial LKjIP. The reference that needs to be considered in the preparation of LKjIP is the Main Performance Indicator (IKU) which contains the program of activities that must be carried out by regional apparatus and will be assessed. Key Performance Indicators are measures of the success of an organization's strategic goals and objectives. The purpose of determining key performance indicators is: (1) to obtain important and necessary performance information in carrying out good performance management; (2) to obtain measures of success in achieving the organization's strategic goals and objectives which are used for performance actions and improving performance accountability.

The Provincial LKjIP consists of several Regional Apparatus IKUs, the number of Regional Apparatus in South Papua Province is 27 (twenty seven) Regional Apparatus and all of them are required to collect their respective LKjIPs, however, of the 27 (twenty seven) Regional Apparatus, only 19 (nineteen) Services or Agencies and 6 (six) bureaus in the Regional Secretariat have their IKUs to be included in the Provincial LKjIP. Therefore, the IKUs in the 19 (nineteen) services or agencies and 6 (six) sections greatly influence the preparation of the Provincial LKjIP, while the process of data collection and data processing from it is still constrained by delays in data collection and incomplete data collected, one of which is the Organization Bureau.

Data collection from the Organization Bureau has not been in accordance with the specified time limit and there are still things that need to be fixed because there are still discrepancies in the targets, realizations and performance achievements that have been set. This results in the South Papua Province LKjIP being inaccurate and unaccountable.

2. Literatur Review

1.1. Government Agency Performance Report (LKjIP)

Government Agency Performance Report (LKjIP) is a report containing accountability and performance of a government agency. The preparation of LKjIP is based on the current budget cycle, which is one year, completely containing a report that compares planning and results. The preparation of a spending activity is made into an input, namely the amount of funds needed and the results, namely a result or form obtained from the funds spent. The function of the Government Agency Performance Report (LKjIP) is:

- a) Written form of accountability of regional work units to the authority and mandate giver;
- b) LKjIP contains the performance of the agency and its accountability, namely a description of the level of achievement of the implementation of an activity or program or policy in realizing the vision, mission, goals, targets of the organization and is a medium of accountability for each regional work unit;
- c) As a medium of information on the extent to which the determination of good governance principles including the implementation of management functions is correct in the relevant regional work unit.

The purpose and benefits of LKjIP are accountability, improvement in planning, increasing accountability, as feedback for improving the performance of Regional Apparatus, knowing and assessing the level of success and failure, becoming an efficient, effective, and responsive agency to the aspirations of the community and the environment. Based on Permenpanrrb Number 53 of 2014, the most important thing needed in preparing a performance report is performance measurement and evaluation as well as disclosure. Performance measurement can be seen from the existence of Performance Indicators. Performance indicators are measures of success that explain the realization of performance, the achievement of program results and activity results.

1.2. Organization Performance

Bernardin and Russel (in Ruky, 2002:15) provide the following understanding of performance: "performance is defined as the record of outcomes produced on a specified job function or activity during a time period. Achievement or performance is a record of the results obtained from certain job functions or activities during a certain period of time. Wibowo (2007:4) put forward his idea that organizational performance is also determined by how the process of activities takes place to achieve organizational goals. The complete idea about this is as follows below: "in the process of implementing activities, monitoring, assessment and review or re-examination of human resource performance should always be carried out. Through monitoring, periodic performance measurements and assessments are carried out to determine the achievement of performance progress that is predicted whether there is a deviation from the plan that can interfere with the achievement of goals". Furthermore, according to Mahsun (2006:25) performance is a description of the level of achievement of the implementation of an activity/program/policy in realizing the goals, objectives, and vision of the organization as stated in the strategic planning of an organization. In accordance with the concept above, it can be said that performance encompasses interactions, both in terms of quantity and quality, of various things, which involve optimal utilization of resource aspects.

Performance Assessment is basically used to assess the success or failure of the implementation of activities, programs and/or policies in accordance with the targets and objectives that have been set in order to realize the vision and mission of government agencies. Performance measurement includes determining the achievement of performance indicators. Bernardin in Robbins (2016:263), the following are some indicators for measuring a person's performance:

- 1) Work Quality, which is the level at which the desired activity results approach perfection in the sense of adjusting some ideal ways of performing activities, or meeting the expected goals of an activity. Work quality is measured from employee perceptions of the quality of work produced and the perfection of tasks against work skills and abilities.
- 2) Quantity, which is the amount produced expressed in terms such as units, the number of activity cycles completed. Quantity is measured from employee perceptions of the number of activities assigned and their results.
- 3) Timeliness, which is the level of activity completed at the beginning of the stated time, seen from the

perspective of coordination with output results and maximizing the time available for other activities. Timeliness is measured from employee perceptions of an activity completed from the beginning of time to output.

- 4) Effectiveness, which is the level of use of organizational resources (money, raw materials, manpower, technology) is maximized with the intention of increasing the results of each unit in the use of resources. Work effectiveness is measured from employee perceptions in assessing the use of time in carrying out tasks, the effectiveness of completing tasks assigned by the organization.
- 5) Independence, which is the level at which employees can perform their work functions without asking for help or guidance from others. Independence is measured from employee perceptions in performing their respective work functions, according to their responsibilities.
- 6) Work Commitment, which is the level at which employees have a work commitment to the agency and employee responsibility to the office, measured from employee perceptions in fostering relationships with the agency and employee responsibility and loyalty.

John Miner (Sudarmanto, 2009:11-12) who stated that there are four dimensions that can be used as benchmarks or indicators in assessing organizational performance, namely:

- a) Quality, namely the level of errors, damage, accuracy.
- b) Quantity, namely the amount of work produced.
- c) Use of Time, in working, namely the level of absence, lateness, effective working time/lost performance hours.
- d) Cooperation with others in working.

While the measurement of organizational performance conveyed by Jerry Harbour (Sudarmanto, 2009:13) recommends six aspects, namely:

- 1) Productivity: the ability to produce goods and services
- 2) Quality: producing goods and services that meet quality standards
- 3) Timeliness (timelines): the time required is strengthened in producing the goods and services:
- 4) Time rotation: in producing the goods and services; 5) Use of resources: resources needed to produce the product of goods and services;
- 6) Costs, costs required.

Dwiyanto (Muntiarin, 2014) argues that in performance assessment there are five indicators to measure the performance of public bureaucracy:

- a) Productivity, The concept of productivity measures the level of efficiency and effectiveness of services, which is understood as the ratio between input and output. The concept has undergone broader development and is oriented towards results, which was developed by the General Accounting Office (GAO);
- b) Service Quality, Issues related to service quality tend to become increasingly important in describing the performance of public service organizations. Many negative views have been formed regarding the public who are dissatisfied with the quality of 11 services from public organizations. Therefore, public satisfaction with services can be a parameter in assessing the performance of public organizations;
- c) Responsiveness, The ability of the organization to understand the needs of the community, set service agendas and priorities, and develop public service programs according to the needs and aspirations of the community;
- d) Responsibility, Whether the implementation of public organization activities has been carried out in accordance with the principles of correct administration or in accordance with organizational policies, both explicitly and implicitly;
- e) Accountability, How much the policies and activities of public organizations are subject to political officials elected by the people. From here, it can be seen how consistent the organization's policies and activities are towards the community.

Related to performance measurement indicators, Steers (1985:8) further stated that performance can also be observed from the following aspects:

- a) Organizational Characteristics, The most important organizational characteristics are structure, technology and culture. Structure is defined as a relatively fixed relationship, and is how people are grouped to complete work. Technology concerns the mechanism of an organization to change raw input into finished output. Organizational culture is all the characteristics that indicate the personality of an organization, namely shared beliefs, values and behaviors adopted by all members of the organization (Effendi, 2005:3-4);
- b) Environmental Characteristics, The organizational environment includes two aspects, namely the internal and external environment. The internal environment is known as the organizational climate, while the external environment is the force that arises from outside the boundaries of the organization that influences decisions or actions within the organization, such as economic conditions, politics, and government regulations;
- c) Human Resource Characteristics, Human resource characteristics are related to the personal differences of workers in relation to effectiveness. Employees have different views, goals, and also have different abilities;
- d) Management Characteristics, As explained that employee performance plays an important role in an organization. In an employee, motivation and enthusiasm must be fostered in working to achieve everything they want. If a

person's work spirit becomes higher, then any work given to him will be completed faster and more precisely.

According to Mangkunegara (2005:13-14) there are several factors that influence performance, namely:

1. Ability Factor, Psychologically, ability consists of potential ability (IQ) and reality ability (knowledge + skill), What is meant is that leaders and employees who have above average IQ (IQ 110-120) especially superior IQ, very superior, gifted and genius with adequate education for their position and skilled in daily work, will be easier to achieve maximum performance;
2. Motivation Factor, Motivation is defined as an attitude of leaders and employees towards the work situation (situation) in their organizational environment. Those who are positive (pro) towards their work situation will show high work motivation and vice versa if they are negative (contra) towards their work situation will show low work motivation. The work situation in question includes, among others, work relationships, work facilities, work climate, leadership policies, work leadership patterns, and work conditions.

Other factors also affect performance, namely;

- a. Individual factors include abilities, skills, family background, work experience, social level and demographics of a person.
- b. Psychological factors consist of perception, role, attitude, personality, motivation, work environment and job satisfaction.
- c. Organizational factors Organizational structure, job design, leadership and rewards.

According to David C. McClelland, here are 6 characteristics of someone who has high performance:

1. Has a high sense of responsibility for his duties and work.
2. Dare to take and bear risks in work.
3. Has reasonable and reasonable (realistic) goals in working.
4. Has a comprehensive work plan and strives to realize a goal that is desired to be achieved.
5. Utilizes concrete feedback in all work activities carried out.
6. Looks for opportunities to realize plans that have been made.

As explained regarding the factors that influence performance above, it can be concluded that in improving performance, apart from the quality, self-ability and sense of responsibility of the person, there are also several external factors that are very motivating and influential on the performance carried out. In order for that performance to be carried out, a work environment and work situation are needed that can spur a person's integrity and enthusiasm in achieving maximum performance.

3. Method

The type of research used by the author in conducting this research is qualitative research with a descriptive research type that focuses on efforts to provide a systematic, factual and accurate overview of the facts, the nature of the phenomena investigated from the research object and is presented as it is. To obtain good data, this study uses secondary data and interview data from 12 informants. Data analysis uses Interactive Model Analysis from Miles, Huberman and Saldana (Miles et al., 2014) which includes the process of compiling data obtained from the research field, then reviewing, checking the validity of the data and then interpreting it to give meaning to the analysis.

4. Result and Discussion

This study will describe the Performance of the Organization Bureau in Compiling the Government Agency Performance Report (LKjIP) of South Papua Province using the theory of organizational performance from several experts, namely Jhon Miner (Sudarmanto, 2009) and Mangkunegara (2005) as can be explained the variables that affect organizational performance, namely:

(1) According to Jhon Miner (Sudarmanto, 2009)

- a) Work Quality
- b) The size and objective indicators as a reference for the focus of this study are to measure the extent to which the Organization Bureau of South Papua Province has paid more attention to the quality of employee performance in carrying out work in the administration and planning subsections, for example the completion of the preparation of reports using accountable data and can be trusted for accuracy, which from the preparation of the report can affect the assessment results.
- c) Quantity
- d) The amount of work in the Organization Bureau in compiling the Government Agency Performance Report that will be produced.
- e) Use of Time
- f) The size and objective indicators as a reference for the focus of this research are to find out more about the extent to which the South Papua Provincial Organization Bureau has completed the LKjIP in terms of coordination with output results and maximizing the available time.
- g) Cooperation
- h) The size and objective indicators as a reference for the focus of this research are to find out more about the

extent to which the South Papua Provincial Organization Bureau has completed the LKjIP by carrying out its work functions together with other individuals as a whole and becoming part of a group or organization in achieving common interests.

(2) According to Mangkunegara (2005:13-14)

a. Ability Factor

Where the leader has the potential and ability to achieve or maximize performance.

b. Motivation Factor

The attitude of the leader and staff in the work situation in the organizational environment.

1.2.1. *Work Quality*

Work quality refers to the extent to which work results meet established standards and expectations. In the context of the South Papua Provincial Government, work quality is influenced by the following factors:

Influencing Factors:

- a) Mismatch of Regional Apparatus Key Performance Indicators (IKU) with Provincial IKU.
Regional Apparatus IKU is not yet aligned with Provincial IKU, so that performance results at the regional level do not always support the achievement of overall provincial targets.
- b) Lack of understanding of IKU
Regional apparatuses do not fully understand the objectives and indicators that must be achieved, so that the implementation of work programs is not optimal.
- c) Minimal involvement of regional apparatuses in compiling IKU
Because regional apparatuses are not directly involved in compiling IKU, they do not have a sense of ownership of the indicators set, so that implementation and achievement of targets are less than optimal.
- d) Lack of socialization of IKU at the regional apparatus level
There is no effective communication mechanism to socialize IKU to all regional apparatuses, which causes differences in perception and implementation errors in the field.

Impact:

- a) The difference in targets between provinces and regional apparatuses causes ineffectiveness in achieving performance.
- b) The lack of understanding of regional apparatuses regarding IKU has an impact on the low quality of data and reports collected.

Implementable Solutions:

- 1) Involve regional apparatuses in the preparation of IKU to improve understanding and sense of ownership.
- 2) Conduct periodic socialization and training regarding IKU, performance standards, and methods of achieving them.
- 3) Develop standard operating guidelines (SOP) related to IKU implementation so that regional apparatuses have a clear reference.

1.2.2. *Quantity Of Work*

The quantity of work reflects the amount of work that can be completed within a certain period of time. In the context of the South Papua Provincial Government, the quantity of work is influenced by:

Influencing Factors:

- a) Data collection targets not achieved
Regional apparatuses experience obstacles in collecting data in accordance with the targets and performance realizations that have been set.
- b) Mismatch between Provincial IKU and Regional Apparatus IKU
Because regional apparatuses work based on different indicators from the province, the results they achieve cannot be directly used to measure provincial achievements.
- c) Lack of monitoring and evaluation systems
The absence of an effective system to monitor the performance achievements of each regional apparatus makes it difficult to assess progress accurately.

Impact:

1. The overall performance of the province is low because data and reports from regional apparatus do not meet the target.
2. The gap between target and realization hinders accurate data-based decision making.

Implementable Solutions:

- 1) Establish a technology-based evaluation system to monitor the realization of performance targets periodically.
- 2) Synchronize KPIs between provinces and regional apparatuses to ensure target alignment.
- 3) Develop incentive mechanisms for regional apparatuses that achieve or exceed the set performance targets.

1.2.3. Time Utilization

Time utilization is related to efficiency in completing tasks and responsibilities within the specified time limit. In this context, time efficiency is hampered by:

Influencing Factors:

- a) Mismatch of data collection time with the specified time limit
Regional apparatus cannot collect data and compile reports within the specified time, which results in delays in evaluating provincial performance.
- b) Lack of coordination between provinces and regional apparatus
There is no clear communication mechanism regarding reporting deadlines, so regional apparatus do not know the main priorities that must be completed first.
- c) Minimal utilization of management information systems
Data collection is still carried out manually without adequate use of technology, so the process is slow and prone to errors.

Impact:

1. Delays in reporting cause analysis and decision-making at the provincial level to be delayed.
2. Time efficiency decreases due to the absence of an optimal data management system.

Implementable Solutions:

- a. Set a more realistic deadline for data collection, taking into account the conditions and capacity of regional devices.
- b. Improve coordination between regional devices by holding regular meetings to ensure that all parties understand the applicable deadlines.
- c. Implement a digital data collection system to speed up and simplify reporting.

1.3.4. Kerjasama

Kerjasama antar perangkat daerah dan pemerintah provinsi sangat berpengaruh terhadap efektivitas pencapaian target kinerja. Dalam konteks ini, terdapat beberapa kendala dalam aspek kerjasama, yaitu:

Faktor yang Mempengaruhi:

- 1) Perangkat daerah tidak dilibatkan langsung dalam penyusunan IKU
Kurangnya keterlibatan menyebabkan perangkat daerah merasa tidak memiliki tanggung jawab penuh dalam mencapai target yang telah ditetapkan oleh provinsi.
- 2) Kurangnya sosialisasi IKU
Perangkat daerah tidak memiliki pemahaman yang seragam mengenai IKU provinsi, sehingga tidak ada keselarasan dalam implementasinya.
- 3) Minimnya koordinasi antar perangkat daerah
Tidak ada forum komunikasi yang efektif antara perangkat daerah, yang menyebabkan kesulitan dalam berbagi data dan informasi yang relevan

Cooperation between regional apparatuses and provincial governments greatly influences the effectiveness of achieving performance targets. In this context, there are several obstacles in the aspect of cooperation, namely:

Influencing Factors:

- 1) Regional apparatuses are not directly involved in the preparation of IKU
The lack of involvement causes regional apparatuses to feel that they do not have full responsibility in achieving the targets set by the province.
- 2) Lack of IKU socialization
Regional apparatuses do not have a uniform understanding of the provincial IKU, so there is no harmony in its implementation.
- 3) Lack of coordination between regional apparatuses
There is no effective communication forum between regional apparatuses, which causes difficulties in sharing relevant data and information.

Impact:

1. Regional apparatuses work separately without good synchronization with the province.
2. Errors in decision making due to lack of accurate and coordinated data.

Implementable Solutions:

- a. Form a coordination team between regional apparatuses to discuss performance achievements and obstacles faced.
- b. Increase the involvement of regional apparatuses in every stage of planning and implementation of IKU.
- c. Conduct periodic socialization of IKU and its achievement strategies so that all parties have the same understanding.

5. Conclusion

Factors affecting performance in the South Papua Provincial Government include work quality, work quantity, time utilization, and cooperation. The main problems found are related to the mismatch of IKU, delays in data collection, and minimal coordination and socialization. To overcome these problems, strategic steps are needed such as: Synchronization of IKU between provinces and regional apparatuses, (2) Increasing the involvement of regional apparatuses in compiling IKU, (3) Using digital systems to increase the efficiency of data reporting, and (4) Increasing coordination and socialization through more effective communication forums. With this approach, it is hoped that the performance of the South Papua Provincial Government can increase significantly.

References

- [1] A.A. Anwar Prabu Mangkunegara. 2013. Manajemen Sumberdaya Manusia Perusahaan. Bandung : PT. Remaja Rosdakarya
- [2] Agus Dwiyanto dkk (2002:83). Kinerja Birokrasi Pelayanan Publik
- [3] Armstrong, M dan Baron F, 2016. Manajemen kinerja Cetakaan Ketujuh, Jakarta: Erlangga
- [4] Bernardin dan Russel (dalam Ruky, 2002:15) Pengertian Kinerja diakses dari <http://teorionline.wordpress.com/category/kumpulan-teori/msdm/> diakses pada tanggal 11 Oktober 2011
- [5] Fahmi, Irfan 2013. Perilaku Organisasi: Teori, Aplikasi Dan Kasus, Cetakan Kesatu, Bandung: Alfabeta
- [6] Gibson, J.L, 2003. Perilaku Manajemen Organisasi, Erlangga, Jakarta
- [7] Gibson, James L., John M. Ivancevich, dan James H. Donnelly. 2003. Organizations Behavior, Structure and Process. 8th ed. Boston: Richard D. Irwin Inc
- [8] Handoko, Hari. 2011. Manajemen Personal dan Sumber Daya Manusia, Bpfe. Yogyakarta
- [9] Hasibuan, Melayu S.P. 2012. Organisasi Dan Motivasi : Dasar Peningkatan Produktivitas. Bumi Aksara, Jakarta
- [10] Instruksi Presiden Nomor 7 Tahun 1999 yang diperbaharui dengan Peraturan Pemerintah Nomor 8 Tahun 2006 tentang Pelaporan Keuangan dan Kinerja Instansi Pemerintah;
- [11] Ivanko, Stefan, 2013. Teori Modern Organisasi, Erlangga. Jakarta
- [12] Jogiyanto. 2005. Analisis dan Desain Sistem Informasi. Andi. Yogyakarta.
- [13] Mangkunegara, 2005, Evaluasi Kinerja Sumber Daya Manusia, Refika Aditama. Jakarta
- [14] Mathis, Robert Dan Jhon Jacksonn. Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia. Erlangga. Jakarta
- [15] Moleong, Lexy. J. (20013). Metode Penelitian Kualitatif. Bandung. Edisi Revisi. PT. Remaja Rosda Karya. Bandung.
- [16] Moleong, Lexy. J. (2007). Metode Penelitian Kualitatif. Bandung : PT. Remaja Rosda Karya. Bandung.
- [17] Mondy, R. Wayne And Robert Noe, 2014. Human Resource Management. Ninth Edition. Prentice Hall. Usa
- [18] Nurtesha Putri, Beby, 2013. Analisis Akuntabilitas Kinerja Instansi Pemerintahan Dinas Kebudayaan, Pariwisata, Pemuda Dan Olahraga Kabupaten Kubu Raya
- [19] Penetapan Kinerja Dan Pelaporan Akuntabilitas Instansi Pemerina. Bandung. Pemerintah. Alfabeta
- [20] Peraturan Menteri Pemberdayaan Aparatur Negara dan Reformasi Birokrasi Nomor 53 Tahun 2014 Tentang Petunjuk Teknis Perjanjian Kinerja, Pelaporan Kinerja dan Tata Cara Reviu Atas Pelaporan Kinerja Instansi Pemerintah;
- [21] Peraturan Presiden Nomor 29 Tahun 2014 Tentang Sistem Akuntabilitas Kinerja Instansi Pemerintah;
- [22] Rakhmat.2013. Reformasi Birokrasi Publik Dalam Perspektif Good Governance. Jurnal Paradigma, Vol 2 No. 1, April 2013: 1-9
- [23] Robbins, Shephen p, 2016. Perilaku Organisasi. PT Indeks, Kelompok Gramedia. Jakarta
- [24] Ruky, Ahmad. 2002. Sistem Manajemen kinerja. Gramedia Pustaka Utama. Jakara
- [25] Santoso, Susan, 2013. Analisis Laporan Kinerja Instansi Pada Dinass Kebudayaan Dan Pariwisata Provinsi Sulawesi Utara, Manado.
- [26] Syafiie, I. K, Dan Welasari. (2015) Ilmu Adminnistrasi. Pustaka Belajar. Yogyakarta.
- [27] Ulber, Silalahi, 2011. Asas Asas Manajemen, Bandung: Rafika Aditama
- [28] Undang- Undang No. 5 tahun 2014 tentang Aparatur Sipil Negara (ASN).
- [29] Undang-Undang Nomor 10 Tahun 2003 Tentang Pembentukan kota Tomohon dan Kabupaten Minahasa Selatan di Provinsi Sulawesi Utara (lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia tahun 2003 Nomor 30, Tambahan Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Nomor 4273);
- [30] Undang-undang Nomor 23 Tahun 2014 tentang Pemerintahan Daerah (Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 2014 Nomor 224, Tambahan Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Nomor 5587, sebagaimana telah beberapa kali diubah, terakhir dengan Undang-Undang Nomor 9 Tahun 2015 tentang Perubahan Kedua Atas Undang-Undang Nomor 23 Tahun 2014 Tentang Pemerintah Daerah (Lembaran Negara Indonesia Tahun 2014 Nomor 28 Nomor 5679);
- [31] Undang-Undang Nomor 28 Tahun 1999 Pasal 3 tentang Penyelenggaraan Negara yang Bersih dan Bebas Korupsi, Kolusi dan Nepotisme;