

THE ROLE OF STREET-LEVEL BUREAUCRATS IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CILIWUNG RIVER NORMALIZATION POLICY IN SOUTH JAKARTA

Cut Laila Karmila¹, Siti Zulaikha²

^{1,2}Institut Pemerintahan Dalam Negeri, Sumedang, Indonesia

Email: cutlaila@ipdn.ac.id

Abstract

This study aims to analyze the role of street-level bureaucrats in implementing the Ciliwung River normalization program in South Jakarta and to identify the factors that support and hinder the performance of that role. This study employs a qualitative approach with a descriptive-analytical design. Data were obtained through in-depth interviews with informants directly engaged with the community, field observation, documentation study, and current news reports. Informants were selected purposively from implementing officials, coordinating officials, related institutional actors, and affected communities. Analysis was conducted through data condensation, data display, pattern identification, and conclusion drawing and verification, supported by source and technique triangulation. Street-level bureaucrats act as policy translators, administrative implementers, facilitators and mediators who interact directly with the community, connectors among actors, and users of *bounded discretion*. This role is important because the implementation of the river normalization policy takes place within a fragmented authority structure and a fairly complex land administration process. Supporting factors identified include regulatory clarity, division of authority, institutional capacity, verification mechanisms, coordination, and public communication. Inhibiting factors consist of administrative complexity, the lengthy resolution of some cases, authority fragmentation, document-related problems, community uncertainty, and high coordination demands.

Keywords: *Street-Level Bureaucracy, Policy Implementation, Ciliwung River Normalization, Discretion, Governance Constraints.*

A. INTRODUCTION

Flooding remains a recurring problem in Jakarta. Efforts to address it have concerned not only the capacity of rivers and the drainage system, but also how the government manages the various interests, authorities, and resources involved. For this reason, the success of flood control cannot be assessed merely by the physical infrastructure that has been completed. There is another issue of equal importance, namely how policy decisions and objectives are translated into action at the implementation level. It is at this stage that policy implementation becomes crucial, because policies that have been formulated must confront real administrative, institutional, and social conditions on the ground (Hill & Hupe, 2002; Knill & Tosun, 2012).

The normalization of the Ciliwung River is one of the policies pursued by the government to control flooding in Jakarta. Its implementation involves more than one institution. The DKI Jakarta Provincial Government, through the Water Resources Agency (Dinas Sumber Daya Air), is responsible for the land acquisition process, while physical construction falls under the authority of the central government through the Ciliwung Cisadane River Basin Authority (Balai Besar Wilayah Sungai Ciliwung Cisadane/BBWSCC). At the land stage, the National Land Agency (Badan Pertanahan Nasional/BPN) plays a role in the verification and administration of land rights. City, sub-district, and village (kelurahan) governments, as well as the community, are also involved in processes taking place at the local level. This condition means that the implementation of normalization does not fall under a

single line of authority. The completion of one stage can depend on information, decisions, or actions from another institution.

In South Jakarta, this issue is evident in the land acquisition process in Pengadegan and Rawajati Sub-districts (kelurahan). Following the determination of the location, the process continues through the inventory and identification of land parcels, document verification, compensation appraisal, deliberation (musyawarah), compensation payment, and the release of rights. In practice, there is a need for repeated verification and the involvement of more than one institution. In March 2026, for example, the verification of original documents and the signing of rights-release agreements were carried out at the South Jakarta BPN Office, covering nine land parcels in Pengadegan Sub-district. This sequence shows that the implementation of the normalization policy is not only about physical construction targets, but also about data accuracy, document completeness, the status of entitled parties, and the administrative processes that must be completed before the next stage can proceed.

Normatively, the land acquisition stage already has a relatively clear legal basis and procedure. Law Number 2 of 2012 and Government Regulation Number 19 of 2021, along with its amendments, provide the framework for land acquisition for development in the public interest. At the regional level, the determination of location and the formation of implementing teams form part of the implementation mechanism. However, the existence of a procedure does not mean that every problem can be anticipated from the outset. In practice, document completeness, the status of land parcels, verification needs, inter-agency coordination, and the community's need for information can make the process longer or require adjustment. Implementation problems are thus not always a matter of conflict between rules and officials' actions. Gaps can emerge when a pathway that has been administratively designed meets concrete conditions that do not entirely match the assumptions built into the policy design.

This condition can be viewed through a policy implementation perspective that attends to policy design, institutional capacity, division of authority, and coordination. Knill and Tosun (2012) place policy design and institutional capacity as important elements in understanding the implementation process. Meanwhile, Peters (2010) explains that coordination becomes a critical issue when a program involves organizations with different but interdependent functions. In the case of Ciliwung normalization, the division of functions among institutions does allow each organization to exercise its own authority, but at the same time creates a need to connect work and information across organizations.

This issue draws attention to the officials who carry out policy at the field level. Lipsky (2010) explains that street-level bureaucrats work under conditions that are not always ideal and must confront job demands, limited information and time, and diverse community problems. In such situations, officials do not merely implement rules mechanically. They must determine how a provision is explained, how an administrative problem is followed up, to whom a matter should be referred, and how communication with the community is conducted. This space for judgment does not mean that officials are free to change the substance of policy. On the contrary, the judgment they use operates within the limits of authority, procedure, and applicable regulation.

A number of previous studies have shown the importance of frontline officials' position in the implementation process. Brodtkin and Majmundar (2018) demonstrate that frontline bureaucrats play a role in shaping policy practice when confronted with problems that cannot always be resolved through uniform rules. Tummers and Bekkers (2014) place discretion as one of the important aspects in understanding implementers' behavior. In environmental policy, Vink et al. (2020) show the relevance of the street-level bureaucracy perspective for understanding how policy is applied at the field level, while Moscarola et al. (2021) demonstrate the connection between frontline officials and local governance. This literature

provides a basis for viewing officials not merely as administrative implementers, but as actors who help shape how policy is carried out in concrete situations.

Nevertheless, research on street-level bureaucracy continues to grow mainly in the context of public services, welfare, education, and environmental policy. Studies that specifically examine the role of frontline officials in infrastructure policy that simultaneously confronts land acquisition issues and authority fragmentation remain relatively limited. This is the gap that concerns this study. The normalization of Ciliwung in South Jakarta provides a context for observing how officials translate policy when confronted with land administration problems, cross-institutional coordination, and communities directly affected by the policy process.

This study further views discretion not as a deviation that automatically occurs when officials have room for judgment. Attention is directed instead at how that space is used in practice and the limits that govern it. The findings show that officials' judgment mainly emerges in explaining policy to the community, following up on document problems, conducting verification, managing communication, and connecting parties with different authorities. At the same time, these actions remain within the framework of regulation and administrative mechanisms. This characteristic is understood in this study as bounded discretion, namely a space for officials' judgment that remains constrained by rules, authority, procedure, and accountability mechanisms. The Pengadegan case, for example, shows that document problems were followed up through joint verification with BPN prior to the release of rights, rather than by bypassing the applicable provisions.

This study aims to analyze the role of street-level bureaucrats in the implementation of the Ciliwung River normalization policy in South Jakarta and to analyze the factors that support and hinder the performance of that role.

B. METHOD

This study employs a qualitative approach with a descriptive-analytical design. This approach was chosen to understand the process of policy implementation and officials' practices when confronting concrete conditions on the ground. The research focuses on the experiences, judgments, and actions of officials in implementing the Ciliwung River normalization policy. The research locus is the South Jakarta area related to the implementation of normalization, with attention to the land acquisition process, administrative verification, communication with the affected community, and coordination among actors. Technical hydrological and construction aspects are not the focus of this study. The study is directed at the policy implementation process and the role of officials at the implementation level.

Informants were selected purposively, taking into account their involvement in the issues studied. Informants came from officials of the DKI Jakarta Provincial Government, local territorial officials, parties involved in the land acquisition and verification process, and the affected community. Street-level bureaucrats served as the primary source of information because they are directly involved in policy implementation on the ground. Information from officials was then compared with information from the community, other institutional actors, and official documents to obtain a more complete picture of the implementation process.

Data were collected through in-depth interviews, observation, and documentation study. Interviews were conducted semi-structured to obtain information on officials' understanding of the policy, the division of authority, coordination among actors, the use of discretion, interaction with the community, administrative problems, resource constraints, and how officials adjusted task implementation to conditions on the ground. Interviews were also used to examine the fit or discrepancy between formal provisions and implementation practice. Observation was conducted to obtain a picture of conditions and interactions at the field level. Meanwhile, documentation study was used to review regulations, location-determination

decrees, land acquisition documents, official government information, and developments in the implementation of normalization.

Data analysis was conducted in stages through data condensation, data display, pattern identification, and conclusion drawing and verification. Data obtained were not merely described, but analyzed by connecting them to the policy implementation perspective and the concept of street-level bureaucracy. Comparison between formal provisions and field practice was used to identify parts that ran in accordance with policy design, parts that required adjustment, and the forms of implementation gap that emerged during the implementation process. The validity of the data was strengthened through source and technique triangulation, by comparing information from interviews, observation, and documentation (Creswell & Poth, 2018; Miles et al., 2014; Patton, 2015).

C. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

1. Implementation Conditions and Authority Fragmentation

The implementation of Ciliwung River normalization in South Jakarta involves several institutions with different tasks and authorities. The DKI Jakarta Provincial Water Resources Agency is responsible for the land acquisition process, while physical construction falls under central government authority through the Ministry of Public Works and BBWSSC. On the land aspect, the National Land Agency is involved in examining and verifying rights and documents related to land parcels. Meanwhile, city, sub-district, and village governments deal with local territorial issues and the affected community. This division of tasks allows each institution to perform its functions according to its authority, but at the same time creates interdependence in completing the stages of implementation.

This interdependence is evident in the land acquisition process in Pengadegan and Rawajati. The stages of location determination, public consultation, inventory and identification of land parcels, document verification, release of rights, and compensation payment cannot be completed by a single institution alone. The regional government requires land verification, while the completion of land acquisition also relates to land readiness for physical construction. In Pengadegan, for example, the process of document verification and rights release for nine land parcels involved both the Water Resources Agency and BPN before the next stage could proceed. This condition shows that a problem at one stage can affect the continuation of other stages. In such a situation, coordination is not merely a supporting activity but becomes part of the implementation process itself. This is consistent with Peters (2010), who explains that authority fragmentation can increase the need for coordination when different organizations have interdependent functions.

In terms of regulation, the available framework provides both direction and limits for officials in carrying out their duties. Law Number 2 of 2012 and Government Regulation Number 19 of 2021 form the basis for land acquisition implementation, while location determination and team formation provide the working structure at the regional level. Nevertheless, the existence of rules does not automatically eliminate problems that arise in the field. Officials must still explain the process stages to the community, follow up on document issues, conduct verification, convey information to relevant institutions, and ensure that administrative processes run according to provisions. In other words, rules provide a working framework, while day-to-day implementation still requires adjustment to problems that arise on each land parcel.

In this context, the implementation gap does not primarily take the form of a conflict between rules and officials' actions. The gap is more evident when the designed implementation pathway confronts concrete conditions, such as differences in document status and completeness, verification needs, the length of the settlement process, and the community's need for information certainty. Research reports also show that implementation problems on

the ground are not solely related to the actions of a single organization, but are influenced by policy design, institutional capacity, division of authority, coordination, and community conditions. Thus, the implementation gap in Ciliwung normalization is better understood as the outcome of interaction between policy design and the institutional and administrative conditions faced when the policy is implemented. This view is consistent with Knill and Tosun (2012) regarding the importance of the institutional environment in understanding the implementation process.

2. The Role of Street-Level Bureaucrats in Implementation

The research findings show that the role of street-level bureaucrats in implementing the Ciliwung River normalization does not stop at carrying out established procedures. In practice, officials who directly face the implementation process and the community must explain the policy, help follow up on administrative problems, maintain communication with the community, and connect parties with different authorities. This position places officials as a link between formulated provisions and the various conditions that arise while the policy is being implemented.

From these findings, six forms of officials' roles are apparent in the implementation process: (1) translating policy, (2) carrying out administrative work, (3) facilitating and mediating the community, (4) connecting actors, (5) using bounded discretion, and (6) bridging policy design with real conditions on the ground. These six roles do not always stand alone. In a single issue, officials may perform several roles at once, especially when resolving a stage requires coordination with other institutions as well as communication with the community.

Table 1. The Role of Street-Level Bureaucrats in Implementing Ciliwung Normalization

Role	Practical Form	Meaning for Implementation
Policy translator	Explaining the provisions of normalization and land acquisition to the community and translating them into administrative actions.	Reducing the distance between formal rules and understanding and action on the ground.
Administrative implementer	Data collection, document verification, land acquisition, release of rights, and follow-up on administrative problems.	Making policy operational at the case level.
Facilitator/mediator	Consultation, communication, provision of information, and assistance in resolving community problems.	Bringing together government procedures with the conditions and needs of residents.
Cross-actor connector	Connecting the Water Resources Agency, BPN, local territorial government, BBWSCC, and other actors.	Managing interdependence resulting from authority fragmentation.
Bounded discretion	Determining how to handle concrete administrative, communication, and coordination problems while remaining within the rules.	Providing limited flexibility without changing the substance of the policy.
Design-practice connector	Adjusting implementation to conditions of land parcels, documents, time, and community response.	Explaining how policy takes concrete form on the ground.

Source: Processed by the Researchers Based on Research Findings, 2026.

3. Officials as Policy Translators and Administrative Implementers

The first role is evident in how officials explain policy to the community and translate normative provisions into understandable steps. The normalization and land acquisition process involves a number of legal and administrative stages that are not simple. In practice, the community interacts most with officials when they need explanations about process developments, required documents, verification stages, public consultation, the release of rights, and compensation payment. Therefore, the way officials convey information becomes part of the implementation process, especially when the community needs clarity about the stages they are going through.

This role runs alongside concrete administrative work. The research findings show data collection activities, inventory and identification of land parcels, document examination, and coordination regarding the status and completeness of land parcels. In Pengadegan, for example, the verification and release-of-rights process covered nine land parcels, involving both the Water Resources Agency and BPN. This examination was necessary to ensure the conformity of documents and land data before the process could continue. This shows that policy implementation does not only occur through formal decisions, but also through administrative work that must be carried out in detail for each case.

These findings are consistent with Lipsky's (2010) view that public policy acquires its concrete form through officials' actions when confronting individual problems. In this study, officials become the link between general provisions and the conditions of each land parcel and the needs of the community. Rules are then applied through document examination, information delivery, coordination, and administrative follow-up. However, this space for judgment does not mean officials are free to act outside applicable provisions. The land acquisition process and verification mechanism remain the limits within which duties are carried out, so that the adjustments officials make take place within the corridor of regulation and the authority they hold.

4. Officials as Facilitators, Mediators, and Cross-Actor Connectors

The next role is evident when officials directly confront the affected community. Land acquisition concerns matters very close to residents' lives, from land ownership and residence to compensation and certainty about the continuation of their lives after the acquisition process. In this situation, public consultation and communication cannot merely be understood as stages to be carried out to fulfill requirements. Officials also need to explain process developments, answer questions, receive objections, and forward matters beyond their authority to the relevant institution.

This condition is evident in the community's experience in Rawajati. Uncertainty regarding compensation payment initially raised doubts about the ongoing process. However, once the process continued and compensation was ultimately received, community acceptance of the process began to form. This finding shows that officials' communication is significant, especially when the community has not yet obtained certainty regarding the ongoing stage. In such circumstances, officials not only convey information but also help the community understand the process and connect their concerns with parties who can provide resolution.

This finding is consistent with Moscarola et al. (2021), who position frontline officials as part of the relationship between local governance and the community. In practice, officials who directly face residents become one of the points connecting the community with the process of government. Unclear information can therefore add to the uncertainty already felt by the community. Conversely, open and easily understood communication can help the community learn about process developments and understand the reasons behind the stages they must go through.

Officials' role does not stop at their relationship with the community. They also need to connect the various institutions involved in implementing normalization. No single organization handles the entire process, so information regarding land parcel status, verification results, implementation schedules, and issues raised by the community must be forwarded to the party with relevant authority. In practice, officials become the party who helps ensure that such information moves from one actor to another.

This finding shows that the practice of street-level bureaucracy in the Ciliwung River normalization operates in two directions at once. On one hand, officials face the community to explain, facilitate, and follow up on emerging problems. On the other, they work among organizations with different authorities to keep the process running. Thus, the ability to communicate and connect actors is not merely a supporting skill, but becomes part of officials' role in policy implementation.

5. Bounded Discretion in Implementation

Discretion is one of the important findings of this study. However, the discretionary space found does not show that officials are free to determine or change the substance of policy. Land acquisition implementation continues to take place within the framework of rules and procedures that must be complied with. This study did not find that officials could independently determine compensation values, change community rights, or make decisions outside the established mechanism. The space for judgment was instead observed more in how officials handled administrative problems, followed up on documents, communicated with the community, determined which parties needed to be involved, and adjusted their working methods when facing particular problems in the field.

This space for judgment can be understood through the concept of bounded discretion. Officials have choices regarding how to handle a problem, but these choices are not unlimited. Regulation, organizational authority, land acquisition procedures, and accountability mechanisms form the limits in determining action. When the data or documents for a land parcel are not yet in order, for example, the problem is not resolved by bypassing procedure. Officials conduct further examination and coordinate with BPN. Similarly, when the community requires additional explanation, adjustment is made through communication and consultation, not by changing provisions regarding community rights or land acquisition stages.

This finding is consistent with Hanafi et al. (2023), who show that implementers at the field level can use discretionary space and initiative to adjust policy implementation to the conditions faced. However, in this study, that space was used mainly to handle administrative problems, verification, coordination, and communication with the community without altering applicable provisions. Discretion in this study did not primarily emerge in the form of procedural simplification or informal action to cope with work pressure. Adjustment was instead carried out mostly through coordination, re-examination, and how information was conveyed to the community. This is consistent with Edri-Peer and Cohen (2025), who show that the practice of street-level bureaucracy needs to be understood by attending to various forms of coping and the conditions that shape it. In the context of Ciliwung normalization, officials used this space for judgment to keep the process running when facing concrete problems, while remaining within applicable rules.

This discretionary space is also inseparable from accountability mechanisms. The Water Resources Agency stated that data collection, measurement, and appraisal are conducted to ensure that compensation values can be accounted for and that the process runs transparently. Payment is made non-cash, while in the Pengadegan process, document verification involved BPN. This mechanism means that decisions taken in the implementation process do not depend entirely on officials' individual judgment. There are examination and recording stages that allow the administrative process to be traced. Thus, bounded discretion in the implementation

of Ciliwung normalization is not an unchecked space of freedom, but a space of judgment that operates within the limits of regulation, division of authority, procedure, and verification mechanisms.

6. Resource Constraints and Adaptation Strategies

The resource constraints found in this study relate more to officials' capacity to handle complex work. In implementing normalization, officials not only deal with administrative work, but must also coordinate with various institutions and communicate with the community at the same time. In the land acquisition process in Pengadegan and Rawajati, for example, there are a number of stages to be completed, from public consultation, inventory and identification of entitled parties, document examination, to the release of rights. Several problems that arose during this process meant that public consultation had to be repeated because earlier stages had not fully resolved the issues at hand.

In facing these conditions, officials made various adjustments to keep the process running. Based on the research findings, these adjustments were mostly carried out through work arrangement, coordination with relevant institutions, verification, and adjustments in how they communicated with the community. Verification of land parcels together with BPN, for example, was carried out to follow up on data and document problems before the process continued. Likewise with the repeated public consultation. This step shows that when previous stages had not provided the necessary certainty, officials made adjustments through communication and facilitation, rather than disregarding established stages.

This finding shows that officials' capacity in policy implementation does not only relate to the number of personnel or budget availability. In policies involving many stages and organizations, the ability to organize work, manage information, and build coordination also becomes an important part of implementation capacity. Tummers et al. (2020) explain that policy characteristics can influence frontline bureaucrats' coping behavior. In implementing Ciliwung normalization, process complexity and administrative demands drove officials to make various adjustments to sustain the process. Nevertheless, these adjustments remained within the limits of authority, procedure, and rules governing policy implementation.

7. Supporting and Inhibiting Factors

Table 2. Factors Supporting and Inhibiting the Performance of Street-Level Bureaucrats' Role

Factor	Empirical Evidence	Influence on Officials' Role
Support: regulation and procedure	Law 2/2012, GR 19/2021, location determination, and the land acquisition mechanism.	Providing direction, stages, and limits for action.
Support: division of authority	Division of functions among the Water Resources Agency, BBWSCC, BPN, and local territorial government.	Enabling functional specialization while requiring coordination.
Support: verification and data	Inventory, identification, and verification of land parcels.	Strengthening administrative certainty and accountability.
Support: public consultation	Public consultations in 2024–2025 in Pengadegan and Rawajati.	Supporting communication, facilitation, and community acceptance.
Inhibitor: administrative complexity	Land acquisition stages, document verification, and release of rights.	Increasing workload and the need for judgment.

Inhibitor: authority fragmentation	Interdependence among the Water Resources Agency, BPN, BBWSCC, and local territorial government.	Increasing the need for coordination and potentially slowing completion.
Inhibitor: community uncertainty	Doubts about status, payment, and completion time.	Increasing demands for communication and facilitation.
Inhibitor: limited operational capacity	Many stages, and the need for time, information, and coordination.	Driving adaptation strategies and work prioritization.

Source: Processed by the Researchers Based on Research Findings, 2026.

The factors supporting and hindering policy implementation in this study do not stand independently. They often arise from the same conditions but exert different effects on the implementation process. The existence of relatively clear regulation, for example, helps officials understand the authority and stages they must carry out. However, this division of authority also means that resolving a problem requires coordination with other institutions. The same applies to the division of functions among organizations. Specialization enables each institution to carry out its tasks according to its authority, but interdependence among institutions can mean that resolving a particular issue is not entirely within the control of a single organization.

One inhibiting factor that is quite evident is the complexity of land administration. Experience in Rawajati shows that the compensation payment process can take considerable time. This study does not attribute the length of this process solely to officials' performance, since resolution involves a number of stages and institutions. However, the longer the process runs, the greater officials' need to provide explanations, follow up on community questions, and maintain communication with involved parties. From Lipsky's (2010) perspective, such conditions can increase officials' need to use judgment in determining how to handle the problems they face.

Uncertainty felt by the community is also a condition that affects officials' work in the field. When residents have not yet obtained clarity about land status, the amount of compensation, or payment timing, officials need to provide explanations while also connecting the community with the institution holding relevant authority. Thus, the relationship between government and community is not separate from implementation. How officials convey information and respond to the uncertainty faced by residents becomes part of the policy implementation process.

Overall, these various conditions shape the working environment of street-level bureaucrats in implementing Ciliwung normalization. Officials work within a framework of clear rules and authority limits, but at the same time face problems that cannot all be anticipated from the outset. The more complex the inter-organizational relationships, the greater the need for officials capable of connecting information, helping the process run smoothly, and adjusting working methods to the conditions faced. Therefore, implementation capacity in this case cannot be viewed solely from overall organizational capability. That capacity is also reflected in field officials' ability to manage administrative problems, coordination, and communication that arise while the policy is being implemented.

8. Implementation Gap and the Position of Street-Level Bureaucrats

The research findings show that the implementation gap in Ciliwung normalization cannot automatically be understood as policy failure. The gap is more evident when administratively designed stages confront real conditions on the ground. Formally, each stage is expected to proceed sequentially. In practice, the process may encounter incomplete documents, the need for re-verification, dependence on other institutions, and the community's

need for explanation about process developments. Thus, the distance between design and implementation in this case is better understood as a consequence of the encounter between designed procedures and concrete conditions that cannot always be anticipated from the outset.

In such situations, street-level bureaucrats occupy an important position because they directly confront problems arising during implementation. They are not policymakers and do not have authority to change the substance of the program. However, how they explain rules, follow up on administrative problems, coordinate, and communicate with the community helps determine how policy is carried out at the field level. This finding is consistent with Brodtkin and Majmundar (2018), who position frontline officials as important actors in shaping policy practice. This study extends that reading to the context of infrastructure policy involving land acquisition and fairly complex inter-institutional relationships.

Theoretically, this study shows that the existence of strict procedures does not automatically eliminate officials' discretion. Rules set limits on action, but the condition of each land parcel, document completeness, and community circumstances can differ, so officials still need to determine the appropriate way to carry out the procedure. This space for judgment is evident in verification, coordination, administrative follow-up, and communication adjustment. At the same time, this space is bounded by regulation, division of authority, documentation, and accountability mechanisms. Therefore, the relationship between rules and discretion in this case is not mutually negating.

This reading also shows that street-level bureaucracy cannot be separated from the institutional structure within which officials work. Officials' actions are influenced not only by personal ability or working conditions, but also by the division of authority, organizational capacity, coordination patterns, and the character of the policy being implemented. This is consistent with more recent accounts that emphasize the institutional embeddedness of frontline work, such as Steinbacher (2025) and Peeters and Widlak (2023), who show that street-level practice is shaped by the structures within which officials are integrated, and not only by individual disposition. In Ciliwung normalization, the involvement of several institutions means that resolving a problem often depends on the action of another organization. This condition increases the need for officials capable of connecting information, maintaining communication, and helping the process run smoothly among actors with different authorities.

Thus, this study offers the understanding that implementation capacity cannot be assessed solely from an organization's ability to provide regulation, budget, and working structure. That capacity also lies in field officials' ability to translate policy, manage administrative problems, build coordination, and adjust working methods when facing concrete conditions. This adjustment nevertheless has limits, as it takes place within a framework of regulation and accountability. It is in this context that street-level bureaucrats function as a micro-connector between policy design and implementation reality.

D. CONCLUSION

This study shows that street-level bureaucrats occupy an important position in implementing the Ciliwung River normalization policy in South Jakarta. Their role is not limited to carrying out established procedures, but is also evident in translating policy for the community, handling administrative work, facilitating and mediating community concerns, and connecting the institutions involved in the implementation process. This role is important because the implementation of normalization involves the Water Resources Agency, BBWSCC, BPN, local territorial officials, and the community, each with different tasks and authorities. In such a situation, field officials become one of the connectors between policy provisions and the problems that arise during implementation.

The research findings also show that officials' discretion is better understood as bounded discretion. Officials have room to determine how to handle administrative problems,

conduct coordination, follow up on documents, and communicate with the community. However, this space for judgment remains bounded by regulation, procedure, organizational authority, and accountability mechanisms. Thus, discretion in this case does not appear as freedom to change the substance of policy, but as a space for adjustment so that established procedures can still be carried out when confronting diverse field conditions.

The performance of this role is influenced by conditions that can serve as both support and hindrance. Regulatory clarity, division of authority, institutional capacity, verification mechanisms, coordination, public consultation, and resource support help officials perform their duties. Conversely, the complexity of land administration, the length of the process, document-completeness problems, authority fragmentation, community uncertainty, and high coordination demands add to the burden of work at the field level. These factors show that implementation success does not depend solely on the availability of rules and institutional structure, but also on officials' ability to manage problems that arise during the process.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors would like to thank all parties who provided support during the conduct of the research and the preparation of this article. Special thanks are extended to government officials, institutional actors, and members of the community who took the time to share information, experiences, and views regarding the implementation of the Ciliwung River normalization policy in South Jakarta.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, J. E. (2011). *Public policymaking: An introduction*. Wadsworth.
- Ansell, C., & Gash, A. (2008). Collaborative governance in theory and practice. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 18(4), 543–571.
- Balai Besar Wilayah Sungai Ciliwung Cisadane. (2026). *BBWS Ciliwung Cisadane dan Kodam Jaya/Jayakarta resmi memperkuat sinergi pemeliharaan sungai dan situ*. <https://sda.pu.go.id/balai/bbwscilicis/berita/kegiatan/bbws-ciliwung-cisadane-dan-kodam-jaya-jayakarta-resmi-memperkuat-sinergi-pemeliharaan-sungai-dan-situ>
- Bovens, M., & Zouridis, S. (2002). From street-level to system-level bureaucracies: How information and communication technology is transforming administrative discretion and constitutional control. *Public Administration Review*, 62(2), 174–184.
- Brockmann, J. (2017). Unbureaucratic behavior among street-level bureaucrats: The case of the German state police. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 37(4), 430–451.
- Brodin, E. Z., & Majmudar, M. K. (2018). Street-level bureaucracy and public service reform. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 28(4).
- Buffat, A. (2015). Street-level bureaucracy and e-government. *Public Management Review*, 17(1), 149–161.
- Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches*. Sage.
- Dinas Sumber Daya Air Provinsi DKI Jakarta. (2025). *Catat! Ini alur pembebasan lahan normalisasi Kali Ciliwung*. <https://dsda.jakarta.go.id/detail-artikel/catat-ini-alur-pembebasan-lahan-normalisasi-kali-ciliwung/42>
- Dinas Sumber Daya Air Provinsi DKI Jakarta. (2026). *Percepat normalisasi Kali Ciliwung, 9 bidang tanah di segmen Kelurahan Pengadegan Jaksel dibebaskan*. <https://dsda.jakarta.go.id/detail-artikel/percepat-normalisasi-kali-ciliwung-9-bidang-tanah-di-segmen-kelurahan-pengadegan-jaksel-dibebaskan/154>
- Dunn, W. N. (2018). *Public Policy Analysis: An Integrated Approach*. Routledge.
- Dye, T. R. (2014). *Understanding Public Policy*. Pearson.
- Easton, D. (1965). *A Systems Analysis of Political Life*. Wiley.

- Edri-Peer, O., & Cohen, N. (2025). Revisiting coping mechanisms on the street-level: A systematic literature review. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 35(4), 397–421.
- Gilson, L. (2015). *Lipsky's street-level bureaucracy*. Oxford University Press.
- Groenendijk, N., et al. (2022). Street-level bureaucracy in environmental policy implementation. *Journal of Environmental Policy & Planning*, 24(2).
- Hanafi, H., Saptawan, A., & Nengyanti, N. (2023). Kinerja implementasi kebijakan pendataan lengkap koperasi, usaha mikro, kecil dan menengah tahun 2022 di Sumatera Selatan. *Jurnal Pemerintahan dan Politik*, 8(4), 325–337. <https://doi.org/10.36982/jpg.v8i4.3582>
- Harmi, H. H., & Syafril, R. (2026). Collaborative governance in sustaining road infrastructure development: Addressing land acquisition challenges. *Journal of Educational Management Research*, 5(4).
- Hill, H. C. (2003). Understanding implementation: Street-level bureaucrats' resources for reform. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 13(3), 265–282.
- Hill, M., & Hupe, P. (2002). *Implementing public policy: An introduction to the study of operational governance*. Sage.
- Hooghe, L., & Marks, G. (2001). *Multi-level governance and European integration*. Rowman & Littlefield.
- Hult, A. (2019). Street-level bureaucracy and implementation in welfare services. *Public Administration Review*, 79(3).
- Keputusan Gubernur DKI Jakarta Nomor 478 Tahun 2025 tentang Penetapan Lokasi Pembangunan untuk Normalisasi Kali Ciliwung di Kelurahan Rawajati dan Kelurahan Pengadegan.
- Keputusan Gubernur DKI Jakarta Nomor 494 Tahun 2024 tentang Tim Verifikasi Dokumen Perencanaan Pengadaan Tanah untuk Normalisasi Kali Ciliwung di Kelurahan Pengadegan dan Rawajati.
- Keputusan Gubernur DKI Jakarta Nomor 733 Tahun 2024 tentang Pembentukan Tim Persiapan dan Sekretariat Tim Persiapan Pengadaan Tanah untuk Normalisasi Kali Ciliwung di Kelurahan Pengadegan dan Rawajati.
- Keputusan Gubernur DKI Jakarta Nomor 93 Tahun 2021 tentang Penetapan Lokasi untuk Normalisasi Kali Ciliwung dari Jalan TB. Simatupang sampai Kampung Melayu
- Knill, C., & Tosun, J. (2012). *Public policy: A new introduction*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Lipsky, M. (2010). *Street-level bureaucracy: Dilemmas of the individual in public services*. Russell Sage Foundation.
- Macena, A., & de Oliveira, V. E. (2022). Discretion and local health policy implementation: Street-level bureaucrats and integrative and complementary therapies in Santos' local health units. *Primary Health Care Research & Development*, 23, e34. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1463423622000172>
- Maynard-Moody, S., & Musheno, M. (2003). *Cops, teachers, counselors: Stories from the front lines of public service*. University of Michigan Press.
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook*. Sage.
- Moscarola, J., et al. (2021). Street-level bureaucracy and local governance. *Urban Affairs Review*, 57(1).
- Nuryana, & Junaidi. (2024). Implementasi kebijakan penyelenggaraan Satu Data Indonesia di Dinas Komunikasi dan Informatika Provinsi Kepulauan Bangka Belitung. *Jurnal Pemerintahan dan Politik*, 10(2).
- Patton, M. Q. (2015). *Qualitative research & evaluation methods*. Sage.

- Peeters, R., & Widlak, A. C. (2023). Administrative exclusion in the infrastructure-level bureaucracy: The case of the Dutch daycare benefit scandal. *Public Administration Review*, 83(4), 863–877. <https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.13615>
- Peraturan Pemerintah Republik Indonesia Nomor 19 Tahun 2021 tentang Penyelenggaraan Pengadaan Tanah bagi Pembangunan untuk Kepentingan Umum.
- Peraturan Pemerintah Republik Indonesia Nomor 39 Tahun 2023 tentang Perubahan atas Peraturan Pemerintah Nomor 19 Tahun 2021.
- Peters, B. G. (2010). *The politics of bureaucracy: An introduction to comparative public administration*. Routledge.
- Rasyid, R. (2000). *Makna pemerintahan: Tinjauan dari segi etika dan kepemimpinan*. Mutiara Sumber Widya.
- Riccucci, N. M. (2005). Street-level bureaucrats and intrastate variation in the implementation of Temporary Assistance for Needy Families policies. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 15(1), 89–111.
- Sabatier, P. A., et al. (2017). Frontline implementation and policy effectiveness. *Policy Studies Journal*, 45(2).
- Steinbacher, C. (2025). The voice of implementation: Exploring the link between street-level integration and sectoral policy outcomes. *Regulation & Governance*, 19(2), 540–557. <https://doi.org/10.1111/regg.12605>
- Tummers, L. G., & Bekkers, V. J. J. M. (2014). Policy implementation, street-level bureaucracy, and the importance of discretion. *Public Management Review*, 16(4), 527–547.
- Tummers, L. G., et al. (2020). The effects of policy characteristics on street-level bureaucrats' coping behavior. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 40(3).
- Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 17 Tahun 2019 tentang Sumber Daya Air.
- Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 2 Tahun 2012 tentang Pengadaan Tanah bagi Pembangunan untuk Kepentingan Umum.
- Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 23 Tahun 2014 tentang Pemerintahan Daerah.
- Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 30 Tahun 2014 tentang Administrasi Pemerintahan.
- Van Eerd, S., et al. (2023). Resilience and street-level bureaucracy in public service delivery under crisis. *Journal of Contingencies and Crisis Management*, 31(1).
- Van Loon, N., & Thoonen, E. (2020). Educational policy implementation and street-level bureaucrats. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 48(5).
- Vink, M. J., et al. (2020). Environmental policy implementation and street-level bureaucracy. *Environmental Policy and Governance*, 30(4).
- Watkins-Hayes, C. (2011). Race, respect, and red tape: Inside the black box of racially representative bureaucracies. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 21(2), 233–251.
- Zacka, B. (2017). *When the state meets the street: Public service and moral agency*. Harvard University Press.