

## Evaluation Of Village Funding Policy In Kampung Mekerima, Kwamki Narama District Mimika Regency

Dorthea Renyaan

University of Cenderawasih, Jayapura, Papua

**Corresponding Author:** Dorthea Renyaan [renyaandorthea14@gmail.com](mailto:renyaandorthea14@gmail.com)

---

### ARTICLE INFO

*Keywords:* Policy Evaluation,  
Village Fund

*Received :* 05, March

*Revised :* 10, April

*Accepted:* 15, May

©2023 Renyaan: This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Atribusi 4.0 Internasional](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).



### ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to describe and analyze the impact of the Village Fund Management policy implemented in Mekerima Village, Kwamki Narama District, Mimika Regency, whether it had achieved its goals, what is the accountability of public implementers to Village Fund policies, and provide input on Village Fund policies in Mekerima Village, Kwamki District The name of Mimika Regency in the future. This study uses a qualitative descriptive approach by describing problems and phenomena to explore and explore and explain the Implementation of Village Fund Management that has been implemented, which is then analyzed qualitatively. However, the process is still not optimal because there are still obstacles related to the availability of Human Resources (HR) managing Village Funds that still need to be adequately prepared. Therefore, the thing that will be of concern in the future is the need for skills training facilities for the community to utilize the potential of human resources in the Village so that they are more independent in managing the Village Fund.

---

## **INTRODUCTION**

The strategy of building a village that places the Village as an object is like a barrage of attacks over the last forty years. During the New Order era, it was clear that the government wanted to regulate and supervise villages for the extension of their power. UU No. 5/1979 as an effective weapon to kill the Village. Entering the era of reform through the regime of Law No. 22/1999 and Law No. 32/2004 attempted to make room for villages. However, a national empowerment program killed the implementation of the law for villages. The regions still need to be more responsible about granting village rights and only placing villages as development targets. Under the pretext of helping people experiencing poverty, both the central and regional governments implemented empowerment programs through direct community assistance, which created higher dependence. Unexpectedly, these programs have caused the community's social capital to need to be better developed. Money becomes the primary motivator for enthusiastic participation (money-driven development). High participation in implementing these programs does not mean they can produce programs/activities responsive to community needs but because they are mobilized by project technical guidelines (Eko et al., 2014).

Based on Kepmendagri 050-145/2022, in detail, the number of government administration areas throughout Indonesia is 34 provinces; 416 districts; 98 cities; 7,266 districts; 8,506 sub-districts; 74,961 villages. The success of the development is very dependent on the success and progress of a village as the spearhead of development because the village government is the lowest government structure in Indonesia that is directly related to the community.

The purpose of village development is to improve the quality of life as much as possible for the welfare of the village community. So that in 2014, villages as autonomous areas were given special rights, including those related to financial management and allocation of village funds as well as village development processes regulated by Law No. 6 of 2014 concerning Villages. To implement the Law, the Government stipulates Government Regulation No. 43 of 2014 concerning Regulations for Implementing Law No. 6 of 2014 concerning Villages which has been revised through Government Regulation No. 47 of 2015 concerning Amendments to Government Regulation No. 43 of 2014 concerning Regulations for Implementing Law No. 6 of 2014 concerning Villages.

They were followed up by the Minister of Home Affairs by stipulating the Regulation of the Minister of Home Affairs of the Republic of Indonesia No. 113 of 2014 concerning Village Finance. The government in the Village is obliged to seek to increase and effectiveness of Village financial resources through the Regulation of the Minister of Villages, Development of Disadvantaged Regions and Transmigration Number 5 of 2015 concerning Priority for the use of Village Funds. In Article 5, it is stated that the Priority for Using Village Funds for Village development is allocated to achieve Village development goals, namely improving the welfare of Village communities and the quality of human life as well as poverty alleviation.

The government's concern for the welfare of the people is a planned and systematic development program. All components of the nation carry out

government efforts by utilizing various available resources optimally, efficiently, effectively, and accountably to sustainably improve the quality of life of humans and society. Development priorities are structured as an operational elaboration of the development strategy to implement the National development agenda to fulfill the Nawacita. Nawacita 4 is to develop Indonesia from the periphery by strengthening village areas within the framework of a unitary state (Appendix to Permendagri No. 52 of 2015 concerning guidelines for preparing the 2016 APBD). This indicates that development in the Village is a government priority to improve people's welfare. The provision of Village Funds continues to be increased so that the acceleration of development in the Village can keep pace with development in the city.

APBDes is a vital instrument that determines the realization of good governance in the Village. Good governance can be measured, among other things, through drafting and accountability of the APBDes. As the holder of genuine autonomy, the Village can manage village finances without any intervention from the government above it. This means that with village autonomy, villages are more flexible in determining the direction of village development policies framed by APBDes. The control function is essential to see how far the transparency of village government financial management is during one year. The village expenditure income budget (APBDes) is, in principle, a village income and expenditure plan for the next year made by the Village Head together with the BPD of Mekurima Village, Kwamki Narama District, Mimika Regency, which is poured into Village Regulations and according to guidelines approved by the Mimika Regent As a reflection village self-sufficiency, the Mimika Regency Regional Regulation guides this APBDes, but the priorities of each Village or Village can be different. This depends on the actual conditions of each village/village and concerns the potential. It must be adapted to the community's needs so that it is expected to make a participatory APBDes.

The several physical developments realized from the use of Village Funds in the Kwamki Narama District, Mimika Regency, were not by the quality that should have existed, where the construction of newly built village roads had begun to show signs of damage, paying little attention to work implementation standards. The existing physical development needs to accommodate the interests of the existing Kwamki Narama District Village, Mimika Regency, which raises questions for the people in the Kwamki Narama District Village, Mimika Regency.

Based on the results of observations in the field, implementing the Village Fund in the Kwamki Narama District, Mimika Regency, needed to meet the community's expectations. Several cases related to the management of the Village Fund that were encountered should be discussed, and it is necessary to evaluate the Village Fund policy. According (Wirawan, 2011:12), evaluation is the process of collecting and presenting information about the object of evaluation, assessing it with evaluation standards, and evaluating it is used to make decisions regarding the object of evaluation.

Evaluation of this policy will be a benchmark for achievement and success that has been determined (Hermawan, 2013). According to Dunn (Dunn, 2000), evaluation can be equated with appraisal, rating, and appraisal. The evaluation function can provide valid and reliable program or policy performance information. Program implementation must also be open, right on target, and sensitive to various problems and community needs (Yustisia, 2016). Because of this, policy evaluation is needed to assess performance levels (Kusuma, 2017). The indicators or evaluation criteria developed by Dunn (Dunn, 2000) include 1) Effectiveness, 2) Adequacy, 3) Equity, 4) Responsibility, and 5) Determination. This evaluation is intended to assess the success of public policy in implementing its constituents (Larasati, 2018).

Evaluation of the Village Fund policy needs to be carried out because it is in line with government regulations, namely Law no. 6 of 2014 is intended to be able to reduce irregularities that occur in the field both from village/village government elements and from district/city government elements that distribute the Village Fund budget due to the increasing amount of budget issued by the government. So that in the future, supervision related to the management of Village Funds can be more stringent, and there will be no irregularities, but if there is deviation and misuse of the use of Village Funds again, there will be a criminal law imposed on the person concerned.

Evaluation is carried out on the running of government and development so that the implementation stays consistent with the plans set and the rules that apply based on physical implementation and financial management. Supervised Village Fund management functionally, namely supervision by the supervisory apparatus or the Jayapura City government organizational unit that carries out supervision.

Based on phenomena in the field, supervision by the Mimika Regency government that occurred in managing village funds in the Kwamki Narama District was by applicable regulations. However, it still needs to be improved in quantity and quality of supervision. The researcher saw that the village head and each activity executor had carried out supervision in the Kwamki Narama District. Based on the research results, there has yet to be direct supervision by the community in managing the Village Fund Budget.

Utilization of Village Funds in Kwamki Narama District Village, Mimika Regency that the management of activities for apparatus spending and operational spending from the Village Fund budget has been running under existing guidelines and regulations, but on the other hand the village government is not optimal in empowering village communities optimally because it is still focused on only on physical development. Based on the description above, it is necessary to examine the Evaluation of the Village Fund Policy in the Village of Kwamki Narama District, Mimika Regency. In line with Central Government policy, the Mimika Regency Government determines the details of funds for each Village, namely by issuing Mimika Regency Regent Regulation No. 3 of 2018 January 11, 2018, concerning Procedures for Distribution and Determination of Details of Village Funds in each Village. In the Mimika Regent's Regulation, the amount of village funds allocated to

villages takes into account the condition of the Village itself. For Mekurima Village, in 2016, received Village Funds of IDR 730,887,000; in 2017, it increased to IDR 1,028,764,081; in 2018, it increased again to IDR 1,188,752,000.

In this regard, visible indications are that there is a management of funds that still needs to answer the substance of the problem and the hopes and needs of the community, which refers to the current objective conditions. This impacts the attitude of the people who have yet to respond to government policies through the Village Fund fully. Therefore, this research is essential to determine to what extent the impact of the Village Fund Management policy has been implemented, whether it has achieved its objectives, and how public implementers' accountability to Village Fund policies is. So that it can provide input on Village Fund policies in Mekurima Village, Kwamki Narama District, Mimika Regency in the future. Another problem underlies this research is that the Kwamki Narama District is prone to horizontal conflict between camps, often referred to as the "Upper Camp" and "Lower Side."

Because of this, studies are needed to be related to the use of Village Funds in Mekurima Village, Kwamki Narama District. Administratively, Mekurima Village is a Village Government that has advantages over nine other villages in the Kwamki Narama District. So it is necessary to make changes and management arrangements where the limited quality of human resources is one of the obstacles in planning and managing village funds.

## **THEORETICAL REVIEW**

According to (Dunn, 2000), evaluation can be equated with appraisal, rating, and assessment. Evaluation is concerned with producing valid information and the benefits of policy outcomes. Evaluation can provide valid and reliable information about policy performance, namely how valid and trustworthy about policy performance, namely how valid needs, values, and opportunities have been able to be achieved through action from public policies; contribute to the clarification and critique of the values that underlie the selection of target objectives; contributes to the application of other methods of policy analysis, including problem formulation and recommendations. Even though it relates to the entire policy process, evaluation has more to do with the performance of the policy, especially in policy implementation (Nugroho, 2014). Dunn describes the criteria for public policy evaluation Evaluation criteria according to Dunn's Types of Questions Illustration criteria for Effectiveness, Efficiency, Adequacy, Equity, Responsiveness, and Accuracy.

Evaluation plays several main functions in policy analysis; namely, evaluation provides valid and reliable information about a policy goal and target (Badjuri & Yuwono, 2002). Evaluation of policy implementation is divided into three according to time, namely at the time before it is implemented, when it is implemented, and after it is implemented. Evaluation at the time of implementation is usually called process evaluation. In contrast, after the policy is implemented, evaluation is referred to as policy consequence (output) evaluation and policy impact/influence (outcome) evaluation.

Evaluation after implementation is also called summative evaluation. Development of policy implementation evaluation approach, according to (Dunn, 2000); (Nugroho, 2014), consists of three approaches, namely pseudo evaluation, formal evaluation, and theoretical decision evaluation (Nugroho, 2014).

According to (Bridgman & Davis, 2000), Public policy evaluation measurements generally refer to four leading indicators: 1) input focuses on assessing whether the supporting resources and basic materials are needed to implement the policy. This indicator can include human resources, money, or other supporting infrastructure; 2) the process focuses on assessing how a policy is transformed through direct service to the community. This indicator covers aspects of the effectiveness and efficiency of the methods or methods used to implement specific public policies; 3) outputs (results) focus the assessment on results or products that can be generated from public policy systems or processes. These outcome indicators are, for example, how many people have successfully joined a particular program; and 4) outcomes (impact) focusing on questions of impact received by the wider community or parties affected by the policy.

Administrative evaluation requires the appropriate collection of information for program delivery and its compilation in a standardized way by making comparisons of costs and outcomes over time and across policy sectors. Judicial evaluation concerns legal issues, which relate to how the implementation of government programs is carried out, which is usually carried out by the courts. Meanwhile, the political evaluation represents a successful or failed policy followed by request to continue or change.

According to (Crossfield & Byrner, 1994), public policy evaluation is an assessment of the performance of a program or policy with basic questions: (1) does the input used to maximize the output?; (2) has the desired impact been achieved as stated in the written objective?; and (3) is the policy aligned with the government's priorities and the needs of its people?

To facilitate the measurement of policy evaluation, (Badjuri & Yuwono, 2002) presents a table of policy evaluation indicators as follows:

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Assessment Focus</b>
<b>Inputs</b>	a. What are the supporting resources and basic materials needed to implement the policy? b. How much human resources (resources), money, or other supporting infrastructure are needed?
<b>Process</b>	a. how is a policy transformed through direct service to the community? b. How effective and efficient are the methods/means used to implement these public policies?
<b>Outputs</b>	a. Is the result or product produced a public policy? b. How many people have successfully participated in the program/policy?
<b>Outcomes</b>	a. Is the impact received by the wider community or parties affected by the policy?

- 
- b. How much positive impact is generated?  
c. Is there a negative impact? How serious?
- 

Table 1. Policy Evaluation Indicator Table

Source: ([Badjuri & Yuwono, 2002](#))

Previous research has shown results that the use of village fund allocations can help the development process in the village. This success was supported by the ability of village officials to translate the rules and regulations for using village funds as well as a community support in every program that had been planned. Apart from that, each program's administrative support and technical implementation deserve the attention of stakeholders and related parties.

## METHODOLOGY

This research uses a descriptive qualitative approach. The descriptive method can be interpreted as a problem-solving process that is investigated by describing the current state of the subject and research object based on the facts that appear or how they are (Nawawi, 2003, p. 26). In addition, Gall & Borg, in (Nugraha & Bajari, 2022) states that the use of qualitative research is a descriptive research design model, with the aim of describing the phenomena observed so that observations and surveys are often used to collect data, thus a qualitative descriptive approach describes the problem to be examined by qualitative analysis.

Analyzing data is an essential part of research because, from this analysis, findings will be obtained, both substantive and formal findings. In addition, qualitative data analysis is complicated because there need to be standard guidelines, linear processes, or systematic rules (Gunawan, 2013: 209). In essence, data analysis is an activity to organize, sort, classify, code/mark, and categorize it to obtain a finding based on the focus or problem to be answered. Through these series of activities, qualitative data that is usually scattered and piled up can be simplified to be easily understood.

(Miles & Huberman, 2014: 33) suggest three stages that must be carried out in analyzing qualitative research data, namely (1) data reduction (data reduction); (2) data display (data display); and (3) conclusion drawing /verifying. Qualitative data analysis was carried out simultaneously with the data collection process, meaning these activities were also carried out during and after data collection.

## RESULTS

As revealed by Badjuri and Yuwono (2002) and emphasized in the proposition, the evaluation of village fund policies in Mekurima village, Kwamki Narama district, Mimika Regency uses input, process, output, and outcome policy evaluation indicators.

### ***Inputs***

Input indicators are whether the supporting resources and materials are needed to implement a policy and how many human resources are needed, money, or other supporting infrastructure. The interviews with informants, the District Head, village apparatus, and the community in Mekurima Village, Kwamki Narama District, Mimika Regency, revealed that all mechanisms had been implemented concerning the technical guidelines for implementing Village Funds. The district/city authority according to the technical guidelines to form a technical team has been implemented properly.

Communication and Human Resources capabilities are crucial in understanding community members regarding Government Programs, especially those channeled through the Village Fund Program in Mekurima Village, Kwamki Narama District, Mimika Regency. Not all people understand the Village Fund Program Priority Scale, which the Government has rolled out since 2015.

Even though it had been agreed upon in the Village Development Planning Meeting, it was still found that not all of the proposals were the aspirations of the local community because some people did not feel involved in the Village Fund Program planning process.

### ***Process***

The intended process indicator is how a policy is transformed in the form of direct service to the community and how the effectiveness and efficiency of the methods/means used to implement the public policy. If related to the primary material in this study, how to determine the recipient group and how it is distributed to the recipients and their utilization can be interpreted.

Village Fund Policy (DD), which aims to improve the performance of the Village/Kampung Government in carrying out government activities, implementation of development, community services, and community empowerment according to the authority of the village government itself. In this study, to measure the effectiveness of implementing the Village Fund (DD) policy in Mekurima Village, Kwamki Narama District, Mimika Regency, it was found that the access received by the Mekurima Village government to utilize Village Funds (DD) from the Mimika Regency government was relatively easy, due to guidance from the Government. Mimika Regency if the Mekurima Village government encounters difficulties accessing the Village Fund (DD) policy. Whereas access for the people of Mekurima Village itself is inclusive, represented by the Bamuskam and community leaders through implementing the Mekurima Village Musrenbang. This follows what is stated in Law Number 6 of 2014, article 68, regarding the rights of village communities to convey aspirations, suggestions, and opinions both orally and in writing.

The village government and community are the target group in the Village Fund (DD) policy in Mimika Regency. In implementing the Village Fund (DD) policy in Mekurima Village, the distribution of funds for the essential services and operations of Mekurima Village follows what has been stipulated in the Mimika Regency Government Regulation concerning Village Funds. To run the wheels of government in Mekurima Village, it has been

fulfilled in the form of government operations, as well as for health services, youth, and also village development wherein the implementation of the Village Fund policy in Mekurima Village, the physical development of the area is carried out alternately according to the results of the Mekurima Village meetings.

In the Village Fund (DD) policy, the implementation time is four times in 1 year, carried out every three months. Implementing the Village Fund (DD) policy is always early because the Mekurima Village government is always on time to collect SPJ quarterly. With the timely implementation of the policy, there will certainly be no problem with budget reductions and policy implementation on time every quarter.

In conveying accountability for the implementation of policies carried out by the Mekurima Village Government to the Mimika Regency Government, especially in the implementation of 2021, there are no crucial problems, because if there are problems, of course, they will also hinder the decline in funds at a later time. In contrast to the accountability to the Mimika Regency government, the accountability of the Mekurima Village government to its people is inversely proportional. In reporting accountability for each activity, not all communities are invited and know what the Village Fund (DD) budget is used for. The thing that is lacking here in the SPJ's presentation is that there is no meeting to evaluate the implementation of the policy in Mekurima Village, and it is in the form of a form that only needs to be signed by the representatives of the Mekurima Village community who participate in the Musrenbangkam. So that the transparency of programs and budgets carried out by the government of Kampung Mekurima is still low; it has even raised suspicion from some of society who think that using the Village Fund does not match the reports with its realization in the field. This is also due to the absence of control from the people of Mekurima Village as a form of community obligation, as stated in Law Number 6 of 2014, article 68, paragraph 2 concerning community obligations in encouraging good governance.

This Village Fund (DD) policy is needed by the village government, especially Kampung Mekurima; with this policy, of course, it is expected to help village finances for village administration, community services, and community services development in the Village. For the last point, it is essential because the facilities and infrastructure of several villages in Mimika Regency, such as offices and village halls, can be considered inadequate, thus hindering the services the village government provides. Likewise, the road infrastructure facilities used to support the village economy have yet to receive attention. In its implementation, verification, and evaluation have also been carried out in several stages after the Musrenbang in Mekurima Village, starting from verification in the District, then verification by the Regency government through the Regional Secretary of the Village administration, then the new Regional Financial and Asset Management Agency (BPKAD). Then there is disbursement from the regional treasury to the village treasury. So that the Village Fund (DD) policy is by what is the need of Kampung Mekurima in carrying out government functions.

Based on the results of observations and interviews related to implementing the Village Fund in Mekurima Village, many informants are still dissatisfied because the Village Fund received by the Mekurima Village Government is very limited and has yet to fulfill the wishes of the community entirely. However, the Village Government always adheres to the priority scale determined through the Musrembangkam, which is carried out by the Village Government, the community, and the Mekurima Village Bamuskam every year.

### ***Output***

Output indicators mean what results or products are produced from a public policy and how many people have successfully followed the program/policy. The research results were obtained from 2018 - 2022. Responsibility is a process in which the village government accounts for all village financial management activities. Accountability for Implementation of Village Fund Management in Mekurima Village, Kwamki Narama District, Mimika Regency, as conveyed by the Head of Mekurima Village, Kwamki Narama District, Mimika Regency said: "Accountability for the Use of Village Fund Management in Mekurima Village, Kwamki Narama District, Mimika Regency is integrated with Village/Village APBD Accountability, so accountability the answer is Village/Village APB Accountability. This accountability is made in the form of a Village Governance Implementation Report (LPPK) at the end of each year and the form of a report on the governance of the Village Mekurima Village, Kwamki Lama District, Mimika Regency, which refers to the Regulation of the Mimika Regent".

The same statement was made by the Head of Finance for Mekurima Village, Kwamki Narama District, Mimika Regency, saying: "Based on the results of a detailed report on Village Fund Management in Mekurima Village, Kwamki Lama District, Mimika Regency, to fund three sectors, namely: 1). Village Development Implementation Sector which includes: Health Sub-Sector, Public Works and Spatial Planning Sub-Sector, Residential Area Sub-Sector. using village funds of Rp. 642,671,555; 2). Field of Community Empowerment which includes: Sub-Sector of Agriculture and Animal Husbandry (increasing livestock production (production equipment/management/cage). using village funds of Rp. 247,475,000. 3). The Disaster Management, Emergency and Village Urgent Sector using village funds of Rp. 1,263,176,320".

Preparation of Accountability Reports by the Village Government in the Management of Village Funds in Mekurima Village, Kwamki Narama District, Mimika Regency, especially the Village Secretary assisted by the Village Treasurer, in the process of preparing Village Governance Reports (LPPK) and assisted by Bamuskam. Based on the accountability report on Village Fund Management in Mekurima Village, Kwamki Narama District, Mimika Regency, it has been used to fund three fields, namely the Village Development Implementation Sector, using village funds of Rp. 642,671,555; The Community Empowerment Sector uses village funds of Rp. 247,475,000; The Disaster Management, Emergency, and Village Urgent Sector using village funds of Rp. 1,263,176,320".

Distribution of Village Funds in Mekerima Village, Kwamki Narama District, Mimika Regency has been running/implemented, but village funds' management/use and accountability have yet to be maximized. The regulations governing the distribution, management/use, accountability, and supervision of village funds are often changing/ revised, causing doubts for implementers at the district level, especially at the village government level. The management/use of village funds at the village level has been carried out, but because of the previous management, human resources needed to be adequately prepared so that in implementation, the work plans/activities and facts on the ground were still Found/there is a non-conformity.

Based on the results of interviews related to Accountability for the Implementation of Village Fund Management in Mekerima Village, Kwamki Narama District, Mimika Regency, the Government of Mekerima Village, Kwamki Narama District, Mimika Regency has carried out well.

### ***Outcomes***

The outcome indicators in question are whether the impact has been received by the wider community or parties affected by the policy, how many positive impacts have been produced, and whether there have been any negative impacts. If it is related to this research, what should be disclosed in this indicator is whether the program from the Village Fund makes a difference to the beneficiary group in terms of benefits. The village head has directed the activity executor in implementing village road construction in Mekerima village. What needs to be considered in the future is the need for skills training facilities for the community to utilize the potential of human resources in the Village to be more independent in managing village funds. In addition, the Activity Executor has been directed by the Village Head in carrying out the Construction and Management of Street Lighting Installations in Mekerima Village. This is very beneficial for the village community. The Village Head has directed the Activity Executor in carrying out Community Institution Capacity Building Activities in Mekerima Village. This is very beneficial because it is related to community religious development in potentially conflict-prone villages. The village head has directed the activity executor in carrying out activities for procuring agricultural and plantation plant seeds. In terms of activity, outcomes have been achieved. However, in terms of impacts and benefits, it still needs to be evaluated so that in the future, there is a need for synergy and integration in implementing activities in Mekerima Village.

### **CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

Based on the research results related to the evaluation of Village Fund policies in Mekerima Village, Kwamki Narama District, Mimika Regency, it can be concluded that the Village Fund Management process in Mekerima Village, Kwamki Narama District, Mimika Regency includes input, process, output, and outcome. It has followed the rules of technical guidelines regulated in laws and regulations, but the process still needs to be more optimal. From the input side, all mechanisms have been implemented with reference to the technical

guidelines for implementing the Village Fund. However, not all of the proposals are the local community's aspirations because some of the communities are not involved in the planning process for the Village Fund Program. In terms of the process, many people are still dissatisfied because the Village Fund received by the Mekurima Village Government is very limited and has yet to fulfill the community's wishes fully. The output is that the accountability implementation of Village Fund Management in Mekurima Village, Kwamki Narama District, Mimika Regency has been carried out correctly. Some of the programs and activities were very beneficial to the village community. Meanwhile, the obstacles in managing Village Funds in Mekurima Village, Kwamki Narama District, Mimika Regency include the low availability of Village Fund management human resources and the community's social conditions that could be more supportive.

Taking into account the various findings in data collection and analysis of research results, the Village Government should identify the problems that exist in the Village and according to what is needed by the village community and the need for facilities for skills training activities for the community to be able to utilize the potential of human resources in the Village. To be more independent in managing the Village Fund.

#### **FURTHER STUDY**

Every research is subject to limitations; thus, you can explain them here and briefly provide suggestions to further investigations.

#### **ACKNOWLEDGMENT**

We would like to thank all participants for supporting this study by sharing time and perspectives with valuable information. Any mistakes are our responsibility.

#### **REFERENCES**

- Bajari, A. H., & Nugraha, R. A. (2020). The improvement of education quality in Jayapura through the evaluation of school operational assistance funding regulation.
- Badjuri, A., & Yuwono, T. (2002). Public Policy: Concept and Strategy. Semarang: Diponegoro University.
- Bridgman, J & Davis G. 2000. Australian Policy Handbook, Allen & Unwin, NSW
- Crossfield, L., Byrne, A., Education and Training Australia. Dept. Of Employment, & Australia. Dept. of Finance. (1994). Review of the Evaluation Function in DEET. Canberra: AGPS.

- Dunn, W. N. (2000). *Introduction to Public Policy Analysis*. Yogyakarta: Gadjah Mada University Press.
- Eko, S., Khasanah, TI, Widuri, D., Handayani, S., Handayani, N., & Qomariyah, P. (2014). *Village builds Indonesia*. FPPD. Yogyakarta.
- Gunawan, P. (2013). *Qualitative Research Methods. Theory and Practice*. Jakarta: PT Bumi Aksara.
- Government Regulation No. 43 of 2014 and Regulation 47 of 2015 concerning Guidelines for Implementing Law No. 6 of 2014.
- Government Regulation No. 22 of 2015 concerning Amendments to Government Regulation No. 60 of 2014 concerning Village Funds sourced from the State Revenue and Expenditure Budget.
- Hermawan, F. (2013). *Evaluation of the Village Fund Allocation Program by the Community Empowerment Agency and the Village Government of Pelalawan Regency (Doctoral dissertation)*.
- Larasati, DC, & Adhitama, MO (2018). *Monitoring and Evaluation of the Village Fund Program (DD) following Law 6 of 2014 concerning Villages (Study in Landungsari Village, Dau District, Malang Regency, East Java)*. *Reform*, 7(2).
- Law No. 6 of 2014 concerning Villages.
- Law No. 23 of 2014 concerning Regional Government.
- Miles, MB, Huberman, AM, and Saldana, J. (2014). *Qualitative Data Analysis, A. Methods Sourcebook, Edition 3*. USA: Sage Publications
- Mimika Regent Regulation No. 11 of 2018 concerning Procedures for Distribution and Determination of Details of Village Funds for Each Village in Mimika Regency for the 2018 Fiscal Year.
- Nawawi, H. (2003). *Human Resource Planning*. Gadjah Mada University.
- Nugraha, R. A., & Bajari A. H., (2022); *Strategies for Increasing Access and Quality of Education at the Elementary School Levels in Papua and West Papua Province*. *Int Aca J Edu Lte*. 3(2); 56-59
- Nugroho, R. (2014). *Public Policy: Theory, Management, Dynamics, Analysis, Convergence, and Policy Chemistry*. Jakarta: PT Elex Media Komputindo.

Rahmad Agung Nugraha & Abner Herry Bajari. (2022); Strategies for Increasing Access and Quality of Education at the Elementary School Levels in Papua and West Papua Province. *Int Aca J Edu Lte.* 3(2); 1-4.

Regulation of the Minister of Home Affairs No. 113 of 2014 concerning Village Financial Management. Minister of Finance No. 93/PMK.07/2015 concerning Procedures for Allocation, Distribution, Use, Monitoring, and Evaluation of Village Funds. 2017 concerning Priority Setting for the Use of Village Funds for 2018

Wirawan, W. (2011). Evaluation of theories, models, standards, applications, and professions. PT. RajaGrafindo Persada.

Yustisia, TV (2016). Official Guidelines for Implementing Village Funds: A Complete Set of Regulations on Budgeting, Allocation, Distribution, Reporting, Monitoring and Evaluation of Village Funds. Media Vision.