



Coordination of the Regional Disaster Management Agency in Disaster Handling

(A Case Study in Karanganyar Regency)

Farco Siswiyanto Raharjo¹, Sri Riris Sugiyarti², Eryta Dyah Ramadany³

¹⁻³ Department of Public Administration, Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Universitas Slamet Riyadi, Surakarta

*Penulis Korespondensi : farcoraharjo@gmail.com

Abstract. This research examines the coordination efforts of the Karanganyar District Disaster Management Agency (BPBD) in managing disasters, identifying obstacles, and exploring efforts to strengthen these coordination efforts. Utilizing a qualitative approach with a case study method, the study aims to investigate the mechanisms of cross-sector coordination, communication patterns, and division of labor within BPBD. Data was gathered through in-depth interviews, observations, and document studies, and analyzed using an interactive model. The findings indicate that BPBD's coordination is relatively effective, demonstrated through unified action, a multi-channel communication system, and a clear division of labor. However, challenges remain, including the complexity of cross-sectoral coordination, differences in capacity and authority, and the pressure of emergency situations. The study concludes that improving coordination requires enhancing staff discipline, developing human resource capacity, and strengthening an integrated work system. These efforts are vital for improving the overall effectiveness of disaster management at the local level, ensuring a more efficient and comprehensive response to disasters in the future.

Keywords: BPBD; Coordination; Disaster Management; Disaster Management; Governance

1. INTRODUCTION

Disaster management is one of the governmental affairs with a high level of complexity because it involves various actors, interests, and cross-sectoral resources. Indonesia, as a country located in a disaster-prone region, faces an increasing risk of disasters in terms of both frequency and impact. Geographic, geological, and demographic conditions make disasters an unavoidable structural problem that must be managed systematically. Therefore, the effectiveness of disaster management is highly dependent on institutional capacity and the quality of inter-agency coordination. Without good coordination, disaster management has the potential to lead to inefficiencies, overlapping authorities, and delayed responses.

Law Number 24 of 2007 concerning Disaster Management emphasizes that disaster management is a shared responsibility between the central government, regional governments, and the community. In the regional context, the Regional Disaster Management Agency (BPBD) is a key institution in coordinating all stages of disaster management. BPBD not only acts as a technical implementer but also as a cross-sectoral coordination hub. This strategic role demands that BPBD have strong coordinating capacity. However, in practice, coordination often faces various structural and operational constraints.

Coordination in disaster management is crucial because of the multidimensional and cross-jurisdictional nature of disasters. Disaster management involves local government agencies, security forces, community organizations, the business sector, and the public. Each

actor has different roles, resources, and interests. Without a clear coordination mechanism, optimal synergy between actors is difficult to achieve. This has the potential to hinder the achievement of rapid, accurate, and integrated disaster management goals.

Conceptually, coordination is understood as the process of aligning actions between organizational units to achieve common goals. In public administration, coordination is seen as an important instrument for overcoming bureaucratic fragmentation. Disaster management is a real-world example of public policy that requires intensive coordination due to its cross-sectoral and cross-governmental nature. Coordination failures can have a direct impact on public safety. Therefore, coordination is not merely a technical aspect, but a determining factor in the success of disaster management policies.

In the regional context, BPBD faces coordination challenges both horizontally and vertically. Horizontal coordination occurs between BPBD and other regional agencies with related functions. Meanwhile, vertical coordination involves the relationship between BPBD and BNPB and the central government. These two forms of coordination are often influenced by differences in authority, resource capacity, and organizational culture. This condition demands a clear and adaptive coordination design.

Coordination problems also arise due to the less-than-optimal division of roles and responsibilities among agencies. In some cases, there is still overlap in tasks between BPBD and other regional agencies. Additionally, limitations in human resources and budget also affect the effectiveness of coordination. Relying on an ad hoc approach in emergency situations often neglects long-term coordination planning. This indicates that disaster response coordination has not been fully institutionalized in a robust manner

From a disaster management perspective, coordination should be carried out continuously throughout all phases of a disaster. The pre-disaster phase demands coordination in mitigation and preparedness. The emergency response phase requires rapid and responsive coordination. Meanwhile, the post-disaster phase necessitates coordination in rehabilitation and reconstruction. Weaknesses in coordination at any one phase can affect the overall effectiveness of disaster response.

Empirical facts show that the impact of disasters is not only physical, but also social and economic. Lack of coordination can increase losses and prolong recovery time. Society is the most affected party when the coordination system doesn't function effectively. Therefore, strengthening coordination is not only in the interest of the bureaucracy, but also a public need. This makes disaster management coordination a strategic issue in local government governance.

Within the framework of regional autonomy, BPBD has broad policy space but also faces structural limitations. Decentralization grants authority, but this is not always accompanied by an increase in institutional capacity. As a result, coordination often relies on individual leadership rather than established systems. This condition risks leading to policy unsustainability. Therefore, research on BPBD coordination is important to strengthen regional institutions.

Research on disaster management coordination is also relevant to the public administration reform agenda. Modern governance demands collaboration and cross-sectoral work as a new paradigm. Disaster management becomes a testing ground for the effectiveness of collaborative governance. BPBD, as the coordinator, is expected to effectively bridge various interests. However, without a strong empirical understanding, efforts to improve coordination could be misdirected.

This research is important because it provides a realistic picture of disaster management coordination practices at the local level. Thru systematic analysis, this research can identify the supporting and hindering factors of BPBD coordination. The results of this research are expected to explain the gap between regulation and implementation. Thus, this research is not only descriptive but also analytical. Research findings can serve as the basis for formulating policy recommendations.

Beside practical contributions, this research also has theoretical contributions to the development of public administration studies. Coordination, as a classic concept, needs to be continuously studied in dynamic policy contexts such as disaster management. This research enriches the discourse on cross-sectoral coordination at the local level. The empirical context of BPBD provides relevant and current space for analysis. Thus, this research has both academic and practical significance.

The urgency of the research is increasing as the intensity of disasters in various regions rises. The challenges of climate change and urbanization increase the risk of disasters in the future. Local governments are required to become increasingly adaptive and responsive. Without effective coordination, the risk of disasters will become increasingly difficult to manage. Therefore, strengthening BPBD coordination is a long-term strategic need. Based on the description, it can be concluded that disaster management coordination is a crucial issue in local government governance. BPBD plays a central role in determining the success of disaster management. However, various coordination challenges still require in-depth study and empirical data. This research is presented to address that need systematically

and scientifically. Thus, this research is expected to make a real contribution to improving the quality of disaster management in the area.

2. RESEARCH METHOD

This research uses a qualitative approach with a case study method to deeply understand the coordination process of the Karanganyar District Disaster Management Agency (BPBD) in disaster management. This approach was chosen because it is able to explore social reality, organizational dynamics, and interactions between actors contextually. The research focus is directed toward coordination mechanisms, communication patterns, division of labor, and apparatus discipline in disaster management. Research informants were determined purposively, including BPBD leaders and personnel, as well as relevant parties directly involved in disaster coordination. The research location is centered at the Karanganyar District Disaster Management Agency (BPBD) as the main institution for disaster management in the area.

Data collection techniques were carried out thru in-depth interviews, field observations, and document studies to obtain comprehensive data. Data analysis was conducted using the interactive model of Miles and Huberman, which includes data reduction, data presentation, and continuous conclusion drawing. To ensure data validity, this study employed technique triangulation by comparing the results of interviews, observations, and policy documents. The analysis process is carried out simultaneously from data collection to the interpretation stage. This method allows researchers to generate findings that are valid, reliable, and fully reflect the empirical conditions of disaster response coordination.

3. RESULTS AND DISSCUSSION

Coordination of Karanganyar District Disaster Management Agency in Disaster Handling

Coordination is a fundamental element in disaster management because it involves various actors with different functions, authorities, and resources. In the context of disaster management, coordination determines the speed, accuracy, and effectiveness of the response to emergency situations. Without good coordination, disaster management has the potential to experience overlapping authorities, delayed action, and wasted resources. Therefore, coordination is not only understood as a technical activity, but as a strategic mechanism in disaster governance. The role of BPBD as the main coordinator becomes crucial in ensuring optimal synergy between actors.

The Karanganyar District Disaster Management Agency (BPBD) has been carrying out its coordination function through a relatively structured mechanism. This coordination is reflected in unity of action, an integrated communication system, and a clear division of labor. These three mechanisms are the main foundation for ensuring that every disaster response is carried out in an integrated manner. BPBD serves as a connecting hub between local government, vertical agencies, and community members. Thus, coordination is not partial, but comprehensive and cross sectoral.

Unity of action is the initial aspect that determines the success of coordination. The Karanganyar District Disaster Management Agency (BPBD) is building a unified response through aligning perceptions both internally within the organization and with relevant agencies. This alignment of perceptions is important to ensure that every actor has the same understanding of the disaster situation, response priorities, and goals to be achieved. In emergency situations, differences in interpretation can lead to confusion and hinder a rapid response. Therefore, unity of action is a key prerequisite for disaster coordination.

The existence of Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) serves as a formal instrument that strengthens the unity of these actions. The SOP provides clear guidelines regarding the chain of command, the duties of each party, and disaster management procedures. In emergency situations filled with uncertainty, SOPs serve as the primary reference to reduce ambiguity in actions. This finding aligns with organizational coordination theory, which emphasizes the importance of standardization for maintaining consistency and accuracy in work. With SOPs, BPBD is able to ensure that every action is carried out within a controlled and directed framework.

Beside unity of action, communication is an important element in supporting disaster management coordination. The Karanganyar District Disaster Management Agency (BPBD) utilizes various communication channels, both formal and informal, to ensure the smooth flow of information. The use of walkie talkies (HTs), instant messaging app groups, command centers, and social media indicates a multi-channel communication approach. This approach allows information to be delivered quickly to those who need it. With effective communication, coordination can be more responsive and adaptable to disaster dynamics.

The communication pattern implemented by BPBD also allows for the verification of information before it is forwarded to relevant agencies. Initial information from the community or volunteers is not directly used as a basis for decisions, but is first confirmed. This mechanism is important for maintaining the accuracy of information and preventing disinformation. In the context of disasters, misinformation can have serious consequences for safety and the

effectiveness of the response. Therefore, communication demands not only speed but also reliability.

The presence of disaster volunteers in every sub-district is an important part of the BPBD communication system. Volunteers serve as the extended arm of BPBD in early detection of disaster events and reporting field conditions. The presence of volunteers shortens the information chain and speeds up the initial response. Additionally, volunteers possess local knowledge that aids in understanding the social and geographical context of the affected area. Thus, volunteers directly contribute to strengthening information based coordination.

From the perspective of public administration theory, the communication practices of the Karanganyar District Disaster Management Agency (BPBD) reflect the concept of information-based coordination. This concept emphasizes that fast, accurate, and verified information is key to effective coordination. The use of various communication media demonstrates BPBD's efforts to reduce structural and technical barriers. Communication is not only internal, but also external with the community. This shows that BPBD adopts an inclusive and adaptive communication approach.

Division of labor is another aspect that strengthens the coordination of the Karanganyar District Disaster Management Agency (BPBD). The work division structure shows a clear separation between the directing and executing elements. The steering element is responsible for policy formulation, oversight, and evaluation of disaster management. Meanwhile, the implementing element focuses on operational coordination and resource mobilization in the field. This division creates clarity of roles and responsibilities at each stage of disaster management.

This division of labor not only applies internally but also involves cross sectoral collaboration. BPBD collaborates with the TNI, Polri, technical services, humanitarian organizations, and disaster volunteers. This involvement of various parties shows that disaster management cannot be handled by a single institution alone. Each actor has complementary contributions according to their capacity and authority. This pattern strengthens the response capacity and scope of disaster management.

The cross sectoral approach implemented by the Karanganyar District Disaster Management Agency (BPBD) reflects the principles of whole of government and whole of society. These principles emphasize that disaster management is a shared responsibility between the government and the community. BPBD acts as a coordinator, uniting various interests and resources. With this approach, coordination is not solely hierarchical, but also collaborative. This allows for the creation of broader and more sustainable synergies.

The coordination built thru unity of action, communication, and division of labor indicates that the Karanganyar District BPBD already has a relatively mature coordination framework. Despite facing the complexities of actors and the dynamics of the disaster situation, BPBD was able to maintain the integration of actions. This indicates a fairly good institutional capacity in managing disaster coordination. However, the effectiveness of coordination still requires continuous maintenance and strengthening. Coordination must be continuously adjusted to reflect the evolving disaster risks and challenges.

Overall, the coordination of the Karanganyar District Disaster Management Agency (BPBD) in disaster management demonstrates structured and adaptive disaster governance practices. Unity of action ensures a coordinated response, communication supports speed and accuracy, and division of labor guarantees clarity of roles. These three aspects complement each other and form an integrated coordination system. This finding confirms that effective coordination is a key prerequisite for successful disaster management at the local level. Thus, strengthening BPBD coordination is a key strategy in enhancing regional resilience to disasters.

Challenges and Strengthening Coordination in Disaster Management

Although the Karanganyar District Disaster Management Agency (BPBD) coordination in disaster management has been relatively effective, this study identified several constraints that could potentially affect the quality of that coordination. These obstacles are not always technical, but also structural and cultural. The complexity of disaster management demands coordination involving numerous cross-sectoral and cross-authority actors. This condition makes coordination a dynamic process that is not always easy to manage. Therefore, identifying constraints is the initial step in formulating a strategy to strengthen coordination.

One of the main obstacles faced by the Karanganyar District Disaster Management Agency (BPBD) is the complexity of cross-sectoral coordination. Disaster management involves government agencies, security forces, humanitarian organizations, volunteers, and the public. Each actor has a different organizational structure, working procedures, and bureaucratic culture. This difference often affects the speed of decision-making and the alignment of actions in the field. Without a strong coordination mechanism, these differences can become a source of friction between actors.

Differences in resource capacity between agencies also pose a challenge to coordination. Not all agencies have equal human resources, equipment, and budgets for disaster management. This capacity imbalance can affect each party's contribution to the coordination. Agencies with limited capacity tend to rely on BPBD or other more prepared agencies. This

condition demands that BPBD play a more active role in regulating and balancing cross sectoral roles.

Beside capacity, differences in authority between agencies also affect coordination. Each institution has limits to its authority, which are regulated by their respective regulations. In emergency situations, these boundaries of authority sometimes become blurred and lead to confusion on the ground. If not managed well, the difference in authority can slow down responses and lead to overlapping tasks. Therefore, clarity of roles and authority is an important aspect in strengthening coordination.

Different levels of preparedness among actors also affect the effectiveness of coordination. Not all agencies and actors have the same level of preparedness in facing disasters. Some actors have adequate experience and training, while others are still limited. This difference in preparedness can affect the ability to work together effectively. In this context, BPBD is required to coordinate actors with varying levels of preparedness.

Dependence on emergency communication was another constraint found in this study. In disaster situations, communication is often carried out under high pressure and time constraints. Reliance on emergency communication has the potential to lead to miscommunication if not supported by a mature system. The psychological pressure experienced by field officers can also affect the accuracy of information delivery. Therefore, communication systems need to be designed not only for emergency situations, but also for long-term preparedness.

Coordination challenges are also related to psychological factors and personnel workload. Disaster management demands quick, accurate work, often in less-than-ideal conditions. High work pressure can affect concentration and the quality of decision-making. If not managed well, this condition has the potential to reduce the effectiveness of coordination. Therefore, the well-being and psychological support aspects of personnel need to be considered in strengthening coordination.

In facing these various constraints, the aspect of bureaucratic discipline becomes an important factor in maintaining the sustainability of coordination. The research results show that the Karanganyar District Disaster Management Agency (BPBD) instills discipline thru a Service Proclamation, which serves as an ethical and professional guideline. Discipline is understood not only as adherence to rules, but also as a moral commitment in providing disaster services. Cultivating this value of discipline strengthens consistency of action in emergency situations. With strong discipline, coordination can proceed in a more orderly and directed manner.

Direct supervision by the leadership is an important instrument in ensuring the discipline of the apparatus. Supervision is carried out vertically to ensure that each personnel member carries out their duties according to procedures. This mechanism allows for early detection of potential coordination barriers. With effective supervision, problems can be identified and addressed immediately. From a public administration perspective, this approach reflects preventive internal control.

The preventive approach in supervision emphasizes preventing errors rather than taking action. This approach is considered more effective in the context of disaster management, which demands speed and accuracy. By preventing errors from the outset, coordination can run more smoothly. This also creates a conducive and trusting work environment. Trust between actors is an important asset in cross-sectoral coordination.

In addition to discipline and supervision, coordination is also strengthened thru capacity building for human resources. The Karanganyar District Disaster Management Agency (BPBD) consistently promotes technical training and certification for its personnel. The training focuses on improving technical, managerial, and coordination competencies. Competent personnel are better equipped to adapt to the dynamics of disaster situations. Thus, capacity building becomes a strategic investment in strengthening coordination.

Improving personnel competency contributes to minimizing operational errors in the field. Trained personnel are better able to understand their roles and responsibilities. This reduces the potential for conflict and miscommunication between actors. Additionally, adequate competence strengthens inter-agency trust in cross-sectoral cooperation. This trust is a key factor in effective coordination.

Conceptually, the findings of this study support organizational theory, which states that coordination is highly dependent on the quality of the implementing actors. Good structure and procedures will not be effective without the support of competent human resources. Therefore, coordination must be strengthened holistically, considering both human and system aspects. Investment in human capacity is a prerequisite for the sustainability of coordination. This confirms the importance of a capacity development approach in disaster management.

Beside individual capacity, strengthening coordination also requires strengthening the work system. A clear and integrated work system facilitates coordination between actors. The integration of information systems, procedures, and evaluation mechanisms is an important part of this strengthening. With a strong system, coordination doesn't depend on specific individuals. This is important to ensure the long-term sustainability of coordination.

Overall, the constraints and strengthening of coordination in disaster management in Karanganyar Regency indicate that coordination is an evolving process. The existing obstacles cannot be avoided, but they can be managed through the right strategies. Strengthening discipline, human resource capacity, and work systems is the key to improving coordination quality. BPBD plays a strategic role in integrating all these strengthening efforts. With continuous strengthening, disaster response coordination is expected to become increasingly effective and adaptable to future challenges.

4. CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

Based on the research findings and discussion, it can be concluded that the Karanganyar District Disaster Management Agency (BPBD) coordination in disaster management has been relatively effective through unified action, an integrated communication system, and clear division of labor. BPBD is capable of playing a strategic role as a cross-sectoral coordinator by utilizing SOPs, various communication channels, and networks of disaster management agencies and volunteers. Nevertheless, coordination still faces obstacles such as cross-sectoral complexity, differences in capacity and authority, and work pressure in emergency situations. Coordination is strengthened through instilling discipline in the apparatus, preventive supervision by leaders, and increasing human resource capacity. Research findings confirm that the effectiveness of coordination is not only determined by structure and procedures, but also by the quality of the actors and the supporting work systems. Therefore, the continuous strengthening of BPBD coordination is key to improving the effectiveness of disaster management at the local level.

REFERENCES

- Ansell, C., & Gash, A. (2008). Collaborative governance in theory and practice. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 18(4), 543–571. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/mum032>
- Boin, A., 't Hart, P., Stern, E., & Sundelius, B. (2005). *The politics of crisis management: Public leadership under pressure*. Cambridge University Press.
- Boin, A., Kuipers, S., & Overdijk, W. (2013). Leadership in times of crisis: A framework for assessment. *International Review of Public Administration*, 18(1), 79–91. <https://doi.org/10.1080/12294659.2013.11873624>
- Comfort, L. K. (2007). Crisis management in hindsight: Cognition, communication, coordination, and control. *Public Administration Review*, 67(s1), 189–197. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2007.00829.x>
- Comfort, L. K., Ko, K., & Zagorecki, A. (2004). Coordination in rapidly evolving disaster response systems. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 48(3), 295–313. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764203256465>

- Emerson, K., Nabatchi, T., & Balogh, S. (2012). An integrative framework for collaborative governance. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 22(1), 1–29. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/mur011>
- Fischer, F., Miller, G. J., & Sidney, M. S. (2015). *Handbook of public policy analysis: Theory, politics, and methods*. CRC Press.
- Gulick, L. (1937). Notes on the theory of organization. *Public Administration Review*, 3(1), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.2307/973056>
- Kapucu, N. (2006). Interagency communication networks during emergencies. *American Review of Public Administration*, 36(2), 207–225. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0275074005280694>
- Kapucu, N. (2012). Disaster resilience and adaptive capacity. *Public Management Review*, 14(3), 301–314. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2011.635199>
- McGuire, M. (2006). Collaborative public management: Assessing what we know and how we know it. *Public Administration Review*, 66(s1), 33–43. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2006.00601.x>
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook* (3rd ed.). Sage Publications.
- Mintzberg, H. (1979). *The structuring of organizations*. Prentice-Hall.
- Ostrom, E. (2010). Beyond markets and states: Polycentric governance of complex economic systems. *American Economic Review*, 100(3), 641–672. <https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.100.3.641>
- Perry, R. W., & Lindell, M. K. (2003). Preparedness for emergency response. *Journal of Contingencies and Crisis Management*, 11(4), 183–192. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-5973.2003.00195.x>
- Roberts, P. S., & Wernstedt, K. (2019). Collaborative governance and disaster response. *Policy Studies Journal*, 47(4), 1081–1105. <https://doi.org/10.1111/psj.12269>
- Thompson, J. D. (1967). *Organizations in action: Social science bases of administrative theory*. McGraw-Hill.