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Abstract. Policy formulation is laden with conflicts. Many actors can be involved in conflict and they form advocacy coalitions. This research is a qualitative research and data were collected through library and field study by employing observations and interviews which are analyzed by interactive model. The results showed that there are two influential internal parameters; technocratic approach and the weakness of legislation capacity in Makassar Council. Meanwhile, external system events of coalition came from the political situation of South Sulawesi governor election, and the release of Presidential Decree Number 122 of 2012 about reclamation of coastal regions and small islands. Belief system of coalitions is characterized by differences in the characteristics of actors from various institutions, which affect the response of actors that make up coalition formation. Policy subsystems lead to the formation of advocacy coalition (support the legalization, against the legalization, and policy brokers).
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INTRODUCTION

Regional autonomy design has allowed a wide maneuver space for local government institution in accelerating development. Paradigm of performing government has shifted to governance, whereas this governance paradigm then ended state domination and ascertained the existence of new actors in performing government (Farazmand, 2004). These governance actors at least consist of state, business society, and civil society, and also multinational or international actors in the perspective of sound governance (Farazmand, 2004; Putra, 2009). The involvement of these actors then brings forth a situation whereas government cannot only rely on sanction and repression based on legal authority. This new governmental paradigm has changed the nature and mode of state interaction from power and control organization to information and communication interchange forum that ascertain empowerment of public participation and, if necessary, bring government closer to public and society (Fuhr, 2011).

In context of city development, which is the autonomic authority of city government, actualization of good urban governance or good urban management concept over a public policy is tested when faced with the size of owned authority aspect in the frame of regional autonomy. Communicative, persuasive, and mediation skills of city government authority are required in interpreting various aspirations of city society into holistic and futuristic visions. Great agenda of city development can only be materialized under a strong and visionary leadership. Regional head is required to play the role of transformative leader in order to establish efficient, effective and equity vision and mission of city organization. City development must be comprehended as an inclusive process by active involvement of all of its stakeholders.
Spatial planning policy is one of policy products that is very strategic in city development. Spatial planning is a social, economic, and political instrument for regional development in escalating and distributing social welfare. Spatial planning policy is an instrument of governmental intervention over space as public resource that is very limited in number. Normatively, in Law Number 32 Year 2004 on Regional Government, it is regulated in Article 14 paragraph 1 (b) that “spatial planning, utilizing, and monitoring is a mandatory under authority of municipal/city”, also in Law Number 26 Year 2007 on Spatial Planning in Article 11 paragraph 2 that “city government has the authority in performing spatial planning of city area including spatial planning, utilizing and controlling of its utilization”. Based on this regulation, the authority of regional government in composing spatial planning of city area is very decentralist.

In technical terms, the procedure of formulating spatial plan policy (RTRW) is stipulated in Regulation of Minister of Public Affairs Number: 17/PRT/M/2009 on Directive for Formulation of Spatial Planning of City Area which specifies processes and procedures of composing spatial planning of city area (RTRW). Ensuring public involvement in formulating RTRW, Regulation of the Government of Republic of Indonesia Number 68 Year 2010 on Form and Procedures of Public Role in Spatial Plan was published. This stipulation clarifies form of public involvement in the process of spatial planning, space utilizing and controlling space utilization. Based on the existing regulations, the attempt to actualized model of advocacy planning in formulating RTRW becomes very prospective.

Although this stipulation ensures the involvement of various parties in spatial planning (RTRW), the fact shows that spatial plan products are more of the works of development consultant legitimized into regional regulations by regional government. Even though it is based on rationality and objectivity, in practice this planning tradition, in particular conspicuous one such as rational comprehensive planning, receives wide critiques as elitist model. This is due to the rigid and complex planning process that can only be completed by those who have undergone specific and formal study of planning science. This tradition is also criticized for making planning activity just as justification for certain political decision (Setiawan, 2005).

The ideas and practices of planning then evolve and become more concern of social and political aspects that are dynamic and full of conflict. In other words, spatial planning is translated as a process of political game, in essence that it is independent to power relations. This conception shows that planning is a process of negotiation or agreement making among many actors and institutions involved in developing an area or a city. In other words, spatial planning is a process of negotiation and making an agreement between stakeholders. This agreement making is mainly required to allow more fair process of natural resources (for example space) utilizing that is not only concerned with efficiency and effective aspects, but also equity aspect.

Mandate of Law Number 26 Year 2007 on Spatial Plan article 78 paragraph 4 (c) states that municipal/city RTRW is adjusted at the latest 3 (three) years after this Law was published. The fact shows that the process of formulating policy of RTRW of Makassar was started in 2010 and has not been legitimized up to now. This is due to conflict of interest between interacted coalitions of policy actor in the whole stages of formulation. In this kind of situation, relationships between the actors form the frame of advocacy coalition. Planning consultant, City Government Expert Staff, and BAPPEDA (executive) actors supported by private organization actors such as Chamber of Commerce and Industry (KADIN) depending on technocratic approach build coalition and dominate plan formulation process. On the other side, coalition of civil society organization such as Indonesian Environmental Society (WALHI), Environmental Issues Study Forum (FOSIL), and Provincial Parliament (COUNCIL) (legislative) actors act as opposition always criticizing policy draft formed by city government and consultant actor coalition. Mediator position is played by professional association actor such as Planning Expert Alliance (IAP) and civil society organization actor such as Indonesia Legislative Watch Committee (KOPEL) encouraging both coalitions to end the deadlock and avoid resistance to Law Number 26 Year 2007.

The tough policy formulation process formed coalition configuration pattern among actors and become interesting when observed from advocacy coalition framework (ACF) perspective. Existence of coalition in policy formulation stage contributes to change of direction by emergence of actors full of value and interest. This advocacy coalition framework (ACF) model has been widely used in analyzing complexity of environmental policy full of conflict of interest from various actor groups. Conflict between two actor coalitions is surely affected by relatively stable system parameter and external system events.

Discovery of Weible & Sabatier (2007) depicted how advocacy coalition model employment contributes much in explaining complexity of conflict between “pro water-quality coalition” and “pro development coalition” in the case of protecting Lake Tahoe Valley in Nevada, United States. Same model had also been applied by Weible (2006) in analyzing the role and interest of stakeholders between pro Marine Protection Area coalition and anti Marine Protection Area coalition in formulating marine protection action in South California, United States. Advocacy coalition approach employed in this research helps elaborating interaction between actor and value system in policy coalition. Policy network existed among government, private sector, and civil society actors can be a learning process of mutual control for public interest (Suwiti, 2008). Observing this phenomenon, this research is intended to analyze reality of interaction between actor coalitions from parameters such as belief systems and policy subsystem interaction dynamics during the process of formulating RTRW of Makassar in 2010 – 2030 policy.
RESEARCH METHODS

This research employed qualitative technique approach and was conducted in some institutions directly involved in activity of formulating RTRW of Makassar in 2010 – 2030 policy in Makassar, South Sulawesi Province. Selected informants were those directly related to the issues concerning RTRW policy of Makassar. The informants selected were official representative of state institutions, such as Provincial Spatial and Settlement Agency, Regional Development Planning Agency (BAPPEDA), City Government Expert Staff and Provincial Parliament (COUNCIL). Informant groups representing business society are Commerce and Industry Chamber (KADIN) and Planning Consultant, while civil society groups are comprised of Indonesia Environmental Society (WALHI), Environmental Issues Study Forum (FOSIL), Legislative Watch Committee (KOPEL) and Planning Expert Alliance (IAP) professional association.

This research employed qualitative data analysis technique. The analytical model employed was designed to be able to disclose important matters concerning determined study focus. Data analyzing technique employed in this research was interactive model (Miles and Huberman, 1992). There are 4 main analyzing components in this interactive model, such as data collection, data reduction, data display, and drawing components.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The policy of spatial planning in Makassar faced a problem with the publication of Law Number 26 Year 2007 on Spatial Planning. It is apparent in contradiction between contents of Perda No. 6 Year 2006 and Law Number 26 Year 2007 in 2 (two) matters, first, plan time dimension, which is 20 (twenty) years according to Law Number 26 Year 2007, and second, allocation of green open spaces at minimum 30 (thirty) percent of city area, with minimum proportion of 20 (twenty) percent for public green open spaces. At this point, revision or change of RTRW policy of Makassar of Year 2005 – 2015 is mandatory, so that formulation of RTRW of Makassar policy of 2010-2030 was initialized.

Factually, condition of Makassar spatial planning gone through accelerated changes ascertained the need to review spatial plan (RTRW) policy determined previously. The primary problem for reviewing Perda No. 6 Year 2006 on RTRW Makassar of 2005-2015 was stipulation of Law Number 26 Year 2007 on Spatial Planning and expiration of Law Number 24 Year 1992 on Spatial Planning. Other fundamental issue for this RTRW policy reviewing was concerned with the matters of city development direction, assurance of investment, availability of Green Open Spaces (RTH) and adjustment to legal regulation of higher order. Observed from these fundamental issues, formulation of RTRW policy is more top-down in nature. Each side responded to the issues in accordance to basic beliefs of their own group of the existence of RTRW policy agreeable to their own expectation.

Technocratic approach by conventional procedure is still the option, even in democracy era at present. The dominant role of Planning Consultant and Technical Team and City Government Expert Staff contributes to more formal mobilization of public aspiration filtering processes (jaring asmana) and incomplete civic engagement situation. Empowerment of the practice of advocacy planning by bottom-up model has not yet been appeared in the activity of formulating policy of RTRW Makassar in 2010-2030.

In policy agenda formulation stage, Regional Development Planning Agency (BAPPEDA) of Makassar formed a technical team to formulate direction of changes and set up term of reference (TOR) as guidance for Planning Consultant. Ideally, the dominant institution in this stage is Regional Planning Coordinating Agency (BKPRD) directly led by Deputy Mayor in order to facilitate inter-sector coordination that is very much needed in the process of policy formulation. The un-optimum function of Regional Planning Coordinating Agency (BKPRD) institution in guarding planning policy became another problem for city government ranks, so that the roles of monitoring and evaluating the plan were taken over by BAPPEDA institution assisted by Makassar Government Expert Team consisted of academician, professional consultant, and Non Governmental Organization (NGO) elements.

The final stage of city area spatial planning process is choosing alternative as manifestation of direction and estimation of development needs and accommodation of various aspiration from input of stakeholders during formulation process. Thus, this final plan will be guidance for accomplishing formulated development directions. This momentum is the stage where agreement of policy substances becomes consensus for any party prior to political process of legalization by City Parliament (COUNCIL).

The attempt to reach agreement concerning substances of policy materials is not a brief process, but surpassed crucial phases full of contestation of ideas and interests of many parties. Often, this process went through momentum of conflict and collision between interests of various sectors due to the long procedure, resulting in delay of legalization process as mandated in Law Number 26 Year 2007 on Spatial Planning. In Makassar condition, the process of RTRW formulation was initialized in 2008 and by this year of 2014 is still in the stage of legalization by Makassar Parliament (COUNCIL).

The first step of arrangement and legalization of RTRW Makassar of 2010-2030 began by presentation of final concept of Spatial Plan (RTRW) by Formulating Team before Makassar Parliament to be discussed as common Regional Regulation Draft. The handing over of the first draft was conducted on September 23, 2010, without Academic Text that could elaborate philosophical, sociological, and judicial fundamental of RTRW Draft formulation. This was followed by reactions from some legislator concerning this Draft proposed by executive. Some members of the Parliament questioned the insufficient content of this Draft.
Negative respond by members of Makassar Council to continue discussion and the returning of Draft to executive (city government) was the first episode of contestation of ideas and interests between legislative and executive in the process of formulating RTRW of Makassar of 2005-2025 policy. Despite its many insufficiencies, consequential discussion on the content of the Draft was still continued. In procedures, discussion stage is followed by conveying the Draft to organs of state of Legislative Body (Baleg) for more profound, holistic and comprehensive study.

Revision and synchronization of the policy efforts conducted by the City Government as suggested by Makassar Council faced obstacles. These obstacles among others originated from Government of South Sulawesi Province concerning stipulation of Green Open Spaces (RTH) that is not specific in the extend of proportion of minimum 30 percent RTH of the entire area, consist of 20 percent Public RTH and 10 percent Private RTH. This in turn ignited dynamics in agreement of synchronizing Perda No. 9 Year 2009 on RTRW of South Sulawesi Province in 2009-2029.

The change in setting and constellation of local politics also ignited conflict between provincial government and city government. This situation change was triggered by “political migration” of the Mayor of Makassar from Golkar Party to Demokrat Party. This condition affected political position of Demokrat Party Fraction and Golkar Party Fraction as the two dominant powerhouses in Makassar Council related to process of discussing Draft of RTRW of Makassar. This situation led to a political deadlock and prevented a fast revision of the proposal.

Being returned to Formulation Team by the Executive, on 11 June 2012, the revision was then followed up by discussion in Legislative Body. Although executive had added (again) points that were lacking in previous draft materials, it still could not satisfy legislators. Despite changes in RTRW Draft were based on demand of Council members, the discussion could not be conducted fluently. This puzzled even BAPPEDA of Makassar as executive institutional responsibility taker on why discussion could not reach point of compromise.

The next stage of formulation process of RTRW of Makassar of 2010-2030 policy was discussion at Consultative Body (Bamus). This organ of COUNCIL possesses some functions administered in Regulation, among others are set the agenda of COUNCIL for 1 (one) assembly year or one period of settlement of Regional Regulation Draft, set schedule for COUNCIL meeting, and recommend formation of Special Committee (Pansus). Conflict between executive (City Government) and Makassar Council did not stop at this stage. Contestation of ideas and interests related to materials of RTRW Draft kept on that Consultative Body (Bamus) failed to set schedule for plenary agenda of Legitimating this RTRW Draft. There was even an agreement to intensify discussion by forming Special Committee (Pansus) while waiting for Consultative Body to set agenda.

On the other hand, hindrance in forming Special Committee (Pansus) came from external social political condition related to momentum of Governor and Deputy Governor of South Sulawesi Election also contributed to legislative performance of members of COUNCIL as a whole. Party political constellation at provincial level had affected the forming of support configuration on issues and siding practices in city legislative institution. External condition influence was admitted to be taken part in discussion of RTRW Draft. Dynamics of local politic during the end of 2012 and early 2013 were resulted in general in decrease in focus of legislative performance in Makassar Council. Politicians from political parties prioritized interests of their political parties over acceleration of legalization of RTRW Draft as legal foundation for other Drafts.

The problem in Special Committee discussion became more complex with stipulation of coastal region zonation for coastal region area development that is also regulated in this RTRW Draft. This stipulation is considered contradictive to substances of Presidential Decree (Perpres) Number 122 Year 2012 on Reclamation of Coastal region and Small Islands Areas. Substance of RTRW Draft was signified as able to legalize reclamation of coastal regions which was considered opposite to Perpres No. 122/2012.

The intertwined condition between legislation dynamics at national level and constellation of political party support prior to the moment of election of Mayor and Deputy Mayor of Makassar in 2013 at local level resulted in uncertainty of public hope of a Spatial Planning (RTRW) directive as spatial guidance in city development activity. The discussion of RTRW Draft is still in a deadlock situation.

The pattern of conflict relation between Government of Makassar and Makassar Council decorate this stage of appointment and legitimization. Contestation of ideas and interest related to material of RTRW Draft kept going on finally ended in a deadlock. Observing how harder discussion to legalization of this RTRW Draft had become, then conflict relation emerged strengthened the thesis that there are coalition configuration between city government actor and its supporters (pro) and City Council and its supporters (contra), while elements of Advocacy NGO and professional planner association became policy brokers of this policy formulation process.

According to informant from Regional Development Planning Agency (BAPPEDA) of Makassar, the actual condition related to progress of discussion of RTRW Draft is refusal of material of Draft proposed by executive, resulting in deadlock situation in relationship of executive and legislative. Meanwhile, according to informant from Council the actual situation is not that Council delays stipulation of this RTRW, but they applied cautionary principle with the consideration of public interest. Members of Council comprehended that there are still impropriety in this RTRW Draft concept which is that there are zones for investors to invest in. This RTRW should be made on equity basis, without discrimination and on the side of society. This factor caused Council to immediately make a conclusion for plenary agenda.

This political deadlock drew the attention of other stakeholders of spatial plan, such as conveyed by...
informant from Planning Expert Alliance (IAP) who wished that City Government and Council can soon reach an agreement. By the perspective of this professional planner association actor, RTRW policy is urgent to green area planning, including becoming guidance in discussion of Green Open Space (RTH) Draft. Critiques from civil society organization in public policy advocacy field such as Legislative Watch Committee (KOPEL) presumed that delay in stipulation of revision of Regional Decree Draft (Ranperda) related to Spatial Plan (RTRW) of Makassar is a resistance to Law Number 26 Year 2007 on Spatial Planning. Council of Makassar, in this case Legislative Body (Baleg), and city government, in this case legal department, BAPPEDA and other concerned agencies involved in formulation of this draft were considered slow in compiling draft of formulating items of requirements in appointment of RTRW Draft revision. Meanwhile, some groups of civil society institution actor opted to take part as policy brokers. The stance selected by stakeholders is variable depending on belief system of each institution.

Public policy management activity processes are not conducted in empty space. Policy environment variable has great influence on accentuation of each public policy product born. In context of legalization of RTRW of Makassar of 2010-2030 Draft, there are some internal and external variables playing important roles and trigger relational dynamics ended in deadlock situation in formulation process of this policy. Coalition external system events are originated from political situation of South Sulawesi Governor Election of 2013 and the change in constellation of coastal region development following publication of Presidential Decree (Perpres) Number 122 Year 2012 on Reclamation of Coastal region and Small Islands Areas.

Internal parameters take part on creating political deadlock in the process of appointment and legalization of this policy are technocratic power selected in formulating the plan and weakness in legislative capacity of Makassar Council institution. Technocratic approach in planning is not appropriate to spirit of present time and contains some problems so far. In technocratic planning, the most important thing is technical and scientific consideration of the government in building argumentative foundation of development strategy.

In context of formulating RTRW of Makassar of 2010-2030 Draft, technocratic approach was conducted again by Executive Formation Team. The pattern of formulating draft for the plan was conducted by utilizing competency of Planning Consultant assisted by power of experts who had access to power. Collaboration of Technical Team led by BAPPEDA, City Government Expert Team and Professional Planning Consultant became dominant side in formulating the plan.

Planning practices ascertain existence of public participation was reduced into formal seminar forums for socialization of predetermined draft. Collaboration of power and expertise represented consecutively by BAPPEDA and expert staff institution and Planning Consultant became competent authoritative group in formulation of plan draft. It is really apparent that expert (technical) power possessed by consultant still became instrument of power directing process of plan formulation.

In other situation, capacity of regional government elements, including Council, is vital. Considering the function of Council as the last determiner in making regional decree, the role and function of Council are crucial in encouraging birth of public policies that are participative, democratic and supportive to public interests. Therefore, members of city Council are demanded to possess strong capacity in understanding issues of democratization, legislative technique skill, budgeting, local politics, and political marketing. In connection to failure in legalization of RTRW of Makassar of 2010-2030 Draft in 2012, legislative capacity of Council of Makassar needs to be explored further on the actual performance of Council in producing Regional Decree, which is one of its main functions. In practice, of nine Drafts yet to be discussed, six were the initiative of Council itself, such as Drafts on green open space (RTH), Telecommunication Tower Control, cultural conservation, non smoking area, asset utilization, and alcohol beverage control, still facing problems in legalization process. Based on field observation, it is apparent that the capacity of Council members in producing Regional Decree is poor, even in their own initiative Drafts. In general, complex procedures led to legalization stage of Perda need strong political back up. Thus, it is almost certain that RTRW of Makassar Draft will not run smoothly and finish in short time like other executive initiative Drafts.

Coalition external system events were originated from political situation around Election of Governor of South Sulawesi in 2013 and changes in constellation of coastal region development following publication of Presidential Decree Number 122 Year 2012 on Reclamation of Coastal region and Small Islands Areas, and also momentum of Election of Governor and Deputy Governor of South Sulawesi in 2013. The election is the most actual arena of network of political parties in competing for local political power. In this situation, and also momentum of Election of Governor and Deputy Governor of South Sulawesi in 2013. The election is the most actual arena of network of political parties in competing for local political power. In this situation, and also momentum of Election of Governor and Deputy Governor of South Sulawesi in 2013. The election is the most actual arena of network of political parties in competing for local political power. In this situation, polarization of political support at Provincial Regional Executive Committee (DPD) level will be responded by all institution at party’s structures to work for victory of candidate nominated by concerned party. The arena of Governor and Deputy Governor Election became gambling place of loyalties, dedication, and solidarity of political parties’ cadre that must be paid by sacrificing time, expense, and material. Political parties’ cadre will be tasked to focus on gaining victory for candidate nominated by each political party.

At this point, work and duty focus of Council members will be disturbed by intense party’s tasks. It will be resulted in neglected institutional agenda of Council. Processes of Drafts Discussion will take longer time since quorum of assembly will be harder to acquire. Political map inside Council will also be affected by political parties siding to each candidate. Compromise between political parties supporting different candidates will get tougher. Legislative member will focus more on party’s tasks and negate institutional agenda mandated by the people. Discussion of RTRW Draft will be more neglected due to low commitment of political parties in sending Fraction members to form Special Committee (Pansus).
In discussion of RTRW 2010-2030 Draft following Governor Election 2013, there was a new external constellation that influenced performance of Special Committee on RTRW of Makassar. Due to the long time of discussion, regulation higher in legal hierarchy was born. This regulation was Presidential Decree Number 122 Year 2012 on Reclamation of Coastal region and Small Islands Areas which in stipulation of area zonation prohibited reclamation activity in coastal region utilization. Meanwhile, content of discussed RTRW Draft was tended to allow reclamation activity on development of coastal region area oriented to be global scale business center.

Contestation of ideas and interests between City Government and Council continued on discussion of RTRW of Makassar of 2010-2030 Draft particularly in context of coastal region area utilization plan. Discussion in Special Committee once again ended in a deadlock due to collision of executive interest that was responded differently by legislative. Legislative needed time to dig deeper on the problem in coastal region area utilization, while executive thought Draft proposed to Council had met requirements. Existence of articles in RTRW Draft that allowed legalization of reclamation activity in coastal region area development drew particular attention in conflict of interest between executive and legislative.

Advocacy coalition approach is an institutional arrangement. This approach does not rigidly separate domain of state, market and community institutions. Those administer areas are regarded as intertwined and therefore it will take cohesive understanding and cooperation between the three actor groups. As a medium to extend political participation of citizen in the process of public decision making, existence of coalition is valid and justifiable. This framework employs belief system pattern as mapping focus.

In perspective of advocacy coalition, policy is always affected by internal parameter and external system events. Internal parameters participate in creating political deadlock in appointment and legalization process of RTRW of Makassar of 2010-2030 policy are technocratic approach employed in formulation of plan draft and weakness in legislative capacity of Makassar Council institution. Variables of external system events of coalition are originated from political situation of Governor of South Sulawesi Election in 2013 and changes in constellation of coastal region development following publication of Presidential Decree (Perpres) Number 122 Year 2012 on Reclamation of Coastal region and Small Islands Areas.

As a medium of extending political participation of citizen in public decision making process, existence of coalition is indeed valid and justifiable. This framework employs belief system pattern as focus of mapping. There are three belief systems becoming basis of advocacy coalition, such as: (1) Deep core, reflecting basic ontology and normative belief of values on the role and function of group; (2) Policy core, basic condition and strategy of a coalition. It shows normative basic commitment allowing development of various perceptions in all policy sub-system and domain. This system becomes adhesive that binds all sides into policy problems; (3) secondary aspects, instrument of policy required in implementing policy core.

In context of formulation of RTRW of Makassar of 2010-2030 policy, belief system mapping pattern of each actor consists of the aspect (1) deep core, coalition of supportive actors (pro) in general has organizational and rational characteristics, opposition group (contra) has political value characteristic, while policy broker group is more personal and clustered, (2) policy core, coalition of supportive actors (pro) in general is based on normative stipulation of laws and rational economic, resistance group (contra) as medium of struggle for more just and humane utilization of city space, while policy broker group is more of instrument to encourage participation and legal assurance for city space utilization, (3) secondary aspects, coalition of supportive actors (pro) in general puts spatial plan (RTRW) policy as an instrument of acquiring organizational vision of city government coherent with stipulation of Provincial RTRW that can guarantee assurance of investment activity, for resistance group (contra) city RTRW function as instrument of policy for grassroots to fight for the rights to utilize city space that always takes investor side, while for policy broker group, RTRW is more of instrument for institutionalizing green city and as a guidance for sectoral development policy guarantees balance in ecological and economic dimension in utilizing city space. These differences in belief system will be reflected in form of demand, interest, and behavior forming formation of pro, contra and policy broker coalitions.

The main pillar of decision making in advocacy coalition approach is policy subsystem. Policy subsystem consists of all parties taking part in process of policy formulation, including elements that can be distinguished on the basis of existing belief and resources. These elements are among others iron triangle, interest group, bureaucrat and politician, academic analyst, think tank, researcher himself, and other governmental actors. Advocacy coalition framework (ACF) explains that policy is a product of repression by various interests. In pluralists policy theory, power does not only lie in the hand of formal actor, but is also distributed among many groups, so that public policy is more understood as decision made by many actors. Relationship between these two groups of actor is perceived as reciprocal relation often mediated by existence of broker group.

Ideas from various groups are constructed into one interest. Groups of the same idea construct an alliance (pro) against groups resisting their idea (contra). To enhance influential power in process of policy formulation, various groups with same interest join together into coalitions. In policy process, advocacy coalition compromises actors from all policy subsystem. Advocacy coalition consists of actors from various institutions that equally possess a set of policy belief.

In context of advocacy coalition, supportive (pro) to legalization of Spatial Plan (RTRW) of Makassar of 2010-2030 draft consists of actors in BAPPEDA, City
Government Expert Staff, Planning Consultant, Spatial & Settlement Agency of South Sulawesi, and KADIN of Makassar actors. Resistance (contra) position is picked by Makassar Council with support from civil society groups, such as Indonesian Environmental Society (WALHII) and Environmental Issues Study Forum (FOSIL) with different view on issue of securing city environment. Mediator function comes from civil society organization such as Indonesian Legislative Watch Committee (KOPEL), previously Sulawesi KOPEL, so far active in issues of policy advocacy, critical political education, and empowerment of more democratic regional governance, and Planning Expert Association (IAP) organization, which is a gathering forum of spatial plan professionals (planolog).

When planning viewed as a tool and method in making public decision and action, it is certain that there is political content, so that planning process is always laden with political activities. Existence of political dimension in planning can be viewed as an acceptable reality. Reasons supporting opinion that planning (spatial) cannot be independent from politic are: planning involves many groups of actor with various interests and plan needs legislative process to be legitimized. Excursion towards legalization consensus point must go through institutional interaction based on belief system of each group. Political context in a policy formulation room full of contestation of ideas and interests led to a deadlock demands existence of mediation group in mediating and encouraging birth of compromising point between pro and contra coalitions. This mediation group is not free from ideas and interests that are also contested with the two coalitions.

**CONCLUSION**

Internal parameters taking part in creating political deadlock in the process of appointing and legitimizing policy are technocratic approach selected in formulating plan and weakness in legislative capacity of Makassar Council institution. Meanwhile, coalition external system events are originated from political situation surrounding Governor of South Sulawesi Election in 2013 and changes in constellation of coastal region development following publication of Presidential Decree (Perpres) Number 122 Year 2012 on Reclamation of Coastal region and Small Islands Areas.

Belief system of coalition actors is decorated by existence of multi actors which will be constructed into groups with diverse interests based on each belief system. Mapping of belief system conducted on the basis of deep core, policy core, and secondary aspects criteria shows different actors’ characteristics which affect actors’ responds in the form of demand, interest and behavior shaping pro, contra, and policy broker coalition formations.

Subsystem policy refers to coalitions as products of compromise between actors possessing same belief system over policy formulation process. Group with the same idea forms an alliance (pro) to go against group resisting the idea (contra). Coalition advocacy consists of various institutions equally possessing a set of belief system. a). Pro RTRW Legitimization group comprised of “executive group” and its ranks, consists of BAPPEDA, City Government Expert Staff, Planning Consultant, and Tarkim Agency of South Sulawesi institutions supported by representatives of private sector such as Commerce and Industry Chambers (KADIN), b). Contra RTRW Legitimization group comprised of Makassar Council and, with distinguish consideration, along with environment advocacy NGO such as Indonesia Environmental Society (WALHII) and Energy and Environment Study Forum (FOSIL), c). Policy brokers, comprised of politic advocacy NGO such as Legislative Watch Committee (KOPEL) and Planning Expert Union professional association. This group always cautions the urgency to accelerate legalization of RTRW of Makassar Draft.

In theory, this research employing advocacy coalition framework can be used in research of public policy field. Tradition of cyclic thinking, with top-down or bottom-up options, deploying government agency as dominant actor can be developed by assuming existence actors other than state actor. Advocacy coalition model can also be very prospective to be developed in analyzing complexity of public policy formulation full of conflicts and involving various actor groups.
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