International Journal of Latest Research in Humanities and Social Science (IJLRHSS)
Volume 05 - Issue 12, 2022
www.ijlrhss.com || PP. 312-319

Supporting and Inhibiting Factors in the Implementation of Kelud Mountain Eruption Risk Reduction Policies in East Java

[1]Slamet Muchsin
[1]Faculty of Administrative Sciences, Islamic Univercity of Malang, Indonesia

Abstract: Disaster risk reduction is a new design in developing a framework for reducing risk by emphasizing efforts to empower individuals and communities in dealing with disasters. Disaster risk reduction is a proactive approach that aims to increase the capacity of individuals and communities in mitigation and preparedness to minimize the impact of disaster events so that people have the capacity to survive and recover from disasters in an effort to maintain sustainable livelihoods.In addition, disaster risk reduction is a comprehensive approach to reduce disaster risk, not only at the stage before the disaster occurs, but at every stage of the disaster. As stated in the Hyogo Framework for Action 2005-2015, the expected outcome of this effort is a significant reduction in the level of loss/loss in terms of loss of life, social, economic and environmental assets in communities and countries caused by disasters. For further in-depth and detailed efforts on DRR efforts with the convening of the Sendai framework for disaster risk reduction 2015-2030 in Sendai Japan with the expected results of up to 15 years of significant reduction in risks and losses due to disasters.

The research method used by researchers is qualitative research. At the end of the current decade, it is in great demand by researchers. which contains an explanation of the processes that occur in the local environment. While the research approach uses a descriptive approach.

From the results of research on supporting factors in the Implementation of the Policy for Disaster Risk Reduction at Mount Kelud Eruption in East Java in 2014. It is known that the management of the Mount Kelud eruption disaster provides valuable lessons, because so many elements are involved and many problems arise as a result of disasters, so success in implementation Policy is very much determined by several conditions that must be prepared and deployed as much as possible.

Keywords: implementation, disaster risk, eruption, Mount Kelud

Introduction

The main basis for implementing disaster management in Indonesia refers to Law 24 of 2007 concerning disaster management. Based on these regulations, it was decomposed into several derivative regulations in the form of Government Regulation number 21 of 2008 concerning the implementation of disaster management, Government Regulation number 22 of 2008 concerning funding and management of disaster relief, Government Regulation number 23 of 2008 concerning the participation of international agencies and foreign non-governmental organizations. government in disaster management. The post-2015 Disaster Risk Reduction Framework was adopted during the 3rd World Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction, which was held on 14 -18 March 2015 in Sendai, Miyagi, Japan, which represents a unique opportunity for all countries to: 1) Adopt in a concise, focused, forward-looking, and action-oriented post-2015 disaster risk reduction framework; 2) Complete the assessment and review of the implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action 2005 -2015: Building nation and community resilience to disasters; 3) Consider the experiences gained through regional and national strategies/agencies and planning for disaster risk reduction and their recommendations, as relevant regional agreements in the implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action; 4) Identify modalities of cooperation based on commitments to implement a post-2015 disaster risk reduction framework; 5) Determine the modalities for conducting periodic reviews of the implementation of the post-2015 disaster risk reduction framework (Institutional and regulatory reviews to support disaster management policies in the 2015-2019 RPJMN)

In reality, policy implementation may not run as smoothly as expected, this is because there are factors that influence the success of policy implementation. Factors can come from internal and external supporting factors in addition to internal and external inhibiting factors. In the policy process, there will always be a possibility of discrepancies between what is expected by policy makers and what is actually achieved. This situation by Dunsire (1978) is called the implementation gap. The size of the difference will more or less depend on what William (1971: 1975) calls the implementation capacity of the organization/actor or group of organizations/actors entrusted with carrying out the task of implementing the policy, adherence to decisions, clear management, target groups. appropriate and external environmental factors that support the implementation of these policies. In the context of DRR these characteristics are referred to as supporting environmental factors.

It is stated in Law Number 24 of 2007 concerning disaster management that disaster management activities have undergone a change in the paradigm of disaster management, which so far has used a responsive approach,

shifting its approach to a preventive approach, namely conducting efforts that prioritize disaster risk reduction, through prevention efforts, mitigation and preparedness before a disaster occurs. Meanwhile, the handling involves the three pillars of society, namely the government, the private sector or the business world and the community itself. In line with this, in the view of Community Based Disaster Management (CBBM), Community Based Disaster Management. Disaster management is everyone's business. Prioritizing the participation of the three pillars is highly emphasized because basically it is the people affected by the disaster who feel the consequences the most, of course they themselves are the ones who understand the needs and ways to overcome them the most.

According to Kusumasari (2014) states that in the implementation of disaster risk reduction policies there are mechanisms and stages that are carried out, namely: First, preparedness. The purpose of preparedness is estimates of the needs that will arise if a disaster occurs and ensuring the resources to meet these needs. Disaster preparedness activities include activities for preparing and testing contingency plans, organizing, installing and testing early warning systems. Basic logistics, training and other regular procedures. Second, early warning as a series of data collection and analysis processes that are carried out systematically as well as dissemination of information about the existence of hazards and/or increasing danger situations. Early warning is used to anticipate hazard escalation, develop response/response strategies and for making decisions about the possibility of an imminent disaster. Third, disaster mitigation as actions taken before a disaster occurs with the aim of reducing or eliminating the impact of disasters on society and the environment (King as quoted by Kusumasari, 2014: 22). There are two types of mitigation, namely structural and non-structural. Structural mitigation is defined as a risk reduction effort carried out through development or physical changes through the implementation of designed solutions. Non-structural mitigation includes reducing the possibility or consequence of risk through modifying human or natural behavioral processes, without requiring the use of a designed structure (Kusumasari, 2014:23).

For handling disaster risk reduction policies, it is necessary to carry out inter-regional cooperation in disaster management. Cooperation between local governments (intergovernmental cooperation), is defined as "an arrangement between two or more governments for accomplishing common goals, providing a service or solving a mutual problem" (Patterson, 2008). This definition implies that there is a common interest that encourages two or more local governments to provide joint services or solve problems together. Or in other words, these arrangements are joint arrangements, which of course have different characteristics compared to self-regulation (internal regions). The nature of cooperation is often interpreted as voluntary, but that does not mean arbitrary, because cooperation has certain goals and targets that must be achieved by the parties working together.

Pusparini (2014) with the title "The Role of Local Government in the Management of Victims of the Mount Kelud Natural Disaster in Nglegok District, Blitar Regency." The government has an active role for victims of natural disasters from pre-disaster, emergency response to post-disaster. Government preparedness is an important stage in natural disaster management. The results showed that the local government's role in managing the Mount Kelud natural disaster in the Nglegok sub-district, Blitar district, was very good. This is evident from the absence of victims due to the Mount Kelud natural disaster. Residents of Nglegok sub-district are also very cooperative in dealing with disasters. So that the evacuation can run smoothly without a hitch.

Since the 15th century, Mount Kelud has been actively erupting. The eruptions in 1586 and 1919 were recorded as the eruptions that claimed the most lives. While in the 20th and 21st centuries, Mount Kelud erupted in 1901, 1919, 1951, 1966, 1990 and 2007. (Primus Supriyono, 2014). On February 13, 2014, the recent eruption of Mount Kelud occurred which caused loss of both property and lives, around 201,228 people were evacuated from Blitar, Kediri and Malang Regencies. Mount Kelud is a volcano located on the island of Java. Administratively, Mount Kelud is located in Kediri, Blitar and Malang Regencies, East Java Province, while geographically it is located at 7°56' South Latitude and 112°18'30" East Longitude with a peak elevation of 1,113.9 m above sea level (asl) . This volcano is strato-shaped which is classified as an active volcano type A with freato-magmatic to magmatic properties.

BPBD data for East Java Province stated that the East Java authorities ended the province's state of emergency status on February 22 and at the same time declared a new provincial emergency status to respond to the threat of cold lava flows at Mount Kelud. In total, at least 8,452 houses were damaged in Kediri, Blitar and Malang Regencies. BNPB has handed over IDR 4 billion (approximately US$351,354) of emergency funds as well as logistics equipment with a total value of IDR 3.8 billion (approximately US$333,787). The success of the Government of East Java and local governments affected by the eruption of Mount Kelud is a signification of efforts to implement disaster risk reduction policies. (http://indonesia.humanitarianresponse.info | www.unocha.org.)

Physiographical factors in the East Java region are not the only factors that play a role in increasing the vulnerability of the area. The rapid advancement of technology and the increasing population are suspected to be other influential factors. The rapid growth of industry and technological advances in this province, which are essentially aimed at boosting regional economic growth, in fact have an impact on increasing the threat of disasters in the area. (Attachment to East Java Governor Regulation Number 1 of 2015). In implementing disaster

management, BNPB carries out a coordination function with the relevant Ministries/Institutions in accordance with their duties, principals and functions. In carrying out its functions, BNPB is supported by a steering committee with 19 (nineteen) members consisting of 10 (ten) government officials and nine professionals. Members of the steering committee from government officials consist of: (1) Coordinating Ministry for People's Welfare, (2) Ministry of Home Affairs, (3) Ministry of Social Affairs, (4) Ministry of Public Works, (5) Ministry of Health, (6) Ministry of Finance, (7) Ministry of Transportation, (8) Ministry of Energy and Resources.

In handling disasters, inter-regional cooperation is a new perspective for Regional Governments to strive for an effective form of cooperation, an effort that so far has been sidelined in the pattern of disaster management management. Various forms of cooperation agreements between governors and governors, cooperation agreements between governors and regents/mayors, cooperation agreements between regents/mayors and other regents/mayors, as well as cooperation agreements between governors, regents/mayors and third parties (Departments/Non-Departmental Government Agencies, Private companies that are legal entities, BUMN, BUMD, foundations, and other domestic institutions that are legal entities), will be an important capital in future disaster management efforts. Regional autonomy should be able to respond to better disaster management mechanisms, not add to the long bureaucratic lines.

Regional autonomy should exist as a system capable of overcoming the mismanagement of disasters that have occurred so far. On the other hand, the implementation of disaster management efforts really needs policies that are really easy and fast to implement, without having to have a conflict of interest that hinders and harms the disaster management efforts themselves. Therefore the problem at the normative level is the change in paradigm or approach, which so far has used a responsive approach, shifting its approach to a preventive approach, namely doing business that prioritizes disaster risk reduction, through prevention, mitigation and preparedness before a disaster occurs as mandated UU no. 24 of 2007 concerning disaster management.

In addition to this, synchronization of policies for determining the responsibilities and authorities of the Central Government and Regional Governments in disaster management, which has been regulated in more detail in Law no. 24 of 2007, must also be explicitly stated in Law no. 32 of 2004, which has been replaced by Law number 23 of 2014 concerning Regional Government, especially regarding the policy of distributing governmental Affairs. So that in the future, the National Disaster Management Agency (BNPB) and the Regional Disaster Management Agency (BPBD) will really carry out their disaster management functions properly. Coordination and cooperation between all actors is an important issue in disaster management. In a normal situation, BNPB and BPBD both at the central and regional levels carry out the function of coordinating and implementing prevention, mitigation and preparedness activities. In an emergency situation BNPB and BPBD carry out the function of commanding, coordinating and at the same time implementing emergency activities. Furthermore, in a post-disaster situation, BNPB and BPBD returned to carrying out their functions in terms of coordinating and implementing recovery, while the functions that were the responsibility of sectoral agencies were still carried out by their respective sectors. (Renas PB 2015-2019)

Research Method

The type of research used by researchers is a type of qualitative research at the end of the current decade, it is in great demand by researchers, this is because qualitative data is very unique and interesting, not only in the form of a series of words and numbers (numeric) but is a source of broad descriptions. and in depth which contains an explanation of the processes that occur in the local environment. While the research approach uses a descriptive approach. In qualitative analysis it is intended to develop a thorough and comprehensive description of the phenomenon under study, which is then known as a broad description (Geertz 1973, Denzin 1978). As opposed to simple adverbs which simply state 'facts', Denzin shows that broad descriptions include information about the context of the action, the intentions and meanings that govern the action, and its subsequent evolution (Denzin 1978: 33). In this case the description includes the context of the action, the intention of the actor, and the process in which the action is embedded.

Furthermore, such as the statement of Miles and Hubermas that "words, especially when they are organized into incidents or stories, have a concrete, vivid, meaningful flavor that often proves for more concisting to a reader-another research, a major policy, a practitioner-than pages of numbers" (Miles and Huberman, 1984: 15). In line with this statement, Lofland and Lofland also stated: "Qualitative observation or direct observation, participant observation refers to the process in which an investigator establishes and sustains a many sided and relatively long term relationship with a human association in natural setting for the purpose of developing in scientific understanding of that association" (Lofland and Lofland, 198: 12). Based on these assumptions, the basis of this research uses a descriptive approach, it is hoped that this research can describe the reality of the research object and give meaning to the object under study. Even the opinion of Straus and Corbin (2003) states that this research also uncovers and understands something behind the newly discovered phenomenon. Thus it means that the descriptive approach will contribute to the development of the theory of the object under study.

Results and Discussion

Supporting Factors for the Implementation of the Mount Kelud Eruption Disaster Risk Reduction Policy

From the results of research on supporting factors in the Implementation of the Policy for Disaster Risk Reduction at Mount Kelud Eruption in East Java in 2014. It is known that the management of the Mount Kelud eruption disaster provides valuable lessons, because so many elements are involved and many problems arise as a result of disasters, so success in implementation Policy is very much determined by several conditions that must be prepared and deployed as much as possible. Quoting Dunsire's (1978) opinion, policy implementation does not run smoothly in reality, because there are factors that influence the success of policy implementation. In the policy process, there will always be a possibility of discrepancies between what is expected by policy makers and what is actually achieved. This situation by Andrew Dunsire (1978) is called the implementation gap. The size of the difference will more or less depend on what William (1971; 1975) calls the implementation capacity of the organization/actor or group of organizations/actor entrusted with the task of implementing the policy.

The results of the study obtained information that the main supporting factors in the implementation of disaster risk reduction policies for the 2014 Mount Kelud eruption were as follows:

First, support the commitment of legislation from the Central and Regional Governments. Availability of Regulations as a reference for the implementation of disaster management policies that have been issued by the Central and Regional Governments which are sufficiently adequate. Law number 24 of 2007, PP number 21 of 2008 and regulations under it that support the Law on disaster management.

Second, strengthening the capacity of local government and community resources and institutions. One of the supporting factors so that disaster management planning based on risk management can be taken into consideration or integrated into regional development planning is by increasing public commitment through increasing the capacity of government and community resources and institutions.

Third, community participation and preparedness through the many kelud caring communities that are members of the 'Jangkar Kelud' community. Anchor Kelud provides a very meaningful support for events that may occur when needed to carry out strategic steps that need to be taken to deal with all threats and risks when Mount Kelutr carries out its activities that cause casualties. Formation of the TRC Team, Formation of a Disaster Resilient Village, Formation of the Village and District Disaster Management Task Force, Formation of the BRC Team and Socialization of the Third School Pen, Regional Potential, for example Malang Regency has natural potential that can be used as a tourism area, besides that many investors are investing, this can be seen from the large number of large companies that have invested capital to invest in former disaster areas such as Mount Kelud which has become a tourist area that has attracted a lot of interest from both domestic and foreign tourists and has even become an area for conducting research in the area.

Fourth, inter-regional cooperation. The disaster that occurred later had an impact on the region, not just one area but many affected areas, so to deal with the impact of a disaster, collaboration between regions is needed.

Fifth, human resource support, facilities and infrastructure as well as funding. The competency of apparatus and personnel involved in disaster management must be increased so that personal professionalism can be relied upon in disaster management. Availability of adequate facilities and infrastructure in order to anticipate the occurrence of disasters and completeness in emergency measures must be available. Availability of a budget allocated to adequate disaster management interests so that the need for funding, especially ready-to-use funds (DSP) in disaster management is available.

The six geographical conditions and regional positions. The geographical position and condition factor of a disaster-affected area makes a very significant contribution, because in the geographical situation the area is very easily accessible by means of transportation which will provide convenience and success in handling the impact of the disaster.

Seventh, socio-economic conditions and regional progress. The condition of a community with well-established and prosperous socio-economic conditions also contributes to the success and ease of handling and accelerating the recovery and normalization of the lives of people affected by disasters.

Factors inhibiting the implementation of the Mount Kelud eruptionRisk Reduction Policy

The inhibiting factor for the implementation of the Mount Kelud eruption DRR policy is that in practice there is always a discrepancy between implementing regulations and the reality on the ground. Obstacles that occur are identified by researchers as follows:

First, Limited support and Budget Allocation. Based on a secondary data study from the 2014 Malang Regency RKPD and 2014 APBD Renja that the disaster budget, especially in BPBD, is closely related to the field of Prevention and Preparedness which supports risk reduction programs disaster is only 26% of the BPBD budget ceiling, routine spending at the secretariat is 43%, while quite large funds are allocated for handling emergency and post-disaster response by 31% plus ready-to-use funds of 1 billion and unexpected funds (which are in the

revenue service) of 2.5 billion, this illustrates that the budget is still prioritized for disaster management during and after a disaster occurs.

Second, the limited human resources of the BPBD apparatus. As a new agency, the number of employees at BPBD is felt to be inadequate in proportion to the volume and workload being carried out, even though ideally employees placed in BPBD are employees who have special competence and are adequate in number, this is because even though the program and activities at BPBD are included in social affairs, but in the field that handles emergency and post-disaster response, employees who have technical skills are needed. Not to mention that because of the subjective and non-technical nature of the BPBD, it seems that the BPBD is a "dumping" place for employees from other SKPDs without considering the quality, integrity and competence of the employee concerned, as a result of which the employee's performance is not optimal.

Third, weak coordination, synchronization, synergy and consistency of programs and activities vertically and horizontally. This is closely related to the consistency and continuity of a program and activities from the center, provinces to regions (districts/cities). In fact, the programs and activities carried out by the BPBD have only touched the sub-district level and only a few have reached the villages, and even then only villages are in a very high category of disaster-prone. This has an impact on the achievement of performance indicators for a program/activity, all of this is a result of the lack of clarity from the center in describing the goals/objectives and the outcomes it wants to achieve, so that the regions have a bit of difficulty in making them happen. Besides that, disaster risk reduction program efforts, which should be supported by massive DRR programs and activities from the central and provincial levels, are in fact still very minimal, so that DRR is only a "jargon" without any real realization. There are many factors behind this, even at the central level this is still happening, the lack of understanding and awareness and concern for DRR issues is a determining factor for the attitude taken by relevant officials. DRR itself, and regions are also affected by things like this. The coordination carried out is not pro-active, meaning that because the leading PB sector is BPBD so that new initiatives from BPBD while other SKPDs are still passive, there are PB activities that are specifically in other SKPDs based on considerations in accordance with their duties and functions, also triggers the emergence of sectoral egos so that the activities carried out are partial, not synergistic and synchronous so that the impact of integrating DRR into development planning is quite a difficult task to realize.

Fourth, the absence of legal products and specific forums on disaster risk reduction. The urgent direction from the center to the regions related to disaster risk reduction is to immediately issue legal regulations and establish a Disaster Risk Reduction platform. And the Regional Government of Malang Regency has not made a policy to make disaster risk maps and their studies, even the Disaster Risk Reduction document that has been facilitated by BNPB is not necessarily used as a reference by all stakeholders in implementing Disaster Reduction Plans, even though this document can also be used as a reference for mainstreaming Disaster Risk Reduction in regional development planning documents.

Fifth, the lack of community involvement in disaster management planning. This trend can be seen through the musrenbang implementation mechanism, where the number of proposals submitted is still minimal and tends to be dominant in physical development proposals such as roads, bridges and drainage. Their active participation in other accesses such as through the media and forums is also still minimal, only forums that care when a disaster occurs, and even then the number is still small. Even though the Malang Regency website and e-mail, especially BPBD, can be accessed, but it is not effective either, in this case community participation in the development planning process is still very passive. So there needs to be assistance and facilitation efforts so that space and access to participation for the community can be channeled.

Thus, various obstacles as factors that influence the failure of the above implementation should be improved so that they can be resolved properly. One simple way to solve the above deficiencies is to increase the intensity of continuous and comprehensive outreach to all levels of society regarding the aims and objectives of the disaster management program, so that the community will clearly understand which in turn the community will feel that they belong and understand and benefit from it. efforts to increase community capacity in dealing with disasters.

Various components contained in the implementation are the factors that cause the success and failure of a policy implementation. Hogwood and Gunn (1986) differentiate into two categories namely; First, non implementation (not implemented). This means that a policy is not implemented according to plan. This failure is caused by internal factors in the implementation of the policy, for example the actors/parties involved in the implementation do not want to cooperate, work inefficiently or half-heartedly, do not understand the problems and these problems are beyond the reach of their powers. So that the implementation effectively difficult to fulfill. Second, unsuccessful implementation (implementation that was not successful). This happens due to unfavorable external conditions, for example natural disasters, economic crises so that they fail to realize the desired impact or end result.

Based on an analysis of the results of research in the field describing the involvement of multiple actors who play a role in the implementation of the Mount Kelud eruption Disaster Risk Reduction policy. The involvement of actors through mechanisms in the pattern of disaster management with activities and programs according to the cycle or stages of the disaster. In general, in relation to the implementation of disaster risk reduction policies for the 2014 Mount Kelud eruption, there is still much to be perfected by policy makers, synergy and collaboration between stakeholders needs to be given space to be actively and dynamically involved in managing disasters that occur simultaneously and coordinated.

Refinement of the ideal model in the implementation of the Disaster Risk Reduction policy provides a way to achieve success in implementing the Mount Kelud eruption Disaster Risk Reduction policy which must be supported by community and community participation, human resources, facilities and infrastructure and adequate funding, conducive inter-regional cooperation and support for strengthening local government institutional capacity, legislative support and commitment from both central and regional officials so that this policy is successful in reducing disaster risk, geographical location and regional position, socio-economic conditions and regional progress are factors that drive success in the implementation of disaster risk reduction policies.

Conclusion

Supporting and inhibiting factors in the implementation of disaster risk reduction policies for the eruption of Mount Kelud in East Java. The results of the study obtained information that the supporting and inhibiting factors in the implementation of disaster risk reduction policies for the 2014 Mount Kelud eruption were as follows:

a. Supporting factors.

First, the policy in the form of Law number 24 of 2007 concerning disaster management which was followed up with the issuance of regional regulations (perda) regarding disasters in the regions as a legal umbrella in the implementation of disaster management.

Second, Resource and Institutional Capacity. One of the supporting factors so that disaster management planning based on risk management can be taken into consideration or integrated into regional development planning is by increasing public commitment through increasing the capacity of its resources and institutions.

Third, community participation and preparedness through the many kelud caring communities that are members of the "Jangkar Kelud" community. Anchor Kelud provides a very meaningful support for events that may occur when needed to carry out strategic steps that need to be taken to deal with all threats and risks when Mount Kelud carries out its activities which cause casualties.

Fourth, the support of facilities and infrastructure as well as inter-regional cooperation contributed to the success in handling the Mount Kelud eruption in 2014.

b. Obstacle factor

First, Limited support and Budget Allocations, Based on secondary data studies from the Local Government Work Plans (RKPD) of Malang, Blitar and Kediri Regencies in 2014 and the 2014 APBD Renja that the disaster budget especially in BPBD which is closely related to the field of Prevention and Preparedness that supports the reduction program disaster risk BPBD budget is limited, the rest is routine spending at the BPBD secretariat, while quite large funds are allocated for handling emergency and post-disaster response.

Second, the limited human resources of the BPBD apparatus. As a new agency, the number of employees at BPBD is felt to be inadequate in proportion to the volume and workload being carried out, even though ideally employees placed in BPBD are employees who have special competence and are adequate in number, this is because even though the program and activities at BPBD are social affairs, but in the field that handles emergency and post-disaster response, employees who have technical skills are needed.

Third, weak coordination, synchronization, synergy and consistency of programs and activities vertically and horizontally. This is closely related to the consistency and continuity of a program and activities from the central, provincial to regional (district/city). In fact, the programs and activities carried out by the BPBD have only touched the sub-district level and only a few have reached the villages, and even then only villages are in a very high category of disaster-prone. This has an impact on the achievement of performance indicators for a program/activity, all of this is a result of the lack of clarity from the center in describing the goals/objectives and the outcomes it wants to achieve, so that the regions have a bit of difficulty in making them happen.

Fourth, the absence of legal products and specific forums on disaster risk reduction. The urgent direction from the center to the regions related to disaster risk reduction is to immediately issue legal regulations and establish a Disaster Risk Reduction platform. And the Regional Government of Malang Regency has not made a policy to make disaster risk maps and their studies, even the Disaster Risk Reduction document that has been facilitated by BNPB is not necessarily used as a reference by all stakeholders in implementing Disaster Risk

Reduction, even though this document can also be used as a reference for disaster risk reduction. mainstreaming Disaster Risk Reduction in regional development planning documents.

Fifth, the lack of community involvement in disaster management planning. This trend can be seen through the musrenbang implementation mechanism, where the number of proposals submitted is still minimal and tends to be dominant in physical development proposals such as roads, bridges and drainage. Their active participation in other accesses such as through the media and forums is also still minimal, only forums that care when a disaster occurs, and even then the number is still small.

References

[1]. Amy Donovan, Clive Oppenheimer (2013). Science, policy and place in volcanic disasters:Insights from Montserrat. University of Cambridge, Department of Geography, Downing Place, Cambridge CB2 3EN, United Kingdom. journalhomepage:www.elsevier.com/locate/envsci.

[2]. A. Zaennudin, Deden Wahyudin, Mamay Surmayadi, and E. Kusdinar (2012). Forecast of the danger of the Ijen Volcano eruption in East Java. Hazard assessment of Ijen volcanic eruption in East Java. Journal of Environment and Geological Disasters, Vol. 3 No. 2 August 2012: 109-132 Geological Agency Jln. Diponegoro 57 Bandung.

[3]. National Disaster Management Agency, (2011). http://www.bnpb.go.id. (accessed January 11, 2012).

[4]. Bevaola Kusumasari (2012). Network organisation in supporting post-disaster management in Indonesia. Department of Management, Faculty of Business and Economics, Monash University, Caulfield East, Australia. International Journal of Emergency Services.Vol. 1 No. 1, 2012 pp. 71-85, Emerald Group Publishing Limited 2047-0894 71 DOI 10.1108/20470891211239326

[5]. Ebru Caymaz , Fehmi Volkan Akyon, Fahri Erenel. A model proposal for efficient disaster management: the Turkish sample (2013). The International Strategic Management Conference. Marmara University,stanbul, 34180, Turkey 1877-0428 © 2013 The Authors. Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University, Çanakkale, 17100, Turkey stanbul Kemerburgaz University, Istanbul, 34317, Turkey.Published by Elsevier Ltd. Open access under CC BY-NC-ND license. Selection and peer-review under responsibility of the International Strategic Management Conference.doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.10.531. Available online at www.sciencedirect.com

[6]. Einar Pétur Heiðarson, Haukur Ingi Jónasson, Helgi Thor Ingason (2014). Geographical Sovereignty in Times of Crisis: The Eyjafjallajökull Eruption and the International Community from a Project Management Perspective . Reykjavik University, Menntavegi 1, 101 Reykjavik, Iceland

[7]. Karam Mustapha, Hamid Mcheick, Sehl Mellouli. (2013). Modeling and Simulation Agent-Based of Natural Disaster Complex Systems . The 4th International Conference on Emerging Ubiquitous Systems and Pervasive Networks (EUSPN-2013) . 1877-0509 © 2013 The Authors. Published by Elsevier B.V. Selection and peer-review under responsibility of Elhadi M. Shakshuki doi: 10.1016/j.procs.2013.09.021. Université du Québec à Chicoutim, 555 Boulevard Université,G7H2B1, Québec, Canada. Université de Laval, 2325 Rue de l'Université, G1k 0A6, Quebec, PQ, Canada.

[8]. Ma'arif, Syamsul. (2010). Introduction to Disaster Management in Indonesia, Course Introduction, delivered at the College of Universal War Strategy, Jakarta Defense University. Marcia Regina Santiago Scarpin, Renata de Oliveira Silva (2014). Humanitarian logistics: empirical evidence from a natural disaster. Humanitarian Technology: Science, Systems and Global Impact 2014, HumTech 2014.

[9]. Fundação Getulio Varga, Av. 9 de Julho, 2029, Bela Vista, São Paulo - SP | 01313-902 Brazil. Fundação Getulio Varga, Av. 9 de Julho, 2029, Bela Vista, São Paulo - SP | 01313-902 | Brazil.

[10]. Maarif, Syamsul (2010). Disaster and Response. Overview of Sociological Aspects. Journal of Disaster Management Dialogue Vol.1 No.1. p.1-72010.

[11]. Miles, Metthew B, A. Michael Huberman and Johnny Saldana. 2014. Qualitative Data Analysis, A Methods Sourcebook, Third Edition. Sage Publications, Inc.

[12]. Nurjannah, et al. (2012). Disaster Management. Bandung: Alphabet

[13]. Neneng Chairiah, Saut Aritua H. Sagala (2010). The Process of Establishing Multi-Disaster Risk on Actors in Lembang. Case Studies in Lembang Village and Gudang Village, Kahuripan. Journal of Regional and City Planning B SAPPK V3N1 | 83

[14]. O'Toole, Laurence J., Jr., Meier, Kenneth J., 2004, "Intergovermental Management", Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 01 – Oct – 2004

[15]. Sarwidi; 2012. Mount Merapi Disaster Management based on the National Disaster Management System (The management of Merapi Volvano Disaster Based On The Nationjal Disaster management System. DPPM UII

[16]. Samantha Jones, Katie J Oven, Bernard Manyena, Komal Aryal.(2014) Governance struggles and policy processes in disaster risk reduction: A case study from Nepal. Geography Department, Northumbria

University, Newcastle NE1 8ST, United Kingdom Department of Geography and the Institute of Hazard, Risk and Resilience, Durham University, Science Laboratories, South Road, Durham DH1 3LE, United Kingdom . Journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/geoforum

[17]. Singhealth. 2014. Basic Disaster Management Support, Singapore

[18]. Supriyono, Primus. 2014. Volcano Eruption Disaster Risk Reduction Education Series. Publisher Andi Yogyakarta.

[19]. Suwitri, Sri (2008). Policy Network in Public Policy Formulation. A Study on the Formulation of Flood and Rob Management Policies for the City Government of Semarang (Published in the Delegation Journal, Journal of Administrative Sciences, STIA Banjarmasin, Vol. VI No. 3, January 2008, Accredited to Kep Director General of Higher Education No. 56/DIKTI/KEP/2005)

[20]. Tuswadi, Takehiro Hayashi.(2013). Disaster Prevention Education in Merapi Volcano Area Primary Schools: Focusing on Students' Perception and Teachers' Performance . Available online at www.sciencedirect.com.

[21]. The 4th International Conference on Sustainable Future for Human Security, SustaiN 2013. Graduate School for International Development and Cooperation , Hiroshima University, 1-5-1 Kagamiyama, Higashi Hiroshima, 739-8529, Japan.

[22]. Ulum, M, Chazienul. (2014) "Disaster Management" an introduction to a proactive approach. UB Press.

[23]. USAID. 2013. Community Resilience: Conceptual Framework and Measurement Feed the Future Learning Agenda

[24]. Wasisto Raharjo Jati. Disaster Management Analysis Based on Cultural Theory Perspective. (2012). Department of Politics and Government, Fisipol Ugm. Journal of Disaster Management Vol. 4, No. 1 of 2013 p. 1-1. Jalan Sosio Yustisio No. 2, Bulaksumur Yogyakarta-55281. E-Mail: Wasisto.Raharjo@Mail.Ugm.Ac.Id.

[25]. Zainuddin et al. 2013. The eruption of Mount Kelud in 690 ± 110 years ago was a very powerful eruption and had a huge impact on the Majapahit Kingdom. Journal of Environment and Geological Disasters, Vol. 4 No. August 2, 2013: 117 – 133.