

# PUBLIC HOUSING MANAGEMENT: REVIEW OF RUSUNAWA POLICY IN CIMAHI CITY, INDONESIA

**Deden Hadi Kushendar, Universitas Padjadjaran**

**Budiman Rusli, Universitas Padjadjaran**

**Entang Adhy Muhtar, Universitas Padjadjaran**

**Candradewini, Universitas Padjadjaran**

## ABSTRACT

*This study aims to provide pieces of evidence on how the lack of management and policy actors' integration in housing management and services has resulted in the poor quality of housing provisions, taking management policy for public housing in Indonesia. This study will only examine the implementation of policies regarding the management of public rental housing managed by local governments in Indonesia. The study was a case study by using a qualitative approach on three Rusunawa managed by Cimahi City Government. The study was conducted from November 2019 to January 2020. The data were obtained through observation and supported with official documents of Rusunawa management. Based on the observation, this study has resulted that the implementation of Rusunawa management policy following Cimahi City Regional Regulation number 12 of 2014 has not realized sustainable housing due to several indications, namely many tenants are unable to pay monthly rent cost for Rusunawa units (Sarusunawa), a short-rental period; which is only two years and can only be extended for another year, lack of human and financial resources for Rusunawa maintenance; infrastructures; facilities; and utility upgrades, a nonfunctional website for public information and communication media, and unsupportive social circumstances and political factors in implementing Rusunawa management policy. These results demonstrated several needs for public housing management policy to success that are: the need for management policy adjustment of Rusunawa with the social and economic conditions of the community; the need for commitment and assistance from stakeholders to maintain financial and human resources in managing Rusunawa; the need for website optimization as the media for information and communication; and the need to alter the organizational structure of Rusunawa to be more independent.*

**Keywords:** Policy Implementation, Management, Public Housing, Public Administration.

## INTRODUCTION

The new urban agenda concept is the UN-Habitat's vision (Golubchikov & Badyina, 2012; United Nations, 2016; United Nations, 2017) to assure people's access to proper and affordable housing as well as increased slum upgrades by 2030. All nations that joined in the UN-Habitat III Conference in Quito-Ecuador in October 2016 agreed to promote Sustainable Development Goals, particularly Goal Number 11. New urban agenda urges member states of the United Nations to prioritize housing as one of the top concerns in their government agendas through five policy concepts, namely (a) creating a framework of integrated housing; (b) adopting an inclusive approach; (c) an expansion of affordable housing; (d) fixing housing

condition; and (e) enhancing informal settlement to achieve sustainable housing (United Nations, 2016).

The new urban agenda serves the paradigm change in urban housing. The standard and principles arranged starting from planning, constructing, developing, managing, and increasing urban area through five pillars of implementation, namely national urban policy; city management and establishment; city planning and design; the local economy and regional budget; and local implementation (United Nations, 2017). Hence, every nation must apply the standard and principles in mobilizing resources at all government layers (regional to national) and civil organizations, private sectors, constituent groups, and all stakeholders to realize the vision of the new urban agenda through sustainable housing. Several developing countries in Asia that have implemented the concept are Malaysia (Mahamud & Hasbullah, 2012; Marianata, 2014; Olanrewaju & Woon, 2017; Prasajo, 2014), Cambodia (Talocci & Boano, 2018), and China (Deng et al., 2011; Duan, 2011; Niu, 2008; Qin et al., 2017; Dyastari et al., 2017).

Implementing sustainable urban housing in developing countries, especially countries in Asia, still leaves problems, particularly regarding the two pillars of sustainable housing: adequate and affordable, yet to be solved. It is due to the high rate of urbanization and population growth. The impact is that the number of houses available is not sufficient for the community's needs or what is known as a backlog. Therefore, public housing is one of several strategies to cover the backlog, including in Indonesia. The most important thing is the Regional Government's support to manage, provide resources, and involve various parties, especially the community.

Public housing in Indonesia is known as Rumah Susun Sederhana Sewa or Rusunawa (essentially means low-cost apartment buildings), which were massively built during the President Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono administration in 2004 with the Seribu Tower program (Prayitno et al., 2012). Rusunawa is one of several strategies to reduce backlogs in urban areas. The Central Statistics Agency (BPS), through the National Socio-Economic Survey in 2015, reported that the number of backlogs in Indonesia was 13.5 million houses, with the highest number of backlogs being in West Java Province with a total of 2.32 million houses. Concerning the number, the West Java Government issued the Governor Regulation (Pergub) Number 50 of 2013, which underlies the issuance of Rusunawa management policy in Cimahi city through the Regional Regulation (Perda) Number 12 of 2014, which replaces the Regional Regulation Number 9 of 2004, along with the construction of Rusunawa Cigugur in 2004, using the Central Government budget through the Seribu Tower program.

Population growth and a high level of urbanization (Rondinelli, 1990) are the main issues in Cimahi city. Rusunawa is arguably one of the various ways to accommodate housing needs, especially for low-income families. Cimahi city is included in Bandung Raya Metropolitan according to delineation analysis (WJP-MDM, 2013). The backlog in Cimahi city could escalate, along with the growing price of land for housing. The Rusunawa, managed by the Cimahi City Government, include 1) Rusunawa Cigugur, 2) Rusunawa Cibeureum, and 3) Rusunawa Leuwigajah. The number of Rusunawa units (Sarusunawa) in the three Rusunawa is 845 units and regulated in Regional Regulation of Cimahi No. 12/2014 about the management of Rusunawa. Cimahi city has limited resources, especially human and financial resources. Consequently, it is necessary to have the right policies by increasing the management organization's capacity, the collaborative synergy of all related parties, and social and political support in the management of Rusunawa in Cimahi city.

The issues identified when the management policy for Rusunawa in Cimahi city is hard to implement. First, management's inconsistency in choosing residents, making it difficult for

the residents to pay monthly rent. Second, Sarusunawa's renting period is short, only two years, and can only be extended for another year. Third, lack of infrastructure, facilities, and utilities (PSU) adequacy and maintenance in the Rusunawa. At last, the unavailability of technology as the media of public information and communication. This research aims to explore the policy implementation results for the Rusunawa in Cimahi city of West Java, Indonesia, as the material for a policy review based on the Regional Regulation of Cimahi No. 9/2004 and renewed through Regional Regulation of Cimahi No. 12/2014 about the management of Rusunawa. The paper will also explain the literature review on the policy implementation framework, the methodology, findings and discussion, and conclusions with recommendations for the public housing management policy or Rusunawa.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

Regarding the Indonesian Government's commitment to meeting the needs of the place, the issuance of Law (UU) Number 1 of 2011 concerning Housing and Settlement Areas was carried out. The law referred to, considering point (d), which states that "the Government realizes that regional growth and development carried out in Indonesia still does not consider the balance for the interests of low-income families, resulting in difficulties for people to obtain decent and affordable housing". Furthermore, housing services by the government in the era of regional autonomy with the existence of several principles of regional autonomy, especially the principle of decentralization, according to Law Number 23 of 2014 concerning Regional Government, in Article 12, paragraph (1) point (d) states that "*Public Housing and Settlement Areas are mandatory government affairs related to basic services*".

To provide housing has always been on the agenda of every government period in Indonesia. It is because housing is an important matter that must be served by the government. Since before Indonesia's independence until President Jokowi's administration period, which is stated in Nawacita or priority work programs, for example, the one million houses program for MBR (low-income families) (Shirleyana et al., 2018; Subaktiawan & Fauziah, 2017).

The shortage of houses or backlogs continues to increase every year. The Secretary of the Coordinating Ministry for People's Welfare said that the housing shortage in Indonesia is as many as 700 thousand houses per year, and the area of slum areas is estimated to continue to increase from 54 thousand hectares in 2004 to 57 thousand hectares in 2009 (Prayitno et al., 2012). The thing that concerns the Government of Indonesia is that the need for housing annually reaches 800 thousand to 1 million housing units. At the same time, the government and developers' ability is only 400 thousand houses per year. Hence, the problem of meeting housing needs for low-income people (MBR) in Indonesia, in terms of the number of houses to be built, must be resolved (Directorate General of Budget Ministry of Finance, 2015).

The data backlog is discussed heavily because the data from each related government agency regarding the backlog is distinct. First, the Ministry of Industry says the number of backlogs in Indonesia is 8.2 million houses. Second, the Ministry of National Development Planning states that the number of backlogs is 9 million houses. Third, the Central Statistics Agency (BPS) illustrates that based on their survey data in 2010, of the total population of 240 million, the national backlog figure was recording 22%, which means as many as 13.6 million households were homeless. Lastly, referring to the National Socio-Economic Survey (Susenas) results, Indonesia's backlog is 13.5 million houses. Meanwhile, frequently used data, as reported by the Ministry of Public Works and Public Housing (PUPR), shows that Indonesia's backlog

reached 13.5 million housing units in 2010 and decreased to 11,378 million houses in 2015 (Directorate General of Budget Ministry of Finance, 2015). Based on these data, the backlog will continue to increase if the government's ability to provide housing is constant (Agus et al., 2002; Sumirat, 2020; Tallocci & Boano, 2018). Thus, Rusunawa (Gilbert, 2015) is expected to reduce the backlog of Indonesia's urban area (Rondinelli, 1990; Setiadi, 2014; Setiadi, 2015).

The Central Government puts effort to overcome the housing backlog in Indonesia. It is as illustrated in the road map for housing policy reform in Indonesia, which is contained in the medium-term development plan (RPJM) for 2015–2019 (Ministry of National Development Planning/Bappenas, 2015:4) through the construction of apartments (Rusun), as many as 1.21 million housing units with a target of 40% for low-income families. The simple vertical housing provided in the forms of either owned or known as Rumah Susun Sederhana Milik or Rusunami (owned low-cost apartment units) or rental system, which is known as Rumah Susun Sederhana Sewa (Rusunawa). Fulfilling housing needs through the Rusun (Director of Settlements and Housing Ministry of National Development Planning / Bappenas, 2015) is a strategy to address land limitations due to increased housing needs caused by the population growth and increased urbanization (Tunas & Peresthu, 2010; Ward, 2012), as well as an increase in slum areas in Indonesia (Dewita et al., 2018; Hoffman et al., 1992; Prayitno et al., 2012; Indah, 2014). Furthermore, with the increasingly high land price in urban areas, it is more complex to own a house, especially for low-income families, which is also the case in Cimahi city.

## METHODS

This research will only examine the implementation of policies regarding the management of public rental houses managed by local governments in Indonesia. The research question that must be answered in this research is how the implementation of the management policy of Rusunawa in Cimahi City, to answer the research question, the researcher must get data from the right source and know thoroughly and deeply the various elements involved in the management of the Rusunawa in Cimahi City. The design used in this study is a qualitative approach (Yin, 2016; Creswell & Poth, 2018), on the grounds that this approach is able to explore, investigate, and reveal meaning to build a deep understanding of the various dimensions of social life, which where this research is about the management of rental houses for the public managed by the government. The reason for using qualitative case study research is because it can explore real life in depth, related to the cases studied in detail by involving various sources of data information, and reporting them by describing the case and the theme of the case, the unit of analysis may consist of several cases that were studied (Yin, 2016; Creswell & Poth, 2018).

The main instrument in qualitative research is the researcher as a key instrument specifically for the qualitative case study approach, so the instrument uses open-ended questions related to the implementation of Rusunawa management policies with a guide to the aspects that are asked about: 1) Policy Itself; 2) Implementing Agency, 3) Inter-organizational relations; 4) Social and Political Factors (Kearns & Lawson, 2008; Kusliansjah & Histanto, 2017).

This study involved three Rusunawa managed by Cimahi City Government, namely Rusunawa Cigugur, Rusunawa Cibereum, and Rusunawa Leuwigajah. This study was conducted from November 2019 to February 2020. To support the primary data obtained from previous three Rusunawa, this study involved various documents in the form of official reports from the government and various online news and regulations on the management of Rusunawa, particularly in Cimahi city.

Data were obtained from multiple sources, as follows:

1. Interviews with parties directly or indirectly involved in the implementation of Rusunawa management in Cimahi city. DPKP of Cimahi city, the UPT Rusunawa, the management coordinator, Rusunawa residents, and various parties related to Rusunawa planning and management.
2. Observations on the implementation of Rusunawa management in Cimahi city.
3. Audio and visual media related to the implementation of management policy in the Rusunawa, Cimahi city.
4. The reference laws and regulations from the Cimahi city regulation (Number. 12/2014 regarding the management of Rusunawa in Cimahi city).
5. Official documents belonging to UN-Habitat, the Central Government from related ministry reports, Provincial Government reports from West Java Bappeda, and Cimahi government reports from DPKP and UPT Rusunawa Cimahi city regarding the management of Rusunawa.

The primary data came from participants in this study. A purposive sampling technique was conducted to evaluate the implementation of management policy in Rusunawa, Cimahi city (Creswell & Poth, 2018; Yin, 2016). A total of 10 participants were used in this study. The participants were divided into four groups:

1. Rusunawa management agency
2. Policy Makers and Planners
3. Relevant agency in the management of Rusunawa
4. Representatives of Rusunawa Residents

Data from 10 participants must provide attention to data credibility (Yin, 2016). Data credibility was conducted through trustworthiness, triangulation, and validity. In this case, the researcher extended the research through field observations. Therefore, trust between the researcher and the participant was critical. The triangulation method was used in this study. In this case, researchers were confirmed various data from participants' interviews, direct observations, and various documents related to research. The validity was conducted to compare the interview result, especially what happened to the Rusunawa, Cimahi city. The final step was a report by descriptions.

## RESULTS

### **Owned Low-cost Apartment Units vs. Rental Housing System: Testing How the Regional Housing Management Policy has been Underway**

Cimahi city is one of the five cities included in the Bandung Raya Metropolitan area. Referring to the delineation analysis of the Regional Planning and Development Agency (Bappeda) of West Java Province, there are 56 districts in the Bandung Raya Metropolitan area. These districts are spread across Bandung City, Cimahi city, parts of Bandung Regency, parts of West Bandung Regency, and parts of Sumedang Regency. In 2015, an estimated 71 districts would have problems related to infrastructure provision, particularly in housing, transportation, clean water supply, and waste management facilities (WJP-MDM, 2013). Data submitted by the Central Statistics Agency (BPS) for Cimahi city in 2018 at <https://cimahikota.bps.go.id>, illustrates that Cimahi city had a population of 586,580 people in 2015 or 157,793 households. The population growth rate was 1.31% in 2014, consisting of 3 districts and divided into 15 sub-districts with an area of approximately 40.2 km<sup>2</sup>. The population density was about 14,592 per

km<sup>2</sup>, the number of backlogs was 32,915 houses in 2010, predicted to be 143,971 houses in 2025. Those statistics underlie the construction of Rusunawa in Cimahi city, which is the Cigugur Rusunawa in 2004, followed by the issuance of the Regional Regulation (Perda) of Cimahi city Number 9 of 2004, which was later updated by Regional Regulation (Perda) of Cimahi city Number 12 of 2014 concerning Management of Rumah Susun Sederhana Sewa (Rusunawa).

The Rusunami program can be characterized as a hybrid subsidy. On the one hand, it is a very light supply-side subsidy, which on its own would have no ability to drive the construction of new units by the private sector. It is also a light demand-side subsidy, also insufficient to act as a sole driver of affordability or access to low-income buyers.

### Rusunami Program Quick Facts

Target housing product	Rusuna (Apartments)
Sales price limits	Currently Rp 144 million
Target population	Formal workers with monthly incomes < Rp 7 million
Tenure	Rusun Apartment Ownership
Developers	Private and Perumnas (SOE)
Incentives offered by the government	To developers: 1% transfer tax, which is discounted from the typical 5% of the unit sales price. To buyers: No VAT (PPN), which is typically 10% of production cost and due upon purchase of the unit.
Cash value of the subsidy per unit (based on example)	VAT Rp 18.4 million; Transfer Tax Rp 5.6 million TOTAL Rp 24,0 million
Subsidy in 2013 reported by MoH	No data
Units produced in 2013 reported by MoH	Not able to attain

At various levels, government entities are the funders, developers, and owners of the housing stock of the current Rusunawa program. Private sector actors are engaged on a contract basis by government entities to perform certain functions during the development and operations. However, they do not provide financing and do not assume risk or long-term responsibility.

### Rusunawa Program Quick Facts

Target housing product	Rusunawa (Flats)
Development cost limits	None
Target population	General low-income population and special target groups (which are largely slum or disaster relocation)
Income eligibility	Up to Rp. 2,500,000 monthly income as a nationwide cap, adjusted by each local government, but not to exceed 1 Provincial Minimum Wage (UMP).
Tenure supported Developers	Rental (three-year lease terms with one extension allowed) Central Government Ministries (Ministry of Public Works and Housing).
Incentives/subsidies offered by Central Government	Full (100%) subsidy for construction cost of the project and limited administration and project management costs.
Subsidies offered by local Government	Contribution of land, obligation to pay operating deficits, and any capital needs not covered by net rental income.
Rents	30% of the UMP, with rents not to exceed the prorated share of operating costs.

Affordability

Not calculated on an actual household basis, so households could pay a very high or low percentage of their income for rent.

The three Rusunawa in Cimahi city was built from the State Revenue and Expenditure Budget (APBN), while the management was left to the Technical Implementing Unit (UPT) of the Cimahi city Housing and Settlement Area Service (DPKP). As regulated in the Regional Regulation of Cimahi City number 6 of 2016 concerning the Formation and Composition of Regional Apparatus for Cimahi City, constructing a Rusunawa is an alternative to fulfill the needs of dignified, comfortable, safe, and healthy housing for lower-to-middle income families, especially MBR (low-income families) to address the issue of the increasing land price points (Roestamy, 2017).

## DISCUSSION

### Some Issues in the Management Policy of Rusunawa

The management of the Rusunawa, which is carried out by UPT Rusunawa DPKP Cimahi City, refers to the applicable policy. First, the physical use of Rusunawa buildings consists of the use of space and buildings, including maintenance and improvement of the quality of infrastructure, facilities, and utilities (PSU). Second, the institution includes the formation of structures, duties, rights, obligations, and prohibitions of managers. Third, financial administration includes financial resources, rental rates, lease receipts, recording, and reporting. Lastly, tenancy includes the target group of residents, process of occupancy, determination of prospective residents, rental agreements and tenant rights, obligations, and restrictions. The management system aims to create apartments that are livable and affordable in a healthy, safe, harmonious, and sustainable environment and create integrated settlements to build economic, social, and cultural resilience, especially for low-income families in Cimahi city. However, in implementing this policy, there are still difficulties in realizing housing sustainability, with two principles, feasibility and affordability.

The first issue is the consistency of residents' selection and affordability of rental prices. It is firmly stated in the referred regional regulations that Rusunawa is a decent and affordable alternative for low-income housing in Cimahi city, meaning it is intended for MBR (low-income families) before they could have their own house. However, it is not the case. It can be seen in the monthly rental prices in Rusunawa, ranging from Rp. 230.000,- to Rp. 320.000,- per month, which are distinguished based on which floor is occupied, Rp. 320.000- for the first floor, and Rp. 230.000- for the top floor. Referring to the Regulation of the Minister of Public Works (Permen PU) number 05/PRT/M/2007, MBR is a community with an income of more than 1 million rupiahs, almost 2.5 million rupiahs per month. Nevertheless, a few residents in the three Rusunawa of Cimahi city are still in arrears to pay monthly rental fees. It is as reported by Jabar Ekspres, which states that the amount of arrears is 200 million rupiahs out of the total bill of around 2.1 billion rupiahs, which is about 10% annually. Furthermore, the Head of the Cimahi City DPKP hopes that there will be a solution for economic empowerment for the residents of the Rusunawa. It is also explained that the issue is caused by residents' work relationship termination and unstable income.

The second issue is the renting period. The renting period for Rusunawa in Cimahi city is considered short, which follows Regional Regulation of Cimahi City number 12/2014 in Article

21. The maximum renting period for the Rusunawa is two years and can be extended for another year as long as the residents meet the criteria and requirements of Article 12 point (1). It is considered short compared to what is mandated in the West Java Governor Regulation (Pergub) number 50/2013 in Article 21 that the Sarusunawa renting period is at most three years and can be extended for another period as long as the residents still meet the criteria and requirements. In terms of that regulation, the renting period for the Rusunawais is a maximum of six years. Many residents complain about the short renting period, especially those who rely on living in the Rusunawa. It is mostly due to their inability to save for down payments in such a short period to buy the subsidized units provided for MBR in the housing finance liquidity facility (FLPP) program, a program of the Central Government to assist MBR in accessing homeownership credit (KPR).

The third issue is the condition of infrastructure, facilities, and utilities (PSU). The physical use of Rusunawa buildings for residents in the three Rusunawa managed by UPT Rusunawa DPKP Cimahi City, as stated in Cimahi City Regional Regulation number 12/2014 includes 1) utilization of residential space; and 2) utilization of non-residential space. Following the objectives of the management of Rusunawa that is to provide decent and affordable Rusunawa for MBR, it is clear that the use of non-residential space (facilities, infrastructure, and utilities) will greatly determine the achievement of the objectives. Utilization of the residential space is in the form of one unit of space or what is called Sarusunawa, which MBR finds very helpful and affordable for MBR with an income of 1.5–2.5 million rupiah per month since it is much lower in price points than contracting on a private contract basis. The facilities that are managed by the Rusunawa include educational, health, religious, sports, and social facilities. Meanwhile, managed infrastructure and utilities consist of roads, stairs, hallways, drainage, waste, electricity, fire-fighting equipment, and wastewater and clean water systems. Based on the observations, it turns out that infrastructure, facilities, and utilities in the Rusunawa are still poorly managed. It is shown in the wastewater disposal installation that is still using a tank car for suction. Moreover, the garbage often accumulated due to the delay of transporting by the garbage truck, and the availability of clean water is yet limited. These indications can be overcome with good coordination between the UPTs under the auspices of the Cimahi city DPKP, namely: UPT of Wastewater, UPT of Clean Water, and UPT of Cleanliness.

The fourth issue is information and communication media. The government of Cimahi city has established a website that provides information on the management of Rusunawa on [www.rusunawacimahi.com](http://www.rusunawacimahi.com). However, it has yet become a medium in channeling information on the management of Rusunawa, especially in implementing Rusunawa management policies in Cimahi city to the public. This shows that the online media in the form of a website managed by the UPT Rusunawa DPKP Cimahi City has not served as the communication media. The fifth issue is the availability of Rusunawa managers. The Rusunawa of Cimahi City DPKP is only managed by six civil servants, the Cimahi city State Civil Apparatus (ASN). The three Rusunawa with 845 units (Sarusunawa) is supposed to be managed by more than six people. Nonetheless, it turns out that the only human resources available are the Head of the UPT Rusunawa DPKP, who is assisted by five people (holding ASN status). Also, there are 7 technical implementers, 26 cleaners, and 27 security and order implementers. Hence, in total 60 people work as Non-Governmental Daily Workers (THL). It shows that the availability of human resources in the management of the Rusunawa is poor in quantity. To overcome this, the management organization must be more independent in managing human resources; therefore, the form of the



Regional Public Service Agency (BLUD) will be more suitable in the management of the Rusunawa.

Implementation of Rusunawa management in Cimahi city was regulated in the Cimahi city regulation (Number. 12/2014) concerning the management of leased flats. Furthermore, it was regulated in the Cimahi city regulation (Number. 36/2017) concerning the rules and procedures for occupancy, retribution and collection procedures, and standard operating procedures for rented flats, Cimahi city regulation (Number. 47/2019) concerning changes in lease rates for rental flats. These are discussed by Kearns & Lawson (2008). Policy implementation will not be difficult if the policies are clear and follow the actual situation (Kearns & Lawson, 2008). Referring to this opinion, clarity and suitability of Rusunawa management's implementation in Cimahi city was regulated in the Cimahi city regional regulation (Number. 12/2014). This regulation ensured feasibility and affordability for low-income families in a healthy, safe, harmonious, and sustainable environment in an integrated housing and settlement management system.

The UPT Rusunawa DPKP Cimahi City managed the clarity and suitability of the governance system. It was in accordance with Cimahi city regulation (Number. 36/2017). Policy is a general guide for administrators (Moran et al., 2008). Referring to the problem, Rusunawa in Cimahi city is to ensure the fulfillment an adequate and affordable apartment for MBR. Rusunawa Leuwigajah, Rusunawa Cigugur, and Rusunawa Cibereum were affordable despite an increase in the monthly rental fee since November 2019. Furthermore, the flat in Cimahi city was feasible and affordable. The Rusunawa in Cimahi city was safe, harmonious, and sustainable. However, in 2018, an incident occurred and there was a problem at Rusunawa Leuwigajah. Service innovation to support the sustainability of homeownership has not been implemented properly. It was indicated by the residents who were in Cimahi city never been offered a savings program and subsidized housing by the government. This program was included in the housing financing liquidation program.

A total of 10% or around 200 million rupiah was the total bill of Rusunawa residents in three Rusunawa in Cimahi city (<http://jabarekspres.com/2018/warga-rusun-banyak-nunggak>). It was confirmed by the Head of UPT Rusunawa DPKP City of Cimahi. Many residents worked, but they got termination of work relations or no longer have a fixed income. Therefore, they did not pay monthly rent bills. These conditions indicate that the unreachable rental price for Rusunawa residents in Cimahi city. According to Regulation Number 36/2017, the process UPT Rusunawa, DPKP Cimahi city have conducted an occupant. This regulation states that prospective residents have a fixed income. Therefore, there is a possibility of changes in socio-economic residents.

The criteria for low-income communities differ in each region. It is due to the social and economic conditions in each region. The income range for low-income communities is regulated in the Minister of Public Works Regulation Number 05/PRT/M/2007. People who have an income of more than 1 million rupiah and below 2.5 million rupiah. According to the Ministry of National Development Planning, a low-income community is a community that has an income of up to 2.5 million rupiah. It indicates that regulation regarding the income range of Rusunawa residents is not clear. It is necessary to pay attention to the socio-economic conditions of prospective residents. Based on the interview results, Cimahi city has an abundant population, especially central Cigugur village. Besides, the limited land in Cimahi city is also the reason for the flat vertical system. There are Rusunawa Cigugur, Rusunawa Cibereum, and Rusunawa Leuwigajah as an alternative place to live in Cimahi city.

## CONCLUSION

The findings and discussion lead to several conclusions as material for policy recommendations for local governments throughout Indonesia and developing countries that will implement sustainable housing by providing public housing similar to Rusunawa. The first is the management policy of the Rusunawa, especially the renting period, which must be reviewed. Then, the criteria for MBR to be the Rusunawa residents would be better if divided into classes based on socio-economic status or the income of the community. The second is the infrastructure, facilities, and utilities (PSU) of the Rusunawa, starting from provision and maintenance, must be improved. It is also must be supported financially by the executive and legislative branches of the Cimahi City Government.

The third is the need for coordination among related institutions in the Cimahi City Government, especially for the empowerment of residents who lose their jobs when renting. Also, coordination with the Central Government through the Provincial Government and related parties, such as banking and housing entrepreneurs, to provide housing after renting in Rusunawa is also highly needed. It can be done by offering subsidized housing, through credit for the subsidized housing savings program provided by the Central Government through the Provincial Government, for Rusunawa to be a sustainable alternative even though the renting period is short. The fourth is optimizing the use of the website in the management of the Rusunawa. It should be a medium for public information and communication. It is also to maintain transparency and accountability. The last is the optimization of human resources management. It is possible to change Rusunawa human resources management with the Public Service Agency (BLUD) management system. It is intended to optimize agency in managing public rental houses (Kearns & Lawson, 2008). Therefore, they are more transparent, accountable, and professional in managing public rental houses for low-income people in Indonesia.

## REFERENCES

- Agus, M.R., Doling, J., & Lee, D.S. (2002). *Housing policy systems in South and East Asia*. Palgrave MacMillan, New York.
- Creswell, J.W., & Poth, C.N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry & research design: Choosing among five approaches*. 4<sup>th</sup> Edition. SAGE Publications, Inc, Los Angeles.
- Deng, L., Shen, Q., & Wang, L. (2011). The emerging housing policy framework in China. *Journal of Planning Literature*, 26(2), 168-183.
- Dewita, Y., Yen, B.T., & Burke, M. (2018). The effect of transport cost on housing affordability: Experiences from the Bandung Metropolitan Area, Indonesia. *Land use policy*, 79, 507-519.
- Director of Settlements and Housing Ministry of PPN/Bappenas. (2015). *Provision of decent housing for low-income communities (MBR) in the 2015-2019 national mid-term development plan*. Jakarta: Director of settlement and housing ministry of national development planning (PPN)/National development planning agency (Bappenas) of the republic of Indonesia.
- Directorate General of Budget Ministry of Finance. (2015). *The role of the state budget in overcoming the housing backlog for low-income communities (MBR)*. Jakarta: Ministry of finance of the republic of Indonesia.
- Duan, M. (2011). *Investigation on housing affordability in Lanzhou, Northwest China*. *International Journal of Housing Markets and Analysis*, 4(2), 180-190.
- Dyastari, F., Ekomadyo, A.S., Tyaghita, B. (2017). Application of modular concepts in flat design based on right conservation method (Case: Rusunami Cibangkong, Bandung). *Scientific Meeting of the Indonesian Association of Built Environmental Researchers (IPLBI)* 6, D 037-042.
- Gilbert, A. (2015). *Rental housing: The international experience*. *Habitat International*, 54(3), 173-181.
- Golubchikov, O., & Badyina A. (2012). *Sustainable housing for sustainable cities: A policy framework for developing countries*. United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat), Nairobi.

- Hoffman, M.L., Walker, C., Struyk, R.J., & Nelson, K. (1992). *Rental housing in urban Indonesia. Habitat INTL*, 15(12), 181-206.
- Indah, D. (2014). *Implementation of the policy for the management of simple flats in the city of Bandung (Study of cingised flats at the department of spatial planning and Cipta Karya, Bandung City). Padjadjaran University, Bandung.*
- Kearns, A., & Lawson, L. (2008). Housing stock transfer in glasgow-the first five years: A study of policy implementation. *Housing Studies*, 23(6), 857-878.
- Kusliansjah, Y.K., & Histanto, E.N. (2017). Patterns of social interaction in the utilization of cimahi rusunawa shared facilities in the social media era. *Journal of Idealog: Indonesian Ideas and Dialogue*, 2(1), 160-177.
- Mahamud, N.A., & Hasbullah, A. (2012). *Housing policy for the poor in Malaysia and Indonesia.*
- Marianata, A. (2014). Implementation of housing development policies for low-income communities in Rusunawa, Dusun Besar village, Singaran Pati district, Bengkulu city. *Journal of Professional FIS UNIVED* 1(2), 1-10.
- Ministry of PPN/Bappenas. (2015). *Indonesia (A roadmap for housing policy reform). Jakarta: Ministry of national development planning (PPN)/National development planning agency (Bappenas) of the republic of Indonesia.*
- Moran, M., Rein, M., & Goodin, R.E. (Eds.). (2008). *The Oxford handbook of public policy.* Oxford University Press.
- Niu, Y. (2008). The performance and problems of affordable housing policy in China: The estimations of benefits, costs and affordability. *International Journal of Housing Markets and Analysis*, 1 (2), 125-146.
- Olanrewaju, A., & Woon, T.C. (2017). *An exploration of determinants of affordable housing choice. International Journal of Housing Markets and Analysis*, 10(5), 703-723.
- Prasojo, W. (2014). Analysis of the level of occupant satisfaction in residential flats is reviewed on the quality of buildings in the Surabaya area. *Civil Engineering Engineering*, 3(1), 54-62.
- Prayitno, B., Fenat, A.S., & Paramita, M. (2012). *People's welfare on board. Jakarta: coordinating ministry of people's welfare.*
- Qin, W., Solino, A.S., & de Albornoz, V.A.C. (2017). Introducing public-private partnerships for affordable housing in China. *Open House International*, 42(2), 75-81.
- Roestamy, M. (2017). Providing affordable housing for low-income people in Indonesia (Development of model on housing law). *International E-Journal of Advances in Social Sciences*, 3(9), 1094-1103.
- Rondinelli, D.A. (1990). Housing the urban poor in developing countries: The magnitude of housing deficiencies and the failure of conventional strategies are world-wide problems. *American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, 49(2), 153-166.
- Setiadi, H.A. (2014). Tenant's satisfactory perceptual level toward kemayoran rental public housing attributes. *Journal of Public Works Social Work*, 6(1), 1-15.
- Setiadi, H.A. (2015). Analysis of influential factors toward public housing tenant's satisfaction case study in kemayoran public housing. *Journal of Settlements*, 10(1), 19-36.
- Shirleyana, S., Hawken, S., & Sunindijo, R.Y. (2018). City of Kampung: Risk and resilience in the urban communities of Surabaya, Indonesia. *International Journal of Building Pathology and Adaptation.*
- Subaktiawan, E., & Fauziah, L. (2017). Implementation of law number 20 of 2011 concerning flats (Study on Simple Rental Flats in Sidoarjo District, Sidoarjo Regency). *Journal of Public Policy and Management*, 5(1), 93-108.
- Sumirat, E. (2020). Risk impact besides capital structure and investment valuation into public housing project's investment rate. *Academy of Strategic Management Journal*, 19(5), 1-9.
- Talloci, G., & Boano, C. (2018). The de-politicisation of housing policies: The case of Borei Keila land-sharing in Phnom Penh, Cambodia. *International Journal of Housing Policy*, 18(2), 290-311.
- Tunas, D., & Peresthu, A. (2010). The self-help housing in Indonesia: The only option for the poor? *Habitat International*, 34, 315-322.
- United Nations (2016). *Policy paper 10: Housing policies.* Surabaya: United Nations.
- United Nations (2017). *New urban agenda.* Quito: Government of the Republic of Ecuador.
- Ward, P.M. (2012). *Housing policies in developing countries.* Elsevier Ltd.
- WJP-MDM. (2013). *Initial concept of greater bandung metropolitan development: Bandung city – Cimahi city – Bandung cegency – West Bandung regency – Sumedang regency. Bandung: Regional development planning agency of West Java Province (Bappeda Jabar).*
- Yin, R.K. (2016). *Qualitative research from start to finish (2<sup>nd</sup> Edition).* The Guilford Press, New York.