

Normalina, S., Purwanti, D., & Amirulloh, M. R. (2026). Collaborative Governance In Hydrometeorological Disasters Mitigation In Sukabumi City. *Prediksi*. Vol. 25 (2) 291-301.

Collaborative Governance in Hydrometeorological Disaster Mitigation in Sukabumi City

Salma Normalina^{1*}, Dian Purwanti², M. Rijal Amirulloh³

^{1,2,3} Universitas Muhammadiyah Sukabumi

Email: ¹salmanormalina@ummi.ac.id, ²dianpurwanti042@ummi.ac.id, ³mrijalamirulloh@ummi.ac.id

ARTICLE INFORMATION

Article History:

Received:

21 Mei 2026

Received in revised form:

19 Juni 2026

Accepted:

14 Juli 2026

Keywords:

Collaborative governance, hydrometeorological disaster, disaster mitigation, disaster risk reduction, Sukabumi City

Kata Kunci:

Collaborative Governance, Mitigasi Bencana, Bencana Hidrometeorologi, Kota Sukabumi

ABSTRACT

The high frequency of hydrometeorological disasters in Sukabumi City makes collaborative governance among actors a fundamental necessity in disaster mitigation. Although mitigation efforts have been supported by formal regulations and institutional frameworks, the effectiveness of their implementation is strongly influenced by the quality of collaborative governance established among stakeholders. This study aims to analyze collaborative governance in hydrometeorological disaster mitigation in Sukabumi City using the Ansell and Gash (2007) model, encompassing starting conditions, institutional design, facilitative leadership, and collaborative process. A descriptive qualitative approach was employed through in-depth interviews, observation, and document study, involving BPBD, Bappeda, Dinas Sosial, Dinas PUPR, KNPI, and PWI Sukabumi City as informants. The findings indicate that collaborative governance has been established through multi-stakeholder engagement, the formation of the Disaster Risk Reduction Forum (FPRB), and the Disaster-Resilient Village program. However, collaboration remains constrained by the unrenewed legal basis of the FPRB, the absence of standardized cross-institutional operational guidelines, dependence on particular leadership figures, and suboptimal information sharing among stakeholders. This study concludes that collaborative governance in Sukabumi City has been formed but has not yet reached an optimal level, thus requiring strengthened institutional frameworks, regulations, and coordination mechanisms to ensure consistent and sustainable collaboration.

ABSTRACT

Tingginya frekuensi bencana hidrometeorologi di Kota Sukabumi menjadikan tata kelola kolaboratif antaraktor sebagai kebutuhan mendasar dalam penyelenggaraan mitigasi bencana. Meskipun telah didukung regulasi dan kelembagaan formal, efektivitas implementasinya sangat dipengaruhi oleh kualitas collaborative governance yang terbangun di antara para pemangku kepentingan. Penelitian ini bertujuan menganalisis collaborative governance dalam mitigasi bencana hidrometeorologi di Kota Sukabumi menggunakan model Ansell dan Gash (2007), yang meliputi kondisi awal, desain kelembagaan, kepemimpinan fasilitatif, dan proses kolaborasi. Pendekatan kualitatif deskriptif digunakan melalui wawancara mendalam, observasi, dan studi dokumen, dengan melibatkan BPBD, Bappeda, Dinas Sosial, Dinas PUPR, KNPI, dan PWI Kota Sukabumi sebagai informan. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa collaborative governance telah terbentuk melalui keterlibatan multipihak, pembentukan Forum Pengurangan Risiko Bencana (FPRB), dan program Kelurahan Tangguh Bencana. Namun, kolaborasi masih terkendala oleh belum diperbaruinya dasar hukum FPRB, belum tersedianya pedoman operasional lintas instansi yang baku, ketergantungan pada kepemimpinan tertentu, serta keterbukaan informasi yang belum optimal. Penelitian ini menyimpulkan bahwa collaborative governance di Kota Sukabumi sudah terbentuk tetapi belum optimal, sehingga memerlukan penguatan kelembagaan, regulasi, dan mekanisme koordinasi agar kolaborasi berlangsung secara konsisten dan berkelanjutan.



This is an open access article under the [CC BY-SA](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/) license

Corresponding author: salmanormalina@ummi.ac.id

INTRODUCTION

Indonesia is a country with a high level of vulnerability to natural disasters because it lies along the Ring of Fire and has geographical features and a tropical climate that increase the potential for disasters. One of the most common types of disasters is hydrometeorological disasters those influenced by meteorological and hydrological factors, as well as changes in environmental conditions such as floods, landslides, and droughts. The increasing intensity of hydrometeorological disasters in recent years indicates that disaster management is not merely a technical issue but also a governance issue requiring the involvement of various stakeholders.

Nationally, disaster management is regulated by Law No. 24 of 2007 on Disaster Management, which stipulates that disaster management must be carried out in a planned, integrated, and coordinated manner, involving the central government, local governments, and the public. In practice, disaster mitigation does not rely solely on the government's capacity but also requires support from various stakeholders, as the complexity of disaster-related issues cannot be resolved by a single institution alone. Therefore, the collaborative governance approach is essential as a governance mechanism that encourages the involvement of the government, the public, the business sector, academia, and the media in achieving shared goals.

According to Ansell and Gash (2007), collaborative governance is a process of decision-making and public policy implementation that directly involves various actors in a shared forum to resolve public issues. Ansell and Gash's collaborative governance model explains that the success of collaboration is influenced by four main aspects: initial conditions, institutional design, facilitative leadership, and the collaborative process. This approach is relevant in the context of disaster mitigation because disaster-related issues are complex in nature, involve multiple sectors, and require sustained coordination among actors.

The city of Sukabumi is one of the areas in West Java Province with a relatively high level of vulnerability to hydrometeorological disasters. Its geographical conditions, high rainfall, and the presence of flood- and landslide-prone areas have led to an increased risk of disasters in Sukabumi. Based on data from the Sukabumi City Regional Disaster Management Agency (BPBD), the incidence of hydrometeorological disasters has increased significantly in recent years, as shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Data on Hydrometeorological Disasters in Sukabumi City

No	Year	Total Occurrences	Type of Disaster
1	2022	225 occurrences	Hydrometeorological Disaster
2	2023	185 occurrences	Hydrometeorological Disaster
3	2024	599 occurrences	Hydrometeorological Disaster

Source: Sukabumi City Disaster Management Agency (2025)

The data in the table above illustrates an extreme surge in disaster incidents in 2024, reaching 599 incidents nearly three times the number recorded in 2023 (185 incidents) and 2022 (225 incidents). The resulting impact was significant, including damage to 1,549 buildings, an affected area of 18,164 square meters, and material losses estimated to exceed Rp9.6 billion. This situation underscores that the threat of hydrometeorological disasters remains a problem requiring more effective mitigation strategies.

The Sukabumi City Government has implemented various mitigation efforts through both structural and non-structural approaches, including the construction and repair of disaster control infrastructure, the formulation of disaster management policies, the

mapping of disaster-prone areas, public awareness campaigns on disaster preparedness, the establishment of volunteer groups, and the development of the “Disaster-Resilient Village” program. The Sukabumi City Government also established the Disaster Risk Reduction Forum (FPRB) pursuant to Sukabumi Mayoral Decree No. 188.45/127-BPBD/2022 as a platform for coordination among stakeholders to support disaster risk reduction.

However, these various mitigation efforts have not yet been fully effective in reducing disaster risks and impacts. The high frequency of disasters in 2024 indicates that there are still challenges in implementing mitigation measures, particularly regarding the effectiveness of coordination among stakeholders, the sustainability of collaborative institutional frameworks, transparency of information, and the integration of roles among various stakeholders. The implementation of mitigation measures still faces challenges due to suboptimal collaboration mechanisms among local governments, communities, the private sector, academia, and the media, resulting in a lack of fully sustainable synergy among these actors.

Previous studies on hydrometeorological disaster mitigation have largely focused on disaster communication, community capacity building, and disaster education. Although these studies have made important contributions, research on the collaborative processes among actors in disaster mitigation implementation remains relatively limited, particularly in the context of Sukabumi City. Therefore, this study offers a novel contribution by analyzing collaborative governance practices in hydrometeorological disaster mitigation using the perspective of Ansell and Gash (2007).

Based on these issues, this study aims to analyze collaborative governance in hydrometeorological disaster mitigation in Sukabumi City and to identify supporting factors and barriers in the collaboration process among actors. The research findings are expected to provide theoretical contributions to the development of public administration studies and practical recommendations for the Sukabumi City Government in strengthening multi-stakeholder coordination and collaboration to achieve more effective and sustainable disaster mitigation.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study employs a descriptive qualitative approach to gain an in-depth understanding of collaborative governance practices in hydrometeorological disaster mitigation in Sukabumi City. A qualitative approach was chosen because this study focuses on understanding social phenomena, the processes of interaction among actors, and the dynamics of collaboration that occur in the implementation of disaster mitigation. According to Sugiyono (2023), qualitative research is grounded in postpositivist philosophy, with the researcher serving as the primary instrument, data collection is conducted through triangulation, and data analysis is inductive in nature.

The research focuses on Ansell and Gash’s (2007) theory of collaborative governance, which consists of four main dimensions: starting conditions, institutional design, facilitative leadership, and the collaborative process. These four dimensions were used to analyze the relationships, coordination, and involvement of various actors in hydrometeorological disaster mitigation in Sukabumi City.

The research was conducted in Sukabumi City, involving various stakeholders involved in disaster mitigation, namely the Sukabumi City Regional Disaster Management Agency (BPBD), the Sukabumi City Regional Development Planning Agency (Bappeda), the Sukabumi City Public Works and Spatial Planning Agency (PUPR), the Sukabumi City Social Affairs Agency, the Indonesian National Youth Committee (KNPI) of Sukabumi City, and the Indonesian Journalists Association (PWI) of Sukabumi City. Informants were selected using the snowball sampling technique, which involves identifying key informants and then

expanding the sample based on recommendations from those informants, starting with one or several initial informants and continuing until sufficient and representative data on the phenomenon under study were obtained (Miles et al., 2014).

The data sources in this study consist of primary and secondary data. Primary data were obtained through in-depth interviews with informants, observations of disaster mitigation activities, and documentation of activities related to collaboration among actors. Meanwhile, secondary data were obtained from policy documents, local government regulations, disaster reports, and other supporting data relevant to the study.

RESEARCH FINDINGS

The research findings are presented based on the four dimensions of Ansell and Gash (2007) Collaborative Governance theory, which include initial conditions, institutional design, facilitative leadership, and the collaboration process. Each dimension was comprehensively analyzed based on data obtained through in-depth interviews with six key informants, field observations of interagency coordination mechanisms, and a review of regulations, disaster incident reports, and local planning documents.

A. Starting Conditions

Ansell and Gash (2007) assert that starting conditions encompass the background and history of relationships among stakeholders, power and resource imbalances, and the incentives and constraints that encourage or hinder stakeholder participation in the collaborative process. The findings indicate that the starting conditions for collaboration in hydrometeorological disaster mitigation in Sukabumi City were underpinned by strong external pressure, in the form of a significant surge in disaster incidents from 225 cases in 2022 to 599 cases in 2024, which fostered a collective awareness that no single agency could address disaster-related problems on its own. This condition was explicitly conveyed by Informant 1 (BPBD) "Disaster management cannot be the responsibility of a single agency alone. It requires the involvement of various parties according to their respective functions and capacities in supporting mitigation, preparedness, emergency response, and post-disaster recovery efforts." A similar view was expressed by Informant 2 (Bappeda) "The impact of disasters is essentially felt by all parties, so collaboration needs to be built starting from the mitigation stage, long before the disaster itself occurs." This was reinforced by Informant 4 (DINSOS), who stated that "a single disaster event can generate multi-dimensional impacts-physical, social, and livelihood-related making it impossible for it to be resolved by only one agency."

Strong resource interdependence among agencies further encouraged the formation of collaboration. BPBD, as the lead sector, identified three key components that could not be fulfilled independently by any single actor method, budget, and human resources. As stated by Informant 1 (BPBD) "There are three main components referred to as the '3M' Method, Money (budget), and Man (human resources) which are distributed among various actors, and no single actor is able to fulfill them independently." BPBD holds coordinative authority and the policy framework for disaster management the Social Affairs Office possesses strong logistical and social-handling capacity backed by the Ministry of Social Affairs, as stated by Informant 4 (DINSOS) "The Social Affairs Office's logistical capacity is very strong thanks to support from the Ministry of Social Affairs and the Provincial Social Affairs Office, so that every report of displaced persons can be handled in full." The Public Works and Public

Housing Office (Dinas PUPR) is responsible for post-disaster infrastructure rehabilitation, while non-governmental actors such as KNPI (the Indonesian National Youth Committee)

and PWI (the Indonesian Journalists Association) possess resources in the form of extensive youth networks and rapid, trusted information-dissemination capacity. This was affirmed by Informant 5 (KNPI), who stated that the organization “manages a network of 97 youth organizations (OKP) and 7 sub-district coordinating bodies (PK District) with substantial potential to drive community participation,” as well as by Informant 6 (PWI), who stated that it possesses “the capacity to disseminate information to the public quickly and reliably.”

Nevertheless, significant imbalances in capacity and influence exist among stakeholders. BPBD and Bappeda occupy the most influential positions in terms of policy authority, program coordination, and budget allocation, while non-governmental actors such as KNPI and PWI hold comparatively weaker formal standing. This was affirmed by Informant 4 (DINSOS) “Leadership policy greatly determines the direction and scale of disaster response,” while Informant 5 (KNPI) stated that “KNPI involvement is driven more by citizens' awareness of protecting the environment of Sukabumi City than by any binding regulation,” indicating that the involvement of non-governmental actors remains voluntary and has yet to be bound by formal mechanisms. The absence of the Social Affairs Office from the FPRB (Disaster Risk Reduction Forum), despite its substantial role, reflects a representational imbalance that needs to be addressed. Furthermore, experience of inter-agency cooperation has been built more extensively during emergency response situations than during the pre-disaster mitigation and preparedness stages, indicating that the foundation for proactive collaboration still needs to be strengthened.

B. Institutional Design

Ansell and Gash (2007) emphasize that an inclusive, transparent institutional design based on jointly agreed rules is a prerequisite for building an effective collaborative process. Sukabumi City already has a legal basis for collaboration through Sukabumi Mayoral Decree No. 188.45/127-BPBD/2022 concerning the Disaster Risk Reduction Forum (FPRB), which serves as an official coordination platform involving government, community, and business elements. BPBD acts as the lead sector coordinating all relevant agencies, while Bappeda serves as a mediator in the planning and budgeting of disaster-related programs to prevent overlap among parties.

The primary formal coordination mechanism is the FPRB Forum, which functions as a space for discussion, coordination, and cross-sector program synchronization. Bappeda regularly holds a Focus Group Discussion (FGD) on disaster management at the beginning of each year, inviting all relevant agencies. As stated by Informant 2 (Bappeda) “The coordination mechanism enables all agencies to align their budget needs in a coordinated manner before programs are implemented.” For day-to-day technical communication, all informants confirmed the use of WhatsApp groups as an informal coordination medium that is more active at the leadership level, while coordination at the technical implementation level remains informal and unstructured.

However, field findings reveal a fundamental problem. The FPRB decree expired in 2025 and has not been renewed, creating a legal vacuum with serious implications for weakening the legitimacy and formal commitment of stakeholders to collaborate. This was directly confirmed by Informant 1 (BPBD) “The Mayoral Decree on the FPRB expired in 2025 and has not been renewed to date.” This condition was also lamented by Informant 6 (PWI), who stated that the organization “has attempted to contact the relevant agencies to push for the renewal of the FPRB decree, but has not received an adequate response.” Moreover, the absence of a standardized and binding cross-agency Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) means that coordination only runs in a structured manner during officially declared

emergency response situations. As stated by Informant 4 (DINSOS) "Coordination runs well once a disaster has been officially designated as an emergency response, but outside of that condition each agency tends to act independently, even resulting in overlapping logistics handling with BPBD." Under normal conditions or small-scale disasters that are not officially declared, coordination proceeds on a situational basis and has the potential to create overlapping responses, particularly in the distribution of logistical aid between BPBD and the Social Affairs Office. In addition, the Social Affairs Office is not involved in the FPRB Forum despite its highly important role in food provision and social protection for disaster victims.

C. Facilitative Leadership

Ansell and Gash (2007) state that facilitative leadership functions to establish and maintain clear ground rules, build trust, facilitate dialogue, and explore mutual gains. Within the structure of disaster mitigation collaboration in Sukabumi City, BPBD occupies a central position as both the lead sector and the primary facilitator. BPBD is responsible for coordinating all relevant agencies, facilitating the establishment of the FPRB Forum, developing the Disaster-Resilient Village (Katana) program, establishing volunteer coordination posts, and serving as an information hub for all stakeholders. This role was directly described by Informant 1 (BPBD) "Disaster management requires multi-party synergy involving all stakeholder elements, and the FPRB Forum serves as an instrument for aligning programs so that policy overlap among agencies does not occur." Bappeda plays an important facilitative leadership role in the planning domain by bringing together all agencies to harmonize disaster-related programs and budgets so as to avoid funding overlap. This was confirmed by Informant 2 (Bappeda) "Every planned disaster-related program is always discussed jointly between Bappeda and BPBD, including in the preparation of work plans, while also encouraging every regional government unit (SKPD) to align its development programs with disaster mitigation efforts."

A notable model of trust-building is the informational collaboration between BPBD and PWI, based on a mutually beneficial exchange of capacities PWI provides journalism training to BPBD public relations staff, while BPBD provides journalists with fast and accurate access to disaster-related information. This pattern of resource and capacity exchange has produced a functional form of trust, demonstrating that facilitative leadership can foster an effective informal collaboration model even in the absence of a formal Memorandum of Understanding (MoU).

However, the findings reveal a significant weakness in the consistency of facilitative leadership. The effectiveness of coordination depends heavily on the individual currently holding a leadership position, meaning that a change in leadership has the potential to substantially alter the dynamics of collaboration. This was explicitly acknowledged by Informant 4 (DINSOS) "Commitment and leadership style depend heavily on whoever is currently in the leadership position, so a change in leadership could alter the dynamics of collaboration there should be an SOP that guarantees the system runs institutionally rather than depending on individuals." Coordination runs far better and in a more structured manner when an official emergency response status is declared by the Mayor or Regional Secretary, who directly leads coordination in the field, whereas outside such conditions the facilitation mechanism becomes inconsistent. This dependence on personal leadership constitutes a structural vulnerability in collaborative governance in Sukabumi City that needs to be urgently addressed through the institutionalization of facilitative leadership that does not rely solely on individuals.

D. Collaborative Process

Ansell and Gash (2007) state that the collaborative process involves face-to-face dialogue, trust-building, commitment to the process, shared understanding, and the achievement of sustainable intermediate outcomes. Face-to-face dialogue in disaster mitigation in Sukabumi City is facilitated through the annual FGD organized by Bappeda and the FPRB Forum, which directly involves community elements. This was explained by Informant 2 (Bappeda) "We hold an annual FGD inviting all relevant agencies to discuss the needs of disaster mitigation programs each year. The dynamics of the FPRB forum are quite good because they involve community elements, so it is not monotonous, and informal communication through the group also takes place almost every day." This mechanism reflects efforts to build open and participatory communication, although dialogue is more dominant during the planning stage, while during the technical implementation and evaluation stages the intensity of dialogue decreases significantly.

Trust-building among stakeholders proceeds gradually and unevenly. Trust among government agencies is relatively well established through long-standing institutional relationships, whereas trust between government and non-governmental actors is more situational and based on experiences of mutually beneficial cooperation. This is consistent with the statement of Informant 6 (PWI) "The cooperation that exists is more informally mutually beneficial without formal ties, because formal ties have the potential to reduce the press independence in carrying out its journalistic function." The commitment of government agencies is relatively strong because it is bound by their core duties and institutional authority, as indicated by informants from BPBD, Bappeda, Dinas PUPR, and DINSOS, who "demonstrate relatively strong commitment because they are bound by their core duties, institutional authority, and responsibility as public servants," while the commitment of non-governmental actors is more voluntary in nature and vulnerable to changes in internal conditions, including budget limitations, which constitute the main obstacle to sustaining continuous participation. This was reinforced by Informant 5 (KNPI) "Budget limitations are the main obstacle in sustaining ongoing participatory commitment."

The existing collaboration has produced several positive outcomes. The Disaster Risk Index (IRB) for Sukabumi City has shown a declining trend each year, although it remains in the moderate-risk category emergency response to major disasters has demonstrated a coordination mechanism capable of working effectively when directly led by regional leadership the Disaster-Resilient Village program is being developed as an instrument for building community self-reliance and information collaboration between BPBD and PWI has run well as a functional collaboration model. On the other hand, however, the exchange of data and information between agencies remains centered at the leadership level. As revealed by Informant 1 (BPBD) "BPBD disaster incident data application is one of the instruments for information exchange, but data access at the technical implementation level remains limited." The participation of non-governmental actors remains responsive rather than institutionally proactive, as acknowledged by Informant 5 (KNPI) "KNPI involvement is more a matter of its own initiative and is not yet bound within a structured, formal collaboration mechanism." In addition, budget limitations constitute a systemic constraint mentioned by nearly all informants in sustaining the collaborative process on an ongoing basis, including Informant 3 (Dinas PUPR), who stated "The budget is insufficient to address all disaster incidents promptly."

DISCUSSION

In this section, the research findings are critically analyzed by comparing them with Ansell and Gash's (2007) theory of Collaborative Governance and relevant prior research findings, to explain the alignments and discrepancies between field observations and the theoretical framework employed.

A. Starting Conditions

The research findings regarding initial conditions confirm the view of Ansell and Gash (2007), who state that the initial conditions driving collaboration are the existence of shared interests and a shared vision that cannot be achieved by a single party alone. The high frequency of hydrometeorological disasters and the multifaceted nature of their impacts have fostered a collective awareness among all stakeholders that disaster management requires multi-stakeholder involvement. This aligns with the findings of Tresnanti et al. (2024), who found that inclusive disaster communication in which various parties are involved from the early stages is effective in enhancing community resilience. The initial conditions for collaboration in Sukabumi City were established based on a genuine sense of urgency, driven by a surge in disaster incidents that prompted all stakeholders to act together.

Nevertheless, there are weaknesses in this dimension. An imbalance in capacity among actors remains evident, as non-governmental actors such as KNPI and PWI are involved more on the basis of independent initiative and a spirit of volunteerism rather than through structured formal ties. This situation indicates that the initial conditions for collaboration still reveal significant disparities in resources and capacity among actors. Furthermore, the fact that most collaboration has been established during emergency response situations rather than during the mitigation and pre-disaster preparedness phases indicates that the foundation for proactive collaboration is not yet sufficiently robust. This finding aligns with Muliadi and Warsidah (2024), who highlight the importance of structured institutional preparedness starting from the pre-disaster phase so that collaboration is not merely reactive.

B. Institutional Design

The institutional design dimension reveals a picture that is not yet fully optimal. The existence of the FPRB Forum and the role of Bappeda as a mediator in budget planning reflect the government's efforts to build an organized collaborative structure, in line with the views of Ansell and Gash (2007), who emphasize that good institutional design requires clear rules and procedures that are enforced fairly and transparently. However, the expiration of the FPRB Decree in 2025 without renewal creates an institutional vacuum that has the potential to weaken the foundation of collaboration that has been built. This situation is not yet in line with the ideals of Ansell and Gash (2007), who emphasize that collaborative forums must have strong and sustainable legal legitimacy.

The absence of standardized and binding interagency standard operating procedures (SOP) is also a critical finding. Coordination functions effectively only when an official emergency response status is declared. However, under normal conditions or during small-scale disasters, each government agency operates based on its own initiative, potentially leading to overlapping efforts. This contrasts with the ideal outlined by Ansell and Gash (2007), who state that in an effective institutional design, participatory processes must be inclusive and the ground rules must be clear to support consistent collaboration. This finding aligns with that of Muliadi and Warsidah (2024), who found that the effectiveness of disaster mitigation depends heavily on that is structured, sustainable, and not limited to times when a state of emergency is declared.

C. Facilitative Leadership

The BPBD and Bappeda of Sukabumi City have played a relatively active facilitative role, in line with the view of Ansell and Gash (2007) that facilitative leadership serves to establish ground rules, build trust, and facilitate dialogue among stakeholders. The BPBD successfully facilitated the formation of the FPRB Forum, the Disaster-Resilient Village program, and a model for information collaboration with the PWI that reflects the principle of facilitation without unduly interfering with partners' independence. The Bappeda plays a role in encouraging each SKPD to align its development programs with disaster mitigation efforts, including ensuring that infrastructure rehabilitation meets disaster resilience standards.

However, the main weakness lies in the collaboration's dependence on the current leadership and the lack of systemic institutionalization of leadership. A change in leadership has the potential to substantially alter the dynamics of collaboration because there are no institutional mechanisms to ensure the continuity of coordination patterns. This situation aligns with the findings of Hidayat et al. (2023), who highlighted that the success of disaster education and mitigation requires consistent leadership and sustained institutional commitment. Without facilitative leadership that is formally institutionalized through instruments such as SOPs and MoUs, multi-stakeholder collaboration risks being reduced to unsustainable personal relationships when leadership changes occur.

D. Collaborative Process

The Collaborative Process for hydrometeorological disaster mitigation in Sukabumi City has shown significant progress, marked by the holding of multi-stakeholder dialogues through FGDs and the FPRB Forum, the establishment of functional trust among various actors, and tangible achievements in the form of a downward trend in the IRB each year. A shared understanding of the urgency of collaboration is also well-established among all informants. This aligns with the views of Ansell and Gash (2007), who state that an effective collaboration process is characterized by face-to-face dialogue, sustained trust-building, and a commitment to a consistent process.

However, the collaborative process remains fragmented and has not yet reached the ideal stage of collaboration. The intensity of dialogue decreases significantly from the planning stage to the implementation and evaluation stages, the exchange of data and information between agencies remains concentrated at the leadership level, resulting in weak coordination at the technical implementation level and budget constraints pose a systemic challenge faced by nearly all agencies. The collaborative process functions optimally only in emergency response situations directly led by regional leaders, whereas in normal situations and during the management of small scale disasters, coordination patterns among actors have not been consistent. This situation reinforces the findings of Muliadi and Warsidah (2024) that without a structured mitigation system that systematically involves all levels of society, disaster mitigation efforts cannot produce optimal and sustainable impacts.

CONCLUSION

The findings indicate that collaborative governance in hydrometeorological disaster mitigation in Sukabumi City has been implemented, yet remains suboptimal and predominantly reactive and situational, particularly in the management of small-scale

Salma Normalina, Dian Purwanti, M. Rijal Amirulloh (2026)

Prediksi. Vol. 25 (2) 291-301

disaster events that fall outside officially declared emergency status. Although shared awareness and resource interdependence among stakeholders were evident, capacity disparities persisted across actors, and collaborative experience remained concentrated in emergency response rather than in pre-disaster mitigation and preparedness. The formal institutional foundation for collaboration, the Disaster Risk Reduction Forum (FPRB), established under Mayoral Decree No. 188.45/127-BPBD/2022, expired in 2025 without renewal, while the absence of binding cross-agency standard operating procedures confined structured coordination to officially declared emergencies alone. Facilitative leadership exercised by the regional disaster management agency (BPBD) and the regional development planning agency (Bappeda) was relatively active, as reflected in the operation of the FPRB Forum and the Disaster-Resilient Village program, although its effectiveness remained contingent on individual leadership rather than systemic institutionalization.

Dialogic mechanisms, notably annual focus group discussions, fostered functional trust among stakeholders and contributed to a declining trend in the Disaster Risk Index (IRB); however, the intensity of dialogue diminished markedly during implementation and evaluation, constrained by centralized information exchange and limited budgetary capacity. Taken together, these findings suggest that collaborative governance in Sukabumi City remains at a developing stage, characterized by collective awareness and formal structures that have yet to be reinforced through robust institutionalization of regulation, procedure, and leadership. Future research would benefit from incorporating regulatory sustainability as an explanatory variable, whereas at the policy level, renewing the FPRB's legal mandate and establishing binding cross-sector coordination procedures represent urgent priorities for sustaining collaboration beyond periods of declared emergency.

REFERENCES

- Ansell, C., & Gash, A. (2007). Collaborative governance in theory and practice. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 18(4), 543–571. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/mum032>
- Hidayat, A., Putranto, T. D., & Sahputra, A. (2023). Penyuluhan bahaya dan upaya mitigasi bencana hidrometeorologi di Desa Lembah Sari, Kecamatan Batu Layar, Kabupaten Lombok Barat. *Rengganis Jurnal Pengabdian Masyarakat*, 3(2), 179–186.
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Muliadi & Warsidah. (2024). Socialization of hydrometeorological disaster mitigation for the community of Rodaya Village, Bengkayang Regency, West Kalimantan. *Journal of Community Development*, 4(3), 237–242. <https://doi.org/10.47134/comdev.v4i3.181>
- Media Indonesia. (2025, January 21). *Sepanjang 2024 terjadi 599 bencana di Kota Sukabumi dan kerugian capai Rp9,6 miliar* [Throughout 2024, 599 disasters occurred in with losses reaching IDR9.6billion]. <https://mediaindonesia.com/nusantara/736535/sepanjang-2024-terjadi-599-bencana-di-kota-sukabumi-dan-kerugian-capai-rp96-miliar>
- Media Indonesia. (2025, August 3). *Masih ada hujan, BPBD Kota Sukabumi mitigasi dampak bencana hidrometeorologi* [Rain persists, BPBD Sukabumi City mitigates impacts of hydrometeorological disaster].

<https://mediaindonesia.com/jabar/berita/797717/masih-ada-hujan-bpbd-kota-sukabumi-mitigasi-dampak-bencana-hidrometeorologi>

- Noor, M., Suaedi, F., & Mardiyanta, A. (2022). *Collaborative governance: A theoretical and practical review*. CV Bildung Nusantara.
- Pemerintah Kota Sukabumi. (2022). *Decree of the Mayor of Sukabumi Number 188.45/127-BPBD/2022 concerning the Sukabumi City Disaster Risk Reduction Forum*. Pemerintah Kota Sukabumi.
- Pradana, I., Putra, R. A., & Wulandari, S. (2024). *Introduction to public administration science*. CV Pustaka Inspirasi Minang.
- Purnomo, E., Djumiarti, T., Subowo, A., & Suwitri, S. (2018). *Collaborative governance in community-based forest management*. LP3M Universitas Muhammadiyah Yogyakarta.
- Republik Indonesia. (2007). *Law Number 24 of 2007 concerning disaster management*. Sekretariat Negara.
- Rohmah, N., Safitri, R., & Darmawan, A. (2025). *Public administration in a contemporary perspective*. Pustaka Akademika.
- Sugiyono. (2023). *Quantitative, qualitative, and R&D research methods*. Alfabeta.
- Tresnanti, D., Setiawan, R., & Pratama, A. (2024). Disaster communication as a hydrometeorological disaster mitigation system due to climate change in Jakarta. *PENDIPA Journal of Science Education*, 8(2), 155–163. <https://doi.org/10.33369/pendipa.8.2.155-163>