

WEIGHING THE EFFECTIVENESS OF POLICY PLANNING SYSTEMS: A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF INDONESIA AND AUSTRALIA

Al-Adly Darniyus¹

¹Politeknik Negeri Medan, Indonesia
al-adlydarniyus@polmed.ac.id

ABSTRACT

Public policy planning is a fundamental pillar in achieving effective, responsive, and adaptive governance. This article analyzes a comparative study of public policy planning systems in Indonesia and Australia, highlighting how differences in governmental systems, administrative capacity, and intergovernmental relations influence policy effectiveness. The study employs a literature review method, examining relevant scholarly sources. The findings indicate that Indonesia, as a unitary state with a presidential system, relies on a formal approach governed by national development planning laws. However, challenges remain in cross-sector synchronization, data integration, and the predominance of political interests in priority-setting. Conversely, Australia, with its federal and parliamentary system, adopts an evidence-based policy approach, reinforced by independent research institutions, structured public consultations, and intergovernmental coordination. Despite of their fundamental differences, the study reveals opportunities for mutual learning, such as enhancing public participation through consultation forums in Australia and drawing inspiration from Indonesia's *musrenbang* (development planning deliberations). These findings aim to provide valuable insights for policymakers in designing inclusive, data-driven, and contextually relevant planning systems.

Keywords: Public Policy Planning, Evidence-based Policy; Administrative Capacity; public participation; Indonesia, Australia

INTRODUCTION

Public policy planning is actually the main foundation in driving an effective, accountable and results-oriented government (I. G. N. P. Widiatedja et al., 2023). The process is not only limited to displaying the state's capacity in identifying and solving public problems, but also becomes a parameter of a country's political system, bureaucratic culture and institutions (Dunn, 2018). Effective policy planning necessitates a balance between bottom-up flexibility and top-down control to address local adaptive capacities and global objectives (Salas & Yepes, 2020). Multilevel governance networks, which involve routine decision making and coordination processes, are essential (Schulz et al., 2017). Indonesia and Australia, although both in the Asia-Pacific region, have very different governance systems and policy approaches. Therefore, cross-jurisdictional comparative studies are becoming increasingly crucial, not only to identify 'best practices' but also to understand the contextual nuances that enable effective transfer of policy learning (Collie, 2022; Dunlop & Radaelli, 2022). Policy learning improves comparative policy

Article History: Received 22 April 2025, Revised 30 April 2025,
Accepted 15 May 2025, Available online 30 June 2025

Copyright: © 2025. The Author(s).

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License

analysis by focusing on causality in learning processes, addressing challenges in policy change, political contexts, and temporal and spatial dimensions (Jackman, 1985). Indonesia adopts a decentralized presidential system of government (Bappenas, 2020). Meanwhile, Australia adheres to a parliamentary system within the framework of a federal state (Wanna et al., 2012). This difference certainly has a direct impact on the state's method of formulating, implementing and evaluating public policies (Keegel et al., 2013).

Contemporary discussion in comparative studies between policy systems are becoming important to identify best practices (*best practice*), as well as understanding the strengths and weaknesses of each model. For example, Australia is often used as a reference in terms of evidence-based governance (*evidence-based policy*), public participation and cross-government coordination. On the other hand, Indonesia faces major challenges in synchronizing regional and national planning, increasing public participation and strengthening institutional capacity (Kristian, 2023) (Amalia & Sholeh, 2020).

Although Indonesia and Australia have considerable structural differences, there are a number of similarities that can be contemplated, such as a commitment to sustainable development, bureaucratic reform, and efforts to strengthen the integration of cross-sectoral planning. Therefore, understanding how variables such as administrative capacity, politics and institutional structure affect policy planning and implementation is important. In addition, the dynamics of government relations both between the regions and the central government in Indonesia and between the federal and state governments in Australia play an important role in determining the overall effectiveness of policies.

Several research studies have been tried by several researchers in raising this issue. For example, (Barkah et al., 2025) provides a comprehensive overview of the similarities and differences between the science curriculum in Indonesia and Australia. They emphasized that the two countries have similar main goals, which are to improve science literacy, critical thinking skills, and scientific inquiry skills. However, a striking difference arises in the approach to curriculum design and implementation. The independent curriculum in Indonesia tends to focus on the integration of local values, such as Pancasila. While *Australian curriculum* emphasizing a three-dimensional structure, namely *science understanding*, *science as a human endeavour* and *science inquiry*. Other studies by (I. G. N. P. Widiatedja et al., 2023) which highlights the need to develop effective public participation procedures in spatial planning regulation in Indonesia, drawing lessons from practice in Australia. This shows the importance of community involvement in the policy planning process.

Despite these studies, there are still few studies that systematically compare the public policy planning system between Indonesia and Australia with an integrated approach, especially in linking three main aspects: administrative capacity, dynamics of relations between levels of government, and the effectiveness of policy implementation in cross-sectoral sectors. On that basis, this research makes an original contribution that lies in the preparation of an integrated comparative analysis framework of these three

aspects. This study is not only limited to illuminating the formal differences between Indonesia and Australia, but also elaborates on the relationship between institutional design, *evidence-based policy practices* and the political context of bureaucracy in both countries.

Then, this study also provides an adaptive approach in cross-border policy learning by emphasizing the importance of *contextual adaptation* in the *policy transfer process*. These findings will enrich the public policy literature, particularly in the field of comparative studies, by providing practical insights for policymakers in Indonesia to adopt best practices from other countries without ignoring the structural, cultural and institutional realities of the domestic institution. Thus, this study focuses on three main aspects in the comparison of policy planning systems, namely administrative capacity, dynamics of relations between levels of government and the effectiveness of policy implementation.

To understand these three aspects more deeply, it is important to first define what is meant by a policy planning system in the framework of public policy. The policy planning system is a part of governance that designs directions, objectives, and strategic steps in solving public problems systematically. Theoretically, policy planning is understood as the government's effort to formulate public policy measures based on short, medium and long-term goals, which involve data analysis, public participation, and institutional coordination (Moysan & Ródenas-Rigla, 2024). Therefore, the policy planning system is not only considered as a technocratic process, but also as a political and institutional process that is influenced by the configuration of power, values, and the administrative capacity of the state.

In an effort to understand the policy planning system more comprehensively in various countries, a methodological approach is needed that is not only descriptive, but also comparative. It aims to identify the main patterns, differences, and determinants of the success of a policy in different contexts. Comparative studies in public policy are the approach used to explain models in policy formulation, implementation and evaluation among several countries. The aim is to identify the general structure, best practices, and contextual variables that affect the effectiveness of the policy. This technique allows researchers to examine the benefits in a practical way to filter out best practices that can be adopted in local contexts (Geva-May et al., 2018)

To support this approach analytically, a theoretical framework is needed that is able to explain the differences and similarities between different policy systems. One of the theoretical frameworks that is often used in comparative studies is the comparative institutional approach, which looks at how institutional structures and systems of government affect policy outputs. In this case, the political structure, decision-making mechanisms, and bureaucratic capacity are important components that affect the effectiveness of the policy (Capano & Howlett, 2021).

Furthermore, in order for comparative studies to be carried out systematically, an appropriate study design strategy is needed. In comparative studies, there are two strategies that are commonly known, namely *Most Similar Systems Design* (MSSD) and *Most Different Systems Design* (MDSD) (Faure, 1994). In this context, the MDSD strategy is particularly relevant to this study, because the approach is used when two or more countries have structural differences but produce similar policies, thus allowing researchers to examine the general factors that contribute to the success of a policy. Thus, the MDSD strategy greatly allows researchers to understand common principles that can be adopted in policy formulation in other countries.

In addition, comparative studies also face methodological challenges. One of them is to focus more on descriptions without an in-depth analysis of the institutional context and processes that shape policy (Tatiana-Camelia & Cruceanu, 2019). Therefore, an integrative approach is needed that is not only limited to comparing policy products, but also considers internal contexts such as administrative capacity, inter-agency coordination and public involvement.

This study is also closely related to the concept of *policy transfer* and *lesson-drawing*, which is the process when a country learns and adopts certain policies that are considered relevant (Dolowitz & Marsh, 2000). In implementation, cross-border learning is often *unlinier* and full of challenges, especially when there are inequalities in institutional capacity or cultural and political values. (Howlett & Mukherjee, 2018) also view the same thing, that policy comparison should not stop at the procedural aspect, but it is also important to look at the *policy substance*, such as efficiency, effectiveness and impact on society.

Thus, the comparative study between Indonesia and Australia becomes very relevant to assess the extent to which structural and contextual differences affect the quality of public policy planning, as well as the potential adaptation of policy practices from one country to another.

RESEARCH METHOD

This study used the Literature Study (*literature review*) as the main method for analysing and comparing policy planning systems in Indonesia and Australia. This method focuses on the collection, analysis, and synthesis of relevant literature, both research results, books, policy documents, government reports, and other academic sources. credible (Snyder, 2019). With this approach, researchers can comprehensively explore the concepts, theories, and practices of policy planning systems from various perspectives.

The process of collecting literature data is carried out systematically in several stages, (a) determining relevant search keywords such as "policy planning system Indonesia", "policy planning Australia", "evidence-based policy making", and "public policy comparison"; (b) Searches are carried out through various academic databases such as Google Scholar, ScienceDirect, and government agency portals such as Bappenas and

Australian Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet; (c) Literature selection based on relevance, credibility, and year of publication (majority in the range 2015-2024) to ensure the information used is up-to-date and reliable (Azarian et al., 2023).

This process identified and analyzed in depth 34 main literature documents, consisting of 21 scientific journal articles, 4 policy reports from the Governments of Indonesia and Australia, 4 international organization report documents (such as OECD), and 5 academic books. All of this literature was selected because it is very relevant to the focus of studies related to policy planning systems, *evidence-based policy practices* and relationships between levels of government.

Table 1. Details of the literature analysed

Yes	Category Literature	Number of Documents	Examples of Primary Sources
1	Scientific journal articles	21	Capano & Howlett (2021), Widiatedja et al. (2023)
2	Academic books	5	Dunn (2018), Wanna et al. (2012)
3	International organization reports	4	OECD (2024), (World Development Report, 2021),
4	Government policy report	4	Bappenas (2020), Australian Government (2021)

Source: data processed (2025)

Furthermore, the narrative synthesis technique became the literature analysis in this study. The goal is to summarize key findings from various sources, identify similarities and differences, and *gaps* in the policy planning systems of the two countries. This process will help researchers to construct a comprehensive picture on which the comparison is based, while also providing valid evidence-based suggestions.

The main reason for choosing the literature study method is the limitation of field-based primary data that is difficult to access directly in a wide scope. On the other hand, literature of immediate relevance has become available to support a comprehensive analysis. Therefore, literature studies allow authors to explore theories, concepts and best practices from various academic sources and official policies in a systematic manner. In addition, this method is considered effective for identifying patterns, gaps, and integrating various relevant perspectives as a basis for the preparation of recommendations in the context of comparative policies between countries (Mukherjee, 2025).

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Public policy planning is a systematic process used by the government to formulate goals, strategies and actions in resolving public affairs equitably (G. N. P. Widiatedja et al., 2023). Policy experts view planning as an integral part of the policy

cycle, which includes the stages of problem identification, formulation, implementation and evaluation of policies. Not only that, they also claim that the planning stage is crucial because it determines the priority aspects and strategic direction of short, medium and long-term development. Therefore, good planning requires a solid data foundation, involvement *stakeholder* relevant institutional systems.

Along with the importance of planning in the policy cycle, policy scientists have developed a number of approaches to explain the dynamics of the planning process. Among them is a rational-comprehensive approach, which emphasizes systematic analysis, the use of evidence, and the logical evaluation of policy alternatives. However, due to complex social problems and frequent political changes, this method often faces obstacles. Therefore, *mixed-scanning* and incrementalism *approaches* are also used in many places, including in democratic countries such as Indonesia and Australia. Taking into account the limitations of information, time, and resources, and acknowledging that actors are negotiating and reaching an agreement, this approach makes more sense.

Beyond the analytical process-based approach, institutional or institutional theories, provide a strong theoretical foundation for understanding how standards, rules and structures influence the behavior of actors during the planning process. According to this model, institutional configuration, power relations and bureaucratic culture greatly influence policy planning. This is in line with the findings in (World Development Report, 2021) which affirms that government institutions have a crucial role in long-term planning, regulation, compliance enforcement and evidence-based policies.

Thus, this article will look at how the institutional and political contexts in Indonesia and Australia shape policy planning systems. This study will also look at how values such as participation, accountability, and the use of evidence are incorporated into the planning process. To make comparisons between the two systems non-normative, they must understand the structural and procedural realities behind the differences and similarities.

Indonesia's Policy Planning System

The policy planning system in Indonesia is based on the legal framework stipulated in Law Number 25 of 2004 concerning the National Development Planning System (SPPN). This law stipulates that development planning is an inseparable unit between the central and regional levels, and is implemented through a political, technocratic, participatory, *top-down*, and *bottom-up* approach. This approach reflects efforts to bridge the gap between public aspirations, national policy directions, and available technical and budgetary considerations.

The planning structure in Indonesia is hierarchical and time-bound, consisting of long-term documents (RPJPN – 20 years), medium-term (RPJMN – 5 years), and annual work plans (RKP). At the regional level, planning is carried out through RPJPD, RPJMD, and RKPD documents prepared by local governments with reference to the national development plan (Bappenas, 2020). This planning is prepared by technocratic

institutions such as the National Development Planning Agency (Bappenas) at the central level and Bappeda at the regional level, and involves ministries/institutions, the DPR/DPRD, and other stakeholders.

One of the characteristics of the planning system in Indonesia is the implementation of Development Planning Deliberation (Musrenbang) which is a multi-storey public space, ranging from village to national (Wirawan et al., 2015). This forum aims to select the aspirations of the community and stakeholders in formulating development priorities (Sudianing, 2020). However, in practice, Musrenbang often faces challenges in integrating community proposals into the government's technocratic plan, mainly due to the misalignment between national priorities and community aspirations, coordination between the government. *stakeholder* and budget constraints (Nurakhmadi et al., 2024) (Mulawati, 2019); (Purwaningsih, 2022).

Furthermore, challenges in the policy planning process in Indonesia include the lack of optimal use of data and evidence in policy formulation (non- *evidence-based policy*). In fact, the results of the research are very helpful in identifying more specific problems, as well as providing more rational and systematic solution options (Darniyus, A, Warsono, 2020). Then there is still weak coordination across sectors and between levels of government, as well as inadequate resource capacity (Cahyono & Mufidayati, 2021) (Adriansyah et al., 2021). Changes in political leadership, at the regional and national levels, are also often the cause of inconsistencies in the implementation of medium- and long-term plans.

Nevertheless, planning reforms continue to be pursued, including adopting digitalization in the process, strengthening the role and resources in policy analysis. This step is certainly to boost leaders to approach *the nature of evidence-based policy*, and can be seen when there is a strengthening of the role of institutions such as policy analysis centers (PAK) and the use of information systems such as SIPD and KRISNA. This effort indicates the emergence of awareness to make the policy planning stage a more adaptive, measurable and responsive instrument to development dynamics.

Australian Policy Planning System

Australia implements a parliamentary system of government within the framework of negara federal, where governmental power is divided between the federal government (*Commonwealth*) and six states and two territories. The system forms a complex yet flexible policy planning structure, with a strong emphasis on collaboration between governments, public accountability, and the use of evidence in decision-making. The legal basis is not based on a single law, which regulates all stages of planning like Indonesia. Even the planning system in Australia develops institutionally and normatively, with reference to a dispersed regulatory framework and inter-agency coordination mechanisms (Windholz, 2011).

Policy formulation at the Australian federal level is coordinated by Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet (PM&C), which serves as a strategic control center for

cross-sectoral policies. On the other hand, sectoral ministries such as the Treasury, Department of Health, and Department of Education still have technical authority in formulating policies according to their respective fields of work. The policy planning system in Australia is known for its evidence-based approach (*evidence-based policy*), which is strengthened with support from independent research institutions such as Productivity Commission, Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS), and various universities and *think-tank* (Government & Cabinet, 2021).

Australia pays great attention to the consultation process and stakeholder engagement in the policy planning stages. Every draft policy generally begins with the publication of a discussion document (*discussion papers*) and followed by an open consultation process involving the public, the business sector, and other interest groups. This approach not only increases the legitimacy and transparency of policies, but also allows the government to absorb diverse views from the public. At the state level, institutions such as State Planning Departments and Cabinet Offices have a central role in formulating policies relevant to the local context, while maintaining alignment with national policies through coordination mechanisms such as Council of Australian Governments (COAG) and now National Cabinet (Government & Cabinet, 2020).

The federalist structure in Australia provides great flexibility for individual states to formulate and implement public policy according to local needs. However, this flexibility is also accompanied by the need for solid coordination, especially in resolving cross-regional issues such as climate change, education and health services. In its implementation, the federal government often uses fiscal incentive mechanisms and co-funding schemes (*joint funding schemes*) to encourage policy relevance between levels of government. This strategy allows for the realization of planning that is adaptive to the local context, transactions and without neglecting the direction of integrated national development (OECD, 2024) (Wanna et al., 2012).

Although the planning system in Australia is generally claimed to be advanced, there are still obstacles in its implementation. Among them are capacity inequality between states, the risk of overlap between policies, as well as political changes that affect the decision-making process (Weller & Beer, 2023) (Burton, 2017) (Wanna et al., 2012). Nevertheless, the sustainability of evidence-based approaches, accountability mechanisms through public audits, and the existence of a professional bureaucracy have strengthened Australia's position as a model that is widely referenced in modern governance studies.

Differences in Policy Planning Systems in Indonesia and Australia

A comparison between the policy planning systems in Indonesia and Australia reveals significant differences in various aspects, such as institutional structure, planning methods, public engagement, and the use of data and evidence in the policy formulation process. These differences reflect the influence of the government system, institutional

configuration, capacity of state apparatus, and political changes that are typical in each country.

As a unitary country with a presidential system, Indonesia places planning as a strategic tool to ensure consistency between central and regional policies. This mechanism is carried out through a formal and multi-level legal system, where Bappenas plays a central role in formulating the direction of national planning. On the other hand, Australia adheres to a federal system of government, where planning authority is spread between the federal and state governments. Within this framework, the federal government acts as a facilitator and coordinator between jurisdictions to ensure national policy cohesion.

In terms of planning approaches, Indonesia applies a combination of technocratic, political, participatory approaches, as well as *top-down* and *bottom-up mechanisms*. But in its implementation, there is often an imbalance between people's aspirations and decisions made based on technocratic considerations. In addition, Australia has demonstrated consistency in the implementation of evidence-based policies, which is reinforced by an established system of research institutions and formally and continuously designed public participation at every stage of the policy process. The following is a summary of a comparison of the policy planning systems in Indonesia and Australia.

Table 2. Comparison of policy planning systems in Indonesia and Australia

Comparative Aspects	Indonesia	Australia
Form of State & System of Government	Unitary, Presidential	Federal, Parliamentary
Legal Framework of Planning	There is a formal and hierarchical SPPN Law (Law No. 25/2004)	There is no single law; based on institutional and coordinated practices
Institutional Structure	Centralized in Bappenas and Bappeda in the regions	Decentralized; PM&C, ministries, and states have autonomy
Planning Approach	A combination of technocratic, political, participatory, top-down & bottom-up	Evidence-based, consultative, collaborative intergovernmental policy
Public Engagement	Musrenbang; participatory, but sometimes symbolic	Formal public consultation through discussion documents and feedback loops

The Role of Evidence/Data	Begin to develop; Database has not been optimally used	Very powerful; research-based and independent institutions
Coordination Between Government Levels	Frequent overlap and weak synchronization	Effective; through the National Cabinet and intergovernmental mechanisms
Key Challenges	Sectoral coordination, inconsistencies between plans, dominance of political aspects	Disparities between states, political interests between parties

Source: data processed (2025)

Overall, the policy planning system in Australia shows a high level of institutionalisation and is based on the systematic use of evidence, supported by well-established institutional capacity. However, the characteristics of the federal system that grant broad autonomy to states also pose challenges, particularly in terms of maintaining the balance of development between regions and ensuring the effectiveness of coordination at the national level.

Meanwhile, Indonesia has the strength in terms of a comprehensive legal framework, as well as a formal mechanism to synchronize policies between the central and regional governments (Wirawan et al., 2015). However, the planning process is often also hampered by weak cross-sector coordination, lack of adequate data integration, and dominated by political considerations in the process of setting development priorities. In these cases, Australia's experience can be a valuable source of inspiration, particularly in strengthening the role of policy research institutions, developing data-driven governance, and encouraging meaningful public participation in the policy cycle.

In comparison, Indonesia has strength in formal efforts for alignment between national and regional levels, as well as a comprehensive legal framework. However, in practice, planning still faces obstacles, especially in cross-sector harmonization, lack of data integration, and political influence in determining development priorities. Therefore, lessons learned from the Australian system, especially in strengthening policy research institutions, data-driven governance, and substantive public engagement, can be a strategic reference for planning reform in Indonesia.

Policy Implementation Case Study

To strengthen the comparative analysis of the policy planning system in Indonesia and Australia, this study looks at concrete case studies from each country as an illustration of policy implementation in the field.

In Indonesia, one example of data-based policy implementation is the "Smart Village" program in Batang Regency, Central Java. The study was carried out by

(Haniyuhana & Widiyarta, 2023), with the goal of the program is to improve the quality of public services in villages through the digitization of services, the use of data for development planning, and the use of information technology. The results show that this program has succeeded in improving the efficiency of public services in Limpung Village. However, the process still has significant challenges such as limited digital infrastructure, community technology literacy, and sustainability of program funding. This indicates a gap between the ideal policy design and the realities of implementation on the ground. Therefore, it is very important for the government to strengthen administrative capacity at the local level so that the *evidence-based policy* can run optimally.

Meanwhile, in Australia, the practice *evidence-based policy* seen in the "Resolve" program, which is implemented in Queensland to address the problem of juvenile crime. The program is designed based on data on juvenile criminalization, community needs evaluation, and risk analysis, which then results in interventions in the form of education, skills training, and psychosocial support services. The results of the evaluation reported by The Courier Mail (2024) and further analysis by (Justice Reform Initiative, 2024). They claim that the implementation of the "resolve" program in the Logan and Cairns regions has significantly reduced the rate of juvenile crime in the last two years. This case study underscores the importance of integration between data analysis, community engagement and program sustainability to ensure policy success.

Two case examples from both countries show that although *evidence-based policy approaches* are adopted in both countries, their implementation is influenced by local contexts, institutional capacity, and meaningful public participation. In Indonesia, the main problems lie in low digital literacy, limited regional bureaucratic capacity, and data fragmentation. In Australia, meanwhile, its strength lies in data reliability, integration of research institutions and institutional structures that support cross-sector coordination. These findings suggest that in addition to emulating practices from other countries, local context adjustments are also equally important to ensure effective, adaptive and sustainable policies.

The Relevance of the Australian Model to Indonesia: Limitations and Challenges

Although the policy planning system in Australia is often rated as *best practice*, but its adoption in Indonesia requires significant adjustments. Here are some of the main reasons:

The first is the bureaucratic culture. Australia has a strong tradition of professionalism and meritocracy. Meanwhile, in Indonesia, bureaucratic practices are often influenced by political patronage and hierarchical culture, which hinders the implementation of purely *evidence-based policies*. Public consultation in Australia is effective because the people have high participation literacy. In Indonesia, public participation through Musrenbang is often ceremonial and not fully inclusive, ultimately the adoption of the consultation model from Australia requires further strengthening of literacy and changing the bureaucratic culture.

The second is administrative capacity. Policy planning in Australia is fully supported by independent research institutes, which provide objective, data-driven analysis. Meanwhile, Indonesia is still facing problems in building a policy research ecosystem. The weak technical capacity of the apparatus, especially in the regions, leads to a high gap between the aspirations of evidence-based policies and the reality of their implementation.

The third is the political structure. Australia as a federal state gives states broad autonomy to adapt policies to local contexts. While in Indonesia, it places the central government as the *primary control* in planning. This is why it is difficult to implement the flexibility of the system in Australia in its entirety in Indonesia without significant reforms in the decentralisation of authority.

For the above three reasons, the adoption of the policy planning system in Australia in Indonesia must be carried out selectively and adaptively. Several components such as the use of data in policy formulation, strengthening policy research institutions and structured public consultation mechanisms can be implemented gradually, while still considering the local context.

Policy implications

A comparison between the policy planning systems in Indonesia and Australia provides valuable insights into efforts to strengthen adaptive and effective governance in both countries. For Indonesia, the main challenge lies in increasing institutional capacity and strengthening coordination mechanisms across sectors and between levels of government, so that national and regional development planning can be more integrated and easy to implement. In addition, increasing the use of data and evidence in the planning process is an urgency in itself, considering that it is dominated by intuition-based approaches and political interests that have the potential to hinder policy effectiveness in the long term.

Planning practices in Australia that prioritize evidence-based policy principles, as well as deeper public engagement, can be an important reference for Indonesia in efforts to improve policy transparency and accountability. The implementation of a structured consultation system and the existence of a continuous feedback mechanism are believed to enrich the planning process while minimizing mismatches between policies and the main needs of the community. In addition, the existence of an independent institution that focuses on policy research such as the Productivity Commission in Australia can be an institutional model for Indonesia in strengthening the function of policy analysis and evaluation in an intuitive, professional and sustainable manner.

On the other hand, Australia can also learn lessons from Indonesia's experience in building synergy between the central and local governments through consultative mechanisms such as the Development Planning Conference (Musrenbang). Although the implementation is not fully optimal, this forum has an important role in channeling the aspirations of the community from the basic level. This kind of more inclusive and

participatory approach has the potential to help Australia reduce disparities between states as well as strengthen social cohesion within the framework of a complex federal system.

Overall, the discussion in this article confirms that an effective policy planning system must be able to adapt to local contexts, be based on valid data and evidence, and ensure substantial involvement of various stakeholders. Efforts to reform institutions, increase the capacity of the apparatus, and the use of information technology in the planning process are key elements to create governance that is more responsive, accountable and supports sustainable development.

CONCLUSION

This study compares the public policy planning systems in Indonesia and Australia, highlighting differences in government structures, administrative capacity, and relationships between levels of government. Indonesia has a system that is legally structured and involves musrenbang, but still faces obstacles to synchronization, data utilization, and political dominance. Instead, Australia is pursuing *evidence-based policies* with the support of strong public research and consulting institutions, although the challenges of inter-regional coordination remain. Based on these findings, it is suggested that Indonesia strengthen institutional capacity, improve data utilization and policy analysis, and reform participatory mechanisms to be more substantive and responsive. Learning from practice in Australia can be an important reference. Australia can also learn from Indonesia's participatory approach to strengthening central-regional relations. To deepen understanding, future research is recommended using an empirical case study approach, in order to explore the dynamics of planning practices in the field and test the validity of the conceptual framework built in this study.

REFERENCES

- Adriansyah, Alexandri, M. B., & Halimah, M. (2021). Implementasi Kebijakan Perencanaan Pengadaan Barang Dan Jasa Pemerintah Di Dinas Kesehatan Kabupaten Bandung. *Responsive*, 4(1), 13. <https://doi.org/10.24198/responsive.v4i1.34108>
- Amalia, M. R., & Sholeh, B. (2020). Australia's Role in Indonesia's Infrastructure Development through KIAT 2017-2019. *Journal of Diplomacy and International Studies*, 3(1).
- Azarian, M., Yu, H., Shiferaw, A. T., & Stevik, T. K. (2023). Do We Perform Systematic Literature Review Right? A Scientific Mapping and Methodological Assessment. *Logistics*, 7(4). <https://doi.org/10.3390/logistics7040089>
- Barkah, E., Jovianto, A., Ridwan, A., & Jakarta, U. N. (2025). Studi Perbandingan Kurikulum Pendidikan Sains Indonesia dengan Australia. *Jurnal Kajian Pembelajaran Dan Keilmuan*, 9(1), 111–123.
- Burton, P. (2017). Is Urban Planning in Australia Hindered by Poor Metropolitan Governance? *Urban Science*, 1(4), 34. <https://doi.org/10.3390/urbansci1040034>

- Cahyono, H., & Mufidayati, K. (2021). Partisipasi Masyarakat Dalam Perencanaan Apbdes Sasakpanjang Kecamatan Tajurhalang Kabupaten Bogor. *Indonesian Treasury Review: Jurnal Perbendaharaan, Keuangan Negara Dan Kebijakan Publik*, 6(2), 173–194. <https://doi.org/10.33105/itrev.v6i2.176>
- Capano, G., & Howlett, M. (2021). Causal logics and mechanisms in policy design: How and why adopting a mechanistic perspective can improve policy design. *Public Policy and Administration*, 36(2), 141–162. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0952076719827068>
- Collie, A. (2022). Cross-Jurisdiction Comparative Research in Work Disability Prevention: Introduction to the Special Series. In *Journal of Occupational Rehabilitation* (Vol. 32, Issue 2, pp. 157–160). Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10926-022-10050-x>
- Darniyus, A, Warsono, H. (2020). Collaboration between Universities and Governments in Realizing Quality Policies, (Evidence-Based Policy). *Journal of Governance and Public Policy*, 7(1), 17–28. <https://doi.org/10.18196/jgpp.71118>
- Dolowitz, D. P., & Marsh, D. (2000). Learning from abroad: The role of policy transfer in contemporary policy-making. *Governance*, 13(1), 5–23. <https://doi.org/10.1111/0952-1895.00121>
- Dunlop, C. A., & Radaelli, C. M. (2022). Policy Learning in Comparative Policy Analysis. *Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis: Research and Practice*, 24(1), 51–72. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13876988.2020.1762077>
- Dunn, W. N. (2018). Public Policy Analysis: An Integrated Approach. In *Taylor & Francis*.
- Faure, A. M. (1994). Some Methodological Problems in Comparative Politics. *Journal of Theoretical Politics*, 6(3), 307–322. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0951692894006003003>
- Geva-May, I, Hoffman, D. C., & Muhleisen, J. (2018). Twenty Years of Comparative Policy Analysis: A Survey of the Field and a Discussion of Topics and Methods. *Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis: Research and Practice*, 20(1), 18–35. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13876988.2017.1405618>
- Government, A., & Cabinet, D. of the P. M. and. (2020). *Final Report – Review of COAG Councils and Ministerial Forums _ PM&C*.
- Government, A., & Cabinet, D. of the P. M. and. (2021). *Purpose 5_ Governing well _ Annual Report 2019-20*.
- Haniyuhana, A., & Widiyarta, A. (2023). Penerapan Evidence Based Policy Dalam Implementasi Program Smart Village. *Jurnal Kebijakan Publik*, 14(1), 56. <https://doi.org/10.31258/jkp.v14i1.8178>
- Howlett, M., & Mukherjee, I. (2018). The Contribution of Comparative Policy Analysis to Policy Design: Articulating Principles of Effectiveness and Clarifying Design Spaces. *Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis: Research and Practice*, 20(1), 72–87. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13876988.2017.1418223>

- Jackman, R. W. (1985). Cross-National Statistical Research and the Study of Comparative Politics. *American Journal of Political Science*, 29(1), 161–182. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2111217>
- Justice Reform Initiative. (2024). *Youth crime solutions are staring Crisafulli in face*.
- Keegel, G., MacFarlane, Black, Cahill, Palmer, Driscoll, Nixon, & Smith. (2013). 198 Diagnosed occupational contact dermatitis compared to occupational dermatitis workers' compensation claims: Are females less likely to claim workers' compensation? *Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, 70(Suppl 1), A67.1-A67. <https://doi.org/10.1136/oemed-2013-101717.198>
- Kristian, I. (2023). Kebijakan Publik dan Tantangan Implementasi Di Indonesia. *Jurnal DIALEKTIKA: Jurnal Ilmu Sosial*, 21(2), 88–98.
- Moysan, T., & Ródenas-Rigla, F. (2024). The Participatory Processes in Public Policy-Making: A Scoping Review. *Societies*, 14(12). <https://doi.org/10.3390/soc14120244>
- Mukherjee, U. (2025). The Future of Literature Reviews: Enhancing Literature Reviews with Multidisciplinary Perspectives. *Academy of Marketing Studies Journal*, 29(3).
- Mulawati, A. H. (2019). Integrasi Sistem Perencanaan Partisipatif, Teknokratif, dan Politis Dalam Perencanaan dan Penganggaran Program Pemberdayaan Ekonomi Masyarakat Kota. *Jurnal MP (Manajemen Pemerintahan)*, 4(1).
- Nurakhmadi, D. A., Rahmawan, T. I., & Suhendro, S. (2024). Optimalisasi Partisipasi Masyarakat dalam Penganggaran: Strategi dan Rekomendasi Kebijakan. *Peradaban Journal of Law and Society*, 3(1), 48–62. <https://doi.org/10.59001/pjls.v3i1.173>
- OECD. (2024). *OECD Public Governance Reviews: Jordan. Together for an Accountable and Transparent Public Administration*. <https://doi.org/10.1787/be41202d-en>
- Purwaningsih, M. R. (2022). Pelaksanaan Musrenbang Daerah Dalam Proses Perencanaan Dan Penganggaran Partisipatif. *Jurnal Litbang Sukowati: Media Penelitian Dan Pengembangan*, 6(1), 151–164. <https://doi.org/10.32630/sukowati.v6i1.346>
- Salas, J., & Yepes, V. (2020). Enhancing sustainability and resilience through multi-level infrastructure planning. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 17(3). <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17030962>
- Schulz, A., Zia, A., & Koliba, C. (2017). Adapting bridge infrastructure to climate change: institutionalizing resilience in intergovernmental transportation planning processes in the Northeastern USA. *Mitigation and Adaptation Strategies for Global Change*, 22(1), 175–198. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11027-015-9672-x>
- Snyder, H. (2019). Literature review as a research methodology: An overview and guidelines. *Journal of Business Research*, 104, 333–339. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.07.039>
- Sudianing, N. K. (2020). Fungsi Perencanaan Pembangunan Partisipatif Dalam Peningkatan Kinerja Kebijakan Publik Di Bidang Pembangunan Daerah. *Locus Majalahn Ilmiah FISIP*, 12(1), 120–131. <https://doi.org/10.37637/locus.v12i1.292>

- Tatiana-Camelia, & Cruceanu, D. (2019). The comparative method for policy studies: the thorny aspects. *HOLISTICA – Journal of Business and Public Administration*, 10(1), 56–67. <https://doi.org/10.2478/hjbpa-2019-0005>
- Wanna, J., Vincent, S., & Podger, A. (2012). With the benefit of hindsight: Valedictory reflections from departmental secretaries, 2004-11. In *Australian National University*. https://doi.org/10.26530/oapen_459792
- Weller, S., & Beer, A. (2023). State structures and the limits of agency: governing the transformation from coal in Australia. *Regional Studies*, 57(8), 1415–1427. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00343404.2022.2047918>
- Widiatedja, G. N. P., Shah, M. Q., Sudiarawan, K. A., & Yogantara, P. (2023). The Rise of Centralistic Governance in Spatial Planning in Indonesia and Australia: A Comparative Study. *Bestuur*, 11(1), 121–143.
- Widiatedja, I. G. N. P., Ranawijaya, I. B. E., Purwani, S. P. M. E., & Atmaja, B. K. D. (2023). Developing Effective Procedures for Public Participation in Spatial Planning Regulation in Indonesia: Lesson Learned from Australia. *Padjadjaran Journal of Law*, 10(3), 389–410. <https://doi.org/10.22304/pjih.v10n3.a5>
- Windholz, E. (2011). Federalism in Australia: A Concept in Search of Understanding. *The Journal of Contemporary Issues in Business and Government*, 17(2), 1–18.
- Wirawan, R., Mardiyono, & Nurpratiwi, R. (2015). Partisipasi Masyarakat Dalam Perencanaan Pembangunan Daerah. *Jurnal Ilmu Sosial Dan Ilmu Politik*, 3(418), 11.
- World Development Report. (2021). Data for Better Lives. In *World Bank*. <https://doi.org/10.1596/978-1-4648-1600-0>