

## Collaborative Governance of One Data Indonesia in East Nusa Tenggara Province

Emanuel Yosep Lamawato<sup>1\*</sup>, Ajis S. Adang Djaha<sup>2</sup>, Nursalam<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1,2,3</sup>Nusa Cendana University, Indonesia

Email: [lamawatoeman@gmail.com](mailto:lamawatoeman@gmail.com) ; [ajis\\_djaha@staf.undana.ac.id](mailto:ajis_djaha@staf.undana.ac.id) ; [nursalam@staf.undana.ac.id](mailto:nursalam@staf.undana.ac.id)

**Abstract.** This study aims to analyze the collaborative governance of One Data Indonesia (SDI) in East Nusa Tenggara Province (NTT) and to identify the obstacles encountered in its implementation. The research is grounded in empirical conditions in which, despite the existence of a national regulatory framework through Presidential Regulation Number 39 of 2019 reinforced by Governor Regulation Number 64 of 2020, regional data management still suffers from sectoral fragmentation, inconsistent indicators across the Regional Apparatus (PD), and limited interoperability within the SASANDO NTT Portal. A qualitative case study approach was applied, with data collected through in-depth interviews with key informants from Bapperida, Walidata at the Communication and Information Service, the Central Bureau of Statistics, and selected PDs, supplemented by non-participant observation and documentary analysis. The data were analyzed using the interactive model of Miles, Huberman, and Saldaña, while the four dimensions of collaborative governance proposed by Ansell and Gash (starting conditions, institutional design, facilitative leadership, and collaborative process) served as the analytical framework. The findings reveal that the collaborative governance of SDI in NTT has been formally established but remains substantively limited. Uneven human resource capacity across PDs, a weak data-sharing culture, and unevenly distributed facilitative leadership constrain the collaboration. Strengthening the Walidata mandate, accelerating data standardization, and embedding a data-driven governance culture are required to shift the collaboration from formal toward substantive engagement.

**Keywords:** Collaborative Governance; One Data Indonesia; Walidata

**Received:**13-03-2026 **Revised:**21-04-2026 **Accepted:**22-06-2026

### INTRODUCTION

Data has become a strategic asset for every modern state in the formulation of evidence based public policy. The Government of the Republic of Indonesia established a national data governance framework through Presidential Regulation Number 39 of 2019 on One Data Indonesia (SDI). This regulation affirms the principles of integrated government data management through coordination among Data Producers, Walidata, and Data Coaches, alongside the application of data standards, metadata, interoperability, reference codes, and master data. The ultimate goal of this framework is to ensure the availability of accurate, up to date, integrated, accountable, accessible, and shareable development data across central and regional agencies.

Conceptually, SDI is directed at building an inclusive and coherent cross sectoral data ecosystem that supports the full policy cycle, from planning and implementation to evaluation of

development. This approach repositions data not merely as an administrative product, but as the foundation of evidence based policy that strengthens governmental effectiveness, transparency, and accountability (Yunita, Santoso, & Hasibuan, 2022). However, almost a decade after the One Data initiative was launched, multiple evaluations indicate that Indonesia remains in the early stages of open government data development, hindered by various policy and administrative bottlenecks (Bernot et al., 2024).

Prior studies have emphasized that SDI implementation in Indonesia faces structural challenges in the stages of data planning, collection, examination, and dissemination. (Islami, 2021), identified several critical success factors for SDI implementation, including leadership commitment, human resource capacity, technological infrastructure, and clarity of derivative regulations. A similar finding was offered by (Maulidya & Rozikin, 2022) through a retrospective analysis of SDI policy that highlighted the weakness of Walidata institutionalization at provincial and district levels. Within the regional context, (Susniwati & Zamili, 2022), in an article published in this journal, found that SDI acceleration is highly dependent on the capacity of collaborative governance among governmental and non-governmental actors, particularly in resolving substantive data discrepancies across institutions.

International scholarship by (Bernot et al., 2024) in Public Performance and Management Review further reinforces these findings, showing that SDI bottlenecks are institutional in nature, encompassing sectoral egoism, uneven technical capacity, and weak incentives for inter-agency data sharing. Meanwhile, (Widyastuti, 2026)) in the Regional Development Journal adds evidence that optimizing sectoral data governance at the provincial level requires sustained cross PD coordination and continuous technical assistance. Although studies on SDI are increasingly diverse, very few have specifically examined the dynamics of collaborative governance of SDI in archipelagic provinces with heterogeneous geographic and institutional capacities such as East Nusa Tenggara.

East Nusa Tenggara Province is among the regions that have implemented the SDI framework through Governor Regulation Number 64 of 2020 on the Implementation of SDI at the Provincial Level, further reinforced by Governor Decree Number 381 of 2022 on the SDI Forum at the Provincial Level. This commitment materialized through the SASANDO NTT Portal, an integrated regional data platform inaugurated by the Governor of NTT on 14 October 2025. By the end of 2025, the portal dashboard recorded 1,461 datasets with the participation of 40 Regional Apparatus (PD). However, only 31 PDs successfully published official sectoral datasets.

The gap of nine PDs signals governance issues, particularly concerning Walidata validation, metadata fulfillment, and consistency of data quality.

The empirical situation becomes more visible when traced to strategic regional issues. Data on the Free Nutritious Meal Program (MBG), stunting, the Rakyat School Program, and poverty have yet to be published in detail on the SASANDO NTT Portal. Field findings reveal that nine PDs are even classified as difficult to coordinate in fulfilling data standards, with a participation rate of only 22.5 percent. Some PDs such as the Regional Disaster Management Agency and the Department of Population and Civil Registration of NTT Province have not entered any data at all. This situation underscores that the national SDI policy has not yet fully translated into consistent institutional practice at the regional level.

This problem is not purely technical, but reflects a deeper issue of collaborative governance. Within the framework of (Ansell & Gash, 2008), public policy is understood as the outcome of ongoing interaction and cooperation among actors with different authorities, resources, and interests. This perspective has been further developed by Emerson, (Emerson, Nabatchi, & Balogh, 2012) through an integrative framework that positions collaborative capacity as the product of interactions between collaborative dynamics, joint decision making, and shared action capacity. SDI implementation at the regional level essentially requires intensive collaboration among Regional Walidata, Data Producers, Data Coaches, and Data Users, making the collaborative approach highly relevant.

This study seeks to fill the academic gap by examining how collaborative governance of SDI in NTT is implemented, while simultaneously identifying the obstacles that accompany the process. Unlike previous studies that have generally framed SDI as a technical issue or a transparency instrument, this research positions the SASANDO NTT Portal as an analytical framework for reading governance dynamics within the social, institutional, and cultural context of an archipelagic region. The research objectives are formulated into two main questions, namely how the collaborative governance of SDI is carried out in East Nusa Tenggara Province, and what obstacles are encountered in the collaboration process.

## **METHODS**

This study employs a qualitative approach with a case study design. The qualitative approach was selected because the research aims to deeply understand the phenomenon of collaborative governance of SDI in NTT from the perspectives of the actors involved, including the meanings, experiences, and dynamics of interaction among them (Sugiyono, 2018). The case study design was chosen because the phenomenon of collaborative governance of SDI in NTT is

contextual, bound by specific geographical, regulatory, and institutional structures. East Nusa Tenggara Province was selected as the research site because it already has a regulatory foundation through Governor Regulation Number 64 of 2020 and has formally established a Provincial SDI Forum involving four main actors with distinct roles.

Data collection was carried out through three techniques. First, in-depth interviews with key informants selected purposively. Key informants included the Head of Bapperida as Forum SDI Coordinator, officials of the Department of Communication and Information as Walidata, BPS Province NTT statisticians as Data Coach, and a number of PD officials as Data Producers. Interviews were conducted using an open guide to explore actors' experiences, coordination mechanisms, and perceptions of the collaboration process. Second, non-participant observation was conducted during Forum SDI activities such as the priority data updating workshop and the SDI governance document review meetings. Third, a documentary study was used to examine regulations, Forum SDI documents, dashboard reports of the SASANDO NTT Portal, and minutes of interactor meetings. Data were analyzed using the interactive model of Miles, (Miles, Huberman, & Saldaña, 2014) consisting of four stages, namely (1) data collection, (2) data condensation as a replacement for the earlier term data reduction, (3) data display in matrices and diagrams, and (4) conclusion drawing and verification. As an analytical framework, this study employed the four dimensions of collaborative governance from (Ansell & Gash, 2008), namely starting conditions, institutional design, facilitative leadership, and collaborative process. These four dimensions were enriched by the integrative framework of (Emerson et al., 2012) to read the collaboration dynamics more holistically.

Data validity was maintained through the four tests commonly applied in qualitative research. The credibility test was conducted through source triangulation, technique triangulation, and member checking with key informants. The transferability test was fulfilled by presenting detailed contextual descriptions so that the findings can be analytically used in similar contexts. The dependability test was performed through research audit trails, while the confirmability test was met through openness to raw data, researcher reflexivity, and the inclusion of interview excerpts and supporting documents as empirical evidence.

## **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

### **Overview of the SASANDO NTT Portal and the Provincial SDI Forum**

East Nusa Tenggara Province comprises 22 autonomous regions consisting of 21 regencies and one city. The archipelagic character of the territory with wide distances between islands influences development patterns, infrastructure availability, and governance practices,

including sectoral data management. The SASANDO NTT Portal, accessible at [sasando.nttprov.go.id](http://sasando.nttprov.go.id), was designed as both a showcase and a collaborative working mechanism for integrating regional development data. By the end of 2025, the portal dashboard displayed 1,461 datasets, the involvement of 40 PDs, and a 100 percent data openness rate. Nevertheless, only 31 PDs had succeeded in publishing official sectoral datasets through the Walidata validation pathway. The Provincial SDI Forum of NTT was established through Governor Decree Number 381 of 2022 with a structure of four mutually complementary actors. Bapperida was designated as Forum Coordinator, the Department of Communication and Information as Walidata, BPS Province NTT as Data Coach, and all PDs as Data Producers. This role distribution aligns with the national SDI framework as stipulated in Presidential Regulation Number 39 of 2019 and Minister of Home Affairs Regulation Number 70 of 2019 on Regional Government Information Systems. This institutional arrangement provides a formal foundation for collaboration, although in practice it still requires substantive strengthening as elaborated in the following sections.

**Table 1. Profile of SDI Implementation in NTT Province as of the End of 2025**

| Indicator                                | Achievement |
|------------------------------------------|-------------|
| Total published datasets                 | 1,461       |
| Registered PDs                           | 40          |
| PDs who successfully published datasets  | 31          |
| PDs are classified as hard to coordinate | 9 (22.5%)   |
| PD's non-statistical category            | 7           |
| Data openness level                      | 100%        |

*Source: processed from the SASANDO NTT Portal dashboard and primary research data, 2026*

### **Starting Conditions in the Provincial SDI Forum**

Ansell & Gash, (2008) position starting conditions as the initial circumstances that influence the success of collaboration, encompassing resource imbalances, prior histories of conflict or cooperation, and incentives to collaborate. In the context of the Provincial SDI Forum of NTT, all three elements are clearly evident. Before Presidential Regulation Number 39 of 2019 came into effect, the Government of NTT Province had in fact initiated regional data management efforts through Governor Regulation Number 14 of 2015. However, during that phase, data management remained partial and unstandardized, and there was no clear division of roles among the Data Coach, Walidata, and Data Producers.

This situation created a distinctive starting condition. First, capacity imbalances existed among PDs in managing the data cycle, which according to the Head of Bapperida Province NTT consists of four stages, namely data searching, data input, data processing, and data analysis.

Each stage requires different competencies and PDs possess varied capacities. Second, the level of trust among actors was relatively low during the early forum period because of the absence of formal cooperation experience. Third, incentives for collaboration emerged primarily from regulatory pressure rather than from collective awareness of the importance of data integration. This finding aligns with the conclusion of (Bernot et al., 2024) which underscores that the main obstacles of open government data in Indonesia are institutional and closely tied to sectoral egoism among ministries and agencies.

Statements from a Senior Statistician of BPS Province NTT reinforced this finding. Before SDI was nationally enacted, sectoral data management was carried out in a fragmented manner across PDs without a strong coordination mechanism in indicator alignment, data standards, and statistical methodology. As a result, the same indicators often produced different numbers across PDs. This situation portrays challenging starting conditions while at the same time providing strong justification for the need for collaboration. In the terminology of (Emerson et al., 2012), such conditions create consequential incentives that drive actors to enter into a collaborative regime.

### **Institutional Design of Collaborative SDI Governance**

The second dimension of the (Ansell & Gash, 2008) framework is institutional design, which refers to the formal rules, procedures, and structures that frame collaboration. In the context of SDI in NTT, the institutional design has been established in a relatively complete manner. At the national level it is structured by Presidential Regulation Number 39 of 2019 on SDI, Minister of Home Affairs Regulation Number 70 of 2019 on Regional Government Information Systems, and Minister of Home Affairs Regulation Number 5 of 2024 on One Data of Internal Government Affairs. At the provincial level, this framework is operationalized through Governor Regulation Number 64 of 2020 and Governor Decree Number 381 of 2022.

This institutional design offers three strengths. First, role clarity among actors ensures that every party understands its responsibilities in the chain of data production, validation, and dissemination. Second, the institutionalization of the SDI Forum as an organized and scheduled collaboration space provides regular cross PD meeting mechanisms. Third, the availability of the SASANDO NTT Portal as a technical infrastructure facilitates data exchange. (Susniwati & Zamili, 2022) in their study published in this journal found that such formal institutionalization is a prerequisite but not a guarantee of SDI acceleration. Without substantive collaborative practices, the formal structure becomes only an empty administrative shell.

The present study found a similar issue in NTT. Rules and structures are already complete, yet the participation mechanism that should involve all PDs consistently has not been fully established. Based on primary research data, out of 40 registered PDs, only 31 actively published datasets, and nine PDs were classified as difficult to coordinate. This indicates that institutional design requires complementary elements such as process transparency, agenda certainty, and clarity of consequences for PDs that fail to contribute to the SDI Forum. (Maulidya & Rozikin, 2022) make a similar point in their retrospective analysis of SDI policy by noting that the absence of internal control instruments often renders formal rules toothless.

**Table 2. Compliance with Data Standards Among PDs Difficult to Coordinate**

| No | Regional Apparatus (PD)                         | Score (%) | Category |
|----|-------------------------------------------------|-----------|----------|
| 1  | Department of Cooperatives, SMEs                | 77.78     | High     |
| 2  | Department of Marine and Fisheries              | 77.61     | High     |
| 3  | Department of Public Works and Housing          | 70.97     | High     |
| 4  | Department of Manpower and Transmigration       | 61.90     | Medium   |
| 5  | Regional Revenue and Asset Agency               | 33.33     | Medium   |
| 6  | Legal Bureau, Regional Secretariat              | 28.27     | Low      |
| 7  | Department of Community and Village Empowerment | 3.55      | Very Low |
| 8  | Regional Disaster Management Agency             | 0         | No input |
| 9  | Dept. of Population and Civil Registration      | 0         | No input |

Source: *primary research data, 2026*

### **Facilitative Leadership in the SDI Forum**

The third dimension of the (Ansell & Gash, 2008) framework is facilitative leadership, defined as leadership that mediates conflict, promotes participation, and safeguards procedural neutrality. In the context of the Provincial SDI Forum of NTT, this leadership function is distributed across three principal actors. Bapperida assumes the role of Coordinator, driving the forum agenda and ensuring coherence between data planning and regional development planning documents. The Department of Communication and Information as Walidata acts as a technical orchestrator that connects Data Producers with data standards, metadata, and reference codes. BPS Province NTT as Data Coach provides methodological recommendations to align sectoral data with national statistical standards.

Interview results indicate that this collaborative leadership has been operating, yet remains uneven. Bapperida actively drives the agenda through priority data updating workshops and reviews of governance documents. Walidata coordinates data validation supported by the SKALA Program team and resource persons from the Center for Data and Information of the Ministry of Home Affairs. However, the intensity of this leadership is not comparable across all PD clusters.

In PDs with strong human resource capacities such as the Department of Cooperatives or the Department of Marine and Fisheries, facilitative leadership has been able to drive standard compliance up to 77 percent. In contrast, in PDs with limited capacity such as the Regional Disaster Management Agency, facilitative intervention has yet to produce any data input.

This finding aligns with the literature emphasizing that facilitative leadership in collaborative governance cannot be limited to the apex level. It must be distributed across every node of the collaboration network (Emerson et al., 2012). (Susniwati & Zamili, 2022) underscore the importance of leadership capable of resolving substantive issues such as inter institutional data discrepancies, not merely chairing administrative meetings. The implication is that strengthening the Walidata mandate and granting more robust correction authority becomes a strategic step toward fostering more evenly distributed collaborative leadership.

### **Collaborative Process and Its Dynamics**

The fourth dimension of the (Ansell & Gash, 2008) framework is the collaborative process, encompassing face to face dialogue, trust building, commitment to process, shared understanding, and intermediate outcomes. The research finds that the first four sub elements are operational but have not yet reached their ideal form. Face to face dialogue occurs in the form of priority data updating workshops, SDI Forum meetings with the SKALA NGO, and SDI governance document review sessions. Such forums serve as actor spaces for aligning indicators, operational definitions, and metadata input mechanisms.

However, the trust building process among actors has not been firmly established, particularly in the practice of cross PD data sharing. Some PDs still tend to manage data sectorally without regular updates on the SASANDO NTT Portal. This condition suggests that the collaboration that occurs remains administrative and rooted in regulatory obligation, rather than developing into collaboration driven by collective awareness. On the aspect of commitment to process, commitment is not yet evenly distributed across PDs. Imbalances in human resource capacity and limited technical budgets in several PDs cause data integration to experience delays. The nine PDs identified as difficult to coordinate serve as quantitative indicators of these commitment issues.

On the aspect of shared understanding, the research finds that comprehension of data standards, metadata, and the benefits of data integration is not yet uniformly embraced across PDs. Some PDs still treat the obligation to input data as an additional administrative burden rather than as part of a data driven work culture. Capacity building activities such as the SDI governance document review involving the SKALA Team and the Center for Data and Information

of the Ministry of Home Affairs serve as instruments to build shared understanding, but their reach has not systematically covered all PDs.

On the aspect of intermediate outcomes, the SDI Forum has produced interim achievements in the form of institutionalizing the SASANDO NTT Portal, partially integrating 1,461 datasets from 31 PDs, and engaging the SKALA NGO as a non governmental partner. These intermediate outcomes are important because, in the Ansell and Gash framework, small wins serve to deepen trust, commitment, and shared understanding. However, to develop into a sustainable collaboration cycle, these achievements must be accompanied by structured feedback mechanisms among the actors.

### **Obstacles in Collaborative Governance of SDI in NTT Province**

Synthesis of the four dimensions of collaborative governance reveals five main groups of obstacles. First, uneven human resource capacity across PDs. Some PDs have competent data management teams, but many others only assign planning officers as Data Producers. Consequently, data collection and processing often experience delays. This finding aligns with (Islami, 2021) who identifies human resource capacity as one of the critical success factors of SDI implementation.

Second, the weakness of the data sharing culture within the regional bureaucracy. Some PDs still perceive sectoral data as institutional property rather than as a collective regional resource. This condition is exacerbated by the perception that data sharing may expose institutional performance weaknesses to external parties. (Bernot et al., 2024) offer similar evidence at the national level, namely sectoral egoism as the primary obstacle to open government data acceleration in Indonesia.

Third, the unevenly distributed information technology infrastructure across PDs. Some PDs have yet to develop internal information systems integrated with the SDI standard format, hindering data consolidation into the SASANDO NTT Portal. Fourth, the weakness of regular monitoring and evaluation mechanisms regarding PD compliance with data and metadata standards. The absence of consistent consequences for negligent PDs renders SDI implementation dependent on the individual initiative of PD leadership. Fifth, cross PD communication remains ineffective, particularly in resolving differences in indicators and operational definitions for the same items.

These five obstacle groups reinforce one another. Human resource limitations hamper standard fulfillment, which then erodes inter actor trust, which weakens commitment to process, and ultimately leaves the available technical infrastructure underutilized. This pattern affirms that

the required intervention must be systemic rather than partial. Strategies for optimizing sectoral data governance, as demonstrated by (Widyastuti, 2026) in Central Java, indicate that a combination of strengthening human resource capacity, reinforcing the Walidata mandate, and developing standardized digital infrastructure yields better results than single interventions

### **Reflective Discussion**

When read through the lens of (Ansell & Gash, 2008) collaborative governance, the collaborative governance of SDI in East Nusa Tenggara Province has acquired a relatively adequate institutional and regulatory foundation, yet the effectiveness of collaboration remains in the suboptimal category. Collaboration among actors has formed formally, but has not yet developed into substantive, outcome-oriented collaboration. In the terminology of (Emerson et al., 2012), the collaborative regime has developed basic components of collaborative dynamics, but has not yet reached the adaptive capacity stage capable of responding rapidly to policy environment changes. This study contributes to the literature on collaborative governance in two ways. First, it confirms the finding of (Susniwati & Zamili, 2022) that SDI acceleration depends heavily on adaptive collaborative governance capacity, adding evidence from an archipelagic provincial context that has been understudied. Second, it extends the argument of (Bernot et al., 2024) that SDI obstacles are institutional in nature by showing that effective intervention mechanisms must address all collaborative dimensions of Ansell and Gash simultaneously. The practical implication of these findings is the need for an intervention package covering human resource strengthening, reinforcement of the Walidata mandate, acceleration of data standardization, development of integrated digital infrastructure, and the cultivation of a data driven governance culture.

### **CONCLUSION**

The collaborative governance of One Data Indonesia in East Nusa Tenggara Province has been formally established through the SDI Forum involving Bapperida as Coordinator, the Department of Communication and Information as Walidata, BPS Province NTT as Data Coach, and 40 Regional Apparatus as Data Producers. The SASANDO NTT Portal, hosting 1,461 datasets, serves as the technical node of data integration. However, only 31 PDs have successfully published datasets, and nine PDs are classified as difficult to coordinate with a participation rate of 22.5 percent. The analysis using the four dimensions of collaborative governance of (Ansell & Gash, 2008) reveals that starting conditions are characterized by capacity imbalances and low trust, institutional design is relatively complete, facilitative leadership is operating but uneven, and the collaborative process remains administrative rather than

substantive. Five main obstacles encountered are uneven human resource capacity across PDs, weak data sharing culture, limited evenly distributed technology infrastructure, weak regular monitoring and evaluation, and ineffective cross-PD communication. These five obstacles are mutually reinforcing and therefore demand systemic intervention through a policy package covering cross PD data standardization as the priority, strengthening the mandate and authority of Walidata as the second priority, development of integrated infrastructure and data systems as the third priority, capacity building of human resources as the fourth priority, and reinforcement of a data driven governance culture as the fifth priority. This study has limitations regarding the coverage of a single case in East Nusa Tenggara, so generalization of findings must be conducted analytically. For future research, it is recommended to use mixed methods approaches to measure collaboration effectiveness more precisely, as well as to undertake comparative studies across provinces with similar geographic characteristics. Such studies will enrich understanding of the dynamics of collaborative governance of SDI in archipelagic regions and strengthen policy recommendations that are more contextually grounded.

## REFERENCE

- Ansell, C., & Gash, A. (2008). *Collaborative governance in theory and practice*. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 18(4), 543–571. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/mum032>
- Bernot, A., Tjondronegoro, D., Rifai, B., Hasan, R., Liew, A. W. C., Verhelst, T., & Tiwari, M. (2024). Institutional dimensions in open government data: A deep dive into Indonesia's Satu Data initiative and its implications for developing countries. *Public Performance & Management Review*, 47(6), 1399–1429. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15309576.2024.2377609>
- Emerson, K., Nabatchi, T., & Balogh, S. (2012). An integrative framework for collaborative governance. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 22(1), 1–29. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/mur011>
- Governor Decree of East Nusa Tenggara Number 381 of 2022 on the One Data Indonesia Forum at the Provincial Level of East Nusa Tenggara.
- Governor Regulation of East Nusa Tenggara Number 64 of 2020 on the Implementation of One Data Indonesia at the Provincial Level of East Nusa Tenggara.
- Islami, M. J. (2021). Implementasi Satu Data Indonesia: Tantangan dan *critical success factors* (CSFs). *Jurnal Komunika: Jurnal Komunikasi, Media dan Informatika*, 10(1), 13–23. <https://doi.org/10.31504/komunika.v10i1.3750>
- Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 39 of 2019 on One Data Indonesia.

- Maulidya, R., & Rozikin, M. (2022). Analisis retrospektif kebijakan Satu Data Indonesia. *Dinamika: Jurnal Ilmiah Ilmu Administrasi Negara*, 9(2), 273–285. <https://doi.org/10.25157/dak.v9i2.7884>
- Minister of Home Affairs Regulation Number 5 of 2024 on One Data of Internal Government Affairs.
- Minister of Home Affairs Regulation Number 70 of 2019 on Regional Government Information Systems.
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Presidential Regulation of the Republic of Indonesia Number 39 of 2019 on One Data Indonesia.
- Sugiyono. (2018). *Metode penelitian kualitatif*. Alfabeta.
- Susniwati, S., & Zamili, M. (2022). Acceleration of one Indonesian data through collaborative governance in Indonesia. *Publik (Jurnal Ilmu Administrasi)*, 11(2), 166–177. <https://doi.org/10.31314/pjia.11.2.166-177.2022>
- Widyastuti, A. (2026). Strategy for optimizing sectoral data governance in Central Java in the realization of one data. *Jurnal Pembangunan Daerah*, 2(1), 83–101.
- Yunita, A., Santoso, H. B., & Hasibuan, Z. A. (2022). Everything is data: Towards one big data ecosystem using multiple sources of data on higher education in Indonesia. *Journal of Big Data*, 9, Article 91. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40537-022-00639-7>