Collaborative Governance in Service Innovation: A Study of Dukcapil with the Religious Court in the Integrated Marriage Legalization Service Program in Raja Ampat

Ivana Beatrice Manpioper [1], Amirul Mustofa [2]*, Sedarmayanti [3], Dian Ferriswara [4]

[1] Prodi Ilmu Administrasi Jenjang S2, Fakultas Ilmu Administrasi, Universitas Dr. Soetomo Surabaya, Indonesia: ivanamanpioper53@gmail.com
[2] Prodi Ilmu Administrasi Jenjang S2, Fakultas Ilmu Administrasi, Universitas Dr. Soetomo Surabaya, Indonesia: amirul.mustofa@unitomo.ac.id
[3] Prodi Ilmu Administrasi Jenjang S2, Fakultas Ilmu Administrasi, Universitas Dr. Soetomo Surabaya, Indonesia: sedarmayanti@unitomo.ac.id
[4] Prodi Ilmu Administrasi Jenjang S2, Fakultas Ilmu Administrasi, Universitas Dr. Soetomo Surabaya, Indonesia: dianferriswara@unitomo.ac.id

* Corresponding Author: amirul.mustofa@unitomo.ac.id

Abstract: This study aims to analyze the practice of collaborative governance in the innovation of population administration services through the integrated marriage legalization (isbat nikah) program implemented by the Civil Registration and Population Office (Dukcapil) in collaboration with the Religious Court. The program represents a governmental initiative to provide legal certainty for unregistered marriages while improving citizens' access to legal identity documents. This research employs a qualitative approach with descriptive analysis to examine inter-organizational collaboration in public service delivery. The analytical framework refers to the collaborative governance model developed by Chris Ansell and Alison Gash, focusing on three key dimensions: starting conditions, institutional design, and facilitative leadership. The findings indicate that the initial conditions of collaboration were driven by the high number of unregistered marriages and the institutional limitations of each agency in addressing the issue independently. In terms of institutional design, the collaboration is supported by formal cooperation agreements, clear division of roles, and integrated service mechanisms among participating institutions. Furthermore, facilitative leadership plays a crucial role in fostering coordination, communication, and shared commitment among stakeholders. The study concludes that collaborative governance in the integrated marriage legalization service program enhances the effectiveness of population administration services while providing legal certainty for citizens.

Keywords: Collaborative Governance; Integrated Marriage Legalization; Inter-Organizational Collaboration; Population Administration; Public Service Innovation.

1. Introduction

Population administration is one of the fundamental functions of the state in guaranteeing the civil rights of its citizens. Through an orderly population administration system, the state can ensure that every citizen has a valid legal identity, such as a birth certificate, family card, and marriage documents. These documents serve not only as formal identification but also as gateways for citizens to access various other public services, including education, healthcare, social assistance, and legal protection. Therefore, the quality of population administration services becomes an important indicator of good governance.

In Indonesia, the administration of population data is regulated under Law Number 23 of 2006 concerning Population Administration, later amended by Law Number 24 of 2013. These regulations affirm the state's obligation to provide orderly, accurate, and accessible

population administration services for all citizens. In practice, these services are implemented by the Population and Civil Registration Office (Dukcapil) at the regional level. Dukcapil plays a strategic role in ensuring that all vital population events, including births, deaths, divorces, and marriages, are officially recorded in the state administration system.

Despite the regulatory framework, several challenges remain in providing population administration services in Indonesia. Unequal access to these services remains a persistent governance challenge in archipelagic regions and geographically remote areas, where dispersed territories, limited connectivity, and high mobility costs systematically hinder citizens' ability to obtain legal identity documents. In island regions, weak maritime transport networks, travel conditions highly dependent on weather, and long distances to administrative centers reduce the feasibility of conventional office-based service models, leading to administrative exclusion and weakening the principle of equal citizenship (Manpioper et al., 2025).

One significant issue is the high number of marriages not officially recorded by the state. This phenomenon occurs due to various factors, including low legal awareness, limited access to marriage registration services, economic constraints, and customary or religious marriages conducted without formal state registration. As a result, many couples are socially and religiously recognized but lack legally recognized marital status. The absence of official marriage records has various administrative and social consequences. Children born from unregistered marriages often face difficulties obtaining birth certificates that list both parents. Moreover, couples encounter obstacles accessing public services that require official marriage documents. These conditions can create social and administrative vulnerabilities, particularly for women and children.

To address these issues, the government, in collaboration with relevant institutions, has developed several public service innovations aimed at expanding citizens' access to marriage legalization. One such innovation in various regions is the Integrated Marriage Legalization Service Program (Pelayanan Isbat Nikah Terpadu). This program is a form of collaborative service involving multiple institutions, including the Population and Civil Registration Office, Religious Courts, and the Office of Religious Affairs (KUA). Through this program, couples whose marriages have not been officially registered can apply for a marriage legalization decree (isbat nikah) at the Religious Court, followed by official registration of their marriage by the relevant agencies in a single integrated service process. The integrated marriage legalization service essentially represents a policy innovation designed to simplify procedures, reduce costs, and accelerate the legalization process. This service eliminates the need for citizens to navigate lengthy, fragmented administrative procedures across multiple agencies. Additionally, outreach approaches often employed in this program help reach communities in remote areas or with limited access to government services.

The success of the integrated marriage legalization program depends on collaboration among institutions with different authorities. Population and Civil Registration Office holds authority over recording vital population events, while the Religious Court has authority to validate marriages through the isbat nikah process. Therefore, the program requires coordination, integration, and synergy among the participating institutions. This context highlights the relevance of collaborative governance in explaining how government actors work together to address complex public issues.

The concept of collaborative governance emphasizes the importance of collaboration among various actors, from government, private sector, and civil society in decision-making and public policy implementation. According to Ansell and Gash (2007), collaborative governance is a collective decision-making process that directly involves multiple stakeholders in a shared forum to reach consensus on public problem-solving. This approach is increasingly relevant in modern governance, which faces complex, cross-sectoral challenges.

Collaborative governance emerged as a response to implementation failures, high costs, and politicization of public sector regulations (Ansell & Gash, 2007). Its focus spans all stages of public policy. Collaborative governance represents a new paradigm for understanding multi-stakeholder involvement in public affairs. Certain characteristics in actor relationships necessitate studying collaboration (Silvia, 2011). Ansell and Gash (2007) describe collaborative governance as an arrangement where one or more public institutions directly engage with non-public stakeholders in a formal, consensus-oriented decision-making process aimed at creating or implementing public policy or managing public programs or assets. Their model emphasizes a formal strategy to integrate stakeholders into decision-making to achieve consensus. Success in collaborative governance is measured through four dimensions: collaborative process (the core), influenced by starting conditions, institutional design, and

facilitative leadership. These dimensions are operationalized to yield collaborative governance outcomes based on formal, consensus-oriented decisions.

Agrawal and Lemos (2007) expand this concept, emphasizing that collaborative governance is not limited to public and non-government stakeholders but also forms "multipartner governance", including private sector, civil society, and community stakeholders, creating hybrid arrangements such as public-private and private-social partnerships.

In practice, collaborative governance in integrated marriage legalization is reflected in policy coordination, procedural integration, and role-sharing among institutions. Dukcapil, local governments, and Religious Courts must establish effective cooperation mechanisms for efficient service delivery and optimal benefits for citizens. However, collaboration among government institutions is not without challenges. Differences in organizational structures, bureaucratic mechanisms, and resource limitations often impede effective collaboration. The study of collaborative governance in population administration is highly relevant to public service innovation. Local governments are encouraged to develop innovations that improve service quality. Innovation includes not only technology but also institutional governance, including strengthening inter-institutional cooperation in addressing public issues.

Previous studies indicate that digital population identity implementation involves collaboration among government, private sector, and communities, though coordination and system integration challenges remain. The applied collaborative governance model is not yet fully optimized, especially regarding coordination mechanisms and distribution of responsibilities among actors. Therefore, strategies to strengthen multi-stakeholder collaboration and improve digital infrastructure capacity are needed to ensure effective implementation and maximum public benefit (Prayogo et al., 2025).

Four indicators of digital transformation-based collaborative governance through the Taring Population and Civil Registration Office Program in Denpasar City include: Starting conditions : the background and supporting resources for establishing the Taring Population and Civil Registration Office Program. Institutional design : regulations or mechanisms for establishing collaboration. Leadership : initiatives driven by the Dukcapil leadership in Denpasar. Collaborative process : face-to-face dialogues between Population and Civil Registration Office and private partners (e.g., Gojek, Grab) leading to formal collaboration agreements (Wismayanti, 2024).

The collaborative process involves dialogue, commitment to the process, and responsibility-sharing among Dukcapil, hospitals, community health centers, and the public. Despite positive outcomes, challenges persist, such as internet connectivity issues and low technology literacy among citizens. This study concludes that collaborative governance is effective in creating synergy among parties but requires improved technology infrastructure and socialization (Asriani et al., 2024).

In summary, the integrated marriage legalization program represents a public service innovation relying on inter-institutional collaboration. The program aims not only to legalize marriages but also to strengthen population administration and protect citizens' civil rights. Its effectiveness depends heavily on the quality of collaboration among the Religious Courts, Ministry of Religious Affairs (KUA), and Dukcapil. This research is essential to understanding collaborative governance practices in population administration service innovation, illustrating inter-institutional dynamics, supporting and inhibiting factors, and implications for improving public service quality in population administration.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Collaborative Governance

Collaborative Governance is a process that involves various stakeholders, each advocating for the interests of their respective institutions, to achieve a shared goal (Hartman et al., 2002). It is a governance model in which one or more public institutions directly engage non-state stakeholders in a formal, consensus-oriented, deliberative collective decision-making process aimed at creating or implementing public policy, managing public programs, or overseeing public assets (Islami, 2008).

According to Ansell and Gash (2007), Collaborative Governance is an arrangement in which one or more public institutions directly involve non-public stakeholders in a formal, consensus-oriented, and deliberative collective decision-making process with the aim of creating or implementing public policies or managing public programs or assets. Dwiyanto (2011) further explains that in collaborative cooperation, parties communicate their vision,

goals, strategies, and activities while maintaining independent decision-making authority and organizational management, even as they adhere to joint agreements.

Collaborative Governance is based on the goal of jointly addressing specific problems or issues among the involved parties. These parties are not limited to government and non-government institutions; in line with good governance principles, civil society is also involved in policy formulation and decision-making. Collaboration is initiated due to the limitations in capacity, resources, or networks each party possesses, allowing cooperation to unite and complement various components to achieve shared objectives. In defining goals, vision-mission, norms, and shared values, each party maintains an equal status, holding independent decision-making authority while adhering to collective agreements (Purwanti, 2016).

The concept of Collaborative Governance has been conceptually strengthened over time as research and academic journals increasingly explore it as a variant of governance. One widely referenced definition is by Ansell and Gash (2007), describing it as an arrangement where one or more public institutions directly involve non-public stakeholders in a formal, consensus-oriented, deliberative process aimed at creating or implementing public policies or managing public programs or assets.

The Ansell and Gash (2007) model of collaborative governance consists of four variables: starting conditions, institutional design, leadership, and collaborative process. These four variables measure the success of collaborative governance, with the collaborative process at the core, influenced by the other three variables: starting conditions, institutional design, and facilitative leadership. These dimensions are analyzed and operationalized to produce collaborative governance outcomes.

Ansell and Gash (2007) identify four components in the partnership model: starting conditions, institutional design, leadership, and collaborative process. The collaborative process is influenced by starting conditions, institutional design, and facilitative leadership. Starting conditions provide the basis for two or more institutions to collaborate. Initial conditions that compel collaboration may include power imbalances, resources, knowledge gaps, incentives, or barriers to participation. Institutional design establishes the rules and frameworks for collaboration. Leadership mediates and facilitates the collaborative process. The collaborative process itself is non-linear, iterative, or cyclical.

Effective government collaboration requires a shared commitment when designing strategies that empower weaker or disadvantaged groups. If opposing views (antagonism) exist among partners, collaborative governance cannot succeed unless (a) there is a high degree of interdependence among stakeholders, or (b) there are positive steps to restore low trust levels. Maintaining harmony in partnerships is crucial to sustaining long-term cooperation.

During the collaborative process, participating organizations negotiate to align expectations and build commitment to joint activities. Organizational participation and mutual commitment continue if collaborative activities are reciprocal. Conversely, if reciprocal collaboration is absent, participants may reduce their commitment and terminate cooperation. Negotiation skills are essential and determine the sustainability of partnership programs. If both collaborating parties avoid communication errors, there is no reason for either party to end the cooperation.

2.2 Collaboration in Public Administration Perspective

To understand the position of collaboration in the context of public administration, the concept is examined from various academic perspectives. Collaboration can be viewed as organizational relations (sociology), intergovernmental relations (public administration), strategic alliances (business management), and multi-organization networks (public management). These four perspectives converge on one theme: explaining interactions and relations across organizations.

In public administration literature, the term governance is often used to describe inter-organizational linkages. Governance does not merely involve the participation of public institutions in policy formulation and implementation, but also refers to the connection of various organizations to achieve public objectives (Agranoff and McGuire, 2003). Furthermore, the concept of collaboration in public administration can be explained through institutional building. This concept emerged in the 1960s alongside the idea of development administration. It relates to efforts to design organizational arrangements for more advantageous purposes, particularly concerning managerial and effectiveness issues in public administration (Siffin, 1990).

The term public administration has often been used to describe government administration. As a result, studies were typically limited to politics, budgeting, personnel, and service provision. However, a broader understanding of "public" encompasses public functions, including governance. Consequently, the focus shifted from merely government administration to all types of organizations—voluntary, nonprofit, business, and government—that function and interact with each other (Frederickson, 1997).

This broadening of the term implies that public administration is not limited to public organizations. Its scope extends to non-public organizations that have public dimensions. Frederickson (1997) states: "Modern public administration is a network of vertical and horizontal linkages between organizations (publics) of all types—government, non-governmental, and quasi-governmental; profit, non-profit, and voluntary. For this reason, the core value or spirit of public administration includes knowledge of a commitment to the public in a general sense, as well as responsiveness to both individual and groups of citizens in the specific sense."

Based on the above discussion, the study of public administration encompasses activities within government organizations, organizations outside of government, or interactions between the two as complementary processes. This complementarity constitutes collaboration relationships that mutually reinforce both government and citizens in the production of goods and social services.

2.3 Population Administration

Population administration is a series of activities for organizing and regulating the issuance of population documents and data through civil registration, population registration, management of population administration information, and the utilization of the results for public services and the development of other sectors. According to Article 1, point 1 of the Population Administration Law, "Population Administration is a series of activities for organizing and regulating the issuance of population documents and data through population registration, civil registration, management of population administration information, and the utilization of the results for public services and development in other sectors." Therefore, the scope of Population Administration consists of three main components: the actions of organizing and regulating the processes related to the issuance of population documents and data through population registration, civil registration, and the management of population administration information (Rohman, 2013).

Administration refers to the management of authority and power. This authority can be held by bureaucratic officials because they are legitimized by the people through the state. Furthermore, according to Siagian (2012), administration is the totality of procedures for decision-making and its implementation, usually carried out by two or more individuals to achieve predetermined goals. Meanwhile, Prihatin (2011) defines administration in a narrow sense as a method to organize the learning process in schools with the aim of managing and arranging activities to achieve specific objectives. The data managed can be retrieved either partially or entirely using administration (Prihatin, 2007).

The science of demography involves understanding the size, composition, and distribution of populations and their changes statistically and mathematically. To achieve this, five main demographic elements are used: births (fertility), deaths (mortality), marriages, immigration, and social mobility. The term "demography" comes from the Greek words "demos," meaning people, and "graphien," meaning to write (Salsabila & Lubis, 2022). In the context of demography, a comprehensive understanding of population composition, geographic distribution, size, and changes, as well as the factors influencing population dynamics, is necessary. Demography is a field of study that examines changes in populations using population data and statistics along with mathematical and statistical methods. The primary focus is on changes in population size, distribution patterns, and demographic structure or composition, using data-driven analytical and statistical approaches (Herawati & Oktaviannoor, 2022).

Based on these definitions, the author concludes that Population Administration is a series of actions taken by the government or relevant authorities to manage and organize data about the population of a particular area. This involves data collection, registration, and storage of population information, including identity data, marital status, family information, and other essential details. One of the main objectives of Population Administration is to maintain legal stability, support public service operations, and uphold administrative order at the government level.

Population administration encompasses aspects such as population size, structure, age, gender, religion, births, marriages, pregnancies, deaths, distribution, mobility, as well as the quality and resilience of the population. It also involves political, economic, social, and cultural dimensions. These conditions are linked to population dynamics, which can affect the success of sustainable development. Every country has the authority to manage its administrative affairs, ensuring that each citizen, from birth, is legally protected through possession of population documents. These documents play a critical role in administrative and bureaucratic matters, with benefits including:

    a. Providing clear identity and status for individuals and groups;
    b. Ensuring legal certainty;
    c. Offering legal protection and security for the document holder; and
    d. Providing benefits for other administrative and public service purposes.

2.4 Public Service Innovation

Innovation relates to something new for individuals, organizations, communities, or specific situations. Innovation itself encompasses the development and implementation of something new. The term "new" here does not necessarily mean an entirely original product, but rather refers to "newness." This newness signifies that innovation involves creating and implementing existing elements into a new combination. The concept of newness is related to the dimensions of space and time (Prabowo et al., 2022). Innovation consists of generating new ideas and implementing them as new products, processes, or services, involving a long and cumulative process of numerous organizational decision-making steps, from the idea generation phase to implementation (Urabe et al., 1988).

Innovation is viewed as a process of adopting or implementing new ideas, in which these ideas are transformed into actual products or services (Godin, 2014; Osborne, 2013). Historically, innovation has developed more in the private sector because it can overcome various barriers that hinder innovation. The private sector is often willing to say "innovate or die," whereas the public sector tends to treat innovation as optional, discretionary, or facultative. Public institutions rarely feel that they will "die" without even minimal innovation. While the government may not cease to exist without innovation, it will certainly lose legitimacy and public trust (Prabowo et al., 2022).

The potential benefits of innovation in the public sector are significant, while the size of the public sector varies by country. On average, the public sector accounts for about one-third of a nation's economy. This size indicates that public sector innovation has the potential to contribute significantly to a country's economic growth and prosperity directly by reducing the cost of providing public services and improving the quality and organization of those services, and indirectly by enhancing private sector productivity through the expansion and improvement of infrastructure on which the private sector depends (Osborne & Brown, 2012).

Innovation is needed to improve, and even enhance, the quality, efficiency, and effectiveness of public service delivery. Through innovation, systems, methods, and technologies can be developed that lower costs, shorten service times, streamline bureaucracy, and most importantly build public trust in government performance. Public service innovation represents a breakthrough in service delivery, whether through original creative ideas or adaptations/modifications that provide benefits to the public, directly and indirectly. Original creative ideas represent a positive value from service providers aimed at delivering novelty in public services (Prabowo et al., 2022).

Public sector innovation has emerged from studies largely dominated by private sector innovation (Moore & Hartley, 2008; Torfing et al., 2020). Innovation is also crucial for effective public service management in dynamic societies, increasingly diverse communities, and populations with higher service expectations. New ICT and communication technologies, new work practices, new forms of social and family organizations, and societal changes have caused previously homogeneous social groups to fragment and diversify.

According to Kuratko (2007), innovation can be classified into four types:

1) Invention – the creation of a new product, service, or process that has not existed before; often considered revolutionary.
2) Extension – the development of an existing product, service, or process; this involves applying existing ideas in a new or different way.
3) Duplication – the imitation of an existing product, service, or process; however, duplication is not mere copying—it adds creative touches to improve the concept and make it competitive.

4) Synthesis – the combination of existing concepts and elements into a new formulation; this process involves taking multiple ideas or products that already exist and shaping them into a product that can be applied in a new way.

Public sector innovation can relate to new outcomes (e.g., new services), the processes used to achieve those outcomes (e.g., co-design approaches), and the support provided to facilitate those processes (e.g., innovation labs used to help teams co-design innovative results) (Nählinder & Eriksson, 2019). Public sector innovation is often driven by public sector agents (e.g., civil servants, public institutions, state-owned enterprises, etc.) and typically involves or impacts actors across the broader ecosystem. However, at times, public sector innovation may also be driven more by actors outside than inside the public sector.

3. Materials and Method

Based on the research objectives, which aim to describe, explain, or provide a comprehensive and in-depth depiction of the research findings, the type of research used is qualitative research. The study titled "Collaborative Governance in Service Innovation" is a qualitative study using a Case Study approach conducted at the Civil Registry Office (Dinas Kependudukan dan Pencatatan Sipil) in collaboration with the Religious Court (Pengadilan Agama) in the Integrated Marriage Legalization (Isbat Nikah) Service Program in Raja Ampat. According to Yin (2015), a case study is a preferred type of research for tracking contemporary events when the events in question cannot be manipulated. Data collection techniques in this study include interviews, observation, documentation, and literature review. Informants are determined continuously using a purposive sampling technique, which in this study includes the Head of the Civil Registry Office and the Head of the Religious Court.

Data analysis techniques follow the method developed by McNabb (2002), which includes:

a. Grouping the data according to key constructs,
b. Identifying bases for interpretation,
c. Developing generalizations from the data,
d. Testing alternative interpretations, and
e. Forming and/or refining generalizable theory from the case study.

4. Results and Discussion

The Integrated Marriage Legalization (Isbat Nikah) Service Program is a public service innovation aimed at providing legal certainty regarding the marital status of citizens while also facilitating the issuance of civil registration documents. This program is implemented through collaboration between the Civil Registry Office (Dinas Kependudukan dan Pencatatan Sipil), the Religious Court (Pengadilan Agama), the Office of Religious Affairs (KUA), and the local government in Raja Ampat.

The collaboration among these institutions represents a practice of collaborative governance, which is a process of decision-making and public policy implementation involving various government and non-government actors working together to achieve public goals. According to Ansell and Gash (2007), collaborative governance is a governance arrangement in which one or more public agencies directly involve non-state stakeholders in a formal, consensus-oriented, and deliberative decision-making process to formulate or implement public policies.

In the context of civil registration services, a collaborative approach is particularly important because the social issues faced by the community are often complex and involve the authority of multiple institutions. The integrated marriage legalization program serves as a concrete example of how local governments integrate the authority of various institutions to provide more effective and inclusive services to the public.

a. Starting Conditions

The starting conditions dimension refers to the initial circumstances that underlie the formation of collaboration between institutions. In the collaborative governance model, starting conditions include resource imbalances among actors, the historical relationships between institutions, and incentives that encourage actors to cooperate. According to Ansell and Gash (2007), collaboration typically arises when public problems cannot be resolved by a single institution independently. In such conditions, collaboration becomes a mechanism to integrate various resources, authorities, and institutional capacities.

Research findings indicate that the initial collaboration process involved the Civil Registry Office (Dinas Kependudukan dan Pencatatan Sipil) of Raja Ampat Regency, Sorong Religious Court (Pengadilan Agama Sorong), Sorong District Court (Pengadilan Negeri Sorong), and the Office of the Ministry of Religious Affairs of Raja Ampat Regency. This collaboration was triggered by the existence of Supreme Court Regulation of the Republic of Indonesia Number 1 of 2015 regarding mobile court services that are fast, easy, and affordable. Furthermore, many couples in Raja Ampat were married according to religious customs (siri) but did not have official marriage certificates. The integrated isbat court sessions provide legal certainty regarding their marital status. The absence of marriage certificates complicates the processing of other civil documents, such as Family Cards (KK), Identity Cards (KTP), and children's birth certificates, and assists communities in remote areas (such as Misool District) who face difficulties accessing the courts to legalize their marriages.

In the context of the integrated isbat marriage service program, the starting conditions for collaboration between the Civil Registry Office and the Religious Court are the still-high number of unregistered marriages in the community. This phenomenon has resulted in many families lacking valid civil documents, such as family cards, children's birth certificates, and updates to marital status in civil registration records. Unregistered marriages lead to various social and administrative consequences. Children born from unregistered marriages often face difficulties obtaining birth certificates, while couples lack legal certainty regarding their marital status. This situation can affect access to various public services, including education, healthcare, and social assistance from the government.

From a public administration perspective, this issue reflects gaps in access to civil registration services, especially for communities living in remote areas or with limited economic resources. Separate service procedures between institutions also often hinder people from obtaining legal recognition of their marriages. From an institutional standpoint, the Civil Registry Office has the authority to record civil events and issue civil registration documents, while the Religious Court has the authority to determine the legality of marriages through the isbat court mechanism. Therefore, resolving the issue of unregistered marriages requires coordination between these two institutions.

Within the collaborative governance framework, this situation demonstrates the interdependence of resources between institutions. The Civil Registry Office does not have the authority to validate marriages, while the Religious Court cannot issue civil registration documents. Thus, collaboration becomes a solution to integrate these authorities into a single, streamlined service mechanism. Moreover, the starting conditions of the collaboration are influenced by the local government's commitment to improving public service quality. Integrated service innovation is viewed as a strategy to accelerate the resolution of civil registration issues that communities have long faced.

This concept aligns with the views of Agranoff and McGuire (2003), who argue that collaboration among public organizations is an important strategy to address complex and cross-sector policy issues. Agranoff emphasizes that inter-institutional cooperation allows for the exchange of resources and knowledge, which can enhance the effectiveness of public policy implementation.

This also aligns with Ansell and Gash (2007) in their work "Collaborative Governance in Theory and Practice", which explains that collaborative processes contain components that form cycles and influence one another. One of these components is face-to-face dialogue, which is crucial in collaboration because it fosters consensus-building. Direct communication (face-to-face) helps reduce stereotypes (i.e., actors' perceptions of negative traits in other actors) and enhances mutual respect among actors.

b. Institutional Design

The institutional design dimension relates to the organizational structure, rules, and mechanisms that govern the collaboration process among actors. According to Ansell and Gash (2007), a good institutional design should be able to create collaborative mechanisms that are transparent, inclusive, and accountable. This institutional structure is typically realized through cooperation agreements, the establishment of coordination forums, and clear role distribution among institutions.

In the implementation of the integrated isbat marriage service program, the institutional design of the collaboration is realized through several mechanisms, including:

    a.   Inter-institutional cooperation agreements

Collaboration between the Civil Registry Office (Dinas Kependudukan dan Pencatatan Sipil), Religious Court (Pengadilan Agama), and Ministry of Religious Affairs (Kementerian Agama) is usually formalized through memoranda of understanding or cooperation agreements that outline the roles and responsibilities of each party. For example, the 2023 cooperation agreement between the Civil Registry Office of Raja Ampat Regency, Sorong Class II Religious Court, and the Ministry of Religious Affairs of Raja Ampat Regency establishes integrated and quality service provision for the community.

b. Formation of cross-sector coordination teams

Coordination teams are established to integrate program implementation, from registering couples participating in the isbat court session to issuing civil registration documents.

c. Integration of service processes

In the integrated service model, the community can participate in isbat marriage sessions conducted by the Religious Court at the service location. Once the court decision is issued, the process of registering the marriage and issuing civil documents can be carried out directly by the Civil Registry Office.

d. Outreach service approach

In some cases, integrated isbat services are conducted at the sub-district or village level to reach communities with limited access to public services.

This institutional design reflects the principle of integrated public service, aiming to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of service delivery to the public. According to Emerson, Nabatchi, and Balogh (2012), collaborative governance requires a collaborative governance regime, which is an institutional system that enables actors involved in collaboration to work in a coordinated manner to achieve shared goals. In this system, formal rules and coordination mechanisms are critical factors in determining the success of the collaboration. In the context of this study, the existence of a clear institutional design allows the service process to run in an integrated manner, so that citizens no longer need to process various documents separately at different institutions. Moreover, a well-structured institutional design also enhances public service accountability, as each institution has clear responsibilities in the service delivery process.

c. Facilitative Leadership

The facilitative leadership dimension refers to the role of leaders in facilitating the collaboration process among institutions. In collaborative governance, leaders do not only act as decision-makers but also serve as mediators and facilitators who can build trust among actors. According to Ansell and Gash (2007), facilitative leadership plays a crucial role in sustaining collaboration because it enables effective communication and mediates conflicts that may arise between institutions. In the implementation of the integrated isbat marriage service program, facilitative leadership is reflected in the roles of the head of the Civil Registry Office, the Chairperson of the Religious Court, and local government leaders in coordinating program execution.

Leaders have several main functions in supporting collaboration, including: building shared commitment among institutions, facilitating cross-sector communication and coordination, mediating differences in organizational interests, and promoting innovation in public services. Facilitative leadership also contributes to creating a collaborative work culture among government agencies. In many cases, the success of integrated service programs heavily depends on the commitment of leaders to promote inter-institutional cooperation.

This perspective aligns with the concept of collaborative leadership proposed by Agranoff and McGuire (2003), which emphasizes that leaders in a collaborative network must be able to coordinate various actors with differing interests and authorities. With facilitative leadership, the collaboration process in the integrated isbat marriage service program can proceed effectively and sustainably.

Ansell and Gash (2007) also note that collaborative governance reflects the mutual interdependence among actors. The desire to engage in collaborative governance arises because actors recognize the limitations they face. Subsequently, these actors need to express their willingness and readiness to establish closer relationships with other actors. Each participating actor must acknowledge the legitimacy of other actors. Once actors commit to collaboration, it is necessary to build a sense of shared ownership over every step of the collaborative process.

5. Conclusion

Based on the findings and discussion regarding the practice of collaborative governance in the integrated isbat marriage service program between the Civil Registry Office (Dukcapil) and the Religious Court, it can be concluded that inter-agency collaboration is a crucial factor in enhancing the effectiveness of civil administration services for communities previously lacking legal marital status.

First, from the starting conditions dimension, collaboration between the Civil Registry Office and the Religious Court emerged as a response to a social problem: the high number of unregistered marriages. This condition caused many families to lack valid civil documents, which limited their access to public services. The interdependence of authority between institutions where the Religious Court has the authority to determine the legality of marriages through the isbat trial, while the Civil Registry Office is authorized to record civil events became a driving factor for establishing collaboration in delivering integrated services.

Second, from the institutional design dimension, the implementation of the integrated isbat marriage service program has been supported by a clear institutional framework through inter-agency cooperation agreements, structured role allocation, and cross-sector coordination mechanisms. This institutional design allows the integration of service processes so that communities can obtain both legal marriage determination and civil administrative documents in a single service sequence.

Third, from the facilitative leadership dimension, the success of collaboration in the integrated isbat marriage service program is influenced by leadership that can facilitate communication and coordination among institutions. Facilitative leadership fosters shared commitment among actors, strengthens cross-sector coordination, and ensures the sustainability of the integrated service program.

Theoretically, this study contributes to the development of collaborative governance research in public administration, particularly in the context of civil administration service innovations. The study reinforces the relevance of the collaborative governance model, which emphasizes the importance of starting conditions, institutional design, and facilitative leadership in determining the success of inter-actor collaboration. This research enriches the literature on public service innovation based on collaboration among government institutions, especially in the context of civil administration services. The study demonstrates that cross-sector collaboration can be an effective strategy to address complex and multidimensional public service issues.

The findings provide several practical implications for public service management, particularly in civil administration. First, local governments need to strengthen inter-agency collaboration mechanisms in public service delivery. The integrated isbat marriage service program shows that service integration between the Civil Registry Office, the Religious Court, and related agencies can improve service efficiency and facilitate community access to legal documents. Second, enhancing human resource capacity in managing inter-agency collaboration is also crucial. Government personnel need coordination, communication, and collaborative management skills to ensure integrated service programs run optimally.

Although this study provides insights into collaborative governance practices in the integrated isbat marriage service program, there are several limitations to consider. This research focuses only on certain dimensions of the collaborative governance model namely, starting conditions, institutional design, and facilitative leadership so it does not provide an in-depth analysis of other dimensions, such as collaborative dialogue processes, trust building, or collaborative outcomes. Limitations in empirical data also pose challenges in depicting the dynamics of collaboration more comprehensively, especially regarding internal coordination processes between institutions and challenges faced in program implementation.

Data Availability Statement: "This article is a case study and includes several new primary data obtained from interviews, observations, and documentation. The materials analyzed in this study are derived from primary data and publicly available secondary sources, including peer-reviewed journal articles and conference proceedings indexed in recognized academic databases."

References

Agranoff, R., & McGuire, M. (2003). *Collaborative public management: New strategies for local governments*. Georgetown University Press. https://doi.org/10.1353/book13050

Ansell, C., & Gash, A. (2007). Collaborative governance in theory and practice. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 18*, 543–571. https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/mum032

Asriani, N. H. Z., & Suaib, M. R. (2024). Collaborative governance dalam inovasi pelayanan akta kelahiran di Dinas Kependudukan dan Pencatatan Sipil Kota Makassar. *Publican: Journal of Public Service, Public Police, and Administration, 3*(2), 86–99. https://doi.org/10.56326/jp.v3i2.3179

Dwiyanto, A. (2006). *Mengembalikan kepercayaan publik melalui reformasi birokrasi*. Gramedia.

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

Frederickson, G. H. (1997). *The spirit of public administration*. Jossey-Bass.

Godin, B. (2014). *The vocabulary of innovation: A lexicon* (Working Paper No. 20).

Hartley, J. (2005). Innovation in governance and public services: Past and present. *Public Money & Management, 25*(1), 27–34.

Hartman, C. L., Hofman, P., & Stafford, E. R. (2002). Environmental collaboration: Potential and limits. In T. de Bruijn & A. Tukker (Eds.), *Partnership and leadership: Building alliances for a sustainable future* (pp. 21–40). Kluwer Academic Publishers. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-017-2545-3_2

Herawati, A., & Oktaviannoor, H. (2022). *Buku ajar pengantar demografi*. Penerbit NEM.

Islamy, L. O. S. (2008). *Collaborative governance: Konsep dan aplikasi*. Deepublish.

Kuratko, D. F. (2007). *Entrepreneurship: A contemporary approach* (7th ed.). Thompson Learning.

Manpioper, I. B., Mustofa, A., Sedarmayanti, & Ferriswara, D. (2025). Mobile outreach services as a strategy for inclusive population administration in archipelagic regions: A literature review. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences Reviews, 3*(1), 1–13. https://doi.org/10.62951/ijhs.v3i1.564

Moore, M., & Hartley, J. (2008). Innovations in governance. *Public Management Review, 10*(1), 3–20. https://doi.org/10.1080/14719030701763161

Nählinder, J., & Fogelberg Eriksson, A. (2019). Outcome, process and support: Analysing aspects of innovation in public sector organizations. *Public Money & Management, 39*(6), 443–449. https://doi.org/10.1080/09540962.2018.1559617

O'Leary, R., & Bingham, L. B. (2009). *The collaborative public manager*. Georgetown University Press.

Osborne, S. P., & Brown, K. (2012). *Managing change and innovation in public service organizations*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203391129

Prabowo, H., Suwanda, D., & Syafri, W. (2022). *Inovasi pelayanan pada organisasi publik*. PT Remaja Rosdakarya.

Prayogo, M. C., Wibowo, J. A. P., Saniyah, S., & Qurratu 'Ain, A. F. (2025). Strategi collaborative governance sebagai upaya optimalisasi pelayanan publik pada program IKD. *Jurnal Dinamika Sosial dan Sains, 2*(3), 572–577. https://doi.org/10.60145/jdss.v2i3.163

Prihatin, E. (2011). *Teori administrasi pendidikan*. Alfabeta.

Purwanti, N. D. (2016). *Collaborative governance (Kebijakan publik dan pemerintahan kolaboratif, isu-isu kontemporer)*. Center for Policy & Management Studies FISIPOL UGM.

Rohman, D. F. (2013). *Implementasi kebijakan pelayanan administrasi kependudukan terpadu* (Doctoral dissertation). Universitas Brawijaya.

Salsabila, R., & Lubis, Z. (2022). Kependudukan dalam masyarakat global. *Jurnal Bakti Sosial, 1*(2), 8–13. https://doi.org/10.63736/jbs.v1i2.57

Siagian, S. P. (2012). *Administrasi pembangunan: Konsep, dimensi, dan strategi*. Bumi Aksara.

Siffin, W. J. (1990). The problem of development administration. In *Handbook of comparative and development of public administration*.

Silvia, C. (2011). Collaborative governance: Concepts for successful network leadership. *State and Local Government Review, 43*(1), 66–71. https://doi.org/10.1177/0160323X11400211

Torfing, J., Andersen, L. B., Greve, C., & Klausen, K. K. (2020). *Public governance paradigms: Competing and co-existing*. Edward Elgar Publishing. https://doi.org/10.4337/9781788971225

Urabe, K., Child, J., & Kagono, T. (1988). *Innovation and management: International comparisons*. De Gruyter. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110864519

Wismayanti, K. D. W. (2024). Collaborative governance berbasis transformasi digital melalui program Taring Dukcapil. *Socio-Political Communication and Policy Review, 1*(3), 127–134. https://doi.org/10.61292/shkr.126