

Management Of Building Permit Policy (PBG) In Masamba City, North Luwu Regency

Marsuki¹, Arifuddin Akil² Mukti Ali³

¹Urban Management Student, Graduate School, Hasanuddin University, Makassar, Indonesia

²Urban Planning and Design, Graduate School, Hasanuddin University, Makassar, Indonesia

³Urban Management Study Program, Graduate School of Hasanuddin University, Makassar, Indonesia

Abstract

This study aims to identify alternative government policies related to the effective implementation of building permits in accordance with government regulations and that can be easily applied by the local community, particularly in Masamba City and North Luwu Regency. The research sample included 91 individuals who had applied for Building Permit Approval (PBG) and 18 government officials responsible for providing PBG services. Scoring analysis techniques were used to identify the mechanisms and challenges in processing PBG applications, while policy recommendations were determined descriptively based on Importance Performance Analysis (IPA). The research findings indicate that the implementation of PBG policies in Masamba City still faces various challenges, such as insufficient public understanding of new regulations, limited resources among implementing officials and technical staff assisting applicants, and inadequate socialization and coordination among relevant agencies. However, the local government has undertaken several strategic initiatives, including the digitization of licensing services and the enhancement of human resource capacity. This study concludes that PBG policy management in Masamba City emphasizes the importance of inter-agency synergy, implementation oversight, and public participation to achieve the goal of orderly building development that meets technical standards.

Keywords: Management, policy, Building Approval, Masamba-North Luwu

INTRODUCTION

Community involvement in the construction of the building is not only for the purpose of constructing and utilizing the building for their own interests, but also to improve compliance with building requirements and orderly building construction in general.

Government Regulation No. 16 of 2021 stipulates that all members of the public must obtain a permit before constructing a building, which is referred to as a Building Construction Permit (PBG). Prior to the enactment of the Job Creation Law No. 11 of 2020, the PBG was known as the Building Construction Permit (IMB), where the requirements for the IMB focused on Administrative Requirements and Technical Requirements, whereas the PBG places greater emphasis on Technical Requirements. According to Government Regulation No. 16 of 2021, the Building Construction Permit is defined as the authorization granted to the owner of a building to construct, alter, expand, reduce, and/or maintain the building in accordance with technical standards for building construction.

In North Luwu Regency, there are many buildings that have been constructed without permits. According to data from the Public Works and Spatial Planning Agency (PUTRPKP2) in Masamba Subdistrict, there are 1,501 buildings along the arterial road from Radda Bridge to Baliase Bridge. Approximately 1,000 of these buildings lack permits. However, the essence of the Building Permit (PBG) is to ensure the safety, reliability, and comfort of constructed buildings. Residents without building permits believe that permits are not yet beneficial to them, and they only apply for permits if they plan to use them to secure bank loans. The lack of strict enforcement of penalties is also a factor contributing to the high number of residents who do not obtain permits before constructing buildings. Therefore, efforts must be made to increase public awareness of the importance of obtaining building permits, either through voluntary compliance or through other measures that compel residents to obtain permits.

The implementation of PBG through the web-based SIMBG application via the link <https://simbg.pu.go.id> aims to simplify the licensing process in accordance with the mandate of Government Regulation No. 16 of 2021. In accordance with the provisions of Government Regulation No. 16 of 2021, Article 347, Paragraph (2), local governments at the district/city level must provide PBG within a maximum period of 6 (six) months from the effective date of this Government Regulation.

Therefore, the local government of Luwu Utara District implemented PBG in January 2022. The initial implementation of the PBG in Luwu Utara District through the SIMBG system at the link <https://simbg.pu.go.id> faced its own challenges and obstacles. On one hand, online permit processing will simplify matters for the public, but on the other hand, it presents its own challenges, particularly regarding the readiness of equipment, applicants' understanding of the internet, and the staff managing the system.

Research by Prajapati and Laha (2019) shows that digitizing licensing services such as PBG can make things easier for the public and improve accountability. In line with this, Forster et al. (2020) and Eom and Lee (2014) emphasize the importance of human resource readiness and community involvement in the implementation of e-government-based policies. In various countries, the implementation of digital building permit systems has also helped to speed up service processes and increase transparency (Jansen and Bloemen, 2018; Lindblad and Wentz, 2018). However, challenges remain, particularly in terms of coordination and technical understanding (Ali and Olanrewaju, 2016; Azmi and Bee, 2017). Research by Zhang & Chen (2020) and Hu and Shi (2021) also found that the quality of digital services significantly influences public satisfaction and trust. According to Sprenkamp et al. (2025), the development of e-government chatbots like AskThePublic can increase public participation and strengthen policy transparency and accountability. This is because during the process, the public plays an active role and can find out how far the application process has progressed. Chen & Zhang (2021) emphasize that the quality of digital licensing services has a significant impact on public satisfaction, which is one of the indicators of the success of public policy implementation. Jansen & Bloemen (2018) compared traditional building permit approaches with systems based on technical standards, showing that the new approach is more flexible and adaptive. A more flexible and adaptive approach greatly facilitates the public in carrying out the permit application process.

The implementation of building permit digitization in various developing countries faces complex challenges that are not only related to technology but also to human resource readiness. Ali & Olanrewaju (2016), in their study in Malaysia, revealed that limitations in the number and competence of human resources are one of the main obstacles slowing down the digital transformation process of permits. Nevertheless, modernization efforts through e-permitting systems have proven to have a positive impact. Azmi & Bee (2017) explain that the implementation of electronic permitting systems by local authorities can significantly improve the transparency of the permitting process and the accountability of public services. Furthermore, Prajapati and Laha (2019), through research in smart cities, found that the digitization of permitting not only speeds up service delivery but also reduces the potential for abuse of authority by relevant parties. To ensure that this public policy is well-received by the public, it is important to present clear and easily understandable policy communication. Wittgenstein (2020) emphasizes the need for an intuitive communicative approach to encourage active public participation in supporting the policy. Additionally, Severin et al. (2020) also highlight the importance of data openness and the application of open access principles as steps to enhance transparency, accountability, and strengthen public trust in digital licensing policies.

In the context of Masamba City, North Luwu Regency, the implementation of PBG through the SIMBG system since 2022 has faced similar challenges. Low public understanding of technical building data, limited certified technical personnel, and coordination constraints between agencies have become obstacles that affect the effectiveness of the policy. This situation aligns with the theory of public policy implementation proposed by Dunn (2003) and Goggin et al. (1990), which emphasizes the importance of inter-agency communication, resource readiness, and community participation as key factors for successful implementation. Forster et al. (2020) explain the complexity of e-government implementation and the importance of inter-agency integration to enhance policy effectiveness. Additionally, Hu and Shi (2021) found that the quality of e-government services is closely correlated with the level of public trust in the government.

Based on the objective of PBG, which is to ensure that the constructed building units meet safety, reliability, and comfort requirements, technical requirements are emphasized in the construction process. The technical documents submitted by the applicant, including drawings and other technical documents,

must be prepared by licensed architects or at least those with STRA certification. This poses a challenge for North Luwu Regency due to the lack of technical personnel with STRA certification.

To date, the implementation of PBG through SIMBG in North Luwu Regency has been running for several years, but there are still shortcomings and obstacles in its implementation, both at the community level and among PBG managers. For this reason, the author deems it necessary to conduct a study to gain an understanding of the implementation of PBG in Luwu Utara District, the challenges faced, and the guidelines required to ensure that PBG implementation is transparent and accountable. Therefore, this research is important to evaluate the implementation of PBG in Luwu Utara District, particularly in Masamba City, to ensure that this policy aligns with government regulations and benefits the community. Additionally, this research is important to analyze the mechanisms, obstacles, and formulation of a more effective PBG policy management system in Masamba City, in line with the principles of good governance (UNDP, 1997) and international experiences (Nduwayezu et al., 2019).

RESEARCH METHODS

Types and Sources of Data

The types of data used are primary data and secondary data. Primary data consists of information on the conditions of the mechanisms and constraints faced by PBG applicants at the research location, as well as employees in the Cipta Karya Division of the PUTRPKP2 Office who are directly involved in processing Building Permits. Secondary data is derived from reports, archives, journals, regulations related to PBG, and data from the PUTR Department of Luwu Utara District.

Data Analysis Techniques

The data analysis used was Importance Performance Analysis (IPA), which was then processed using Microsoft Excel software analysis tools. Importance Performance Analysis (IPA) aims to evaluate Building Approval services in North Luwu Regency based on performance levels and importance. To determine the direction of effective Building Permit policy management to be implemented in Masamba City, the third research objective can be achieved through the collection of secondary data in the form of policies and data results from the second objective using descriptive analysis, with the output being the formulation of an effective Building Permit (PBG) policy management system and procedures to be implemented in Luwu Utara Regency, using Masamba City as a case study.

RESULT

Based on Table 1, the results of the questionnaire calculations for the secretariat show that the level of compliance of respondents with the criteria used is almost entirely substandard. The types of criteria that are already of high quality are only found in 3 criteria, namely the signing of all documents by authorized/certified parties (101.96), the provision of PBG management training for other employees (103.70), and the availability of a special room for PBG services (113.73). These values indicate that the 3 criteria are already available and functioning very well.

Table 1. Level of compliance based on information from the Secretariat (staff)

Variable	Criteria	Performance	Importance	Level of Suitability (%)
Mechanism for Implementing PBG Policy	All data on land ownership/control is complete and valid	51	64	79,69
	The applicant's identity data is accurate and still valid	54	64	84,38
	The difference between spatial conformity information documents and building zoning	51	61	83,61
	Environmental documents (SPPL) are complete and valid	50	64	78,13

Variable	Criteria	Performance	Importance	Level of Suitability (%)
Obstacles Implementation of PBG	Completeness and conformity of architectural drawing standards	49	56	87,50
	Complete calculation documents and structural drawings in accordance with regulations	50	59	84,75
	Complete Mechanical, Electrical, and Plumbing (MEP) documents that comply with standards	49	63	77,78
	Signing of all documents by authorized/certified parties	52	51	101,96
	Compliance of the building plan conditions in the field with all documents	49	54	90,74
	Architectural, structural, and MEP documents are complete, compliant with standards, and signed by experts	51	52	98,08
	The building design complies with safety, health, comfort, and convenience requirements	47	57	82,46
	Compliance of field conditions with planning documents	47	54	87,04
	All buildings meet technical standards	47	51	92,16
	Sufficient number of managers	42	51	82,35
	Procurement of PBG management training for other employees	56	54	103,70
	Availability of special rooms for PBG services	58	51	113,73

Meanwhile, the criterion with the lowest level of compliance is that environmental documents (SPPL) are complete and valid (78.13). This is because there are several environmental documents (SPPL) that are incomplete and invalid.

Table 2 shows the results of the Importance-Performance Analysis (IPA) conducted based on the assessment of the Secretariat Elements. The current condition of Building Permit (PBG) services shows that administrative aspects are functioning quite well. This is reflected in indicators such as the completeness of land ownership/possession documents, applicant identification data, and the consistency of information with land use purposes, which fall under Quadrant II (Maintain Performance). This means that this aspect has both high importance and performance levels, thus meeting expectations and requiring maintenance. Conversely, technical aspects such as environmental documents (SPL), structural building calculation documents, MEP documents, and the alignment of building designs with safety and comfort principles fall under Quadrant I (Top Priority). This quadrant indicates that these indicators have a high level of importance but low performance, making them the primary focus that needs to be improved immediately.

Table 2. Quadrant qualifications based on the results of IPA analysis for Secretariat Elements

Quadrant	No.	Criteria
Quadrant I Top Priority (Concentrate Here)	4	Environmental documents (SPPL) are complete and valid
	6	Complete calculation documents and structural drawings in accordance with regulations
	7	Complete Mechanical, Electrical, and Plumbing (MEP) documents that comply with standards
	11	The building design complies with safety, health, comfort, and convenience requirements
Quadrant II Maintain Prestasi (Keep Up The Good Work)	1	All data on land ownership/control is complete and valid
	2	The applicant's identity data is accurate and still valid
	3	The difference between spatial conformity information documents and building zoning
Quadrant III Priority Rendah (Low Priority)	5	Completeness and conformity of architectural drawing standards
	9	Compliance of the building plan conditions in the field with all documents
	12	Compliance of field conditions with planning documents
	13	All buildings meet technical standards
	14	Sufficient number of managers
Quadrant IV Excessive (Possible Overkill)	8	Signing of all documents by authorized/certified parties
	10	Architectural, structural, and MEP documents are complete, compliant with standards, and signed by experts
	15	Procurement of PBG management training for other employees

Furthermore, there are also several service aspects that fall under Quadrant III (Low Priority), such as the suitability of field conditions with technical plans and the sufficient number of managers. Indicators in this quadrant have low levels of importance and performance, so they are not a top priority for improvement in the short term. Meanwhile, indicators such as the completeness of technical documents and signatures by authorized parties fall into Quadrant IV (Excessive), meaning that their performance is already high but their level of importance is low according to the Secretariat, so they can be evaluated from an efficiency perspective. By understanding this quadrant map, it can be concluded that there is still a gap between the Secretariat's expectations regarding technical services and the actual conditions, particularly in terms of the substance of technical building documents. Therefore, there is a need to enhance human resource capacity, improve the technical support system, and strengthen cross-unit coordination to bridge the gap between expectations and implementation in the conduct of PBG.

Table 3. Quadrant qualifications based on IPA analysis results for Applicants/Community

Quadrant	No.	Criteria
Quadrant I Top Priority (Concentrate Here)	1	How to register for PBG online
	4	The verification process for PBG application documents does not exceed 3 days
	7	Understanding of the technical building data required in PBG applications
	13	Availability of technical personnel to prepare the applicant's technical documents
	14	Technical service fees for applicants
	15	Costs incurred other than levies and technical services
	16	The PBG issuance procedure is clear, well-documented, and easy to understand
	17	Information regarding PBG requirements, procedures, and fees is easily accessible to the public

Quadrant II Maintain Prestasi (Keep Up The Good Work)	6	There is a discrepancy in the building data
	10	The time required for the issuance of Rekomtek is as promised
	11	Professional and responsive service from PMPTSP officers
	12	Public satisfaction with overall services at the PMPTSP Office
Quadrant III Priority Rendah (Low Priority)	2	The online registration process makes it easier for the public
	3	Public opinion if registration is assisted by officers at the PUTRPKP2 Office
Quadrant IV Excessive (Possible Overkill)	20	The number of officers handling PBG issuance is sufficient to serve the community
	5	There is a discrepancy in the applicant's data
	8	The public receives clear and easy-to-understand explanations about how retribution values are determined, including the functions and classifications of buildings, as well as the unit prices used by local governments
	9	The staff at the Technical Office are friendly and helpful
	18	The PBG issuance process is in accordance with the service time standards set by the relevant agencies
	19	Officials handling the issuance of PBG have adequate competence to serve the public

Table 3 shows the results of the Importance-Performance Analysis (IPA) conducted based on the assessment of the Applicant/Community. The current condition of the Building Permit (PBG) service shows that the administrative aspects are functioning quite well. This is reflected in indicators such as building data, the time taken to issue Rekomtek, staff service, public satisfaction with the service, and the registration process, which fall into Quadrant II (Maintain Performance). This means that these aspects have equally high levels of importance and performance, and are therefore considered to have met expectations and should be maintained. On the other hand, technical aspects such as the online registration process for PBG, the verification process for PBG application documents not exceeding 3 days, understanding of the technical building data required for PBG applications, the availability of technical staff to prepare technical documents for applicants, technical service fees for applicants, costs incurred besides fees and technical service charges, PBG issuance procedures, information regarding the requirements, procedures, and costs of PBG being easily accessible to the public, fall into Quadrant I (High Priority). This quadrant indicates that these indicators have a high level of importance but low performance, making them the primary focus that needs to be improved immediately.

Furthermore, there are also several service aspects that fall under Quadrant III (Low Priority), such as public opinion on whether registration is assisted by officers and whether the number of officers handling PBG issuance is sufficient to serve the public. Indicators in this quadrant have low levels of importance and performance, so they are not a top priority for improvement in the short term. Meanwhile, indicators such as discrepancies in applicant data, the public receiving clear and easy-to-understand explanations about how retribution values are determined, and staff at the Technical Department being friendly and helpful, the PBG issuance process is in line with the service time standards set by the relevant agency, and staff handling PBG issuance have adequate competence to serve the public fall into Quadrant IV (Excessive), meaning their performance is already high but their level of importance is low according to applicants/the public, so they can be evaluated from an efficiency perspective. By understanding this quadrant map, it can be concluded that there is still a gap between the expectations of applicants/the public regarding technical services and the actual conditions, particularly in terms of the substance of technical building documents. Therefore, there is a need to improve the online registration and verification system to make it faster and more user-friendly, provide technical training to staff to deeply understand the technical needs of buildings, ensure sufficient and competent technical personnel to assist applicants, and ensure transparency in costs and easily accessible documentation of PBG procedures for the public.

DISCUSSION

Based on the research results, it appears that the implementation mechanism for the Building Permit Policy in Masamba City, North Luwu Regency, is generally in line with Government Regulation No. 16 of 2021. The process of issuing PBG through the SIMBG application has also followed standard procedures and mechanisms, from submitting applications, reviewing document completeness, conducting technical assessments, to issuing documents digitally.

However, the research findings also reveal that the implementation of the PBG policy in the field still faces various challenges. These challenges primarily stem from limitations in human resources (HR), both in terms of quantity and competence, as well as low public awareness of the importance of the PBG document. These challenges result in longer service processes, suboptimal coordination between agencies, and low public compliance in obtaining the PBG. These findings align with Dunn's (2003) Policy Implementation Theory, which explains that the success of public policy implementation is not solely determined by the quality of policy documents. Other factors such as the readiness of implementing agencies, availability of resources, clarity of communication between institutions, and public involvement also play significant roles. Although regulations are in place, policy implementation still requires adequate human resource capacity and active public participation.

In addition, the results of this study are also in line with the views of Goggin et al (1990), who emphasize the importance of inter-agency communication in the implementation of public policy. The lack of coordination between Regional Apparatus Organizations (OPD) such as the PUTRKP2 Office and the PMPTSP Office, as well as other related agencies, is one of the causes of ineffective service delivery. Good coordination is necessary to unify perceptions, speed up the verification process, and avoid duplication of work. Furthermore, this is also relevant to the concept of Good Governance introduced by UNDP (1997). The principles of Good Governance emphasize the importance of transparency, accountability, effectiveness, and efficiency in the delivery of public services. In this context, the implementation of PBG through a digital system such as SIMBG is a step toward more transparent and efficient services. However, to function optimally, it requires support from human resource readiness, comprehensive supporting regulations, and greater public awareness.

Based on the findings of the study on the implementation mechanism of the PBG policy in Masamba City, it is in line with Government Regulation No. 16 of 2021; however, there are challenges related to the limited number and competence of human resources involved in its implementation, including certified technical personnel (Architects/STRA). Therefore, it is necessary to enhance human resource capacity through regular training and additional recruitment as needed. The implementation of the PBG policy still depends on regional regulations that are not yet fully complete, such as the RDTR for all districts. The supporting regulations at the regional level are not yet optimal. It is necessary to accelerate the formulation, updating, and harmonization of regional regulations, particularly the RDTR and zoning regulations.

Other findings include that implementation still involves several government agencies such as the Department of Public Works and Spatial Planning (PUTRKP2) and the Department of Investment and One-Stop Service (PMPTSP), as well as other relevant agencies. However, coordination among these agencies has not been optimal, as there is no regular communication forum. A regular inter-agency coordination forum should be established to align perspectives and expedite the verification process.

It was also found that there is low compliance and awareness among the public regarding the obligation to have a PBG, due to insufficient socialization and low public understanding. It is necessary to conduct massive socialization activities using social media, and direct outreach to the public is very important.

The service system is already SIMBG-based, but some staff and the public are still unfamiliar with or unskilled in using SIMBG or encounter difficulties when the system is updated. Technical training on SIMBG for staff is very necessary, and it should be socialized to village and sub-district governments to facilitate socialization to the public, and internal guidelines should be prepared to deal with system changes.

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the results and discussion of the research conducted using the five variables modified from previous studies, it can be concluded that the mechanism for implementing the Building Permit (PBG) policy in Masamba City has been carried out in accordance with Government Regulation No. 16 of 2021, namely through the following stages: submission of applications, document review, technical assessment and consultation, and issuance of the PBG through the Building Permit Management System (SIMBG). Although this procedure complies with regulations, its implementation still faces several challenges. The challenges faced in implementing the PBG policy include: limited number and capacity of technical human resources (HR), instability in the SIMBG system, regional regulations that are not fully supportive (especially regarding zoning details), weak coordination among Regional Government Agencies (OPD), and low public awareness of the importance of PBG.

REFERENCE

1. Ali, M. & Olanrewaju, A. L. (2016). Implementation of building permit process improvement in Malaysia: Challenges and opportunities. *Journal of Construction in Developing Countries*, 21(1), 1-19.
2. Azmi, I. A. G. and Bee, N. G. (2017). The effectiveness of local authority e-permitting system in improving building control process in Malaysia. *Journal of Technology Management and Business*, 4(1), 1-12.
3. Chen, J. and Zhang, Q. (2021). Citizen satisfaction with e-government services: A comprehensive review. *Government Information Quarterly*, 38(4), 101505.
4. Duwayezu, G., Sliuzas, R. and Kuffer, M. (2019). The challenge of informal settlement upgrading using participatory approaches and spatial planning tools: The case of Kigali, Rwanda. *Habitat International*, 90, 102003.
5. Dunn, W. N. (2003). *Public Policy Analysis: An Introduction*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
6. Eom, S. J., and Lee, K. B. (2014). Determinants of citizens' participation in e-government: Focusing on open government data. *Government Information Quarterly*, 31(1), 123-132.
7. Forster, T., Ammons, D. N. and Mangum, S. (2020). E-government and the complexity of policy implementation. *Public Administration Review*, 80(5), 755-765.
8. Goggin, M. L., Bowman, A. O'M., Lester, J. P. and O'Toole, L. J. (1990). *Implementation Theory and Practice: Toward a Third Generation*. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman/Little, Brown Higher Education.
9. Hu, Q. and Shi, W. (2021). E-government service quality and citizen trust: Evidence from local governments in China. *Public Performance & Management Review*, 44(4), 845-867.
10. Jansen, J. and Bloemen, P. (2018). Managing urban development with building permits in the Netherlands: From traditional regulation to performance-based approaches. *Planning Practice & Research*, 33(1), 63-80.
11. Lindblad, M. R. and Wentz, E. A. (2018). Regulation and its enforcement: The impact of building permit systems on urban form. *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 40(7), 1005-1019.
12. Peraturan Pemerintah Republik Indonesia Nomor 16 Tahun 2021 tentang Peraturan Pelaksanaan Undang-Undang Nomor 28 Tahun 2002 tentang Bangunan Gedung.
13. Prajapati, R. and Laha, A. (2019). E-governance initiatives and building permit management: A study on smart cities. *Cities*, 93, 116-124.
14. Severin, A., Egger, M., Eve, M. P., and Hürlimann, D. (2020). Discipline-specific open access publishing practices and barriers to change: an evidence-based review. *F1000Research*, 9, 102003.
15. Sprenkamp, K., Messerschmidt, N. and Sartipi, A. (2025). Towards Effective EU E-Participation: The Development of AskThePublic. arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.03287.
16. UNDP. (1997). *Governance for Sustainable Human Development*. United Nations Development Programme.
17. Wittgenstein, L. (2020). Intuitive explanations, research narratives and 'maths dread'. In *Maximizing the Impacts of Academic Research*.
18. Zhang, J. and Chen, Q. (2020). Citizen satisfaction with e-government services: A comprehensive review. *Government Information Quarterly*, 37(4), 101505.