



TECHNIUM
SOCIAL SCIENCES JOURNAL

www.techniumscience.com



Vol. 69/2025
A New Decade for Social Changes

PLUS
COMMUNICATION P



International
Communication & PR

Implementation of the Monitoring Center for Prevention (MCP) Program in the Regional Inspectorate of the Province of North Sulawesi

Marsela Elsa Rondonuwu¹, Evi Elvira Masengi², Laurens Bulu³

Public Administration Magister Program, Universitas Negeri Manado, Indonesia

Email: merondonuwu@gmail.com¹, evielviramasengi@unima.ac.id²,
laurensbulu@unima.ac.id³

Abstract. The purpose of this research is to find out, analyze, and describe the implementation and determinant factors that exist in the Monitoring Center For Prevention (MCP) Program at the Regional Inspectorate of North Sulawesi Province. This research uses qualitative research methods. The results showed that first, the Capacity of Government Internal Supervisory Apparatus (APIP); In the implementation of supervision in the regional inspectorate, functional APIP for the first level is still lacking, functional competency improvement of APIP has not been fulfilled, and the budget for increasing APIP capacity is still lacking. Second, Institutional Strengthening; The filling of inspector and irbansus positions in the regional inspectorate is in accordance with procedures and the availability of supporting facilities for the implementation of supervision is not sufficient. Third, Control and Supervision; Forms of control and supervision from the Regional Inspectorate of North Sulawesi Province are the availability of media for handling public complaints, namely through the SP4N report application, telephone numbers to contact, websites, emails and can be brought directly to the inspectorate office. Anti-corruption socialization has been carried out aimed at the executive, namely the chairman, deputy and members of the DPRD, regional officials and their staff, village heads and village officials and the community. Determinant factors are that the budget for the implementation of supervision is still lacking, only getting 0.26 of the APBD which should be 0.9 of the APBD. The supporting facilities and infrastructure available in the implementation of supervision are inadequate, the filling of the first functional auditor position is not in accordance with the procedure.

Keywords. Policy Implementation, Monitoring Center For Prevention, Government Internal Audit Apparatus

A. Introduction

In Indonesia today, the government has made various policies and programs in order to achieve the state goals stated in the fourth paragraph of the Preamble of the 1945 Indonesian Constitution. Policies and programs that have been determined by the government are then implemented by policy actors.

Policy implementation is related to the implementation of policies that have been determined and there are various efforts in the form of activities directed at realizing policies through certain programs that have objectives to be achieved, even making policies and

programs is also present as a solution to problems that occur in society even in government organizations (Mamonto, 2023) [1]. One of the problems that still often occurs in Indonesia, both at the central and regional levels, is related to corruption, which is one of the main sources of state losses. To prevent the problem of corruption, one of the breakthroughs made by the government is to establish the Monitoring Center For Prevention (MCP) program in an effort to eradicate and prevent corruption.

Corruption eradication efforts according to Law Number 19 of 2019 concerning the Second Amendment to Law Number 30 of 2002 concerning the Corruption Eradication Commission Article 6 letter b is a series of actions to prevent and overcome corruption (through coordination, supervision, monitoring, investigation, prosecution and court hearings) with the participation of the community based on applicable laws and regulations. Corruption does not only occur at the Central Government level but also at the Local Government level. One form of the high commitment of the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK) in eradicating regional corruption is to eradicate regional corruption through coordination tasks.

There are eight areas of corruption prevention in the MCP program as stated in the 2023 MCP Program Guidebook for Local Governments and each area is equipped with indicators and sub-indicators as success criteria for regional corruption prevention. In 2023, there are 8 areas, 30 indicators, and 63 sub-indicators as the focus areas of the Local Government corruption prevention program.

First, Planning and Budgeting Area, indicators such as a) Regional Development Planning, b) Prevention of Budget Mark Up, c) Community Needs, d) Control and Supervision of the Use of APBD. Second, Goods and Services Procurement Area, the indicators are a) Procurement Implementation Innovation, b) Procurement Control, c) Strengthening UKPBJ Professionalism. Third, Licensing Area, the indicators are a) Transparency and Accountability, b) Facilities and Infrastructure, c) Ease of Licensing, d) Control and Supervision. Fourth, APIP Supervision Area, the indicators are a) APIP Capacity, b) Institutional Strengthening, c) Control and Supervision. Fifth, ASN Management Area, indicators are a) Merit System, b) ASN Governance, c) Increased ASN Integrity and Performance. Sixth, Regional Tax Optimization Area, the indicators are a) Strengthening the Tax Database, b) Innovation in Increasing Regional Taxes, c) Control and Supervision. Seventh, BMD Management Area, the indicators are a) BMD Administrative Security, b) BMD Physical and Legal Security, c) BMD Ordering, d) Control and Supervision. Eighth, Village Governance Area, the indicators are a) Regulation, b) Village Financial System, c) Village APB Consolidated Report, d) Publication and Transparency, e) Village Asset Database, f) Supervision.

The Regional Inspectorate of North Sulawesi Province as one of the local government agencies that also participates in implementing the MCP program which specifically handles the APIP Supervision Area, has indicators and sub-indicators such as the first APIP Capacity Indicator, its sub-indicators are Adequate Quantity / Personnel and HR Competence, Budget Adequacy. Second, Institutional Strengthening Indicators, the sub-indicators are Filling Inspector and Irbansus Positions, Supporting Facilities. Third, Control and Supervision Indicators, the sub-indicators are Handling Public Complaints, and Anticorruption Socialization.

The position of the Regional Inspectorate as a Government Internal Supervisory Apparatus (APIP) as stated in Government Regulation number 12 of 2017 concerning guidance and supervision is tasked with providing assistance to carry out guidance and supervision of regional government administration, in the administration of government, the Regional

Inspectorate has a strategic role and position to ensure that local government financial management is managed accountably and in accordance with established rules.

Presidential Regulation Number 54 of 2018 concerning the National Strategy for Corruption Prevention in article 1 point 1 explains that the National Strategy for Corruption Prevention, hereinafter referred to as Stranas PK, is the direction of national policies that contain the focus and objectives of corruption prevention as a reference for ministries, institutions, local governments and other stakeholders in implementing corruption actions in Indonesia. Furthermore, point 2 states that Corruption Prevention Action, hereinafter referred to as PK Action, is the elaboration of the focus and objectives of Stranas PK in the form of programs and activities.

In coordinating corruption prevention, KPK exercises its authority by establishing a reporting system in corruption eradication activities and requesting reports from authorized agencies on prevention efforts to prevent corruption. KPK coordinates with agencies authorized to eradicate corruption and agencies in charge of implementing public services. This task is carried out both in the context of prevention and eradication of corruption. Reporting on corruption prevention efforts by local governments is submitted through the Monitoring Center for Prevention (MCP) which can be accessed on the official JAGA.ID website. Efforts to implement the MCP Program are carried out with the aim that Local Governments can make efforts to prevent corruption both before corruption occurs and after corruption prosecution efforts have been carried out.

The Monitoring Center For Prevention (MCP) program is a joint agreement between the Ministry of Home Affairs, the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK), and the Financial and Development Supervisory Agency (BPKP) to strengthen MCP management and also as an instrument in eradicating corruption in the regions. In the Monitoring Center For Prevention (MCP) Assessment Guidebook, it is explained that based on statistical data on corruption crimes handled by the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK) since its establishment in 2004 until 2023, the agency with the highest perpetrators of corruption is the Regional Government (Province and Regency / City), which is 53%. For the North Sulawesi Provincial Government, there were 10 corruption cases handled by the KPK between 2004 and 2023. This shows that the North Sulawesi Provincial Government needs to be strengthened in corruption prevention actions and programs that are more focused and directed at points of corruption-prone areas.

Data on the results of the Monitoring Center For Prevention (MCP) program in 2023 according to Jaga.id, namely for North Sulawesi province is ranked 17th with an index of 90 compared to the provinces of Bali, West Java, and West Kalimantan which reached an index of 98 and as a province that achieved the highest MCP results in 2023. As for the Data Per MCP Area in North Sulawesi Province in 2023, especially the APIP Supervision area for the North Sulawesi Provincial Government reached 84.02, North Minahasa Regency 78.2, Southeast Minahasa Regency 85.45, South Minahasa Regency 84.48, Tomohon City 86.05, North Bolaang Mongondow Regency 76, 21, Talaud 76.24, Kotamobagu City 87.87, East Bolaang Mongondow 80.58, Minahasa 78.28, South Bolaaan Mongondow 68.51, Siau Tagulandang Biaro Islands 73, Manado City 74.88, Bolaang Mongondow 79.11, Bitung City 60.33, and Sangihe Islands 53.1.

Based on the results of research that has been obtained by researchers related to the implementation of the MCP Program in the Regional Inspectorate of North Sulawesi Province which specifically handles the APIP Supervision area, there are still several problems, namely that the achievement of the North Sulawesi Provincial Government towards this MCP program

is still not optimal, this can be seen from the KPK assessment data which only touches 90 compared to other provinces, Even the assessment from the KPK that the North Sulawesi Provincial Government is ranked 17th below other Provincial Governments, the data can be seen in the previous paragraph, then for the Regional Inspectorate of North Sulawesi Province which handles the APIP Supervision area, it can be seen that the existing data only touches 84 compared to other areas, so that this is what causes the North Sulawesi Provincial Government not to get a regional incentive fund reward from the Ministry of Home Affairs on the recommendation of the KPK. In fact, there are still other obstacles in the implementation of this program, namely the weak supervision carried out by the inspectorate as APIP, besides that the regulations are not ready and are not well known by government officials in the Regional Inspectorate, even limited budgets and facilities, the ability of APIP resources is still lacking, so that these problems can cause this program not to run in accordance with the objectives and targets that have been set. The KPK MCP Program should be expected to provide benefits, effects on improving local governance in the context of efforts to prevent corruption in North Sulawesi Province, but in reality there are still gaps and problems that occur in the implementation of this MCP Program.

Based on the background description of the research problem, the researcher is interested in conducting research by raising the title of the Implementation of the Monitoring Center For Prevention (MCP) Program at the Regional Inspectorate of North Sulawesi Province.

B. Method

The research approach used by researchers is qualitative research methods. This method is considered good and can help researchers in describing and analyzing problems regarding the Implementation of the Monitoring Center For Prevention (MCP) Program at the Regional Inspectorate of North Sulawesi Province. Through qualitative research which emphasizes the process of searching for meaning, disclosing the meaning, behind the phenomena that arise in research, with the aim that the problems to be studied are more comprehensive, in-depth, natural and as they are and without much interference from researchers to the facts that appear in the field.

The first research focus is on the Implementation of the Monitoring Center For Prevention (MCP) Program seen from the APIP Supervision area at the Regional Inspectorate of North Sulawesi Province based on the 2023 MCP Program Guidelines, for a description of the focus, namely the first APIP Capacity which consists of Quantity / Personnel Adequacy, Personnel Competence, Budget Adequacy. Second Institutional Strengthening consists of Filling Inspector and Irbansus Positions, Supporting Facilities. Third Control and Supervision consists of Handling Public Complaints, Anticorruption Socialization. Then the second focus is on Determinant Factors in the Implementation of the Monitoring Center For Prevention (MCP) Program at the Regional Inspectorate of North Sulawesi Province.

The data collection techniques used were interviews, observations, and documentation studies. The data analysis technique uses the interactive model of Miles and Huberman (1984) in Sugiyono (2017), namely: data collection, data reduction, data display, and data conclusion/verification. [2].

C. Result and discussion

Implementation of the Monitoring Center For Prevention (MCP) Program seen from the APIP Supervision area at the Regional Inspectorate of North Sulawesi Province

Policy has a broad meaning and multiple interpretations. For example, James Anderson in Sutmasa (2021) gives the meaning of policy as the behavior of actors in certain fields of activity. The above definition is very broad and can be interpreted in various ways, for example, the actor can be an individual or organization; can be government or non-government. Likewise, the term certain activities can mean administrative, political, economic and other activities. In addition, the form of activity is also broad and has multiple interpretations, for example, it can be in the form of achieving goals, planning, programs, and so on [3].

The development of policy science is heavily influenced by changes and developments in natural sciences and social sciences. In its development, the science of policy analysis undergoes a metamorphosis in terms along with the development of human understanding of the needs of social life and how to organize social life. Thus policy analysis is one of the applied social science disciplines, which uses various research methods and arguments to produce policy-relevant information (Nugroho, 2021) [4].

According to William N. Dunn in Masengi et al. (2023) says that public policy is a series of interconnected choices made by government agencies or officials in areas concerning government duties, such as defense and security, energy, health, education, public welfare, crime, urban areas and others [5]. Meanwhile Santoso (2010) argues that policy implementation is the activities carried out to implement a policy effectively. Policy implementation here emphasizes on precisely operationalizing the policy objectives that have been set in the form of temporary actions [6].

The concept of Laswell and Kaplan in Langkai (2020) says that public policy is a program projected with certain goals, values and practices. Public policy is a result of government activity. So the government carries out activities in the form of public policy [7].

In line with these developments, there are at least 3 basic things that are significant in the study of public policy, namely: a) The fact that the demands of society are increasingly numerous and diverse requires a study in the form of research and development before public policy is determined. This then raises the discipline of policy analysis which is believed to be one of the basic keys in making public policy; b) The need for in-depth abilities for public policy makers, public policy analysts and also public policy advisers encourages the importance of study and understanding of public policy; c) Global developments that lead to competition and the implementation of a rapidly growing market model require the need for public policy to be strategized in order to deal with various problems that surround it, both internal and external.

The public policy process is a complex process because it involves many processes and variables that must be studied. Therefore, some political scientists who are interested in studying public policy divide the processes of formulating public policy into several stages. The purpose of this division is to make it easier for us to study public policy.

To facilitate policy implementation Akib (2014) in Bulu et al. (2016) explained that it is necessary to do dissemination well. There are four requirements for managing policy dissemination, namely: a) the respect of community members for government authorities to explain the moral need to comply with laws made by the authorities, b) awareness to accept policies. Awareness and willingness to accept and implement policies are realized when policies are considered logical, c) belief that policies are made legally, d) initially a policy is considered controversial, but over time the policy is considered a natural thing [8]. Public Policy exists as a form of effort in solving problems that occur in society or the public. Where public policy is

directed at fulfilling the interests and organizing public affairs. The main task of the government is to provide services, which means services for the public or public services.

Policy implementation is related to the implementation of policies that have been determined and there are various efforts in the form of activities directed at realizing policies through certain programs that have goals to be achieved, even making policies and programs is also present as a solution to problems that occur in society even in government organizations (Ramhdani & Ramdhani, 2017) [9]. One of the problems that still often occurs in Indonesia, both at the central and regional levels, is related to corruption, which is one of the main sources of state losses. To prevent the problem of corruption, one of the breakthroughs made by the government is to establish the Monitoring Center For Prevention (MCP) program in an effort to eradicate and prevent corruption.

Corruption eradication efforts according to Law Number 19 of 2019 concerning the Second Amendment to Law Number 30 of 2002 concerning the Corruption Eradication Commission Article 6 letter b is a series of actions to prevent and overcome corruption (through coordination, supervision, monitoring, investigation, prosecution and court hearings) with the participation of the community based on applicable laws and regulations. Corruption does not only occur at the Central Government level but also at the Local Government level. One form of the high commitment of the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK) in eradicating regional corruption is to eradicate regional corruption through coordination tasks.

In coordinating corruption prevention, KPK exercises its authority by establishing a reporting system in corruption eradication activities and requesting reports from authorized agencies on prevention efforts to prevent corruption. KPK coordinates with agencies authorized to eradicate corruption and agencies in charge of implementing public services. This task is carried out both in the context of prevention and eradication of corruption. Reporting on corruption prevention efforts by local governments is submitted through the Monitoring Center for Prevention (MCP) which can be accessed on the official JAGA.ID website. Efforts to implement the MCP Program are carried out with the aim that Local Governments can make efforts to prevent corruption both before corruption occurs and after corruption prosecution efforts have been carried out.

The Monitoring Center For Prevention (MCP) program is a joint agreement between the Ministry of Home Affairs, the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK), and the Financial and Development Supervisory Agency (BPKP) to strengthen MCP management and also as an instrument in eradicating corruption in the regions.

There are eight areas of corruption prevention in the MCP program as stated in the 2023 MCP Program Guidebook for Local Governments and each area is equipped with indicators and sub-indicators as criteria for the success of regional corruption prevention. In 2023, there are 8 areas, 30 indicators, and 63 sub-indicators as the focus areas of the Local Government corruption prevention program.

First, Planning and Budgeting Area, indicators such as a) Regional Development Planning, b) Prevention of Budget Mark Up, c) Community Needs, d) Control and Supervision of the Use of APBD. Second, Goods and Services Procurement Area, the indicators are a) Procurement Implementation Innovation, b) Procurement Control, c) Strengthening UKPBJ Professionalism. Third, Licensing Area, the indicators are a) Transparency and Accountability, b) Facilities and Infrastructure, c) Ease of Licensing, d) Control and Supervision. Fourth, APIP Supervision Area, the indicators are a) APIP Capacity, b) Institutional Strengthening, c) Control and Supervision. Fifth, ASN Management Area, indicators are a) Merit System, b) ASN Governance, c) Increased ASN Integrity and Performance. Sixth, Regional Tax Optimization

Area, the indicators are a) Strengthening the Tax Database, b) Innovation in Increasing Regional Taxes, c) Control and Supervision. Seventh, BMD Management Area, the indicators are a) BMD Administrative Security, b) BMD Physical and Legal Security, c) BMD Ordering, d) Control and Supervision. Eighth, Village Governance Area, the indicators are a) Regulation, b) Village Financial System, c) Village APB Consolidated Report, d) Publication and Transparency, e) Village Asset Database, f) Supervision.

The position of the Regional Inspectorate as a Government Internal Supervisory Apparatus (APIP) as stated in Government Regulation number 12 of 2017 concerning guidance and supervision is tasked with providing assistance to carry out guidance and supervision of regional government administration, in the administration of government, the Regional Inspectorate has a strategic role and position to ensure that local government financial management is managed accountably and in accordance with established rules.

The Regional Inspectorate of North Sulawesi Province as one of the local government agencies that also participates in implementing the MCP program which specifically handles the APIP Supervision Area, has indicators and sub-indicators such as the first APIP Capacity Indicator, its sub-indicators are Quantity / personnel adequacy, HR competence, Budget adequacy. Second, Institutional Strengthening Indicators, the sub-indicators are Filling Inspector and Irbansus Positions, Supporting Facilities. Third, Control and Supervision Indicators, the sub-indicators are Handling Public Complaints, and Anticorruption Socialization.

APIP Supervision in the 2023 MCP Guidebook is explained to have several indicators and sub-indicators, including the following: First, APIP Capacity which consists of Quantity/personal Adequacy, HR Competence, Budget Adequacy. Second, Institutional Strengthening which consists of Filling Inspector and Irbansus Positions, and Supporting Facilities. Third, Control and Supervision, which consists of Handling Public Complaints, and Anticorruption Socialization (Mustafiq et al., 2024) [10].

Based on this theory when juxtaposed with this research, it was found that the APIP Capacity indicator, namely APIP functional personnel in the regional inspectorate, was insufficient, and for increasing the functional competence of APIP in the inspectorate had not been fulfilled, the budget for increasing the capacity of APIP in the inspectorate was still lacking.

In the Institutional Strengthening indicator, research data were obtained, namely the filling of inspector and irbansus positions in the regional inspectorate in accordance with existing procedures, and the availability of facilities to support the implementation of supervision in institutional strengthening is inadequate.

In the Control and Supervision indicator, namely the availability of media for handling public complaints, namely the SP4N report application, telephone numbers that can be contacted, websites, emails and can come directly to the regional inspectorate office. In addition, anti-corruption socialization has also been carried out to reduce the risk of corruption. Socialization is aimed at the executive, namely the chairman, deputy and members of the DPRD, regional officials and their staff, village heads and officials and even the general public.

Determinant Factors in the Implementation of the Monitoring Center For Prevention (MCP) Program at the Regional Inspectorate of North Sulawesi Province

Public policy implementation is a process of administrative activities carried out after the policy is determined / approved. This activity lies between policy formulation and policy evaluation. Policy implementation contains top-down logic, which means reducing /

interpreting alternatives that are still abstract or macro into concrete or micro alternatives. Meanwhile, policy formulation contains bottom-up logic, in the sense that this process begins with mapping public needs or accommodating environmental demands, followed by searching and selecting alternative ways of solving them, then proposing to be determined (Tumbel, 2024) [11].

Pasolong (2017) in Masengi et al. (2023) argue that people often assume that implementation is only the implementation of what the legislature or decision makers have decided, as if this stage has little effect. However, in reality it can be seen for yourself that no matter how good the plan that has been made is, it is useless if it is not implemented properly and correctly. It requires truly honest implementers, to produce what is the goal and really show the applicable government signs. Policies that have been recommended by policy makers are not a guarantee that the policy will be successful in its implementation [12].

Some of the challenges faced by implementers consider the impact of several phases of the policy process according to Nawawi, namely: (1) Problems and demands are constantly redefined in the policy process, (2) Policymakers often define problems for those who have not defined them themselves, (3) programs that require community and intergovernmental participation when they contain various interpretations of the purpose of the program itself. Inconsistent interpretations of program objectives often go unresolved, (4) Programs may be implemented without the need to study failures. (5) Programs often reflect agreements that can be easily reached rather than actual certainty, (6) Many programs are developed and implemented without clearly defining the problem.

Obstacles in the effectiveness of policy implementation can be analyzed according to the views of George C. Edwards III in Setyawan et al. (2021), namely the policy implementation model with a top down perspective that plays an important role in achieving successful implementation, namely: communication, resources, disposition and bureaucratic structure [13]. The four perspectives can be explained below:

First, Communication; Implementation of public policy in order to achieve success, requires that implementors know what to do clearly. What are the goals and objectives of the policy must be informed to the target group so that it will reduce implementation distortion. If the delivery of the goals and objectives of a policy is unclear, does not provide understanding or even the goals and objectives of the policy are not known at all by the target group, then there is likely to be a rejection or resistance from the target group concerned.

Second, Resources; in policy implementation must be supported by resources, both human resources, material and methods, goals, objectives and policy content even though they have been communicated clearly and consistently, but if implementers lack the resources to carry out implementation it will not run effectively and efficiently. Resources are an important factor for policy implementation to be effective and efficient. Without resources, policies only stay on paper as documents and are not realized to provide solutions to problems in society and efforts to provide services to the community.

Third, Disposition (Attitude); a disposition in implementation is the characteristics, attitudes possessed by policy implementers, such as commitment, communicative honesty, ingenuity and democratic nature.

Fourth, Bureaucratic Structure; the organization provides a simple map to show in general terms its activities and the distance from the top shows its relative status. The lines between the various positions are framed to show the formal interactions that are established. In implementing policies, the organizational structure has an important role. One of the aspects of the organizational structure is the existence of standard operating procedures (SOPs). The

function of the SOP is to guide each implementor in action. Organizational structures that are too long tend to weaken supervision and create red-tape, which is a complicated and complex bureaucratic procedure. This in turn makes organizational activities inflexible.

According to Gow and Morss (Pasolong, 2007), there are various obstacles in policy implementation, including (1) political, economic and environmental obstacles, (2) institutional weaknesses, (3) human resource incompetence in technical and administrative fields, (4) lack of technical assistance, (5) lack of decentralization and participation, (6) timing, (7) unsupportive information systems, (8) differences in goal agendas between actors (continuous support). [14].

Van Meter and Horn in Sirajuddin (2014) also explain the determining factors in the success of policy implementation as outlined in the policy implementation model, which must run linearly from public policy, implementors, and public policy performance [15].

Several variables in the Meter and Horn Implementation Model in Supit & Lumingkewas (2023), namely, (1) policy standards and objectives, policy standards and objectives are basically what the program or policy is trying to achieve, whether tangible or intangible, short, medium or long term. The clarity and objectives of the policy must be seen specifically so that at the end of the program the success or failure of the policy or program can be known. (2) policy performance, is an assessment of the achievement of policy standards and objectives that have been set at the beginning. (3) resources point to how much financial and human resources to implement the program or policy. (4) communication between implementing agencies, refers to the procedural mechanism launched to achieve program goals and objectives. (5) characteristics of the implementing agency, pointing to how much support the organizational structure, values, relationships and communication occur within the bureaucracy. (6) social, economic and political environment, indicating that the environment in the implementation domain can affect the success of the policy implementation itself. (7) the attitude of the implementer, indicating that the attitude of the implementer is an important variable in policy implementation. So it can be seen that this model shows that policy implementation is a very complex model, where one variable can affect other variables [16].

The Monitoring Center for Prevention (MCP) program is a joint agreement between the Ministry of Home Affairs, the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK), and the Financial and Development Supervisory Agency (BPKP) to strengthen the management of the MCP and also as an instrument in eradicating corruption in the regions (Abadi, 2023) [17].

The MCP program on regional corruption prevention efforts for local governments has the following objectives as recorded in the MCP Program Guidebook 2023, namely as follows: 1) Identifying corruption hotspots so as to map the potential vulnerability of corruption in each Local Government. 2) Encouraging the commitment of the Regional Head and Regional ASN Officials and Employees including legislative elements and other relevant stakeholders in preventing corruption. 3) Encourage improvements in local governance as part of efforts to prevent regional corruption. 4) Ensure the implementation and consistency of the corruption prevention system that has been built. 5) Provide advice and / or recommendations to the Regional Government regarding steps to improve governance that can prevent regional corruption practices (Tua & Mahi, 2022) [18].

Based on the theory above, if it is related to this research, it is found that the Determinant Factors in the Implementation of the Monitoring Center For Prevention (MCP) Program at the Regional Inspectorate of North Sulawesi Province, namely the budget or resources in implementing the supervision program at the Regional Inspectorate of North Sulawesi Province are still insufficient. Which resulted in still not optimal achievement results

obtained by the Regional Inspectorate of North Sulawesi Province in the MCP Program, because in 2023, especially in the Supervision Area section, the results decreased.

Implementation of public policy requires sufficient funds or resources. One of the main challenges is ensuring that the approved budget can be used efficiently. Even the success of policy implementation also depends heavily on the competence and capacity of the human resources involved in the implementation process. This includes government officials, bureaucrats, and technical personnel who have the skills to carry out the policy.

These resources are critical in ensuring that public policies are implemented effectively and efficiently, and have a positive impact on society. It is important to manage all these resources effectively and efficiently. Without good resources, public policies can fail to achieve their goals, and can even create new problems. Therefore, public policies need to be designed by taking into account the availability and proper management of resources, as well as considering the existing limitations. The success of public policy also requires the ability to optimize the use of these resources by reducing waste and ensuring that existing resources are utilized to the maximum extent possible to achieve the stated policy objectives.

Another determinant factor is that the filling of functional positions is closely related to the variables that influence the policy, namely: Communication, Resources, Disposition and Bureaucratic Structure. Communication is a very important variable in the successful implementation of policies, including the appointment of functional positions. Unclear communication leads to misunderstanding or confusion which ultimately causes delays in the appointment of functional officials. Resources include everything needed to support policy implementation, including the appointment of functional positions. Resources include not only human resources but also an adequate budget and good facilities and infrastructure that will help smooth the process of appointing functional officials. Disposition refers to the readiness, attitude and motivation of those involved in policy implementation. In this case, it is related to the strong commitment of leaders and officials. The leadership's commitment to the process of filling positions greatly affects the smoothness. If the leadership does not fully support it, the implementation of this position filling policy can be hampered. Bureaucratic Structure includes regulatory procedures within the organization that affect how a policy or program is implemented. The more complicated the bureaucracy, the more difficult it is for policies to be implemented effectively. Procedures for filling functional positions that are too bureaucratic and complicated can slow down the process of appointing functional officials. In addition, if the bureaucratic structure is unclear or there is no coordination between related units in the process of filling positions, it can cause delays or mismatches in positions. In the context of policy implementation according to Edward III, filling positions in accordance with procedures can ensure that communication, resources, disposition and bureaucratic structure can optimally support policy implementation.

If this research is compared with previous research, it can be explained that it has differences, namely this research focuses more on the Monitoring Center For Prevention (MCP) Program and discusses more about its implementation and determinants, while previous research focuses more on the effectiveness of MCP, analysis of the role of APIP in the MCP Program, and on the implementation of E-Government in Corruption Prevention. Then it has a different research locus where the researcher takes the locus in the Regional Inspectorate of North Sulawesi Province, while previous research took the locus in Riau and in other areas. But between this research and previous research, there are similarities, namely using the same qualitative research method to discuss the MCP program.

D. Conclusion

Based on the research data that has been presented, analyzed, and discussed in the research described above related to the Implementation of the Monitoring Center For Prevention (MCP) Program at the Regional Inspectorate of North Sulawesi Province, it can be concluded that the implementation of this MCP program has been running but not yet effective. This is evidenced by the data that 1) APIP Capacity; In the implementation of supervision in the Regional Inspectorate of North Sulawesi Province, APIP functional personnel are insufficient, APIP functional capacity building has not been fulfilled, and the budget for increasing the quantity of APIP in the regional inspectorate is still lacking. 2) Institutional Strengthening; Filling the positions of Inspector and Irbansus in the regional inspectorate is in accordance with procedures and the availability of supporting facilities is not yet adequate. 3) Control and Supervision; The form of control and supervision from the Regional Inspectorate is the availability of media for handling public complaints, namely the SP4N report application, telephone numbers to contact, websites, and email can come directly to the inspectorate office. Anti-corruption socialization has been carried out and is aimed at the executive, namely the chairman, deputy, and members of the DPRD, regional officials and their staff, village heads and village officials and the community.

The determinant factors in the implementation of this MCP program are the budget for the implementation of supervision in the regional inspectorate is still lacking because it only gets 0.26 of the APBD which should be 0.9% of the APBD. The facilities and infrastructure available in the implementation of supervision at the Regional Inspectorate of North Sulawesi Province are still inadequate. And the filling of the first functional auditor position is not in accordance with the procedure.

References

- [1] F. H. Mamonto, "Analisis Kebijakan Publik," 2023.
- [2] P. D. Sugiyono, *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif dan R&D*. Bandung: Bandung: Alfabeta, 2017.
- [3] Y. G. Sutmasa, "Memastikan Efektivitas Implementasi Kebijakan Publik," *J. Ilm. Cakrawarti*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 25–36, 2021, doi: <https://doi.org/10.47532/jic.v4i1.242>.
- [4] R. Nugroho, *Kebijakan Publik: Implementasi dan Pengendalian Kebijakan*. Jakarta: Elex Media Komputindo, 2021.
- [5] E. E. Masengi, E. M. C. Lumingkewas, and B. F. Supit, "Implementation of Government Regulation No. 53 of 2010 concerning Civil Servant Discipline in the Finance, Asset, and Revenue Management Office of Minahasa Regency," *Tech. Soc. Sci. J.*, vol. 40, pp. 11–22, 2023, doi: <https://doi.org/10.47577/tssj.v40i1.8404>.
- [6] P. Santoso, "Analisis kebijakan publik," *Res. Cent. Polit. Gov. (1st ed.)*. *Res. Cent. Polit. Gov. Jur. Polit. dan Pemerintah. Univ. Gajah Mada. www.jpp.fisipol.ugm.ac.id*, 2010.
- [7] J. E. Langkai, *Kebijakan Publik*. Malang: Seribu Bintang, 2020.
- [8] L. Bulu, M. Ratulangi, A. Tangkere, and H. Akib, "Quo Vadis Administrative Discretion," *Mediterr. J. os Soc. Sci.*, vol. 7, 2016.
- [9] A. Ramdhani and M. A. Ramdhani, "Konsep umum pelaksanaan kebijakan publik," *J. Publik J. Ilm. Bid. Ilmu Adm. Negara*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 1–12, 2017.
- [10] M. Mustaufiq, L. Sultan, M. S. Ridwan, and H. Hasan, "The supervision of the internal government internal supervisory apparatus (APIP) on the abuse of authority in governmental positions in Jenepono Regency," *Anayasa J. Leg. Stud.*, vol. 2, no. 1,

- pp. 56–74, 2024.
- [11] G. H. Tumbel, “Kebijakan Publik: Konsep dan Model Formulasi, Implementasi dan Evaluasi Kebijakan,” *Tanggung Denara Jaya Publ.*, 2024.
- [12] E. E. Masengi, E. M. C. Lumingkewas, and B. F. Supit, *Reformasi Administrasi Publik*. Purbalingga: Eureka Media Aksara, 2023.
- [13] D. Setyawan, A. Priantono, and F. Firdausi, “George Edward III Model,” *Publicio J. Ilm. Polit. Kebijak. dan Sos.*, vol. 3, no. 2, pp. 9–19, 2021, doi: <https://doi.org/10.51747/publicio.v3i2.774>.
- [14] H. Pasolong, *Theory of Public Administration*. Bandung: Alfabeta, 2007.
- [15] I. A. Sirajuddin, “Implementasi Kebijakan Pemerintah Daerah Dalam Pelayanan Publik Dasar Bidang Sosial Di Kota Makassar,” *J. Adm. Publik*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 1–14, 2014.
- [16] B. F. Supit and E. Lumingkewas, “Implementasi Kebijakan Bantuan Sosial Tunai Di Kelurahan Talikuran Utara Kecamatan Kawangkoan Utara Minahasa,” *Acad. Educ. J.*, vol. 14, no. 2, pp. 1059–1068, 2023, doi: <https://doi.org/10.47200/aoej.v14i2.1981>.
- [17] M. P. Abadi, “Effectiveness of MCP in Overseeing Government’s Internal Supervision: A Case Study of Riau’s Local Governments,” *Aptisi Trans. Technopreneursh.*, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 190–204, 2023.
- [18] M. Tua and B. R. Mahi, “Analysis of the effect of corruption prevention on private investment at the district/city level in Indonesia,” *Integritas J. Antikorupsi*, vol. 8, no. 2, pp. 247–258, 2022.