

Diálogos

ISSN 2177-2940

Collaborative Governance as an Effort to Strengthen Corporate Social Responsibility Program in the Health Sector in Bandung

Ade Sudrajat¹, Kamal Alamsyah², Thomas Bustomi³

^{1,2,3}Universitas Pasundan Bandung, Indonesia

Email: sudrajatade128@gmail.com

Abstract. This study aims to determine the implementation of the company's Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) Program in the health sector in the city of Bandung, which until now has not been running as expected. The research method that the author uses in this study is descriptive analysis with a qualitative approach with data collection carried out using observation, in-depth interviews, and documentation studies. The data analysis technique used is Analytical Hierarchy Process (AHP). The results of the study state that the Corporate Social Responsibility Program in the health sector in the city of Bandung has been running well. To make CSR programs more effective, it can be done by prioritizing the Collaborative Process factor, which is supported by Drivers, which is also influenced by System Contexts. Collaborative Dynamics factor, an important aspect to prioritize is the increase in Capacity for Joint Action supported by Shared Motivation based on Principled Engagement. Collaboration Dynamics itself is supported by the presence of Drivers that influence it. System Context, in this case, affects all factors (collaboration dynamics and drivers). Regarding the findings, aspects that need to be emphasized are attention to Resource Conditions and socio-economic/Cultural Health & Diversity. All of this can be adequately realized with Network Connectedness, Levels of Conflict/Trust, and Political Dynamics/Power Relations that are aligned.

Keywords: *Collaborative Governance, Corporate Social Responsibility, Health Sector.*

INTRODUCTION

The mutually influencing relationship between the company and the community are two sides of a coin that cannot be separated. The company's presence during society will affect the development of the community itself, both economically, socially, culturally, educationally, and so on, likewise with companies, where the survival of the company will depend on the acceptance of the local community for the presence of the company (Jack & Anderson, 2002; Freeman, 2001; Sinkovic et al., 2014). In running a sustainable and long-term business, one must pay attention to the concept of the planet, people, and profit or what is known as the 3P, such as the triple bottom line concept where in addition to pursuing profit, a company must also pay attention to the welfare of the surrounding community and contribute to preserving the environment around it (Wilson & Post, 2013; Dyllick & Muff, 2016; Holliday et al., 2017). The form of implementation of the policy in each company is the practice of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR). Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) is the commitment of the business world to contribute to sustainable economic development while still paying attention to balance in economic, social, and environmental aspects (Blowfield, 2007; Kirat, 2015; Fontaine, 2013). In general, there are still many obstacles in implementing CSR, such as costs, human resources, targeting, form, and distribution of activities, licensing and regulations, lack of partnerships, socialization of activities, and lack of socialization. Understanding of CSR implementation by companies (Abbott & Snidal, 2013; Moon, 2014; Hejjas et al., 2019).

CSR is a business model that helps businesses and society work together in a good way (Corporate Social Responsibility). Development of a country is a form of government and corporate social responsibility, or what is called CSR. This is how a country grows in the modern world (Corporate Social Responsibility). In the last few years, a lot of

companies in Indonesia and around the world have been doing a lot of CSR. Some business organizations or companies are starting to see how important it is to do good things for the community as well as good things for business (Joyner & Payne, 2002; Jamali & Mirshak, 2007; Zeitlin & Vanhercke, 2018). Corporate social responsibility shows that the company cares about more than just the company's own interests. People who work for a company, as well as customers, investors, the government, and even competitors. This is called "corporate social responsibility." (Li et al., 2016; Smith, 2007; Dam & Scholtens, 2012).

To realize good governance, it is necessary to have a structured change movement to achieve the goals to be completed. One of the new strategies present in the current government is Collaborative Governance (Ansel & Gash, 2008; Emerson et al., 2012; Bryson et al., 2014). The development of an increasingly globalized environment today demands the role of the government in accommodating all interests within the framework of democracy. Therefore, Collaborative governance is present as a cooperative effort carried out between stakeholders in government administration in handling public problems. The collaboration in question is between stakeholders involving the government, the private sector, and the community (Purdy, 2012; Roger & Weber, 2010; Jhonston et al., 2011).

The concept of collaborative governance is a new strategy in the governance structure that involves several stakeholders or government officials making joint decisions formulated in a forum (Ansell & Gash, 2008; Choi & Robertson, 2014). The focus of collaborative governance is on public policies and issues. Public institutions are extensively oriented in policymaking, goals, and collaboration processes to achieve a degree of agreement between stakeholders. Therefore, collaborative governance wants social justice to meet the public interest. The need to collaborate arises because of the dependence between the parties involved and the stakeholders involved (Booher, 2004; Scott & Thomas, 2017).

One type of governance is collaborative governance. In order to produce legal products, rules, and policies that are acceptable to the public or society, public and private actors must work together in specific ways and processes. This idea illustrates how government administration works. Actors from the public and private sectors, such as governments and private companies, are not separate entities that operate on their own; rather, they collaborate for the common good (Newman et al., 2004; Batory & Svensson, 2019). For the purposes of this case, collaborative governance is more concerned with promoting the voluntary aspects of collaboration. We hope that each participant's contribution to the partnership will be utilized to its full potential. Organizational and institutional relations are involved in the implementation of the program or policy, making it more effective (Morse, 2014; Ansell & Torfing, 2015).

Companies in Bandung have a responsibility to all stakeholders (including the environment, community, society, customers, and shareholders) in all aspects of business operations, according to the concept of "Corporate Social Responsibility." As a result, "sustainable development" and "CSR" are closely intertwined. CSR can be a company's contribution to sustainable development goals by utilizing impact management (minimizing negative impacts and maximizing positive effects) on all its stakeholders in various aspects needed to achieve these goals (Marco-Fondevila et al., 2018). This program's success is dependent on the policies and developments of private sector businesses in a wide range of industries. Investors expect government and business to maximize their corporate social responsibility (CSR) to their communities. To demonstrate the company's commitment to environmental and social sustainability, responsibility is realized in the form of pro-community initiatives like health or other social programs (Gelbmann, 2010).

The Bandung City Government, in carrying out its vision and mission, which is translated into the Regional Medium-Term Development Plan (RPJMD), requires adequate support from stakeholders ranging from infrastructure support, Human Resources, infrastructure facilities, especially financial aid, which until now has not been sufficient to finance development. The Bandung City Government needs the participation of other parties (private and community) to participate in sustainable development. These efforts are summarized in the Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) program. One of these partnerships is with the private sector to manage environmental action in the Environmental Social Responsibility program, TJSI. Social Responsibility through Corporate Social Responsibility of companies, including in the city of Bandung, is related to social discourse to encourage sustainable development. The company's work programs are not only business-oriented. Companies must ensure a balance between profit, people, and the planet.

After the determination of the RPJMD, one of which was the Corporate Social Responsibility Program in Bandung City related to social and community development carried out by private companies, which had a positive impact on the community. Some of the effects include improving the welfare of the surrounding community through community

economic empowerment activities, increasing participation that provides for education and entrepreneurship training, and business capital assistance. However, the implementation orientation has not fully pushed the concept of the Tribotom line, especially on sustainable environmental aspects. The company's profits, among others, are used for Corporate Social Responsibility funds of a maximum of 5% (five percent) consisting of (three) pillars, namely the environment, education, and health. CSR allocation is more focused on West Java, and the research source is Bandung City.

The Infid (2018) report shows the lack of role of companies in the region in implementing sustainable development. The survey of citizen perceptions regarding the implementation of sustainable development goals conducted by Infid (2018:8) showed that 29% of respondents considered local governments to be ready and very ready to carry out efforts to achieve sustainable development goals. Overall, only a few districts/cities have started implementing Global Sustainability Development (SDGs) or development within sustainable development (TPB). The Social Barometer Index showed the quality of government social programs in 2018 to 6.6 from 6.2 in 2017 and 2016, at 5.8. Infid (2018) these results cannot be said to be optimal or change the service category from simply seeking to achieve social justice" to "very much seeking to achieve social justice (Results of the 2017 social inequality survey according to residents' perceptions have increased).

The results of the Bandung CSR TIM report found that the Corporate Social Responsibility Program in the city of Bandung is still tiny compared to the number of private companies in the city of Bandung, in the last 5 (five) years, the realization of the Corporate Social Responsibility Program has fluctuated, meaning that the number of company participation is inconsistent as well as the number of funds channeled to the Corporate Social Responsibility Program in the city of Bandung. Funds for Corporate Social Responsibility in the health sector in the last five years are still relatively small compared to other fields of activity. Overall in five years (2016-2020), the total CSR funds for the health sector for five years amounted to Rp. 20,626,115,913 or only 17.77%, far from socio-economic activities which reached Rp. 55,367,062,724 or 45.17%, whereas health, is a basic need of society.

Instead of focusing on the lack of strengthening the management of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) programs by the Bandung City Government, the author intends to publish a journal article entitled "Collaborative Governance as an Effort to Strengthen the Corporate Social Responsibility Program in the Health Sector in Bandung". Because the idea and the phenomenon in the implementation of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) management by the Bandung City Government are so closely related, the concept of collaborative governance was chosen for this research. Bandung City TJSI Team has failed to achieve compelling results in managing Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) or Environmental Social Responsibility (TJSI) particularly in the health sector.

METHOD

This study employed a descriptive analysis with a qualitative approach. As Creswell (2007) argues, qualitative research is a method for examining and comprehending the meaning ascribed to social or humanitarian problems by several individuals or groups of people. This qualitative research process entails numerous steps, including the use of a variety of questions and procedures, the collection of specific data from participants, the inductive analysis of data from specific to general themes, and the interpretation of the data. Additionally, Garna (2009) explains that "a qualitative approach is defined by research objectives that aim to comprehend symptoms in ways that do not always require quantification."

The use of qualitative research with a description of the analysis is necessary because descriptive research aims to describe current problem-solving using field data and to gain a better understanding of stakeholders' perceptions, motivations, and actions in the management of Corporate Social Responsibility Programs in Bandung City. This qualitative approach is used because it is deemed more appropriate for explaining the phenomenon of corporate social responsibility program implementation.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Collaborative Governance as an Effort to Strengthen Corporate Social Responsibility Programs in the City of Bandung.

The description of the research data and discussion of "collaborative governance as an effort to strengthen corporate social responsibility programs in the city of Bandung" is obtained from the results of interviews, documentation studies, and observations, equipped with theoretical references and previous research results. The data collected relates to the focus on (1) collaborative governance, which consists of (a) system context, (b) drivers, and (c) collaboration dynamics; (2) the factors that hinder the success of the Collaborative Governance Program in Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR), which consist of (a) Starting conditions, (b) Institutional design, (c) Facilitative leadership, and (d) Collaborative process; (3) Analytical Hierarchy Process (AHP) for each focus, and (4) Model of increasing the effectiveness of CSR programs.

1. System Context

System context or system context can be the scope (such as political, legal, socio-economic, environmental, etc.) that affects or is influenced by CG. While this system context can provide opportunities and constraints, it can also influence the dynamics of and performance of collaborations both in the short-term and long-term. From the context of this system, there will also be drivers that generate energy for CG initiation and set its initial direction, leading to collaboration dynamics of collaboration dynamics as the core of the CG framework.

2. Drivers

Conditions that arise at the beginning of collaboration can support or otherwise hinder cooperation between stakeholders and between external parties and stakeholders. These obstacles can occur because of the lack of clarity. It can confuse the context of the system and conditions specifically related to the drivers of the collaboration (Ansell & Gash, 2008). These drivers appear together with contextual variables (system context) so that the urge to collaborate can emerge to achieve their goals.

3. Collaboration Dynamics

Three interrelated components make up the core of collaborative governance: (1) principled engagement, (2) shared motivation, and (3) joint action capacity (Emerson & Nabatchi, 2015). As a result of the three components of collaborative dynamics, Bandung's corporate social responsibility programs are implemented in a collaborative and iterative manner. Actions in these collaboration dynamics can lead to both internal and external results. The impact and potential for adaptation of these actions apply to the context and collaborative governance system as a whole.

The Bandung City Government has tried to design and implement various government programs through collaborative governance, namely by managing one or several representatives with one or more non-governmental parties (business, industry, MSMEs, the creative economy, and the general public) in a collaborative or collective decision-making process that is formal, consensus-oriented and based on deliberation and agreement, to formulate and implement public policies or managing programs and several assets and utilities for the community.

Factors Inhibiting the Success of Collaborative Governance of Corporate Social Responsibility Program.

Based on the research findings, the factors that can be used as dimensions to measure the success of collaborative governance here refer to the opinion of Ansell & Gash (2007), namely: (1) starting conditions, (2) institutional design, (3) facilitative leadership, and (4) collaborative processes. In this case, the collaborative process is a 'core' dimension influenced by the previous three dimensions. The findings of this study focus on the various factors inhibiting the success of each of these dimensions in the CSR program in the city of Bandung.

1. Starting Conditions

The success of collaborative governance in policy implementation is heavily dependent on the state of affairs at the outset. At the outset of a collaboration, factors like power and resource distribution, mutual trust, different kinds of incentives to encourage participation, and the past history of cooperation or conflict among the parties involved all play a role in determining how effective the collaboration will be. Corporate social responsibility programs in Bandung face a wide range of common issues. The problem occurs when the starting point of each collaborating party is quite different. Companies that previously carried out CSR directly to the surrounding community felt a slight gap when collaborating with the city government with all kinds of complexities and priorities of development programs. At first,

these companies simply carried out their own CSR programs following their capacity, which was often dominated by the 'practical' or practicality in distributing CSR to the community.

2. Institutional Design

The protocols and fundamental rules for collaborating are referred to as "institutional design" in this context. The collaborative process's legitimacy is viewed as dependent on this design. When it comes to the design of a collaboration, the most fundamental issue is determining which parties should be involved. Collaborative governance emphasizes the importance of an open and inclusive design process when it comes to the creation of an institution. Since its inception, Bandung City's CSR facilitation team has continued to be more open to other parties involved in the collaboration. With the right institutional design, the commitment of all parties involved in the CSR program can implement the program more effectively. If there are under-represented parties in the institutional structure, proactive strategies can be implemented to mobilize parties who are less committed to the collaboration process. Facilitative leaders can optimize this condition.

3. Facilitative Leadership

Establishing and maintaining clear ground rules, building trust, facilitating dialogue, and exploring mutual benefits all require leadership. Stakeholders must be embraced and empowered before they can be mobilized. Change, serve, or facilitative leadership is typically stewarded by collaborative leaders who have a leadership style that emphasizes the promotion and maintenance of process (rather than on individual leaders taking decisive action and leaders fearing subordinates). Rather than a small group of individuals, the so-called leaders in collaborative governance include individuals who at the very least represent all the parties involved. It's common for these leaders to have the ability to (1) promote and encourage participation, (2) ensure broad-based influence/control; (3) facilitate productive group dynamics; (4) broaden the scope of the process (Fernandez, 2018). Having multiple leaders, both formally and informally, can also lead to a successful collaboration (Bryson et al., 2015). Time, resources, and extensive knowledge transfer skills may be required for effective collaborative leadership (Yahya & Goh, 2002).

4. Collaborative Process

There are three main stages to this collaborative process: identifying the issue, determining a course of action, and putting the plan into action. Changes in the context necessitate these phases in the collaboration model when a new implementation strategy is needed. Collaborative work can be seen as an iteration of trust, commitment, understanding and results in this context (Ansell & Gash, 2008). Since face-to-face dialogue is at the core of the collaborative process, it's important to communicate this way. Face-to-face discussions between stakeholders are the foundation of all forms of collaborative governance. There must be direct dialogue between stakeholders in order for them to identify mutually beneficial opportunities in a consensus-oriented process. Negotiation is just one of the many benefits of having face-to-face conversations. Breaking down stereotypes and other barriers to communication is at the heart of the process of exploring mutual benefit in the first place. As a result, trust, respect, mutual understanding, and commitment to the process are all built through effective communication. Face-to-face communication is necessary, but it is not sufficient for successful teamwork. Face-to-face communication, for example, may reinforce stereotypes or differences in status, or increase hostility and mutual contempt. Face-to-face communication, on the other hand, is a necessity for effective collaboration.

Analytical Hierarchy Process (AHP) Collaborative Governance and Effectiveness of Corporate Social Responsibility Programs.

The AHP procedure in this study is to (1) develop a pairwise comparison matrix for each criterion; (2) change to the average value (normalize) of the resulting matrix; (3) average the values in each row to get the appropriate ranking, and (4) calculate and check the consistency ratio. From this ranking, it can be seen which components are the most dominant or essential in a construct and which are less prevalent. In other words, here, the analysis can lead to what factors are practical or more effective than other factors in the same construct and which are not effective or not so effective compared to other factors in the construct.

1. Analytical Hierarchy Process (AHP) System Context

Based on the AHP matrix in the system context construct, it can be observed that the Resource Conditions (SCI) dimension is the most dominant factor in this construct, followed by the Socio-Economic/Cultural Health & Diversity

(SC7) dimension. These findings indicate that the system context is strongly influenced by the condition of resources in the preparation and implementation of collaborative governance to strengthen CSR programs in Bandung City, compared to other factors in this system context construct. In other words, the Resource Conditions (SC1) and Socio-Economic/Cultural Health & Diversity (SC7) dimensions are important and necessary factors to be prioritized in the system context construct.

Referring to the system context in the concept and theory of collaborative governance, this resource condition needs to be used as a significant starting point in the system context so that it can be the basis for building trust, resolving conflicts, and developing existing social capital (Ansell & Gash, 2008). If all these resources can be accessed and managed by all parties involved in the CG process, then the condition of these resources can be utilized more effectively. So, by understanding the external and external environments of a system you want to build, attention to the condition of the existing and required resources can determine the system's success. The direction of change, system complexity, and uncertainty in the future will depend on the conditions of resource availability and the limitations of the resource itself (Cabral & Krane, 2018). Adequate resources can support the implementation of a program, while limited resources may hinder the performance of a program. Therefore, an analysis of the external environment needs to be carried out beforehand to be adapted to the conditions of the internal environment.

The focus on the socio-economic/cultural dimensions of health & diversity itself can be related to anticipatory efforts in dealing with uncertainty in running a program. Understanding the various socio-economic and cultural diversity of the community can be an essential factor that needs to be considered in programs implemented for the benefit of the local community itself (Bradley, 2012). The high degrees of inequality in society, especially related to socio-economic and cultural disparities, need to be studied before sustainably implementing a collaborative program (Hamann & April 2013). That way, the programs implemented by the government can run smoothly and continuously, not separately, to implement various policies and programs that have been previously planned, both by the government and collaboratively with other parties. Alignment of different local and regional environmental contexts in socio-economic, cultural, educational, and health issues and these various gaps need to be used as guidelines for those who plan and manage initiatives to facilitate multiple programs of sustainable change.

Related to the dimensions of levels of conflict/trust here, it can be stated that attention to the level of conflict in collaboration and the formation of faith in a collaboration should also be anticipated. In this case, all parties involved in collaboration need to accept each other's strengths and weaknesses to avoid conflicts as soon as possible. If there is still a conflict, it is necessary to have a conflict resolution so that the conflict is not prolonged, either done with each party or through certain mediation. After the conflict has been resolved, trust can be built and developed. That way, the various collaboration networks that exist can work together effectively to implement the policies or programs that have been planned.

Furthermore, the focus of attention on this system context can be directed to the dimensions of Policy Legal Frameworks (SC2), Prior Failure to Address Issues (SC3), and Political Dynamics/Power Relations (SC4). These dimensions are not unimportant, but it can be said here that they are basically "established," which means that they have become the principal capital for all parties involved in collaborative governance to implement all their programs. Regarding the legal policy framework, the government already has a legal basis that is used as a guide to implementing all policies and work programs, both internally and collaboratively with other parties, such as programs CSR is discussed in this study. Aspects of the legal policy framework seem to be neglected even though in collaborative governance, this aspect should include the legal framework as an essential variable in collaboration as the legality of public values (Amsler, 2016).

Overall, it can be said that the emphasis on resource conditions and socio-economic/cultural health & diversity in the system context can be a good choice for all parties in achieving the goals of collaborative governance. After that, attention can be focused on the dimensions of network connectedness and the level of conflict/trust. Finally, if all of these dimensions have been running smoothly, it can be continued with strengthening legal policy frameworks, prior failure to address issues, and political dynamics/power relations.

2. Analytical Hierarchy Process (AHP) Drivers

Based on the AHP matrix on the drivers construct, it can be observed that the Leadership dimension (D1) is the most dominant factor in this construct, followed by the Uncertainty dimension (D4), then the dimension (3)

Interdependence (D3), and finally the Consequential Incentives dimension (D2). . The dominance of the leadership dimension in the drivers construct is related to the explanation that the leader is the primary driver in an action that starts from planning to evaluation on an ongoing basis. The leadership aspect can be the core that mobilizes and facilitates all the initiatives carried out.

These types of leadership have proven to impact collaborative governance to strengthen corporate social responsibility programs in the city of Bandung. Aspects that emerge in this leadership are financial management, human resources, knowledge management, and the provision of facilities such as the latest technology devices. The leader has a high self-development character to be an example for the followers under him. The collaborative leader can synergize with the team formed in various activities or development programs. However, in practice, the leaders here also need to ensure the reasons and the right time for implementing collaborative leadership are related to the strategy being built (Scott & Thomas, 2017).

The next dimension that is also important to prioritize hereafter leadership is the dimension of uncertainty. The uncertainty here is a driver that becomes a challenge that needs to be managed by these leaders so that the various elements in the uncertainty can be immediately anticipated by all parties involved so that the multiple uncertainties can be directed into certain certainties that have an impact on the ability of the actors in carrying out their duties. decision making (Ulibarri, 2019). That way, various uncertainties can be anticipated internally to encourage the work team to collaborate to reduce, spread, and share risks.

Here, four factors or drivers are uncertainty, interdependence, powerful incentives, and leadership. All combinations of these dimensions are needed to spur collaborative resource management efforts. However, the findings of this study differ from previous studies, which suggest that collaboration initiation is best explained by the positive consequential incentives (i.e., financial opportunities) that predispose leaders to take the initiative. This study provides additional information for the complex natural resource management process that often overrides collaboration by investigating what enables and hinders collaborative efforts in countries where natural resources are managed and used according to central planning principles.

In essence, it can be stated in this research that collaborative leadership is the primary driver or driver to overcome various uncertainties into certainties. In this way, it is hoped that the interdependence of each work team involved in the collaborative effort will be more substantial. Carefully planned long-term incentive support can facilitate all these drivers to be achieved effectively—the findings of this study support previous results regarding the importance of leadership as the main driver.

3. Analytical Hierarchy Process (AHP) Collaboration Dynamics.

Based on the AHP matrix in the collaborative dynamics construct, it can be observed that the Capacity for Joint Action dimension gets a position that needs to be prioritized, followed by the Principle Engagement dimension, and finally, the Shared Motivation dimension.

Capacity for joint action refers to a number of factors that enable cross-functional teams to collaborate in order to take a practical step toward achieving shared goals. Formal and informal procedural and institutional arrangements, leadership, knowledge, and resources are all examples of these elements. This capacity must be developed through the process of principled engagement and fueled by a shared motivation to create a positive and complete CG dynamic. This analytical component of the study examines how collaborating parties establish new relationships, resources, institutions, and cultures in order to facilitate or obstruct the realization of shared motivation through principled engagement.

Principled engagement entails 'getting the right people to work' in order for diverse parties with divergent perspectives, interests, and identities to collaborate across institutional and sectoral boundaries to solve problems and create value through open and constructive conversations. - common values. Five major stakeholder groups in the health sector can be identified in this study, dubbed the Penta-helix (academic, business, community, government, and media), most notably joint business users and the general public whose lives are impacted by the business. Thus, principled engagement refers to integrating the program's governance process with the primary actors from the previously mentioned stakeholder groups in order to create an enabling environment for the implementation of other collaboration dynamics (Emerson & Nabatchi, 2015).

Shared motivation is defined as a self-reinforcing cycle comprised of mutual trust, understanding, internal legitimacy, and commitment, emphasizing the interpersonal and relational components of collaborative dynamics. This shared motivation is critical for sustaining the newly formed principled engagement in the direction of a sustainable cycle of cross-sector collaboration. The shared motivation for this research is to align CSR programs with a sustainable health development strategy for Bandung City, which can also help strengthen the engagement of academia, government, business, the community, and the media (Penta-helix). As a result, it is necessary to increase both the participation of those who have been involved for a long period of time and those who are new to CG in order to affect the shared motivation. These factors can have an effect on the cycle of positive collaboration dynamics (Emerson et al., 2012).

Thus, the integrated CG framework used in this study provides a critical lens through which to view the implementation of CSR programs sustainably and collaboratively, as well as a window into the evolutionary process of collaborative dynamics in Bandung City's CSR programs. This condition demonstrates the dynamic, contingent, and adaptive nature of moral engagement, shared motivation, and the capacity for collaborative action necessary to implement the program. This also shows that CG is compelling to be applied to deal with various issues that arise during the implementation of CSR programs proactively, not just reactively. The findings of this study confirm that capacity for joint action needs to be prioritized to be maintained while aligning principle engagement and increasing shared motivation so that there is good synergy between the three elements in collaboration dynamics as a whole.

4. Analytical Hierarchy Process (AHP) Collaborative Governance

This follow-up analysis related to collaborative governance starts from the importance of paying attention to collaboration dynamics as the core of the entire collaborative governance process to support successful CSR programs in the health sector in Bandung. Dimensions of these drivers in determining the strength of collaboration dynamics.

Finally, more adjustments are needed in the system context factor or rather the external environment that can affect the smoothness of the drivers and collaboration dynamic factors in all collaborative governance processes in increasing the success and effectiveness of CSR programs in the city of Bandung. This condition is in line with the results of previous research, which states that appropriate adjustments (adaptations) are needed so that all parties involved in collaboration can move freely so that the implementation of collaborative governance from beginning to end can run smoothly in a sustainable manner (Emerson et al., 2012; Emerson & Nabatchi, 2015). However, it is necessary to set standards in the system context that allow all parties involved in collaborative governance to have specific benchmarks to determine the minimum standard requirements needed to achieve collaboration goals (Rasche, 2010). This means it is necessary to make some improvements and adjustments in several dimensions in the system context that is not yet optimal, especially in overcoming several obstacles that often arise during the collaboration process.

5. Analytical Hierarchy Process (AHP) Inhibiting Factors for Program Strengthening

The factor that emerged in determining the success and strengthening of the program (in this case, the CSR program in the health sector in Bandung City) as a finding in this study was the collaborative process factor. Referring to the existing theory, the success of this collaborative process will indeed determine the success of collaborative governance because it is the core of collaborative governance itself. This dimension describes the collaboration as a gradual development. The collaborative process is a cycle that often appears to depend on achieving a good cycle between its various sizes. Feedback from collaboration influences further collaboration. It is even difficult to know from where to start the collaboration process. However, because communication is the core of collaboration, Ansell & Gash (2007) began with face-to-face dialogue, Trust Building, Commitment to the process, Shared understanding, and arrived at the Intermediate outcome.

After focusing on the collaborative process, the next step is to empower facilitative leadership to encourage all resources to function correctly. The optimization of the aspect of the influence of facilitative leadership on this collaborative process has been confirmed by various previous studies (Ansell & Gash, 2008; Hamann & April 2013). The collaboration process can be carried out according to planning and needs with exemplary leadership.

Referring to the AHP calculation, the next factor that needs attention is the starting condition. The findings in this study indicate that the starting condition is closely related to the existence of a system context and drivers in collaborative governance (Ansell & Gash, 2008; Emerson et al., 2012; Ulibarri, 2019). The suitability between the system context and drivers in collaborative governance with the starting conditions can increase the success and effectiveness of the CSR program in question.

Finally, in this study, the institutional design factor is a factor that can be considered as "easy-to-easy," which means that it is easy to design but sometimes challenging to implement. In the case of Bandung City, the problem is not very prominent. Still, if it involves networks from other regions or regions, it can become an obstacle that can hinder the program's success. In this case, accuracy in designing the right institutions can be the primary key to successful program achievement (Bell & Scott, 2020). With the right design, access to the collaboration process can be smoother, open, and inclusive to be easily adapted by all parties (Ansell & Gash, 2008; Emerson & Gerlak, 2014). The institutional design can be further improved to support the overall collaboration process with proper adaptation.

The model for improving or strengthening the Corporate Social Responsibility Program in the health sector can run more effectively if collaborative governance prioritizes collaborative process factors supported by drivers, which are also influenced by the system context. In this case, the program's effectiveness needs to prioritize the Collaborative Process, which is supported by the optimization of Facilitative Leadership with Starting Conditions that meet the standards and are supported by the exemplary Institutional Design. In the collaboration dynamics factor, an essential aspect of prioritizing is increasing Capacity for Joint Action supported by Shared Motivation based on Principled Engagement. Furthermore, collaboration dynamics are supported by drivers that influence it. The aspect of the drivers that need to be prioritized is leadership, assuming that all parties can anticipate uncertainty by implementing interdependence, which is driven by an increase in powerful incentives.

System content, in this case, affects all factors (collaboration dynamics and drivers). Regarding the findings, aspects that need to be emphasized here are attention to Resource Conditions and socio-economic/Cultural Health & Diversity. All of this can be adequately realized with Network Connectedness, Levels of Conflict/Trust, and Political Dynamics/Power Relations that are aligned. Several improvements need to be emphasized in responding to the Prior Failure to Address Issues and Policy Legal Frameworks aspects to ensure the initiation of collaborative governance as a whole. Thus, it can be stated here that the appropriate model related to collaborative governance to strengthen corporate social responsibility programs in Bandung City is to optimize and modify the model adopted from Emerson & Nabatchi (2015) and Ansell & Gash (2008). The adoption results, in turn, can be used as an initial benchmark in implementing other CSR programs or other similar programs, both in the city of Bandung and in other areas.

CONCLUSION

CSR implementation in the health sector in Bandung City is relatively the best compared to other cities/regencies in West Java due to good coordination and collaboration from all parties. This success is supported by the implementation of the process and the achievement of the goals of collaborative governance, which is supported by the excellent collaboration dynamics and the correct drivers. All of that, in turn, is very dependent on the environment that influences it (system context). All parties involved in the collaboration have primarily anticipated the inhibiting factors for the success of collaborative governance in strengthening CSR programs. These parties can focus on collaboration dynamics in making the collaborative process effective as a whole. Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) Environmental Social Responsibility (TJSL) in the health sector in the city of Bandung, AHP is used as an analysis to formulate a suitable model in the collaborative governance of CSR programs. The model is the adoption and modification of the previous models. The adoption results, in turn, can be used as an initial benchmark in implementing other CSR programs or other similar programs, both in the city of Bandung and in other areas.

REFERENCES

1. Abbott, K. W., & Snidal, D. (2013). Taking Responsive Regulation Transnational: Strategies For International Organizations. *Regulation & Governance*, 7(1), 95-113.
2. Amsler, L. B. (2016). Collaborative Governance: Integrating Management, Politics, and Law. *Public Administration Review*, 76(5), 700-711.
3. Ansell, C., & Gash, A. (2008). Collaborative Governance in Theory and Practice. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 18(4), 543-571.
4. Ansell, C., & Torfing, J. (2015). How Does Collaborative Governance Scale? *Policy & Politics*, 43(3), 315-329.
5. Batory, A., & Svensson, S. (2019). The Fuzzy Concept of Collaborative Governance: A Systematic Review of The State of The Art. *Central European Journal of Public Policy*, 13(2), 28-39.

6. Bell, E., & Scott, T. A. (2020). Common Institutional Design, Divergent Results: A Comparative Case Study of Collaborative Governance Platforms for Regional Water Planning. *Environmental Science & Policy*, *111*, 63-73.
7. Blowfield, M. (2007). Reasons to be cheerful? What we know about CSR's impact. *Third World Quarterly*, *28*(4), 683-695.
8. Booher, D. E. (2004). Collaborative Governance Practices and Democracy. *National Civic Review*, *9*(4), 32-46.
9. Bradley, Q. (2012). A 'Performative' social Movement: The Emergence of Collective Contentions Within Collaborative Governance. *Space and Polity*, *16*(2), 215-232.
10. Bryson, J. M., Crosby, B. C., & Bloomberg, L. (2014). Public Value Governance: Moving Beyond Traditional Public Administration and The New Public Management. *Public Administration Review*, *74*(4), 445-456.
11. Bryson, J. M., Crosby, B. C., & Stone, M. M. (2006). The Design and Implementation of Cross-Sector Collaborations: Propositions from The Literature. *Public Administration Review*, *66*, 44-55.
12. Cabral, S., & Krane, D. (2018). Civic Festivals and Collaborative Governance. *International Review Of Administrative Sciences*, *84*(1), 185-205.
13. Choi, T., & Robertson, P. J. (2014). Deliberation and Decision in Collaborative Governance: A Simulation of Approaches to Mitigate Power Imbalance. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, *24*(2), 495-518.
14. Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Research Design (Pendekatan Kualitatif, Kuantitatif, dan Mixed)*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
15. Dam, L., & Scholtens, B. (2012). Does Ownership Type Matter for Corporate Social Responsibility? *Corporate Governance: An International Review*, *20*(3), 233-252.
16. Dyllick, T., & Muff, K. (2016). Clarifying The Meaning of Sustainable Business: Introducing A Typology from Business-As-Usual to True Business Sustainability. *Organization & Environment*, *29*(2), 156-174.
17. Emerson, K., & Gerlak, A. K. (2014). Adaptation In Collaborative Governance Regimes. *Environmental Management*, *54*(4), 768-781.
18. Emerson, K., & Nabatchi, T. (2015). *Collaborative Governance Regimes*. Georgetown University Press.
19. Emerson, K., Nabatchi, T., & Balogh, S. (2012). An Integrative Framework for Collaborative Governance. *Journal Of Public Administration Research and Theory*, *22*(1), 1-29.
20. Fontaine, M. (2013). Corporate Social Responsibility and Sustainability: The New Bottom Line? *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, *4*(4).
21. Freeman, R. E. (2001). A Stakeholder Theory of The Modern Corporation. *Perspectives in Business Ethics* *Sie*, *3*, 144.
22. Garna, Y. K. (2009). *Metoda Penelitian Kualitatif*. Bandung: Judistira Foundation & Primaco Akademika.
23. Gelbmann, U. (2010). Establishing Strategic CSR In SMEs: An Austrian CSR Quality Seal to Substantiate The Strategic CSR Performance. *Sustainable Development*, *18*(2), 90-98.
24. Hamann, R., & April, K. (2013). On The Role and Capabilities of Collaborative Intermediary Organisations in Urban Sustainability Transitions. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, *50*, 12-21.
25. Hejjas, K., Miller, G., & Scarles, C. (2019). "It's Like Hating Puppies!" Employee Disengagement and Corporate Social Responsibility. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *157*(2), 319-337.
26. Holliday, C. O., Schmidheiny, S., & Watts, P. (2017). *Walking The Talk: The Business Case for Sustainable Development*. Routledge.
27. Jack, S. L., & Anderson, A. R. (2002). The Effects of Embeddedness on The Entrepreneurial Process. *Journal Of Business Venturing*, *17*(5), 467-487.
28. Jamali, D., & Mirshak, R. (2007). Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR): Theory and Practice in A Developing Country Context. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *72*(3), 243-262.
29. Johnston, E. W., Hicks, D., Nan, N., & Auer, J. C. (2011). Managing The Inclusion Process in Collaborative Governance. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, *21*(4), 699-721.
30. Joyner, B. E., & Payne, D. (2002). Evolution and Implementation: A Study of Values, Business Ethics, and Corporate Social Responsibility. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *41*(4), 297-311.
31. Kirat, M. (2015). Corporate Social Responsibility in The Oil and Gas Industry in Qatar Perceptions and Practices. *Public Relations Review*, *41*(4), 438-446.
32. Li, D., Lin, H., & Yang, Y. W. (2016). Do The Stakeholders-Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) Relationship Exist in Emerging Countries? Evidence from China. *Social Responsibility Journal*.

33. Marco-Fondevila, M., Moneva Abadía, J. M., & Scarpellini, S. (2018). CSR and Green Economy: Determinants and Correlation of Firms' Sustainable Development. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, 23(5), 756-771.
34. Moon, J. (2014). *Corporate Social Responsibility: A Very Short Introduction*. OUP Oxford.
35. Morse, R. S. (2014). Developing Public Leaders in An Age of Collaborative Governance. In *Innovations in Public Leadership Development* (pp. 91-112). Routledge.
36. Newman, J., Barnes, M., Sullivan, H., & Knops, A. (2004). Public Participation and Collaborative Governance. *Journal of Social Policy*, 33(2), 203-223.
37. Purdy, J. M. (2012). A Framework for Assessing Power in Collaborative Governance Processes. *Public Administration Review*, 72(3), 409-417.
38. Rasche, A. (2010). Collaborative Governance 2.0. *Corporate Governance: The International Journal of Business in Society*.
39. Rogers, E., & Weber, E. P. (2010). Thinking Harder About Outcomes for Collaborative Governance Arrangements. *The American Review of Public Administration*, 40(5), 546-567.
40. Scott, T. A., & Thomas, C. W. (2017). Unpacking The Collaborative Toolbox: Why and When Do Public Managers Choose Collaborative Governance Strategies? *Policy Studies Journal*, 45(1), 191-214.
41. Scott, T. A., & Thomas, C. W. (2017). Unpacking The Collaborative Toolbox: Why and When Do Public Managers Choose Collaborative Governance Strategies? *Policy Studies Journal*, 45(1), 191-214.
42. Sinkovics, N., Sinkovics, R. R., & Yamin, M. (2014). The Role of Social Value Creation in Business Model Formulation at The Bottom of The Pyramid—Implications for MNEs? *International Business Review*, 23(4), 692-707.
43. Smith, A. D. (2007). Making The Case for The Competitive Advantage of Corporate Social Responsibility. *Business Strategy Series*.
44. Ulibarri, N. (2019). Collaborative Governance: A Tool to Manage Scientific, Administrative, And Strategic Uncertainties in Environmental Management? *Ecology and Society*, 24(2).
45. Wilson, F., & Post, J. E. (2013). Business Models for People, Planet (& Profits): Exploring the Phenomena of Social Business, A Market-Based Approach to Social Value Creation. *Small Business Economics*, 40(3), 715-737.
46. Yahya, S., & Goh, W. K. (2002). Managing Human Resources Toward Achieving Knowledge Management. *Journal of knowledge management*.
47. Zeitlin, J., & Vanhercke, B. (2018). Socializing The European Semester: EU Social and Economic Policy Co-Ordination in Crisis and Beyond. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 25(2), 149-174.