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**Abstract**

The sub-district head (Camat) plays an important role in managing general government affairs at the sub-district level in accordance with applicable laws and regulations. Coordination among management functions in government continues to evolve, in line with the shift in government paradigms in the digital era. This research aims to examine and analyze the issues and challenges in the implementation of government coordination at the sub-district level, in order to find a more effective and efficient coordination model. The method used is qualitative descriptive with data collection techniques including observation, structured and unstructured interviews, documentation, and Focus Group Discussions (FGD). The results of the study show that the electronic-based coordination model implemented by the sub-district head in Magetan Regency, East Java, involves a coordination network outside of the government structure and sub-district-level coordination meetings (Rakorca) for collaboration with stakeholders. The coordination model applied is hierarchical, although its implementation depends on the managerial capabilities of the sub-district head and the available budget. The study found that there are no clear guidelines or mechanisms for government coordination, and the use of electronic media such as WhatsApp and Zoom Meetings is still limited. Based on these findings, the study recommends strengthening the position of the sub-district head through budgetary support from the central government and institutionalizing hierarchical coordination mechanisms to improve the effectiveness of government coordination.
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**Introduction**

The history of government administration in ensuring and restoring security in regions, particularly those requiring coordination, began with the establishment of the National Security Council and Regional Security Coordination, based on Government Regulation No. 17 of 1954 in conjunction with Government Regulation No. 14 of 1955. This initial step focused on improving security coordination in special regions. The next step was the coordination of all civil government administrations, outlined in the Republic of Indonesia Government Regulation No. 27 of 1956 on the Establishment of Civil Government Coordination. With the issuance of this regulation, the Prime Minister's Circular Letter No. 2/R.I./1952 dated May 31, 1952, was declared null and void.

The civil government coordination aimed to establish close and effective cooperation among civil services in the regions. This coordination covered departments and vertical agencies led by Pamong Praja, who acted as the central government representative in the regions. However, this coordination did not apply to services within autonomous regions, where the Regional Head, as the Chairman of the Regional Government Council, has the authority to maintain cooperation in matters concerning the autonomous region, which is free to manage its internal affairs.

The implementation of coordination for vertical agencies in the regions became more detailed with the enactment of Law No. 5 of 1974 on the Principles of Regional Government and Government Regulation No. 6 of 1988. These regulations emphasize that coordination is carried out by regional heads to achieve alignment, harmony, and integration in the planning and implementation of activities by vertical agencies and local services. Regional heads, such as governors, regents, mayors, and district heads, are responsible for coordinating the administration of general government affairs.

The coordination mechanism is carried out through several methods, including coordination meetings of regional heads, requests and delivery of data, information, and consultations between vertical agencies and local services. The results of this coordination are reported by the regional head to the relevant officials, with copies sent to the concerned agencies. With the enactment of Law No. 22 of 1999 on Regional Government, the roles of governors, regents/mayors, and district heads in government coordination became more distinct. Governors still hold the role of regional head at the provincial level, but regents/mayors and district heads no longer have the authority as regional heads. A similar situation occurred in Law No. 32 of 2004, which stipulated that regents/mayors no longer had the authority to coordinate vertical agencies in the regions. Coordination, including the Regional Leadership Communication Forum (Muspida), only continued existing practices and no longer followed Government Regulation No. 6 of 1988.

Law No. 23 of 2014 mandates that regents/mayors, in carrying out general government affairs at the sub-district level, delegate the implementation to the district heads as regional apparatus. Based on this, Government Regulation No. 12 of 2022 on the Forum for Regional Leadership Coordination (Forkopimda) was established, aiming to support the effectiveness of governance in the regions and to build synergy among leadership elements in the regions to resolve issues.

Coordination in government administration has received attention in the literature, as stated by Van Poelje in Syafrudin (1976:67), who mentioned that coordination is one of the most important government issues, becoming more complex after World War I. Moekijat (1994:1) also explained that coordination is a process that develops good relationships between activities, both physical and spiritual. The challenges of coordination are also outlined by Lawrence and Lorscb (in Syafrudin, 1976), who identified four differences in organizational orientation, which become obstacles in the coordination process.Koordinasi penyelenggaraan urusan pemerintahan di Provinsi Jawa Timur, khususnya di Kabupaten Magetan, mengikuti Peraturan Bupati Magetan No. 82 Tahun 2016 tentang Kedudukan, Susunan Organisasi, Tugas, dan Fungsi Kecamatan, serta Keputusan Bupati Magetan No. 188/200/Kept./403.013/2022 tentang Pembentukan Forum Koordinasi Pimpinan di Kecamatan (Forkopimcam), yang berfungsi untuk mendukung kelancaran urusan pemerintahan umum di kecamatan.

The results of observations in Magetan Regency indicate that coordination is routinely carried out through Sub-district Coordination Meetings (Rakorca), involving all sub-district stakeholders to discuss program activities and identify issues. However, budget constraints and the absence of standardized operational procedures (NSPK) pose challenges in the implementation of coordination. So far, coordination activities have been largely based on tradition and the intuition of leadership.

On the other hand, the information technology-based coordination mechanism in Magetan Regency still faces challenges such as limited human resources, budget constraints, high sectoral egos, and a lack of shared perceptions among regional apparatus organizations. The establishment of regional regulations and communication with the Ministry of Communication and Information (Kementerian Kominfo) has been an initial step to strengthen electronic-based coordination. An evaluation by the Ministry of Administrative and Bureaucratic Reform (Kementerian PAN & RB) in 2023 showed that Magetan Regency has an SPBE (Electronic-Based Government System) implementation index of 2.76 with a "good" rating, though improvements are still needed to optimize information technology-based coordination at the sub-district level.

Public administration has evolved alongside the complexity of societal life. Etymologically, administration comes from the words ad (intensive) and ministrare (to serve), emphasizing service to the public interest (Basuki, 2018:9). This concept encompasses human cooperation to achieve goals with values of service, rationality, effectiveness, and resource efficiency (Syafri, 2012:20). The paradigm of public administration has shifted, starting from the separation of politics and administration (1900-1926), the principles of administration (1927-1937), to the implementation of the New Public Management paradigm (1970-present), which focuses more on efficiency and public management transformation.

Over time, the definition of public administration has also changed, reflecting the dynamics of human development. Public administration involves the coordination and direction of human and material resources to achieve national goals (Waldo, in Syafri, 2012:20). The paradigm of public administration has developed in five main phases, including the separation of politics and administration, the principles of POSDCORB (1927-1937), and critiques of the separation of politics and administration (1950-1970) (Basuki, 2018:24). In the fifth paradigm (1970-present), public administration focuses on organizational theory, management, and public policy.

The New Public Management paradigm that emerged in the 1990s focused on bureaucratic efficiency by adopting private sector practices, while The New Public Service emphasizes public service with accountability and democratic values (Denhardt & Denhardt, 2003; Hood & Vigoda, in Basuki, 2018:30).

Public management is a process that involves planning, organizing, leadership, and controlling organizational resources to achieve set goals (Stoner in Satibi, 2012:2). In this context, "public" refers to the common interest that must be prioritized over personal interests. Public management also emphasizes the importance of effective governance within government organizations, particularly through the role of top-level management (Mintzberg, 1983:13). Furthermore, public managers are responsible for coordinating and developing organizational strategies by effectively utilizing resources, which requires collaboration between work units and optimal resource management.

Public management, as a branch of public administration, can be understood through two main concepts: management and public. Management, according to Stoner (in Satibi, 2012:2), involves planning, organizing, leadership, and controlling to achieve organizational goals, while Koontz & Weihrich (2012:3) define management as achieving goals through cooperation with others. Public, on the other hand, has a broader contextual meaning, encompassing society, the state, and the common interest (Basuki, 2018:9; Tangkilisan in Satibi, 2012:12). Public management includes the management of government organizations aimed at serving the public interest, with an emphasis on effective human resource management and the development of strategies that align with the nation's objectives (Pasolong in Satibi, 2012:14).

In organizational structure, according to Mintzberg (1983:13), management can be viewed as a role carried out by top managers (strategic apex) and middle managers. Top managers are responsible for formulating organizational strategies and overseeing the functioning of the organization, while middle managers play a key role in coordinating directly between operators and management. The organization itself consists of various elements, such as the operating core, strategic apex, middle line, techno-structure, and support staff, each of which plays a critical role in achieving the organization's objectives (Mintzberg, 1983).

The role of management within an organization is crucial, especially in formulating strategies and overseeing the organization's operations. As stated by Pfiffner and Presthus (1960:5), the goal of an organization is to arrange individuals and functions in productive relationships, while administration involves decision-making and directing individuals to achieve the goals set by political leaders. Human resources are a key factor in an organization's success, and therefore human resource management must be carried out carefully to ensure the organization functions effectively and achieves its set objectives.

Coordination is a crucial process in government management, aimed at aligning the efforts of various parties to achieve a common goal. Etymologically, coordination comes from the words co and ordinare, which mean "to regulate." Ndraha (2011:290) defines coordination as an effort to align the activities of equal parties to avoid overlap, while from a functional perspective, coordination aims to optimize the division of labor and minimize the negative impacts of specialization.

Coordination includes various forms, such as time coordination (synchronization of activities), spatial coordination (cross-regional), inter-institutional coordination (between work units), functional coordination (based on functional relationships), and planning coordination (James G. March and Herbert A. Simon, 1958). Furthermore, coordination is an ongoing process that requires intensive communication and involves leadership as the main coordinator (McFarland, 1999:186). According to Sugandha (1988:12), each unit within an organization cannot function independently, as the success of one unit depends on the support of other units.

In the context of public administration, Peters (2018) explains that coordination became even more critical starting in the 1980s, as the success of New Public Management led to the fragmentation of the public sector. Peters suggests several coordination mechanisms, including networks (social actor networks), collaboration (idea- and compromise-based cooperation), and hierarchy (hierarchical authority from the central government). These mechanisms help resolve cross-sectoral issues and ensure the integration of policies and effective public services.

According to Panglaykim (2004:43), coordination also requires group judgment or collective decision-making to ensure organizational effectiveness and efficiency. Joint planning, training of members, and strong commitment are key to the success of sustainable coordination in addressing the challenges of modern administration.

According to the Indonesian Dictionary, a model is a pattern or reference used to produce something. In general, a model is understood as a conceptual framework that serves as a guide for conducting activities. Mill (in Suprijono, 2016:64) states that a model is an accurate representation of a process that allows individuals or groups to act based on it. Achmad (2008:1) defines a model as a simplified representation of an object or idea used to study the actual phenomenon. Mulyana (2007) argues that a model is a representation of a phenomenon that highlights the essential elements needed to explain it. These three definitions emphasize that a model functions as a representation of a phenomenon, as seen in the electronic-based government coordination carried out by subdistrict heads in general government affairs. As a representation of this phenomenon, a model can help formulate coordination mechanisms involving local agencies, vertical institutions, and community leaders. Severin and Tankard (2008) add that a model is a simplified representation of the real world used to develop theories, although it does not directly generate accurate predictions. Thus, an electronic-based government coordination model at the subdistrict level can be developed after conducting in-depth observations of existing practices.

On the other hand, According to the Indonesian Dictionary (KBBI), electronics refers to devices based on the principles of electronics and used to facilitate specific activities. In the context of this research, electronics relates to the Electronic-Based Government System (SPBE), which is the implementation of information and communication technology in the administration of government. E-government, or electronic-based governance, can take various forms and scopes, with a development vision that must reflect the common goals of all stakeholders (Indrajid et al., 2005:9). This concept is not a cheap or easy initiative and requires a paradigm shift as well as a re-engineering of government business processes to achieve it (Indrajid et al., 2005:7). The success of e-government implementation depends on the readiness of various factors, including telecommunications infrastructure, IT connectivity, human resource competence, available funding, legal frameworks, and a paradigm shift in governance.

Indrajid et al. (2005:12) identify several factors determining e-government readiness, such as adequate infrastructure, the level of IT utilization by the government, human resource readiness, sufficient funding, and supporting legal frameworks. A paradigm shift in governance is also necessary for the successful implementation of e-government. Presidential Regulation No. 95 of 2018 on SPBE reflects the readiness for e-government implementation by emphasizing governance that is clean, effective, and transparent. While e-government implementation still varies between regions, this policy sets out four strategic directions: governance, services, information and communication technology, and human resource development. SPBE in the public sector aims to support development in the areas of law and security by enhancing protection for citizens through the integration of processes between the central government and local authorities.

Government plays a vital role in creating order and justice within society, stemming from the social condition that is fraught with conflicts between communities. Hobbes, as cited by Rasyid (2000:1), described this condition as a "war of all against all," where every group struggles for survival. In such a situation, justice and order do not exist, and the presence of government is essential to establish rules that regulate societal life. Modern government, according to Rasyid (2000:1), is not only for serving itself but for serving society, creating conditions that allow society to flourish. One of the main responsibilities of the government is the creation of laws and regulations that provide certainty to society about what is allowed and what is prohibited. These regulations serve as indicators of governmental progress, both in the creation and implementation of laws that ensure security and social justice for all members of society.

In order to achieve governmental objectives, which according to Rasyid (2000:13) are to maintain social order and provide services to society, the government has the task of managing public affairs, which are divided into three categories: absolute, concurrent, and general governmental affairs. General governmental affairs include authorities carried out by the central government and subsequently delegated down to the subdistrict level, with the subdistrict head (camat) acting as the representative of the regent and playing a key role in coordinating intergovernmental agencies at the local level. General government affairs encompass various strategic tasks such as fostering a national perspective, maintaining national unity, handling social conflicts, and coordinating inter-agency tasks to address local issues, all while adhering to the principles of democracy, human rights, and equity. These affairs also include the development of democratic life in line with the values of Pancasila and the preservation of the unity of the Republic of Indonesia (Rasyid, 2000:1).

Based on the concepts outlined above and in accordance with the research problem, goal of this article is to identify an effective mechanism or model for electronic-based government coordination in the implementation of general governmental affairs at the subdistrict level in Magetan Regency, East Java Province. The concepts presented are used as a framework by the researcher to guide the analysis of empirical facts discovered through the collection of predetermined data. Based on the above explanation, the author is interested in taking the title “Model of Electronic-Based Government Coordination in the Implementation of General Government Affairs at the Subdistrict Level in Magetan Regency, East Java Province” for this study.

The choice of this title and focus on Magetan subdistrict is based on the fact that, according to the evaluation of the Electronic-Based Government System (SPBE) conducted by the Ministry of Administrative and Bureaucratic Reform (Kemenpan RB) in 2023, the condition of Magetan Regency still lags behind other regencies and cities in East Java. Additionally, as the smallest regency in East Java Province, located on the border with Central Java, Magetan is highly influenced by the Mataraman culture, which has its own unique communication style compared to the coastal or northern regions of East Java. Furthermore, the focus of the research on government coordination models is driven by regulatory changes that shifted the role of the subdistrict head (camat) from a regional apparatus to a district apparatus. However, at the empirical level, the subdistrict head's regional duties remain attached to their position. The coordination carried out by the subdistrict head involves the delegation of tasks from the regent in the implementation of general governmental affairs, which, in reality, fall under the authority of the president as the head of government.

**Method**

This study employs a descriptive-analytical method with a qualitative approach aimed at interpreting phenomena in their natural context through interviews, observations, and document analysis. This method involves an inductive approach, focusing on individual meanings and the complexity of the issue at hand. The research focuses on three dimensions of coordination: network, collaboration, and hierarchy, with sub-indicators such as stakeholder interactions, differing ideas, authority, and coordination mechanisms. Operational parameters are translated into concrete and measurable forms for empirical analysis. The research indicators include aspects of networks (stakeholder interaction, social actors, network partners), collaboration (differences in problem definitions, commitment, capabilities), and hierarchy (authority, mechanisms, structure, budget). These parameters are used to evaluate the effectiveness of coordination at various levels of government.

Data collection techniques include in-depth interviews, direct observations, documentation, and the use of audio-visual materials. Additionally, the study employs Focus Group Discussions (FGD) as an additional data collection method. The FGD is designed to explore the perceptions, motivations, and arguments of informants in a more focused and in-depth group discussion setting. The research instrument in this qualitative study is the researcher themselves. As the primary instrument, the researcher is responsible for gathering, analyzing, and interpreting the data. In addition, supporting instruments, such as an interview question guide, are used to direct the data collection process from informants. Informants in this study include individuals considered relevant and competent, such as the Head of the Communication and Information Office, Head of the BKPSDM, subdistrict heads, community leaders, and officials from vertical agencies. Informants are selected based on their ability to provide relevant information related to the research focus.

Data analysis is conducted by following the stages outlined by Creswell, which include data processing and preparation, reading through the entire data, coding to identify themes, describing categories, and interpreting the data. This process involves continuous reflection on the collected data, narrative construction, and comparison with relevant literature. The reference model in this study is based on the theory of Peters (2018), which emphasizes the three main dimensions of coordination: network, collaboration, and hierarchy. This model is used to understand the effectiveness of coordination carried out by the subdistrict head in government, although some challenges were identified, such as the lack of clear legal foundations, budget constraints, and partial reporting mechanisms.

Data validity is ensured through data source triangulation to ensure the accuracy and reliability of the data. Triangulation is carried out by comparing various sources of information to ensure that the data obtained is accurate and trustworthy. The research location is based in the subdistrict offices across Magetan Regency.

**Result and Discussion**

The Implementation of Electronic-Based Government Coordination in the Administration of General Government Affairs at the Subdistrict Level. According to Law No. 23 of 2014, general government affairs include inter-agency coordination, fostering inter-ethnic and inter-religious harmony, and handling social conflicts. The governor and regents/mayors carry out these governmental affairs by delegating certain tasks to the subdistrict head (camat). In the context of Magetan Regency, these tasks are carried out through the Subdistrict Leadership Coordination Forum (Forkopimcam), employing various mechanisms, both conventional and electronic-based.

Interviews with subdistrict heads across Magetan Regency revealed that the three most prominent affairs are: (1) fostering harmony between ethnic groups, religious communities, and races; (2) handling social conflicts; and (3) coordinating inter-agency tasks. Some subdistrict heads, such as those in Lembeyan, Takeran, and Nguntoronadi, emphasized the importance of preventive efforts in maintaining regional security stability. Meanwhile, inter-agency coordination is generally carried out through regular meetings in the Subdistrict Coordination Meetings (Rakorca), held monthly, although the frequency depends on the policies of each subdistrict head. The coordination mechanisms employed by subdistrict heads in Magetan involve three models: network, collaboration, and hierarchy. In the network-based coordination model, subdistrict heads establish communication with social actors such as community leaders, religious figures, and youth. This coordination is often done personally through direct visits or informal communication using phones and WhatsApp. This mechanism is considered effective in preventing potential conflicts due to the social and cultural closeness.

The collaboration-based coordination model is carried out through Rakorca, which involves various cross-sector parties, such as the police, the military (TNI), and local government agencies. Rakorca serves as an important forum for aligning perceptions, addressing cross-sectoral issues, and formulating strategic steps in handling issues at the subdistrict level. However, in urgent situations, coordination is often done through electronic technologies like Zoom and WhatsApp. In the hierarchy-based coordination mechanism, subdistrict heads have formal authority to lead Forkopimcam in accordance with Government Regulation No. 17 of 2018. In practice, coordination is top-down, where the subdistrict head has full control over organizing and directing the implementation of general government affairs. Although the Rakorca schedule is set, its implementation still depends on the subdistrict head’s policies and the local conditions, and thus lacks standardized guidelines.

The implementation of the Electronic-Based Government System (SPBE) in Magetan Regency is regulated by Regional Regulation No. 6 of 2021 and Regent Regulation No. 66 of 2022. Several applications, such as SIPD, SRIKANDI, and SIMPEG, are used to support administrative and office tasks. However, according to the subdistrict heads of Kartoharjo and Karangrejo, the implementation of SPBE at the subdistrict level is still limited to routine tasks and has not fully supported cross-sector coordination. The main obstacles in SPBE implementation are limited human resources (HR) and the suboptimal governance system.

Overall, government coordination at the subdistrict level still faces challenges in integrating electronic technology with traditional coordination mechanisms. Although SPBE is operational, its use has not been maximized to address complex cross-sectoral issues. Efforts to improve coordination require synergy between the network, collaboration, and hierarchy mechanisms, as well as support for technological infrastructure and the enhancement of HR capacity.

Several factors hinder the implementation of electronic-based government coordination in the administration of general government affairs at the subdistrict level in Magetan Regency. The main challenges identified include limited infrastructure, a minimal budget, non-standardized coordination mechanisms, and the managerial competence of subdistrict heads as coordinators in their respective areas.

Firstly, infrastructure remains a significant barrier to the implementation of the Electronic-Based Government System (SPBE). Technological infrastructure, such as internet connectivity, is not yet evenly distributed down to the village level, making system integration difficult. Additionally, the innovation of applications developed to support government services remains partial and not fully interconnected between vertical and horizontal agencies. The limited human resources (HR) capable of operating technology further slows the efforts to accelerate SPBE implementation. Secondly, budget limitations also serve as a barrier to coordination efforts. Document reviews and interviews reveal that budget allocations for coordination activities at the subdistrict level are extremely limited. In the 2024 Budget Implementation Document (DPA) for Kartoharjo Subdistrict, only IDR 85,000,000 is allocated for public order and security coordination activities. This budget must cover various synergy activities, so the budget for Subdistrict Coordination Meetings (Rakorca) is only about IDR 13,747,000 per year. As a result, Rakorca cannot be held routinely and is conducted only when necessary or in urgent situations.

Furthermore, the coordination mechanisms at the subdistrict level lack standardized guidelines. Interviews show that coordination is carried out flexibly through Rakorca, direct communication, and the use of messaging apps such as WhatsApp. While this method is considered quick and practical, coordination tends to be reactive, occurring only when issues or situations arise that require immediate attention. Formal mechanisms, such as Rakorca, are often delayed due to budget constraints and limited supporting resources. Finally, the managerial competence of subdistrict heads is a critical factor influencing the effectiveness of coordination. Data obtained shows that not all subdistrict heads in Magetan Regency have an educational background in government administration, as required by Law No. 23 of 2014. This creates potential competence gaps in carrying out cross-sector coordination tasks. The Head of the Magetan Regency Personnel and Human Resources Development Agency emphasizes the importance of developing technical, managerial, and socio-cultural competencies through training and regular assessments to enhance the capacity of subdistrict heads as regional leaders.

Overall, electronic-based government coordination in Magetan Regency still faces complex challenges from technical, financial, and human resource aspects. To overcome these barriers, synergy among policymakers, improvements in technological infrastructure, adequate budget allocations, and strengthening the managerial competence of subdistrict heads are necessary. By addressing these issues, it is hoped that effective, efficient, and accountable governance can be realized at the subdistrict level.

The model of electronic-based government coordination in the administration of general government affairs at the subdistrict level encompasses three main mechanisms: network, collaboration, and hierarchy, as explained by Peters (2018). These mechanisms are used by subdistrict heads (camat) to coordinate with various parties, including vertical agencies, local government offices, and community leaders in their regions.

The network coordination mechanism focuses on the informal communication relationships established between the camat and stakeholders, such as religious leaders, community figures, and social organizations. Coordination occurs through direct communication, such as visits or social gatherings, as well as through communication media like telephone or WhatsApp. Camat, such as Camat Plaosan and Camat Barat, emphasize the importance of building networks with these parties to prevent and detect potential social conflicts early in their areas. This mechanism is not bound by formal procedures and is more flexible, adapted to the situation and needs on the ground.

The collaboration coordination mechanism is used to align differing ideas, programs, and activities among stakeholders. The camat plays a role as a facilitator, guiding discussions to reach a mutual agreement on development planning or social issue resolution. Several camat, including Camat Kawedanan and Camat Plaosan, explain that collaboration is realized through planning forums such as Musrenbang (Development Planning Meeting), regular Rakorca meetings, or cross-sector mini workshops. This collaboration requires commitment and the ability of each party to work together in achieving the agreed-upon goals.

Finally, the hierarchy coordination mechanism is carried out through a formal structure that is procedural and administrative. The camat coordinates with the district government leadership (Forkopimcam), the local police chief (Kapolsek), the military commander (Danramil), and other related agencies through official forums such as Rakorca, which ideally should be held regularly. However, the research findings indicate that the implementation of hierarchy coordination still faces challenges. The absence of standardized guidelines or procedures is a significant barrier, leading to coordination that is often conditional and dependent on the situation. Moreover, budget limitations also affect the frequency and effectiveness of Rakorca, as noted by Camat Kawedanan and Camat Bendo.

Evolution of regulations related to local government, in line with global societal dynamics, demands a strengthening of the administration of general government affairs at the subdistrict level. In this context, the role of the subdistrict head (camat) as the organizer of general government affairs and coordinator of regional apparatus activities requires special attention. Current regulations do not provide clear guidelines regarding the mechanisms, procedures, and adequate budgetary support for camat to carry out their duties effectively and efficiently. The complexity of the camat's tasks, which involve coordination with various parties through the mechanisms of networks, collaboration, and hierarchy, calls for a strengthening of the camat's position and institutionalizing coordination mechanisms to ensure these tasks are executed optimally.

Proposing the strengthening of the camat's position and the institutionalization of coordination mechanisms in the administration of general government affairs at the subdistrict level. First, coordination mechanisms, which have so far been flexible and intuitive, need to be institutionalized through clear regulations. This mechanism should include formal authority for the camat to mobilize the parties involved in coordination. Second, the timing of coordination must be set periodically to ensure the synchronization of programs and the resolution of issues at the subdistrict level in a structured and sustainable manner.

Another innovation proposed is the reporting procedure for the results of coordination, which is cross-organizational in nature. Each party involved in the coordination must report the follow-up actions to their direct superior, with a copy sent to the camat as the coordinator. The camat, in turn, must report the coordination results to the regent, with a copy sent to the superior of the participating agency or department. This procedure aims to create uniformity in responding to coordination outcomes and ensure accountability in the performance of duties.

Furthermore, strengthening the camat's position also requires support in the form of enhanced authority and adequate budget allocation. The central government is expected to commit to revising the competency standards for the camat’s position to ensure they possess the necessary managerial and technical capacities. This standard should be followed by regular evaluations conducted through the governor as the representative of the central government, ensuring that coordination is carried out effectively and the camat holds the authority to manage governance in their region.

With the strengthening of the camat’s position, the institutionalization of coordination mechanisms, and clear reporting procedures, the coordination model moving forward is expected to address the various obstacles previously faced. This model will serve as a practical guide in the administration of general government affairs, making coordination more structured, efficient, and effective, while fostering harmony between the camat and relevant parties at the subdistrict level.

**Conclusions**

The conclusion of this article indicates that the implementation of an electronic-based government coordination model in the administration of general government affairs at the subdistrict level in Magetan Regency, East Java, based on research analyzed through Peters' (2018) theory, which examines coordination through the mechanisms of network, collaboration, and hierarchy, can be summarized as follows. First, the Electronic-Based Government System (SPBE) at the subdistrict level has been implemented, although its use is still limited to administrative tasks. Coordination between the camat and relevant agencies, as well as the Subdistrict Leadership Coordination Forum (Forkopimcam), still predominantly relies on applications like WhatsApp and Zoom. Second, factors hindering electronic-based government coordination at the subdistrict level include infrastructure, budget limitations, coordination mechanisms, and managerial competence. In terms of infrastructure, the integration of the SPBE system in Magetan Regency is still limited to assistance and has not yet expanded to the subdistrict level. Budget constraints, particularly the limited allocation of funds for Subdistrict Coordination Meetings (Rakorca) in the DPA (Budget Implementation Document) of subdistricts across Magetan Regency, hinder the expansion of coordination efforts.

Additionally, the lack of standardized guidelines for coordination mechanisms weakens the camat’s control functions in achieving collective goals. The limited managerial competence of the camat, particularly in technical, managerial, and socio-cultural aspects, also impedes effective coordination. Third, camat across Magetan Regency employ all three coordination mechanisms when interacting with stakeholders and community leaders. These include the network mechanism, which is carried out through social visits to actors outside the government structure, the collaboration mechanism, implemented through limited meetings or Rakorca forums, and the hierarchy mechanism, also conducted through Rakorca, with its implementation depending on the camat's ability to identify the conditions in their area. Lastly, the absence of regulations to guide the camat in coordinating tasks affects the level of commitment from the parties involved, as there are no procedural reporting guidelines for cross-organizational coordination results.
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