DIJMS: Dinasti International Journal of Management Science
E-ISSN: 2686-522X
P-ISSN: 2686-5211
DINASTI PUBLISHER
https://dinastipub.org/DIJMS dinasti.info@gmail.com +62 811 7404 455

DOI: https://doi.org/10.38035/dijms.v8i1
https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/
Received: 19 Oktober 2026 | **Revised:** 26 Oktober 2026 | **Accepted:** 31 Oktober 2026

Strengthening the Governance of Sectoral Statistics Development: Analysis of the 2025 BPS In-Depth Study Results

Diena Wijayanti[1], Iwan Kurniawan Subagja[2], Azis Hakim[3], Triana Rachmaningsih[4]
[1]Universitas Krisnadwipayana, Jakarta, Indonesia, diena.wijayanti@gmail.com
[2]Universitas Krisnadwipayana, Jakarta, Indonesia, iwankurniawan@unkris.ac.id
[3]Universitas Krisnadwipayana, Jakarta, Indonesia, dr_azishakim@unkris.ac.id
[4]Badan Pusat Statistik, Jakarta, Indonesia, nana@bps.go.id

Corresponding Author: diena.wijayanti@gmail.com[1]

Abstract: The development of sectoral statistics is a strategic function designed to ensure that statistics produced by government agencies meet established standards, maintain high quality, and support the National Statistical System. This study aims to examine the current state of governance in the development of sectoral statistics, identify existing governance gaps, and translate these findings into a framework for sustainable improvement. Employing a descriptive qualitative approach, the study conducted an in-depth analysis of sectoral statistical development in 2025, involving 18 development teams comprising 5 provincial-level teams and 13 regency/city-level teams. The primary data consist of qualitative accounts regarding respondents' experiences, challenges, practices, and recommendations, while closed-ended responses serve as contextual information to strengthen interpretation rather than as a basis for statistical generalization. The findings indicate that while an operational foundation for governance exists covering preparation, execution, reporting, and monitoring and evaluation the current framework remains overly dependent on specific individuals, lacks uniformity, and is not yet fully documented. The study identifies six key gaps: clarity of roles and accountability, process standardization, capacity, coordination, digital support, and monitoring and feedback. Based on these findings, the study proposes a "closed-loop governance" model that integrates network governance, quality assurance, public-sector data governance, and continuous improvement through a cycle of: plan → execute → document → verify → evaluate → correct → re-assess. This model emphasizes minimum standardization, needs-based flexibility, quality gates, capacity building, the use of a digital platform as a central control hub, and traceable follow-up actions. Ultimately, the study suggests that the effectiveness of statistical development should be evaluated based on improvements in process quality and an institution's capacity to sustainably reduce identified issues, rather than merely by the number of activities conducted or the completeness of administrative documentation.

Keywords: Sectoral Statistics, Network Governance, Quality Assurance, Public-Sector Data Governance; Continuous Improvement

INTRODUCTION

Data is a strategic asset for the government, as it supports the formulation of plans, the implementation of policies, and the evaluation and monitoring of development performance. The value of data is determined not only by its availability but also by its quality. Data quality depends on clear roles, consistent processes, cross-organizational coordination, human resource capacity, digital infrastructure, and mechanisms for control and feedback. This perspective aligns with the concept of "public-sector data governance," which positions data governance as the foundation for a data-driven public sector; effective governance connects leadership, regulations, capacity, architecture, and data utilization to create public value (OECD, 2019).

In Indonesia, Law Number 16 of 1997 concerning Statistics and Government Regulation Number 51 of 1999 concerning the Implementation of Statistics establish sectoral statistics as an integral part of the National Statistical System. Furthermore, regarding the implementation of sectoral statistics, Presidential Regulation Number 39 of 2019 concerning "One Data Indonesia" defines the division of functions among data stewards, data custodians, and data producers. It also mandates the adoption of data standards, metadata, interoperability, and reference codes or master data. Within this framework, Statistics Indonesia (BPS) serves as the data steward for government agencies that conduct sectoral statistical activities.

In practice, the stewardship of sectoral statistics is a cross-organizational process. The literature on "network governance" suggests that the effectiveness of inter-institutional networks is heavily influenced by coordination mechanisms, the number of members within the network, the level of trust, and a consensus on goals (Provan and Kenis, 2008). This perspective is consistent with the work of Ansell and Gash (2008) as well as Emerson, Nabatchi, and Balogh (2012), who emphasize that public collaboration requires structures for interaction, trust, shared capacity, and mechanisms for collective action. In the development of sectoral statistics, BPS (Statistics Indonesia) serves as the lead organization, mandated to provide guidance and establish methodological standards. Meanwhile, data ownership and the implementation of processes reside with the respective sectoral agencies involving data stewards, data producers, agency leadership, and supporting units. This arrangement underscores that statistical quality can only be achieved through coordination, consensus, capacity building, and shared accountability.

These governance aspects are directly linked to statistical quality. The United Nations National Quality Assurance Framework (UN NQAF) defines quality as the outcome of a system encompassing the institutional environment, statistical processes, and statistical outputs. The Generic Statistical Business Process Model (GSBPM) version 5.2 provides a standardized framework for documenting, harmonizing, assessing, and improving the quality of statistical processes. Consequently, the development of sectoral statistics should extend beyond the mere delivery of training materials; it must ensure that standards are actively applied within operational workflows. Both frameworks emphasize that, in the context of sectoral statistics, quality must be built into the entire process rather than being assessed solely at the final product stage.

Literature on data governance also highlights the importance of decision-making regarding who is authorized to set standards, who is responsible for quality, and how data and metadata are managed. Khatri and Brown (2010) identify clear decision rights and accountability as core components of data governance. This perspective is highly relevant to the development of sectoral statistics, as the success of such initiatives depends on clearly defined roles for BPS, data stewards, data producers, agency leadership, and those responsible for specific statistical activities.

In 2025, the Secretariat for Sectoral Statistics Development at BPS (Statistics Indonesia) conducted an in-depth study on sectoral statistics development across 18

development teams, comprising 5 provincial-level teams and 13 regency/city-level teams from five selected provinces. The study covered the stages of preparation, implementation, reporting, as well as monitoring and evaluation. Preliminary findings indicate variations in the division of tasks, coordination mechanisms, understanding of statistical activities, the use of development-support applications, and the execution of monitoring. However, these operational findings require further analysis to elucidate the governance patterns underlying the observed issues.

Previous research in Indonesia has addressed the institutional dimensions of government data governance within the "One Data Indonesia" (Satu Data Indonesia) framework, encompassing policies and strategies, organizational arrangements, capacity and competence, leadership, and stakeholder engagement (Bernot et al., 2024). Sarihastuti (2024) emphasizes the importance of development, evaluation, collaboration, and resource support in enhancing the quality of sectoral statistics. Gaib, Masengi, and Bulo (2026) demonstrate that communication, resources, and bureaucratic structure collectively exert a significant influence on the implementation of sectoral statistics in Tomohon City, with bureaucratic structure identified as the most dominant factor.

Gymnastiar, Stiawati, and Riswanda (2026) found that while the implementation of "One Data Indonesia" in Banten Province possesses a reasonably strong regulatory and institutional foundation, it still faces challenges such as gaps in the capacity of data managers, technical constraints regarding the portal, and suboptimal interoperability. Meanwhile, Puspasari and Pramesti (2026) indicate that improvements in the "One Data Indonesia" index score for the National Institute of Public Administration do not fully reflect substantive implementation maturity, as gaps persist in areas such as data verification, dissemination, management, standardization, and integration. This series of studies reveals a consistent pattern: the success of government data governance is determined not merely by the existence of regulations or administrative achievements, but also by capacity, coordination, organizational structure, standardization, system integration, and follow-up mechanisms. An area that requires further strengthening is the use of operational evidence derived from guidance and support activities to identify governance gaps and translate them into structured, sustainable improvement mechanisms.

This research does not aim to produce statistical generalizations applicable to all BPS (Statistics Indonesia) work units. Instead, the findings provide an analytical explanation of coordination patterns, role distribution, organizational capacity, quality assurance mechanisms, and the continuity of follow-up support within the studied contexts. The analysis is intended to serve as a foundation for understanding governance challenges and formulating sustainable improvements to the mechanisms for guiding sectoral statistics.

The analytical framework integrates four perspectives: network governance (to examine relationships and accountability among actors), quality assurance (to assess process quality controls), public-sector data governance (to evaluate roles, data, and digital platforms), and continuous improvement (to assess the interplay between monitoring, corrective actions, and iterative enhancements).

The novelty of this research lies in three aspects. First, the results of the in-depth study are interpreted as a complete governance cycle for guidance and support, rather than merely a collection of obstacles. Second, the findings are translated into actionable themes concerning governance gaps. Third, the research proposes a "closed-loop governance" model that connects network arrangements, quality assurance, public-sector data governance, and continuous improvement.

METHODS

This study employs a descriptive qualitative approach. A qualitative approach focuses on collecting data in the form of narratives and descriptions, which are subsequently analyzed to understand and interpret events (Suganda et al., 2025). The research was conducted through interviews using an instrument containing both closed-ended and open-ended questions; however, the study prioritizes the narrative responses from the open-ended questions specifically the respondents' explanations regarding challenges, practices, and suggestions as the primary data. Closed-ended responses serve only as contextual information to indicate the prevalence of specific issues within the studied settings and are not treated as a basis for quantitative analysis.

The unit of analysis consists of 18 "guidance teams" that served as the focus for an in-depth study, comprising 5 provincial-level teams and 13 regency/city-level teams across five selected provinces. The in-depth study was carried out from August 4 to 15, 2025. Informants were selected purposively, based on their positions, experience, and involvement in the preparation, implementation, reporting, and monitoring and evaluation of sectoral statistics guidance.

The study instrument was structured according to the stages of the guidance process. The preparation stage covers the formation of the guidance team, the distribution of tasks among team members, and the updating of contact persons. The implementation stage addresses the guidance work plan, the identification of statistical activities, the prioritization of these activities, the level of enthusiasm among data custodians and data producers, budgetary requirements, and challenges encountered during the guidance process. The reporting stage assesses the management of team members' accounts within the guidance application, the actual usage of the application, and the documentation maintained therein. The monitoring and evaluation stage encompasses the verification of guidance team personnel, the understanding of Key Performance Indicators for Sectoral Statistics Guidance, performance targets, and the execution of monitoring and evaluation (M&E) activities conducted both independently and through a hierarchical (multi-level) framework.

Data analysis was conducted through a process of organizing data, coding, grouping information, and drawing conclusions to identify the governance patterns for the development of sectoral statistics. According to Abdussamad (2021), data analysis in qualitative research is carried out systematically through data processing and interpretation, leading to an understanding of the phenomenon under study. In this research, the analysis followed these stages: (1) reading and comprehending the entire set of research findings; (2) applying initial codes to information regarding roles and authority, development processes, human resource capacity, coordination, the use of applications, and monitoring and evaluation; (3) grouping codes with similar meanings into categories and themes; (4) examining the interrelationships between themes based on the research focus and questions; (5) formulating the meaning of each theme based on the data obtained; and (6) constructing an analytical narrative to explain the governance patterns and gaps in the implementation of sectoral statistics development.

Data validity was maintained through source triangulation comparing information from various research sites as well as by cross-referencing responses to open-ended questions with measurements derived from closed-ended questions. Furthermore, the consistency of information across different stages of the development process was examined to identify both alignments and discrepancies in the findings. Triangulation is a technique used to enhance research credibility by comparing data from diverse sources, data collection methods, or theoretical perspectives (Suganda et al., 2025). This technique helps verify the consistency of information and strengthens the validity of the analytical results.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

State of Governance for Sectoral Statistics Development

The study indicates that the governance of sectoral statistics development has established an operational foundation, encompassing the formation of development teams, the drafting of work plans, the execution of development activities, the use of dedicated development applications, and monitoring and evaluation. Nevertheless, this foundation is not yet fully institutionalized; working patterns vary across different locations, and some activities remain dependent on specific individuals.

During the preparation phase, all locations have established development teams. Team leaders or coordinators are typically appointed by the head of the respective work unit (provincial or regency/city-level BPS office), while members are selected based on various criteria such as prior training in statistics development, experience from previous development cycles or the Evaluation of Sectoral Statistics Implementation (EPSS), and experience in coordinating with local government agencies. In most locations, tasks are distributed based on the specific entities being supported, subject-matter expertise, or roles related to the use of development applications. However, some locations operate without a clear division of responsibilities. While the process of updating points of contact (liaisons) is generally in place, it often occurs informally through personal communication. In some instances, staff rotation and inter-institutional "sectoral ego" necessitate repeated coordination efforts. This can disrupt the continuity of working relationships especially in the absence of a formal "Person in Charge" (PIC) and a structured handover mechanism making coordination overly reliant on personal rapport.

During the implementation phase, work plans are generally drafted in accordance with technical guidelines; in some locations, they are developed collaboratively with data stewards, data producers, or regional development planning agencies (Bappeda/Bapperida). However, there is inconsistent adherence to established regulations, and differing perspectives exist regarding the extent to which work plans should be standardized, necessitating a multi-tiered verification process for the drafted plans. A significant challenge arises in identifying sectoral statistical activities, stemming from a limited understanding of statistical business processes, constraints in budget and personnel, and less-than-optimal responsiveness from data producers. The selection of priority development activities still relies on a diverse set of criteria, including the ease of coordination with activity leads, the relevance of activities to the 2026 Statistical Sector Development Evaluation (EPSS), the technical proficiency of activity leads, recommendations from local leadership, and the level of cooperation from data producers. This indicates that while adaptive practices are in place, the prioritization framework lacks consistency.

The implementation of development activities faces several challenges: participants often lack a technical statistical background; scheduling conflicts arise between data stewards and data producers; training materials tend to be overly theoretical rather than practical; development tasks are frequently perceived as an additional burden; and there are constraints related to budget, a lack of initiative or autonomy among data stewards, turnover within the development team, and a reliance on informal communication channels. These findings suggest that the effectiveness of development efforts hinges on a combination of capacity, personnel continuity, and coordination.

Regarding reporting, the development-tracking application serves as a documentation tool, though its utilization remains uneven. Users encounter issues such as account management difficulties, personnel status changes, unclear access schedules, over-reliance on administrators or coordinators, and a lack of comprehensive user manuals. Suggested improvements for the application include providing user guides, incorporating metadata for Key Performance Indicators (IKU) related to the Statistical Sector Development Team (TPSS),

displaying activity timelines, adding administrative roles, implementing year-based filters, managing account lifecycles, enabling the upload of contact person documentation, and providing summaries of regency/city-level TPSS activities for provincial-level monitoring. These findings indicate that user needs extend beyond simple document uploading; there is a demand for the application to function as a central hub for managing development activities.

In the monitoring and evaluation (M&E) phase, self-assessments are conducted at various times before, during, or after formal M&E meetings. Tiered monitoring is carried out by provincial development teams for their regency/city counterparts; however, the methods for communicating results and the formats used for documentation vary significantly. At several locations, the results of monitoring and evaluation (M&E) are communicated solely through online meetings or presentations, without any formal reports. The absence of a consistent follow-up format makes it difficult to track the link between findings and corrective actions specifically through an "action log" that should detail the person responsible, target deadlines, evidence of completion, and final verification. Furthermore, the understanding of the TPSS Key Performance Indicators (IKU) which serve as a measure of the success of guidance and support efforts remains uneven, often concentrated only among coordinators or administrative staff.

Gaps in the Governance of Sectoral Statistics Development

The analysis identifies six interrelated gaps. These are not isolated issues; rather, one gap often reinforces another.

a. Gaps in roles and accountability

While tasks are distributed across various units, they have not always been formalized in terms of specific roles, authority, designated persons-in-charge (PICs), and handover mechanisms. Consequently, process continuity becomes vulnerable whenever personnel rotations occur.

b. Gaps in process standardization

There is significant variation in work plans, criteria for prioritizing development activities, documentation, and monitoring and evaluation (M&E). While some flexibility is necessary, there is a lack of consistent minimum standards.

c. Gaps in capacity

Difficulties in identifying statistical activities, understanding Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) for sectoral statistics development, and utilizing development-related applications point to gaps in substantive, governance, and digital competencies.

d. Gaps in coordination

Coordination often relies on personal relationships; however, changes in points of contact and conflicting interests between institutions can hinder continuity.

e. Gaps in digital support

Existing applications do not yet fully integrate role management, timelines, supporting documentation, monitoring, and follow-up processes. As a result, some control functions are still managed outside the system.

f. Gaps in monitoring and feedback

Although monitoring and evaluation are being conducted, findings are not always accompanied by an "action log" that specifies the person responsible, target deadlines, evidence of completion, and final verification.

Table 1. Summary of the identification results regarding the governance of sectoral statistics development

Theme	Qualitative evidence	Contextual indications	Meaning of governance
Roles & accountability	Variations in task distribution; coordination	Most have divided tasks, though not entirely	Risk of person-dependency and loss of knowledge

Theme	Qualitative evidence	Contextual indications	Meaning of governance
	depends on the person-in-charge (PIC)/point of contact		
Process standardization	Variations in work plans, priority activities, documentation, and monitoring & evaluation (M&E)	Variations in practice across different locations	Requirement for a mandatory core + an adaptive layer
Capacity	Difficulties in identifying activities, Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) for TPSS, and using the guidance/support application	Issues recur across many locations	Need for practice-based competency strengthening
Coordination	Changes in informal points of contact; staff rotation/silo mentality (sectoral ego)	General coordination takes place, but it is not always formal	Requirement for an institutionalized coordination mechanism
Digital support	Accounts, roles, guidelines, timelines, and summary reporting are not yet optimized	Usage is often concentrated among administrators/coordinators	Applications must function as a control tower
Monitoring & feedback	Inconsistent M&E formats; follow-up actions are difficult to track	Formal reporting is not yet consistent	Need for action logs, corrective actions, and re-verification

Framework for Strengthening Sectoral Statistics Development

The Plan → Do → Check → Act (PDCA) cycle is a continuous improvement approach that iteratively links planning, execution, result verification, and corrective action (Isniah et al., 2020). In the context of sectoral statistics development, the PDCA model is highly relevant; monitoring and evaluation should not merely conclude with the recording of findings, but must also lead to corrective actions.

Based on the interrelationships between themes, strengthening development efforts requires a model that goes beyond simply adding new activities it must comprehensively improve governance mechanisms at every stage of the development process. The proposed framework is a "closed-loop governance" model: Plan → Execute → Document → Verify → Evaluate → Correct → Re-assess. This model expands upon the PDCA concept by incorporating two additional requirements identified through this study: documentation and verification.

The "Plan" stage involves defining roles, assigning persons-in-charge (PICs), establishing minimum work plans, and setting priorities based on specific needs and risks. "Execute" focuses on development efforts driven by actual cases and tangible outputs. "Document" ensures that all evidence of the process is recorded within a single platform. "Verify" implements "quality gates" at critical, high-risk junctures. "Evaluate" utilizes monitoring and evaluation (M&E) to identify gaps. "Correct" translates findings into specific corrective actions, each assigned an owner, a target timeline, and a requirement for proof of completion. "Re-assess" evaluates whether these actions have successfully reduced gaps in the subsequent cycle. Within this framework, corrective actions based on M&E findings are essential to ensure that the results of the M&E process effectively contribute to improving the development framework in the next cycle.

Table 2. Framework for strengthening the governance of sectoral statistics development

Dimensions	Evaluation focus	Minimum output	Indicators of success
Clarity of roles and authority	PIC matrix, assignment letters, handovers	Role matrix and contact person register	Roles filled and updated
Process standardization	Mandatory core + adaptive layer	Minimum work plan, priority activity criteria, checklist	Consistency and quality of verification
Capacity development	Coaching, simulations, real-world cases	Competency modules and assessments	Increased personnel autonomy
Coordination	Formal problem-solving mechanisms at the leadership level	Coordination agenda and problem notes	Cross-stakeholder issues resolved
Digital support	Integration of roles, timelines, evidence, and action logs	Dashboard/control tower	Improved process traceability
Quality assurance and feedback	Quality gates, corrective actions	Checklist, action owner, due date, evidence	Decrease in recurring findings

DISCUSSION

Governance Foundations Exist but Are Not Fully Institutionalized

The finding that all stages of the guidance process are underway indicates that the core issue is not an absence of structure, but rather the quality of institutionalization. In network governance, an effective network requires coordination and accountability mechanisms that can endure beyond personal relationships (Provan & Kenis, 2008). The person-dependent patterns observed among points of contact (POCs), administrators, and coordinators suggest that the guidance process remains highly reliant on specific individuals.

These findings align with Bernot et al. (2024), who demonstrate that data governance within the Indonesian government is shaped by institutional arrangements, capacity, and coordination. Building on that research, this study provides more granular evidence of how these institutional challenges manifest in practice specifically through personnel turnover, inconsistent division of tasks, and a lack of uniformity in process documentation.

The findings are also consistent with Gaib, Masengi, and Bulo (2026), who show that communication, resources, and bureaucratic structure collectively influence the implementation of sectoral statistics. This study further specifies that these factors manifest through concrete operational mechanisms, such as reliance on specific individuals (PICs), staff turnover, procedural variations, and inconsistent documentation of follow-up actions.

The perspective of collaborative governance further clarifies that successful coordination cannot rely solely on forums or communication; it requires shared capacity and stable rules for interaction (Ansell & Gash, 2008; Emerson et al., 2012). Consequently, the guidance process must transition from relying on effective informal relationships toward establishing formal mechanisms that remain sufficiently flexible.

Governance Gaps Are Systemic and Mutually Reinforcing

The six identified gaps indicate that the challenges within the guidance process are systemic in nature. For instance, a capability gap in the identification of statistical activities is not merely a matter of individual competence; it is also influenced by process standardization, application support, coordination with data producers, and the quality of monitoring. The same applies to a digital enablement gap, where issues with an application are not solely about features, but rather concern decision rights, role management, and the traceability of accountability.

Khatri and Brown (2010) emphasize that data governance requires clarity regarding decision rights and accountability. Research findings reinforce this concept within the context of sectoral statistical development, where the roles of those who identify, verify, rectify, and

approve must be traceable. The OECD (2019) further underscores that effective data governance requires an interconnected strategic, tactical, and operational approach. Consequently, a development application should not function merely as a repository; it must also support decision-making workflows and controls.

Regarding quality, the UN NQAF and GSBPM indicate that quality must be embedded within the processes themselves, rather than being assessed only at the end. The significant challenges encountered in identifying statistical activities, combined with the variability in monitoring and evaluation documentation, highlight the need for "quality gates" checkpoints designed to evaluate the viability of a process before it proceeds to the next stage. Such quality gates could be implemented at least four high-risk junctures: the approval of work plans, the validation of identified statistical activities, the completeness of development-related documentation, and the follow-up actions based on monitoring and evaluation.

These results align with the findings of Gymnastiar, Stiawati, and Riswanda (2026), who observed that a relatively robust regulatory and institutional foundation is insufficient if data management capacity, interoperability, and portal support remain weak. Similarly, research by Puspasari and Pramesti (2026) suggests that strong administrative achievements or high index scores do not automatically reflect substantive maturity in data governance. In the context of this study, the implication is that the success of capacity-building efforts should be measured by the process's ability to generate traceable changes, rather than merely by adherence to specific activities or administrative indicators.

These findings also extend the work of Sarihastuti (2024). While that study emphasizes the importance of capacity building, evaluation, collaboration, and resources, the present research identifies more specific mechanisms: capacity development must be linked to role clarity, minimum standardization, quality gates, and action tracking to ensure that such enhancements genuinely result in process-level changes.

Closed-Loop Governance as an Integration of Four Perspectives

The proposed closed-loop governance framework is the result of an analysis incorporating four perspectives. Network governance addresses who is involved and how relationships between actors are managed. Quality assurance identifies the specific process points that require control. Public-sector data governance addresses how decision rights, data, metadata, access, and platforms support accountability. Continuous improvement addresses how evaluation results are utilized to refine subsequent cycles.

While the PDCA (Plan-Do-Check-Act) cycle provides a logic for iterative improvement, the study indicates a need to incorporate two additional elements: "Document" and "Verify." Consequently, a model consisting of Plan → Execute → Document → Verify → Evaluate → Correct → Re-assess is better suited to the nature of sectoral statistical development. "Document" ensures an evidentiary trail; "Verify" confirms that minimum standards are met; "Correct" ensures that findings lead to specific actions; and "Re-assess" confirms the effectiveness of those actions.

In practice, this model balances standardization with adaptation. Relying solely on standardization risks overlooking differences in the capacity and requirements of specific entities, while complete flexibility risks resulting in significant variations in quality. Therefore, a "mandatory core + adaptive layer" approach is more appropriate: it establishes a set of mandatory minimum requirements, while the intensity and form of additional support are tailored to the maturity level, data-related risks, and specific needs of each entity.

CONCLUSION

An in-depth study on the development of sectoral statistics for 2025 reveals that the development framework possesses an operational foundation encompassing preparation,

execution, reporting, as well as monitoring and evaluation. However, its implementation lacks full consistency, remaining heavily dependent on specific individuals particularly regarding role distribution, coordination, the use of software applications, procedural variations, and inconsistent documentation.

The research identifies that the most prominent governance gaps center on six interconnected themes: role clarity and accountability, process standardization, capacity, coordination, digital support, and monitoring and feedback. These gaps indicate that challenges in the development process cannot be resolved merely by increasing outreach activities; rather, they require a strengthening of the governance system.

The proposed approach to strengthening governance is a "closed-loop" model that integrates network governance, quality assurance, public-sector data governance, and continuous improvement through a cycle of: Plan → Execute → Document → Verify → Evaluate → Correct → Re-assess. Implementation requires establishing minimum standards, allowing for needs-based flexibility, incorporating quality gates, enhancing capacity, utilizing applications as central control hubs, and ensuring traceable follow-up actions.

For BPS (Statistics Indonesia), the practical implication is that the success of development efforts should be measured by improvements in process quality and the capacity of the target entities (locus) to independently bridge gaps rather than by the number of activities conducted, the completeness of documentation, or purely administrative achievements. Future research could employ longitudinal studies and cross-entity comparisons to assess how the application of this framework influences the sectoral statistics development teams (TPSS) and the overall quality of sectoral statistics.

This study utilizes data from 18 development teams across five selected provinces and is therefore not intended to be representative of all BPS work units. Consequently, the findings should be interpreted as analytical generalizations regarding governance patterns. Future research could expand the scope to include a wider variety of entities, incorporate interviews with data stewards and data producers, and track the follow-up of development efforts through longitudinal analysis.

REFERENCES

Abdussamad, Z. (2021). Metode Penelitian Kualitatif. Makassar: CV. Syakir Media Press.

Ansell, C., & Gash, A. (2008). Collaborative Governance in theory and practice. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 18(4), 543–571. https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/mum032

Badan Pusat Statistik. (2022). Peraturan Badan Pusat Statistik Nomor 3 Tahun 2022 tentang Evaluasi Penyelenggaraan Statistik Sektoral. Jakarta: Badan Pusat Statistik.

Badan Pusat Statistik. (2023). Peraturan Kepala Badan Pusat Statistik Nomor 117 Tahun 2023 tentang Pedoman Penjaminan Kualitas Statistik melalui Quality Gates. Jakarta: Badan Pusat Statistik.

Badan Pusat Statistik. (2025). Petunjuk Teknis Pembinaan Statistik Sektoral. Jakarta: Badan Pusat Statistik.

Bernot, A., Tjondronegoro, D., Rifai, B., Hasan, R., Liew, A. W.-C., Verhelst, T., & Tiwari, M. (2024). Institutional dimensions in open government data: A deep dive into Indonesia's Satu Data initiative and its implications for developing countries. *Public Performance & Management Review*, 47(6), 1399–1429. https://doi.org/10.1080/15309576.2024.2377609

Emerson, K., Nabatchi, T., & Balogh, S. (2012). An integrative framework for collaborative governance. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 22(1), 1–29. https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/mur011

Gaib, I. O., Masengi, E. E., & Bulo, L. (2026). Pengaruh komunikasi, sumber daya dan struktur birokrasi terhadap implementasi program penyelenggaraan statistik sektoral di Kota Tomohon. PAPATUNG: *Jurnal Ilmu Administrasi Publik, Pemerintahan dan Politik*, 9(3), 45–53. https://doi.org/10.54783/japp.v9i3.1680

Gymnastiar, A., Stiawati, T., & Riswanda, R. (2026). Evaluasi pelaksanaan kebijakan Satu Data Indonesia di Provinsi Banten. JIPAGS (*Journal of Indonesian Public Administration and Governance Studies*), 10(2), 226–240. https://doi.org/10.62870/jipags.v10i2.37471

Isniah, S., Purba, H. H., & Debora, F. (2020). Plan-Do-Check-Act (PDCA) method: Literature review and research issues. *Jurnal Sistem dan Manajemen Industri*, 4(1), 72–81. https://doi.org/10.30656/jsmi.v4i1.2186

Khatri, V., & Brown, C. V. (2010). Designing data governance. *Communications of the ACM*, 53(1), 148–152. https://doi.org/10.1145/1629175.1629210

OECD. (2019). The path to becoming a data-driven public sector. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/059814a7-en

Provan, K. G., & Kenis, P. (2008). Modes of network governance: Structure, management, and effectiveness. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 18(2), 229–252. https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/mum015

Puspasari, H. M., & Pramesti, E. N. (2026). Dari kepatuhan menuju pemanfaatan: Evaluasi penyelenggaraan Satu Data Indonesia (studi kasus LAN). *Jurnal Analis Kebijakan*, 10(1), 88–96. https://doi.org/10.37145/jak.v10i1.992

Republik Indonesia. (1997). Undang-Undang Nomor 16 Tahun 1997 tentang Statistik. Jakarta: Sekretariat Negara.

Republik Indonesia. (1999). Peraturan Pemerintah Nomor 51 Tahun 1999 tentang Penyelenggaraan Statistik. Jakarta: Sekretariat Negara.

Republik Indonesia. (2019). Peraturan Presiden Nomor 39 Tahun 2019 tentang Satu Data Indonesia. Jakarta: Sekretariat Negara.

Sarihastuti, D. (2024). Optimalisasi penyelenggaraan statistik sektoral sebagai upaya pemenuhan data statistik berkualitas di Indonesia. *Jurnal Syntax Admiration*, 5(10), 4343–4363. https://doi.org/10.46799/jsa.v5i10.1715

Suganda, D. A., Haura, R., Widodo, S., & Datu, Y. A. (2025). Metode Penelitian Kualitatif, Kuantitatif, dan Campuran: Teori dan Implementasi. Medan: PT Media Penerbit Indonesia.

United Nations Economic Commission for Europe. (2025). Generic Statistical Business Process Model (GSBPM), Version 5.2. United Nations.

United Nations Statistics Division. (2019). United Nations National Quality Assurance Frameworks Manual for Official Statistics. United Nations.