

Population-Centered Development Through IPBK Integration in Regional Planning

Mubarak Husni* 

Badan Kependudukan dan Keluarga Berencana Nasional (BKKBN) Provinsi Sulawesi Barat, Komp. Gunernus Sulawesi Barat

Corresponding Author Email: mubarakhusnibro@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Received : March 01, 2026

Revised : March 16, 2026

Accepted : March 31, 2026

Keywords:

IPBK, Regional Development Planning, Results-Based Management, Population-oriented Development

Regional development planning requires an evidence-based approach that utilizes population dynamics as the foundation for establishing policy priorities. This study aims to analyze the integration of the Population-Based Development Index (IPBK) within the regional planning cycle and propose concrete strategies for its institutionalization as a population-centered development instrument. The IPBK was developed as a composite indicator to measure the linkages between development outcomes and population structure and needs, yet its application in formal planning documents remains limited and unsystematic. Using a qualitative-descriptive method with policy analysis based on regulatory reviews, analysis of regional planning documents including the RPJPD, RPJMD, Renstra OPD, and RKPD, and a Results-Based Management (RBM) framework, this study systematically assesses gaps in indicator integration and performance cascading mechanisms across planning levels. The findings reveal three main problems: the absence of binding regional regulations mandating IPBK use in planning documents, the lack of a cascading mechanism linking IPBK to regional apparatus (OPD) performance indicators, and weak cross-sectoral oversight and utilization of the SIPD platform. These structural gaps have collectively prevented IPBK from functioning as an effective outcome indicator that steers the direction of regional development. Therefore, strengthening IPBK integration in the regional planning cycle requires a three-pronged strategy: institutionalization through a Regional Head Regulation that mandates indicator integration, the development of cascading technical SOPs connecting IPBK to OPD-level indicators, and the establishment of a cross-agency oversight forum. This approach will ensure that regional development becomes more measurable, accountable, and genuinely population-centered.

INTRODUCTION

Regional development planning should ideally be prepared in an evidence-based manner, based on strong data and empirical evidence, so that the resulting policies are able to respond to the real needs of the community and reduce the dominance of political considerations in development decision-making (Muluk et al., 2022). In the context of national development, the mainstreaming of population-oriented development is an important foundation so that development policies do not only focus on program output, but also ensure that development outcomes respond appropriately to the needs and structure of the population. The population aspect in development is very important because population and development are inseparable parts. Population-oriented development is an important component in national or regional development, so to evaluate it, IPBK figures are used (Akolo et al., 2026).

Evidence-based planning has been widely discussed in the literature as a key driver of effective public policy. Studies have demonstrated that integrating demographic data into development planning improves the accuracy of intervention targets and enhances policy responsiveness to community needs (World Bank, 2018). Furthermore, research on Results-Based Management (RBM) frameworks highlights that cascading performance indicators across planning documents is essential for ensuring strategic objectives translate into measurable outcomes at the operational level (Ramesh & Howlett, 2018). Population-centered development itself fun-

damentally depends on the extent to which data and indicators are integrated within the cross-sectoral decision-making system (UNDESA, 2019). In the Indonesian context, studies have identified persistent challenges in regional planning quality, including data fragmentation, weak inter-agency coordination, and misalignment between planning and budgeting processes, which collectively reduce the effectiveness of development interventions (Fatimah et al., 2024; Malila et al., 2024). Despite these findings, limited scholarly attention has been paid to the specific integration of composite population indicators such as the IPBK within formal regional planning cycles.

The IPBK is officially established through BKKBN regulation as a composite indicator to measure the extent to which regional development pays attention to population aspects, serving as the basis for evaluation and formulation of integrated policies across sectors and levels of government (BKKBN, 2020). However, in practice, IPBK integration in planning and budgeting documents still faces real challenges. Local development planners face technical and institutional barriers in integrating population variables into regional planning documents, with direct impacts on low policy responsiveness to the demographic needs of the community (Malila et al., 2024). The relationship between planning and budgeting at the regional level has not always been aligned, so strategic indicators such as those contained in the IPBK do not cascade into operational measures across planning documents

(Fatimah et al., 2024). Furthermore, the use of data in regional planning is often still partial, has not been integrated into decision-making systems, and has not fully influenced budget allocation (World Bank, 2018).

Three structural problems underlie this integration gap. First, the IPBK has not been institutionalized as a cross-document outcome indicator and has not become a binding performance reference in regional planning documents. Second, from an institutional and regulatory perspective, no binding regional policy currently requires IPBK adoption as a performance indicator across planning and budgeting documents, and governance capacity among regional planner human resources remains inadequate to encourage consistent IPBK integration. Third, the cascading mechanism linking IPBK from the RPJMD level down to regional apparatus (OPD) indicators across the RPJMD Renstra OPD–RKPD–APBD chain remains absent, while IPBK is still perceived as a sectoral issue of population affairs rather than a cross-sector strategic indicator that must be the concern of all regional apparatus. As a result, because population-oriented development depends on the extent to which data and indicators are integrated in the cross-sectoral decision-making system (UNDESA, 2019), the IPBK has not functioned as an outcome indicator that encourages real changes in planning and budgeting direction.

Addressing these gaps, this study offers novelty in two key aspects. First, unlike prior studies that examine evidence-based planning or indicator integration in general terms, this study specifically analyzes the institutionalization pathways of a composite population indicator the IPBK within the formal regional planning cycle, from RPJPD and RPJMD down to RKPD and budgeting documents. Second, this study proposes a concrete policy architecture combining binding regional regulations, cascading technical SOPs, and cross-agency governance forums as an integrated strategy to ensure IPBK functions not merely as a supporting indicator, but as a strategic outcome indicator that steers the direction of population-centered regional development.

Based on these problems, this policy paper provides a comprehensive analysis of IPBK integration challenges while offering policy directions to ensure that IPBK can be institutionalized effectively, measurably, and sustainably in the regional planning and budgeting cycle. The main focus is directed at the formulation of policy recommendations in the form of strengthening binding regional regulations, the preparation of cascading indicator mechanisms and SOPs, and the formation of cross-OPD coordination governance so that regional development becomes more responsive to population dynamics and increases the accuracy of development intervention targets.

RESEARCH METHOD

This policy paper was prepared using a qualitative-descriptive approach with a policy analysis method. Policy analysis is a multidimensional field, where different activities and objectives find their space (Mayer et al., n.d.). This approach is used to produce policy recommendations that are not only conceptually strong, but also realistic and implementable within the context of local government governance. The preparation of this policy paper is grounded in the principle of evidence-based policy formulating policy options based on evidence drawn from data, regulations, and field documents which not only strengthens policy legitimacy but also increases the effectiveness of public intervention through

the selection of the best available evidence-supported policy options (Phillips & Smyth, 2020). This approach is further supported by the Results-Based Management (RBM) framework to ensure that policy recommendations are oriented towards measurable development outcomes and performance. RBM is a management strategy so that existing actors or stakeholders can contribute directly or indirectly to the desired results (Wijaya, 2018).

The subjects of this study consist of regional planning documents and regulatory instruments at both the national and regional levels. Specifically, the research subjects include the RPJPD, RPJMD, Renstra OPD, and RKPD documents, as well as budgeting documents (APBD), relevant national and regional regulations pertaining to IPBK, and performance indicator frameworks used by regional apparatus organizations (OPD). These documents serve as the primary units of analysis in assessing the extent to which IPBK has been integrated into the formal regional planning cycle.

Data were collected through two main methods. First, documentary review, involving systematic collection and examination of official regional planning documents, national regulations, BKKBN technical guidelines, and existing policy studies related to IPBK and regional development planning. Second, regulatory and normative analysis, involving a structured review of the legal and regulatory framework governing the use of development performance indicators at both the national and regional levels. The instruments used in the data collection process include document review checklists and regulatory mapping matrices to systematically identify gaps in IPBK integration across planning documents.

Data analysis was conducted through three stages. First, gap analysis was applied to identify discrepancies between the normative framework as established by BKKBN regulations and RBM principles and actual IPBK integration practices found in regional planning documents. Second, root cause analysis was employed to trace the underlying institutional, regulatory, and technical factors driving these integration gaps. Third, policy option analysis was used to evaluate feasible and realistic policy alternatives, considering institutional readiness, regulatory instruments, and implementation sustainability, in order to formulate concrete recommendations for strengthening IPBK institutionalization in the regional planning and budgeting cycle.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Gap in IPBK Integration Across Regional Planning and Budgeting Documents

The analysis of regional planning documents reveals a systematic integration gap across all levels of the regional planning cycle. IPBK has not been institutionalized as a binding cross-sectoral outcome indicator in any of the key planning documents from long-term to annual and budgeting documents. Table 1 presents the gap analysis across each planning document.

The gap at the RPJMD level is particularly critical. As a composite index representing population-oriented development achievements, IPBK should be positioned as a cross-sectoral strategic indicator within the RPJMD performance architecture. Its absence at this level means there is no binding performance mandate for regional apparatus, and consequently, IPBK is not cascaded into derivative documents and does not serve as a reference for determining development targets (Fatimah et al., 2024; Oktriastra, 2020). This condition is

Table 1. Gap Analysis of IPBK Integration Across Regional Planning Documents

| Planning Document | Normative Function | IPBK Integration Status | Gap Description |
|-------------------|--|-------------------------|---|
| RPJPD | Long-term development direction (20 years) | Not integrated | No population outcome indicator referencing IPBK dimensions |
| RPJMD | Medium-term performance targets (5 years) | Partially referenced | IPBK mentioned as context but not established as a binding outcome indicator |
| Renstra OPD | OPD-level strategic plan & indicators | Not integrated | No cascading of IPBK dimensions into OPD performance indicators |
| RKPD | Annual work plan & priorities | Not integrated | Annual priorities not linked to IPBK achievement targets |
| APBD | Budget allocation | Not integrated | No budget tagging mechanism connecting programs/activities to IPBK dimensions |

compounded at the Renstra OPD level, where OPD performance indicators remain dominated by narrow activity output measures such as the number of training sessions or socialization events without a clear operational linkage to integrated population outcomes (Tampubolon, 2020). Several studies confirm that the integration of IPBK into Renja OPD, Renstra, RKPD, and RKA-OPD remains suboptimal due to fragmented operational attributes and the absence of technical guidelines for cross-sectoral indicator linking (Oktriastra, 2020; Budiman et al., 2021; Sunoto et al., 2020).

At the RKPD and APBD levels, the gap is even more pronounced. Annual IPBK targets have not been used as references in priority-setting, and budget allocations have not been explicitly linked to contributions toward index achievement. As a result, it becomes structurally impossible to evaluate whether public spending has produced measurable improvements in population-centered development quality as captured by IPBK. This finding is consistent with World Bank (2018), which documented that the use of data in regional planning is often partial, has not been integrated into decision-making systems, and has not fully influenced budget allocation. Studies on inclusive development and the SDGs further reinforce this concern, emphasizing the importance of shifting focus from output-driven growth toward sustainable development that is measured through comprehensive composite indices a direction that aligns with the effort to position IPBK as a cross-sectoral index within the RPJMD and APBD frameworks (Pellu, 2024; Asnuri & Yuliana, 2023; Putra, 2015). As shown by Margaretha & Hertati (2025), optimization of digital-based population services at the service level still relies on operational output measures and is not yet structurally connected to a more macro development planning framework.

Although the Regulation of the Minister of Home Affairs Number 70 of 2019 concerning SIPD provides a systemic framework for synchronizing data, planning, and budgeting through program coding and indicator tracking, this potential has not been optimized for IPBK integration. The process of linking IPBK indicators to OPD programs remains manual and inconsistent across regional apparatus (Oktriastra, 2020; Budiman et al., 2021; Siswati & Hermawati, 2018). Some literature highlights the significant potential of institutional capacity strengthening through digital transformation and the adoption of composite indicator-based performance systems that account for multiple dimensions economic, social, and environmental as drivers of cross-sectoral coordination (Tampubolon, 2019; Mudyanti & Trihutomo, 2022; Mahmud & Tesniwati, 2023). Research on regional competitiveness frameworks further suggests that IPBK can be positioned as an engine of cross-sectoral coordination through transparent sectoral contribution mapping to the index (Mudyanti & Trihutomo, 2022; Siswati & Hermawati, 2018). However, realizing this potential requires the addition of linking guidelines within SIPD so that every OPD program has a measurable contribution to IPBK achievement across its dimensions of health, education, income, and access to public services (Oktriastra, 2020; Budiman et al., 2021; Siswati & Hermawati, 2018).

Root Causes of IPBK Non-Integration in Regional Planning

The gap identified in the previous section is not attributable to a single technical failure, but rather reflects three interconnected structural deficits: regulatory, mechanical, and governance. Table 2 presents the comparison between existing regulatory instruments and the requirements needed for full IPBK integration.

Table 2. Comparison of Existing Regulations and Requirements for IPBK Integration

| Aspect | Existing Regulatory Basis | Gap Identified | Required Instrument |
|----------------------------|--|---|--|
| Legal mandate for IPBK use | BKKBN Regulation No. 5/2024; BKKBN Decree No. 242/2025 | No binding regional regulation (Pegub/Perbup) requiring IPBK adoption in planning documents | Regional Head Regulation mandating IPBK as outcome indicator across RPJMD, Renstra OPD, RKPD |
| Cascading mechanism | Permendagri No. 86/2017 | No technical SOP linking IPBK from RPJMD to OPD performance indicators | Cascading technical SOP: RPJMD, Renstra OPD, RKPD, APBD |

| | | | |
|-----------------------------|---|---|--|
| Cross-sectoral coordination | BKKBN Regulation No. 3/2020 | No formal cross-OPD coordination forum for IPBK monitoring and oversight | Establishment of cross-OPD IPBK oversight forum |
| Budgeting alignment | Permendagri No. 70/2019 (SIPD) | SIPD features for program tagging and OPD contribution tracking not yet utilized for IPBK | Program/activity tagging mechanism in SIPD linked to IPBK dimensions |
| Performance evaluation | Presidential Decree No. 153/2014 (GDPK) | IPBK not embedded in regional performance evaluation cycle | IPBK integrated into regional monitoring and evaluation system with annual reporting |

First, the most fundamental root cause is the absence of binding regional regulations. Although BKKBN Regulation No. 5/2024 and its operational derivative Ministerial Decree No. 242/2025 provide a credible normative foundation establishing IPBK as a composite index built from five dimensions and 17 indicators, no regional-level regulatory instrument currently mandates its adoption as a performance indicator in planning documents. This regulatory vacuum means IPBK carries no administrative coercive power at the regional level, and its use remains voluntary and ad hoc. Contemporary research confirms that without a binding regional legal framework, population planning tends to remain voluntary and ad hoc, making inter-regional implementation variation highly likely and reducing cross-sectoral policy consistency (Malila et al., 2024; Basrowi et al., 2024; Oktriastra, 2020). Local development planners face significant institutional barriers in integrating population variables into formal planning documents precisely when no enforceable regulatory framework exists at the regional level (Malila et al., 2024; Listyaningsih et al., 2021). Furthermore, a strong national regulatory framework that is not translated into regional instruments can widen the gap between central policy and local realization, as regional planners face institutional barriers in aligning population indicators with regional programs without clear enforcement mechanisms (Basrowi et al., 2024; Listyaningsih et al., 2021; Alta et al., 2023). Efforts to harmonize inter-agency regulations therefore need to be strengthened through broader regulatory reform, including evaluation and updating of the regulatory base to avoid conflicts between central and regional policies (Soemarmi et al., 2025; Nasution, 2021; Pramudianto, 2023; Tarigan, 2021).

Second, the absence of a cascading mechanism from RPJMD to OPD-level indicators constitutes a critical operational failure. Without technical SOPs that systematically translate IPBK dimensions into measurable OPD contribution targets, IPBK remains a standalone macro indicator with no operational linkage to programs and activities. Ramesh & Howlett (2018) emphasize that cascading indicators is a necessary condition to ensure that strategic indicators do not stop at the level of planning documents, but are translated into measurable and accountable performance measures for each organizational unit. Comparative regional studies further confirm that strengthening the cascading indicator mechanism through technical SOPs that systematically translate IPBK dimensions into measurable OPD contribution targets is a prerequisite for achieving cross-organizational performance accountability (Ramesh & Howlett, 2018; Budiman et al., 2021). The lack of a cross-OPD contribution matrix and annual target-setting mechanism further widens the gap between macro and operational indicators (Budiman et al., 2021; Sunoto et al., 2020). As a result, no sense of shared ownership of IPBK is formed across regional apparatus, and IPBK remains outside the operational realm of OPD programs

and activities (World Bank, 2018; UNDESA, 2019; Budiman et al., 2021; Sunoto et al., 2020).

Third, weak governance and limited IPBK literacy among regional apparatus planners reinforce the perception that IPBK is a sectoral population affair rather than a cross-sector strategic instrument. Cross-sector coordination has not been structured, and IPBK has not become a strategic agenda for regional leaders. Governance literature confirms that the lack of IPBK literacy among planners and fragmented cross-sectoral coordination structures increase the risk that IPBK will not function as a strategic compass but will remain merely a macro indicator without operational impact on OPD programs (World Bank, 2018; UNDESA, 2019; Budiman et al., 2021; Siswati & Hermawati, 2018). Theoretically, governance literature affirms that cross-sectoral data integration through system interoperability such as SIPD is the foundation for making IPBK an operational policy compass that can be operationalized through budgets and OPD programs (Mahmood et al., 2021; Tarigan, 2021; Tampubolon, 2019; Jiwantara & Nasaruddin, 2022). However, implementation remains limited due to a bureaucratic culture that tends to be fragmented and low IPBK data literacy among regional planners, meaning that institutional capacity to fully adopt IPBK has not yet been established (World Bank, 2018; Budiman et al., 2021; Wigati & Ciptanurani, 2023; Azwar et al., 2021). Because population-oriented development fundamentally depends on the extent to which data and indicators are integrated within the cross-sectoral decision-making system (UNDESA, 2019), the current governance arrangement structurally prevents IPBK from functioning as an effective development compass.

Overall, strong integration between binding regional regulations, clear cascading SOPs, and increased cross-sectoral data literacy is required to transform IPBK from a macro indicator into an operational compass that genuinely directs budget allocation and OPD performance evaluation related to population-based development. Without synergy among these three elements, regulatory, cascading, and data governance constraints will continue to maintain IPBK's position as a conceptual idea without adequate operational support (Basrowi et al., 2024; Listyaningsih et al., 2021; Budiman et al., 2021; Nakamura, 2022; Pramudianto, 2023; Tarigan, 2021).

Policy Choice Alternatives

Based on the gap analysis and root cause identification in the preceding sections, three policy alternatives are formulated. Each alternative is evaluated against evidence support, measurability of results, and feasibility of implementation at the regional level, drawing on the Population Mainstreaming concept (UNFPA, 2022; Lutz et al., 2014; May, 2012), the Results-Based Management (RBM) framework (Kaplan & Norton, 1996; Wijaya, 2018), and principles of Collaborative Governance and Incrementalism.

Alternative 1: Status Quo Plus Approach

The first alternative is a fast and flexible administrative strategy to encourage IPBK integration through non-regulatory instruments such as regional head circulars, socialization, and technical guidance for OPD planners. This approach positions IPBK as a gradual reference in the preparation of RKPD and Renja OPD, enabling regional apparatus to begin building linkages between programs and population indicators without requiring formal regulatory processes. Its primary strength lies in speed and flexibility it functions as a quick win to increase cross-sector literacy and reduce the perception that IPBK is solely a sectoral affair. However, because it lacks regulatory binding force, this approach is prone to inconsistency and is highly dependent on the commitment of specific leaders or individuals. From an institutionalization perspective, a non-binding approach cannot ensure the sustained mainstreaming of population indicators across planning cycles (Muluk et al., 2022). Therefore, this alternative is more appropriate as an initial stage for building institutional readiness, rather than as a standalone long-term solution.

Alternative 2: Strengthening Binding Regional Regulations

The second alternative involves the issuance of a Regional Head Regulation in the form of a Governor's Regulation (Pergub) or Regent's/Mayor's Regulation (Perbup/Perwali) that explicitly stipulates IPBK as an indicator of regional development performance based on population outcomes. This regulation serves as a policy umbrella requiring all regional apparatus to integrate IPBK into the RPJMD, Renstra OPD, RKPD, budgeting, and evaluation mechanisms. Supported by cascading technical SOPs, IPBK is systematically translated into OPD performance indicators according to each apparatus's contribution to the relevant index components. This alternative directly addresses the two most fundamental root causes identified: the absence of binding regulations and the lack of a cascading indicator mechanism. Within the RBM framework (Kaplan & Norton, 1996), formal regulatory institutionalization is a prerequisite for transforming IPBK from a standalone macro indicator into a strategic outcome instrument that controls the direction of cross-sectoral development programs. Phillips & Smyth (2020) further affirm that the effectiveness of evidence-based policy interventions is significantly strengthened when policy options are anchored in enforceable regulatory instruments. However, implementation requires a bureaucratic process, technical readiness of planners, and strong policy leadership from regional leaders.

Alternative 3: Strengthening Collaborative Governance

The third alternative centers on the establishment of a cross-OPD IPBK oversight forum and the optimization of the SIPD planning information system. This forum functions as a structured coordination mechanism for agreeing on each OPD's contribution to IPBK dimensions, as well as a space for periodic monitoring and evaluation of index achievements. Simultaneously, the optimization of Permendagri No. 70/2019 on SIPD enables the systematic linking of regional programs and expenditures to IPBK outcomes through tagging mechanisms and indicator tracking. The Population Mainstreaming concept (UNFPA, 2022) affirms that mainstreaming population indicators across all development sectors requires not only formal regulation, but also structured governance arrangements that build collective ownership and cross-sector accountability. This alternative is particularly effective for ensuring operational integration and building shared ownership across sectors. However, without strong formal regula-

tory support, the forum risks becoming a mere coordination mechanism without binding coercive power.

Recommended Direction

The three alternatives are not mutually exclusive, but rather complementary and should be implemented in a sequenced, incremental manner. Alternative 1 serves as the entry point for building institutional readiness and cross-sector literacy. Alternative 2 provides the binding regulatory architecture that ensures IPBK integration is sustained beyond individual leadership commitments. Alternative 3 operationalizes the integration through governance structures and information systems that make IPBK a living instrument in the annual planning cycle. Together, this three-pronged strategy ensures that IPBK transitions from a supporting indicator to a strategic outcome instrument that genuinely steers population-centered regional development consistent with the GDPK mandate established under Presidential Decree No. 153/2014 and the cross-sectoral development accountability principles emphasized by BKKBN (2020) and UNDESA (2019).

CONCLUSION

Based on these three alternatives, it can be concluded that IPBK integration efforts require a combination of policies that not only strengthen the literacy and technical capacity of planners, but also ensure the existence of formal ties and collaborative governance across sectors. Therefore, the strongest and most sustainable policy is the institutionalization of regulations through the issuance of Regional Head Regulations (Alternative 2), which is then strengthened through the establishment of Forums/Escort Teams and optimization of SIPD (Alternative 3). Meanwhile, the administrative and capacity building approach (Alternative 1) can be used as a first step to accelerate human resource readiness, build understanding across OPDs, and generate quick wins before policies are fully institutionalized. The integration of IPBK in the regional development planning cycle is a strategic need to strengthen regional development that is evidence-based and responsive to population dynamics. However, IPBK integration is not enough to be solved through socialization or technical strengthening alone, because the root problems faced are systemic: the absence of binding regional regulations, the formation of a cascading mechanism for indicators from the RPJMD level to OPD, and weak governance of cross-sector escorts.

Taking into account the characteristics of these problems, policy recommendations focus on institutionalization policies through formal regional instruments that provide binding power while creating coordination and control mechanisms. Therefore, the recommended policy is not only "what to do", but also "how the policy is implemented" through procedures, role sharing, and clear monitoring and evaluation mechanisms. Based on the results of the analysis in Chapter II and the comparison of alternative policies in Chapter III, the main policy recommendations proposed in this policy paper are the need to institutionalize IPBK systematically in the regional planning and budgeting cycle.

REFERENCES

- Akolo, I. R., Umar, R., & Yasin, I. A. (2026). *Proyeksi Indeks Pembangunan Berwawasan Kependudukan (IPBK) Menggunakan Single dan Double Exponential Smoothing (Studi Di Kabupaten Gorontalo 2024 – 2026) (IPBK) Menggunakan Single Dan Double Exponential Smoothing*

- (Studi Di Kabupaten Gorontalo 2024 – . Jambura Journal of Probability and Statistics, 5(1).
- Alta, A., Auliya, R., & Fauzi, A. (2023). Policy Barriers to a Healthier Diet: The Case of Trade and Agriculture.. <https://doi.org/10.35497/559018>
- Asnuri, S. and Yuliana, R. (2023). Penyusunan Indeks Keberlanjutan Sistem Ketersediaan Beras di Indonesia Tahun 2021. Seminar Nasional Official Statistics, 2023(1), 675-686. <https://doi.org/10.34123/semnasoffstat.v2023i1.1766>
- Azwar, A., Kabullah, M., Zamzami, L., & Dermawan, R. (2021). Managing policies for stunting prevention during the COVID-19 disaster: the case of West Sumatra Province. E3s Web of Conferences, 331, 02011. <https://doi.org/10.1051/e3sconf/202133102011>
- Basrowi, ., Suseno, B., Yusuf, F., & Utami, P. (2024). The Effectiveness of Government Policy on MSMEs Through Empirical Data Analysis in Lampung. Kne Social Sciences. <https://doi.org/10.18502/kss.v9i16.16264>
- BKKBN. (2020). Peraturan Badan Kependudukan dan Keluarga Berencana Nasional Nomor 3 Tahun 2020 tentang Indeks Pembangunan Berwawasan Kependudukan (IPBK).
- Budiman, S., Kurniadi, D., Matridi, R., Jenawi, B., & Junriana, J. (2021). Analisa Pemetaan Hasil Inovasi Daerah Kabupaten Bintang Pada Penilaian Indeks Inovasi Daerah Tahun 2020. Indonesian Governance Journal Kajian Politik-Pemerintahan, 4(2), 112-126. <https://doi.org/10.24905/igj.v4i2.1839>
- Budiman, S., Kurniadi, D., Matridi, R., Jenawi, B., & Junriana, J. (2021). Analisa Pemetaan Hasil Inovasi Daerah Kabupaten Bintang Pada Penilaian Indeks Inovasi Daerah Tahun 2020. Indonesian Governance Journal Kajian Politik-Pemerintahan, 4(2), 112-126. <https://doi.org/10.24905/igj.v4i2.1839>
- Fatimah, Haryanto, & Retnandari. (2024). Central-Local Government Relations in Regional Planning and Budgeting in Indonesia. Policy & Governance Review.
- Jiwantara, F. and Nasaruddin, N. (2022). Post-Covid-19 Pandemic, Innovation of Local Government Policy Perspective of State Administration Law. Devotion Journal of Research and Community Service, 3(12), 1922-1931. <https://doi.org/10.36418/dev.v3i12.240>
- Kaplan, & Norton. (1996). The Balanced Scorecard: Translating Strategy into Action. Harvard Business School Press.
- Listyaningsih, U., Sukamdi, S., Ruri, S., & Pebrianti, R. (2021). Synchronization of Policies and Performance Achievements: Which Should Come First?. Jurnal Perencanaan Pembangunan the Indonesian Journal of Development Planning, 5(1), 51-70. <https://doi.org/10.36574/jpp.v5i1.169>
- Lutz, Butz, & Samir. (2014). World Population and Human Capital in the Twenty-First Century. Oxford University Press.
- Mahmud, M. and Tesniwati, R. (2023). Peningkatan Kinerja Melalui Transformasi Digital Layanan Publik Kepabebaran Yang Diperkuat Dengan Budaya Dan Pola Kerja Adaptif. Jurnal Ilmiah Ekonomi Bisnis, 28(2), 161-182. <https://doi.org/10.35760/eb.2023.v28i2.7004>
- Malila, Mwageni, & Mwamlangala. (2024). Challenges in Integrating Population Variables into Local Government Authorities' Development Plans. Rural Planning Journal, 26(1).
- Margaretha, K., & Hertati, D. (2025). The utilization of digital technology in population administration services in Mojokerto Regency. Jurnal Kebijakan Publik, 16(3), 195–200. <http://dx.doi.org/10.31258/jkp.v16i3.8799>
- May. (2012). World Population Policies: Their Origin, Evolution, and Impact. Springer.
- Mayer, I. S., Daalen, C. E. Van, & Bots, P. W. G. (n.d.). Perspectives on policy analyses: a framework for understanding and design. International Journal of Technology, Policy and Management, 4(2), 1–23.
- Mudyanti, R. and Trihutomo, N. (2022). Membangun Kerangka Konseptual Aspek Penguat Daya Saing Daerah (Studi Kasus di Kabupaten Jombang). Journal of Regional Economics Indonesia, 3(1), 46-60. <https://doi.org/10.26905/jrei.v3i1.8009>
- Muluk, Winoto, & Anggoro. (2022). Review Rencana Pembangunan Jangka Menengah Daerah (RPJMD) Kabupaten Probolinggo Tahun 2018–2023 dalam Perspektif Evidence-Based Policy.
- Nakamura, J. (2022). Legal Reflections on the Small-Scale Fisheries Guidelines: Building a Global Safety Net for Small-Scale Fisheries. The International Journal of Marine and Coastal Law, 37(1), 31-72. <https://doi.org/10.1163/15718085-bja10081>
- Nurkholis. (2018). Analisis indeks pembangunan berwawasan kependudukan (ipbk) & indeks pembangunan manusia (ipm) di provinsi bengkulu.
- Oktriastra, K. (2020). Strategi Pengembangan Dan Implementasi Smart City Pemerintah Kota Pontianak. Jurnal Indonesia Sosial Sains, 1(5), 425-447. <https://doi.org/10.36418/jiss.v1i5.74>
- Pellu, A. (2024). Peningkatan Akses Keuangan: Mendorong Pertumbuhan Ekonomi Inklusif. crc, 2(2), 279-295. <https://doi.org/10.32806/ffyp8n53>
- Peraturan BKKBN RI Nomor 5 Tahun 2024 tentang IPBK. (2024). Peraturan BKKBN RI Nomor 5 Tahun 2024 tentang IPBK. BKKBN.
- Peraturan Menteri Dalam Negeri Nomor 70 Tahun 2019. (n.d.). Peraturan Menteri Dalam Negeri Nomor 70 Tahun 2019 tentang Sistem Informasi Pemerintahan Daerah (SIPD). Kemendagri.
- Peraturan Menteri Dalam Negeri Nomor 86 Tahun 2017. (2017). Peraturan Menteri Dalam Negeri Nomor 86 Tahun 2017 tentang Tata Cara Perencanaan, Pengendalian dan Evaluasi Pembangunan Daerah, Tata Cara Evaluasi Rancangan Peraturan Daerah tentang RPJPD dan RPJMD, serta Tata Cara Perubahan RPJPD, RPJMD, dan RKPd. Kemendagri.
- Perpres RI No. 153 th 2014. (2014). Grand Design Pembangunan Kependudukan. Pemerintah Republik Indonesia.
- Phillips, & Smyth. (2020). Evidence-based policy making: Determining what is evidence. Heliyon.
- Pramudianto, A. (2023). The Existence of International Agreements on National and Regional Legislation Related to Handling Marine Plastic Waste in Indonesia. International Journal of Law and Politics Studies, 5(6), 84-94. <https://doi.org/10.32996/ijlps.2023.5.6.9>
- Putra, I. (2015). Pembangunan Manusia Kabupaten Kepulauan Anambas. Jurnal Bina Praja, 07(02), 173-184. <https://doi.org/10.21787/jbp.07.2015.173-184>
- Ramesh, & Howlett. (2018). Policy capacity: A conceptual framework for understanding policy competencies and capabilities. Policy and Society.

- Siswati, E. and Hermawati, D. (2018). Analisis Indeks Pembangunan Manusia (Ipm) Kabupaten Bojonegoro. *Jurnal Ilmiah Sosio Agribis*, 18(2). <https://doi.org/10.30742/jisa1822018531>
- Sunoto, S., Indraswanti, B., & Tarsilohadi, E. (2020). Analisis Pertumbuhan Dan Pergeseran Struktur Ekonomi Kabupaten Induk Di Provinsi Bengkulu. *Convergence the Journal of Economic Development*, 2(1), 54-69. <https://doi.org/10.33369/convergence-jep.v2i1.12074>
- Tampubolon, D. (2020). Kebijakan Intervensi Penanganan Stunting Terintegrasi. *Jurnal Kebijakan Publik*, 11(1), 25-32. <https://doi.org/10.31258/jkp.v11i1.7886>
- Tampubolon, H. (2019). Analisis Pengukuran Kinerja Pada Dinas Perhubungan Kab. Mandailing Natal Berbasis Balanced Scorecard (BSC). *Wahana Jurnal Ekonomi Manajemen Dan Akuntansi*, 22(2), 114-134. <https://doi.org/10.35591/wahana.v22i2.158>
- Tarigan, M. (2021). Measuring Indonesia's Commitment To Reducing Plastic Waste In The Sea Through A Legal Approach. *Lambung Mangkurat Law Journal*, 6(1), 103-118. <https://doi.org/10.32801/abc.v6i1.1113>
- UNDESA. (2019). World public sector report 2019: Sustainable development and public institutions.
- UNFPA. (2022). State of World Population Report 2022. United Nations Population Fund.
- Wigati, M. and Ciptanurani, C. (2023). Policy Triangle Analysis of Stunting Issues in Urban Areas: A Case Study of Yogyakarta City. *Jkap (Jurnal Kebijakan Dan Administrasi Publik)*, 27(2), 144. <https://doi.org/10.22146/jkap.86489>
- Wijaya. (2018). Sistem monitoring dan evaluasi pengelolaan program studi di institusi pendidikan tinggi. *Indonesian Journal of Information Systems*, 1(1), 13-24.
- World Bank. (2018). Improving public sector performance through better governance and management.