



Implementation of the Smart Village Nusantara (SVN) Program in Sambirejo Village, Sleman Regency

Agustina Rahmawati¹, Hanantyo Sri Nugroho², Vidia Lestari³

^{1,2}Departement Government Science, Universitas Amikom Yogyakarta

³Departement Public Administration, Incheon National University

ARTICLE INFORMATION	A B S T R A C T
<p>Received: July 23, 2024 Revised: September 25, 2024 Available online: October 31, 2024</p>	<p>This research will examine implementing the Smart Village Nusantara (SVN) program in the Sambirejo District. This research aims to determine the management and implementation of the village headquarters in implementing the smart village program, the aim of which is to facilitate the sustainable improvement of the welfare of the Sambirejo community. This sub-district, which is famous for its Breksi Cliff, is one of the sub-districts that has become a pilot project for other sub-districts to manage Bumdes and increase Ali Village Income (PADes). This is very different from the period in the 2000s when Sambirejo was even included in the list of the poorest villages in Sleman Regency. This problem is interesting to research because currently, villages have space to manage resources through various innovations after the existence of village law policies, namely Law Number 6 of 2014. A perspective is used to analyze this problem, namely the perspective of public policy implementation. Furthermore, the research method used in this research is a descriptive qualitative method. In the descriptive qualitative method, the factor that must be considered is the validity of the data, where this research uses a data triangulation model. Meanwhile, this research was conducted in Sambirejo Village in Sleman Regency. This research aims to determine the aspects that drive the success of the program and the challenges in implementing the smart village program in Sambirejo District through accelerating the smart economy, smart society, and smart government. It is hoped that this research will be able to produce at least three main findings. First, to what extent are efforts to implement smart villages implemented in the development of Sambirejo. Second, opportunities and challenges in implementing smart villages. Third, recommendations to relevant stakeholders.</p>
KEYWORDS	
<p>Smart Village; Sambirejo District, Program Implementation, Smart Village Nusantara (SVN) Program</p>	
CORRESPONDENCE	
<p>Name: Agustina Rahmawati Email: agustinarahma@amikom.ac.id</p>	

INTRODUCTION

There is a global push for 'smarter' solutions provided by digital technologies, and a focus on improving transport, healthcare, and energy provision in cities (European Commission, 2017). In the case of developing countries, it is crucial that these solutions simultaneously focus on smart village policies where rural communities can access ICT, education, healthcare, and energy services to empower youth and young adults with the skills needed to increase agricultural production opportunities and provide the pathways needed to achieve these goals. Smart villages represent a paradigm shift in rural development, emphasizing the integration of digital technologies, sustainable practices, and community engagement to improve the quality of life for rural populations (Renukappa et al., 2022).

Smart Village Sambirejo Village, Sleman is one of the villages that has achieved in Sleman Regency. The village which is famous for its Tebing Breksi is one of the villages that has become a pilot project for other villages to manage Bumdes and increase Village Revenue (PADes). Sambirejo Village in the 2020 Village Revenue and Expenditure Budget (APBDes) was able to contribute 1.2 billion to PADes. This is considered a good achievement, especially from the results of Tebing Breksi tourism. Mr. Mujimin as Carik and head of Pokdarwis himself is often a resource person regarding his experience in managing Tebing Breksi in several villages outside Java. The life of the Sambirejo Village community is now very different from the period of the 2000s, at that time Sambirejo was even included in the list of the poorest villages in Sleman Regency. The livelihoods of the community revolve around agriculture during the rainy season, construction

workers, mine workers, and others, with an average education level of junior high school and high school. Because it is located in a rocky mountainous area, residents have difficulty farming and getting clean water, and many residents earn a living from natural stone mining. Many have transmigrated and even urbanized to seek a better life. This achievement is supported through the Smart Village Nusantara (SVN) program initiated by PT Telkom as a form of contribution to the Government in realizing smart villages.

The concept of a smart village is to make various types of policies work together to find the best method to promote comprehensive rural development, taking into account the strong diversity of rural areas and their various development challenges. "Smart" does not necessarily mean the implementation of technologically advanced projects, but one that focuses on unsolved problems and basic social needs that characterize an area, and especially refers to the skills, knowledge, and potential of a community (McArdle, 2012; Jucevičius et al., 2014; Glasmeier and Christopherson, 2015; Wolski, 2018). Based on this, researchers are interested in studying the phenomenon of program policy implementation, driving factors, keys to success, and even challenges in implementing smart village programs to realize sustainable community welfare through acceleration in the aspects of smart economy, smart society, and smart government.

In the broadest sense, an implementation can be considered as a form of operationalization or organization of activities that have been determined based on laws and that have been agreed upon by various stakeholders, actors, organizations, both public

and private, procedures, and techniques synergistically encouraged to work together to implement policies in a certain desired direction (Abdul Wahab, MA, 2017). According to Sabatier (1986), there are two models in the policy implementation process, namely the top-down and bottom-up models, both of which are present in every policy-making process. The Top Down approach is carried out in one direction, namely from top to bottom where the role of the government is very large, in this approach there is an assumption that decision-makers are the key to successful implementation, while other parties involved are considered as obstacles so that an attitude of underestimating strategic initiatives that come from lower bureaucratic levels arises.

In addition to top-down, there is a bottom-up approach model where this model identifies a network of actors involved in one or more local areas and questions the goals and relationships between them related to planning, financing, and implementation of government programs in addition to focusing on the issue of interactions that occur between policy actors. The elite model, process model, and incremental model are descriptions of policymaking using the top-down model, while the group model and institutional model are descriptions using the bottom-up.

Grindle (1980) has stated that political and administrative processes are part of the implementation model that attempts to explain the decision-making process carried out by various actors whose final output is determined by the program material that has been implemented or through the interaction of actors in terms of administrative politics. The political process can be seen when policy actors determine a decision, while the administrative process can be seen through the general process of administrative activities that can be studied at a certain program level (Imronah, 2009).

There are two effective public policy implementation models when viewed from the implementation aspect, namely the linear model and the interactive model, where in the linear model the decision-making stage is the most important aspect which is in contrast to the policy implementation stage which receives less attention which is considered the responsibility of other groups (Imronah, 2009). In addition, Van Meter and Horn developed a policy implementation process model where both of them affirm the position that change, control, and compliance in acting are important concepts in the implementation procedure finally Van Meter and Horn have developed a policy typology namely (1) the number of changes produced, and (2) the scope of the agreement on the objectives by the various actors involved in the implementation process (Imronah, 2009). According to Grindle and Quade to measure the performance of public policy implementation, it is necessary to pay attention to several variables such as the policy itself, the organization, and the environment (Grindle, 1980). This attention needs to be directed because by choosing the right or appropriate policy, the community can participate in providing a maximum contribution to achieve the desired goals, furthermore, when the appropriate policy has been found, an implementing party is needed in the form of an organization because in an organization there is authority and various resources that support policy implementation.

Furthermore, Grindle (1980) explains that the success of policy implementation can be influenced by two major variables, namely the content of the policy and the context of implementation which includes several factors. The policy content variables include factors such as (1) target groups which

can be individuals or groups that can cause a reaction in the form of satisfaction or loss which will cause resistance; (2) the type of benefits obtained by the target group in the form of collective or separate benefits where policies that have collective benefits are easier to implement; (3) the scope of changes desired by the policy, which concerns changes in the behavior of the parties who receive benefits influenced by the benefits or time to achieve policy objectives; (4) the accuracy of a program related to the position of the decision maker related to the structural organizational position; (5) whether a policy has mentioned its implementor in detail, which relates to the expertise, activeness and responsibility of the program implementer; (6) the availability of adequate resources to support a program (Grindle, 1980). Furthermore, environmental variables include things such as (1) how much position, power, interests, and strategies are held by the actors involved in policy implementation where in the administrative decision-making process each actor has a position and interests that can cause conflicts of interest through the strategies used; (2) the characteristics of the regime in power, which illustrates that the reactions of implementing actors and political elites are influenced by the characteristics of the institutions and rulers concerned; (3) the responsiveness of the target group in the form of community participation in the form of an attitude of understanding and supporting the implemented program.

METHOD

The approach used is descriptive qualitative with data collection methods of interviews, observations, and documentation studies. Researchers use a qualitative approach because this approach aims to create a systematic, factual, and accurate description, picture, or painting of the facts and nature and relationships between the phenomena studied (Sugiyono, 2016). Qualitative research emphasizes more on the meaning and understanding of the inner direction (*verstehen*), reasoning, and definition of a situation in a certain context. By using the policy implementation approach model proposed by Grindle (1980), researchers try to understand the situation and conditions of individuals and groups who are considered to play a role in the implementation of the Smart Village Nusantara (SVN) program in Sambirejo Village, Sleman Regency. In this study, researchers use the theory and model of the public policy implementation approach presented by Grindle. The theory states that the political and administrative processes are part of the implementation model that tries to explain the decision-making process that is to be carried out by various actors, where the final output is determined by the program material that has been implemented or through the interaction of actors in terms of administrative politics.

The implementation approach model proposed by Grindle consists of two major variables, namely 1) policy content variables that relate to several factors including target groups; types of benefits obtained; scope of changes desired by the policy; program accuracy; detailed mention of implementors; and availability of resources, 2) policy environment variables include factors such as the magnitude of the position, power, interests, and strategies of actors; regime characteristics; responsiveness of target groups.

In this study, the method used by the researcher is qualitative research so that the power that has been obtained by the researcher is descriptive and in the form of words and sentences from the results of interviews with sources, the results of field

observations, and documentation that has been done while in the field. The data analysis technique used by the researcher is the interactive model by Miles and Huberman which has been explained in the previous chapter, where the first activity the researcher does is to collect raw data which is done by interviewing several sources, documentation, and observation.

The next activity is data reduction, which is an activity where researchers summarize and select the main and important things obtained from collecting data in the field previously, which is then the activity of presenting data where in this qualitative research the data is presented in the form of narrative text. The last step is to draw conclusions which are carried out when the data is considered saturated and there is a repetition of the same answers obtained from the data source, so conclusions can be drawn to solve the research problem.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Implementation of the Smart Village Nusantara Program in Sambirejo Village

About cities or urban spaces in general, [Visvizi and Lytras \(2018b\)](#) emphasize that space is smart when its inhabitants can intelligently use the provision of smart services. However, this requires a joint effort from all stakeholders involved in the complex socio-economic processes related to the construction of everyday spaces, and thus sustainable development; the participation of stakeholders, both local governments that influence the development of spatial policies, and external stakeholders, depends on their access to reliable and up-to-date information ([Carroll, 2020](#)). Therefore, the concept does not offer a single solution and is based on the needs and potential of each territory, the wishes of the community, and the cultural environment. The animators of the change in question are local communities working together with local authorities, and the goal of the change is to maintain the vitality of territorial unity and improve the quality of life ([Guzal-Des, 2018](#)). Smart villages can be understood as communities that refuse to wait for change, and take the initiative. Smart village innovations include, among other things, changes and the formation of attitudes – from reactive to proactive. The application of the smart village concept needs to use an integrated bottom-up approach, build effective public-private-community partnerships, develop a supportive policy framework, and enable access to financing mechanisms ([Van Gevelt et al., 2018](#); [Zavratnik et al., 2018](#)). The Impact of digital transformation is oriented toward the benefits received through activities and performance in the village ([Sampetoding and Mahendrawathi, 2023](#))

The concept of a smart village is based on solutions tailored to the needs and potential of a particular region. This includes technology development, as well as investment in infrastructure, business development, human resources, community potential and development, good management, and citizen involvement ([Susilowati et al., 2024](#); [Zhimin He et al., 2024](#)). Government support promotes the broader implementation of digital technology in rural areas, thus enhancing the efficiency and effectiveness of managing rural public affairs ([Wang and Ren, 2023](#)). Government interventions typically allocate targeted resources to these regions through intergovernmental fiscal policies, subsidies, financial services, and specialized regulatory frameworks ([He et al., 2017](#)). The spectrum of possible solutions is diverse and unique to each area and is not always based on information and communication technology ([Jucevičius et al., 2014](#)). The smart solutions introduced may include among others

1) innovative solutions to environmental problems and ecosystem protection, sustainable energy supply, water resources management, implementation of a circular economy referring to agricultural waste, 2) education, reduction of inequalities, empowerment of women, 3) promotion of local products supported by Information and Communication Technologies (ICT), greater availability of e-Services for the population of rural areas, implementation and full use of the benefits of smart specialization referring to agricultural products and food (safe food), tourism and cultural events, 4) building resilient infrastructure, transport, 5) taking action to combat climate change, including climate-smart agriculture, and reducing the climate footprint of agricultural practices ([Poggi et al., 2015](#); [Zavratnik et al., 2018](#); [Wassmann et al., 2019](#)).

Although the concept of smart villages is closely related to areas such as digitalization and innovation, the definition of the term should not be too narrow because the concept mainly refers to procedures in conditions of transformation and response to the resulting challenges, and not to a specific field of activity ([Wolski and Woźcik, 2018](#)). It should be emphasized that the “volume” of the definition of smart villages is not a weakness of the idea. The term “place”, related to the implementation of new development policies at the local level, remains undefined and is widely understood, although it is related to the territorial analysis of formal and informal social and economic relations ([Wolski and Woźcik, 2018](#)). The local scale relates to the analysis of settlement units (towns, villages) or groups of settlement units that are interconnected within the scope of territorial cooperation and the determination of the specific conditions of a “place” where certain economic activities occur, including attracting investment and the influx of certain resources ([Woźcik, 2018](#)). It should be emphasized that despite its local scale, smart villages cannot be implemented in isolation, and must be embedded in a broader development strategy for the region. Due to the complexity of the process, it must involve the participation of local governments, at the local and regional levels, governments, at the national level, and supranational structures ([Wolski and Woźcik, 2018](#)).

The Smart Village program in Sambirejo Village is managed by BUMDes Sambimulyo. BUMDes Sambimulyo was established in 2016 with capital investment funds from Sambirejo Village of Rp 51,000,000 in cash to accelerate the improvement of people's standard of living. The Rp 51,000,000 fund was allocated as follows, namely BUMDes Operational costs of Rp 11,000,000 and Sambijaya Savings and Loan Capital of Rp 40,000,000. Furthermore, in 2019, it received assistance funds of Rp 100,000,000 used to open a New Business Unit, namely Sambimakmur Printing. In 2020, it received assistance funds of Rp 100,000,000 used to open a New Business Unit, namely the Sambikaya Village Shop. The various business units managed by BUMDes Sambimulyo through Smart Village are Tebing Breksi Tourism Park Unit, Sambijaya Savings and Loans Unit, BRILink Business, BUMDes Partners, Sambimakmur Printing Unit, Sambikaya Village Shop Unit, Sambirejo Balkondes Unit, UMKM Management, Multipurpose Building Management, Sumberwatu Parking Management.

Policy content variables that concern several factors include target groups, namely BUMDes Sambimulyo administrators and the community, as well as the types of benefits obtained by BUMDes Sambimulyo. First, the Tebing Breksi Tourism Park business unit such as the Lowo Ijo Business Unit manager 120 people, the Jeep Wisata community 115 people, 60 culinary

entrepreneurs, and 50 street vendors. The average result of empowering communities who are trying to earn a living in the Tebing Breksi Park area is approximately between 350 and 450 people. Second, the Sambijaya Savings and Loans business unit such as eliminated the debt system to loan sharks which is burdensome due to the large interest charges because USP Sambijaya provides loan relief with very small services, increasing the mindset of saving to prepare for the future. Third, the Sambimakmur Printing business unit such as the availability of its own ticket printing business, which so far has relied on ticket printing services from outside Sambirejo, opening up employment opportunities by empowering the abilities of residents. Fourth, the Village Economic Center business unit such as all Balkondes managers are residents of Sambirejo Village, opening up employment opportunities by empowering the abilities of residents. Fifth, the Village Shop business unit such as opening up employment opportunities by empowering the abilities of residents, establishing cooperation with third parties to increase the village's original income, and providing goods needed by traders in the Tebing Breksi Tourism Park and the Sambirejo Community with an online system so that consumers do not need to go out to shop for their needs, a cash tempo system that is very beneficial to consumers so that consumers do not need to spend capital first.

The scope of the desired policy changes is the improvement of the welfare of the BUMDes Sambimulyo community. Furthermore, regarding the accuracy of the program, it is appropriate, in the mention the implementor also contains in detail the BUMDes administrators, the community involved and not directly involved. Furthermore, the availability of resources is also quite good in terms of the capacity of the implementing human resources to the supporters of the activities, namely the third party who is financially supportive, technologically, to monitoring and evaluating the program.

Sambirejo Village seeks to implement policies in the management of Sambirejo Village funds. This study focuses on the tourism development sector of Sambirejo Village seen from the dimensions of the policy implementation approach according to Grindle which is greatly influenced by two variables, namely the content of the policy and the policy environment which consists of several factors. Researchers have carried out field data collection through observation, structured interviews with informants, and documentation. The field findings obtained are as follows: implementation based on Village Regulation Number 11 of 2017 concerning the Management of Tourism Objects in the Sambirejo Village Area; Village Head Decree Number 67 of 2018 concerning Delegation of Duties and Authorities of BumDesa in the management of Sambirejo Village Tourism. Based on the results of the study, the implementation of the Village fund management policy in Sambirejo Village towards the tourism development sector can be seen using 9 factors from two policy content variables and policy environment variables which can be indicators of assessing whether the implementation of the policy was successful in Sambirejo Village.

Policy Content Variables

In the policy content variable, the first factor is the first factor is the target group, namely the Sambirejo Village community, who gave a fairly positive reaction to the Village fund management policy, especially in the tourism management sector for the realization of Smart Village. However there are still reactions of dissatisfaction where the community regrets the

policy because according to the community in previous years, the management of Village funds could provide an opportunity to create a program of activities without being too tied to a policy, especially in the 2019 budget year, the community proposed more development programs and carried out socialization and understanding to the community regarding the flow of activity planning by the policy and by the potential and priority scale of Sambirejo Village, thus causing a positive reaction from the community.

The second factor is the type of benefits obtained, where in this factor, based on the results of research in Sambirejo Village, this factor can be implemented well, this is indicated by the existence of Village funds which can be useful for procuring programs or activities that can affect the standard of living of the community.

The third factor is the scope of change where the implementation of the Village fund policy in the community empowerment sector in Sambirejo Village can be implemented quite well. Based on the results of the study, the Sambirejo Village community can participate in planning activities up to the implementation of activities, although in planning there are still differences of opinion and proposals because the community still bases proposals on desires not needs, but with the socialization provided by the Village apparatus and community institutions that try to combine community proposals with policies, potential and priority scales can provide an effect on the community in the form of understanding, this is also proven based on data on the poor population in Sambirejo Village which has decreased from 2018 to the end of 2022.

The fourth factor of policy content is the accuracy of a program related to the position of the decision-maker. The accuracy factor of the program can be implemented well in Sambirejo Village as seen from the compliance of government officials, BUMDes, and the community in terms of administrative activities that have been carried out and by the mandate of Village Regulation Number 11 of 2017 concerning Management of Tourism Objects in the Sambirejo Village Area.

The fifth factor is regarding the implementer of the Village Head Decree Number 67 of 2018 concerning the Delegation of Duties and Authorities of BumDesa in the management of Sambirejo Village Tourism, there are problems related to the limited personnel who can manage BUMDes, especially in the technical field within the scope of the Sambirejo Village management, while in the scope of MSMEs or community institutions in terms of personnel can be met by utilizing each member in the section in the organizational structure starting from planning to program realization by the section that handles the activity or program. So in the policy implementor factor, it still cannot be implemented optimally due to limited personnel, especially in the technical field on the part of BUMDes. So training is needed for cadre formation in technical matters.

The sixth factor is the availability of adequate resources where in the implementation of the tourism development program to achieve a Smart Village, as with the implementor factors involved, the resources owned have not been maximized due to a lack of personnel related to technical matters. This is because there is not enough time available, especially if in one day there are many requests for events on the same day.

Policy Environment Variables

As for the policy environment variables, there are 3 factors, the first is regarding the position, power, and strategy of actors

involved in the implementation of the Smart Village Nusantara program in Sambirejo Village. Based on the results of the study, there is a conflict caused by a gap or disparity regarding the interests of the community where the proposals given are still based on desires and this causes proposals that are not by regulations and other policies concerning the availability of funds, the vision and mission of the region and regional leaders, and also the strategic plan for village development.

As a program implementer, BUMDes Sambimulyo has a strategy of conducting socialization and approaching the community to provide an understanding of programs or activities that can be realized using aid funds or grants and then holding discussions with the community to align proposals provided by the community with existing policies or regulations where these efforts and strategies are carried out in Pramusenbangdes and Musrenbangdes. The discussion is one of the BUMDes programs as a community institution strategy in collecting community proposals and as a representative of the community so that in the implementation of Village Head Decree Number 67 of 2018 concerning the Delegation of Duties and Authorities of BumDesa in managing Sambirejo Village Tourism can be implemented properly.

The second factor is related to the characteristics of the institutions and regimes in power, where based on the research results, this factor can be implemented well because BUMDes strives to facilitate the community in planning fund management with the aim that the community participates in program planning by regional potential and regulations that have been determined regarding tourism management, in addition, the purpose of community participation is also to train the community in understanding activity planning and budgeting.

The Sambimulyo BUMDes also tries to build a good emotional relationship with the community as the target of the policy by not immediately rejecting community proposals that do not comply with the guidelines in the policy but by trying to align community proposals with policies, the vision, and mission of the region and the regional head, regional potential, and innovations that are considered to support the village development program.

The last factor in the policy environment variable is regarding the responsiveness of the target group which in this case is the Sambirejo Village community, in this factor the implementation of the Village Head Decree Number 67 of 2018 concerning the Delegation of Duties and Authorities of BumDesa in the management of Sambirejo Village Tourism can be implemented well. This is because seeing the responsiveness of the Sambirejo Village community in terms of village management in the tourism sector, where the community starting from the program planning stage has high enthusiasm in participating in the form of proposals and ideas for programs or activities and understands the planning by the policies that have been socialized by the Sambirejo Village government institution and also BUMDes Sambimulyo.

The community supports the realization of programs and activities that have been agreed upon in the Village Musrenbang. This is proven by the enthusiasm of the community when the program or activity is high. In addition, the community also supports the program by being responsible as a committee or resource person when there are events in Sambirejo Village, this is also proven by the existence of reports of community activities both from Sambirejo Village and BUMDes Sambimulyo.

Supporting Factors for Successful Program Implementation

Supporting Factors for BUMDes Sambimulyo is the professionalism of Bumdes management, access to Bumdes capital, mastery of information and technology media, cooperation with the business ecosystem, transparency of financial reports, and collaboration between village elements. This has given rise to innovations such as the construction of lodging, UMKM galleries, the internet, local arts and culture performances, cooperation with third parties related to capital, Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR), and rewards. Furthermore, several impacts on the community are not directly involved in BUMDes. First, BUMDes Sambimulyo has 10% of the budget allocated for Social and Education Funds. In 2019, 84 million funds were distributed for scholarships for underprivileged students, redemption of diplomas for students who have not been able to take diplomas at their schools, compensation for the elderly, assistance in renovating houses that are not yet habitable, religious funds for all religions, both Islam, Christianity, Catholicism, Hinduism, Buddhism in Sambirejo, RT funds divided into 45 RTs in Sambirejo. Second, the development of Sambikaya Village shop units, improving performance and promotion, and expansion of cooperation such as Obelix Hills, Suwatu Mil and Bay, and BUMDES partners. Third, the development of Sambirejo Balkondes units such as mentoring homestay and restaurant managers, increasing manager capacity, improving restaurant and homestay management, and adding inventory. Fourth, the development of Sambijaya savings and loan units such as increasing capital due to increasing demand for loans, and establishing cooperation with regional banks. Fifth, development of Sambimakmur printing units such as maximizing promotion and marketing, and cooperation with third parties. Sixth, the development of MSMEs such as cooperation with BRI, procurement of MSME infrastructure, training of MSME actors, and PIRT Issuance process.

CONCLUSION

The implementation approach model proposed by Grindle consists of two large variables, namely policy content variables and policy environment variables. In the policy content variable, there are several factors, namely 1) the target group of the Sambirejo Village community gave a fairly positive reaction to the village fund management policy, especially in the tourism management sector for the realization of Smart Village, 2) the type of benefits obtained, namely the existence of the village fund can be useful for procuring programs or activities that can affect the standard of living of the community, 3) the scope of the desired changes in the responsiveness policy of the target group, in this case the Sambirejo Village community, as evidenced by data on the poor population in Sambirejo Village which decreased from 2018 to the end of 2022, 4) the program's accuracy factor can be implemented well in Sambirejo Village as seen from the compliance of government officials, BUMDes and the community in terms of administrative activities that have been carried out have also been in accordance with that mandated in Village Regulation Number 11 of 2017 concerning Management of Tourism Objects in the Sambirejo Village Area, 5) the implementing factor in the implementation can be seen in the implementation of the Village Head Decree Number 67 of 2018 concerning Delegation of Duties and The authority of BumDesa in managing Tourism in Sambirejo Village can be implemented well, this is because of the responsiveness of the Sambirejo Village

community in terms of village management in the tourism sector, 6) the resource factor that is owned is felt to not be optimal due to a lack of personnel related to technical matters. In the policy environment variable, there are several factors, namely 1) BUMDes Sambimulyo has a strategy with socialization and an approach to the community to provide an understanding of programs or activities that can be realized using aid funds or grants and then holding discussions with the community in an effort to align proposals given by the community with existing policies or regulations where these efforts and strategies are carried out in Pramusrenbangdes and Musrenbangdes, 2) BUMDes Sambimulyo also tries to build a good emotional relationship with the community as the target of the policy by not immediately rejecting community proposals that are not in accordance with the guidelines in the policy but trying to align community proposals with policies, regional vision and mission and regional heads, regional potential to innovations that are considered to support village development programs, 3) the responsiveness of the Sambirejo Village community in terms of village management in the tourism sector, where the community starting from the program planning stage has high enthusiasm in participating in the form of proposals and ideas for programs or activities and understanding the planning flow in accordance with the policies that have been socialized by the Sambirejo Village government institution and also BUMDes Sambimulyo.

There is still a need to improve cooperation and collaboration with stakeholders to increase resource support in developing programs at BUMDes Sambimulyo. In addition, community participation in the involvement of Tebing Breksi tourism development also needs to be improved so that various action plans for the next few years can continue to be sustainable. Meanwhile, the limitation of this study is that it has not seen the level of community participation in the Smart Village program managed by the Sambirejo Village-Owned Enterprise. The findings of this study are limited to seeing the original village income from year to year, stakeholder involvement, and the forms of business that are utilized to improve community welfare through the smart village program.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Thank you to LPPM Universitas Amikom Yogyakarta for providing funding support for the research and all managers of BUMDes Sambimulyo who have facilitated the research well so that this research can be carried out smoothly.

REFERENCES

- Abdul Wahab, M.A., P. D. H. S. (2017). *Analisis Kebijakan Dari Formulasi ke Penyusunan Model-Model Implementasi Kebijakan Publik* (F. Hutari (ed.); Keenam). PT Bumi Aksara.
- Carroll, J., 2020. One study, four cities: information impact in neighborhood economic development. *Transform. Gov. People Process Policy* 14 (4), 663–680. <https://doi.org/10.1108/TG-07-2019-0070>.
- Glasmeier, A., Christopherson, S., 2015. Thinking about smart cities. *Camb. J. Reg. Economy Soc.* 8 (1), 3–12. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cjres/rsu034>.
- Guzal-Dec, D., 2018. Intelligent development of the countryside – the concept of smart villages: assumptions, possibilities and implementation limitations. *Econ. Reg. Stud.* 11 (3), 32–49. <https://doi.org/10.2478/ers-2018-0023>.
- He, S. Y., Lee, J., Zhou, T., & Wu, D. (2017). Shrinking cities and resource-based economy: The economic restructuring in China's mining cities. *Cities*, 60, 75–83. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cities.2016.07.009>
- Jucevičius, R., Patašienė, I., Patašius, M., 2014. Digital dimension of smart city: critical analysis. *Procedia Soc. Behav. Sci.* 156, 146–150. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.11.137>.
- Imronah. (n.d.). *Perspektif, Model dan Kriteria Pengukurannya IMPLEMENTASI KEBIJAKAN*: 65–85.
- McArdle, K., 2012. What makes a successful rural regeneration partnership? The views of successful partners and the importance of ethos for the community development professional. *Community Dev.* 43 (3), 333–345. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15575330.2011.621211>.
- Poggi, F., Firmino, A., Amado, M., 2015. Moving forward on sustainable energy transitions: the smart rural model. *Eur. J. Sustain. Dev.* 4, 43–50. <https://doi.org/10.14207/ejsd.2015.v4n2p43>.
- Renukappa, S., Suresh, S., Abdalla, W., Shetty, N., Yabbati, N., & Hiremath, R. (2022). Evaluation of smart village strategies and challenges. *SMART AND SUSTAINABLE BUILT ENVIRONMENT*.
- Sampetoding, Eliyah Acantha Manapa & Mahendrawathi ER. (2024). Digital Transformation of Smart Village: A Systematic Literature Review
- Sugiyono, P. F. (2016). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R&D* (23rd ed.). ALFABETA, CV. www.cvalfabeta.com
- Susilowati, Anindya Puteri Eka, Rini Rachmawati, R. Rijanta. 2024.
- Van Gevelt, T., Canales Holzeis, C., Fennell, S., Heap, B., Holmes, J., Hurley Depret, M., Jones, B., Safdar, M.T., 2018. Achieving universal energy access and rural development through smart villages. *Energy Sustain. Dev.* 43, 139–142. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esd.2018.01.005>.
- Visvizi, A., Lytras, M.D., 2018. It's not a fad: smart cities and smart villages research in European and global contexts. *Sustainability* 10 (8), 2727. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su10082727>.
- Wang, C., Zhou, T., & Ren, M. (2023). Driving spatial network connections in rural settlements: The role of e-commerce. *Applied Geography*, 159, Article 103067. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apgeog.2023.103067>
- Wassmann, R., Villanueva, J., Khounthavong, M., Okumu, B.O., Vo, T.B.T., Sander, B.O., 2019. Adaptation, mitigation and food security: multi-criteria ranking system for climate-smart agriculture technologies illustrated for rainfed rice in Laos. *Glob. Food Secur.* 23, 33–40. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gfs.2019.02.003>.
- Wolski, O., 2018. Smart villages in the UE policy: how to match innovativeness and pragmatism? *Wiśł Rol.* 4 (181), 163–179. <https://doi.org/10.7366/wir042018/09>.
- Wolski, O., Wójcik, M., 2018. Podłoże teoretyczne podejścia smart villages w polityce UE. *Perspektywa geograficzna (theoretical considerations on the smart villages approach in the EU Policy: a geographical perspective)*. *Stud. Obsz. Wiej.* 51, 139–152. <https://doi.org/10.7163/SOW.51.8>.
- Zavratnik, V., Kos, A., Duh, E.S., 2018. Smart villages: comprehensive review of initiatives and practices. *Sustainability* 10 (7), 2559. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su10072559>.
- Zhimin, He., Meiling Chen, Dongming Gu. (2024). How digital village construction affects to the effectiveness of rural governance? — Research on the NCA and QCA methods.