Check for updates

Review Paper

Risk Mitigation from a Public Service Perspective

Subhan Ilham Thareq *

State Administration Science, Universitas Palangka Raya, Yos Sudarso Kota Palangka Raya, **Indonesia**

✉ subhanilham@fisip.upr.ac.id

Open Access

This article contributes to:

17 PARTNERSHIPS FOR THE GOALS

SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS

Abstract. This article seeks to explain disaster risk mitigation from a public service. The variety of disasters that occur and have the potential in Indonesia requires risk mitigation that public services can run normally. Literature studies conducted by the author through various research journal references related to public service risk mitigation are represented in explaining disaster risk mitigation in the perspective of public service. The findings show that risk mitigation can shape public service providers in facing various risks of natural and non-natural disasters through an understanding built between all stakeholders. The dimensions of compliance, deliberation and collaboration, accountability and transparency, and the use of technology are aspects of risk mitigation to optimize public service.

Keywords: Risk Mitigation, Public Service, Disaster, Perspective.

1. Introduction

This article seeks to explain disaster risk mitigation from a public service perspective. Various natural disasters that occur to potential disasters in various parts of Indonesia have the potential to cause direct and indirect losses, including casualties, damage, loss of property, infrastructure damage, environmental damage, and mental trauma. Susanto states that natural disasters are classified into two types: the first is natural disasters caused by nature that often occur in Indonesia, including landslides, floods, earthquakes, and so on; the second is natural disasters caused by human actions, such as deforestation, forest burning, littering, petroleum drilling, and many more caused by conflicts in human relations or activities with fellow humans such as disputes between tribes/groups [1].

Various types of risks that can arise from natural and non-natural disasters are influenced by ever-changing environmental conditions and situations. Benson (2007) argues that unexpected situations open up the meaning of risk that relates to the possibility of potential material and non-material losses that are undesirable or unexpected in nature that occur internally and externally due to various events such as natural disasters, fires, traffic accidents, disease outbreaks that occur in an area within a certain period of time that have an impact on society and government. [2]. That risk mitigation for public services is needed to ensure that programs, projects, and public service delivery run optimally by identifying and preventing potential risks that will occur such as in disaster emergency management. [3], [4]. Research conducted by Fadlurrahman et.al suggests that strong policies and regulations supported by the community are important to protect infrastructure and public services [5].

The importance of risk management in influencing the success or failure of a public service in Indonesia is stated from the perspective of public service governance reform. According to Dwiyanto, public service management is required to transform and innovate. [6]. This is supported by research conducted by Kartika and Oktariyanda which suggests that innovation has good performance and functionality with support for technical guidance to implementing officials. [7]. The implementation of risk mitigation is a momentum for innovation to realize the success of public service delivery. Risk

mitigation is a form of transformation and innovation simultaneously through the conception of a paradigm shift in public services. The concept of risk mitigation is an innovation effort carried out by the government through systematic improvement and integration between policies and public service management. The implementation of risk mitigation requires consistency so that the ideals of realizing optimal public services can be achieved. However, the standardization of public service delivery based on laws and regulations on public services has not yet regulated risk mitigation governance in public service delivery.

Another problem is the absence of risk mitigation elements in the public service delivery process. The degradation of the level of public trust in the government which is decreasing due to government performance hampers the relationship between the government and the community [1]. Hardin states that the gap in relations between the government and society due to the unclear policies carried out by the government has resulted in violence against minorities, the rise in crime rates, the trend of corruption cases committed by political elites in the government which tends to increase, government performance which is considered slow and does not answer public problems and so on, accumulating which affects the level of public trust in public services that occur when the disaster occurs [8].

The absence of risk mitigation in operational policies in public services results in uncertainty in public service delivery because public service delivery policies and programs do not have governance to deal with changing situations and conditions to reduce or prevent risks that occur. To deal with changes in the situation and conditions of ideal public service delivery, the formation of risk mitigation through full access participation for citizens and collaboration of government elites and community leaders in government administration and changes in government capacity in responding to and fighting for the collective interests of the community are needed to encourage risk mitigation in public service delivery [7]. So far, collaboration between the government and community participation in the delivery of public services is a form of risk mitigation attitude from an internal organizational perspective so that the delivery of government public services is free from bureaucratic pathologies such as corruption, collusion, nepotism and inefficiency.

Furthermore, in an external perspective, stakeholder collaboration initiated by the government together with the community and private elements, academics, and community organizations in the deliberation process seeks to oversee and oversee policies carried out by the government so that services carried out by the government in mitigating various risks that can arise from various aspects can be carried out optimally [9]. This is in line with a study conducted by Ibty which states that the relationship between empowerment capacity as a form of community preparedness for the benefit of risk mitigation in public services can be carried out in conjunction with collaboration and deliberation between the government and the community through the planning process in identifying risks together with other interested parties [9].

2. Methods

This article uses a literature review approach in explaining risk mitigation through a public service perspective. Nursalam, the literature review method is a process related to library data collection methods, in processing writing materials [10]. In the literature review approach, the author sources information through journals, books, and documentation, the internet and literature related to the topic raised, namely risk mitigation through a public service perspective. Data analysis is carried out through

synthesizing the contents of the literature obtained through journals, books and other secondary data collected then a journal summary is made which includes the name of the researcher, year of publication, study design, purpose of the study, to a summary of the research results or findings. The summary is then sorted alphabetically by author, title, and year of publication.

3. Result and Discussion

3.1 Fundamentals of Public Service Risk Mitigation

Legislation is the legal basis for the implementation of public services carried out by the government. The implementation of public services has the aim of achieving the values of protecting the rights of citizens [11]. The orientation of public services needs to pay attention to global changes that require achieving equality, sustainability and shared growth. Meanwhile, Freeman suggests consideration of the orientation of forming an understanding that is built between all stakeholders in public services in a proactive and far-sighted manner for interested parties to be the basis for the formation of public service delivery [12]. The breakthrough of governance reform serves to answer the challenges of global change with the innovation of policy makers.

Borrins suggests a policy adoption approach from the results of public service innovation in the midst of widespread public distrust of government. governance reform requires momentum and becomes a challenge to get out of the comfort zone [13]. Thus, the need for transformation by innovating or adapting policies is a key driver and an effort to reconstruct the power of public service providers as a solutive breakthrough to be regulated. In line with this thought, Purwanto proposes a conception of a paradigm shift in public services with a mix of indicators for regulatory scrutiny including (1) an agile government approach, (2) internet-based service digitization innovation, and (3) citizen-oriented as service users. The prerequisites for government reform are related to systemic improvements for policy harmonization and public service management [14].

3.2 Public Services and Citizen Protection

The management of the public service approach shows a shift in perspective towards the existence of citizens as users. This can be seen from; first, the greater active role of public service providers in line with the situation and conditions of a very dynamic environment with the development of public literacy due to the influence of the development of information and technology that is growing [15]. This has implications for the pattern of direct relationships between the government as a service provider and the community to ensure the will of the state to create social justice through the implementation of public services with citizens as users as well as instruments in overseeing the course of public services. Second, access and control of citizens as the benefits of public service functions to create community welfare and social justice which is part of the alignment to citizens, and the implementation of a government that is free of corruption, collusion, and nepotism, as well as legal certainty and enforcement of regulations with the recognition of citizens' rights.

According to Shabbir in Ibty, communities are able to organize themselves in order to obtain equal access and equal treatment with social and economic justice for all citizens, which is characterized by two main pillars of the democratic tradition. The first pillar is the participation of the community in governing its own life and in the broader decision-making processes that govern the community. The second pillar is a rights platform that supports and protects the role of individuals and minorities in the governance process. Furthermore, the third approach to public service management is

participation in addressing the widespread socio-economic and ecological impacts that require more detailed regulation [16].

Bessette, encourages the mainstreaming of citizen alignment which can be further formulated through a social engineering approach [11]. This alignment is intended to manage public services in a participatory, open, accountable or supervise public services on the basis of the influence of trust, satisfaction, and usefulness on the success of good public outputs/services, from the factors of distributive justice, procedural legal justice, and citizen alignment. The design of citizen participation can be arranged together between the various parties involved so that it can truly become the orientation of service management. Meanwhile, risk management has many perspectives. Situations and conditions within the organization and its environment often have different views on risk and there are always potential risks and alternatives that can be chosen in the face of adverse possibilities.

3.3 Establishment of Public Service Risk Mitigation

Martinovski states that there are several factors and elements that make up risk mitigation for public services, including the following. (1) Compliance with the leadership is an element in risk mitigation and the orientation of creating risk mitigation conditions with the aim that policies and programs made by the government can be implemented optimally. (2) Approach in involving the participation of parties, identifying risks, evaluating classifications and types and potential losses, and selecting and using risk mitigation methods in decision making involving risk owners from organizers and users. (3) The process of handling risk mitigation, both preventing, reducing cost losses and public distrust as well as determining losses and to whom losses are borne by involving interested parties, integrating data, risk assessment, implementing accountability, transparency, effectiveness and efficiency; and increasing the capabilities of risk mitigation managers and continuous improvement. (4) Monitoring or controlling the risk mitigation business process and how to improve it. Then the researchers added or separated a separate factor as follows. (5) Integration of risk mitigation in the preparation of policy formation and (6) Capacity building of human resources and resources owned by the government and the community through integrating these resource elements in encouraging efforts to establish risk mitigation, as well as Enterprise risk management which shows the importance of integrating it into strategic planning by the government at the central and local levels [17], [16].

The literature shows the importance of an integrated risk mitigation governance process in the strategic management of public service delivery with its external environment as occurs in disaster management and in ERM. However, it has been reported that the governance of public service standards has not been well integrated between the financial risk management component and the service integrity component. Thus, it is believed that all these factors will be able to influence the success of the risk mitigation management process in public services. These influential factors are then moderated by the risk mitigation governance space which has elements of condition creation from the content of the substance of laws and regulations and the clarity of the value of protecting citizens' rights stated in public service regulations. Another factor in the process of preparing the dimensions of risk mitigation in public services is the aspect of compliance, which means the nature of obedience or obedience, such as requests from state leaders to be fulfilled by their citizens and the willingness to comply with predetermined limits, both mandatory and independent. An example is the limit of the obligation to pay taxes that must be fulfilled by citizens and companies or other entities/organizations. Susilo divides compliance into two. (1) Compliance requirements

(compliance requirement), which are based on laws and regulations, financial standards, service standards and the like. This is called compliance only in practice. (2) Compliance commitment (self-regulation), which is based on the organization's willingness to voluntarily commit itself to certain obligations. These obligations are commonly set out in company/association ethical guidelines, internal standard operating procedures known as business/organizational ethics or standards of conduct [16].

The compliance dimension is an important element to produce quality public services. The dimensions of compliance can prevent the occurrence or not of mal-administration, such as unclear procedures, uncertainty of service timeframes, illegal levies, corruption, and others. [16]. Furthermore. Other impacts include the risk of high cost economics, obstacles to investment growth, and the level of public trust continues to decline until public apathy or public service failure occurs. Compliance relates to the mindset and behavior of being obedient, compliant, ethical, and self-aware of fulfilling obligations. This is the basis of mitigation as stated by Martinovski who defines mitigation as a form of pressure management and usually manifests in discourse. Discourse integrates different levels of consciousness and is one of the few empirical entrances into cognition [17]. Meanwhile, mitigation involves argumentation so it is also a way of practicing and learning about social judgment, which is involved in the creation, maintenance, and change of social institutions, including self-concepts.

Through the results of ERM implementation, the process of implementing compliance includes the procedure of complying with regulatory requirements/standards and obeying them, resilience to risk, coordination and integration of risk management practices, and ensuring clarity of efficiency and exploitation of opportunities [16]. In that case, the application of adherence to financial risk management standards is complemented by standards to achieve quality based on product standards. This can be adjusted for the paradigm of public organizations that have a relationship of rights and obligations between service providers and their users, which is derived in the vision and mission with governance oriented towards fulfilling the basic rights of citizens or with the criteria of achieving the value of justice and welfare, distribution of benefits, and legal procedures. For this reason, the leadership element and the orientation of alignment towards the rights of citizens as users are indicative of the perspective of the leadership and service provider apparatus to understand and obey the way of working to mitigate risks in public services systematically. [18], [6], [14].

3.4 Stakeholder Deliberation and Collaboration

The approach to carry out risk mitigation is one of the factors influencing the creation of conditions in order to prevent losses or reduce their potential harm and ensure the anticipation of loss guarantees properly and appropriately [16]. The approach to dealing with regulatory and ethical risks and fraudulent behavior, deviations from internal organizational approaches to ERM for risk targets in the form of efficiency and exploitation of opportunities and dealing with disaster risks due to catastrophic events and social conflict shocks from the external environment [3]. Martinovski integrates discourse, psychological, and cognitive approaches to responsibility, blaming statements or facts, and countermeasures, also explores the judgment of guilt and self-defense seen in institutional discourses, such as the judiciary and the relationship between mitigation and discourse structures [17]. Furthermore, the identification of linguistic features that can be used to recognize mitigation reasoning through the discourse that occurs between the government and the community is carried out through a deliberation process to unify understanding and create conditions in the risk mitigation process [17]. The identification of linguistic features requires individual capacity in the community and government so

that the identification and formulation of risk mitigation implementation policies in public services are optimally integrated.

Individual and community capacity is needed as a case of community-based action preparedness that is at the forefront of protecting citizens in health emergency situations and conditions as explained by Abraham, that in emergencies community capacity is needed in the form of ERM-H (Emergency Risk Management for Health) which focuses on strengthening local health work capacity and centers on community planning and action to obtain a strong evidence base [3]. In the high-risk population factor, Abraham prioritizes targeting efforts to reduce human vulnerability. Indicators of human vulnerability risk factors concerning morbidity and mortality include the following. (a) low income, (b) low socioeconomic status, (c) lack of home ownership, (d) single parent family, (e) age older than 65 years, (f) age younger than 5 years, (g) female gender, (h) chronic disease, (i) disability, and (j) social isolation or exclusion [3]. Regarding the importance of risk management in health emergencies, Abraham explains that the goal is to build the capacity and resilience of individuals and communities to risk and to reduce its impact and recover from the effects of adversity [3]. An integrated approach that involves the community refers to the importance of citizen representation [11]. The first step is to identify the source of risk to risk factors and find the root of the problem, using integrated data [19]. The identification uses a deliberative method arranged in a series of meetings between a group of citizens and public service providers, including public consultation activities open to the public [3], [11], [17]. In good management, it is independently managed by the leadership as the owner or risk controller.

Risk-oriented leaders play an important role in management within the host organization and align the organization's strategy beyond financial matters. Leaders pay attention to and place risk managers as an important part of implementing management strategies. Directors must also understand and comply with regulations, implement them consistently, and communicate them to relevant parties to be able to reduce negative impacts or prevent possible risks. This is influenced by the momentum of renewal owned by the risk leader and the led apparatus. The momentum of public service reform is related to regulatory opportunities, both those that are attributable and those that are delegated and formed with certain procedures in accordance with laws and regulations relating to regional autonomy. In the formation of regional regulations and their derivative policies, the interests of the regional head in accordance with his vision and mission can be accommodated to be outlined as regional government policy, generally applicable, and binding for the community along with the provision of facilities, sanctions or rewards. It also includes every written decision issued by the authorized leader as a policy that contains rules of behavior that are and are binding in general.

3.5 Accountability and Transparency

So far, the policy and operational management of public services have been organized on the basis of technical thinking of efficiency, effectiveness, and accountability which tend to use a market approach [16]. This method results in a gap and a shift in the will of the pattern of accelerated development idealized by the people so that adjustments need to be made by service providers by paying attention to decentralization and regional and rural autonomy regulations [6]. Thus, public service risk mitigation management is influenced by risk mitigation leaders in reducing losses and development impacts carried out by local governments in collaboration with stakeholders. Its success is determined from two aspects, namely the improvement of transparent governance and the participation of citizens and stakeholders.

Accountability is the responsibility and fulfillment of the accountability of the participation of interested parties and the leadership of service providers to determine its success in all work units and at all levels of government [6]. It is contained in the laws and regulations. Situations and conditions of the possibility of potential risks from socio-economic and ecological impacts always exist due to rapid changes and the existence of increasingly widespread multi hazard threats. Meanwhile, the service user community does not understand or have not prepared preparedness due to the absence of more detailed arrangements or citizens have not been involved from the beginning [16].

Then the need for citizen access and control is also an element to ensure the benefits of public service functions (outcomes and super goals). This is because the state through public service delivery organizations needs to make serious efforts to participate in creating a basis for governance that is free of corruption, collusion and nepotism, as well as legal certainty and substantive enforcement. Therefore, Bessette encourages the mainstreaming of citizen alignment which can be further formulated through a social engineering approach contained in the policy [11]. The existence of this alignment is loaded to ful-fill the principles of participatory, open, inclusive, effective and efficient, accountability, and clarity of public access and control on the basis of the influence of trust, satisfaction, and usefulness on the success of good public services.

Elements of openness and accountability, as well as effectiveness and efficiency Ibty are among the things that determine the risk mitigation process. Meanwhile, the risk mitigation process starts at the level of presenting the plan and the need for implementation, implementing it, ascertaining the potential benefits of implementation, and setting a good example of practice, taking into account the current capacity situation. [16]. That is also the concern of ERM, which also takes into account the gaps in all these things in private enterprise risk management, the need for human and financial resources, and the possibility of challenges being addressed with accuracy by experts [16]. In addition, there is also a need for information and accessibility to information for all parties, and follow-up measures and related deadlines, staff training modalities, possible risks and estimated costs of implementing continuous improvement.

3.6 Information Technology Utilization

The importance of data being managed in an integrated and regulated manner with clear organization of ERM implementation by using IoT devices and appropriate data-related methods for cross-stakeholder coordination, communication and consultation for risk identification and assessment, decision-making on risk mitigation and treatment plans, and monitoring and control of risk mitigation activities [14]. In addition, the importance of stakeholder tolerance in all processes and outcomes of the risk mitigation phase, up to integrating it in strategic management, is required in order to develop preparedness for change and uncertainty [16]. The importance of strategic integration related to the design of citizen participation can be compiled together between the various parties involved so that it can really be a basis for consideration in the preparation, decision making, implementation, and evaluation of policies, all of which require updated data and information. So far, the process of updating and integrating these data has shown indications of dependence on the elite as policy initiators and implementers. Thus, there is a lot of distrust because the results of policies are often not in accordance with the rights and needs of the community [6]. The method of participation by placing citizens as service users, according to previous research can be carried out through deliberation and collaboration by involving all parties [20], [6], [21].

Public services are coveted by citizens to meet the needs of citizens' rights, which have not been able to satisfy citizens [18]. An example is the regulation on service

standards based on openness and affordability of information so that service providers and users can anticipate, detect, receive and respond to changes and events quickly and precisely according to the terms of service provisions, time, costs and procedures.

Information and communication should be well organized, data up-to-date, and structured to meet future expectations. Enterprise risk management practices explicitly address the handling limitations and uncertainties associated with information and expectations. Information should be immediate, clear, and available to relevant stakeholders. The communication element of humanized personnel information risk sources and work culture, significantly affects all areas of work, every level and stage. Its application is an internalization process called the transaction process of information and knowledge sharing or adaptation in change management at the organizational and individual levels. This is the same as Iersel's concept of preparedness and detection of opportunities for disasters, losses, or poor risk management results. The uncertain conditions arise due to various causes, which include the following. a) The time interval from the start of planning for an activity to its end. The greater the time interval, the greater the uncertainty. b) Limited availability of necessary information. c) Limited knowledge/skills/decision-making techniques [21].

Meanwhile, Yang, et.al. added risk search by adding elements of information affordability and its risk management process affecting the success of supporting the public on the implementation of policy risk mitigation in the case of climate change [19]. This is also stated by Abraham, which shows that the way data integration is carried out by public service providers affects the involvement and dominating role of the state towards the community or service users. The government as an organizing organization acts as a regulator, disseminates, and controls in a balanced and equitable manner so that services through market mechanisms that become public choice can function [3], [22]. Citizens are treated as users or consumers and this often results in access barriers due to socio-economic disparities, especially for disadvantaged communities [22], [2], [3]. Thus, the availability and affordability of risk information affects the understanding of stakeholders on the tendency of vulnerabilities that become threats and uncertainties to be anticipated with risk mitigation. Likewise, for the governance of mitigation by sharing and transaction of knowledge and expertise due to the situation of conditions that can cause risk, to the need for information availability, communication and adaptation to be able to manage changes.

4. Conclusion

Natural disasters in Indonesia cause significant direct and indirect losses, including casualties, property damage, infrastructure destruction, environmental harm, and trauma for survivors. Effective risk mitigation in public services is crucial to ensure the continued delivery of programs and projects, particularly in disaster emergency management. Public service management in Indonesia needs to innovate and adapt to various situations. Implementing risk mitigation governance is key to successful public service delivery, marking a transformation through a paradigm shift. Comprehensive risk mitigation policies, aligned with government regulations, protect citizens' rights and support the vision and mission of public services. These policies must adapt to global changes, focusing on equality, sustainability, and growth, with proactive and forward-looking engagement from all stakeholders.

Innovations in public service risk mitigation are essential to meet the challenges of global change. Policy transformation and innovation drive the reconstruction of public service delivery. There is a shift toward viewing citizens as active users of services. Public

service providers must be proactive and adapt to dynamic environments influenced by the rise in public literacy due to telematics. Enhancing citizens' access and control over public services promotes community welfare and social justice, supporting a corruption-free government that upholds legal certainty and citizens' rights. Key factors in shaping risk mitigation for public services include leadership compliance and the creation of risk mitigation conditions, involvement of stakeholders in risk identification, evaluation, and decision-making, data integration, accountability, transparency, effectiveness, efficiency, and continuous improvement. Monitoring and improving the risk mitigation process, integrating risk mitigation in policy formation, and utilizing information technology in risk mitigation are also essential. Given Indonesia's high risk of natural and non-natural disasters, comprehensive risk mitigation mechanisms are essential. The lack of such mechanisms poses a challenge for maintaining public services. Identifying risks is complex for both the government and the community as service providers and users. Future research should explore the relationship between central and local governments, focusing on the impact of overlapping regulations on public service delivery and risk mitigation.

5. Declaration

Author contributions and responsibilities - The authors made major contributions to the conception and design of the study. The authors took responsibility for data analysis, interpretation and discussion of results. The authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Funding - This research did not receive external funding.
Availability of data and materials - All data is available from the author.
Competing interests - The authors declare no competing interests.
Did you use generative AI to write this manuscript? - I do not use AI assistance in my manuscript.
Declaration of generative AI and AI-assisted technologies in the writing process - During the preparation of this work the author did not use AI to write, edit, or other things related to the manuscript.

6. References

[1] A. B. Susanto, Disaster management in disaster-prone countries: a strategic management approach, Jakarta: Eka Tjipta Foundation, 2006.

[2] Benson, C, Twigg J and Rossetto, T, Tools for Mainstreaming Disaster Risk Reduction: Guidance Notes for Development Agencies, Yogyakarta: Hivos and CIRCLE Indonesia, 2007.

[3] J. Abraham, "Emergency Risk Management for Health OVERVIEW; Global," The World Health Organization, Public Health England, England, 2013.

[4] National Audit Office, in Managing Risks to Improve Public Service, London, The Stationery Office, 2003-2004.

[5] Alfi Muhammad, Yundari Puti Ni and Tsaqif Ahnaf, "Cyber Security Risk Analysis in the Digital Transformation of Public Services in Indonesia," Journal of Strategic Studies on National Resilience, vol. 6, no. 2, p. 5, 2023.

[6] A. Dwiyanto, Contextual Bureaucratic Reform, Yogyakarta: UGM Press, 2015.

[7] D. F. Kartika and T. A. Oktariyanda, "Public Service Innovation Through the POEDAK (Online Service for Population Administration Registration) Application at the Population and Civil Registration Office of Gresik Regency," Publika, vol. 9, no. 5, pp. 245-260, 2022.

[8] R. Hardin, Do we want trust in government?, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.

[9] I. Ibty, "Community Empowerment Capacity Needs Public Service Risk Mitigation Study of Empowerment Social Audit," Enersia Publik, vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 51-66, 2017.

[10] Nursalam, Nursing Science Research Methodology Ed. 4, Jakarta: Salemba Medika, 2016.

[11] J. Bessette, American Government and Politics, Deliberation, Democracy and Citizenship, Boston: Suzanne Jeans, 2011.

[12] Freeman, R., H. Edward, S. Jeffrey, A. C. Wicks, B. Parmar and S. de Colle, Stakeholder Theory the State of the Art, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.

[13] S. Borins, Innovation in Government Research Recognition and Replication, Ash Institute for Democratic Governance and Innovation John, 2008.

[14] Purwanto, E,A, "Recommendations for the Improvement of the Law on Public Services in the Perspective of State Administration Science," in Seminar on the Improvement of the Public Service Law of the Ministry of PAN &RB, Jakarta, 2019.

[15] Janet V. Denhardt and Robert B. Denhardt, The New Public Service Serving, Not Steering, New York: Routledge, 2015.

[16] I. Ibty, "Public Service Risk Mitigation Analysis of the Implementation of Public Service Risk Mitigation Governance at Yogyakarta International Airport," Doctoral Dissertation, Gadjah Mada University, Yogyakarta, 2021.

[17] B. Martinovsky, "Framework for Analysis of Mitigation in Courts," Journal of Pragmatics, 2005.

[18] M. Holowchak, "The Paradox of Public Service Jefferson, Education, and the Problem of Plato's Cave," Springer Science Business Media, vol. 32, pp. 73-86, 2013.

[19] Yang, K and K. Callahan, "Citizen Involvement Efforts and Bureaucratic Responsiveness: Participatory Values, Stakeholder Pressures, and Administrative Practices," Public Administration Review, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 249-264, 2007.

[20] Scolobig, A, Thompson, M. and Bayer, J.A, Compromise not Consensus: Designing a Participatory Process for Landslide Risk Mitigation, Springer Science Business Media Dordrecht, 2015.

[21] Iersel, V.M, Greenberg, H.E and Westrick, M.L, "Structured Risk Assessment for First in Human Studies," Therapeutic Innovation & Regulatory Science, vol. 51, no. 3, pp. 288-297, 2017.

[22] Harper, T.L and Stein, S.M, Postmodernist Planning Theory: The Incommensurability Premise in Explorations in Planning Theory, Seymour, 1996.

Publisher's Note – Tinta Emas Institute stays neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.