Journal of Public Representative and Society Provision
Vol. 5, Issue 3, 2025
Page 724-735
Doi: https://doi.org/10.55885/jprsp.v5i3.637

Policy Advocacy for Disaster Risk Reduction Integration in Regional Spatial Planning: Lessons from Purwakarta

Afi Rafita[1], Sinta Ningrum[1], Dedi Sukarno[1]
[1]Universitas Padjajaran, Indonesia
Email: afi23001@mail.unpad.ac.id

Abstract. *This study investigates policy advocacy strategies employed to integrate disaster risk reduction (DRR) into spatial planning through a case study of the revised Spatial Plan (RTRW) of Purwakarta Regency for 2025–2045. Given Indonesia's high disaster risk profile, integrating DRR into planning documents is crucial to ensuring sustainable and resilient regional development. Despite national regulatory mandates, the previous RTRW of Purwakarta (2011–2031) inadequately addressed disaster vulnerability. This research adopts a qualitative descriptive case study design, using in-depth interviews with stakeholders from local government agencies and technical experts. The analysis is guided by the Advocacy Logic Model by Gen and Wright (2013), which outlines advocacy components including input, activities, and outcomes. The integration of DRR into the revised RTRW of Purwakarta was largely driven by a strong sense of agency among stakeholders, effective inter-agency collaboration, and the technocratic engagement of experts. Key activities involved coalition-building, engaging policymakers, public mobilization, and defensive actions to sustain reform momentum. These strategies led to a substantial shift in decision-makers' awareness, resulting in the formal incorporation of spatially explicit disaster risk data into the revised RTRW. The study concludes that strategic and context-sensitive advocacy can effectively bridge the gap between regulatory imperatives and local implementation, especially in regions facing complex disaster risks. These findings offer practical insights for policymakers and contribute theoretically to the literature on disaster governance and public policy advocacy.*

Keywords: *Policy Advocacy, Disaster Risk Reduction, Spatial Planning, Purwakarta Regency Spatial Planning*

Received: June 20, 2025 Revised: July 24, 2025 Accepted: August 26, 2025

INTRODUCTION

Indonesia is among the countries with the highest disaster risk in the world, due to its geographical location at the convergence of three major tectonic plates: the Indo-Australian, Eurasian, and Pacific Plates (Suprapto & Rizki, 2024; Stern et al., 2016). This positioning renders the country highly vulnerable to geophysical hazards such as earthquakes, tsunamis, and volcanic eruptions, as well as hydro-meteorological disasters like floods, landslides, and droughts. In recent years, the increasing frequency and impact of disasters have significantly disrupted development and the livelihoods of affected communities (Sina et al., 2019).

Khan et al. (2022) said that, These events have led to fatalities, displacement, loss of critical infrastructure, and extensive economic damage, straining public resources and local resilience. In response, spatial planning has emerged as a strategic instrument for disaster risk

ISSN 2776-1266 (print), 2776-1266 (online)

reduction (DRR), especially at the subnational level. Scholars argue that spatial planning, if not informed by disaster risk assessments, can contribute to new forms of vulnerability (Del et al., 2024; Farinós-Dasí et al., 2024; Preston et al., 2011). Hence, integrating DRR into spatial planning policies is not only a legal mandate but a critical requirement for sustainable development.

According to Rozita & Setiadi (2020) and Yanuari & Prangsi (2020) In Indonesia, national regulations such as Law No. 26 of 2007 on Spatial Planning and Law No. 24 of 2007 on Disaster Management mandate that spatial plans must incorporate risk assessments and environmental carrying capacity. Furthermore, Government Regulation No. 21 of 2021 emphasizes the importance of disaster data and public participation in spatial planning processes (Dandoulaki et al., 2023). Despite this regulatory framework, local governments often face challenges in translating DRR principles into their regional spatial plans. Purwakarta Regency exemplifies such a case.

The previous RTRW (2011–2031) did not adequately account for disaster risks, despite the region's vulnerability to floods, landslides, and potential technological hazards related to aging dams like Jatiluhur and Cirata. Recent disaster events, including severe landslides and flooding in 2022–2025, have underscored the urgency of updating the spatial plan to incorporate disaster risk considerations. This study addresses the gap between policy mandates and local planning practice by exploring how policy advocacy has been employed to support the integration of DRR into the revised RTRW of Purwakarta Regency for 2025–2045.

While prior research has focused on technical risk assessments and sectoral policy responses, fewer studies have examined the advocacy process as a dynamic mechanism that drives institutional change (Weber & Rohracher, 2012). Using the advocacy logic model developed by Gen and Wright (2013), this study investigates the strategic activities, actor dynamics, and enabling conditions that facilitated policy change (Schut et al., 2014). The objective of this study is to analyze how advocacy strategies were formulated and implemented by policy actors to support the integration of DRR into the regional spatial planning process. The study hypothesizes that successful policy integration is not merely a result of regulatory compliance, but also of collective agency, inter-sectoral collaboration, and strategically executed advocacy efforts.

METHODS

This study employs a qualitative research design with a descriptive case study approach, aiming to explore the dynamics of policy advocacy in integrating disaster risk reduction (DRR) into regional spatial planning. The qualitative method was chosen to capture the depth and complexity of social interactions and actor strategies in their natural context, allowing a contextual understanding of advocacy practices in local policy processes. The case study focuses on Purwakarta Regency, a disaster-prone region in West Java, Indonesia, which is currently undergoing the revision of its Regional Spatial Plan (RTRW) for the 2025–2045 period. The object of the study is the advocacy process carried out by policy actors to promote the inclusion of DRR considerations into the revised RTRW. The unit of analysis includes official and non-official actors involved in the policy process, such as representatives from government agencies (DPUTR, BPBD, Bapperida), technical experts, and community stakeholders. Primary data were collected through in-depth, semi-structured interviews with key informants who played strategic roles in the RTRW revision process. Informants were selected based on their institutional relevance and direct involvement in spatial planning or disaster risk governance. Open-ended questions were used to explore actors' perspectives, strategies, and motivations in advocating for DRR integration. Secondary data were obtained from policy documents, official reports, regulatory texts, and academic publications relevant to DRR and spatial planning in Purwakarta. These documents were used for triangulation and contextual validation of primary data. Data analysis followed a thematic coding process adapted from Umar et al. (2023), including open coding, axial coding, and selective coding. Thematic patterns were categorized based on the Advocacy Logic Model by Elgin et al. (2013), which provided the analytical lens to identify advocacy inputs, strategic

ISSN 2776-1266 (print), 2776-1266 (online)

activities, outcomes, and impacts. To ensure trustworthiness, several validation techniques were employed. These included source triangulation (comparing interviews with document reviews), member checking (confirming interpretations with informants), and peer debriefing (discussing emerging findings with academic supervisors and colleagues). These steps enhanced the credibility and dependability of the findings.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The results of this study reveal that the integration of disaster risk reduction (DRR) into the revised Spatial Plan (RTRW) of Purwakarta Regency was not merely a regulatory exercise, but a result of strategic policy advocacy involving multiple actors and institutional negotiations. Based on the Advocacy Logic Model by Gen & Wright (2013), the findings are categorized into advocacy inputs, strategic activities, and observed outcomes.

Advocacy Inputs and Actor Strategies

The advocacy process relied on four critical input dimensions: sense of agency, inter-actor relationships, technical expertise, and material resources. Each actor contributed differently, based on their institutional mandate and capacity.

Table 1. Strategic Advocacy Inputs and Activities by Actors

Actor	Sense of Agency	People & Relationships	Knowledge & Skills	Resources	Key Advocacy Activities
DPUTR	High – driven by institutional reflection on past spatial planning failures	Strong – cross-sector coordination with DLH and other OPDs	High – mastery of technical spatial planning substance	Sufficient – supported by technical legitimacy	Coalition building, engaging decision-makers, reform efforts
Bapperida	High – understands DRR as essential for sustainable infrastructure	Strong – facilitator across public and sectoral actors	Moderate – policy integration with budgeting and planning	Limited – relies on formal mechanisms	Coalition building, public mobilization, information campaigning
BPBD	Medium – aims to be included in upstream planning processes	Moderate – informal coordination with technical institutions	Moderate – disaster risk knowledge, limited in authority	Limited – constrained by human resources	Public engagement, defensive activities, information campaigning
Technical Experts	High – normative motivation and commitment to mainstreaming DRR	Strong – collaborative with government and civil society	High – expertise in DRR and spatial planning	Sufficient – supported by consultancy networks	Reform efforts, policy framing, information campaigning
Local Communities	Growing – rooted in lived	Moderate – involved via FGDs and	Low – technical	Very limited –	Public mobilization

	experience of disaster impacts	public consultations	understanding limited	depends on facilitation	, defensive actions

Source: Research Findings, 2025

The table highlights the varying contributions of key actors in the advocacy process. DPUTR played a leading role, driven by institutional reflection and equipped with technical authority to reform the spatial plan. Bapperida acted as a policy integrator, facilitating coordination among sectors and aligning DRR content with regional development frameworks such as the RPJMD. Although lacking formal authority, BPBD advocated for upstream involvement by contributing disaster data and raising awareness of spatial vulnerability. Technical experts supported the process by translating risk information into planning language, while local communities, though limited in resources, contributed through participatory forums and lent legitimacy to DRR-focused proposals during political review.

Proximal outcomes refer to the initial results of advocacy efforts that have not yet taken the form of final policies or regulations, but show changes in attitudes, perceptions, and preferences of key actors, especially decision makers. One of the main indicators is changes in decision makers' view on the issues being advocated. In this research, the shift in perspective on the importance of PRB as an integral part of the revision of the Purwakarta Regency RTRW is a very strategic result and provides direction for the success of long-term advocacy. In the early stages of the revision process, PRB was seen as only an additional technical issue and was not a top priority in spatial planning policy. This is illustrated by the statement of the Head of Spatial Planning at DPUTR:

> *"Previously, PRB was considered as a small part, sometimes only mentioned briefly in the script... but now we consider it as the basis for the preparation. So, PRB is not an addition, but a foundation."*

The statement shows that there has been a substantive paradigm shift among spatial planning technocrats (Inch, 2012). If previously PRB was only discussed briefly, now it has become a basic framework in assessing the feasibility of space and the direction of regional development. One concrete indicator of the change in perspective is the formal recognition by DPUTR and other technical agencies of the importance of technical recommendations from BPBD. If previously input from BPBD was often not considered binding, now it is increasingly recognized as an important document in the assessment of space utilization.

> *"We start to use recommendations from BPBD as a reference. If they have given a warning that it is a disaster-prone area, we will try to find alternative developments."* (DPUTR, 2025).

This indicates a shift in BPBD's position in technocratic power relations, from being a complement to a source of authority in spatial decision-making. Although not all regional head decisions are explicit, there are indications that PRB is starting to enter the formal narrative of regional development (Paasi, 2013). This is marked by references to disasters as obstacles to development that need to be addressed in a structured manner. According to a source from Bapperida:

> *"The deputy regent began to mention disasters in RPJMD meetings... this means that PRB is starting to enter the language of development politics, not just a technical issue."*

This transformation indicates that the PRB issue has moved up a class from a sectoral matter to a strategic issue adopted by the policy-making elite. The change in decision-makers' perceptions of the importance of PRB integration in the revision of Purwakarta Regency's RTRW is the earliest and most essential indicator of the success of substantial policy advocacy. In the policy advocacy model of Gen & Wright (2013), this change is categorized as a proximal outcome because it occurs before formal policies are established, but has great potential in directing the content, quality, and sustainability of the policies that will be produced. Reflection on this shift in

perspective is important, because basically public policy is not only born from regulatory orders or structural pressures, but also from the transformation of the way of thinking of those in authority.

Changes in views in this case do not occur instantly, but are an accumulation of social interactions, information delivery, coalition strengthening, and strategic communication practices that take place over a long period of time. In this case study, the influence on the views of decision makers is not only carried out through a technical approach, but through the engineering of policy discourse carried out by a cross-sector coalition, namely DPUTR, BPBD, Bapperida, and practitioners/experts. Each of these actors plays a different role in framing DRR as an issue that is not only technically rational, but also politically and normatively valid.

From the perspective of technical actors, such as DPUTR and Bapperida, the change in perspective is reflected in the shift in perception of PRB as an "additional substance" to a "basic framework". This shift is not simple, because it requires deconstruction of the old logic in spatial planning that tends to prioritize investment attraction and infrastructure development, without considering the systemic impact of disasters on spatial sustainability. In this case, the success of the change in perspective becomes a kind of epistemic indicator that technical actors have experienced a reorientation of values, namely from productivity values to safety and resilience values (Bibri, 2021).

Meanwhile, at the legislative level, the shift in the attitude of DPRD members towards the urgency of PRB shows that the process of political persuasion requires an approach that is more than just data. Align with research from Nasution & Kosasih (2025), Visual, narrative, and contextual approaches carried out by experts have proven to be more effective in building emotional resonance and policy logic. This means that changes in views are not always produced by the accumulation of technical arguments, but also by the ability of advocacy to touch the political intuition of decision makers.

Another important reflection is that the changes in perspective that occur are multilevel, not only occurring in central figures such as heads of departments or legislators, but also at the middle level: functional officials, technical staff, and even non-ASN staff. Changes at this level indicate that the PRB agenda is starting to stick as a new work logic, not just instructions from above. This strengthens the view that successful advocacy is advocacy that changes the structure of thinking, not just the structure of rules. Overall, the change in the perspective of decision makers towards the integration of PRB in the revision of the Purwakarta RTRW can be interpreted as collective cognitive capital, which is the meeting point between technical logic, social logic, and political logic in one policy negotiation space (Orsini & Compagnon, 2013).

To understand the extent to which DRR advocacy has succeeded in shaping changes at the relational and behavioral levels of actors, it is necessary to see how this transformation is reflected in the process of drafting and revising the RTRW. The following table summarizes changes in perspective, institutional roles, and patterns of coordination between actors that are the main indications of the achievement of proximal outcomes from DRR policy advocacy in Purwakarta Regency:

Table 2. 1Outcomes Achievements of PRB Policy Advocacy: Dynamics of Attitudes and Coordination Between Actors

Dimensions	Before Advocacy	After Advocacy	Evidence
Perspective on PRB	PRB is considered a technical issue for BPBD	PRB is seen as an important component of spatial planning	Interview excerpt from actor DPUTR
The Role of BPBD in Spatial Planning	Not actively involved	To be a technical reference for space utilization	Draft Regional Regulation RTRW Article 72 paragraph (5)

Coordination between OPDs	Fragmented	It is mandatory to accommodate and align the results of the disaster mitigation aspects	Minutes of FGD with Spatial Planning Forum on October 11, 2022

Source: Analysis Results, 2025

Changes in mindset, relationship structure, and increased involvement of technical actors such as BPBD in the spatial planning process are important indications that PRB advocacy has produced significant medium-term achievements. This transformation is not symbolic, but rather shows a shift towards more collaborative, intersectoral, and disaster risk-based spatial governance. With the increasing recognition of DRR issues as a strategic component in spatial planning, there is room for spatial planning policies to truly accommodate regional vulnerabilities in a more structured manner. This achievement is an important foundation for the emergence of changes in regulatory substance, as will be discussed in the next section on Distal Outcomes.

Distal **Outcomes**

Distal Outcomes of Gen & Wright's (2013) policy advocacy framework refers to the long-term impact or end result of a series of policy advocacy activities. In this research, these achievements are represented through two main categories, first, policy adoption, which is the extent to which the substance of PRB has been formally adopted in the draft regional regulation document RTRW. Second, implementation change, which is a change in the implementation system of spatial planning policy in response to the new substance that has been advocated.

Policy Adoption

Policy adoption is a concrete result of advocacy work reflected in the form of formal policies, regulations, and legal products. Advocacy of DRR policy in Purwakarta Regency can be observed through the success of encouraging the adoption of DRR substance into official spatial planning policy documents, namely the draft regional regulation of the Purwakarta Regency Spatial Planning Plan (RTRW). Policy adoption in this case refers to the form of formal recognition of DRR issues through binding legal norms in articles, appendices, and general zoning provisions.

When compared to the previous RTRW, the document does not include in detail the obligation to conduct a risk assessment in the use of space. In other words, the disaster aspect has not been an important concern and has not been a core part of the spatial planning policy structure in the previous document. However, in the latest RTRW draft regional regulation document, PRB has been adopted not only as a spatial planning strategy but also as the goal of the Purwakarta Regency spatial planning policy, through Article 4 paragraph (4) letter a which states:

> *"The policy for developing the District Spatial Pattern as referred to in paragraph (2) letter b, includes: a. protection, development, utilization and management of Forest Areas, Water Bodies, Conservation Areas, Local Protection Areas and Disaster-Prone Areas, as well as other Protected Areas based on ecosystems, culture and local wisdom."*

In addition, the substance of PRB has been adopted explicitly, one of which is through Article 20 paragraph (1) which states:

> *"The disaster evacuation network system as referred to in paragraph (1) consists of: a. disaster evacuation routes; and b. disaster evacuation locations."*

These substances were not found in the previous RTRW, either in the body or appendices, indicating that PRB issues had not previously been a primary concern in the preparation of spatial planning policies. Furthermore, Article 72 paragraph (5) in the latest draft regional RTRW regulation also stipulates that:

> *"Every activity of utilizing space in disaster-prone areas must be based on a disaster risk study prepared by the authorities and approved by the technical agency that handles disaster affairs and the Spatial Planning Forum."*

This change was also acknowledged by a resource person from the expert/practitioner team as part of the RTRW drafting team who stated:

> *"Previously, PRB was never a big topic in the RTRW, but during the recent revision we kept pushing for it to be included. Finally, it was included in the evacuation network system."*

The quote shows that the adoption of DRR substance was not solely an initiative of the technical team, but rather the result of an advocacy process that brought together cross-sector interests and encouraged recognition of the urgency of disaster risk.

Table 3. 2of the Substance of the Purwakarta Regency RTRW Before and After PRB Advocacy (Policy Adoption)

Policy Substantive Aspects	**Draft Regional Regulation on RTRW – Before Advocacy**	**Draft Regional Regulation on RTRW – After Advocacy**
Disaster Evacuation Routes & Locations	Not included in the article or attachment	Set out in Article 20 and Appendix XII as an evacuation network system
Disaster Prone Areas	Not regulated in detail	Article 72 mentions six types of disaster-prone areas (floods, landslides, earthquakes, forest fires, etc.)
Technical Requirements in Danger Zones	Not technically managing risk mitigation	It is mandatory to maintain vegetation, building distance, and have a geological study

Source: Analysis Results, 2025

Thus, this adoption process reflects the success of advocacy actors in shifting spatial planning policies from a normative-conventional approach to policies that are based on disaster risk and more adaptive to the dynamics of regional vulnerability. In a public policy perspective, this achievement marks the achievement of *the authoritative choice stage* of the policy cycle, where the substance of DRR has become part of a binding and mandatory regional regulatory instrument.

Implementation Change

In addition to the formal ratification of PRB substance in the RTRW document, another impact of the policy advocacy process is the emergence of changes in the implementation aspects of spatial planning policies. These changes not only include shifts in the contents of the document, but also the way institutions work, the roles between actors, and the procedures that apply in decision-making related to space utilization. In the advocacy framework of Gen & Wright (2013), this is referred to as implementation change, namely changes in institutional practices as a result of the transformation of policy substance.

The most prominent indication of implementation change in the context of Purwakarta is the increasing technical role of BPBD as an institution directly involved in the spatial utilization assessment process. If previously BPBD only played an incidental or consultative role, now its presence has been structurally recognized in the spatial planning process, as stated in Article 72 paragraph (5) of the draft regional regulation of the Purwakarta Regency RTRW:

> *"Every activity of utilizing space in disaster-prone areas must be based on a disaster risk study prepared by the authorities and approved by the technical agency that handles disaster affairs and the Spatial Planning Forum."*

This change not only strengthens the position of BPBD, but also marks the existence of a new validation mechanism based on disaster risk that was previously unavailable. This was also confirmed by one of the sources from DPUTR who stated:

"Now, if there is a request for information on the suitability of space utilization in disaster-prone areas, we must refer to BPBD first. This procedure has just been carried out, it never happened before."

The statement underscores a notable shift in policy implementation practices, particularly in the procedures for assessing and granting licenses for space utilization in areas identified as high-risk. This adjustment reflects a growing recognition of the need for more stringent, context-sensitive regulatory approaches that balance development objectives with risk mitigation (Pahl-Wostl et al., 2013). Beyond procedural refinement, the establishment of the Spatial Planning Forum as a cross-sector coordination mechanism represents a strategic move toward more collaborative governance. By bringing together stakeholders from different sectors and levels of government, the forum has the potential to strengthen evidence-based decision-making, harmonize policy perspectives, and ensure that spatial planning decisions are informed by comprehensive risk assessments.

However, the effectiveness of this forum will depend on its ability to move beyond symbolic coordination and foster genuine inter-agency cooperation (Bautista-Beauchesne, 2022). Without clear mandates, standardized data-sharing protocols, and measurable performance indicators, such forums risk becoming consultative in name only, offering limited impact on actual governance outcomes. Strengthening institutional accountability and ensuring consistent stakeholder engagement are therefore essential to translating this structural innovation into tangible improvements in spatial governance. The following summarizes the changes in implementation aspects as a result of PRB integration through the policy advocacy process:

Table 4. Aspects of Change Implementation in the Advocacy Process

Implementation Aspects	**Draft Regional Regulation on RTRW – Before Advocacy**	**Draft Regional Regulation on RTRW – After Advocacy**	**Evidence**
The Role of BPBD in Spatial Planning	Not formally mentioned in spatial planning procedures	Mandatory to provide technical recommendations in disaster-prone areas	Article 72 paragraph (5)
Functions of the Spatial Planning Forum	Inactive as a risk validation instrument	Functions as a validation forum for disaster risk-based spatial utilization	Regulated in the KKPR approval mechanism
Risk Assessment Obligation	Not required in space utilization permits	Mandatory for all development in disaster-prone areas to be the basis for licensing	Article 72 paragraph (5), Attachment XII

Source: Analysis Results, 2025

This change in the implementation system reflects a shift from a bureaucratic-sectoral approach to collaborative spatial governance of disaster risk. In this context, the DRR advocacy process has succeeded in encouraging the emergence of new mechanisms that ensure that disaster risk considerations do not stop at the planning level, but also influence the process of implementing and controlling space technically and administratively. Thus, implementation change is an important marker that the advocacy carried out has produced a structural and systemic influence on the governance of spatial planning policies in Purwakarta Regency.

Impact

In the policy advocacy framework, impact refers to the long-term results of policy advocacy that do not only stop at the long-term results of policy advocacy that do not only stop at changes in substance and implementation systems, but also touch on transformational aspects in

governance, planning culture, and community and regional preparedness for risk. The success of advocacy for the integration of DRR in spatial planning is not only reflected through formal adoption in the revision of the RTRW and procedural changes in implementation, but has begun to show indications of structural impacts on several important aspects of spatial planning and regional development policies.

Paradigm Shift in Regional Development

One of the main impacts that can be identified is the paradigm shift in regional development from an economic growth approach alone to a development model that considers disaster risk aspects (Mahadiansar et al., 2020; Nurikhsan et al., 2025). This is reflected in the use of disaster-prone area zoning as one of the main considerations in determining development locations. As conveyed by one of the speakers from Bapperida:

> *"If previously we viewed RTRW from the perspective of land function and growth, now disaster risk is also mining. If the area is prone to it, then it must be postponed or other options must be sought."*

This statement shows that the PRB content integrated into the RTRW is starting to form a new spatial planning logic that is more contextual to regional conditions and disaster potential.

More Adaptive Institutional Readiness

Another significant impact is the increase in institutional readiness, especially in terms of coordination between sectors and strengthening the capacity of technical institutions, such as BPBD and DPUTR. The active involvement of BPBD in the validation process of spatial utilization, as regulated in Article 72 paragraph (5) of the draft regional regulation of Purwakarta Regency RTRW, has increased the status of BPBD from a reactive institution to a strategic partner in regional development.

To this extent, the current structural development increases cross-sector collaboration opportunities that were originally available as informal or ad hoc agreements between the sectors. The official installation of the Spatial Planning Forum with a focus on assessing spatial uses through the prism of disaster risk is an indication of a move to incorporate elements of inclusivity by establishing the concept within the general spatial planning operations as an institutional environment. This is one critical understanding that spatial governance cannot be separated without risk management, especially in that area that is susceptible to natural hazards.

However, institutionalization of such forums is just the initial stage. Whether this integration becomes effective or not depends on whether the operation of the forum will go beyond procedure and consist of substantive risk-informed decision-making. Unless there are common methodologies of assessing the risks, clear accountability mechanisms across agencies, and worst of all, lack of consistency in resource allocations there is a risk that ideally what has been touted as inclusivity will never become a reality. The way forward For the Spatial Planning Forum to reach its full potential, it is vitally important not only to develop formal coordination but also collaborative data systems, common monitoring structures, and true sharing of power between the sectors so that the concept of disaster risk reduction should not be an add-on but an ingrained principle into spatial governance.

Impact on Derivative Documents and Policies

The integration of PRB in the RTRW also has the potential for *a multiplier effect* on other derivative policy documents, such as the Detailed Spatial Plan (RDTR), Strategic Environmental Assessment (KLHS) document, RPJMD, and other documents. Several sources said that the substance of PRB in the RTRW has begun to be used as a reference for the preparation of the RDTR and the formulation of disaster risk studies at the sub-district level. The Sub-Coordinator of Spatial Planning at the DPUTR stated:

ISSN 2776-1266 (print), 2776-1266 (online)

"RTRW is the main reference. If there is a disaster-prone zone there, then automatically it must be included in the RDTR. We just need to synchronize."

Thus, RTRW is not only a legal product, but also a strategic instrument in forming a policy ecosystem that is sensitive to disaster risks.

Potential for Increasing Long-Term Regional Resilience

Normatively, the integration of DRR in spatial planning aims to increase regional resilience to disasters. Although the real impact in the form of reduced losses due to disasters cannot be measured quantitatively in the short term, the policy direction that has been formed through the revision of the Purwakarta Regency RTRW provides a strong foundation for safer and more sustainable development. In other words, the revision of the Purwakarta Regency RTRW which has adopted the DRR principle creates a framework for regions to reduce exposure and vulnerability from the planning stage. This is theoretically in line with the principles of build back better and resilient spatial planning.

Based on the four dimensions above, it can be concluded that the advocacy process of DRR integration in spatial planning carried out by Purwakarta Regency has produced substantive impacts that are strategic and long-term. Although it still requires strengthening in terms of supervision and operationalization in the field, the integration of DRR in the revision of the Purwakarta Regency RTRW has proven to provide a real contribution in directing regional development that is more inclusive, collaborative, and responsive to disaster risks.

CONCLUSION

This study concludes that the integration of disaster risk reduction (DRR) into the revised Spatial Plan (RTRW) of Purwakarta Regency resulted from a strategic and adaptive advocacy process involving multiple policy actors. Guided by the Advocacy Logic Model, the research demonstrated that a combination of strong institutional agency, cross-sectoral collaboration, technical knowledge, and sustained engagement enabled the effective translation of disaster risk narratives into planning regulations. The advocacy strategies, coalition building, policy engagement, public mobilization, and defensive actions, contributed to the inclusion of risk-based zoning and spatially explicit disaster data in the new RTRW, marking a shift toward anticipatory spatial governance. These findings imply that policy integration requires more than regulatory mandates; it depends on the alignment of actor motivations and institutional structures. For local governments, this means investing not only in technical planning tools but also in inclusive and strategic policy processes. This study contributes to the advancement of public policy and disaster governance literature by showing how embedded, multi-actor advocacy can shape risk-informed planning, especially in decentralized and disaster-prone contexts.

SUGGESTION

Future research may further explore how advocacy dynamics interact with legal, political, and community-based drivers in shaping spatial development policies.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The author would like to express sincere gratitude to all stakeholders in the Purwakarta Regency Government, particularly the Department of Public Works and Spatial Planning (DPUTR), the Regional Development Planning, Research, and Innovation Agency (Bapperida), the Regional Disaster Management Agency (BPBD), and all technical experts, for their valuable time, insights, and access to key planning documents during the research process. Special thanks are also extended to the Master of Public Policy Program at Universitas Padjadjaran, especially the thesis supervisors, for their continuous academic guidance, constructive feedback, and encouragement throughout the research. This study was conducted independently without external funding.

REFERENCES

Bautista-Beauchesne, N. (2022). Building anti-corruption agency collaboration and reputation: Hanging together or separately hanged. *Regulation & Governance*, *16*(4), 1399-1419. https://doi.org/10.1111/rego.12433

Bibri, S. E. (2021). Data-driven smart sustainable urbanism: the intertwined societal factors underlying its materialization, success, expansion, and evolution. *GeoJournal*, *86*(1), 43-68. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10708-019-10061-x

Dandoulaki, M., Lazoglou, M., Pangas, N., & Serraos, K. (2023). Disaster risk management and spatial planning: evidence from the Fire-Stricken Area of Mati, Greece. *Sustainability*, *15*(12), 9776. https://doi.org/10.3390/su15129776

Del Pinto, M., Chmutina, K., Palaiologou, F., & Bosher, L. (2024). The role of the Spatial Network in Urban Disaster Risk variations: reimagining the notion of spatial vulnerability at the Urban Scale. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Science*, *15*(3), 303-316. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13753-024-00554-w

Elgin, D. J., & Weible, C. M. (2013). A Stakeholder Analysis of C olorado Climate and Energy Issues Using Policy Analytical Capacity and the Advocacy Coalition Framework. *Review of Policy Research*, *30*(1), 114-133. https://doi.org/10.1111/ropr.12005

Farinós-Dasí, J., Pinazo-Dallenbach, P., Peiró Sánchez-Manjavacas, E., & Rodríguez-Bernal, D. C. (2024). Disaster risk management, climate change adaptation and the role of spatial and urban planning: evidence from European case studies. *Natural Hazards*, 1-34. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11069-024-06448-w

Gen, S., & Wright, A. C. (2013). Policy advocacy organizations: A framework linking theory and practice. *Journal of Policy Practice*, *12*(3), 163-193. https://doi.org/10.1080/15588742.2013.795477

Inch, A. (2012). Deconstructing spatial planning: re-interpreting the articulation of a new ethos for English local planning. *European Planning Studies*, *20*(6), 1039-1057. https://doi.org/10.1080/09654313.2012.673564

Khan, M. T. I., Anwar, S., & Batool, Z. (2022). The role of infrastructure, socio-economic development, and food security to mitigate the loss of natural disasters. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, *29*(35), 52412-52437. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-022-19293-w

Mahadiansar, M., Ikhsan, K., Sentanu, I. G. E. P. S., & Aspariyana, A. (2020). Paradigma pengembangan model pembangunan nasional Di Indonesia. *Jurnal Ilmu Administrasi: Media Pengembangan Ilmu Dan Praktek Administrasi*, *17*(1), 77-92. https://doi.org/10.31113/jia.v17i1.550

Nasution, A. K., & Kosasih, N. (2025). Analisis Naratif Kampanye Jerhemy Owen tentang Pengelolaan Sampah Banyumas di Media Sosial. *Publish: Basic and Applied Research Publication on Communications*, *4*(1), 90-104. https://doi.org/10.35814/njqv4z74

Nurikhsan, M., Kamaruddin, S. A., & Awaru, A. O. T. (2025). Evolusi Paradigma Respon Sosial terhadap Bencana: Analisis Literatur dari Pendekatan Reaktif ke Proaktif. *Journal Of Administrative And Social Science*, *6*(2), 78-87. https://doi.org/10.55606/jass.v6i2.1934

Orsini, A., & Compagnon, D. (2013). From logics to procedures: arguing within international environmental negotiations. *Critical policy studies*, *7*(3), 273-291. https://doi.org/10.1080/19460171.2012.752970

ISSN 2776-1266 (print), 2776-1266 (online)

Paasi, A. (2013). Regional planning and the mobilization of 'regional identity': From bounded spaces to relational complexity. *Regional studies*, *47*(8), 1206-1219. https://doi.org/10.1080/00343404.2012.661410

Pahl-Wostl, C., Palmer, M., & Richards, K. (2013). Enhancing water security for the benefits of humans and nature—the role of governance. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*, *5*(6), 676-684. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cosust.2013.10.018

Preston, B. L., Yuen, E. J., & Westaway, R. M. (2011). Putting vulnerability to climate change on the map: a review of approaches, benefits, and risks. *Sustainability science*, *6*(2), 177-202. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11625-011-0129-1

Rozita, S. G., & Setiadi, R. (2020). Kerangka kerja penilaian rencana tata ruang berbasis manajemen risiko bencana. *Region: Jurnal Pembangunan Wilayah dan Perencanaan Partisipatif*, *15*(2), 189-205. https://doi.org/10.20961/region.v15i2.38451

Schut, M., van Paassen, A., Leeuwis, C., & Klerkx, L. (2014). Towards dynamic research configurations: A framework for reflection on the contribution of research to policy and innovation processes. *Science and public policy*, *41*(2), 207-218. https://doi.org/10.1093/scipol/sct048

Sina, D., Chang-Richards, A. Y., Wilkinson, S., & Potangaroa, R. (2019). What does the future hold for relocated communities post-disaster? Factors affecting livelihood resilience. *International journal of disaster risk reduction*, *34*, 173-183. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdrr.2018.11.015

Stern, R. J., Scholl, D. W., & Fryer, G. (2016). An introduction to convergent margins and their natural hazards. *Plate boundaries and natural hazards*, 77-98. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119054146.ch4

Suprapto, N., & Rizki, I. A. (2024). Evaluation of Geohazards Research in the World and Pacific Region: A Comparative Bibliometric Study. *The Iraqi Geological Journal*, 143-161. https://doi.org/10.46717/igj.57.2A.11ms-2024-7-21

Umar, F. Q., Tawakkal, G. T. I., & Sobari, W. (2023). Analisis Kepemimpinan Politik BUMDes Kerto Raharjo Dalam Meningkatkan Kesejahteraan Masyarakat Ekowisata Boonpring. *Satwika: Kajian Ilmu Budaya dan Perubahan Sosial*, *7*(2), 419-446. https://doi.org/10.22219/satwika.v7i2.28072

Weber, K. M., & Rohracher, H. (2012). Legitimizing research, technology and innovation policies for transformative change: Combining insights from innovation systems and multi-level perspective in a comprehensive 'failures' framework. *Research policy*, *41*(6), 1037-1047. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2011.10.015

Yanuari, F. S. Y., & Prangsi, D. (2020). Kajian Yuridis Efektivitas Penegakan Hukum Pidana Dalam UU Nomor 26 Tahun 2007 tentang Penataan Ruang. *Padjadjaran Law Review*, *8*(2), 27-40.

ISSN 2776-1266 (print), 2776-1266 (online)