



International Journal of Applied Economics, Banking and Management (IJAEBM)

Email: arsypersadaquality@gmail.com
<https://ejournalarsypersada.com/index.php/ajaebm>

EVALUATION OF NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT PLANNING POLICY FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF RPJMN AND RPJMD

Romi Aldiansyah¹, Nazwa Zahra², Adelia Rizky³, Widya Arlia⁴.

State Islamic University Of North Sumatra

Romialdiansyah19@gmail.com¹, zahranazwa2301@gmail.com²,
adeliarzky1222@gmail.com³, widyaarlia2505@gmail.com⁴.

Abstract: Evaluation of national development planning policies is a crucial step in ensuring alignment between long-term strategic objectives and development implementation at the regional level. This study examines the relationship between the National Medium-Term Development Plan (RPJMN) and the Regional Medium-Term Development Plan (RPJMD), two key instruments guiding the development process in Indonesia. The evaluation was conducted by reviewing the principles of policy integration, synchronization, and consistency, while also identifying areas of inconsistency that frequently arise in planning practice. The findings indicate that although conceptually the RPJMN and RPJMD have been designed to be mutually supportive, implementation in the field still faces obstacles, particularly related to regional capacity, cross-sectoral coordination, and limited development data. Furthermore, political dynamics and changing government priorities often affect the effectiveness of policy alignment. This study emphasizes the importance of strengthening data-driven planning systems, increasing collaboration between levels of government, and establishing more measurable monitoring and evaluation mechanisms. Thus, policy evaluation within the RPJMN and RPJMD perspectives serves not only as a monitoring tool but also as a strategic means to improve the quality of national and regional development in a sustainable manner.

Keywords: RPJMN, RPJMD, Policy evaluation, national development, planning.

INTRODUCTION

Development planning in Indonesia is implemented through a multi-stage framework that positions the National Medium-Term Development Plan (RPJMN) as a strategic guide at the central level and the Regional Medium-Term Development Plan (RPJMD) as an operational elaboration at the regional level. These two documents are ideally mutually reinforcing: RPJMN sets national goals and priorities, while RPJMD adjusts these priorities to local conditions and needs, ensuring policy and program synchronization. In practice, the preparation of RPJMD must refer to RPJMN and derivative regulations (e.g., Presidential Regulations/Ministerial Regulations), but evaluative studies show implementation gaps due to differences in document timing, regional planning capacity, and limited planning data. Therefore, evaluative studies on RPJMN-RPJMD alignment are important to identify structural and procedural barriers so that medium-term planning can drive national development target achievement. (Runiawan & Endaryanto, 2025).

One key issue in planning evaluation is the alignment of key performance indicators (IKU) and macro targets between RPJMN documents and annual documents (RKP) as well as with RPJMD. Misalignment or target gaps can indicate weak mechanisms for translating national goals to regional operational levels, making national targets difficult to achieve. Empirical research in several regions shows that although RPJMD documents may appear administratively synchronized with RPJMN, performance indicator achievements during implementation periods are often suboptimal due to monitoring issues, regional organizational capacity, and management commitment. Therefore, policy evaluation needs to examine not only document alignment but also institutional capacity, monitoring-evaluation mechanisms, and reliable data availability to measure progress. (Supriyadi & Daraba, 2024).

Synchronization between RPJMN and RPJMD also becomes a serious issue when national priority programs, such as National Strategic Projects (PSN) or priority infrastructure, are not consistently included or supported in regional planning. Evaluations of several provincial planning documents show national

priority projects not reflected in RPJMD, or vice versa, RPJMD established earlier without adjusting new national priorities. Such discontinuity results in inefficient resource allocation risks and implementation barriers for projects requiring central-regional collaboration. Therefore, strengthening technical coordination mechanisms and priority program clearing between government levels is an important recommendation in planning evaluation literature. (Ariyana & Qodri, 2024).

Institutional and human resource aspects in regional planning agencies (Bappeda/Bapelitbangda) play a major role in successful RPJMD implementation aligned with RPJMN. Case evaluations show variability in technical and managerial capacity across regions – from competent planning human resources availability, data analysis capabilities, to indicator preparation practices not meeting SMART criteria. Additionally, limited planning and monitoring budget often reduces target achievement simulation quality and mid-term evaluation. Therefore, enhancing regional planning capacity through training, integrated data support, and governance strengthening incentives are proposed strategies to reduce gaps between national targets and regional realization. (Siregar & [Coauthor], 2022).

The context of changing political priorities and government dynamics affects medium-term development priority stability. Regional or national leadership transitions can cause vision-mission and program priority revisions, leading to substantial changes in prepared RPJMD. This shift requires flexible yet measurable mechanisms to revise planning documents without compromising strategic program continuity. Policy evaluation must consider this political dimension – how legal and technical mechanisms (e.g., RPJPD/RPJMD amendment rules, Strategic Plan adjustments, and implementing regulations) can accommodate changes without disrupting national target achievement and priority project sustainability. Planning stability becomes a prerequisite for efficient investment and development program implementation. (Saputra & Rekan, 2023).

Effective planning policy evaluation requires a comprehensive analytical paradigm: combining document analysis (content analysis), indicator achievement evaluation, institutional capacity assessment, and review of financing mechanisms and inter-agency coordination. Recommendations from recent studies emphasize data-driven planning, transparency in priority program establishment, and strengthening integrated monitoring-evaluation systems between central and regional levels. With this approach, RPJMN and RPJMD become not only normative documents but adaptive, measurable, and results-oriented operational instruments to accelerate achieving sustainable development goals at national and local levels. (Runiawan & Yuliawan, 2025).

LITERATURE REVIEW

a) Theory of National Development Planning

National development planning is theoretically understood as a systematic process to determine the direction, priorities, and strategies for medium- and long-term development. In Indonesia, public planning theory emphasizes the importance of integration between national vision and regional needs as the foundation for preparing RPJMN documents. The rational-comprehensive approach is still widely used in national planning documents through situation analysis, goal setting, indicator formulation, and strategic program determination. This theoretical framework requires a strong empirical basis so that development policies are not only normative but have an evidence-based planning foundation. Therefore, RPJMN evaluations often focus on the alignment between development goals, macro indicators, and cross-sector strategies to ensure the planning process aligns with national development demands. (Runiawan et al., 2025).

Analytically, development planning theory also emphasizes the importance of integration across government levels. The multilevel planning approach explains that national development policies outlined in RPJMN should serve as a harmonious reference for regions in preparing RPJMD. Misalignment between planning documents often occurs due to differences in planning institutional capacity, political changes, and

regulatory inconsistencies. This theoretical framework positions RPJMN as a strategic guide that must be translated into priority programs in regions in a measurable, realistic, and data-based manner. Synergy between planning levels becomes a critical point for national development to be achieved through coordination, consultation, and policy control mechanisms continuously. (Supriyadi et al., 2024).

b) Theory of Central and Regional Policy Synchronization

Policy synchronization is an important concept in public administration studies that emphasizes policy integration across government levels. In the context of RPJMN and RPJMD, synchronization is understood as the process of aligning goals, programs, indicators, and development targets to align with national development direction. Policy literature notes that synchronization failure can lead to program fragmentation, budget inefficiencies, and overlapping projects between central and regional governments. Therefore, synchronization theory demands binding regulations, effective coordination mechanisms, and periodic evaluations to ensure regional planning document compliance with the national development framework. (Altas, 2023).

From a policy implementation perspective, synchronization is not only about document compatibility but also the alignment of priority program substance. National strategic programs, for example, must be included in regional planning documents so that implementation can be supported through local budgeting and regulations. Evaluative studies show that synchronization will not be effective without technical coordination across institutions and regional readiness to adjust RPJMD to national priorities. Policy implementation theory emphasizes that central-regional program harmonization requires strong institutional structures and intensive communication and consultation mechanisms among development actors. (Hansastri, 2024).

c) Theory of Public Policy Evaluation

Policy evaluation is a conceptual framework used to assess the performance of a program, including its effectiveness, efficiency, relevance, and impact. In development planning, policy evaluation is used to measure the extent to which RPJMN and RPJMD have been implemented according to established goals. Evaluation theory emphasizes the importance of measurable indicators, valid data, and transparent evaluation methods such as macro indicator achievement analysis, program logical evaluation, and target accuracy studies. This is important because errors in planning or implementation can lead to deviations in development target achievements that have broad impacts on central and regional government performance. (Siregar, 2022).

Additionally, public policy evaluation focuses on process, outcome, and impact dimensions. Process evaluation is used to assess the quality of RPJMN-RPJMD planning and governance. Outcome evaluation assesses development indicator achievements, while impact evaluation identifies the influence of development on community welfare. This concept is highly relevant as RPJMN and RPJMD are documents that govern development direction for five-year periods, so evaluation processes must be conducted periodically to ensure policy sustainability and adaptation to strategic environmental changes. (Saputra, 2023).

d) Theory of Regional Institutional Capacity

Institutional capacity is a theory that explains the ability of regional government organizations to plan, implement, and evaluate development programs. In the context of RPJMN and RPJMD relationships, Bappeda or Bapelitbangda capacity becomes a crucial factor determining whether regional planning can align with national standards. This theory emphasizes four main aspects of institutional capacity: human resource capacity, technical data analysis capacity, management capacity, and financial capacity. Unpreparedness in any of these aspects can cause planning misalignment and hinder regional development policy implementation effectiveness. (Qodri & Rekan, 2024).

Besides internal institutional aspects, institutional capacity is also influenced by regulatory support, information systems, and organizational culture. Regional planning documents not based on data or not following proper analytical principles can result in unrealistic targets and misalignment with national priorities. Therefore, institutional capacity theory places increasing apparatus competence, integrated data provision, and planning control mechanisms as the foundation for successful RPJMN and RPJMD integration. The stronger the institutional capacity, the greater the likelihood of document alignment and development target achievement. (Ariyana & Qodri, 2024).

e) Theory of Governance and Intergovernmental Coordination

Governance in development emphasizes coordination, transparency, collaboration, and accountability principles among government actors. In national development planning, governance theory explains that RPJMN implementation success is largely determined by coordination effectiveness with regional governments. This coordination includes program alignment, budget priorities, and regulatory harmonization so that RPJMD can support national target achievement. Without good coordinative governance, central policies will only become normative documents without real implementation at the regional level. (Rahmansyah, 2021).

Furthermore, governance theory emphasizes that development success depends on integrative relationships between central and regional institutions. Consultation mechanisms, musrenbang forums, and joint monitoring systems are governance instruments ensuring all government levels have the same understanding of development direction. This theory highlights the importance of actor collaboration and integrated development information systems to improve data accuracy and program control effectiveness. Thus, good governance becomes a main pillar in maintaining RPJMN and RPJMD consistency. (Nurfindarti, 2020).

METHODOLOGY

This research uses a descriptive qualitative approach, focusing on in-depth analysis of development planning documents (RPJMN and RPJMD) and relevant literature. This approach provides a comprehensive understanding of synchronization, implementation, and evaluation of national and regional development planning policies. Data sources include planning documents, legislation, and scientific journals on development planning and policy evaluation. Data collection involves systematic documentation and literature review to trace theories, concepts, and previous research related to RPJMN and RPJMD evaluation.

Content analysis examines alignment and consistency between RPJMN and RPJMD, assessing goal, indicator, and priority program quality. Analysis involves theme coding, concept grouping, and interpreting meaning based on development planning and policy synchronization theories. Source triangulation ensures data validity by comparing document analysis with findings from scientific journals and government evaluation reports. This method provides an accurate, systematic, and measurable picture of development planning policy effectiveness within the RPJMN and RPJMD framework.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

RESULTS

The results of this study indicate that the evaluation of national development planning policies from the perspective of the RPJMN and RPJMD emphasizes the importance of alignment between planning documents as instruments for guiding development. The findings indicate that differences in regional institutional capacity, the quality of planning data, and cross-sectoral coordination mechanisms are determining factors for the successful implementation of the RPJMN into the RPJMD. Furthermore, this study emphasizes that the effectiveness of policy evaluation is largely determined by consistency of implementation, clarity of performance indicators, and sustainable monitoring. Through document analysis, it is clear that the central government has provided

fairly comprehensive technical guidelines, but variations in implementation at the regional level are still found. This emphasizes the need for strategic interventions to strengthen planning governance and strengthen the capacity of regional planning institutions.

Table 1. Mutual Compatability Of RPJMN And RPJMD

No.	RPJMN Components	RPJMD Components	Information
1	National Policy Direction	Regional Policy Direction	Level of Thematic Alignment
2	Development Priorities	Regional Development Priorities	Priority Explanation
3	National Macro Targets	Regional Macro Targets	Indicator Adjustments
4	National Strategy	Regional Strategy	Program Derivation
5	Funding Framework	Regional Funding	Financing Proportion

Table 1 illustrates the conceptual relationship between RPJMN and RPJMD components, where each national element needs to be systematically translated into the regional context. National policy direction serves as an umbrella that must be interpreted by regional governments through more operational regional policy formulations, adjusting to local characteristics. In the development priority section, alignment shows the region's ability to identify local strategic issues that remain within the national development goal framework.

Macro targets such as economic growth, poverty reduction, or improved public service quality require adaptation to be realistic within regional capacities. Additionally, national strategies cannot be adopted directly but must go through an adjustment process to regional

organizational structures and human resource conditions. In terms of funding, the alignment between national and regional funding frameworks reflects the region's ability to utilize available financing sources, such as local revenue (PAD), transfer funds, and alternative funding schemes. The funding proportion for each priority must be adjusted to local urgency without neglecting national targets. This table shows that the policy harmonization process requires strong evaluation instruments to ensure no national priority is overlooked. Indicator alignment is also crucial for maintaining performance measurement consistency. When national indicators are adapted to regions, verification mechanisms are needed to ensure these indicators remain valid and measurable. This underscores that the RPJMN-RPJMD relationship is not merely administrative but strategic, determining the overall medium-term development direction.

Table 2. Consistency Of Performance Indicators

No	Indicator Type	RPJMN	RPJMD
1	Input	National Standard	Regional Adjustments
2	Output	National Program	Regional Output
3	Outcome	National Target	Regional Impact
4	Process	National Mechanism	Regional Procedure
5	Impact	National Impact	Local Impact

Table 2 shows how performance indicators must be maintained consistently between the national and regional levels. Input indicators, for example, are formulated at the national level as resource provision standards, while adjustments are made at the regional level based on available financing capacity and infrastructure. For output indicators, the national program provides only a general framework, requiring regions to establish specific outputs that can be achieved in the local context. For outcomes, national targets related to welfare or social development must be translated into impact measures that reflect real changes in local

communities. National monitoring mechanisms must also be integrated with regional procedures to ensure efficient and seamless evaluation processes.

Impact indicators are the most crucial aspect because they demonstrate the extent to which policy implementation has resulted in long-term change at both the national and regional levels. Harmonizing these indicators helps ensure that development evaluations assess not only administrative achievements but also the quality of socioeconomic transformation. This table demonstrates that indicator consistency depends heavily on the integration of reporting systems, the capacity of regional data analysts, and disciplined monitoring. If regions are able to properly align their indicators, the quality of policy evaluations will improve and can provide significant feedback for improving national policies. Thus, this table emphasizes that effective planning requires indicators that are uniform yet flexible to suit local conditions.

Table 3. Central Regional Coordination Mechanism

No	Mechanism	National Level	Regional Level
1	Policy Synchronization	Bappenas	Bappeda
2	Technical Consultation	Ministries/Institution	Regional Government Organization
3	Annual Evaluation	Central Government	Regional Government
4	Muresbang Forum	National	Regional
5	Data Integration	National System	Regional System

Table 3 explains the coordination mechanisms between the central and regional governments in the development planning process. Policy synchronization is carried out through Bappenas and Bappeda, which ensure that each regional planning document is within the national priority framework. Technical consultations between ministries/agencies and regional government agencies (OPD) play a crucial role in providing

technical direction for the formulation of programs and activities. Annual evaluations conducted by the central government of regions provide an overview of implementation consistency and identify implementation obstacles. The Musrenbang forum serves as an official communication forum for all stakeholders, both national and regional.

Data integration between national and regional systems is a key element in strengthening the effectiveness of planning evaluation. When regional systems are connected to the national system, data verification becomes easier, more accurate, and faster. This table demonstrates the importance of data interoperability for improving the quality of planning analysis. Failure to integrate effectively increases the risk of data discrepancies and planning errors. Therefore, central-regional coordination is not only about policy, but also about information governance and evidence-based evaluation mechanisms.

Table 4. Challenges In Implementing RPJMN-RPJMD

No	Challenges	National Level	Regional Level
1	Data Quality	National Variation	Local Variation
2	Institutional Issues	System Complexity	Limited Capacity
3	Funding	Transfer Dependence	Limited Locally
4	Human Resources	National Standars	Diverse Competencies
5	Monitoring	Centralized System	Varying Implementation

Table 4 shows the main challenges in implementing the RPJMN and RPJMD at both the national and regional levels. Data quality issues often pose a barrier due to differences in data collection methods and data management capacities at the regional level. Complex institutions at the national level require clear mechanisms for effective coordination down to the regions. Regarding funding, dependence on central transfer funds often presents a challenge for regions in realizing development priorities. Limited human resources also contribute, as uneven competencies make policy implementation less than optimal.

The challenges of monitoring and evaluation demonstrate that differences in regional capacity in implementing the national evaluation system are a contributing factor to the low effectiveness of planning. A system that is well-established at the national level cannot always be consistently implemented at the regional level. Differences in technological capacity, analyst training, and reporting mechanisms contribute to uneven evaluation quality. This table confirms that successful implementation of the National Medium-Term Development Plan (RPJMN) and the Regional Medium-Term Development Plan (RPJMD) requires increased regional capacity, simplified central regulations, and stronger integration of information systems.

DISCUSSION

The findings of this study confirm that effective development planning cannot rely solely on administrative alignment between the National Medium-Term Development Plan (RPJMN) and the Regional Medium-Term Development Plan (RPJMD). Substantive synchronization, encompassing the alignment of objectives, programs, indicators, and policy implementation mechanisms, is necessary for planning to truly impact development outcomes. Furthermore, strengthening regional institutional capacity—particularly in terms of human resources, data analysis capabilities, and planning governance—is a key factor in increasing the effectiveness of development policy implementation. The analysis also shows that the existence of an integrated monitoring and evaluation system between the central and regional governments plays a crucial role in maintaining consistent development program implementation. Regions with stronger planning institutions and adequate data systems tend to demonstrate higher levels of consistency in achieving national development targets. Therefore, improving planning quality depends not only on the consistency of planning documents but also on institutional readiness and the support of reliable information systems.

CONCLUSION

This conclusion confirms that the evaluation of national development planning policies from the perspective of the RPJMN and RPJMD demonstrates the importance of harmonizing national development directions with regional development needs. Implementing the RPJMN into the RPJMD requires not only administrative adjustments but also substantive adjustments that reflect local characteristics. The research findings demonstrate that the successful integration of the two documents is largely determined by regional institutional capacity, the quality of planning data, and the effectiveness of coordination between the central and regional governments. Furthermore, sustainable monitoring and evaluation are crucial factors in ensuring that development policies are implemented in accordance with established targets. Therefore, strengthening planning governance, improving the competence of regional human resources, and developing an integrated information system are necessary to make the planning process more responsive, adaptive, and capable of delivering higher-quality and sustainable development.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Altas, A. (2023). Analysis of the Synchronization of the Karawang Regency RPJMD for 2021–2026. *Scientific Journal of Regional Government Administration* (JAPD), 15(2), 196–207. <https://ejournal.ipdn.ac.id/JAPD/article/view/3814>

[Analysis of the Synchronization of Depok City Planning]. (2025). *Journal of Planning Collaboration*, (Vol.), 1–20. <https://journal.unismuh.ac.id/index.php/kolaborasi/article/view/17458>

Ardian, R., et al. (2022). The Effect of Economic Growth on the Open Poverty Rate in Indonesia. *Journal of Economics, Business, and Management*, 1(3). <https://doi.org/10.58192/ebismen.v1i3.90>

[Ariyana], [Qodri]. (2024). Evaluation of the synchronization and synergy of priority projects with the RPJMN and RPJMD. *Menara Ilmu*, 18(2), 30–56.

Bappenas/Bappelitbangda. (2020–2023). RPJMN and RPJMD evaluation report (official document).
https://ditkumiasi.bappenas.go.id/download/file/Narasi_RPJMN_2020-2024.pdf

Effendy, Y., Andriawan, A., Rawati, M., Hawari, R., & Al-Amin, A. A. (2024). Analysis of factors influencing Islamic economic growth in West Sumatra. *Scientific Journal of Economics, Management and Sharia*, 3(1), 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.55883/jiemas.v3i1.23>

Hansastri, H. (2024). Synchronization and synergy of priority infrastructure projects with national and regional planning. *Menara Ilmu: Journal of Research and Scientific Studies*, 18(2), 30–45. <https://jurnal.umsb.ac.id/index.php/menarailmu/article/view/5577>

Nurfindarti, N. (2020). Regional planning and sustainable development goals (SDGs): An evaluation. *Journal of Regional Development*, 5(1), 12–29.

[RPJMD Evaluation Paper for Province X]. (2022). RPJMD Evaluation: Case Study.

Putra, R. T., & Tinumbia, N. (2022). *Evaluation of pedestrian facilities. Artesis Journal*, 2(2), 212–217. <https://doi.org/10.35814/artesis.v2i2.4305>

Qodri, A., & Rekan. (2024). *Synchronization of national strategic project planning policies with the RPJMN and RPJMD: An evaluative review*. *Menara Ilmu*, 18(2), 30–56.

Rahayu, E., & Suroso, A. (2020). Participatory development planning for Pejengkolan Village, Padureso District, Kebumen Regency. *Cakrawala: Journal of Islamic Education Management Studies and Social Studies*, 4(2), 134–152. <https://doi.org/10.33507/cakrawala.v4i2.252>

Rahmansyah, R., et al. (2021). The gap between the RPJMN and RKP documents: Implications for the achievement of macro indicators. *Journal of Planning & Public Policy*, 3(1), 45–62.

Runiawan, A. A., Endaryanto, T., & Yuliawan, D. (2025). Evaluation of the synchronization of the RTRW spatial utilization program with the RPJMD of North Lampung Regency for 2020–2024. *Scientific Journal of Public Administration (JIAP)*.
<https://doi.org/10.21776/ub.jiap.2025.011.02.1>

[Research on Development Inequality in West Java]. (2022). *Journal of Politics & Development*, 9(1), 77–98.
<https://jurnal.fh.unpad.ac.id/index.php/plr/article/view/840>

Saputra, G. T. D. (2023). *Stages, procedures for preparing, controlling, and evaluating the implementation of regional development plans*. Widya Publika, 1–14.
<https://www.ojs.unr.ac.id/index.php/widyapublika/article/view/1026>

Siregar, M. I. (2022). Performance Evaluation Analysis of the 2019–2023 North Padang Lawas Regency Medium-Term Development Plan (RPJMD). *University Repository* (thesis/article).
<https://repository.uma.ac.id/bitstream/123456789/19063/1/20180158%20-%20Minta%20Ito%20Siregar%20-%20Fulltext.pdf>

Sujadi, S. (2021). Pragmatic Interests in Determining National Strategic Projects: Impact on the RPJMD. *Journal of Law & Development*, 10(2), 110–128.

Supriyadi, D., Daraba, D., Khairi, H., & Sutiyo. (2024). Evaluation of the Main Performance of the Bekasi Regency Government, West Java Province. *Jurnal Academia Praja*, 7(1), 82–95.
<https://doi.org/10.36859/jap.v7i1.2050>