

**GOVERNANCE: STATIC, DYNAMIC, AND CHAOTIC**Riant Nugroho<sup>1</sup>, Agustina Setiawan<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1,2</sup> Program Studi Ilmu Pemerintahan, Fakultas Ilmu Sosial dan Ilmu Politik  
Universitas Jenderal Achmad Yani

Alamat email Koresponden: [riant.nugroho@lecture.unjani.ac.id](mailto:riant.nugroho@lecture.unjani.ac.id)**ABSTRACT**

*Governance is the key success of Government. The reforming governance among developing countries is difficult, costly, and exhausted. It was caused by the less-comprehensive of the understanding of governance itself. There are three types or mode of governance, historically: static, dynamic, and chaotic. The static is governance concept which was develop in 1980s and still as mainstream until today practices among Government, includes in Indonesia. The finding of the second types of dynamic governance has been introduced, but in fact it was facing some new challenges from character of the people to the policy. Some countries with factor of a fit culture for dynamic governance are effectively able to develop the capabilities to exercise governance. Some other countries do not have, or they have but insufficient. Chaotic governance is the new imperative for today and tomorrow government. It is governance in the digital age. Scholars and leaders of Governments need to have a same premise and commitment to use the recent technology of digital profoundly.*

**Keywords:** *governance, static-dynamic-chaotic, new global challenge*

**INTRODUCTION**

*Governance is a way of governing. Governance is about power exercised by a Government. It is about how sound and accountable it is. However, governance what we knew today is a neo-liberalist concept. It was started in 1980s when PM Thatcher of UK pronounced that Government should reduce its power to manage the (public) administration, while invite business-players (market) to take over some of the government's share. Privatization then became the new word of managing the nation (Bevir, 2007). Therefore, The World Bank's approach on governance is how government shares their power with market –and then civil society. The World Bank has the recent definition that governance as the traditions and institutions by which authority in a country is exercised. This includes (a) the process by*

*which governments are selected. monitored and replaced; (b) the capacity of the government to effectively formulate and implement sound policies; and (c) the respect of citizens and the state for the institutions that govern economic and social interactions among them (Kaufmann & Kraay, 2023). However, the triangle of government-market-civil society was becoming “a belief” on governance primary concept around the world. The anti-neoliberalist is also being part of the understanding, as they, civil society activist, have another part of “cake” of government power sharing.*

*What we need today is to understand the sound understanding of governance. Indeed, governance is how Government using the power soundly and performing (Kaufmann & Kraay, 2023). It means Government has to be performed, as it has sound in carrying out the political power and its associated ones. The performance of Government is a never-ending public request, and every Government’s leader relentlessly strives for it (Nugroho, Public Policy, 2018 ). The performance of Government is measured by their ability to deliver excellent public policies and high quality public services (Nugroho, 2012). Therefore, the recent understanding of governance is about government invite public participation in the policy process. As Bhatta noted that governance is the relationship between governments and citizens that enable public policies and programs to be formulated, implemented, and evaluated (Bhatta, 2015). It makes the policy process transforming from “a black box” into a “transparent box”.*

*They way policy have been developing excellently and public services delivered in high quality is the core issue of governance. Therefore we found the issue of “Voice and Acoountability, Political Stability and Absence of Violence, Government effectiveness, Regulatory Quality, Rule of Law, and Control of Corruption”. The problem is the understanding of governance has been driven into a neoliberal approach alone, by the global trend (and push) on public private partnership (PPP) as the twin brother’s of privatization. Government which is not promoting PPP as their core economic policy was assumed by “global economic policy driver” as a less sound governance of a Government. If privatization means government is giving their ownership in state owned enterprises to the private sectors. mostly to the global players (Nugroho & Wrihatnolo, 2006), while PPP means government is giving their monopolistic-services the private sectors while provide subsidy through “public service obligation” scheme (Farquharson, 2018) (Nugroho, 2011).*

*Therefore, the issue in managing Government performing is becoming the core issue of governance. Public policy is still becoming government monopoly, even in the many developing countries, it is becoming more in participating mode that before. But, public services is becoming the contesting issue whether it would be inside government ownership and and practices, or giving (more than transforming) to the private sector by privatization and PPP. It was unsolved yet, as the practicing policy is under split understanding between “Government goodness” of “Private goodness” (Nugroho, Research and Multistakeholder Dialogues in Indonesia's Water & Sanitation, 2011). Governance means better governance; and better governance means government runs as business. A failed understanding as noted by Jim Collins that we must reject the idea – well-intentioned. but dead wrong – that the primary path to greatness in the social sectors is to become more like a business; to reject the belief, common among politicians, that all would be well in society if only the public sector operated more like the private sector (Collins, 2005).*

*By having governance quality, a Government might transform the nation, the country, and the people in the the winning one. A global positions that make them have a high standing for every “bargaining”, means in politics, economy, social, and cultural. The strategic position to bargain make their people enjoy global welfare compare to the others. It might be acknowledged, that the quality of governance is going beyond democracy. PR China and Singapore under Lee Kuan Yew, perhaps, are not a democratic countries, but the as the governance is taking place, therefore the countries are becoming world exceptions. Therefore, the fanatic of democracy is “fighting back” by developing a concept of “democratic governance”; it a concept that inducing democratic process in practicing governance as the best mode of any governance (Bevir, 2010).*

*In sum, governance is a “mode” of performing and accountable Government, regardless political system they have. It might be democratic, non-democratic, Pancasila, or other political system. Therefore, the issue of government is rather a managerial and technical issue than political one. The question is what kind of governance we might have today and tomorrow.*

## **RESEARCH METHODS**

*The research method used is descriptive qualitative, with reinforcement from literature studies. Primary data is collected through documentation.*

*Meanwhile secondary data was obtained from relevant literature, books, photos and documents. The validity of the data is tested through triangulation of sources, techniques and time, increasing consistency in data collection. The data analysis process includes data compression, data presentation, and drawing conclusions.*

### **THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK**

*Michiel S. de Vries and Pan Suk Kim (2011) and Charles Garofalo (2011) found that the “Accountable Government” is a government which able to deliver value to the society. There are, at least, three types of society by value measurement. A high value society is a society who able to produces, maintains, and develops their best assets, potencies, and opportunities to create their social realities become the winning one. On the contrary, a low value society is a society who unable to to what high value society can do. However, the low value society might learn to become a high value society. The third model is a value-deprived society. It is a society which unable to find their values. There are countries which is suffering their people by never-ending conflict; countries who saddled their people by dispossessing their own values and universal humanity. Therefore, the accountable-government also means how ethical and integrity is a Government in exercising power (Huberts, Maesschalck, & Jurkiewicz, 2008).*

*Boon Siong Neo and Geraldine Chen promoted the second model of governance: Dynamic Governance in their “Dynamic Governance: Embedding Capabilities and Change in Singapore”. Boon and Chen demonstrated the story behind the Singapore story. It was acknowledge that in a world of uncertainty and change, current achievements are no guarantee for future survival. Even if the initial chosen set of principles, policies and practices are good, static efficiency and governance would eventually lead to stagnation and decay. No amount of careful planning can assure a government of continuous relevance and effectiveness if there is insufficient institutional capacity for learning. innovation and change in the face of ever new challenges in a volatile and unpredictable global environment.*

### **DISCUSSION**

*Static, Dynamic, and Chaotic*

*There are some prominent global governance indexes as aggregate and individual governance indicators for over 200 economies. The World Bank has The Worldwide Governance Indicators report. The Worldwide Governance*

*Indicators (WGI) project reports aggregate and individual governance indicators for over 200 countries and territories over the period 1996–2017. for six dimensions of governance: Voice and Accountability, Political Stability and Absence of Violence, Government Effectiveness, Regulatory Quality, Rule of Law, and Control of Corruption.*

*There is also The Forum for a new World Governance (FnWG) launched the World Governance Index- WGI project in 2008. The idea was to develop a “tool” that would allow the players in charge of governance to be aware of the emerging issues and problems, and to help them to find the necessary solutions. The aim is to to reduce inequalities, establish sustainable development, and build peace in a world of diversity. The foundations of governance derived from the main governance principles set out in the Charter of the United Nations and in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Earth Summit Declaration (Rio, 1992), the Millennium Declaration (New York, 2000), and the findings of the World*

*Summit on Sustainable Development (Johannesburg, 2002). The UN mentions the result of this work is an index that hopes to be as complete as possible and describes the state of world governance, not for theoretical, but for practical purposes. The World Governance Index (WGI) is an indicator developed in 2008 by the Forum for a new World Governance (FnWG). It aims to provide, year on year, a precise image of the situation of world governance and of its evolution.*

*Table 1. ASEAN “Plus” WGI Rank 2011*

<b>Rank</b>	<b>Country</b>	<b>WGI</b>
28	Singapore	0.724
67	Malaysia	0.641
85	Thailand	0.609
96	Indonesia	0.596
99	Brunei	0.594
103	East Timor	0.592
106	Philippines	0.589
120	Viet Nam	0.571
122	Laos	0.568
125	Cambodia	0.562
140	China	0.549

Rank	Country	WGI
152	India	0.525
176	Myanmar	0.413

Source : Forum for a new World Governance (FnWG)

*In 2012 Indonesia Partnership for Governance, a non-government organization (NGO), has developed Indonesia Good Governance Index (IGI). IGI is an assessment for local/provincial governance performance. The approach derived from the decentralization policy enacted in early 2000 has challenged the quality of sub-national level delivery units and public services. IGI is aim to be an actionable index as part of advocacy tools to promote good governance practices at the provincial level. IGI could identify area of improvements for the provincial government, local parliament, civil society and economic society functions. In order to increase their overall performance, by referring to objective and subjective indicators used by IGI, all actors could refine their performances which ultimately enhance the quality of local good governance practices.*

*IGI is an integrated and comprehensive measure of governance performance based on six good governance principles which are contributed by four key arenas, i.e. political office, bureaucracy, civil society and economic society. Each arena has its own weight of contribution to creating good governance. The assessment applies a composite of both objective (i.e. local documents such as local budget, development planning documents, government records of activities, etc.) and subjective data (i.e. opinion of well-informed persons and scoring by researchers). However, the main indicators of regional human development index, which is develop by National Planning Development Agency, and performance evaluation of local government, which is developed by Ministry of Administrative Reform. The other indicators were public participation, accountability, transparency, efficiency, effectiveness, and fairness. Although the data and computation behind it is complex, the presentation of IGI is aimed for a simple and intuitive reading.*

Table 2. Indonesia Governance Index 2014

Best 10		Worse 10	
Rank	Province	Rank	Province
1	Yogyakarta	1	Riau Island
2	East Java	2	Central Sulawesi

Best 10		Worse 10	
Rank	Province	Rank	Province
3	Jakarta	3	West Kalimantan
4	Jambi	4	North Sulawesi
5	Bali	5	Maluku
6	South Sumatera	6	Papua
7	South Kalimantan	7	East Nusa Tenggara
8	Riau	8	Bengkulu
9	North Sulawesi	9	West Papua
10	Lampung	10	North Maluku

Source : Good Governance Index (IGI)

There are some measurement models for governance. The agenda is what kind of governance the world has today and tomorrow. In my seminal finding, there are three types of governance. The first is called as Static Governance. It is governance that focused on principles, on regulations. Most of the governance index we knew today is Static Governance. It was marked by the using of static indicator as UNDP-Indonesia has promoted 10 principles of good governance: participation, rule of law, transparency, responsiveness, consensus orientation, equity, effectiveness, accountability, strategic vision, interrelationship between policies. UN-ESCAP (United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific) define eight principles possessed by good governance, namely participation, rule of law, openness, concern, consensus oriented, fairness and inclusiveness, effectiveness and efficiency, and accountability. Government Regulations No. 101/2000 stated that good governance indicators were professionalism, accountability, transparency, excellent service, democracy, efficiency, effectiveness, rule of law and can be accepted by all people. The principles have the sameness to the World Bank, The Forum for a new World Governance and Indonesia Partnership for Governance that has been discussed.

The approach might be assumed as static model as it focused on “still-indicator”, a “photo-shot” indicator –which is different to a “video-shot” indicator. The model is positive, objective, and comparative. The weakness of the model is promoted the “hard-side” of governance that unable to provide that leveraging factors in performing the governance. Therefore, some countries were still laggard in their governance reform to achieve the high level

*of governance; even Government has invested a lot in making the governance perform.*

*The model of “Static Governance” has been making most of government of the developing countries exhausted in dealing with developing governance. The huge investment in money, people, strategy, and consuming time seems to be less effective. Therefore, the failure of governance reform around the world because what we might be called as the “theory failure”. The Static Governance is the right theory in the wrong time.*

*Government institutions need to be dynamic. The problem is government institution is not usually regarded as a dynamic. entrepreneurial organization, but a slow, stodgy bureaucracy that consistently and, sometimes, mindlessly enforces outdated rules and sticks to procedures without any care or concern for individuals or businesses. Dynamism is characterized by new ideas, fresh perceptions, continual upgrading, quick actions, flexible adaptations and creative innovations. Dynamism implies continuous learning, fast and effective execution, and unending change. Dynamic institutions can enhance the development and prosperity of a country by constantly improving and adapting the socio-economic environment in which people, business and government interact. They influence economic development and social behavior through policies, rules and structures that create incentives or constraints for different activities.*

*Dynamic governance is the key to success in a world undergoing accelerating globalization and unrelenting technological advancement. If institutions can evolve and embed the cultures and capabilities that enable continuous learning and change, their contributions to a country’s socio-economic progress and prosperity would be enormous. The lessons from their efforts in institutionalizing culture, capabilities and change would be useful for achieving similar outcomes in other types of organizations, such as business firms and volunteer groups. If bureaucratic public sector institutions can learn to be dynamic, the lessons from their efforts could provide meaningful and valuable insights for transforming organizations in other contexts.*

*In sum, Dynamic Governance has been modelling the way to achieve governance performance by making culture and capabilities in place. The culture –“Guidelines for Action based on Values & Beliefs”—consist of: Integrity/Incorruptibility. People are Key/Meritocracy for best use of talent,*



*Results-oriented/Rationality with pragmatism, Efficiency/Use of market adjusted for social equity, and Multi-racial, multi-religious understanding. The dynamic capabilities are thinking ahead, thinking again and thinking across*

*Singapore's Dynamic Governance was the heritage of the PM Lee Kuan Yew (1923 – 2015) that make Singapore transform “from the third world to the first”. Singapore model has been copied-and-modified by PR China. As the same community –Chinese—and the relatively the same political system –less democratic and non-democratic, China has been undergoing tremendous improvement, from the “miserable” to the strongest economy in the world. They key contribution of the Dynamic Governance model is its foundation on the hidden-power behind governance performance and dynamic: the right and strong culture and the right and strong capabilities. The two components are a “video-shot” types rather than a “photo-shot” type's indicator; it is rather a series of principles, but a set of systemic factor. In fact, the Dynamic Governance has implemented in some Asian prominent countries as such Japan, South Korea, and Taiwan. Therefore, the issue of making performing governance is changing from the “still-factors” to the “dynamics factors”.*

*The Dynamic Governance is being promoting in Indonesia but not yet implemented. The challenge is because the “dynamics factors” are not easy to find and develop in Indonesia today. The making of the character as the platform of culture and capability is not delivered yet. The problem has been creating by the prevailing policies in political arena, as such policy in political party, general election, security, to the public administration. Therefore, the issue of governance is getting ambiguous than before. Therefore, also, the problem of achieving Government with performing governance is rather a “project” than a “strategy”. At last, governance is becoming a symbolic effort and performance than the delivered product.*

*The question is, can Government in other countries promoting the Dynamic Governance in their home countries? Boon & Chen has been encouraging that the culture and capabilities as the core issues of Dynamic Governance can be achieved by every Government of any nations. Therefore, it keeps optimism that Dynamic Governance can be implemented in Indonesia, but with some prerequisites. First, there are some basic policies toward Dynamic Governance that need to be improved, corrected, and changed, especially Act No 2/2008 revised by Act No 2/2011 on Political Parties, Act No 5/2014 on State Civil Apparatus, Act No. 7/2017 on General Election, Act*

*No 31/ 1999 on Eradication of Corruption Criminal Act, and Act No. 39/2008 on State Ministries. President Jokowi has been starting to strongly reform the governance of the government. However, the effort has been facing difficulties as the existing policies are restraining the effort. Even there were some significant governance's reform; it would meet some inconsistency regard to the existing policy.*

*Dynamic governance might be understood as a Self-Healing Government; it means when Government has ability to solve her problem by herself --not dependent to the consultant, especially "offshore consultant"—and also a self-healing Government. Dynamic governance is a Government that able to redesign herself in time of trouble efficiently, effectively, relevantly, and accountably. Then, Government is becoming a human-like than machine-like. The self-help and self-healing Government will transform the citizens –business and society—to become also the self-help and self-healing citizens. It is becoming an independent and interdepend citizens of the nation. In sum, Dynamic Governance consists of three dynamic factors: culture, capability –as mentioned by Boon and Chen—and System –as the media of where governance is standing.*

*The third model of governance is Chaotic Governance. The "poverty of public administration" has been noted by Hubbard and Paquet, a set of dysfunctions of the public administration process that have contributed to generating significant pathologies of governance. Raadschelders. Vigoda-Gadot, and Kisner (2015) strengthened by naming a highly interconnected world; a hyper-connected world, as the speed of the global communication has increased to the point that little happens that is not known on the other side of the globe within minutes, even seconds. There is no shortage of information, and one could very well argue that we are drowning in a deluge of information, making it increasingly difficult to determine what is important and what is not. In this hyper-connected world people are increasingly aware that it is a small world and that it may even be shrinking further.*

*The first globalization was marked by the age of trade in the middle age. It was spreading from Europe to the Asian. The second globalization was the age of colonialization and therefore exploitation of the less develop nations in Asia, Africa, and America by the developed nations in Europe. The third globalization was marked by the revolution of transportation, support by the technology of airplane and the invention of container. High speed train was*

*following the revolution. The fourth globalization is where we are today: digital technology, internet, and cyber-space. The four generation of globalizations are now prevailing altogether, in the same time, in the same small place name “global village”. The first and second generation of globalizations has drive governance reform in many developing countries has been failed. as the multinational –supported by their home country’s government—enforce their interests to the the Government leaders of the developing (and also less-develop) countries. The presence of comprador’s Officers has speed up the process of deteriorating governance level of the Government. The third globalization was making the governance in the developing countries has been facing the imposing-collide-interest of the local business and global business. Government policy as well as public services is administered toward business interest –investor’s interests, mostly non-resident-investors—rather than society. The “pro-investment—policy is becoming the “panacea’s policy” among developing countries.*

*The fourth globalization is dictating government to do or not to do “what, when, where, and how”. McKinsey Center for Government on November 2016 has released is report as well as a “global recommended-advise” of “Digital by default: A guide to transforming government” promoted that “the only survive of any government is the digital government”. It was noted that by digitizing. governments can provide services that meet the evolving expectations of citizens and businesses, even in a period of tight budgets and complex challenges such as income inequality, geopolitical instability, and aging populations. Not only do citizens prefer digital services and interactions with governments but digital services can also empower citizens and broaden their engagement with government. For businesses, too, digital government services are convenient and efficient. Government digitization efforts can also compel businesses to digitize more quickly. Singapore has been transforming most of the governance system into digital mode. Singapore Government premised that digitalization is a key pillar of the Government’s public service transformation efforts. The Digital Government Blueprint (DGB) is a statement of the Government’s ambition to better leverage data and harness new technologies, and to drive broader efforts to build a digital economy and digital society, in support of Smart Nation. The vision is to create a Government that is “Digital to the Core, and Serves with Heart”. A Digital Government will be able to build stakeholder-centric services that cater to citizens’ and*

*businesses' needs. Transacting with a Digital Government will be easy, seamless and secure. Our public officers will be able to continually upskill themselves, adapt to new challenges and work more effectively across agencies as well as with our citizens and businesses. OECD has developed a vision of digital government by the measurement of how governments can best use information and communication technologies (ICTs) to embrace good government principles and achieve policy goals.*

*Welchman noted that digital governance is a framework for establishing accountability, roles, and decision-making authority for an organization's digital presence—which means its websites, mobile sites, social channels, and any other Internet and Web-enabled products and services. It is a notion that only “well-designed digital governance framework” that able to minimizes the number of tactical debates regarding the nature and management of an organization's in the digital presence. Digital governance as it is managed and measured by computerized-interconnected-smart-machine creates a single standard for every practices of power exercise of Government.*

*The most digital-developed countries has been prepared, implemented, managed, and controlled the digital ecosystem. USA, OECD countries, Japan, South Korea, and Singapore are the leading countries. The well-placed culture and capabilities make those countries effectively transform the governance of their government into digital space. They are the main actors in controlling the flow of information to the global telecommunication infrastructure –especially global-sea-cable and satellites. By controlling the flow of information, those actors manage the agenda of the global policy and state's policies around the world. Today, the only agenda is promoting open economy and the digital economy. Some of the countries are fortunate, others are becoming the rest. However, the recent digital-globalized-world has been troubling the strongest economies of the word. The governance crises happening even in the most advanced governing-countries. If Shuck mentioned about inability of Government to develop excellent policies and highquality services. the raise of outnumber and unidentified actors at the global in the digital-space, upscaling information –and hoax, too—to the level that Government infrastructure hard and uneasy to manage. The border is not merely disappear symbolically as the rise of economic globalization, and the end of the nation state, as noted by Ohmae, but it is getting real by the presence of internet. Google and other*

*giant global platform engine have turned the world into an "interneted" world. The Industry 4.0 hand in hand with Government 4.0. The convergence of internet, computer, telecommunication, smartphone, and artificial intelligence, promoted what will be publicly practiced as "internet of thing".*

*Policy agendas are getting control by twitter –the trending topics—and WhatsApp’s-group-chatting. analyzed by well-programmed computer-program, verified and judged by mathematical algorithm of “a cost benefit analysis”, and the policy-makers meet with the perfect-machine-made and inhumanly policy recommendation. Public services delivered by internet-computerized-AI-system. Public servants turn into machine’s operators. In Indonesia, the Online Single Submission, an investment policy and services systematically “turn-off” the Investment Coordinating Board and the same offices in the regions.*

*Government is entering the Chaotic Governance mode; Government that has to practice governance in the digital age and its subsequent revolution. However, internet is a place for the strongest, as there are only two players inside: the winner and the dead. The predatory competition is the name of the game of business in the digital-space, the internet. The type of “competition” will be hampered the Government sector, too. The strongest government with winning governance will lead and impose its power to all government around the world. The chaotic mode will be prevails as Government is unable to control the governance the have as before. In 1980s, PM Thatcher was practicing governance by reducing government power and giving those parts into the private sector. The next governance was inviting civil society inside the governance. Today, governance’s actor comprise of government, business/market, society, academicians, and mass media –the “Penta helix”—and three other actors: the terrorist, the UFO (“unidentified flying actors), and “ghost in the machine”. The polar smart-city policy has been transforming the governance of the government around the world meet with the new governance standard that unavailable before.*

*Table 3. Issues of Static governance, Dynamic governance and Chaotic governance*

<b>Issue</b>	<b>1980 – now</b>	<b>2000 – now</b>	<b>2010 – now</b>
Brand	Static governance	Dynamic governance	Chaotic governance

Main ideas	Governance is a product	Governance is a process	Governance is uncertainty
Focus	Principles/Law	System/mechanism	Pattern/change
Measurement	Government output, outcome	System's drivers	Ecosystem
Indicators	Efficiency, effectiveness, participation, transparency, etc	Embedded culture, capability, systemic process	Control toward pattern of uncertainty
Governance level	Traditional	Advanced	Future governance
Theory	Public choice	Organizational behavior	Chaos
Promotor	World Bank, UN, EU	Boon & Chen	McKinsey, Raadschelders et.al., Farazmand, Welchman
Implementor	Indonesia	US, Japan, Korea, Singapore	UK, EU, Qatar, US, Australia

*The EU has anticipated the digital governance by implement the General Data Protection Regulation ("GDPR"). on the protection of natural persons is regard to the processing of personal data and on the free movement of such data. This text includes the corrigendum published in the OJEU of 23 May 2018. The regulation is an essential step to strengthen individuals' fundamental rights in the digital age and facilitate business by clarifying rules for companies and public bodies in the digital single market. A single law will also do away with the current fragmentation in different national systems and unnecessary administrative burdens. The regulation entered into force on 24 May 2016 and applies since 25 May 2018. It is a regulation in EU law on data protection and privacy for all individuals within the European Union (EU) and the European Economic Area (EEA). It also addresses the export of personal data outside the EU and EEA areas. The GDPR aims primarily to give control to individuals over their personal data and to simplify*

*the regulatory environment for international business by unifying the regulation within the EU. the regulation contains provisions and requirements pertaining to the processing of personal data of individuals (formally called data subjects in the GDPR) inside the*

*European Union, and applies to an enterprise established in the EU or—regardless of its location and the data subjects' citizenship—that is processing the personal data of people inside the EU. Controllers of personal data must put in place appropriate technical and organizational measures to implement the data protection principles. "Data protection by design and by default" means that business processes that handle personal data must be designed and built with consideration of the principles and provides safeguards to protect data.*

*In sum, governance of government is entering the new stage of mode: the Chaotic Governance. It is a mode where Government has to be able to exercise powers in a chaotic ecosystem. It is in the human-kind ability to manage, as there was a foundation of Chaos Theory. Chaos Theory is a delicious contradiction - a science of predicting the behavior of “inherently unpredictable” systems, initiated by Edward Lorenz in 1961. Chaos theory is a mathematical theory, and it is still in development. It enables the description of a series of phenomena from the field of dynamics, i.e., that field of physics concerning the effect of forces on the motion of objects. Public administration and governance scholar need to develop a new approach based on chaos theory to generate a profound understanding toward today and the next stage of governance.*

## **CONCLUSION**

*The quality of any government is regarding to its governance quality: how government exercise its power to be perform and accountable to their people as well their existence. The 1980s governance understanding have been taught government to share her power with the market, and then added by the new actor, civil services. Governments of the developing countries, as such Indonesia, were unsuccessful in making the “governance” in place, instead of a symbolic actions and results. It was caused by insufficient understanding that governance is not merely a “photo-shot” mode, as it called as “Static Governance”, but it needs a “dynamic-governance”, a “video-shot” mode. The understanding of “Dynamic Governance” has created a new*

*insight, policy, and subsequent program and initiatives to make governance presence profoundly. There new difficulties rise as Dynamic Governance needs a set of new imperatives which is started from the character to the underlying policies.*

*The world is changing tremendously. The VUCA – volatile, uncertainty, complex, and ambiguous-- phenomenon is merely a symptom of the wordily global reality. The core issue is about managing chaos. There is a third mode of governance, the Chaotic Governance. While the next level of governance is emerging, in the other side many developing countries still laggard in performing high quality governance. There is a triple challenge: coping with the first generation of governance, developing the second generation of governance, and, in the same time adopting the third generation of governance. Chaotic governance is become the global governance challenge, too. It is a pervasive issue that needs to be answer globally. It is a call for scholars and Government around the globe to define the premises and make a committed-promise to deliver it to the people among, between, across countries around the globe. A new learning is coming.*

## **BIBLIOGRAPHY**

Bevir, Mark. (2007)., Encyclopedia of Governance, London: Sage

------. (2010)., Democratic Governance, Princetown: Princetown University Press.

Bhatta, Gambhir. (2015). (2006), International Dictionary of Public Management and Governance, London: Routledge; see also the World Bank definition.

Boon Siong Neo and Geraldine Chen. (2007)., Dynamic Governance: Embedding Capabilities and Change in Singapore, Singapore: World Scientific Publishing.

Clinton, Bill . (2011)., Back to Work: Why We Need Smart Government for a Strong Economy, New York: Free Press.

Collins, Jim. (2005)., Good to Great and the Social Sectors: Why Business Thinking is Not the Answer, New York: Harper & Collins.



- De Vries, Michiel S., & Pan Suk Kim. (2011)., Value and Virtue in Public Administration, A Comparative Perspective, New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Garofalo, Charles. (2011)., "Governance and Values in Contemporary Public Service", in Michiel S. De Vries and Pan Suk Kim. (2011)., Value and Virtue in Public Administration, A Comparative Perspective, New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hubbard, Ruth, and Gilles Paquet. (2010)., The Black Hole of Public Administration, Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press, p. 109.
- Huberts, Leo W.J.C., Jeroen Maesschalck and Carole L. Jurkiewicz, eds.. (2008)., Ethics and integrity of governance : perspectives across frontiers, Cheltenham (UK): Edward Elgar Publishing Limited
- Kasim, Azar, Martani Huseini, Rozan Anwar, Boon Siong Neo. (2015)., Merekonstruksi Indonesia: sebuah perjalanan menuju Dynamic Governance, Jakarta: Kompas.
- Raadschelders, Jos C.N., Eran Vigoda-Gadot, and Mirit Kisner. (2015)., Dimension of Public Administration and Governance, New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons, p.1.
- Riant Nugroho & Rizang Wrihatnolo. (2006)., Manajemen Privatisasi BUMN, Jakarta: Elex/Gramedia.
- Ohmae, Kenichi. (1990)., The Borderless World: Power and Strategy in the Interlinked Economy, New York: Harper Business.
- . (1995)., The End of the Nation State: The Rise of Regional Economies. New York: The Free Press.
- Nugroho, Riant. 2018. Public Policy, Jakarta: Elex/Gramedia
- . (2012)., Public Policy for the Developing Countries, Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- . (2018)., Membangun Kebijakan Karakter Bangsa, Jakarta: Elex/Gramedia.

-----, "Public Private Partnership as a Policy Dilemma",  
International Journal of Administrative Science & Organization,  
September 2011 Volume 18, Number 3

Schuck, Peter H.. (2014)., Why Government Fails So Often: And How It Can  
Do Better, Princeton: Princeton University Press

Yescombe, E. R., & Edward Farquharson. (2018). (2006), Public-Private  
Partnerships for Infrastructure, Oxford: Butterworth & Heinemman.