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- It was started from Jakarta in 2004

- Currently, there are 15 major cities in Indonesia operating Bus Rapid Transit (semi-BRT) (Susantono, 2014)
Implementation Stage of BRT Program

The Cooperation between National Government and City Government (sub-national level) (MOT, 2014)

Interaction between Central and Local Government in Formulation Urban Transport master plan

Establishing Joint Commitment between Central and Local Government

1. Network
2. Shelter
3. Pool
4. Service capacity and Quality
5. Cost and Tariff
6. Ticketing
7. Park and ride
8. Institutional Design

1. Fund Sharing between central and local government based on annual work plan
2. Handling over bus fleet (technical assistant for pilot)

Development of Urban Public Transport System (pilot)

Monitoring and Evaluation
Why Institution Matter?

**Step 1: Establish Independent Public Transport Authority**
- a. Provide Public Transport Service by Operator
- b. Collect money from services by cooperation with third party
- c. Pay the service provided by Operator

**Step 2: To determine public transport service operator**
- a. Operator provide a service based on contract
- b. No cash transaction with bus crews
- c. Crews are employed by company
Step 3: Integration of Informal Transport Sector

It play as important role for BRT’s Oriented Development (BOD) but their operation characters are different: (a) Individual Ownership and (b) Informal management system and fee

How to solve this matter?

a. Feeder system
b. Limited operation zone
Step 4: Integration of Existing Public Transport Operators

Strategies:

a. Keep to serve at the Branch network services
b. Buy its services (reform operational management)
c. Trade-in
d. Ownership (shareholders)
e. Determine Level of Services (LOS)
f. Integration of Operational Management such as: ticket, tariff or organization
g. Physical integration with trunk route (shelter interchangeable, terminal, etc)
Can current institutions manage all steps (1-4) ?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Operator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jakarta (2004)</td>
<td>Special Task Unit (UPTB) - Under transport agency *</td>
<td>Consortium of Existing Public Transport Operator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bogor (2007)</td>
<td>Special Task Unit (UPTD) – Under transport Agency</td>
<td>City-owned Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bandung (2007)</td>
<td>Special Task Unit (UPTD) – Under transport Agency</td>
<td>Private company and Stated-owned company (DAMRI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yogyakarta (2008)</td>
<td>Special Task Unit (UPTD) – Under transport Agency</td>
<td>Private Company (consortium of existing operators/4 unions) and stated-owned company (Damri)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pekanbaru (2009)</td>
<td>Special Task Unit (UPTD) – Under transport Agency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palembang (2010)</td>
<td>Special Task Unit (UPTD) – Under transport Agency</td>
<td>City-owned Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gorontalo (2010)</td>
<td>Special Task Unit (UPTD) – Under transport Agency</td>
<td>Stated-owned company (DAMRI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surakarta (2010)</td>
<td>Special Task Unit (UPTD) – Under transport Agency</td>
<td>Stated-owned company (DAMRI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bandar Lampung (2011)</td>
<td>Special Task Unit (UPTD) – Under transport Agency</td>
<td>Private Company (Consortium of 37 Angkot Operator)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Considering all reason, It is adaptive and dynamic process

I. Dynamic Institutional Arrangement Process

1999-2004 Pre-BRT
Governor's Office
Jakarta Transportation Agency (DisHub)

2004-2006 BRT-Lines 1-3
Governor's Office
Jakarta Transportation Counsel
TransJakarta
Jakarta Transportation Agency (DisHub)

2007-2008 BRT-Lines 4-7
Governor's Office
Jakarta Transportation Counsel
Jakarta Transportation Agency (DisHub)
TransJakarta

II. Physical Integration with Regional Bus Operator
Shelter interchangeable for feeder from other cities - since 2012/2013
Conclusion

a. Simply removing informal transit and existing operator are not a solution! We need to consider Economic and Social issues simultaneously

b. Integration of newly developed BRT is a dynamic process!

c. Need a strong and consistent commitment!
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