

Policy Transfer Through Return Migration: Lesson From Indonesian Returnees

Violita Sinda Arinda

Public Administrative Science, Universitas Indonesia
violitasindaa@gmail.com

Reza Fathurrahman

Public Administrative Science, Universitas Indonesia
rezafathurrahman@ui.ac..id

Abstract

This article investigates the extent to which policy transfer activities facilitated by Indonesian skilled returnees after finishing their studies in Germany can support various local actors in accelerating developmental progress in their homeland. By using the five-dimensional policy transfer (Evans, 2017), this study found that returnees strengthen the working environment by promoting exchange of knowledge, improving current work methods, and advocating for most common forms of transfer including knowledge sharing, experiences, and networks that they had while abroad. The research also found that most cases of successful policy transfer adoption were characterized by hybridization of new ideas with existing policy and institutional framework in organizations that participated in the program.

Keywords: *policy transfer, knowledge transfer, returnees, development.*

INTRODUCTION

The phenomenon of Returning Experts cannot be separated from the globalization, which has lowered boundaries between countries. Globalization involves a wide network of interconnections in economic, cultural, social, and political processes that transcend national boundaries (Yalcin, 2018). Moreover, globalization has also created an opportunity for enabling Indonesia to obtain a substantial assistance from international donor agencies to support the government operations and accelerate national economic growth. One of the donor agencies, The Federal Ministry of Economic Cooperation and Development Germany (BMZ) provides supporting services tailored to the needs of individual governments and organizations in developing countries, including Indonesia, particularly to implement specific development projects (BMZ.de, 2019). Indonesia and Germany have for long forged collaboration in the provision of financial assistance as well as exchange of knowledge and ideas.

German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ) has so far extended approximately 37 million euros in grants to Indonesian government and other institutions (GIZ.de, 2019). Within this context, *The Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit* (GIZ) plays an important role in supporting BMZ to channel development assistance to foreign countries, including Indonesia. Among others, GIZ has been facilitating since 1980s the return of former students and workers in Germany to their

countries of origin under a Returning Expert program (also known as CIM's Returning Expert Program) that fosters the transfer of knowledge, skills and experience in home countries. Through the program, GIZ aims at supporting development countries by enhancing technical and institutional capacity to implement activities and programs that are related to achieving sustainable development goals (SDGs). Therefore, the beneficiary countries of GIZ services are expected to gain valuable advantages from their global experience, as well as from a network of experts on project sustainability (GIZ.de, 2020).

One of the key instruments employed by GIZ to support development projects and programs in Indonesia is through policy transfer activities. Policy transfer is a deliberate activity to support the development of policies that is action-oriented and dynamic in the exchange of policy knowledge related to administrative or institutional arrangements from one time/place to another time/place (Evans, 2017; Minkman et al., 2018; Stone, 1999); Furthermore, emphasize the focus of policy transfer on the exchange of ideas, policies, and policy instruments between various political systems around the world (Bulmer et al., 2017). (Stone, 1999) argues that policy transfer concept facilitated the emergence of a solution to the concern shared among policy makers about the need to improve the quality of decision making through the search for comprehensive policy process and practices in other countries.

Considering the above-mentioned defini-

tions, policy transfer plays an important role in the policy making process through policy learning. This is consistent with the argument stated (Haas, 1992) that policy change cannot occur without learning. In that respect, Haas defines knowledge-based policy as a set of causal recipes that are encapsulated in “scientific knowledge”. Such knowledge (at the level of a central government agency) is based primarily on quantitative data that are sourced from professional organizations or policy specialists. Subsequently, knowledge from specialists, is transformed into consensual knowledge, a process that makes it generally accepted. On the same note, Dunlop (2009) explains that policy transfer is closely related to the concept of policy learning, with levels of learning influencing policy change or movement from one context to another (Dolowitz & Medearis, 2009). The importance of studying a policy lies in lessons it provides for policy makers, which in turn influence whether to implement the policy (Park et al., 2014).

At the practical level, decried on the policy transfer programs for the ahistorical, concept of policy transfer (Stone, 1999). She criticized the difficulty of timing the knowledge transfer policy. There are also no best practices on implementing policy transfer for implementers of the policy to use as reference in planning and executing their work. Stone also argues that policy transfer and sharing policies in many countries fail to achieve their objectives because of poor program design and timing of policy implementation. Further-

more, much of the previous literature on policy transfer assumes that half of the transfer relationship involves state actors and that the process is very reliant on the involvement of official actors. This is a direct consequence of laying strong emphasis on that the “policy transfer” rather than the “transfer” process (Stone, 1999). In brief, the policy transfer is expected to not only facilitate the transfer, but most importantly knowledge sharing between institutions/countries that provide and receive training.

Assessing the work of the Center for International Migration and Development organization (CIM) provides important insights into the implementation of policy transfer that GIZ provides to the government of Indonesia. CIM is a joint collaboration between GIZ and the German Federal Employment Agency. CIM is a source and place where experts from the European Union and outside Europe who have settled in Germany and those in developing countries. CIM provides a network for experts who have migrated to Germany, live in the European Union (EU) and outside EU countries as well as those living in developing countries support development in their home countries. Besides, CIM, also provides advice to individuals and policymakers on migration issues (cimonline.de, 2019).

CIM has three main programs *inter alia*, Diaspora Experts, Integrated Experts, and Returning Experts. The focus of this research is on the CIM Returning Experts’ program. The term Returning Experts (experts who return to their homeland), hereinafter referred to as re-

turnees, is used for those who have acquired technical or managerial skills through S1/S2/S3 studies or have worked in Germany. The experts are expected to use their knowledge and expertise in their home country, in this case Indonesia, upon leaving Germany. CIM provides all the support returnees require to return to their home country. The support ranges from finding a suitable job through forging a network of contacts in the country of origin upon their returning home.

The CIM Returning Experts' program focuses on promoting development through knowledge transfer in certain fields (Cimoline, 2020a), which CIM achieves through recruiting experts who are nationals of partner countries who have studied or worked in Germany and are assigned to their home country. The aim of the program is to identify the right positions for returnees, where the latter are expected to use their expertise, knowledge, experience, and contacts they have in their home country.

According to (Chen, 2008), China has been implementing a similar program that is called China returnees. The program adopts a reverse brain drain policy by taking measures to attract Chinese experts who have been working abroad to return and assist China in transferring technology and contributing to industrial improvement and development. The policy has generated benefits for the country, including making contribution to the increase in number of startups and industries in China (Chen, 2008).

The CIM Returning Experts program sup-

ports returnees who are German alumni to make knowledge transfer efforts to institutions where they work in Indonesia. As regards the program's history, CIM (Center for International Migration and Development) was established in 1980s and has supported about 15,000 Returning Experts worldwide. In 1996, the CIM Returning Experts Program was established in Indonesia. Today, CIM 4600 members and alumni who are spread in different regions of the Country (Interview with Ibad, CIM Coordinator, 2020). Thus, based on the number of Indonesians who are members of CIM, the country contributes nearly 1/3 of the total number of Returning Experts worldwide. Based on CIM database, the returnees' program has facilitated the return of about 340 experts during 2011-2020 period. The experts are working in various sectors in various parts of the country (CIM, 2020). As of July 2019, Indonesian returnees are employed in various sectors, including academia, the government sector, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), and the private sector. However, the highest percentage of returnees (44%) works in academia, followed by government sector (42%). Meanwhile, the private sector and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) employ the lowest percentage of returnees (7%).

The establishment of the returnees' program was initially aimed at reducing unemployment. However, with time CIM has been managed professionally turning it into an important contributor to the development of social, economic, political, sectors among oth-

ers. As regards Indonesia, the main goal of the program initiation was to enable the country to benefit from the expertise of Indonesian migrants in various fields toward supporting the country's development. CIM's philosophy and values on knowledge sharing and transfer are embodied in CIM Returning Experts program (Interview with Ibad, CIM Coordinator, 2020). Experts gain experience and knowledge while in Germany, which can contribute to the development of the countries of origin (Indonesia). Knowledge transfer is also in line with CIM's mission promoting development through knowledge transfer. Returning experts have specialized knowledge, experience, and expertise they can transfer making use of contacts they have to their home country (Indonesia).

The CIM Returning Experts program is considered to have an edge over similar programs implemented by donor agencies because of the purpose, methods and approaches used in achieving its goals. CIM approach is to focus on developing human resources by facilitating the returning of individuals who have acquired technical or managerial knowledge and skills in Germany to their home countries. The existence of this program is expected to help developing countries in solving development problems in countries of origin of experts as well as efforts on improving the performance of public sector organizations.

This article investigates the extent to which policy transfer activities facilitated by Indonesian skilled returnees after finishing their

studies in Germany can support various local actors in accelerating developmental progress in their homeland. While there is a lot of previous research on returnees, not much has specifically focused on the role of Returning Experts from Germany in the development of countries of origin of students, who studied and acquired expertise in Germany. Moreover, this research improves our understanding on the roles of Returning Experts as a key policy transfer actor, which remains underexplored within the literature on policy transfer. The research results are expected to support the policy transfer processes which accommodate the uniqueness of Indonesia's social, economic, and cultural conditions.

METHODS

The research was based on a mixed method research design, which was implemented by using blended data collection techniques that included online questionnaires and conducting in-person in-depth interviews. The theoretical underpinning of the research was drawn from the five-dimensional policy transfer framework proposed (Evans, 2010). The five policy dimensions include Agents of policy transfer, Forms of policy transfer, Processes of policy-oriented learning, Barriers to policy-oriented learning, and Outputs from the process of transfer.

Data collection took 10 days from July 13, 2020, to July 22, 2020. Respondents included 31 individuals who were selected at random from a list of alumnae who have been active in the CIM Returning Experts program for the

past 10 years and employed in public sector organizations (population = 300 people). Data analysis involved description analysis and conducting Four-column analysis of the interview data (Saldana, 2015).

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This subsection presents analysis results of Evans (2010) five-dimensional policy transfer framework, including Agents of policy transfer, Forms of policy transfer, Processes of policy-oriented learning, Barriers to policy-oriented learning, and Outputs from the process of transfer.

In *the first dimension* of “**Agents of Policy Transfer**”, Evans (2010) recommends that study of policy transfer analysis should be limited to actions that oriented towards deliberate learning, that is what occurs consciously and generates policy action. The definition constitutes construction of policy transfer as a potential causal phenomenon: a factor that fosters policy convergence. Thus, the criteria for identifying transfer policies are: (1) identifying transfer agents and the policy belief systems that they advocate; (2) identify and determine resources they bring to the learning process; (3) determine the role they play in transfers; and (4) determine the nature of the transfer which the agent intends to make (Evans & Davies, 1999).

With regards to agents/actors in policy transfer, literature on policy transfer identifies at least eight main categories of transfer agents, *inter alia*, politicians,; bureaucrats,; Think-tanks,; knowledge institutions, academ-

ics, and other experts,; pressure group; global financial institutions,; international organizations,; and supranational institutions (Evans, 2017).

Based on previous research on policy transfer, the dimension of agents of policy transfer is crucial to understanding policy transfer performance. Results showed that all the returnees considered Germany as the source of the ideas and materials returnees used in the policy transfer process. However, Germany was not the only source ideas and materials, which returnees used and adopted during their participation in the policy transfer program, but also private and public sector agencies in Indonesia and other countries. Subsequently, returnees merged the ideas from various sources to create a change project that connects and links them to the United Nations sustainable development goals (SDGs). This is because all CIM work is connected with efforts to support the implementation of SDGs.

All CIM programs are driven by the main goal of promoting the positive impact of migration and global labor mobility on the development of countries of origin (Cimoline, 2020a). This is a notion that Immanuel, who is one of the returnees, and works in the Ministry of Trade, corroborates. Germany in general and Universities where returnees undertook their studies, are the key sources of ideas that returnees adopt and use during their involvement in the policy transfer program. More aptly, according to Immanuel (Interview with Immanuel, Returnees from

the Ministry of Trade, 2020), Ideas which expert returnees use and adopt in their work are based on in the education system organization, the way professors teach, and students learn, and way of life in Germany with GIZ limited to facilitating the process. In other words, GIZ does not influence on policies that CIM expert returnees support or recommend in their countries of origin (Interview with Barliana, Portfolio advisor GIZ, 2020). Neither the Germany government nor GIZ conduct any policy advocacy for CIM expert returnees to adopt while serving in various roles in public sector organizations in Indonesia.

As regards for returning to Indonesia and participating in the CIM Returning Experts program, more than 50 percent of respondents acknowledged the desire to contribute to Indonesia's development through sharing their knowledge and skills. However, other reasons some respondents gave for their participation in CIM expert returnees programs included the desire to be close to family and friends, applying knowledge learned in universities in places of work, gaining practical experience, and meeting the obligation to return to Indonesia as stipulated as one of the scholarship requirements. In an excerpt of an interview with, Rudi who participated in the programs and is an academic in Syiah Kuala University, being a civil servant, he was obliged to return to Indonesia after completing his studies in Germany. Another reason for participating in the program was the desire for returnees to use CIM expert returnees programs as a forum to foster their access to financial re-

sources, tools and equipment they use in their work, and strengthen networking opportunities (Interview with Rudi, Returnees, and academics from Syiah Kuala University, 2020).

Agents/actors involved in the CIM expert's returnee program are supposed to have supervisors who may be drawn from organizations where they are employed or other organizations. Based on the results of the study, more than half of the respondents opted to choose agents/actors that were directly involved in the policy transfer process as their direct supervisors. Other agents/organizations that were involved in the policy transfer process, hence could serve as supervisors of participants in CIM policy transfer program, included academics, bureaucrats, international organizations, think tanks, partner organizations abroad, NGOs, schools, community groups, colleagues at work, and professional associations.

Participating organizations in CIM expert returnees' program, formed what Ibad who was the CIM Coordinator, called a quadruple helix that comprised, academia; the government (public sector), including local governments (Interview with Barliana, Portfolio advisor GIZ, 2020),; the private sector; and civil society organizations (CSO). All stakeholders of the program were adhered to principles and work in line with the mandate of the program (Interview with Ibad, CIM Coordinator, 2020).

Agents /actors contributed various resources to the policy transfer process. Nonetheless, contributions that agents/actors made

to the program could be categorized broadly into two groups. *First*, resources which individual Returning Experts gave to the agency where they work. Based on research results, all returnees considered knowledge and competences they have as their main contribution to organizations where they work. The knowledge and skills that expert transferred to places of work provided the connection and link between the work they were doing in their organizations and SDGs, which is one of the underlying goals of CIM expert returnees program (Cimoline, 2020b).

Meanwhile, some of the respondents considered networks, equipment support, financial support, and other resources related to German industrial management systems and mentoring as key resources expert returnees contributed to the policy transfer process during the CIM expert returnee program. This was corroborated by Immanuel who is an employee in the Ministry of Trade who considered contributions of returnees to the program not only limited to science knowledge but also teaching methods that participants experienced while studying in Germany Universities, experiences during their stay in Germany and research networks. One example that Immanuel cited is the research collaboration between the Ministry of Trade (Indonesia) and a certain Germany research institute (Interview with Immanuel, Returnees from the Ministry of Trade, 2020).

Second, networks, competency improvement programs (workshops/training), funding support, and equipment support, were the oth-

er resources that actors/parties involved in the program, including organizations where returnees were employed and CIM contributed to the program. Ibad, who was one of the respondents acknowledged that CIM provided various facilities for returnees including finding jobs, supplementary remuneration that ensured decent standard salaries, work equipment, networks, and training. The training which CIM provided to expert returnees was in two forms, *inert alia*, mandatory form (compulsory) and optional. Mandatory training comprised learning technical skills, managing development for results, and other usual program training on programs phases and evaluation dynamics including input, process, output, outcome, and impact. Case in this respect, CIM focused on activities that required the contribution and transfer of returnees' knowledge and expertise (Interview with Ibad, CIM Coordinator, 2020).

Meanwhile, based on the experience of Tedi, who is a returnee working in Ministry of Energy and Mineral Resources, resources which places of work for returnees contributed to the program included providing opportunities for returnees to have exposure to experience of working in mining companies, interact with prospective mining inspectors, and also government related agencies that related to mining activities. In addition, places of work also entrusted returnees with trust and responsibility to do their work (Interview with Tedi, Returnees from the Ministry of Energy and Mineral Resources, 2020).

The second dimension is **“The Form of**

Policy transfer". Policy analysts use the policy transfer approach as a generic concept that includes different claims about factors that influence the engagement of public organizations in policy learning. In general, policy transfer analysts consider the process to consist of three forms of transfer, including voluntary transfer; lesson drawing, policy learning or negotiated transfer (three concepts that can be used interchangeably); and direct coercive transfer (Evans, 2010).

Understanding this dimension is crucial for determining the relevancy of the policy transfer to interests and requirements of institutions where the returnee are employed. Based on the results of the study, most respondents contended that organizations where returnees were employed were more receptive to ideas and lessons proposed in the policy transfer program if the ideas were relevant and in line with their work and delivered through negotiations. This notion was corroborated by Rudi, who is an academic in Syiah Kuala University and a participant in CIM expert returnees' program. The UPT library, Syiah Kuala University accommodated ideas which Rudi as a participant in the CIM expert returnees program on condition that there were not imposed by delivered through negotiations and did not contradict existing regulations (Interview with Rudi, Returnees, and academics from Syiah Kuala University, 2020).

A similar argument is discernible in a statement by Ocasa, who is also a returnee and participant in CIM expert returnees' program. Central Java provincial government

welcomed ideas/lessons, which returning experts proposed toward improving the local government environmental protection agency as long as they were delivered through negotiations and such ideas did violate existing regulations, principles and procedures of local government bureaucracy (Interview with Ocasa, Returnees from the Central Java Provincial Government, 2020). A similar argument can be construed from comments by Tedi, who is also a returnee working in the Ministry of Energy and Mineral Resources. The ministry, Tedi argued, accepted ideas /lessons proposed selectively through a negotiated transfer process. One of the ideas related to technical guidelines for mining companies. Results of discussions that involve various actors reached the conclusion that adoption of ideas/lessons that were proposed had to be conditional on taking into consideration and the condition of the mining sector in Indonesia in general and the state and condition of mining companies in Indonesia, especially small and medium companies in particular.

Another point that returnees emphasized that influenced acceptability of ideas/lessons proposed by program participants was the condition that the adoption process as not imposed but voluntary nature of the adoption. The voluntary nature of ideas /lessons is considered especially important for academia and researchers. Teaching methods, and other knowledge that are proposed can only be adopted if the lecturers /researchers consider them relevant and useful to teaching and research work of the program participant in the

University or other institutions of advanced education (Interview with Rudi, Returnees, and academics from Syiah Kuala University, 2020).

The third dimension is “Processes of policy-oriented learning”. Four distinct processes of policy-oriented learning emerge from the transfer process (Evans, 2017). Copying policies, programs, or institutions of a government organization without modification is the first and rare form of policy-oriented learning. Second, competition, whereby government organizations acknowledge and recognize the need to adopt a foreign policy, program or an institution to improve quality standards of a domestic policy, program, or institution. One good example in this regard was the adoption of UK public service quality standards by Australia in designing the country’s public service digitalization policy (Dunleavy et al., 2015). Third, Hybridization, this is most typical form of policy-oriented learning. This involves combining program elements and arrangements to develop policies that are relevant, pertinent, and appropriate to the needs of program recipients (Evans, 2017). Fourth, inspiration which involves ideas that emerge from fresh thinking of policy issues that aim at fostering policy change (Chapman, 2006). The relevancy of the approach lies in the fact that it fosters combination of ideas/lessons that returnees propose with organizational context and culture.

To be relevant and appropriate to the Indonesian context, teaching approaches and methods that expert returnees learnt from

their experiences while studying in Germany, can be proposed for adoption in Indonesian educational institutions with modifications that take into account differences in teaching and learning conditions that in turn are influenced by the goals, objectives and principles of the educational system. The education system is influenced by the country’s social, political (ideology), economic and cultural context (Interview with Rudi, Returnees, and academics from Syiah Kuala University, 2020).

Nonetheless, there are cases the policies that were adopted were inspired by ideas/lessons that expert returnees proposed which were used to modify existing policies and institutions to improve the quality and organizational performance. Policies that were adopted in the Ministry of Trade, and Central Java province, were for example in part, based on ideas/lessons, which participants of the CIM expert returnees’ program proposed (Interview with Immanuel, Returnees from the Ministry of Trade, 2020). Such ideas were combined with organizational conditions and requirements and needs, knowledge, conditions of the community, and the local environment (central Java province (Interview with Ocaso, Returnees from the Central Java Provincial Government, 2020)) to inform the design and development of policies that were both relevant and appropriate to the needs and condition of the organization. Some respondents contended that ideas/lessons. This happened to be the case where ideas/lessons that were proposed were in line with organizational requirements and institutional condi-

tions that obviated the need for modification.

The fourth dimension is “barriers to policy-oriented learning”. Evidence of policy transfer is only discernible from its implementation. Based on a meta-analysis study, three sets of variables influence policy transfer (Evans, 2017), including: “cognitive” barriers in the pre-decision phase, “environmental” barriers in the implementation phase and “domestic public opinion”.

Based on research results, one of the key factors that influenced acceptance of ideas/lessons was the extent to which the organizations where expert returnees worked had a welcoming culture to new ideas/lessons as well as individuals with varying personalities. Acceptance of ideas/lessons in this context is not limited to providing employment to expert returnees but also ensuring the positions returnees held were vested in sufficient authority and responsibility to support the policy adoption and improvement process (Interview with Immanuel, Returnees from the Ministry of Trade, 2020). In addition, receptibility of ideas/lessons by working colleagues in organizations where expert returnees worked, also influenced the effectiveness of the program. Based on results of the study, colleagues in organizations where expert returnees worked were not resistant to ideas and lessons/knowledge that program participant proposed. This in part because such ideas /lessons generated benefits to organizational working environment, business process and other aspects that enhanced performance.

A good example of this was the acceptabil-

ity of educational equipment (robots) by Syiah Kuala University, which expert returnees contributed to the University in their capacities as participants in CIM expert returnee program. Organizations and colleagues did not hamper the adoption of such equipment because of the contribution they made toward improving the learning process, and by extension, organizational performance (Interview with Rudi, Returnees, and academics from Syiah Kuala University, 2020) such as technical guidelines (Interview with Tedi, Returnees from the Ministry of Energy and Mineral Resources, 2020).

Nonetheless, some of the ideas/lessons that program participants proposed faced resistance from organizations where expert returnees worked. This happened to be the case where ideas or knowledge that expert returnees proposed for adoption in the organization were deemed not relevant or not in line with the needs and conditions of the organization, and fears that implementing such ideas would be difficult. That said, resistance that occurred was in certain cases as a result of sufficient understanding of some stakeholders about the relevancy and significance of the ideas/lessons that were proposed by expert returnees to the organization. Thus, there was need for the program to create space where expert returnees could address some of the fears of organizations prior to taking decisions on whether to accept or reject such ideas. One of the ways to enhance acceptability in organizations where resistance occurred was to intensify communication and engagement with

middle managers and employees to explain the benefits, relevancy, and importance of adopting such ideas/lessons to working environment and employee performance in the organization (Interview with Rudi, Returnees, and academics from Syiah Kuala University, 2020). In some cases, resistance to ideas program participants proposed was attributable to the failure of communication between top management and leaders with managers and organizational staff about the need and urgency for the adoption. It is a problem that is emblematic of public bureaucracy that is festooned in rigidity that is formalized in operational procedures, multi layered decision making and hierarchy. Reducing such resistance called for negotiated agreements that supported by explanations and expositions of the urgency and importance of the proposed ideas to the organization.

Resistance from external sources was another obstacle, which ideas/lessons that CIM program participants proposed to organizations where they work. In most cases opposition to ideas arose downstream industries and agents that nursed fears that the implementation of ideas proposed would harm their businesses. This was the case with respect to ideas on agricultural products such as palm oil. Trade and agriculture practitioners and regulators showed resistance to proposals that were aimed at improving production and trading practices of palm oil. More specifically, producers of cosmetics, biodiesel, and other palm oil derivative industries were opposed to any ideas, which they deemed would con-

strain the supply of one their main raw material-palm oil (Interview with Immanuel, Returnees from the Ministry of Trade, 2020).

What should be underrated is the importance of winning the support of the local community if the ideas are not only going to be acceptable to organizations but also incorporated into aspects of organizations that affect communities. Many program participants found public opposition to ideas they proposed for adoption as a major obstacle that led to their rejection by organizations where they were employed. The main source of opposition came from members of the public, who perhaps did not have sufficient knowledge and information about the ideas and how their implementation would impact their lives. A good case in point was the idea of adopting organic waste processing system using black solid flies, which received support of Central Java provincial government. Despite the benefits of the idea to the community, the novelty of its implementation and public perception about the effect those involved in its adoption on their esteem in the community, meant that the idea failed to receive wide acceptance which eventually culminated in its abandonment (Interview with Ocaso, Returnees from the Central Java Provincial Government, 2020).

The fifth dimension is “Outputs from the process of transfer”. Based on Hall (1993) terminology, there are several outputs of policy transfer process. First-order changes in the arrangement of policy instruments that are used to achieve policy objectives (marginal

adjustment to the status quo). Change can occur more than once during the compilation process. Changes can be in the form of a policy to increase budget support for improvement, which are reflected in past policies and new developments. Second, the second-order changes in policy instruments themselves, such as the development of new institutions and systems. This change takes the form of changing existing policy instruments without radically changing the objectives behind the policy. Third, changes in the actual goals that guide policy in certain areas (ideas, attitudes, and concepts). Not only have policy settings changed, but also there has also been a radical shift in the objectives and set of instruments that guide policy, which can lead to changes in ideas, attitudes, and concepts. Doubtless, policy change can generate negative lessons that can inform policy improvement (Evans, 2017).

The relevancy and importance of this dimension lies in helping in determining whether or not identifying policy transfer is beneficial to agencies/organizations. Based on the results of the study, respondents acknowledged the importance of outcomes of the policy transfer process in triggering and supporting changes/developments to existing policies/systems in the organization or agency where program participants were working. The changes and adjustments that were made were aimed at ensuring that the ideas or policies implemented based on ideas /lessons program participants proposed were in line with conditions and situation in Indonesia. This

notion was corroborated by one of the program participants who is an employee of Ministry of Energy and Mineral Resources. In responding to the need for changes in ideas/lessons that were proposed, Tedi noted that changes in the policy transfer process was necessary in order to align them to existing policies and institutional framework in the organization. Specifically for ideas that related to changing technical guidelines in the mining industry, the adoption process entailed making changes that ensured that the impact of the policy change in the aftermath of the implementation of the technical guidelines created a level playing fields for large, medium, and small mining enterprises in Indonesia.

CONCLUSION

The implementation of policy transfer through CIM's Returning Experts facilitated by the GIZ has the main goal of promoting development through knowledge transfer of ideas that support national development in general and the implementation of activities that contribute to archiving SDGs. The policy transfer process entails transfer of knowledge, experience, and networks that expert returnees acquired while studying and living in Germany. Output from policy transfers led to changes and adjustments in operational, management, and working environment of organizations that were beneficiaries of the program. Policy change through knowledge transfer contributed to strengthening various local actors who were participants in activities

that support development and SDG related in Indonesia.

Highlights of the research results underscore the fact that policy transfer occurs through a negotiated process of the ideas/that returnees propose to agencies prior to becoming accepted and adopted in the organization. In most cases adoption of ideas/knowledge is possible through a hybridization process that involves a combination of of news ideas /knowledge with organizational values and culture. The policy transfer process takes mainly two forms including knowledge and experience. The adoption of knowledge and experience that expert returnees bring to the organization is preceded by or occurs in simultaneity with alignment and adjustment of the ideas /lessons with conditions in the receiving organization. The policy transfer process faced various obstacles including lack of understanding of the relevancy and importance of ideas and knowledge to organizations and community, negative perception of the local community, and opposition from external stakeholders who considered the adoption of the ideas to be detrimental to their interests.

From this study, there are three following lessons learned for successful policy transfer processes: First, the policy transfer recipient, in general, will sort out which policy lessons are appropriate, and which are not. Therefore, the negotiated transfer form becomes preferable. Second, a learning process that accommodates the incorporation of ideas or policy lessons from outside into the preexisting local

culture remains critical to the success of policy transfer. Finally, substantial efforts to provide understanding to key stakeholders regarding the urgency of the problems to be addressed and the proposed solution ideas offered by returnees are the main keys in overcoming obstacles to the transfer of policy learning processes. Future research is required to improve our understanding of the main sources of inspiration advocated by the returnees, particularly under what conditions do the returnees are highly influenced by their experiences from abroad rather than the insights that they get soon after their return or other alternative resources. Furthermore, it is also suggested to examine the collective impact contributed by the returnees as a group (not as an individual) to the achievement of wider local/national objectives and sustainable development goals (SDGs).

REFERENCES

- BMZ.de. (2019). *Ministry*. <https://www.bmz.de/en/ministry>
- Bulmer, S., Dolowitz, D., Humphreys, P., & Padgett, S. (2017). *Policy transfer in European Union Governance*. Routledge.
- Chapman, B. (2006). *Income Contingent Loans as Public Policy. Occasional Paper 2/2006, Canberra*. The Academy of the Social Sciences in Australia.
- Chen, Y. C. (2008). The limits of brain circulation: Chinese returnees and technological development in Beijing. *Pacific Affairs*, 81(2), 195–215. <https://doi.org/10.5509/2008812195>

- Cimoline. (2020a). *About CIM*. <https://www.cimonline.de/en/html/about-cim.html>
- Cimoline. (2020b). *Returning Experts*. <https://www.cimonline.de/en/html/returning-experts.html>
- Dolowitz, D. P., & Medearis, D. (2009). Considerations of the obstacles and opportunities to formalizing cross-national policy transfer to the United States: A case study of the transfer of urban environmental and planning policies from Germany. *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy*, 27(4), 684–697. <https://doi.org/10.1068/c0865j>
- Dunleavy, P., Mark, E., & McGregor, C. (2015). *Connected Government: Towards digital era governance?* <https://researchprofiles.canberra.edu.au/en/publications/connected-government-towards-digital-era-governance>
- Evans, M. (2010). *New Directions in the Study of Policy Transfer*. Routledge.
- Evans, M. (2017). *International Policy transfer: Between Global and Sovereign and Between Global and Local*. In D. Stone & K. Moloney (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Global Policy and Transnational Administration* (pp. 1-16). Oxford University Press.
- Evans, M., & Davies, J. (1999). Understanding policy transfer: A Multi-level, multi-disciplinary perspective. *Public Administration*, 77(2), 361-385. *Public Administration*, 77(2), 361–385.
- GIZ.de. (2019). *Germany further supports Indonesia with around 37 million EUR in grant funding*. <https://www.giz.de/en/worldwide/76182.html>
- GIZ.de. (2020). *Our Service*.
- Haas, P. M. (1992). Introduction: Epistemic communities and international policy coordination. In *International Organization* (Vol. 46, Issue 1). <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0020818300001442>
- Hall, P. A. (1993). Policy Paradigms, Social Learning, and the State: The Case of Economic Policymaking in Britain. *Comparative Politics*, 25(3), 275. <https://doi.org/10.2307/422246>
- Minkman, E. (Ellen), van Buuren, M. W. (Arwin., & Bekkers, V. J. J. M. (Victor. (2018). Policy transfer routes: an evidence-based conceptual model to explain policy adoption. *Policy Studies*, 39(2), 222–250. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01442872.2018.1451503>
- Park, C., Wilding, M., & Chung, C. (2014). The importance of feedback: Policy transfer, translation and the role of communication. *Policy Studies*, 35(4), 397–412. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01442872.2013.875155>
- Saldana, J. (2015). *The Coding Manual for Qualitative Researchers* (3rd edition). SAGE Publications.
- Stone, D. (1999). Learning Lessons and Transferring Policy across Time, Space and Disciplines. *Politics*, 19(1), 51–59. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9256.00086>
- Yalcin, B. (2018). What is Globalization. *ResearchGate Article*. <https://doi.org/10.13140/>

RG.2.2.16793.93288