

## VILLAGE FUND POLICY: MEASURING THE PROGRESS OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT IN FOUR REGENCY IN THE TOBA CALDERA THROUGH THE VILLAGE DEVELOPMENT INDICATOR (IPD) AND VILLAGE BUILDING INDEX (IDM)

Amran Manurung<sup>1\*</sup>, Erlina<sup>2</sup>, Sirojuzilam<sup>3</sup>, Suwardi Lubis<sup>4</sup>

Student of the Regional Planning Doctoral Program, Universitas Sumatera Utara<sup>1</sup>

Faculty of Economic and Business Universitas Sumatera Utara<sup>2,3,4</sup>

\*Correspondence Email: [amran.sdkkonsultan@gmail.com](mailto:amran.sdkkonsultan@gmail.com)

### Abstract

Economic development is a process of developing community capacity in the long term so that it requires proper and accurate planning in reducing economic inequality between cities and regencies. One of the indicators for measuring the success of economic development in 4 regencies, namely North Tapanuli, Toba, Humbang Hasundutan and Samosir, which are in the Toba Caldera Area as a center for the development of world Geopark tourism which has been designated by UNESCO as a world heritage from the geological aspect. The purpose of this research is to conduct a descriptive economic analysis of the progress of the economic aspects of the 4 districts in the Toba Caldera region through the 2018 Village Development Index (IPD), namely to become Disadvantaged - Developing - Independent districts. While the Developing Village Index (IDM) will explain 5 categories of Regency achievements for the status of villages classified as Very Disadvantaged - Underdeveloped - Developing - Advanced - Independent to prove the implementation of the Village Fund policy. The results of the study show that the 4 districts resulting from the division of regional autonomy policies and Fiscal Decentralization in Indonesia plus the Village Fund, it turns out that in 2020-2021 there are no districts that are included in the category of Independent and Advanced IDM Status. However, there are 2 districts that are in the Developing category, namely Samosir Regency with an IDM achievement of 0.6275 which is ranked 301st nationally and 12th at the provincial level in North Sumatra for City Regency. Furthermore, Toba Regency with an IDM of 0.6268 ranks 314th nationally and 14th province. Finally, Humbang Hasundutan Regency has an IDM of 0.60502 in the 347th and 15th ranks. While the parent district, before the era of Regional Autonomy, namely North Tapanuli Regency, was only included in the IDM status category, it was still lagging behind with an achievement of only 0.5904 being ranked 358th nationally and 8th in the province. In the IPD category, North Sumatra Province only reached 56.82, below the Sumatra Island average of 60.02, and the national average IPD reached 59.36. Furthermore, for these 4 regencies below the national average, the Sumatra Island region and the Provinces namely North Tapanuli 55.04, Toba 56.20, Humbang Hasundutan 56.08 and Samosir 54.84. So there is still much to be achieved by the Government of the 4 Regencies in order to improve people's lives optimally, prosperously, fairly and evenly, where the central government has stimulated the Village Fund policy which increased in value in the last 5 years before the Covid-19 pandemic.

**Keywords:** Economic Development- IMD and IPD- Toba Caldera

### INTRODUCTION

Economic development is an effort to improve people's living standards as measured by the level of income per capita. Economic development is a process that includes changes in structure, attitude to life, institutions, in addition to increasing economic growth, reducing inequality in income distribution and eradicating poverty. As a result of the differences and diversity of natural resource potential, geographical location, and quality of human resources in various regions of Indonesia, which is followed by

*Amran Manurung\*, Erlina, Sirojuzilam, Suwardi Lubis*

differences in the performance of each region, this has led to development imbalances between regions (Todaro & et al, 2011: 54)1.

Economic development is also a process of developing community capacity in the long term so that it requires proper and accurate planning. This means that planning must be able to cover when, where and how development must be carried out in order to be able to stimulate sustainable economic and social growth. In other words, development plan makers must be able to predict the impact of development that will be carried out both in the short term and in the long term (Alfiaturrahman, 2016: 252)2.

One of the efforts to improve the regional economy, the Jokowi government has chosen a policy with the concept of building from the periphery. The current application of the concept of “building from the periphery” is supported by the situation where fiscal policy focuses on infrastructure development, especially with the aim of developing connectivity between suburban areas and economically more developed areas. Thus, infrastructure development focuses on the construction of transportation infrastructure and facilities such as roads (including toll roads), bridges, airports, seaports, rivers and lakes. This policy emphasizes the importance of long-term insight, in the sense that the return on investment can only be obtained relatively long after the investment is invested. This choice raises its own problems in fiscal management which is not easy and the management of public trust is quite risky (Priyarsono, 2017: 48)3.

Regional economic development is a process by which local governments and their communities can manage existing resources and form a partnership pattern between local governments and the private sector to create new jobs to support the development of regional economic activities. Regional economic development strategies can be grouped into 4, namely: (1) physical/local development strategy (locality or physical development strategy), (2) business development strategy, (3) Human resource development strategy (strategy), and (4) Community-based development strategy in Fendy and Siwu, (2015: 21)4.

In Law No. 32 of 2004 it is stated that regional autonomy is the right, authority, and obligation of an autonomous region to regulate and manage its own government affairs and the interests of the local community in accordance with statutory regulations. There are 3 (three) main reasons for the implementation of regional autonomy, namely (1) political equality, to increase community political participation at the regional level; (2) local accountability, increasing the ability and responsibility of regional governments in realizing the rights and aspirations of the community in order to increase economic growth and social welfare in the region; (3) local responsiveness, increasing the responsibility of local governments to socio-economic problems that occur in their regions in Sjafrizal (2018: 30)5. The objectives of regional autonomy have 3 main missions, namely: a) improving the quality and quantity of public services and public welfare. b) creating efficiency and effectiveness in the management of regional resources. c) empowering and creating space for the community to participate in the development process in Tambunan (2019: 233)6.

*Amran Manurung\*, Erlina, Sirojuzilam, Suwardi Lubis*

Village development is one of the affairs under the authority of the Village, as an implication of implementing development from the periphery. This policy requires financing that is supported by the central government through Regional Financial Transfers with Village Funds from expenditure components in the APBN. The Village Fund is also a component of revenue in the APBDes (Village Revenue and Expenditure Budget). The Village fund allocation budget will be used to support Village autonomy activities so that they can be maximized in providing services, development, and community empowerment at the rural level in Karimah (2018: 597).

The existence of development priorities in this village area can provide many economic and social benefits, one of which is reducing the occurrence of urbanization of residents from villages to cities. Infrastructure development in the village will be adapted to the needs of the village, both for aspects of education, health, transportation, tourism and others. This means that through facilities and infrastructure, the economy in the village will provide business opportunities that will provide employment for the villagers. If in the villages there are already many business fields open in increasing the income and quality of life of the community, then the flow of urbanization of the population from villages to cities will decrease.

The village, as the lowest administrative area, has independently been made the subject of economic development. The goal is to reduce the development gap between rural and urban areas which tends to be urban biased (urban bias). In addition, bringing government services closer to the village level, so that it becomes a solution for socio-economic changes in rural areas. So the village government is expected to be able to provide services to the community through infrastructure development and empowerment.

According to Law Number 6 of 2014 concerning Villages, villages need to be protected and empowered to become strong, advanced, independent. An independent village can create a solid foundation in implementing governance and development towards a just, prosperous and prosperous society. Its implementation is regulated in the 2015–2019 RPJMN, which places villages as targets for regional progress. The objectives are to: (1) Map out the condition of villages in Indonesia based on their level of development; (2) Setting development targets/targets in the next 5 (five) years that must be achieved jointly by village development actors; and (3) Photographing the performance of development that has been implemented in the village.

In realizing this goal, it is necessary to have a measure in the form of an index such as the Village Development Index (IPD) in the BPS (2019)<sup>8</sup> about a composite index describing the level of progress or development of a village at a time. Furthermore, the Village Development Index (IDM) in the Ministry of Villages PDT (2020)<sup>9</sup> regarding an approach that relies on social, economic and ecological strengths without forgetting the power of politics, culture, history, and local wisdom. and Geographical Difficulty Index (IKG) The source of IKG data comes from the attachment to the Minister of Finance Regulation Number 247 of 2015 concerning Village Funds in Adinugroho et al (2016)<sup>10</sup>.

Amran Manurung\*, Erlina, Sirojuzilam, Suwardi Lubis

Through the IPD, village development is the target of the Indonesian government's 2015-2019 RPJMN where there will be a reduction in underdeveloped villages by 5,000 villages, as well as an increase in independent villages by 2,000 villages. On the basis of this mandate, villages are classified based on IPD into Independent Villages, Developing Villages, and Disadvantaged Villages, with the final result of the preparation of this IPD being the mapping of villages based on the level of village development.

The village development paradigm has followed the pattern of decentralization, by providing a new paradigm for village officials to understand and run the financial system, transparency through community empowerment, so that institutional strengthening at the village level is needed to encourage village government to work better. can be a new hope and a good stimulus for economic growth in rural areas in Antlöv (2016)<sup>11</sup>. The condition of the development of the Village Fund from the APBN can be seen in the following picture:



Source : [www.indonesiabaik.id](http://www.indonesiabaik.id)

Picture 1-1

## LITERATURE REVIEW

### Development of Village Funds and Number of Villages in 2015 – 2020

North Sumatra Province is known to have great potential in the development of very varied natural and cultural tourism. One of its biggest potentials is the tourism sector, namely Lake Toba. Lake Toba is the largest Caldera Lake in the world as a result of the eruption of Mount Toba (super volcano) and has been recognized by the UNESCO world body as a Global Geopark. As a world geopark, the Toba Caldera area consists of areas with different histories regarding the number of eruptions that produce differences in formation from one location to another. Each has its own uniqueness and characteristics as caldera walls, sediments, volcanic hills (lava dome), and Samosir Island which rises from the bottom of the caldera with many lakes above the lake. Although the lake above the lake that is often mentioned is only Lake Sidihoni, in fact there are also Aek Natonang and other small lakes.

In terms of culture, the Batak tribe consists of various sub-ethnics as a unit that is united by Lake Toba. It is also united from all aspects, so that it can become a stronger unit as a tourist attraction, as well as in the context of preserving cultural values, local wisdom.

*Amran Manurung\*, Erlina, Sirojuzilam, Suwardi Lubis*

(local wisdom), as well as tangible and intangible heritage related to sub- ethnicity. The Toba Caldera area includes 7 (seven) district government areas, namely: Samosir, Toba Samosir, Simalungun, Karo, Dairi, North Tapanuli and Humbang Hasundutan regencies. The Toba Caldera area is also included in the category of National Tourism Strategy Area (KSPN) based on PP No. 50 2011 concerning the National Tourism Development Master Plan 2010-2025, so that it becomes a priority in tourism development.

The formulation of the problem from this research is about how the development of the Village Fund and the achievements of the Village Building Index (IDM) and the Village Development Index (IPD) that can be achieved by the 4 districts namely North Tapanuin, Toba, Humbang Hasundutan and Samosir are located in the World Geopark area as the location tourist attraction in the TobaCaldera area. While the goal is to conduct a descriptive economic analysis for the development of Village Funds, the achievement of the Village Development Index (IDM) in measuring the development of the Village classification and the Village Development Index (IPD) as a measuring tool for the achievement of village facilities and infrastructure procurement on average for the district level, so that The average achievement of these indicators is a measure of economic development achievement at the district government level, namely, North Tapanuli, Toba, Samosir, and Humbang Hasundutan which are located in the Toba Caldera Region, North Sumatra.

Economic development is a process of change that can be planned to improve various aspects of people's lives. The transformation of the economic structure, for example, can be seen from the increase or rapid production growth as well as sectoral economic changes. Social transformation can be seen through the distribution of wealth through equitable access to socio-economic resources, such as education, health, housing, clean water, recreational facilities and participation in the political decision-making process. The process that occurs in society has several goals, namely increasing the availability of development and expanding the distribution of various necessities of life, increasing living standards, and expanding economic and social choices for each individual and the nation as a whole (Todaro and Smith, 2006: 28)12 .

From the point of view of economics, it is usually defined as an effort to achieve a sustainable growth rate of per capita income (per capita income) so that the state can increase output faster than the rate of population growth. The rate and rate of growth of gross national income (gross national income) per capita "real" is often used to measure the economicwelfare of the population.

There are three basic components (basic items) of economic development that serve as practical guidelines for understanding the true meaning of development. The three components are:

- a) Adequacy (food) is the ability to meet basic needs.
- b) Self-esteem, namely being a whole person, which is a feeling of worth and dignity, not being used to achieve other people's goals.
- c) Freedom, namely the ability to choose, namely the concept of human freedom.

There are 3 methods of calculating national income, namely (a) Aggregate expenditure; (b) Revenue; and (c) Net production. The aggregate expenditure approach has 5 components in Mankiw (2007)<sup>13</sup>, namely: household consumption (C); gross fixed capital (I); Government spending (G); Net exports (X- M). formulation becomes:

$$Y = C + I + G + (X-M)$$

Village development as a process to improve the capability of the population in managing and utilizing the potential that exists in the village. The development paradigm that prioritizes human development is based on the social dimension (social resilience index-IKS), economic dimension (economic resilience index-IKE), and ecological dimensions (Environmental resilience index-IKL). The social resilience index consists of the following dimensions: social capital, health, education, and housing. The economic resilience index consists of an economic dimension. While the environmental resilience index consists of ecological dimensions (Naritha et. al., 2016: 41)<sup>15</sup>. Meanwhile, according to Sumarja's opinion, it states that community development is a development effort that is only directed at the quality of its human beings, while rural development seeks community development accompanied by its environment (Numan, 2015: 240)<sup>16</sup>. The formulation of the development program includes three main elements, namely: first, the direction of the policy, second, the description and specifications of the development goals, and third, the targets and targets to be achieved from the implementation of the program.

The Village Development Index (IPD) is a measure compiled to assess the level of progress or development of villages in Indonesia with the unit of analysis "Village". The IPD measurement is village specific, which is built from 2 (two) data sources, namely: (1) data from the Village Potential Data Collection (Podes) conducted by the Central Statistics Agency (BPS) and used as a reference for the main indicators that make up the index; and (2) data on Government Administration Areas according to the Regulation of the Minister of Home Affairs of the Republic of Indonesia Number 39 of 2015 in the Ministry of Home Affairs (2015)<sup>17</sup> which is used as a standard reference regarding the number of registered villages in Indonesia.

On the basis of this mandate, Villages are classified based on IPD into Independent Villages, Developing Villages and Disadvantaged Villages in all provinces or urban districts in Indonesia accompanied by information for each of its constituent dimensions, variables, and indicators. The classification of villages has been carried out with the following classifications: Self-sufficient Villages, Self-Sufficient Villages, and Self-Help Villages. Almost all villages welcome the classification as an effort to find out the level of development of each village. The village classification is re-emerged in the 2015–2019 RPJMN, especially in relation to village development goals which aim to:

Mapping the condition of villages in Indonesia based on their level of development;

- a) Setting development targets/targets in the next 5 (five) years that must be achieved jointly by village development actors; and

- b) Photographing the performance of development that has been implemented in the village

The preparation of this IPD was carried out with the aim of making the IPD as:

1. A tool/instrument that provides information for village development actors at the central, regional, and village levels so that they can carry out appropriate policy interventions as an effort to leverage their village development;
2. A tool to monitor and evaluate village development performance in order to achieve the 2015–2019 RPJMN targets/targets.

IPD is compiled with “Village” as the unit of analysis, and is added with various information in the form of average index per island, average index per province, and average index per district/city to provide a portrait related to the condition or development status of villages. per island, province, and regency/city in Indonesia. In other words, IPD is a measuring tool made to answer questions related to how to fulfill or achieve the dimensions/aspects, variables, and indicators as an elaboration of the dimensions/aspects of village development. IPD is expected to provide a number of benefits.

IPD has contained important data and information that can be used as a reference/reference to see the condition and level of village development in Indonesia in its current position. This data is very helpful for policy makers at the central and regional levels, observers, researchers, students, and even the village community itself to understand the current state of progress in village development in Indonesia. IPD is useful as material for village development planning at the central level (Ministry/Institution) , provincial level (Bappeda and SKPD related to village development), district/city level (Bappeda and SKPD related to village development), and village level (village government and village community). IPD contains data that can show which dimensions, variables, and indicators need to be supported to be further improved and which do not need to be supported because they are considered optimal/adequate at the village level. All village development stakeholders can use IPD as a reference in the process of policy formulation, preparation, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of village development programs. Third, IPD is useful for monitoring and evaluating the implementation of programs in village development, the suitability of the programs that have been implemented with village needs, and achieving an increase in the status of the village's progress in the BPS (2014)18.

The dimensions and variables of IPD are based on the synthesis of: (1) 2014 Village Potential Data (2) Law no. 6 of 2014 concerning Villages, especially in Article 74 concerning the needs of village development and Article 78 concerning the objectives of village development. Article 74 states that there are at least 4 aspects that need to be fulfilled in village development, namely: (1) basic needs; (2) basic services; (3) environment; and (4) Village community empowerment activities. In the explanation section of the law, basic needs are defined as efforts to meet the needs of food, clothing, and housing.

*Amran Manurung\*, Erlina, Sirojuzilam, Suwardi Lubis*

Meanwhile, basic services include education, health, and basic infrastructure. Whereas in the article the objectives of village development include: (1) Community Welfare; (2) Quality of Life; and (3) Poverty Reduction. This is realized through (1) Basic Needs; (2) Facilities; (3) Infrastructure; (4) Local Economic Development; and (5) Sustainable Utilization of Natural Resources.

- a. The results of the synthesis divide the IPD dimensions into 5 dimensions according to the availability of data/variables in the 2014 Village Potential data, namely as follows.
- b. a. Basic Services represent aspects of basic services to realize part of the basic needs, specifically for education and health.
- c. b. Infrastructure Conditions represent Basic Needs; Means; Infrastructure; Local Economic Development; and Sustainable Utilization of Natural Resources by separating the aspects of the 7 2014 Village Development Index from accessibility/transportation.
- d. Accessibility/Transportation is separated as a separate dimension in village development indicators with the consideration that transportation facilities and infrastructure have the specificity and priority of village development as a liaison for socio-economic activities in the village.
- e. Public Service is an effort to fulfill service needs for goods, services, and/or administrative services with the aim of strengthening democracy, social cohesion, environmental protection, and so on.
- f. The administration of government represents an indication of the performance of the village government, which is a form of administrative service organized by service providers for residents, in this case the government.

The constituent variables include independence such as: completeness of the Village Development Index, village governance, village autonomy, and village assets/wealth; and the quality of human resources such as: the quality of human resources for village heads and village secretaries.

The Village Development Index (IDM) in the Ministry of Village (2016)<sup>19</sup> is a concept of facilities in carrying out the development and development of village potential which is then contained in the 2015-2019 RPJMN Book. His visionary projection is to reduce the number of underdeveloped villages by 5000 villages and strive to increase independent villages by 2000 villages. In addition to focusing on village development and development, IDM also supports efforts to increase village autonomy. The spirit of village autonomy contained in Law no. The year 2014 also gave the village government flexibility in optimizing its village which then referred to national development.

The principles that form the basis for village regulation in the Village Law are strengthened by the affirmation of Village Authority. The authority of the village itself is explained to include authorities which include the administration of village governance, implementation of village development, village community development, and village

*Amran Manurung\*, Erlina, Sirojuzilam, Suwardi Lubis*

community empowerment based on community initiatives, origin rights, and village customs.

In the context of village typology, the Developing Village Index classifies villages into five (5) statuses, namely: Very Disadvantaged Village, Disadvantaged Village, Developing Village, Advanced Village and Independent Village. Of the five classifications, now the village statute has several divisions that are used as village indicators or parameters. The typology of the distribution of the Developing Village Index (IDM) can be divided into several things such as: “(1) very underdeveloped villages:  $< 0.491$ ; (2) underdeveloped villages:  $> 0.491$  and  $< 0.599$ ; (3) developing villages:  $> 0.599$  and  $< 0.707$ ; (4) developed villages:  $> 0.707$  and  $< 0.815$ ; and (5) independent village:  $> 0.815$ ” in Suroso (2019).

The typology is in line with the Ministry of Village Regulation No. 6 of 2016 which regulates the village development map. The first is very underdeveloped villages and underdeveloped villages. The characteristics of this village have several concepts in its development such as: first development, procurement, and maintenance; secondly the development of development facilities for economic activities in order to carry out activities both production, distribution, and marketing. In addition, to support the management of the village economy, the establishment of community economic enterprises can be carried out through the management of BUMDes as an asset owned by the village.

The second is a developing village which has several characteristics including: development and development of all economic infrastructure starting from production, retribution, and marketing as well as trying to become a food barn and economic business for rural communities. In terms of maintaining village infrastructure, developing villages try to procure facilities and infrastructure owned by the village so that they can provide services to the village community. To encourage this, the strengthening of the village economy is supported by BUMDes as access to the economy starting from the provision of capital, business management, distribution processes, and finally the marketing process, all of which are guided by the village government in order to help the economy and improve the quality and quantity of human resources.

The third is an advanced village and an independent village which is characterized as a village that has both the development, development and maintenance of village infrastructure based on productivity figures that are focused on a superior product. The process of empowering and maintaining infrastructure is supported by an excellent community service process with support for food security for rural communities. Management of village assets is supported by the productivity of BUMDes which strives to be able to carry out a good production, levy, and marketing and is supported by the quality of the village community with the aim of being a livelihood and activating the economy of the surrounding community in Sukarno (2020).

## METHOD

This research is a descriptive research which includes data collection to conduct economic analysis in answering the problem formulation that has been determined in this research. This descriptive research includes the assessment of attitudes or opinions towards individuals, organizations, circumstances or procedures. Examples of this assessment include market surveys. Descriptive data are generally collected through a list of questions in surveys, interviews or observations in Kuncoro (2013)<sup>20</sup>. While the research approach used is qualitative, namely data that cannot be measured on a numerical scale.

Basically, the types of qualitative data are classified into: nominal data, namely data stated in the form of categories, ordinal data, namely data that is not of the same degree because it is expressed on a ranking scale. The data that will be examined is the management of village funds in the Caldera area, especially in the Caldera area, especially in Simalungun Regency and Humbang Hasundutan Regency, when the research collected is from 2019 to 2021 and the questionnaire.

The scope of this research is to discuss and analyze the results of the Village Development Index (IPD) and the Village Development Index (IDM) in 4 districts in the Caldera Region, namely North Tapanuli, Toba, Humbang Hasundutan and Samosir regencies which were collected from BPS data including: underdeveloped villages, villages developing, and independent villages and the Ministry of Villages for IDM.

The focus of indicators in this study are rural socio-economic indicators which are included in the dimensions of the Village Development Index (IPD) and the Village Building Index (IDM). The procedure for generating the Developing Village Index is as follows:

- a) Each indicator has a score between 0 to d. 5; the higher the score reflects the level of significance. For example: scores for indicators of access to primary school education; if Village A has physical access  $\leq 3$  Km, then Village A gets a score of 5, and Village B has physical access  $> 10$  Km, then gets a score of 1. This means that Village A residents have better access than residents of Village B.
- b) Each indicator score is grouped into variables, resulting in a variable score. For example, the health variable consists of indicators (1) travel time to health services  $< 30$  minutes, (2) availability of health workers from doctors, midwives and other health workers, (3) access to poskesdes, polindes and posyandu, (4) activity level of posyandu and (5) membership of the Social Security Administration (BPJS).

Determining the status of each village is classified by calculating the range obtained from the maximum and minimum values. The range value obtained becomes the limiting status of each village, so that five village status classifications are determined, namely:

Tabel 3-1 : Village Status based on Building Village Index

No.	VILLAGE STATUS	LIMIT VALUE
1	Very Lagging	$\leq 0,491$
2	Lagging	$>0,491$ dan $\leq 0,599$
3	Develop	$>0,599$ dan $\leq 0,707$
4	developed	$>0,707$ dan $\leq 0,815$
5	independent	$>0,815$

Source : Kementrian desa dan PDT 2019

Furthermore, the data used in this study is a type of quantitative data presented in the form of numbers in the form of information or explanations about the classification of districts based on the village development index (IPD) and the Village Development Index (IDM).

The contents of the study method are data collection techniques, data sources, methods of data analysis, correlation tests, and so on, written in Times New Roman 12 font. This chapter can also include the scientific formula used for data analysis/correlation testing.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Administratively, Lake Toba is surrounded by 7 administrative districts, namely Samosir, Toba, Simalungun, Karo, Dairi, North Tapanuli, and Humbang Hasundutan districts which are divided into the waters of Lake Toba. The Toba Caldera area is mostly inhabited by the Batak tribe. However, before the implementation of the regional autonomy policy concept, the Toba Caldera area only consisted of 4 districts namely Simalungun, North Tapanuli, Dairi and Karo districts, so the 3 new districts were the result of governance policies, namely regional autonomy as a manifestation of regional expansion in achieving accelerated and equitable development. economy.

Based on this research, only 4 districts will be selected to achieve the research objectives, namely North Tapanuli, Toba, Samosir and Humbang Hasundutan Regencies. The total area of the 4 regencies to the area of the province of North Sumatra is as follows:

Tabel 4-1 : Area of 4 Regencies in the Toba Caldera Area Percentage to the area of North Sumatra Province

N O	KABUPATEN	IBUKOTA KABUAPTEN	LUAS WILAYAH (Km <sup>2</sup> )	PERSENTASE LUAS WILAYAH KABUPATEN TERHADAP PROVINSI (%)
1	Tapanuli Utara	Tarutung	3.791,64	5,20
2	Toba	Balige	2.328,89	3,19
3	Humbang Hasundutan	Dolok Sanggul	2.335,33	3,20
4	Samosir	Pangururan	2.069,05	2,84
	Sumatera Utara	Medan	72.981,23	-

Amran Manurung\*, Erlina, Sirojuzilam, Suwardi Lubis

As for the number of people living or residing in the 4 regencies and by gender in the Toba Caldera area, it can be seen in the following table:

Tabel 4-2 : Population Total by Gender in 4 Regencies of the Toba Caldera Area in 2020

No	Kabupaten	Laki-laki	Perempuan	Jumlah
1	Samosir	67.957	68.484	136.441
2	Toba	102.850	103.349	206.199
3	Tapanuli Utara	156.176	156.582	312.758
4	Humbang Hasundutan	98.958	98.793	197.751

Source: BPS Sumut (www.bps.sumut.go.id)

Based on the table above, the largest population is North Tapanuli Regency with 312,758 people in the Toba Caldera Region in 2020, while the least is Samosir Regency with only 136,441 people. So the largest population is North Tapanuli Regency as a Regency parent before regional autonomy.

Indikator Ekonomi Kaldera Toba Sumut

Economic growth is a process of changing the economic conditions of a country on an ongoing basis towards a better state over a certain period. The economic development of a region can be seen from the growth rate of Gross Regional Domestic Product (GDP) based on the constant price of the area, the occurrence of GRDP growth in an area can be caused by the increasing contribution of one of the sub-sectors in the area.

GRDP is one of the important indicators to determine the economic conditions in an area within a certain period, both on the basis of current prices and on the basis of constant prices. the value of final goods and services produced by all economic units in an area. The following is table 4- 3, namely GRDP in 4 Regencies in the Toba Caldera Region in 2014 and 2018 as follows:

Tabel 4-3 : PDRB untuk 4 Kabupaten Kawasan Kaldera Toba menurut Lapangan Usaha (3 sektoral tertinggi) Atas dasar Harga Konstan Tahun 2014 dan 2018

No	Kabupaten	PDRB 2014 (Rp ribuan)			PDRB 2018 (Rp.)		
		Pertanian, Kehutanan & Perikanan (1)	Perdagangan dan Eceran (2)	Industri Pengolahan (3)	Pertanian, Kehutanan & Perikanan (1)	Perdagangan dan Eceran (2)	Industri Pengolahan (3)
1	Samosir	1,467 200,28	30,590,25	16, 246,08	2,084, 654,42	44.463,45	21,373,57
2	Toba	124,46	143,325	106,87	132,55	159,72	114,65
3	Tapanuli Utara	2,353	603 911,12	95	3 223,92	1,056,49	161,40

Amran Manurung\*, Erlina, Sirojuzilam, Suwardi Lubis

		115,87		716,68			
4	Humbang Hasundutan	1,768 162,73	796, 470,14	652, 772,35	1,791,10	600,20	61,28

Based on the table above, it shows that the GRDP of the Regency in the Toba Caldera Region in 2014-2018 for the 3 Leading Sectors, namely Agriculture, Forestry & Fisheries, Wholesale and Retail Trade and Management Industry. As for the total number of GRDP in 4 regencies, it increased from 2014 to 2018. As is the case, the agriculture, forestry & fisheries sector in Simalungun Regency in 2014 gave a constant price of 12,026.85 while in 2018 the constant price changed to Rp. 14,496.33 billion which shows that there has been an increase for the sector in the last 4 years. In addition, the industrial management sector in Toba Regency in 2014 only provided a constant price of 108.87 while in 2018 it was seen that the sector contributed to a constant price of 114.65. This means that the industrial management sector in Toba Regency continues to grow and has an influence on GRDP. district.

#### Social Indicators of North Sumatra's Toba Caldera

Poverty is a state of being unable to meet basic needs such as food, clothing, shelter, education and health. According to the Central Statistics Agency (BPS), the poor are those whose calorie intake is below 2,100 calories based on food and non-food categories measured by infrastructure, including roads, houses, as well as social measures such as health and education. The problem of poverty is caused by things of a natural or cultural nature and by poor existing development strategies and policies. Many Indonesian people face poverty,

especially after the economic crisis in 1998, where the poverty rate tends to increase from year to year.

Poverty causes a person to be unable to meet his needs properly. Poor people have low purchasing power so that they cannot meet their needs, both physical and non-physical needs. This situation lowers his standard of living. A low standard of living can adversely affect human development, because the standard of living is one component of the Human Development Index (HDI). In the concept of human development, it is shown that human progress or human ability to meet the needs of life, both physical needs and non-physical needs. Poverty is a condition opposite to human development. So it can be concluded that the magnitude of poverty is negatively related or opposite to human development as measured by the Human Development Index (HDI).

Amran Manurung\*, Erlina, Sirojuzilam, Suwardi Lubis

The poverty level in the Toba Caldera area of North Sumatra can be seen in the following table:

Table 4-4 : Poverty Levels in 4 Regencies in the Toba Caldera Region 2020

N O	KABUPATEN	TINGKAT KEMISKINAN (%)	Jumlah Orang Miskin (Jiwa)	Garis Kemiskinan (Rp perbulan)
1	Tapanuli Utara	9,37	28,41	406.819
2	Toba	8,71	16,05	404.864
3	Humbang Hasundutan	9,36	17,92	374.768
4	Samosir	12,48	15,80	341.843
	<b>Sumatera Utara</b>	<b>8,83</b>	<b>72.981,23</b>	<b>502.904</b>

Source : BPS Sumatera Utara dalam Angka (www.bps.go.id)

Based on the table above, the highest poverty rate in the region in 4 districts is Samosir district at 12.48%, but the highest number of poor people is in North Tapanuli Regency as many as 28,410 people. When compared with the province of North Sumatra, it turns out that these 4 districts are above the province which reached 8.83%, as well as the poverty line indicator which is below the province as well.

#### Analysis of the Development of Village Funds in Regencies in North Sumatra

The National Tourism Development Program is contained in the PP of the Republic of Indonesia No. 50/2011 which underlies the policy on the management and development of tourism areas in Indonesia, including the Lake Toba tourism area. The development of this area will be even more significant with the stipulation of the Toba Caldera as a Unesco Global Geopark. At the meeting of the Unesco member states on 4 July in Paris. including with this determination, Lake Toba has been recognized worldwide as a tourist area and a place of research on local community wisdom and biodiversity. But on the other hand, the status as a Unesco Global Geopark is a challenge in itself to maintain it because it will be validated and evaluated every four years.

As a National Tourism Strategic Area (KSPN) which was proclaimed by President Jokowi through Presidential Regulation No. 3/2016, and in the context of coordinating tourism development, the Lake Toba Area Management Authority Agency was formed based on Presidential Regulation No. 49 of 2016, where the agency Besides having an authoritative function that has the authority to manage Lake Toba tourism, it also has a coordinating function in order to coordinate every stakeholder interest in the area.

The government through the Ministry of Tourism explained that the development of the Lake Toba area will be based on three main factors. The three factors are attractions, accessibility, and amenities (3A) as follows:

- a. Attractions are performances related to local cultural activities such as musical performances, dance performances, traditional customs and religious ceremonies, historical heritage, and othernatural resources. The government developed this attraction by referring to the UNESCO Global Geopark (UGG) certification qualification standards.

Amran Manurung\*, Erlina, Sirojuzilam, Suwardi Lubis

- b. Accessibility is the degree of ease of reaching a tourist attraction such as the Toba caldera through a means of transportation and its supporting facilities, both land, lake and air transportation.
- c. Amenity is tourism facilities such as restaurants, restaurants, gift shops, and public facilities such as places of worship, health, parks, and others.

The various tourism potentials of Lake Toba which are already worldwide, of course, my main thing is its natural resources, but of course the other ones are also no less potential such as culture, art, culinary, and souvenirs. All these potentials and conditions are certainly an opportunity for regions, especially regencies around the Lake Toba ecosystem to establish Inter-Regional Cooperation (KAD) to create various efficiencies and effectiveness in order to advance and develop the tourist area of Lake Toba. In order to improve the performance of Lake Toba tourism Toba, the government through Presidential Regulation Number 49 of 2016 has established the Lake Toba Tourism Area Management Authority Agency BOPDT. to carry out the development of the Lake Toba Tourism Area which is under and responsible to the President (Matthew Bangun, 2020: 219). So one of the supporters of development in the village area in order to support its development in the era of regional autonomy, the central government has a Village Fund policy as a central government deconcentration fund aimed directly at the village government.

According to data released by the Director General of Fiscal Balance, North Sumatra Province received the first Rp 1.46 trillion Village Fund in 2015. The amount of the Village Fund continued to increase fantastically until it reached Rp. 4.45 trillion in 2019. In detail in the explanation of the Ministry of Finance of the Republic of Indonesia in 2020, that the Provincial Government (Pemprov) of North Sumatra has received Village Funds of Rp. 4.5 trillion for 5,417 Villages. Furthermore, North Sumatra received a Budget Allocation of Rp. 7,915,875,054,000, - with details, among others, consisting of Profit Sharing Funds (DBH) of Rp. 406,297,261,000 (in thousands), Physical Special Allocation Funds (DAK) of Rp. 498,388,442,000 (in thousands), and Allocation Funds Specifically for Non-physical Rp.4,247,821,553,000 (in thousands) which is detailed in table 4-5 as follows:

Tabel 4-5 : Allocation of Village Funds in North Sumatra Province Year 2019-2020

Nama Daerah	Jumlah Desa	Dana Desa(dalam ribuanrupiah)		
		2019	2020	2021
Kab. Asahan	177	146.090.415	150.506.325	152.083.710
Kab. Dairi	161	127.172.564	130.304.470	129.738.730
Kab. Deli Serdang	380	306.386.948	312.277.329	312.546.966
Kab. Karo	259	197.078.926	201.208.286	198.409.273
Kab. Labuhan Batu	75	70.226.102	72.182.696	74.477.417
Kab. Langkat	240	205.446.268	211.213.265	213.259.749
Kab. Mandailing Natal	377	285.841.420	290.920.103	286.845.864

Amran Manurung\*, Erlina, Sirojuzilam, Suwardi Lubis

Kab. Nias	170	180.585.127	181.381.215	179.544.025
Kab. Simalungun	386	294.442.204	298.689.733	296.800.840
Kab. Tapanuli Selatan	211	167.751.279	172.034.790	169.754.513
Kab. Tapanuli Tengah	159	140.541.973	144.349.335	142.631.022
Kab. Tapanuli Utara	241	184.186.164	194.621.304	192.016.817
Kab. Toba Samosir	231	176.101.238	179.571.269	177.074.852
Kab. Pakpak Bharat	52	48.298.630	50.424.120	50.970.983
Kab. Nias Selatan	459	348.422.333	356.099.164	351.138.751
Kab. Humbang Hasundutan	153	123.336.297	126.028.454	124.934.505
Kab. Serdang Bedagai	237	184.774.302	187.834.594	185.739.448
Kab. Samosir	128	108.744.499	109.313.044	107.929.748
Kab. Batu Bara	141	118.843.171	121.634.028	121.071.737
Kab. Padang Lawas	303	230.097.858	233.549.721	230.275.200

Source : Direktorat Jenderal Perimbangan Keuangan 2020 (www.djpk.kemenkeu.go.id)

Based on the table above, it can be seen that the districts in North Sumatra Province that received the largest 2021 Village fund budgets were South Nias Regency (Rp. 304,227,954), Deli Serdang Regency (Rp. 251,866,280) with the number of villages the most that reached 459 villages. Then Simalungun Regency (Rp. 255,843,116) with a total of 386 villages. North Padang Lawas Regency (Rp. 255,843,116) is the third serial number with a total of 386 villages.

Mandailing Natal Regency with 377 villages, the amount of Village Funds obtained is Rp. 49,877,862,-. It is interesting to observe because of the five regions, South Nias District received the largest allocation of village funds, even though South Nias is a small district with the least population after North Padang Lawas District.

As for the regencies in the Toba Caldera area, where the central government through the Village Fund policy in the form of deconcentration by allocating a budget of Rp. 4.04 trillion for infrastructure development and basic utilities for the Toba Caldera area in 2020 (Bisnis.com, 2020)<sup>21</sup>. In addition, the development of tourist villages in the Toba Caldera area is considered to be able to take advantage of economic progress in rural areas.

The largest Village Fund Budget is in 2020, while in 2019 and 2021 the Village Fund Budget has decreased. The district in the Toba Caldera Region that received the largest Village Fund Budget was Simalungun Regency with a total of 386 villages, amounting to Rp. 296,800,840,-. Meanwhile, the regency that received the lowest Village Fund Budget in the Toba Caldera area was Samosir Regency with the least number of villages among the 7 regencies in the Toba Caldera area, which was only 128 villages. Management of Village Funds in the Caldera Area is currently required to focus on the tourism sector and better agriculture, as was determined before the Caldera area was known as a world geopark, which is stated in the Regional Regulation (Perda) of Samosir Regency Number 4 of 2011 concerning the Medium-Term Development Plan. Region (RPJMD) of Samosir Regency 2011- 2015. However, in reality, there is still economic inequality in villages in 7 (seven) regencies in the Toba Caldera area.

*Amran Manurung\*, Erlina, Sirojuzilam, Suwardi Lubis*

### **Development of the Village Development Index (IPD) in the Toba Caldera Region, North Sumatra**

The Village Development Index (IPD) is a measure compiled to assess the level of progress or development of villages in Indonesia. In Indonesia itself, at this time the acceleration of village development is closely related to the Village Fund policy which focuses on 2 categorizations, namely to increase economic activities including infrastructure development and quality of life for rural communities. Some of the developments that have been carried out are the construction of dams, village roads, bridges, village markets, soil retainers, boat moorings, clean water, drainage, irrigation canals, to toilets and wells. Development also includes social economic activities such as BUMDes (Village Owned Enterprises), construction of village sports venues, construction of PAUD (Early Childhood Education), Polindes (Village Maternity Boarding Schools), Posyandu (Integrated Health Service Posts), and other infrastructure.

This is consistent with the mandate of the Regulation of the Minister of Villages, Development of Disadvantaged Regions and Transmigration. The dimensions of the Village Development Index (IPD) can be seen in the following table into 5 dimensions that are adjusted to the availability of data/variables in the 2018 Village Potential data, as follows:

1. Basic Services, namely representing aspects of basic services to realize part of the basic needs, specifically for education and health.
2. Condition of Infrastructure, which represents Basic Needs; Means; Infrastructure; Local Economic Development; and Sustainable Utilization of Natural Resources by separating the aspects of accessibility/transportation.
3. Accessibility/Transportation, which is separated as a separate dimension in village development indicators with the consideration that transportation facilities and infrastructure have the specificity and priority of village development as a liaison for socio-economic activities in the village.
4. Public Services, namely efforts to fulfill service needs for goods, services, and/or administrative services with the aim of strengthening democracy, social cohesion, environmental protection, and so on.
5. Governance, which represents an indication of the performance of the village government, is a form of administrative service organized by service providers for residents, in this case the Government.

In relation to the Village Development Index (IPD) indicator and the dimensions of the IPD for 2014 and 2018 in 4 districts in the Toba Caldera Region and data for the Province of North Sumatra. The development of the Village Development Index (IPD) and the Dimensions of the Village Development Index (IPD) can be seen below:

Amran Manurung\*, Erlina, Sirojuzilam, Suwardi Lubis

Table 4-7 : Development of the Village Development Index (IPD) and IPD Dimensions in 2014 and 2018 for 4 Regencies in the Toba Caldera Region

NO	KABUPATEN	IPD - 2014	DIMENSI IPD 2014					IPD - 2018	Dimensi IPD 2018				
			Pelayanan Dasar	Kondisi Infrastruktur	Akses transportasi	Pelayanan Umum	Pelayanan Pemerintah		Pelayanan Dasar	Kondisi Infrastruktur	Akses transportasi	Pelayanan Umum	Pelayanan Pemerintah
1	Tapanuli Utara	48,95	49,89	36,56	77,75	39,31	30,57	55,03	51,97	43,09	78,65	41,63	60,85
2	Toba	51,44	50,87	41,53	72,27	39,31	30,57	56,2	50,64	46,37	77,95	44,58	66,59
3	Humbang Hasundutan	54,83	51,33	38,96	84,95	40,36	59,02	56,08	49,13	43,06	86,3	41,59	65,05
4	Samosir	49,15	47,7	33,78	73,55	38,62	48,02	54,84	51,54	39,67	79,46	42,15	66,57
	Sumatera Utara	53	54,34	38,15	74,58	46,01	49,97	53	54,34	38,15	74,58	46,01	49,97

Based on the data above, that in these 4 regencies the achievement of the IPD is still below the average standard of North Sumatra Province of 53.00 for both 2014 and 2018. When viewed based on the 5 dimensions of the IPD, namely basic services, infrastructure conditions, transportation access, Public services and government services are generally below the average for the province of North Sumatra, so there is still a lot to improve so that they are above the provincial and national averages. Only on the dimension of transportation access which is above the provincial average, which is more than 74.58. Humbang Hasundutan Regency reached the highest which was 84.95 in 2014 86.30 in 2018, then for the government service dimension the average index was close to the Province value in 2014 and experienced a fairly large increase in 2018 which was above the IPD average. dimensions of North Sumatra provincial government services.

Based on the IPD dimension table of North Sumatra Province in 2014 above, if you look at the 4 regencies in the Toba Caldera Region, North Sumatra, the following conclusions can be drawn:

1. Samosir Regency with a total of 128 Villages has a Basic Service system that reaches a level of 49.70 with Infrastructure Conditions of 33.53 and an Accessibility/Transportation level of 73.55 and Public Services has a level of 38.62 and the implementation of Government Administration has been running at 48.70. The percentage level of village classification in Samosir Regency which is still classified as underdeveloped village is 58.59 while developing village is 41.41 and independent village is 0.00 or no village is already independent.
2. Toba Samosir Regency with a total of 230 Villages has a Basic Service system that reaches a level of 50.87 with Infrastructure Conditions of 41.53 and an Accessibility/Transportation level of 72.27 and Public Services has a level of 39.49 and the implementation of good governance already running at 49.14. The percentage level of village classification in Toba Samosir Regency which is still classified as underdeveloped village is 39.96 while developing village is 62.61 and independent village is 0.00 or no village is already independent.
3. North Tapanuli Regency with a total of 241 Villages has a Basic Service system that reaches a level of 49.89 with an Infrastructure Condition of 36.56 and a level of Accessibility/Transportation of 77.75 and Public Services has a level of 39.31 and the implementation of good governance already running at 30.57. The percentage level of village classification in North Tapanuli Regency which is still classified as

*Amran Manurung\*, Erlina, Sirojuzilam, Suwardi Lubis*

underdeveloped village is 48.96 while developing village is 51.04 and independent village is 0.00 or no village is already independent.

4. Humbang Hasundutan Regency with a total of 153 Villages has a Basic Service system that reaches a level of 51.73 with an Infrastructure Condition of 38.96 and an Accessibility/Transportation level of 84.95 and Public Services has a level of 48.04 and the implementation of good governance already running at 59.02. The percentage level of village classification in Humbang Hasundutan Regency which is still classified as underdeveloped village is 29.41, while developing village is 69.93 and independent village is 0.65.

Based on the 2018 North Sumatra IPD dimension table, the following can be seen:

1. Samosir Regency with a total of 128 Villages has a Basic Service system that reaches a level of 51.54 with an Infrastructure Condition of 39.67 and a level of Accessibility/Transportation of 79.46 and Public Services has a level of 42.15 and the implementation of Government Administration has been running at 66.57. The percentage level of village classification in Samosir Regency which is still classified as underdeveloped village is 30.47 while developing village is 68.75 and independent village is 0.78.
2. Toba Samosir Regency with a total of 230 Villages has a Basic Service system that reaches a level of 50.64 with Infrastructure Conditions of 46.37 and an Accessibility/Transportation level of 77.95 and Public Services has a level of 44.58 and the implementation of good governance already running at 66.59. The percentage level of village classification in Toba Samosir Regency which is still classified as underdeveloped village is 21.21 while developing village is 77.92 and independent village is 0.87.
3. North Tapanuli Regency with a total of 241 Villages has a Basic Service system that reaches a level of 51.97 with Infrastructure Conditions of 43.09 and a level of Accessibility/Transportation of 78.65 and Public Services has a level of 41.63 and the implementation of good governance already running at 60.85. The percentage level of village classification in North Tapanuli Regency which is still classified as underdeveloped village is 28.63 while developing village is 70.95 and independent village is 0.41.
4. Humbang Hasundutan Regency with a total of 153 Villages has a Basic Service system that reaches a level of 49.13 with Infrastructure Conditions of 43.06 and an Accessibility/Transportation level of 86.30 and Public Services has a level of 41.59 and the implementation of Good Governance already running at 65.05. The percentage level of village classification in Humbang Haanglean Regency which is still classified as underdeveloped village is 21.57, while developing village is 75.82 and independent is 2.61. So, the above description in a more concise manner can be seen in Table 4-7 below:

Amran Manurung\*, Erlina, Sirojuzilam, Suwardi Lubis

Table 4-7 : Development of the Village Development Index (IPD) with the percentage of Villages according to Village Status achieved in 4 Regencies in the Toba Caldera Region, North Sumatra in 2014 and 2018

NO	KABUPATEN	Tahun 2014					Tahun 2018				
		IPD	Jumlah Desa	% Desa menurut Status Desa			IPD	Jumlah Desa	% Desa menurut Status Desa		
				Tertinggal	Berkembang	Mandiri			Tertinggal	Berkembang	Mandiri
1	Tapanuli Utara	48,95	241	48,96	51,04	0	55,03	241	28,63	70,95	0,41
2	Toba	51,44	230	39,96	62,61	0,43	56,2	231	21,21	77,92	0,87
3	Humbang Hasundutan	54,83	153	29,41	69,93	0,65	56,08	153	21,57	75,82	2,61
4	Samosir	49,15	124	58,59	41,49	0	54,84	124	30,47	68,75	0,78
	Sumatera Utara	53	5389	37,65	61,22	1,63	53	5390	37,65	61,22	1,63

Based on table 4-7 above, the Implementation of Government, which represents an indication of the performance of the village government, is a form of administrative service organized by service providers for residents, which in this case is the Government. Therefore, this variable needs to be measured and stands alone as an indicator of village development, because of its nature as a tool for implementing the village development goals. The constituent variables include independence such as: completeness of village administration, village autonomy, and village assets/wealth; and the quality of human resources such as: the quality of human resources for village heads and village secretaries.

Based on the IPD comparison table above, it can be seen that village development indicators such as: basic services, infrastructure, accessibility/transportation, public services and governance have increased between IPD in 2014 to IPD in 2018 in 4 districts in the Toba Caldera Region, North Sumatra. This means that a lot of progress can be seen and felt by the people who live in the 4 regencies, and also for the newcomers who enjoy the increasing number of Geopark tourist sites and are increasingly enjoyed by both domestic and foreign tourists. So, it can be concluded that the IPD comparison for that year has grown. At this time, the government in 7 regencies in the Toba Caldera area together with the North Sumatra Provincial government to attract investors both domestic and foreign in investing in the world's Geopark areas so that it will support increased economic growth as well as create jobs in Sumatra. North.

### Development of the Developing Village Index (IDM) in Region 4 Districts in the Caldera Region of Toba, North Sumatra

The concept of the Village Building Index (IDM) itself is then explained in the Ministry of Village Regulation (Permendes) No. 2 of 2016 concerning patterns and maps of village development development. Article 3 states that the IDM concept is integrated from several categories which include: Economic Resilience Index (IKE), Environmental Resilience Index (IKL), and Social Resilience Index (IKS). These three factors are then used as a reference in the process of measuring the strata of independence and progress of a village.

Based on the context of village typology, the Developing Village Index classifies Villages into five (5) statuses, namely: "(i) Very Disadvantaged Villages; (ii) Disadvantaged Villages; (iii) Developing Villages; (iv) Advanced Village; and (v)

*Amran Manurung\*, Erlina, Sirojuzilam, Suwardi Lubis*

Independent Villages”. Of the five classifications, now the village statute has several divisions that are used as village indicators or parameters. The typology of the distribution of the Developing Village Index (IDM) can be divided into several things, such as: (1) very underdeveloped villages:  $< 0.491$ ; (2) underdeveloped villages:  $> 0.491$  and  $< 0.599$ ; (3) developing villages:  $> 0.599$  and  $< 0.707$ ; (4) developed villages:  $> 0.707$  and  $< 0.815$ ; and (5) independent village:  $> 0.815$ ” (Suroso, 2019).

This typology is in line with Permendes No. 6 of 2016 which regulates the village development map. The first is very underdeveloped villages or underdeveloped villages. The characteristics of this village have several concepts in its development such as: first development, procurement, and maintenance and secondly the development of development facilities for economic activities in order to carry out activities both production, distribution, and marketing. In addition, to support the management of the village economy, the establishment of community economic enterprises can be carried out through the management of BUMDes as an asset owned by the village.

The second is a developing village which has several characteristics including: development and development of all economic infrastructure starting from production, retribution, and marketing as well as trying to become a food barn and economic business for rural communities. In terms of maintaining village infrastructure, developing villages try to procure facilities and infrastructure owned by the village so that they can provide services to the village community. To encourage this, the strengthening of the village economy is supported by BUMDes as access to the economy starting from the provision of capital, business management, distribution processes, and finally the marketing process, all of which are guided by the village government in order to help the economy and improve the quality and quantity of human resources.

The third is a developed village or an independent village which is characterized as a village that has both the development, development and maintenance of village infrastructure based on productivity figures that are focused on a superior product. The process of empowering and maintaining infrastructure is supported by an excellent community service process with support for food security for rural communities. Management of village assets is supported by the productivity of BUMDes which strives to be able to carry out a good production, levy, and marketing and is supported by the quality of the village community with the aim of being a livelihood and activating the economy of the surrounding community.

There are at least 3 (three) dimensions of developing village indicators which are described in the Ministry of Village Building Index Book as follows:

Amran Manurung\*, Erlina, Sirojuzilam, Suwardi Lubis

Table 4-8 : Indicator Variable Dimensional Village Index Building (IDM)

No.	Dimensi	Variabel
1.	Ketahanan Sosial	Modal Sosial
		Kesehatan
		Pendidikan
		Pemukiman
2.	Ketahanan Ekologi	Kualitas lingkungan
		Potensi rawan bencana
		Tanggap bencana
		Keragaman produksi masyarakat desa
3.	Ketahanan Ekonomi	Tersedianya Pusat perdagangan
		Akses distribusi dan logistic
		Akses ke lembaga keuangan
		Lembaga Ekonomi
		Keterbukaan wilayah

Based on the table above, in general the IDM has increased although it is still very small, but at least there has been an increase. The achievements of its IDM are above the average for North Sumatra Province in both 2020 and 2021. There are 3 regencies, namely in 2020, Samosir Regency is in first place (0.6135), followed by Toba Regency (0.6122) in the third place. 2 and Humbang Hasundutan Regency (0.5989) in 3rd place. But in 2021, North Sumatra Province is still in a far from developing ranking, which is 29th out of 34 with an IDM reaching 0.6004 in the developing category with a very low score. Even though the IDM number is small, in 2020 it is still in the category of lagging Province in terms of the achievement of the IDM figure of 0.5958, so the increase is very small. However, the oldest regencies or parent districts, namely North Tapanuli (0.5818) in 2020 and (0.5904) in 2021, in these 2 years are still in the category of underdeveloped villages, which should be the number one district to achieve development and can be above district as a result of division.

## CLOSING

### Conclusion

Analysis of the development of the Village Development Index (IDM) and the Village Development Index (IPD) in rural areas for 4 districts in the Toba Caldera Region, North Sumatra, namely North Tapanuli, Toba, Humbang Hasundutan and Samosir Regencies in general, there has been a lot of economic progress after being established as KSPN and World Geopark. The achievements of the IPD have increased quite well but for the dimensions of the IPD. As for the IPD comparison above, it can be seen that village development indicators such as: basic services, infrastructure, accessibility/transportation, public services and governance have increased between IPD in 2014 to IPD in 2018 in 4

Regencies in the Toba Caldera Region, North Sumatra. So, it can be concluded that the IPD comparison for that year has entered the category of developing districts for Toba, Humbang Hasundutan and Samosir Regencies, while North Tapanuli Regency is still in the underdeveloped category.

Amran Manurung\*, Erlina, Sirojuzilam, Suwardi Lubis

The optimal management of village funds is based on regulations from the central government in Geopark and Geosite villages in the Toba Caldera area, which is carried out in 2 (two) Regencies namely Simalungun Regency and Samosir Regency with 10 (ten) respondents each. As for the village fund components according to the SOP, they already understand, for transparency and accountability in managing village funds, the village government or BPD always invites the community to every village financial management planning meeting every time a number of respondents are held, the results are not understood. For the output of village funds, some respondents did not know that the village ponds or Paud Desa were the output of village funds..

## REFERENCES

- Achmad Amiruddin. (2018). Pemberdayaan Usaha Kecil Menengah (UKM) Binaan Dinas Perdagangan Kota Surabaya Dalam Upaya Meningkatkan Kesejahteraan. Surabaya: Universitas Airlangga.
- Abdul Halim. (2004). Akuntansi Keuangan Daerah. Jakarta: Penerbit Salemba Empat.
- Antlöv, H., Wetterberg, L. Dharmawan. (2016). "Village Governance, Community Life, and the 2014 Village Law in Indonesia." *Bulletin of Indonesian Economic Studies* 52 (2):1-42.
- Bakri, Syafrizal, Hasdi Aimo. (2015). Analisis Ketimpangan Pembangunan Antar Kabupaten/Kota Di Sumatera Barat Dan Kebijakan Penanggulangnya, *Jurnal Kajian Ekonomi* Vol. 4, No. 7
- Basri, Yuswar Zainul & Mulyadi Subri. (2005). Keuangan Negara dan Analisis Kebijakan Utang Luar Negeri. Jakarta: PT. Raja Grafindo Persada.
- Bappenas and Statistics Indonesia. 2015. "Village Development Index of 2014 – Challenges in Meeting the Village Minimum Service Standard." Bappenas and Statistics Indonesia.
- Breman, J. 2001. "The Impact of the Asian Economic Crisis on Work and Welfare in Village Java." *Journal of Agrarian Change* 1 (2): 242–282.
- Darise, Nurlan. (2009). Pengelolaan Keuangan Daerah. Jakarta: PT. Indeks.
- Prastiwi, DP&dkk; (2019) "Indeks Pembangunan Desa Tahun Anggaran 2018. Jakarta- Subdirektorat Statistik Ketahanan Wilayah.
- Faridi, Muhammad Zahir. (2011). Contribution of Fiscal Decentralization to. Economic Growth. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Hanly Fendy Djohar. (2015). Strategi Pertumbuhan Dan Pembangunan Ekonomi Daerah. *Jurnal Ekonomi dan Bisnis Universitas Sam Ratulangi Manado.*
- Kemen PUPR. (2019). Pejelasan Profil Kabupaten Kawasan Kaldera. Diakses melalui: <https://Sippa.Ciptakarya.Pu.Go.Id/>
- Kemendes RI. (2015). Indeks Desa Membangun (IDM). Kementrian Desa, Pembangunan Daerah Tertinggal dan Transmigrasi. <https://idm.kemendes.go.id/>
- Kemenkeu RI. (2017). Buku Pintar Dana Desa Dengan Tema "Dana Desa Untuk Kesejahteraan Masyarakat: Menciptakan Lapangan Kerja, Mengatasi Kesenjangan, Dan Mengentaskan Kemiskinan. Jakarta: Kementerian
- Kuncoro, Mudrajad. (2004). Otonomi Daerah dan Pembangunan Daerah: Reformasi, Perencanaan, Strategi, dan Peluang. Jakarta:

Amran Manurung\*, Erlina, Sirojuzilam, Suwardi Lubis

Penerbit Gramedia.

-----, (2013). Metode Riset Untuk Bisnis dan Ekonomi. Jakarta: Erlangga.

Karya et al. (2016). Makroekonomi Pengantar Untuk Manajemen”. Jakarta: Rajawali Press.

Kunarjo. (2002). Perencanaan dan Pengendalian Program Pembangunan. Jakarta: Universitas Indonesia UI Press.

Lalira,D.,A.T.Nakoko,andI.P.F.Rorong.2018. “ImpactsofVillageFundAnd AllocationofVillageFundonthe PovertyLevelinGemehSub-district TalaudIslandsRegency.”EfficiencyScientificPeriodicJournal18(4).

Mangkoesoebroto, Guritno (2002). Ekonomi Publik. Yogyakarta: BPFE.

Mardiasmo. (2002). Otonomi dan Manajemen Keuangan Daerah. Yogyakarta: Penerbit Andi.

-----, (2009). Akuntansi Sektor Publik. Yogyakarta: Andi Yogyakarta.

Mohamad Sukarno. (2020). Analisis Pengembangan Potensi Desa Berbasis Indeks Membangun Desa (IDM) (Studi Kasus: Desa Ponggok, Kecamatan Palohharjo, Kabupaten Klaten). Prosiding Seminar Edusainstech, FMIPA UNIMUS.

Nordiawan. (2008). Akuntansi Pemerintahan. Jakarta: Salemba Empat.

Numan. (2015). Strategi Pembangunan Daerah. Jakarta: Raja Grafindo Persada.

Pislawati Alfiaturrahman. (2016). Perencanaan Pembangunan Desa Di Desa Bagan Limau Kecamatan Ukui Kabupaten Pelalawan. Jurnal Valuta Vol. 2, No. 2.

Puspawjaya, Andrian, Julia Dwi Naritha. (2016). Pengelolaan Keuangan Desa. Bogor: Pusdiklatwas BPKP.

Priyarsono. (2017). Membangun Dari Pinggiran: Tinjauan Dari Perspektif Ilmu Ekonomi Regional. Journal of Regional and Rural Development Planning, Vol. 1, No. 1.

Sjafrizal. (2018). Analisis Ekonomi Regional Dan Penerapannya Di Indonesia. Jakarta: PT. Raja Grafindo Persada.

Sumarto, S., M. Vothknecht, dan L. Wijaya. (2014). Explaining the Regional Heterogeneity of Poverty: Evidence from Decentralized Indonesia. SMERU Working Paper. The SMERU Research Institute.

Suparmoko. (2002). Ekonomi Publik Untuk Keuangan Dan Pembangunan Daerah. Yogyakarta: Andi Press.

Suharto, Edi. (2010). Membangun Masyarakat Memberdayakan Rakyat. Bandung: Alfabeta

Todaro,MP&Smith, SC. (2011).”Ekonomi Pembangunan.Edisi ke-9 Jilid I, Jakarta: Erlangga.

Tulus. (2019). Pembangunan Ekonomi Perdesaan Berbasis Pariwisata dan Ekonomi Kreatif. Jawab Barat: Anggota IKAPI.

UNDP. (2015). Converging Development Agendas: Nawa Cita, RPJMN, andSDGs.

United Nations Development Programme Indonesia CountryOffice..