

Research Article

# Public Service Innovation through the Cheap Food Movement in Realizing Sustainable Food Security in Sorong City

Gusniyati Abustan<sup>1\*</sup>, Indra Kertati<sup>2</sup>, Charis Christiani<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Magister Administrasi Publik Universitas 17 Agustus 1945 Semarang, Indonesia; email: [gusniyatiabustan2@gmail.com](mailto:gusniyatiabustan2@gmail.com)

<sup>2</sup> Magister Administrasi Publik Universitas 17 Agustus 1945 Semarang, Indonesia; email: [Indra-kertati@untagsmg.ac.id](mailto:Indra-kertati@untagsmg.ac.id)

<sup>3</sup> Magister Administrasi Publik Universitas 17 Agustus 1945 Semarang, Indonesia; email: [Charis-christiani@untagsmg.ac.id](mailto:Charis-christiani@untagsmg.ac.id)

\* Corresponding Author: [gusniyatiabustan2@gmail.com](mailto:gusniyatiabustan2@gmail.com)

**Abstract:** This research aims to analyze the implementation of public service innovations through the Cheap Food Movement in realizing sustainable food security in Sorong City. The research uses a qualitative approach, collecting data through in-depth interviews, observations, and documentation of key informants at the Sorong City Food Security Office, business actors, and beneficiary communities. Data analysis used the Miles and Huberman model, with triangulation of sources and methods to ensure data validity. The study results show that the Cheap Food Movement has increased community food accessibility through regular implementation, a coordinated distribution system, and partnerships with local farmers. Price affordability is achieved through cross-subsidization and a reduction of up to 30% of the market price in the distribution chain. The program's sustainability is supported by local economic empowerment and multi-stakeholder collaboration. The research implications inform the development of public service innovation models grounded in community needs. The study's limitations lie in its focus on a single region, which limits generalization. Recommendations aim to expand the program's scope, strengthen technology-based monitoring systems, and replicate models in other areas with similar conditions.

**Keywords:** Affordability; Cheap Food Movement; Food Accessibility; Public Service Innovation; Sustainability.

Received: December 23, 2025

Revised: January 28, 2026

Accepted: February 23, 2026

Online Available: February 26, 2026

Curr. Ver.: February 26, 2026



Copyright: © 2025 by the authors.  
Submitted for possible open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY SA) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/>)

## 1. Introduction

Food security is a national strategic issue that is a priority for Indonesia's development, as stated in the 2020-2024 National Medium-Term Development Plan (RPJMN). Law Number 18 of 2012 concerning Food mandates that the state is obliged to ensure the availability, affordability, and quality of sufficient, safe, balanced food (Government of Indonesia, 2012). In the global context, food security is an integral to the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), particularly the second goal, which aims to end hunger, improve food security and nutrition, and promote sustainable agriculture (United Nations, 2015). The problem of food security in Indonesia is not only related to production but also to distribution, accessibility, and affordability across all levels of society (Ariani & Suryana,

2016). High food price volatility, distribution inequality, and limited access to nutritious food are structural challenges that require responsive and sustainable public service innovation (Rachman & Ariani, 2016).

Sorong City, as the center of economic growth in the Southwest Papua region, faces complex food security dynamics. As a city with a high economic growth rate of 6.2% in 2022, Sorong City experienced a significant population increase of 284,410 people with a population growth rate of 2.8% per year (Sorong City Central Statistics Agency, 2023). Geographical conditions, as an archipelago with a high dependence on food supplies from outside the region, cause food prices in Sorong City to be, on average, 40-60% higher than national prices (Sorong City Food Security Office, 2022). To respond to this problem, the Sorong City Government, through the Food Security Office, launched a public service innovation in the form of the Cheap Food Movement in 2021 as an effort to increase the accessibility and affordability of community food (Sorong City Government, 2021).

This program reflects the local government's commitment to achieving inclusive and sustainable food security through collaboration among the government, the private sector, and the community (Sorong City Food Security Office, 2022).

However, a gap phenomenon emerges in the implementation of the Cheap Food Movement in Sorong City. On the one hand, this program has shown a positive impact with the implementation of the Cheap Food Movement, which is held ahead of religious holidays in various strategic locations, serving more than 5,000 families at prices 20-30% cheaper than market prices (Sorong City Food Security Office, 2023). However, there are still gaps in coverage, uneven service-area coverage, especially in suburban districts; a limited variety of available commodities; and sustainability programs that still depend on local government budgets (Initial observations by researchers, 2023).

This phenomenon indicates challenges in integrating the principles of public service innovation with the imperative of sustainable food security. Denhardt and Denhardt (2015), in the theory of New Public Service, emphasize that public services must be oriented to the public interest, democratic accountability, and the creation of shared value between the government and the community. In the context of food security, service innovation focuses not only on distribution efficiency but also on community empowerment, sustainability of local food systems, and responsiveness to the needs of vulnerable groups (Mulgan & Albury, 2003). The relationship between public service innovation and sustainable food security lies in the ability to create systems that not only solve short-term problems but also build community resilience in the face of food system turmoil (Klerkx & Leeuwis, 2009).

Empirical studies on public service innovations in food security reveal research gaps that need to be addressed. Prasetyo and Widayanti's (2020) research on public service innovation in the food sector in East Java emphasizes the role of information technology and digitalization. However, it does not explore in depth the dimensions of accessibility and socio-

economic sustainability. Meanwhile, Rahmawati et al.'s (2019) study on food security in the Papua region focuses on aspects of local food production and availability. However, it lacks an analysis of institutional innovations and public services in food distribution. Furthermore, Kusuma and Setiawan's (2021) research on low-cost food programs in several cities in Indonesia found short-term success of the program in the short term. However, they did not comprehensively analyze how the programs contribute to sustainable food security or how the principles of the New Public Service are implemented. This research gap shows the need for a study that integrates the dimensions of public service innovation, food accessibility, affordability, and sustainability in one holistic analytical framework.

Sorong City was chosen as the research site for several strategic reasons. First, Sorong City is representative of a city with archipelagic geographic characteristics and a high dependence on external food sources, so the problem of food security is particularly complex (BPS Sorong City, 2023). Second, the Cheap Food Movement, implemented by the Sorong City Food Security Office, is a relatively new public service innovation that has not been widely studied academically, thereby contributing new knowledge in the literature on public administration and food security (Sorong City Government, 2021). Third, as a city with high economic growth yet still facing challenges in food access inequality, Sorong City is an interesting case for understanding how public service innovations can bridge the gap between economic growth and social welfare (Sorong City Food Security Office, 2022). The Sorong City Food Security Office, as the research object, is an institution directly responsible for the planning, implementation, and evaluation of food security programs, making it the appropriate unit for analyzing the public service innovation process (Sorong Mayor Regulation Number 45 of 2021).

Based on the description above, the main problem of this research can be framed in a central question: How does public service innovation through the Cheap Food Movement contribute to achieving sustainable food security in Sorong City? This major question is then elaborated in several minor questions: (1) How is the implementation of public service innovations in the Cheap Food Movement in Sorong City? (2) How does the Cheap Food Movement improve food accessibility for the people of Sorong City? (3) How does the Cheap Food Movement realize the affordability of food prices for vulnerable communities? (4) How is the sustainability of the Cheap Food Movement in supporting long-term food security in Sorong City? To answer these questions, this study took the title "Public Service Innovation through the Cheap Food Movement in Realizing Sustainable Food Security in Sorong City" with the hope of making a theoretical and practical contribution to the development of a public service innovation model in the food security sector.

## 2. Literature Review

### Theoretical Foundations

#### *Theory New Public Service*

The New Public Service theory developed by Denhardt and Denhardt (2015) emerged as an alternative paradigm in public administration that emphasizes democratic values, citizenship, and public interest service. In contrast to New Public Management, which is oriented towards efficiency and market mechanisms, New Public Service places citizens as owners of government and public administrators as public servants (Denhardt & Denhardt, 2015). This paradigm is built on seven main principles: serving citizens rather than customers, putting the public interest first, valuing citizenship over entrepreneurship, thinking strategically and acting democratically, realizing that accountability is not a simple thing, serving rather than controlling, and valuing people, not just productivity (Denhardt & Denhardt, 2015).

In the context of food security services, this theory is relevant because it emphasizes active community participation, inter-stakeholder collaboration, and orientation to sustainable public value creation (Osborne, 2010). New Public Service encourages service innovation that is not only responsive to short-term needs, but also builds community capacity in realizing independent and sustainable food security (Vigoda, 2002). The principle of democratic accountability in this theory also requires a mechanism of transparency and participatory evaluation in the implementation of low-cost food programs (Bryson, Crosby, & Bloomberg, 2014).

#### *Food Security Theory*

Food security is conceptually defined by the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO, 2008) as a condition where everyone, at all times, has physical, social, and economic access to sufficient, safe, and nutritious food to meet their dietary needs and food preferences for an active and healthy life. Modern food security theory has evolved from an approach that originally focused on national food availability to a multi-dimensional approach that includes availability, access, utilization, and stability as the four main pillars (Barrett, 2010). Maxwell and Smith (1992) emphasize that food security must be understood not only at the macro (national), but also at the meso (community) and micro (household) levels.

In the context of sustainability, the concept of food security has evolved to encompass environmental, economic, and social dimensions, ensuring that the food system can meet the needs of the current generation without sacrificing the capabilities of future generations (Ericksen, 2008). This theory emphasizes the importance of a systems approach in understanding the complexity of food security, which involves the interactions among production, distribution, consumption, and external factors such as climate change and market dynamics (Ingram, 2011). In its implementation, sustainable food security requires innovation not only in production technology but also in distribution systems, policies, and

public services to increase community resilience to food system disruptions (Tendall et al., 2015).

### **Research Concepts**

#### ***Concept of Public Service Innovation***

Public service innovation refers to the process of creating and implementing new ways in delivering services to the community, or significant improvements that produce added value for the public (Mulgan & Albury, 2003). This concept includes not only technological innovation, but also innovations in processes, organizations, policies, and service systems that can improve the quality, efficiency, effectiveness, and responsiveness of public services (Hartley, 2005). In the public sector, innovation is driven by the need to address complex social problems, increase community satisfaction, and create sustainable public value (Moore & Hartley, 2008). Osborne and Brown (2013) identified that public service innovation has unique characteristics compared to the private sector, namely multiple stakeholders, regulatory complexity, and an orientation toward non-profit public values.

In the implementation of the Cheap Food Movement, public service innovations are manifested in the development of efficient food distribution models, the use of information technology for coordination, and multi-stakeholder collaboration between governments, farmers, and distributors (De Vries, Bekkers, & Tummers, 2016). Public service innovation is also closely related to food accessibility, as it creates new mechanisms that make it easier for people to access quality food (Walker, 2014). Further, sustainable innovation requires institutional capacity, political commitment, and active participation of the community in the co-creation of public services (Voorberg, Bekkers, & Tummers, 2015).

#### ***Concept of Food Accessibility***

Food accessibility is a critical dimension in food security, which refers to the ability of individuals and households to obtain sufficient and nutritious food through various legal means (Sen, 1981). This concept encompasses three main dimensions: physical access, related to the availability of distribution infrastructure and the geographical distance to food sources; economic access, related to purchasing power and food prices; and social access, related to norms, cultures, and discriminatory factors that can affect the ability to obtain food (Pinstrup-Andersen, 2009). Riely et al. (1999) emphasized that accessibility depends not only on the availability of food in the market but also on households' ability to access those markets through sufficient income, assets, and social safety nets. In the context of archipelagic areas such as Sorong City, food accessibility is influenced by geographical factors, limited transportation infrastructure, and the length of the distribution chain, which increases logistics costs (Timmer, 2014).

The Cheap Food Movement plays a role in increasing accessibility by creating distribution points closer to community settlements, reducing geographical barriers, and providing sales mechanisms that are tailored to the economic conditions of the local

community (Hawkes & Ruel, 2011). The relationship between accessibility and affordability is close: increased physical accessibility should be accompanied by price policies that ensure vulnerable groups can afford available food (Jones & Bhatia, 2011). Furthermore, sustainable food accessibility requires strengthening local food systems, diversifying food sources, and empowering communities to avoid dependence on external assistance (Clapp, 2017).

### ***Concept of Price Affordability***

Food affordability refers to households' ability to buy adequate food without sacrificing other basic needs, such as health, education, and housing (Inglis, Ball, & Crawford, 2008). This concept is measured through the ratio of food expenditure to total household income, where households are considered food vulnerable if they allocate more than 50-60% of their income to food (Darmon & Drewnowski, 2015). In the food economics literature, price affordability is influenced by three main factors: the level of absolute food prices in the market, the level of consumers' income or purchasing power, and the availability of government subsidies or social safety nets (Headey & Fan, 2010). In developing countries, high volatility in food prices poses a serious threat to affordability, especially for the urban poor who are completely dependent on food purchases (Ivanic & Martin, 2008).

The Cheap Food Movement contributes to price affordability through cross-subsidy mechanisms, the elimination of overdistribution margins, and direct purchases from farmers, which reduce the cost of intermediation (Reardon & Timmer, 2012). In the context of sustainability, price affordability cannot rely solely on short-term government subsidies; it requires structural approaches such as increasing local agricultural productivity, price stabilization through buffer stocks, and community economic empowerment (Timmer, 2015). The relationship between affordability and public service innovation lies in the government's ability to create effective market intervention mechanisms without distorting production and distribution incentives (Anderson & Nelgen, 2012). Furthermore, sustainable price affordability requires balancing consumer protection through affordable prices with producer protection through fair prices, thereby creating a healthy food ecosystem for all parties (Swinnen & Squicciarini, 2012).

### ***Concept of Sustainability***

Sustainability in the food system refers to the system's capacity to provide safe, nutritious, and affordable food for the current generation without compromising future generations' ability to meet their needs, considering economic, social, and environmental dimensions (Ericksen et al., 2010). This concept, developed from the principles of sustainable development articulated in the Brundtland Report, has been adapted specifically for the food sector (World Commission on Environment and Development, 1987). According to Garnett (2014), food sustainability encompasses three main pillars: ecological sustainability, which ensures that production systems do not damage natural resources; economic sustainability,

which ensures the viability of farming and distribution systems; and social sustainability, which ensures equitable access and the empowerment of local communities.

In the context of government programs such as the Cheap Food Movement, sustainability is crucial because food intervention programs are often short-term and depend on government budgets, without creating a mechanism for self-sufficiency (Harvey et al., 2014). Program sustainability requires several key elements: long-term political commitment, diversification of funding sources, local economic empowerment, active community participation, and adaptive evaluation monitoring systems (Borras et al., 2008). The relationship between sustainability and public service innovation lies in innovation's ability to create systems that are resilient and adaptive to external changes, such as global price fluctuations, climate change, and demographic dynamics (Folke et al., 2010).

In practice, the sustainability of the Cheap Food Movement can be achieved by strengthening partnerships with local farmers to create a secure market, developing community and institutional capacity to manage food distribution independently, and integrating programs with productive economic empowerment schemes (Pretty et al., 2010). Furthermore, sustainability is also related to accessibility and affordability in a holistic framework where a sustainable food system must be able to provide equitable access and stable prices in the long term without damaging the production and distribution ecosystem (Ingram, 2011).

### **3. Research Methods**

This research uses a qualitative approach with a case study design to analyze in depth the implementation of the Cheap Food Movement as a public service innovation in Sorong City. The qualitative approach was chosen because it is appropriate to explore complex phenomena in real-life contexts, especially in understanding the process, meaning, and dynamics of public policy implementation (Creswell, 2014). The research is conducted at the Sorong City Food Security Office, the leading sector implementing the program, with a coverage area spanning five districts targeted by the Cheap Food Movement. The research informants were selected by purposive sampling consisting of: (1) structural officials and staff of the Sorong City Food Security Office, (2) business actors and distributors who partner in the program, (3) representatives of local farmers, (4) community leaders and program beneficiaries, and (5) academics and public policy observers.

Data were collected through semi-structured in-depth interviews, participatory observation of the implementation of the Cheap Food Movement, and documentation of policy documents, program reports, and related secondary data. Data analysis follows the Miles, Huberman, and Saldana (2014) model, which includes the stages of data condensation, data presentation, and iterative drawing of conclusions. The validity of the data is supported

by source triangulation, method triangulation, and member checking to enhance the credibility of the research findings (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

## 4. Research Results and Discussion

### Results

#### *Implementation of Public Service Innovation in the Cheap Food Movement*

The study shows that the Cheap Food Movement in Sorong City is a manifestation of public service innovation that integrates the principles of the New Public Service with the community's real needs. Based on an interview with the Head of the Sorong City Food Security Office (Informant A), "this program was initiated in 2021 as a response to the high disparity in food prices in Sorong City, which reached 40-60% above the national average". This innovation includes four main dimensions that are in line with the concept of innovation in public services put forward by Osborne and Brown (2013).

The first dimension is innovation in the food distribution model. The Cheap Food Movement develops a direct distribution system from farmers and producers to consumers through periodic events held in five strategic districts: Sorong District, East Sorong District, West Sorong District, Sorong Islands District, and North Sorong District. Data from the Food Security Office show that in 2025, there will be 10 Cheap Food Movements, serving a total of 5,427 families (Program Document, 2025). This distribution model eliminates 2-3 levels of intermediaries in the conventional distribution chain, as explained by the Program Coordinator (Informant B): "We built direct partnerships with 4 farmer groups in Sorong and the surrounding areas, as well as 3 authorized distributors, to cut distribution costs by 30-35%."

The second dimension is innovation in pricing and subsidy mechanisms. In contrast to the conventional cheap market program that relies on full government subsidies, the Cheap Food Movement proposes a cross-subsidy scheme involving contributions from multiple parties. The Head of the Food Distribution and Reserve Section (Informant C) explained: "Local governments provide transportation and logistics subsidies of 40%, while 35% comes from reducing the margins of distributors willing to partner, and 25% from supply chain efficiency." This mechanism sets a final selling price 20-30% below market price for 9 strategic commodities, including rice, sugar, cooking oil, eggs, chicken, vegetables, and other staples. Comparative price data shows that in December 2025, the price of medium rice in the Cheap Food Movement will be IDR 9,500/kg compared to the market price of IDR 13,000/kg, while cooking oil is sold at IDR 12,000/liter compared to the market price of IDR 16,500/liter (Price Monitoring Report, 2023).

The third dimension is innovation in a multi-stakeholder coordination and collaboration system. The implementation of the Cheap Food Movement involves establishing a Food Security Coordination Team comprising not only government agencies

(Food Security Service, Trade Service, and Social Service) but also the private sector, farmers, and community leaders. Based on observations at the monthly coordination meeting (October 25, 2025), this forum functions as a co-creation platform, as conceptualized by Voorberg, Bekkers, and Tummers (2015), in which various stakeholders contribute to the program's planning, implementation, and evaluation. Central Market Traders (Informant D) stated: "We were initially worried that this program would disrupt the business of market traders, but with intensive dialogue, it actually helps stabilize prices and traders still get supplies from the same distributors."

### ***Increasing Food Accessibility Through the Cheap Food Movement***

Food accessibility has increased significantly through three main strategies in the Cheap Food Movement—first, the expansion of the geographical reach of services. The data show that the location of the Cheap Food Movement was selected based on an analysis of district-level population density and the poverty index, with priority given to areas with poverty rates above the urban average (11.2%). Each implementation of the Cheap Food Movement serves an average of 600-700 families over 6-8 hours, and the location is rotated to ensure equitable access (Program Implementation Report, 2025). A beneficiary from the Sorong Islands District (Informant F) said: "Before this program, we had to cross to the city center to shop with round-trip transportation costs; now that the Cheap Food Movement is implemented in the Islands District, we can finally reduce transportation costs."

Second, strengthening accessibility through partnerships with the local economy. The Cheap Food Movement prioritizes procurement from local farmers for commodities available in Sorong, such as vegetables. Data shows that 42% of the Cheap Food Movement's supply comes from local production, involving farmer groups. The Chairman of the Farmer Group (Informant G) stated: "This program provides market certainty for us. Every time we implement the Cheap Food Movement, we supply vegetables at the price that has been agreed upon in advance, so that we can plan production well." This strategy not only increases consumer accessibility but also expands market access for local producers, in line with the concept of two-way accessibility in the food system proposed by Sonnino (2016).

The results of a satisfaction survey conducted by the Food Security Office on 100 respondents using the Cheap Food Movement in August 2025 showed that 87.3% of respondents stated that this program increased the ease of access to quality food, with a satisfaction index reaching 4.2 out of a scale of 5 (Satisfaction Survey Report, 2025). However, 23.4% of respondents from suburban districts stated that the frequency of the implementation of the Cheap Food Movement is inadequate and proposed increasing it.

### ***Realizing Price Affordability for Vulnerable Groups***

Affordability is a key outcome of the Cheap Food Movement, measured by three main indicators—first, the percentage of savings in household food expenditure. Based on a comparative study of 100 beneficiary households, the average savings in food expenditure

ranged from Rp 450,000 to Rp 600,000 per month, equivalent to 18-25% of total monthly food expenditure (Impact Assessment Study, 2025). A beneficiary housewife (Informant H) explained: "With Rp 500,000, in the ordinary market I can only get 20 kg of rice, 2 liters of cooking oil, and 2 kg of sugar. In implementing the Cheap Food Movement, I got 30 kg of rice, 4 liters of oil, 3 kg of sugar, plus 2 kg of eggs and vegetables, all for the same amount of money. I use these savings for my children's school fees."

Second, the program's reach to poor and vulnerable groups. Based on the verification of beneficiary data with the Integrated Social Welfare Data (DTKS), 68.4% of users of the Cheap Food Movement come from the income deciles 1-4 (40% of the poorest population), while 31.6% come from the 5-7 decile (lower middle group) (Beneficiary Profiling Data, 2025). This targeting indicates that the program is relatively successful in reaching the group that needs the most price subsidies, despite a 31.6% leakage to the non-target group. The Head of the Sorong City Social Service (Informant I) explained: "We do not apply exclusive targeting because the nature of the program is universal access. However, with the strategic location and timing of implementation, naturally, the majority of those who come are the lower economic group because the upper group prefers modern convenience retail."

#### ***Sustainability of the Cheap Food Movement in Long-Term Food Security***

The implementation of this Cheap Food Movement depends on the political commitment of regional heads. Some informants expressed concern that a change in regional leadership could threaten the program's continuity if it is not institutionalized through strong regulations. The Cheap Food Movement program needs to be transformed from a Mayor's policy to a Regional Regulation to give it stronger legal standing and make it harder to dismiss. Furthermore, sustainability is supported by the development of a data-based monitoring and evaluation system. The Food Security Office has developed a Food Security Dashboard that integrates real-time data on supply, prices, distribution, and beneficiaries (Observation Dashboard). This system provides early warning of potential supply disruptions and price fluctuations, enabling the Cheap Food Movement to function as a responsive stabilization instrument. This dashboard is also used for public transparency. The public can access data on program realization, budget allocation, and feedback channels, in line with the principle of open government" (Meijer, Curtin, & Hillebrandt, 2012).

### **Discussion**

#### ***Overview of Resource Persons and Data Triangulation***

This study uses purposive sampling in selected resource persons to ensure comprehensive representation of all stakeholders involved in the Cheap Food Movement ecosystem. Nine key informants were selected based on criteria of direct involvement, in-depth knowledge, and strategic position within the program.

In terms of policymakers, the Head of the Sorong City Food Security Office (Informant A) became a key informant who provided a macro perspective on the policy background, strategic vision, and the context of the food price disparity of 40-60% above the national average, which triggered the program. His position as a decision-maker provides insight into the political economy and the policy design process. The Program Coordinator (Informant B) and the Head of the Distribution and Food Reserve Section (Informant C) represented the operational implementation level, providing technical data on the partnership mechanism with 4 farmer groups, cross-subsidy schemes, and distribution logistics.

In the private sector and local economy, Central Market Traders (Informant D) offer a critical perspective on the dynamics of interest negotiations and potential conflicts between government programs and existing traders. His testimony about the transformation from resistance to support reveals the deliberation and conflict resolution processes that are crucial in collaborative governance. The Chairman of the Farmer Group (Informant G) represents the voice of local producers, providing insight into the program's impact on market certainty and production planning at the grassroots level.

In terms of beneficiaries, three informants provided a rich lived experience. Beneficiaries from the Sorong Islands District (Informant F) revealed geographical dimensions and transportation costs as barriers in food access. Beneficiary housewives (Informant H) provided concrete testimony about the program's economic impact on household budgets and allocations for other needs, such as education. The Head of the Sorong City Social Service (Informant I) provides administrative data on beneficiary profiling and verification with Integrated Social Welfare Data (DTKS).

Triangulation is carried out not only across different informants but also across different data sources: in-depth interviews, observations (coordination meetings and dashboards), and documents (the 2025 Program Document, 2025 Price Monitoring Report, 2025 Satisfaction Survey Report, and 2025 Impact Assessment Study). These multiple data sources enable cross-validation and increase the credibility of the findings. For example, the Program Coordinator's claim of a 30-35% reduction in distribution costs is validated by comparative price data in the Price Monitoring Report, which shows a 20-30% price reduction. Testimony from homemakers about saving Rp 450,000-600,000 each time there is an implementation of the Cheap Food Movement is implemented was confirmed by an Impact Assessment Study of 100 households.

### ***Uncovering Patterns and Meanings***

#### ***a) Disintermediation as a Distribution Innovation Strategy***

The first theme that consistently emerges from various data sources is the concept of disintermediation – the elimination of intermediaries in the supply chain. From the Program Coordinator's perspective: "build direct partnerships with 4 farmer groups and 3 authorized distributors, cutting distribution costs by 30-35%." From the perspective of the Chairman of

the Farmer Group: "market certainty with a price that has been agreed upon in advance." From the consumer's perspective: "the price is 20-30% cheaper than the normal market." The coding process identifies recurring concepts: "direct," "trimming," "eliminating 2-3 levels of intermediaries," "partnerships," which are categorized as manifestations of disintermediation strategies. This theme is significant because it challenges conventional wisdom about food distribution, which treats long supply chains as a given. Quantitative data (10 implementations, 5,427 households served, and specific price reductions for rice and cooking oil) provide evidence of this strategy's effectiveness.

***b) Cross-subsidization as a Shared Responsibility***

The second theme is a financing model that differs from the conventional full government subsidy. The pattern that emerged from the data was burden-sharing: "40% government subsidies, 35% distributor margin reductions, 25% supply chain efficiency" (Informant C). This is not just a technical arrangement but a representation of the philosophy of shared responsibility in addressing public problems. Coding identifies concepts such as "multi-stakeholder contribution," "partnership," "margin reduction," "efficiency," which indicate a shift from paternalistic government provision toward collaborative financing. This theme is central because it has implications for fiscal sustainability: the program is not fully dependent on the government budget, making it more resilient to fiscal constraints.

***c) Deliberation as a Governance Mechanism***

The third theme emerged from data on the decision-making process in the Coordination Team's decision-making process. Observations from the coordination meeting indicate that "various stakeholders contributed to the planning, implementation, and evaluation." Market Trader Testimonial: "With intensive dialogue, this program helps stabilize prices," reveals that deliberation is not just consultation but genuine negotiation that results in mutual benefits. Coding identifies recurring patterns: "dialogue," "coordination," "platform," "discussion," "negotiation of interests," which are categorized as manifestations of deliberative governance. This theme is significant because it shows that collaborative governance is not only an ideal normative ideal but can also be operationalized in practice, even though it requires substantial time and effort.

***d) Spatial Justice as a Principle of Service Distribution***

The fourth theme is a commitment to equitable geographical access. The data showed a pattern: "locations were selected based on population density and poverty index analysis," "rotated locations," "prioritized areas with above-average urban poverty." Testimony from the Sorong Islands District about reducing transportation costs is particularly powerful in revealing the hidden dimension of food insecurity: the spatial barrier. The coding process identifies the concepts "reach," "rotation," "equity," "archipelago territory," and "crossing," which reflect attention to geographical equity. This theme is significant because it challenges

the tendency of public services to concentrate in urban centers, showing an intentional effort to "bring services to citizens" rather than expecting citizens to access services.

***e) Cheap Food Movement as a New Public Service-Based Public Service Innovation***

The implementation of the Cheap Food Movement in Sorong City shows the characteristics of public service innovation that are in line with the New Public Service paradigm (Denhardt & Denhardt, 2015). In contrast to the New Public Management approach, which emphasizes efficiency and market mechanisms, the Cheap Food Movement prioritizes public interest service, multi-stakeholder collaboration, and democratic accountability. The study's findings confirm that this program is not just a mechanism for distributing cheap food but a co-creation process among the government, the private sector, local farmers, and the community in realize food security as a public value (Moore, 1995).

The first principle of New Public Service, namely "serve citizens, not customers", is manifested in the design of programs that do not treat people as passive consumers, but as active citizens with the right to food (Alkon & Agyeman, 2011). This is evident in the mechanisms of community participation in planning the location and schedule of low-cost markets, the formation of village-level management groups, and the establishment of open feedback channels. The active involvement of the community not only increases the program's responsiveness to local needs but also builds a sense of ownership that is crucial to sustainability (Ostrom, 1996).

The second principle, namely "seek the public interest", is reflected in the targeting program, which prioritizes vulnerable groups while not closing access for other groups. The finding that 68.4% of users are from the poorest 40% of the population suggests that, although the program is universal, it effectively reaches the groups most in need. This is different from the means-tested approach, which often creates stigma and administrative burden (Currie, 2006). This universal access with progressive outcome approach is in line with the concept of progressive universalism in social policy advocated by Mkandawire (2005).

The third principle of "value citizenship over entrepreneurship" is reflected in the partnership model with local farmers, which is oriented not only toward the transactional economy but also toward building long-term, mutually beneficial relationships. The finding that 42% of the supply comes from local production involving 4 farmers shows a commitment to local economic empowerment, in line with the concept of territorial development in food policy (Marsden & Sonnino, 2008). This partnership creates a "double dividend," where consumers gain access to affordable food while local producers gain market certainty, in contrast to the unidirectional, charity-based food aid model (Poppendieck, 1998).

The fourth principle of "think strategically, act democratically" is reflected in the program's governance structure, which features a multi-stakeholder Coordination Team that makes deliberative decisions. Findings from observations of the coordination meeting

indicate that strategic decisions, such as commodity selection, pricing, and location allocation, are made through discussions that incorporate diverse perspectives. This deliberative process, although longer than top-down decisions, results in stronger legitimacy and support from stakeholders (Fung & Wright, 2003). However, the implementation of the New Public Service principle in the Cheap Food Movement also faces several dilemmas and tensions—first, the tension between administrative efficiency and democratic participation. The Head of the Agency acknowledged that deliberative and participatory processes often slow decision-making, especially in situations requiring a quick response, such as sudden price fluctuations. This is in line with the criticism of participatory governance, which shows the trade-off between inclusiveness and efficiency (Fung, 2006). Second, the tension between universal access and targeted efficiency

***f) Food Accessibility: From Physical Access to Social Inclusion***

The increase in food accessibility through the Cheap Food Movement reflects an evolution from a narrow concept of accessibility (physical availability) to a more comprehensive understanding that includes economic access and social inclusion (Sen, 1981; Riely et al., 1999). The study's findings confirm that food accessibility is not only about the availability of food in the market but also about people's ability to access it without geographical, economic, or social barriers.

The strategy of expanding geographical reach with the rotation of the implementation locations of the Cheap Food Movement in various districts, including the archipelago, responds to the challenges of physical accessibility that are typical in complex geographical areas. Testimony from informants in the Sorong Islands District who save on transportation costs indicates that distance and transportation costs are significant hidden barriers to food access for people experiencing poverty, as identified in the food desert literature (Walker, Keane, & Burke, 2010). Bringing the market to people, rather than expecting people to come to the market, represents spatial justice in food policy that is responsive to geographical inequality (Bedore, 2013).

Partnerships with local farmers that increase the proportion of local supply to 42% have important implications for accessibility in the long run—first, reducing dependence on external supply, which is vulnerable to logistical disruptions and price fluctuations, thereby increasing the stability dimension in food security (FAO, 2008). Second, shortening the food supply chain not only reduces costs but also increases product freshness and nutritional value, contributing to the utilization dimension (Morgan & Sonnino, 2010) and third, creating a more resilient and sustainable local food economy, in line with the concept of foodshed and food sovereignty (Kloppenborg, Hendrickson, & Stevenson, 1996).

However, a critical analysis shows that, despite increased accessibility, there are still exclusions that need to be addressed. First, temporal exclusion, in which the schedule for implementing the Cheap Food Movement (working days and hours) excludes groups of

workers who cannot leave their jobs. This is in line with the findings of Walker (2012) about the temporal dimension in social exclusion. Second, informational exclusion, where groups with limited access to information (e.g., those without smartphones or who are illiterate) may not know the schedules and locations of cheap markets, even though an application is available. This shows the digital divide in access to public services that needs to be anticipated (Norris, 2001). Third, cultural exclusion, where there is a possibility that certain groups feel uncomfortable or stigmatized accessing programs labeled "for the poor". The literature on welfare stigma shows that labeling programs can create psychological barriers that prevent eligible people from participating (Stuber & Schlesinger, 2006).

***g) Price Affordability: The trade-off between Subsidies and Sustainability***

The achievement of price affordability through the Cheap Food Movement demonstrates success in short-term welfare improvement, but it also raises critical questions about long-term sustainability and unintended consequences. The saving of 18-25% in household food expenditure and the reduction in the proportion of food insecure households from 34.7% to 26.3% are positive and significant outcomes. However, following Timmer's (2015) framework for food subsidy analysis, it is necessary to examine fiscal sustainability, targeting efficiency, and the impact on market structure.

From a targeting-efficiency perspective, the finding that 68.4% of users are in the poorest 40% of the population indicates relatively good targeting for universal programs. However, the 31.6% leakage to non-target groups needs to be evaluated to determine whether this is an inefficiency or an acceptable trade-off to avoid exclusion errors and stigma. The literature on targeting shows that universal programs with a self-targeting mechanism (where the program characteristics naturally attract intended beneficiaries) often have better coverage and lower exclusion error than means-tested programs, even with higher inclusion errors (Coady, Grosh, & Hoddinott, 2004). In the case of the Cheap Food Movement, the program's characteristics (location in poor areas, timing, and the effort required to queue) serve as self-targeting that excludes non-poor groups.

The critical question is the program's impact on market structure and the potential crowding out of the private sector. The concern conveyed by the Chairman of the Traders Association (Informant D) at first, about the potential for unfair competition, highlights the inherent tension in government intervention in the market. The literature on food subsidies shows that poorly designed programs can distort markets, discourage private investment, and create dependency (Rashid, Sharma, & Bouis, 2005). However, the finding that market traders ultimately supported the program because they also benefited from price stabilization, and that the same supplier was involved, showed that with the right design, government intervention and the market can be complementary rather than substitutive. This aligns with the concept of "market-friendly intervention" advocated by the World Bank, in which

government intervention is designed to correct market failure rather than replace the market (World Bank, 1993).

#### ***h) From Project Programs to Institutional Systems***

From the institutional dimension, the development of SOPs, data-based monitoring systems, and real-time dashboards is a positive indicator for institutionalization. Rogers (1995) identified that institutionalization – embedding innovation in organizational structures, cultures, and routines – is key to sustainability. However, the Academic Expert's concerns about dependence on the political will of regional heads and vulnerability to political transitions are critical. The literature on policy sustainability shows that programs that rely heavily on individual champions are highly vulnerable when leadership changes (Pluye et al., 2004). The transformation from the Mayor's Regulation to the Regional Regulation proposed by the informant is a valid strategy for legal institutionalization, but it is not sufficient on its own. Sustainability also requires cultural institutionalization, in which programs become part of shared norms and societal expectations, creating public pressure to continue regardless of who is in power (Goodman & Steckler, 1989).

### **5. Conclusion**

Based on the research and discussion, it can be concluded that the Cheap Food Movement in Sorong City has proven effective as a New Public Service-based public service innovation that increases food accessibility and affordability. This program has succeeded in serving 5,427 households, reducing food expenditure by 18-25% in food expenditure, and reducing food insecurity from 34.7% to 26.3%, and reaching 68.4% of the poorest group. The program transforms food service from a paternalistic approach to multi-stakeholder co-creation, by integrating distribution efficiency, local farmer partnerships (42% of supply), and democratic participation. In practice, this program is a model of collaborative food security innovation. Theoretically, it confirms the relevance of the New Public Service in the context of basic services in areas with high price disparities. The study was limited to a single city with specific geographical conditions and did not measure the long-term impact of changes in people's consumption and nutrition patterns. Recommendations: Transforming policies into Regional Regulations, increasing the frequency of implementation in suburban districts, developing mechanisms to include worker groups, and strengthening the monitoring system to ensure the sustainability of post-transition leadership programs.

## References

- Alkon, A. H., & Agyeman, J. (2011). *Cultivating food justice: Race, class, and sustainability*. MIT Press. <https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/8922.001.0001>
- Anderson, K., & Nelgen, S. (2012). Trade barrier volatility and agricultural price stabilization. *World Development*, 40(1), 36–48. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2011.05.018>
- Barrett, C. B. (2010). Measuring food insecurity. *Science*, 327(5967), 825–828. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1182768>
- Bedore, M. (2013). Geographies of capital formation and rescaling. *Economic Geography*, 89(2), 201–226.
- Bryson, J. M., Crosby, B. C., & Bloomberg, L. (2014). Public value governance: Moving beyond traditional public administration and the new public management. *Public Administration Review*, 74(4), 445–456. <https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.12238>
- Clapp, J. (2017). Food self-sufficiency: Making sense of it, and when it makes sense. *Food Policy*, 66, 88–96. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodpol.2016.12.001>
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). Sage Publications.
- Currie, J. (2006). The take-up of social benefits. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 20(1), 17–38.
- Darmon, N., & Drewnowski, A. (2015). Contribution of food prices and diet cost to socioeconomic disparities in diet quality and health. *Nutrition Reviews*, 73(10), 643–660. <https://doi.org/10.1093/nutrit/nuv027>
- De Vries, H., Bekkers, V., & Tummers, L. (2016). Innovation in the public sector: A systematic review and future research agenda. *Public Administration*, 94(1), 146–166. <https://doi.org/10.1111/padm.12209>
- Denhardt, J. V., & Denhardt, R. B. (2015). *The new public service: Serving, not steering* (4th ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315709765>
- Erickson, P. J. (2008). Conceptualizing food systems for global environmental change research. *Global Environmental Change*, 18(1), 234–245. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2007.09.002>
- Folke, C., Carpenter, S. R., Walker, B., Scheffer, M., Chapin, T., & Rockström, J. (2010). Resilience thinking: Integrating resilience, adaptability and transformability. *Ecology and Society*, 15(4), 20.
- Food and Agriculture Organization. (2008). *An introduction to the basic concepts of food security*. FAO.
- Fung, A. (2006). Varieties of participation in complex governance. *Public Administration Review*, 66(Suppl. 1), 66–75. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2006.00667.x>
- Fung, A., & Wright, E. O. (2003). *Deepening democracy: Institutional innovations in empowered participatory governance*. Verso.
- Government of Indonesia. (2012). *Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 18 of 2012 concerning Food*. State Secretariat.
- Hartley, J. (2005). Innovation in governance and public services: Past and present. *Public Money & Management*, 25(1), 27–34.

- Headey, D., & Fan, S. (2010). *Reflections on the global food crisis: How did it happen? How has it hurt? And how can we prevent the next one?* International Food Policy Research Institute.
- Inglis, V., Ball, K., & Crawford, D. (2008). Socioeconomic variations in women's diets: What is the role of perceptions of the local food environment? *European Journal of Clinical Nutrition*, 62(1), 119–126. <https://doi.org/10.1038/sj.ejcn.1602680>
- Ingram, J. (2011). A food systems approach to researching food security and its interactions with global environmental change. *Food Security*, 3(4), 417–431. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12571-011-0149-9>
- Ivanic, M., & Martin, W. (2008). Implications of higher global food prices for poverty in low-income countries. *Agricultural Economics*, 39(Suppl. 1), 405–416. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1574-0862.2008.00347.x>
- Jones, A. D., & Bhatia, R. (2011). The geography of social vulnerability and food insecurity. *Journal of Public Health Management and Practice*, 17(4), 368–373.
- Klerkx, L., & Leeuwis, C. (2009). Establishment and embedding of innovation brokers at different innovation system levels: Insights from the Dutch agricultural sector. *Agricultural Systems*, 101(3), 117–128.
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Sage Publications.
- Marsden, T., & Sonnino, R. (2008). Rural development and the regional state. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 24(3), 422–431. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2008.04.001>
- Maxwell, S., & Smith, M. (1992). Household food security: A conceptual review. *IDS Bulletin*, 23(3), 1–11.
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook* (3rd ed.). Sage Publications.
- Moore, M. H. (1995). *Creating public value: Strategic management in government*. Harvard University Press.
- Moore, M. H., & Hartley, J. (2008). Innovations in governance. *Public Management Review*, 10(1), 3–20. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14719030701763161>
- Mulgan, G., & Albury, D. (2003). *Innovation in the public sector*. Cabinet Office.
- Osborne, S. P. (2010). *The new public governance? Emerging perspectives on the theory and practice of public governance*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203861684>
- Prasetyo, D. A., & Widayanti, S. (2020). Information technology-based public service innovation. *Journal of Public Administration*, 18(1), 45–62.
- Riely, F., Mock, N., Cogill, B., Bailey, L., & Kenefick, E. (1999). *Food security indicators and a framework for use in the monitoring and evaluation of food aid programs*. FANTA Project.
- Sen, A. (1981). *Poverty and famines: An essay on entitlement and deprivation*. Oxford University Press.
- Sorong City Food Security Office. (2022). *Performance report of the Sorong City Food Security Office in 2022*. Sorong City Government.
- Sorong City Food Security Office. (2023). *Evaluation of the implementation of the cheap food movement*. Sorong City Government.

- Sorong City Government. (2021). *Sorong Mayor Regulation Number 45 of 2021 concerning the Cheap Food Movement*. Sorong City Government.
- Swinnen, J., & Squicciarini, P. (2012). Mixed messages on prices and food security. *Science*, *335*(6067), 405–406. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1210806>
- Timmer, C. P. (2014). Food security in Asia and the Pacific. *Asia & the Pacific Policy Studies*, *1*(1), 7–19. <https://doi.org/10.1002/app5.6>
- Vigoda, E. (2002). From responsiveness to collaboration: Governance, citizens, and the next generation of public administration. *Public Administration Review*, *62*(5), 527–540. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1540-6210.00235>
- Voorberg, W. H., Bekkers, V. J. J. M., & Tummers, L. G. (2015). A systematic review of co-creation and co-production: Embarking on the social innovation journey. *Public Management Review*, *17*(9), 1333–1357. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2014.930505>
- Walker, R. M. (2014). Internal and external antecedents of process innovation: A review and extension. *Public Management Review*, *16*(1), 21–44. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2013.771698>