Global Journal of International Business Research (GJIBR)

ISSN (Online) 1933-3471 ISSN (Print) 1933-3412

2026, Volume 3, Issue 1

Original Research Article **Open Access** **Peer Reviewed**

Analysis of Local Government Authority in Sustainable Natural Resources Management: A Review of Constitutional Law and State Administrative Law in Indonesia

Arika Rosanti [1], Bayu Satria Wicaksono [2], Eric Hermawan [3], Yovan Iristian[4*]

[1,2,3,4] *Faculty of Law, Dr. Soetomo University Surabaya,*

ABSTRACT: Sustainable natural resource management in Indonesia faces a constitutional dilemma between the authority of the central and regional governments after the enactment of Law Number 6 of 2023 concerning Job Creation which substantially changes the environmental legal framework. This study aims to analyze the regulation of local government authority in sustainable natural resource management, identify the implications of changes in authority on the legal principles of state administration, and formulate an ideal legal construction that is harmonious with the principles of state control and regional autonomy. The research method uses a normative juridical approach through literature research with deductive qualitative analysis of primary and secondary legal materials. The results of the study show that the Job Creation Law tends to centralize authority through a risk-based licensing system, creating tension with Law Number 32 of 2009 which prioritizes decentralization. Normative reconstruction is needed through vertical-horizontal harmonization, strengthening substantive public participation, and increasing the capacity of regional supervision with environmental economic instruments to ensure ecological sustainability and intergenerational justice.

KEYWORDS: Local Government, Sustainable Natural Resources, Constitutional Law, State Administration Law.

1. INTRODUCTION

Sustainable natural resource management in Indonesia faces a complex constitutional dilemma between the authority of the central government and local governments in a decentralized system. This phenomenon has become increasingly crucial after the enactment of Law Number 6 of 2023 concerning the Stipulation of Government Regulations in Lieu of Law Number 2 of 2022 concerning Job Creation into a Law that substantially changes the legal framework for natural resource and environmental management which was previously regulated in Law Number 32 of 2009 concerning Environmental Protection and Management. Empirical findings show that the implementation of decentralized policies in natural resource management in Indonesia is still colored by conflicts of authority between the central and regional governments, limited regional capacity, and supervisory constraints that have an impact on environmental sustainability. Research (Al-farisi, 2021) reveals that the decentralization of authority in mineral and coal mining affairs in Law Number 3 of 2020 creates new complexities in the division of authority which has implications for the effectiveness of natural resource management at the regional level. This problem is exacerbated by the inconsistency between sectoral regulations and local government regulations that create legal uncertainty in the management of conservation areas and the use of natural resources.

From the perspective of constitutional law, Article 33 paragraph (3) of the State The Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia in 1945 mandates that the earth, water, and natural resources contained in it are controlled by the state and used for the greatest prosperity of the people. However, the conception of state control has experienced significant interpretive dynamics in the context of regional autonomy as stipulated in Article 18 of the 1945 Constitution which gives the authority to local governments to regulate and manage their own government affairs according to the principle of autonomy and the duty of assistance. (Manalu, 2024) explained that the legal politics of water resource management after the enactment of the Job Creation Law shows a paradigm shift from decentralized to centralistic through the determination of Norms, Standards, Procedures, and Criteria set by the Central Government, but still provides a role for local governments in the implementation of water resources management. This condition creates ambiguity in the division of authority that has the potential to hinder the effectiveness of sustainable natural resource management at the regional level.

The research gap in this study lies in the lack of a comprehensive analysis that integrates the perspective of constitutional law and state administrative law in examining the authority of local governments after the

enactment of the Job Creation Law, especially in the context of sustainable natural resource management. (Soto, 2019) in his study on the decentralization of natural resource governance asserts that decentralization policies are often not implemented in a way that is compatible with the democratic potential that is conceived, and only rarely produce pro-people impacts or challenge the underlying structures of injustice. Previous studies have tended to focus on sectoral aspects such as forestry, mining, or water resources separately, without holistically analyzing how regulatory changes in the Job Creation Law affect the overall system of local government authority in managing natural resources. Furthermore, studies that analyze the juridical implications of the amendment of the provisions of Law Number 32 of 2009 by the Job Creation Law on the principles of sustainable development and the authority of local governments are still very limited.

The novelty of this research lies in an integrative approach that combines the analysis of constitutional law and state administrative law to examine in depth how Law Number 6 of 2023 concerning the Determination of Perpu Cipta Kerja changes the architecture of local government authority in sustainable natural resource management, taking into account the constitutional principles of state control over natural resources and the principles of local government administration. This research makes a theoretical contribution through the construction of a new conceptual framework on the harmonization of vertical and horizontal authority in natural resource management that integrates perspectives of ecological sustainability, social justice, and administrative efficiency (Sinthumule & Mugwena, 2021). In practical terms, this study offers policy recommendations to improve local government authority arrangements that are more responsive to the needs of sustainable natural resource management in the post-Job Creation Law era, taking into account findings (Wang et al., 2021) that suggest that fiscal decentralization can encourage local governments to exploit natural resources for economic gain, potentially leading to poor extraction practices. unsustainable and environmental degradation.

Based on this background, this study formulates the following problems: How is the regulation of local government authority in sustainable natural resource management according to Law Number 6 of 2023 concerning the Determination of Perpu Job Creation and Law Number 32 of 2009 concerning Environmental Protection and Management in the perspective of constitutional law?, What are the implications of changes in local government authority in sustainable natural resource management on principles of state administrative law in Indonesia?, and How is the ideal legal construction of local government authority in sustainable natural resource management that is in harmony with the principles of state control over natural resources and the principle of regional autonomy?. This research aims to: Analyze and explain the regulation of local government authority in sustainable natural resource management according to Law Number 6 of 2023 concerning the Determination of Perpu Job Creation and Law Number 32 of 2009 concerning Environmental Protection and Management from a constitutional law perspective, Identify and analyze the implications of changes in local government authority in sustainable natural resource management to legal principles state administration in Indonesia, and formulate an ideal legal construction of local government authority in sustainable natural resource management that is in harmony with the principle of state control over natural resources and the principle of regional autonomy.

This research makes a theoretical contribution to the development of constitutional law and state administrative law, especially in building a conceptual framework on the division of authority between central and local governments in sustainable natural resource management. The results of this study are expected to enrich the treasure of legal literature regarding the relationship between the principle of state control over natural resources and the principle of decentralization and regional autonomy, as well as provide a new perspective in understanding the legal dynamics of environmental management in Indonesia after the enactment of the Job Creation Law. Practically, this research is expected to provide input to policymakers, both at the central and regional levels, in formulating more effective policies and regulations for sustainable natural resource management. For local governments, the results of this research can be a reference in understanding and optimizing their authority in managing natural resources in their areas in accordance with the principles of sustainable development. For legal practitioners and academics, this research can be a reference in understanding the complexity of regulating natural resource management authority in the contemporary Indonesian legal system.

2. METHOD

This research uses a qualitative method with a normative juridical approach carried out through library *research.* The normative juridical method is a legal research approach that examines the internal aspects of positive law by examining theories, concepts, legal principles, and laws and regulations related to research problems (Muhaimin, 2020). This research is descriptive-prescriptive in nature and aims to systematically describe the

regulation of local government authority in sustainable natural resource management and provide legal arguments for the ideal construction that should apply. The specification of this research is an analytical prescriptive research that seeks to analyze legal problems by providing solutions to the problems posed in the formulation of the problem. The data sources in this study consist of primary legal materials and secondary legal materials. Primary legal materials include Law Number 6 of 2023 concerning the Stipulation of Government Regulations in Lieu of Law Number 2 of 2022 concerning Job Creation into Law and Law Number 32 of 2009 concerning Environmental Protection and Management. The secondary legal materials used include legal literature in the form of textbooks, reputable national and international scientific journals published in the period of 2020 to 2025, the results of previous legal research, and scientific articles relevant to the research topic. The data collection technique is carried out through documentation studies by collecting, identifying, and classifying legal materials relevant to the research problem. Data analysis is carried out using qualitative analysis techniques with a deductive thinking pattern, namely analyzing legal problems using major premises in the form of legal norms and minor premises in the form of legal facts or concrete events to be drawn (Nugroho et al., 2020). The analysis process begins with an inventory of the collected legal materials, then systematization is carried out by classifying them based on the hierarchy of laws and regulations and their relevance to the formulation of the problem. Furthermore, the interpretation of legal norms is carried out using various legal interpretation methods such as grammatical, systematic, and teleological interpretation.

3. RESEARCH AND DISCUSSION RESULTS

Regulation of Local Government Authority in Sustainable Natural Resources Management: A Constitutional Law Perspective

Constitutional Construction of Natural Resource Management Authority

The constitutional construction of the authority to manage natural resources in the Indonesian legal system is built on the foundation of Article 33 of the 1945 Constitution which places the state as the ruler of important branches of production and sources of natural resources for the greatest prosperity of the people. This constitutional provision has been interpreted by the Constitutional Court in its various decisions as the concept *of State's Right to Control* which does not mean ownership in the private sense, but public authority to regulate, manage, manage, and supervise the use of natural resources (Ritonga et al., 2021). In the context of a unitary state that adheres to the principle of decentralization, this construction then translates into a vertical division of authority between the central government and local governments that must reflect a balance between national interests and the needs of regional autonomy. (Ilham, 2024) emphasized that natural resource management from the perspective of Indonesian constitutional law must prioritize the principles of social justice and environmental sustainability as a manifestation of the *welfare state*. The implementation of this constitutional construction in the practice of constitutional law shows a complex dynamic, where local governments have operational authority in the management of natural resources in their territory but remain bound by norms, standards, procedures, and criteria set by the central government. (Satria et al., 2025) in their comparative study shows that the model of sharing authority for natural resource management in Indonesia tends to be more centralized compared to the model applied in the European Union, even though it formally adheres to a decentralized system. The tension between the principle of regional autonomy and the need for harmonization of national policies is a key characteristic in this constitutional construction, which demands an effective coordination and synchronization mechanism to prevent conflicts of authority and ensure sustainable management of natural resources. This construction is in line with the provisions of Article 174 of Law Number 6 of 2023 which emphasizes that the authority of ministers, heads of institutions, or local governments that have been determined must be interpreted as the exercise of the President's authority, which reflects the hierarchy of administrative decision-making within the framework of a unitary state (Law of the Republic of Indonesia, 2023).

Regulation of Authority in the Job Creation Law and the Environmental Protection Law

The regulation of local government authority in natural resource management has undergone a significant shift through Law Number 6 of 2023 concerning the Determination of the Job Creation Perppu, which introduces a risk-based business licensing system and simplifies administrative procedures. Article 7 of Law Number 6 of 2023 regulates a risk-based business licensing framework that assesses the level of danger and potential hazard based on aspects of health, safety, environment, and/or the utilization and management of resources, which categorizes activities into low, medium, or high risk as stipulated in Articles 7 to 11. This regulation stipulates that the technical authority for the implementation of spatial planning and certain authorities are carried out by local governments while still referring to the norms, standards, procedures, and criteria set by the central government, especially in the preparation of a digital Detailed Spatial Plan (RDTR) that is integrated with the

national licensing system as stipulated in Articles 14 to 15. (Hamdani et al., 2024) analyzed that after the ratification of the revision of the Mineral and Mineral Law, there was a centralization of the authority to grant mining business licenses based on Article 35 paragraph (1) which states that mining businesses Implemented under the authority of business licenses from the central government, reflecting the spirit of bureaucratization and bureaucratic simplification for investment effectiveness. Article 18 of Law Number 6 of 2023 strengthens the dominance of the substance of spatial planning by the central government by stipulating that the determination of the Spatial Plan of the province or district/city must still receive substantive approval from the central government, and if the regional head does not determine the RDTR within a certain period of time, the central government can determine it. Law Number 32 of 2009 concerning Environmental Protection and Management, on the other hand, shows a stronger decentralized approach with Article 63 which explicitly regulates the division of duties and authorities between the central, provincial, and district/city governments in determining policies, preparing Environmental Protection and Management Plans (RPPLH), Strategic Environmental Assessments (KLHS), and issuing environmental permits according to their authority. (Satria et al., 2025) in their research in Kubu Raya Regency found that although the national legal framework has provided an adequate foundation, the implementation of environmental policies at the regional level still requires harmonization of local regulations with national laws to ensure consistency of environmental protection. Articles 9 to 10 of Law Number 32 of 2009 require RPPLH at all levels (national, provincial, regency/city) to be prepared according to authority and make RPPLH the basis for the use of natural resources, while Article 12 paragraph (3) regulates the determination of carrying capacity and environmental carrying capacity that can be determined by the Minister, governor, or regent/mayor according to their level as the basis for the use of natural resources. The difference in philosophy between the Job Creation Law, which is oriented towards ease of doing business, and the Environmental Protection Law, which emphasizes the principles of prudence and sustainable development, creates complexity in the implementation of local government authority, which requires high administrative capacity to balance the acceleration of economic development with the protection of ecosystem functions (Hudi, 2024).

Implications of Changes in Authority on the Legal Principles of State Administration
Application of General Principles of Good Governance (AUPB)

The change in the authority of local governments in the management of natural resources has profound implications for the application of the General Principles of Good Governance (AUPB) as a fundamental principle of state administrative law. Article 24A of Law Number 6 of 2023 emphasizes that the implementation of the duties of the Special Economic Zone Administrator must be in accordance with good governance and general principles of good governance, which require transparency, accountability, legality, proportionality, and non-discrimination in natural resource management. Law No. 32 of 2009 explicitly accommodates the principles of transparency, public participation, and accountability through the provisions of Articles 65 to 66 concerning the right to information, access to participation in the preparation of the KLHS regulated in Articles 15 to 18, as well as the AMDAL/UKL-UPL process in Articles 25 to 26, including the obligation to announce environmental permit applications and decisions that reflect the principles of openness and *due process* in administrative decision-making. (Kennedy et al., 2024) emphasized that sources of state administrative law, both formal and material, play a crucial role in supporting the principles of *good governance* by providing a clear legal basis for the administration of government as well as flexibility in interpretation and implementation. However, the implementation of AUPB in the context of risk-based licensing introduced by Articles 21 to 22 of Law Number 6 of 2023 which revises Law Number 32 of 2009 faces significant challenges because the simplification of administrative procedures has the potential to reduce the space for public participation if it is not balanced with an effective and transparent consultation mechanism (Law of the Republic of Indonesia, 2009). (Rusydi & Santina, 2023) in their study found that the government's responsibility in enforcing environmental laws from the perspective of state administrative law faces internal and external obstacles that require socialization of environmental management and strengthening the capacity of law enforcement officials. The application of the principles of proportionality and legality demands that any administrative decision related to licensing and supervision must be based on an objective, comprehensive, and scientific evidence-based risk assessment, rather than mere economic considerations or ease of investment. Article 14A of Law Number 6 of 2023, which requires the preparation of strategic environmental assessments in the preparation of spatial plans, is an important foothold for including sustainability indicators in licensing, but successful implementation requires detailed implementing regulations as well as effective administrative and criminal sanctions as exemplified in the transitional provisions for natural resources and sanctions in Article 40A and Article 75A. The provisions in the Job Creation Law that require the implementation of governance in accordance with the AUPB in specialized institutions demonstrate normative recognition of the importance of these principles, but

their effectiveness depends on the availability of independent oversight mechanisms and accountability systems that can ensure that the discretionary authority of administrative officials is not abused.

Implications for the Environmental Licensing and Monitoring System

The transformation of the licensing system through a risk-based approach in the Job Creation Law has substantive implications for the licensing and environmental monitoring mechanisms that were previously regulated separately in various sectoral regulations. The new system regulated in Articles 6 to 12 of Law Number 6 of 2023 categorizes business activities based on the level of risk (low, medium, high) that determines the type of business license (business identification number, standard certificate, or permit) and the intensity of supervision, with the aim of simplifying bureaucracy and speeding up the approval process without sacrificing environmental protection. Article 11 of Law Number 6 of 2023 places frequency-based supervision that is adjusted to the level of risk and compliance of business actors, which requires an active monitoring system and qualified regional supervision capacity for the AUPB to be realized. (Hamdani et al., 2024) assesses that centralization and simplification of licensing can create investment certainty and ease of doing business, but require a robust *monitoring* and evaluation system to ensure business actors' compliance with environmental standards. Law Number 32 of 2009 through Article 63 establishes a layered supervision mechanism involving the central, provincial, and regency/city governments according to their authority, with administrative sanctions instruments that are comprehensively regulated including written warnings, government coercion, license freezes, and revocation of permits as *the ultimate remedium* before the application of criminal sanctions to ensure the proportionality of law enforcement. (Role et al., 2024) and (Febrian & Triadi, 2024) in their study on forest area management emphasized that the effectiveness of supervision depends on strengthening regulatory implementation, increasing supervision transparency, and community participation as a *social control* that can identify violations early. Integration of environmental approval into the electronic business licensing system mandated by Articles 21 to 22 of Law Number 6 of 2023 has the potential to increase administrative efficiency but also poses the risk of formalizing processes that reduce the substance of environmental impact assessments if it is not accompanied by strengthening the capacity of the EIA assessment commission and environmental auditors at the regional level. Articles 54 to 55 of Law Number 32 of 2009 regulate the obligation of environmental restoration guarantee funds attached to permit holders as a form of accountability and responsibility for recovery. (Satria et al., 2025) show that although the principles of public participation, transparency, and accountability have been normatively accommodated in local regulations, strengthening legal instruments and oversight mechanisms is still needed to ensure that risk-based licensing systems do not become an entry point for environmental degradation in the name of ease of investment. Articles 6 to 11 of Law Number 32 of 2009 which regulate an integrated environmental information system are an important foundation for the interoperability of inventory data, vulnerable maps, and KLHS results that can be accessed and used as a basis for decisions at all levels of government.

Ideal Legal Construction of Local Government Authority in Sustainable Natural Resources Management

Vertical and Horizontal Authority Harmonization Model

The ideal legal construction for local government authority in sustainable natural resource management requires vertical and horizontal harmonization models that can accommodate national standards while providing adaptive flexibility to local ecological and socio-economic conditions. Vertical harmonization requires clarity in the division of authority between the central government, provinces, and districts/cities which is not only hierarchical-normative but also functional-operational, where the central government establishes a strategic framework and national criteria based on scientific evidence as mandated by Article 14A of Law Number 6 of 2023 which requires consideration of the Strategic Environmental Assessment in the preparation of the Spatial Plan, the provinces operationalize at the level of the Cross-district and district/city ecoregions adjust operational plans by taking into account local wisdom and local environmental carrying capacity. (Kennedy et al., 2024) emphasizes the need for harmonization of regulations between the central and regional governments as well as increased coordination between government agencies to overcome regulatory fragmentation and mismatches between regulations and practices in the field. Horizontal harmonization requires cross-sector coordination (spatial planning, forestry, mining, agriculture, fisheries) and cross-regions (inter-province, inter-district/city) to avoid space utilization conflicts and policy inconsistencies that can damage the ecosystem across administrative boundaries as stipulated in the provisions on inter-district/city and inter-provincial spatial planning cooperation in Law Number 6 of 2023. (Satria et al., 2025) In its comparative study, it shows that an effective harmonization model requires institutional mechanisms such as regional coordination forums, inter-regional cooperation agreements, and integrated information systems that allow for real-time data exchange and policy synchronization. Articles 9 to 11 of Law Number 32 of 2009 have laid the foundation for harmonization through the obligation to prepare RPPLH at all levels of government which must be consistent with the higher level

RPPLH and the ecoregion inventory set by the Minister after coordination, but its implementation requires strengthening regional technical capacity and *dispute resolution* mechanisms which is effective when there is a conflict of authority or differences in the interpretation of norms between the central and regional governments. Articles 42 to 43 of Law Number 32 of 2009 regulate environmental economic instruments such as natural resource balances, cost internalization, inter-regional compensation mechanisms, and incentives/disincentives jointly developed by the central and regional governments as horizontal harmonization instruments that can align economic interests with cross-regional environmental protection. Article 62 of Law Number 32 of 2009 emphasizes the need for an integrated environmental information system that allows access to data and effective coordination in decision-making at all levels of government.

Normative Reconstruction for Sustainable Natural Resources Management

The normative reconstruction of local governments' authority in sustainable natural resource management must be built on three main pillars that reinforce each other: transparent and inclusive risk assessment technical criteria, meaningful public participation mechanisms, and strengthening regional oversight capacity. Risk assessment criteria in the system perizinan risk-based activities regulated by Article 7 of Law Number 6 of 2023 must include ecological, social, and economic aspects in an integrated manner, not only considering potential economic losses but also impacts on ecosystem function, biodiversity, and long-term environmental resilience so that licensing does not sacrifice sustainability for the sake of short-term investment acceleration. (Ilham, 2024) emphasized that effective community participation can have a significant positive impact on the sustainability of natural resource management, but requires strategies to strengthen access to information, empower community capacity, and fair and accessible conflict resolution mechanisms. The public participation mechanism regulated in Articles 25 to 41 of Law Number 32 of 2009 must go beyond procedural consultation and provide the public with the substantive right *to be* heard, their opinions considered, *and to obtain explanations for decisions taken (*right to be *explained*), including access to *legal remedies* through administrative lawsuits when the licensing decision is detrimental to the public interest or violates environmental regulations. (Rusydi & Santina, 2023) shows the importance of strengthening effective administrative supervision and sanction mechanisms to minimize environmental pollution violations. Strengthening regional supervisory capacity requires investment in human resources (auditor and environmental inspector training), information technology infrastructure such as the integration of digital RDTR into the central licensing system mandated by Articles 14 to 15 of Law Number 6 of 2023, and institutions (the establishment of independent regional environmental supervisory institutions) supported by adequate financing and knowledge transfer from the central government. (Role et al., 2024) recommend strengthening regulatory implementation, increasing oversight transparency, and developing alternative economic programs for communities around the region to support environmental sustainability and social welfare. This normative reconstruction must also include strengthening environmental economic instruments regulated by Articles 42 to 43 of Law Number 32 of 2009 such as *payment mechanisms for ecosystem services*, environmental restoration guarantee funds as stipulated in Articles 54 to 55, environmental performance-based incentive-disincentive systems, and internalization of environmental externality costs in calculating the economic feasibility of projects. Transitional provisions and sanctions stipulated in Article 40A and Article 75A of Law Number 6 of 2023 provide an example of a sanctions approach that needs to be strengthened with a firm but proportionate law enforcement mechanism, so that natural resource management not only meets short-term economic interests but also ensures ecological sustainability and intergenerational justice.

4. CONCLUSION

The regulation of local government authority in sustainable natural resource management faces the complex dynamics between decentralization and national harmonization. Law Number 6 of 2023 concerning Job Creation introduces a risk-based licensing system with a tendency to centralize authority to the central government, creating tension with Law Number 32 of 2009 which prioritizes a strong decentralization approach through the explicit division of duties in setting environmental policies. The philosophical difference between ease of doing business and the principle of prudence creates implementation complexity that demands high administrative capacity. The implementation of the AUPB faces challenges in simplifying procedures that have the potential to reduce public participation, while the transformation of the licensing system requires strengthening the capacity of regional oversight to ensure compliance with environmental standards without sacrificing ecosystem protection and long-term sustainability.

Recommendations

Normative reconstruction is needed that builds vertical and horizontal harmonization through clarity in the division of functional-operational authority, not just hierarchical-normative. Risk assessment criteria must

integrate ecological, social, and economic aspects holistically with meaningful public participation mechanisms, going beyond procedural consultation towards the substantive right of communities to be heard, considered, and explained on administrative decisions. Strengthening regional supervisory capacity requires investment in human resources, integrated information technology infrastructure, and independent institutions supported by adequate financing. Environmental economic instruments such as payment for ecosystem services, recovery guarantee funds, and internalization of environmental externalities need to be strengthened with firm but proportionate law enforcement mechanisms to ensure ecological sustainability and intergenerational justice.

REFERENCE

1. Al-farisi, M. S. (2021). Desentralisasi Kewenangan Pada Urusan Pertambangan Mineral Dan Batubara Dalam Undang-Undang Nomor 3 Tahun 2020. Jurnal Ilmiah Ecosystem, 21(April), 20–31. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.35965/eco.v21i1.699
2. Febrian, F. M., & Triadi, I. (2024). Peran Hukum Tata Negara dalam Mewujudkan Keberlanjutan Pengelolaan Hutan dan Ekosistemnya. Indonesian Journal of Law and Justice Volume:, 1(4), 1–10. https://journal.pubmedia.id/index.php/lawjustice
3. Hamdani, F., Awang, E., & Putra, M. (2024). Perizinan dalam Pengelolaan SDA Pasca Pengesahan Revisi UU Minerba : Perspektif Hukum Administrasi dalam Konteks Welfare State. Rio Law Jurnal Volume., 5(1). https://doi.org/10.36355/.v1i2
4. Hudi, R. M. (2024). Analisis Kewenangan Pemerintah Daerah Dalam Pengelolaan Sumber Daya Alam Berdasarkan Uu Otonomi Daerah. Indragiri Law Review, 2(2).
5. Ilham, M. (2024). Pengelolaan sumber daya alam dalam perspektif hukum tata negara indonesia. Indonesia of Journal Business Law, 3(1). https://doi.org/10.47709/ijbl.v3i1.4147
6. Kennedy, A., Surya, W. H., Mustika, S. R., Xaverius, F., & Pemerintah, P. (2024). Sumber-Sumber Hukum Administrasi Negara dalam Kerangka Good Governance di Indonesia. IURIS STUDIA: Jurnal Kajian Hukum, 5(September), 558–569.
7. Manalu, G. B. (2024). Politik Hukum Pengusahaan Sumber Daya Air Setelah Disahkannya Undang-Undang Cipta Kerja. Binamulia Hukum, 13, 55–69. https://doi.org/10.37893/jbh.v13i1.693
8. Muhaimin. (2020). Metode Penelitian Hukum. In Sustainability (Switzerland) (Vol. 11, Issue 1). http://scioteca.caf.com/bitstream/handle/123456789/1091/RED2017-Eng-8ene.pdf?sequence=12&isAllowed=y%0Ahttp://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.regsciurbeco.2008.06.005%0Ahttps://www.researchgate.net/publication/305320484_SISTEM_PEMBETUKAN_TERPUSAT_STRATEGI_MELESTARI
9. Nugroho, S. S., Haryani, A. T., & Farkhani. (2020). Metodologi Riset Hukum. In Oase Pustaka (Vol. 2). https://unmermadiun.ac.id/repository_jurnal_penelitian/Sigit Sapto Nugroho/URL Buku Ajar/Buku Metodologi Riset Hukum.pdf
10. Ritonga, R., Oktarizka, A., & Pusita, V. (2021). Hak Negara untuk Mengontrol Sumber Daya Alam di Indonesia : Review Putusan Mahkamah Konstitusi. 1(2).
11. Role, T., Area, F., Hudaya, C. R., Paradita, S. A., Febrian, F. M., & Triadi, I. (2024). Peran Hukum Tata Negara dalam Pengelolaan Kawasan Hutan. Indonesian Journal of Law and Justice, 1(4), 1–13. https://journal.pubmedia.id/index.php/lawjustice
12. Rusydi, J., & Santina, R. (2023). Tanggungjawab pemerintah dalam penegakan hukum lingkungan hidup di tinjau dari persepektif hukum administrasi negara. 02(1), 54–63.
13. Satria, R., Hidayat, M., Suyadi, Y. H., & Nurhadi, S. (2025). " Analisis Implementasi Kebijakan Lingkungan dalam Perspektif Hukum Tata Negara di Kabupaten Kubu Raya ". JUMPA BHAKTI : Jurnal Multidisiplin Pascasarjana Bhakti, 1(2), 103–115. https://jurnal@upb.ac.id
14. Sinthumule, N. I., & Mugwena, T. (2021). The Conflict between Preserving a ‘ Sacred Natural Site ’ and Exploiting Nature for Commercial Gain : Evidence from Phiphidi Waterfall in South Africa. Sustainability. https://doi.org/https:// doi.org/10.3390/su131810476 Academic Soto, F. (2019). Decentralization of Natural Resource Governance Regimes. Annual Review of Environment and Resources, December 2008. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.energy.33.020607.095522
15. Wang, K.-H., Liu, L., Adebayo, T. S., Lobonț, O.-R., & Claudia, M. N. (2021). Fiscal decentralization, political stability and resources curse hypothesis: A case of fiscal decentralized economies. Resources Policy, 72, 102071. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resourpol.2021.102071

Undang – Undang :

16. Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia. (2009). Nomor 32 Tahun 2009 Tentang Perlindungan Dan Pengelolaan Lingkungan Hidup, 19(19), 19.
17. Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia. (2023). Nomor 6 Tahun 2023 Tentang Penetapan Peraturan Pemerintah Pengganti Undang-Undang Nomor 2 Tahun 2022 Tentang Cipta Kerja Menjadi Undang-

Undang. Jurnal Hukum To-Ra : Hukum Untuk Mengatur Dan Melindungi Masyarakat, 9(3), 428–447. https://doi.org/10.55809/tora.v9i3.276