

Constitutional Transformation in the Arrangement of Regional Autonomy Content: A Comparative Analysis of Regional Government Legislation from the New Order Era to the Reform

I Made Sudharma^{1✉}, Ida Bagus Sudarma Putra², I Made Adi Widnyana³, Putu Ulandari Sri Lestari⁴

imadesudharma@uhnsugriwa.ac.id, sudarmaputraidabagus@uhnsugriwa.ac.id²

widnyanamadeadi@gmail.com³, ulandarilestari@uhnsugriwa.ac.id⁴

^{1,2,3,4} Hindu Law Study Program, Faculty of Dharma Duta, Universitas Hindu Negeri I Gusti Bagus Sugriwa Denpasar, Indonesia

Keywords: Regional Autonomy; Decentralization; Regional Government; Comparative Legislation.	Abstract
Submitted: 06/11/2025	This research looks at how regional autonomy arrangements changed under the constitution by comparing laws pertaining to regional governments throughout the New Order and Reform periods. This research examines Laws No. 5 of 1974, Law No. 22 of 1999, Law No. 32 of 2004, and Law No. 23 of 2014 using a normative legal research technique using statutory and conceptual methods. From the New Order's centralization to the Reform era's widespread decentralization and efforts toward effective regional governance based on unitary state principles, the results show that every law reflects the dynamic pursuit of balance between the two extremes. The reforms include reorganizing the power structure between the federal and state levels of government, establishing new procedures for the election of regional chiefs, and dividing up governmental responsibilities.
Revised: 12/12/2025	
Accepted: 22/12/2025	
Author Correspondent: I Made Sudharma Hindu Law Study Program, Faculty of Dharma Duta, Universitas Hindu Negeri I Gusti Bagus Sugriwa Denpasar, Indonesia Email: imadesudharma@uhnsugriwa.ac.id	

INTRODUCTION

The transition from the New Order regime to the Reform era was accompanied by amendments to the 1945 Constitution, which fundamentally reshaped the constitutional structure of Indonesia. One of the central aspirations of this transformation was the restructuring of regional autonomy through the distribution of state authority and the strengthening of local governance. There have been many regulatory changes in Indonesia's type of autonomous governance as it pertains to regional government administration. One of the most long-lasting frameworks for

governance was regional government regulation during the New Order era. This was mostly accomplished by Law No. 5 of 1974, which was in effect until the Reform period brought about a shift in power. A reorganization of governmental powers between the federal and regional levels followed this change, with the final product being the 1999 Law No. 22 on Regional Government. (Namlis, 2018).

A number of factors were in play when Law No. 22 of 1999 came into being in 1999, the most important of which was the collapse of Soeharto's administration, which had utterly disrupted the structure of government policymaking. For this reason, many people in society sought systemic change in the government (Safitri, 2016). With the exception of those areas that were still under federal control, the federal government granted broad autonomy to regional governments via a process wherein it transferred governmental responsibilities to regional authorities (Mahmuzar, 2020).

The Second Amendment to the Constitution of 1945, which bolstered the role of regional administrations in national development and established Article 18, further solidified this structure. The Constitution of 1945 states in Article 18(2) that "The regional governments of provinces, regencies, and municipalities shall govern and administer their own governmental affairs in accordance with the principles of autonomy and co-administration." In addition, Article 18(5) states that "Regional governments shall exercise the broadest possible autonomy, except for governmental affairs designated by law as the prerogative of the Central Government." With this constitutional framework in place, the concepts of extensive, genuine, and responsible decentralization were established in Law No. 32 of 2004 on Regional Government.

A decade later, Law No. 32 of 2004 was found to be ill-suited to the evolving realities of regional government administration. This called for immediate change, which resulted in the passing of Law No. 23 of 2014 on Regional Government, which upholds the unitary state's fundamentals while stressing the maximum feasible distribution of regional autonomy. Regional autonomy is not incompatible with a unitary state (*eenheidstaat*). According to the principle of broad-based autonomy, the federal government can only be involved in legally defined absolute governmental affairs; all other matters are handled by the regional governments. (Rudy, 2012). Accordingly, decentralization and the principle of the unitary state should not be regarded as contradictory, but rather as mutually reinforcing concepts (Santoso, 2013).

The ongoing evolution of regional government regulation reflects a continuous search for the most appropriate and effective form of autonomous governance within the existing governmental system and structure. This is evident in the development of regional autonomy arrangements, which have traversed a diverse range of regulatory frameworks and dynamics from the centralistic character of governance during the New Order era, to the shift toward decentralization in the Reform era, followed by efforts to strike a balance and ultimately to evaluate the effectiveness of regional government administration. Each of these laws embodies a distinct arrangement, and revisions have been consistently undertaken to reconstruct the relationship between the central and regional governments, with significant implications for the structuring of regional governmental authority and affairs.

RESEARCH METHODS

A normative legal research technique was used in this work, which combines a conceptual approach with a statutory approach. Additionally, the author's study is guided by the approach of legal material tracing. The discussion in this article places particular emphasis on, and is deliberately limited to, the scope of comparing the arrangement of regional autonomy content within the development of regional

government legislation spanning from the New Order era, beginning with Law No. 5 of 1974, through to the Reform era, concluding with Law No. 23 of 2014.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The Arrangement of Regional Autonomy Content in the Development of Regional Government Legislation Since the New Order Era to the Reform Era

Conceptual Review

The term "autonomy" is etymologically derived from the words "*autos*," meaning "self," and "*nomos*," meaning "rule" (Darumurti & Rauta, 2000). The concept of autonomy carries a broader meaning than its etymological roots suggest. As articulated by J.H.A. Logemann, it connotes "freedom" or "independence," though not sovereignty. Nevertheless, the freedom referred to here is a limited freedom regulated by law, and independence constitutes a form of opportunity granted to exercise governmental responsibility (Sunindhia, 1987). In line with this view, autonomy is the ability to protect and advance a region's unique requirements, such as handling its own money, passing its own laws, and running its own government.

On this basis, the implementation of autonomy gives rise to the arrangement of regional autonomy content, aimed at achieving a form of regional autonomy that continuously seeks the most appropriate structure within the existing governmental system. Ongoing changes and refinements from the regulation of one law to the next have carried significant implications for the structuring of authority and affairs administered by regional governments. The central concern revolves around what regional governments must do in delivering public services and realizing the welfare of the people.

Doctrinal Review

The Liang Gie (1981) defines autonomy as the authority to manage the needs of a community group residing within a particular territorial area. The exercise of authority emphasized by Gie encompasses the power to administer, regulate, control, and develop all aspects deemed essential for the sustainability of the entire community.

Furthermore, C.W. Van der Pot, as summarized by Koesoemahatmadja, identifies three doctrines concerning the content of regional household affairs: (1) the material household doctrine (*materieel huishoudingsbegrip*); (2) the formal household doctrine (*formeel huishoudingsbegrip*); and (3) the real household doctrine (*reëel huishoudingsbegrip*) (Koesoemahatmadja, 1979). The use of the phrase "household doctrine," upon closer examination, may effectively be equated with "autonomy system." Accordingly, to understand the content and scope of regional autonomy as previously discussed, three autonomy systems are theoretically recognized: material autonomy, formal autonomy, and real autonomy.

Under the material autonomy system, there exists an explicit division of tasks encompassing authority and responsibility between the central and regional governments, as expressly detailed in legislation governing regional government. The formal autonomy system, by contrast, presupposes no fundamental difference in nature between the affairs administered by the central government and those administered by regional governments. In essence, what the state (central government) may do, regional autonomous governments may in principle also perform. The third system is real autonomy, also known as genuine autonomy. It is described as "real" or "genuine" because the substance of regional autonomy is grounded in actual conditions and variables, corresponding to the genuine circumstances, needs, and capacities of each region and its population. Tresna characterizes this as a middle ground between the material and formal autonomy systems. In agreement with Tresna, R.D.H.

Koesoemahatmadja similarly contends that: "the real autonomy system is a synthesis of the material and formal autonomy systems, meaning that it incorporates elements of both, and may therefore be regarded as a distinct autonomy system in its own right" (Koesoemahatmadja, 1979).

All three systems possess distinct characteristics and have at various times been adopted in Indonesia. However, since the enactment of successive regional government laws Law No. 5 of 1974, replaced by Law No. 22 of 1999, subsequently replaced by Law No. 32 of 2004, and later replaced by Law No. 23 of 2014 a discernible transformation has taken place, shifting from a predominantly centralized form of regional governance toward a decentralized model that prioritizes democratic values and societal diversity, moving toward a system of real autonomy.

The Republic of Indonesia is pluralistic, diverse, and multicultural, as acknowledged by the 1945 Constitution, and the actual autonomy system that has persisted from the New Order period to the Reform era is well-suited to this nature, according to a deeper assessment. To achieve the goal of people-centered governance and administration at the regional level, the true autonomy system lays the groundwork for doing so. The progressive acceptance of the actual autonomy system, coupled with a democratic orientation, is most noticeable in the evident development of the organization of regional autonomy content from the New Order period to the Reform era, as shown by the consecutive legislative revisions. What this means is that decentralization and regional autonomy put local communities' needs first while yet protecting the integrity of the country.

Normative Review

Indonesia has practiced a system of autonomy; however, not all governmental affairs have been fully transferred from the central government to the regions. Certain authorities remain entirely within the purview of the central government of the Republic of Indonesia, given their externalities and the nature of matters that must be handled through central government policy (Aswiwin, 2017).

Tracing the normative dimension of regional autonomy regulation since 1945 beginning with Law No. 1 of 1945 through to Law No. 5 of 1974 a discernible spirit of regional autonomy began to emerge, laying the regulatory groundwork for the implementation of governance at the regional level. Nevertheless, the spirit of those governing regional administration remained far from the true principles of regional autonomy (Marbun, 2005).

With regard to regional government legislation enacted during the New Order era, it commenced with Law No. 5 of 1974 on the Basic Principles of Regional Government. This law distinguished between *Daerah* (autonomous regions, in the context of decentralization) and *Wilayah* (administrative territories, in the context of deconcentration). Regions were structured into two tiers Level I Region (*Daerah Tingkat I*) and Level II Region (*Daerah Tingkat II*) while administrative territories were organized into five levels: Province, Regency/Municipality, *Kotip* (where applicable), Sub-district (*Kecamatan*), and Urban Village (*Kelurahan*). The principle governing the distribution of autonomy to regions shifted from "real and broad autonomy" to "genuine and responsible autonomy." This law was predominantly centralistic in character.

After that, the goal of passing Law No. 22 of 1999 on Regional Government was to reorganize decentralization at the regional level by giving regions wide latitude to handle their own affairs. The tyrannical New Order regime's downfall and the growth of reform movements aiming at reshaping the constitution in every way were the primary factors behind the creation of this legislation. The implementation of regional autonomy, the just division and utilization of national resources, and fiscal balance

between the central and regional governments within the framework of the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia were all emphasized in MPR Decree No. XV/MPR/1998, which further strengthened this momentum. The idea of implementation welcomed true, extensive, and accountable independence. Provinces and Regency/Municipal Regions were established under this statute, and they were each granted some degree of autonomy in accordance with the decentralization idea. Regencies and municipalities were no longer subject to provincial supervision. Level II Regency/Municipality is now known as Regency/Municipality, while Level I Province is now known as Province.

It was necessary to restructure the connection between the central and regional administrations due to flaws in the structuring of several sectors that were discovered during the execution of Law No. 22 of 1999. As a result, based on the revisions to the 1945 Constitution, Law No. 32 of 2004 on Regional Government was passed. As to this statute, the Republic of Indonesia is split into regional units called provinces, which are further divided into sub-regions called regencies and municipalities. According to Setiawan (2018), the goal of this legislation was to find a middle ground between extremes of centralization and decentralization. In accordance with the ideals of wide, real, and responsible autonomy, the federal government relinquished control of all governmental matters to the individual regions. First, international affairs; second, defense; third, security; fourth, justice; fifth, national fiscal and monetary policy; and sixth, religion are the exclusive domains of the central government, as stated in Article 10(3). As a result, there are three distinct branches of government: (1) the federal government, (2) the states and territories, which are each responsible for their own set of responsibilities (both mandatory and optional), and (3) the other branches.

Ten years later, Law No. 23 of 2014 on Regional Government superseded Law No. 32 of 2004 on Regional Government due to incompatibilities with changing conditions, new constitutional provisions, and administrative needs of regional government entities. The Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia is structured according to the following law: province regions, then regency and municipal regions, then sub-districts (Kecamatan), and finally urban villages (Kelurahan) and/or villages (Desa) within sub-districts. The unitary state's governing principles dictate that regional autonomy should be as extensive as feasible. However, the Central Government is ultimately responsible for administering regional governments, irrespective of the extent to which regions are allowed autonomy.

Law No. 32 of 2004 had not yet clearly regulated the division of authority from the central government to regional governments including the extent of such authority and the rights and obligations of each party resulting in a narrow interpretation of its provisions (Pratama, 2015). Accordingly, Law No. 23 of 2014 explicitly enumerates three categories of governmental affairs: (1) *Absolute governmental affairs* (exclusively within the authority of the Central Government, encompassing foreign affairs, defense, security, justice, national monetary and fiscal policy, and religion); (2) *Concurrent governmental affairs* (shared between the Central Government and provincial and regency/municipal regions); and (3) *General governmental affairs* (within the authority of the President as head of government).

Comparative Analysis of Regional Autonomy Arrangements in the Development of Regional Government Legislation from the New Order Era to the Reform Era

Comparison of Regional Autonomy Arrangements between Law No. 5 of 1974 and Law No. 22 of 1999

Based on the foregoing discussion, several principal and fundamental differences in the arrangement of regional autonomy content between Law No. 5 of 1974 and Law No. 22 of 1999 can be identified as follows.

First, under Law No. 22 of 1999, the designation of Level I Province (*Provinsi Daerah Tingkat I*) was renamed Province, and the designation of Level II Regency/Municipality (*Kabupaten/Kotamadya Daerah Tingkat II*) was renamed Regency/Municipality. *Second*, a clear distinction was drawn between the Regional Head and the Regional Legislative Council (*DPRD*). Under Law No. 5 of 1974, the *DPRD* was subsumed within the definition of "Regional Government," whereas under Law No. 22 of 1999, the scope of "Regional Government" was limited solely to the Regional Head and other regional apparatus, collectively referred to as the regional executive. *Third*, Law No. 22 of 1999 fully vested regional autonomy in Regencies and Municipalities, thereby eliminating the administrative territory concept previously known as territorial government at the Regency/Municipal level as had been provided under Law No. 5 of 1974.

Fourth, Law No. 22 of 1999 established Provincial Regions as both Autonomous Regions and Administrative Territories, exercising central government authority delegated to the Governor. *Fifth*, Provincial Regions were no longer conceived as superior governments over Regencies and Municipalities, introducing a clear delineation of authority between Provinces and Regencies/Municipalities. *Sixth*, the Autonomous Regions of Provinces, Regencies, and Municipalities no longer maintained hierarchical structural ties. *Seventh*, According to Law No. 22 of 1999, the decentralization concept was upheld when wide, authentic, and accountable autonomy was granted to Regencies and Municipalities. As a result, the deconcentration principle-based execution of governmental duties was limited to the provincial level. *Eighth*, With the exception of certain sectors including religion, foreign affairs, military and security, the judiciary, and monetary and fiscal policy, Law No. 22 of 1999 ordered the distribution of regional power throughout all parts of government. *Ninth*, By virtue of Law No. 5 of 1974, the Regional Head was answerable to the President via the Minister of Home Affairs; by virtue of Law No. 22 of 1999, on the other hand, the Governor was answerable to the Provincial *DPRD* and the Regent/Mayor to the Regency/Municipal *DPRD*. *Tenth*, under Law No. 5 of 1974, Level I and Level II Regional Heads were nominated and elected by the *DPRD*, with Level I Regional Heads inaugurated by the President and Level II Regional Heads inaugurated by the Minister of Home Affairs, whereas under Law No. 22 of 1999, the Regional Head and Deputy Regional Head were elected by the *DPRD*.

Comparison of Regional Autonomy Arrangements between Law No. 22 of 1999 and Law No. 32 of 2004

A comparative analysis of regional autonomy arrangements between Law No. 22 of 1999 and Law No. 32 of 2004 reveals several substantive changes to the pattern of regional government administration, which may be elaborated as follows.

First, under Law No. 32 of 2004, decentralization and deconcentration are treated as complementary rather than separate in character. *Second*, with respect to regional development, Law No. 32 of 2004 introduced administrative, technical, and territorial physical requirements, aimed at ensuring that regional development effectively supports the delivery of optimal public services.

Third, under Law No. 32 of 2004, the scope of governmental affairs distribution is divided into several categories: (1) certain matters that are solely controlled by the federal government, including international relations, national defense, security, fiscal policy, justice, and religion; (2) matters that can be handled simultaneously by the federal government, provinces, and regencies/municipalities, with an eye toward achieving a fair distribution of governmental responsibilities and promoting transparency and coherence in intergovernmental relations; and (3) matters that are handled concurrently within regional authority, further divided into mandatory and optional affairs. Fundamental public services, including healthcare, education, housing, and the provision of essential necessities, as well as the maintenance of adequate environmental infrastructure, are considered mandatory matters. In contrast, optional affairs are those that really take place in an area and have the ability to boost regional economy. Fourth, regional administrations are democratically chosen via direct public elections under Law No. 32 of 2004.

Fifth, Law No. 32 of 2004 affirms that regional autonomy encompasses the rights, authority, and obligations of autonomous regions. Law No. 22 of 1999, by contrast, confined autonomy to the concept of authority alone. This distinction gave rise to a terminological shift from the use of "authority" (*kewenangan*) in Law No. 22 of 1999 (Article 7) to the use of "affairs" (*urusan*) in Law No. 32 of 2004. The substantive difference between "authority" and "division of affairs" can be understood from a legal perspective: authority fundamentally constitutes the right of government to select or determine strategies in conducting governance, whereas governmental affairs represent the substance of authority that has been apportioned between the central government and the regions, with clearly defined competencies for the central government, provinces, and regencies/municipalities. Within this framework, Law No. 22 of 1999 did not assign a share to the central government for consolidating affairs already within the domain of Provinces, Regencies, and Municipalities, nor could Provinces intervene in or consolidate Regency/Municipal affairs.

Accordingly, the emphasis in Law No. 22 of 1999 on "authority" essentially concerned the examination and selection of what content should be filled or fulfilled through the exercise of that authority a scheme that inspired regions to explore a wide range of activities and ideas in delivering public services within the framework of regional governance. Law No. 32 of 2004, on the other hand, specifically regulated the distribution of governmental affairs delegated for the conduct of governance. The key distinction thus lies in the object of emphasis: under the division of affairs framework, regional authority is confined to matters explicitly assigned by a clear legal basis, and regional competence expands only upon the delegation of affairs by the central government. In this sense, Law No. 32 of 2004 continued to regard decentralization as a transfer of affairs.

Comparison of Regional Autonomy Arrangements between Law No. 32 of 2004 and Law No. 23 of 2014

First, under Law No. 23 of 2014, the election of Regional Heads was no longer conducted through direct popular elections, but instead reverted to indirect election through DPRD representatives, with Regional Heads obligated to recommend the appointment of Deputy Regional Heads. *Second*, under Law No. 32 of 2004, provincial regional apparatus comprised bodies assisting the Regional Head in administering regional government, including the Regional Secretariat, DPRD Secretariat, Regional Service Offices (*Dinas Daerah*), and Regional Technical Institutions (*Lembaga Teknis Daerah*), whereas under Law No. 23 of 2014, the regional apparatus encompasses the Regional Secretariat, DPRD Secretariat, Inspectorate, Service Offices (*Dinas*), and

Agencies (*Badan*). The notable addition in Law No. 23 of 2014 is the inclusion of the "Inspectorate" and "Agency" as distinct categories within the regional technical institution classification. *Third*, Foreign affairs, defense, security, justice, national monetary and fiscal policy, and religion are all considered absolute governmental affairs, which are solely under the control of the Central Government. Concurrent governmental affairs include mandatory and optional matters that can be divided among the federal government, provinces, and regencies/municipalities. Lastly, general governmental affairs are under the authority of the President as head of state. This division is laid out in Law No. 23 of 2014. *Fourth*, the following principles were set out by Law No. 23 of 2014: (a) accountability, (b) efficiency, (c) externality, and (d) national strategic interest. These principles apply to the Central Government, Provincial Regional Governments, and Regency/Municipal Regional Governments.

Fifth, Law No. 23 of 2014 introduces several significant updates to the allocation of authority, with a notable recentralization of certain powers as set out in an annex containing a comprehensive matrix detailing the division of governmental responsibilities across three tiers of government:

The Central Government and Provincial Regional Governments now have sole jurisdiction in the Energy and Mineral Resources sector, which was previously shared among Regency/Municipal Regional Governments and Provincial Regional Governments. The ability to issue permits (except geothermal energy), oversee and develop projects, and establish regional laws (*Perda*) relating to energy and mineral resources are among the powers taken away from Regencies/Municipalities.

The maritime sector has seen a redistribution of power, with the former being vested in the federal government and the provincial and municipal governments, and the latter two receiving no more than the former. Policy implementation, marine spatial planning, law enforcement and monitoring, management and usage coordination, and licensing (excluding fisheries business licenses) are among the powers taken away from Regencies/Municipalities.

In the *Forestry* sector, authority previously shared among the Central Government, Provincial Regional Governments, and Regency/Municipal Regional Governments is now conferred exclusively upon the Central Government and Provincial Regional Governments. Among the authorities withdrawn from Regencies/Municipalities are forest inventory, forest park management, technical consideration, permit issuance, and related functions.

CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

Conclusion

The arrangement of regional autonomy in Indonesia from the New Order era to the Reform era reflects the dynamic pursuit of balance between centralization and decentralization. Law No. 5 of 1974 applied a centralistic approach through the concept of genuine and responsible autonomy, with regional heads elected through the DPRD. Entering the Reform era, Law No. 22 of 1999 moved toward broad decentralization by granting extensive authority to regions and abolishing administrative territories at the regency/municipal level. Law No. 32 of 2004 subsequently rebalanced the relationship between the central and regional governments through a more structured division of affairs, while also introducing the direct popular election of regional heads. Finally, Law No. 23 of 2014 sought to enhance the effectiveness of regional governance by recentralizing several strategic authorities including those over energy, maritime affairs, and forestry to the central and provincial levels, while simultaneously reverting the mechanism for electing regional heads to the DPRD. This marked a discernible shift back

toward a more controlled pattern of governance to uphold the principles of the unitary state

Suggestion

As an implication of the constitutional transformation in the arrangement of regional autonomy content comparatively analyzed from the New Order era through the Reform era it is recommended that future legislators draw upon this comparative regulatory analysis as a foundational basis for designing regional government policies that are more adaptive yet remain firmly anchored to the principles of the unitary state. In doing so, every legislative amendment should not be reactive to political dynamics, but should instead constitute the outcome of thorough, measured, and constitutionally grounded evaluation, oriented toward the sustained improvement of public service quality at the regional level.

REFERENCE

- Darumurti, Krishna D dan Umbu Rauta. (2000). *Otonomi Daerah Perkembangan Pemikiran dan Pelaksanaannya*. Bandung: Citra Aditya Bakti, Bandung.
- Gie, The Liang. (1981). *Unsur-Unsur Administrasi*, Yogyakarta: Super sukses.
- Koesoemahatmadja, R.D.H. (1979). *Pengantar ke Arah Pemerintahan Daerah di Indonesia*. Bandung: Bina Cipta.
- Marbun, BN. (2005). *Otonomi Daerah 1945-2005 Proses dan Realita Perkembangan Otda. Sejak Zaman Kolonial sampai Saat Ini*. Jakarta: Pustaka Sinar harapan.
- Rudy, (2012). *Hukum Pemerintahan Daerah Perspektif Konstitusionalisme Indonesia*. Bandar Lampung: Indepth Publishing.
- Santoso, Lukman. (2013). *Hukum Pemerintahan Daerah Mengurai Problematika Pemekaran Daerah Pasca Reformasi di Indonesia*. Yogyakarta: Katalog Dalam Terbitan.
- Sunindhia, Y.W. (1987). *Praktek Penyelenggaraan Pemerintahan Daerah*. Jakarta: Bina Aksara.
- Gede Wahyu Pratama, I.B. (2015). Perubahan Kewenangan pemerintah Daerah berdasarkan Undang-Undang Nomor 23 Tahun 2014 tentang Pemerintahan Daerah. *Jurnal Kertha Negara*, 3(2), 1-15. DOI: <https://ojs.unud.ac.id/index.php/Kerthanegara/article/view/13088>.
- Mahmuzar. (2020). Model Negara Kesatuan Republik Indonesia di Era Reformasi. *Jurnal Hukum & Pembangunan*, 50(2): 302-316. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.21143/jhp.vol50.no2.2590>.
- Namlis, Achmad. (2018). Dinamika Implementasi Penyelenggaraan Pemerintahan Daerah. *Jurnal Kajian Pemerintahan*, 4(1), 37-43. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.25299/jkp.2018.vol4\(1\).2167](https://doi.org/10.25299/jkp.2018.vol4(1).2167).
- Safitri, Sani. (2016). Sejarah Perkembangan Otonomi Daerah di Indonesia. *Jurnal Criksetra*, 5(9), 79-83. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.36706/jc.v5i1.4804>.
- Setiawan, Rizky. (2018). Implikasi Perubahan Undang-Undang Pemerintahan Daerah Terhadap Kewenangan Tata Kelola Pemanfaatan Energi dan Sumber Daya Mineral Oleh Pemerintahan Daerah di Indonesia. *Jurnal Kajian Pemerintahan*, 4(1), 63-76. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.25299/jkp.2018.vol4\(1\).2170](https://doi.org/10.25299/jkp.2018.vol4(1).2170).
- Aswiwin. (2017). Penataan Hukum Sistem Otonomi Daerah Dalam Mewujudkan Kesejahteraan Rakyat Di Indonesia. Universitas Hasanuddin.
- Undang-Undang Dasar Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 1945.
- Undang-Undang Nomor 5 Tahun 1974 Tentang Pokok-Pokok Pemerintahan di Daerah. Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 1974 Nomor 38, Tambahan Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Nomor 3037.

Undang-Undang Nomor 22 Tahun 1999 Tentang Pemerintahan Daerah. Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 1999 Nomor 60, Tambahan Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Nomor 3839.

Undang-Undang Nomor 32 Tahun 2004 Tentang Pemerintahan Daerah. Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 2004 Nomor 125, Tambahan Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Nomor 4437.

Undang-Undang Nomor 23 Tahun 2014 Tentang Pemerintahan Daerah. Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 2014 Nomor 244, Tambahan Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Nomor 5587.