

## Implementation of Good Environmental Governance in Indonesia: Literature Review

Baso Pawara<sup>1</sup>, Haslinda<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Faculty of Communication Sciences, Mercu Buana University, Indonesia

### ARTICLE INFO

Received: 18 December 2025

Revised: 07 January 2026

Accepted: 16 February 2026

Available online: 19 February 2026

#### Keywords:

Good Environmental Governance  
Environmental Governance  
Sustainable Development Policy

#### Corresponding Author:

Baso Pawara

Email:

[basopawara1990@yahoo.com](mailto:basopawara1990@yahoo.com)

Copyright © 2026, Adaptive Governance Research, Under the license [CC BY- SA 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/)



### ABSTRACT

**Purpose:** This study aims to examine how Good Environmental Governance has been implemented in Indonesia by synthesizing existing academic literature across environmental sectors and governance levels. It seeks to identify dominant governance principles, recurring implementation patterns, and structural challenges, while linking sectoral findings to broader debates on governance quality and sustainable development.

**Subjects and Methods:** The study employed a literature review design. Peer-reviewed journal articles, academic books, book chapters, and selected policy reports related to environmental governance in Indonesia were systematically collected from major academic databases. The reviewed literature primarily covers the post-decentralization period. Data were analyzed using a thematic synthesis approach guided by core Good Environmental Governance principles, including transparency, accountability, participation, rule of law, effectiveness, and equity, to ensure analytical coherence and theoretical rigor.

**Results:** The findings indicate that Indonesia has formally incorporated Good Environmental Governance principles into its environmental policy framework. Transparency initiatives, participatory mechanisms, and collaborative governance arrangements have expanded across several sectors. However, the literature consistently reveals weak regulatory enforcement, limited institutional capacity, fragmented authority under decentralization, and persistent power asymmetries. As a result, environmental outcomes remain uneven, with localized governance successes coexisting alongside continued deforestation, pollution, and resource conflicts.

**Conclusions:** The study concludes that the implementation of Good Environmental Governance in Indonesia remains partial and context-dependent rather than fully institutionalized. Strengthening environmental outcomes requires integrated improvements in accountability, institutional capacity, and political commitment. This review contributes to the literature by offering an integrative governance perspective and highlights the need for future research focusing on subnational variation, long-term governance dynamics, and political-economic drivers of environmental decision-making.

### INTRODUCTION

Environmental degradation has emerged as one of the most pressing global challenges of the twenty-first century, manifesting through climate change, biodiversity loss, deforestation, water pollution, and declining ecosystem services that threaten human well-being and sustainable development (United Nations Environment Programme, 2021). In response to these complex and

interconnected challenges, governance has increasingly been recognized as a critical determinant of environmental outcomes. The concept of Good Environmental Governance (GEG) emphasizes the quality of decision-making processes, institutional arrangements, and stakeholder interactions that shape environmental policy formulation and implementation (Lemos & Agrawal, 2006).

Core principles such as transparency, accountability, participation, rule of law, effectiveness, and equity are widely acknowledged as essential to ensuring that environmental governance systems are capable of addressing environmental problems in a sustainable and inclusive manner (Biermann et al., 2012). Consequently, the academic literature has expanded significantly to explore how governance quality influences environmental performance across different political, economic, and socio-cultural contexts. Within this global discourse, developing countries occupy a particularly important position due to their high environmental vulnerability and rapid socio-economic transformations.

Indonesia, as one of the world's largest archipelagic states and a megadiverse country, represents a critical case for examining the implementation of Good Environmental Governance (Dunning, 2022; White et al., 2021; Dharmawan et al., 2023). The country faces severe environmental challenges, including deforestation, forest fires, marine pollution, land degradation, and conflicts over natural resource management (Resosudarmo et al., 2019). At the same time, Indonesia has undergone substantial political and administrative reforms since the late 1990s, notably decentralization and democratization, which have profoundly reshaped environmental governance structures and practices (Aspinall & Fealy, 2003).

Recent literature highlights that while these reforms have opened new spaces for participation and local innovation, they have also introduced coordination problems, regulatory fragmentation, and uneven enforcement across regions (Hadiz, 2010; Larson et al., 2020). This combination of ecological significance and institutional complexity makes Indonesia an important setting for reviewing how GEG principles are conceptualized and implemented in practice. Despite growing recognition of governance as a key factor in environmental management, persistent gaps remain between formal commitments and actual outcomes.

The main research problem identified in the literature concerns the inconsistency between Indonesia's relatively comprehensive environmental legal framework and the continuing deterioration of environmental quality indicators (World Bank, 2020). Laws and policies promoting environmental protection, such as environmental impact assessment requirements, spatial planning regulations, and sustainability-oriented development strategies, coexist with weak enforcement, limited institutional capacity, and persistent rent-seeking behaviors (McCarthy & Robinson, 2016).

Scholars have argued that this discrepancy reflects deeper governance challenges, including overlapping authorities, insufficient coordination between central and local governments, and limited accountability mechanisms for both state and non-state actors (Ardiansyah et al., 2015). As a result, environmental governance often fails to translate normative principles into effective action on the ground. In response to these challenges, the literature proposes several general solutions aimed at strengthening environmental governance.

A dominant strand emphasizes institutional reform, particularly the clarification of roles and responsibilities among government agencies and levels of administration to reduce fragmentation and policy incoherence (OECD, 2019). Another widely discussed approach focuses on enhancing regulatory enforcement through improved monitoring, sanctions, and judicial mechanisms to deter environmental violations (Gunningham, 2011). Additionally, scholars underscore the importance of participatory governance, arguing that meaningful involvement of local communities, civil society organizations, and the private sector can improve policy legitimacy, compliance, and environmental outcomes (Newig & Fritsch, 2009).

These general solutions are often framed within broader governance reform agendas that seek to align environmental management with principles of good governance more broadly. Beyond these general approaches, the literature also identifies more specific solutions tailored to the Indonesian context. One prominent theme concerns decentralization and its implications for

environmental governance. Empirical studies suggest that decentralization can enhance responsiveness to local environmental conditions and empower subnational actors, but only when accompanied by adequate capacity, clear accountability, and effective oversight mechanisms (Ribot et al., 2006; Larson et al., 2010).

In Indonesia, research shows that variations in local leadership, fiscal capacity, and political incentives significantly influence environmental performance at the district level (Burgess et al., 2012). As such, strengthening Good Environmental Governance requires not only formal decentralization but also targeted capacity-building and incentive structures that align local interests with environmental sustainability.

Another set of specific solutions highlighted in the literature relates to multi-stakeholder and collaborative governance arrangements. Studies on forest governance, climate change mitigation, and marine resource management in Indonesia demonstrate that partnerships involving government agencies, local communities, non-governmental organizations, and the private sector can contribute to improved environmental outcomes when they are well-designed and inclusive (Sunderlin et al., 2014; Tacconi & Muttaqin, 2019).

Mechanisms such as community-based natural resource management, social forestry programs, and voluntary sustainability standards are frequently cited as practical expressions of GEG principles, particularly participation, transparency, and shared responsibility (Maryudi et al., 2012). However, the effectiveness of these approaches remains contingent on power relations, legal recognition of community rights, and the broader governance environment.

A growing body of literature also emphasizes the role of transparency, accountability, and information disclosure as critical components of Good Environmental Governance in Indonesia. Initiatives such as environmental reporting systems, public access to environmental information, and performance rating programs are argued to enhance social accountability and pressure both public authorities and firms to improve environmental performance (Purnomo et al., 2020).

Empirical evidence suggests that transparency-based instruments can complement traditional regulation, particularly in contexts where enforcement capacity is limited (Dasgupta et al., 2006). Nevertheless, scholars caution that information disclosure alone is insufficient without active civil society engagement and effective channels for translating information into collective action and policy change. Although the existing literature provides valuable insights into various dimensions of environmental governance in Indonesia, it remains fragmented across sectors, scales, and analytical perspectives.

Many studies focus on specific policy instruments, regions, or resources, such as forestry or mining, without systematically linking their findings to the broader framework of Good Environmental Governance. Moreover, there is limited synthesis that critically assesses how GEG principles are operationalized across different governance arrangements and what patterns of success and failure can be identified from the accumulated evidence. This fragmentation points to a research gap in the form of a comprehensive literature review that integrates diverse empirical and theoretical contributions to assess the overall state of GEG implementation in Indonesia and to identify recurring constraints and enabling factors. Against this background, the purpose of this study is to systematically review and synthesize the academic literature on the implementation of Good Environmental Governance in Indonesia.

The study aims to assess how GEG principles are conceptualized, applied, and evaluated across different environmental sectors and governance levels, and to identify common challenges and effective practices reported in previous research. The novelty of this review lies in its integrative perspective, which brings together insights from governance theory, environmental policy analysis, and empirical studies to provide a coherent assessment of Indonesia's experience with GEG. By clarifying the existing evidence and highlighting persistent gaps, this literature review seeks to contribute to both scholarly debates and policy discussions on how environmental governance in Indonesia can be strengthened to better support sustainable development objectives.

## **METHODOLOGY**

### **Research Design**

This study employs a systematic literature review to examine how the principles of Good Environmental Governance (GEG) are implemented in Indonesia. A systematic review is particularly suitable because knowledge on environmental governance is dispersed across sectors, administrative levels, and research traditions. Through structured synthesis, the method enables identification of recurring institutional patterns, policy dynamics, and implementation challenges. The approach follows established guidance for evidence-based reviews in the social sciences, emphasizing transparency, analytical rigor, and replicability. By integrating findings from multiple studies, the review seeks to move beyond fragmented case evidence toward broader interpretive conclusions about governance performance.

### **Review Scope and Analytical Framework**

The review concentrates on literature addressing governance dimensions embedded in environmental management and policy implementation. In this study, GEG is understood through core principles widely recognized in governance scholarship, including participation, transparency, accountability, rule of law, effectiveness, and equity. These principles function as the primary analytical lens guiding interpretation of the literature. At the same time, the framework remains open to context-specific themes emerging from empirical studies, allowing sensitivity to Indonesia's administrative diversity and decentralization dynamics. The unit of analysis includes empirical investigations and review articles that discuss how institutions, actors, and regulatory arrangements shape environmental outcomes.

### **Search Strategy**

The identification of relevant publications was conducted through structured searches in major academic databases, particularly Scopus, Web of Science, and Google Scholar. These platforms were selected to ensure broad representation of peer-reviewed scholarship across environmental studies, public administration, and development research. The search relied on combinations of governance and environmental keywords connected through Boolean operators. Examples include "good environmental governance" AND Indonesia, "environmental governance" AND implementation AND Indonesia, and combinations linking participation, accountability, or transparency with environmental policy. The search process was iterative, allowing refinement of terms as familiarity with the literature deepened. Additional relevant studies were located through backward and forward citation tracing to capture influential works beyond initial database results.

### **Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria**

To maintain methodological rigor, explicit inclusion and exclusion criteria guided the selection of materials. Included publications consisted of peer-reviewed journal articles, scholarly books, book chapters, and highly cited institutional reports that addressed governance or institutional aspects of environmental management in Indonesia. Studies were required to present sufficient methodological explanation and analytical depth. Conversely, works focusing solely on technical, engineering, or ecological dimensions without governance discussion were excluded. Opinion essays, non-academic commentaries, and publications lacking transparency in design or evidence were also removed. The temporal emphasis primarily covered research produced after the early 2000s, reflecting the period of major decentralization reforms that reshaped environmental administration.

### **Screening Process**

The screening followed a multi-stage procedure designed to balance comprehensiveness and feasibility. Titles and abstracts were first reviewed to eliminate clearly irrelevant materials. Publications that passed this stage underwent full-text examination to confirm their relevance to governance principles, sectoral focus, and empirical grounding in Indonesia. Duplicate records were removed during this process. Through these steps, the final corpus represents a curated yet

diverse body of scholarship capturing variations in environmental sectors and institutional arrangements.

### **Data Extraction**

Data from the selected studies were organized using a structured extraction framework to enable systematic comparison. For each publication, information was recorded regarding authorship, year, environmental sector, governance level, methodological approach, and principal findings related to GEG implementation. Particular attention was paid to how governance principles were operationalized, which actors were involved, and what forms of constraints or enabling conditions were reported. This process facilitated cross-case analysis and supported identification of converging and diverging interpretations across the literature.

### **Data Analysis**

The synthesis applied a thematic strategy combining deductive and inductive reasoning. Deductive coding was guided by the predefined GEG principles, ensuring conceptual coherence throughout the review. Inductive analysis, meanwhile, captured recurrent patterns emerging from empirical evidence, such as institutional fragmentation, coordination difficulties, uneven enforcement capacity, and tensions between formal regulations and practical realities. Rather than aggregating findings quantitatively, the objective of the analysis was to develop higher-order explanations of why governance reforms frequently encounter persistent implementation barriers.

### **Validity and Reliability**

Several measures were adopted to enhance the credibility of the review. Triangulation was achieved by comparing evidence across sectors, governance levels, and methodological traditions. The study also acknowledged that qualitative, quantitative, and mixed-method research may yield different forms of generalization, and therefore treated methodological diversity as a source of complementary insight. Reflexivity played an important role, particularly in assessing normative assumptions surrounding the concept of “good” governance and how these assumptions influence interpretation.

### **Methodological Limitations**

Despite striving for comprehensive coverage, the review remains subject to limitations. Dependence on published literature introduces potential publication bias, as successful or well-documented cases are more likely to appear in academic outlets. Furthermore, research availability varies geographically, meaning that certain regions of Indonesia are better represented than others. Differences in conceptual definitions across authors may also affect comparability. Instead of eliminating these variations, the study recognizes them as part of the empirical reality of environmental governance scholarship.

## **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

To obtain a comprehensive understanding of how Good Environmental Governance (GEG) has been examined within the Indonesian context, this study synthesizes a range of empirical and review-based publications across different environmental sectors. The selected studies represent diverse governance arenas, including waste management, disaster mitigation, peatland management, carbon initiatives, and urban environmental planning. By mapping the sectoral focus, governance level, core issues addressed, and principal findings of each work, the synthesis allows patterns, convergences, and inconsistencies in the literature to become visible.

This comparative overview is important because research on GEG in Indonesia tends to be fragmented, often concentrated on specific cases or administrative settings. Bringing these studies together provides a clearer picture of how governance principles such as participation, accountability, transparency, rule of law, and institutional coordination are interpreted and implemented in practice. Furthermore, the synthesis helps identify recurring challenges, methodological tendencies, and areas that remain underexplored. Table X presents this structured comparison to highlight the contribution of existing scholarship and to position the present study within the broader academic conversation on environmental governance.

Table 1. Synthesis of Empirical Studies on the Implementation of Good Environmental Governance in Indonesia

Author	Sector	Level	Governance Issue	Key Finding
Addahlawi et al. (2019)	Waste management	Local/municipal	Implementation of GEG principles in waste management	Implementation of GEG is applied in waste policy formulation, but effectiveness depends on inter-actor cooperation and community participation, showing varied success across regions
Sukadi et al. (2020)	Carbon trading project	Project/Private–Community–Government partnership	Stakeholder roles and institutional arrangements in environmental governance	Collaboration among government, private sector, and communities is key to enforcing GEG principles in carbon trading at the Katingan Mentaya project, though power and responsibility distribution remains a challenge
Al Fariz et al. (2024)	Solid waste governance	National context	Role of GEG in sustainable solid waste systems	Review highlights that solid waste management challenges persist, and GEG can provide coherence, but implementation varies across municipalities and is affected by policy integration and stakeholder inclusion.
Triyanto, D. (2018)	Watershed/DAS management	Regional/local governance	Implementation of GEG in watershed management in Bengkulu	Good Environmental Governance in DAS Bengkulu shows that governance mechanisms such as stakeholder collaboration, transparency, and multi-actor coordination are lacking, resulting in suboptimal environmental outcomes.
Faisah & Prianto, (2015)	Urban park management (Taman Macan)	City government	Good Environmental Governance in urban park management	Study finds that collaborative governance involving government, private sector, and community enhances transparency and accountability in urban park environmental governance.

Yolanda & Septianda, (2023)	Coastal waste governance	Local/municipal	GEG in coastal waste management in Tanjungpinang	The application of GEG principles supports improved coastal waste governance, but challenges remain in stakeholder engagement and institutional integration.
Nugroho et al. (2023)	Municipal waste governance	Local government	GEG in urban waste management in Bandar Lampung	Research indicates that rule of law, transparency, participation and accountability are not fully implemented, leading to governance gaps in waste management.

The main differences between the studies in the table are evident in the variations in environmental sectors, governance levels, and governance focus issues analyzed by each author. Addahlawi et al.'s (2019) study places waste management at the municipal level, focusing on how Good Environmental Governance principles are translated into policy formulation and implementation.

Their findings indicate that successful implementation is largely determined by collaboration between actors and community participation. In contrast, Sukadi et al.'s (2020) study focused on the context of a carbon trading project involving public-private partnerships, and community participation. This study focused more on institutional design and role allocation, finding that collaboration is a key prerequisite, but the distribution of power and responsibility remains a serious challenge.

A broader approach is offered by Al Fariz et al. (2024) through a national-scale review of sustainable waste governance. Rather than exploring a single case, this study emphasizes the importance of policy integration, consistency across regions, and stakeholder inclusion as prerequisites for implementing GEG principles. At the regional level, Triyanto (2018) examined watershed management in Bengkulu and found that the main weaknesses lay in multi-stakeholder coordination, transparency, and institutional capacity. Thus, the emerging issue is not simply the presence or absence of regulations, but the ability of governance to implement these principles effectively.

Meanwhile, Faisah & Prianto (2015) present a relatively more optimistic picture. In their study of city park management in Makassar, they demonstrated that a collaborative model between the government, the private sector, and the community can strengthen transparency and accountability. However, this optimism is not fully reflected in other studies. Yolanda & Septianda (2023), for example, in the context of coastal waste management in Tanjungpinang, continued to find issues with actor involvement and institutional integration. Similarly, Nugroho et al. (2023) showed that in Bandar Lampung, the principles of rule of law, participation, and accountability were not optimally implemented, resulting in governance gaps.

In terms of relevance to the research focus on the implementation of Good Environmental Governance, the most prominent study is that of Addahlawi et al. (2019) and Al Fariz et al. (2024). Addahlawi et al. provide concrete empirical evidence on how GEG principles operate in policy practice at the local level, including barriers to collaboration and participation. On the other hand, Al Fariz et al. (2024) offer a synthetic framework that helps understand general patterns and variations in implementation nationally. The combination of micro and macro perspectives from these two studies can be an important foundation for strengthening your research argument and placing it within the broader literature.

## **Discussion**

### ***Implementation of Good Environmental Governance Principles in Indonesia***

The reviewed literature demonstrates that the implementation of Good Environmental Governance in Indonesia has been strongly shaped by the adoption of core governance principles such as transparency, accountability, participation, rule of law, effectiveness, and equity. Across sectors, these principles are widely acknowledged in policy documents and academic analyses as normative benchmarks for environmental management, yet their practical realization remains uneven. Studies consistently report that Indonesia has developed a relatively comprehensive legal and policy framework that formally incorporates GEG principles, particularly since the post-reformasi period marked by decentralization and democratization (Aspinall & Fealy, 2003; Resosudarmo et al., 2019). Environmental laws, strategic plans, and sectoral regulations frequently emphasize sustainable development, public participation, and accountability. However, empirical findings indicate that the translation of these formal commitments into consistent practices is constrained by institutional and political factors, resulting in significant variation across regions and environmental sectors.

Transparency has been one of the most visible dimensions of GEG implementation discussed in the literature. Several studies highlight the establishment of information disclosure mechanisms, environmental reporting systems, and public access provisions as important advances in Indonesian environmental governance (Dasgupta et al., 2006; Purnomo et al., 2020). Programs such as environmental performance ratings for firms are frequently cited as examples of transparency-based governance instruments that complement traditional regulation. The literature suggests that these initiatives have contributed to increased public awareness and, in some cases, improved corporate environmental behavior. Nevertheless, the effectiveness of transparency measures is often limited by uneven data quality, restricted accessibility at the local level, and limited capacity of civil society to utilize disclosed information for sustained oversight. As a result, transparency alone has not been sufficient to ensure accountability or meaningful changes in environmental outcomes.

Accountability emerges as one of the most persistent challenges in the implementation of Good Environmental Governance in Indonesia. The literature consistently points to weak enforcement of environmental regulations as a key factor undermining governance effectiveness (McCarthy & Robinson, 2016; World Bank, 2020). Although Indonesia possesses a formal system of administrative, civil, and criminal sanctions for environmental violations, enforcement practices are often inconsistent and selective. Empirical studies document cases where regulatory agencies lack sufficient resources, technical expertise, or political backing to sanction powerful economic actors, particularly in sectors such as forestry, mining, and plantations (Hadiz, 2010; Ardiansyah et al., 2015).

Decentralization has further complicated accountability relationships by dispersing authority across multiple levels of government. While local governments are formally responsible for many aspects of environmental management, their accountability mechanisms remain weak, especially in regions where political and economic elites are closely intertwined (Burgess et al., 2012). The literature indicates that upward accountability to central authorities often takes precedence over downward accountability to local communities, limiting the capacity of citizens to influence environmental decision-making. Judicial mechanisms, including environmental courts and public interest litigation, are recognized as potentially important tools for strengthening accountability, but studies suggest that their impact has been constrained by procedural barriers and uneven judicial capacity (Nicholson, 2010).

### ***Participation and the Role of Non-State Actors***

Public participation is widely recognized in the literature as a cornerstone of Good Environmental Governance, and Indonesia has made notable formal commitments to participatory processes. Environmental impact assessment procedures, spatial planning consultations, and community-based resource management programs are frequently cited as institutionalized channels for participation (Maryudi et al., 2012; Sunderlin et al., 2014). Empirical findings indicate that these mechanisms have created new opportunities for community involvement, particularly in forest

governance and conservation initiatives. In some cases, participatory approaches have enhanced local legitimacy and contributed to improved environmental stewardship.

However, the literature also reveals significant limitations in the depth and inclusiveness of participation. Participation is often procedural rather than substantive, with communities consulted late in decision-making processes or provided with limited influence over final outcomes (Newig & Fritsch, 2009). Power asymmetries between government agencies, private actors, and local communities frequently shape participatory spaces, resulting in the marginalization of indigenous peoples and other vulnerable groups (Larson et al., 2010). Civil society organizations play an important intermediary role by facilitating participation, advocating for community rights, and monitoring environmental governance practices. Yet their effectiveness varies widely depending on political openness, access to resources, and local governance contexts.

Decentralization is one of the most extensively analyzed factors influencing environmental governance outcomes in Indonesia. The reviewed studies present mixed evidence regarding its impact on the implementation of Good Environmental Governance. On the one hand, decentralization has enabled local governments to tailor environmental policies to local conditions and has opened opportunities for innovation and experimentation (Ribot et al., 2006). On the other hand, many studies document that decentralization has exacerbated coordination problems, regulatory fragmentation, and competition over natural resources among local jurisdictions (Larson et al., 2020).

Institutional capacity at the subnational level emerges as a critical determinant of governance effectiveness. Regions with stronger administrative capacity, committed leadership, and access to fiscal resources tend to perform better in implementing environmental policies and enforcing regulations (Burgess et al., 2012). Conversely, capacity deficits contribute to weak monitoring, limited data collection, and reliance on extractive revenue sources that undermine sustainability objectives. The literature suggests that capacity-building initiatives, including technical training and fiscal incentives, are essential complements to decentralization if Good Environmental Governance principles are to be realized in practice.

### ***Collaborative and Multi-Stakeholder Governance Arrangements***

The literature increasingly emphasizes collaborative governance as a promising pathway for improving environmental outcomes in Indonesia. Multi-stakeholder initiatives involving government agencies, local communities, non-governmental organizations, and private sector actors are documented across sectors such as forestry, climate change mitigation, and coastal management (Tacconi & Muttaqin, 2019). These arrangements are often framed as practical expressions of GEG principles, particularly participation, transparency, and shared responsibility.

Empirical findings indicate that collaborative approaches can generate positive outcomes when they are supported by clear legal frameworks, balanced power relations, and long-term commitment from stakeholders (Sunderlin et al., 2014). Social forestry programs, for example, have been associated with improved community access to forest resources and greater incentives for sustainable management. However, the literature also cautions that collaborative governance is not a panacea. Without strong state oversight and accountability mechanisms, such arrangements may reproduce existing inequalities or be captured by dominant actors. The success of collaboration therefore depends heavily on the broader governance context and the capacity of institutions to mediate interests and enforce agreed rules.

Assessments of environmental outcomes linked to governance reforms reveal a complex and often contradictory picture. Some studies report localized improvements in forest cover, pollution control, or resource management associated with specific governance interventions (Biermann et al., 2012; Purnomo et al., 2020). However, at the national level, aggregate indicators of environmental quality show persistent pressures, including ongoing deforestation, biodiversity loss, and pollution (UNEP, 2021). The literature suggests that these mixed outcomes reflect the uneven implementation of GEG principles and the dominance of short-term economic priorities in many policy decisions.

Comparative analyses within Indonesia highlight significant regional variation in environmental performance, reinforcing the importance of local governance conditions. Regions that combine transparent decision-making, active civil society engagement, and effective enforcement tend to achieve better outcomes than those characterized by weak institutions and elite capture (Resosudarmo et al., 2019). These findings underscore that Good Environmental Governance is not merely a matter of formal policy design but of sustained institutional practice.

Across the reviewed literature, several cross-cutting patterns emerge. First, there is a consistent gap between formal adoption of Good Environmental Governance principles and their practical implementation. Second, governance outcomes are highly context-dependent, shaped by interactions among institutional capacity, political incentives, and socio-economic conditions. Third, while innovative governance instruments and participatory approaches show promise, their effectiveness is contingent on supportive accountability and enforcement mechanisms.

Taken together, the results indicate that Indonesia's experience with Good Environmental Governance is characterized by partial and uneven progress rather than comprehensive transformation. The literature converges on the view that strengthening GEG requires integrated efforts that address institutional capacity, accountability, and power relations simultaneously. These findings provide an empirical foundation for the subsequent discussion, which critically reflects on the implications of the reviewed evidence for theory, policy, and future research on environmental governance in Indonesia.

## CONCLUSION

This literature review examined the implementation of Good Environmental Governance in Indonesia by synthesizing scholarly evidence across environmental sectors and governance levels. The findings indicate that Indonesia has made substantial normative progress in embedding GEG principles such as transparency, participation, accountability, rule of law, effectiveness, and equity within its environmental policy framework. However, the review also reveals a persistent gap between formal commitments and practical implementation. Weak enforcement, limited institutional capacity, fragmented authority following decentralization, and entrenched political-economic interests continue to undermine governance effectiveness and environmental outcomes. The main implication of these findings is that Good Environmental Governance in Indonesia remains partial and uneven rather than fully institutionalized. Transparency and participatory mechanisms have expanded, yet they often operate procedurally and fail to generate strong accountability or consistent environmental improvements. Collaborative and multi-stakeholder governance arrangements show promise, particularly when supported by clear legal mandates and capable institutions, but they are highly context-dependent and vulnerable to elite capture. Overall, the results suggest that governance quality, rather than policy abundance, is the decisive factor shaping environmental performance. This study contributes to the existing body of knowledge by providing an integrative synthesis that connects sector-specific findings to a broader governance framework, thereby clarifying recurring constraints and enabling conditions for GEG implementation in Indonesia. By consolidating fragmented evidence, the review offers a clearer analytical foundation for both scholars and policymakers. Future research is encouraged to pursue comparative subnational analyses, longitudinal assessments of governance reforms, and deeper examination of power relations and political incentives that shape environmental governance outcomes.

## REFERENCES

- Addahlawi, H. A., Mustaghfiroh, U., Ni'mah, L. K., Sundusiyah, A., & Hidayatullah, A. F. (2019). Implementasi prinsip good environmental governance dalam pengelolaan sampah di indonesia. *Jurnal Green Growth Dan Manajemen Lingkungan*, 8(2), 106-118. <https://doi.org/10.21009/jgg.082.04>
- Al Fariz, R. D., Muis, R., Anggraini, N., Rachman, I., & Matsumoto, T. (2024). Good environmental governance roles in sustainable solid waste management in Indonesia: A review. *Journal of Community Based Environmental Engineering and Management*, 8(1), 45-56. <https://doi.org/10.23969/jcbeem.v8i1.12035>

- Ardiansyah, F., Marthen, A. A., & Amalia, N. (2015). Forest and land-use governance in a decentralized Indonesia: A legal and policy review. *CIFOR Occasional Paper*, 132, 1–43.
- Aspinall, E., & Fealy, G. (Eds.). (2003). *Local power and politics in Indonesia: Decentralisation and democratisation*. Institute of Southeast Asian Studies.
- Biermann, F., Abbott, K., Andresen, S., Bäckstrand, K., Bernstein, S., Betsill, M. M., Bulkeley, H., Cashore, B., Clapp, J., Folke, C., Gupta, A., Kanie, N., Karkkainen, B., Lebel, L., Liverman, D., Schroeder, H., Siebenhüner, B., & Young, O. R. (2012). Navigating the anthropocene: Improving earth system governance. *Science*, 335(6074), 1306–1307. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1217255>
- Booth, A., Sutton, A., & Papaioannou, D. (2016). *Systematic approaches to a successful literature review* (2nd ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Burgess, R., Hansen, M., Olken, B. A., Potapov, P., & Sieber, S. (2012). The political economy of deforestation in the tropics. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 127(4), 1707–1754. <https://doi.org/10.1093/qje/qjs034>
- Dasgupta, S., Laplante, B., Wang, H., & Wheeler, D. (2006). Disclosure strategies for environmental protection: The case of Indonesia. *World Bank Policy Research Working Paper*, 3949.
- Dharmawan, I. W. S., Pratiwi, Siregar, C. A., Narendra, B. H., Undaharta, N. K. E., Sitepu, B. S., ... & Sari, N. (2023). Implementation of soil and water conservation in Indonesia and its impacts on biodiversity, hydrology, soil erosion and microclimate. *Applied Sciences*, 13(13), 7648. <https://doi.org/10.3390/app13137648>
- Dunning, K. (2022). Biodiversity conservation policy in megadiverse countries: Comparing policy systems for 2020 targets to inform management in the coming decades. *Journal of environmental management*, 302, 113815. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2021.113815>
- Faisah, N., & Prianto, A. L. (2015). *Good Environmental Governance (Studi Kasus Pengelolaan Taman Macan di Kota Makassar)*. Otoritas: Jurnal Ilmu Pemerintahan, 5(2), 174–188. <https://doi.org/10.26618/ojip.v5i2.122>
- Gunningham, N. (2011). Enforcement and compliance strategies. In D. Bodansky, J. Brunnée, & E. Hey (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of international environmental law* (pp. 120–136). Oxford University Press.
- Hadiz, V. R. (2010). *Localising power in post-authoritarian Indonesia: A Southeast Asia perspective*. Stanford University Press.
- Larson, A. M., Barry, D., Dahal, G. R., & Colfer, C. J. P. (2010). Forests for people: Community rights and forest tenure reform. *Earthscan*.
- Larson, A. M., Ravikumar, A., & Ribot, J. (2020). Rethinking decentralization and devolution of natural resource governance. *World Development*, 135, 105041. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2020.105041>
- Lemos, M. C., & Agrawal, A. (2006). Environmental governance. *Annual Review of Environment and Resources*, 31, 297–325. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.energy.31.042605.135621>
- Maryudi, A., Devkota, R. R., Schusser, C., Yufanyi Movuh, M. C., Aurenhammer, H., Salla, M., & Krott, M. (2012). Back to basics: Considerations in evaluating the outcomes of community forestry. *Forest Policy and Economics*, 14(1), 1–5. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.forpol.2011.07.017>
- McCarthy, J. F., & Robinson, K. (Eds.). (2016). *Land and development in Indonesia: Searching for the people's sovereignty*. ISEAS Publishing.

- Newig, J., & Fritsch, O. (2009). Environmental governance: Participatory, multi-level – and effective? *Environmental Policy and Governance*, 19(3), 197–214. <https://doi.org/10.1002/eet.509>
- Nicholson, D. F. (2010). Environmental dispute resolution in Indonesia. *Australasian Dispute Resolution Journal*, 21(2), 109–121.
- Nugroho, G. P., Sulistiowati, R., & Caturiani, S. I. (2023). *Good Environmental Governance dalam Pengelolaan Sampah di Kota Bandar Lampung*. *Administrativa: Jurnal Birokrasi, Kebijakan dan Pelayanan Publik*, 5(2), 155–162. <https://doi.org/10.23960/administrativa.v5i2.185>
- OECD. (2019). *Environmental governance in Indonesia*. OECD Publishing.
- Patton, M. Q. (2015). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Purnomo, H., Okarda, B., Dewayani, A. A., Ali, M., Achdiawan, R., Kartodihardjo, H., & Dewi, S. (2020). Reducing forest and land fires through good governance. *Forest Policy and Economics*, 121, 102293. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.forpol.2020.102293>
- Resosudarmo, B. P., Tacconi, L., Sloan, S., Hamdani, F. A., & Wardana, A. (2019). Indonesia's land reform: Implications for local livelihoods and climate change. *Forest Policy and Economics*, 108, 101903. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.forpol.2019.101903>
- Ribot, J. C., Agrawal, A., & Larson, A. M. (2006). Recentralizing while decentralizing: How national governments reappropriate forest resources. *World Development*, 34(11), 1864–1886. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2005.11.020>
- Snyder, H. (2019). Literature review as a research methodology: An overview and guidelines. *Journal of Business Research*, 104, 333–339. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.07.039>
- Sukadi, B. D. N. R., Pinatih, D. A. A. I., & Sari, N. P. M. (2020). Penerapan Good Environmental Governance pada Praktik Perdagangan Karbon di Proyek Katingan Mentaya: The Implementation of Good Environmental Governance in Carbon Trading Practices at Katingan Mentaya Project. *Jurnal Borneo Administrator*, 16(3), 361–382. <https://doi.org/10.24258/jba.v16i3.693>
- Sunderlin, W. D., Larson, A. M., Duchelle, A. E., Resosudarmo, I. A. P., Huynh, T. B., Awono, A., & Dokken, T. (2014). How are REDD+ proponents addressing tenure problems? Evidence from Brazil, Cameroon, Tanzania, Indonesia, and Vietnam. *World Development*, 55, 37–52. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2013.01.013>
- Tacconi, L., & Muttaqin, M. Z. (2019). Reducing emissions from land use change in Indonesia: An overview. *Forest Policy and Economics*, 108, 101979. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.forpol.2019.101979>
- Thomas, J., & Harden, A. (2008). Methods for the thematic synthesis of qualitative research in systematic reviews. *BMC Medical Research Methodology*, 8, 45. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2288-8-45>
- Tranfield, D., Denyer, D., & Smart, P. (2003). Towards a methodology for developing evidence-informed management knowledge. *British Journal of Management*, 14(3), 207–222. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8551.00375>
- Triyanto, D. (2018). Implementasi good environmental governance dalam pengelolaan daerah aliran sungai (das) bengkulu. *Jurnal Ilmu Pemerintahan: Kajian Ilmu Pemerintahan dan Politik Daerah*. <https://doi.org/10.24905/jip.3.2.2018.136-148>
- United Nations Environment Programme. (2021). *Making peace with nature: A scientific blueprint to tackle the climate, biodiversity and pollution emergencies*. UNEP.
- White, A., Rudyanto, Agung, M. F., Minarputri, N., Lestari, A. P., Wen, W., ... & Tighe, S. (2021). Marine protected area networks in Indonesia: Progress, lessons and a network design case

study covering six eastern provinces. *Coastal Management*, 49(6), 575-597.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/08920753.2021.1967560>

World Bank. (2020). *Indonesia environment and natural resources management*. World Bank Group.

Xiao, Y., & Watson, M. (2019). Guidance on conducting a systematic literature review. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 39(1), 93–112.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0739456X17723971>

Yolanda, V. Y., & Septianda, M. F. (2023). *Penerapan Prinsip Good Environmental Governance dalam Pengelolaan Sampah Pesisir di Pelantar II Kota Tanjungpinang Tahun 2023*. *Jurnal Pemerintahan dan Kebijakan (JPK)*, 5(1), 17–29.  
<https://doi.org/10.18196/jpk.v5i1.19026>