

**COLLABORATIVE GOVERNANCE STRATEGY
IN INTEGRATED LICENSING SYSTEM ON THE AUTHORITY TO
REVOKE MINING BUSINESS LICENSES
FROM THE MINISTRY OF ENERGY AND MINERAL RESOURCES TO
THE INVESTMENT COORDINATING BOARD**

Sindy Atul Mubarokah

MONEV Studio Global,
cindyatulmubarokah@gmail.com;

Edy Sutrisno

Politeknik STIA LAN Jakarta.
edysutrisno@stialan.ac.id;

ABSTRACT

There are several problems with this collaboration: First, *BKPM*'s authority is obtained through the *Peraturan Menteri Energi dan Sumberdaya Mineral Nomor 19 Tahun 2020* concerning Amendments to the *Peraturan Menteri Energi dan Sumberdaya Mineral Nomor 25 Tahun 2015* concerning Delegation of Authority to Grant Licensing in the Mineral and Coal Mining Sector in the Framework of Implementing Integrated One-Stop Services to the Head of *BKPM* (the *Permen ESDM 19/2020*) which was then emphasized by the *Keputusan Presiden Nomor 1 Tahun 2022* concerning the Investment Task Force, but there is a problem that the granting of the delegation is not in accordance with the Government Administration Law. Second, the collaboration policy between *KESDM* and *BKPM* is not quite right if based on the Collaborative Governance theory proposed by Ansell and Gass, namely four variables consisting of initial conditions, institutional design, facilitative leadership and collaboration processes, from the data that the author found many companies that owned mining business permits (*IUP*) that were revoked by *BKPM* filed lawsuits at the State Administrative Court and the main topic of the lawsuit was the issue of *BKPM*'s authority in the revocation. This study uses a qualitative descriptive method of analysis in the form of Ansell and Gass's theory of government collaboration, a review of government authority, and aspects of mining licensing. The conclusion of this study is that the Collaborative Governance policy between *KESDM* and *BKPM* is ineffective because there is a conflict of norms, and the strategy for effective collaboration is to obtain the basis for policy determination and an in- depth study of the philosophical, sociological, and empirical aspects.

Keywords: *Collaborative Governance, Licensing, Mining, Authority.*

A. INTRODUCTION

The mining sector is not only about competitive extractive commodities but also involves many things including administration, licensing, law and disputes. This is certainly a concern for the government so that Indonesia's natural resources, especially in the mining sector, can make a major contribution to the

welfare of the nation. In this regard, the government has carried out a collaborative governance movement between the Ministry of Energy and Mineral Resources and the Ministry of Investment/Investment Coordinating Board (BKPM) by granting some of the authority of *KESDM* which has the authority to determine the direction of mining sector policies.

This research is interesting to conduct because it will examine the effectiveness of the collaboration of the integrated licensing system in the mining licensing sector, as well as the mining licensing policy strategy between *KESDM* and *BKPM* in the perspective of collaborative governance Ansell and Gass. As is known, Indonesia has diverse natural resources, so these resources should be able to provide the greatest possible benefits to the community, that is, the earth, water, and natural resources of Indonesia are gifts from God Almighty to the Indonesian people, even the *Undang-Undang Dasar Republik Indonesia Tahun 1945* (Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia) has regulated this in the Provisions of Article 33 paragraph (3) to be managed by the state which is used as much as possible for the prosperity of the people, but in fact these natural resources have not been able to provide a significant contribution to the progress of the nation.

Indonesia is a country rich in natural resources (gold, coal, nickel, tin, bauxite, etc.), but with such great wealth it has not been able to raise the status of our country in terms of the economic welfare of its people, with such abundant wealth Indonesia should now be able to be on par with developed countries. Indonesia's natural resources are very diverse and abundant, because our country is so rich there are many valuable mineral contents that can change the fate of the nation and its people if managed properly, here are the data and facts about how rich our country Indonesia is in terms of abundant and diverse natural resources:



Figure 1: Sources of Indonesia's Natural Resources

The mining sector is often referred to as a "wet field" because many elite businessmen are involved there, regulations related to mining itself are regulated

in the *Undang-Undang Nomor 3 Tahun 2020* concerning Amendments to the *Undang-Undang Nomor 4 Tahun 2009* concerning Mineral and Coal Mining (hereinafter referred to as the *Minerba Law*). Terms such as *KK*, *PKP2B* and *KP* have been replaced by Mining Business Permits (*IUP*). The licensing regime positions the state as superior to mining companies where the state has the authority to impose sanctions ranging from temporary suspension of mining activities to revocation of *IUP* in Article 151 paragraph (2) of the *Minerba Law*. This licensing concept is expected to provide a better bargaining position for the government which is ultimately believed to be able to increase the value of benefits for people's welfare.

To obtain a business license in the mining sector requires capital and complicated administration in the field of mineral and coal mining in the context of the Implementation of One-Stop Integrated Services to *BKPM*, the Ministry of Energy and Mineral Resources issued the *Peraturan Menteri Energi dan Sumberdaya Mineral Nomor 25 Tahun 2015* which delegates the authority to grant permits to the Head of *BKPM*, so that entrepreneurs who will start a business in the mining sector must apply for a business license to the Head of the Investment Coordinating Board, then updated through the *Peraturan Menteri Energi dan Sumberdaya Mineral Nomor 19 Tahun 2020* which is the topic of discussion in this research because the granting of authority through the *Peraturan Menteri Energi dan Sumberdaya Mineral Nomor 19 Tahun 2020* is considered legally flawed.

The actions of *BKPM* and *ESDM* regarding the revocation of the permit refer to the provisions of Article 1 number 30 of the *Undang-Undang Nomor 30 tahun 2014* concerning Government Administration "Delegation is the delegation of Authority from a higher Agency and/or Government Official to a lower Agency and/or Government Official with responsibility and accountability transferred entirely to the recipient of the delegation.

Meanwhile, according to these provisions, the delegation of authority becomes legally valid if it is determined based on the provisions of laws and regulations. Agencies and/or Government Officials obtain Authority through Delegation with the criteria that it is given by an Agency/Government Official to another Agency and/or Government Official, determined in a Government Regulation, Presidential Regulation, and/or Regional Regulation, and is a delegation of authority or has previously existed.

Considering the provisions of the delegation requirements stipulated in the Law, the form of delegation authority held by the Head of *BKPM* to issue and/or revoke *IUP* according to law must be in the form of delegation of delegation authority regulated by the Regulation of the Order and/or Presidential Regulation. The basis for the delegated authority held by the Head of *BKPM* to issue and/or revoke *IUP* is not regulated in the provisions of Government Regulations and/or Presidential Regulations.

In terms of effectiveness, the Collaborative Governance policy between *KESDM* and *BKPM* is not effective because there are conflicting norms, from the revocation of the *IUP* carried out by the Head of *BKPM*, there are several parties who feel aggrieved and take legal action at the Jakarta State Administrative Court,

for example, a lawsuit was filed by *PT. Prospek Bumindo Sejahtera* as the Plaintiff against the Minister of Investment/Head of *BKPM* as the Defendant who in his decision canceled the letter of revocation of the *IUP* issued by the *Keputusan Menteri Investasi/Kepala Badan Koordinasi Penanaman Modal Nomor 20220218-01-97206* dated February 18, 2022 (PTUN, 2022), then the submission of *PTUN, PT. Perisai Prima Utama* as the Plaintiff against the Minister of Investment/Head of *BKPM* as the Defendant who in his decision canceled the revocation letter issued by the *Keputusan Kepala Badan Koordinasi Penanaman Modal Nomor 20220405-01-38401* dated April 5, 2022 (PTUN, 2023), and there are still many examples of such cases that accompany the policy of revoking *IUP* by *BKPM*.

Therefore, it is necessary to determine policies, especially taking collaborative policies across ministries and institutions, to require in-depth studies in terms of decision-making both philosophically, sociologically, and legally, so as to mitigate conflicts of norms and their implementation. Judging from the background and problems in this study, the author discusses based on the reality of inconsistencies between *das sollen* and *das sein* of applicable laws and regulations, by connecting *das sollen* and *das sein* of applicable laws and regulations with existing facts. This is the reason the author is interested in conducting research on delegation by *KESDM* related to the revocation of *IUP* to *BKPM* which uses delegation rules according to Ministerial Regulations and Presidential Regulations that are not accommodated in Laws and Regulations.

B. THEORY

Collaborative governance is a government management that collaborates not only with the government but also with stakeholders outside the government or state, and the decision-making process in policy formulation is oriented to consensus and deliberation and aims to improve the quality of public policies to serve the community better (Ansell & Gash, 2007; Astuti et al., 2020; Torfing & Triantafillou, 2013).

Ansell & Gash (2007) explained that collaborative governance consists of four perspectives, which start with the initial conditions, institutional design, leadership, and collaboration process. This perspective is relatively different from that offered by Ratner (2012), where collaborative governance is viewed from the perspective of sequential phases, namely, identification of obstacles and opportunities, debate of strategies to influence each other, and planning collaborative actions.

The term "collaborative governance" refers to a way of government management that directly involves stakeholders outside the government or state and is oriented toward consensus and deliberation in the collective decision-making process that aims to make or implement public policies and public programs (Ansell and Gash, 2007).

C. METHOD

In this study, the author uses a qualitative research method. Qualitative research methodology is used to understand social phenomena in their natural

context, with an emphasis on interpretation and in-depth understanding of the meaning contained therein. The data used are data obtained directly from applicable policies and regulations from the results of interviews with informants. Primary data used in this study were obtained from authoritative documents, meaning they have authority, namely reports of the results of actions or activities carried out by authorized agencies. These documents are in the form of laws and regulations, official notes or minutes in the making of laws and regulations, and judges' decisions. The documents used in this study include: a) The *Undang-Undang Dasar Republik Indonesia Tahun 1945* (Constitution); b) *Minerba Law*; c) Administrative Law of Government d) Delegation of Authority to Revoke Mineral and Coal Mining Business Licenses by *BKPM (Peraturan Menteri Energi dan Sumberdaya Mineral Nomor 19 Tahun 2020* regulates Amendments to the *Peraturan Menteri Energi dan Sumberdaya Mineral Nomor 25 Tahun 2015* concerning Delegation of Authority to Grant Licensing in the Mineral and Coal Mining Sector in the Framework of Implementing Integrated One-Stop Services to the Head of *BKPM*). The data obtained were analyzed descriptively and quantitatively, meaning that it states the data obtained from respondents objectively based on the facts that occurred. Then it is linked to the existing provisions to be included in the discussion of the main problem, so that a general conclusion is obtained. As well as a review of written information about which comes from various sources and is widely published which is obtained from several libraries in universities, and browsing the internet, and websites. The steps in conducting the data analysis are; first, data analysis is basically the researcher reveals how to record, record answers, stories of respondents, when collecting data. Likewise, when researchers observe the activities or daily work of research subjects, field notes must be made.

D. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Effectiveness of Collaboration of Integrated Licensing System in Minerba Licensing Sector

The permit to carry out mining activities in the *Minerba Law* is called Mining Business Permit (*IUP*) where in the issuance of *IUP* the *Minerba Law* gives authority to the Regent, Governor, and Minister to issue mining permits in accordance with their territorial authority. The permit can be given to business entities; cooperatives and individual companies. The issuance of *IUP* is expected to be the embodiment of orderly administration in the management of natural resources in the mineral and coal sector. The revocation of *IUP* carried out by the Ministry of Investment/*BKPM* against several companies, both domestic investment and foreign investment engaged in the mineral and coal mining business with coal commodities. One of the locations with a lot of mining activity is in East Kalimantan; the mining industry in Kalimantan Province is the main foundation in the regional economy and provides a substantial contribution to economic growth and job creation. Of course, the revocation carried out by the Minister of Investment/*BKPM* has caused chaos for investors who have poured out very large funds to invest in Indonesia. Although there are regulations governing mining activities, there are still problems in the mining sector, both

between entrepreneurs and entrepreneurs, entrepreneurs and the surrounding community, and/or entrepreneurs and the government. One common problem is regarding Permits, based on this, the government conducted an evaluation of *IUP* holders, until finally the Government formed a task force through the *Keputusan Presiden Nomor 1 Tahun 2022* concerning the Establishment of the Land Use and Investment Arrangement Task Force (*Keppres 1/2022*) which has one of the tasks to conduct evaluations and then provide recommendations to the Minister of Investment/Investment Coordinating Board (*BKPM*) to revoke *IUPs*, at least since the task force was formed, 2,078 *IUPs* have been revoked.

In relation to the obligations that must be fulfilled by business actors, if not fulfilled, it will result in consequences for the business actors themselves, in chapter XXII starting from Article 151 to 157 of the *Minerba Law*, it is explained that in essence if the *IUP* holder does not carry out the obligations as referred to, administrative sanctions can be imposed in the form of: a) written warning; b) fines; c) temporary suspension of some or all Exploration or Production Operation activities; and/or d) revocation of *IUP*, *IUPK*, *IPR*, *SIPB*, or *IUP* for Sales.

The imposition of administrative sanctions is a form of administrative law enforcement that functions as a preventive measure, aimed at supervising and controlling the actions of individuals, legal entities, and government agencies. *BKPM* through its official website has issued some of the revoked *IUPs* in mid-January 2022, revoking 165 *IUPs*, and then around 48 have filed objections and lawsuits with the Jakarta State Administrative Court.

The sporadic actions taken by the Ministry of Investment/*BKPM* in 2022 were related to the revocation carried out by the Ministry of Investment/*BKPM*, which can be known together in 2022 until now at least 2,078 *IUPs* have been directly revoked by the Ministry of Investment/*BKPM* which should only be done if the company is proven to meet the elements of Article 188 in the *Peraturan Pemerintah Nomor 96 Tahun 2021* in conjunction with. Article 100 of the *Peraturan Menteri ESDM Nomor 7/2020*.²⁸ Causes anxiety and worry for investors because mineral and coal mining activities are not cheap investments, investments require very large funds because they are long-term investments. The actions taken by the Ministry of Investment/*BKPM* are actions that illustrate legal flaws, which in obtaining delegation authority from one with the same position, whereas in Indonesian positive law the definition of delegation is the delegation of authority from a higher Government Agency and/or Official to a lower Government Agency and/or Official, so that the actions taken by the Ministry of Investment/*BKPM* in the author's opinion can be categorized as maladministration.

Government actions that fall into the category of maladministration are if they have met the following elements: a) Unlawful behavior or actions; b) Exceeding authority, or using authority for purposes other than those intended by the authority, or including negligence or neglect of legal obligations in the provision of public services; c) Carried out by state and government administrators; d) Causing material and/or immaterial losses to the community and individuals.

The revocation of Mining Business Permits (*IUP*) by the Ministry of Investment/*BKPM* should be carried out in accordance with the *Minerba Law*, the *Peraturan Pemerintah Nomor 96 Tahun 2021* in conjunction with the *Peraturan Pemerintah Nomor 25 Tahun 2024*, and the *Peraturan Menteri ESDM Nomor 7 Tahun 2020*. Direct revocation of permits is only permitted under certain conditions, such as criminal acts or environmental damage. The mass revocation of *IUPs* by *BKPM* in 2022 that does not meet these provisions has the potential to be maladministration and cause investor unrest. Investors who feel disadvantaged have the right to take administrative measures based on the State Administration Law, with objection and appeal mechanisms. If administrative steps fail, *IUP* holders can take the case to the State Administrative Court so that the collaborative governance strategy carried out by *KESDM* and *BKPM* is ineffective. Strategic vision is a strategic view to face the future, because future changes may be a trap for supervisors in making policies. This is where effective strategies are needed to handle the changes that exist. In the case of the revocation of the *IUP* resulting from the "Collaboration" between *BKPM* and *KESDM*, in the author's opinion, it was not effective because so many objects filed objections even in the court process at the State Administrative Court. This means that the ideals of the Collaborative Governance policy conceptualized by Ansel and Gass were not fulfilled in the collaboration process of these two ministries.

Collaborative Governance Policy Strategy in Mineral and Coal Licensing

The concept of state control over mineral and coal resources in Indonesia is based on the provisions of Article 33 paragraph (3) of the *Undang-Undang Dasar Republik Indonesia Tahun 1945* (constitution), which states, "The earth, water and natural resources contained therein are controlled by the state and used for the greatest prosperity of the people", this is the philosophical basis as well as the legal basis for the management of natural resources in Indonesia.⁵ Various regulations on mining do not explicitly explain what mining law is. So mining is not only seen from the state's legal products, but also norms and behavior in society, whether it is about local wisdom, or attitudes, behaviors and values adopted by the community around the mining area. Comprehensive, because mining law must completely regulate mining activities from pre- to post-mining, and based on social justice of natural resources, containing the principle of the results of managing natural resources as much as possible for the prosperity of the people, the principle of sustainable and environmentally friendly development.

As the discussion stage in point A of this study, it was found that the legal norms underlying the Collaborative Governance policy between *KESDM* and *BKPM* were administratively flawed so that they did not run effectively, in this discussion we will explore the side of effective collaboration and how the strategy is if we refer to the theory of Ansell and Gass.

Collaborative governance between institutions is an important issue in government science considering that many government problems have broad implications that cannot be handled optimally and solved completely if they only rely on one government institution. Through this collaboration, it is hoped that the problems faced can be overcome or at least can be minimized significantly.

Ansel and Gash's collaborative governance model has a comprehensive explanation and shows various problems in each variable. Four variables consisting of initial conditions, institutional design, facilitative leadership and collaboration processes are considered by researchers as the best model to describe the collaborative governance research to be conducted. Researchers have obtained an overview of the explanation of the model to conduct further collaborative governance research.

The collaborative governance process is implemented through several stages or steps, as explained by Ansell and Gash, that in the collaborative governance process model, collaboration sometimes develops gradually, in this case related to this research, it is also necessary to describe the consensus building process as having a pre-negotiation phase, negotiation phase, and implementation phase, such as the following theory which defines the collaborative process through three (3) steps, namely problem setting, direction setting, and implementation. Three steps including preparation, policy development, and decision-making, with each step having several stages (identifying obstacles and opportunities (listening phase), debating strategies for influence (dialogue phase), and planning collaborative actions (choice phase).

Returning to the main problem, namely the collaboration strategy between *KESDM* and *BKPM*, which according to the author's research results is ineffective because there is a conflict between *das sollen* and *das sein* where there are norms and policies that are violated, after on Thursday, January 6, 2022, President Joko Widodo announced a plan to revoke 2,078 *IUPs* in the mining sector as a result of the inability of mining companies to submit *RKAB*. In addition, the permits were revoked because they had been granted for years but not implemented. During 2022, the Land Use Arrangement and Investment Arrangement Task Force have revoked 1,118 *IUPs* and 15 *IPKHs*. These permits are part of 2,078 *IUPs*, 192 *ISKs*, and 34,448 hectares of plantation *HGUs* that abandoned, announced by President Joko Widodo in January 2022. In terms of the reasons behind the revocation of the permit, the available information shows that the *IUP* was given to entrepreneurs but was not used properly. For example, this *IUP* was used to be pawned at the bank, traded, taken only to be placed in the financial market without being used for real investment in the field, the *IUP* was held only to be held until decades later it was managed, or the *IUP* existed but was not used or had not submitted the *RKAB* (Saptowalyono, 2022). From the revocation of the *IUP* carried out by the Head of *BKPM*, several parties who felt aggrieved took legal action at the Jakarta State Administrative Court between *PT. Bumindo Sejahtera* Prospect as the Plaintiff against the Minister of Investment/Head of *BKPM* as the Defendant who in his decision canceled the letter of revocation of the *IUP* issued by the *Keputusan Menteri Investasi/Kepala BKPM Nomor 20220218-01-97206* dated February 18, 2022 (PTUN, 2022), then the submission of *PTUN, PT. Perisai Prima Utama* as the Plaintiff against the Minister of Investment/Head of *BKPM* as the Defendant who in his decision canceled the letter of revocation issued by the *Keputusan Kepala BKPM Nomor 20220405-01-38401* dated April 5, 2022 (PTUN, 2023). Therefore, based on the *Undang-Undang Nomor 3 Tahun 2020*, the issuance and revocation of *IUP* can only be carried out by the Minister of

Energy and Mineral Resources. The decision of the Minister of Investment to revoke the *IUP* has no legal basis, so the Minister of Investment's decree revoking 2,000 or so *IUPs* is invalid based on academic analysis, in the *Minerba Law* it is stated that the authority lies with the Minister of Energy and Mineral Resources, in making decisions at least three strong bases are needed, namely philosophical, sociological, and legal.

He assessed that in the revocation of this *IUP*, the government did not fulfill these bases. One of the characteristics of a state of law is that there is a state administrative court. The people have the right to correct decisions from officials or public bodies, although the revocation of the *IUP* was on the orders of President Joko Widodo at that time, but the revocation through the Minister of Investment is still not in accordance with the laws and regulations in force today. The President must also follow the provisions of the law. The *Minerba Law* regulates the Minister of Energy and Mineral Resources who issues and revokes *IUPs*. If you want to give authority to *BKPM*, there must also be a law regarding the revocation of *IUP* by *BKPM*, thus the Collaborative Governance strategy in the mining licensing sector can be achieved.

E. CONCLUSION

IUP has 3 (three) classifications, namely revocation of *IUP* because the *IUP* holder does not carry out his obligations, revocation of *IUP* because the *IUP* holder commits a crime (criminal act), and finally revocation of *IUP* because the company holding the *IUP* is bankrupt. The revocation of *IUP* by the government is considered more beneficial and fair from an economic perspective. In 2022, the government plans to revoke 2,078 *IUPs* because the *IUPs* are not used or cannot meet the *RKAB*. During 2022, the Land Use Arrangement and Investment Arrangement Task Force have revoked 1,118 *IUPs* and 15 *IPKHs* from the planned target of 2,078. Based on the provisions of the State Administration Law, it is explained that the basic form of regulations for granting delegation authority to other government agencies or organs is based on Government Regulations, Presidential Regulations and Regional Regulations. So far, the basis for the delegation of authority held by the Head of *BKPM* in issuing *IUP* and/or revoking *IUP* is based on the *Peraturan Menteri Energi dan Sumberdaya Mineral Nomor 25 Tahun 2015* as amended by the *Peraturan Menteri Energi dan Sumberdaya Mineral Nomor 19 Tahun 2020* concerning the Delegation of Authority to Grant Licensing in the Mineral and Coal Mining Sector in the Framework of Implementing Integrated One-Stop Services to the Head of *BKPM*. That on the basis of the delegation of authority held by the Head of *BKPM*, legally the issuance of permits and/or revocation of permits issued by the Head of *BKPM* has contradicted the law and provisions of laws and regulations and has created legal uncertainty. The Collaborative Governance policy between *KESDM* and *BKPM* is not effective in regulating licensing in the mining sector.

The Ministry of Investment/*BKPM* should be carried out in accordance with the *Minerba Law*, *Peraturan Pemerintah Nomor 96 Tahun 2021* in conjunction with the *Peraturan Pemerintah Nomor 25 Tahun 2024*, and the *Peraturan ESDM Nomor 7 Tahun 2020*. Direct revocation of permits is only permitted under certain

conditions, such as criminal acts or environmental damage. The mass revocation of *IUPs* by *BKPM* in 2022 that does not meet these provisions has the potential for maladministration and causes investor unrest. Investors who feel disadvantaged have the right to take administrative measures based on the State Administration Law, with objection and appeal mechanisms. If administrative steps fail, *IUP* holders can bring the case to the State Administrative Court. Therefore, legal protection for investors who comply with legal provisions in the mining sector is essential to maintain investor trust and ensure that natural resource management runs according to the principles of a state of law. Furthermore, the author provides views for the future in order to ensure justice for *IUP* holders who have complied with legal provisions but whose permits have been revoked, clearer and simpler regulations are needed regarding the delegation of authority to grant and revoke permits from the Minister of Energy and Mineral Resources to the Minister of *BKPM*. This regulation should ideally be stated in the form of a Government Regulation or Presidential Regulation. In addition, supervision of the *BKPM* Task Force needs to be clarified to prevent abuse of authority and overlap with other regulations.

REFERENCES

- Ansell dan Gash, (2007). Collaborative Governance in Theory and Practice, Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory Volume; 543 571.
- Joko Widodo, (2008), Analisis Kebijakan Publik, Jakarta. Bayumedia.
- Peraturan Presiden Nomor 32 Tahun 2021 tentang Perubahan atas Peraturan Presiden Nomor 68 Tahun 2019 tentang Organisasi Kementerian Negara
- Peraturan Menteri Energi dan Sumber Daya Mineral Nomor 25 Tahun 2015 tentang Pendelegasian Wewenang Pemberian Perizinan Bidang Pertambangan
- Peraturan Menteri Energi dan Sumberdaya Mineral Nomor 19 Tahun 2020 Perubahan Atas Peraturan Menteri Energi dan Sumber Daya Mineral Nomor 25 Tahun 2015 tentang Pendelegasian Wewenang Pemberian Perizinan Bidang Pertambangan
- Peraturan Menteri Energi dan Sumber Daya Mineral Nomor 9 Tahun 2024 tentang Organisasi Dan Tata Kerja Kementerian Energi Dan Sumber Daya Mineral
- Sørensen, E., & Triantafillou, P. (2013). The politics of selfgovernance. In The Politics of Self-Governance. [https:// doi.org/10.4324/9781315554259](https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315554259)
- Undang-Undang Dasar Republik Indonesia Tahun 1945
- Undang-Undang Nomor 30 Tahun 2014 tentang Administrasi Pemerintahan
- Undang-Undang Nomor 4 Tahun 2009 tentang Pertambangan Mineral dan Batu Bara.
- Undang-Undang Nomor 3 Tahun 2020 tentang Perubahan Undang-Undang Nomor 4 Tahun 2009 tentang Pertambangan Mineral dan Batu Bara