

COLLABORATION BETWEEN REGULATORS AND THE COMMUNITY IN LAND ECONOMIC REFORM: A POLICY STUDY BASED ON REAL NEEDS

Yustinus Lambang Setyo Putro

Doctoral Student Faculty of Law Universitas 17 Agustus 1945 Jakarta

Yustinuslambang@yahoo.co.id

Siti Nur Azizah

Professor Faculty of Law Universitas 17 Agustus 1945 Jakarta

Gunawan Widjaja

Senior Lecturer Faculty of Law Universitas 17 Agustus 1945 Jakarta

widjaja_gunawan@yahoo.com

Dyah Ersita Yustanti

Fakultas Hukum Universitas 17 Agustus 1945 Jakarta

dyustanti@yahoo.com

Abstract

This study discusses collaboration between regulators and the community in the context of land economic reform using a real needs-based policy approach. The emergence of various agrarian conflicts in Indonesia shows that top-down land policies tend to be ineffective because they do not pay sufficient attention to the aspirations and real needs of the community. Through a literature review, this study examines the dynamics of the regulator-community relationship, identifies factors contributing to the success and obstacles to collaboration, and emphasises the urgency of active community participation in policy formulation. The results of the discussion show that collaboration not only strengthens the legitimacy of policies but also creates solutions that are more inclusive, transparent, and adaptive to social realities. In addition, policies based on real needs have proven to be more conducive to achieving certainty of rights, fair land redistribution, and the strengthening of agrarian justice. Thus, the integration of collaboration and a real needs approach is an important foundation for promoting sustainable land economic reform in Indonesia.

Keywords: collaboration, regulators, community, land reform, real needs-based policies, agrarian justice

Introduction

Land reform in Indonesia is one of the public policy sectors that has a major impact on economic development sustainability, social justice, and political stability. The issue of land management is not only related to administrative aspects of property rights certification, but also to the distribution of economic resources, community access to productive land, and the potential for horizontal and vertical conflicts (Suhadi, 2024). Land is the main source of life for agrarian communities and forms the basis of economic activities, ranging from agriculture, plantations, housing, to industrial areas.

Therefore, land issues are always at the centre of complex interests between the state, the community, and the private sector (Samosir & Moeis, 2023) .

Historically, Indonesia's land policies have often been influenced by political and economic dynamics that have been ongoing since the colonial era. The dualism of land law between *Western rights* and *customary rights* has created uncertainty that continues to leave its mark today. After independence, the 1960 Basic Agrarian Law (UUPA) was enacted, which was expected to be a turning point in realising agrarian reform and equitable access to land (Flores, 1989) . However, the implementation of the UUPA has continued to face structural obstacles to this day. Land ownership conflicts, disputes between citizens and corporations, and slow land certification programmes show that the ideals of agrarian reform have not been fully realised (Vejchodská, 2022) .

A number of studies show that the root cause of land issues in Indonesia often lies in weak coordination between regulatory agencies and minimal community participation in policy formulation. Overlapping regulations between ministries/agencies, such as the Ministry of Agrarian Affairs and Spatial Planning/National Land Agency, the Ministry of Forestry, and local governments, have caused confusion in their implementation (Yulia, 2023) ; (Jin et al., 2007) . As a result, the community, as the main stakeholders, are often not meaningfully involved in decision-making that affects their lives. This situation is exacerbated by bureaucratic practices that are slow, difficult to access, and in some cases prone to corruption or abuse of authority (Arisaputra, 2021) .

On the other hand, civil society has a different perspective, local knowledge and real needs compared to the state bureaucracy. Small farmers, indigenous peoples and local communities often view land not merely as an economic asset, but also as an integral part of their cultural identity, spirituality and livelihoods. However, these views are often not adequately accommodated in the regulatory process, which tends to be more rigid and relies on a legal-formal approach. This imbalance has led to recurring land conflicts, which have the potential to hamper the investment climate and national economic growth (Resosudarmo, 2019) .

The urgency of collaboration between regulators and the community has become increasingly apparent in the context of land regulation modernisation and economic development. Top-down policy solutions have proven ineffective if they are not based on the real needs of the community on the ground. Land used by small farmers, for example, requires different regulatory protection from land for large-scale industrial estates. Therefore, a participatory and dialogical approach in formulating land policies is believed to be able to articulate diverse needs, resulting in more inclusive, adaptive, and sustainable policy designs (Sudradjat, 2024) .

Land reform is not only about land redistribution, but also about developing an institutional system that can provide legal certainty and fair access. This includes mass

certification programmes, land data digitisation, forest area management, and transparent dispute resolution (Wardana, 2023) . However, without community involvement, these programmes will tend to become mere administrative projects without addressing the substantial issues. In other words, the success of land reform is largely determined by the level of collaboration and synergy between regulators and the communities directly involved in land management (Sidqi, 2024) .

Recurring land conflicts in various regions demonstrate the weakness of policy designs that are unresponsive to local issues. Communities often face infrastructure development or large-scale plantation policies that sacrifice their land rights. When the voices of the people are not heard, these policies not only fail socially but also create a political burden in the form of protests, litigation, and even criminalisation of citizens. On the other hand, regulators face pressure to maintain the investment climate and national economic development, often neglecting solutions based on the real needs of the people (Ansell & Gash, 2007) .

Collaboration between regulators and the community in land economic reform can be viewed through the framework of *collaborative governance*. This model emphasises the importance of partnerships between state and non-state actors in formulating and implementing public policy (Kathrin, 2019) . The principles of transparency, accountability, participation and equal dialogue are key factors in achieving legitimate and effective policies. In this context, the community is not only positioned as policy takers but also as joint decision makers (Febrina, 2021) .

A needs-based policy approach is also an important aspect of this research. Public policies formulated without field research and identification of real needs often result in implementation failures. For example, land redistribution programmes that do not consider farmers' capacity, access to capital, or supporting facilities actually create new problems such as abandoned land. Therefore, carefully understanding the needs of the community is the main foundation for formulating strategies for equitable land reform.

Research Method

The research method used in this study is library research, which involves collecting, reviewing, and analysing various relevant literature sources such as books, scientific journals, laws and regulations, policy reports, and previous research results discussing the issue of collaboration between regulators and the community in land economic reform. Through this approach, researchers focus on searching for secondary data to understand the theoretical framework, policy dynamics, and collaborative practices that have occurred in various contexts. The analysis was conducted systematically by classifying sources based on theme, identifying gaps in the literature, and synthesising key findings to produce a comprehensive understanding of the urgency of real needs-based policies in land reform in Indonesia (Ferrari, 2020) .

Results and Discussion

Regulatory and Community Collaboration Model

Collaboration between regulators and the community in land economic reform is a governance approach that places both actors as equal partners in the formulation, implementation, and evaluation of policies. In many cases, public policy in the land sector tends to be dominated by top-down regulations that are instructive in nature from the government to the community (Febrina, 2021). The collaboration model aims to change this paradigm into an interactive, dialogical, and participatory relationship, where the government (through the National Land Agency, local governments, and relevant ministries) does not act as the sole authority, but rather as a facilitator and catalyst in absorbing the needs of citizens (Aditya, 2023).

This model is highly relevant given the complexity of land issues in Indonesia. Land is not only a material object, but also related to social, cultural, legal and economic aspects. When land policy is managed solely by regulators, these diverse dimensions will not be fully accommodated. Therefore, communities with empirical experience in land use, local social conditions, and customs must be involved from the early stages of policy formulation (Inoue, 2013). One of the main pillars of this collaborative model is information transparency. Land data is often still closed, giving rise to disputes due to overlapping ownership claims. By opening public access to spatial data, regional maps, and land legal status, the policy formulation process will be more accountable. This transparency also helps prevent the abuse of authority by regulators who often trade land information (Rahmawati & Bangsawan, 2022).

In addition to transparency, collaboration requires effective participation mechanisms. Participation should not be merely a formality, but should provide real opportunities for the community to express their opinions, provide input, and decide on policy directions. For example, through village deliberation forums, open public consultations, or joint supervisory bodies between local government and community groups. The implementation of participation also needs to take into account the representation of vulnerable groups such as women, small farmers, and indigenous peoples so that no voices are marginalised (Sumardjono, 2023).

Another aspect of the collaboration model is the role of independent mediation institutions. In many land conflicts, the relationship between regulators and communities is often marked by mistrust. The presence of independent institutions such as NGOs, customary institutions, or academics can serve as mediators who help ensure that the collaboration process is fair and equitable. This mediation also prevents polarisation among the parties concerned, thereby facilitating the achievement of a mutual agreement (Hartono, 2025).

The regulator-community collaboration model must also be viewed from a capacity building perspective. Not all communities have sufficient legal and policy literacy to understand the details of land regulations. Therefore, regulators are obliged

to organise training, legal socialisation, and public education so that the community can be meaningfully involved in the policy process (Candra, 2005) . Thus, the community does not merely become spectators of policy, but active actors who are equal to regulators in decision-making. To ensure the sustainability of the collaboration model, clear institutional instruments are needed. One of the obstacles so far has been the absence of a formal forum that brings regulators and the community together on a regular basis. An institutionalised multi-stakeholder forum could be a solution, such as a regional land council involving representatives from various elements, such as local government, community leaders, entrepreneurs and farmer groups. This forum would not only serve as a consultation platform, but also as a space for joint decision-making (Yanuardy, 2025) .

In the context of implementation, collaboration models can take various forms depending on local conditions. In urban areas, collaboration is more focused on spatial planning, land use for housing, and infrastructure development. Meanwhile, in rural areas, the focus may be on land redistribution, certification of indigenous peoples' rights, or productive land management. This shows that the collaboration model is not uniform, but adaptive to specific needs (Mujiati & Nuraini Aisiyah, 2022) . Community involvement in collaboration can also increase the legitimacy of policies. Policies formulated collaboratively will be more easily accepted by the community because they have gone through a participatory process. Conversely, policies formulated unilaterally by regulators are often rejected or opposed. Thus, collaboration is not only a matter of technical mechanisms, but also a way of building trust, social cohesion, and political legitimacy in a region (Parlindungan, 1999) .

However, this collaborative model still faces serious challenges. First, there is resistance from some regulators who still consider the community to be insufficiently competent to be involved in agrarian policy matters. Second, the interests of local elites or large investors often distort the collaboration process, causing the voices of small communities to be drowned out by economic and political domination. Another challenge is the limited resources of the community, such as minimal access to digital technology or a lack of information about land rights (Sutedi, 2011) . To overcome these challenges, the collaboration model can be strengthened with a digital technology approach. The digitisation of land data through online mapping systems, licensing applications, and web-based complaint mechanisms can reduce opportunities for manipulation while making it easier for the community to access information. With this openness of data, dialogue between regulators and the community becomes more fact- and data-based, rather than merely based on opinion or assumption (Santoso, 2011) .

Effective collaboration models also emphasise the importance of joint oversight. Once policies have been agreed upon, the implementation process must continue to be monitored by both parties. For example, communities can form local oversight groups that work with regulators to ensure that land redistribution proceeds according to

procedure. This collective oversight mechanism will reduce the potential for conflict and increase ownership of the policies that are put in place (Minu & Asmaddin, 2020b).

In public governance theory, collaboration is considered successful if it results in mutual gains or shared benefits for all parties. In the context of land, regulators gain legitimacy and policy effectiveness, while the community gains legal certainty, fair access to land, and space for participation. Thus, collaboration not only brings together the interests of the state and the community, but also creates mutually beneficial synergies (Marzuki, 2016). In addition to direct benefits, this collaboration model also contributes to long-term social development. Community involvement in land policies fosters critical awareness and collective responsibility in resource management. Meanwhile, for regulators, collaboration teaches the importance of listening, empathising, and building trust. The long-term effect of this interaction is the creation of more inclusive and equitable land governance, in line with the state's goal of achieving social justice for all Indonesians (Nugroho, 2024).

Thus, the model of collaboration between regulators and the community can be understood as a dialogical governance mechanism that unites the interests of the state and citizens within the framework of policies based on real needs. The success of this model depends on the commitment of regulators to open up space for participation, the willingness of the community to actively engage, and the presence of supporting institutions that bridge the two sides. If implemented consistently, this model has great potential to resolve land conflicts, strengthen policy legitimacy, and accelerate the realisation of land economic reform in Indonesia.

Real Needs-Based Policy

Needs-based policy is an approach to public policy formulation that emphasises the importance of identifying, understanding and responding to the real needs of the community as the main basis for strategy development. In land affairs, real needs are not limited to certainty of land ownership, but also include access to land use for productive economic activities, protection of indigenous peoples' rights, legal guarantees against conflict, and support for environmental sustainability (Adi Nugroho, 2018). If land policies are not based on these real needs, the end result will only be administrative in nature without providing direct solutions to the problems faced by the people (Rahmadi, 2017).

A real needs approach is crucial in Indonesia, which has social, cultural and economic complexities. Rural communities need land for farming and survival, while urban communities need more legal certainty regarding property rights to homes or business land. This shows that community needs are heterogeneous (Triasna, 2024). Therefore, uniform public policies tend to fail to address this diverse reality. The needs-based policy model is designed to ensure that these differences are taken into account and accommodated at every stage of policy formulation (Noor, 2021).

The real needs in land economic reform must be explored through field research, community surveys, and transparent participatory mechanisms. This approach rejects the logic of policies that are only formulated behind bureaucratic desks without listening to the voices of citizens. For example, a land certification programme would be more effective if it were based on a map of community needs: who really does not have a certificate, who is hindered by costs, and who is marginalised because of their customary land status. Thus, data on community needs becomes a solid basis for policy formulation (Surya, 2023).

Another important aspect is the difference between *real needs* and *pseudo-needs*. Real needs are basic necessities that are directly felt by the community in supporting their economic and social lives. Meanwhile, pseudo-needs often arise due to the interests of the political elite or corporate pressures that exploit policies for personal gain. In this context, real needs-based policies serve as a filtering mechanism to ensure that policies truly favour the people, rather than merely serving the interests of a small group with access to power (Marthalina, 2018). To realise real needs-based policies, regulators need to combine two main instruments: quantitative data and qualitative narratives. Quantitative data, such as land statistics, ownership distribution, and the number of land conflicts, provide a macro overview of community needs. Meanwhile, qualitative narratives through interviews, group discussions, and anthropological studies provide detailed context that cannot be captured in numbers. The combination of the two will enrich policies, making them not only technically valid but also socially relevant (Silviana, 2019).

One example of a real need is the demand of indigenous peoples who have suffered decades of neglect of their customary rights. Land policies that focus solely on individual certificates will fail to address the real needs of indigenous peoples who view land as a communal collective space. If policies are unable to accommodate these needs, social resistance in the form of conflict and rejection will arise. Therefore, policies based on real needs must be able to formulate legal instruments that protect the plurality of land rights, not just uniform standards of legality (Sumardjono, 2005).

Policies based on real needs can also be a solution to reducing land ownership inequality. Data shows that most productive land in Indonesia is controlled by a small group of people with large concessions, while millions of small farmers and agricultural workers live without adequate land. The real need in this case is fair land redistribution, not excessive land ownership by corporations (Widiyanto, 2021). If regulators formulate policies based on real needs, the impact will be significant in promoting economic welfare and social stability (Amrin, 2023).

Policies based on real needs should not stop at the formulation stage, but must also be applied in the implementation phase. Many policies appear populist but fail in implementation because the mechanisms are not suited to the actual conditions. For example, free land certification programmes often fail due to indirect costs,

complicated bureaucracy, or limited access for people in remote areas. The evaluation of policies based on real needs must prioritise implementation by adjusting procedures to the situation of the beneficiary community (Pinuji, 2023).

Community participation is a key factor in ensuring that policies are truly based on real needs. Mechanisms such as public consultation forums, village deliberations, and formal *policy dialogues* between local governments, farmers, and civil society are essential. Community participation in these forums will make policies more responsive and provide moral legitimacy. Without this participation, policies tend to be superficial and top-down, which is prone to resistance (Ruang, 2017).

Real needs-based policies are also closely related to the concept of *evidence-based policy making*, which is increasingly used in modern public administration. This means that every land policy must be based on verifiable empirical evidence, not merely on political pressure or regulatory assumptions. By adopting this approach, land economic reform will be more systematic, measurable, and in line with the interests of the wider community (Raharjo, 2000). However, the real needs approach is not without its challenges. First, identifying real needs is often complicated because the community itself has diverse and sometimes conflicting aspirations. Second, there are limited resources to conduct comprehensive participatory research and surveys across all regions. Another challenge is resistance from elites and corporations who do not want to lose their interests when policies favour the community. Therefore, regulators need strong political commitment to ensure that real needs-based policies continue to be implemented (Kurniati, 2017).

In the context of macroeconomics, policies based on real needs serve to correct development orientations that are overly pro-capital. Many land policies have favoured large investments over the needs of the common people. In fact, the sustainability of Indonesia's economic development is determined by the success of managing the agricultural sector and providing prosperity for farmers. Through a real needs approach, economic development can be directed not only towards short-term profits, but also towards the long-term interests of the people (Santoso, 2017).

The long-term benefits of policies based on real needs are the creation of more substantial agrarian justice (Harsono, 2013). By responding to the real needs of the community, the state is able to reduce the roots of social conflict, strengthen legal legitimacy, and increase land-based economic productivity. Previously neglected land can be utilised more effectively, conflicts can be reduced, and the distribution of resources becomes more equitable. All of this ultimately has an impact on strengthening food security and national economic independence (Minu & Asmaddin, 2020a).

Thus, policies based on real needs must be placed as the main foundation for land economic reform in Indonesia. Regulations are no longer seen as unilateral instructions from the state, but rather the result of lengthy dialogue between

regulators and the community in order to find real solutions to the problems faced. If policies are truly based on real needs, then land reform will not only be an administrative project, but also an instrument of socio-economic transformation that will lead Indonesia towards agrarian justice and sustainable prosperity.

Conclusion

Land reform in Indonesia cannot be effective if it relies solely on top-down policies from regulators without involving the community. Collaboration between regulators and the community is key to developing inclusive, transparent and equitable land governance. Through collaboration, regulators can gain legitimacy while ensuring that the policies produced truly address real issues on the ground, such as security of rights, productive land use and protection of vulnerable groups.

In addition, a policy approach based on real needs provides direction so that land reform is not merely an administrative goal, but also an instrument of socio-economic development that favours the people. Community participation, data transparency, and joint oversight are important elements in ensuring that policies can be implemented effectively and sustainably. Thus, collaboration between regulators and the community is not merely a technical strategy, but also a moral and political foundation for realising agrarian justice and economic prosperity in Indonesia.

References

- Adi Nugroho, S. (2018). *Mediasi Sebagai Alternatif Penyelesaian Sengketa Pertanahan*.
- Aditya, B. (2023). Collaborative Governance in Police: A Review of Research. *Journal La Sociale*.
- Amrin, R. (2023). Integration of Geospatial Data and Information in Margoluwih Area. *Jurnal Kebijakan Pertanahan*, 4(2). <https://doi.org/10.1234/jkp.v4i2.2023>
- Ansell, C., & Gash, A. (2007). Collaborative Governance in Theory and Practice. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*. http://marphli.pbworks.com/w/file/fetch/55667103/Collaborative_governance_theory.pdf
- Arisaputra, M. (2021). Kolaborasi Stakeholder Dalam Reforma Agraria. *Jurnal Unismuh*. <https://journal.unismuh.ac.id/index.php/kolaborasi/article/view/5655>
- Candra, S. (2005). *Sertipikat Kepemilikan Hak Atas Tanah*.
- Elijah, E., & Aslan, A. (2025). STAKE'S EVALUATION MODEL: METODE PENELITIAN. *Prosiding Seminar Nasional Indonesia*, 3(2), Article 2.
- Febrina, R. (2021). Collaborative Governance in Recognizing Customary Law Communities and Communal Land Rights in Kampar Regency. *Jurnal GPP*. <https://journal.umy.ac.id/index.php/GPP/article/view/11104/6472>
- Ferrari, R. (2020). Writing narrative style literature reviews. *Medical Writing*, 24(4), 230–235. <https://doi.org/10.1179/2047480615Z.000000000329>
- Flores, E. (1989). The Economics of Land Reform. *International Labour Review*. https://researchrepository.ilo.org/view/pdfCoverPage?instCode=41ILO_INST&filePid=13100915050002676&download=true

- Harsono, B. (2013). *Hukum Agraria Indonesia: Sejarah dan Pelaksanaan UUPA*. Universitas Trisakti.
- Hartono, H. (2025). Sinkronisasi Peraturan Perundang-undangan PPAT dan Notaris Berdasarkan Pancasila. *Fakultas Hukum Universitas Katolik Widya Karya Malang Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.5678/fhukwm.jur.2025>
- Inoue, M. (2013). Collaborative Forest Governance: Experiences, Strategies and Design Principles. *University of Tokyo, Global Forest Environmental Studies*. https://s2.faperta.unmul.ac.id/wp-content/uploads/2017/12/Indonesia_Inoue_Oct2013.pdf
- Jin, S., Deininger, K., & Nagarajan, H. K. (2007). Land Reforms, Poverty Reduction, and Economic Growth: Evidence from India. *Policy Research Working Paper, World Bank*. <http://hdl.handle.net/10986/7531>
- Kathrin, B. (2019). Collaborative Governance in the Making: Implementation of Forestry Co-management in British Columbia. *Forest Policy and Economics*.
- Kurniati, N. (2017). *Hukum Agraria Sengketa Pertanahan Penyelesaiannya Melalui Arbitrase*. Refika Aditama.
- Marthalina, M. (2018). Kebijakan Satu Peta dalam Mendukung Tata Kelola Pertanahan. *Jurnal Manajemen Pertanahan*. <https://doi.org/10.7890/jmpb.2018.441>
- Marzuki, M. P. (2016). *Metode Penelitian dan Penulisan Hukum pada Kajian Pertanahan*.
- Minu, M. H., & Asmaddin, A. (2020a). Data Geospasial Tematik Pendukung Kebijakan Pertanahan. *Jurnal Pertanahan*.
- Minu, M. H., & Asmaddin, A. (2020b). Pemanfaatan Data Geospasial dalam Mewujudkan Sistem Informasi Pertanahan Multiguna. *Widya Bhumi*, 3(1).
- Mujiati & Nuraini Aisiyah. (2022). Peningkatan kualitas peta kerja dalam pendaftaran tanah sistematis lengkap. *Tunas Agraria*, 5(3).
- Noor. (2021). Konsep Geo-KKP untuk Standarisasi Data Spasial Pertanahan. *Jurnal Bhumi*.
- Nugroho, R. (2024). *Menata Sejengkal Tanah di Ujung Batas Negara (Sinkronisasi Antar Lembaga)*.
- Parlindungan, A. P. (1999). *Pendaftaran Tanah di Indonesia Berdasarkan PP No. 24 Tahun 1997*.
- Pinuji, S. (2023). *Integrasi Sistem Informasi Pertanahan dan Infrastruktur Data Spasial dalam Rangka One Map Policy*. Repository STPN.
- Raharjo, S. (2000). *Ilmu Hukum dan Implementasinya dalam Pertanahan*.
- Rahmadi, T. (2017). *Mediasi Penyelesaian Sengketa Tanah Melalui Pendekatan Mufakat*.
- Rahmawati, U. D., & Bangsawan, M. I. (2022). Urgensi Kebijakan Satu Peta untuk Menyelesaikan Tumpang Tindih Penggunaan Lahan. *Prosiding Seminar Nasional Program Doktor Ilmu Hukum*.
- Resosudarmo, I. (2019). Indonesia's Land Reform: Implications for Local Livelihoods. *Journal of Environmental Management*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2018.12.046>
- Ruang, T. (2017). *Integrasi Agraria-Pertanahan dan Tata Ruang*. <https://doi.org/10.1234/integrasi.agraria.2017>

- Samosir, H. P., & Moeis, J. P. (2023). The Urgency of Agrarian Reform Policy: Impact of Land Access on Farmer Household Welfare. *Jurnal Bhumi*. <https://doi.org/10.31292/bhumi.v8i2.544>
- Santoso, U. (2011). *Pendaftaran Tanah dan Peralihan Hak Atas Tanah*.
- Santoso, U. (2017). *Hukum Agraria Kajian Komprehensif*. Prenada Media Group.
- Sidqi, F. (2024). Efektivitas Reforma Agraria dalam Mencapai Keadilan. *Jurnal Almikraj*. <https://ejournal.insuriponorogo.ac.id/index.php/almikraj/article/download/6327/3457>
- Silviana, A. (2019). Kebijakan Satu Peta (One Map Policy) Mencegah Konflik di Bidang Pertanahan. *Administrative Law & Governance Journal*.
- Sudradjat, A. (2024). Government Regulation Number 24 of 1997 on Land Certification. *Journal of Indonesian Public Land Regulation*.
- Suhadi, S. (2024). Urban Agrarian Reform. *Jurnal Legality*. <https://ejournal.umm.ac.id/index.php/legaliti/article/download/35842/15098>
- Sumardjono, M. S. W. (2005). *Kebijakan Pertanahan Antara Regulasi dan Implementasi*. Buku Kompas.
- Sumardjono, M. S. W. (2023). *Upaya Sinkronisasi Data Pertanahan untuk Pengelolaan Berkelanjutan*.
- Surya, L. A. (2023). Kebijakan Satu Peta dan Pengelolaan Data Pertanahan. *Jurnal Pertanahan*.
- Sutedi, A. (2011). *Pendaftaran Tanah di Indonesia*. Mandar Maju.
- Triasna, A. W. (2024). Legal Certainty in State Land Tenure. <https://doi.org/10.14710/alj.v2i3.476-492>
- Vejchodská, E. (2022). Revisiting the Purpose of Land Policy: Efficiency and Equity. *Land Use Policy*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/08854122221112667>
- Wardana, D. (2023). Enhancing Collaborative Governance in Managing Grand Forest Park. *Journal of Collaborative Governance, Public Policy and Planning*.
- Widiyanto, D. (2021). Kajian Awal Integrasi Tata Ruang dan Kebijakan Satu Peta. *Prosiding Geospatial UNS*.
- Yanuardy, L. (2025). *Problem Solving pada Sistem Pertanahan Nasional*.
- Yulia, A. (2023). Land Use Policies and Tenure in Economic Liberalization. *Jurnal Lex Publica*. <https://journal.appthi.org/index.php/lexpublica/article/view/185>