Cognitionis Civitatis et Politicae, 1(5) - October 2024 248-266

Dynamics of Legal Framework for Public-Private Partnership (PPP) in Infrastructure Provision

Andriansyah Tiawarman K. [1], **Zudan Arief Fakrulloh** [2]
[1] *Universitas Borobudur, Indonesia*
[2] *Universitas Borobudur, Indonesia*

Corresponding Author: Andriansyah Tiawarman K. E-mail; andryantw@gmail.com

Received: Sep 19, 2024	Revised: Sep 22, 2024	Accepted: October 25, 2024	Online: October 27, 2024

ABSTRACT

The increasing demand for public infrastructure in Indonesia, coupled with national budget limitations, has elevated the importance of the Public-Private Partnership (PPP) scheme as an alternative financing mechanism. This study aims to analyze the legal framework and challenges associated with the implementation of PPP in infrastructure provision. Using a qualitative approach, the research examines existing regulations, including Presidential Regulation No. 38 of 2015, as well as other supporting policies that form the basis of PPP implementation in Indonesia. The findings reveal two critical aspects: first, the current legal framework for PPP provides a foundation for collaboration but requires enhancement to address gaps in clarity and effectiveness; second, significant challenges, including risk allocation, dispute resolution, and legal protection for parties, hinder the execution of PPP projects. The study concludes that an improved and accountable legal framework is essential to attract private sector investment and ensure the success of PPP projects. Strengthening regulatory certainty and addressing legal challenges are pivotal for fostering sustainable infrastructure development in Indonesia.

Keywords: *Dispute Resolution, Infrastructure Provision, Legal Framework, Public-Private Partnership, Risk Allocation*

Journal Homepage https://journal.ypidathu.or.id/index.php/politicae

How to cite: K, T, A., & Fakrulloh, A, Z. (2024). Dynamics of Legal Framework for Public-Private Partnership (PPP) in Infrastructure Provision. *Cognitionis Civitatis et Politicae*, 1(5), 248-266. https://doi.org/10.70177/politicae.v1i5.1631
Published by: Yayasan Pendidikan Islam Daarut Thufulah

INTRODUCTION

Article 18, paragraphs (1) and (2) of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia (UUD RI 1945) stipulates that the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia (NKRI) is divided into provincial regions, which are further divided into districts and cities (Sulfikar et al., 2022). Each province, district, and city have its regional government regulated by law (Barsasella et al., 2022). The provincial, district, and city local governments have the right to organize and manage their governmental affairs based on the principles of autonomy and assistance tasks (Kuswanto, 2024). Independence in regional autonomy is not the same as independence (onafhankelijkheid, independence); rather, it is the granting of rights to formulate regulations and manage internal affairs by autonomous bodies such as provincial, district, or city governments, within certain limits, both in territorial and material aspects (Yuwono, 2023). In the legal context, regional autonomy is defined as the rights, powers, and obligations of autonomous regions to regulate and manage governmental affairs and the interests of their local communities within the framework of the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia (Andyani et al., 2023).

To support the implementation of regional autonomy, Law No. 23 of 2014 concerning Regional Government has been enacted (Nugraha, 2024), which has undergone several changes, most recently with Law No. 9 of 2015 concerning the Second Amendment to Law No. 23 of 2014. Article 1, number 6 of Law 23/2014 states that regional autonomy is the rights, powers, and obligations of autonomous regions to regulate and manage governmental affairs and the interests of local communities within the system of the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia (Anwar et al., 2023). The provision of extensive autonomy to regions is aimed at accelerating the realization of community welfare through improved services, empowerment, and public participation (Syarif, 2023). In order to implement regional autonomy, local governments need to take steps to increase local revenue sources to support the growth and development of economic development (Gazali & Kumano, 2023). To encourage regional economic growth and enhance public services, a real, dynamic, and responsible business climate must be created, as well as efforts to add to and develop local original revenue sources (Nurrochmat et al., 2021).

The implementation of regional autonomy aims to improve the quality and quantity of public services, the welfare of the community, create efficiency and effectiveness in the management of regional resources, and empower the community to participate in the development process (Roberto Di Maria, 2021). Based on these goals, the central government provides opportunities for regional governments to develop and advance development in the regions, one of which is through Public-Private Partnerships (PPP) or Government-Private Cooperation (KPBU) in infrastructure provision that includes technical facilities, physical structures (Potiker, 2023), systems, hardware, and software needed to provide services to the community and support structural networks to facilitate the economic and social growth of the community effectively (Stoyan, 2024). This is regulated in Presidential Regulation Number 38 of 2015 concerning Government Cooperation with Business Entities in Infrastructure Provision (Perpres KPBU). The cooperation between local governments and businesses in infrastructure provision (KPDBU) is expected to provide an alternative source of funding for regions, in addition to the Regional Revenue and Expenditure Budget (APBD) and allocations from the State Revenue and Expenditure Budget (APBN) (Ma et al., 2024). According to information provided by the Minister of Finance, local governments still have a high level of dependence on funding channeled by the central government, including allocations for transfers to regions and village funds (TKDD) (Konečný, 2023).

The dynamics of the legal framework for the Public-Private Partnership (PPP) scheme in infrastructure provision in Indonesia reflect the government's efforts to accelerate infrastructure development by utilizing resources from the private sector (Hirotsu et al., 2024). PPP is regulated in Presidential Regulation Number 38 of 2015 concerning Government Cooperation with Business Entities in Infrastructure Provision. In this scheme, the government provides support in the form of regulations, permits, and project guarantees, while the business entities participate in funding, constructing, and operating infrastructure projects (Busarova & Sennikovskaya, 2023). Legally, this partnership must adhere to the principles of transparency, accountability, and healthy competition, ensuring that the collaborative projects provide optimal benefits for the community (Battista & Uva, 2023). However, in practice, various obstacles often arise regarding licensing issues, land acquisition, and inter-agency coordination, which affect the smooth implementation of projects (Ricca, 2023). In addition, the PPP scheme also faces legal challenges related to risk management, responsibility sharing, and dispute resolution. Each PPP project requires a complex and detailed agreement, covering technical, commercial, and risk-sharing aspects between the government and the private entity. An important element is the regulation regarding compensation for the business entities in the event that a project fails or encounters obstacles due to government policies or regulatory changes. In this case, the role of the Indonesian National Arbitration Board (BANI) or other arbitration forums is often necessary as a dispute resolution mechanism. On the other hand, these legal challenges also compel the government to continuously refine regulations and strengthen the legal framework of PPP to be more responsive to changing needs on the ground and to maintain investor confidence in the investment climate in the infrastructure sector (Mutimba et al., 2024).

Improving infrastructure is one of the crucial elements that support economic growth (Mancini et al., 2024). Adequate infrastructure provision has a significant impact on enhancing the quality and quantity of economic activities. For instance, efficient transportation infrastructure will facilitate the smooth movement of people and goods, thus propelling a sustainable economy (Al-Dahabreh et al., 2024). Infrastructure plays a vital role in supporting economic growth and improving the quality of life for communities (Li et al., 2022). In many countries, including Indonesia, adequate infrastructure contributes to the smooth flow of economic activities, increased accessibility, and promotion of social inclusion. However, governments often face significant challenges in terms of effective and efficient infrastructure financing, primarily due to budget limitations (Goonetillake et al., 2023). The costs required for the development and maintenance of infrastructure, such as roads, bridges, water supply systems, and healthcare facilities, are considerably high. Given the urgent need for adequate and sustainable infrastructure to support national development and to enhance Indonesia's economy and competitiveness at the global level, there is an urgency to accelerate infrastructure development processes. This requires comprehensive steps to create a conducive investment climate, as well as to encourage private sector participation in providing infrastructure and services in accordance with healthy business principles.

This research will discuss the legal framework governing the PPP scheme at the regional level and the legal challenges faced in the implementation of infrastructure projects through the PPP scheme (Lima et al., 2021).

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

In this research, the method used is the statutory approach, also known as the legal normative research method, which is a process to discover legal rules, legal principles, and legal doctrines to address legal issues (Thai, 2023). This approach is utilized to examine the legal framework that regulates the PPP scheme (Setty & Dobson, 2023). The case approach is another method employed to analyze and review legal problems in order to identify the legal challenges faced in the implementation of infrastructure projects through the PPP scheme (Düvel et al., 2022). Additionally, the conceptual approach is based on the views and doctrinal patterns or ideas of experts that have developed within legal science (Krüger, 2022). Through the various approaches and legal research presented, this study aims to address the legal framework that governs the PPP scheme as well as the legal challenges encountered in the execution of infrastructure projects through the PPP scheme (Rajput & Bhalla, 2024).

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Regulations Governing the Public-Private Partnership (PPP) Scheme at the Regional Level

In the development of the power system between the central government and local governments in Indonesia, regional autonomy has now become a significant part. The implementation of regional autonomy does not mean that all matters are entirely handed over to local governments; rather, there is a division of authority that allows local governments to take the initiative in formulating policies that align with the aspirations, potential, and socio-cultural characteristics of the local community. The delegation of authority from the central government to the regions can have both positive and negative impacts on the government and society. Therefore, a profound understanding of regional autonomy policy from a democratic perspective is necessary. Democracy plays an important role in the distribution of power in a country (Khalid et al., 2021). The authority of the state, which comes from the people, must be used to realize the welfare and prosperity of the people (Bharatee et al., 2022). In addition, regional autonomy policies must also be viewed from the perspective of Human Rights (HAM). In implementing regional autonomy, the fulfillment of basic rights within human rights, which includes civil and political rights as well as economic, social, and cultural rights, must be taken into account. By considering both perspectives, it is expected that the implementation of regional autonomy can enhance the welfare of the community in accordance with the aspirations, potential, and socio-cultural character of each region (Liao et al., 2022).

Law No. 33 of 2004 on financial balance between the central and local governments states that with regional autonomy, local governments are expected to become more independent and reduce dependence on the central government, both in funding development and in managing local finances (Wang et al., 2024). Local governments at the district/city level consist of district/city governments and the Regional House of Representatives (DPRD) of districts/cities. According to Law No. 9 of 2015, local governments have the rights, authorities, and obligations to regulate and manage government affairs and the interests of the local community in accordance with prevailing regulations. Regional autonomy is defined as the rights, authorities, and obligations granted to autonomous regions to regulate and manage their own government affairs and the interests of the local community in accordance with statutory provisions. The essence of regional autonomy is to provide freedom to the regions in making broader decisions while remaining accountable, in order to manage the resources they possess based on the interests, priorities, and potential of the region (Anthias, 2022). Regional autonomy is interpreted as the authority of autonomous regions to independently manage and govern the interests of the local community based on the aspirations of the people (Synthesa & Hartono, 2023).

In the distribution of state power, there are two types of division: vertical and horizontal. In horizontal power distribution, state power is divided into several branches according to the functions of certain state institutions, such as the legislative, executive, and judiciary, based on the principle of check and balance. Meanwhile, in vertical power distribution, a relationship is formed between centers of power and their branches within a hierarchical system ("top-down"). This vertical power distribution includes the delegation of a portion of authority from the center to the regions to implement policies that have been established by the center. In its implementation, local governments face several factors, one of which is the quality of the human resources as essential performers in local government administration (Bonal et al., 2023). Humans play a central role as the main subjects in every government activity, acting as key actors and drivers in implementing governmental mechanisms. For governance to align with its established goals, the quality of human resources as implementers or subjects is crucial. "Good quality" in this context encompasses two primary aspects. First, individuals must possess a strong mentality and moral character, characterized by honesty, a deep sense of responsibility toward their work, and the ability to serve as public servants. Second, they must have adequate skills and abilities to perform government tasks efficiently and effectively.

In addition to human resources, financial factors are equally significant in government activities. Finance refers to all rights and resources related to financial aspects, including sources of revenue, the availability of sufficient funds, and financial management aligned with applicable laws and objectives. Financial resources are vital, as almost no government activity can be executed without incurring costs. The greater the availability of funds, the more activities or tasks can be realized. To achieve effective regional governance and fulfill autonomous responsibilities, financial factors must be regarded as essential prerequisites that cannot be overlooked. Together, the quality of human resources and financial management form the backbone of successful governance. (Baranes & Hazen, 2022).

The organizational factor referred to here pertains to the structural arrangement of organizational units, including officials, authority, tasks, and the relationships between units, all aimed at achieving specific goals. The achievement of regional development targets through autonomy policies faces numerous challenges that must be addressed by local governments. Each region encounters distinct challenges depending on its readiness and prevailing conditions. Some of the key constraints include inadequate and unstable regional institutions, which hinder the effective implementation of decentralization and regional autonomy. Additionally, limited development funds pose a significant challenge, especially as demands for accelerated development continue to rise. Basic facilities and infrastructure remain insufficient in several regions, while disparities in natural resource availability exacerbate inequalities across areas. Moreover, a shortage of quality human resources weakens regional competitiveness, curtails creativity, and stifles local innovation. Natural constraints, such as variations in resource potential, further contribute to regional disparities. Institutional weaknesses in regional management, coupled with investment barriers, also impede development efforts. Finally, limitations in regional financial sources within the Regional Revenue and Expenditure Budget (APBD) present another significant hurdle. Addressing these issues is critical for the successful implementation of regional autonomy and achieving sustainable regional development.

The principle of regional autonomy in Indonesia embodies the concept of broad autonomy, granting regions the authority to manage and regulate all governmental affairs except for those explicitly designated as the responsibility of the central government, as stipulated in Law Number 23 of 2014 on Regional Government. This autonomy allows regions to formulate local policies aimed at providing public services, fostering participation, encouraging community initiatives, and empowering communities, all with the ultimate objective of improving societal welfare.

One of the mechanisms supporting regional development is Government Cooperation with Business Entities (KPBU), which is governed by several key regulations. The primary legal foundation includes Presidential Regulation (Perpres) Number 38 of 2015, which sets the framework for such partnerships. Additionally, Regulation of the Minister of National Development Planning (PPN) Number 2 of 2020 provides amendments to earlier regulations, while Regulation of the Head of the Government Goods/Services Procurement Policy Agency Number 29 of 2018 specifies procedures for procuring business entities for infrastructure development under the KPBU scheme. These regulations enable initiatives led by Ministers, Regional Heads, or Agency Heads to facilitate infrastructure provision.

The types of infrastructure eligible for development through the KPBU scheme encompass a wide range of economic and social infrastructure, including transportation, roads, water resources, irrigation, drinking water, centralized and local wastewater management systems, waste management, telecommunications and information systems, electricity, oil and gas, renewable energy, energy conservation, urban facilities, educational facilities, sports and arts facilities, regional infrastructure, tourism, health, correctional facilities, and public housing. Through these diverse categories, the KPBU scheme plays a critical role in advancing regional and national development objectives.

Regarding road infrastructure, street lighting is implemented through a Government Cooperation with Business Entities (KPBU) scheme via a cooperation contract between the Government, acting as the Project Responsibility Holder (PJPK), and Business Entities. At the end of the cooperation period, the infrastructure that has been constructed will be handed over to the PJPK. The essence of this agreement is the proportional sharing of risks between the Government (through the PJPK) and the Business Entities. These risks are distributed to the party best able to manage, control, prevent, or absorb them. PJPK can be a government agency or an institution representing the Government in providing KPBU projects. The Business Entities involved can include State-Owned Enterprises (BUMN), Regional-Owned Enterprises (BUMD), private companies in the form of Limited Liability Companies, foreign legal entities, or cooperatives (Arban, 2021).

In KPBU contracts, Business Entities are responsible for various aspects of the project, such as financing, design, construction, operation, and maintenance. The scope of responsibility of the Business Entities will determine the form of project cooperation, which can include the operation and maintenance of facilities, as well as financing, provision, and operation of infrastructure. KPBU contracts typically have a long duration to ensure the return on investment made by the Business Entities.

In addition to the PJPK, there are other parties involved in the implementation of KPBU projects, including sponsors, financial institutions or banks, contractors, and the user community. Sponsors typically consist of consortia that have expertise and capability in executing infrastructure projects. Sponsors contribute funds in the form of equity to support the project. Financial institutions or banks provide financing in the form of loans. Contractors are responsible for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the project. The general public acts as users of the infrastructure services (Reuchamps et al., 2021).

In the implementation of KPBU for the provision of street lighting infrastructure, there are several stages, starting with the planning phase. In the planning process for KPBU, there are two important steps that must be carried out: project identification and the preparation of a Preliminary Study. The planning phase of KPBU aims to gather information related to the infrastructure needs that can be cooperated on with Business Entities, based on planning documents such as the RPJM (Medium-Term Development Plan), RKP (Annual Work Plan), Renstra (Strategic Plan), and Renja of Ministries/Agencies, as well as RPJMD (Regional Medium-Term Development Plan) and RKPD (Regional Development Work Plan). All of this must comply with the prevailing regulations and support the coordination of planning and the development of the KPBU plan, including transparency in information to the public regarding the plan.

The identification of potential projects for cooperation is carried out through the preparation of a Preliminary Study, which must contain at least a plan for the KPBU structure, financing scheme along with its sources, and a proposal plan for the KPBU, including schedule, process, and assessment methods. In this regard, the Minister, Head of the Agency, or Head of the Region is responsible for preparing the budget plan for the KPBU implementation in accordance with the regulations. This budget can come from the State Budget (APBN), Regional Budget (APBD), loans, grants, or other sources compliant with applicable regulations. Subsequently, the Minister, Head of the Agency, or Head of the Region identifies the infrastructure provision that will be cooperated under the KPBU scheme. During this identification process, they must prepare a preliminary study and conduct public consultations. The preliminary study must include at least needs analysis, compliance criteria, value for money criteria, business entity participation, potential revenue analysis and project financing schemes, as well as recommendations and follow-up plans.

The budgeting phase in the planning of KPBU by the Minister, Head of the Agency, Head of the Region, the board of directors of BUMN, or the board of directors of BUMD must also be carried out in accordance with applicable regulations. Furthermore, the Minister, Head of the Agency, Head of the Region, the board of directors of BUMN, or the board of directors of BUMD will decide whether the KPBU plan will be continued or not. If it is decided to proceed, the plan must be submitted to the Minister of National Development Planning or the Head of BPPN, accompanied by supporting documents as stipulated in the regulations. If the KPBU implementation is carried out by a region, this proposal must also be forwarded to the Minister of Home Affairs.

The final stage of Public-Private Partnership (PPP) planning involves the Minister of Planning compiling a list of PPP plans based on proposals from various entities, including the Minister, Head of the Agency, Head of the Region, the board of directors of State-Owned Enterprises (BUMN), or Regional-Owned Enterprises (BUMD). These proposals require government support and/or guarantees and are identified based on national development priorities. Subsequently, the Minister of Planning conducts a selection and assessment process to categorize PPP projects into two groups: projects ready for offer and those still in the preparation process. At this stage, the Minister, Head of the Agency, Head of the Region, or BUMN/BUMD acting as the Project Responsibility Holder (PJPK) forms a PPP team to assist with the preparation process.

The PPP team undertakes various responsibilities, including conducting initial studies and assessing final feasibility studies, managing PPP transaction activities until achieving financial close (excluding the procurement of the implementing business entity), providing regular reports to the PJPK through the PPP node, and coordinating with the PPP node to carry out tasks effectively. The role of the PJPK is crucial in ensuring that each project complies with regulations and meets both technical and financial feasibility criteria. The preparation stage demands good coordination among the central government, regional governments, and private entities to attract investor interest and ensure optimal community benefits.

However, the success of PPP project preparation largely depends on the capacity of regional governments to manage these projects, particularly during evaluation and in meeting the requirements necessary before offering the projects to business entities.

Challenges often arise due to capacity disparities between central and regional governments in technical and administrative understanding, impacting the effectiveness of PPP implementation across various levels.

The regulation of the Government Cooperation with Business Entities (KPBU) scheme at the regional level has several weaknesses that need to be addressed. One of the main weaknesses is the institutional capacity at the regional level, which is often still limited in understanding and applying the KPBU scheme. Many regional governments do not yet have sufficiently competent or trained human resources in KPBU project management, especially related to drafting agreements, risk assessment, and complex legal and financial aspects. This results in the KPBU implementation process in the regions often being slow, fraught with obstacles, or even failing due to a lack of understanding of the scheme's mechanisms.

Additionally, regulations at the regional level are often not harmonized with regulations at the central level, creating legal uncertainty for business entities partnering with regional governments. Inconsistency in the application of rules between the central and regional levels, as well as differences in licensing standards or local policies, further increases risks for investors. In some cases, regional governments have weaknesses in providing financial guarantees and budget limitations that can affect the project's feasibility, resulting in low interest from business entities to participate in KPBU projects. This underscores the need for improving technical and legal capacities at the regional level, as well as aligning regulations so that KPBU implementation in the regions can operate more effectively and be attractive to private investors.

Legal Challenges and Efforts Faced in the Implementation of Infrastructure Projects Through the Government Cooperation with Business Entities (KPBU) Scheme

Legal uncertainty is one of the main challenges faced in the implementation of infrastructure projects through the Government Cooperation with Business Entities (KPBU) scheme. This uncertainty is often caused by sudden regulatory or policy changes that can affect the operations and strategies of all parties involved in the project. In the context of KPBU, regulatory changes can occur at various levels, from laws governing the procurement of goods and services to specific policies related to the implementation of certain infrastructure projects. One of the most significant impacts of legal uncertainty is the disruption of the planning process. When the government issues new regulations or changes existing policies, business entities may need to reevaluate their plans, including cost-benefit analyses. This process is not only time-consuming but can also lead to delays in project implementation. On the other hand, government entities face challenges in adjusting their internal regulations to align with new regulatory changes, which can result in confusion in field implementation.

Legal uncertainty can affect investment decisions by business entities. Investors tend to avoid projects that carry high risks, including legal risks. When they doubt the stability of regulations or perceive the potential for sudden policy changes, they may choose to withdraw their investments or even cancel their plans to engage in the project. This can reduce private sector interest in participating in the KPBU scheme, which in turn can slow the development of much-needed infrastructure. Legal uncertainty may also contribute to a lack of transparency and accountability in project management. When regulations change abruptly, stakeholders may not fully understand their obligations and responsibilities, leading to issues in project implementation. This can create risks of corruption, abuse of power, or unethical decision-making, ultimately harming society and undermining public trust in the government.

Complex regulations represent one of the significant obstacles in implementing Government Cooperation with Business Entities (KPBU) projects. Complex legal procedures can create barriers for entrepreneurs and business entities in drafting contracts and executing projects. This is due to the myriad provisions and regulations that must be adhered to, ranging from national legislative regulations to local regulations that may vary by region. Ambiguities or complexities in these regulations often lead to difficulties in understanding applicable requirements, ultimately hindering project implementation.

One of the most problematic aspects is the contract drafting process. In the context of KPBU, contracts are crucial documents that serve as the foundation for the agreements between the government and business entities. However, convoluted contract drafting procedures can consume significant time and resources. Entrepreneurs may struggle to navigate the various provisions they must comply with, such as procurement regulations, environmental provisions, and technical requirements. As a result, they may require assistance from third parties, such as legal consultants or advisors, which adds costs and time to the project planning process. Furthermore, regulatory complexity can also pose legal risks for entrepreneurs. If entrepreneurs do not fully understand existing provisions, they may make mistakes in project execution, leading to breaches of contract or non-compliance with the law. This can not only result in administrative or legal sanctions but also damage the company's reputation and reduce their opportunities to participate in future projects. The legal uncertainties arising from regulatory complexity can diminish entrepreneurs' interest in engaging in KPBU projects, which in turn can slow the development of necessary infrastructure.

Additionally, complex regulations can increase the administrative burden on the government. To ensure compliance with applicable provisions, the government must conduct intensive supervision and evaluation of ongoing projects. This requires significant human and financial resources, which are often limited. If the government cannot conduct effective oversight, the potential for deviations or corruption in project implementation increases.

Dispute resolution is another significant challenge in the implementation of Government Cooperation with Business Entities (KPBU) projects. This process often experiences slow handling and inefficiency, which can negatively impact project continuity. Ambiguities in contracts, which serve as the legal foundation for the relationship between the government and business entities, can trigger disputes. When contracts are not clearly defined, differing interpretations of existing provisions can lead to conflicts concerning responsibilities, risk allocation, and the fulfillment of obligations by each party. One of the primary causes of slow dispute resolution is the complex and prolonged legal procedures. In many cases, the parties involved in a dispute must go through various stages, such as negotiation, mediation, and arbitration, before reaching a final decision. This process often takes months or even years, during which project implementation can come to a halt. The uncertainty that arises during this dispute period can result in financial losses for both parties and diminish investor trust in the investment climate within the infrastructure sector.

Moreover, the legal uncertainty caused by disputes can disrupt the working relationship between the government and business entities. When disputes arise, tensions usually occur that can hinder communication and collaboration between both parties. A good relationship between the government and business entities is essential for smooth project implementation, especially in the context of KPBU, where synergy between both parties is crucial. This tension can cause delays in decision-making and slow project progress, ultimately harming the community and end-users of the infrastructure services.

Inefficient dispute resolution can also negatively impact the reputation of both the government and business entities. Projects frequently hindered by disputes can attract negative attention from the media and the public, which can erode public trust in the government's ability to manage infrastructure projects. On the other hand, for business entities, involvement in legal disputes can tarnish their market image and affect their relationships with other stakeholders.

One of the significant challenges in the implementation of Government Cooperation with Business Entities (KPBU) projects is the uncertainty regarding funding guarantees from the government. In the KPBU scheme, funding is a critical element that must be well managed to ensure that projects proceed as planned. Uncertainty about the availability and sustainability of funding can become a barrier for business entities when planning and executing projects, as they need to ensure that the necessary funds for each project phase are readily available and timely.

In this context, business entities are highly dependent on assurances from the government regarding the funding agreed upon in the contract. When the government cannot provide certainty regarding budget allocations or if there are policy changes affecting funding, this can create doubts for business entities. This uncertainty not only has the potential to delay project implementation but can also pose significant financial risks for business entities. Without stable funding guarantees, business entities may struggle to make the necessary upfront investments to initiate projects, causing delays or even cancellations.

Furthermore, sustainable funding is also crucial for the operational phase of projects. Once infrastructure is built, business entities must ensure that funding for maintenance and operations is available to maintain the quality of services provided. If the government cannot guarantee adequate budget allocations for this phase, it may lead to infrastructure quality deterioration, negatively impacting the community that relies on the services. This situation can create dissatisfaction among the public and diminish trust in the government and business entities involved in the project.

To address this challenge, the government needs to create a clear and transparent framework regarding funding for KPBU projects. This can be achieved by developing an integrated budget planning process that includes adequate budget allocations for each project and ensures that funding guarantees are provided according to the agreed-upon plans. Additionally, the government should involve business entities in the funding planning process, allowing them to better understand the policies and budget allocations to be implemented.

In the implementation of Government Cooperation with Business Entities (KPBU) projects, the division of authority between the central and regional governments is a crucial issue that often becomes a source of conflict. This authority encompasses various aspects, including planning, implementation, and project oversight. Ambiguities or imbalances in this division of authority can hinder the effectiveness and efficiency of project execution, creating significant challenges for all parties involved.

Regional governments often find themselves in a difficult position, especially when they lack adequate authority to manage infrastructure projects. In many cases, regional governments may need to rely on decisions and policies set by the central government, which may not always align with local needs and conditions. This can lead to misalignment between central plans and on-the-ground realities, ultimately hampering project execution. For example, if regional governments are not granted the authority to formulate relevant policies, they may struggle to respond to local community needs in the context of ongoing projects.

Additionally, resource limitations at the regional government level can also hinder the implementation of KPBU projects. These resources include budgets, workforce, and technical expertise needed for effective project planning and execution. If regional governments lack sufficient resources, they may struggle to fulfill their responsibilities within the KPBU scheme. This situation can lead to frustration among business entities, which hope to collaborate effectively with regional governments to achieve common goals.

Conflict may also arise when there is an overlap of authority between the central and regional governments. For instance, if the central government makes decisions that directly impact projects being managed by regional governments without involving them in the decision-making process, it can create tensions and disagreements. The uncertainty about who is responsible for specific aspects of the project can lead to confusion and hinder project progress.

To address these challenges, it is important for the central government to develop clear policies regarding the division of authority in KPBU projects. These policies should consider the capacity and conditions of regional governments while providing them with opportunities to actively participate in project management. Building the capacity of regional governments through training and adequate funding is also a crucial step to enhance their effectiveness in exercising their existing authority.

The alignment of proposed projects with public policy is a fundamental aspect of implementing Government Cooperation with Business Entities (KPBU) projects. Every planned infrastructure project must not only address urgent community needs but should also be in line with the medium- and long-term development plans established by the government. Misalignment between proposed projects and public policy can result in serious problems in implementation and the long-term impacts of those projects.

First, the importance of this alignment lies in achieving national development goals. Established public policies reflect the government's vision and mission to enhance community welfare and drive economic growth. If proposed projects do not align with the direction of these policies, it will not only waste resources but also create dissatisfaction among the community. For example, infrastructure projects built without considering existing spatial plans or social needs can lead to negative impacts on the environment and communities, such as land displacement and decreased quality of life.

Delays in the project planning process also pose a significant challenge. When projects do not align with public policy, extra time is needed for adjustments and revisions. This process may involve various stakeholders, including the community, which can slow project implementation and hinder the realization of expected benefits. Furthermore, misalignments can create uncertainties for the business entities involved, which may need to readjust their business strategies and resource allocations.

To address these challenges, it is essential for the government to conduct thorough analyses of each proposed project within the context of applicable public policies. This process should involve consultations with various stakeholders, including communities, government agencies, and the private sector, to ensure that proposed projects not only meet infrastructure needs but also align with broader development plans. In doing so, proposed projects can significantly contribute to achieving development goals and ensure effective resource utilization.

Unhealthy competition in the procurement of Government Cooperation with Business Entities (KPBU) projects is a significant challenge in implementing infrastructure projects. Unfair competition often arises from harmful practices such as collusion, corruption, and abuse of power. This not only impacts business entities striving to operate fairly and legally but can also undermine the quality and sustainability of the projects themselves.

One consequence of unhealthy competition is the creation of an unfair business climate for business entities that wish to compete fairly. Businesses that prioritize integrity and business ethics may find themselves at a disadvantage when facing competitors who engage in dishonest practices to win contracts. For instance, if there are entrepreneurs who collude with government officials to secure projects, then businesses operating transparently will struggle to compete. This situation can result in the neglect of fairness and transparency principles in procurement, which in turn can diminish the quality and efficiency of the resulting projects.

Additionally, unhealthy competition can affect the quality of the final project outcomes. When business entities are compelled to lower their operational standards to remain competitive, it can result in projects that do not meet expected quality levels. In the long term, low-quality projects can lead to high maintenance costs, infrastructure damage, and even public safety threats. Therefore, it is essential to create an environment that encourages healthy competition, where all business entities have an equal opportunity to participate and compete fairly.

To address these challenges, decisive actions from the government are required to enforce regulations and ensure transparency in procurement processes. Strict oversight of the implementation of KPBU project procurements must be carried out to prevent collusion and corruption practices. Additionally, the government can encourage broader participation from business entities by introducing more transparent and inclusive procurement mechanisms. In this way, healthy competition can be created, ultimately resulting in better and more sustainable infrastructure projects.

CONCLUSION

The implementation of regional autonomy in Indonesia represents an important step in developing a governance system that is more responsive and accountable to the needs of local communities. Through regional autonomy, local governments are granted the authority to manage and address governmental affairs and community interests in accordance with the aspirations, potentials, and socio-cultural characteristics of their respective regions. However, the challenges faced in implementing regional autonomy, such as the quality of human resources, funding availability, and limited infrastructure, need to be addressed to ensure that regional development goals can be effectively achieved.

In the context of Government Cooperation with Business Entities (KPBU), there is a legal framework that supports the execution of infrastructure projects involving collaboration between the government and the private sector. KPBU offers the potential for enhanced efficiency and effectiveness in the provision of public services through a proportional risk-sharing model among the involved parties. Therefore, a deep understanding of the policies and implementation of KPBU is essential to ensure that the resulting projects can meet community needs and enhance overall welfare.

The success of implementing regional autonomy and KPBU greatly relies on the involvement of all stakeholders, including the central government, local governments, business entities, and the community. Strong support from the central government, in terms of regulations and funding, will strengthen the capacity of local governments in carrying out their autonomous duties. Additionally, it is important to ensure that the principles of democracy and Human Rights (HR) are applied at every stage of policy implementation, in order to create an inclusive and just governance system.

The implementation of Government Cooperation with Business Entities (KPBU) has shown that legal uncertainty, regulatory complexity, slow dispute resolution, uncertainty in funding guarantees, and unclear division of authority between the central and local governments are the main obstacles to infrastructure project implementation. Legal uncertainty can hinder planning and investment decisions, as well as reduce transparency and accountability. Meanwhile, complicated regulations can complicate contract drafting processes and increase administrative burdens for the government. Inefficient dispute resolution processes can also potentially harm the relationship between the government and business entities, affecting their reputations. Furthermore, challenges related to funding guarantees and project alignment with public policy can result in delays and dissatisfaction among the community. Lastly, unhealthy competition in project procurement poses a threat to the quality and sustainability of projects, which can harm all parties involved.

REFERENCES

Al-Dahabreh, N., Sayed, M. A., Sarieddine, K., Elhattab, M., Khabbaz, M. J., Atallah, R. F., & Assi, C. (2024). A Data-Driven Framework for Improving Public EV Charging Infrastructure: Modeling and Forecasting. *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, *25*(6), 5935–5948. https://doi.org/10.1109/TITS.2023.3337324

Andyani, R. A., Setiawan, & Ratnasari, V. (2023). *Estimation of random effect probit panel parameter using adaptive Gauss Hermite quadrature integration (Case study: Provincial economic in Indonesia)*. 080022. https://doi.org/10.1063/5.0106043

Anthias, P. (2022). The Pluri-Extractivist State: Regional Autonomy and the Limits of Indigenous Representation in Bolivia’s Gran Chaco Province. *Journal of Latin American Studies*, *54*(1), 125–154. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022216X21000997

Anwar, M. S., Ruhtiani, M., & Hendriana, R. (2023). Carbon: Integrative Management of Coastal Ecosystems Based on Regional Autonomy. *Jambe Law Journal*, *6*(2), 185–204. https://doi.org/10.22437/jlj.6.2.185-204

Arban, E. (2021). Sovereignty and Autonomy of Constituent Units in Federal and Regional Systems: A Case Study of Italy. In T. B. Fenwick & A. C. Banfield (Eds.), *Beyond Autonomy* (pp. 47–66). Brill | Nijhoff. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004446755_005

Baranes, A. I., & Hazen, T. (2022). Regional Intergovernmental Organization Response to COVID-19: The Impact of Neoliberalism on Bureaucratic Autonomy. *Review of Radical Political Economics*, *54*(4), 420–428. https://doi.org/10.1177/04866134221114692

Barsasella, D., Iman, A. T., Fadly, F., Uddin, M., Mohammed, A., Shaik, T., Saputra, H., Malwade, S., Dhar, E., Zakiah, Nurhadi, Jonnagaddala, J., & Syed-Abdul, S. (2022). Information Flow and Data Gaps in COVID-19 Recording and Reporting at National and Provincial Levels in Indonesia. *Healthcare*, *10*(2), 204. https://doi.org/10.3390/healthcare10020204

Battista, D., & Uva, G. (2023). Exploring the Legal Regulation of Social Media in Europe: A Review of Dynamics and Challenges—Current Trends and Future Developments. *Sustainability*, *15*(5), 4144. https://doi.org/10.3390/su15054144

Bharatee, A., K. Ray, P., & Ghosh, A. (2022). A Power Management Scheme for Grid-connected PV Integrated with Hybrid Energy Storage System. *Journal of Modern Power Systems and Clean Energy*, *10*(4), 954–963. https://doi.org/10.35833/MPCE.2021.000023

Bonal, X., Pagès, M., Verger, A., & Zancajo, A. (2023). Regional policy trajectories in the Spanish education system: Different uses of relative autonomy. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, *31*. https://doi.org/10.14507/epaa.31.8031

Busarova, O. R., & Sennikovskaya, D. V. (2023). Dynamics of the Attitude of Students of the Faculty of Legal Psychology to Study in Different Modes of Study Caused by the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Psychology and Law*, *13*(1), 77–93. https://doi.org/10.17759/psylaw.2023130106

Düvel, J. A., Gensorowsky, D., Hasemann, L., & Greiner, W. (2022). Lösungsansätze für den Zugang digitaler Gesundheitsanwendungen zur Gesetzlichen Krankenversicherung: Eine qualitative Studie. *Das Gesundheitswesen*, *84*(01), 64–74. https://doi.org/10.1055/a-1341-1085

Gazali, & Kumano, M. (2023). Quantifying the Dynamics of Ecosystem Services Value in Response to Decentralization and Regional Autonomy in Indonesia: A Case Study of Southeast Sulawesi Province. In K. Ujikawa, M. Ishiwatari, & E. V. Hullebusch (Eds.), *Environment and Sustainable Development* (pp. 363–382). Springer Nature Singapore. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-99-4101-8_28

Goonetillake, J. F., Ren, G., & Li, H. (2023). An Integration of Business Processes and Information Management for Improving the Efficiency and Reliability of Infrastructure. *Applied Sciences*, *13*(24), 12974. https://doi.org/10.3390/app132412974

Hirotsu, Y., Nagakubo, Y., Maejima, M., Shibusawa, M., Hosaka, K., Sueki, H., Mochizuki, H., & Omata, M. (2024). Changes in Viral Dynamics Following the Legal Relaxation of COVID-19 Mitigation Measures in Japan From Children to Adults: A Single Center Study, 2020–2023. *Influenza and Other Respiratory Viruses*, *18*(3), e13278. https://doi.org/10.1111/irv.13278

Khalid, M. R., Khan, I. A., Hameed, S., Asghar, M. S. J., & Ro, J. (2021). A Comprehensive Review on Structural Topologies, Power Levels, Energy Storage Systems, and Standards for Electric Vehicle Charging Stations and Their Impacts on Grid. *IEEE Access*, *9*, 128069–128094. https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2021.3112189

Konečný, P. (2023). Examining Regional Autonomy through Policies: Evidence from the Czech Republic. *Politologický Časopis - Czech Journal of Political Science*, *2*, 73–94. https://doi.org/10.5817/PC2023-2-73

Krüger, S. (2022). Statutory and Operational Damage Stability by a Monte Carlo Based Approach. *Journal of Marine Science and Engineering*, *11*(1), 16. https://doi.org/10.3390/jmse11010016

Kuswanto, K. (2024). Analysis of The Efficiency Performance Of Cooperatives In Indonesia: Analysis Of Provincial Cooperatives Using The Data Envelopment Analysis Approach. *International Journal of Industrial Engineering & Production Research*, *35*(3). https://doi.org/10.22068/ijiepr.35.3.1858

Li, S., Chang, Z., Wang, X., Bu, X., Chen, M., & Zhang, J. (2022). A Toughness-Evaluating and Toughness-Improving Method of Power Security Infrastructures.

2022 2nd International Conference on Computer, Control and Robotics (ICCCR) , 146–150. https://doi.org/10.1109/ICCCR54399.2022.9790225

Liao, K., Lu, D., Wang, M., & Yang, J. (2022). A Low-Pass Virtual Filter for Output Power Smoothing of Wind Energy Conversion Systems. *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Electronics*, *69*(12), 12874–12885. ‘https://doi.org/10.1109/TIE.2021.3139177

Lima, A., Barbosa, C., Sobrinho, A., Calado, R., & Sobral, A. P. (2021). Capacity Management as a Tool for Improving Infrastructure in the Lean Healthcare: A Systematic Review. In A. Dolgui, A. Bernard, D. Lemoine, G. Von Cieminski, & D. Romero (Eds.), *Advances in Production Management Systems. Artificial Intelligence for Sustainable and Resilient Production Systems* (Vol. 631, pp. 298–304). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-85902-2_32

Ma, J., Zhao, T., Hao, Y., Qin, W., Yu, H., Du, M., Liu, Y., Zhang, L., Mu, S., Li, C., & Li, J. (2024). Enhancing Autonomy Capability in Regional Power Grids: A Strategic Planning Approach with Multiple Autonomous Evaluation Indexes. *Energy Engineering*, *121*(9), 2449–2477. https://doi.org/10.32604/ee.2024.051244

Mancini, A., Galdelli, A., Capello, E., Du Mutel De Pierrepont Franzetti, I. D., Primatesta, S., Fasano, G., Opromolla, R., Causa, F., & Vitiello, F. (2024). 4IPLAY - Improving Intelligent Infrastructure Inspection by Pushing UAS Level of Autonomy in Challenging Environments. *2024 11th International Workshop on Metrology for AeroSpace (MetroAeroSpace)*, 278–283. https://doi.org/10.1109/MetroAeroSpace61015.2024.10591600

Mutimba, K., Watanabe, T., & Chand, M. B. (2024). Land Use Land Cover (LULC) Change Dynamics Associated with Mining Activities in Kitwe District and Adequacy of the Legal Framework on Mine Closure in Zambia. *Earth*, *5*(2), 110–132. https://doi.org/10.3390/earth5020006

Nugraha, A. (2024). Integrated Coastal Management In The Current Regional Autonomy Law Regime In Indonesia: Context Of Community Engagement. *Australian Journal of Maritime & Ocean Affairs*, *16*(4), 508–527. https://doi.org/10.1080/18366503.2023.2283355

Nurrochmat, D. R., Pribadi, R., Siregar, H., Justianto, A., & Park, M. S. (2021). Transformation of Agro-Forest Management Policy under the Dynamic Circumstances of a Two-Decade Regional Autonomy in Indonesia. *Forests*, *12*(4), 419. https://doi.org/10.3390/f12040419

Potiker, S. L. (2023). Exit-With-Autonomy or Autonomy-Without-Exit? Divergent Political Trajectories in Rojava and the Kurdish Regional Government. *Critical Sociology*, *49*(1), 115–132. https://doi.org/10.1177/08969205211048547

Rajput, N., & Bhalla, G. S. (2024). Testing the Relationship Between Income and Expenditure of a Statutory Organization: Cointegration and Causality Approach. *Journal of the Knowledge Economy*, *15*(1), 4338–4355. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13132-023-01201-3

Reuchamps, M., Boerjan, H., Niessen, C., & Randour, F. (2021). More or less regional autonomy? A qualitative analysis of citizen arguments towards (de)centralization in Belgium. *Comparative European Politics*, *19*(2), 225–247. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41295-020-00234-1

Ricca, M. (2023). Human Rights, Legal Chorology and Modern Art: The Dis-Compositional Approach to the 'Visual' and the Worldwide Dynamics of Cultural Spaces. In M. Ricca, *Intercultural Spaces of Law* (Vol. 10, pp. 245–290). Springer Nature Switzerland. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-27436-7_5

Roberto Di Maria. (2021). La Potestà Legislativa Regionale, Fra (Endogena) Autonomia Politica Ed (Esogena) Attuazione Programmatica. *Le Regioni*, *1–2*, 115–125. https://doi.org/10.1443/101367

Setty, E., & Dobson, E. (2023). Department for Education Statutory Guidance for Relationships and Sex Education in England: A Rights-Based Approach? *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, *52*(1), 79–93. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10508-022-02340-5

Stoyan, A. T. (2024). Decentralization in Bolivia: Popular Support for Regional Autonomy. In C. N. Avellaneda & R. A. Bello-Gómez (Eds.), *Handbook on Subnational Governments and Governance* (pp. 70–88). Edward Elgar Publishing. https://doi.org/10.4337/9781803925370.00013

Sulfikar, S., Junarto, G., Syam, M. A., Efendy, A. Z., Sahrir, M., & Ningsih, H. (2022). A Snapshot of Antibiotic Resistances in Air Particulate of a Provincial Capital City, Indonesia. *Jurnal Kimia Valensi*, *8*(1), 42–53. https://doi.org/10.15408/jkv.v8i1.24559

Syarif, A. (2023). Fiscal Decentralization and Corruption: The Facts of Regional Autonomy Policies in Indonesia. *Jurnal Ilmu Sosial Dan Ilmu Politik*, *27*(1), 60. https://doi.org/10.22146/jsp.69007

Synthesa, P., & Hartono, D. (2023). The Effect of Regional Characteristics and Women's Autonomy on Infant and Young Child Feeding Practice. *Amerta Nutrition*, *7*(2), 230–239. https://doi.org/10.20473/amnt.v7i2.2023.230-239

Thai, L. (2023). *Corporate Governance and Statutory Derivative Actions: Comparative Approach to Shareholder Litigation* (1st ed.). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003430063

Wang, J., Lan, J., Wang, L., Lin, Y., Hao, M., Zhang, Y., Xiang, Y., & Qin, L. (2024). Voltage Hierarchical Control Strategy for Distribution Networks Based on Regional Autonomy and Photovoltaic-Storage Coordination. *Sustainability*, *16*(16), 6758. https://doi.org/10.3390/su16166758

Yuwono. (2023). Determination of the Provincial Sea Area Boundary in Indonesia Archipelagic Regions using Cartometric Method. *IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science*, *1127*(1), 012039. https://doi.org/10.1088/1755-1315/1127/1/012039