

Research Horizon

ISSN: 2808-0696 (p), 2807-9531 (e)

Research Horizon

Volume: 06

Issue: 05

Year: 2026

Page: 2289-2300

Citation:

Meisari, W. C., & Listiana, Y. D. (2026). The regional autonomy paradox in green economy integration: A multi-level governance analysis of West Kalimantan. *Research Horizon*, 6(5), 2289-2300.

Article History:

Received: September 7, 2026

Revised: October 6, 2026

Accepted: October 16, 2026

Online since: October 25, 2026

The Regional Autonomy Paradox in Green Economy Integration: A Multi-Level Governance Analysis of West Kalimantan

Winda Chelsea Meisari^{1*}, Yunika Depri Listiana¹

¹ Department of Public Administration, Politeknik Negeri Pontianak, Pontianak, Indonesia

* Corresponding author: Winda Chelsea Meisari (cmwinda@polnep.ac.id)

Abstract

The implementation of the green economy under regional autonomy presents a paradox between local governments' decision-making space and the need for integrated national policies. This qualitative study examines the dispersion of authority, intergovernmental interactions, and regional decision space in integrating the green economy in West Kalimantan Province. Data were collected through semi-structured interviews, observations, and document analysis involving key informants from the Ministry of Home Affairs, particularly the Directorates General of Regional Autonomy and Regional Development, and subnational institutions, including Bapperida, the Governance Bureau, and the Environment and Forestry Office of West Kalimantan. Data were analyzed using Creswell's data analysis spiral. The findings show that although the division of authority is normatively clear, implementation remains fragmented because green economy responsibilities are distributed across multiple sectors. Existing coordination mechanisms have not produced substantive policy integration, while regional decision space is constrained by sectoral regulations, fiscal limitations, and limited institutional resources. Green economy integration remains largely confined to formal planning documents and has not driven cross-sectoral structural transformation. The autonomy paradox arises as regional governments are expected to accelerate economic growth while preserving environmental sustainability despite uneven authority distribution and inadequate fiscal incentives.

Keywords

Decision Space, Green Economy, Multi-Level Governance, Policy Integration, Regional Autonomy.

1. Introduction

The green economy agenda in Indonesia forms part of the country's national development transformation toward a low-carbon economy aligned with global commitments, including the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and Indonesia's Nationally Determined Contribution (NDC). This transformation requires strong cross-sectoral integration in national and regional development planning (Nabila et al., 2026). Operationally, this commitment has been translated into various strategic policy instruments, ranging from the implementation of a carbon tax following the ratification of the Paris Agreement to green financing mechanisms. The influence of this agenda is also reflected in the 2020–2024 National Medium Term Development Plan (*Rencana Pembangunan Jangka Menengah Nasional/RPJMN*) through the Low Carbon Development Indonesia (LCDI) initiative and is further reinforced in the 2025–2045 National Long-Term Development Plan (*Rencana Pembangunan Jangka Panjang Nasional/RPJPN*) (Bappenas, 2019). However, despite the issuance of regulations such as Presidential Regulation Number 98 of 2021 on the Economic Value of Carbon, Indonesia still lacks a single umbrella law that explicitly governs the green economy. Consequently, green economy policies remain dispersed across various sectoral regulations.

The cross-sectoral and dispersed nature of this agenda means that green economy implementation does not fall within a single, integrated policy domain. Instead, it involves multiple actors across different levels of government. This governance complexity becomes even more pronounced within Indonesia's decentralized system, as regulated by Law Number 23 of 2014 on Regional Government. The division of authority among the central, provincial, and regency or municipal governments in resource-related sectors, such as energy, forestry, and environmental management, creates a multilayered governance structure (Di Gregorio et al., 2019).

This multi-level governance structure can lead to policy fragmentation and inconsistency at the local level (Liesbet & Gary, 2003). This situation gives rise to a fundamental governance paradox: a persistent tension between granting subnational governments the discretion to determine their own development priorities and ensuring coherent and systemic national policy integration (Faguet, 2014; Hooghe & Marks, 2016). From a Multi-Level Governance (MLG) perspective, this mismatch may create an institutional misfit, in which central policy designs do not align with local implementation realities and the resulting discrepancies are not fully recognized by the actors involved. As a result, failures to achieve environmental targets are often attributed narrowly to technical and operational constraints, although they may fundamentally stem from structural weaknesses in intergovernmental relations.

This governance paradox is clearly evident in West Kalimantan Province. On the one hand, West Kalimantan faces substantial ecological challenges resulting from deforestation and environmental pressures over the past two decades (Austin et al., 2019). On the other hand, its regional economy remains heavily dependent on natural resource-based activities. Data from BPS Provinsi Kalimantan Barat (2026) indicate that the regional economy grew by 5.39%, with the mining and quarrying sector expanding by 31.48%, while the agriculture, forestry, and fisheries sector accounted for 21.66% of the Gross Regional Domestic Product (GRDP). This pattern demonstrates that the province's reliance on extractive and land-based sectors remains high despite efforts to promote a green economic transformation.

The Provincial Government of West Kalimantan has responded to the sustainable development agenda through several local policy instruments and initiatives, including Regional Regulation Number 6 of 2018 on Sustainable Land-Based Business Management, participation in REDD+ schemes, and the promotion of industrial downstreaming. In practice, however, these efforts remain

predominantly sectoral and project-based and have therefore not yet produced an integrated structural transformation (Tovar, 2015; Ravikumar et al., 2018; Mulyadi et al., 2026). These local implementation barriers cannot be understood solely through the internal dynamics of the region. Rather, they are shaped by interactions between regional and central governments, as well as by policy designs and coordination mechanisms established across different levels of government.

Based on these conditions, a theoretical and empirical gap remains in understanding how intergovernmental interactions and regional decision-making autonomy influence the depth of green economy integration within a decentralized framework. A single-level analysis focusing exclusively on regional governments is insufficient to fully explain these complexities. Therefore, this study aims to analyze how multi-level governance shapes the integration of the green economy in West Kalimantan Province. From an academic perspective, this study contributes to a better understanding of the autonomy–integration paradox while also providing practical insights into strengthening intergovernmental policy coordination.

2. Literature Review

2.1. Multi-Level Governance (MLG)

The concept of Multi-Level Governance (MLG) was introduced by Marks (1993) to explain European integration, particularly the dispersion of authority from nation-states to supranational and subnational levels. MLG challenges the state-centric paradigm by asserting that public authority is distributed and overlaps across multiple tiers of government (Piattoni, 2009; Panke & Stapel, 2024). Consequently, it offers an analytical framework for examining the distribution of authority, coordination mechanisms, and actor networks in policy implementation. Originally developed within the context of the European Union, MLG is now widely applied in environmental governance, health, and public administration (Saito-Jensen, 2015). It underscores the necessity of vertical coordination across government levels and horizontal coordination across sectors and non-state actors to address complex, transboundary issues such as climate change and sustainable development that cannot be effectively managed by a single tier of government (Hartono et al., 2023).

Hooghe and Marks (2016) distinguish between two primary typologies of MLG. Type I comprises general-purpose jurisdictions characterized by hierarchical, stable, and non-overlapping authority. In contrast, Type II consists of task-specific, flexible, and polycentric jurisdictions with overlapping authority. Substantively, MLG operates through vertical interactions among local, national, and supranational entities, as well as horizontal interactions involving civil society and private sector actors. Ultimately, the effectiveness of MLG hinges on authority distribution, intergovernmental coordination, and multi-actor engagement. Accordingly, this study focuses on the dispersion of authority and inter-level interaction as the primary analytical dimensions to examine the structural and relational dynamics within a multi-level system (Di Gregorio et al., 2019).

2.2. Decentralization and Regional Autonomy

Decentralization is a multifaceted concept that transcends conventional political ideologies. It encapsulates aspirations for popular sovereignty while simultaneously expressing resistance to centralized state dominance (Di Bona et al., 2023). Although initially implemented with limited empirical backing, decentralization has been widely recognized as a mechanism to enhance public participation, alleviate civic alienation, and bridge the distance between decision-makers and their constituents (Faguet, 2014; Mookherjee, 2015). Decentralization involves the transfer of authority, responsibilities, and resources from central governments to subnational authorities or non-state actors. Encompassing political, administrative, fiscal, and

technological dimensions, it aims to improve policy responsiveness, allocative efficiency, and institutional legitimacy (Gadenne & Singhal, 2014).

Regional autonomy is the normative expression of political decentralization, granting legislative and decision-making authority to subnational governments within a state's constitutional framework. The integration of its political, administrative, and fiscal dimensions enables subnational governments to function as autonomous institutions rather than passive extensions of the central bureaucracy (Faguet, 2014). Analytically, regional autonomy can be examined through the lens of decision space, which refers to the degree of flexibility or discretion available to local authorities in strategic planning, budget allocation, and development priority setting (Bossert, 1998; Seshadri et al., 2016). In this study, decision space is utilized to assess the de facto autonomy of subnational governments and the extent to which it fosters policy innovation within a multi-level governance framework.

2.3. Green Economy

The green economy represents a development paradigm that seeks to improve social well-being and equity while reducing environmental risks and ecological pressures (Adamowicz, 2022; Basthiani & Pangestuti, 2024; Marpaung et al., 2024). Unlike conventional neoclassical approaches that emphasize continuous economic growth and capital accumulation, it promotes the fulfillment of human needs within ecological limits. Wall (2006) conceptualizes the green economy through four core pillars: ecological sustainability, social justice, decentralization, and peace. These principles emphasize ecosystem protection, equitable resource allocation, localized decision-making, and the reduction of environmentally harmful activities (Wall, 2006; Kenis & Lievens, 2015). The green economy also encompasses strategic sectors, including renewable energy, residential energy efficiency, organic agriculture, sustainable water management, waste recycling, clean transportation, and ecosystem conservation.

In regional development, green economy principles need to be embedded in development planning and sectoral policy frameworks rather than treated as separate environmental objectives (Chairunnisa & Kusumadewi, 2024). Such integration requires institutional and financial support because regulatory commitment alone cannot drive green transformation. Desdiani et al. (2021) emphasize the importance of financial instruments, fiscal arrangements, and investment and financing mechanisms in supporting climate and environmental initiatives at the regional level. Similarly, green and low-carbon development should be incorporated across policies and institutions rather than implemented as standalone environmental policies (Dermawan et al., 2026). Therefore, implementing a regional green economy requires policy integration, institutional coordination, and appropriate financing mechanisms to translate sustainability principles into concrete development outcomes.

3. Methods

This study employed a qualitative research design to examine the transformation of green economy governance through a multi-level governance perspective in West Kalimantan Province. The research locations and participants were selected purposively based on the multi-level governance framework. The selection of these key actors was intended to capture the interactions between central-level policy formulators and regional policy implementers comprehensively. The involvement of central government institutions was essential because of their roles in formulating regional autonomy policies, allocating authority, establishing Norms, Standards, Procedures, and Criteria (*Norma, Standar, Prosedur, dan Kriteria*/NSPK), and providing supervision and guidance. Meanwhile, the involvement of provincial-level institutions was necessary to assess the extent to which national regulations and

green economy targets were translated into regional planning documents, as well as to examine how regional decision space was operationalized in the implementation of local programs. Key informants were selected based on their direct involvement in regional autonomy, green economy policy formulation, intergovernmental coordination, regional planning, budgeting, or program implementation. Informants were recruited purposively by identifying institutions and officials whose roles were directly related to the research objectives and subsequently contacting them to request participation.

Primary and secondary data were collected through an integrated approach combining interviews, document analysis, and observation. The interview guide was developed based on the MLG framework and covered authority distribution, intergovernmental interaction, decision space, policy coordination, and green economy implementation. Semi-structured interviews using open-ended guides were conducted with key informants at both the central and subnational levels to systematically examine their perspectives. The interviews focused on authority distribution, coordination mechanisms, and the translation of national policies into regional programs.

Document analysis focused on a critical review of regulations, development planning documents, including the RPJMN and RPJMD, fiscal budget structures, and program implementation reports. Documents were selected based on their official status, relevance to regional autonomy and green economy policies, and connection to planning, budgeting, coordination, and program implementation. This analysis was conducted to identify governance tensions and potential regional budget dependencies on extractive sectors. In addition, observations were conducted through direct engagement with coordination forums, planning processes, and decision-making activities to identify patterns of intergovernmental interaction within their institutional contexts.

All qualitative data were analyzed using the Data Analysis Spiral approach developed by Creswell and Poth (2018), with ATLAS.ti was used to support systematic data management and analysis. The analytical process was iterative and non-linear, beginning with the organization of interview transcripts and the classification of documents, followed by in-depth reading, reflective memoing, and the coding of units of meaning into key theoretical themes, including authority dispersion, inter-level interaction, and decision space. Initial codes were assigned to meaningful data segments, compared and grouped into categories, and refined into analytical themes. Data from interviews, documents, and observations were triangulated to strengthen interpretation. In the final stage, the data were synthesized and interpreted by linking the findings to the MLG theoretical framework to examine the regional autonomy paradox in West Kalimantan Province's green economy transition.

4. Results

4.1. Dispersion of Authority

This research framework positions authority dispersion and inter-level interaction as the primary dimensions of Multi-Level Governance (MLG) that shape the decision space available to the regional government. As Marks (1993) and Panke and Stapel (2024) emphasize, MLG views public authority as distributed across multiple levels rather than concentrated within a single government tier. The scope of this discretionary space subsequently influences the extent of green economy integration in West Kalimantan Province. The regional autonomy paradox emerges when the formal dispersion of authority is not matched by sufficient flexibility, fiscal support, and coordination capacity, leading to policy fragmentation driven by poorly integrated sectoral interests (Hooghe & Marks, 2016; Di Gregorio et al., 2019).

The research findings indicate that authority over the green economy agenda has been distributed among the central, provincial, and regency/city governments based on the formal division of governmental affairs. The central government establishes national policies and issues Norms, Standards, Procedures, and Criteria, while provincial governments manage affairs that extend across regency/city boundaries. Meanwhile, regency/city governments administer affairs within their respective jurisdictions. Although this division has a normative foundation, it is not always accompanied by operational clarity on accountability for targets, responsibility for providing baseline data, funding sources, program implementation units, and integrated evaluation mechanisms. This condition reflects the MLG concern that dispersed authority requires effective institutional linkages and coordination across government levels (Piattoni, 2009; Di Gregorio et al., 2019).

The complexity of this dispersion is further intensified because the green economy is not positioned as a stand-alone policy but is instead distributed across various sectors, including the environment, forestry, energy, agriculture, plantations, mining, industry, transportation, spatial planning, investment, and waste management. Consequently, each Regional Government Agency (*Organisasi Perangkat Daerah*/OPD) implements components of the green economy agenda according to its respective sectoral and technical mandate. Within this institutional architecture, the Regional Development Planning, Research, and Innovation Agency (*Badan Perencanaan Pembangunan, Riset, dan Inovasi Daerah*/BPPRID) plays a coordinating role in aligning these diverse governmental affairs through regional development planning documents. However, the cross-sectoral integration of targets, programs, data, budgets, and evaluation systems has not yet been consistently established, despite the importance of mainstreaming green development across institutions and policies (Chairunnisa & Kusumadewi, 2024; Dermawan et al., 2026).

In strategic sectors such as forestry, mining, energy, and natural resources, key authority remains primarily vested in the central and provincial governments. This arrangement restricts the decision-making space of regency/city governments in several areas, even though they experience the social and environmental impacts of natural resource exploitation directly at the local level. The interview findings confirm that this limited authority may reduce the motivation of regency/city governments to allocate personnel, budgets, and institutional attention to matters that are no longer perceived as falling within their primary jurisdiction. These findings show a gap between the formal division of authority and the operational capacity of each level of government to exercise that authority effectively in practice. This distinction corresponds to Bossert's (1998) concept of decision space, in which formal authority does not necessarily translate into equivalent practical discretion, and is further supported by Faguet (2014) and Seshadri et al. (2016).

4.2. Intergovernmental Interaction

Interactions between the central and regional governments have been institutionalized through various formal forums and mechanisms, including Technical Coordination Meetings for Development Planning (*Rapat Koordinasi Teknis Perencanaan Pembangunan*/Rakortekrenbang), Development Planning Deliberations (*Musyawarah Perencanaan Pembangunan*/Musrenbang), National Development Planning Deliberations (*Musyawarah Perencanaan Pembangunan Nasional*/Musrenbangnas), the facilitation and evaluation of Regional Medium Term Development Plans and Regional Government Work Plans (*Rencana Kerja Pemerintah Daerah*/RKPD), consultations, technical assistance, guidance, monitoring and evaluation, and Regional Government Implementation Reports (*Laporan Penyelenggaraan Pemerintahan Daerah*/LPPD). These forums serve to align national development targets with geographical conditions, fiscal capacity, local

potential, and regional institutional readiness, reflecting the vertical coordination emphasized in multi-level governance (Saito-Jensen, 2015; Di Gregorio et al., 2019).

Although structured coordination mechanisms are in place, their outcomes have not yet been effectively translated into joint work programs, explicit divisions of responsibility, integrated data systems, coordinated budgeting arrangements, or agreements on cross-sectoral funding schemes. Vertically, coordination between the central government and the Provincial Government of West Kalimantan is more structured. By contrast, relations between the provincial government and regency/city governments continue to face challenges arising from disparities in human resource capacity, asymmetries in data availability, divergent development priorities, and limited fiscal capacity. This suggests that the existence of formal coordination mechanisms does not necessarily ensure substantive integration across governance levels (Di Gregorio et al., 2019; Ravikumar et al., 2018).

Horizontally, the green economy agenda continues to be narrowly perceived as the exclusive domain and responsibility of agencies responsible for environmental and forestry affairs. The active involvement of agencies responsible for key economic sectors, such as mining, energy, plantations, industry, transportation, and investment, has not reached a comparable level. Under these circumstances, Bapperida functions as a planning coordinator but lacks direct authority over budget allocations and the implementation of technical programs across individual regional agencies. This finding highlights the importance of horizontal coordination and institutional capacity in translating green economy objectives into integrated sectoral action (Piattoni, 2009; Chairunnisa & Kusumadewi, 2024; Dermawan et al., 2026).

4.3. Regional Government Decision Space

The Provincial Government of West Kalimantan demonstrates discretionary policy space (decision space) in determining development priorities, designing regional programs, allocating the Regional Revenue and Expenditure Budget (*Anggaran Pendapatan dan Belanja Daerah/APBD*), establishing strategic partnerships, and incorporating green economy principles into the RPJMD and RKPD. This discretion is reflected in the formulation of the Provincial REDD+ Strategy and Action Plan (SRAP REDD+), establishment of the provincial Forest Reference Emission Level (FREL), enactment of Regional Regulation Number 6 of 2018 on Sustainable Land-Based Business Management, designation of High Conservation Value (HCV) areas, and commitment to the FOLU Net Sink 2030 target. These initiatives indicate that regional autonomy gives local governments space to adapt sustainability priorities to regional conditions (Bossert, 1998; Faguet, 2014; Seshadri et al., 2016).

However, the exercise of this decision space remains constrained by NSPK provisions, the formal division of governmental affairs, national performance indicators, sectoral regulations, and budget-tagging requirements for central government fiscal transfers. Thus, regional authority is not exercised independently but remains embedded within vertically distributed governance arrangements. This finding reflects the MLG perspective that policy authority is dispersed across levels of government, requiring coordination between regional priorities and national policy frameworks (Hooghe & Marks, 2016; Di Gregorio et al., 2019; Panke & Stapel, 2024).

The findings further indicate a gap between de jure and de facto decision space. Although the Provincial Government possesses formal authority to formulate green-oriented policies, its capacity to implement these priorities is influenced by fiscal space, dependence on central transfers, baseline data quality, technical human resources, and access to green financing. This suggests that regional autonomy alone does not guarantee effective green economy integration. Rather, the depth of

integration depends on whether formal decision-making authority is supported by sufficient institutional and financial capacity (Bossert, 1998; Desdiani et al., 2021).

4.4. Green Economy Integration

Green economy principles have been integrated into West Kalimantan's development planning documents through the formulation of visions, missions, objectives, targets, programs, budget allocations, and Key Performance Indicators (*Indikator Kinerja Utama/IKU*) within the RPJMD and RKPD. This integration aligns with the view that green economy principles should be embedded in regional development planning rather than treated as separate environmental objectives (Chairunnisa & Kusumadewi, 2024). Concrete manifestations of these principles include programs to reduce Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions, improve land cover, develop integrated waste management systems, expand renewable energy, promote social forestry, and strengthen sustainable land-based business governance.

Nevertheless, this formal institutionalization still faces operational challenges. Several green economy indicators have not yet been operationalized, cross-sectoral emission baselines remain fragmented, institutional capacity for conducting environmental and economic impact analyses remains limited, and green budgeting instruments have not been comprehensively implemented. These challenges indicate that regulatory and planning commitments alone are insufficient without appropriate financial and institutional mechanisms (Desdiani et al., 2021). In addition, the implementation of the green economy agenda remains concentrated in the environmental and forestry sectors, while structural transformation in key economic sectors, such as mining, plantations, energy, industry, transportation, and investment, has not progressed at a comparable pace. This condition reinforces the need to mainstream green and low-carbon development across sectors and institutions rather than treating it as a standalone environmental agenda (Dermawan et al., 2026).

The provincial government is held accountable for achieving regional Green Economy Index indicators, even though data availability and program implementation depend heavily on regency/city governments and private-sector actors. This situation is further complicated by the fact that not all regional green economy indicators are mandatory for regency/city governments. The resulting mismatch between responsibility and actual decision-making authority reflects the broader decentralization challenge in which the transfer of responsibilities does not necessarily provide equivalent discretion and resources to exercise them effectively (Faguet, 2014). This phenomenon confirms the existence of an authority accountability gap, namely an imbalance between the provincial government's responsibility for achieving ultimate outcomes and its limited authority to require contributions from all regency/city governments.

5. Discussion

The findings indicate that the regional autonomy paradox in integrating the green economy in West Kalimantan emerges from the mismatch between formally dispersed authority and the capacity to exercise that authority effectively. This finding supports the MLG perspective, which views public authority as distributed across multiple levels rather than concentrated within a single government tier (Marks, 1993; Panke & Stapel, 2024). In West Kalimantan, central, provincial, and regency/city governments possess differentiated responsibilities, while green economy implementation simultaneously involves multiple sectoral agencies. Although this arrangement reflects the multi-level and overlapping nature of governance described by Hooghe and Marks (2016), the findings show that dispersion alone does not guarantee effective integration. Limited clarity regarding operational responsibilities, data ownership, funding, and evaluation creates

fragmentation across institutional boundaries. Thus, the findings extend the MLG perspective by demonstrating that dispersed authority requires mechanisms that connect responsibilities across levels and sectors.

The findings on intergovernmental interaction further demonstrate that formal coordination does not necessarily produce substantive governance integration. Rakortekrenbang, Musrenbang, RPJMD and RKPD evaluations, consultations, and technical assistance provide institutional channels for vertical interaction, consistent with the MLG emphasis on coordination across government levels (Saito-Jensen, 2015; Di Gregorio et al., 2019). However, these mechanisms have not consistently resulted in joint programs, integrated data, coordinated budgets, or explicit cross-sectoral responsibilities. This condition is particularly evident in horizontal coordination, where the green economy remains strongly associated with environmental and forestry agencies, while economic sectors such as mining, plantations, energy, transportation, industry, and investment remain less integrated. The limited authority of Bapperida over sectoral budgets and implementation further constrains its ability to function as an effective policy coordinator. These findings suggest that coordination capacity depends not only on the availability of formal forums but also on institutional authority to translate coordination into collective action.

The findings also reinforce the importance of decision space in understanding regional autonomy. Decentralization transfers authority, responsibilities, and resources to subnational governments, but the extent of actual autonomy depends on the discretion available to determine priorities, allocate resources, and implement policies (Faguet, 2014). Consistent with the decision-space perspective of Bossert (1998) and Seshadri et al. (2016), West Kalimantan retains formal space to formulate regional initiatives such as REDD+, FREL, sustainable land-based business management, and FOLU Net Sink 2030. Nevertheless, this space is constrained by NSPK, sectoral regulations, fiscal dependence, limited human resources, data limitations, and restricted financing access. The distinction between *de jure* and *de facto* decision space therefore explains why formal regional autonomy can coexist with limited implementation capacity. The autonomy paradox is consequently reflected in the coexistence of substantial formal responsibilities and constrained practical discretion.

The findings show that green economy integration requires more than incorporating it into regional planning documents. The green economy emphasizes ecological sustainability, social equity, and decentralized decision-making (Wall, 2006; Kenis & Lievens, 2015; Basthiani & Pangestuti, 2024). In West Kalimantan, these principles are formally reflected in the RPJMD, RKPD, programs, and performance indicators, but implementation remains uneven across strategic economic sectors. This finding supports Chairunnisa and Kusumadewi (2024), who emphasize embedding green economy principles within regional development planning and sectoral policies. It also reinforces the importance of financial instruments, fiscal arrangements, and investment mechanisms identified by Desdiani et al. (2021), as well as the need to mainstream green and low-carbon development across institutions rather than treating it as a standalone environmental agenda (Dermawan et al., 2026). The findings suggest that substantive green economy integration requires simultaneous alignment of authority, accountability, coordination capacity, fiscal resources, and institutional incentives across government levels.

6. Conclusion

This study concludes that the regional autonomy paradox in integrating the green economy in West Kalimantan arises not from the absence of formal authority, but from the gap between *de jure* authority and the operational capacity to exercise

it. Authority is dispersed vertically across government levels and horizontally across sectoral agencies, yet this dispersion has not been matched by integrated targets, data, programs, budgets, and accountability mechanisms. Although intergovernmental coordination is institutionally established, interactions remain predominantly procedural rather than substantive. The Provincial Government retains decision space to formulate green economy initiatives, but its practical discretion is constrained by sectoral regulations, fiscal dependence, limited technical capacity and data, and the allocation of strategic authority. Consequently, green economy integration remains largely embedded in planning documents and performance indicators without comparable structural transformation across major economic sectors.

These findings imply that strengthening subnational green economy governance requires greater alignment between authority, responsibility, resources, and coordination capacity. Bapperida's coordinating and evaluation mandate should be strengthened, cross-sectoral data systems institutionalized, operational responsibilities clarified, and fiscal incentives developed to encourage green economy implementation. However, this study is limited by its qualitative design, purposive selection of key informants, and focus on West Kalimantan, which may limit the transferability of its findings to other regions. Future research could employ comparative multi-regional studies to examine how differences in fiscal capacity, institutional arrangements, and sectoral structures influence green economy integration. Quantitative or mixed-method research could also assess the relationship between decision space, intergovernmental coordination, fiscal incentives, and measurable green economy outcomes.

References

- Adamowicz, M. (2022). Green deal, green growth and green economy as a means of support for attaining the sustainable development goals. *Sustainability*, 14(10), 1-26. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su14105901>.
- Austin, K. G., Schwantes, A., Gu, Y., & Kasibhatla, P. S. (2019). What causes deforestation in Indonesia?. *Environmental Research Letters*, 14(2), 1-24. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/aaf6db>.
- Bappenas. (2019). *Rencana Pembangunan Jangka Menengah Nasional 2020-2024*. Jakarta: Kementerian PPN/Bappenas.
- Basthiani, I. A., & Pangestuti, I. R. D. (2024). The role green economy in sustainable development as long-term environmental and economic stability: a literature. *Research Horizon*, 4(4), 187-196. <https://doi.org/10.54518/rh.4.4.2024.323>.
- Bossert, T. (1998). Analyzing the decentralization of health systems in developing countries: decision space, innovation and performance. *Social Science & Medicine*, 47(10), 1513-1527. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0277-9536\(98\)00234-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0277-9536(98)00234-2).
- BPS Provinsi Kalimantan Barat. (2026). *Produk domestik regional bruto Provinsi Kalimantan Barat menurut lapangan usaha 2021-2025*. Badan Pusat Statistik. Retrieved on May 21, 2026, from <https://kalbar.bps.go.id/id/publication/2026/04/06/416f4f79140f4b1d7f83a3af/produk-domestik-regional-bruto-provinsi-kalimantan-barat-menurut-lapangan-usaha-2021-2025.html>.
- Chairunnisa, R. S., & Kusumadewi, H. (2024). Analyzing the implementation of green-economy inclusive strategy in East Java province through urban good governance in green-economy framework: the case of Surabaya. *East Java Economic Journal*, 8(1), 73-98. <https://doi.org/10.53572/ejavec.v8i1.123>.
- Creswell, J.W. and Poth, C.N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry and research design choosing among five approaches*. 4th edition. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Dermawan, A., Angelsen, A., Naime, J., Chervier, C., Dwisatrio, B., Nofyanza, S., & Martius, C. (2026). *Forest policy diagnostics for Indonesia*. Bogor: CIFOR Indonesia.
- Desdiani, N. A., Afifi, F. A. R., Cesarina, A., Sabrina, S., Husna, M., Violeta, R. M., Adinegoro, A., & Halimatussadiah, A. (2021). *Climate and environmental financing at regional level*.

- Amplifying and seizing the opportunities* (LPEM-FEB UI Working Paper No. 067). Depok: LPEM, Faculty of Economics and Business, Universitas Indonesia.
- Di Bona, G., Bracci, A., Perra, N., Latora, V., & Baronchelli, A. (2023). The concept of decentralization through time and disciplines: a quantitative exploration. *EPJ Data Science*, 12(1), 1-16. <https://doi.org/10.1140/epjds/s13688-023-00418-1>.
- Di Gregorio, M., Fatorelli, L., Paavola, J., Locatelli, B., Pramova, E., Nurrochmat, D. R., ... & Kusumadewi, S. D. (2019). Multi-level governance and power in climate change policy networks. *Global Environmental Change*, 54(1), 64-77. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2018.10.003>.
- Faguet, J. P. (2014). Decentralization and governance. *World Development*, 53(1), 2-13. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2013.01.002>.
- Gadenne, L., & Singhal, M. (2014). Decentralization in developing economies. *Annu. Rev. Econ.*, 6(1), 581-604. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-economics-080213-040833>.
- Hartono, D., Indriyani, W., Iryani, B. S., Komarulzaman, A., Nugroho, A., & Kurniawan, R. (2023). Carbon tax, energy policy, and sustainable development in Indonesia. *Sustainable Development*, 31(4), 2332-2346. <https://doi.org/10.1002/sd.2511>.
- Hooghe, L., & Marks, G. (2016). *Community, scale, and regional governance: A postfunctionalist theory of governance, Volume II*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kenis, A., & Lievens, M. (2015). The limits of the green economy: From green capitalism to green anti-capitalism. Oxfordshire: Routledge.
- Liesbet, H., & Gary, M. (2003). Unraveling the central state, but how? Types of multi-level governance. *American Political Science Review*, 97(2), 233-243. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055403000649>.
- Marks, G. (1993). Structural policy and multilevel governance in the EC. In A. Cafruny & G. Rosenthal (Eds.), *The state of the European Community* (pp. 391-410). Colorado: Lynne Rienner.
- Marpaung, C. R., Tsabit, I. A. Z., & Pangestuti, I. R. D. (2024). The role of gen-z in supporting sustainable development through green economy towards golden Indonesia 2045. *Research Horizon*, 4(4), 315-320. <https://doi.org/10.54518/rh.4.4.2024.341>.
- Mookherjee, D. (2015). Political decentralization. *Annual Review of Economics*, 7(1), 231-249. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-economics-080614-115527>.
- Mulyadi, A., Keban, Y., Ikhwan, H., & Maryudi, A. (2026). Political will in decentralized forest governance: developing a typological-relational model from the formalization of customary forests in Indonesia. *Forest and Society*, 10(1), 77-107. <https://doi.org/10.65844/2549-4333.1244>.
- Nabila, Z. M., Susanti, A., Safitri, H., & Nuriansyah, F. (2026). Green economy policies in achieving sustainable development goals through the renewable energy sector: systematic literature review. In *International Conference on Education, Economics, Business, Entrepreneurship, and Finance* (Vol. 4, No. 1, pp. 406-410). Bandung: Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia.
- Panke, D., & Stapel, S. (2024). Multi-level governance. In *Handbook of Regional Cooperation and Integration* (pp. 417-430). Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Piattoni, S. (2009). Multi-level governance: a historical and conceptual analysis. *European Integration*, 31(2), 163-180. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07036330802642755>.
- Ravikumar, A., Larson, A. M., Myers, R., & Trench, T. (2018). Inter-sectoral and multilevel coordination alone do not reduce deforestation and advance environmental justice: Why bold contestation works when collaboration fails. *Environment and Planning C: Politics and Space*, 36(8), 1437-1457. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2399654418794025>.
- Saito-Jensen, F. (2015). *Theories and methods in multi-level environmental governance*. Bogor: CIFOR Working Paper.
- Seshadri, S. R., Parab, S., Kotte, S., Latha, N., & Subbiah, K. (2016). Decentralization and decision space in the health sector: a case study from Karnataka, India. *Health Policy and Planning*, 31(2), 171-181. <https://doi.org/10.1093/heapol/czv034>.
- Tovar, J. G. (2015). Multilevel governance challenges in transitioning towards a national approach for REDD+: evidence from 23 subnational REDD+ initiatives. *International Journal of the Commons*, 9(2), 909-931.
- Wall, D. (2006). Green economics: an introduction and research agenda. *International Journal of Green Economics*, 1(1-2), 201-214. <https://doi.org/10.1504/IJGE.2006.009345>.

Acknowledgment

We gratefully acknowledge the contributions of individuals who supported the completion of this article.

Funding Information

This research did not receive any funding.

Conflict of Interest Statement

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest.

Ethical Approval and Originality Statement

Ethical approval was obtained for this study. The manuscript represents original work and has not been previously published, nor is it under consideration by another journal.

Data Disclosure Statement

The data that support the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.



Copyright: © 2026 by the authors.

This work is licensed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons

Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License

(<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/>).