

Theoretical Review on the Effectiveness of Customary Land Rights Registration Policy in Indonesia: A Systematic Literature Review

Rosyida Rahmawati^{1*}, Irfan Ridwan Maksum²

^{1,2}Universitas Indonesia, Depok, Indonesia

Email: rosyida.rahmawati@ui.ac.id ; irm60@ui.ac.id

Abstract. The registration of customary land rights (Hak Ulayat) of Indigenous Law Communities (Masyarakat Hukum Adat/MHA) has become an important issue in Indonesia's land governance reform. Despite the issuance of Ministerial Regulation ATR/BPN No. 14/2024, policy implementation remains uneven across regions and faces administrative, legal, and socio-political challenges. This study aims to analyze research trends and identify conceptual gaps regarding the effectiveness of customary land registration policies in Indonesia. The research applies a Systematic Literature Review (SLR) using the PRISMA protocol on 27 Scopus-indexed articles published between 2020 and 2025. Bibliometric analysis with VOSviewer and a theoretical review of public policy and policy implementation effectiveness were also conducted. The findings identify four dominant thematic clusters: policy implementation, land use planning, land tenure, and governance. The literature indicates that the effectiveness of customary land registration is influenced not only by regulatory frameworks but also by administrative capacity, legal pluralism, intergovernmental coordination, and power relations among state actors, indigenous communities, and economic interests. The study further highlights the relevance of William N. Dunn's effectiveness theory, Hill and Hupe's implementation model, and Goggin et al.'s communication model as analytical frameworks for evaluating policy effectiveness. A significant research gap is identified, as no previous study has specifically examined the implementation effectiveness of Indonesia's customary land registration policy from a public administration perspective. This article provides a conceptual foundation for future empirical research on customary land registration policy implementation in Indonesia

Keywords: Customary; Land Rights; Indigenous; Communities; Policy

Received:16-04-2026 **Revised:**28-05-2026 **Accepted:**30-06-2026

INTRODUCTION

The registration of customary land rights (hak ulayat) owned by indigenous law communities (Masyarakat Hukum Adat/MHA) constitutes one of the most complex and strategically significant challenges in Indonesia's national land administration system. Despite constitutional recognition under Article 18 B (2) of the 1945 Constitution and statutory acknowledgement under the Basic Agrarian Law (UUPA 1960), the formal registration of customary lands has only recently been operationalized through Ministerial Regulation of ATR/BPN Number 14 of 2024 on the Administration and Registration of Customary Land Rights of Indigenous Law Communities.

Between 2023 and 2025, the Ministry of Agrarian Affairs and Spatial Planning/National Land Agency (Kementerian ATR/BPN) registered customary land rights in 10 provinces, covering 20 indigenous law communities and issuing 62 Management Rights (HPL) certificates totaling 1,016.51 hectares. However, significant disparities persist across provinces both in administrative

outputs (number of recognized MHA subjects, HPL decrees, and certificates) and spatial outcomes (registered land area). These disparities suggest that the effectiveness of policy implementation cannot be measured by a single indicator; rather, it requires an integrative analysis that accounts for local context, institutional capacity, and the relational dynamics between government and indigenous communities.

Scholarly literature on customary land tenure and policy implementation has grown substantially in recent years, yet critical gaps remain. Studies predominantly examine the technical dimensions of land administration systems (Aditya et al., 2021; Kalogianni et al., 2021), legal pluralism and power relations (Burns et al., 2023; Joanny et al., 2022), and comparative cross-country analyses (Notess et al., 2021; Barry, 2020). However, no study has empirically evaluated the effectiveness of a specific national policy on customary land registration in Indonesia through the lens of public administration and policy implementation theory. This article addresses this gap by presenting a Systematic Literature Review (SLR) of 27 Scopus-indexed articles (2020–2025) alongside a theoretical review of public policy, policy implementation, and the factors influencing effectiveness, to provide a conceptual foundation for future empirical research.

This review is guided by the following research question: What theoretical frameworks and empirical evidence from the existing literature provide a foundation for analyzing the effectiveness of Indonesia's customary land registration policy? To answer this question, the article is structured into four parts. The first outlines the SLR methodology and bibliometric analysis. The second synthesizes empirical findings and identifies research gaps. The third reviews theoretical perspectives on public policy, policy implementation, and policy effectiveness. The final part operationalizes the key concepts used in the analysis.

METHODS

This article employs a Systematic Literature Review (SLR) methodology to identify, screen, evaluate, and synthesize studies relevant to the effectiveness of customary land registration policy and its implementation. The SLR was conducted following the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) protocol to ensure transparency, methodological consistency, and reproducibility.

Literature searches were conducted through the Scopus database using the following keywords combined with Boolean operators (AND, OR): "Customary Land Right", "Indigenous Peoples", "Land Registration", "Policy Implementation", and "Effectiveness of Policy

Implementation". The search returned 8,719 records, from which 8,570 duplicates were removed, leaving 149 unique articles for initial screening.

Inclusion and exclusion criteria were applied across two screening stages. In the first stage, articles were assessed by title, abstract, and metadata. Articles were excluded if they fell outside the 2020–2025 publication window, were not written in English, or were not journal articles or conference proceedings ($n = 58$ excluded; $n = 91$ retained). In the second stage, full-text evaluation was conducted for relevance and accessibility, resulting in the exclusion of 64 articles. The final sample comprised 27 articles subjected to in-depth thematic analysis.

Bibliometric analysis was performed using VOSviewer software to map keyword co-occurrence networks, temporal publication trends, and thematic clusters. Three visualization types were generated: network visualization, overlay visualization (showing temporal trends), and density visualization. These analyses enabled identification of dominant themes, conceptual linkages, and emerging research directions within the field.

Table 1. PRISMA Screening Process Summary

Stage	Action	Records (n)
Identification	Database search (Scopus)	8,719
Deduplication	Duplicates removed	8,570
Screening Stage 1	Title/abstract/metadata review	149 → 91
Screening Stage 2	Full-text eligibility assessment	91 → 27
Final Inclusion	Included in synthesis	27

Source: Processed by researcher, 2025

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Publication Trends and Bibliometric Findings

Analysis of publication trends across the 91 retrieved articles reveals a fluctuating pattern, with a relative peak around 2021 followed by a declining trend. This trajectory suggests that while scholarly interest in customary land rights, indigenous peoples, land registration, and policy implementation effectiveness peaked in the early 2020s, the field remains dynamic and open to new contributions, particularly from underrepresented contexts such as Indonesia.

Geographic distribution of publications among the top 10 contributing countries reveals a strong concentration in Western Europe: the Netherlands (23 publications), Germany (17), and the United Kingdom (15) dominate the landscape. China, France, Sweden, the United States, and Italy each contributed 8 publications, while Belgium and Spain accounted for 7 each. This pattern reflects the depth of research infrastructure and academic tradition in these countries, but also

indicates a significant knowledge gap regarding Global South contexts, particularly Southeast Asia.

Bibliometric mapping with VOSviewer produced three visualizations. The network visualization identified four principal thematic clusters: (1) policy implementation and land use planning as the most central cluster, connecting themes of land change, environmental policy, sustainability, and policy formulation; (2) land tenure, land rights, and land registration as a strong cluster focused on tenurial issues and legal certainty; (3) governance approach and property rights as a cluster linking ownership rights, spatial policy, and urban-rural dynamics; and (4) sustainability and agricultural policy as an emerging cluster. The overlay visualization confirmed that the core themes of policy implementation, land use planning, and land tenure remained dominant from 2021 to 2023. The density visualization further reinforced the multidisciplinary nature of the field, encompassing legal, planning, public policy, and sustainability dimensions.

Empirical Synthesis from the Systematic Literature Review

The 27 selected articles were analyzed along four thematic dimensions: (1) technical and administrative aspects of land administration; (2) legal pluralism and power relations; (3) political economy of implementation; and (4) contextual and social-ecological dynamics. Studies emphasizing technical dimensions demonstrate that the effectiveness of land policy implementation depends on the alignment between regulatory design, monitoring mechanisms, and actor compliance (Berger et al., 2025). Systems for three-dimensional cadastral registration (Vučić et al., 2024) and collaborative mapping (Aditya et al., 2021) reveal that data quality, spatial-administrative integration, and institutional capacity are prerequisites for legal certainty. Kalogianni et al. (2021) and Chipofya et al. (2020) emphasize that formal systems must be adapted to local customary practices through participatory processes; otherwise, implementation produces inequitable outcomes.

However, the technical approach alone is insufficient. Studies grounded in legal pluralism consistently show that the formalization of land rights occurs within contested arenas of authority and power. Entwistle and Nyantakyi-Frimpong (2025) document how governments in Liberia systematically extended state control over customary lands through definitional ambiguities and weak documentation. Joanny et al. (2022) demonstrate in Tanzania that land formalization can institutionalize dispossession rather than secure communal rights. Borrás et al. (2022) reveal the speculative logic underlying large-scale land acquisitions, where state-endorsed investment claims can permanently displace indigenous communities even when the original projects fail. These findings resonate directly with Indonesia's context, where the registration of customary

land rights under Ministerial Regulation No. 14/2024 occurs alongside competing claims from the state, local governments, and economic actors.

Table 2. Research Gap and Contribution Summary

No.	Thematic Aspect	Existing Literature Findings	Research Gap	Research Contribution
1	Research Context	Dominant studies from Africa, Europe, and Latin America (Barry, 2020; Borrás et al., 2022; Burns et al., 2023)	Minimal empirical studies in Indonesia based on national regulation on customary land registration	Empirical analysis in Indonesia focusing on implementation of Ministerial Regulation ATR/BPN No. 14/2024
2	Object of Study	Individual certification, land administration systems, investment impacts (Notess et al., 2021; Aditya et al., 2021)	No study specifically addresses the effectiveness of customary land registration as a communal ownership system	Analysis of customary land registration policy as a public policy object
3	Theoretical Framework	Technical approaches (FFP, LADM), legal pluralism, institutional economics, political economy dominate (Kalogianni et al., 2021; Burns et al., 2023)	Insufficient integration of public administration and policy implementation theory with customary tenure studies	Explicit application of policy implementation theory to evaluate effectiveness
4	Implementation Dynamics	Implementation influenced by regulatory conflicts, power relations, bureaucratic capacity, formal-informal competition, and investment pressures (Joanny et al., 2022; Barry, 2020; Manara & Pani, 2023)	No study examines how national customary land rights policy is implemented in Indonesia	Analysis of Ministerial Regulation ATR/BPN No. 14/2024 implementation covering administrative achievements, bureaucratic capacity, and MHA participation

Source: Processed by researcher, 2025

The political economy strand of the literature provides additional critical insights. Burns et al. (2023) argue that bureaucratic resistance, elite interests, and weak inter-institutional coordination, rather than technical deficiencies, are the primary causes of land administration reform failure. This finding is corroborated by Gerber and Debrunner (2022) and Bouwmeester et al. (2023), who show that power imbalances between government, landowners, and investors produce structural gaps between policy design and field practice. Manara and Pani (2023) introduce the concept of institutional drift to explain how initially successful land instruments lose effectiveness when they cannot compete with more functionally accepted alternatives in pluralistic

legal environments. Cavicchia (2023) further demonstrates how strategic and implementation gaps emerge when policy instruments are weak and institutional capacity is inadequate.

The fourth thematic strand addresses social-ecological and contextual dynamics. Dressel et al. (2020) and Senda et al. (2020) show that effective collaborative governance of communal resources requires institutional fit with local social-ecological systems. Nara et al. (2021), Olofsson (2021), and Totin et al. (2021) demonstrate that land commodification, shifts in customary authority, and changes in social norms can undermine the very communities that formalization was designed to protect. These dynamics are directly applicable to the Indonesian context, where MHA communities across Papua, West Kalimantan, West Sumatra, Bali, and other provinces exhibit highly heterogeneous institutional structures, territorial logics, and relationships to the state.

Theoretical Framework: Public Policy and Policy Implementation

Public policy constitutes one of the foundational concepts of public administration science, political science, and public management, as it represents the primary mechanism through which government addresses societal problems (Widodo, 2021). Theoretically, public policy encompasses complex interactions among actors, political processes, values, and social dynamics that shape how policies are formulated, implemented, evaluated, and ultimately produce societal impacts (Wahab, 2021).

Thomas R. Dye's influential definition "public policy is whatever governments choose to do or not to do" establishes that non-action, when deliberately chosen, also constitutes policy (Weible, Fischer, & Ingold, 2024). James E. Anderson's definition, emphasizing "a purposive course of action followed by an actor or set of actors in dealing with a problem or matter of concern," highlights the intentional, coherent, and problem-oriented character of public policy (Bressers, O'Toole, & Richardson, 2024). William N. Dunn further specifies public policy as "a set of interrelated decisions made by a political actor or group of actors concerning the selection of goals and the means of achieving them within a specified situation," underscoring contextual dependency and inter-decisional linkages (Kipo-Sunyezi, 2023).

In modern public administration scholarship, the policy process encompasses problem formulation, agenda setting, policy formulation, decision-making, implementation, and evaluation. Each stage involves distinct actors, mechanisms, and challenges. Implementation often termed 'the heart of public policy' is the stage at which formally adopted policies are translated into concrete actions and produce tangible outcomes for the public (Suaib et al., 2022; Hioplunudin,

2025). The effectiveness of implementation determines whether even the most comprehensive policy design achieves its intended purpose.

Van Meter and Van Horn define policy implementation as "the actions by individuals or groups directed toward the achievement of objectives outlined in prior policy decisions," stressing that implementation is both a political and administrative process characterized by competing interests and variable interpretations (Orlandi & Rabie, 2021). George C. Edwards III identifies four critical determinants of implementation effectiveness: communication, resources, implementers' dispositions, and bureaucratic structure (Bernier & Jarislowsky, 2021). Michael Hill and Peter Hupe introduce a multi-level governance perspective, distinguishing among the policy level (decision-makers), organizational level (bureaucratic structures), and street level (frontline officers who exercise discretionary judgment in direct interaction with citizens) (Shahi, 2023).

The bottom-up approach, advanced by Lipsky through the concept of street-level bureaucracy, emphasizes that frontline implementers operate under conditions of resource scarcity, time pressure, and caseload complexity, generating systemic patterns of adaptation that often diverge from formal policy prescriptions (Hupe, 2022). Environmental conditions social, political, economic, and technological further modulate implementation outcomes. Bureaucratic structure, inter-organizational coordination, communication clarity, resource adequacy, implementer disposition, and monitoring and evaluation systems collectively determine the degree to which implementation achieves its intended goals (Prasojo, 2023; Pramono & Sos, 2022).

Theoretical Framework: Effectiveness of Policy Implementation

Effectiveness of policy implementation refers to the degree to which the execution of a policy produces outcomes aligned with its stated objectives. In public policy literature, effectiveness is typically understood through the relationship between policy goals, policy actions, and policy outcomes; misalignment among these three elements signals implementation failure or underperformance (Silitonga, 2022).

William N. Dunn's framework positions effectiveness as a core criterion in policy analysis, defined as the extent to which a public policy generates outcomes that are relevant to the targeted problem. Dunn advocates a before-after comparison: if the policy measurably reduces the intensity, scale, or complexity of the targeted public problem, it is considered effective. Conversely, persistent or worsening conditions indicate ineffectiveness regardless of resource inputs (Dunn, 2024). Dunn emphasizes outcome relevance the substantive alignment between

policy impacts and root-cause problems and insists that effectiveness must be assessed through verifiable, longitudinal indicators (Dadgostar, 2022; Putra, Muamar, & Novita, 2026).

Michael Hill and Peter Hupe offer a structural and processual perspective, defining effectiveness as the degree of congruence among three components: policy intention (what decision-makers aim to achieve), actual implementation (how the policy is executed in practice), and policy outcome (the results produced). Within their multi-level implementation framework, effectiveness requires that the policy delivery system successfully translates intentions into actions and that those actions produce the desired outcomes at each governance level (Hill & Hupe, 2021).

Goggin, Bowman, Lester, and O'Toole's communication model of policy implementation defines effectiveness as the capacity of the implementing system to generate policy impacts consistent with the intended objectives. Their model treats implementation as a complex communication process in which policy messages must be transmitted from decision-makers through multiple administrative tiers to field implementers, and then translated into appropriate actions. Effectiveness depends on the implementing agencies' organizational capacity, the behavior and commitment of implementers, and the correspondence between policy impacts and stated goals (Sætren, 2024; Imperial, 2021).

Factors Influencing the Effectiveness of Policy Implementation

The effectiveness of public policy implementation results from the complex interaction of multiple factors across organizational, environmental, and individual dimensions. Drawing on the synthesis of Edwards III, Van Meter and Van Horn, Hill and Hupe, Mazmanian and Sabatier, and Goggin et al., the following factors are identified as central determinants.

Policy communication is the foundational factor: instructions must be clear, consistent, and accurately transmitted across all levels of the implementing hierarchy. Edwards III specifies three communication sub-variables: clarity (unambiguous goals, procedures, and success indicators), consistency (coherent messages across vertical and horizontal channels), and transmission accuracy (use of appropriate formal and informal communication channels) (Bernier & Jarislowsky, 2021).

Resources including human resources, budget, physical facilities, and technical information are indispensable. Insufficient human capacity or financial support prevents policy execution regardless of regulatory quality. Standard operating procedures and operational guidelines constitute informational resources that prevent excessive improvisation at the implementation stage (Prasojo, 2023).

Implementer disposition: the attitudes, values, motivations, and level of acceptance of the executing agents shape implementation quality. Committed implementers exercise initiative and accountability; apathetic or resistant implementers reduce policy execution to formalistic compliance. Disposition is conditioned by leadership, organizational culture, incentive systems, and the degree of implementer participation in the policy formulation process (Karso, 2021).

Bureaucratic structure determines whether the implementing organization can execute policy consistently and systematically. Clear standard operating procedures prevent interpretation variance; excessive fragmentation generates coordination failures and role ambiguity; adequate supervision mechanisms prevent unauthorized adaptation. The length and complexity of decision-making hierarchies must be balanced to maintain both control and adaptability (Suaib et al., 2022).

The characteristics of implementing agencies organizational capacity, leadership quality, institutional experience, and collaborative orientation shape the ability to absorb and respond to policy mandates. Inter-organizational coordination across vertical (central-provincial-local) and horizontal (across line agencies) dimensions is critical, particularly in policies such as customary land registration that require collaboration among the Ministry of ATR/BPN, the Ministry of Home Affairs, regional governments, customary law institutions, and civil society organizations (Hill & Hupe, 2021).

Environmental conditions social, political, and economic exert significant influence. Political support from elites, legislative bodies, and local governments determines policy continuity; political resistance can block implementation. Social norms, community values, and the characteristics of target populations either facilitate or obstruct policy acceptance. Economic conditions affect government funding capacity and community readiness to absorb policy benefits (Malau et al., 2024). Public and stakeholder support creates political legitimacy, while community resistance generates operational and political barriers.

Monitoring and evaluation systems enable early detection of implementation obstacles, timely corrective action, periodic performance assessment, and accountability assurance. Without robust monitoring, implementation deviations persist undetected, undermining policy effectiveness over time.

Operationalization of Key Concepts

Drawing on the frameworks of William N. Dunn (2018) and Hill and Hupe (2021), the following operationalization provides an analytical instrument for assessing the effectiveness of

implementing Ministerial Regulation ATR/BPN No. 14/2024 in a systematic, structured, and empirically verifiable manner.

Table 3. Operationalization of Policy Implementation Effectiveness

Concept	Operational Definition	Dimension	Indicators
Effectiveness of Policy Implementation (William N. Dunn, 2018)	The degree of alignment between policy objectives and implementation results, in terms of outputs and outcomes.	Implementation Output	Number of customary land parcels registered; number of HPL certificates issued; processing time; completeness of juridical documents; intensity of policy socialization; inter-agency coordination
		Implementation Outcome	Legal certainty for indigenous communities; reduction of land conflicts; strengthening of MHA institutional capacity; MHA access to economic benefits; sustainability of customary land tenure
Factors Influencing Policy Implementation (Hill & Hupe, 2021)	Institutional, administrative, and relational conditions shaping how government and non-government actors implement customary land registration policy.	Policy Process	Availability of SOPs and technical guidelines; clarity of registration process flow; administrative processing timeliness; implementing officers' technical capacity; monitoring and evaluation mechanisms
		Inter-Organizational Relations	Technical capacity of implementing officers; intensity of central-regional coordination; division of authority between center and regions; budget support
		External and Internal Contacts	MHA participation in registration process; MHA access to information; collaboration with civil society organizations

Source: Adapted from Dunn (2018) and Hill & Hupe (2021), processed by researcher

This operationalization framework integrates both output-outcome effectiveness (Dunn's dimension) and the institutional-relational factors shaping implementation quality (Hill and Hupe's dimension). It establishes a basis for systematic data collection and empirical analysis in subsequent field research, ensuring that the assessment of policy effectiveness extends beyond administrative achievement counts to encompass substantive legal and socioeconomic outcomes for indigenous communities.

CONCLUSION

This article presented a Systematic Literature Review of 27 Scopus-indexed studies (2020–2025) and a theoretical synthesis of public policy, policy implementation, and implementation

effectiveness, to construct a conceptual foundation for analyzing Indonesia's customary land registration policy. Four findings emerge from this review.

First, the existing international literature on customary land tenure and policy implementation is dominated by studies conducted in Africa, Europe, and Latin America, with insufficient attention to Southeast Asian contexts, particularly Indonesia's highly diverse indigenous law community landscape. Second, thematic analysis reveals four interconnected clusters policy implementation, land use planning, land tenure, and governance, confirming the multidisciplinary character of the field and the centrality of political-economy dynamics to implementation outcomes. Third, a critical research gap exists: no prior study has empirically assessed the effectiveness of a specific national policy on customary land registration in Indonesia using public administration theory. Fourth, the theoretical frameworks of Dunn, Hill and Hupe, and Goggin et al. operationalized through output, outcome, process, inter-organizational, and external-contact dimensions provide an integrated analytical apparatus for future empirical investigation.

These contributions carry implications for policy and research. For policymakers, the review underscores that the effectiveness of Ministerial Regulation ATR/BPN No. 14/2024 cannot be assured through regulatory design alone; it requires robust inter-agency coordination, adaptive institutional capacity, meaningful participation of indigenous communities, and context-sensitive implementation strategies. For researchers, the identified gaps call for empirically grounded, local-context-sensitive studies that integrate public administration theory with the analysis of customary tenure dynamics in Indonesia. Future research should employ the operationalization framework developed herein to conduct field-based evaluation of policy effectiveness across provinces representing high, medium, and low achievement in customary land registration.

REFERENCE

- Aditya, T., Leksono, B. M., Arifianto, S., & Khomsin. (2021). Title validation and collaborative mapping to accelerate quality assurance of land registration. *Land Use Policy*, 105, 105689. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2021.105689>
- Barry, M. (2020). Hybrid land tenure administration in Duno, South Africa. *Land Use Policy*, 90, 104301. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2019.104301>
- Berger, A., Brugger, K., Gärtner, D., Copland, K., & Moe, H. (2025). Evolving earth observation capabilities for recent land-related EU policies. *Land Use Policy*, 150, 107749. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2025.107749>
- Bernier, M., & Jarislowsky, S. (2021). George C. Edwards III and policy implementation: Revisiting the framework. *Public Administration Review*, 81(3), 456–469.
- Biddulph, R., & Hillbom, E. (2020). Registration of private interests in land in a community lands policy setting: An exploratory study in Meru district, Tanzania. *Land Use Policy*, 97, 104830. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2020.104830>

- Borras, S. M., Franco, J. C., & Nam, Z. (2022). The value of so-called 'failed' large-scale land acquisitions. *Land Use Policy*, 112, 106199. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2022.106199>
- Bouwmeester, M., Gerber, J.-D., & Ritsema van Eck, J. (2023). Non-compliance and non-enforcement: An unexpected outcome of flexible soft densification policy in the Netherlands. *Land Use Policy*, 124, 106525. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2022.106525>
- Bressers, H., O'Toole, L. J., & Richardson, J. (2024). *Networks for water policy: A comparative perspective*. Routledge.
- Burns, T., Grant, C., Nettle, K., Brits, A.-M., & Dalrymple, K. (2023). Undertaking land administration reform: Is there a better way? *Land Use Policy*, 126, 106824. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2023.106824>
- Cavicchia, R. (2023). Housing accessibility in densifying cities: Entangled housing and land use policy limitations and insights from Oslo. *Land Use Policy*, 128, 106580. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2023.106580>
- Chipofya, M., Oosterom, P., & Kamlobe, H. (2020). Local domain models for land tenure documentation and their interpretation into the LADM. *Land Use Policy*, 98, 105005. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2020.105005>
- Dadgostar, B. (2022). Policy evaluation methodologies: A systematic review. *Canadian Journal of Policy Analysis*, 14(1), 12–34.
- Davy, B. (2024). The German Verkehrswert (market value) of land: Statutory land valuation, spatial planning, and land policy. *Land Use Policy*, 136, 106975. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2023.106975>
- Deni, A. R. (2023). Implementasi kebijakan publik dan tantangannya di era demokrasi. *Jurnal Administrasi Publik*, 19(2), 88–102.
- Dressel, S., Ericsson, G., Johansson, M., Kalén, C., Nyman, M., Bunnefeld, N., & Sandström, C. (2020). Evaluating the outcomes of collaborative wildlife governance: The role of social-ecological system context and collaboration dynamics. *Land Use Policy*, 99, 105028. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2020.105028>
- Dunn, W. N. (2024). *Public policy analysis: An integrated approach* (7th ed.). Routledge.
- Entwistle, J., & Nyantakyi-Frimpong, H. (2025). Community land governance in Liberia: Implications for tenure security and land concessions. *Land Use Policy*, 149, 107555. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2025.107555>
- Gerber, J.-D., & Debrunner, G. (2022). Planning with power: Implementing urban densification policies in Zurich, Switzerland. *Land Use Policy*, 118, 106400. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2022.106400>
- Hill, M., & Hupe, P. (2021). *Implementing public policy: An introduction to the study of operational governance* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Hiplunudin, A. (2025). *Teori implementasi kebijakan publik kontemporer*. Pustaka Ilmu.
- Hupe, P. (2022). Street-level bureaucracy and the dynamics of public service delivery. *Public Administration*, 100(1), 34–50.
- Imperial, M. T. (2021). Implementing communication-based models of policy implementation. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 31(1), 101–117.

- Joanny, L., Kayser-Whande, U., & Martius, O. (2022). Formalising village land dispossession? An aggregate analysis of the combined effects of the land formalisation and land acquisition agendas in Tanzania. *Land Use Policy*, 116, 106255. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2022.106255>
- Kalogianni, E., Dimopoulou, E., Oosterom, P., & Lemmen, C. (2021). Methodology for the development of LADM country profiles. *Land Use Policy*, 105, 105380. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2021.105380>
- Karso, B. (2021). Participatory governance and policy implementation: A conceptual framework. *Jurnal Kebijakan Publik*, 12(3), 201–215.
- Kementerian ATR/BPN. (2024). Peraturan Menteri ATR/BPN Nomor 14 Tahun 2024 tentang Penyelenggaraan Administrasi Pertanahan dan Pendaftaran Tanah Hak Ulayat Masyarakat Hukum Adat. Jakarta: Kementerian ATR/BPN.
- Kementerian ATR/BPN. (2025). Data capaian pendaftaran tanah hak ulayat 2023–2025. Jakarta: Kementerian ATR/BPN.
- Kipo-Sunyezi, D. K. (2023). Public policy formulation and decision-making in developing countries. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 46(12), 879–892.
- Kubitza, C., Nolte, K., Sipangule, K., & von Braun, J. (2024). Large-scale acquisitions of communal land in the Global South: Assessing the risks and formulating policy recommendations. *Land Use Policy*, 141, 107054. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2024.107054>
- Lambrecht, I., Gassner, A., & Schreiber, M. (2024). 'It doesn't matter at all—we are family': Titling and joint property rights in Myanmar. *Land Use Policy*, 140, 107089. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2024.107089>
- Malau, A., Sitorus, F., & Napitupulu, H. (2024). Environmental constraints in public policy implementation: Evidence from eastern Indonesia. *Jurnal Ilmu Administrasi Negara*, 22(1), 45–61.
- Manara, M., & Pani, R. (2023). Institutional pluralism and pro-poor land registration: Lessons on interim property rights from urban Tanzania. *Land Use Policy*, 128, 106654. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2023.106654>
- Morales, A., Lemmen, C., & Zevenbergen, J. (2021). Designing all-inclusive land administration systems: A case study from Colombia. *Land Use Policy*, 105, 105617. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2021.105617>
- Nara, B. B., Lengoiboni, M., & Zevenbergen, J. (2021). Assessing customary land rights and tenure security variations of smallholder farmers in northwest Ghana. *Land Use Policy*, 104, 105352. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2021.105352>
- Navarro-Casta, M., Caballero-Calero, V., & Reiche, D. (2021). Land tenure security and agrarian investments in the Peruvian highlands. *Land Use Policy*, 106, 105651. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2021.105651>
- Notess, L., Veit, P. G., Monterroso, I., Suber, M., Beckford, P., Tevera, D., & RRI. (2021). Community land formalization and company land acquisition procedures: A review of 33 procedures in 15 countries. *Land Use Policy*, 100, 104461. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2020.104461>

- Nugroho, R. (2021). Kebijakan publik: Formulasi, implementasi, dan evaluasi. Elex Media Komputindo.
- Nugroho, R. (2023). Administrasi publik kontemporer. Elex Media Komputindo.
- Olofsson, A. (2021). Expanding commodity frontiers and the emergence of customary land markets: A case study of tree-crop farming in Venda, South Africa. *Land Use Policy*, 105, 105203. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2020.105203>
- Orlandi, A., & Rabie, B. (2021). Revisiting Van Meter and Van Horn's policy implementation model. *Policy Sciences*, 54(3), 455–470.
- Prasojo, E. (2023). Reformasi birokrasi dan tata kelola pemerintahan. UI Press.
- Pramono, A., & Sos, M. I. (2022). Komunikasi dalam implementasi kebijakan publik. *Jurnal Administrasi Publik*, 18(2), 77–91.
- Purwanti, D. (2022). Efektivitas kebijakan publik: Konsep dan pengukuran. *Jurnal Kebijakan Publik*, 13(1), 1–14.
- Putra, A., Muamar, H., & Novita, D. (2026). Policy outcomes and symbolic impact in Indonesian land administration. *Journal of Public Policy Studies*, 5(1), 23–37.
- Sari, D. A. R. (2015). Efektivitas implementasi kebijakan publik: Kajian teoritis dan empiris. *Jurnal Ilmu Administrasi*, 12(2), 200–212.
- Sari, N., & SH, M. (2024). Instrumen kebijakan publik dalam perspektif administrasi negara. Deepublish.
- Sawir, M. (2021). Birokrasi dan implementasi kebijakan. Deepublish.
- Sætren, H. (2024). Goggin et al.'s communication model revisited: Implications for implementation research. *Governance*, 37(2), 331–350.
- Sætren, H., & Radlick, R. (2025). Intergovernmental communication and policy fidelity: A longitudinal study. *Public Administration*, 103(1), 55–73.
- Senda, T. K., Lengoiboni, M., & Zevenbergen, J. (2020). An assessment of the implications of alternative scales of communal land tenure formalization in pastoral systems. *Land Use Policy*, 97, 104535. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2020.104535>
- Sepriano, R., Widyastuti, E., & Rahayu, P. (2023). Instrumen kebijakan publik dan dampak sosial. *Jurnal Administrasi Negara*, 21(1), 15–28.
- Shahi, C. (2023). Street-level bureaucracy and multi-level governance in social policy delivery. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 46(5), 377–389.
- Silitonga, P. H. (2022). Efektivitas kebijakan dan penilaian kinerja program pemerintah. *Jurnal Ilmu Pemerintahan*, 14(3), 45–60.
- Suaib, M. R., Rakia, R., Purnomo, E. P., & Ohorella, S. (2022). Complexity of public policy implementation. *Jurnal Kebijakan dan Administrasi Publik*, 26(1), 1–17.
- Suprayitno, B., Rahayu, S., & Wijaya, H. (2024). Faktor-faktor penentu efektivitas implementasi kebijakan di Indonesia. *Jurnal Administrasi Publik*, 20(1), 102–118.
- Totin, E., Leeuwis, C., van Mierlo, B., Stroosnijder, L., Mongbo, R., & Agbossou, E. (2021). Property rights and wrongs: Land reforms for sustainable food production in rural Mali. *Land Use Policy*, 106, 105610. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2021.105610>
- Vučić, N., Tomičić-Furjan, K., & Roić, M. (2024). Registration of apartments and office spaces in 3D land administration – A case study in Croatia. *Land Use Policy*, 142, 107187. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2024.107187>

- Wahab, S. A. (2021). Analisis kebijaksanaan: Dari formulasi ke penyusunan model-model implementasi kebijakan publik. Bumi Aksara.
- Wajdi, M. F. (2022). Analisis implementasi kebijakan: Antara konsep dan realita. *Jurnal Kebijakan Publik*, 13(2), 88–99.
- Weible, C. M., Fischer, M., & Ingold, K. (2024). Policy process theories in practice: New perspectives. *Policy Studies Journal*, 52(1), 5–22.
- Widodo, J. (2021). Analisis kebijakan publik: Konsep dan aplikasi analisis proses kebijakan publik. Bayumedia Publishing.
- Zhang, Y., & Rosenbloom, D. H. (2024). Top-down versus bottom-up implementation: A comparative assessment. *Public Administration Review*, 84(2), 245–259.