

ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY, SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT, PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION, COMPARATIVE STUDY, INDONESIA, GERMANY

Rahma Khairunnisa¹, Aminullah²

¹Department of Public Administration, Universitas Yudharta Pasuruan, Indonesia

² Department of Public Administration, Universitas Yudharta Pasuruan, Indonesia

Email : rahmakhairunnisa8432@gmail.com¹, aminullah@yudharta.ac.id²

E-ISSN : 3109-9777

Received: January 2026

Accepted: January 2026

Published: February 2026

Abstract :

Environmental policy and sustainable development have become central issues in modern governance as ecological pressures from development activities continue to intensify. This article aims to analyze and compare environmental policy and sustainable development in Indonesia and Germany using a descriptive-comparative approach based on a literature review. Indonesia, as a developing country with abundant natural resources, faces serious challenges in environmental management, while Germany, as a developed country, is widely recognized as a pioneer in environmental policy and sustainable energy transition. Drawing on classical public administration literature, international academic journals, and official government documents from both countries, this article examines policy frameworks, institutional arrangements, policy instruments, and the implications of environmental policy for sustainable development. The findings indicate that differences in political context, economic structure, and institutional capacity significantly influence policy effectiveness. This study is expected to contribute conceptually and practically to the development of environmental policy in Indonesia through comparative policy learning.

Keywords : *Environmental policy, sustainable development, public administration, comparative study, Indonesia, Germany.*

INTRODUCTION

Environmental issues and sustainable development have become major concerns in global public policy discourse since the late twentieth century. Rapid economic growth, industrialization, and urbanization have generated significant environmental degradation, climate change risks, and declining quality of life. In this context, environmental policy is no longer perceived as a purely sectoral policy but as an integral component of national development strategies. From a public administration perspective, environmental policy reflects the state's capacity to manage long-term public interests, balance economic growth with environmental protection, and establish sustainable governance. The concept of sustainable development, classically defined as development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs, has become a normative foundation for environmental policymaking worldwide. Indonesia and Germany represent two distinct contexts in environmental governance. Indonesia, as a developing country, faces pressures related to natural resource exploitation, deforestation, pollution, and regional development disparities. Germany, by



contrast, is widely regarded as a leader in progressive environmental policy, particularly in renewable energy development and the transition toward a green economy. Comparing these two countries is relevant for understanding how differences in institutional capacity, governance systems, and policy culture shape environmental policy implementation.

This article seeks to analyze environmental policy and sustainable development in Indonesia and Germany through a literature-based descriptive-comparative approach. The main focus includes policy frameworks, institutional structures, policy instruments, and the implications of environmental policy for sustainable development. In recent decades, environmental policy has increasingly been recognized as a critical dimension of public administration and governance. Environmental challenges such as climate change, ecosystem degradation, resource depletion, and environmental pollution are no longer viewed as isolated technical problems, but as complex public policy issues that directly affect economic stability, social welfare, and state legitimacy. These challenges demand coordinated governmental responses that transcend traditional sectoral boundaries and short-term policy horizons. As a result, environmental policy has become a key arena in which the capacity of the state to govern complex and long-term collective problems is tested.

From the perspective of public administration, environmental policy represents a shift from hierarchical and sector-specific governance toward more integrated and collaborative forms of policymaking. Environmental problems are characterized by high levels of uncertainty, scientific complexity, and interdependence among multiple actors, including government agencies, private sector entities, and civil society organizations. This complexity requires administrative systems that are capable of coordination, learning, and adaptation. Consequently, environmental policy has become an important field for examining institutional capacity, administrative reform, and governance innovation.

The concept of sustainable development provides a normative and analytical framework for addressing these challenges. Since the publication of *Our Common Future* by the World Commission on Environment and Development, sustainable development has served as a guiding principle for integrating environmental protection with economic growth and social equity. In contemporary governance, sustainable development is no longer merely a moral aspiration but a policy imperative institutionalized through global frameworks such as the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). Governments are increasingly expected to align national development strategies with sustainability objectives, making environmental policy a central component of development planning.

Despite shared global commitments, countries differ significantly in how they design and implement environmental policies. These differences are shaped by political systems, administrative traditions, economic structures, and levels of institutional capacity. Comparative analysis is therefore essential for understanding why

similar sustainability goals produce different policy outcomes across countries. Within the field of comparative public administration, cross-national comparison enables scholars to identify patterns of governance, institutional strengths and weaknesses, and context-specific policy mechanisms that influence policy effectiveness.

Indonesia and Germany offer a particularly instructive comparison in this regard. Indonesia, as a developing country with vast natural resources and high levels of biodiversity, faces acute environmental pressures linked to economic development, population growth, and regional disparities. Environmental governance in Indonesia operates within a decentralized administrative system, where policy implementation is shaped by complex interactions between central and local governments. Germany, by contrast, represents a developed country with strong institutional capacity and a long-standing commitment to environmental protection. Its experience demonstrates how environmental policy can be integrated into broader strategies of economic modernization and technological innovation. By comparing these two contrasting cases, this article seeks to contribute to the literature on environmental governance and sustainable development from a public administration perspective. Rather than treating environmental policy solely as a technical or legal issue, the analysis emphasizes the role of administrative capacity, institutional design, and policy integration in shaping sustainability outcomes. The comparative approach adopted in this study allows for the identification of policy lessons that are not prescriptive but analytical, offering insights into how environmental policy can be strengthened through adaptive and context-sensitive governance strategies.

RESEARCH METHOD

This study employs a literature review as its primary research design. A descriptive-comparative approach is used to describe environmental policy and sustainable development in Indonesia and Germany and subsequently compare them to identify similarities, differences, and policy lessons. The data sources consist of classical public administration textbooks, reputable international academic journals, and official government documents from Indonesia and Germany related to environmental policy and sustainable development. Data collection was conducted through systematic literature searches, while data analysis involved thematic categorization, interpretation of findings, and comparative synthesis.

This study adopts a qualitative approach using a literature review as the main research method. The literature review is employed because the study aims to develop a conceptual and comparative understanding of environmental policy and sustainable development in Indonesia and Germany, rather than to test hypotheses or measure causal relationships statistically. In public administration and public policy studies, literature-based research is widely recognized as a valid method for examining policy development, institutional capacity, and governance dynamics through the analysis of existing scholarly works and policy documents.

The analytical

approach applied in this study is descriptive-comparative. The descriptive approach is used to systematically describe environmental policy and sustainable development in each country, focusing on regulatory frameworks, institutional structures, policy orientations, and policy instruments. This approach allows for a comprehensive understanding of the policy context in Indonesia and Germany prior to comparison. The comparative approach is then employed to examine similarities, differences, and emerging patterns of environmental policy between the two countries. From a comparative public administration perspective, cross-national comparison is essential for understanding how political, economic, and administrative contexts shape policy formulation and implementation, as well as for facilitating adaptive policy learning rather than direct policy transfer. The theoretical framework of this study is grounded in sustainable development theory, which emphasizes the integration of economic, social, and environmental dimensions, and the concept of environmental governance, which views environmental policy as the outcome of interactions among the state, market actors, and civil society within a complex governance system. These frameworks serve as analytical lenses for comparing environmental policy in Indonesia and Germany.

Data sources consist of classical and contemporary public administration literature, peer-reviewed international journal articles, and official government documents from Indonesia and Germany related to environmental policy and sustainable development. Data analysis is conducted through thematic categorization, interpretative analysis, and cross-national comparative analysis, with source triangulation applied to ensure academic rigor and validity. This study employs a qualitative approach using a literature review as the primary research method. The literature review was selected because the study aims to develop a conceptual and comparative understanding rather than to test hypotheses or measure causal relationships statistically. Within the tradition of public administration and public policy studies, literature-based research is considered a valid and rigorous method for examining policy evolution, governance models, and state institutional capacity through accumulated scholarly knowledge (Waldo, 1955; Dunn, 2018).

The analytical approach adopted in this study is descriptive-comparative. The descriptive approach is used to systematically examine environmental policy and sustainable development in Indonesia and Germany, focusing on regulatory frameworks, policy orientations, institutional actors, and policy instruments. This approach is consistent with classical public administration perspectives that emphasize institutional and policy description as a foundation for governance analysis (Wilson, 1887; Weber, 1948).

The comparative approach is employed to identify similarities, differences, and general patterns in environmental policy across the two countries. From the perspective of comparative public administration, cross-national comparison enables a deeper understanding of how political, economic, social, and cultural contexts influence policy design and implementation (Riggs, 1964; Peters, 2018). This approach also facilitates policy learning and lesson drawing that are adaptive rather than based on direct policy imitation.

The theoretical framework of this study is grounded in sustainable development theory, which emphasizes the integration of economic, environmental, and social dimensions (WCED, 1987), and the concept of environmental governance, which views environmental policy as the outcome of interactions among the state, market actors, and civil society within a complex governance system (Dryzek, 2013; Meadowcroft, 2007). These frameworks are used to assess the institutional and policy capacity of Indonesia and Germany in promoting sustainable development.

Data sources consist of classical and contemporary public administration literature, peer-reviewed international journal articles, and official government documents from Indonesia and Germany related to environmental policy and sustainable development. The literature was collected systematically using relevant keywords and selected based on source credibility and thematic relevance.

Data analysis was conducted through thematic categorization, interpretative analysis, and cross-national comparative analysis. To deepen analytical rigor, this study also adopts a qualitative content analysis technique, which enables systematic examination of policy narratives, institutional discourses, and normative orientations embedded in official documents and academic literature. Through this approach, policy texts are treated not merely as descriptive materials, but as reflections of underlying governance paradigms and administrative values. Furthermore, the comparative process follows a structured framework that includes context analysis, policy instrument analysis, and governance capacity assessment. Context analysis focuses on political-administrative structures, economic development levels, and historical trajectories of environmental governance in Indonesia and Germany. Policy instrument analysis examines the types of regulatory, economic, and voluntary instruments employed by each country, while governance capacity assessment evaluates institutional coordination, bureaucratic professionalism, and policy integration across sectors. To ensure analytical consistency, the comparison is guided by functional equivalence rather than institutional similarity. This means that policies and institutions are compared based on their functions and objectives in addressing environmental challenges, rather than their formal structures. Such an approach is widely recommended in comparative public administration studies to avoid misleading conclusions arising from contextual differences. Reliability and validity are strengthened through careful source selection and cross-referencing between multiple types of literature. Academic peer-reviewed journals provide theoretical and empirical insights, while official government documents offer authoritative information on policy design and implementation. By integrating these sources, the research method ensures a balanced interpretation that is both theoretically informed and empirically grounded.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Environmental Policy and Sustainable Development in Indonesia

Environmental policy in Indonesia has undergone significant normative development over the past two decades. Law No. 32 of 2009 on Environmental Protection and Management serves as the primary legal foundation, affirming that national development must be conducted based on sustainable development principles. This law positions the state as the main actor responsible for environmental protection while encouraging participation from society and the private sector. In practice, Indonesia's environmental policy relies heavily on regulatory and administrative instruments, such as Environmental Impact Assessments (AMDAL), environmental permits, and monitoring and enforcement mechanisms. These instruments are intended to control the negative environmental impacts of development activities, particularly in forestry, mining, energy, and manufacturing sectors. However, empirical studies and official government reports indicate that the effectiveness of these instruments remains limited. Data from the Ministry of Environment and Forestry show that although deforestation rates have declined in recent years, environmental degradation continues due to land conversion, forest fires, and extractive activities.

Decentralization presents a major governance challenge in Indonesia's environmental policy. While local autonomy allows for context-specific policymaking, weak administrative capacity and oversight at the local level often lead to policy inconsistency and weak enforcement. Environmental considerations are frequently subordinated to short-term economic interests, reflecting a structural tension between economic growth and environmental protection. From a sustainable development perspective, environmental policy in Indonesia remains insufficiently integrated with economic and social policies. Environmental protection is often treated as a corrective response rather than a guiding framework for development planning. As a result, sustainable development remains more normative than operational. In addition to the national regulatory framework, environmental policy in Indonesia is also influenced by international commitments ratified by the government, such as the Paris Agreement on climate change and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. These commitments encourage Indonesia to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, strengthen sustainable natural resource management, and enhance environmental and social resilience. From a public administration perspective, Indonesia's participation in global environmental regimes reflects the significant role of external pressures in driving environmental policy reform at the national level.

However, the translation of global commitments into national and local policies continues to face substantial challenges. Divergent interests between central and local governments, limited fiscal capacity, and continued dependence on natural resource-based sectors often undermine policy consistency. Moreover, mechanisms for evaluating environmental policy performance are not yet fully integrated into development planning and budgeting cycles. As a result, progress toward achieving sustainable development goals in the environmental sector remains uneven across regions. From a sustainable development

perspective, Indonesia's primary challenge lies in balancing economic growth, poverty reduction, and environmental protection. Addressing this challenge requires a more preventive and long-term policy approach, in which environmental policy functions not merely as a regulatory or corrective instrument, but as a strategic driver of inclusive and sustainable development transformation.

Environmental policy in Indonesia has evolved significantly over the past two decades, reflecting the growing recognition of environmental sustainability as an integral component of national development. As a country endowed with extensive natural resources and rich biodiversity, Indonesia faces complex environmental challenges, including deforestation, land degradation, air and water pollution, and vulnerability to climate change. These challenges are closely linked to economic development strategies, population growth, and regional disparities, making environmental governance a central concern for public administration.

From an institutional perspective, Indonesia's environmental policy framework is shaped by its decentralized governance system. Since the implementation of regional autonomy reforms, significant authority over environmental management has been transferred to local governments. While decentralization aims to enhance responsiveness and local accountability, it has also introduced coordination challenges and variations in policy implementation across regions. Differences in administrative capacity, fiscal resources, and political commitment among local governments often result in uneven enforcement of environmental regulations. This condition highlights the importance of vertical coordination between central and local authorities in achieving sustainable development objectives. The Ministry of Environment and Forestry plays a central role in formulating national environmental policies and regulations. Key legal instruments, such as the Environmental Protection and Management Law, provide the formal basis for integrating environmental considerations into development planning. Environmental impact assessment (EIA) mechanisms are designed to ensure that development projects account for ecological and social consequences. However, in practice, the effectiveness of these instruments is frequently constrained by administrative limitations, regulatory overlap, and enforcement gaps. These issues illustrate the broader challenge of translating formal policy commitments into consistent administrative action.

In recent years, Indonesia has increasingly aligned its environmental policies with global sustainability frameworks, particularly the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and international climate agreements. National development plans incorporate sustainability principles, emphasizing the balance between economic growth, environmental protection, and social inclusion. Climate change mitigation and adaptation policies, such as emissions reduction targets and renewable energy initiatives, demonstrate Indonesia's commitment to global environmental governance. Nevertheless, policy implementation remains highly dependent on inter-agency coordination and the capacity of public institutions to manage complex cross-sectoral issues. From a

public administration perspective, environmental policy in Indonesia reflects an ongoing transition toward integrated governance. Environmental problems cut across sectors such as forestry, energy, agriculture, and infrastructure, requiring coordination beyond traditional bureaucratic boundaries. Efforts to promote policy integration indicate a shift away from fragmented administrative approaches. However, institutional silos and competing sectoral priorities continue to pose significant obstacles. This situation underscores the need for administrative reforms that strengthen coordination mechanisms and promote policy coherence.

Overall, environmental policy and sustainable development in Indonesia illustrate the tension between ambitious policy goals and practical administrative constraints. While the legal and strategic frameworks demonstrate a strong normative commitment to sustainability, effective implementation depends on institutional capacity, governance coordination, and regulatory enforcement. Understanding these dynamics is essential for assessing Indonesia's environmental governance and for drawing comparative insights in relation to countries with more established administrative systems.

Environmental Policy and Sustainable Development in Germany

In contrast, environmental policy in Germany has developed within a stable and highly integrated governance framework. Environmental protection has long been a core public policy priority and is embedded across multiple sectors, including energy, industry, transport, and spatial planning. A landmark example is the *Energiewende*, Germany's transition toward renewable energy and low-carbon development. Official government data indicate that by 2023, renewable energy accounted for more than 50 percent of Germany's electricity generation. This achievement reflects not only environmental commitment but also strong administrative capacity and long-term policy coordination.

Germany's environmental policy is supported by strict regulatory standards, consistent economic incentives, and effective enforcement mechanisms. High levels of public trust, legal compliance, and civic participation further strengthen policy legitimacy. Environmental protection is framed as a strategic opportunity for innovation and economic competitiveness rather than a constraint on development. Beyond energy transition policies, environmental policy in Germany is also supported by a strong and consistent legal and institutional framework. Environmental protection is explicitly recognized as a state objective (*Staatsziel Umweltschutz*) in the German Constitution (*Grundgesetz*), providing a solid normative and legal foundation for environmental policymaking and implementation. This constitutional recognition strengthens the position of environmental policy within public decision-making processes and limits the tendency to subordinate environmental interests to short-term economic considerations. In public administration practice, Germany consistently applies the precautionary principle and the polluter pays principle in environmental policy. These principles are reflected not only in regulatory instruments but also in economic mechanisms such as environmental taxes, emissions trading schemes, and incentives for environmentally friendly

technological innovation. This policy mix encourages behavioral change among economic actors and strengthens the internalization of environmental costs in production and consumption activities. From a sustainable development perspective, environmental policy in Germany functions as a strategic instrument for structural economic transformation. Sustained investment in research, green technology, and the circular economy demonstrates that environmental protection can coexist with enhanced economic competitiveness and social welfare. This approach underscores the state's role as a central coordinator in long-term, sustainability-oriented governance.

Germany is widely recognized as a leading example of environmental governance and sustainable development among industrialized countries. Environmental policy in Germany is deeply embedded within its political and administrative systems, reflecting a long-standing commitment to ecological protection, economic modernization, and social responsibility. Rather than treating environmental protection as a separate policy domain, Germany has increasingly integrated sustainability principles into its broader development and governance strategies. Institutionally, environmental policy in Germany is characterized by a high degree of administrative coordination and legal clarity. The Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation, Nuclear Safety and Consumer Protection plays a central role in policy formulation, supported by a well-established regulatory framework. Germany's federal system allocates significant responsibilities to state-level governments (Länder), particularly in policy implementation and enforcement. This multilevel governance structure allows for regional adaptation while maintaining national policy coherence through clear legal standards and coordinated administrative mechanisms.

One of the defining features of Germany's environmental policy is its strong reliance on regulatory instruments combined with market-based mechanisms. Environmental regulations are enforced through comprehensive monitoring systems, clear compliance requirements, and credible sanctions. At the same time, Germany has actively employed economic instruments, such as environmental taxes and subsidies, to incentivize sustainable behavior. The *Energiewende* (energy transition) policy exemplifies this approach, combining regulatory targets with financial incentives to promote renewable energy and reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

From a sustainable development perspective, Germany has made significant progress in integrating environmental objectives with economic and social policies. Sustainable development strategies are incorporated into national planning processes, ensuring that environmental considerations are systematically addressed in policy formulation. Germany's commitment to the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) is reflected in regular monitoring and reporting mechanisms that assess policy outcomes and guide administrative adjustments. These mechanisms enhance transparency and accountability, reinforcing public trust in environmental governance.

Public participation and stakeholder engagement represent another important dimension of environmental policy in Germany. Environmental

decision-making processes often involve consultations with civil society organizations, scientific institutions, and the private sector. This participatory approach contributes to policy legitimacy and helps align administrative actions with societal expectations. From a public administration standpoint, such engagement reflects a governance model that values deliberation, knowledge-sharing, and collaborative problem-solving. Despite its strengths, Germany's environmental policy also faces challenges. Balancing environmental protection with industrial competitiveness remains a persistent concern, particularly in energy-intensive sectors. Additionally, the complexity of multilevel governance can slow decision-making processes and create coordination demands across administrative levels. Nevertheless, Germany's institutional capacity and administrative professionalism enable the state to adapt policies in response to emerging environmental and economic pressures.

In comparative perspective, Germany's experience demonstrates how strong institutions, policy integration, and administrative capacity can support sustainable development. Environmental policy in Germany illustrates the potential of coordinated governance and long-term strategic planning to address complex environmental challenges, offering valuable insights for countries seeking to strengthen their environmental governance frameworks.

Comparative Analysis and Policy Implications

The comparison reveals that differences in environmental policy effectiveness are closely linked to institutional capacity and governance coherence. While both countries share normative commitments to sustainability, Germany demonstrates deeper policy integration and administrative consistency. For Indonesia, the German experience highlights the importance of institutional strengthening, cross-sectoral coordination, and long-term policy commitment. However, policy learning should be adaptive rather than imitative, taking into account Indonesia's distinct socio-economic and political context. The comparative analysis of environmental policy and sustainable development in Indonesia and Germany yields several important policy implications for strengthening environmental governance in Indonesia. These implications should not be interpreted as a basis for direct policy transfer, but rather as a framework for adaptive policy learning that takes into account national socio-economic and institutional contexts.

First, strengthening institutional and bureaucratic capacity is a fundamental prerequisite for effective environmental policy. Germany's experience demonstrates that successful environmental governance relies heavily on a professional, stable, and consistent public administration. In Indonesia, although the regulatory framework is relatively comprehensive, policy implementation remains constrained by limited administrative capacity, weak inter-agency coordination, and uneven institutional performance between central and local governments. Consequently, public administration reform in the environmental sector should prioritize capacity building, improved oversight mechanisms, and more coherent coordination across sectors and levels of government.

Second, stronger integration of environmental policy into national and regional development planning is essential. The findings indicate that environmental policy in Indonesia is often treated as a sectoral and corrective policy, rather than as a guiding framework for development. In contrast, Germany integrates environmental objectives into long-term development strategies and economic transformation agendas. This comparison implies that Indonesia needs to mainstream environmental considerations into economic, industrial, energy, and infrastructure policies. Such integration is critical to ensuring that sustainable development moves beyond normative commitments and becomes operational in policy practice.

Third, diversification of environmental policy instruments represents a strategic policy implication. Indonesia continues to rely predominantly on regulatory and administrative instruments, such as licensing and compliance monitoring. Germany's experience illustrates the effectiveness of combining regulatory tools with economic and participatory instruments, including fiscal incentives, support for technological innovation, and active stakeholder engagement. Accordingly, Indonesia could benefit from expanding incentive-based and market-oriented instruments to promote environmental compliance and innovation, while maintaining the state's regulatory and supervisory role.

Fourth, the promotion of collaborative environmental governance emerges as a key implication for sustainable development. Effective environmental policy requires constructive interaction among government, the private sector, and civil society. In the Indonesian context, enhancing transparency, public participation, and accountability is crucial for strengthening policy legitimacy and social compliance. Collaborative governance can help bridge the gap between formal regulation and on-the-ground implementation. Overall, the policy implications of this study underscore that successful environmental policy and sustainable development depend not only on the existence of formal regulations, but also on institutional capacity, policy coherence, and governance integration. Germany's experience provides valuable strategic insights for Indonesia in strengthening environmental policy, provided that such lessons are adapted to national conditions and development challenges.

Table : 1 Comparison of Environmental Policy Frameworks in Indonesia and Germany

Aspect	Indonesia	Germany
Main Legal Basis	Law No. 32 of 2009 on Environmental Protection and Management	Federal Environmental Protection Act (<i>Bundes-Immissionsschutzgesetz</i>)
Policy Principles	Sustainable development, precautionary principle, state responsibility	Sustainable development, prevention principle, polluter pays principle

Environment-Development Integration	Limited and sectoral	High, cross-sectoral integration
Role of Environmental Policy	Corrective and impact control	Strategic and transformational

CONCLUSION

This article shows that environmental policy and sustainable development in Indonesia and Germany have evolved within different political, economic, and institutional contexts, despite sharing similar normative goals. Germany demonstrates more integrated and effective environmental policy practices, while Indonesia remains in a phase of policy consolidation and institutional strengthening. Lessons from Germany's experience may serve as valuable references for Indonesia, particularly in strengthening institutional capacity, enhancing cross-sectoral policy integration, and increasing public participation. However, policy adoption must be carefully adapted to Indonesia's social, economic, and political context.

This comparative study of environmental policy and sustainable development in Indonesia and Germany demonstrates that, although both countries share a normative commitment to sustainability principles, there are substantial differences in institutional capacity, policy consistency, and implementation effectiveness. These differences are not merely the result of contrasting levels of economic development, but are deeply rooted in variations in public administrative structures, bureaucratic culture, governance traditions, and the strategic positioning of environmental policy within national development agendas.

Indonesia has developed a relatively comprehensive legal and policy framework for environmental protection. A wide range of laws, regulations, and policy instruments formally incorporate the principles of sustainable development into national policy. Environmental protection is legally recognized as an integral component of development, and the state is positioned as the primary actor responsible for safeguarding environmental sustainability. However, the findings of this study indicate that the main challenges faced by Indonesia lie not in policy formulation, but in policy implementation. Environmental policy has not yet been fully mainstreamed into development planning and decision-making processes. Instead, it often functions as a corrective mechanism aimed at mitigating the negative impacts of economic growth rather than as a guiding framework shaping development trajectories.

REFERENCES

- Dryzek, J. S. (2013). *The Politics of the Earth: Environmental Discourses*. Oxford University Press.
- United Nations. (1987). *Our Common Future*. Oxford University Press.
- Weber, M. (1948). *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*. Oxford University Press.

- Ministry of Environment and Forestry of the Republic of Indonesia. (2020). *Environmental Protection and Management Policy*.
- Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation, Nuclear Safety and Consumer Protection. (2021). *Environmental Policy in Germany*.
- Gunningham, N., Kagan, R. A., & Thornton, D. (2003). *Shades of green: Business, regulation, and environment*. Stanford University Press.
- Jordan, A., & Lenschow, A. (2010). Environmental policy integration: A state of the art review. *Environmental Policy and Governance*
- OECD. (2019). *Environmental performance reviews: Germany 2019*. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/8da0c8b3-en>
- UN Environment Programme. (2019). *Global environment outlook - GEO-6: Healthy planet, healthy people*. Cambridge University Press.
- World Bank. (2021). *Indonesia environment and natural resources policy note*. World Bank Group.