



Collaborative Public Management Governance in the Implementation of Communal-Based Green Economic Development in Jayapura Regency

Ibrahim Kristofol Kendi¹

¹Program Doktor Administrasi Publik FISIP Universitas Hasanuddin

*Corresponding Author: Ibrahim Kristofol Kendi

Email: kendiibrahim@gmail.com

Article Info

Article History:

Received May 4, 2025

Revised June 1, 2025

Accepted: July 3, 2025

Keywords:

Collaborative Public Management, Green Economy, Collaborative Governance, Network Management, Jayapura Regency.

Abstract

This research analyzes Collaborative Public Management (CPM) in the implementation of Jayapura Regency Regent Regulation Number 5 of 2021 concerning Communal-Based Green Economic Development. The research uses a qualitative approach with secondary data in the form of regulations, regional development planning documents, RKPD, Renja OPD, as well as documents related to village government and indigenous communities. The analysis uses Agranoff and McGuire's four CPM activities, namely activating network, framing, mobilizing, and synthesizing. The research results show that policy implementation has adequate institutional foundations and actors but has not yet developed into integrated collaborative governance. In the activating network, strategic actors are available, but the involvement of traditional villages, Ondoafi, and universities is not yet fully institutionalized. Regarding framing, Perbup Number 5 of 2021 has provided a normative framework but has not yet produced a shared vision and understanding across sectors. In mobilizing, various programs and resources are available, but they are still being mobilized sectorally. Meanwhile, synthesizing has been supported by coordination forums, but has not resulted in integration of priorities, programs, resources, conflict resolution and joint evaluation. The research concludes that CPM in communal-based green economic development in Jayapura Regency is at the emerging collaborative management stage. Strengthening policy implementation needs to be directed at integrating actors, aligning goals, mobilizing joint resources, and developing collective decision-making and evaluation mechanisms.

Introduction

The pursuit of sustainable and inclusive economic development has increasingly required governments to move beyond conventional sectoral approaches toward governance arrangements that integrate economic, social, institutional, and environmental dimensions. Green economy development represents one such approach because it seeks to connect economic productivity and community welfare with environmental sustainability and the responsible use of natural resources. In regions characterized by diverse ecological resources, strong community institutions, and plural governance arrangements, the implementation of green economy policies cannot depend solely on formal government institutions. Instead, it requires collaboration among government agencies, local communities, customary institutions, private actors, civil society organizations, and knowledge institutions. This perspective is particularly relevant in Jayapura Regency, where the implementation of communal-based green economy development involves government institutions, villages, customary villages, Ondoafi,

indigenous communities, universities, and other stakeholders with different authorities, resources, knowledge, and interests. The existing study identifies Regent Regulation of Jayapura Regency Number 5 of 2021 concerning Communal-Based Green Economy Development as the principal policy framework for this process.

The implementation of this policy presents a complex governance challenge because the actors involved operate within different institutional and organizational arrangements. The Jayapura Regency Government and its regional apparatus organizations (OPDs) possess formal administrative authority, while village governments and customary village institutions operate within local governance structures. Ondoafi and indigenous communities also possess social authority, local knowledge, and relationships with communal resources, including customary land, forests, sago areas, waters, and other natural resources. Consequently, green economy development requires more than a clear division of institutional responsibilities. It requires mechanisms capable of connecting these different sources of authority and ensuring that development decisions reflect shared objectives. The study indicates that although institutional responsibilities are relatively clear, challenges remain in aligning objectives, integrating cross-sectoral programs, establishing effective communication, resolving differences of interest, and sustaining inter-organizational cooperation.

This condition demonstrates a shift from institutional arrangement toward collaborative management. The central issue is not simply which institution has authority over a particular development activity, but how relationships among institutions can be managed to generate effective collective action. In the context of communal-based green economy development, environmental protection, local economic development, community empowerment, agriculture, fisheries, tourism, and village development are interconnected. Programs in these areas may be implemented by different OPDs, yet their outcomes are mutually dependent. For example, the development of local commodities requires connections between production, processing, marketing, infrastructure, financing, community empowerment, and environmental protection. When these activities remain separated within individual institutional programs, government interventions may continue to operate administratively without producing the integrated collective action required by a green economy framework.

Collaborative Public Management (CPM), particularly the framework developed by Agranoff and McGuire (2003), provides a relevant perspective for examining this governance challenge. CPM emphasizes the management of relationships and networks among public organizations rather than the creation of a new centralized organization or the transfer of authority from one institution to another. Its relevance lies in explaining how actors with different mandates, resources, and organizational capacities can coordinate their activities to achieve shared public outcomes. In Jayapura Regency, this perspective allows the implementation of the green economy policy to be examined as a process of network management involving the local government, Bappeda, technical OPDs, village governments, customary villages, Ondoafi, indigenous communities, universities, civil society organizations, and other development partners. The study positions Bappeda as a potential network manager or meta-governor responsible for connecting development programs, facilitating cross-sectoral communication, addressing coordination barriers, and maintaining policy integration without taking over the authority of other institutions.

The CPM framework further identifies four important activities for understanding collaborative network management: activating, framing, mobilizing, and synthesizing. Activating concerns identifying and connecting actors that possess strategic resources, knowledge, authority, or interests. Framing concerns developing a shared understanding, vision, and commitment regarding the direction of development. Mobilizing focuses on moving organizational

resources, programs, capacities, and authority toward collective action. Synthesizing concerns integrating the activities of different actors through coordination, information sharing, joint evaluation, learning, and collaborative conflict resolution. These four dimensions are particularly important for communal-based green economy development because the availability of actors and programs alone does not guarantee effective collaboration. What matters is whether these actors are genuinely connected, whether they share a common understanding of green economy objectives, whether resources are jointly mobilized, and whether coordination produces integrated decisions and collective outcomes.

The Jayapura context also highlights the importance of incorporating customary institutions into collaborative governance. Communal-based economic development is closely associated with the management of resources that are embedded within customary relationships and local social institutions. Therefore, customary villages and Ondoafi should not merely be treated as beneficiaries or consultation partners but as active participants in planning, resource management, decision-making, monitoring, and evaluation. The study finds that these actors have not yet been fully institutionalized across all stages of development decision-making. Similarly, universities possess important research and knowledge capacities but have not yet been strongly institutionalized within a permanent green economy governance network. This indicates that the potential network of actors already exists, but it has not been fully transformed into an organized and sustained collaborative network.

Another important challenge concerns the gap between the normative framework of the policy and its operational implementation. Regent Regulation Number 5 of 2021 provides a policy foundation for economic development that considers ecological sustainability and community interests. However, the existence of a regulation does not automatically produce a shared frame among implementing organizations. Planning documents such as the RPJMD, RKPD, and OPD strategic plans continue to reflect sectoral mandates, with environmental agencies emphasizing environmental protection, agricultural agencies focusing on production and farmers, fisheries agencies emphasizing fisheries production, tourism agencies developing tourism potential, and village-related institutions focusing on community and village development. These activities can contribute to the green economy, but without a shared framework they may remain disconnected initiatives rather than components of a common development strategy.

Therefore, examining CPM in Jayapura Regency is important for understanding why a policy with an established institutional and regulatory foundation may not yet produce fully integrated collaborative governance. The central problem is not necessarily the absence of actors, programs, resources, or coordination forums, but the limited integration of these elements into a sustained mechanism for collective action. Existing findings indicate that activating remains partial, framing has not fully produced shared understanding, mobilizing remains largely sectoral, and synthesizing has not yet generated comprehensive integration of priorities, programs, resources, conflict resolution, and joint evaluation. Consequently, CPM in Jayapura Regency can be characterized as an emerging collaborative management arrangement rather than a fully integrated collaborative governance system.

Based on this problem, this study aims to analyze the implementation of Collaborative Public Management in the implementation of Regent Regulation of Jayapura Regency Number 5 of 2021 concerning Communal-Based Green Economy Development. The analysis focuses on the four CPM dimensions—activating network, framing, mobilizing, and synthesizing—to examine how actors are connected, how shared objectives are developed, how resources are mobilized, and how cross-organizational activities are integrated. The study is expected to contribute to public administration scholarship by strengthening understanding of collaborative governance in development settings characterized by multiple formal and customary

authorities. Practically, the findings are expected to provide a basis for strengthening collaborative mechanisms that connect government institutions, customary institutions, villages, communities, universities, and other stakeholders in planning, implementing, monitoring, and evaluating communal-based green economy development in Jayapura Regency.

Method

Research Method

This study employed a qualitative approach using a case study design to examine the implementation of Collaborative Public Management (CPM) in communal-based green economy development in Jayapura Regency. A qualitative case study was considered appropriate because the study seeks to understand governance processes, institutional relationships, coordination mechanisms, and interactions among multiple actors within their specific policy and administrative context. The case examined in this study is the implementation of Jayapura Regent Regulation Number 5 of 2021 concerning Communal-Based Green Economy Development, which involves government institutions, regional government agencies, village governments, customary villages, indigenous institutions, and other relevant stakeholders. The qualitative case study design follows the methodological principles outlined by Creswell and Poth (2018) and Yin (2018).

Data Sources and Data Collection

The study relied primarily on secondary data obtained through document analysis. The documents examined included policy and regulatory documents, regional development planning documents, government program reports, government publications, statistical data, village-related documents, customary governance regulations, and relevant academic literature. These documents were selected based on their relevance to the implementation of communal-based green economy development and the relationships among the actors involved in its governance. Document analysis was used because it enables researchers to systematically examine written materials as sources of information concerning institutional arrangements, policy implementation, organizational responsibilities, coordination practices, and development priorities (Bowen, 2009).

The documentary materials were examined to identify evidence concerning the roles and interactions of key actors, particularly the Jayapura Regency Government, Bappeda, relevant regional government organizations, village governments, customary villages, Ondoafi, indigenous communities, universities, and other stakeholders. Particular attention was given to documents that describe development planning, program implementation, institutional responsibilities, coordination mechanisms, and the integration of economic, social, and environmental objectives. The analysis therefore focused not merely on the formal existence of institutions or policies but also on evidence indicating how these institutional arrangements support or constrain collaborative action.

Analytical Framework

Data analysis was guided by the Collaborative Public Management framework developed by Agranoff and McGuire (2003). The framework was operationalized through four analytical dimensions: activating network, framing, mobilizing, and synthesizing. Activating network was used to examine the identification, involvement, and activation of actors possessing relevant authority, resources, knowledge, and interests. Framing was used to assess the extent to which participating actors developed shared understandings, objectives, priorities, and commitments regarding communal-based green economy development. Mobilizing focused on

how organizational resources, programs, authority, knowledge, and capacities were utilized to support collective action. Synthesizing examined the extent to which coordination among actors produced integrated priorities, programs, decisions, conflict-resolution mechanisms, and joint evaluation.

The four dimensions were applied as analytical categories to organize and interpret evidence contained in the documentary materials. This approach enabled the study to assess the extent to which the existing institutional arrangements had developed into substantive collaborative management practices. The analysis consequently distinguished between the formal availability of institutions, regulations, programs, and coordination forums and their capacity to generate integrated cross-organizational action.

Data Analysis Procedure

The data were analyzed thematically following the qualitative data analysis process described by Miles, Huberman, and Saldaña (2020). The analysis involved three interconnected activities: data condensation, data display, and conclusion drawing/verification. First, relevant information was identified and condensed from the collected documents according to the four CPM dimensions. Second, the relevant findings were organized and displayed thematically to identify patterns of institutional interaction, coordination, communication, negotiation, resource mobilization, and network development. Third, conclusions were developed by comparing patterns across documents and interpreting them in relation to the CPM framework.

The analysis also emphasized the relationship among the four dimensions rather than treating them as completely independent processes. Evidence concerning actor activation was examined in relation to the development of shared objectives, while resource mobilization was considered in relation to the effectiveness of coordination and network integration. This enabled the study to identify potential gaps between the institutional structure of collaboration and the actual practice of collaborative management.

Result and Discussion

This section presents the findings and discussion concerning the implementation of Collaborative Public Management (CPM) in the development of a communal-based green economy in Jayapura Regency. The analysis focuses on four dimensions of CPM proposed by Agranoff and McGuire (2003), namely activating network, framing, mobilizing, and synthesizing. The analysis is based on secondary data obtained from policy and regional development planning documents, particularly Jayapura Regent Regulation Number 5 of 2021, the RPJMD, RKPD, OPD work plans (Renja), village development documents, and regulations concerning customary village governance and indigenous communities. Rather than examining only the formal existence of policies, institutions, and coordination forums, the analysis assesses whether these instruments have generated substantive collaborative management practices in the implementation of communal-based green economy development.

Activating Network

The first dimension of CPM concerns the capacity of government to identify, involve, and activate actors that possess relevant resources, authority, knowledge, and interests in achieving collective development objectives. The findings indicate that communal-based green economy development in Jayapura Regency involves a relatively complex network of actors. Bappeda occupies an important position in regional planning and coordination, while various regional government organizations (OPDs) exercise sectoral authority according to their respective mandates. At the local level, village governments, customary villages, indigenous communities, and Ondoafi possess important social authority, local knowledge, and

relationships with communal resources. Universities also represent potential knowledge partners that can contribute research, evidence, and policy evaluation.

However, the existence of these actors does not automatically indicate that an effective collaborative network has been established. Regional planning documents continue to demonstrate a strong sectoral division of governmental responsibilities. Bappeda functions primarily as a planning coordinator, but an explicit mechanism that integrates all relevant OPDs into a dedicated network for communal-based green economy development remains relatively weak. Environmental management, agriculture, fisheries, community empowerment, tourism, and village development programs tend to remain within the respective domains of individual OPDs.

A more significant issue concerns the institutional position of customary actors. Although Regent Regulation Number 5 of 2021 provides a policy foundation for green economy development, Ondoafi and customary villages have not yet been fully institutionalized throughout the various stages of development decision-making. This is particularly important because communal-based economic development differs from conventional economic development. Resources such as customary land, forests, sago areas, waters, and social spaces are embedded within customary institutional relationships. Therefore, indigenous actors cannot be treated merely as beneficiaries or consultation participants. Their participation needs to extend to planning, decision-making, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation.

A similar condition can be observed in relation to higher education institutions. The capacity of Universitas Cenderawasih as a source of knowledge could strengthen evidence-based policy formulation and evaluation, yet the available documentary evidence does not demonstrate a permanent mechanism positioning universities as institutional members of the green economy management network. Thus, the actors required for collaboration are potentially available, but they have not all been transformed into an organized and sustainable working network.

From the perspective of Agranoff and McGuire, activating a network involves more than identifying relevant actors. It requires actors to be genuinely incorporated into working relationships and to exchange resources, authority, information, and expertise in pursuit of common objectives. Accordingly, the activating network dimension in Jayapura Regency can be characterized as partial. The institutional and actor base for collaboration already exists, but network activation remains insufficiently structured to produce sustained cross-organizational collective action.

Framing

The second dimension, framing, concerns the development of a shared understanding regarding problems, objectives, interests, priorities, and directions for collective action. The findings show that Jayapura Regency already possesses a relatively clear normative foundation through Regent Regulation Number 5 of 2021. The regulation provides a framework for economic development that incorporates not only economic growth but also ecological sustainability and community interests.

Nevertheless, the existence of a policy framework does not necessarily mean that a shared frame has been established among implementing organizations. The RPJMD, RKPD, and OPD work plans indicate that development continues to be interpreted primarily through sectoral mandates. Environmental institutions emphasize environmental protection, agricultural institutions focus on production and farmer empowerment, fisheries institutions emphasize fisheries production, tourism institutions develop tourism potential, while institutions responsible for villages emphasize community and village development. Although these

activities can contribute to a green economy, they are not necessarily formulated within a unified set of collective objectives.

This finding is important because communal-based green economy development requires a common understanding of what constitutes a green economy, who should receive its primary benefits, which resources need to be protected, and how economic development should relate to indigenous rights and customary institutions. Without such a shared frame, the green economy may become merely an additional environmental dimension attached to existing sectoral programs rather than an integrated development paradigm.

The documentary evidence also does not strongly demonstrate the existence of a specific institutional instrument for establishing a common understanding among OPDs, customary villages, village governments, and Ondoafi regarding the implementation of Regent Regulation Number 5 of 2021. Although planning forums are available, the existence of a planning forum should not automatically be interpreted as evidence of effective framing. In CPM, framing requires the development of shared meanings and understandings that subsequently influence program choices, role allocation, performance indicators, and approaches to problem solving.

Therefore, the framing dimension remains relatively weak. The policy framework exists, but it has not yet been fully transformed into a common framework for action. This finding provides only partial support for the CPM perspective of Agranoff and McGuire because the existence of a formal policy does not necessarily produce shared interpretations among participating organizations. Instead, sectoral fragmentation continues to influence how the green economy agenda is understood and implemented, which subsequently affects the effectiveness of resource mobilization.

Mobilizing

The third CPM dimension is mobilizing, which refers to the capacity of participating actors to utilize resources, programs, authority, organizational capabilities, and knowledge to produce collective action. The findings indicate that Jayapura Regency possesses substantial resources for developing a communal-based green economy. These include sago, agricultural resources, fisheries in Lake Sentani, forest products, ecotourism potential, and community-based businesses utilizing local resources. Collectively, these resources provide a foundation for connecting community welfare with ecological sustainability.

At the government level, various OPDs have programs that potentially support these objectives. However, the central challenge concerns the integration of these programs. Regional planning documents indicate that resource mobilization remains largely structured according to individual OPD programs. Consequently, government resources are being mobilized administratively, but not necessarily through a collaborative mechanism. This distinction is important because administrative mobilization involves organizations implementing their respective programs, whereas collaborative mobilization requires the pooling or coordinated deployment of resources across organizational boundaries.

The weakness of collaborative mobilization becomes particularly visible when community economic programs intersect with issues of land ownership, spatial utilization, and customary resource management. Within indigenous communities, the success of development programs depends not only on government budgets but also on social legitimacy, recognition of customary rights, local knowledge, and community consent. Consequently, customary villages and Ondoafi should not simply function as locations for government programs; they should participate directly in the mobilization and management of resources.

Cross-sectoral synergy is another major challenge. The development of a local commodity, for example, requires connections among production, processing, marketing, infrastructure, financing, community empowerment, and environmental protection. When these functions are implemented separately by different OPDs without an integrated collaborative design, individual programs may continue to operate successfully within their own administrative boundaries but fail to generate collective action.

Accordingly, mobilizing can be classified as operational but fragmented. Government and community resources are available, and various programs have been implemented, but mechanisms for combining these resources into integrated cross-organizational action remain insufficient. This represents partial conformity with the CPM framework: resource mobilization has occurred, but it has not yet developed into network-based mobilization capable of producing strong institutional synergy.

Synthesizing

The fourth dimension, synthesizing, represents the extent to which activated actors, shared frameworks, and mobilized resources are integrated into coordinated collective action. This dimension is particularly important because the existence of actors, policies, programs, and resources does not necessarily guarantee collaborative outcomes. The findings indicate that the Jayapura Regency Government has established several coordination arenas, including Musrenbang, coordination meetings, RKPD preparation, OPD work-plan preparation, and development consultation forums. Institutionally, these mechanisms provide opportunities for bringing together different organizational interests.

The critical issue, however, is whether coordination produces genuine synthesis. When proposals from villages, customary villages, or indigenous communities are subsequently processed separately through sectoral planning mechanisms, coordination primarily functions as an administrative procedure. Genuine synthesizing should produce shared priorities, complementary division of responsibilities, common performance indicators, mutually supportive resource allocation, and collective evaluation.

The synchronization between the RKPD and OPD work plans is therefore an important indicator. The RKPD should function as a space for consolidating diverse development interests, while OPD work plans translate these priorities into sectoral programs. If green economy priorities are not consistently translated into OPD work plans, a planning gap emerges between the macro-level policy framework and sectoral implementation. In such circumstances, the policy may provide a comprehensive development direction while implementation remains fragmented across individual institutions.

Conflict management is another important component of synthesizing. Communal-based green economy development may bring government authority into interaction with customary authority, particularly regarding customary land, natural resource utilization, and spatial planning. Effective coordination should therefore function not only as an information-sharing mechanism but also as a space for negotiation, harmonization of authority, conflict resolution, and agreement building. Although customary governance regulations and village institutions provide an institutional basis, the available evidence suggests that an integrated mechanism for managing these potential conflicts remains insufficiently developed.

Joint evaluation also remains a significant weakness. Evaluation conducted independently by individual OPDs tends to produce sector-specific assessments rather than an understanding of collective performance. From a CPM perspective, evaluation should connect the contributions of different actors to shared development outcomes. In the context of communal-based green economy development, relevant indicators could include increased community income,

sustainability of local enterprises, protection of ecological areas, utilization of local resources, and strengthening of indigenous institutional capacity.

Therefore, synthesizing remains suboptimal. Although coordination forums and institutional instruments exist, they have not yet consistently produced integrated decisions, programs, resources, conflict-resolution mechanisms, and joint evaluation. In terms of Agranoff and McGuire's framework, CPM practices in Jayapura Regency remain closer to inter-organizational coordination than to genuine synthesis of collective action.

Integrated Discussion

The analysis of the four CPM dimensions reveals a consistent pattern. The principal challenge in communal-based green economy development in Jayapura Regency is not the absence of actors, programs, resources, or regulations, but the limited integration of actors, objectives, resources, and decisions into a unified collaborative working mechanism. The activating network dimension has established a potential network but has not fully activated all relevant actors. Framing has a formal policy foundation but has not yet generated a sufficiently shared understanding. Mobilizing has generated numerous programs and resources but remains predominantly sectoral, while synthesizing has established coordination forums without consistently producing integrated collective action.

These findings demonstrate an empirical gap between the structure of collaboration and the practice of collaboration. Institutional structures provide spaces for collaboration, but actual implementation continues to be influenced by fragmented authority, sectoral programs, and the insufficient institutionalization of customary actors within collective decision-making mechanisms.

From the perspective of Collaborative Public Management, this condition suggests that Jayapura Regency is experiencing an emerging collaborative management arrangement rather than a fully integrated collaborative governance system. Regent Regulation Number 5 of 2021 has established an important policy direction for communal-based green economy development, but the policy has not yet been translated into a fully integrated governance mechanism. Therefore, the key intervention is not necessarily the creation of additional programs, but the development of mechanisms that connect customary and governmental actors, establish shared development objectives, integrate programs across OPDs, and create joint planning, monitoring, and evaluation systems.

Conclusion

Research findings indicate that Collaborative Public Management (CPM) for communal-based green economic development in Jayapura Regency possesses an adequate foundation of institutions and actors including the Regent Regulation (Perbup) No. 5 of 2021, Bappeda (Regional Development Planning Agency), Regional Apparatus Organizations (OPD), village governments, customary villages, Ondoafi (traditional leaders), the community, and higher education institutions. However, this foundation has not yet been integrated into robust collaborative practices. Regarding the "activating networks" dimension, the necessary actors are present but not yet fully activated; "framing" has a policy basis but has not yet yielded a shared vision and understanding; "mobilizing" is supported by various programs and resources but remains sectoral in nature; and while "synthesizing" involves coordination forums, it has not yet resulted in the integration of priorities, programs, authority, indicators, and joint evaluation. Based on this analysis, CPM in Jayapura Regency is at the "emerging collaborative management" stage a form of collaboration that is institutionally established but has not yet achieved integrated collective action. The primary challenge lies in transforming Regent Regulation No. 5 of 2021 from a normative framework into an operational collaboration

mechanism that links local government, OPDs, villages, customary villages, *Ondoafi*, and the community in the planning, implementation, and evaluation of communal-based green economic development.

References

- Agranoff, R., & McGuire, M. (2003). *Collaborative public management: New strategies for local governments*. Georgetown University Press.
- Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Kooiman, J. (2003). *Governing as governance*. SAGE Publications.
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2020). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Ostrom, E. (2010). Beyond markets and states: Polycentric governance of complex economic systems. *American Economic Review*, 100(3), 641–672. <https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.100.3.641>
- Pemerintah Kabupaten Jayapura. (2017). *Peraturan Daerah Kabupaten Jayapura Nomor 13 Tahun 2017*. Pemerintah Kabupaten Jayapura.
- Pemerintah Kabupaten Jayapura. (2021a). *Peraturan Bupati Jayapura Nomor 5 Tahun 2021 tentang pembangunan ekonomi hijau berbasis komunal*. Pemerintah Kabupaten Jayapura.
- Pemerintah Kabupaten Jayapura. (2021b). *Peraturan Daerah Kabupaten Jayapura Nomor 8 Tahun 2021*. Pemerintah Kabupaten Jayapura.
- Pemerintah Kabupaten Jayapura. (2021c). *Rencana kerja pemerintah daerah (RKPD) Kabupaten Jayapura*. Pemerintah Kabupaten Jayapura.
- Pemerintah Kabupaten Jayapura. (2021d). *Rencana pembangunan jangka menengah daerah (RPJMD) Kabupaten Jayapura*. Pemerintah Kabupaten Jayapura.
- Pemerintah Kabupaten Jayapura. (2021e). *Rencana strategis perangkat daerah Kabupaten Jayapura*. Pemerintah Kabupaten Jayapura.
- Pemerintah Kabupaten Jayapura. (2022). *Peraturan Daerah Kabupaten Jayapura Nomor 1 Tahun 2022*. Pemerintah Kabupaten Jayapura.
- Pemerintah Provinsi Papua. (2014). *Peraturan Menteri Dalam Negeri Republik Indonesia Nomor 52 Tahun 2014 tentang pedoman pengakuan dan perlindungan masyarakat hukum adat*. Kementerian Dalam Negeri Republik Indonesia.
- Pemerintah Provinsi Papua. (2022). *Peraturan Daerah Provinsi Papua Nomor 3 Tahun 2022 tentang kampung adat*. Pemerintah Provinsi Papua.
- Republik Indonesia. (2014). *Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 6 Tahun 2014 tentang desa*. Sekretariat Negara Republik Indonesia.
- Republik Indonesia. (2021). *Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 2 Tahun 2021 tentang perubahan kedua atas Undang-Undang Nomor 21 Tahun 2001 tentang otonomi khusus bagi Provinsi Papua*. Sekretariat Negara Republik Indonesia.
- Yin, R. K. (2018). *Case study research and applications: Design and methods* (6th ed.). SAGE Publications.