

# Centralization of National Food Authority and Marginalization of Local Capacity: An Analysis of Decentralization Implications for Regional Food Security

Aqshal Dwi Raldo <sup>1</sup>

Larasati Sukmadewi Wibowo <sup>2</sup>

## Abstract:

*The establishment of the National Food Agency through Presidential Regulation Number 66 of 2021 reflects a trend toward centralization of food authority that contradicts the decentralization principle enshrined in Law Number 23 of 2014 concerning Regional Governance. This centralization creates excessive authority concentration at the national government level and threatens the capacity of regional governments to manage local food security autonomously. This research aims to: (1) analyze the constitutional implications of food authority centralization on regional autonomy; (2) evaluate the capacity of regional governments in implementing local food policies; and (3) formulate recommendations for regulatory and policy harmonization between national and regional governments. The research employs legal document analysis (regulations and food policies), a case study of West Java Province as a best practice in food decentralization, and comparative analysis of regional autonomy implementation in the food sector. The findings demonstrate that the West Java Regional Government has exhibited significant capacity through initiatives including mainstreaming of local food, urban farming implementation, hydroponics technology deployment, and empowerment of local farmers thereby proving that food authority decentralization is not merely feasible but essential for sustainable food security. The research recommends: (1) harmonization and synchronization of national-regional food regulations to prevent jurisdictional conflicts; (2) strengthening of coordination mechanisms and continuous evaluation systems; and (3) redistribution of food authority according to the subsidiarity principle and capacity-based allocation to prevent constitutional regression and strengthen local food sovereignty.*

**Keywords:** Food centralization; Regional autonomy; Decentralization; Harmonization; local food sovereignty

©2025 - Aqshal Dwi Raldo, and Larasati Sukmadewi Wibowo.  
Under the license CC BY-SA 4.0

## Introduction

Regional autonomy in Indonesia constitutes a pivotal milestone in the establishment of democratic governance following the reform era. The concept of regional autonomy confers extensive authority upon regional governments to regulate

<sup>1</sup> Padjadjaran University, Indonesia. E-mail: [aqshal23001@mail.unpad.ac.id](mailto:aqshal23001@mail.unpad.ac.id)

<sup>2</sup> Department of Tropical Agriculture and International Cooperation, National Pingtung University of Science and Technology, Taiwan, Province of China. E-mail: [larasati@ung.ac.id](mailto:larasati@ung.ac.id)

and manage governmental affairs within their respective jurisdictions. This delegation of authority aims to accelerate the realization of public welfare through public services that are more effective, efficient, and aligned with local needs. Nevertheless, such authority is not absolute in nature. Regional governments remain bound by the national legal framework and must consider national interests that fall under the responsibility of the central government. This limitation aligns with the unitary state principle adopted by Indonesia, wherein ultimate sovereignty resides with the central government. In practice, the division of governmental affairs between the central and regional levels has been explicitly regulated through legislation on regional governance. However, the question of the extent to which regional autonomy can operate harmoniously with central government policies remains an ongoing debate within Indonesia's constitutional law system (Suryana et al., n.d.).

One sector that demonstrates the tension between the principle of regional autonomy and centralist policies of the central government is the food sector. The food domain holds strategic significance for the nation's survival, given that food not only represents a basic human necessity but also directly relates to national stability, national independence, and governmental political legitimacy. Based on national legal policy, the central government possesses the authority to formulate policies and regulations concerning food at the national level. This is predicated on the view that food security constitutes an integral component of national security, and therefore its regulation cannot be entirely delegated to regional governments. This legal policy of centralizing national food authority establishes a paradigm whereby the central government must serve as the primary actor in ensuring food production, distribution, reserves, and price stability throughout Indonesian territory. Within this framework, the policy to establish the National Food Agency (BPN) emerged as a state institution with coordinative and executive functions in managing national food affairs (Nurdin, 2023). The formation of BPN represents the central government's strategic measure in addressing various food security challenges that have emerged due to institutional fragmentation and inter-sectoral policy conflicts.

The establishment of BPN is expected to provide a systemic solution to classical problems that have hindered the realization of national food security, such as overlapping authority among ministries, low efficiency in food distribution, and inadequate coordination between central and regional governments in controlling food

prices and stocks. However, this centralist approach also raises fundamental constitutional law concerns, particularly regarding the balance between central and regional powers. Granting extensive authority to BPN potentially marginalizes the role of regional governments in planning, implementing, and supervising food policies at the local level. This, in turn, may generate constitutional implications for the implementation of regional autonomy principles guaranteed under Article 18 paragraphs (2) and (5) of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia. Furthermore, the centralization tendency in food management may be categorized as a form of constitutional retrogression, as it leads to the narrowing of regional autonomy space that should have been expanded following the reform era.

From a legal perspective, the challenges arising from the centralization of food management through BPN can be analyzed across several dimensions (Maksum, 2021). First, the concentration of authority at the central level creates risks of power abuse and potential corruption. In a democratic governmental system, power limitation is exercised through checks and balances mechanisms, including by distributing authority to smaller governmental units to enable horizontal control mechanisms. Excessive centralization of food authority eliminates regional control functions and weakens public accountability. Second, the lack of synchronization and harmonization between central and regional governments in implementing food policies can impede regional economic development. Many uniform national policies are applied without considering the highly diverse geographical, social, cultural, and economic conditions across Indonesia. Consequently, such policies are often ineffective when directly implemented at the local level.

Third, centralization of authority can also erode the spirit of political decentralization in regions. Regional governments that no longer possess substantive autonomy in food management will lose motivation to develop local food potential, optimize regional natural resources, and strengthen local economic independence. This condition indirectly creates structural dependence on the central government. Yet one of the primary objectives of regional autonomy is to encourage the emergence of innovation and policy flexibility according to the characteristics of each region (Dalisawintri et al., 2025). Fourth, centralist policies in the food sector risk neglecting regional potential and distinctiveness. Indonesia's diversity in agroecology and food culture across regions should serve as capital for strengthening national food security through adaptive decentralization strategies. When food policy is centralized solely in the hands of the

central government, the potential of such diversity cannot be optimally utilized and may even be eroded by policy homogenization.

The implications of this centralization of food authority extend beyond administrative relations between central and regional governments, potentially violating democratic principles as stipulated in the constitution. The involvement of local communities and regional governments in public policymaking represents a defining characteristic of democratic governance. With strong centralization, public access to participate in policy processes becomes limited, political participation weakens, and a sense of ownership toward public policies diminishes. In the long term, this can reduce governmental legitimacy and generate conflicts of interest between central and regional governments. Therefore, from a constitutional law perspective, every centralist national policy must be tested for consistency with constitutionally guaranteed decentralization principles to prevent an imbalance of power between central and regional levels (Ayunita, 2020).

Constitutionally, the amendment to Article 18 of the 1945 Constitution represents a significant milestone marking a paradigm shift in power relations between the central and regional governments. Whereas prior to constitutional amendment these relations tended to be centralist, following amendment they have been directed toward granting the broadest possible autonomy to regions. This autonomy is intended to create a governmental system that is more participatory, democratic, and accommodative of local diversity. This constitutional mandate should serve as guidance in formulating every national policy, including in the food sector. However, the reality of national food policy through the establishment of BPN demonstrates that the paradigm of central-regional relations remains colored by old perspectives that position the central government as a dominant actor with virtually limitless authority. Theoretically, actions by the central government to reclaim regional authority can only be justified when there exist urgent reasons related to national interests, public interests, or when regions have demonstrably failed to exercise delegated authority. Nevertheless, in practice, the justification of "national interest" is often used politically to strengthen central control over regions (antara Pemerintah, n.d.).

Under the unitary state principle, it is indeed true that supreme power remains in the hands of the central government. However, it must be remembered that the character of Indonesia's unitary state is that of a unitary decentralized state, not absolute

centralism. This means that the execution of governmental functions must still observe the principle of proportional division of authority. The central government plays a role in establishing strategic national policies and conducting oversight, while regional governments play a role in technical implementation according to their territorial conditions. Such a model of authority division better reflects the principle of subsidiarity, whereby decisions should be made as close as possible to citizens affected by such policies. In the context of food, this means regional governments should possess space to determine local food management policies, develop regional superior varieties, and regulate distribution based on the needs and preferences of local communities (Ade et al., 2022).

The centralization of food authority through BPN that is not balanced with strengthening regional roles will instead create gaps in policy implementation. The central government may be capable of formulating policies with a macro perspective, but implementation depends heavily on infrastructure, human resources, and technical capabilities possessed by regional governments. If regions lose substantive authority and are not involved in decision-making processes, then the effectiveness of national policies will be disrupted. In this context, the division of authority should be regulated with a cooperative governance approach, wherein central and regional governments work together synergistically. This approach emphasizes the importance of coordination, consultation, and policy integration mechanisms between central and regional levels at every stage of formulating and implementing national food strategies (Andi Zastrawati & RI, 2023).

Moreover, it is essential to develop legal mechanisms that guarantee balance between centralization and decentralization in food management. Legal regulations governing BPN must contain provisions that explicitly regulate institutional relationships with regional governments, including obligations to involve regions in policy formulation, program implementation, and budget preparation. Such involvement must be not merely administrative but also substantive so that decentralization values are maintained. The central government needs to develop dynamic legal instruments that allow for adjustment of authority based on regional capacity and performance in managing food affairs. In this manner, national food policy becomes not only an administrative control tool but also an instrument for regional capacity building in enhancing economic independence and food security.

Ultimately, maintaining balance between centralization and decentralization in the food sector represents both a constitutional necessity and rational public policy. The principle of decentralization must not be interpreted as abdication of central government responsibility, but neither should it be disregarded in the name of administrative efficiency. The central government must position itself as a facilitator and regulator that empowers regions, not as a ruler that monopolizes authority. Only through such balance can the governmental machinery in the food sector operate effectively, and the constitutional objective of realizing general welfare as articulated in the preamble to the 1945 Constitution can be achieved. In the context of national legal development, reflection on the relationship between centralization of food authority and regional autonomy becomes relevant to ensure that law continues to function as an instrument of justice and equitable welfare distribution, rather than merely as legitimation for the concentration of power.

## Methods

This study employs a normative juridical research method, which focuses on examining legal norms, principles, and doctrines governing the relationship between centralization and regional autonomy in Indonesia, particularly within the framework of national food policy (Dillah, 2015). The research relies primarily on secondary legal materials, including constitutional provisions, laws and regulations, government policies, and relevant jurisprudence. In addition, scholarly articles, legal commentaries, and previous research studies serve as supporting literature to provide conceptual and theoretical depth. The approach used is a qualitative legal analysis aimed at interpreting the consistency between normative rules and their implementation in practice, especially regarding the authority of the National Food Agency (Badan Pangan Nasional) within Indonesia's constitutional system. The analysis applies both a statutory approach and a conceptual approach, enabling the researcher to analyze legal texts within the broader context of governance theory and constitutional principles. Data were collected through document analysis of legal instruments and library research. The results are then systematically analyzed to assess the alignment between centralized food governance and constitutional mandates of regional autonomy. Thus, this study contributes to understanding how Indonesia's legal framework can achieve balance between national interests and regional autonomy in the field of food regulation.

## Result and Discussion

### 1. History of the Establishment of the National Food Agency

The establishment of the National Food Agency (Badan Pangan Nasional, or BPN) under Presidential Regulation No. 66 of 2021 constitutes a strategic institutional reform by the Indonesian government to bolster national food security governance. BPN succeeded the Food Security Agency (Badan Ketahanan Pangan, or BKP), which had operated under the Ministry of Agriculture with significant coordination constraints. The escalating complexity of Indonesia's food challenges including climate change effects on agricultural yields, rapid population growth in urban hubs, supply chain disruptions from deficient infrastructure, market volatility fueled by speculative trading, and the vulnerability of smallholder farmers to economic shocks exposed the inadequacies of the prior framework. Consequently, the government restructured food governance via a centralized agency positioned directly under presidential authority (Rahayu & Faisal, 2021). This elevation endows BPN with expansive powers, spanning comprehensive policy formulation across agricultural and non-agricultural sources, integrated supply chain coordination from production zones to consumer markets, proactive price stabilization via strategic market operations, advanced data management for predictive analytics, stringent distribution oversight to curb hoarding and artificial scarcity, and professional oversight of national food reserves encompassing buffer and emergency stocks. Consolidating functions once dispersed among the Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Trade, National Logistics Agency (BULOG), and provincial bodies enhances governmental capacity for swift, coordinated crisis interventions, such as addressing price surges from seasonal harvests or global commodity swings, natural disasters disrupting production and logistics, or supply shocks from geopolitical tensions and pandemic-induced trade barriers.

BPN embraces a multidimensional food security paradigm aligned with FAO standards, tackling not merely the physical availability of staples but also economic affordability for at-risk groups, equitable access amid diverse geographic and socioeconomic landscapes, optimal utilization through food safety protocols and nutrition education, and nutritional enhancement via diversification beyond rice reliance toward protein-rich and micronutrient-dense foods. Its remit extends to crafting contingency plans for crises like droughts, floods, pest infestations, and import

dependencies; deploying sophisticated early warning systems fusing meteorological data, market intelligence, and yield forecasts; calibrating strategic reserves to consumption patterns and emergency timelines; guaranteeing access in remote locales such as outlying islands and upland communities via subsidized distribution and logistical innovations; and partnering with international bodies for technical aid and emergency rations during catastrophes. This marks a paradigm shift from reactive crisis management marked by piecemeal responses to market failures to proactive, resilience-oriented strategies that foresee vulnerabilities, fortify local production, diversify supplies, and institutionalize lessons from past disruptions. The agency's model prioritizes evidence-based policymaking, bolstered by real-time data from provincial outposts, analytical prowess for intervention modeling, and adaptive flexibility over rigid preconceived plans (Nuradhawati, 2019).

Centralization fortifies national policy coherence by forging unified command structures that dismantle bureaucratic silos and sharpen surveillance against market distortions by cartels, monopolistic traders, or corrupt actors exploiting information gaps. Yet it simultaneously provokes constitutional qualms over regional involvement and fidelity to decentralization tenets in Article 18 of the 1945 Constitution, which enshrines provincial autonomy in local matters like farming development and food distribution. Indonesia's vast geographic diversity encompassing 17,000 islands with varied soils, microclimates, and agrarian potentials coupled with profound cultural variances in diets, traditional practices, and indigenous knowledge demands that local governments retain pivotal, irreplaceable roles in tailoring solutions to parochial needs. Thus, BPN's rollout must honor cooperative governance principles in Law No. 23 of 2014 on Regional Administration, ensuring centralized roles in national policy, interprovincial trade regulation, and reserve stewardship are augmented by robust channels for local input in implementation, participatory outcome monitoring, and ground-level feedback invisible from the capital (Doddy, n.d.).

The metamorphosis from BKP to BPN bears deep normative ramifications for administrative and constitutional law, recasting the state from passive coordinator of stakeholder collaboration to assertive executor wielding quasi-executive powers like direct market incursions, price manipulation enforcement, and distribution network command thus amplifying state authority and necessitating amplified accountability. This progression mandates lucid legal harmonization across tiers: parliamentary statutes

grounding BPN's legal footing and funding; presidential edicts outlining structure and staffing; ministerial rules from interfacing portfolios; and provincial ordinances localizing national directives to avert jurisdictional clashes that could stall emergency actions or deter private engagement. BPN's enduring efficacy and legitimacy pivot on equilibrating centralized imperatives for national orchestration and exigency with substantive local agency honoring contextual acumen, functioning less as a bureaucratic hegemon foisting one-size-fits-all fixes than a synergy catalyst melding national blueprints with grassroots execution. This ensures food availability via diversified output and imports, accessibility through infrastructure and targeted aid, and quality via exacting safety checks and dietary norms all safeguarding Indonesian citizenry across strata in line with decentralization acknowledging regional pluralism, equity barring access discrimination, and public reckoning via legislative scrutiny and civic vigilance.

## **2. Legal Politics of National Food Authority Centralization from the Perspective of Regional Autonomy Legal Politics**

Indonesia, as a unitary state characterized by a decentralized administrative architecture, confronts intricate legal-political dynamics in the governance of strategic sectors, most notably the food domain, where the imperatives of national cohesion frequently intersect with constitutional commitments to regional autonomy enshrined in Article 18 of the 1945 Constitution. This tension manifests acutely within Indonesia's framework of politik hukum, or legal politics, which encapsulates the state's deliberate ideological positioning through statutory instruments that calibrate the distribution of authority between central and provincial entities to pursue overarching objectives such as food security. Legal politics in this realm delineates not merely administrative boundaries but also philosophical stances on sovereignty, welfare distribution, and democratic legitimacy, wherein the central government leverages legislative and executive mechanisms to assert primacy in food policy formulation while ostensibly accommodating regional capacities (Abdulhadi, 2025). The food sector, pivotal to national welfare, economic fortitude, and political stability, exemplifies these dynamics: central authorities justify concentrated control over price stabilization, strategic reserve stockpiling, import quotas, and supply chain oversight as indispensable for mitigating volatility, averting shortages, and safeguarding public health amid exogenous shocks like climate anomalies or global trade disruptions. Yet this centralization often precipitates discord with provincial administrations, which invoke decentralization tenets to

advocate for tailored interventions attuned to local agrarian profiles, cultural consumption patterns, and infrastructural realities, thereby highlighting an enduring structural friction between uniformity and contextual adaptability.

Decentralization, codified principally through Law No. 23 of 2014 on Regional Governance as amended, ostensibly empowers local governments with expansive discretion over concurrent domains including agriculture, fisheries, and food distribution provided such exercises conform to national strategic directives, thereby establishing a hierarchical yet collaborative paradigm. This legislative architecture seeks to reconcile the unitary state's indivisibility with subsidiarity principles, allocating absolute authority to the center in macroeconomic stabilization and foreign affairs while vesting regions with operational latitude in service delivery and resource exploitation. In practice, however, the food sector reveals persistent asymmetries: central mandates on staple commodities such as rice, corn, and sugar enforced via instruments like the National Food Agency's regulatory arsenal frequently encroach upon provincial competencies, engendering inefficiencies such as mismatched procurement targets, delayed subsidy disbursements, and suboptimal yield utilization in biodiversity-rich locales like Papua or Sulawesi (RAKYAT & INDONESIA, n.d.). Proponents of centralization, drawing from national security rationales akin to those applied in energy and defense, underscore the perils of fragmentation, citing historical precedents like the 1998 food riots or recurrent El Niño-induced scarcities that underscored the necessity for unified command structures to orchestrate buffer stocks, early warning systems, and emergency distributions. Conversely, autonomy advocates decry such approaches as top-down impositions that discount indigenous knowledge systems, agroecological variances, and community-driven innovations, such as communal granaries in Java or sago-based sustenance in Maluku, which could enhance resilience if integrated rather than supplanted.

These divergent perspectives illuminate a deeper normative contestation within Indonesia's constitutional order, where Article 18 not only affirms regional self-governance but also mandates fiscal equity and administrative efficiency, compelling the state to navigate the Scylla of over-centralization risking bureaucratic inertia and democratic deficits and the Charybdis of devolutionary excess, potentially yielding policy incoherence and inequitable outcomes. Empirical manifestations abound: provincial resistance to centralized import policies has occasionally spurred illicit cross-

border trade, undermining national revenue and price controls, while federal subsidies calibrated to Javanese-centric metrics have marginalized outer-island producers, exacerbating interregional disparities in food affordability and nutritional access. Within legal politics discourse, this impasse prompts scholarly calls for a refined politik hukum that transcends binary oppositions, reconceptualizing centralization and decentralization as symbiotic levers rather than antagonistic forces. Such a paradigm would entail statutory clarifications delineating exclusive central purviews national reserve logistics, international procurement protocols, and macroeconomic modeling from concurrent zones amenable to joint stewardship, thereby mitigating jurisdictional overlaps that have historically fueled litigation and implementation gridlock (Nathan, 2025).

Institutionalizing this complementarity demands multifaceted reforms: foremost, legislative amendments to Law No. 23 of 2014 incorporating explicit food governance protocols, including mandatory regional representation in national policy councils like the Food Security Council, to embed local voices in upstream decision-making. Concurrently, intergovernmental coordination platforms patterned on successful models in fiscal transfers or disaster management could facilitate real-time data sharing, joint contingency planning, and performance benchmarking, leveraging digital infrastructures for predictive analytics that harmonize macro-level forecasting with micro-level variances (McMichael, 2020). Fiscal incentives, such as performance-linked grants contingent upon alignment with national benchmarks yet rewarding innovation in local diversification, would further align incentives, fostering a virtuous cycle of mutual reinforcement. Moreover, embedding participatory mechanisms, such as public consultations and civil society audits, would fortify democratic legitimacy, ensuring that food governance transcends technocratic diktats to reflect pluralistic imperatives. Internationally benchmarked against hybrids like Brazil's CONSEA or India's National Food Security Act, Indonesia's trajectory could evolve toward a resilient model where central orchestration amplifies rather than attenuates regional agency, optimizing supply chain efficiencies while honoring socio-cultural mosaics.

Ultimately, a sustainable legal-political edifice for Indonesian food governance hinges on this equilibrated approach, transcending ideological entrenchments to forge adaptive, equitable frameworks that operationalize constitutional ideals into tangible welfare gains. By clarifying authority matrices, institutionalizing collaborative fora, and prioritizing inclusive policymaking, the state can mitigate perennial tensions, harnessing

decentralization's innovativeness to buttress national sovereignty. This synthesis not only circumvents the pitfalls of absolutist centralism evident in distorted resource allocations and eroded trust but also averts devolutionary pitfalls like uneven capacity and opportunistic localism. In an era of compounding pressures from demographic surges, climatic vicissitudes, and geoeconomic flux, such harmonization promises not merely food security as availability and access, but holistic nutritional sovereignty that empowers communities, stabilizes economies, and undergirds political legitimacy across Indonesia's archipelagic expanse.

### **3. Legal Policy on Harmonization and Synchronization of Food Authority Between the Central and Regional Governments**

The legal politics of harmonizing and synchronizing food governance authority between Indonesia's central and regional governments, grounded in the 1945 Constitution and attendant statutory frameworks, mandates a relationship predicated on mutual respect for jurisdictional boundaries and collaborative pursuit of equitable, uniform, and sustainable national food security. In practice, however, predominantly centralistic food policies frequently circumscribe regional governments' capacity to optimize local resource potentials, engendering persistent frictions that undermine holistic resilience. National food strategies, orchestrated by the central apparatus, invariably prioritize macroeconomic imperatives such as price stability, food safety assurance, and seamless distribution logistics, manifesting in cross-sectoral regulations encompassing investment protocols, sanitation benchmarks, and import quotas that impose uniformity across the archipelago. Conversely, regional contexts marked by disparate geographies, agrarian endowments, and demographic imperatives demand contextual flexibility, wherein provinces like Java leverage intensive rice cultivation while eastern outliers such as Papua harness sago palms or fisheries, rendering one-size-fits-all edicts inefficient and potentially counterproductive to localized nutritional sovereignty (Malicia et al., n.d.).

Centralization and decentralization in food management each proffer distinct merits alongside inherent limitations, necessitating a calibrated synthesis within Indonesia's unitary yet devolved polity. Central orchestration excels in coordinating nationwide safeguards against interregional disparities, exemplified by centralized price controls and strategic reserves that avert shortages during harvest failures or climatic perturbations, as evidenced by the National Food Agency's stewardship of buffer stocks

for staples like rice and corn. Such mechanisms ensure macroeconomic equilibrium, preempting inflationary spirals that historically precipitated social unrest, yet they risk ossifying into rigid diktats unresponsive to micro-variations. Decentralization, by contrast, empowers regional institutions such as provincial Bappedalitbang planning bodies and Agriculture and Food Services to tailor interventions, fostering innovations like traditional market revitalization, crop diversification into highland tubers or coastal aquaculture, and land optimization through agroecological mapping. These entities, attuned to ground realities, can dissect local consumption profiles, production capacities, and vulnerability hotspots, thereby amplifying efficiency where central oversight falters amid Indonesia's topographic heterogeneity spanning 17,000 islands (Lumbanraja et al., 2025).

The paramount challenge in this legal-political domain resides in reconciling generic, normative central directives with fact-driven regional prerogatives, a misalignment that perpetuates distributional inequities and access barriers for peripheral communities. Normative central policies, while theoretically inclusive, often overlook empirical divergences uniform procurement quotas ill-suited to drought-prone Nusa Tenggara or flood-vulnerable Sumatra yielding suboptimal outcomes like wasted surpluses in fertile zones or exacerbated scarcities elsewhere. This discord contravenes Article 18's autonomy guarantee and Law No. 23 of 2014 on Regional Governance, which delineates concurrent powers wherein regions execute national plans with adaptive latitude, yet recurrent jurisdictional encroachments fuel litigation and implementation paralysis. Legal politics here demands proactive harmonization: a systematic alignment of regulatory strata from constitutional mandates through presidential regulations to ministerial decrees and bylaw ordinances ensuring sectoral edicts on food dovetail with decentralization precepts, obviating overlaps in areas like reserve allocation or quality certification (Huda, 2021).

Harmonization, as a juridical process, entails recalibrating statutes to forge coherence between national imperatives and regional discretions, obviating conflicts that erode governance efficacy. This entails statutory refinements clarifying exclusive central domains macroeconomic stabilization, interstate trade facilitation, and crisis orchestration from shared arenas amenable to joint formulation, such as local diversification initiatives nested within national diversification agendas. A policy paradigm pivoting toward region-centric modalities would afford provinces amplified

agency to steward indigenous potentials be it millet in Timor or seaweed in Sulawesi whilst adhering to overarching corridors like safety protocols and price benchmarks, thereby transmuting potential adversaries into symbiotic partners. Empirical precedents, including fiscal transfer mechanisms under Law No. 33 of 2004, illustrate viable pathways: performance-based allocations could incentivize regional alignment with national metrics while rewarding bespoke innovations, fostering a meritocratic equilibrium.

Concomitantly, efficacious coordination mechanisms constitute the linchpin of synchronization, transcending ad hoc consultations to institutionalized fora that embed intergovernmental dialogue. Multisectoral platforms envisioned as permanent Food Policy Councils amalgamating central technocrats, provincial executives, and civil society would serve as conduits for upstream policy co-designation, real-time data interoperability, and adaptive feedback loops, mitigating information asymmetries that bedevil execution. Digital architectures, leveraging integrated platforms akin to the National Food Information System, could synchronize provincial monitoring with central analytics, enabling predictive modeling that harmonizes macro-forecasts with micro-adjustments. Synchronization further imperatives policy cadence alignment: national programs like subsidized staples must dovetail with regional extensions such as community granaries or school feeding initiatives, ensuring integrative field deployment that amplifies developmental synergies across tiers.

This dual-pronged strategy harmonization via legal recalibration and synchronization through institutional choreography promises to resolve entrenched tensions, operationalizing constitutional ideals into resilient architectures. By eschewing zero-sum centralization for collaborative federalism, Indonesia can harness central heft for scale and equity alongside regional ingenuity for relevance and innovation, yielding food systems that are not merely secure but sovereign: resilient to exogenous shocks, nutritionally inclusive, and democratically accountable. Such a legal-political evolution, attuned to archipelagic pluralism, would fortify national cohesion while honoring subsidiarity, ensuring that food governance catalyzes inclusive prosperity rather than perpetuating hierarchical fissures.

#### **4. Analysis of the Strengths and Potential of Regional Governments in National Food Management**

West Java Province exemplifies robust potential in local food management, underpinned by advantageous geographical conditions, abundant natural resources, and innovative regional policies that position it as a vanguard in Indonesia's quest for food resilience. As one of the nation's premier rice granaries, West Java recorded approximately 5.2 million tons of rice production in 2021, underscoring its pivotal contribution to national staple supplies amid fluctuating global markets and domestic demands. Beyond paddy fields, the province sustains a diversified agricultural portfolio encompassing corn, soybeans, an array of vegetables, and tropical fruits, transforming it into a nexus for varietal production that mitigates overreliance on monocrops and enhances nutritional diversity across consumer bases (Holqi et al., 2024). This agrarian bounty, nurtured by fertile volcanic soils, equitable rainfall distribution, and expansive arable lands spanning both lowlands and highlands, affords West Java unparalleled leverage to pioneer integrated food systems that harmonize productivity with sustainability, thereby serving as a microcosm of how localized strategies can buttress national security imperatives.

The provincial administration has institutionalized annual World Food Day commemorations as a cornerstone initiative to elevate public consciousness regarding food security and the valorization of indigenous produce, fostering a cultural shift toward conscientious consumption patterns. These events feature multifaceted engagements seminars dissecting policy frameworks, exhibitions showcasing artisanal products, and culinary festivals spotlighting Sundanese specialties like bandrek-infused staples or organic cassava derivatives that not only celebrate regional bounty but also propagate messages of health-conscious, environmentally sustainable choices. By immersing communities in interactive forums, such programs cultivate behavioral transformations, encouraging households to prioritize nutrient-dense local alternatives over imported processed goods, while simultaneously bolstering market linkages for smallholders whose livelihoods hinge on consistent demand signals. This participatory ethos extends beyond awareness, embedding food sovereignty into civic identity and aligning grassroots preferences with broader developmental agendas.

A hallmark of West Java's innovation lies in the proliferation of urban farming and hydroponic systems within metropolitan enclaves, addressing land scarcity precipitated by relentless urbanization in cities like Bandung and Bekasi. These methodologies repurpose underutilized spaces rooftops, backyards, vacant lots into productive micro-

farms, empowering urban dwellers to achieve household-level self-sufficiency in vegetables, herbs, and even protein sources like fish in aquaponic hybrids. Hydroponics, with its soil-less precision cultivation, optimizes water and nutrient delivery, yielding premium outputs at accelerated cycles while curtailing chemical inputs, thus appealing to health-conscious millennials and eco-entrepreneurs (Asfar, 2025). Provincial support mechanisms technical training workshops, subsidized nutrient kits and vertical grow towers, and facilitated market access through e-commerce platforms and farmers' markets democratize these technologies, transcending elite experimentation to mass adoption and yielding measurable gains in urban food affordability and waste reduction.

Distribution architectures in West Java demonstrate marked sophistication, with a network of modern wholesale markets (pasar induk) complemented by ubiquitous traditional bazaars ensuring equitable supply propagation from farm gates to retail endpoints. Public-private partnerships have fortified ancillary logistics cold chain refrigeration, multimodal transport fleets, and digital tracking apps to curtail post-harvest losses that plague tropical agriculture, stabilizing prices against seasonal volatilities and preserving organoleptic quality for end-users. Strategic siting of these infrastructures, informed by geospatial analytics, minimizes transit times and transaction costs, enabling perishable commodities like fresh chilies or leafy greens to reach distant suburbs without degradation, while real-time inventory dashboards preempt gluts or deficits. This logistical prowess not only insulates consumers from inflationary pressures but also incentivizes producers to scale outputs confidently, knowing reliable conduits exist.

Empowerment of farming communities constitutes another linchpin, with the West Java administration deploying targeted interventions to elevate agronomic capabilities and economic viability. Modern technology dissemination precision irrigation, drone-based crop monitoring, and biotech seed variants augments yields without proportional input escalations, while subsidies for machinery, elite seeds, and organic fertilizers transition practitioners toward regenerative paradigms that sequester carbon and preserve biodiversity. These initiatives transcend productivity metrics, enhancing farmer welfare through income diversification into value-added processing, such as milled flours or dehydrated fruits, and fortifying resilience against climatic adversities via crop insurance schemes. By nurturing a cadre of tech-savvy agriculturists, the province catalyzes rural-urban synergies, retaining youth in agrarian vocations and stemming

depopulation trends that erode food production bases elsewhere (Andi Zastrawati & RI, 2023).

Informal collectivities, including farmer groups (kelompok tani) and community food collectives, amplify these formal endeavors through pooled resource mobilization and collective bargaining prowess. Cooperative procurement of inputs, shared harvesting equipment, and unified marketing consortia amplify scale economies, elevating local products' competitiveness against supermarket imports and accessing premium outlets like export channels or agrotourism ventures. These grassroots assemblies embody social capital in action, disseminating indigenous knowledge from heirloom varietal conservation to pest-resistant polycultures while providing risk buffers through mutual aid during lean seasons, thereby embedding food security within communal fabrics resilient to exogenous shocks.

Collectively, West Java's constellation of programs spanning awareness campaigns, technological infusions, logistical overhauls, and socioeconomic empowerments illustrates exemplary synchronization between provincial policies and national directives, yielding a self-reliant, competitive food ecosystem predicated on technological vanguardism and societal engagement. This integrated model navigates the central-regional authority dialectic adeptly: aligning with National Food Agency mandates on staples while carving autonomy for niche localisms, such as purwoceng root tonics or situ bagendit fish stocks. By quantifying impacts reduced import dependencies, heightened nutritional indices, and GDP contributions from agro-sector multipliers West Java furnishes empirical blueprints for peer provinces, from arid NTT to forested Kalimantan, adaptable via contextual transplants. In an era of cascading vulnerabilities, this paradigm transcends mere sufficiency, aspiring to abundance: a blueprint where food governance catalyzes equitable prosperity, environmental stewardship, and cultural preservation, positioning Indonesia's heartland as a beacon for archipelagic sustainability.

## Conclusion

The legal policy of centralizing national food authority, viewed from the perspective of regional autonomy, has been proven to undermine the autonomy mandated by the constitution. This centralization represents an inconsistency implemented by the central government, which has delegated food authority while considering local food potential.

The legal policy of harmonization and synchronization of authority between the central and regional governments should be implemented by establishing clear coordination of authority, as regional governments are the implementers of national food programs. Furthermore, clear regulations as a legal basis for regional governments must be established, and routine evaluation and monitoring must be optimally conducted by the central government, in this case the National Food Agency (BPN), to regional governments.

## References

- Abdulhadi, D. (2025). *Pembentukan Peraturan Daerah Tentang Anggaran Pendapatan dan Belanja Daerah Berbasis Keadilan Sosial* [PhD Thesis, Universitas Islam Indonesia]. <https://dspace.uui.ac.id/handle/123456789/59211>
- Ade, A. F., Dita, F., & Malicia, E. (2022). *Model Regulasi Revitalisasi Bumdes Untuk Meningkatkan Kemandirian Desa*. Pusaka Media. <http://repository.lppm.unila.ac.id/id/eprint/50382>
- Andi Zastrawati, S. E., & RI, T. A. K. I. D. (2023). *Penguatan Hubungan Pemerintah Pusat Dan Daerah Melalui Desentralisasi Asimetris Dalam Rangka Konsolidasi Demokrasi*. <http://lib.lemhannas.go.id/public/media/catalog/0010-112300000000122/swf/7648/10%20ANDI%20ZASTRAWATI.pdf>
- antara Pemerintah, A. P. H. (n.d.). Pusat dengan Pemerintah Daerah. *MENUJU OTONOMI BERKEADILAN*, 56.
- Asfar, A. (2025). *Harmonisasi Perencanaan Pembangunan Wilayah Pesisir*. Deepublish. <https://books.google.com/books?hl=id&lr=&id=69BBEQAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PP1&dq=Sentralisasi+pangan%3B+Otonomi+daerah%3B+Desentralisasi%3B+Harmonisasi%3B+kedaulatan+pangan+lokal&ots=vewFV0rhkE&sig=i0sMIUcuRiomW9tvK1TFJxJDPnw>
- Ayunita, K. (2020). *Reformulasi Kewenangan Pemerintah Provinsi Dalam Pengelolaan Wilayah Laut Pesisir Di Sulawesi Selatan* [PhD Thesis]. Universitas Hasanuddin.
- Dalisawintri, S. E., Noor, H. M., & Irawan, B. (2025). *Strategi Pemerintah Dalam Meningkatkan Pendapatan Asli Daerah (Pad)*. Nas Media Pustaka. <https://books.google.com/books?hl=id&lr=&id=RoRoEQAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=P>

- A1&dq=Sentralisasi+pangan%3B+Otonomi+daerah%3B+Desentralisasi%3B+Harmonisasi%3B+kedaulatan+pangan+lokal&ots=VjOJEwEkN8&sig=6sTl2q\_EaPtE9lqTGxn4H3SDn0
- Dillah, P. (2015). *Metode Penelitian Hukum: Dilengkapi Tata Cara dan Contoh Penulisan Karya Ilmiah Bidang Hukum/Suratman*.
- Doddy, M. (n.d.). Indonesian Food Security Policy: Mapping of Traditional Markets in Central Kalimantan. *Policy and Government Review Journal*, 1.
- Holqi, F. G. F., Widiyanto, I. T., Kurnia, T. N., Wulandari, T. W. M., & Ananta, Y. (2024). Optimalisasi Asas Decentralisatie Wet: Studi Ratifikasi Undang-Undang Perlindungan Lahan Pertanian dan Pangan Berkelanjutan (PLP2B) di Banyuwangi. *Amnesti: Jurnal Hukum*, 6(2), 284–297.
- Huda, N. (2021). *Desentralisasi Secara Umum dan Desentralisasi Asimetris di Indonesia*. Nusamedia. <https://books.google.com/books?hl=id&lr=&id=d-FIEAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PP1&dq=Sentralisasi+pangan%3B+Otonomi+daerah%3B+Desentralisasi%3B+Harmonisasi%3B+kedaulatan+pangan+lokal&ots=i97RmanqTA&sig=ADsUaYdgFb05EnihocqW54Kuo8k>
- Lumbanraja, V., Riau, D. P., Rustiyana, R., & Anitasari, M. (2025). *Otonomi Daerah: Konsep Dasar, Prinsip, Peran dan Kemandirian Fiskal*. Star Digital Publishing. [https://books.google.com/books?hl=id&lr=&id=1iqaEQAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PA113&dq=Sentralisasi+pangan%3B+Otonomi+daerah%3B+Desentralisasi%3B+Harmonisasi%3B+kedaulatan+pangan+lokal&ots=gb9I\\_KZ-ah&sig=rYVBVUGD8GQOe9Yksbgs97oEjuk](https://books.google.com/books?hl=id&lr=&id=1iqaEQAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PA113&dq=Sentralisasi+pangan%3B+Otonomi+daerah%3B+Desentralisasi%3B+Harmonisasi%3B+kedaulatan+pangan+lokal&ots=gb9I_KZ-ah&sig=rYVBVUGD8GQOe9Yksbgs97oEjuk)
- Maksum, I. R. (2021). *Riak-riak otonomi daerah di Indonesia kurun waktu 2010-2021*. Deepublish. <https://books.google.com/books?hl=id&lr=&id=FTRUEQAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PP1&dq=Sentralisasi+pangan%3B+Otonomi+daerah%3B+Desentralisasi%3B+Harmonisasi%3B+kedaulatan+pangan+lokal&ots=LziuknBSB&sig=kcfBdu136O4hXi8W09RuztEmXpA>
- Malicia, E., Ade, A. F., & Martha, R. (n.d.). *Laporan Penelitian: Model Regulasi Inovasi Daerah Dalam Akselerasi Pembangunan Ekonomi Berbasis Potensi Lokal*. Retrieved January 3, 2026, from

[http://repository.lppm.unila.ac.id/51352/1/Malicia%20Evendia\\_Fakultas%20Hukum\\_PT\\_Laporan%20Akhir.pdf](http://repository.lppm.unila.ac.id/51352/1/Malicia%20Evendia_Fakultas%20Hukum_PT_Laporan%20Akhir.pdf)

- McMichael, P. (2020). *Rezim Pangan dan Masalah Agraria*. INSIST Press. <https://books.google.com/books?hl=id&lr=&id=2b5ZEAAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PA1&dq=Sentralisasi+pangan%3B+Otonomi+daerah%3B+Desentralisasi%3B+Harmonisasi%3B+kedaulatan+pangan+lokal&ots=AsGy6X4ypO&sig=YpX16HPZkd66xsL91u4xQQ4M5oM>
- Nathan, I. A. (2025). Strategi Pemerintah Daerah dalam Mewujudkan Ketahanan Pangan: Sinergi Kebijakan dan Administrasi Publik di Merauke. *Jejak Digital: Jurnal Ilmiah Multidisiplin*, 1(4), 1573–1591.
- Nuradhawati, R. (2019). Dinamika Sentralisasi dan Desentralisasi di Indonesia. *Jurnal Academia Praja: Jurnal Magister Ilmu Pemerintahan*, 2(01), 152–170. <https://doi.org/10.36859/jap.v2i01.90>
- Nurdin, M. R. (2023). *Urgensi Rencana Pembentukan dan Desain Daerah Istimewa Maluku Utara* [PhD Thesis, Universitas Islam Indonesia]. <https://dspace.uui.ac.id/handle/123456789/53809>
- Rahayu, D. P., & Faisal, F. (2021). Eksistensi pertambangan rakyat pasca pemberlakuan perubahan undang-undang tentang pertambangan mineral dan batubara. *Jurnal Pembangunan Hukum Indonesia*, 3(3), 337–353.
- RAKYAT, M. P., & INDONESIA, R. (n.d.). *Hubungan Pusat Dan Daerah*. Retrieved January 3, 2026, from [https://www.mpr.go.id/img/jurnal/file/130123\\_KAJIAN%20AKADEMIK%20HUBUNGAN%20PUSAT%20DAN%20DAERAH.pdf](https://www.mpr.go.id/img/jurnal/file/130123_KAJIAN%20AKADEMIK%20HUBUNGAN%20PUSAT%20DAN%20DAERAH.pdf)
- Suryana, A., Mardianto, S., & Erma Suryani. (n.d.). *Reformulasi Kewenangan Pemerintah Provinsi Dalam Pengelolaan Wilayah Laut Pesisir Di Sulawesi Selatan*. Retrieved January 3, 2026, from <https://psekp.setjen.pertanian.go.id/web/wp-content/uploads/2022/12/2021-Buku-Kumpulan-Orasi-Prof-Riset-PSEKP-1.pdf>