

ASYMMETRIC DECENTRALISATION: AUTONOMOUS POWER SHARING BETWEEN
JAKARTA AND IBU KOTA NUSANTARA

DESENTRALISASI ASIMETRIS: PEMBAGIAN KEKUASAAN OTONOM ANTARA JAKARTA DAN
IBU KOTA NUSANTARA

Aulia Kartika Putri, Titin Purwaningsih*, Helen Dian Fridayani

Universitas Muhammadiyah Yogyakarta
Jalan Brawijaya Bantul 55183, Indonesia

INFO ARTIKEL

Riwayat Artikel:

Diterima : 01 Mei 2024

Disetujui : 07 Juli 2025

Keywords:

capital city relocation; asymmetric decentralization; Ibu Kota Nusantara

Kata Kunci:

pemindahan ibu kota; desentralisasi asimetris; Ibu Kota Nusantara

***) Korespondensi:**

E-mail: titinpurwaningsih@umy.ac.id

Abstract: The purpose of this study is to analyze the concept of asymmetric decentralization and the implications of implementing asymmetric decentralization in the context of moving the national capital from Jakarta to Ibu Kota Nusantara. This study used a normative juridical method with a legislative approach and a conceptual approach. The results of the study show that asymmetric decentralization as applied in Indonesia can be seen in the efforts to relocate the national capital as regulated by Law Number 2 of 2024. The relocation of the national capital from Jakarta to Ibu Kota Nusantara leads to the concept of functional asymmetric decentralization, which emphasizes the division of power based on function and productivity rather than geographical boundaries. The relocation of the capital from Jakarta to Ibu Kota Nusantara has implications for governance, triggering various problems, including infrastructure and resource capacity imbalances, the emergence of social polarization and urban gentrification, and overlapping authorities and policies due to the absence of a legal framework that explicitly regulates coordination between Jakarta and Ibu Kota Nusantara.

Abstrak: Tujuan kajian ini yaitu untuk menganalisis konsep desentralisasi asimetris serta implikasi penerapan desentralisasi asimetris dalam konteks pemindahan ibu kota negara dari Jakarta ke Ibu Kota Nusantara. Kajian ini menggunakan metode yuridis normatif dengan pendekatan perundang-undangan dan pendekatan konseptual. Hasil kajian menunjukkan bahwa desentralisasi asimetris yang diterapkan di Indonesia terlihat pada upaya pemindahan ibu kota negara sebagaimana diatur berdasarkan Undang-Undang Nomor 2 Tahun 2024. Pemindahan ibu kota negara dari Jakarta ke Ibu Kota Nusantara mengarah pada konsep desentralisasi asimetris fungsional yang menekankan pembagian kekuasaan berdasarkan fungsi dan produktivitas bukan pada batas geografis. Pemindahan ibu kota dari Jakarta ke Ibu Kota Nusantara berimplikasi pada tata kelola pemerintahan yang memicu terjadinya berbagai permasalahan diantaranya menyebabkan ketimpangan infrastruktur dan kapasitas sumber daya, munculnya polarisasi sosial dan gentrifikasi perkotaan, serta menimbulkan tumpang tindih kewenangan dan kebijakan karena tidak ada kerangka hukum yang secara eksplisit mengatur koordinasi antara Jakarta dan Ibu Kota Nusantara.

INTRODUCTION

Indonesia has moved its capital from Jakarta to Nusantara, commonly known as the Ibu Kota Nusantara (IKN), located in Kutai Kartanegara and Penajam Paser Utara Regencies

East Kalimantan. The relocation of the national capital from Jakarta to Nusantara as stipulated in Article 6 paragraph (2) of Law Number 21 of 2023 amending Law Number 3 of 2022 on the National Capital is a monumental political

decision in the history of Indonesia's state administration (Amal & Sulistyawan, 2022). This policy not only relocates the physical centre of government but also restructures administrative, symbolic, and economic power that was previously concentrated in Jakarta (Asnawi, Simamora, & Andrizal, 2021). Jakarta still plays a crucial role despite no longer being the nation's capital. Law No. 2 of 2024 concerning the Special Capital Region of Jakarta reaffirms its status as a national economic center and a global city that continues to play a strategic role in national development.

The relocation of the capital does not mean that Jakarta is completely replaced, but rather that its role is shared with the new capital. The state does not simply replace Jakarta but rather reposition the roles of Jakarta and the IKN functionally (Khairi, 2018). This strategy represents a power-sharing arrangement based on rational considerations, Jakarta remains the primary hub for Indonesia's global connectivity, given that infrastructure, trade networks, financial institutions, and high-quality human resources have long been concentrated in this region (Sandy, 2023). The IKN is designed as an ideal well-planned government centre that reflects the paradigm of sustainable development in the future (Addas, 2024). This approach balances Jakarta's continuing role with the innovation offered by IKN.

The relocation of the capital city is not only happening in Indonesia, because several other countries are also experiencing a similar process. The relocation of the capital city also occurred in Malaysia. The relocation involved moving the government centre from Kuala Lumpur to Putrajaya in 1999 (Hadi & Ristawati, 2020; Sumarno, 2020). However, the capital city remains in Kuala Lumpur as the residence of the king and the centre of trade and finance (Hutasoit, 2018). The relocation of the capital is justified because Kuala Lumpur is overpopulated, polluted, and congested which is considered to disrupt the smooth operation of national administrative processes (Amal & Sulistyawan, 2022). This case illustrates that relocating the capital can be used as a strategy to improve governance while maintaining the economic and symbolic role of the city of origin.

Indonesia's decision to move its capital reflects not only administrative considerations,

but also broader political and development goals. The transfer of government functions to the IKN is intended to create power equality and strengthen national integration through the presence of a new administrative centre outside Java (Addas, 2024). However, from an economic perspective, Jakarta remains the main driving force supporting national competitiveness amid global competition. This gives rise to a dualism of power centers supported by functional differentiation, IKN as the center of administrative and symbolic power while Jakarta is the center of autonomous economics within certain limits of authority (Khairi, 2018). Indonesia seeks to balance the goals of decentralization and equity to maintain Jakarta's established role in the global economic system.

Asymmetric decentralization arose as a result of the relocation of the capital from Jakarta to the IKN. Asymmetric decentralisation as stipulated in Article 18B paragraph (1) of the 1945 Constitution provides constitutional legitimacy for such a division of power (Hayati & Ifansyah, 2019b). This model has previously been implemented in several regions with special characteristics such as Aceh, Papua, and Yogyakarta (Herdanawati, 2024; Jamil, 2019; Pratama, Purwanti, & Wijaningsih, 2018; Sustikarini, 2019). However, what distinguishes Jakarta is its position as a global city with a transnational economic role (Bath, 2024). The division of power between Jakarta and the IKN is not merely an administrative matter but reflects institutional engineering driven by national political needs and global economic interests (Sari et al., 2019). Therefore, an analysis of Law Number 2 of 2024 is crucial for understanding the strategic efforts undertaken by the state to ensure a balance between central and regional development, as well as economic growth and national political stability.

The relocation of Indonesia's capital requires a broader perspective than merely administrative and physical changes. This study seeks to explore in depth the concept of asymmetric decentralization applied in the context of the relationship between Jakarta and the IKN, as well as its implications for the governance of autonomous power in the post-capital relocation era. This approach will examine institutional configurations and the distribution of authority through a political-economic lens highlighting the

interactions between legal structures, economic logic, and national political design. The study is expected to explain how Indonesia balances decentralization, economic competitiveness, and political stability within a new governance framework.

METHODS

This study uses a normative legal approach to analyze the problem in depth and comprehensively. The normative legal approach refers to the applicable laws and regulations (Soekanto & Mamudji, 2001; Soerjono, 2012). The approaches used include the statute approach and the conceptual approach. The statute approach focuses on the study of relevant laws and regulations. The conceptual approach utilizes the views and doctrines of legal experts. Data sources consist of primary legal materials, secondary legal materials, and tertiary legal materials. Primary legal materials include laws and regulations and court decisions. Secondary legal materials include books, journals, and the opinions of legal scholars. Tertiary legal materials include legal dictionaries, encyclopedias, and other supporting sources that can assist in the search for primary and secondary legal materials. Data collection techniques were carried out through literature studies by searching, reading, and recording relevant legal materials. Data analysis was conducted using qualitative descriptive methods (Cresswell, 2007; Sakti et al., 2022). The research results are presented in a qualitative descriptive manner to describe and present data related to an event or phenomenon systematically, factually and accurately.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The Concept of Asymmetric Decentralization in the Context of Relocating the Capital City of Indonesia

Indonesian governance cannot be separated from the principle of decentralization which has shaped the distribution of authority since the reform era. Decentralisation is a fundamental principle in Indonesia's post-reform system of government as enshrined in Articles 18 and 18B of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia (Jamil, 2019). Decentralisation is intended to grant autonomy to regions in managing government affairs with the aim of achieving equitable development, effective public services,

and strengthening local democracy (Agustino, Hikmawan, & Silas, 2024; de Mello & Jalles, 2024; Sahabuddin et al., 2019). Indonesia has adopted two main forms of decentralisation namely symmetrical and asymmetrical decentralisation (Herdanawati, 2024; Susanto, 2019). Symmetrical decentralisation applies generally to all regions, while asymmetrical decentralisation grants special status to certain regions based on their unique geographical, historical, social, or political characteristics (Fatmawati, 2018; Hayati & Ifansyah, 2019a; Putra et al., 2024). This shows Indonesia's efforts to balance governance so that it can run effectively and efficiently.

Asymmetric decentralisation represents one of Indonesia's most significant innovations in accommodating regional diversity within a unitary state framework. Asymmetric decentralisation allows the state to grant broader or different autonomy to regions such as Aceh, Papua, and Yogyakarta (Herdanawati, 2024; Jamil, 2019; Pratama, Purwanti, & Wijaningsih, 2018; Sustikarini, 2019). Aceh has the authority to implement Sharia law (Asnawi, Simamora, & Andrizal, 2021; Iriyani et al., 2021; Sustikarini, 2019), while Papua has special authority related to natural resource management and affirmative development (Djeen, 2022; Sandy, 2023; Sutan & Purwaningsih, 2022). Yogyakarta has a unique form of governance structure with the appointment of a Governor based on lineage. Asymmetric decentralisation is not only constitutionally legal but also an important instrument for responding to diversity and local aspirations that cannot be accommodated by a uniform approach (Firdaus, 2023; Pratama, Purwanti, & Wijaningsih, 2018). This model demonstrates that Indonesia combines constitutional flexibility to strengthen unity while respecting regional distinctiveness.

The application of asymmetric decentralisation in Indonesia takes different forms depending on the characteristics of each region. Asymmetric decentralisation, in the context of Jakarta, established through Law Number 2 of 2024 is a strategic step in redesigning Jakarta's role after it is no longer the national capital (Khairi, 2018). The law grants special authority to the Special Capital Region of Jakarta in its function as the national economic centre and global city (Hartono & Kastowo, 2021). This indicates that

the concept of asymmetry in the case of Jakarta is not based on cultural or historical specificity like Yogyakarta, but rather on economic interests and strategic position within the global network (Yahya, 2018). Therefore, Jakarta can be considered a new model of functional economic-based asymmetric decentralisation (Rahmatunnisa, Hindersah, & Achmad, 2018). This shows that Indonesia's decentralisation system is flexible enough to respond to current challenges, keep Jakarta globally competitive, and maintain national unity.

The relocation of the capital city has resulted in a reconfiguration of power between Jakarta and the new capital city. The relocation of the national capital to IKN is a political decision with far-reaching economic implications (Hadi & Ristawati, 2020). The relocation of the government centre reflects the state's desire to reduce the burden on Jakarta as a megacity facing extraordinary pressures from infrastructure, population density, and spatial inequality (Zainal et al., 2025). Jakarta is focused as the centre of economic and global activities, while the IKN takes on the role of a symbolic and technocratic administrative centre (Iksan, Soong, & Anandi, 2023). This shows that moving the capital does not immediately shift all centers of power.

The division of authority in political economy theory reflects the principle of functional decentralization. The division of power is not based on territory but on institutional function and role (Susanto, 2019; Utomo, 2012). Jakarta has advantages in financial infrastructure, logistics, and international business networks so maintaining this role legally through Law Number 2 of 2024 is an effort to maintain national economic stability amid major political changes (Zainal et al., 2025). The IKN is designed as a long-term project representing a new direction in state governance based on technology, social inclusion, and environmental sustainability (Amri & Lessy, 2024). The success of asymmetric decentralisation heavily depends on the state's ability to manage central-regional relations dynamically, if Jakarta and the IKN are not regulated with clear and coordinated distribution of authority overlapping functions and conflicts of interest may arise (Emrialdi, Valentina, & Putri, 2022). Imbalances in infrastructure investment and human resources can create disparities between regions contradicting the

very spirit of decentralisation (Haryanto & Darmawan, 2024). Therefore, Law Number 2 of 2024 should be viewed as part of the state architecture that not only regulates institutions but also ensures the sustainability of national politics and the economy through the rational and strategic distribution of power functions.

Jakarta has a different position before and after the implementation of Law Number 2 of 2024. Jakarta held a strategic position as the national centre of power with a dual role, serving as the capital city and simultaneously as the economic, political, administrative, and symbolic centre (Lubis et al., 2024). All branches of state power, including the executive (President and ministries), legislative (House of Representatives, Regional Representatives Council, People's Consultative Assembly), and judicial (Supreme Court, Constitutional Court, Judicial Commission) are headquartered in Jakarta (Febria & Kurniawan, 2025). Jakarta functions as an administrative province that also bears the burden of central government coordination and national-scale public services. However, with the enactment of Law Number 2 of 2024 and the ratification of Law Number 21 of 2023 as amendments to the IKN Law, there has been a major repositioning of Jakarta's functions (Lubis et al., 2024). These laws stipulate that the administrative functions of the central government will be transferred to the IKN, while Jakarta will be designated as the Jakarta Special Region Province with the primary role as the national economic centre and a global city. Jakarta no longer holds the status of the national capital. This marks a fundamental shift from a centralised power structure to a more functional and divided structure between two strategic regions.

Jakarta, prior to the enactment of Law Number 2 of 2024, had a very strategic dual status namely as the capital city of the country as well as the centre of national economic activity. Jakarta's main functions include administrative, political, and economic aspects as the centre of government, all branches of state power are centred in Jakarta. This makes Jakarta the epicentre of national power, where institutional coordination is fully centralised and centralised. Jakarta still follows the same conventional decentralisation pattern as other regions, albeit with greater complexity due to its

dual role. However, after the enactment of Law Number 2 of 2024, there has been a fundamental change in the structure of Jakarta's authority and functions. The city no longer holds the status of the national capital, but is designated as a Daerah Khusus Jakarta Province with the main role as a national economic centre and global city. The main focus of local government administration is no longer on political-administrative functions but on strengthening the economic sector, trade, and integration of Jakarta in the global network. Jakarta now applies a function-based asymmetric decentralisation pattern. This means that although it still has a democratic local government structure with an elected Governor and legislative, Jakarta is given special authority that is different from other provinces especially in terms of managing strategic economic areas, limited international cooperation, and flexibility in fiscal governance and regional finances.

The most significant difference is also seen in the pattern of institutional coordination, previously all centres of power were concentrated in Jakarta but after Law Number 2 of 2024, there is a clear division between Jakarta and the IKN. The administrative and symbolic functions of the state are moved to IKN, while the economic functions remain centred in Jakarta. The structure of authority at the national level is no longer singular, but rather divided by function and region. These changes represent a paradigm shift from conventional decentralisation to functional asymmetric decentralisation. Jakarta, before Law Number 2 of 2024, held all the functions of power at once, whereas afterwards Jakarta was focused as an economic centre with a special status that distinguished it from other regions. The shift is not only a matter of changing administrative status, but also an institutional transformation that emphasises the division of state functions, IKN as the administrative centre of government and Jakarta as the national economic engine with global reach.

Future projections indicate that Jakarta will face dual pressures. Jakarta must maintain high economic competitiveness as a centre of capital and international business and on the other hand it must ensure social inclusivity and environmental sustainability (Tawil, Syugiarto, & Rahmarini, 2022). The risk of dualism between

global ambitions and domestic inequalities will become more acute, if the management of this transformation is not optimal. Inequality in access to the digital economy, adequate housing, and gentrification pressures could widen class disparities in Jakarta. The IKN, which is now the centre of national government, is still under construction and faces major challenges from an administrative perspective such as land disputes, conflicts with indigenous communities, and exploitation of natural resources (Pramono, Latif, & Setyowati, 2025; Rivandi & Pramono, 2024). The burden of national development will still be heavily supported by Jakarta in the coming years. The absence of strong coordination mechanisms between Jakarta and IKN in the design of cross-functional and cross-regional policies also has the potential to create an institutional void that could impact the effectiveness of national governance as a whole.

Implications of Asymmetric Decentralization between Jakarta and Ibu Kota Nusantara

Jakarta's uniqueness lies in the functions and scope of its authority. Law Number 2 of 2024 grants asymmetric autonomy based on economic functions (Lubis et al., 2024). This means that Jakarta has special authority in managing strategic matters related to its global role, such as the management of international economic zones, the development of intelligent transportation systems, the strengthening of limited international cooperation, and more flexible and innovative local financial management. Jakarta's institutions are also strengthened by technical units and strategic agencies that support its transformation into a global city (Lubis et al., 2024). For example, the Jakarta Regional Development Planning Agency no longer merely formulates regional development plans but also plays a role as a strategic thinker in designing long-term economic policy directions. This authority makes Jakarta's governance more complex than other regions as it must balance local, national, and international interests simultaneously.

The institutional structure of the IKN takes a fundamentally different form. IKN is not established as a province or autonomous region in the conventional sense. IKN is managed through an Authority, a technocratic government entity directly under the President. The Head of the IKN Authority and the Deputy Head of the

Authority are appointed by the President and are fully responsible for all aspects of planning, development, and management of the new capital city (Addas, 2024; Sandy, 2023). The institutional framework in the IKN focuses on administrative functions and long-term planning. The main tasks of the IKN Authority include managing the spatial planning and infrastructure of the capital city, implementing green policies and environmental sustainability, developing a digital government system, and controlling national strategic areas that will house central government institutions. The Authority is also responsible for managing state assets and investments in the IKN area, as well as serving as the central point of coordination for all national projects related to the relocation of the capital city.

The differences between the institutional structures of Jakarta and IKN are striking. Jakarta adopts a democratic regional government system with electoral legitimacy, but is granted special authority based on economic functions and international relations. The IKN follows a technocratic governance system with direct control from the centre, without local political representation. Jakarta reflects Indonesia's global city identity with its market dynamics, technology, and high mobility, the IKN embodies the idealisation of an efficient, inclusive, and well-planned central government. These two institutional models reflect the practice of asymmetrical decentralisation based on functions and national interests (Masitah & Dewi, 2022). Jakarta no longer plays a central administrative role but becomes the main hub in Indonesia's international economic network. The IKN takes over the functions of political and administrative power, but without the usual regional autonomy. Both become strategic components in the new configuration of Indonesia's post-capital relocation state system and will only succeed if there is strong institutional coordination, cross-regional policy integration, and legal certainty that guarantees the clarity of each region's role.

The implementation of Law Number 2 of 2024 has raised a number of issues in practice both legally, institutionally, and politically. The absence of coordination mechanisms between institutions and regions, one of the main weaknesses is the lack of legal and institutional frameworks explicitly regulating coordination

between Jakarta and the IKN. Relations between centres of power must have a coordinative design to prevent overlapping functions and policies. This vacuum has the potential to create conflicts of authority, inefficiency in national policy-making, and dualism in state representation at the global level. Overlapping authority and policies, the lack of clarity in the delimitation of functions between institutions in the Jakarta National Capital Region and the IKN creates room for regulatory overlap. For example, in foreign investment management, economic diplomacy, or metropolitan area development, it is unclear who has dominant authority. Disparities in infrastructure and resource capacity, Jakarta already has mature infrastructure and excellent human resources, while IKN is still in the early stages of development. This creates a gap that risks creating long-term dependence on Jakarta, even though the administrative power has been legally transferred to IKN.

Fiscal readiness and governance reforms in Jakarta, the repositioning of Jakarta requires local governments to build a self-reliant fiscal system without significant dependence on the state budget. This requires optimisation of original local government revenue, management of strategic city assets, and economic incentive systems for business areas. Potential social polarisation and urban gentrification, the transformation of Jakarta into a global city could lead to social exclusion for vulnerable groups. Rising land prices, the development of elite neighbourhoods and urbanisation pressures could trigger class inequality, displacement of local communities, and inequality in access to the digital economy and basic services. These problems show that implementing asymmetric decentralisation in the context of Jakarta and IKN is not simple. The absence of an inter-agency coordination mechanism has direct implications for the risk of overlapping authority, especially in strategic issues such as investment management, metropolitan area development, and Indonesia's representation in international forums. The resulting policies are potentially contradictory and weaken the effectiveness of governance.

The lack of clarity in the delimitation of functions between Jakarta and IKN shows that there are empty spaces in the legal architecture. Jakarta as a global city has a need to engage in

international economic cooperation, while IKN is formally the political-administrative centre of the state. This situation creates a dualism that risks confusion among domestic and foreign actors about the legitimate centre of authority. The imbalance in infrastructure and human resource capacity between Jakarta and IKN deepens the transition challenge. Jakarta is mature in terms of transport networks, logistics, and economic bureaucracy, while IKN still has to build a basic foundation. This disparity has the potential to create a long-term dependency on Jakarta, even though administrative functions have been moved to Kalimantan. Jakarta is required to be able to manage its finances independently by maximising original local government revenue, strategic assets, and financing innovations. However, without supporting regulations, this could lead to significant fiscal disparities between regions. IKN still requires substantial fiscal support from the centre, resulting in a potential tug-of-war over national budget allocations.

Jakarta's transformation into a global city presents risks of gentrification, exclusive urbanisation, and marginalisation of vulnerable groups. Rising land prices and the development of elite areas could marginalise small communities from their living space, triggering sharper social polarisation. IKN also faces social problems related to land conflicts with local communities and environmental sustainability issues. This series of problems shows that Law Number 2 of 2024 needs to be complemented by clear derivative regulations, cross-regional institutional coordination, and inclusive fiscal and social policies. This is done to avoid the risk of governance fragmentation, legal uncertainty, and increased socio-economic tensions. However, if handled appropriately, this transition can be an opportunity to build a modern, adaptive model of state governance that is balanced between the political-administrative needs of IKN and the dynamics of the global economy in Jakarta.

The implementation of Law Number 2 of 2024 has significant implications for the structure of regional autonomy in Indonesia. Jakarta now serves as a new model of asymmetric decentralisation based on functions, rather than cultural identity like Yogyakarta or historical conflicts like Aceh and Papua. This model opens up space for local government innovation in the economic sector, but also challenges the

consistency of the national regional autonomy system (Hasti & Purwaningsih, 2022). Jakarta is expected to become the engine of national growth connected to global markets. However, if this is not accompanied by equitable development in other regions, the risk of inequality will increase. The relocation of the government centre to the IKN does not automatically guarantee fair distribution of power if institutional coordination is not improved. Fragmentation of state legitimacy arises if Jakarta is too dominant as an economic center and the IKN is unable to fully play its administrative role.

The implementation of Law Number 2 of 2024 cannot stand alone. It requires derivative legal instruments, coherent inter-institutional policies, and institutional reforms at both the central and regional levels to ensure that this power transition does not create a legal and political vacuum but rather serves as a strong foundation for modern, functional, and sustainable governance. Based on some of the points that have been explained, the changing role of Jakarta as the national economic centre and global city accompanied by the relocation of administrative functions to the IKN, indicates that the implementation of asymmetric decentralisation is not merely a matter of redistributing administrative authority but a strategic agenda to redefine power relations and the distribution of functions among regions within the framework of a unitary state (Fatmawati, 2018; Saraswati & Adi, 2022; Tawil, Syugiarto, & Rahmarini, 2022). This design can be interpreted as a realistic step to maintain the sustainability of national economic growth while creating a more geographically equitable distribution of government centres.

The decentralisation implemented in Jakarta and the IKN is a form of functional asymmetrical decentralisation. Decentralisation that is not based on cultural, geographical, or historical characteristics, as is the case in Aceh, Papua, or Yogyakarta, but rather on the division of institutional roles (Herdanawati, 2024; Jamil, 2019; Pratama, Purwanti, & Wijaningsih, 2018; Sustikarini, 2019). Jakarta is aimed at becoming a national and global economic hub, while the IKN will serve as the administrative and symbolic centre of the state. This model is based on the theory of functional decentralisation, which emphasises the division of power based on function and productivity,

not merely geographical boundaries. The state can decentralise not only spatially but also functionally to achieve efficiency and effectiveness in governance (Utomo, 2012). This approach has complex consequences because without integrated and coordinated planning, functional decentralisation risks creating confusing dualism of power particularly in relations between regions and between levels of government. Strong coordination mechanisms are required to prevent policy overlap and fragmentation, if two centres of power operate under fundamentally different institutional systems,

The reconstruction of Jakarta's role as an economic centre without administrative functions creates a new model of functional decentralisation. This model is not only unique to Indonesia but also reflects adaptation to the dynamics of urban globalisation, unlike decentralisation in Aceh or Papua which is based on identity and historical conflict (Setiawan, Ulfa, & Purwaningsih, 2020). Jakarta marks the emergence of a new form of regional autonomy based on global functions and economic productivity. This allows the state to manage centres of power based on the core strengths of regions, rather than solely on administrative boundaries. However, significant challenges arise in institutional coordination (Fridayani et al., 2024). The transfer of administrative power to the IKN requires a cross-regional and cross-functional coordination system that is not yet fully established. The failure of national institutions to build a synergistic working relationship between the IKN and Jakarta could give rise to the risk of overlapping policies, regulatory dualism, and disputes over authority (Mazda, 2022). This would impact the effectiveness of national governance broadly, including in the legislative process, budgeting, and foreign policy related to diplomatic and international economic activities.

Jakarta's asymmetrical decentralisation risks strengthening economic oligarchy if not balanced with policies for equitable distribution and strengthening local economic capacity. Jakarta's repositioning as a global city with a must remain grounded in the principle of social justice. Local governments need to design anticipatory policies against potential class polarisation, urban gentrification, and neglect of vulnerable groups living in informal economic pockets. The IKN

must prove itself as an effective and inclusive centre of government, not merely a symbolic or administrative project. The distribution of autonomous authority between Jakarta and the IKN creates equal opportunities and challenges. Indonesia could become a successful example of creating a functional national governance architecture that is adaptive to globalisation and the needs of sustainable development, if managed successfully. However, if it fails, Indonesia could face governance fragmentation and a crisis of legitimacy between the national government and economic centres. Therefore, follow-up policies to Law Number 2 of 2024 must be directed towards strengthening institutions, increasing regional capacity, and developing a sustainable coordination system between Jakarta and the IKN.

CONCLUSION

Asymmetric decentralization implemented in Indonesia can be seen in the effort to relocate the national capital as stipulated in Law Number 2 of 2024. The relocation of the national capital from Jakarta to Ibu Kota Nusantara leads to the concept of functional asymmetric decentralization, which emphasizes the division of power based on function and productivity rather than geographical boundaries. Jakarta, which previously had the dual function of national capital and center of government, has been repositioned with its main function as the national economic center and global city. The relocation of the capital from Jakarta to the Ibu Kota Nusantara has implications for governance that trigger various problems, including infrastructure and resource capacity imbalances, the emergence of social polarization and urban gentrification, and overlapping authorities and policies due to the absence of a legal framework that explicitly regulates coordination between Jakarta and Ibu Kota Nusantara. Asymmetric decentralization between Jakarta and Ibu Kota Nusantara risks strengthening economic oligarchy if it is not balanced with policies of equity and strengthening local economic capacity.

REFERENCES

- Addas, I. H. (2024). Daerah Otorita Ibu Kota Negara: Koherensi Status Daerah pada Ibu Kota Negara Nusantara Peraturan Perundang-Undangan Pemerintahan

- Daerah di Indonesia. *UNES Law Review*, 7(1), 12744-12756. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.31933/unesrev.v6i4>
- Agustino, L., Hikmawan, M. D., & Silas, J. (2024). Decentralization in Indonesia: From Reformation to the Local Regime. *Public Policy and Administration*, 23(2), 238-258. <https://doi.org/10.13165/VPA-24-23-2-09>
- Amal, B., & Sulistyawan, A. Y. (2022). Dinamika Ketatanegaraan Pemindahan Ibu Kota Negara Indonesia dalam Perspektif Hukum. *Masalah-Masalah Hukum*, 51(4), 346-354. <https://doi.org/10.14710/mmh.51.4.2022.346-354>
- Amri, D. R., & Lessy, Z. (2024). Analisis Diskursus Pemerataan Ekonomi dalam Pembangunan Nasional Ibu Kota Nusantara. *Al-Kharaj: Jurnal Ekonomi, Keuangan & Bisnis Syariah*, 6(5), 2655-2672. <https://doi.org/10.47467/alkharaj.v6i5.2642>
- Asnawi, E., Simamora, B., & Andrizal. (2021). Otonomi Khusus terhadap Eksistensi Negara Kesatuan Republik Indonesia. *Jurnal Analisis Hukum*, 4(2), 242-263.
- Bath, A. S. H. (2024). Disparitas Desentralisasi: Konsepsi Otonomi Daerah Khusus Ibukota terhadap Sistem Ketatanegaraan Indonesia. *Jurisprudensi: Jurnal Ilmu Syariah, Perundang-Undangan dan Ekonomi Islam*, 16(1), 129-144. <https://doi.org/10.32505/jurisprudensi.v16i1.7056>
- Cresswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative Inquiry & Research Design: Choosing Among Five Approaches*. New York: Sage Publishing.
- de Mello, L., & Jalles, J. T. (2024). Decentralization and the Environment: Cross-Country Evidence. *Applied Economics*, 56(57), 7960-7970. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00036846.2024.2313607>
- Djeen, A. A. (2022). Upaya-Upaya Indonesia dalam Resolusi Konflik Papua. *Jurnal Sosio-Komunika*, 1(2), 175-193. <https://doi.org/10.57036/jsk.v1i2.27>
- Emrialdi, P., Valentina, T. R., & Putri, I. A. (2022). Policy Analysis of the National Capital from an Economic-Political Perspective. *Adabi: Journal of Public Administration and Business*, 9(2), 25-30. <https://doi.org/10.62066/jpab.v9i2.23>
- Fatmawati, N. I. (2018). Desentralisasi Asimetris, Alternatif bagi Masa Depan Pembagian Kewenangan di Indonesia. *Madani Jurnal Politik dan Sosial*, 10(3), 73-85. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.52166/madani.v10i3.1265>
- Febria, T., & Kurniawan, D. (2025). Pembentukan Perda Berbasis Syari'ah dalam Bingkai Negara Hukum Pancasila. *UNES Journal of Swara Justisia*, 8(4), 798-810. <https://doi.org/10.31933/tkst8647>
- Firdaus, M. (2023). Empat Elemen Governance dalam Pengelolaan Sampah di Daerah Istimewa Yogyakarta. *The Journalish: Social and Government*, 4(4), 471-481. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.55314/tsg.v4i4.689>
- Fridayani, H. D., Darumurti, A., Atmojo, M. E., Hanif, N. A., & Perdana, V. A. (2024). *Dinamika Sosial, Ekonomi, dan Politik: Tantangan Otonomi Khusus dan Pembangunan Berkelanjutan di Indonesia*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Hadi, F., & Ristawati, R. (2020). Pemindahan Ibu Kota Indonesia dan Kekuasaan Presiden dalam Perspektif Konstitusi. *Jurnal Konstitusi*, 17(3), 530-557. <https://doi.org/10.31078/jk1734>
- Hartono, Y., & Kastowo, C. (2021). Perwujudan Politik Hukum Desentralisasi Asimetris melalui Perda dan Perdais di Daerah Istimewa Yogyakarta. *Kajian Hasil Penelitian Hukum*, 5(2), 1-15. <https://doi.org/10.37159/jmih.v5i2.1505>
- Haryanto, A., & Darmawan, A. B. (2024). Geopolitical Analysis of the Relocation of Indonesia's Capital City to the Archipelago's Capital City, East Kalimantan. *Malaysian Journal of History, Politics & Strategic Studies*, 51(4), 596-615. <https://doi.org/10.17576/jebat.2024.5104.12>
- Hasti, I., & Purwaningsih, T. (2022). Bibliometrics Analysis of Regional Autonomy Problem in Indonesia. *STI Policy and Management Journal*, 7(1), 77-85. <https://doi.org/10.14203/stipm.2022.320>
- Hayati, R., & Ifansyah, M. N. (2019a). Praktik Desentralisasi Asimetris di Indonesia. *Jurnal Pemikiran dan Penelitian Administrasi Publik dan Administrasi Bisnis*, 3(2), 131-140.
- Hayati, R., & Ifansyah, M. N. (2019b). Praktik Desentralisasi Asimetris di Indonesia. *Jurnal Pemikiran dan Penelitian Administrasi*

- Publik dan Bisnis*, 3(2), 131-140. <https://doi.org/10.35722/pubbis.v3i2.60>
- Herdanareswari, I. (2024). Desentralisasi Asimetris dalam Mewujudkan Kesejahteraan Masyarakat pada Daerah Otonomi Khusus Papua. *Jurnal Yustika Media Hukum dan Keadilan*, 27(1), 1-23.
- Hutasoit, W. L. (2018). Analisa Pemindahan Ibukota Negara. *Dedikasi: Jurnal Ilmiah Sosial, Hukum, Budaya*, 19(2), 108-128.
- Iksan, M., Soong, J. J., & Anandi, M. F. (2023). *Jakarta in a Time of Political and Economic Change: Capital Transformation, City Resilience, and Collaborative Governance*. https://doi.org/10.29180/978-615-6342-64-5_1
- Iriyani, S., Hamid, A. H., Setyarso, A., & Basri, H. (2021). *Provincial Autonomy and Forest Management Unit Legislation in Aceh Province, Indonesia: A Review of Regulatory Asynchronies*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-323-85729-1.00011-6>
- Jamil, A. (2019). Reformasi Struktur Pemerintahan dengan Berlakunya Otonomi Khusus di Aceh. *Jurnal Transformasi Administrasi*, 9(1), 71-85.
- Khairi, H. (2018). Masalah dan Masa Depan Otonomi Khusus DKI Jakarta sebagai Ibu Kota Negara. *Jurnal Ilmu Pemerintahan*, 53(1), 25-37.
- Lubis, A. S., Saputro, B., Wibowo, R. W., & Al-Qindi, M. F. (2024). Problematika Pemberian Otonomi Khusus Provinsi Daerah Khusus Jakarta yang Hanya Berada pada Tingkat Provinsi. *Jurnal Hukum & Pembangunan*, 54(1), 129-150. <https://doi.org/10.21143/jhp.vol54.no1.1617>
- Masitah, A. D., & Dewi, D. S. K. (2022). Analisis Opini Publik Berdasarkan Teori Agenda Setting pada Proses Perencanaan Pemindahan IKN. *Jurnal Ilmu Sosial dan Pendidikan*, 6(3), 10207-10217.
- Mazda, C. N. (2022). Analisis Dampak Pemindahan Ibu Kota Negara (IKN) terhadap Social Security. *Jurnal Enersia Publika*, 6(1), 1-12.
- Pramono, B., Latif, A., & Setyowati, R. K. (2025). Kewenangan Khusus Otorita Ibu Kota Nusantara dalam Sistem Tata Usaha Negara di Indonesia. *Visa: Journal of Vision and Ideas*, 5(1), 40-59. <https://doi.org/10.47467/visa.v5i1.4634>
- Pratama, G. P., Purwanti, A., & Wijaningsih, D. (2018). Yogyakarta Special Region Policy Upon Gender Biased Leader Transition Reviewed from Law No. 13/2012 on the Special Rights of Yogyakarta Special Region. *IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science*, 175(1), 1-12. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1755-1315/175/1/012196>
- Putra, R., Suryanti, R., Chynta, D., Putri, B., & Nabila, M. L. (2024). Dinamika Politik dan Hukum Desentralisasi Asimetris di Indonesia. *Ensiklopedia of Journal*, 6(2), 295-304. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.33559/eoj.v6i3.2197>
- Rahmatunnisa, M., Hindersah, R., & Achmad, T. H. (2018). Why Regions with Archipelagic Characteristics in Indonesia Also Need Asymmetric Decentralization? *Jurnal Bina Praja*, 10(2), 251-261. <https://doi.org/10.21787/jbp.10.2018.251-261>
- Republik Indonesia. (2023). Undang-Undang Nomor 21 Tahun 2023 tentang Perubahan atas Undang-Undang Nomor 3 Tahun 2022 tentang Ibu Kota Negara. Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 2023 Nomor 142. Tambahan Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Nomor 6898.
- Republik Indonesia. (2024). Undang-Undang Nomor 2 Tahun 2024 tentang Provinsi Daerah Khusus Jakarta. Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 2024 Nomor 76. Tambahan Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Nomor 6913.
- Rivandi, S., & Pramono, S. (2024). IKN: Economic Opportunity or Threat? A Comprehensive Public Policy Analysis on the Economic and Social Impacts of Indonesia's Capital City Relocation. *Jurnal Public Policy*, 10(2), 130-137. <https://doi.org/10.35308/jpp.v10i2.8938>
- Sahabuddin, C., Muliaty, M., Farida, U., Hasbi, & Yusriadi, Y. (2019). Administration of Post-Reformation Decentralization Government. *International Journal of Recent Technology and Engineering*, 8(3), 7631-7634. <https://doi.org/10.35940/ijrte.C6182.098319>
- Sakti, F. T., Wahyudi, E., Rifki, E. M., & Ufah, H. A. (2022). Otonomi Daerah Pembentuk Intensi Perilaku Koruptif Kepala Daerah di Indonesia. *Jurnal Dialektika: Jurnal Ilmu Sosial*, 20(1), 49-58. <https://doi.org/10.54783/dialektika.v20i1.32>

- Sandy, I. G. S. (2023). Otorita Ibu Kota Nusantara dalam Perpektif Otonomi Khusus. *Civilia: Jurnal Kajian Hukum dan Pendidikan Kewarganegaraan*, 2(1), 10-16.
- Saraswati, M. K., & Adi, E. A. W. (2022). Pemindahan Ibu Kota Negara ke Provinsi Kalimantan Timur Berdasarkan Analisis SWOT. *Jurnal Ilmu Sosial dan Pendidikan*, 6(2), 4042-4052. <https://doi.org/10.58258/jisip.v6i2.3086>
- Sari, P., Muzaki, I. S., Mulyatini, N., Faridah, E., & Prawiranegara, B. (2019). Local Own Revenue, Decentralization and Local Financial Independent. *Jurnal Manajemen Indonesia*, 19(3), 250-259. <https://doi.org/10.25124/jmi.v19i3.2413>
- Setiawan, D., Ulfa, K., & Purwaningsih, T. (2020). Poor Aceh: The Impact of Special Autonomy as Effort Poverty Reduction in Aceh. *Jurnal Ilmiah Administrasi Publik*, 18(2), 1-14. <https://doi.org/10.30996/dia.v18i2.3654>
- Soekanto, S., & Mamudji, S. (2001). *Penelitian Hukum Normatif suatu Tinjauan Singkat*. Jakarta: Raja Grafindo Persada.
- Soerjono, S. (2012). *Pengantar Penelitian Hukum*. Jakarta: Universitas Indonesia Press.
- Sumarno. (2020). *Pembelajaran dari Malaysia dalam Pemindahan Ibu Kota Negara*. Jakarta: Universitas Muhammadiyah Jakarta.
- Susanto, S. N. H. (2019). Desentralisasi Asimetris dalam Konteks Negara Kesatuan. *Administrative Law and Governance Journal*, 2(4), 631-639. <https://doi.org/10.14710/alj.v2i4.631-639>
- Sustikarini, A. (2019). Financing Peace: Special Autonomy Fund as a Peace Dividend in Aceh, Indonesia. *Journal of ASEAN Studies*, 7(2), 99-121. <https://doi.org/10.21512/jas.v7i2.5787>
- Sutan, A. J., & Purwaningsih, T. (2022). Using Social Media to Support the Special Autonomous Region of Papua's Continuity Program. *Journal of Governance*, 7(1), 37-52. <https://doi.org/10.31506/jog.v6i3.12824>
- Tawil, Y. P., Syugiarto, & Rahmarini, G. M. (2022). The Fate of Jakarta Special Autonomy After the Movement of the Capital City of the United State of the Republic of Indonesia. *Journal of Public Administration and Government*, 4(2), 140-149. <https://doi.org/10.22487/jpag.v4i2.475>
- Utomo, T. W. W. (2012). Dekonsentrasi dan Desentralisasi dalam Diskursus Negara Kesatuan dan Negara Federal. *Jurnal Ilmu Administrasi*, 9(1), 34-44. <https://doi.org/10.31113/jia.v9i1.254>
- Yahya, M. (2018). Pemindahan Ibu Kota Negara Maju dan Sejahtera. *Jurnal Studi Agama dan Masyarakat*, 14(1), 21-30. <https://doi.org/10.23971/jsam.v14i1.779>
- Zainal, I., et al. (2025). Relocating or Retaining the Capital City of Jakarta—Evaluation the Feasibility, Sustainability, and Strategic Planning of Indonesia in Facing the Challenges of Relocating the National Capital from a Multidimensional Perspective. *Journal of Infrastructure, Policy and Development*, 9(1), 1-22. <https://doi.org/10.24294/jipd10920>