International Journal of Psychosocial Rehabilitation, Vol. 24, Issue 08, 2020
ISSN: 1475-7192

# Synchronizing the Regional Boundary Dispute Resolution

[1]Naswar, [2]Maskun, [3]Aminuddin Ilmar, [4]Achmad

***ABSTRACT***---*The issue of regional boundaries does not become an absolute requirement that must be met before being legalized as a new autonomous region. Therefore, the map made in the appendix to the Law on Regional Formation (UUPD) also means merely a clue to the location of the region that the territory exists among other regions, or is just a differentiator between one region and another, no more. This problem is one of the triggers for conflict with regional boundaries. The purpose of this study is to synchronize Law No. 22 of 1999, Law No. 32 of 2004 as well as Law No. 23 of 2014) and their derivative laws, particular the Ministry of Internal Affairs Decree (Permendagri) No. 1 of 2006 which has been replaced by Permendagri No. 76 of 2012, then replaced again with Permendagri No. 141 of 2017 concerning Affirmation of Regional Boundaries. Those laws and Permendagri are exercised in the West Sulawesi as the site of the study. The results of the study show that the synchronization of the regional boundaries must be done by adoption the bottom-up concept. In the context of the Province of West Sulawesi, the delimitation stage of the area boundaries has not been followed by the definition of a clear point and boundary line in the map of Law No. 26 of 2004.*

***Keywords***--*The Regional Boundaries, Conflicts, Synchronizing Laws*

## I. INTRODUCTION

Boundaries dispute has been an international issue and become a serious threat to human life (Saliternik, 2017) whether it is inter-state boundaries dispute or regional boundaries dispute. Regional boundaries are one of the important aspects of autonomous regions because they are related to domain of authority of a regional government. Based on the theory of power limitation (Oodir & Laksono, 2012). Governmental authority is not only limited by the scope of content and time, but also its territory. Regional boundaries become the domain boundaries and at the same time determine the orderly implementation of the authority of a regional government. Unclear boundaries of a region can trigger conflicts in the region. For instance, conflicts in exploitation of natural resources that associated with unclear ownership (Lai *et al.*, 2018) so that it indirectly impacts on the weakness of national security (Batubara, 2015).

The regional boundary conflict in legal perspective is caused by unclear regional boundaries in the law on the formation of the relevant region. As stated by Batubara (2015), a prominent cause of border disputes lies in the law on regional formation (UUPD). The boundary clause is only mentioned as being bordered by a neighbouring area (Batubara, 2015). This condition at the operational level raises serious demarcation problems due to the regional boundary peg points. A report from the General Directorate General of the Ministry of Internal Affairs

[1] *Faculty of Law, Universitas Hasanuddin, Indonesia, naswar@unhas.ac.id*

[2] *Faculty of Law, Universitas Hasanuddin, Indonesia, maskunmaskun31@gmail.com*

[3] *Faculty of Law, Universitas Hasanuddin, Indonesia, aminuddin@unhas.ac.id*

[4] *Faculty of Law, Universitas Hasanuddin, Indonesia,achmad@unhas.ac.id*

**Received: 27 Mar 2020 | Revised: 20 Apr 2020 | Accepted: 05 May 2020** 

(Arifin, 2016) states that many regional boundary maps in the UUPD do not meet cartographic technical requirements when used as a basis in asserting regional boundaries (such as there is no scale and coordinate points), even only in the form of sketches that have an impact on (i) overlapping of area coverage, (ii) duplication of government services or lack of government services, (iii) struggles to manage natural resources, (iv) overlapping of business location licensing. (v) multiple electoral districts in the Election process, and (vi) difficulties in regulating regional spatial planning. It is generally concluded that the emergence of regional boundary conflicts so far has been triggered by regional planning policies that are not well planned (Arifin, 2016). Sulistyono et.al (2014) indicates that since the opening of the regional 'tap' of regional expansion, up to 2014 there were 946 border disputes conflicts, both between regencies / cities in one province and regencies / cities in one province with regencies / cities in neighbouring provinces (Sulistyono *et. al.*, 2014).

In the context of regional expansion, regional aspects have been required in local government laws, both Law No. 22 of 1999, Law No. 32 of 2004 as well as Law No. 23 of 2014. This means that the expansion of an area must have clear boundaries. However, the three laws do not specifically regulate the technicality of determining regional boundaries. At present, the division of regions still refers to PP No. 78 of 2007 concerning Procedures for the Formation, Abolition and Merger of Regions - which is stipulated as the implementation of Law No. 32 of 2004, while government regulations themselves (also) do not regulate the technical determination of regional boundaries. Therefore, the boundaries of the UUPD tend to be improvised. This condition drives the issuance of the policy of asserting regional boundaries through Permendagri No. 1 of 2006 which has been replaced by Permendagri No. 76 of 2012, then replaced again with Permendagri No. 141 of 2017 concerning Affirmation of Regional Boundaries. Like (two) predecessors, Permendagri No. 141 of 2017 was preceded by the formation of a number of regions resulting from the division. Within this time period, the territorial boundaries in the UUPD have the potential to be disputed. Even though regional boundaries have been affirmed - the results of which are set forth in the form of a Permendagri, the potential for disputes remains. Therefore, the aims of this research is to synchronize the laws of regional boundary settlement either in UUPD, statutory regulations, or other legally binding documents. Indeed, it will be started by making clear the regulation of regional boundaries in local government laws and its implementing regulations.

## II. METHODOLOGY

This research was conducted by conducting a literature study . In this case in addition to reviewing the legislation, would also examine various other data such as the opinion of experts, the results of research and legal decisions related to the border, all the data is obtained, the next in the Inventory and in identification to be adjusted to the legal issues. Then, the data were analyzed qualitatively.

## III. RESULTS

***Regional Boundary Setting***

***a. Review in Law No. 23 of 2014 and PP No. 78 of 2007***

Regional boundaries related to regional expansion. Why is that? Regional expansion activities always have consequences for changes in regional coverage, which means changing existing boundaries, or creating new

regional boundaries. Seeing this connection, a number of studies said that regional expansion policies triggered conflicting boundaries (Ratnawari, 2010; Muqoyyidin, 2013; Endarto, 2014). Indeed, regional expansion has the potential to cause boundary issues, but not every regional expansion activity always causes conflict. As long as the boundaries are clear, regional expansion will not trigger regional / boundary conflicts. On the other hand, if the boundaries are unclear, regional expansion activities will be the source of conflict boundaries.

Therefore, it is not appropriate if the phenomenon of the rise of regional boundary conflicts is responded to, for example by imposing a moratorium on regional expansion as was done by President Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono, on September 3, 2009. The moratorium policy is actually just delaying the triggering of conflict, not eliminating triggers, let alone resolve the conflict. However, opening a 'faucet' of regional expansion also means maintaining conflict, if then the regional expansion activities do not anticipate the triggers of the conflict.

In this context, in addition to setting boundaries, the actual expected response is to keep open the possibility of regional expansion. Why is that? As part of state government, regions are formed with the intention to carry out some of the functions of government administration (in the field of state administration) which are dynamic in nature. This nature causes the contents of government that must be handled by the region is also dynamic in line with the dynamics of governance, including the composition of regional government and the number of regions. This dynamism lasted throughout the ages, and because of that, delaying or even eliminating the division of the region became something impossible.

But this dynamic can certainly be directed. In the case of regional expansion, it must be avoided, lest the policy actually brings new problems. In this context, a *grand design of* regional expansion is needed which answers objectively what the ideal number of regions in Indonesia is in a certain period. At this time, the Ministry of Home Affairs has succeeded in compiling a grand regional arrangement design in Indonesia for the period 2010-2025. Unfortunately, the big design has not become part of the laws and regulations so it does not have binding legal force.

In connection with the regulation of regional boundaries, Law No. 23 of 2014 does not specifically regulate this issue, but relates to the provisions of regional formation in the form of regional expansion and regional integration. Specifically for regional expansion activities, two requirements are laid down, one of which is relevant to this study, is the basic requirements, among others, the area boundaries and the area coverage. The boundaries of the preparation area to be formed into a new area, as evidenced by the coordinates on the base map, issued by the authorized institution in accordance with statutory provisions. Meanwhile, the coverage area for the preparation area includes (a) at least 5 (five) regency / city areas for the formation of a provincial region, (b) at least 5 (five) districts for the formation of regency areas, and (c) at least 4 (four) districts for the formation of regions / cities.

From this information it appears that regional expansion is *bottom-up* , with the understanding that smaller administrative units are the elements that make up larger administrative units. Sub-district units form district units, and district units form provincial units. At a glance, the provisions of Article 2 paragraph (1) of Law no. 23 of 2014 which states 'The Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia is divided into Provincial Regions and Provincial Regions are divided into Regency and City Regions' gives rise to an interpretation as if the regional division must be *top-down* . If related to the following provisions, Article 3 paragraph (2) which mentions 'Provincial Region and Regency / City'. . . formed by law ', it is clear that the phrase' formed 'refers to the formation of regions, especially the division of regions which are indeed *bottom-up* .

The question is, does this mean that regional boundary management must also be done *top-down* or *bottom-up* ? In the *top-down* concept , the administrative boundaries of smaller units are first settled, then followed by the larger units. With the complete arrangement of administrative boundaries in the smallest unit, the boundary arrangement for the larger units will be easily carried out because the larger units are arrangements of smaller units. In the view of Lulus Hidayatmo and Fahrul Hidayat, *bottom-up* regional boundary arrangement - starting from the smallest administrative unit - is one of the answers to ambiguities or duplication of interpretation of administrative boundaries that have occurred so far. The practice that has been carried out so far, for example in the arrangement of provincial, or district / city boundaries, actually always involves village / kelurahan officials as the smallest administrative tip that understands location (Poniman, 2016).

Regulatively ( *wider sense* ), the concept of *bottom-up* in the demarcation of regional boundaries has been adopted, for example in Law No. 32 of 2004 or its predecessor namely Law No. 22 of 1999. So, in terms of the concept approach, there is no difference between Law No. 23 of 2014 and its predecessor (regional government) law. The difference, in terms of regional expansion, Law No. 23 of 2014 pays attention to the arrangement of regional boundaries. In the two predecessor (regional government) laws, regional boundaries are not put as a regional requirement for regional formation, except for regional coverage and others. Indeed, regional coverage also refers to the location of the region, but this area coverage certainly has a different meaning and is distinguished from the regional boundaries. In terms of its founding, the area coverage is depicted in a map of the area which is usually only in the form of sketches, while the boundaries of the area are proven by a basic map (map of the shape of the earth of Indonesia) and depicted in a boundary map for reference to the regional map.

Regional boundary arrangements are further elaborated in government regulations. At this time, government regulations be *opdracht* -kan Law 23 of 2014 never formed. Therefore, based on the provisions of Article 408 of Law No. 23 of 2014, PP No. 78 of 2007 concerning Procedures for Formation, Elimination and Merger of Regions, still applies selectively. That is, the provisions in PP No. 78 of 2007 which is not contrary to Law No. 23 of 2014 is still used as the legal basis for regional expansion activities. One of them is the area of the prospective new autonomous region (DOB) as stated above. Regional coverage is depicted on the DOB candidate area map. This regional requirement, prior to the enactment of Law No. 23 of 2014, do not have to be equipped with coordinates on the base map, because that is not required by PP No. 78 of 2007 and its basic regulations, namely Law No. 32 of 2004.

More relaxed rules are also contained in PP No. 129 of 2000 which was formed as the implementation of Law No. 22 of 1999. This looseness of rules then led to aspects of the territorial boundary not so important in regional expansion activities. As a result, many DOB boundary maps in the regional formation law (UUPD) were improvised. Strengthening these indications, Sumaryo Joyosumarto and friends revealed, the 1999-2003 UUPD period was generally accompanied by maps but did not meet cartographic standards (such as no scale and coordinates) as a map of boundary results making it difficult to use as a basis in regional boundary affirmation activities (Joyosumarto *et. al.*, 2013). Almost the same as Sumaryo Joyosumarto and his friends, Harmen Batubara stated, the determination of the area in the UUPD in general was not followed by the definition of a point and a clear boundary line in the map of the annex to the UUPD (Batubara, 2014).

Seeing this phenomenon, the legislators (No. 23 of 2014) emphasized the need to determine the correct boundaries and in accordance with the rules of the perpetration. For this reason, regional boundary conditions are

laid, which must be met in the context of regional expansion. With this condition, potential boundary conflicts that are triggered by unclear DOB boundaries can be eliminated because when they are formed, definite points and boundaries can be defined in the map attached to the relevant UUPD. Must complete the territory boundary condition in the framework of regional expansion does not need to be 'constrained' by the absence of government regulation be *opdracht* -kan Law 23 of 2014. This requirement can be applied using PP No. 78 of 2007. It must be remembered, the basis applies PP No. 78 of 2007 at this time is no longer according to Law No. 32 of 2004 - which is the basic regulation, but based on Law no. 23 of 2014, namely Article 408, as stated above. With Law No. 23 of 2014 as the parent regulation - based on the provisions of Article 408 - the enactment of PP No. 78 of 2007 must be viewed in the context of implementing Law No. 23 of 2014 - which sets boundary conditions. In this context, the fulfillment of the area coverage requirements described in the DOB candidate area map as regulated in PP No. 78 of 2007 must be followed by defining the coordinate points on the base map as desired Article 35 paragraph (3) of Law no. 23 of 2014.

Thus, it can be said, the regulation of administrative boundaries at the level of laws and government regulations is adequate and anticipatory to potential conflicts related to regional boundaries. DOB candidates must prove the coordinates on the base map, if examined, the *legis ratio* is the arrangement of the boundaries of the parent region and at the same time the preparation area (candidate DOB). Of course, the DOB administrative boundaries must be preceded by the administrative boundaries of their parent regions. Furthermore, the DOB administrative boundaries will be used as a reference for the preparation of the next preparatory area (candidate DOB). The area to be divided - to be divided into two or more new regions - is composed of smaller administrative units. Because of the smaller units to be split into new autonomous regions, chronologically, the administrative boundaries of those units must be completed first and then used as a reference for the preparation of regional boundaries (DOB candidates) - which are composed of more units the little one. From a systematic and way of thinking Law No. 23 of 2014, clearly demarcating the boundaries using the concept of *bottom-up*.

***b. Review in Permendagri No. 141 of 2017***

From the theoretical point of view ( *boundary making* ), the existence of boundaries as evidenced by the coordinate points on the base map shows that the DOB area coverage has gone through a delimitation process. That is, the DOB has chosen the location of the boundary line (with the inclusion of verses that determine the scope of the area with boundaries indicated by the designation of boundaries in the north, east, south and west) and define (point and borderline carefully) in the map attachment UUPD.

The next step is to follow up with the stage of demarcation of the area (demarcation), which is to put boundary signs on the ground (such as a pillar or boundary pillar, wall or other facilities). By regulation, this stage is beyond the scope (domain) of Law no. 23 of 2014 and PP No. 78 of 2007, but included in the Permendagri domain No. 141 of 2017 concerning Affirmation of Regional Boundaries. This shows that the regulation of regional boundaries is insufficient or is considered to have been completed with the provisions relating to territorial boundaries at the level of laws and government regulations.

Indeed, in theory (*boundary making*), the regulation of regional boundaries in the UUPD still has to go through the stages of demarcation and administration (assuming that the delimitation process has been completed). Related to this, Saru Arifin said that in the context of regional expansion, the determination of the boundary line had been

set forth in the Law on the formation of an area. However, the problem of determining the boundary lines that have been outlined in the form of a law in its implementation in the field still raises the interpretation of each adjoining region. It is this difference in interpretation from each party that results in border disputes between regions (Arifin, 2016).

Harmen Batubara said that this difference in interpretation was due to unclear regional boundaries in the field. According to him, after the limit was stipulated in the UUPD, it should immediately be followed up with an affirmation of the regional boundaries (Batubara, 2018). · Added Harmen Batubara, currently there are still many areas that have been formed that have not yet confirmed the boundaries of their area on the ground for various reasons, namely budget constraints, difficult terrain / topography conditions, limited human resources (HR) (Batubara, 2018). Data from the Ministry of Home Affairs states that since 1999, out of 33 provinces, only 11 of them have completed or implemented regional boundary affirmations and only 42 districts / cities out of a total of 465 districts / cities (Antaranews, 2007). The Ministry of Home Affairs in 2017 also mentioned that out of 977 interregional boundary segments (162 interprovincial boundary segments and 815 inter-regency / municipal boundary segments), the Ministry of Home Affairs had completed 453 segments (78 interprovincial boundary segments and 375 inter-regency / municipal boundary segments) which were determined with 364 Permendagri, as many as 355 segments in the process of the regional boundary affirmation stage and 169 segments have not yet been confirmed (CNN Indonesia, 2017).

With these statistics, amidst the many proposals for regional expansion (there are currently 314 applications for regional expansion that have been received by the Ministry of Home Affairs) (Sindonews, 2018), the need for regulations that support the acceleration of the settlement of regional boundaries is increasingly urgent to be met. On this basis, Permendagri No. 141 of 2017 on 29 December 2017 - which revokes and declares no Permendagri No. 79 of 2012. Like its predecessor, Permendagri No. 141 of 2017 also prioritizes the cartometric method. In other words, the assertion of regional boundaries for determining the coordinates of boundary points does not have to always be done by survey methods in the field. Cartometric method according to Permendagri No. 141 of 2017 is 'tracing / drawing boundaries on the work map and measuring / calculating the position of points, distances and wide area coverage using base maps and other maps as a complement'.

This cartometric method is the use of present day survey and mapping technology, which can bring real conditions in the field to the meeting room. With this cartometric method it is clear that it can reduce survey activities in the field which usually require large funds and relatively long time, especially in terrain conditions that are difficult to reach due to natural obstacles themselves, making the technical boundary affirmation work can be done in much more time short without reducing the accuracy needed.

With regard to the resolution of territorial disputes, PP No. 141 of 2017 contains a new provision that confirms the authority of the Minister of Home Affairs to take over the settlement of the boundary affirmation in the event that the governor (as a representative of the central government) does not submit an administrative process that ends in an inconclusive manner. This provision arises with the intention to speed up the process of resolving border disputes between regions. However, in terms of de mikian, it may be a decision taken by the Minister of Home Affairs to resolve the border disputes are less accepted by the parties to the dispute. The same thing can also happen to the affirmation of the provincial boundary decided by the Minister of Home Affairs in the event that no settlement agreement is reached from the disputing parties.

Considering that, Permendagri No. 141 of 2017 contains provisions that allow regional boundaries that have been regulated by the Ministry of Home Affairs to be amended, among others, in the case of inter-regional agreements that border and are proposed jointly to the Minister of Home Affairs (for the province) through the governor (for regencies / cities). With this provision also, the regional boundaries that have been regulated by the Ministry of Home Affairs, even though conclusively ending, can be changed as long as there is agreement between the regions concerned. Tri Ratnawati once said, the settlement of regional boundaries, the ' *ending* ' is not always solely able to be solved by cartometric technical-mechanistic processes because after the cartometric method can produce the results, there will then be a bargaining between the parties disagree so as to get political decisions that they can jointly accept ( *win-win solutions* ) (Sulistyono *et. al.,* 2014).

In addition to agreements between bordering regions, regional boundaries can also be changed in the case of a court decision that has permanent legal force . Thus, Permendagri No. 141 of 2017 has ended the polemic regarding the settlement of territorial disputes before a court hearing, which arises due to the understanding that the phrase 'final' in Permendagri No. 76 of 2012 means that there are no other remedies available including settlement through court facilities. In fact, this phrase is related to the context of the dispute resolution method set out in the relevant Permendagri, namely administrative *quasi rechtspraak* not *rechtspraak* in the true sense so that the phrase means no more available settlement through the pseudo justice, but other recourse solutions are available including the court route ( judicial institution).

***Synchronization of Regulations concerning Settlement of Regional Boundaries***

The fact that there are many disputes over regional boundaries between provinces or districts / cities is an indication of the unsynchronization of regional boundary regulations in legislation. Why is that? Delimitation of boundaries is always set forth in the form of laws and regulations. In theory ( *boundary making* ), delimitation as the process of choosing where the boundaries are and defining them is expressed in the form of laws for the formation of each region (and the attached map). However, the practice that has occurred so far, the delimitation process in general is not completed through the UUPD so the delimitation process still needs to be done. The results of the delimitation process are then poured into the Regional Regulation Permendagri.

If so, the problem is not only the result of the asynchronous delimitation between the MUs (for example the case of the Pulau Berhala dispute), but also the process that has not been resolved through the UUPD (not defining precise points and boundaries on the map). This means that boundary disputes are not only caused by the unsynchronized condition of the regional boundary regulations, but also due to the absence of regulations on the matter, even after the post-regulation regulation is produced there can be territorial disputes.

For example, the dispute over the border between the Province of West Sulawesi and Central Sulawesi related to the areas of Ngovi Village and Mbulawa Village (formed by Donggala Regency) which is ± 10 km2 into the province of West Sulawesi or crossing PBU 17, PBU 18 and PBU 19 Permendagri No. 52 of 1991 (Sulbar, 2018). In fact, embryo disputes have arisen after the affirmation of regional boundaries through Permendagri No. 52 of 1991. Only I, at that time the issue of boundaries was never raised. But after reform, the problem is very different. When the area became a guideline for general allocation funds (DAU), it suddenly changed to a very high value. Especially if there is a natural resource potential (SDA), then the two regions will ask that the boundaries in that region be determined in full.

The boundary disputes referred to above, use Victor Prescott's analysis, including the type of positional dispute (and potentially functional disputes), that is, disputes that occur after the assertion of regional boundaries or more precisely after the formation of the Province of West Sulawesi. The object of the dispute is Permendagri No. 52 of 1991. From the object of this dispute the subject of dispute is clearly related to boundary delimitation. However, is Permendagri No. 52 of 1991 regulates the issue of boundary delimitation? If examined, no information regarding the area of the province of South Sulawesi and Central Sulawesi is found in the general explanation Act on the formation of the area concerned, but found scattered in the Law on the formation of other regions. For example, in the General Explanation of Law No. 5 of 2013 concerning the Establishment of the Banggai Laut Regency in Central Sulawesi Province, it was mentioned that the area of the Province of Central Sulawesi was ± 61,841.29 km2, while the area of South Sulawesi Province, for example, was mentioned in Law 26 of 2004 concerning the Establishment of the Province of West Sulawesi with an area of ± 62,903.64 km2. Meanwhile, the area of West Sulawesi Province based on the Law of its formation is ± 16,787.19 km2. The total area of the three provinces is ' *clear* ', so logically, the boundaries of these three provinces are also (should be) ' *clear* ' because the boundaries determine the area.

The borders of West Sulawesi Province are 'fragments' of the territory of the Province of South Sulawesi, so the determination of the boundaries of these provinces refers to the delimitation of the boundaries of the parent province. Unfortunately, the boundary map of the parent province was not enclosed in the Law of its formation. The same thing also happened to the Law on the formation of the Province of Central Sulawesi (not accompanied by a boundary map). This can be called 'half-hearted delimitation'. Because, the process is only at the stage of choosing the location of the boundary line by designating boundaries to the north, east, south and west, not yet defining the boundary points carefully in the map of the annex to the Capital Market Law. Therefore, the next stage of delimitation is done later, the results of which are set forth in Permendagri No. 52 of 1991. Thus, Permendagri No. 52 of 1999 is clearly a delimitation product (continuing a process that was not completed through the Capital Market Law). As such a product, Permendagri No. 52 of 1991 is a legal document that binds the parties and even other parties ( *Erga Omnes* ). Therefore, like it or not, this legal document must be referred to by the Province of West Sulawesi and Central Sulawesi in defining boundaries in the field (demarcation of boundaries).

Apart from the dispute above, there is an indication of asynchronous regulation regarding (data) the wide area of Polman Regency. As explained in Perda No. 2 of 2013 concerning Regional Spatial Planning (RTRW) of Polewali Mandar Regency for 2012-2032, the total area reaches ± 2,094.18 km2. Meanwhile, according to Permendagri No. 56 of 2015 which has been replaced by Permendagri No. 137 of 2017 concerning Code and Data of Government Administration Areas is only ± 1,775.65 km2. Responding to this difference, it needs to be emphasized, that these two regulations are not a product of boundary delimitation, but only reaffirm the indicative area mentioned by other general UUPD explanations such as the general explanation of the Law on the formation of Mamasa Regency, where the area of the parent district (Polman Regency) ± 1,775.65 km2, or the same as the area recorded by Permendagri No. 137 of 2017. This means, that the area of Polman Regency in Permendagri No. 137 of 2017 is in sync with the general explanation of the Law on the formation of Mamasa Regency - even though the explanation of legislation is not a binding norm, which means the problem has been ' *clear* '.

However, the information delivered at the initial seminar of this study stated that there had been an agreement between Polman Regency and Mamasa Regency regarding this matter as outlined in the official report signed by

the parties. The next process is still ongoing at the Ministry of Home Affairs for the preparation of Permendagri regional boundaries. This invites a question mark, isn't there Permendagri No. 15 of 2005 concerning the Boundary of Mamasa Regency with Mamuju Regency, Majene Regency and Polewalimamasa Regency in West Sulawesi Province?

## IV. CONCLUSION

The regional boundary arrangement in Indonesia adopts the concept of *bottom-up* , meaning that the administrative boundaries of the more sophisticated units are laid out first, then followed by the larger units. This concept conditions the stages of regional allocation and delimitation of the boundaries carried out at the time of formation of the region, while the demarcation stages of the area in the field and administration are subsequently carried out after the formation of the area concerned. In the context of the Province of West Sulawesi, the delimitation stage (determination) of the area boundaries has not been followed by the definition of a clear point and boundary line in the map of Law No. 26 of 2004. This then raises the problem of unclear regional boundaries on the map and problems in the process of demarcation (affirmation) of the area in the field. Synchronization of regional boundary settlement arrangements carried out so far, is a process/activity of delimitation and demarcation at the same time, which is known as 'affirmation of regional boundaries'. This process/activity is carried out based on Permendagri No. 1 of 2006 which has been replaced the last few times with Permendagri No. 141 of 2017.

## REFERENCES

1. Antaranews. (2007). “11 Provinsi Selesaikan Batas Daerah”. https://www.antaranews.com/berita/86356/11-provinsi-selesaikan-batas-daerah.
2. Arifin, S. (2016). Penyelesaian Sengketa Batas Daerah Menggunakan Pendekatan Regulasi. Jurnal Hukum IUS QULA IUSTUM, 23(3): 439- 460.
3. Batubara, H. (2014). Perselisihan Batas Daerah, Konflik Setengah Hati. Bandung: Wilayahperbatasan.com.
4. Batubara, H. (2015). “Masalah Penyelesaian Sengketa Batas Antar Daerah”. https://www.kompasiana.com/harmenbatubara/550e10aca33311a42dba7f1c/masalah-penyelesaian-sengketa-batas-antar-daerah.
5. Batubara, H. (2018). “Percepatan Penyelesaian Perselisihan Batas Antar Daerah”. http://www.wilayahperbatasan.com/percepatan-penyelesaian-perselisihan-batas-antar-daerah/
6. CNN Indonesia. (2017). “Kemendagri Pangkas Batas Daerah Bermasalah”. https://www.cnnindonesia.com/nasional/20171010004939-20-247295/kemendagri-pangkas-batas-daerah-bermasalah.
7. Endarto. (2014). Evaluasi Pemekaran Daerah di Era Reformasi. Jurnal Lingkar Widyaiswara, 1(4): 60-65.
8. Humas Sulbar. (2018). “Manajemen Konflik Sengketa Tanah di Sulbar”. http://www.humassulbarprov.id.
9. Joyosumarto, et. al. (2013). Geospatial Information and Regional Border Disputes in the Regional Boundary Affirmation Activities in the Era of Regional Autonomy in Indonesia. Yogyakarta: Annual Scientific Forum of the Indonesian Surveyors Association at the College of Land.

**Received: 27 Mar 2020 | Revised: 20 Apr 2020 | Accepted: 05 May 2020** 

10. Lai, L.W.C., Davies, S.N.G., Chau, K.W. et al. (2018). The Determination Of The "True" Property Boundary In Planned Development: A Coasian Analysis. The Annals of Regional Science, 61: 579–599.
11. Muqoyyidin, A.W. (2013). Pemekaran Wilayah dan Otonomi Daerah Pasca Reformasi di Indonesia: Konsep, Fakta Empiris dan Rekomendasi ke Depan. Jurnal Konstitusi, 10(2): 287- 309.
12. Poniman, A. (eds). (2016). Accelerating National Development through Geospatial Information. Cibinong: SCIENCE PRESS.
13. Qodir, Z & Laksono, T. (2012). Politik Rente dan Konflik di Daerah Pemekaran: Kasus Maluku Utara. Jusuf Kalla School of Government.
14. Ratnawari, T. (2010). Satu Dasa Warsa Pemekaran Daerah Era Reformasi: Kegagalan Otonomi Daerah? Jurnal Ilmu Politik, 21: 122-235.
15. Saliternik, M. (2017). Expanding The Boundaries Of Boundary Dispute Settlement: International Law And Critical Geography At The Crossroads. Vanderbilt Journal of Transnational Law, 50(1): 113-154.
16. Sindonews. (2018). "314 Daerah Antre Menunggu Pemekaran". https://nasional.sindonews.com/berita/1283560/12/314-daerah-antre-menunggu-pemekaran.
17. Sulistyono. D., Nuryadin, D., & Hadi, A.S. (2014). Evaluasi Tim Penegasan Batas Daerah (Studi Kasus di Provinsi Lampung dan Kalimantan Timur). Jurnal Bina Praja, 6(1): 53-64.