

Network Governance in Public Transport Integration Policy: Institutional Coordination and Regulatory Design in Jakarta's JakLingko Program

Muhammad Ziyad Zainudin¹, Raihan Raditya², Waki Muhammad Rizki³, Az Radzi Atha Setiawan⁴, Fatkhuri Fatkhuri⁵, Ridwan Ridwan⁶

UPN "Veteran" Jakarta, Jakarta Selatan, Indonesia¹⁻⁶

2410413126@mahasiswa.upnvj.ac.id¹, 2410413159@mahasiswa.upnvj.ac.id²,
2410413144@mahasiswa.upnvj.ac.id³, 2410413158@mahasiswa.upnvj.ac.id⁴, fatkhuri@upnvj.ac.id⁵,
anzridwan@upnvj.ac.id⁶



Article History:

Received on 03 November 2025
 1st Revision on 22 December 2025
 2nd Revision on 12 January 2026
 Accepted on 19 January 2026

Abstract

Purpose: This study examines the formulation and implementation of Jakarta's public transport integration policy, specifically focusing on the JakLingKo program introduced in 2018. It investigates how the program integrates multiple transport modes through unified route management, institutional coordination, and a digital account-based fare system.

Methodology/approach: This study uses a qualitative research design based on a systematic literature review and genealogical discourse analysis. An interpretive-constructivist framework is applied to conceptualize policy as the product of historically embedded institutional interactions and power relations.

Results: The study finds that JakLingko operates within a network governance arrangement, involving interdependence and collaboration among public and private actors. However, the effectiveness of the program is constrained by fragmented institutional authority, uneven funding structures, and persistent coordination challenges.

Conclusions: The research concludes that successful transport integration requires not only coordination mechanisms but also clear institutional mandates and political authority to address the governance challenges in Jakarta's public transport system.

Limitations: The study's findings may be limited by the scope of the literature reviewed and the specific context of Jakarta, which might not be fully generalizable to other cities with different governance structures or transport systems.

Contributions: The study contributes to urban governance literature by demonstrating that collaborative transport integration, such as JakLingko, requires a holistic approach that combines effective coordination, clear mandates, and strong political authority to overcome governance challenges.

Keywords: Collaborative Governance, JakLingko, Network Governance, Public Transport Integration, Urban Policy

How to Cite: Zainudin, M. Z., Raditya, R., Rizki, W. M., Setiawan, A. R. A., Fatkhuri, F., & Ridwan, R. (2026). Network governance in public transport integration policy: Institutional coordination and regulatory design in Jakarta's JakLingko program. *Advances in Public Law and Policy*, 1(1), 1-12.

1. Introduction

Public transport is a cornerstone of sustainable metropolitan development, as it directly affects urban mobility, spatial efficiency, and social equity while mitigating congestion, air pollution, and carbon emissions. In rapidly growing megacities, however, the effectiveness of public transport systems depends not only on infrastructure provision but also on the degree to which services are integrated

across different modes and institutions. Therefore, multimodal integration has emerged as a central policy objective to enhance accessibility, improve service reliability, and reduce dependence on private vehicles (Rahma, Rosyadi, & Gunarto, 2024).

In contemporary urban contexts, transport integration extends far beyond the technical coordination of routes, fares, and ticketing systems. It increasingly involves complex governance arrangements that require sustained coordination among multiple public agencies, state-owned enterprises, private operators, and technology providers (Hirschhorn, van de Velde, Veeneman, & ten Heuvelhof, 2020; Marsden & Reardon, 2017). Consequently, conventional hierarchical models of public administration are often insufficient to explain policy outcomes in integrated transport systems. Instead, the concept of *network governance* has gained prominence as an analytical framework for understanding how public policies are formulated and implemented through interdependent actor networks characterized by negotiation, resource exchange, and shared decision-making (Amiel, Yemini, & Rechavi, 2024; Baalbergen, Bolt, Lin, & Hooimeijer, 2023).

The relevance of network governance is particularly evident in metropolitan transport systems, where institutional fragmentation and overlapping mandates frequently undermine their policy coherence. Empirical studies have shown that the success of transport integration initiatives is strongly influenced by the quality of inter-organizational coordination, the clarity of institutional roles, and the capacity of governance networks to manage conflict and align interests (Rye, Monios, Hrelja, & Isaksson, 2018; Sørensen, Hansson, & Rye, 2023a). Consequently, integration failures are often rooted not in technological limitations but in governance deficiencies.

Jakarta provides a compelling case for examining these challenges. As one of the largest metropolitan areas in Southeast Asia, Jakarta has experienced rapid motorization that has far outpaced road capacity expansion, resulting in chronic congestion, deteriorating air quality, and substantial economic losses. Oktorini and Barus (2022) identifies weak multimodal integration as a key factor limiting the performance of Jakarta's mass transit system. Despite the operation of major public transport modes, such as TransJakarta Bus Rapid Transit (BRT), Mass Rapid Transit (MRT), and Light Rail Transit (LRT), service integration remains inconsistent because of fragmented management structures and unstable inter-agency coordination mechanisms (Surahman, Nurasa, & Munajat, 2025).

In response to these challenges, the Jakarta government launched the JakLingko program in 2018 as a comprehensive initiative to integrate buses, rail services, and urban paratransit into a unified system. The program seeks to harmonize routes, implement fare integration, and introduce account-based ticketing as a foundation for seamless travel across modes (Mukhlis, Fahmi, & Umayasari, 2026). This reform represents a significant shift from mode-based management to a system-oriented approach to public transport provision. However, previous assessments indicate that the integration process continues to face substantial challenges.

Rye et al. (2018) highlights institutional asymmetries in authority, heterogeneous funding models, and uneven technological readiness as persistent barriers. From the user perspective, disparities in digital literacy and access to non-cash payment systems further complicate policy implementation and limit equitable adoption. International experiences reinforce the importance of governance in shaping integration outcomes. In Kuala Lumpur, longstanding fragmentation among operators prompted the creation of a stronger central transport authority to coordinate planning and service delivery (Musa, Hashim, & Muhammad, 2020).

Bogotá's TransMilenio reform illustrates how integration efforts can be constrained by tensions between public authorities and private operators within the public–private partnership framework. Meanwhile, Seoul's transport reform demonstrates that successful integration requires clear institutional mandates, political commitment, and the strategic use of governance networks to align diverse stakeholders (Haider, Rehman, Khan, Ilyas, & Khan, 2021). In the Indonesian context, research on Surakarta shows that misalignment between national and local government policies can significantly

weaken public transport reforms Rohmah, Ramadhani, and Pratio (2024), reflecting governance challenges similar to those faced in Jakarta.

Despite the growing body of literature on transport integration, existing studies on JakLingko have largely concentrated on its technical performance, service coverage, or passenger satisfaction. Systematic analyses that foreground the dynamics of network governance, particularly the interactions, power relations, and coordination mechanisms among key actors, remain limited. This represents a significant gap, given that integrated transport systems are inherently institutional projects shaped by negotiation, mandate construction, and the management of interdependencies (Skuzinski, Weinreich, & Velandia Hernandez, 2024).

Addressing this gap, the present study examines how network governance operates in the formulation and implementation of Jakarta's integrated public transport policy through the JakLingko Program. Specifically, it analyzes how interorganizational collaboration is structured, how institutional challenges emerge and are managed, and how these dynamics affect policy effectiveness from the perspective of users. This study aims to contribute theoretically to the literature on network governance in urban transport policy and empirically to ongoing debates on how metropolitan governments in developing countries can design more robust and sustainable transport integration frameworks.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Network Governance in Public Transport Policy

This study adopts *network governance* as the primary analytical framework to examine public transport integration in Jakarta. Network governance refers to modes of governance in which public policies are formulated and implemented through relatively stable patterns of interaction among interdependent actors who are formally autonomous but substantively connected through resource dependencies (Wang & Ran, 2023). Unlike hierarchical governance, which relies on authority and command, or market-based governance, which emphasizes competition and contracts, network governance highlights negotiation, collaboration, and coordination as the central mechanisms of policy delivery.

Urban transport systems are a paradigmatic case for network governance analysis. The sector is characterized by fragmented institutional responsibilities, long investment horizons, mixed public-private provision, and strong interdependencies between infrastructure, operations, and regulations (Rongen, Lenferink, Arts, & Tillema, 2025a). In such contexts, no single actor possesses sufficient authority or resources to unilaterally achieve policy objectives, such as multimodal integration. Instead, outcomes emerge from interactions among transport agencies, local governments, operators, technology providers, and users.

2.2 Network Governance and Transport Integration

In transport literature, integration has increasingly been conceptualized as a governance challenge rather than a purely technical one. While early studies focused on physical and operational coordination, such as synchronized timetables or unified ticketing, more recent studies have emphasized institutional alignment, decision-making processes, and actor relationships as critical determinants of integration success (Skuzinski et al., 2024). From a network governance perspective, transportation integration depends on three interrelated dimensions.

First, *actor constellations* shape governance network structures. These include public authorities at different levels, state-owned enterprises, private operators, and intermediaries, such as system integrators. Each actor enters the network with distinct mandates, interests, and resources that influence both cooperation and conflict. Second, *institutional rules*—formal regulations, contracts, and informal norms—condition how actors interact and how decisions are made within a network. Third, *governance processes*, including negotiation, trust-building, and conflict resolution, determine a network's capacity to coordinate actions and adapt to change (George, Klijn, Ropes, & Sattlegger, 2024).

Empirical studies have demonstrated that weak integration outcomes often stem from misaligned mandates, asymmetric power relations, or insufficient coordination capacity within governance

networks. Conversely, successful cases tend to exhibit clearly defined roles, shared problem definitions, and institutional mechanisms that facilitate collaboration across organizational boundaries.

2.3 Analytical Dimensions: Actors, Institutions, and Processes

Building on this literature, this study conceptualizes Jakarta's transport integration as a policy process embedded within a governance network comprising multiple interdependent actors. The analysis is structured around three core analytical dimensions (Rachman, Nooraeni, & Yuliana, 2021). First, the *actor dimension* focuses on identifying key organizations involved in the JakLingko Program and examining their roles, interests, and resource dependencies. This includes public transport authorities, local government agencies, operators, and technology providers in the transport sector.

Understanding actor configurations is essential for assessing the distribution of power and influence within a network. Second, the *institutional dimension* examines the formal and informal rules that structure the interactions among actors. These include legal mandates, contractual arrangements, funding mechanisms and accountability structures (Shukhrat, 2025). Particular attention is given to how institutional fragmentation or overlap affects coordination and decision making in the integration process. Third, the *process dimension* analyzes the mechanisms through which coordination is achieved or undermined within the governance network.

This includes negotiation practices, information-sharing routines, conflict management strategies, and the roles of leadership and political support. These processes are critical for translating integration objectives into operational results. Together, these dimensions allow for a systematic examination of how network governance operates in practice and how it shapes the implementation of integrated public transport policies (Alfiyan & Rinova, 2024). In addition, this framework enables the study to capture the dynamic and adaptive nature of policy implementation in complex urban transportation systems.

Jakarta's transport integration does not occur in a static institutional environment but evolves in response to political priorities, technological innovations, fiscal constraints, and public demand. By applying a network governance perspective, this study highlights how collaboration, trust, and mutual adjustment among actors influence policy effectiveness over time. This approach also allows for the identification of governance gaps and coordination failures that may hinder integration outcomes, thereby providing insights for improving institutional design and policy learning in metropolitan transport governance.

2.4 Linking Network Governance to Policy Outcomes

Finally, this framework recognizes that governance arrangements have direct implications for policy outcomes, particularly regarding service coherence, user experience, and equity. Previous research suggests that governance networks with high coordination capacity are more likely to deliver integrated fares, seamless transfers, and reliable services, thereby increasing public transport attractiveness and social inclusion (Sogbe, Susilawati, & Pin, 2025). Conversely, fragmented governance networks tend to produce partial or uneven integration, limiting policy effectiveness despite technological investment (Suriyani, Respationo, & Erniyanti, 2025). In this study, policy effectiveness is understood not only in operational terms but also in relation to user accessibility and system usability. By linking governance dynamics to implementation outcomes, the framework enables an assessment of how institutional and relational factors mediate the translation of integration policies into tangible public benefits.

Moreover, this framework facilitates critical reflection on the sustainability of integrated transport governance over time. Effective coordination is not merely a short-term achievement; it requires continuous institutional learning, adaptive leadership, and mechanisms for accountability across actors. As urban mobility challenges evolve, driven by population growth, digitalization, and changing travel behavior, the resilience of governance arrangements becomes a key determinant of long-term policy success. By incorporating temporal and adaptive dimensions, the framework allows the study to assess whether existing governance structures can sustain integration efforts and respond to emerging challenges in Jakarta's public transport system (Akther & Evans, 2024).

2.5 Positioning of the Framework

This theoretical framework directly informs the empirical analysis by guiding the data collection and interpretation of actors, institutions, and governance processes. By applying a network governance lens to the JakLingko program, this study moves beyond technical evaluations and contributes to a more nuanced understanding of how integrated transport systems are governed in complex metropolitan contexts, particularly in developing countries. Positioning the framework in this way enables the study to bridge the gap between abstract governance theory and empirical policy analysis.

Rather than treating network governance as a descriptive concept, the framework operationalizes it into observable dimensions that can be systematically examined using documentary evidence. This analytical positioning strengthens the explanatory power of this study by clarifying how variations in actor relationships, institutional arrangements, and coordination mechanisms shape policy implementation outcomes. The framework not only structures the analysis but also enhances the study's capacity to generate theoretically informed insights relevant to urban transport governance in comparable metropolitan settings (Gergis, 2024).

3. Research Methodology

This study adopts a qualitative research approach based on systematic document analysis to examine the governance dynamics underlying Jakarta's public transport integration through the JakLingko program. A qualitative design is appropriate given the study's objective of understanding policy formulation and implementation as socially constructed processes shaped by institutional interactions, historical trajectories, and power relations rather than as purely technical or outcome-oriented phenomena. Consistent with Mariani, Albanesi, Prati, and Cicognani (2025), qualitative inquiry enables an in-depth interpretation of meanings embedded in policy texts and governance practices within their specific socio-political context.

This research is grounded in a constructivist–interpretive paradigm that conceptualizes public policy as the product of negotiated interactions among multiple actors operating within evolving institutional settings. From this perspective, policy documents are treated not merely as administrative instruments but as discursive artifacts that reflect dominant ideas, contested interests, and shifting governance arrangements. This epistemological stance aligns with the study's theoretical framework, which emphasizes network governance and interorganizational relations in urban transport policy.

Data for this study were collected from a range of primary and secondary documents relevant to the JakLingko Program. These include national and regional regulations, policy reports, strategic planning documents, official government publications, inter-agency agreements, and publicly available statements from key transport authorities and operators in the country. Document selection was guided by relevance, credibility, and temporal alignment with the implementation phases of Jakarta's transport integration policy. The analysis followed a systematic coding process, combining deductive codes derived from the analytical framework—actor, institutional, and process dimensions—with the inductive codes that emerged from the data. This approach allows for a nuanced examination of governance interactions while remaining sensitive to contextual variations and the dynamics of emerging policies (Ansell & Torfing, 2021).

3.1 Data Collection

Data were collected through purposive and theoretical document selection. The corpus includes formal regulatory instruments such as regional regulations (*Peraturan Daerah*), governance regulations (*Peraturan Gubernur*), memoranda of understanding involving state-owned and regionally owned enterprises, and official planning documents related to JakLingko. In addition, the study draws on reports from national and international institutions, including Bappenas, the World Bank, JICA, and the Institute for Transportation and Development Policy (ITDP), as well as peer-reviewed journal articles and relevant digital media. Documents were selected based on their relevance to three core analytical concerns: (1) institutional arrangements governing transport integration, (2) roles and interactions of key actors, and (3) evolution of policy ideas and implementation strategies over time. This approach

allows for a comprehensive reconstruction of policy development while ensuring analytical focus and coherence of the study.

To enhance the credibility and trustworthiness of the findings, this study employed triangulation across multiple document types and sources. Cross-referencing regulatory texts with institutional reports and academic literature enabled the verification of key claims and identification of discrepancies between formal policy intentions and implementation practices. Furthermore, attention was paid to the temporal sequencing of documents to trace policy continuity and change across different administrative periods. By situating documentary evidence within broader governance and political contexts, the analysis minimizes interpretive bias and strengthens the validity of the conclusions drawn regarding the governance dynamics of Jakarta's public transport integration.

3.2 Data Analysis

Data analysis was conducted inductively, following established qualitative analysis procedures. The process began with the systematic organization and close reading of documents to familiarize the researcher with the policy landscape. This was followed by open coding to identify recurring concepts, narratives, and references regarding coordination, authority, and collaboration among actors. The codes were then grouped into higher-order themes corresponding to the analytical dimensions of actors, institutions, and governance processes.

To capture the temporal and relational dimensions of policy change, the analysis also incorporates a genealogical perspective, tracing how key ideas, institutional arrangements, and power relations surrounding transport integration emerged, evolved, and were reconfigured over time. This enabled the identification of critical junctures, shifts in policy discourse, and moments of institutional consolidation or contestation within the JakLingko Program. The interpretation focused on identifying patterns of governance interaction, sources of institutional tension, and mechanisms of coordination within the transport policy network. Rather than seeking causal generalization, the analysis aims for analytical generalization by linking empirical findings to broader theoretical insights from the literature on network governance.

Analytical memos were used throughout the coding and interpretation stages to document emerging insights, conceptual linkages, and reflexive observations. These memos supported iterative movement between the data and theory, allowing preliminary interpretations to be continuously refined as new patterns and contradictions emerged. By engaging in this iterative analytical process, the study was able to move beyond descriptive categorization toward a more interpretive understanding of the dynamics of governance. This strategy strengthens the analytical rigor of the study by ensuring that theoretical claims are grounded in systematic engagement with empirical material rather than post hoc interpretations (Rongen, Lenferink, Arts, & Tillema, 2025b).

3.3 Trustworthiness and Rigor

The trustworthiness of the study was ensured using several strategies commonly recommended in qualitative research. First, source triangulation was applied by comparing regulatory documents, institutional reports, academic literature, and media accounts to corroborate the interpretations and reduce source bias. Second, an audit trail was maintained to document the data selection, coding decisions, and analytical steps, enhancing transparency and replicability. Third, a thick description of the policy context was employed to situate the findings within Jakarta's specific institutional and political environment. Finally, peer debriefing was conducted to critically assess the interpretations and strengthen analytical credibility. Together, these measures enhanced the dependability, credibility, and confirmability of the findings, ensuring that the analysis met the established standards of qualitative rigor and provided a robust foundation for examining network governance in Jakarta's integrated public transport system.

Reflexivity was incorporated throughout the research process to acknowledge and manage the researchers' interpretive positions. Given the interpretive nature of document analysis, continuous reflection was undertaken to assess how analytical assumptions, theoretical commitments, and

contextual familiarity shaped data interpretation. This reflexive practice helped minimize subjective bias and ensured that the conclusions were grounded in empirical evidence rather than presuppositions. By combining reflexivity with triangulation and systematic documentation, this study reinforces methodological rigor and enhances confidence in the robustness and transferability of its findings.

4. Results And Discussion

4.1 Governance Process of Public Transport Integration through JakLingko

The findings indicate that public transport integration in Jakarta through the JakLingko program is governed by a multi-actor collaborative arrangement involving the Provincial Government of DKI Jakarta, the Department of Transportation, public transport operators, regionally owned enterprises (BUMDs), and private operators. Rather than operating under a purely hierarchical model, JakLingko functions as a collaborative governance system in which policy outcomes depend on coordination, negotiation, and shared responsibility among interdependent actors. This finding aligns with the core assumptions of collaborative governance theory, which posits that complex public problems, such as multimodal transport integration, cannot be effectively addressed by a single authority acting alone. Consistent with prior studies, the JakLingko case demonstrates that integration outcomes are shaped by enabling initial conditions, institutional design, facilitative leadership and iterative collaborative processes. Thus, JakLingko can be conceptualized as a policy arena in which public and private actors jointly construct and implement integrated transport policies.

4.2 Policy Formulation and Governance Structure

The Department of Transportation of DKI Jakarta plays a central role in policy formulation by designing regulations, supervising service standards, and harmonizing operational arrangements across all transport modes. Additionally, the establishment of PT JakLingko Indonesia as a joint-venture entity constitutes a key institutional mechanism for integrating ticketing systems, route management, and inter-operator coordination. Theoretical mapping. These findings reflect the logic of network governance, where the government acts as a *meta-governor* rather than a command-and-control authority. In this model, public agencies coordinate autonomous yet interdependent actors using rules, incentives, and shared platforms. PT JakLingko Indonesia functions as a network hub, facilitating coordination, rather than replacing existing operators. Furthermore, the adoption of account-based ticketing systems illustrates the growing importance of digital governance, where technological infrastructure becomes an integral policy instrument for achieving integration, transparency, and behavioral alignment across actors.

This governance structure also reveals a deliberate separation between strategic oversight and operational execution within Jakarta's transport integration framework. While the Department of Transportation retains regulatory authority and policy direction, operational responsibilities are distributed among multiple public and private operators coordinated through PT JakLingko Indonesia. This arrangement reflects contemporary governance models that seek to balance flexibility and control by combining centralized steering with decentralized implementation. However, this division of roles also introduces coordination challenges, particularly in aligning organizational incentives and ensuring consistent compliance with integration objectives. Consequently, the effectiveness of this governance structure depends not only on formal institutional design but also on the capacity of actors to engage in sustained collaboration and trust-based coordination (Gergis, 2024).

4.3 Implementation and Cross-Actor Collaboration

At the implementation stage, successful integration depends heavily on sustained communication, face-to-face interaction, and trust building among participating organizations. Actors have distinct interests, resources, and organizational logics, which require continuous negotiation and adjustment. PT JakLingko Indonesia operates as a technical integrator connecting TransJakarta, MRT, LRT, commuter rail, and microtrans services. However, its coordinating role is constrained by its limited formal authority.

This dynamic is consistent with process-oriented collaborative governance models, which emphasize that collaboration is not a one-off agreement but an ongoing, deliberative process. Trust, shared

understanding, and commitment gradually emerge through repeated interactions. Simultaneously, PT JakLingko Indonesia's limited authority reveals a tension identified in governance theory between coordination capacity and formal mandate. While network governance relies on persuasion and consensus, insufficient institutional authority can weaken enforcement, slow decision-making, and reduce policy coherence, particularly in systems involving multiple transport modes and levels of government.

4.4 Institutional Fragmentation and Coordination Challenges

This study identifies persistent institutional fragmentation as a major obstacle to effective integration. Differences in regulatory authority, policy priorities, and funding mechanisms across agencies and levels of government hinder coherent implementation of the law. Coordination between national and subnational governments further complicates the governance arrangements. This finding reinforces the concept of fragmented governance, in which overlapping jurisdictions and sectoral silos undermine policy effectiveness. Comparative governance literature suggests that integrated transport systems require a strong, coordinating authority with sufficient legitimacy and regulatory power. In the JakLingko case, the absence of such a consolidated authority limits the ability to resolve inter-organizational conflicts and align long-term strategic objectives.

Technical integration—particularly tariff alignment and operational standardization—remains uneven, especially for non-BUMD operators such as microtrans (microbuses). Funding schemes differ across operators, creating disparities in service quality and complicating the standard-setting processes. These challenges reflect a classic public–private governance dilemma in which efficiency goals conflict with the divergent incentive structures. Governance theory highlights that standardization in networked systems requires not only technical solutions, but also financial harmonization and contractual clarity. Without consistent funding mechanisms, collaborative arrangements risk becoming more symbolic than functional.

Moreover, the lack of an integrated performance monitoring and accountability framework exacerbates the coordination challenges among participating institutions. Although individual agencies and operators are subject to their own performance indicators, there is no unified mechanism to evaluate collective outcomes related to service integration, user satisfaction, or system efficiency. This fragmentation in performance assessment weakens the incentives for inter-organizational collaboration and limits opportunities for policy learning. Consequently, coordination efforts tend to be reactive and ad hoc rather than strategic and outcome-oriented, reinforcing path dependencies that constrain the effectiveness of Jakarta's public transport integration initiatives (Ansell & Torfing, 2021).

4.5 Policy Effectiveness, User Outcomes, and Social Acceptance

From the user perspective, the benefits of integration are not evenly distributed. The peripheral areas of Jakarta remain insufficiently served, reducing inclusivity and limiting the policy's ability to shift commuters from private vehicles to public transport. Additionally, resistance from conventional transport operators persists, thereby slowing the pace of reform. These findings underscore the importance of political leadership and policy enforcement in the context of collaborative governance. While collaboration emphasizes consensus, governance theory cautions that entrenched interests may resist change unless they are backed by strong political commitment. International experience suggests that successful transport integration combines collaboration with decisive political authority, ensuring that standardization and service reforms are consistently implemented.

User acceptance of integrated public transport is closely linked to perceptions of its reliability, affordability, and ease of use. Even when technical integration has been achieved, inconsistencies in service frequency, last-mile connectivity, and information accessibility can undermine public confidence in the system. For many users, particularly those in lower-income and peripheral communities, integration is experienced less as a structural reform and more as a daily assessment of service adequacy than for higher-income users. This highlights that policy effectiveness cannot be measured solely through institutional or technological indicators but must also account for lived user experience and behavioral responses. Without tangible improvements in everyday mobility, public

support for integration initiatives remains fragile, potentially constraining the long-term sustainability of Jakarta's transport-reform agenda.

Moreover, communication and public engagement strategies play crucial roles in shaping the social acceptance of transport integration policies. Limited awareness and uneven dissemination of information regarding fare systems, route integration, and service changes can exacerbate user confusion and skepticism, particularly among infrequent users and among marginalized groups. Effective policy communication, supported by transparent information systems and responsive feedback mechanisms, can help bridge the gap between institutional reforms and user perceptions. By fostering trust and informed participation, such strategies enhance not only user satisfaction but also the legitimacy of integrated transport governance, thereby reinforcing the long-term effectiveness of Jakarta's public transport integration efforts (Sørensen, Hansson, & Rye, 2023b).

4.6 Theoretical Contribution

Overall, this study contributes to the governance literature by demonstrating that public transport integration through JakLingko represents a hybrid governance model that combines collaborative, networking, and digital governance. The findings highlight that collaboration alone is insufficient without adequate institutional authority, financial alignment and political leadership. This insight refines existing governance theories by emphasizing the need to balance horizontal collaboration with vertical authority in complex urban transport systems (Aristovnik, Murko, & Ravšelj, 2022).

In addition, this study advances governance theory by illustrating how digital platforms function not only as technical instruments but also as institutional actors that reshape power relations and coordination dynamics within governance networks. In the JakLingko case, digital integration mediates interactions among public authorities, operators, and users, influencing accountability, transparency, and decision-making processes. By incorporating the role of digital infrastructure into the analysis of hybrid governance, this study extends existing network governance frameworks and offers a more nuanced understanding of how digitalization interacts with institutional authority and collaborative arrangements in the implementation of complex public policies (Almulhim & Yigitcanlar, 2025).

This study contributes to the literature by bridging governance theory with user-centered policy analysis, demonstrating that governance effectiveness cannot be fully understood without considering how institutional arrangements translate into daily service experiences. By linking governance structures to user outcomes and social acceptance, this study moves beyond state-centric or organization-focused perspectives and highlights the relational nature of policy implementation. This approach underscores the importance of legitimacy, trust, and perceived fairness as integral components of effective governance. Thus, this study provides a conceptual basis for integrating governance analysis with public service delivery research. Ultimately, this contribution broadens the analytical scope of transport governance studies by situating institutional dynamics within the lived realities of urban mobility systems (Rode, 2019).

5. Conclusions

5.1 Conclusion

The study concludes that the success of public transport integration in Jakarta through the JakLingko program is heavily influenced by the quality of institutional coordination, the robustness of institutional design, and the effectiveness of collaboration among various actors. JakLingko operates as a complex governance arrangement where policy outcomes result from political negotiations, power relations, and leadership's capacity to drive systemic change. The Department of Transportation, PT JakLingko Indonesia, and public transport operators play critical roles, but the effectiveness of this collaborative model depends on clear institutional mandates, formal authority, and the capacity of the involved organizations.

Despite some progress, the study identifies persistent institutional coordination challenges, such as fragmented governance and misaligned interests between public authorities and private operators, which hinder effective implementation. These challenges are compounded by issues like fare integration, infrastructure readiness, and resistance from conventional transport operators. International

examples highlight that successful integration requires a legitimate coordinating authority, political commitment, and enforceable policy frameworks. For Jakarta, strengthening these areas is crucial for JakLingko to become a more inclusive, efficient, and sustainable public transport system. The study emphasizes that a balanced governance model, combining horizontal collaboration with vertical authority, digital integration, and political leadership, is essential for managing complex urban transport systems.

5.2 Research Limitations

This study's findings may be constrained by the scope of the literature reviewed, which primarily focused on a specific set of documents related to the JakLingKo program. Additionally, the analysis is largely centered on Jakarta's context, which might limit its applicability to other cities or countries with differing transport governance systems or institutional frameworks. While the study emphasizes network governance, the complexity of urban transport integration across various global contexts may result in different outcomes influenced by unique political, economic, and social factors. Furthermore, the reliance on secondary data and document analysis, though comprehensive, may not capture the nuanced, real-time dynamics of ongoing governance processes that could provide deeper insights into the integration challenges faced by Jakarta's public transport system.

5.3 Suggestions and Directions for Future Research

Future research could focus on expanding the geographical scope of the study by examining other cities in Indonesia or globally, which would allow for a comparative analysis of transport integration policies across different governance frameworks. Longitudinal studies that track the JakLingKo program's evolution over time would provide valuable insights into the effectiveness of governance mechanisms and their long-term impact on transport system integration. Additionally, integrating more empirical data from key stakeholders, including transport users, government officials, and private operators, could offer a more holistic view of the policy's real-world impacts. Investigating the role of emerging technologies, such as digital platforms and data analytics, in facilitating coordination and improving policy outcomes could also provide valuable directions for future research, particularly in the context of smart cities and digital governance.

References

Akther, S., & Evans, J. (2024). Emerging attributes of adaptive governance in the global south. *Frontiers in Environmental Science*, 12, 1372157. doi:<https://doi.org/10.3389/fenvs.2024.1372157>

Alfiyan, A., & Rinova, D. (2024). Policy on Environmental Law Reform in the Context of Environmental Preservation in Bandar Lampung City. *Jurnal Ilmiah Hukum dan Hak Asasi manusia (jihham)*, 4(1), 27-33. doi:<https://doi.org/10.35912/jihham.v4i1.3208>

Almulhim, A. I., & Yigitcanlar, T. (2025). Understanding smart governance of sustainable cities: A review and multidimensional framework. *Smart Cities*, 8(4), 113. doi:<https://doi.org/10.3390/smartcities8040113>

Amiel, M., Yemini, M., & Rechavi, A. (2024). Behind the scenes: an analysis of policy networks in the contemporary Israeli education landscape. *Journal of Education Policy*, 39(3), 490-513. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1080/02680939.2024.2315147>

Ansell, C., & Torfing, J. (2021). *Public governance as co-creation: A strategy for revitalizing the public sector and rejuvenating democracy*: Cambridge University Press.

Aristovnik, A., Murko, E., & Ravšelj, D. (2022). From neo-Weberian to hybrid governance models in public administration: Differences between state and local self-government. *Administrative Sciences*, 12(1), 26. doi:<https://doi.org/10.3390/admsci12010026>

Baalbergen, I., Bolt, G., Lin, Y., & Hooimeijer, P. (2023). Governance networks and accountability patterns in the provision of housing for migrants: The case of Central and Eastern European workers in the Netherlands. *Housing, Theory and Society*, 40(4), 411-434. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1080/14036096.2023.2186946>

George, B., Klijn, E. H., Ropes, E., & Sattlegger, A. (2024). Do network management and trust matter for network outcomes? A meta-analysis and research agenda. *Public management review*, 26(11), 3270-3297. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2024.2327629>

Gergis, F. H. (2024). Collaborative forms of governance in sustainable urban mobility schemes at the sub-governmental levels: a scoping literature review. *International Journal of Urban Sustainable Development*, 16(1), 343-359. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1080/19463138.2024.2411049>

Haider, F., Rehman, Z. u., Khan, A. H., Ilyas, M., & Khan, I. (2021). Performance evaluation of BRT standard in decision support system for integrated transportation policy. *Sustainability*, 13(4), 1957. doi:<https://doi.org/10.3390/su13041957>

Hirschhorn, F., van de Velde, D., Veeneman, W., & ten Heuvelhof, E. (2020). The governance of attractive public transport: Informal institutions, institutional entrepreneurs, and problem-solving know-how in Oslo and Amsterdam. *Research in Transportation Economics*, 83, 100829. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.retrec.2020.100829>

Mariani, S., Albanesi, C., Prati, G., & Cicognani, E. (2025). A Qualitative Study on the Meaning of Participation in Public Administration: A Case Study of the Emilia-Romagna Region in Italy. *Societies*, 15(9), 257. doi:<https://doi.org/10.3390/soc15090257>

Marsden, G., & Reardon, L. (2017). Questions of governance: Rethinking the study of transportation policy. *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice*, 101, 238-251. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tra.2017.05.008>

Mukhlis, M., Fahmi, T., & Umayasari, U. (2026). Dissensus in collaborative governance: Future challenges of Lampung's capital relocation policy. *Journal of Governance and Accountability Studies*, 6(1), 15-27. doi:<https://doi.org/10.35912/jgas.v6i1.2889>

Musa, M., Hashim, N., & Muhammad, R. (2020). *Integrated Transport System: Challenges and Potential Toward Sustainability in the Malaysian Transport System*. Paper presented at the IOP Conference Series: Materials Science and Engineering.

Oktorini, R., & Barus, L. S. (2022). Integration of Public Transportation in Smart Transportation System (Smart Transportation System) in Jakarta. *Konfrontasi: Jurnal Kultural, Ekonomi Dan Perubahan Sosial*, 9(2), 341-347. doi:<https://doi.org/10.33258/konfrontasi2.v9i2.223>

Rachman, F. F., Nooraeni, R., & Yuliana, L. (2021). Public opinion of transportation integrated (jak lingko), in dki jakarta, indonesia. *Procedia Computer Science*, 179, 696-703. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procs.2021.01.057>

Rahma, H. A., Rosyadi, S., & Gunarto, G. (2024). Collaborative Governance in Management of the JakLingko Program (Case Study on Public Transportation Management in DKI Jakarta). *Journal of Economics, Bussiness and Management Issues*, 1(2), 36-46. doi:<https://doi.org/10.47134/jebmi.v2i1.139>

Rode, P. (2019). Urban planning and transport policy integration: The role of governance hierarchies and networks in London and Berlin. *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 41(1), 39-63. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1080/07352166.2016.1271663>

Rohmah, W., Ramadhani, M., & Pratio, G. (2024). Implementasi Kebijakan Pemerintah dalam Pengelolaan Transportasi Publik di Kota Surakarta: Tinjauan Hukum dan Pemerintahan. *Jurnal Bengawan Solo Pusat Kajian Penelitian dan Pengembangan Daerah Kota Surakarta*, 3(1), 55-66. doi:<https://doi.org/10.58684/jbs.v3i1.48>

Rongen, T., Lenferink, S., Arts, J., & Tillema, T. (2025a). Examining network governance of multimodal integration: A comparative study of rural mobility hubs in The Netherlands. *Case Studies on Transport Policy*, 101525. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cstsp.2025.101525>

Rongen, T., Lenferink, S., Arts, J., & Tillema, T. (2025b). Examining network governance of multimodal integration: A comparative study of rural mobility hubs in The Netherlands. *Case Studies on Transport Policy*, 21, 101525. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cstsp.2025.101525>

Rye, T., Monios, J., Hrelja, R., & Isaksson, K. (2018). The relationship between formal and informal institutions for governance of public transport. *Journal of Transport Geography*, 69, 196-206. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtrangeo.2018.04.025>

Shukhrat, S. (2025). Ensuring the right to higher education: A general overview. *Annals of Justice and Humanity*, 5(1), 51-61. doi:<https://doi.org/10.35912/ajh.v5i1.3649>

Skuzinski, T., Weinreich, D. P., & Velandia Hernandez, C. (2024). How can we better study the links between regional governance and public service outcomes? Governance topologies in metropolitan public transportation systems. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 44(3), 1448-1463. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1177/0739456X221074061>

Sogbe, E., Susilawati, S., & Pin, T. C. (2025). Scaling up public transport usage: a systematic literature review of service quality, satisfaction and attitude towards bus transport systems in developing countries. *Public Transport*, 17(1), 1-44. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1007/s12469-024-00367-6>

Sørensen, C. H., Hansson, L., & Rye, T. (2023a). The role of meta-governance in public transport systems: A comparison of major urban regions in Denmark and England. *Transport policy*, 130, 37-45. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tranpol.2022.10.018>

Sørensen, C. H., Hansson, L., & Rye, T. (2023b). The role of meta-governance in public transport systems: A comparison of major urban regions in Denmark and England. *Transport policy*, 130(2), 37-45. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tranpol.2022.10.018>

Surahman, A., Nurasa, H., & Munajat, D. E. (2025). Evaluation of Development Policy and Increased Integrated Public Transportation in Bandung City. *Eduvest-Journal of Universal Studies*, 5(3), 2979-2991. doi:<https://doi.org/10.5918/eduvest.v5i3.1747>

Suriyani, L., Respationo, H. M. S., & Erniyanti, E. (2025). Juridical analysis of legal certainty regarding the role of the Batam Business Entity and the Land Office in the land certificate transfer system in Batam City. *Annals of Justice and Humanity*, 4(2), 99-112. doi:<https://doi.org/10.35912/ajh.v4i2.3416>

Wang, H., & Ran, B. (2023). Network governance and collaborative governance: A thematic analysis on their similarities, differences, and entanglements. *Public management review*, 25(6), 1187-1211. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2021.2011389>