Jurnal Dinamika Global Vol. 11 No. 1, Juni 2026
P-ISSN 2548-9216 | E-ISSN 2684-9399

INDONESIA'S ENERGY SECURITY THROUGH THE JUST ENERGY TRANSITION PARTNERSHIP: IMPLICATIONS FOR ENERGY SOVEREIGNTY

Faiz Mumtaz[1], Dadan Suryadipura[2]
[12]Universitas Padjadjaran
[1]faiz22002@mail.unpad.ac.id, [2]suryadipura@unpad.ac.id

Abstract

Recent studies on Indonesia's Just Energy Transition Partnership (JETP) focus heavily on policy design and finance, overlooking the impact on energy sovereignty. This article addresses that gap, utilizing Cherp and Jewell's sovereignty perspective to analyse JETP as a mechanism that reconfigures vulnerabilities within national energy security strategies. Through qualitative analysis of policy documents, literature, and five interviews, we examine three dimensions: control over the energy system, diversification and reduction of external vulnerability, and autonomy in energy transition governance. The findings reveal that JETP strengthens sovereignty only selectively. While it supports power sector diversification and formal national policy leadership, execution remains constrained by domestic overcapacity, procurement barriers, and dependence on foreign finance and technology. We argue that JETP does not eliminate vulnerability but reconfigures it from fossil-fuel dependence toward transition dependence. Thus, in the energy transition, sovereignty is not simply preserved but renegotiated through state control and asymmetric interdependence.

Keywords: Indonesia, Just Energy Transition Partnership, Energy security, Energy sovereignty, Energy transition

INTRODUCTION

Energy remains a strategic instrument in international relations to maintain the functioning of political, economic, and technological systems (Dannreuther, 2017). Yet, global energy security has become increasingly unstable over the past decade due to geopolitical tensions, fluctuating energy prices, the politicization of energy resources, disruptions to distribution routes, population growth, and uncertainty in the global energy market (Dannreuther, 2024; Iriani, 2022). These challenges are intensified for countries with high dependence on fossil fuels and imported energy (Alshwawra & Almuhtady, 2020; Dannreuther, 2024). Thus, this phenomenon challenges countries' ability to maintain reliable and sustainable energy systems (East Asia Forum, 2016).

Energy transition, beyond environmental considerations, has been seen as a strategic pathway to strengthen energy security by diversifying the energy mix, reducing vulnerability to fossil-fuel volatility, import dependence, and geopolitical disruptions (Gribkova & Milshina, 2022; Plank et al., 2023; Thura Zan et al., 2025). It is also encouraged by global initiatives such as the United Nations' Global Green New Deal and the Paris Agreement (Cherp et al., 2016; UNEP, 2009; Vinichenko et al., 2021). Yet, the implementation and the trajectory of the transition vary significantly due to tension with national interests and the feasibility conditions in geophysical, socio-technical, and political aspects (Jewell & Cherp, 2023; Johnstone, 2022; Li & Haneklaus, 2022; Suzuki et al., 2023). On the other hand, without sufficient domestic capabilities and supporting institutional frameworks, it may generate new dependencies on foreign capital, imported technology, and external infrastructure support (Iyke, 2024; Scholten, 2018).

For developing countries such as Indonesia, balancing commitments of energy transition with national energy security remains a critical policy challenge (Jazuli et al., 2024; Loy et al., 2024). Despite possessing abundant energy resources, Indonesia remains heavily dependent on fossil fuels and imported energy to meet its domestic demand (IEA, 2025; IESR, 2020; MEMR, 2020). Moreover, Indonesia's coal-fired power plants (CFPPs) are still relatively young (H. M. Bintang & A. O. Halim, personal communication, May 19, 2026). Hence, Indonesia's energy security has become a central national priority under Jokowi's presidency and has been pushed through energy policies. (Guild & Chen, 2019; Harding & Searight, 2019; Ray & Ing, 2016). Yet, Indonesia remains constrained due to its financial capability; of the target $97 billion, its allocated budget is only $9.2 million annually (Larasati & Mafira, 2023; Simanjuntak, 2023).

The Just Energy Transition Partnership (JETP) is an international initiative to support Indonesia's energy transition, which launched in November 2022 and has a similar framework to JETP South Africa (von Lüpke, 2025). It

represents a cooperative framework between Indonesia and the International Partners Group (IPG), committed to $20 billion in financial support, with six investment focuses over a three-to-five-year period (Bachtiar et al., 2023; JETP Secretariat Indonesia, 2024). Nevertheless, the financing structure raises concerns regarding potential financial and technology dependency, since most of the funds are loans and investments (Rizqia & Wulansari, 2026).

Existing scholarship can be grouped into three broad strands. First, studies on energy security increasingly show that the concept has expanded beyond supply stability to include geopolitical exposure, technological capability, institutional resilience, and climate risk (Cherp et al., 2016; Cherp & Jewell, 2014; Iyke, 2024; Li & Haneklaus, 2022). However, this literature also reveals an unresolved tension: while decarbonization is often presented as a route to stronger energy security, the transition itself may generate new vulnerabilities through infrastructure lock-in, technology dependence, and uneven market power. Second, scholarship on energy transition partnerships and climate finance highlights how cross-border cooperation can accelerate transition by mobilizing capital, expertise, and institutional coordination (Karg et al., 2025; Ramluckun et al., 2024; Thura Zan et al., 2025; von Lüpke, 2025). Yet this strand often treats interdependence primarily as a functional solution, rather than asking when external support begins to constrain domestic strategic autonomy. Third, studies on Indonesia's JETP have examined policy regime dynamics, financing architecture, and the broader transition agenda (Jazuli et al., 2024; Massagony et al., 2025; Muyasyaroh, 2024; Rahmanitya & Ardiansyah, 2023; Setiawan et al., 2025). While valuable, these studies have not systematically addressed how JETP affects Indonesia's energy sovereignty by reshaping the relationship between formal state control and material dependence on external finance and technology.

This article addresses that gap by placing JETP within the debate between sovereignty and interdependence in energy transition. Rather than assuming that international cooperation either strengthens or undermines sovereignty, our

analysis asks how a country-led transition partnership may simultaneously reduce one form of vulnerability while producing another. Its novelty lies in applying Cherp and Jewell's sovereignty perspective to JETP as a mechanism of strategic reconfiguration, not merely as a policy or financing instrument. In this sense, the study contributes to international relations scholarship by showing that, in the Global South, energy sovereignty under transition is best understood not as the absence of interdependence, but as the state's ability to manage interdependence without losing control over the strategic direction of its energy system.

In understanding the dynamics of the JETP implementation mentioned above, this study utilized the sovereignty perspective of Cherp and Jewell (2011), which emphasizes the low vulnerability of vital energy systems, particularly against external pressures, dependencies, and disruptions. The perspective's central concern is not merely the availability of energy, but the extent to which the state retains strategic control over the systems, resources, and decisions that sustain national energy needs. The perspective is chosen because the research problem centres on external dependence, state control, and national energy sovereignty in the context of international partnership.

This article does not treat energy sovereignty as a purely normative or self-sufficient condition, but approaches sovereignty as a relational condition shaped by the degree of vulnerability embedded in a state's energy system. In this sense, interdependence is not automatically incompatible with sovereignty. External cooperation can expand state capacity, widen energy options, and support strategic transition (Schelly et al., 2020). Nevertheless, interdependence becomes sovereignty-constraining when it creates asymmetrical dependence over financing, technology, or implementation choices that the state cannot easily control. The analytical question is therefore not whether Indonesia is connected to external actors, but under what conditions those connections strengthen national control and under what conditions they narrow it. This relational understanding is consistent with scholarship that treats energy sovereignty as a

matter of managing structural barriers and opportunities rather than eliminating interdependence (Raimi & Davicino, 2024).

To apply the sovereignty perspective empirically, the article operationalizes energy sovereignty through three related dimensions. First, control over the energy system concerns formal authority: whether Indonesia retains strategic control over energy policy direction, institutional coordination, and transition priorities under the JETP. Second, diversification and reduction of external vulnerability concern structural exposure: whether the JETP helps reduce dependence on fossil fuels and widen Indonesia's strategic room for manoeuvre by diversifying the energy systems. Third, autonomy in energy transition governance concerns material implementation capacity: whether Indonesia can carry out the transition without becoming excessively dependent on foreign financing and technology systems. These dimensions are related but not identical. A state may preserve formal policy control while remaining materially constrained in implementation. Through this distinction, the article treats sovereignty not as an all-or-nothing condition, but as a differentiated and contested outcome within the politics of energy transition.

This article employs a qualitative research design to examine how JETP influences Indonesia's energy security strategy and its implications for national energy sovereignty during 2022-2024. A qualitative approach is appropriate because the article seeks to analyse policy meaning, strategic positioning, and implementation mechanisms rather than test causal relationships statistically (Lamont, 2015). The analysis combines documentary research with semi-structured elite interviews to capture both formal policy direction and the perspectives of actors directly engaged with, or observing, Indonesia's energy transition.

The study draws on two types of data. Secondary data include official documents, institutional reports, and academic literature, such as the *Rencana Umum Energi Nasional* (RUEN), the *Comprehensive Investment and Policy Plan*

(CIPP), official JETP documents, reports from the Ministry of Energy and Mineral Resources (MEMR), PLN statistics, and scholarly work on energy security, climate finance, and energy transition. Primary data were obtained through four semi-structured interviews involving five key informants conducted between 30 April and 19 May 2026. Informants were selected through purposive sampling based on their relevance to JETP and Indonesia's energy transition. They included two researchers from the Institute for Essential Services Reform (IESR), one researcher from the Aksi Ekologi dan Emansipasi Rakyat (AEER), one research officer from ISEAS, and one junior policy analyst from Indonesia's National Energy Council. These interviews were used not to establish statistical representativeness, but to clarify mechanisms, implementation constraints, and institutional interpretations that are not fully visible in documentary sources.

The interviews were conducted offline, online, and in writing, with consent to recording, and were transcribed for analysis. The data were analysed using qualitative content analysis with a deductive coding framework derived from the article's three analytical dimensions. In the first stage, documents and interview excerpts were coded according to these three dimensions. Then, in the second stage, subthemes were identified within each dimension, including country-led ownership, policy alignment, overcapacity, procurement barriers, bankability, financing structure, and technological dependence. The purpose of this two-stage coding process was to trace not only what JETP formally seeks to achieve, but also how its implementation interacts with domestic institutional constraints and external dependencies. To enhance credibility, the article applies triangulation across documents, interviews, and academic literature. Official documents are used to identify formal commitments and policy design; academic literature provides conceptual and critical interpretation; and interviews are used to assess how actors understand the implementation dynamics of JETP in practice. Through this procedure, the article seeks to produce an empirically grounded and theoretically transparent account of how JETP affects Indonesia's energy security.

DISCUSSION

JETP as an Instrument of Diversification

Diversification constitutes a central strategy in strengthening Indonesia's energy security, and the JETP has emerged as a mechanism to support the country's ambitions (International Partners Group & Republic of Indonesia, 2022; Jazuli et al., 2024). It is planned to solve Indonesia's dependence on fossil fuels and imported energy, the inability to meet domestic demand, and two crucial sectors (industry and transportation) that were highly reliant on fossil fuels (APEC, 2025; Republic of Indonesia, 2017). Moreover, electricity generation was dominated by coal, accounting for 67.5%, while new & renewable energy (NRE) contributed only 12.8% (IESR, 2022). Although coal did not create import dependence, its dominance generated vulnerability due to its high carbon intensity, exposure to international climate pressure, financing risks, and limited contribution to long-term diversification (Rahmanitya & Ardiansyah, 2023). This fossil-fuel-based vulnerability may also be amplified by geopolitical disruption. As Qia Jiahui of ISEAS noted, the Russia-Ukraine conflict generated shocks in the global energy market, although its direct effect on Indonesia was more limited than in gas-dependent regions (Q. Jiahui, personal communication, May 4, 2026).

The 2022 Joint Statement set out ambitious objectives for Indonesia, including increasing the share of NRE to 34% of total electricity generation, reducing the generation of CFPPs to 208,300 GWh, and capping power-sector emissions at 290 MtCO2 by 2030, and achieving net-zero emissions by 2050 (JETP Secretariat Indonesia, 2023a). It also aims to diversify the architecture of Indonesia's electricity system through five broad investment priorities: transmission and grid development, early retirement of CFPPs, acceleration of NRE, development of NRE, and strengthening of NRE supply chains. Yet, official reports show that NRE contribution to the national primary energy mix hasn't improved significantly despite its 25% growth in total from 2022 to 2024 (MEMR, 2023a, 2024, 2025). In the power generation sector, NRE accounted for only

18.1% of total production, and that remains far from the transition pathway articulated in the JETP/CIPP framework. Additionally, coal continues to dominate, contributing between 228,430 and 242,250 GWh by 2024, and hasn't shown any signs of decline (BPS - Statistics Indonesia, 2025; PLN, 2025; Ritchie & Rosado, 2025). Consequently, Indonesia's strategy to mitigate external risks through renewable energy diversification, supported by the JETP framework, faces a significant implementation gap that threatens the transition's role in securing national energy sovereignty.

Interview evidence suggests that this implementation gap cannot be attributed to JETP design alone. Rather, it reflects the interaction between JETP ambition and domestic structural constraints. IESR interviewees emphasized that the period 2022-2024 was still shaped by overcapacity, the relatively young age of many CFPPs, slow procurement processes, limited grid-hosting capacity, and an uneven economic playing field between coal and renewables under the existing BPP-DMO regime (H. M. Bintang & A. O. Halim, personal communication, May 19, 2026). In this sense, the delay in diversification was not simply the result of insufficient international support, but of domestic institutional and market conditions that limited the transition of JETP targets into implementable renewable projects.

From the perspective of energy security, these findings indicate that diversification through JETP has, by 2024, remained more aspirational than transformative. JETP has clearly introduced an institutional and financial framework intended to reorient Indonesia's power sector away from coal dependence. Yet, the available evidence suggests that implementation has not advanced far enough to significantly alter the underlying structure of electricity generation. As a result, Indonesia's strategy of reducing vulnerability through diversification still faces a substantial gap between policy ambition and empirical realization. This matters for energy sovereignty because a diversification strategy that does not materially reduce coal concentration and expand renewable capacity cannot yet be said to have significantly strengthened the state's

strategic room for maneuver. In this sense, JETP remains important as a diversification instrument, but its effect on Indonesia's energy security by 2024 appears limited by slow implementation and the persistence of coal dominance in the electricity sector.

State Control and Policy Leadership in the JETP Framework

Within the sovereignty perspective, state control is reflected in the extent to which Indonesia retains authority over the direction, coordination, and institutional design of its energy transition under JETP. From its initial launch, JETP was explicitly framed as a partnership to be led by Indonesia, and this principle was reinforced in the CIPP (International Partners Group & Republic of Indonesia, 2022; JETP Secretariat Indonesia, 2023b). Indonesia's central role in energy policy and transition implementation is also emphasized by the country-led principle, according to Arie Pujiwati from the National Energy Council (A. Pujiwati, personal communication, May 9, 2026).

Documentary and institutional evidence further indicate that JETP was formally structured to operate under Indonesian leadership rather than as an externally imposed transition agenda. This formal ownership is reflected in the establishment of the JETP Secretariat in Jakarta under the direction of the Energy Transition and Green Economy Task Force (Satgas TEH) (MEMR, 2023b). However, interview evidence suggests that formal control should not be equated with full substantive control. IESR interviewees described JETP as a catalytic and complementary mechanism rather than Indonesia's primary national strategy, since the state continues to rely on its official energy planning documents as the main policy reference (H. M. Bintang & A. O. Halim, personal communication, May 19, 2026). This means that JETP remains country-led at the level of institutional design, but the range of projects that can move forward is still influenced by lender expectations, project bankability, and delivery capacity. Thus, the country-led principle should be understood as preserving formal ownership rather than guaranteeing unrestricted strategic autonomy in implementation.

JETP's relationship with Indonesia's pre-existing policy framework further supports this interpretation. The partnership is positioned as consistent with national energy strategies such as the RUEN and LTS-LCCR 2050 (Republic of Indonesia, 2017, 2019). This alignment suggests that JETP does not formally replace Indonesia's national energy strategy but instead operates as an external instrument in support of it. From the sovereignty perspective, these arrangements indicate that JETP formally preserves Indonesia's policy leadership over the transition process. Although this does not eliminate the possibility of new dependencies in other dimensions, it suggests that, at the level of institutional design and policy direction, Indonesia remains the central actor in shaping the strategic orientation of its energy transition.

New Dependencies in Financing and Technology

Indonesia's aspiration to strengthen energy sovereignty through transition is constrained by the broader structural limitations typical of an emerging economy. Moving from a sovereignty-oriented energy security strategy to actual transition infrastructure requires substantial financial, technological, and human-resource capacity, all of which remain limited in the Indonesian context (Resosudarmo et al., 2023). Indonesia's transition targets need $97.3 billion, but the state's annual budget only amounts to $9.2 million between 2019 and 2024 (JETP Secretariat Indonesia, 2023a; Larasati & Mafira, 2023). In parallel, existing research suggests that domestic human resources remain constrained in terms of skills and technical knowledge, while available technologies are still insufficient to meet the scale of transformation envisioned in the CIPP (Ardyanto et al., 2025; Loy et al., 2024; Nugroho et al., 2023). These conditions indicate that Indonesia's transition capacity remains structurally dependent on support from outside the state.

JETP is designed to help Indonesia address precisely these limitations. According to the JETP report, the partnership mobilizes $21.6 billion USD in funding commitments to support renewable energy development and the broader net-zero agenda (JETP Secretariat Indonesia, 2024; PT PLN, 2026). Beyond

financing, JETP also includes support for workforce development and technological upgrading. Chapter 6 of the CIPP proposes reskilling and upskilling programs for workers affected by the transition, with JETP expected to assist the government in evaluating and designing programs that can deliver the competencies required for the new energy economy (JETP Secretariat Indonesia, 2023a). In the technological domain, JETP has also introduced initiatives such as PRIME STeP and Women-Led Coal Transition (WOLCOT), which are intended to encourage innovation, research, and capacity-building to narrow Indonesia's technological gap (JETP Secretariat Indonesia, 2024). In this sense, JETP does not simply offer capital but seeks to provide a broader transition framework that responds to Indonesia's financial, human-resource, and technological constraints.

However, the same support that enables transition may also raise concerns for Indonesia's energy sovereignty. The financing committed under JETP is not entirely grant-based. Rather, it consists of public financing from IPG countries and private financing from GFANZ institutions, meaning that transition support is embedded in external financial arrangements rather than being fully driven by domestic public resources. This distinction is important because it suggests that the funding package is dominated by loans, while grants account for only around 4% of total commitments (Rizqia & Wulansari, 2026). As Timotius Rafael of AEER argued, concerns over potential debt burdens have made the Indonesian government more cautious in accepting the JETP-related financing, contributing to a relatively low absorption rate (T. Rafael, personal communication, April 30, 2026).

Interview evidence indicates that this dependence is not merely hypothetical. In addition to the loan-heavy composition of JETP finance, implementation has also been constrained by the limited number of projects considered bankable under prevailing due diligence, tariff, and feasibility conditions (H. M. Bintang & A. O. Halim, personal communication, May 19, 2026). This means that external finance does not simply supplement domestic

capacity; it also shapes which projects can proceed and under what commercial terms. A similar pattern appears in the technological dimension. Although JETP includes technical assistance and skills upgrading, domestic capacity gaps mean that key components of transition remain tied to external expertise, project preparation standards, and imported systems. The mechanism of dependence, therefore, lies less in formal donor control over Indonesian policy and more in the practical conditioning of implementation through finance, technical standards, and project viability requirements.

From the sovereignty perspective, this raises an important concern. Although JETP expands Indonesia's transition capacity, it may also tie that process to external creditors, investors, and financing conditions. A similar issue arises in the technological dimension. If transition implementation relies predominantly on imported systems, foreign expertise, and externally controlled supply chains, then Indonesia risks shifting dependence from imported fossil fuels to imported transition technologies. Without stronger use of local industries and domestic capability-building, the JETP-supported transition may deepen rather than reduce structural dependence. Therefore, while JETP is crucial in addressing Indonesia's financing and technology gap, its current structure also suggests that the transition may generate new forms of dependence that complicate the pursuit of energy sovereignty.

CONCLUSION

This study concludes that JETP's impact on Indonesia's energy sovereignty reveals a complex paradox rather than a straightforward success or failure. Using Cherp and Jewell's sovereignty perspective, it finds that JETP strengthens selected dimensions of sovereignty by supporting diversification, expanding transition capacity, and preserving formal national policy leadership through a country-led framework. At the same time, these gains remain conditional, as implementation continues to be shaped by domestic overcapacity, procurement barriers, bankability constraints, and reliance on foreign financing and technology. Consequently, JETP does not eliminate Indonesia's energy

vulnerability but rather reconfigures it from traditional fossil-fuel dependence toward transition dependence.

The broader theoretical implication is that energy sovereignty under a low-carbon transition implies not insulation from external actors, but the state's capacity to manage interdependence while maintaining control over the strategic direction of its system. The Indonesian case suggests that transition partnerships do not simply strengthen or weaken sovereignty, but rather redistribute vulnerability across the domains of policy, finance, and technology. Thus, the article contributes to international relations scholarship by showing that transition partnerships in the Global South are best analysed as an intersection between security, development, and political economy.

Moreover, the article contributes to energy security debates by showing that decarbonization strengthens security only when it reduces, rather than merely shifts, structural vulnerability. Future research could develop this argument by tracing project-level implementation under JETP, comparing Indonesia with other JETP countries, or examining how lender conditionalities and technology supply chains shape national autonomy over time. For Indonesia, stronger energy sovereignty will depend not only on external support for the transition but also on the consolidation of domestic industrial capability, technological readiness, and financial autonomy.

REFERENCES

Alshwawra, A., & Almuhtady, A. (2020). Impact of regional conflicts on energy security in Jordan. *International Journal of Energy Economics and Policy*, *10*(3), 45–50. https://doi.org/10.32479/ijeep.9031

APEC. (2025). *APEC Energy Statistics 2022*.

Ardyanto, F., Thamrin, S., & Laksmono, R. (2025). Analysis of Human Resources Readiness in Supporting Energy Transition for National Energy Security. *Journal of Geosciences and Environmental Studies*, *2*(3), 14. https://doi.org/10.53697/ijgaes.v2i3.4936

Bachtiar, R., Naufal, M., & Safira, S. (2023). JETP - The Commencement of Just Energy Transition Partnership. *ARMA LAW*.

BPS - Statistics Indonesia. (2025). *Energy Balance of Indonesia 2020-2024*.

Cherp, A., & Jewell, J. (2011). The three perspectives on energy security: Intellectual history, disciplinary roots and the potential for integration. In *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability* (Vol. 3, Number 4, pp. 202–212). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cosust.2011.07.001

Cherp, A., & Jewell, J. (2014). The concept of energy security: Beyond the four as. *Energy Policy*, *75*, 415–421. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2014.09.005

Cherp, A., Jewell, J., Vinichenko, V., Bauer, N., & De Cian, E. (2016). Global energy security under different climate policies, GDP growth rates and fossil resource availabilities. *Climatic Change*, *136*(1), 83–94. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10584-013-0950-x

Dannreuther, R. (2017). *Energy Security*. Polity Press.

Dannreuther, R. (2024). Oil, materiality and International Relations. *International Relations*. https://doi.org/10.1177/00471178241231726

East Asia Forum. (2016, September 26). Indonesia and the revolution in Asian energy markets. *East Asia Forum*.

Gribkova, D., & Milshina, Y. (2022). Energy Transition as a Response to Energy Challenges in Post-Pandemic Reality. *Energies*, *15*(3). https://doi.org/10.3390/en15030812

Guild, J., & Chen, J. (2019). *"Jokowinomics": Has It Worked?* www.rsis.edu.sg

Harding, B., & Searight, A. (2019, October 18). *Jokowi 2.0: Policy, Politics, and Prospects for Reform*. Https://Www.Csis.Org/Analysis/Jokowi-20-Policy-Politics-and-Prospects-Reform.

IEA. (2025). *World Energy Balance*. https://www.iea.org/data-and-statistics/data-product/world-energy-balances

IESR. (2020). *National Energy General Plan (RUEN): Existing Plan, Current Policies Implication, and Energy Transition Scenario*. https://iesr.or.id/pustaka/ruen-existing-plan-current-policies-and-energy-transition-scenario/

IESR. (2022). *Indonesia Energy Transition Outlook 2023: Tracking Progress of Energy Transition in Indonesia: Pursuing Energy Security in the Time of Transition*.

International Partners Group, & Republic of Indonesia. (2022). *Joint Statement: Just Energy Transition Partnership (JETP) Indonesia*. https://ec.europa.eu/commission/presscorner/api/files/document/print/en/statement_22_6892/STATEMENT_22_6892_EN.pdf

Iriani, M. L. (2022). THE ENERGY TRANSITION DILEMMA IN EUROPEAN UNION (EU) REGION. *Jurnal Dinamika Global*, *7*(01), 122–135. https://doi.org/10.36859/jdg.v7i01.980

Iyke, B. N. (2024). Climate change, energy security risk, and clean energy investment. *Energy Economics*, *129*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eneco.2023.107225

Jazuli, M. R., Roll, K., & Mulugetta, Y. (2024). A review of Indonesia's JETP through the dynamics of its policy regime. *Global Policy*, *15*(15), 989–1006. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/1758-5899.13452

JETP Secretariat Indonesia. (n.d.). *About Us*. JETP Secretariat Indonesia.

JETP Secretariat Indonesia. (2023). *Comprehensive Investment and Policy Plan 2023*.

JETP Secretariat Indonesia. (2024, August 7). *JETP Grant Mapping*. Https://Jetp-Id.Org/.

Jewell, J., & Cherp, A. (2023). The feasibility of climate action: Bridging the inside and the outside view through feasibility spaces. In *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Climate Change* (Vol. 14, Number 5). John Wiley and Sons Inc. https://doi.org/10.1002/wcc.838

Johnstone, I. (2022). Global governance and the Global Green New Deal: the G7's role. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, *9*(1). https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-022-01046-2

Karg, A., Gupta, J., & Chen, Y. (2025). Just Energy Transition Partnerships: An inclusive climate finance approach? *Energy Research and Social Science*, *125*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2025.104103

Lamont, C. (2015). *Research Methods in International Relations*. London: SAGE Publications.

Larasati, L. K., & Mafira, T. (2023, December 5). *Highlights from Indonesia's JETP Comprehensive Investment and Policy Plan*. Https://Www.Climatepolicyinitiative.Org/Highlights-from-Indonesias-Jetp-Comprehensive-Investment-and-Policy-Plan/.

Li, B., & Haneklaus, N. (2022). Reducing CO2 emissions in G7 countries: The role of clean energy consumption, trade openness and urbanization. *Energy Reports*, *8*, 704–713. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.egyr.2022.01.238

Loy, N., Rachmawati, I.-, Issundari, S., & Soesilo, J. (2024). Barriers to Indonesia's Energy Transition. *The Indonesian Journal of Planning and Development*, *9*(2), 54–65. https://doi.org/10.14710/ijpd.9.2.54-65

Massagony, A., Pandit, R., & White, B. (2025). Political economy of energy policy in Indonesia towards net zero emissions by 2060. *Energy for Sustainable Development*, *88*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esd.2025.101757

MEMR. (2020). *Handbook of Energy & Economic Statistics of Indonesia 2019*.

MEMR. (2023a). *Handbook of Energy & Economic Statistics of Indonesia 2022*.

MEMR. (2023b, February 16). Sekretariat JETP Terbentuk, Siap Realisasikan Kerja Sama Pendanaan Transisi Energi. *MEMR*. https://www.esdm.go.id/en/media-center/news-archives/sekretariat-jetp-terbentuk-siap-realisasikan-kerja-sama-pendanaan-transisi-energi

MEMR. (2024). *Handbook of Energy & Economic Statistic of Indonesia 2023*.

MEMR. (2025). *Handbook of Energy & Economic Statistics of Indonesia 2024*.

Muyasyaroh, A. P. (2024). Rethinking Energy Security in Indonesia from a Net Zero Perspective. *Indonesian Journal of Energy*, *7*(1), 16–26. https://doi.org/10.33116/ije.v7i1.197

Nugroho, H., Widyastuti, N. L., & Rustandi, D. (2023). Is Indonesia Really Prepared for The Energy Transition? An Analysis of Readiness for Regulations, Institutions, Finance, and Manpower Aspects. In A. Kiswantono & R. M. Shoedarto (Eds.), *Indonesia's energy transition preparedness framework towards 2045* (pp. 89–122). BRIN Publishing. https://doi.org/10.55981/brin.892.c813

Plank, F., Daum, B., Muntschick, J., Knodt, M., Hasse, C., Ott, I., & Niemann, A. (2023). Hydrogen: Fueling EU-Morocco Energy Cooperation? *Middle East Policy*, *30*(3), 37–52. https://doi.org/10.1111/mepo.12699

PLN. (2025). *Statistics PLN 2024*.

PT PLN. (2026). *Just Energy Transition Partnership (JETP)*. Https://Web.Pln.Co.Id/Pln-Jetp/Jetp-Home.

Rahmanitya, N., & Ardiansyah, P. (2023). Indonesia's Just Energy Transition Partnership (JETP) as a Strategy for Achieving Energy Security. *Journal of International Studies on Energy Affairs*, *4*(1), 1–14. https://doi.org/10.51413/jisea.vol4.iss1.2023.1-14

Raimi, D., & Davicino, A. (2024). Securing energy sovereignty: A review of key barriers and opportunities for energy-producing Native nations in the United States. In *Energy Research and Social Science* (Vol. 107). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2023.103324

Ramluckun, R., Malumbazo, N., & Ngubevana, L. (2024). A Review of the Energy Policies of the BRICS Countries: The Possibility of Adopting a Just Energy Transition for South Africa. In *Sustainability (Switzerland)* (Vol. 16,

Number 2). Multidisciplinary Digital Publishing Institute (MDPI). https://doi.org/10.3390/su16020703

Ray, D., & Ing, L. Y. (2016). Addressing Indonesia's Infrastructure Deficit. *Bulletin of Indonesian Economic Studies*, *52*(1). https://doi.org/10.1080/00074918.2016.1162266

Republic of Indonesia. (2017). *Peraturan Presiden Republik Indonesia Nomor 22 Tahun 2017 Tentang Rencana Umum Energi Nasional [Presidential Regulation Number 22 of 2017 concerning the National Energy General Plan]*. President of the Republic of Indonesia. https://peraturan.bpk.go.id/Home/Details/72238/perpres-no-22-tahun-2017

Republic of Indonesia. (2019). *Peraturan Presiden Republik Indonesia Nomor 55 Tahun 2019 tentang Percepatan Program Kendaraan Bermotor Listrik Berbasis Baterai [Presidential Regulation Number 55 of 2019 concerning the Acceleration of the Battery Electric Vehicle Program]*. https://peraturan.bpk.go.id/Details/116973/perpres-no-55-tahun-2019

Resosudarmo, B. P., Rezki, J. F., & Effendi, Y. (2023). Prospects of Energy Transition in Indonesia. *Bulletin of Indonesian Economic Studies*, *59*(2), 149–177. https://doi.org/10.1080/00074918.2023.2238336

Ritchie, H., & Rosado, P. (2025). *Energy*. OurWorldinData.Org. https://ourworldindata.org/profile/energy/indonesia

Rizqia, A. M., & Wulansari, I. (2026). Implementation of Just Energy Transition Partnership (JETP) Indonesia. *Jurnal Manajemen Dan Bisnis Madani*, *8*(1), 1–10. https://journal.paramadina.ac.id/

Schelly, C., Bessette, D., Brosemer, K., Gagnon, V., Arola, K. L., Fiss, A., Pearce, J. M., & Halvorsen, K. E. (2020). Energy policy for energy sovereignty: Can policy tools enhance energy sovereignty? *Solar Energy*, *205*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.solener.2020.05.056

Scholten, D. (2018). The geopolitics of renewables—an introduction and expectations. In *Lecture Notes in Energy* (Vol. 61). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-67855-9_1

Setiawan, A., Mentari, D. M., Hakam, D. F., & Saraswani, R. (2025). From Climate Risks to Resilient Energy Systems: Addressing the Implications of Climate Change on Indonesia's Energy Policy. *Energies*, *18*(9). https://doi.org/10.3390/en18092389

Simanjuntak, U. (2023, November 2). Draft CIPP Targets 44 Percent Renewable Energy Mix by 2030. *IESR*. https://iesr.or.id/en/draft-cipp-targets-44-percent-renewable-energy-mix-by-2030/

Suzuki, M., Jewell, J., & Cherp, A. (2023). Have climate policies accelerated energy transitions? Historical evolution of electricity mix in the G7 and the EU compared to net-zero targets. *Energy Research and Social Science*, *106*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2023.103281

Thura Zan, T., Dokk Smith, I., Overland, I., & Pradnyaswari, I. (2025). Transaction costs of the Indonesian Just Energy Transition Partnership. *IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science*, *1511*(1). https://doi.org/10.1088/1755-1315/1511/1/012012

UNEP. (2009). *GLOBAL GREEN NEW DEAL POLICY BRIEF*.

Vinichenko, V., Cherp, A., & Jewell, J. (2021). Historical precedents and feasibility of rapid coal and gas decline required for the 1.5°C target. *One Earth*, *4*(10), 1477–1490. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.oneear.2021.09.012

von Lüpke, H. (2025). The just energy transition partnership in South Africa: Identification and assessment of key factors driving international cooperation. *Earth System Governance*, *25*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esg.2025.100274

Walde, T. W. (2008). US Foreign Oil Policy since World War I - For Profits and Security. *The Journal of World Energy Law & Business*, *1*(1), 113–117. https://doi.org/10.1093/jwelb/jwn002