Jurnal IUS Kajian Hukum dan Keadilan
Volume 14, Issue 2, August 2026, E-ISSN 2477-815X, P-ISSN 2303-3827
Indexing: Scopus, DOAJ, Sinta 1, open access at : https://jurnalius.ac.id/

Government Control and Environmental Corporate Social Responsibility Commitments

Eko Nuriyatman[1], Fitria[2], Lili Naili Hidayah[3], Hanif Hardianto[4], Rahmad Hendra[5]
[1]Faculty of Law, Universitas Jambi, Indonesia, email: ekonuriyatman@unja.ac.id
[2]Faculty of Law, Universitas Jambi, Indonesia, email: fitria@unja.ac.id
[3]Faculty of Law, Universitas Jambi, Indonesia, lilinailihidayah@unja.ac.id
[4]Faculty of Law, Social, and Political Sciences, Universitas Terbuka, Indonesia, email: hanifh@ecampus.ut.ac.id
[5]Faculty of Law, Universitas Riau, Indonesia, email: rahmad.hendra@lecturer.unri.ac.id

Abstract

This study examines the adequacy of government oversight in ensuring corporate compliance with the environmental dimension of corporate social and environmental responsibility (TJSL). The study addresses a normative problem arising from the fragmented relationship between the corporate-law regime governing TJSL and the environmental-law regime governing environmental compliance, supervision, reporting, and enforcement. Using normative legal research with statutory and conceptual approaches, the study analyzes the coherence of Law Number 40 of 2007, Law Number 25 of 2007, Law Number 32 of 2009 as amended by Law Number 6 of 2023, Government Regulation Number 47 of 2012, and Government Regulation Number 22 of 2021. The analysis identifies regulatory fragmentation as the principal structural problem, while weak institutional integration, limited verification, inadequate environmental disclosure, and weak public participation operate as related institutional consequences. The novelty lies in reconstructing government oversight through an Integrated Environmental CSR Accountability Framework that connects TJSL obligations, environmental compliance, governmental supervision, outcome-based reporting, independent verification, public participation, and proportionate enforcement. The reconstruction proposes that Government Regulation Number 47 of 2012 be strengthened, particularly its provisions on corporate planning, reporting, and sanctions, through explicit cross-references to the environmental compliance and supervisory mechanisms under Government Regulation Number 22 of 2021. The framework shifts environmental CSR assessment from expenditure and activity-based reporting toward legally and environmentally measurable outcomes.

Keywords: Corporate Compliance; Environmental CSR; Environmental Accountability; Government Oversight; Regulatory Integration.

1. INTRODUCTION

Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) in Indonesia has evolved from a predominantly voluntary corporate practice into a legally recognized corporate obligation, particularly through the concept of Social and Environmental Responsibility (TJSL). Article 74 of Law Number 40 of 2007 concerning Limited Liability Companies requires companies conducting business in and/or related to natural resources to undertake social and environmental responsibility,[1] while Government Regulation Number 47 of 2012 was specifically enacted to implement this provision. The regulatory character of CSR

[1]Eko Nuriyatman et al., "Strategi Implementasi Tanggung Jawab Sosial Lingkungan Dalam Perusahaan: Dampak Dan Tantangan," *LITIGASI* 25, no. 2 (October 31, 2024): 269–89, https://doi.org/10.23969/LITIGASI.V25I2.18877.

 DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.29303/ius.v14i2.1839

is further reinforced by Article 15 letter b of Law Number 25 of 2007 concerning Investment, which requires every investor to carry out corporate social responsibility, while Article 16 letter d requires investors to preserve environmental sustainability.

This statutory framework is supported by normative legal scholarship that examining CSR in the mining sector as a legal obligation rather than merely a form of voluntary corporate philanthropy. Such Scholarship demonstrates that changes in the regulatory framework governing mining activities may affect the legal status, implementation, and protection of CSR obligations, particularly in natural-resource-based industries.[2] The legal character of Social and Environmental Responsibility is further reinforced by normative legal scholarship affirming that its implementation derives from Article 74 of Law Number 40 of 2007 and constitutes an integral part of the corporate responsibility framework advancing sustainable development.[3] Accordingly, the discharge of such responsibility must comply with the principles of transparency and accountability, while providing meaningful opportunities for community participation and feedback within the legal and institutional framework governing corporate responsibility.[4]

The legal character of environmental CSR must therefore be understood within the broader framework of environmental law rather than exclusively through corporate law. Law Number 32 of 2009 concerning Environmental Protection and Management, as amended, including by Law Number 6 of 2023, establishes an integrated regime governing environmental protection, corporate obligations, public participation, governmental supervision, administrative enforcement, dispute resolution, and criminal liability.[5] This framework confirms that corporate environmental responsibility is not merely voluntary but forms part of a legally regulated system of environmental governance, consistent with scholarship recognizing the mandatory character of CSR in Indonesia.[6] Moreover, Government Regulation Number 22 of 2021 operationalizes this framework through environmental approvals, quality standards, environmental information, supervision, and administrative sanctions, thereby linking corporate activities to legally enforceable environmental compliance obligations. Recent legal research further confirms that the post-Job Creation Law regime has shifted environmental licensing toward an environmental-approval framework intended to integrate investment activity with environmental sustainability.[7]

The integration of CSR with environmental compliance is reinforced by research showing that the effectiveness of environmental law enforcement depends on the extent to which business actors comply with environmental management and monitoring

[2]Lelisari Lelisari, Hamdi Hamdi, and Imawanto Imawanto, "Kemunduran Pengaturan Tanggung Jawab Sosial Perusahaan Dalam Sektor Pertambangan Mineral Dan Batubara," *Jurnal IUS Kajian Hukum Dan Keadilan* 9, no. 2 (August 17, 2021): 404–21, https://doi.org/10.29303/ius.v9i2.907.

[3]Lelisari Siregar and Rahdian Ihsan, "THE IMPLEMENTATION OF CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY (CSR) IN PRIVATELY OWNED COMPANIES," *Jurnal IUS Kajian Hukum Dan Keadilan* 1, no. 2 (2013), https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.12345/ius.v1i2.234.

[4]Eko Nuriyatman et al., "Strategi Implementasi Tanggung Jawab Sosial Lingkungan Dalam Perusahaan: Dampak Dan Tantangan."

[5]Eko Nuriyatman et al., "Shifting Regulatory Paradigms in the Political Development of National Environmental Law," *Indonesian Journal of Environmental Law and Sustainable Development* 5, no. 1 (June 30, 2026): 133–66, https://doi.org/10.15294/ijel.v5i1.34498.

[6]Patricia Rinwigati Waagstein, "The Mandatory Corporate Social Responsibility in Indonesia: Problems and Implications," *Journal of Business Ethics* 98, no. 3 (February 14, 2011): 455–66, https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-010-0587-x.

[7]Jerzy Jendrośka, "The Substantive Right to Environment and the Procedural Environmental Rights under the Aarhus Convention – Part II," *The Opole Studies in Administration and Law* 22, no. 2 (November 7, 2024): 43–83, https://doi.org/10.25167/osap.5633.

obligations established under environmental approvals.[8] CSR can serve as an instrument for strengthening environmental protection, particularly where corporate activities create risks of pollution and environmental degradation, while legal remedies remain necessary to address implementation barriers and ensure corporate compliance with environmental responsibilities.[9] These findings indicate that environmental CSR may not be treated merely as expenditure for community development, to the broader legal system governing environmental protection and corporate compliance.

The multiple legal instruments does not necessarily create a coherent framework for environmental CSR governance. PP Number 47 of 2012 regulates a corporation of social and environmental responsibility within the corporate-law regime, while the Investment Law imposes obligations on investors and environmental legislation which governs environmental compliance, supervision, and sanctions. The regulatory framework therefore remains fragmented across sectoral instruments, rather than forming a coherent and integrated regime for governing corporate environmental responsibility.

Regulatory fragmentation remains a significant challenge to CSR governance in Indonesia, as corporate social responsibility obligations are dispersed among corporate, investment, and sector-specific regulations with different scopes, standards, and enforcement mechanisms.[10] These regulatory inconsistencies emerge legal uncertainty and may weaken the effective implementation and enforcement of CSR.[11] Although Indonesian law has shifted CSR from a largely voluntary practice towards a mandatory legal obligation, uncertainty concernng the scope, standard, and mechanisms of implementation continues to weaken effective enforcement. These challenges are further reflected in environmental law enforcement, which continues to face regulatory disharmony, overlapping institutional authority, unclear procedures, and weak enforcement mechanisms, particularly in corporate cases involving environmental damage and restoration obligations.[12]

The primary issue is therefore not the absence of CSR regulations, but whether the existiing framework provides a clear, coherent, and effective system of governmental supervision over corporate environmental responsibilities. Effective supervision should link corporate obligations with clear environmental standards, measurable compliance, monitoring, verification, public access to information, and enforceable sanctions. This is particularly important because environmental law places government supervision at the core of environmental protection and provides administrative sanctions for violations of environmental obligations.

A stronger regulatory oversight framework is therefore required to ensure that corporate environmental responsibilities are consistently implemented, monitored,

[8]Dyah Mustika Prasetyaningsih et al., “Effectiveness of Environmental Law Implementation: Compliance and Enforcement,” *Volksgeist: Jurnal Ilmu Hukum Dan Konstitusi*, December 19, 2022, 215–25, https://doi.org/10.24090/volksgeist.v5i2.6826.

[9]Andrew Shandy Utama and Rizana Rizana, “PELAKSANAAN CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY DALAM RANGKA OPTIMALISASI PELESTARIAN LINGKUNGAN,” *LITIGASI* 19, no. 2 (January 1, 2020), https://doi.org/10.23969/litigasi.v19i2.843.

[10]Basrawi Basrawi et al., “Efforts To Harmonize Conflicts In The Regulation Of Corporate Social Responsibility (Csr) In The Indonesian Legal System,” *Pandecta Research Law Journal* 20, no. 2 (December 15, 2025): 643–68, https://doi.org/10.15294/pandecta.v20i2.18702.

[11]Vanessha Dasenta Demokracia, “KONSISTENSI PENGATURAN TANGGUNG JAWAB SOSIAL DAN LINGKUNGAN PERUSAHAAN DALAM PERATURAN PERUNDANG-UNDANGAN DI INDONESIA,” *Justitia et Pax* 39, no. 1 (April 16, 2024): 193–232, https://doi.org/10.24002/jep.v39i1.7031.

[12]Anis Widyawati et al., “Legal Challenges in Criminal Execution of The Environmental Crime Cases in Indonesia: Efforts Toward Criminal Law Reform,” *Jambe Law Journal* 9, no. 1 (April 19, 2026): 53–88, https://doi.org/10.22437/k1djt237.

and enforced.[13] Effective environmental governance depends on clear compliance requirements, transparent and accountable implementation, and meaningful community participation. It also requires a combination of binding legal obligations, regulatory guidance, monitoring, and other accountability mechanisms to ensure that corporations cannot rely solely on voluntary commitments.

A further legal issue concerns the role of corporate disclosure in enabling effective governmental and public oversight of environmental CSR. Supervision cannot operate effectively where information concerning corporate environmental obligations, programs, impacts, and performance is incomplete, inconsistent, inaccessible, or difficult to verify.[14] Accordingly, environmental CSR governance should require transparent, reliable, and verifiable disclosure, supported by mechanisms for public access and community participation.

Public participation is essential to effective environmental governance because environmental sustainability depends on the involvement of diverse social actors and meaningful opportunities for public engagement. This principle is particularly relevant to environmental CSR because governmental oversight should not operate solely as a vertical administrative relationship between the state and corporations,[15] transparency and public participation should also function as complementary mechanisms of social accountability.

Environmental enforcement requires a clear distinction between CSR obligations and environmental violations. Failure to implement a CSR program does not automatically constitute an environmental offence, but violations of binding environmental obligations may result in administrative, civil, or criminal liability. Government Regulation Number 22 of 2021 reinforces this framework by providing for environmental supervision and administrative sanctions to ensure compliance with obligations attached to environmental approvals and government permissions.

Legal certainty is essential to effective environmental enforcement because corporate environmental obligations, compliance standards, and sanctions must be clearly defined, predictable, and consistently applied. Mahrus Ali's research highlights the need to balance clarity and flexibility in defining environmental offences, while recent legal scholarship also identifies regulatory disharmony, overlapping institutional authority, unclear procedures, and weak enforcement of judicial decisions as persistent barriers to effective enforcement, particularly in cases involving corporations.[16]

Previous scholarship has established that CSR in Indonesia has a mandatory legal character, is closely connected to environmental protection and sustainable development, and requires effective enforcement, transparency, accountability, and public participation.[17] However, these perspectives have largely been examined separately, leaving insufficient attention to how the corporate-law basis of TJSL, investment

[13]Dyah Mustika Prasetyaningsih et al., "Effectiveness of Environmental Law Implementation: Compliance and Enforcement."

[14]Giovanna Michelon, Silvia Pilonato, and Federica Ricceri, "CSR Reporting Practices and the Quality of Disclosure: An Empirical Analysis," *Critical Perspectives on Accounting* 33 (December 2015): 59–78, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpa.2014.10.003.

[15]M. Wildan Humaidi, Hariyanto Hariyanto, and Mabarroh Azizah, "Green Philanthropy: Islamic Activism on Indonesia's Environmental Democracy," *Ijtihad : Jurnal Wacana Hukum Islam Dan Kemanusiaan* 24, no. 2 (December 28, 2024): 167–91, https://doi.org/10.18326/ijtihad.v24i2.167-191.

[16]Mahrus Ali, "Overcoming the Dilemma between the Clarity and Flexible Norms in Environmental Offenses," *De Jure: Jurnal Hukum Dan Syar'iah* 14, no. 2 (2022): 276–87, https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.18860/j-fsh.v14i2.18279.

[17]Sunaryo Sunaryo et al., "Regulatory Frameworks to Integrate Corporate Social Responsibility with Circular Economy Principles," *Hasanuddin Law Review*, July 24, 2025, 236–53, https://doi.org/10.20956/halrev.v11i2.6135.

obligations, environmental requirements, governmental supervision, disclosure and verification, public participation, and enforcement can be integrated into a coherent framework for environmental CSR oversight. This gap is particularly important because fragmented and overlapping regulatory arrangements may themselves weaken legal certainty and corporate compliance, whereas effective environmental governance requires coherent regulation and clearly coordinated institutional authority.[18] The central issue is not merely whether corporations satisfy CSR obligations, but whether the existing legal architecture provides the state with sufficiently clear, coherent, and effective mechanisms to supervise, verify, and enforce their environmental dimension.

This implementation gap is also connected to structural weaknesses within corporate governance frameworks, particularly where corporate autonomy is insufficientlynot adequately balanced by mechanisms of public accountability.[19] Based on these normative concerns and the identified research gap, this study examines two questions: first, whether the Indonesian legal framework provides an adequate basis for government oversight of environmental CSR, including supervisory authority, institutional responsibility, reporting and disclosure, verification, public participation, and enforcement; and second, which legal, institutional, and structural factors contribute to persistent corporate non-compliance despite binding CSR and environmental obligations. These questions enable the study to distinguish normative deficiencies in the legal framework from weaknesses in institutional implementation and enforcement.

The novelty of this study lies in reconstructing government oversight of environmental CSR as an integrated legal framework connecting (1) corporate environmental obligations, (2) governmental supervisory authority, (3) transparent and verifiable reporting, (4) public participation and social accountability, and (5) proportionate and legally certain enforcement. Rather than examining these elements separately, the study integrates them into a single framework for assessing the state's capacity to supervise, verify, and enforce corporate environmental responsibility. This approach builds upon existing scholarship on mandatory CSR, environmental compliance, corporate accountability, transparency, public participation, and environmental enforcement.

This study uses normative legal research to assess the adequacy, coherence, and enforceability of legal norms governing corporate social and environmental responsibility and environmental compliance in Indonesia. It applies statutory and conceptual approaches. The statutory approach examines the Limited Liability Companies Law, Investment Law, Environmental Protection and Management Law as amended by Law Number 6 of 2023, Government Regulation Number 47 of 2012, and Government Regulation Number 22 of 2021. The conceptual approach is used to examine regulatory integration, government oversight, corporate accountability, environmental performance, transparency, public participation, and proportional enforcement. Primary legal materials consist of legislation and implementing regulations, while secondary legal materials comprise scholarly books and journal articles. The analysis is conducted through statutory interpretation, systematic analysis, and conceptual analysis to identify normative gaps, institutional disconnections, and the legal basis for possible reconstructionreconstructing of the existing regulatory framework. Accordingly, references to corporate "non-compliance" in this study are understood as a normative risks or regulatory implementation problems identified fromthrough the

[18]Andri G. Wibisana, "Kegamangan Sistem Perlindungan Dan Pengelolaan Lingkungan:," *Jurnal Hukum & Pembangunan* 55, no. 3 (2025): 433–70, https://doi.org/10.21143/jhp.vol55.no.3.2420.

[19]Lu Sudirman et al., "International Laws and The Reality: The Complexity of Corporate Law in Empowering Human Rights," *Jambura Law Review* 6, no. 1 (January 23, 2024): 1–32, https://doi.org/10.33756/jlr.v6i1.22514.

legal framework and existing documented scholarship, rather than as an empirically measured compliance rate of corporate non-compliance

2. ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

2.1. Evaluation of Government Oversight on Environmental Compliance in the Implementation of CSR

Corporate Social and Environmental Responsibility (TJSL) in Indonesia has evolved from a voluntary corporate initiative into a legally recognized obligation. Article 74 of Law Number 40 of 2007 concerning Limited Liability Companies requires companies conducting business activities in or related to natural resources to implement TJSL, while Government Regulation Number 47 of 2012 establishes provisions concerning its planning, budgeting, implementation, reporting, and accountability. This mandatory character distinguishes the Indonesian CSR framework from conventional voluntary CSR models.[20] Nevertheless, the regulatory framework continues to face challenges concerning legal certainty, implementation, supervision, and enforcement,[21] particularly regarding the clarity of supervisory mechanisms, and applicable sanctions, and the effective implementation of TJSL obligations in natural-resource sectors.

Recent legal scholarship has similarly identified institutional weakness in environmental governance and supervision as a significant obstacle to effective environmental compliance under the post-Job Creation Law framework .[22] Government Regulation Number 22 of 2021 further establishes mechanisms for environmental supervision and administrative enforcement. Accordingly, the existence of a CSR program does not, in itself, demonstrate compliance with environmental law; compliance must be assessed against the specific environmental obligations imposed by law and environmental approvals.[23] Conversely, CSR acquires legal significance in the environmental context when corporate activities or programs are directly connected to legally binding duties for environmental protection and management. This distinction is essential to avoid conflating general corporate social initiatives with legally enforceable environmental obligations within Indonesia's fragmented regulatory framework.

Government supervision is a central mechanism for ensuring compliance with corporate environmental obligations because the environmental regime provides supervisory powers and administrative sanctions for violations. The principal legal issue identified through statutory and systematic analysis is not the absence of supervisory authority, but the absencelack of an explicit institutional and regulatory bridgelinked between TJSL accountability and environmental compliance supervision. TJSL under Government Regulation Number 47 of 2012 is primarily structured around corporate planning, budgeting, implementation, reporting, and accountability, whereas

[20]Laurensia Andrini, "Mandatory Corporate Social Responsibility in Indonesia," *Mimbar Hukum* 28, no. 3 (October 15, 2016): 512, https://doi.org/10.22146/jmh.16669.

[21]Martono Anggusti, Fitri Yanni Dewi Siregar, and Ruetaitip Chansrakaeo, "Corporate Social Responsibility Legal Framework in Southeast Asia: Comparing Indonesia, Malaysia, and Thailand," *SASI*, July 20, 2025, 188–200, https://doi.org/10.47268/sasi.v31i2.2984.

[22]Muhammad Irfan Dhiaulhaq AR and Dodik Setiawan Nur Heriyanto, "Striking A Balance Between Job Creation and Sustainability: The Need to Establish A True Environmental Protection Authority in Indonesia," *Jambe Law Journal* 7, no. 1 (May 31, 2024): 1–23, https://doi.org/10.22437/home.v7i1.317.

[23]Dwiki Putra Perkasa and Putri Mei Lestari Lubis, "Legal Responsibility for Environmental Damage Due to Failure to Implement Corporate Social Responsibility," *Academia Open* 11, no. 1 (May 1, 2026), https://doi.org/10.21070/acopen.11.2026.13902.

Government Regulation Number 22 of 2021 structures environmental supervision around compliance with environmental approvals and other binding environmental requirements.

This separation creates a normative and institutional verification gap: a company may report environmental CSR activities under the corporate regime without the TJSL report being systematically connected to the environmental performance information used in governmental supervision. The problem is particularly significant in natural-resource sectors, where overlapping regulatory mandates and unclear boundaries of authority may weaken legal certainty and produce inconsistent supervisory practices.[24]

The appropriate reconstruction is therefore not to create a new CSR supervisory institution, but to establish an explicit legal and insttutional linkage between TJSL reporting and the existing environmental supervision system.[25]

Transparency and accountability are essential to effective environmental CSR supervision. Government Regulation Number 47 of 2012 requires TJSL activities to be reported in the company's annual report and accounted for to the General Meeting of Shareholders. However, reporting alone does not establish actual environmental compliance or substantive environmental performance.[26] Regulatory disharmony and weak accountability may limit the effectiveness of CSR implementation, while credible and verifiable disclosure is necessary to ensure that reported environmental information corresponds with actual corporate performance.[27] Effective supervision should therefore link corporate reporting with measurable environmental indicators, reliable verification mechanisms, public access to relevant information, and government oversight.

Based on the normative analysis, the principal weakness of Indonesia's environmental CSR governance is regulatory fragmentation rather than regulatory absence. The Company Law and Government Regulation Number 47 of 2012 establish TJSL obligations and corporate accountability, while the environmental regulatory framework establishes environmental standards, supervision, information systems, and sanctions. The critical normative gap is the absence of an explicit rule requiring information generated through TJSL reporting to be connected to environmental compliance assessment. This gap should be treated as the root cause, while weak verification, limited transparency, and weak coordination are consequential institutional problems. Government oversight should therefore be reconstructed around five mutually connected elements: legally defined environmental CSR obligations,[28] institutional coordination, standardized outcome-based reporting, independent verification and public participation, and proportionate enforcement

[24]Iin Ratna Sumirat et al., "Constitutional Framework for Mining Regulation: Regional Autonomy and State Authority," *Volksgeist: Jurnal Ilmu Hukum Dan Konstitusi*, October 3, 2025, 415–29, https://doi.org/10.24090/volksgeist.v8i2.12616.

[25]Basrawi et al., "Efforts To Harmonize Conflicts In The Regulation Of Corporate Social Responsibility (Csr) In The Indonesian Legal System."

[26]Kasmita Andriani and Gunardi Lie, "Regulatory Disharmony of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) between State-Owned and Private Enterprises and Its Implications for Sustainable Development Indicators in Indonesia," *Indonesian Journal of Law and Economics Review* 20, no. 4 (November 25, 2025), https://doi.org/10.21070/ijler.v20i4.1389.

[27]Eko Nuriyatman et al., "Efektifitas Penerapan Tanggung Jawab Sosial Lingkungan," *Riau Law Journal* 9, no. 1 (July 24, 2025): 1–12, https://doi.org/10.30652/rlj.9.1.1-12.

[28]Soonpeel Edgar Chang, "Has Indonesiaâ€™s Unique Progressivism in Mandating Corporate Social Responsibility Achieved Its Ends?," *Sriwijaya Law Review* 2, no. 2 (July 31, 2018): 131–51, https://doi.org/10.28946/slrev.Vol2.Iss2.131.pp131-151.

2.2. Normative and Institutional Factors Contributing to Corporate Environmental Compliance Gaps

From a normative perspective, the principal compliance gap is produced by the separation between the legal obligation to conduct TJSL and the legal mechanisms used to supervise environmental performance. The existing framework contains binding obligations, but the corporate-law regime and environmental-law regimes do not establish a sufficiently explicit mechanism for translatinglinking TJSL plans and reports intoto measurable environmental compliance indicators. The first and most fundamental factor is therefore regulatory fragmentation. The other factors discussed below—limited regulatory integration, inadequate information and verification mechanisms, and institutional capacity constraints— should be understood as consequences of, or reinforcing conditions that reinforce, this fragmentation rather than as independent empirical causes of a measured compliance rate of corporatae non-compliance. This distinction is important because the present study is normative and does not claimsupport to statistically measure corporate complianceor establish causal relationships among these factors.[29]

A second, derivative factor is the limited integration between corporate TJSL governance and environmental compliance mechanisms. Corporate reporting under Government Regulation Number 47 of 2012 is primarily directed to the company's annual report and accountability to the General Meeting of Shareholders, whereas environmental compliance under Government Regulation Number 22 of 2021 is assessed through legally binding environmental requirements and governmental supervision. The two mechanisms therefore operate withthrough different regulatory information purposes, information flows, and institutional pathways. The reconstruction proposed byin this study is to makentegrate relevant environmental CSR information as a supplementary input into the existing environmental supervision system, without treating CSR expenditure or program implementation as evidence of. or a substitute for, compliance with legally binding environmental obligations.[30] This concern is consistent with recent legal scholarship questioning expenditure-oriented CSR and emphasizing the need to assess CSR in light of through its substantive social and developmental objectives rather than merely the amount of corporate expenditure.[31]

A third factor is the quality and legal relevance of environmental information. A description of CSR activities or expenditure does not necessarily demonstrate compliance with environmental obligations. Effective supervision requires information that can be connectedlinked to the applicable environmental approvals, environmental standards, baseline conditions, measurable indicators, implementation results, and environmental outcomes. Accordingly, environmental CSR reporting should be reconstructed from predominantly activity- and expenditure-based disclosure toward outcome-based disclosure capable of supporting environmental supervision and verification.[32] The indicators should be derived from the legal obligations and environmental risks

[29]Eko Nuriyatman et al., "Strategi Implementasi Tanggung Jawab Sosial Lingkungan Dalam Perusahaan: Dampak Dan Tantangan."

[30]Guoyou Qi, Hailiang Zou, and Xuemei Xie, "Governmental Inspection and Green Innovation: Examining the Role of Environmental Capability and Institutional Development," *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management* 27, no. 4 (July 25, 2020): 1774–85, https://doi.org/10.1002/csr.1924.

[31]Lego Karjoko et al., "Corporate Social Responsibility Shouldn't Do Infrastructure? Spending and Overcoming Poverty with Graduation Model Theory," *Jurnal IUS Kajian Hukum Dan Keadilan* 13, no. 1 (April 30, 2025): 275–89, https://doi.org/10.29303/ius.v13i1.1580.

[32]Qi, Zou, and Xie, "Governmental Inspection and Green Innovation: Examining the Role of Environmental Capability and Institutional Development."

applicable to each business activity,, so that the information can be verified and used by the competent supervisory authority.[33] so that the information can be verified and used by the competent supervisory authority.

A fourth reinforcing factor is the weakness of verification and external accountability. Corporate self-reporting can provide important information, but it cannot by itself establish the legal and technical reliability of reported environmental outcomes, particularly where corporate activities programs involve significant environmental risks or affect substantial public interests. Independent or third-party verification, ehere appropriate, should verification should therefore operate function as an evidentiary support mechanism for governmental supervision rather than, not as a transfer of public supervisory authority to private actors. This requirementSuch verification may strengthens the credibility of environmental CSR information and reduces the risk that formal corporate reporting will beis treated as conclusive evidence of substantive environmental compliance or performance.[34]

The factors identified above should be understood form as a hierarchy rather than as four equalequivalent causes. Regulatory fragmentation isconstitutes the root normative problem because it separates the TJSL obligation, corporate reporting mechanism, and environmental supervision system. Limited integration, inadequate environmental information and verification, and institutional capacity constraints are reinforcing conditions consequences that maketranslate this regulatory the fragmentation into practical weaknesses in supervision and enforcementoperationally significant.[35] The reconstruction should therefore address the root problem first by establishing an explicit regulatory bridge between Government Regulation Number 47 of 2012 and Government Regulation Number 22 of 2021, followed by standardized indicators, reporting, verification, public participation, and enforcement mechanisms. This sequence provides a clearer causal and normative logic for the proposed governance model.

2.3. Reconstruction of Government Oversight for Environmental CSR

The reconstruction of government oversight of Corporate Social and Environmental Responsibility (TJSL) should be directed toward overcoming the regulatory fragmentation between corporate responsibility and environmental compliance. Indonesian law has established TJSL as a legal obligation through Article 74 of Law Number 40 of 2007 concerning Limited Liability Companies and Government Regulation Number 47 of 2012. At the same time, environmental compliance is regulated through Law Number 32 of 2009 concerning Environmental Protection and Management and Government Regulation Number 22 of 2021. The problem is therefore not the absence of legal instruments, but the absence of a sufficiently integrated regulatory mechanism linking TJSL implementation and reporting with measurable environmental compliance and governmental supervision.

Karjoko, Santosa, and Handayani identify dysfunction in the Indonesian TJSL regulatory framework, particularly regarding differences in the formulation of obligated

[33]Bima Adi Putra et al., "Corporate Environmental Compliance and Sustainability in Palm Oil Plantation Activities," *Jurnal Bisnis Kehutanan Dan Lingkungan* 3, no. 1 (July 31, 2025): 1–17, https://doi.org/10.61511/jbkl.v3i1.2025.1818.

[34]Qi, Zou, and Xie, "Governmental Inspection and Green Innovation: Examining the Role of Environmental Capability and Institutional Development."

[35]Dietrich Earnhart and Lana Friesen, "The Effect of Professional Social Norms on Corporate Environmental Compliance," *Resource and Energy Economics* 79–80 (December 2024): 101460, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.reseneeco.2024.101460.

subjects, funding, allocation, programs, and implementation mechanisms.[36] This finding is reinforced by Sunaryo et al., who demonstrate that the legal relationship between CSR and broader environmental regulation remains fragmented and requires greater regulatory harmonization to strengthen the substantive environmental dimension of corporate responsibility.[37]

The reconstruction should begin with normative integration. Article 74 of Law Number 40 of 2007 requires companies operating in or related to natural resources to implement TJSL, while Article 15(b) of Law Number 25 of 2007 requires investors to undertake corporate social responsibility and Article 16(d) requires them to maintain environmental sustainability. These provisions establish a normative connection between corporate responsibility and environmental protection while preserving their distinct legal bases and consequences. Accordingly, failure to implement TJSL does not automatically constitute an environmental violation, and a CSR program cannot substitute for compliance with binding environmental obligations. The fragmented regulation of these obligations, however, may weaken legal certainty, regulatory coordination, and effective implementation.

The reconstruction should not create another independent CSR regulatory regime. Instead, it should connectintegrate the existing TJSL and environmental compliance regimes with the environmental compliance regime through explicit statutory and regulatory cross-references, coordinated reporting requirements, and implementing standards that allow relevant TJSL information to support environmental supervision without altering the distinct legal character of environmental compliance obligations.[38] More concretely, this study proposes strengthening Government Regulation Number 47 of 2012 in three pointsrespects. First, the provision governing on the annual TJSL work plan should require identification of the environmental risks, applicable environmental obligations, objectives, and measurable performance indicators relevant to the proposed program. Second, the reporting provision should be supplemented to require so that the annual report containsto include baseline conditions, applicable indicators, implementation results, environmental outcomes, identified deviations, corrective measures, and other information relevant necessary forto environmental supervision. Third, the sanctions provision should expressly distinguish between failure to fulfillsatisfy TJSL obligations, from violations of binding environmental obligations, with the latter remaining subject to the administrative enforcement regime under Government Regulation Number 22 of 2021. The proposed amendment would therefore create a regulatory legal bridge between TJSL accountability rather than duplicate the existingand environmental supervisory regimesupervision rather than duplicate the existing environmental enforcement regime.

The second element is the transformation from input-based supervision to outcome-based supervision. Under the current framework, corporate TJSL accountability is substantially associated with planning, budgeting, implementation, reporting, and corporate accountability. These mechanisms remain necessary, but they do not by themselves establish whether an environmental CSR program has generatedproduced a

[36]Lego Karjoko, Josephine Santosa, and I Gusti Ayu Ketut Rachmi Handayan, "Disfungsi Peraturan Perundang-Undangan Tanggung Jawab Sosial Dan Lingkungan Di Indonesia," *Jurnal Hukum IUS QUIA IUSTUM* 26, no. 2 (August 22, 2019): 305–25, https://doi.org/10.20885/IUSTUM.VOL26.ISS2.ART5.

[37]Sunaryo et al., "Regulatory Frameworks to Integrate Corporate Social Responsibility with Circular Economy Principles."

[38]Ashar Maulana Religia, "Permasalahan Hukum Tanggung Jawab Sosial Perusahaan (Corporate Social Responsibility) Di Indonesia," *University of Bengkulu Law Journal* 4, no. 2 (2019): 183–97, https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.33369/ubelaj.4.2.188-201.

legally and environmentally measurable results or contributed to compliance with relevant environmental obligations.[39] A company may report expenditure on tree planting, waste management, community environmental programs, or ecosystem rehabilitation while the environmental condition of the affected area remains unchanged. Consequently, the central question of supervision should shift from "How much has the company spent?" to "What legally and environmentally measurable result has been achieved?".

Environmental accountability also requires the development of ecological awareness among affected communities, because meaningful participation depends not only on formal access to information but also on the capacity of communities to identify, understand, recognize and articulate environmental concerns.[40] The government should establish sector-specific Environmental CSR Performance Indicators (ECSR-PIs) through an implementing instrument expressly authorized byunder the reconstructed TJSL framework. The indicators should not constitute a parallel environmental licensing system; rather, they should translate relevant existing environmental obligations and performance expectations into measurable information for TJSL reporting, supervision, and CSR accountability. For mining, indicators may cover reclamation, post-mining rehabilitation, pollution control, water quality, land restoration, and biodiversity protection; for plantations, fire prevention, peatland protection, water management, biodiversity conservation, and ecosystem restoration; and for manufacturing, waste reduction, emission control, wastewater treatment, resource efficiency, and circular production. Each indicator should be traceable to the applicable environmental approval, environmental quality standard, technical requirement, or other binding environmental instrument. This legal traceability is essential to ensure that ECSR-PIs function are enforceable as legally relevant accountability and verification benchmarks standards without creating a parallel transforming CSR into a substitute forset of environmental complianceobligations or transforming CSR nto a substitute for environmental compliance.

The third element is institutional integration without creating a new supervisory body. Government Regulation Number 22 of 2021 already provides the environmental supervision and administrative enforcement architecture. The reconstruction should therefore assign a coordination function to the existing competent environmental authority: TJSL environmental information submitted by corporations should be made available through the existing environmental information and supervision system, and relevant findings should be capable of triggering verification or targeted supervision.[41] The corporate organs remain responsible for TJSL governance, while the environmental authority remains responsible for determining compliance with binding environmental obligations. This division preserves institutional competence while closing the information gap between corporate reporting and environmental supervision.

The fourth element is standardized environmental CSR reporting. Government Regulation Number 47 of 2012 currently requires TJSL implementation to be included in the company's annual report and accounted for to the General Meeting

[39]Hussain Muhammad and Mohamed Aman, "How Environmental Regulations Influence ESG Controversies: The Role of Climate Governance and Environmental Decoupling," *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management* 33, no. 1 (January 19, 2026): 1320–38, https://doi.org/10.1002/csr.70235.

[40]Liza Diniarizky Putri et al., "Developing Ecological Piety in Pesantren: The Kyai's Cognition and the Practice of Living Fiqh Al-Bī'ah in Banten," *Ijtihad : Jurnal Wacana Hukum Islam Dan Kemanusiaan* 23, no. 2 (January 2, 2024): 235–59, https://doi.org/10.18326/ijtihad.v23i2.235-259.

[41]Natalia Ortiz-de-Mandojana, Javier Aguilera-Caracuel, and Matilde Morales-Raya, "Corporate Governance and Environmental Sustainability: The Moderating Role of the National Institutional Context," *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management* 23, no. 3 (May 31, 2016): 150–64, https://doi.org/10.1002/csr.1367.

of Shareholders. The reconstruction proposed here is to supplement that reporting requirement through an implementing standard that requires disclosure of: (1) the environmental issue addressed; (2) the applicable legal and environmental obligations; (3) baseline conditions; (4) program objectives; (5) measurable indicators; (6) budget and implementation; (7) verified environmental outcomes; (8) deviations; and (9) corrective measures. The information relevant to environmental compliance should then be accessible to the competent environmental authority and, subject to applicable confidentiality rules, to affected communities. This would convert reporting from a primarily corporate accountability document into a verifiable governance instrument.

The fifth element is independent verification. Corporate self-reporting should not be the sole basis for assessing environmental CSR performance, particularly for programs involving significant environmental risks or public interests. Verification may be conducted by accredited environmental auditors, qualified experts, or other authorized independent bodies, depending on the nature, scale, and environmental risk of the program.[42] Its purpose is to provide reliable technical and evidentiary support for governmental supervision without transferring public authority to private actors. Verification should therefore focus on measurable environmental outcomes, rather than merely confirming the completeness of corporate documentation.

The sixth element is public participation and access to environmental information. Because environmental CSR affects communities surrounding corporate activities, particularly in natural-resource sectors, affected communities should have access to information on the objectives, implementation, and environmental outcomes of CSR programs. Their participation can also provide valuable information for government supervision, especially where monitoring capacity is limited. This participatory dimension is particularly important in environmental governance because the effectiveness of state regulation may depend on its interaction with integration with local institutions ,and community-based knowledge, and locally observed environmental conditions.[43] Therefore, community involvement should be treated as a substantive element of environmental CSR governance rather than merely an administrative formality, particularly because weak participation may reduce accountability and contribute to environmental and social conflicts.[44]

Public participation should be supported by clear legal procedures that allow communities to submit information, complaints, objections, or requests for verification. Government authorities should assess and respond to such submissions according to established procedures, so that credible complaints concerning environmental CSR may trigger further verification or targeted governmental supervision. This complaint-to-supervision mechanism would give public participation a concrete legal effect beyond mere consultation. The seventh element is coordination between environmental supervision and corporate governance. An integrated environmental governance approach also requires institutional coordination and meaningful community

[42]Amelia Setiawan and Haryanto Haryanto, "Corporate Governance Mechanisms, Risk Oversight and Corporate Social Responsibility: Evidence from Cyclical and Non-Cyclical Industries," *Cogent Business & Management* 13, no. 1 (December 31, 2026), https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2026.2673639.

[43]Deni Yusup Permana et al., "Integrating Indigenous Wisdom in Environmental Protection: Exploring Village Authority within the Framework of State Responsibility in Indonesia," *Jambura Law Review* 7, no. 2 (May 22, 2025): 359–89, https://doi.org/10.33756/jlr.v7i2.29582.

[44]Dini Kusuma Ningrum and Dipo Wahyoeno Hariyono, "SANKSI HUKUM SEBAGAI INSTRUMEN PENEGAKAN TANGGUNG JAWAB SOSIAL DAN LINGKUNGAN PERUSAHAAN DI INDONESIA," *COURT REVIEW: Jurnal Penelitian Hukum (e-ISSN: 2776-1916)* 5, no. 06 (October 28, 2025): 372–84, https://doi.org/10.69957/cr.v5i06.2477.

participation, particularly where environmental management involves localized risks and impacts.[45]

Environmental CSR reports should not remain solely within the corporate governance system; where they relate to binding environmental obligations, relevant and verifiable information should also be made available to the competent environmental authorities. Conversely, environmental supervisory findings should inform the Board of Directors, Board of Commissioners, and General Meeting of Shareholders.[46] This would create a two-way accountability mechanism in which governance bodies receive verified environmental compliance, information capable of supporting supervision and verification.

The eighth element is a differentiated enforcement mechanism. Legal consequences should correspond to the legal nature of the violation. Failure to fulfill the TJSL obligation under the corporate regime should be addressed under the applicable corporate and TJSL provisions, including the sanction framework referred to in Article 7 of Government Regulation Number 47 of 2012. By contrast, a breach of a binding environmental obligation, including an obligation attached to an environmental approval,[47] should remain subject to the administrative enforcement regime under Government Regulation Number 22 of 2021 and, where the statutory elements are satisfied, civil or criminal liability under environmental law. This distinction is necessary to preserve legality and prevent the proposed environmental CSR framework from creating an unauthorized new category of environmental offences.

Sanctions should therefore follow a graduated enforcement model within the competence already provided by the applicable legislation. Remediable deficiencies in TJSL reporting or implementation should first trigger corrective measures and orders to complete or rectify the obligation where legally available. Persistent or material breaches of binding environmental requirements should be addressed through the administrative sanctions provided by environmental law. Serious, repeated, or deliberate conduct may attract stronger enforcement where the statutory elements are satisfied. The proposed framework consequently does not invent a new sanctioning regime; it clarifies the legal pathway by separating TJSL accountability from environmental-law enforcement and connecting the two through verified information.

The ninth element is integrating environmental CSR with sustainable development and circular-economy objectives. CSR should not be limited to distributing benefits to surrounding communities but should also reduce environmental impacts and strengthen the resilience of affected communities and ecosystems. For natural-resource and environmentally intensive industries, CSR should therefore support pollution prevention, resource efficiency, ecosystem restoration, and sustainable production.[48] This orientation is consistent with the regulatory development of circular-economy principles, which requires environmental responsibility to be translated into concrete

[45]Annisa Weningtyas and Endang Widuri, "Pengelolaan Sumber Daya Air Berbasis Kearifan Lokal Sebagai Modal Untuk Pembangunan Berkelanjutan," *Volksgeist: Jurnal Ilmu Hukum Dan Konstitusi* 5, no. 1 (June 30, 2022): 129–44, https://doi.org/10.24090/volksgeist.v5i1.6074.

[46]Luluk Muhimatul Ifada, Hendar Hendar, and Norman Mohd Saleh, "Board Governance Model, Institutions, Financial Performance, and Environmental Performance: Stakeholder Supremacy or Coordination Problems?," *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management* 31, no. 5 (September 20, 2024): 3869–83, https://doi.org/10.1002/csr.2772.

[47]Perkasa and Lubis, "Legal Responsibility for Environmental Damage Due to Failure to Implement Corporate Social Responsibility."

[48]Sunaryo et al., "Regulatory Frameworks to Integrate Corporate Social Responsibility with Circular Economy Principles."

and sustainable regulatory mechanisms rather than remaining at the level of general policy objectives.[49]

The reconstruction therefore requires a shift in the legal paradigm from "CSR as corporate expenditure" to "CSR as measurable environmental accountability." Under the existing model, the company is primarily required to plan, budget, implement, and report its TJSL activities. Under the reconstructed model, the company must additionally demonstrate the environmental objective, measurable outcome, verification, and compliance implications of its environmental CSR activities. This transformation is consistent with the broader development of mandatory CSR in Indonesia, which has moved CSR from an ethical or voluntary concept toward a legally enforceable corporate responsibility.

2.4. Strengthening Environmental CSR Accountability through Sustainable Corporate Governance

Environmental CSR should be integrated into corporate governance rather than treated merely as a philanthropic corporate program. The governance reconstruction should operate at two levels: internal corporate accountability and external public supervision. This approach is consistent with the emerging sustainable corporate governance paradigm, which links corporate accountability, sustainability disclosure, stakeholder protection, and environmental responsibility within a unified governance framework.[50] Internally, the Board of Directors, Board of Commissioners, and General Meeting of Shareholders should receive verified information concerning environmental CSR objectives, expenditure, risks, indicators, outcomes, and corrective actions. Externally, information relevant to environmental compliance should be capable of being used by the competent environmental authority under the existing supervisory framework.[51] This dual structure prevents CSR from being isolated within a CSR unit and places environmental responsibility within corporate risk management and legally accountable decision-making.

The regulatory reconstruction proposed in this study is therefore directed primarily at the interface between Government Regulation Number 47 of 2012 and Government Regulation Number 22 of 2021. Government Regulation Number 47 of 2012 should be strengthened so that TJSL planning and reporting contain environmental objectives, measurable indicators, outcome information, and verification requirements. Government Regulation Number 22 of 2021 should function as the environmental compliance and enforcement framework against which relevant environmental outcomes are assessed. The objective is not to merge the two regimes into one legal instrument, but to establish a clear normative bridge: TJSL generates accountable corporate information, while environmental law determines whether the underlying environmental obligations have been fulfilled.

Accordingly, environmental CSR should be assessed not merely by the existence or amount of corporate expenditure, but by its contribution to legally identifiable environmental objectives and measurable outcomes. This requires clear identification of the responsible corporate organs, beneficiaries and affected communities, applicable

[49] Fenty Puluhulawa and Amanda Adelina Harun, "Enabling Circular Economy: Towards Sustainable Electronic Waste Management Regulation," *Jambura Law Review* 6, no. 1 (January 29, 2024): 33–65, https://doi.org/10.33756/jlr.v6i1.24024.

[50] Ilham Abbas et al., "Rethinking Indonesian Single-Member Companies: Lessons from the European Union for Sustainable Business Governance," *Jambe Law Journal* 9, no. 1 (July 25, 2026): 435–73, https://doi.org/10.22437/w3f9r267.

[51] Waagstein, "The Mandatory Corporate Social Responsibility in Indonesia: Problems and Implications."

environmental obligations, performance indicators, and verification methods. The first governance reconstruction is therefore to incorporate environmental CSR into corporate environmental risk management and decision-making while maintaining the distinction between corporate TJSL accountability and the state's authority to determine environmental compliance.

Consequently, environmental CSR should be incorporated into corporate decision-making concerning environmental risks, compliance, sustainability, and stakeholder protection rather than delegated exclusively to a CSR unit. For companies operating in natural-resource sectors, the environmental consequences of principal business activities cannot be separated from corporate responsibility. Corporate governance should therefore ensure that TJSL plans are linked to environmental risk identification, applicable environmental obligations, measurable objectives, implementation, verification, and corrective action. This internal governance mechanism complements, but does not replace, government supervision.

Sector-specific environmental CSR indicators should be aligned with the environmental risks and legal obligations of each business activity, including pollution control, waste management, ecosystem restoration, biodiversity protection, resource efficiency, and emission reduction. These indicators should be adopted through a legally authorized implementing standard and should remain traceable to existing environmental approvals and binding environmental requirements.[52] This approach shifts CSR assessment from activity-based accountability to outcome-based environmental accountability while avoiding the creation of a parallel environmental licensing or standard-setting regime. A comparable normative reconstruction approach demonstrates that sustainability oriented legal reform requires the integration of economic, social, and ecological interests rather than treating environmental protection as an external limitation on corporate activity.[53]

Under this model, environmental CSR information reported by corporations should serve as supplementary and verifiable information for the competent environmental authority, while compliance must continue to be assessed against binding environmental standards and requirements. The institutional mechanism should therefore establish a clear information flow from corporate TJSL reporting to environmental supervision, and from supervisory findings back to corporate governance for corrective action. This integration reduces institutional duplication while creating a legally traceable accountability chain between corporate responsibility, governmental supervision, and environmental outcomes.

The need for standardized reporting and verification is not merely a corporate governance preference; it follows from the normative gap identified in this study. If TJSL reporting remains limited to activities and expenditure, the state lacks a sufficiently structured basis for connecting corporate responsibility with measurable environmental outcomes. The proposed reporting model therefore requires environmental objectives, baseline conditions, indicators, results, verification, deviations, and corrective measures. These requirements should be incorporated through the reconstruction of the implementing framework for Government Regulation Number 47 of 2012 and linked,

[52]Andriani and Lie, "Regulatory Disharmony of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) between State-Owned and Private Enterprises and Its Implications for Sustainable Development Indicators in Indonesia."

[53]Nina Nurani, Apriwandi Apriwandi, and Hafied Noor Bagja, "Intellectual Property Rights Law Reform Based on Maqāṣid Al-Sharīʿah as a Model for Green Business-Based Creative Industry Protection to Support Sustainable Development," *De Jure: Jurnal Hukum Dan Syar'iah* 18, no. 1 (February 27, 2026): 1–32, https://doi.org/10.18860/j-fsh.v18i1.40840.

where relevant, to the supervision and information mechanisms established under Government Regulation Number 22 of 2021.

3. CONCLUSION

Government oversight of corporate environmental social responsibility is presently limited by a structural regulatory gap rather than by the absence of legal obligations or supervisory authority. The normative analysis identifies regulatory fragmentation between the TJSL framework under Government Regulation Number 47 of 2012 and the environmental compliance and supervision framework under Government Regulation Number 22 of 2021 as the root problem. Limited institutional integration, inadequate environmental information and verification, and weak public accountability reinforce this gap. The study therefore proposes an Integrated Environmental CSR Accountability Framework that connects TJSL planning and reporting with measurable environmental performance, independent verification, public participation, corporate governance, and proportionate enforcement. The proposed reconstruction does not create a new supervisory institution or a new environmental offence. Instead, it strengthens Government Regulation Number 47 of 2012, particularly its provisions on planning, reporting, and sanctions, and establishes explicit cross-references to the existing environmental supervision and enforcement mechanisms under Government Regulation Number 22 of 2021.

The ideal oversight model is therefore outcome-based, institutionally coordinated, and legally traceable. Corporate TJSL plans should identify applicable environmental obligations and measurable indicators; annual reports should disclose implementation and environmental outcomes; significant environmental claims should be independently verifiable; relevant information should be available to competent environmental authorities and affected communities; and verified violations should follow the appropriate corporate or environmental enforcement pathway. This reconstruction provides a clearer division of legal competence: corporate law governs TJSL accountability, while environmental law determines substantive environmental compliance. By establishing an explicit regulatory bridge between the two regimes, government supervision can move from formal monitoring of CSR expenditure toward verifiable environmental accountability and substantive environmental governance.

REFERENCES

Abbas, Ilham, Rizki Ramadani, Aan Aswari, and Ma'adul Yaqien Makkarateng. "Rethinking Indonesian Single-Member Companies: Lessons from the European Union for Sustainable Business Governance." *Jambe Law Journal* 9, no. 1 (July 25, 2026): 435–73. https://doi.org/10.22437/w3f9r267.

Ali, Mahrus. "Overcoming the Dilemma between the Clarity and Flexible Norms in Environmental Offenses." *De Jure: Jurnal Hukum Dan Syar'iah* 14, no. 2 (2022): 276–87. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.18860/j-fsh.v14i2.18279.

Andriani, Kasmita, and Gunardi Lie. "Regulatory Disharmony of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) between State-Owned and Private Enterprises and Its Implications for Sustainable Development Indicators in Indonesia." *Indonesian Journal of Law and Economics Review* 20, no. 4 (November 25, 2025). https://doi.org/10.21070/ijler.v20i4.1389.

Anggusti, Martono, Fitri Yanni Dewi Siregar, and Ruetaitip Chansrakaeo. “Corporate Social Responsibility Legal Framework in Southeast Asia: Comparing Indonesia, Malaysia, and Thailand.” *SASI*, July 20, 2025, 188–200. https://doi.org/10.47268/sasi.v31i2.2984.

Ashar Maulana Religia. “Permasalahan Hukum Tanggung Jawab Sosial Perusahaan (Corporate Social Responsibility) Di Indonesia.” *University of Bengkulu Law Journal* 4, no. 2 (2019): 183–97. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.33369/ubelaj.4.2.188-201.

Basrawi, Basrawi, Laode Awal Sakti, Jusafri Jusafri, Putri Aulia, and Satmawati Satmawati. “Efforts To Harmonize Conflicts In The Regulation Of Corporate Social Responsibility (Csr) In The Indonesian Legal System.” *Pandecta Research Law Journal* 20, no. 2 (December 15, 2025): 643–68. https://doi.org/10.15294/pandecta.v20i2.18702.

Chang, Soonpeel Edgar. “Has Indonesiaâ€™s Unique Progressivism in Mandating Corporate Social Responsibility Achieved Its Ends?” *Sriwijaya Law Review* 2, no. 2 (July 31, 2018): 131–51. https://doi.org/10.28946/slrev.Vol2.Iss2.131.pp131-151.

Dyah Mustika Prasetyaningsih, Eko Hendarto, Nurul Anwar, and Khalid Eltayeb Elfaki. “Effectiveness of Environmental Law Implementation: Compliance and Enforcement.” *Volksgeist: Jurnal Ilmu Hukum Dan Konstitusi*, December 19, 2022, 215–25. https://doi.org/10.24090/volksgeist.v5i2.6826.

Earnhart, Dietrich, and Lana Friesen. “The Effect of Professional Social Norms on Corporate Environmental Compliance.” *Resource and Energy Economics* 79–80 (December 2024): 101460. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.reseneeco.2024.101460.

Eko Nuriyatman, Fitria, Lili Naili Hidayah, and Mutia Dwi Arita Deli. “Efektifitas Penerapan Tanggung Jawab Sosial Lingkungan.” *Riau Law Journal* 9, no. 1 (July 24, 2025): 1–12. https://doi.org/10.30652/rlj.9.1.1-12.

Eko Nuriyatman, Fitria, Lili Naili Hidayah, Siti Fatimah, and Agus Irawan. “Strategi Implementasi Tanggung Jawab Sosial Lingkungan Dalam Perusahaan: Dampak Dan Tantangan.” *LITIGASI* 25, no. 2 (October 31, 2024): 269–89. https://doi.org/10.23969/LITIGASI.V25I2.18877.

Eko Nuriyatman, Fitria, Pahlefi, Melia Rizki Ruswandi, and Seguito Monteiro. “Shifting Regulatory Paradigms in the Political Development of National Environmental Law.” *Indonesian Journal of Environmental Law and Sustainable Development* 5, no. 1 (June 30, 2026): 133–66. https://doi.org/10.15294/ijel.v5i1.34498.

Humaidi, M. Wildan, Hariyanto Hariyanto, and Mabarroh Azizah. “Green Philanthropy: Islamic Activism on Indonesia’s Environmental Democracy.” *Ijtihad : Jurnal Wacana Hukum Islam Dan Kemanusiaan* 24, no. 2 (December 28, 2024): 167–91. https://doi.org/10.18326/ijtihad.v24i2.167-191.

Ifada, Luluk Muhimatul, Hendar Hendar, and Norman Mohd Saleh. “Board Governance Model, Institutions, Financial Performance, and Environmental Performance: Stakeholder Supremacy or Coordination Problems?” *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management* 31, no. 5 (September 20, 2024):

3869–83. https://doi.org/10.1002/csr.2772.

Jendrośka, Jerzy. "The Substantive Right to Environment and the Procedural Environmental Rights under the Aarhus Convention – Part II." *The Opole Studies in Administration and Law* 22, no. 2 (November 7, 2024): 43–83. https://doi.org/10.25167/osap.5633.

Karjoko, Lego, Ayu Ketut Rachmi Handayani I Gusti, Jadmiko Anom Husodo, and Dararida Fandra Mahira. "Corporate Social Responsibility Shouldn't Do Infrastructure? Spending and Overcoming Poverty with Graduation Model Theory." *Jurnal IUS Kajian Hukum Dan Keadilan* 13, no. 1 (April 30, 2025): 275–89. https://doi.org/10.29303/ius.v13i1.1580.

Laurensia Andrini. "Mandatory Corporate Social Responsibility in Indonesia." *Mimbar Hukum* 28, no. 3 (October 15, 2016): 512. https://doi.org/10.22146/jmh.16669.

Lego Karjoko, Josephine Santosa, and I Gusti Ayu Ketut Rachmi Handayan. "Disfungsi Peraturan Perundang-Undangan Tanggung Jawab Sosial Dan Lingkungan Di Indonesia." *Jurnal Hukum IUS QUIA IUSTUM* 26, no. 2 (August 22, 2019): 305–25. https://doi.org/10.20885/IUSTUM.VOL26.ISS2.ART5.

Lelisari, Lelisari, Hamdi Hamdi, and Imawanto Imawanto. "Kemunduran Pengaturan Tanggung Jawab Sosial Perusahaan Dalam Sektor Pertambangan Mineral Dan Batubara." *Jurnal IUS Kajian Hukum Dan Keadilan* 9, no. 2 (August 17, 2021): 404–21. https://doi.org/10.29303/ius.v9i2.907.

Michelon, Giovanna, Silvia Pilonato, and Federica Ricceri. "CSR Reporting Practices and the Quality of Disclosure: An Empirical Analysis." *Critical Perspectives on Accounting* 33 (December 2015): 59–78. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpa.2014.10.003.

Muhammad, Hussain, and Mohamed Aman. "How Environmental Regulations Influence ESG Controversies: The Role of Climate Governance and Environmental Decoupling." *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management* 33, no. 1 (January 19, 2026): 1320–38. https://doi.org/10.1002/csr.70235.

Muhammad Irfan Dhiaulhaq AR, and Dodik Setiawan Nur Heriyanto. "Striking A Balance Between Job Creation and Sustainability: The Need to Establish A True Environmental Protection Authority in Indonesia." *Jambe Law Journal* 7, no. 1 (May 31, 2024): 1–23. https://doi.org/10.22437/home.v7i1.317.

Ningrum, Dini Kusuma, and Dipo Wahyoeno Hariyono. "SANKSI HUKUM SEBAGAI INSTRUMEN PENEGAKAN TANGGUNG JAWAB SOSIAL DAN LINGKUNGAN PERUSAHAAN DI INDONESIA." *COURT REVIEW: Jurnal Penelitian Hukum (e-ISSN: 2776-1916)* 5, no. 06 (October 28, 2025): 372–84. https://doi.org/10.69957/cr.v5i06.2477.

Nurani, Nina, Apriwandi Apriwandi, and Hafied Noor Bagja. "Intellectual Property Rights Law Reform Based on Maqāṣid Al-Sharī'ah as a Model for Green Business-Based Creative Industry Protection to Support Sustainable Development." *De Jure: Jurnal Hukum Dan Syar'iah* 18, no. 1 (February 27, 2026): 1–32. https://doi.org/10.18860/j-fsh.v18i1.40840.

Ortiz-de-Mandojana, Natalia, Javier Aguilera-Caracuel, and Matilde Morales-Raya. "Corporate Governance and Environmental Sustainability: The Moderating Role of the National Institutional Context." *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management* 23, no. 3 (May 31, 2016): 150–64. https://doi.org/10.1002/csr.1367.

Perkasa, Dwiki Putra, and Putri Mei Lestari Lubis. "Legal Responsibility for Environmental Damage Due to Failure to Implement Corporate Social Responsibility." *Academia Open* 11, no. 1 (May 1, 2026). https://doi.org/10.21070/acopen.11.2026.13902.

Permana, Deni Yusup, Imamulhadi Imamulhadi, Idris Idris, and Montisa Mariana. "Integrating Indigenous Wisdom in Environmental Protection: Exploring Village Authority within the Framework of State Responsibility in Indonesia." *Jambura Law Review* 7, no. 2 (May 22, 2025): 359–89. https://doi.org/10.33756/jlr.v7i2.29582.

Puluhulawa, Fenty, and Amanda Adelina Harun. "Enabling Circular Economy: Towards Sustainable Electronic Waste Management Regulation." *Jambura Law Review* 6, no. 1 (January 29, 2024): 33–65. https://doi.org/10.33756/jlr.v6i1.24024.

Putra, Bima Adi, Marlon I. Aipassa, Yosep Ruslim, and Martha E. Siahaya. "Corporate Environmental Compliance and Sustainability in Palm Oil Plantation Activities." *Jurnal Bisnis Kehutanan Dan Lingkungan* 3, no. 1 (July 31, 2025): 1–17. https://doi.org/10.61511/jbkl.v3i1.2025.1818.

Putri, Liza Diniarizky, Catur Nugroho, Abdul Malik, and M Nastain. "Developing Ecological Piety in Pesantren: The Kyai's Cognition and the Practice of Living Fiqh Al-Bī'ah in Banten." *Ijtihad : Jurnal Wacana Hukum Islam Dan Kemanusiaan* 23, no. 2 (January 2, 2024): 235–59. https://doi.org/10.18326/ijtihad.v23i2.235-259.

Qi, Guoyou, Hailiang Zou, and Xuemei Xie. "Governmental Inspection and Green Innovation: Examining the Role of Environmental Capability and Institutional Development." *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management* 27, no. 4 (July 25, 2020): 1774–85. https://doi.org/10.1002/csr.1924.

Setiawan, Amelia, and Haryanto Haryanto. "Corporate Governance Mechanisms, Risk Oversight and Corporate Social Responsibility: Evidence from Cyclical and Non-Cyclical Industries." *Cogent Business & Management* 13, no. 1 (December 31, 2026). https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2026.2673639.

Shandy Utama, Andrew, and Rizana Rizana. "PELAKSANAAN CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY DALAM RANGKA OPTIMALISASI PELESTARIAN LINGKUNGAN." *LITIGASI* 19, no. 2 (January 1, 2020). https://doi.org/10.23969/litigasi.v19i2.843.

Siregar, Lelisari, and Rahdian Ihsan. "THE IMPLEMENTATION OF CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY (CSR) IN PRIVATELY OWNED COMPANIES." *Jurnal IUS Kajian Hukum Dan Keadilan* 1, no. 2 (2013). https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.12345/ius.v1i2.234.

Sudirman, Lu, David Tan, Winsherly Tan, and Ampuan Situmeang. "International Laws and The Reality: The Complexity of Corporate Law in Empowering Human

Rights." *Jambura Law Review* 6, no. 1 (January 23, 2024): 1–32. https://doi.org/10.33756/jlr.v6i1.22514.

Sumirat, Iin Ratna, Arif Rahman, Dhika Tabrozi, and Wazin Wazin. "Constitutional Framework for Mining Regulation: Regional Autonomy and State Authority." *Volksgeist: Jurnal Ilmu Hukum Dan Konstitusi*, October 3, 2025, 415–29. https://doi.org/10.24090/volksgeist.v8i2.12616.

Sunaryo, Sunaryo, Kasmawati Kasmawati, Hong Nhung Pham, and Astri Rahayu. "Regulatory Frameworks to Integrate Corporate Social Responsibility with Circular Economy Principles." *Hasanuddin Law Review*, July 24, 2025, 236–53. https://doi.org/10.20956/halrev.v11i2.6135.

Vanessha Dasenta Demokracia. "KONSISTENSI PENGATURAN TANGGUNG JAWAB SOSIAL DAN LINGKUNGAN PERUSAHAAN DALAM PERATURAN PERUNDANG-UNDANGAN DI INDONESIA." *Justitia et Pax* 39, no. 1 (April 16, 2024): 193–232. https://doi.org/10.24002/jep.v39i1.7031.

Waagstein, Patricia Rinwigati. "The Mandatory Corporate Social Responsibility in Indonesia: Problems and Implications." *Journal of Business Ethics* 98, no. 3 (February 14, 2011): 455–66. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-010-0587-x.

Weningtyas, Annisa, and Endang Widuri. "Pengelolaan Sumber Daya Air Berbasis Kearifan Lokal Sebagai Modal Untuk Pembangunan Berkelanjutan." *Volksgeist: Jurnal Ilmu Hukum Dan Konstitusi* 5, no. 1 (June 30, 2022): 129–44. https://doi.org/10.24090/volksgeist.v5i1.6074.

Wibisana, Andri G. "Kegamangan Sistem Perlindungan Dan Pengelolaan Lingkungan:" *Jurnal Hukum & Pembangunan* 55, no. 3 (2025): 433–70. https://doi.org/10.21143/jhp.vol55.no.3.2420.

Widyawati, Anis, Zico Junius Fernando, Ridwan Arifin, and Ali Masyhar Mursyid. "Legal Challenges in Criminal Execution of The Environmental Crime Cases in Indonesia: Efforts Toward Criminal Law Reform." *Jambe Law Journal* 9, no. 1 (April 19, 2026): 53–88. https://doi.org/10.22437/k1djt237.