

The Supermajority Coalition and the Legal Policy of the 2025 National Legislation Program: Challenges to Democratic Legislation

Irmanjaya Thaher¹, Rita Alfiana², M. Abyan Mufid³

¹Universitas Esa Unggul. Email: Irman.java@esaunggul.ac.id

²Universitas Esa Unggul. Email: rita.alfiana@esaunggul.ac.id

³Leeds University, United Kingdom. Email: mufid.abyan1996@gmail.com

Abstract: This article examines Indonesia's national legal policy for the 2024–2025 period, focusing on the legislative priorities of the Prabowo–Gibran administration under the Red-White Cabinet, supported by the Indonesia Maju Coalition (KIM) Plus. The study includes an analysis of the 2025 Priority National Legislation Program (Prolegnas), which contains 42 bills—comprising 33 bills from the House of Representatives (DPR), 8 from the government, and 1 from the Regional Representatives Council (DPD), as well as the 2024–2029 Medium-Term Legislative Program (Prolegnas), with the following distribution by legislative stage: 45% in the drafting stage, 28% in first-level deliberation, 21% new proposals, and 6% in harmonization. This article analyzes the political dynamics of legislation within the context of the supermajority coalition in the DPR, evaluates the structural implications of KIM Plus's dominance on the quality of legislative deliberation, examines the Prabowo–Gibran "Asta Cita" agenda as the ideological direction of legislation, and formulates challenges and recommendations to ensure a national legal policy that is inclusive, responsive, and oriented toward the interests of the people.

Keywords: national legal policy; 2025 National Legislation Program (Prolegnas); KIM Plus; Red-White Cabinet; priority legislation; Prabowo–Gibran; Asta Cita; House of Representatives (DPR); constitutional law.

I. Introduction

Legal policy is a central concept in constitutional law that refers to the policy direction established by the state through its constitutional organs in shaping and enforcing the law. In the context of Indonesia as both a rule-of-law state (*rechtsstaat*) and a democratic state (*demokratische staat*), legal policy not only reflects the will of those in power but must also align with constitutional values, justice, and the diverse interests of the people.

The transition of government from Joko Widodo to Prabowo Subianto in October 2024 marks a new chapter in Indonesia's national legal policy. With the formation of the Red-White Cabinet, supported by the Indonesia Maju Coalition (KIM) Plus—a coalition of political parties controlling more than 80% of the seats in the House of Representatives (DPR)—this new administration possesses extraordinary political capital to advance its legislative agenda. This substantial political capital presents an opportunity to accelerate legislation, but at the same time poses a risk to the quality of deliberation and the checks and balances in the lawmaking process.

The 2025 Priority National Legislation Program (Prolegnas) includes 42 bills, consisting of 33 bills from the DPR, 8 bills from the government, and 1 bill from the DPD. This figure, along with the 2024–2029 Medium-Term Prolegnas—which covers 42 proposals at various stages of the legislative process (45% in the drafting stage, 28% in first-level deliberation, 21% new proposals, and 6% in harmonization)—illustrates the new administration's considerable legislative ambition.

This article aims to: first, examine the concept of national legal policy and its relevance in the context of the Prabowo–Gibran administration; second, analyze the composition and political implications of KIM Plus on legislative dynamics; third, examine the 2025 Priority Prolegnas both quantitatively and qualitatively; fourth, to analyze the 2024–2029 Medium-Term Prolegnas along with the distribution of stages in the drafting of bills; fifth, to evaluate the Asta Cita agenda as the ideological foundation of legislation; and sixth, to identify challenges and recommend steps to ensure the quality of legal policy oriented toward the interests of the people.

II. Concepts and Framework of National Legal Policy

A. The Concept of Legal Policy from the Perspective of Constitutional Law

Mahfud MD, one of Indonesia's most influential constitutional law scholars, defines legal policy as "the official policy regarding the law to be enforced—whether through the enactment of new laws or the replacement of existing ones—in order to achieve the state's objectives." This definition highlights two key elements: first, legal policy is an official policy (not merely the desire of a particular group); second, its purpose is to achieve the state's objectives as set forth in the Preamble to the 1945 Constitution.

From a broader perspective, legal policy encompasses three interrelated dimensions:

- Substantive dimension: what legal matters are to be enacted, amended, or repealed, including the values, principles, and norms to be realized through legislation.
- Procedural dimension: how the lawmaking process is conducted—who is involved, what mechanisms are used, and what quality standards must be met.
- Institutional dimension: which institutions play a role in the formation, implementation, and enforcement of the law, and how the relationships between these institutions are regulated.

B. The Constitutional Foundations of Indonesian Legal Policy

Indonesia's national legal policy is grounded in several constitutional foundations that cannot be ignored:

Preamble to the 1945 Constitution, Paragraph IV	The objectives of the state are: to protect the entire nation, to promote the general welfare, to cultivate the nation's intellectual life, and to contribute to world order. Legislation must contribute to these objectives.
Article 1, Paragraph (3) of the 1945 Constitution	Indonesia is a state governed by the rule of law. All policies, including legal policy, must be based on the law, not solely on the will of those in power.
Article 20 of the 1945 Constitution	The People's Representative Council (DPR) holds the power to enact laws; every bill must be deliberated with the President to obtain mutual approval.
Article 20A of the 1945 Constitution	The DPR's legislative, budgetary, and oversight functions serve as the constitutional foundation for its role in legal policy.
Article 22A of the 1945 Constitution	Further provisions regarding the procedures for enacting laws are regulated by Law No. 12 of 2011 as amended by Law No. 15 of 2019.

C. The National Legislation Program (Prolegnas) as an Instrument of Legal Policy

The National Legislation Program (Prolegnas) is a planning instrument that systematically translates legal policy into a list of draft laws that is measurable, prioritized, and monitorable. Pursuant to Law No. 12 of 2011 as amended by Law No. 15 of 2019 on the Formulation of Legislation, Prolegnas is a planning instrument for the legislative process that is formulated in a planned, integrated, and systematic manner.

Prolegnas consists of two types: the Medium-Term Prolegnas (5 years, aligned with the DPR's term) and the Annual Priority Prolegnas. In practice, the Annual Priority Prolegnas serves as the most important indicator of the actual legislative agenda, as this list serves as the working reference for the DPR and the government for the coming year.

III. Political Context: The Indonesia Maju Plus Coalition and the Red-White Cabinet

A. Supermajority Coalition: The Balance of Power in the DPR

The formation of the Indonesia Maju (KIM) Plus Coalition—which subsequently became the parliamentary support base for the Red-White Cabinet—is one of the most significant political phenomena in the history of contemporary Indonesian governance. KIM Plus encompasses nearly all political parties that participated in the election and successfully cleared the parliamentary threshold, with the exception of the PDI Perjuangan, which chose to position itself as the opposition.

Party	Full Name	Chairperson	Seats in the House of Representatives	% of Seats	Rank
Gerindra Party	Great Indonesia Movement	Prabowo Subianto (Chairman/President)	78 seats	13.45%	KIM Plus
Golkar Party	Golongan Karya	Bahlil Lahadalia	102 seats	17.59%	KIM Plus
PKB	National Awakening Party	Muhaimin Iskandar	68 seats	11.72%	KIM Plus
PKS	Prosperous Justice Party	Ahmad Syaikh	53 seats	9.14%	KIM Plus
NasDem	NasDem Party	Surya Paloh	69 seats	11.90%	KIM Plus
Democratic Party	Democratic Party	Agus Harimurti Yudhoyono	44 seats	7.59%	KIM Plus
PAN	National Mandate Party	Zulkifli Hasan	48 seats	8.28%	KIM Plus
PPP	United Development Party	(Did not qualify for the 2024 ET)	0 seats		Not in the House of Representatives
PDI-P	Indonesian Democratic Party of Struggle	Megawati Soekarnoputri	110 seats	18.97%	Opposition

The data above shows that KIM Plus holds approximately 82% of the seats in the House of Representatives—a figure that constitutionally enables this coalition to pass nearly all legislative proposals without significant opposition from the PDI-P, the only meaningful opposition force. This situation creates a political dynamic in the legislative process that is vastly different from previous periods.

B. Implications of a Supermajority for the Quality of Legislation

The government coalition's control of a parliamentary majority has dual implications that warrant critical scrutiny:

Aspect	Potential Positive Impacts	Potential Negative Impact
Acceleration of Legislation	Bills can be debated and passed more quickly without procedural obstacles	Acceleration risks compromising the depth of review and public participation
Agenda Coherence	Consistency between the government's agenda and DPR legislation is better maintained	Rubber-stamp parliament: The DPR loses its independence as a legislative body

Political stability	A stable government without the threat of a serious no-confidence motion	Weakening of the DPR's checks and balances on the executive branch
Budget efficiency	Deliberations on the state budget and budget bills can be more efficient	Weak budget oversight; risk of misuse of state budget funds
Legislative inclusivity	A broad coalition allows for the representation of various interest groups	The interests of the opposition and minorities tend to be overlooked in the process

Indonesia’s constitutional history shows that parliamentary dominance by a single large coalition can result in laws that are “efficient” in terms of process but problematic in substance, as seen in the controversy surrounding the 2020 Job Creation Law, which ultimately had to be revised via a Government Regulation in Lieu of Law (Perppu). A supermajority that is not balanced by strong oversight mechanisms and meaningful public participation risks producing legislation that better reflects the interests of the coalition elite than the needs of the people.

C. The Red-White Cabinet: Composition and Policy Direction

The Red-White Cabinet under the Prabowo–Gibran administration reflects the distribution of power among the member parties of KIM Plus. The allocation of ministerial portfolios to various coalition parties creates a complex interdependence between the parties’ legislative interests and the government’s policy agenda. This situation can be advantageous because it fosters solid coalition loyalty, but it also has the potential to be a hindrance if the interests of a particular party within the coalition clash with the broader reform agenda.

The eight Asta Cita priorities outlined by Prabowo–Gibran—ranging from strengthening food and energy security, equitable development, to eradicating corruption—provide a fairly clear ideological direction for national legal policy from 2024 to 2029. The main challenge is translating this grand vision into concrete legislation that is effective and not counterproductive.

IV. 2025 Priority Legislative Program: Quantitative and Qualitative Analysis

A. Overview: 42 Priority Bills for 2025

42	33	8	1
Total 2025 Priority Bills	From the House of Representatives	From the Government	From the Regional Representative Council (DPD)
<i>Annual Prolegnas</i>	<i>78.6% of the total</i>	<i>19.0% of the total</i>	<i>2.4% of the total</i>

Proposers	Number of Bills	Proportion	Analysis
House of Representatives	33 bills	78.6%	The majority of priority bills are initiated by the DPR; this reflects the legislative capacity of the representative body
Government	8 bills	19.0%	Executive initiatives; typically of a technical-implementation nature or involving sectoral reforms
Regional Representatives Council (DPD)	1 bill	2.4%	The DPD’s minimal contribution reflects its structural limitations in the legislative process

Total	42 bills	100%	Annual priority targets for 2025 as set forth in the Priority National Legislation Program (Prolegnas Prioritas)
-------	----------	------	--

B. Analysis of the Distribution of Proposers

Data on the distribution of proposers of the 2025 Priority Bills reveals several structurally significant points. First, the dominance of the House of Representatives (33 bills, 78.6%) in bill proposals reflects the central role of the representative body in the legislative process—a constitutionally appropriate arrangement, given that Article 20 of the 1945 Constitution affirms the House of Representatives as the body vested with the power to enact laws.

Second, the government's contribution of 8 bills (19%) reflects the executive branch's sectoral agenda, which requires new legal foundations or revisions to existing laws. Bills from the government are generally more technical and implementation-oriented, translating the President's policies into generally applicable legal norms.

Third, only 1 bill from the Regional Representatives Council (DPD) (2.4%) reflects the DPD's structural limitations in the legislative process, as has been extensively discussed in the literature on Indonesian constitutional law. This inequality is not merely a matter of capacity but a matter of constitutional design that positions the DPD as a second chamber lacking legislative authority equivalent to that of the DPR.

C. Historical Note: The Realities of the Prolegnas

Before becoming overly optimistic about the 2025 target of 42 priority bills, it is important to note a sobering historical fact: the implementation of Indonesia's Prolegnas Prioritas has consistently fallen far short of its targets. Over the past decade, the average number of bills passed per year has ranged from 10 to 25 of the set targets.

The low implementation rate of Prolegnas can be attributed to various factors: the complexity of deliberations requiring more time than planned, the emergence of new priorities that displace previously planned agendas, limitations in the legislative capacity of the DPR and the government, and weak inter-ministerial coordination in drafting high-quality academic papers.

With KIM Plus dominating the DPR, there is an expectation that the implementation of the 2025 Prolegnas will be higher than in previous years. However, accelerating the legislative process alone is not enough; what is more important is the quality of the resulting laws, not merely their quantity.

V. 2024–2029 Medium-Term Prolegnas: Phase Distribution and Implications

A. Overview of the 2024–2029 Prolegnas

In addition to the Annual Priority Prolegnas, the 2024–2029 Medium-Term Prolegnas provides a more comprehensive legislative roadmap for a single term of the House of Representatives (DPR). The government has proposed 42 bills in this medium-term Prolegnas, with a distribution based on the drafting stage that reflects the readiness status of each bill:

Drafting Stage 45%



First-Level Deliberation 28%



New Proposals 21%**Harmonization Stage 6%**

Formulation Stage	Proportion	Description	Estimated Number	Critical Notes
Drafting Stage	45%	Most bills are still in the process of drafting academic papers and initial drafts	About 19 of 42 bills	Potential delays if the drafting process exceeds the target timeline
First-Level Deliberations	28%	Bills are currently under discussion between the House of Representatives and the government	About 12 of 42 bills	Crucial; often the longest and most contentious stage
New Proposals	21%	Newly proposed bills that have not yet entered the formal drafting stage	About 9 of 42 bills	Require rapid planning and assignment
Harmonization Stage	6%	Bills that are nearing finalization; currently being harmonized among ministries/agencies	About 2–3 bills	Set to be submitted to the House of Representatives for passage

B. Critical Analysis of Stage Distribution

The distribution of bill development stages in the 2024–2029 National Legislation Program (Prolegnas) presents a picture that is both realistic and challenging. The fact that 45% of bills are still in the drafting stage indicates that the legislative planning process often precedes substantive readiness: bills are included in Prolegnas before their academic papers and initial drafts are fully developed.

This situation reflects structural problems in Indonesia's legislative planning system: Prolegnas often functions as a "wish list" rather than a realistic and measurable work plan. When academic papers are either nonexistent or of poor quality, the resulting laws tend to be of low quality and vulnerable to constitutional challenges before the Constitutional Court (MK) or the Supreme Court (MA).

Of particular concern is the 21% proportion of "new proposals": this means that more than one-fifth of the bills in the medium-term Prolegnas have not yet entered the drafting stage at all. If they are not immediately prioritized and assigned to the relevant committees or ministries, these bills risk becoming mere ornaments in planning documents without any real implementation.

C. Thematic Clusters of Priority Bills

Although the complete list of 42 bills in the 2024–2029 National Legislation Program (Prolegnas) varies, based on the Prabowo–Gibran "Asta Cita" agenda and the government's policy direction, the priority thematic clusters for legislation can be identified as follows:

Thematic Clusters	Examples of Bills	Relevance to Asta Cita
Food Security & Agrarian Affairs	Land Bill; Farmers' Protection Bill	Agenda for food security and agrarian equity

Energy Security	Renewable Energy Bill; Oil and Gas Bill	Energy Self-Sufficiency and Green Transition Agenda
Equitable Development	Nusantara Capital City Bill (amendment); Underdeveloped Regions Development Bill	Agenda for Equitable Development and Reducing Inequality
Legal Reform & Anti-Corruption	Criminal Procedure Code Bill (revised); Asset Forfeiture Bill	Law enforcement and anti-corruption agenda
Strengthening State Institutions	Draft MD3 Law (revision); Draft Constitutional Court Law; Draft Supreme Court Law	Bureaucratic Reform and Governance Agenda
Economy & Investment	Job Creation Bill (amendment); Investment Bill	Inclusive Economic Growth Agenda
Health & Education	Omnibus Health Bill; Higher Education Bill	Agenda for High-Quality Human Resources and Health Transformation
Digitalization & Security	Personal Data Protection Bill (implementation); Cybersecurity Bill	National Digital Transformation Agenda

VI. Asta Cita as the Ideological Foundation of Legal Policy

A. The Eight Asta Cita Agendas and Their Relevance to Legislation

Asta Cita—the eight priority agendas announced by the Prabowo–Gibran ticket during the campaign and implemented as the administration’s vision—provide a fairly clear ideological direction for national legal policy from 2024 to 2029. These eight agendas—which include food security, energy security, strengthening national defense, combating corruption, equitable development, human resource development, industrial development, and economic self-reliance—implicitly determine the legislative priorities that must be realized through the National Legislation Program (Prolegnas).

What is worth examining is whether the 42 bills in the 2025 Priority Prolegnas truly reflect the eight Asta Cita agendas proportionally, or whether there is a disparity between the declared political priorities and the actual legislative priorities that have been planned. The answer to this question will reveal the extent of the new administration’s commitment to its own agenda.

B. The Challenge of Aligning Political Agendas with Legislative Reality

In the history of Indonesia’s constitutional system, there has often been a gap between the vision and mission proclaimed by the government and the actual substance of the laws produced. Several factors contribute to this gap, including:

1. The dynamics of coalition negotiations: In a multiparty coalition such as KIM Plus, every law produced is the result of negotiations and compromises among the interests of various parties. The outcome is often a “watered-down” version of the original vision.
2. Technical capacity for drafting regulations: The quality of legislation depends heavily on the quality of the academic drafts and the drafting process carried out by ministries and the House of Representatives. Limited technical capacity often results in regulations that contain internal inconsistencies or conflict with higher-level regulations.
3. Time pressures and quantitative targets: Pressure to meet targets for the number of bills passed can lead to an accelerated process that sacrifices the depth of analysis and meaningful public participation.
4. Lobbying and organized interest groups: Legislative processes that take place behind closed doors (without adequate transparency) create opportunities for powerful interest groups to influence the substance of legislation.

VII. Evaluation of Legal Policy and Future Challenges

A. Factors Affecting the Effectiveness of Legal Policy

Political Factors	Empirical Conditions	Legislative Implications	Risks
KIM Plus supermajority coalition	The House of Representatives is controlled by government supporters holding >82% of seats	Potential for accelerated legislation; risk of insufficient deliberation	Moderate-High
PDI-P as the sole opposition party	PDI-P is the only significant opposition party	Limited checks and balances in the House of Representatives	High
Composition of the Red-White Cabinet	The party coalition receives a proportional allocation of ministerial seats	Interdependence between the legislative agenda and the interests of coalition parties	Moderate
The minimal role of the DPD	Only 1 bill from the DPD among the 42 priority bills for 2025	Weak representation of regional interests in national legislation	High
Prabowo-Gibran's "Asta Cita" Agenda	Prabowo's 8 priority agendas guide the focus of legislation	Coherence between the executive's agenda and DPR legislation must be maintained	Moderate

B. Structural Risks in Legal Policy for 2024–2029

Based on the above analysis, there are several structural risks that could hinder the effectiveness and legitimacy of national legal policy during this period:

1. Risk of weak public participation: With a supermajority guaranteeing the passage of nearly all bills desired by the coalition, the incentive to open the legislative process to meaningful public participation tends to weaken. Without substantive public participation, the resulting laws are vulnerable to rejection by the public and constitutional challenges before the Constitutional Court.
2. Risk of "rushed" legislation: The experience with the 2020 Job Creation Law demonstrates that legislation enacted too quickly and without adequate review can result in problematic legal products. The pressure from the supermajority to accelerate the legislative process carries the same risk.
3. Risk of legislative corruption: A legislative process that lacks transparency and does not meaningfully involve the public opens the door to legislative corruption, in which the interests of certain groups are accommodated in statutory provisions in exchange for material benefits or political support.
4. Risk of Normative Inconsistency: With 42 bills processed in a single year, the risk of inconsistencies between laws or between laws and higher-level regulations is very high if the harmonization process is not carried out carefully.

C. Recommendations for High-Quality Legal Policy

To ensure that the 2024–2029 national legal policy is truly oriented toward the interests of the people and meets high standards of legislative quality, this article formulates the following recommendations:

1. Strengthening public participation as a substantive obligation: The House of Representatives (DPR) and the government must establish minimum standards for public participation in every discussion

of a bill, including the obligation to hold public consultations in the regions most affected by each law under discussion.

2. A moratorium on bills lacking a well-developed academic draft: Every bill included in the annual Priority Legislative Program (Prolegnas) must already have an academic draft that has been independently reviewed by relevant academics and experts before it is brought to the deliberation stage.
3. Strengthening the opposition's role in the legislative process: Although the PDI-P is in the minority, formal mechanisms must be guaranteed to allow the opposition to provide substantive input that is seriously considered in every bill deliberation process.
4. Technology-based transparency: The entire bill deliberation process—including drafts, academic papers, meeting minutes, and substantial amendments—must be accessible to the public in real time through a comprehensive digital platform.
5. Periodic evaluation of the implementation of the National Legislation Program (Prolegnas): The House of Representatives (DPR) and the government must establish a quarterly evaluation mechanism for the implementation of Prolegnas, accompanied by transparent public accountability for bills that are delayed or canceled.
6. Strengthening the DPD's legislative capacity: Given the DPD's minimal contribution (only 1 bill out of 42 priority bills for 2025), steps must be taken to strengthen the DPD's legislative capacity, either through a revision of the MD3 Law or through an amendment to the 1945 Constitution that expands the DPD's authority.

VIII. Conclusion

Based on the analysis conducted, this article draws the following conclusions:

1. The national legal policy for 2024–2025 exists within a unique and tense context: on the one hand, the KIM Plus supermajority coalition grants extraordinary political power to the Prabowo–Gibran administration to advance its legislative agenda; on the other hand, excessive majority dominance poses serious risks to the quality of deliberation and the DPR's role in providing checks and balances against the executive branch.
2. The 2025 Priority National Legislation Program (Prolegnas), comprising 42 bills, is dominated by DPR initiatives (33 bills, 78.6%), reflecting high legislative ambition. However, historical experience shows that the implementation of Prolegnas has consistently fallen far short of targets, and accelerating quantity without attention to quality has the potential to result in problematic legislation.
3. The distribution of bill development stages in the 2024–2029 Medium-Term Prolegnas—with 45% still in the drafting stage and 21% being new proposals—indicates that Indonesia's legislative planning system still faces fundamental challenges in ensuring substantive readiness before bills are included in the priority list.
4. The Prabowo–Gibran “Asta Cita” provides a fairly clear ideological direction, but the quality of legal policy will ultimately be determined by the extent to which that ideological agenda is translated into legal norms that are effective, inclusive, and capable of withstanding constitutional scrutiny.
5. To ensure that the 2024–2029 national legal policy truly contributes to the realization of the state's objectives as mandated by the Preamble to the 1945 Constitution, simultaneous strengthening is required across four dimensions: substantive public participation, the quality of academic drafts, transparency of the process, and accountable evaluation mechanisms.

Ultimately, sound legal policy is not just about how many laws are successfully passed, but about how well those laws reflect the will and interests of all the people of Indonesia—not just the interests of the coalition that dominates parliament. This is the greatest challenge that the Prabowo–Gibran administration and the House of Representatives must address during the 2024–2029 term: ensuring that significant political power is used to produce laws that are truly fair, not merely laws that benefit those in power.

ORCID

Irmanjaya Thaher 

Bibliography

- Asshiddiqie, Jimly. (2006). Pengantar Ilmu Hukum Tata Negara Jilid I dan II. Jakarta: Sekretariat Jenderal MK RI.
- Budiardjo, Miriam. (2008). Dasar-Dasar Ilmu Politik (Edisi Revisi). Jakarta: Gramedia Pustaka Utama.
- DPR RI. (2024). Laporan Kinerja Legislasi DPR RI Periode 2019–2024. Jakarta: Sekretariat Jenderal DPR RI.
- DPR RI. (2025). Program Legislasi Nasional Prioritas Tahun 2025: Daftar Rancangan Undang-Undang. Jakarta: Sekretariat Jenderal DPR RI.
- Farida Indrati S., Maria. (2007). Ilmu Perundang-undangan: Jenis, Fungsi, dan Materi Muatan. Yogyakarta: Kanisius.
- Haris, Syamsuddin (Ed.). (2019). Masalah-Masalah Demokrasi dan Kebangsaan Era Reformasi. Jakarta: Yayasan Obor Indonesia.
- Isra, Saldi. (2010). Pergeseran Fungsi Legislasi: Menguatnya Model Legislasi Parlementer dalam Sistem Presidensial Indonesia. Jakarta: RajaGrafindo Persada.
- Keputusan DPR RI tentang Program Legislasi Nasional Rancangan Undang-Undang Tahun 2025.
- Keputusan DPR RI tentang Program Legislasi Nasional Rancangan Undang-Undang Tahun 2024–2029.
- Lijphart, Arend. (1999). Patterns of Democracy: Government Forms and Performance in Thirty-Six Countries. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Manan, Bagir. (2003). DPR, DPD, dan MPR dalam UUD 1945 Baru. Yogyakarta: FH UII Press.
- MD, Mahfud. (2009). Politik Hukum di Indonesia (Edisi Revisi). Jakarta: RajaGrafindo Persada.
- Presiden Republik Indonesia. (2024). Visi–Misi Prabowo–Gibran: Bersama Indonesia Maju. Jakarta: Tim Kampanye Nasional Prabowo–Gibran.
- Undang-Undang Dasar Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 1945.
- Undang-Undang Nomor 12 Tahun 2011 tentang Pembentukan Peraturan Perundang-undangan sebagaimana diubah dengan UU No. 15 Tahun 2019 dan UU No. 13 Tahun 2022.
- Undang-Undang Nomor 17 Tahun 2014 tentang MD3 sebagaimana diubah dengan UU No. 13 Tahun 2019.
- Zoelva, Hamdan. (2011). Pemakzulan Presiden di Indonesia. Jakarta: Sinar Grafika.