



Optimizing Legal Protection of Communal Intellectual Property for Regional Specialty Products to Promote Local Economic Growth

Muhammad Satria Akbar^{1*}, Ravie Surya Justico², Rayhan Ade Dwiyanas³, Ikhwan Aulia Fatahillah⁴

¹⁻⁴ UIN Sunan Gunung Djati Bandung, Indonesia
email: msatriakbar23@gmail.com¹

Article Info :

Received:
24-02-2026
Revised:
02-03-2026
Accepted:
16-03-2026

Abstract

This study examines the effectiveness of communal intellectual property protection in safeguarding regional specialty products and promoting local economic growth in Indonesia through a normative legal research approach. The analysis is based on statutory and conceptual approaches using primary legal sources, including Law Number 20 of 2016, Law Number 28 of 2014, Government Regulation Number 56 of 2022, and Ministerial Regulation Number 13 of 2017, complemented by scholarly literature on intellectual property governance and regional development. The findings indicate that Indonesia has established a relatively comprehensive legal framework for protecting geographical indications, traditional knowledge, and traditional cultural expressions. Despite this regulatory foundation, implementation remains constrained by documentation deficiencies, fragmented institutional authority, limited community participation, and uneven regional administrative capacity. The study further demonstrates that effective communal intellectual property protection contributes to product differentiation, market reputation, community empowerment, regional competitiveness, and sustainable economic development. Legal protection functions not only as a mechanism for cultural preservation but also as a strategic development instrument. Strengthening institutional coordination, improving registration systems, and expanding community based governance are essential to optimize the developmental benefits of communal intellectual property protection within Indonesia's regional economic landscape.

Keywords : Communal Intellectual Property, Geographical Indications, Local Economic Growth, Regional Competitiveness, Sustainable Development.



©2022 Authors.. This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Non Commercial 4.0 International License.
(<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>)

INTRODUCTION

The increasing recognition of cultural assets as strategic economic resources has transformed the global discourse on intellectual property governance from an exclusive focus on individual rights toward broader protection mechanisms that accommodate collective ownership, traditional knowledge, and community based innovation. Contemporary development policies increasingly acknowledge that regional specialty products embody not only economic value but also cultural identity, social legitimacy, and intergenerational knowledge that contribute to sustainable local development. The growing integration of local products into global value chains has simultaneously intensified risks of cultural appropriation, unauthorized commercialization, and unequal benefit distribution, creating new challenges for legal systems seeking to balance economic competitiveness with social justice. Recent studies demonstrate that effective intellectual property protection contributes significantly to innovation capacity, technological advancement, and economic performance, particularly when legal institutions are capable of safeguarding intangible assets that possess unique territorial characteristics (Wang, 2025). Parallel research on regional development further indicates that territorial competitiveness is increasingly shaped by the ability of local governance systems to mobilize endogenous cultural and economic resources as drivers of sustainable growth (Гавкалюба et al., 2023). In this context, communal intellectual property protection has emerged as a critical policy instrument for preserving cultural heritage while strengthening the economic position of local communities in an increasingly competitive global economy.

Existing scholarship has produced substantial evidence regarding the relationship between communal intellectual property protection and local economic development, although the underlying

mechanisms remain subject to continuing debate. Research examining traditional knowledge and traditional cultural expressions demonstrates that legal recognition of communal rights can enhance community welfare by preserving cultural assets while generating new economic opportunities through commercialization and market differentiation (Widiarsa & Mayasari, 2024). Studies on geographical indications similarly reveal that legal protection enhances product reputation, strengthens consumer trust, and creates premium market value through the certification of origin and quality attributes (Rohmat et al., 2022). Complementary findings in economic development literature suggest that regulatory quality, government intervention, and innovation ecosystems play a decisive role in converting institutional protection into tangible economic outcomes (Zhong & Chen, 2023). The significance of state support has also been reinforced by research showing that fiscal incentives and policy interventions can accelerate innovation driven development and strengthen long term economic resilience (Shi & Ge, 2025). Collectively, these studies suggest that legal protection functions most effectively when integrated with broader governance structures that facilitate market access, institutional coordination, and community participation.

Despite these advances, significant conceptual and empirical limitations remain evident within the existing literature. Much of the current research examines geographical indications, traditional knowledge, and traditional cultural expressions as separate legal regimes rather than interconnected components of a broader communal intellectual property framework. Consequently, the cumulative effects of these protection mechanisms on local economic growth remain insufficiently understood. Existing studies frequently emphasize normative legal analysis or cultural preservation objectives while providing limited examination of how legal protection translates into measurable economic benefits for local communities. Furthermore, comparative investigations often focus on registration procedures and formal legal recognition without adequately addressing implementation challenges, institutional fragmentation, documentation deficiencies, and governance disparities at the local level (Rohmat et al., 2022). The legal framework governing communal intellectual property in Indonesia has established important foundations through Law Number 20 of 2016 concerning Trademarks and Geographical Indications, Law Number 28 of 2014 concerning Copyright, Government Regulation Number 56 of 2022 concerning Communal Intellectual Property, and Minister of Law and Human Rights Regulation Number 13 of 2017 concerning Communal Intellectual Property Data. Nevertheless, the effectiveness of these regulatory instruments in generating sustainable economic outcomes remains insufficiently explored (Undang Undang Nomor 20 Tahun 2016, 2016; Undang Undang Nomor 28 Tahun 2014, 2014; Peraturan Pemerintah Nomor 56 Tahun 2022, 2022; Peraturan Menteri Hukum dan Hak Asasi Manusia Republik Indonesia Nomor 13 Tahun 2017, 2017).

The unresolved nature of these issues creates substantial scientific and practical urgency. From a scholarly perspective, the absence of integrated analytical frameworks limits understanding of how communal intellectual property protection operates as a multidimensional development instrument that simultaneously safeguards cultural heritage and stimulates economic growth. From a policy perspective, inadequate protection mechanisms expose regional specialty products to risks of misappropriation, unfair competition, and value extraction by external actors, thereby reducing potential economic returns for local communities. Evidence from Indonesia indicates that local governments occupy a strategic position in facilitating documentation, registration, promotion, and commercialization of communal intellectual property, yet institutional involvement remains uneven across regions and sectors (Sulistyo, 2022). The resulting governance gap undermines the capacity of legal protection systems to function as effective tools for local economic transformation. As global markets increasingly reward authenticity, territorial identity, and cultural uniqueness, strengthening communal intellectual property protection becomes essential not only for preserving cultural resources but also for ensuring equitable participation in development processes.

Against this backdrop, the present study positions itself at the intersection of intellectual property law, regional economic development, and community based governance by examining communal intellectual property protection as an integrated legal and economic system rather than a collection of isolated regulatory instruments. Unlike previous studies that primarily focus on legal formalities or cultural preservation dimensions, this research investigates the effectiveness of geographical indications and traditional cultural expressions in protecting regional specialty products while simultaneously assessing their contribution to local economic growth. Such a perspective enables a more comprehensive understanding of how legal norms interact with institutional capacity, local governance

structures, and economic development objectives. By situating Indonesian communal intellectual property regulation within broader debates on innovation driven development and sustainable territorial competitiveness, this study seeks to bridge the analytical divide between legal protection and economic performance that continues to characterize much of the existing literature.

This study aims to analyze the effectiveness of legal regulations governing geographical indications and traditional cultural expressions in protecting regional specialty products in Indonesia and to evaluate their role in promoting local economic growth. The research contributes theoretically by developing an integrated perspective that conceptualizes communal intellectual property protection as a mechanism linking cultural preservation, legal governance, and regional economic development. Methodologically, it contributes through a normative juridical analysis that systematically examines the interaction between legislative frameworks, institutional implementation, and development objectives in order to generate a more comprehensive understanding of how communal intellectual property protection can be optimized to produce sustainable economic benefits for local communities.

RESEARCH METHODS

This study employs a non empirical normative legal research design to examine the effectiveness of legal protection for communal intellectual property in safeguarding regional specialty products and promoting local economic growth in Indonesia. The research is based exclusively on secondary legal materials consisting of primary legal sources, secondary legal sources, and supporting scholarly documents. Primary sources include Law Number 20 of 2016 concerning Trademarks and Geographical Indications, Law Number 28 of 2014 concerning Copyright, Government Regulation Number 56 of 2022 concerning Communal Intellectual Property, and Minister of Law and Human Rights Regulation Number 13 of 2017 concerning Communal Intellectual Property Data. Secondary sources comprise academic books, peer reviewed journal articles, policy analyses, and authoritative commentaries addressing intellectual property governance, traditional knowledge protection, geographical indications, and local economic development, including works by Rosidawati Wiradirja and Munzil (2018), Sulistyo (2022), and Sople (2026). Sources were selected based on their relevance to communal intellectual property protection, legal validity, academic credibility, and direct contribution to understanding the relationship between legal regulation and regional economic development. The analytical framework combines a statutory approach and a conceptual approach to evaluate the coherence, adequacy, and practical implications of the existing legal framework governing geographical indications and traditional cultural expressions.

The analysis was conducted through a systematic process of legal interpretation, classification, and synthesis of regulatory provisions, legal doctrines, and scholarly arguments. Relevant legal materials were examined using qualitative normative analysis to identify the strengths, limitations, and implementation challenges of communal intellectual property protection mechanisms within the Indonesian legal system. Interpretive techniques involving grammatical, systematic, and teleological construction were employed to assess the extent to which existing regulations support cultural preservation, legal certainty, and local economic empowerment. To ensure analytical rigor, the study applied source triangulation across legislation, academic literature, and policy documents, while maintaining consistency through cross verification of legal norms and scholarly interpretations. Because the research relied exclusively on publicly accessible legal and documentary materials and did not involve human participants, issues related to informed consent and human subject ethics approval were not applicable. Nevertheless, the study adhered to principles of academic integrity, transparency, and accurate citation in the collection, interpretation, and presentation of all legal and scholarly sources.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Legal Architecture of Communal Intellectual Property Protection for Regional Specialty Products in Indonesia

The normative analysis indicates that Indonesia has progressively developed a legal architecture for communal intellectual property protection through the integration of copyright law, geographical indication regulation, and communal intellectual property governance. This regulatory structure reflects a transition from conventional intellectual property paradigms toward approaches that recognize collective ownership and community based rights. Contemporary intellectual property theory emphasizes that legal recognition of collective cultural assets contributes to both social justice and

economic development objectives (Gupta, 2024). The Indonesian framework demonstrates an effort to reconcile proprietary protection with the preservation of cultural identity and local economic interests.

Law Number 20 of 2016 concerning Trademarks and Geographical Indications establishes a legal basis for protecting products whose quality, reputation, and characteristics are inseparable from their geographical origin. The statutory provisions create legal certainty regarding ownership, use, and enforcement mechanisms for geographical indication products. Economic studies suggest that geographical indications function not merely as legal instruments but also as mechanisms for market differentiation and value creation (Menapace & Moschini, 2024). Such characteristics are particularly relevant for regional specialty products whose economic value derives from unique territorial attributes.

The legal recognition of Traditional Cultural Expressions under Law Number 28 of 2014 concerning Copyright introduces a complementary dimension to communal intellectual property protection. Unlike conventional copyright regimes that emphasize individual authorship, the regulation assigns custodial responsibility to the state for cultural expressions whose creators cannot be individually identified. This approach reflects the understanding that cultural heritage constitutes a collective resource requiring long term protection against misappropriation (Ghose & Ali, 2023). The normative structure consequently extends legal protection beyond economic interests toward cultural continuity and identity preservation.

Government Regulation Number 56 of 2022 concerning Communal Intellectual Property further strengthens the legal framework by introducing more explicit mechanisms for identification, recognition, and protection of communal intellectual assets. The regulation expands the scope of protection to include traditional knowledge, genetic resources, traditional cultural expressions, and potential geographical indications. The regulatory expansion reflects developments in international intellectual property discourse that increasingly recognize the economic significance of community generated knowledge systems (Widiarsa & Mayasari, 2024). Legal protection is consequently positioned as an instrument of both cultural governance and economic empowerment.

The effectiveness of this framework can be observed through the complementary functions assigned to different regulatory instruments. Geographical indication protection safeguards product reputation and market value, while traditional cultural expression protection secures cultural authenticity and collective identity. The interaction between these instruments creates a multilayered protection system capable of addressing diverse forms of exploitation. Similar integrated approaches have been identified as important determinants of sustainable intellectual property governance in developing economies (Chidede, 2022).

Table 1. Regulatory Framework Governing Communal Intellectual Property Protection in Indonesia

Legal Instrument	Regulatory Focus	Protected Subject Matter	Economic Relevance
Law No. 20 of 2016	Geographical Indications	Regional specialty products	Product differentiation and market value
Law No. 28 of 2014	Copyright	Traditional Cultural Expressions	Cultural preservation and creative economy
Government Regulation No. 56 of 2022	Communal Intellectual Property	Traditional knowledge and communal assets	Community based economic development
Ministerial Regulation No. 13 of 2017	Communal Intellectual Property Data	Documentation and registration	Legal certainty and asset identification

Source: Compiled and analyzed from Law Number 20 of 2016, Law Number 28 of 2014, Government Regulation Number 56 of 2022, and Ministerial Regulation Number 13 of 2017.

The legal instruments summarized in Table 1 reveal a layered regulatory model in which protection is distributed across different normative domains. Such a structure demonstrates that communal intellectual property protection is not dependent on a single legal mechanism. The presence of documentation and registration provisions strengthens the institutional foundation required for legal

recognition. Similar institutional arrangements have been associated with improved governance outcomes and stronger territorial development capacities (Гавкалова et al., 2023).

Despite the existence of an extensive regulatory framework, normative analysis reveals several structural limitations affecting implementation effectiveness. The legal provisions establish rights and responsibilities but provide limited operational guidance regarding coordination among governmental institutions. This condition often creates uncertainty in the practical administration of communal intellectual property assets. Studies on intellectual property governance identify institutional fragmentation as a major obstacle to effective legal protection and economic utilization of protected assets (Sople, 2026).

Another important finding concerns the relationship between legal protection and broader development objectives. The statutory framework implicitly recognizes that intellectual property protection serves functions extending beyond legal ownership claims. Contemporary development theory argues that economic growth increasingly depends on the capacity of legal institutions to transform intangible assets into productive resources (Hill, 2023). The Indonesian regulatory model reflects this orientation by linking communal intellectual property protection with local economic opportunities and cultural sustainability.

The normative framework also demonstrates compatibility with emerging approaches emphasizing community centered development. Economic empowerment strategies rooted in local resources tend to generate more sustainable outcomes because they are closely connected to cultural legitimacy and social participation (Ali, 2024). The protection of communal intellectual property therefore represents not only a legal response to cultural appropriation but also a mechanism for strengthening local productive capacities. Such an interpretation aligns with contemporary perspectives that regard intellectual, cultural, and institutional capital as foundational components of economic resilience (Ausat et al., 2023).

The overall analysis indicates that Indonesia possesses a relatively comprehensive legal foundation for protecting regional specialty products through communal intellectual property mechanisms. The interaction among geographical indications, traditional cultural expressions, documentation systems, and communal intellectual property regulations creates an integrated normative structure. The principal challenge lies not in the absence of legal norms but in ensuring their effective implementation and institutional coordination. The capacity of this framework to generate local economic growth ultimately depends on how legal protection is translated into practical mechanisms that enhance market access, preserve cultural authenticity, and strengthen community welfare.

Institutional and Governance Challenges in the Implementation of Communal Intellectual Property Protection

The normative analysis demonstrates that Indonesia has established a relatively comprehensive legal framework governing communal intellectual property through Law Number 20 of 2016, Law Number 28 of 2014, Government Regulation Number 56 of 2022, and Ministerial Regulation Number 13 of 2017. These instruments collectively provide legal recognition for geographical indications, traditional cultural expressions, traditional knowledge, and communal intellectual property documentation systems. Legal completeness, however, does not automatically translate into effective protection outcomes because implementation depends on institutional capacity and administrative coordination. Similar observations have been reported in studies emphasizing that legal effectiveness is determined not only by regulatory substance but also by governance performance and enforcement structures (Ayu Palar et al., 2023).

A significant implementation gap emerges from the distinction between normative recognition and operational execution. Government Regulation Number 56 of 2022 introduces a more inclusive framework for communal intellectual property protection by emphasizing documentation and inventory mechanisms. Practical implementation remains constrained because many local authorities lack sufficient institutional resources to operationalize these obligations at the regional level (Sulistyo, 2022). The resulting condition creates legal uncertainty regarding the identification and protection of communal intellectual assets despite the existence of detailed regulatory provisions.

The analysis further reveals that communal intellectual property protection depends heavily on the availability of accurate documentation systems. Ministerial Regulation Number 13 of 2017 established a legal basis for communal intellectual property data management, yet implementation

remains uneven across regions. Many traditional cultural expressions and local specialty products continue to exist outside formal documentation frameworks, creating vulnerabilities to unauthorized use and ownership disputes (Rosidawati Wiradirja & Munzil, 2018). From a normative perspective, incomplete documentation weakens the evidentiary foundation required for legal protection mechanisms.

Another challenge concerns the relatively low registration rate of geographical indications and communal intellectual property assets. Registration procedures are formally available through existing legislation, yet many communities encounter difficulties in preparing documentation, fulfilling administrative requirements, and navigating institutional procedures. Research on intellectual property governance indicates that procedural accessibility often determines whether legal rights can be effectively exercised by local communities (Rohmat et al., 2022). This finding suggests that legal accessibility constitutes an important dimension of regulatory effectiveness.

Institutional fragmentation represents another major obstacle within the Indonesian communal intellectual property regime. Responsibility for protection is distributed across several governmental bodies with different mandates, administrative procedures, and policy priorities. Fragmented authority may create overlapping responsibilities and weaken accountability mechanisms during implementation (Sople, 2026). The absence of fully integrated governance structures limits the ability of institutions to respond efficiently to emerging protection challenges.

Table 2. Major Institutional Barriers to Effective Communal Intellectual Property Protection

Institutional Issue	Legal Implication	Economic Consequence	Required Improvement
Documentation gaps	Weak evidentiary basis for legal protection	Reduced utilization of communal assets	Integrated digital documentation system
Weak local government involvement	Limited implementation of legal mandates	Underdeveloped local protection initiatives	Strengthening regional institutional capacity
Low public awareness	Low registration and legal participation	Missed opportunities for asset recognition	Continuous legal education programs
Fragmented institutional authority	Overlapping responsibilities and coordination problems	Inefficient protection mechanisms	Interagency coordination framework
Limited registration support	Administrative barriers for communities	Low registration rates	Technical assistance and facilitation
Market linkage constraints	Weak integration between protection and utilization mechanisms	Limited sustainability of protected assets	Cross sector policy coordination

Source: Analytical synthesis based on Ayu Palar et al. (2023), Sulisty (2022), Rosidawati Wiradirja and Munzil (2018), Widiarsa and Mayasari (2024), and Government Regulation Number 56 of 2022.

The institutional barriers summarized in Table 2 indicate that implementation challenges are multidimensional rather than purely legal. Documentation deficiencies interact with weak institutional coordination and insufficient public engagement, producing cumulative barriers to effective protection. The findings support the argument that legal frameworks require complementary governance mechanisms to achieve intended policy outcomes (Widiarsa & Mayasari, 2024). Normative effectiveness therefore depends on the interaction between legal norms and institutional performance.

The role of local governments occupies a particularly important position within the communal intellectual property protection system. Regional authorities possess direct access to communities and cultural resources, enabling them to facilitate identification, documentation, and registration activities.

Existing studies note that local governments often function as the primary bridge between national legal frameworks and community level implementation processes (Sulistyo, 2022). Variations in regional commitment and administrative capacity consequently influence protection outcomes across different provinces and districts.

Community participation also emerges as a central element in the effectiveness of communal intellectual property governance. Government Regulation Number 56 of 2022 adopts an inclusive rights perspective by recognizing the importance of community involvement in identifying and safeguarding communal assets. Effective participation nevertheless requires legal literacy, institutional support, and accessible administrative procedures that remain unevenly distributed throughout Indonesia (Ayu Palar et al., 2023). Without meaningful participation, formal recognition may fail to generate substantive protection.

Comparative scholarship on traditional knowledge governance highlights similar implementation challenges across multiple jurisdictions. Global experiences indicate that documentation systems, institutional cooperation, and community representation frequently determine whether communal intellectual property protection can function effectively in practice (Ghose & Ali, 2023). Critiques of conventional intellectual property governance also emphasize the limitations of regulatory frameworks that prioritize formal rights without addressing institutional inequalities and implementation barriers (Baker & Thrasher, 2022). These perspectives reinforce the relevance of governance centered approaches in evaluating Indonesian communal intellectual property protection.

The findings suggest that the principal weakness of communal intellectual property protection in Indonesia does not originate from regulatory absence but from implementation deficits. Existing legislation provides a substantial normative foundation for protecting regional specialty products and traditional cultural assets. Governance fragmentation, uneven documentation practices, limited local government engagement, and constrained community participation continue to reduce regulatory effectiveness (Rosidawati Wiradirja & Munzil, 2018). Future policy development should prioritize institutional integration and implementation capacity as central components of communal intellectual property protection.

Economic Implications of Communal Intellectual Property Protection for Local Development and Regional Competitiveness

Communal intellectual property protection possesses significance that extends beyond cultural preservation because it also functions as a legal instrument capable of stimulating local economic transformation. From a law and development perspective, legal certainty creates incentives for communities to maintain the quality, authenticity, and market reputation of regional specialty products. Intellectual property governance contributes to productive economic activities when legal recognition is connected to market access and value creation processes (Wang, 2025). This relationship demonstrates that communal intellectual property protection should be evaluated not only through legal effectiveness but also through its developmental outcomes.

Normative analysis indicates that geographical indications represent one of the most effective mechanisms for converting local identity into economic value. Products protected through geographical indications benefit from stronger market differentiation because consumers associate them with specific territorial characteristics and quality standards. Studies on geographical indication economics reveal that legal protection can generate premium pricing and improve producer bargaining positions within competitive markets (Menapace & Moschini, 2024). Similar findings indicate that geographical indication recognition contributes to regional economic expansion by strengthening local production systems and increasing product competitiveness (Qie et al., 2023).

The relationship between legal protection and regional competitiveness becomes increasingly relevant within contemporary economic development frameworks. Competitiveness is shaped not only by physical resources but also by the ability of regions to transform cultural assets into productive economic capital. Intellectual property protection supports this transformation by preventing unauthorized appropriation and preserving exclusive market identities associated with local products (Wang, 2025). Regional development literature similarly recognizes institutional quality and innovation capacity as important determinants of long term competitiveness (Zhong & Chen, 2023).

Communal intellectual property also strengthens the economic position of micro, small, and medium enterprises operating within local production networks. Legal recognition enhances consumer

trust because protected products are perceived as authentic and culturally legitimate. This condition creates opportunities for enterprise expansion and encourages innovation based on local resources rather than external imitation (Erviana, 2025). The strategic use of intellectual property rights increasingly serves as a mechanism for improving business resilience in competitive markets (Ashardiono & Trihartono, 2024).

The developmental relevance of communal intellectual property becomes more evident when examined through community based economic frameworks. Local communities remain the primary custodians of traditional knowledge and cultural expressions that form the basis of regional specialty products. Economic empowerment emerges when communities maintain ownership and control over the utilization of these collective assets (Ali, 2024). Community participation therefore functions not merely as a cultural necessity but also as an economic prerequisite for sustainable development.

Table 3. Potential Economic Contributions of Communal Intellectual Property Protection

Protection Mechanism	Economic Effect	Development Outcome	Supporting Literature
Geographical Indications	Product differentiation and price premium	Increased regional competitiveness	Menapace & Moschini (2024), Qie et al. (2023)
Traditional Cultural Expressions	Commercialization of cultural assets	Community income diversification	Erviana (2025)
Traditional Knowledge	Value creation based on local expertise	Sustainable local production systems	Ali (2024)
Community Branding	Stronger product identity and market trust	Expanded market access	Ashardiono & Trihartono (2024)
Creative Economy Integration	Increased innovation and business opportunities	Growth of local enterprises	Ausat et al. (2023)
Tourism Integration	Higher visitor spending and local demand	Regional economic multiplier effects	de Rozari et al. (2024), Rahayu & Abbas (2024)

Source: Analytical synthesis developed from Menapace and Moschini (2024), Qie et al. (2023), Erviana (2025), Ashardiono and Trihartono (2024), de Rozari et al. (2024), Rahayu and Abbas (2024), Ali (2024), and Ausat et al. (2023).

The analytical synthesis presented in Table 3 demonstrates that communal intellectual property protection generates multidimensional economic effects extending from market differentiation to regional development outcomes. Geographical indications create direct commercial value through reputation enhancement, while traditional knowledge and cultural expressions support income diversification strategies. Community branding strengthens local identity and contributes to broader market penetration opportunities (Ashardiono & Trihartono, 2024). The findings suggest that legal protection mechanisms become more effective when integrated with broader economic development initiatives.

Creative economy development represents another important pathway through which communal intellectual property protection produces economic benefits. Creative industries depend heavily on intellectual, cultural, and institutional capital that originates from local communities and cultural traditions. Effective protection systems encourage investment in innovation because communities gain confidence that their cultural assets will receive legal recognition and economic returns (Ausat et al., 2023). This dynamic reinforces the position of communal intellectual property as a productive economic resource rather than a purely cultural asset.

Tourism development also benefits from stronger protection of regional identity and cultural authenticity. Visitors increasingly seek experiences associated with unique local traditions, products, and cultural expressions. Legal protection contributes to authenticity assurance and reduces the risk of

commercialization practices that dilute cultural value (de Rozari et al., 2024). Regulatory integration between tourism governance and rights protection frameworks further strengthens sustainable destination development strategies (Rahayu & Abbas, 2024).

Sustainable development considerations require communal intellectual property protection to be linked with broader environmental, social, and economic objectives. Development frameworks increasingly emphasize the importance of preserving local resources while generating inclusive economic opportunities. Legal protection supports this objective by encouraging responsible utilization of traditional knowledge and culturally embedded production systems (Guo & Li, 2024). Similar perspectives emphasize that sustainable regional development depends on balancing economic growth with social inclusion and resource preservation (Karani et al., 2022).

An optimized policy model should integrate legal protection, economic incentives, market development, and community empowerment within a coherent governance framework. Fiscal support mechanisms, innovation policies, and institutional coordination can strengthen the economic impacts generated by communal intellectual property protection (Shi & Ge, 2025). Complementary initiatives involving social investment and community based economic partnerships may further expand local development opportunities derived from protected cultural assets (Azwar, 2023). Such an integrated approach increases the likelihood that communal intellectual property protection will function as a sustainable driver of local economic growth and regional competitiveness.

CONCLUSION

The study demonstrates that communal intellectual property protection constitutes a strategic legal instrument for preserving regional specialty products while simultaneously supporting local economic growth. The normative analysis reveals that Indonesian legislation has provided a relatively coherent framework for the protection of geographical indications, traditional knowledge, and traditional cultural expressions through interconnected regulatory mechanisms. Legal effectiveness, however, depends not only on normative completeness but also on the capacity of institutions to implement documentation, registration, supervision, and community participation processes in a coordinated manner. Persistent governance challenges, including fragmented authority, limited administrative support, and insufficient public awareness, continue to reduce the practical effectiveness of existing protections. At the same time, stronger protection mechanisms enhance product reputation, strengthen community based economic activities, increase regional competitiveness, and support sustainable development objectives. Communal intellectual property protection therefore operates as both a legal safeguard and a development catalyst. An optimized model requires integrated governance, inclusive rights recognition, strengthened institutional coordination, and continuous support for community driven commercialization strategies to ensure that regional specialty products generate enduring economic value while maintaining their cultural authenticity.

REFERENCES

- Ali, A. H. (2024). Community-based economic development and partnership cooperation: The economics strategy for prosperity of the ummah. *Samarah: Jurnal Hukum Keluarga Dan Hukum Islam*, 8(2), 1280-1300.
- Ashardiono, F., & Trihartono, A. (2024). Optimizing the potential of Indonesian coffee: a dual market approach. *Cogent Social Sciences*, 10(1), 2340206.
- Ausat, A. M. A., Al Bana, T., & Gadzali, S. S. (2023). Basic capital of creative economy: The role of intellectual, social, cultural, and institutional capital. *Apollo: Journal of Tourism and Business*, 1(2), 42-54.
- Ayu Palar, M. R., Rafianti, L., & Muchtar, H. N. (2023). Inclusive rights to protect communal intellectual property: Indonesian perspective on its new government regulation. *Cogent Social Sciences*, 9(2), 2274431.
- Azwar, A. (2023). The role of Islamic philanthropy in green economy development: Case in Indonesia. *International Journal of Islamic Economics and Finance Research*, 6(2 December), 40-55.
- Baker, B. K., & Thrasher, R. (2022). From business as usual to health for the future: Challenging the intellectual property regime to address COVID-19 and future pandemics. *Boston University International Law Journal*, 41.

- Chidede, T. (2022). The role of intellectual property rights' protection in advancing development in South Africa. *Law, Democracy and Development*, 26, 168-189.
- de ROZARI ROZARI, P. E., Polinggomang, Y., & Fanggidae, A. H. (2024). Sustainable ecotourism and creative economy development model with local wisdom perspective. *Journal of Tourism Economics and Policy*, 4(4), 388-404.
- Erviana, A. N. (2025). Optimizing Intellectual Property Rights (Ipr) Protection In Local Creative Enterprises In Strengthening The Tourism Sector. *Journal of Law and Social Change Review*, 1(01), 70-81.
- Ghose, A., & Aamir Ali, S. M. (2023). Protection and Preservation of Traditional Cultural Expressions & Traditional Knowledge in Handicraft Industry: Advocating the Need for a Global Cultural Policy Framework. *Ghose, A., & Ali, SMA (2023). Protection and preservation of traditional cultural expressions & traditional knowledge in handicraft trade: Advocating the need for a global cultural policy framework. Revista de Direito Internacional*, 20(2).
- Guo, Y., & Li, S. (2024). A policy analysis of China's sustainable rural revitalization: integrating environmental, social and economic dimensions. *Frontiers in Environmental Science*, 12, 1436869.
- Gupta, M. (2024). Intellectual property rights: a comprehensive review of concepts, challenges, and implications. *Challenges, and Implications (May 27, 2024)*.
- Hill, E. (2023). What is economic development? And what is the job of an economic development professional?. *Economic Development Quarterly*, 37(1), 34-48.
- Karani, P., Failler, P., Gilau, A. M., Ndende, M., & Diop, S. T. (2022). Africa blue economy strategies integrated in planning to achieve sustainable development at national and regional economic communities (RECs). *Journal of Sustainability Research*, e220011.
- Menapace, L., & Moschini, G. (2024). The economics of geographical indications: an update. *Annual Review of Resource Economics*, 16(1), 83-104.
- Peraturan Menteri Hukum dan Hak Asasi Manusia Republik Indonesia Nomor 13 Tahun 2017 tentang Data Kekayaan Intelektual Komunal, Berita Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 2017 Nomor 964 (2017).
- Peraturan Pemerintah Nomor 56 Tahun 2022 tentang Kekayaan Intelektual Komunal, Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 2022 Nomor 90 (2022).
- Qie, H., Chao, Y., Chen, H., & Zhang, F. (2023). Do geographical indications of agricultural products promote county-level economic growth?. *China Agricultural Economic Review*, 15(3), 666-681.
- Rahayu, S. W., & Abbas, S. (2024). A Synergy of Halal Tourism Regulations and Tourism Rights Protection in Aceh: Pentahelix Model. *Samarah: Jurnal Hukum Keluarga Dan Hukum Islam*, 8(3), 1454-1475.
- Rohmat, R., Waspih, W., & Wei, D. C. C. (2022). Simple patent protection: a case of sarung tenun goyor Indonesia and the comparison to Malaysia utility innovation protection. *Journal of Indonesian Legal Studies*, 7(1), 299-338.
- Rosidawati Wiradirja, I., & Munzil, F. (2018). *Pengetahuan tradisional dan hak kekayaan intelektual: Perlindungan pengetahuan tradisional berdasarkan asas keadilan melalui sui generis intellectual property system*. PT Refika Aditama.
- Shi, Y., & Ge, J. (2025). The role of government fiscal and tax incentives in green technology innovation and enterprise development: implications for human health and hygiene. *Frontiers in public health*, 12, 1502856.
- Sople, V. V. (2026). *Managing intellectual property: The strategic imperative*. PHI Learning Pvt. Ltd..
- Sulistyo, P. D. (2022, April 14). Pemda berperan melindungi kekayaan intelektual komunal. *Kompas.id*. <https://www.kompas.id/artikel/pemda-berperan-melindungi-kekayaan-intelektual-komunal>
- Undang-Undang Nomor 20 Tahun 2016 tentang Merek dan Indikasi Geografis, Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 2016 Nomor 252 (2016).
- Undang-Undang Nomor 28 Tahun 2014 tentang Hak Cipta, Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 2014 Nomor 266 (2014).
- Wang, S. (2025). Strengthening intellectual property rights for sustainable development: Insights Into economic performance and technological advancement. *Information Development*, 02666669251349154.

- Widiarsa, A. P., & Mayasari, H. (2024). Enhancing community economies through legal protection models of traditional knowledge and cultural expressions: a study on Indonesia's communal intellectual property framework. *Gelar: Jurnal Seni Budaya*, 22(2), 239-257.
- Zhong, Z., & Chen, Z. (2023). Business environment, technological innovation and government intervention: influences on high-quality economic development. *Management Decision*, 61(8), 2413-2441.
- Гавкалова, Н., Аведян, Л., Акімов, О., Акімова, Л., & Белявцева, В. (2023). The effectiveness of the development of territories in the state regional system politicians. *Financial and Credit Activity Problems of Theory and Practice*, 4(51), 333-344.