

Restructuring Indonesia's Directorate General of Intellectual Property Into an Autonomous Agency to Strengthen Valuation Function and Economic Utilization of Intellectual Property in Indonesia

Muhammad Insan Kamil¹

Doctoral Candidate Faculty of Law, Trisakti University¹

Entere : April 15, 2025
Accepted : June 01, 2025

Revised : May 3, 2025
Published: June 26, 2025

Abstract

This research examines the urgency of restructuring the Directorate General of Intellectual Property (DGIP) into an autonomous body to strengthen the valuation functions and optimize the economic utilization of intellectual property in Indonesia. Intellectual Property (IP) plays a strategic role in driving innovation and knowledge-based economic growth. However, IP governance in Indonesia continues to face challenges, including weak institutional capacity, low commercialization rates of innovation outputs, and an inefficient valuation system. The Directorate General of Intellectual Property (DGIP), as the national authority responsible for IP protection and administration, currently lacks an adequate institutional structure to address these challenges optimally. This study examines three main issues: (1) the characteristics of current IP governance in Indonesia and its challenges in valuation and economic utilization; (2) the effectiveness of DGIP's institutional framework in supporting IP valuation and commercialization; and (3) an ideal institutional restructuring model to transform DGIP into an autonomous body. The research combines normative juridical approaches, qualitative data analysis, and comparative studies of IP institutional models in South Korea, Japan, the United States, the European Union, China, Singapore, Saudi Arabia, and Egypt. Findings reveal that DGIP's current administrative and bureaucratic structure limits flexibility in resource management, innovation ecosystem development, and IP commercialization. The study recommends restructuring DGIP into a Public Service Agency (PSA the Indonesian term being *Badan Layanan Umum*) to strengthen valuation functions and optimize the economic utilization of IP. This model is expected to enhance public service efficiency, encourage private sector engagement, and foster cross-sectoral synergy in developing a knowledge-based economy.

Keywords: intellectual property, governance, institutional reform, restructuring, autonomous body, IP office, valuation.

I. Introduction

In the contemporary knowledge-based economy, Intellectual Property (IP) has emerged as a vital driver of innovation, creativity, and sustainable economic growth. The legal protection afforded to intangible assets aims to provide moral and economic rights that incentivize further creation.¹ However, in Indonesia, the management of IP faces fundamental challenges that hinder the optimalization of its economic and social value.

¹ Darwance Darwance, Y. Yokotani and Wenni Anggita, "Dasar-Dasar Pemikiran Perlindungan Hak Kekayaan Intelektual", *Jurnal Hukum Progresif*, Volume 14 No. 22, (2020) 193-208, 15, accessed September 1, 2024, <https://doi.org/10.33019/progresif.v15i2.1998>

The Directorate General of Intellectual Property (DGIP or DGIP), the primary institution responsible for IP management in Indonesia, operates within a governmental bureaucratic framework that has proven suboptimal in addressing the dynamic global IP landscape and domestic needs. This institutional inadequacy is reflected in minimal IP valuation and commercialization activities.

According to the World Bank, Indonesia's royalty and license fee revenues were a mere 0.1% of its GDP in 2023,² significantly lower than high-income nations like the United States and Japan. While Indonesia ranks among the top 20 globally for patent applications³, only 15.9% of these come from domestic applicants, indicating low formal innovation activity by local inventors.⁴ Furthermore, less than 5% of the 15,789 patents held by Indonesian universities and research institutions have been successfully commercialized, a phenomenon known as "sleeping patents" that points to a systemic gap between legal protection and economic utilization.

Indonesia's IP ecosystem performance is also middling in global rankings. The 2023 Global Innovation Index (GII) placed Indonesia 61st out of 132 countries, an improvement from 75th in 2022 but still below the regional average across all pillars, including knowledge and technology outputs and institutional quality. Similarly, the Global Innovation Policy Center ranked Indonesia 45th out of 55 nations in its 2023 International IP Index, noting weaknesses in enforcement and administrative efficiency.⁵

The core issue lies in the philosophical paradigm of IP management in Indonesia, which remains predominantly legalistic and administrative rather than focused on economic exploitation. This paradigm has shaped DGIP into a bureaucratic institution that is less responsive to market needs and innovation dynamics. Its position under a government ministry limits its operational flexibility, policy agility, and ability to

² Extracted from World Bank, Charges for the use of intellectual property and GDP (current US\$) - Indonesia, accessed March 25, 2025, https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/BX.GSR.ROYL.CD?contextual=default&locations=ID&name_desc=true and <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/NY.GDP.MKTP.CD?locations=ID>.

³ World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) Statistics Database (2023), accessed March 25, 2025. <https://www.wipo.int/edocs/statistics-country-profile/en/list/I7.pdf>

⁴ World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO), Indonesia Intellectual Property Statistics Country Profile, 2023, 1, March 25, 2025 <https://www.wipo.int/edocs/statistics-country-profile/en/id.pdf>.

⁵ World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO). WIPO Publication 2000-2023. 2023, 1-5, accessed March 25, 2025 <https://www.wipo.int/edocs/pubdocs/en/wipo-pub-2000-2023/id.pdf>

coordinate effectively across different governmental bodies, making it vulnerable to political intervention.

Establishment of a strong IP governance structure is crucial to support the advancement of innovation and economic growth in various countries, especially developing countries. This is in line with the development of IP offices that play a protagonist role in a country's economic development, promoting innovation, technology transfer, and knowledge dissemination.⁶ In fact, the importance of the role of an office that regulates IP in a country has been realized for a long time, as stated by Mark Twain in his book *A Connecticut Yankee in King Arthur's Court* (1889) "*A country without a patent office and good patent laws is just a crab, and can't travel any way but sideways and backwards*". This expression, in general, means that a country should have an IP office and good IP laws.

Carolyn Deere in her writing "The Politics of Intellectual Property Reform in Developing Countries: The Relevance of the World Intellectual Property Organization", reveals that IP offices have a very important role in supporting innovation, economic growth, and social development in developing countries. By strengthening capacity, increasing public engagement, and integrating intellectual property policies with national development goals, IP offices can contribute significantly to the country's progress. He also emphasized that the success of intellectual property reform in developing countries largely depends on the ability of IP offices to adapt to local needs and evolving global challenges.⁷

Independent studies conducted by CSIS (2023) show that IP institutional reforms in developing countries have been shown to improve national innovation performance. The transformation of the Korean Intellectual Property Office (KIPO) into a semi-

⁶ Maximiliano Santa Cruz and C. Olivos, The Twenty-First Century Intellectual Property Office, in: Correa, C., Seuba, X. (eds) *Intellectual Property and Development: Understanding the Interfaces*, (Singapore: Springer, 2019), accessed June 25, 2025, 182.

⁷ Summarized from the writings of Carolyn Deere, who is a *Director of the Global Trade Governance Project at the Global Economic Governance Programme, University College, Oxford*, title "*The Politics of Intellectual Property Reform in Developing Countries: The Relevance of the World Intellectual Property Organization*", in Neil Weinstock Netanel (ed.), *The Development Agenda: Global Intellectual Property and Developing Countries* (New York, 2008; online edn, Oxford Academic, 1 Jan. 2009), 89, accessed, April 28, 2025, <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195342109.003.0005>.

autonomous institution in 2006 successfully reduced patent processing time by 40% and increased domestic patent registrations by 157% within a 10-year period. Similarly, the reform of the Brazilian National Institute of Industrial Property (INPI) in 2015 successfully reduced the patent backlog by 35% and increased revenue from IP services by 89%.

Comparative studies of IP institutions in various countries show that the global trend is moving towards an institutional model that is more autonomous, flexible, and oriented towards the creation of economic value. The Korea Intellectual Property Office (KIPO), Japan Patent Office (JPO), and Intellectual Property Office of Singapore (IPOS) are examples of IP institutional transformation that have successfully increased the economic contribution of national IP assets through a more independent and service-oriented organizational structure.

This paper argues that a comprehensive restructuring of DGIP into a more autonomous body is urgently needed to strengthen its valuation and economic utilization functions. By analysing the current governance framework, evaluating DGIP's institutional effectiveness, and proposing a restructuring model based on a comparative study of global best practices, this research aims to provide a roadmap for transforming Indonesia's IP governance. The goal is to create an agile, efficient, and strategically-oriented IP institution capable of catalysing a robust innovation ecosystem and maximizing the economic potential of intellectual property for national development.

II. Methodology

This study is grounded in several key legal and economic theories that provide a comprehensive framework for analysing the proposed institutional restructuring of DGIP. The primary theoretical underpinnings include the theory of the rule of law, legal certainty, and legal protection. These theories are crucial for understanding the foundational principles governing intellectual property rights and the institutional mechanisms required for their effective enforcement and utilization. The rule of law ensures that all actions, including those related to intellectual property, are governed by clear and consistent legal principles. Legal certainty provides predictability and stability

in the application of IP laws, which is essential for fostering innovation and investment. Legal protection, on the other hand, emphasizes the state's role in safeguarding IP rights against infringement and ensuring that IP holders can fully exercise their prerogatives.

In addition to these legal theories, the study also incorporates concepts related to institutional economics and public administration, particularly concerning the principles of autonomy, efficiency, and good governance in public sector organizations. The concept of an autonomous body for IP management is explored through the lens of institutional design, aiming to identify the optimal structure that can enhance DGIP's operational effectiveness and responsiveness to market demands. Good governance principles, such as transparency, accountability, and participation, are also integral to the proposed restructuring, ensuring that the new autonomous body operates with integrity and serves the public interest effectively.

A. Research Methodology

The research employs a normative legal research methodology, complemented by empirical data analysis. This approach allows for a thorough examination of legal norms, principles, and doctrines related to intellectual property, as well as an assessment of their practical implementation and impact. The normative aspect involves analysing relevant laws, regulations, and international conventions pertaining to intellectual property in Indonesia and other jurisdictions. This includes a detailed review of the existing legal framework governing DGIP and its functions.

For the empirical component, the study utilizes a comparative legal approach, drawing insights from the experiences of intellectual property offices in various countries. The selection of these countries—South Korea, Japan, the United States, the European Union, China, Singapore, Saudi Arabia, and Egypt—is based on their diverse institutional models and varying levels of success in intellectual property valuation and economic utilization. This comparative analysis helps identify best practices and potential models for restructuring DGIP, adapting them to the specific context of Indonesia. Data collection involves document analysis of legal texts, policy documents, and reports from national and international IP organizations.

B. Research Questions and Objectives

The overarching research question guiding this study is how the restructuring of DGIP into an autonomous body can strengthen its intellectual property valuation functions and optimize the economic utilization of intellectual property in Indonesia. To address this, the study sets forth several specific objectives:

1. To analyse the current institutional position and functions of DGIP within the Indonesian administrative system.
2. To identify the challenges and limitations faced by DGIP in performing its IP valuation and economic utilization functions.
3. To conduct a comparative study of institutional models for intellectual property management in selected countries.
4. To propose an ideal institutional model for DGIP based on the findings of the comparative analysis and theoretical framework.
5. To assess the potential impact of the proposed restructuring on the effectiveness of IP valuation and economic utilization in Indonesia.

III. Results and Discussion

This section presents the key findings derived from the analysis of DGIP's current institutional framework, its performance in intellectual property management, and a comparative study with international intellectual property offices. The discussion highlights the critical issues impeding DGIP's effectiveness, particularly concerning intellectual property valuation and economic utilization.

A. Institutional Structure and Performance of DGIP

The Directorate General of Intellectual Property (DGIP) operates under the Ministry of Law, a hierarchical structure that, while providing governmental oversight, often limits its operational autonomy and flexibility.⁸ The Directorate General of Intellectual Property (DGIP) carries out tasks and functions that are

⁸ Kementerian Hukum dibentuk pada 21 Oktober 2024 dengan Dasar hukum pendirian Peraturan Presiden Nomor 155 Tahun 2024 tentang Kementerian Hukum dan Peraturan Menteri Hukum Nomor 1 Tahun 2024 Tentang Organisasi dan Tata Kerja Kementerian Hukum

broadly in the form of: (1) formulation of policies in the field of legal protection of intellectual property, (2) implementation of policies in the field of legal protection of intellectual property, (3) provision of technical guidance and supervision in the field of legal protection of intellectual property, (4) implementation of monitoring, evaluation, and reporting in the field of legal protection of intellectual property, (5) implementation of DGIP administration, and (6) implementation of other functions assigned by the Minister. This organizational setup can lead to bureaucratic inefficiencies, slow decision-making processes, and a lack of specialized focus on the rapidly evolving demands of intellectual property management and valuation.

The institutional performance of Indonesia's Directorate General of Intellectual Property (DGIP) can be evaluated through its strategic alignment with national development plans and public satisfaction metrics. Aligned with the 2020-2024 National Medium-Term Development Plan (RPJMN), the DGIP's policy direction is structured around ensuring public services in the legal sector are consistent with public service principles, with the programmatic goal of protecting intellectual property throughout Indonesia.⁹ In 2023, the DGIP reported a Key Performance Indicator (IKU) achievement of 105.68%, surpassing its target of 3.34 with a realization of 3.53 (on a scale of 4). This indicates success in meeting its top-level strategic objectives.

However, a more granular analysis of public satisfaction reveals significant areas for improvement. The 2023 Public Satisfaction Index (IKM) survey, while yielding an overall "very good" rating with a score of 88.31, highlights critical weaknesses in specific service areas. The lowest scores were recorded for Complaint Handling (81.70) and Post-Registration IP Services (82.26). These scores are particularly concerning as they represent a decline from previous years; for instance, the score for complaint handling dropped from 84.46 in 2022, and post-registration services have seen a steady decline from a high of 90.90 in 2020.

These weaknesses are felt more acutely by certain user groups. For patent applicants, the satisfaction scores for "Complaint Handling" and "Post-Registration

⁹ Direktorat Jenderal Kekayaan Intelektual (DGIP). *Laporan Kinerja Instansi Pemerintah (LKJIP) DGIP Tahun 2023*. Jakarta: DGIP, 2024, p. 21.

Services” were even lower, at 72.18 and 68.75 respectively, falling into the “poor” to “fair” categories. This suggests that users dealing with more complex IP matters face greater difficulties.

The gap between public expectation and perceived performance further underscores these issues. The 2023 IKM survey reveals a significant gap of 7.99 points for “Complaint Handling” and 5.87 points for “Post-Registration IP Services,” the largest gaps among all service parameters. This indicates that the public expects a much higher quality of service in these crucial areas, which are directly related to legal certainty and the enforcement of IP rights after they have been granted.

While the increasing number of IP applications from 2019 to 2023 signals a growing public awareness of IP's importance, it also puts immense pressure on the DGIP. This surge necessitates an urgent enhancement of human resource capacity, both in quantity and quality, to manage the growing workload and the increasing complexity of IP examination and dispute resolution effectively.

Indonesia's performance on the global stage provides an external benchmark for its IP and legal ecosystem, where the DGIP plays a central role. Three key international indices offer a comprehensive view: the International Property Rights Index (IPRI), the World Justice Project's Rule of Law Index, and the Global Innovation Index (GII).

The 2024 International Property Rights Index (IPRI) places Indonesia at 62nd out of 125 countries globally and 11th in the Asia and Oceania region, with an overall score of 5.0. While this represents a slight improvement, the score for the “Legal and Political Environment” sub-index remains modest at 4.402, with the “Rule of Law” component scoring 4.622. Within the IP-specific sub-index, “Copyright Protection” scores particularly low at 3.957, despite a recent uptick. This overall ranking places Indonesia below regional peers such as Singapore (1st in the region) and Malaysia (7th).

The 2024 Rule of Law Index by the World Justice Project ranks Indonesia 68th out of 142 countries, with a score of 0.53. This places Indonesia in the middle tier globally but highlights persistent challenges. Key weaknesses are identified in factors such as “Regulatory Enforcement” and “Civil Justice,” both of which are directly

impacted by the efficiency and effectiveness of government bodies like the DGIP in implementing regulations and facilitating dispute resolution.

The 2023 Global Innovation Index (GII) offers the most direct reflection of the IP ecosystem's health. Indonesia ranked 61st out of 132 countries, a notable improvement from 75th place in 2022. However, this performance is historically volatile. A critical area of weakness is the "Institutions" pillar, where Indonesia ranks a low 95th. This pillar assesses the quality of the regulatory and business environment, including the effectiveness of government and the rule of law, areas where the DGIP is a key institution. The low ranking in this pillar suggests that the institutional framework supporting innovation in Indonesia is not yet optimal.

The institutional weaknesses are a major contributing factor to Indonesia's GII ranking. An effective innovation ecosystem requires more than just laws; it needs strong, efficient, and responsive institutions. The DGIP's challenges in providing consistent, high-quality services and its struggles with enforcement and post-grant support undermine the very foundation of legal certainty that innovators and investors rely upon. In conclusion, a comprehensive institutional reform of the DGIP is crucial not only to improve domestic public services but also to enhance Indonesia's global competitiveness in innovation and investment.

The research identifies several key areas where DGIP's current structure impacts its performance:

1. **Limited Institutional Position:** As a directorate general, DGIP's authority and resource allocation are subject to ministerial priorities and budgetary constraints. This can hinder its ability to independently pursue strategic initiatives, invest in necessary technological infrastructure, or attract and retain highly specialized talent required for complex IP valuation tasks.
2. **Lack of Policy Synergy:** The intellectual property ecosystem in Indonesia involves multiple stakeholders, including government agencies, universities, research institutions, and industries. The study reveals a lack of cohesive policy synergy among these entities, leading to fragmented efforts in promoting IP creation, protection, and commercialization. DGIP, in its current capacity, struggles to effectively coordinate these diverse actors to build a robust national IP ecosystem.

3. **Human Resource Capacity:** While DGIP possesses dedicated personnel, there is a recognized need for enhanced capacity in specialized areas such as intellectual property valuation, technology transfer, and commercialization. The existing training programs and recruitment strategies may not adequately address the evolving skill sets required to effectively manage and leverage intellectual assets in a globalized economy.
4. **Underdeveloped Financial Infrastructure:** The current financial mechanisms for intellectual property valuation and commercialization in Indonesia are nascent. This includes limited access to IP-backed financing, a lack of standardized valuation methodologies, and insufficient market platforms for IP transactions. DGIP's ability to facilitate the economic utilization of IP is constrained by these systemic deficiencies.

B. Comparative Analysis of International IP Offices

To identify best practices and potential models for institutional reform, this study conducted a comparative analysis of intellectual property offices in several countries known for their advanced IP ecosystems. The selected countries include South Korea, Japan, the United States, the European Union, China, Singapore, Saudi Arabia, and Egypt. This comparative approach reveals diverse institutional structures, operational models, and strategies for promoting intellectual property valuation and economic utilization.

Country/Region	Institutional Model	Key Strength in IP Valuation/Commercialization
South Korea	Autonomous agency (KIPO) with strong government support and industry linkages.	Robust IP-backed financing, active technology transfer, strong R&D investment.
Japan	Independent administrative agency (JPO) with a focus on	Comprehensive IP support services, strong patent

	supporting innovation and SMEs.	examination, IP financing schemes.
United States	Executive agency (USPTO) within the Department of Commerce, but with significant operational autonomy.	Mature IP market, extensive legal and financial infrastructure for IP commercialization.
European Union	Decentralized system with national IP offices and a regional office (EUIPO) for trademarks and designs.	Harmonized IP laws, cross-border IP enforcement, growing IP valuation services.
China	Centralized administration (CNIPA) with a strong focus on IP creation and enforcement.	Rapid growth in patent filings, government-led IP commercialization initiatives.
Singapore	Statutory board (IPOS) under the Ministry of Law, with a mandate to develop Singapore as an IP hub.	Proactive IP strategy, strong legal framework, incentives for IP commercialization.
Saudi Arabia	Emerging IP framework with a focus on economic diversification and technology transfer.	Developing IP infrastructure, increasing awareness of IP's economic value.
Egypt	Centralized IP office (EGPO) with efforts to modernize IP administration and enforcement.	Focus on capacity building and international cooperation in IP.

Table 1: Comparative Overview of International Intellectual Property Office Models

Key takeaways from the comparative analysis include:

- **Autonomy and Specialization:** Many successful IP offices operate with a high degree of autonomy, allowing them to focus on their core mandate without

undue bureaucratic interference. This autonomy often translates into specialized expertise in IP valuation, commercialization, and enforcement.

- Integrated Ecosystem Approach: Leading IP jurisdictions demonstrate a strong emphasis on building an integrated IP ecosystem, where government, industry, academia, and financial institutions collaborate to foster innovation and economic utilization of IP.
- Proactive Role in Valuation and Commercialization: Beyond registration and protection, advanced IP offices actively engage in promoting IP valuation, facilitating technology transfer, and developing financial instruments that leverage intellectual assets.

C. Identified Problems in IP Governance in Indonesia

Based on the analysis of DGIP's performance and the comparative study, several core problems in Indonesia's intellectual property governance framework are identified:

1. Limited Institutional Position of DGIP: The current status of DGIP as a directorate general within a ministry restricts its flexibility, budget, and ability to act as a truly independent and agile institution. This limits its capacity to respond effectively to the dynamic needs of the IP landscape.
2. Lack of Synergy in National IP Ecosystem Policies: There is a discernible gap in coordinated policy-making and implementation among various government bodies and stakeholders involved in the IP ecosystem. This fragmentation hinders the development of a holistic approach to IP creation, protection, and commercialization.
3. Orientation and Human Resource Capacity of DGIP: While efforts have been made, there is a need for a stronger market-oriented approach within DGIP and further development of specialized human resources, particularly in the complex and evolving field of intellectual property valuation.
4. Underdeveloped Financial Infrastructure: The current financial mechanisms for intellectual property valuation and commercialization in Indonesia are nascent. This includes limited access to IP-backed financing, a lack of standardized valuation methodologies, and insufficient market platforms for

IP transactions. DGIP's ability to facilitate the economic utilization of IP is constrained by these systemic deficiencies.

D. The Autonomous Public Service Agency (PSA / BLU) Model

To address the institutional challenges, the most viable and strategic path is the restructuring of DGIP into an autonomous Public Service Agency (PSA), or *Badan Layanan Umum* (BLU). The BLU model, governed by Government Regulation No. 23 of 2005, grants government agencies the flexibility to manage their finances and operations more independently, akin to a private enterprise, while still fulfilling a public service mandate. This model is the ideal solution as it directly tackles the core weaknesses identified in DGIP's current structure.

By becoming a BLU, DGIP would gain several key advantages:

1. **Financial Autonomy:** It could manage its own revenue (PNBP in Indonesian term) to reinvest in critical areas like technology upgrades, examiner training, and the development of new services, such as a dedicated IP valuation unit, without being constrained by the standard state budget cycle.
2. **Operational Flexibility:** It would have greater freedom to design its organizational structure, streamline bureaucratic procedures, and establish partnerships directly with the private sector and financial institutions.
3. **Performance-Based Management:** The BLU framework encourages a focus on results and service quality, with performance measured against clear indicators, shifting the institutional orientation from administrative process to economic impact.

This model has been successfully implemented by other technical service-oriented government bodies in Indonesia and mirrors the semi-autonomous status of highly effective IPOs like KIPO and IPOS. Transforming DGIP into a BLU is a pragmatic first step that provides the necessary autonomy to build a modern, responsive, and economically-focused IP institution.

E. Expected Impacts of Restructuring

The transformation of DGIP into a BLU is expected to yield significant positive impacts across the IP ecosystem. Firstly, it will lead to a marked increase in service

efficiency. With streamlined bureaucracy and the ability to invest in technology, processing times for IP registration are projected to decrease, addressing a major complaint from users. Secondly, the model will strengthen coordination with industry and financial institutions. An autonomous DGIP can forge strategic partnerships to develop standardized valuation methodologies and facilitate IP-backed financing schemes, unlocking new capital for innovators.

Thirdly, it will enable a more optimal IP valuation function by allowing for the creation of a specialized valuation unit and the development of a national IP transaction database. Finally, these improvements will culminate in increased economic utilization of IP. By providing clear valuation pathways and better access to commercialization support, the restructuring will help translate Indonesia's creative and innovative potential into tangible economic growth, job creation, and enhanced national competitiveness.

IV. Conclusion and Recommendations

This study has highlighted the critical need for the restructuring of the Directorate General of Intellectual Property (DGIP) into an autonomous body to enhance its capacity for intellectual property (IP) valuation and optimize the economic utilization of IP in Indonesia. The current institutional framework, characterized by its limited autonomy, lack of synergistic policies within the national IP ecosystem, and challenges in human resource capacity, significantly impedes DGIP's effectiveness in fostering innovation and contributing to economic development.

The comparative analysis of international IP offices, including those in South Korea, Japan, the United States, the European Union, China, Singapore, Saudi Arabia, and Egypt, provides compelling evidence that autonomous or semi-autonomous IP institutions are better positioned to adapt to the dynamic IP landscape, attract specialized talent, and implement proactive strategies for IP valuation and commercialization. These successful models demonstrate the importance of operational flexibility, financial independence, and a strong focus on market-oriented services to unlock the full economic potential of intellectual assets.

Therefore, the primary recommendation of this study is the transformation of DGIP into an autonomous body. This restructuring should be accompanied by:

1. **Enhanced Operational Autonomy:** Granting DGIP greater independence in decision-making, resource allocation, and strategic planning will enable it to respond more effectively to the evolving needs of the IP ecosystem and implement innovative programs for IP valuation and commercialization.
2. **Strengthened Policy Synergy:** Developing a comprehensive national IP strategy that fosters greater collaboration and coordination among all stakeholders—government agencies, industry, academia, and financial institutions—is crucial. An autonomous DGIP can play a pivotal role in leading and facilitating these synergistic efforts.
3. **Capacity Building in IP Valuation:** Investing in specialized training programs, recruiting experts in IP valuation, and developing standardized methodologies for assessing the economic value of intellectual assets are essential steps to enhance DGIP's capabilities in this critical area.
4. **Development of IP Financial Infrastructure:** Creating a more robust financial ecosystem that supports IP-backed financing, facilitates IP transactions, and encourages investment in intellectual assets will be vital for maximizing the economic utilization of IP in Indonesia.

By implementing these recommendations, Indonesia can significantly strengthen its intellectual property framework, transform DGIP into a more effective and responsive institution, and ultimately leverage intellectual property as a powerful engine for sustainable economic growth and national competitiveness.

References

Books

- Acemoglu, D., and J. A. Robinson. *Why Nations Fail: The Origins of Power, Prosperity, and Poverty*. Crown Business, 2012.
- Ahmad, T., and M. Sulistyaningsih. *Potensi Ekonomi Kekayaan Intelektual*. Bandung: Penerbit Universitas, 2023.
- Anson, W., and D. C. *वृत्तस. Fundamentals of Intellectual Property Valuation: A Primer for Identifying and Determining Value*. Chicago: American Bar Association, 2005.
- Asmoro, A. *Administrasi Kekayaan Intelektual di Indonesia: Analisis dan Solusi*. Jakarta: Penerbit Universitas, 2022.

- Bachtiar. *Politik Hukum Konstitusi Pertanggung Jawaban Konstitusional Presiden*. Jakarta: Suluh Media, 2018.
- Correa, C. *Integrating Public Health Concerns into Patent Legislation in Developing Countries*. Swiss: The South Centre, 2000.
- Damodaran, A. *Investment Valuation: Tools and Techniques for Determining the Value of Any Asset*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, 2012.
- Djokosutono. *Kuliah Ilmu Negara*. Jakarta: Ghalia Indonesia, 1982.
- Friedman, L. M. *The Legal System: A Social Science Perspective*. Russell Sage Foundation, 2017.
- Ganea, P., and Pattloch. *Intellectual Property Law in China*. Max Planck Institute for Foreign and International Patent, Copyright and Competition Law: Kluwer Law International, 2005.
- Hadjon, P. M. *Perlindungan Hukum Bagi Rakyat - Sebuah Studi Tentang Prinsip-prinsipnya, Penanganannya Oleh Pengadilan Dalam Lingkungan Peradilan Umum Dan Pembentukan Peradilan Administrasi Negara*. Surabaya: Bina Ilmu, 1987.
- Hassan, E., O. Yaqub, and S. Diepeveen. *Intellectual Property and Developing Countries: A review of the literature*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, 2010.
- Heller, M. A., and M. Cohn. *Design Rights and the Creative Economy*. London: Routledge, 2021.
- International Accounting Standards Board. *International Financial Reporting Standards*. London: IFRS Foundation, 2023.
- Jaffe, A. B., and J. Lerner. *Innovation and Its Discontents: How Our Broken Patent System is Endangering Innovation and Progress, and What to Do About It*. Princeton University Press, 2004.
- Kansil, C.S.T. *Pengantar Ilmu Hukum Dan Tata Hukum Indonesia*. Jakarta: Balai Pustaka, 1986.
- Keller, K. L. *Strategic Brand Management*. New York: Wiley, 2022.
- Kretschmer, M., and L. Bently. *Intellectual Property Law*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019.
- Marzuki, P. M. *Pengantar Ilmu Hukum*. Jakarta: Kencana, 2008.
- Merges, R. P., P. S. Menell, and M. A. Lemley. *Intellectual Property in the New Technological Age*. 7th ed. New York: Wolters Kluwer, 2016.
- Muhtaj, M. E. *Hak Asasi Manusia dalam Konstitusi Indonesia*. Jakarta: Kencana, 2005.
- Munawir, H. *Hukum Kekayaan Intelektual*. Bandung: Refika Aditama, 2015.
- North, D. C. *Institutions, Institutional Change and Economic Performance*. Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- Olwan, R. M. *Intellectual Property and Development*. Springer eBooks, 2013.
- Patton, M. Q. *Qualitative Research & Evaluation Methods: Integrating Theory and Practice*. SAGE Publications, 2014.
- Pollitt, C., and G. Bouckaert. *Public Management Reform: A Comparative Analysis - Into the Age of Austerity*. 4th ed. Oxford University Press, 2017.
- Pratt, S. P. *Valuing a Business: The Analysis and Appraisal of Closely Held Companies*. 5th ed. New York: McGraw-Hill, 2008.
- Pusat Kajian Ekonomi Kekayaan Intelektual. *Studi Regulasi dan Kelembagaan Valuasi KI di Indonesia*. Jakarta: Universitas Indonesia, 2024.
- Raharjo, S. *Ilmu Hukum*. Bandung: PT Citra Aditya Bakti, 2000.

- Scott, W. R. *Institutions and Organizations: Ideas, Interests, and Identities*. 4th ed. Sage Publications, 2014.
- Setiono. *Rule Of Law (supremasi hukum)*. Surakarta: Magister Ilmu Hukum Program Pascasarjana Universitas Sebelas Maret, 2004.
- Sibuea, H. P. *Ilmu Negara*. Jakarta: Erlangga, 2014.
- Smith, G. V., and R. L. Parr. *Intellectual Property: Valuation, Exploitation, and Infringement Damages*. Hoboken: John Wiley & Sons, 2005.
- Supriyanto, A. *Valuasi Kekayaan Intelektual*. Jakarta: Salemba Empat, 2017.
- Suryadi, A. *Peran Badan Otonomi dalam Penegakan Hukum Kekayaan Intelektual*. Yogyakarta: Penerbit Akademik, 2022.
- Yamin, M. *Proklamasi dan Konstitusi Republik Indonesia*. Jakarta: Ghalia Indonesia, 1982.
- Yin, R. K. *Case Study Research and Applications: Design and Methods*. 6th ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2018.

Book Chapters

- Arrow, K. J. "Economic Welfare and the Allocation of Resources for Invention." In *The Rate and Direction of Inventive Activity: Economic and Social Factors*, 609–26. Princeton University Press, 1962.
- Deere, Carolyn. "The Politics of Intellectual Property Reform in Developing Countries: The Relevance of the World Intellectual Property Organization." In *The Development Agenda: Global Intellectual Property and Developing Countries*, edited by N. W. Netanel. New York: Oxford Academic, 2009.
- Phan, K. "Protecting Intellectual Property Rights in Vietnam: Opportunities and Challenges." In *Challenges of Governance*, 13. 2021.
- Santa Cruz, M., and C. Olivos. "The Twenty-First Century Intellectual Property Office." In *Intellectual Property and Development: Understanding the Interfaces*, edited by C. Correa and X. Seuba, 182. Singapore: Springer, 2019.

Journals and Research Articles

- Alcácer, J., K. Beukel, and Cassiman. "Capturing Value from Intellectual Property (IP) in a Global Environment." *Journal of International Business Studies*, 2017.
- Ardiansyah, E., R. Rachman, S. Datupalinge, and D. K. Sari. "The Role and Authority of the Directorate General of Intellectual Property in Handling Complaints of Copyright Infringement in Indonesia." *Lambung Mangkurat Law Journal* 8 (2023).
- Barbosa, A. F., F. P. Velloso, and J. Bastos. "Do surgimento ao ocaso da anuência prévia da Anvisa: uma análise crítica do patenteamento farmacêutico no Brasil." *Revista Digital de Direito Administrativo*, 2024, 334.
- Barbosa, D. B. "Technology Contracts in Brazil: The Patent Office Screening Rôle," 2012, 5.
- Bowen, G. A. "Document Analysis as a Qualitative Research Method." *Qualitative Research Journal* 9, no. 2 (2009): 27–40.
- Braun, V., and V. Clarke. "Using thematic analysis in psychology." *Qualitative Research in Psychology* 3, no. 2 (2006): 77–101.
- Brignall, S., and S. Modell. "An Institutional Perspective on Performance Measurement and Management in the 'New Public Sector'." *Management Accounting Research* 11 (2000): 281–306.
- Darwance, D., Y. Yokotani, and W. Anggita. "Dasar-Dasar Pemikiran Perlindungan Hak Kekayaan Intelektual." *Jurnal Hukum Progresif* 14, no. 22 (2020): 193–208.
- Dewi, P., and F. Anwar. "Strategi Pemanfaatan Kekayaan Intelektual: Peluang dan Tantangan." *Jurnal Ekonomi Kreatif* 13, no. 4 (2023): 45–60.

- Drahoš, P. "Developing Countries and International Intellectual Property Standard-Setting." *The Journal of World Intellectual Property* 5, no. 5 (2002): 765–89.
- Fitriani, N., and L. Indriani. "Koordinasi Lembaga Pengelola Kekayaan Intelektual: Studi Kasus dan Best Practices." *Jurnal Kebijakan Publik* 11, no. 3 (2021): 102–19.
- Gorian, E. "Singapore state strategy on development of intellectual property: normative-legal and institutional aspects," 2020, 10–21.
- Greenwood, R., and C. R. Hinings. "Understanding Radical Organizational Change: Bringing Together the Old and the New Institutionalism." *Academy of Management Review* 21, no. 4 (1996): 1022–54.
- Gurgur, T., and W. Xiong. "Institutional Reforms, Productivity and Efficiency: From Measurement to Implementation." *The World Bank Economic Review* 35, no. 3 (2021): 643–62.
- Hakim, A. "Dinamika Pelaksanaan Good Governance di Indonesia (dalam Perspektif Yuridis dan Implementasi)." *Civil Service* 10, no. 1 (2016): 15–33.
- Hood, C. "The 'New Public Management' in the 1980s: Variations on a Theme." *Accounting, Organizations and Society* 46, no. 1–2 (2021): 93–109.
- Kalmyrza, G. M., and G. T. Alaeva. "Issues of legal protection of intellectual property rights." *Eurasian Scientific Journal of Law*, 2024, 15.
- Kim, J. H. "Intellectual Property Reform in South Korea: Effects on Innovation and Economic Growth." *Journal of East Asian Studies* 12, no. 3 (2015): 245–67.
- Kitch, E. W. "The Nature and Function of the Patent System." *The Journal of Law and Economics* 20, no. 2 (1977): 265–90.
- Kshetri, N. "Institutionalization of Intellectual Property Rights in China." *European Management Journal* 27 (2009): 155–64.
- Landes, W. M., and R. A. Posner. "An Economic Analysis of Copyright Law." *The Journal of Legal Studies* 18, no. 2 (1989): 325–63.
- Lee, M., J. D. Alba, and D. Park. "Intellectual Property Rights, Informal Economy, and FDI into Developing Countries." *ADB Working Paper*, 2018, 15.
- Lozova, G., and I. P. Bagriy. "Reforming the Intellectual Property System of Ukraine in the Context of European Integration." *Theoretical and Applied Issues of Economics*, 2024.
- Magalhães, G. R. F., and R. L. Sichel. "A Burocracia nos Contratos de Averbção de Tecnologia no Brasil," 2020, 153–67.
- Mangar, I., and M. R. Rosyid. "Lembaga Independen Negara dalam Ketatanegaraan Indonesia." *Definisi: Jurnal Agama dan Sosial-Humaniora* 1, no. 2 (2022): 75–84.
- May, R., and S. L. Cooper. "Intellectual Property Rights Under the Constitution's Rule of Law." *Perspectives from FSF Scholars* 9, no. 31 (2014): 4.
- Meyer, J., and B. Rowan. "Institutionalized Organizations: Formal Structure as Myth and Ceremony." *American Journal of Sociology* 83 (1977): 340–63.
- Muis, L. S. "Hak Atas Aksesibilitas Obat Paten Bagi Masyarakat." *Widya Pranata Hukum Jurnal Kajian Dan Penelitian Hukum* 1, no. 1 (2019): 36–64.
- Natalia, A. "Paradigma Good Governance Dalam Administrasi Publik Memfasilitasi Pencapaian Tujuan Pembangunan Berkelanjutan (TBP)." *Jurnal Tapis: Teropong Aspirasi Politik Islam* 17, no. 1 (2021): 15–26.
- Papageorgiadis, N., F. McDonald, C. Wang, and P. Konara. "The characteristics of intellectual property rights regimes: How formal and informal institutions affect outward FDI location." *International Business Review*, 2020, 7.

- Park, J. H. "Comparative Analysis of IP Valuation Systems in ASEAN Countries." *Journal of Intellectual Property Rights* 28, no. 3 (2023): 145–60.
- Pratama, A., and R. Kusuma. "Efisiensi Administrasi dalam Pengelolaan Kekayaan Intelektual: Studi Kasus dan Rekomendasi." *Jurnal Administrasi Negara* 19, no. 1 (2022): 12–28.
- Putri, R. Z. "Eksistensi HAKI di Indonesia pada Era Disrupsi." *Jurnal Ilmiah Wahana Pendidikan*, 2023, 456–58.
- Rastogi, M., V. Rastogi, and D. Rajpoot. "Intellectual Property Challenges in Cross-border Business Transactions." *International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research*, 2024.
- Reichman, J. H., and R. C. Dreyfuss. "Harmonization Without Consensus: Critical Reflections on Drafting a Substantive Patent Law Treaty." *Duke Law Journal* 57, no. 1 (2007): 85–130.
- Romer, P. M. "Endogenous Technological Change." *Journal of Political Economy* 98, no. 5 (1990): S71–S102.
- Saputra, J. I., M. F. Rizki, and Iskandar. "Perspektif Negara Hukum Dalam Pengimplementasian Hak Kekayaan Intelektual." *Jurnal Renvoi: Jurnal Hukum dan Syariah* 1, no. 2 (2024): 122–23.
- Sari, S., and R. Wijaya. "Penegakan Hukum Kekayaan Intelektual di Indonesia: Tantangan dan Solusi." *Jurnal Hukum Indonesia* 15, no. 2 (2021): 85–102.
- Saydakhmedov, U. M. "Issues of Organizational and Legal Support for the Protection of Intellectual Property in Administrative Courts." *The American Journal of Political Science Law and Criminology*, 2024, 21.
- Setianingrum, R. B. "Evaluasi Regulasi Valuasi Kekayaan Intelektual di Indonesia: Perspektif Komparatif." *Jurnal Hukum Bisnis* 41, no. 2 (2022): 78–92.
- Sitepu, V. "Pelaksanaan Prinsip First To File dalam Penyelesaian Sengketa Merek Dagang Asing di Pengadilan (Studi Kasus Tentang Gugatan Pencabutan Hak Merek 'Toast Box' oleh Breadtalk Pte.ltd No: 02/merek/2011/pn.niaga/medan)," 2015, 3.
- Sivova, T. "Intellectual Property Protection in Ukraine and the EU." *Odessa National University Herald. Economy*, 2021, 90.
- Snyder, D. C. "Locke on Natural Law and Property Rights." *Canadian Journal of Philosophy* 16, no. 4 (1986): 723–50.
- Tan, C. L., and A. Nugroho. "IP-Backed Financing in Southeast Asia: Challenges and Opportunities." *Singapore Journal of Legal Studies*, 2022, 89–107.
- Verhoest, K., B. G. Peters, G. Bouckaert, and B. Verschuere. "The Study of Organisational Autonomy: A Conceptual Review." *Public Administration and Development* 24, no. 2 (2004): 101–18.
- Wulandari, Suartini, F. F. "Valuasi Aset Hak Kekayaan Intelektual dalam Jaminan Fidusia." *Binamulia Hukum* 13, no. 2 (2024).
- Zuhad, Z. M. "Analisis Kepegawaian Lembaga Negara Independen Dalam Menunjang Good Governance (Studi Kasus Komisi Pemberantasan Korupsi)." *Jurnal Hukum Kebijakan Publik: Res Publica* 7, no. 3 (2023).
- Reports and Official Documents**
- China National Intellectual Property Administration. *White Paper on Intellectual Property Protection in China 2020*. Beijing, 2020.
- Direktorat Jenderal Kekayaan Intelektual (DGIP). *Laporan Tahunan 2022*. 2022.
- Direktorat Jenderal Kekayaan Intelektual (DGIP). *Laporan Kinerja Instansi Pemerintah DGIP Tahun 2023*. 2023.

- DPMA. *DPMA Annual Review*. 2022.
- Egypt National Intellectual Property Strategy. Executive Summary. 2022.
- Egyptian Authority for Intellectual Property. *EAIP Annual Report 2023*. 2023.
- Egyptian Authority for Intellectual Property. *International Cooperation Programme 2023*. 2023.
- European Patent Office. *Annual Report*. 2023.
- European Patent Office. *Patent Statistics Report 2023*. 2023.
- European Union Intellectual Property Office (EUIPO). *Intellectual Property Perception Study*. Alicante: EUIPO, 2020.
- Intellectual Property Office of Singapore (IPOS). *IP Financing and Commercialisation Report*. Singapore: IPOS, 2021.
- Intellectual Property Office of Singapore. *IPOS Annual Report 2023*. 2023.
- IP Australia. *Trade Marks*. Canberra: IP Australia, 2021.
- Japan Patent Office. *Intellectual Property Strategic Program 2004 as of May 2004*. Tokyo, 2004.
- Japan Patent Office. *JPO Status Report 2022*. 2022.
- Japan Patent Office. *JPO Status Report 2024*. 2024.
- Jang, J. *WIPO Solutions for IP Offices*. 2017.
- JPO. *Intellectual Property Strategy Headquarters, Comparison of IP Valuation Systems Worldwide*. 2022.
- Kementerian Hukum dan Hak Asasi Manusia. *Laporan Tahunan Direktorat Jenderal Kekayaan Intelektual 2023*. 2023.
- Korean Intellectual Property Office (KIPO). *KIPO Annual Report 2018*. Seoul, 2018.
- Korean Intellectual Property Office (KIPO). *National Intellectual Property Strategy Annual Implementation Report*. Seoul: KIPO, 2021.
- Korean Intellectual Property Office. *KIPO Annual Report 2022*. 2022.
- Korean Intellectual Property Office. *Annual Report 2023*. Seoul: KIPO Publications, 2023.
- Nagaoka, S. *Hitotsubashi University, 21st Century Innovation Systems for Japan and The United States: Lesson from a Decade of Change*. Washington DC: The National Academies Press, 2001.
- Ogada, T. P. M., and World Intellectual Property Organization. *Methodology for the Development of National Intellectual Property Strategies, Toolkit 3: Benchmarking Indicators*. 2016.
- Peraturan Menteri Hukum dan Hak Asasi Manusia Republik Indonesia Nomor 28 Tahun 2023 Tentang Organisasi Dan Tata Kerja Kementerian Hukum Dan Hak Asasi Manusia. 2023.
- Saudi Authority for Intellectual Property. *Annual Report 2023*. 2023.
- U.S. Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO). *Fiscal Year 2021: Congressional Justification*. 2020.
- U.S. Patent and Trademark Office. *FY 2023 Performance and Accountability Report*. 2023.
- U.S. Patent and Trademark Office. *Patents: How They Work*. Washington, D.C.: USPTO, 2023.
- U.S. Patent and Trademark Office. *USPTO Outreach Programs Overview*. 2023.
- U.S. Patent and Trademark Office. *USPTO Public Engagement Policies and Procedures Manual*. 2023.
- World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO). *WIPO Intellectual Property Handbook: Policy, Law and Use*. 2nd ed. Geneva: WIPO, 2004.

- World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO). *The Evolution of Modern Patent Systems*. WIPO Publications, 2008.
- World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO). *Module 11: IP Valuation, IP Panorama*. 2016.
- World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO). *Methodology for the Development of National Intellectual Property Strategies*. Geneva: WIPO, 2019.
- World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO). *The Berne Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works*. Geneva: WIPO, 2020.
- World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO). *Case Study: Singapore's IPOS as a Strategic IP Agency*. 2021.
- World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO). *Intellectual Property Needs and Expectations of Traditional Knowledge Holders*. 2021.
- World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO). *World Intellectual Property Report*. 2021.
- World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO). *Report on the International IP System and Office Cooperation*. Geneva: WIPO, 2022.
- World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO). *The Role of IP Offices in the Innovation Ecosystem*. Tbilisi, 2022.
- World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO). *WIPO Performance Report 2022/2023*. 2022.
- World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO). *An International Guide to Patent Case Management for Judges*. WIPO, 2023.
- World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO). *Indonesia Intellectual Property Statistics Country Profile*. 2023.
- World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO). *Patent Cooperation Treaty (PCT) Guide*. 2023.
- World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO). *WIPO Publication 2000-2023*. 2023.
- World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO). *WIPO Statistics Database*. 2023.
- World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO). *Models of Intellectual Property Governance and Administration*. Geneva: WIPO, 2024.
- World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO). *Autonomy and Governance of National IP Offices*. Geneva, 2021.

Online News and Websites

- Candra, A. "Mengapa Hak Kekayaan Intelektual (HKI) Perlu Dilindungi?" Kompasiana, October 31, 2010. <https://www.kompasiana.com/aguscandra/55003caea33311d07550fe0b/mengapa-hak-kekayaan-intelektual-hki-perlu-dilindungi>.
- Direktorat Jenderal Kekayaan Intelektual. "Direktorat Penegakan Hukum DGIP Siapkan Langkah Strategis Hadapi Tantangan Digital di Tahun 2025." January 27, 2025. <https://www.dgip.go.id/index.php/artikel/detail-artikel-berita/direktorat-penegakan-hukum-DGIP-siapkan-langkah-strategis-hadapi-tantangan-digital-di-tahun-2025?kategori=liputan-humas>.
- Direktorat Jenderal Kekayaan Intelektual. "Penegakan Hukum KI di Indonesia: Upaya dan Pencapaian DGIP." January 27, 2025. <https://dgip.go.id/index.php/artikel/detail-artikel-berita/penegakan-hukum-ki-di-indonesia-upaya-dan-pencapaian-DGIP>.
- European External Action Service. "Sekilas Uni Eropa." Accessed 2024. <https://www.eeas.europa.eu/>.

- Jose, T. "What is TRIPs Plus? What is Data Exclusivity?" *Indian Economy*, March 11, 2017. <https://www.indianeconomy.net/splclassroom/what-is-trips-plus-what-is-data-exclusivity/>.
- Kementerian Hukum Republik Indonesia. "Sejarah DGIP." Accessed n.d. <https://www.dgip.go.id/tentang-DGIP/sejarah-DGIP>.
- Kementerian Koordinator Bidang Perekonomian. "Industri Kreatif dan Digital: Kembangkan Potensi, Gerakkan Ekonomi, dan Ciptakan Lapangan Kerja." Accessed 2025. https://www.ekon.go.id/unduh/info_sektoral/324/berita-industri-kreatif-dan-digital-kembangkan-potensi-gerakkan-ekonomi-dan-ciptakan-lapangan-kerja.
- Konstitusi dan Konstitualisme. "Pembatasan Kekuasaan Organ-Organ Eksekutif Independen." Accessed n.d. <https://text-id.123dok.com/document/6qmrnpv7y-pembatasan-kekuasaan-organ-organ-eksekutif-independen.html>.
- Lepoer, B. L., ed. *Singapore: A Country Study*. Washington: GPO for the Library of Congress, 1989. <https://countrystudies.us/singapore/47.htm>.
- Mariani, and I. Rilyansyah. "Perlindungan Hukum Atas Folklor Dalam Instrumen Hukum Internasional dan Impelementasinya di Indonesia." May 27, 2013. https://mariani-irnilryansyah.blogspot.com/2013/05/perlindungan-hukum-atas-folklor-dalam_27.html.
- SAIP. "Application Grant Date." Accessed 2025. <https://www.saip.gov.sa/>.
- Satriana, E. "Analisa Konsep Keadilan, Kepastian dan Kemanfaatan dalam Penegakan Hukum Tindak Pidana Pertambangan." July 4, 2020. <https://www.kejari-bone.go.id/artikel/detail/1/analisa-konsep-keadilan-kepastian-dan-kemanfaatan-dalam-penegakan-hukum-tindak-pidana-pertambangan.html>.
- "Teori Negara Hukum." Accessed n.d. Universitas Islam Indonesia. <https://dspace.uui.ac.id/bitstream/handle/123456789/1751/05.2%20bab%202.pdf?sequence=9>.
- Trisno. "Teori Hukum HAKI." *Academia.edu*, September 19, 2017. https://www.academia.edu/15289152/TEORI_HUKUM_HAKI.
- Ukrainian National Office for Intellectual Property and Innovations (UANPIO). Accessed n.d. <https://nipo.gov.ua/en/>.
- United Kingdom Intellectual Property Office. Accessed 2024. <https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/intellectual-property-office>.
- U.S. International Trade Administration. "SAIP Information." Accessed 2024. <https://www.trade.gov/market-intelligence/saudi-arabia-intellectual-property-agency>.
- Wicaksono, I. "Politik Hukum Peindungan Hak Kekayaan Intelektual di Indonesia Pasca di Ratifikasinya TRIPS Agreement." 2019.
- World Bank. "Charges for the use of intellectual property dan GDP (current US\$) – Indonesia." Accessed March 25, 2025. https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/BX.GSR.ROYL.CD?contextual=default&locations=ID&name_desc=true.