



Legal Review of the Distribution of Song Copyright Royalties According to Law Number 28 of 2014 on Copyright from the Perspective of Justice

Orpa Juliana
Nubatonis*

Universitas Nusa Cendana,
Indonesia

Chatryen M Dju
Bire

Universitas Nusa Cendana,
Indonesia

Yossie Maria
Yulianty Jacob

Universitas Nusa Cendana,
Indonesia

***Corresponding author:**

Orpa Juliana Nubatonis, Universitas Nusa
Cendana, Indonesia.

✉ orpa.nubatonis@staf.undana.ac.id

Article Info:

Article history:

Received: August 12, 2026

Revised: September 15, 2026

Accepted: September 23, 2026

Available Online: October 6, 2026

Keywords:

Perspective of Fairness;

Royalty Distribution;

Song Copyright;



This is an open access article under the CC
BY-SA license.

Copyright © 2026 by Author. Published by
Politeknik Siber Cerdika International

Abstract

Background: A song is an artistic work created through the integration of melody, lyrics, and musical arrangement. In the digital era, the protection of song royalties has become increasingly important due to rapid technological developments that facilitate copyright infringement, particularly piracy, which undermines creators' economic rights. Economic rights, including the right to receive royalties, are explicitly protected under Law Number 28 of 2014 on Copyright.

Objective: This study examines the mechanism for distributing song royalties under the Copyright Law and evaluates the accountability and legal protection afforded in the distribution of royalties from the perspective of justice for songwriters.

Methods: Using a normative legal research method with a statutory approach, this study analyzes relevant legal provisions governing copyright and royalties.

Results: The findings show that royalty payments, as stipulated in Article 87 of Law Number 28 of 2014, are managed through *Lembaga Manajemen Kolektif* (LMK) to ensure the effective fulfillment of creators' economic rights arising from the commercial use of copyrighted works. Royalties are mandatory when songs and/or music are used commercially in circumstances covered by the applicable copyright regulations. In Indonesia, the management of royalties for songs and/or music involves *Lembaga Manajemen Kolektif Nasional* (LMKN), which is authorized to collect, administer, and distribute royalties in accordance with the applicable legal framework.

Conclusion: The study recommends enhancing public awareness of copyright and royalty obligations among both creators and users of music. It also suggests revising the Copyright Law, particularly regarding the determination of royalty rates, to provide greater legal certainty rather than relying solely on abstract standards of fairness and reasonableness.

To cite this article: Nubatonis, O. J., Bire, C. M. D., & Jacob, Y. M. Y. (2026). Legal review of the distribution of song copyright royalties according to Law Number 28 of 2014 on Copyright from the perspective of justice. *Journal of Law & Social Politics*, 4(4), 1064-1080. <https://doi.org/10.59261/jlsp.v4i4.275>

INTRODUCTION

In recent years, the creative industry sector, particularly in the field of music, has shown significant growth. This development is reflected in the increasing frequency of concerts and various performance events involving a range of actors, from government agencies and corporations to creative communities. These conditions have also encouraged young people to pursue careers in music. The presence of a number of musicians from Kupang who have successfully broken into the national and international music scenes has further reinforced the

perception that being a musician is not merely a form of artistic expression but also a promising career choice for individuals with talent and competence in the field of music.

A song is an important manifestation of Intellectual Property Rights, which essentially provide recognition and protection for a person's intellectual creativity, including the right to obtain economic benefits from the work produced (Yossie M. Y. Jacob et al., 2023). The process of creating a song is neither simple nor instantaneous but involves a series of complex stages and requires significant dedication. It involves various forms of sacrifice, both material, such as time, energy, and costs, and immaterial, such as emotional outpourings, inner experiences, and reflective processes that often drain the creator's psychological energy. The entire process ultimately culminates in the creation of a musical work that has aesthetic value and can be enjoyed not only by the creator but also by the wider community. The protection of songs as copyrighted works in Indonesia is normatively regulated under Law Number 28 of 2014 on Copyright. The existence of the copyright regime provides legal guarantees for songwriters to obtain fair compensation for the use of their works by other parties, whether in the form of royalty payments or other economic compensation schemes. The granting of these economic rights is a reasonable and proportional consequence of the creative contributions and sacrifices made by creators. More than merely serving as an instrument of protection, the copyright mechanism also serves as an incentive that encourages the sustainability of creativity by motivating songwriters to continue creating and contributing to the development of the music industry and culture more broadly (Suciadi et al., 2024).

Government Regulation Number 56 of 2021 on the Management of Royalties for Song and/or Music Copyright provides conceptual clarification that royalties are a form of compensation legally received by creators or related rights owners for the utilization of the economic rights in a work or related rights product. Royalties are not merely understood as a financial obligation but also as a mechanism for rewarding the intellectual and creative contributions embodied in songs and/or music. Within this framework, royalty payments reflect the principles of fairness and balance of interests among the parties involved. On the one hand, users gain access to and benefit from creative works for commercial and non-commercial purposes; on the other hand, creators or copyright owners receive appropriate economic recognition for the works they have produced. Furthermore, industry regulations and practices recognize several royalty payment schemes for song or music creators. First, the pure royalty system is a royalty payment mechanism calculated based on the copies of a work sold or the extent to which the work is utilized, so that remuneration depends on the level of utilization of the work in the market. Second, advance royalties are a system of advance royalty payments based on the number of copies or instances of utilization agreed upon in advance and subsequently reconciled against actual sales or use of the work. Third, the flat-fee system is a one-time payment of a specified amount agreed upon by the parties, without being directly linked to the number of copies sold or the intensity of the work's utilization. The diversity of these schemes demonstrates flexibility in the management of economic rights while also reflecting efforts to adapt the protection and recognition afforded to creators to the evolving dynamics of the music industry.

Law Number 28 of 2014 on Copyright does not explicitly stipulate a fixed amount of royalties that must be collected and distributed to creators or related rights owners. The absence of rigid nominal regulations reflects the choice of lawmakers to provide flexibility in the management of economic rights, given the diversity of forms of work utilization and the dynamics of the creative industry that continue to evolve. However, the law still provides a normative framework that serves as a basis for determining royalties. This is confirmed in Article 89 paragraph (3) of the Copyright Law, which states that, in carrying out the collection referred to in the preceding paragraph, the two national Collective Management Organizations are required to coordinate and determine the amount of royalties to which each Collective Management Organization is entitled in accordance with customary practices and the principle of fairness. This provision shows that the operational determination of royalty amounts is carried out through coordination between the national Collective Management Organizations, while still adhering to customary practices in the industry and the principle of fairness as a fundamental value. Thus, the determination of royalties is not merely technical and administrative in nature but also has ethical

and social dimensions, namely, ensuring a balance of interests among creators, related rights owners, and users of creative works (Pratiwi et al., 2024).

In Indonesia, there are still a number of musicians or songwriters who have not received adequate economic benefits in the form of royalties for their creative works. This situation is not solely due to the weak position of creators but is also influenced by the limited understanding of some musicians regarding the mechanisms for distributing royalties in accordance with applicable laws. In addition, the effectiveness of Collective Management Organizations in carrying out their functions of collecting and distributing royalties is often questioned, resulting in the economic rights of creators not always being optimally distributed. This situation is reflected, among other things, in the polemic that occurred between Ahmad Dhani and Once Mekel in early 2023. The dispute arose when Ahmad Dhani, as a member and songwriter of the band Dewa 19, publicly prohibited his former vocalist from performing Dewa 19 songs during a concert tour. The controversy, which was initially personal in nature, subsequently developed into a legal debate regarding royalties and payment obligations for the use of songs in commercial performances. On the one hand, Ahmad Dhani still gave Once Mekel permission to sing songs that Once himself had co-written but refused to allow the use of other songs on the grounds of alleged non-fulfillment of royalty obligations. On the other hand, Once Mekel asserted that the obligation to pay royalties for commercial performances was not the responsibility of the singer but rather of the event organizer that invited the performer and utilized the copyrighted works.

This difference in legal interpretation became even more apparent when Ahmad Dhani referred to Article 9 paragraph (3) of the Copyright Law, which prohibits the commercial use of a work without the permission of the creator or copyright holder. Meanwhile, Once Mekel based his argument on Article 23 paragraph (5) of the Copyright Law, which allows the commercial use of a work in a performance without obtaining direct permission from the creator, provided that compensation is paid to the creator through a Collective Management Organization. This controversy demonstrates a gap in the understanding and implementation of copyright law in practice, particularly regarding the division of roles and responsibilities among creators, performers, and event organizers. A similar case also arose in a broader context, such as during the opening of the XX Papua National Sports Week, when the song *Aku Papua*, composed by Franky Sahilatua, was performed during the event without clear permission from the composer. This incident sparked public controversy and reinforced the view that issues concerning royalties and copyright licensing affect not only individual relationships between musicians but also institutions and organizers of national-scale events. Overall, these various cases indicate the need to strengthen copyright law literacy, clarify the role of Collective Management Organizations, and ensure the consistent enforcement of regulations so that the protection of songwriters' economic rights can be realized fairly and sustainably (Pratiwi et al., 2024).

Based on the foregoing, the research questions in this study are as follows: (1) How is the distribution of song royalties regulated under Law Number 28 of 2014 on Copyright? and (2) How does the law protect the distribution of royalties from the perspective of justice in relation to song copyrights?

METHOD

This study used a normative legal method by examining legislation as positive law to obtain a formal legal understanding of the issues under review. Through this approach, the research sought to formulate relevant legal arguments and concepts for analyzing the distribution of song copyright royalties based on Law Number 28 of 2014 on Copyright from the perspective of justice (Marzuki, 2005). The approaches used included a legislative approach and a conceptual approach. The legislative approach was carried out by systematically reviewing the relevant legal norms and assessing the consistency among regulations. Meanwhile, the conceptual approach was used to strengthen the analysis through an understanding of legal principles, doctrines, and legal thought, so that the legal issues under study could be explained and resolved comprehensively and based on legal certainty. This normative legal method served three analytical functions. First, it established the formal legal framework by examining and interpreting the statutory provisions of Law Number 28 of 2014 on Copyright, particularly the provisions concerning royalty

determination and distribution. Second, it systematically identified gaps and ambiguities in the existing legislation regarding royalty mechanisms. Third, it evaluated the correspondence between legal provisions and their practical implementation within the Indonesian copyright management system. Through this approach, the study constructed a comprehensive understanding of how royalty distribution should function within the established legal framework and identified areas requiring legislative or administrative clarification.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Results

Distribution of Royalties for Song Copyrights in Accordance with Law Number 28 of 2014 on Copyright

As the world continues to evolve, humans continue to produce a wide variety of works in various fields, ranging from industry and technology to the arts and culture, such as dance, literature, film, and music, which are now widely available in digital formats, both audio (MP3) and audiovisual (MP4). The increase in the quantity and variety of these works reflects a growing awareness that the results of human creativity are not merely of material value but also embody non-material rights attached to their creators. Recognition of various discoveries, creations, and innovations, whether produced by individuals or groups, has ultimately given rise to the concept of Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) as a legal regime that provides protection and recognition for the products of human thought. On the other hand, the acceleration of the digital era has brought ambivalent consequences. On the one hand, advances in digital technology have opened up significant opportunities for Indonesians to improve their economic welfare through expanded access to the production, distribution, and consumption of creative works. However, on the other hand, the ease of digital replication and distribution of works has also increased vulnerability to infringement, particularly in the realm of copyright. This situation places intellectual property rights in a strategic yet vulnerable position, requiring legal awareness, adaptive regulations, and effective enforcement mechanisms to ensure that the protection of intellectual property rights can proceed in tandem with the positive utilization of developments in digital technology.

Music copyright plays a strategic role as an instrument that supports the sustainability of various business activities, especially those that use music as a key element in creating economic value, such as discotheques, karaoke establishments, and television and radio broadcasting. In this context, music is not merely a complement but an essential component that directly influences the appeal, consumer experience, and operational success of a business. However, it cannot be denied that there are also certain types of business activities that can still operate without the use of music or use music only as an additional element that is not decisive.

This difference in the level of dependence on music then becomes a rational basis for determining the amount of royalties that must be paid by users of musical works. The determination of these rates generally considers two main dimensions, namely, the intensity of music utilization, which refers to the extent to which music plays a role in supporting business activities, and the extent of its use, namely, the duration or length of time that music is used in commercial activities. With this approach, the imposition of royalty rates seeks to reflect the principles of fairness and proportionality, so that the burden borne by music users is commensurate with the economic benefits obtained from the use of the copyrighted work (Margono, 2002). Therefore, every party that utilizes copyrighted musical works, whether on a limited or massive scale, and obtains commercial profits or benefits has an ethical and legal obligation to respect the rights of the creator. This respect is manifested through a legitimate licensing mechanism and the provision of appropriate compensation as a form of recognition of the intellectual and creative contributions of songwriters. Thus, the relationship between users and creators is not based solely on economic exploitation but also on the principles of fairness, appreciation, and recognition of the strategic role of creators in producing works of value to the wider community (Soelistyo, 2011).

This is different from the use of musical works for personal purposes, such as when someone buys a cassette or music recording to listen to in their private car or at home. In this context, the use of music is non-commercial and therefore does not, in itself, give rise to an

obligation to pay royalties for commercial use. However, the situation is different if the same music recording is used in business activities, for example, by a television station operator that plays songs or cassettes that it has purchased as part of its broadcasting activities. In such circumstances, the use of music has a commercial dimension, thereby giving rise to the applicable legal obligations concerning authorization and royalty payment to the relevant copyright or related rights holders.

If someone sings spontaneously while walking around a market, this activity does not necessarily require a license merely because it occurs in public, particularly where there is no commercial exploitation. However, if the same person performs at the invitation of a promoter in a show that charges admission through ticket sales, the activity constitutes commercial use of a copyrighted work and may require the appropriate authorization and payment of royalties. It is in this context that the basic principle of copyright applies, namely, that commercial exploitation of copyrighted works must comply with the applicable licensing and royalty framework as a form of respect for the rights and creative contributions of creators (Sutedi, 2009). Copyright consists of economic rights and moral rights (Djumhana, 1993).

In the context of music copyright, the owner of copyright in a sound recording is generally the party that holds the relevant copyright or related rights in the recording, which may include the record producer or recording company. Sound recordings are generally protected as related rights rather than being classified simply as derivative works. Meanwhile, musical compositions or songs—which include melodies, harmonies, and lyrics—are protected as copyrighted works and constitute the underlying works from which further exploitation may arise. Copyright in the field of music or songs arises automatically upon the creation being expressed in a tangible form, without requiring prior registration. From that moment, the creator obtains legal protection for the work. One important dimension of this protection is the moral rights of the creator or composer, which are personal rights attached to the creator. These moral rights include, among other things, the right to be recognized as the creator of the musical work or song, as well as the right to have the creator's name duly indicated in connection with the use or publication of the work. Thus, moral rights not only protect the legal interests of the creator but also affirm the integrity and creative identity inherent in the musical work (Hendra, 2003). Article 1 paragraph (1) of the Copyright Law defines copyright as an exclusive right that arises automatically based on the declaratory principle after a creation is realized in a tangible form. This exclusive nature means that the copyright holder has the authority to exercise the economic rights attached to the work and to authorize or prohibit certain uses of the work in accordance with the law. In the field of music, copyright protection covers musical compositions and songs as creations, while sound recordings are protected under the separate regime of related rights. However, in current social and economic practice, copyright infringement, particularly in relation to the performance, communication, or other use of songs and/or music, continues to occur and often appears to persist without effective legal resolution. Many commercial actors use music or songs as part of their business activities without first obtaining the required authorization or fulfilling their obligation to pay royalties to the relevant creator or copyright holder. This situation demonstrates a gap between normative legal provisions and their implementation in society.

In principle, songwriters have the authority to grant permission to commercial users to utilize their creative works. Upon granting such permission, creators are entitled to receive royalties as a form of legitimate and fair economic compensation. This mechanism not only serves to protect the economic rights of creators but also functions as an instrument to foster an atmosphere of appreciation for creativity, encourage the sustainability of artistic works, and uphold the principle of fairness in the relationship between creators and users of creative works in the field of music.

Article 1 paragraph (21) of the Copyright Law defines royalties as compensation received by creators or owners of related rights for the use of the economic rights of a creation or related-rights product. In the legal construction of copyright, royalties occupy a central position as a concrete manifestation of the economic rights attached to creators and holders of related rights. The existence of royalties is not merely an economic transaction mechanism but also reflects appreciation for the hard work, competence, and creative talent invested in the process of creating

a work. Furthermore, the royalty system serves as an incentive that encourages the sustainability of creativity. With the guarantee of adequate economic compensation, creators and related rights holders are motivated to continue working and producing new creations that are valuable to society. Conversely, the absence of royalties has the potential to undermine proportional recognition of creative contributions, which in turn can hinder or even halt the process of creation and innovation in the field of music.

In the context of commercial use, song and music creators have exclusive economic rights over the exploitation of their creative works. Therefore, any person or party who uses the creative works of songs and music belonging to another party for commercial purposes may be required to obtain authorization from the relevant creator or copyright holder and to pay royalties in accordance with the applicable legal framework. Furthermore, users are required to fulfill the economic rights of creators through the payment of royalties when such payment is legally required. This mechanism affirms a fair relationship between creators and users while strengthening legal protection for the continuity of creativity in the music industry (Maramis, 2014). The process of creating a musical work or song requires considerable sacrifice, both in terms of energy, time, intellectual concentration, and often significant costs. All of these resources are devoted to producing a creation that has both aesthetic value and economic potential. Based on these sacrifices and contributions, creators or composers are granted exclusive rights for a certain period to legally control and exploit their creative works. The granting of these exclusive rights is intended as a mechanism of protection and incentive, so that creators have a fair opportunity to recoup the investment of energy, time, and costs incurred in the creative process. Thus, the copyright regime functions not only as a legal instrument but also as a means of ensuring the sustainability of creativity and fostering a healthy, equitable, and intellectual-property-oriented music ecosystem (Nainggolan, 2011). Specifically, under Article 8 of Law No. 28 of 2014, creators possess exclusive economic rights, including the rights of reproduction, distribution, rental, public performance, and communication. In the context of musical performances, the public performance right is particularly relevant because it grants the copyright holder the exclusive authority to authorize or prohibit the public performance of the work, subject to the applicable provisions of the Copyright Law. A related-rights holder, such as a phonogram producer or recording company, retains separate rights over the sound recording, including the applicable economic rights in the phonogram. This distinction between copyright-holder rights and related-rights-holder rights is critical in royalty distribution because different categories of rights may be implicated when music is commercially exploited through performance or other channels.

This situation presents an irony, considering that Indonesia already has a Copyright Law as a legal instrument that aims to provide comprehensive protection for intellectual works, but public understanding of royalties remains relatively limited. This situation often leads to a permissive attitude toward the use of songs and/or music without fulfilling applicable royalty obligations. One factor contributing to this situation is that the Copyright Law does not provide all of the technical details necessary for the operational implementation of royalty management, thereby creating room for interpretation and uncertainty in practice. Nevertheless, in principle, royalties constitute a legal consequence associated with certain forms of commercial use of creative works. This obligation is rooted in the nature of songs and music as the products of human thought and creativity, which possess intellectual, economic, and cultural value and are protected by law. Thus, the payment of royalties cannot be viewed merely as an additional burden but rather as a form of respect and recognition of the rights of creators, as well as a manifestation of the principle of fairness in the use of intellectual works in society (Audah, 2004).

The fundamental principles governing the distribution of royalties by *Karya Cipta Indonesia (KCI)* are set out in Article 3 paragraph (8) of the KCI Royalty Distribution Regulations, particularly in relation to the right of publication. This provision stipulates that royalties are distributed only from the use of musical works by users who have fulfilled their royalty payment obligations. Royalty distribution is carried out based on reports on the use of musical works (logsheets), which form the basis for recording the playing or announcement of works. Furthermore, royalty distribution is carried out based on music-usage groups (pool distribution),

so that distribution is structured according to the relevant category of use. Royalties are distributed to KCI members and members of foreign royalty-collection organizations with which KCI has an official reciprocal relationship. In addition, royalty distribution is based on music-work data (*repertoire*) that has been registered by KCI members and/or authorized royalty-collection organizations. Ultimately, royalties collected for the use of musical works within a certain period are distributed in accordance with the applicable distribution rules. These principles reflect KCI's efforts to ensure accountable and proportional royalty distribution based on valid data concerning the use of works.

In principle, legislation does not require songwriters to join *Karya Cipta Indonesia* (KCI) or any particular Collective Management Organization (CMO). Membership in such organizations is generally voluntary and based on the choice of each individual creator or rights holder, subject to the statutory framework governing collective management. However, in practice, joining a collecting society such as KCI may be considered a means of facilitating the administration and management of royalty rights over one's works. Through a collective management mechanism, copyright owners or holders who grant authority do not need to collect royalties individually, which can require considerable time, energy, and resources. Instead, by pooling these powers in one institution, the process of collecting and distributing royalties can be carried out in a more coordinated, efficient, and professional manner. This approach ultimately not only eases the administrative burden on creators but also strengthens their ability to exercise and manage their economic rights, so that copyright protection can be realized more effectively and sustainably (Supramono, 2010).

The scope of membership of *Karya Cipta Indonesia* is based on an individual membership system, without representation through associations. Under this framework, the legal relationship between creators or copyright holders and *Karya Cipta Indonesia* constitutes a private-law relationship arising from a contractual agreement. This construction is consistent with Article 1338 paragraph (1) of the Indonesian Civil Code, which affirms that legally concluded agreements bind the parties as law. Once a copyright owner or holder grants authority to *Karya Cipta Indonesia* to collect royalties, the grantor may be subject to contractual restrictions concerning the conferral of similar authority on another collective management organization for the same purpose. Such arrangements are intended to prevent overlapping or double collection of royalties for the same copyrighted work, thereby promoting legal certainty, administrative order, and transparency in royalty management. Consequently, *Karya Cipta Indonesia* is authorized to collect royalties only for works that have been lawfully entrusted to it by creators or copyright holders in accordance with the applicable membership and authorization arrangements. In the practice of collective rights administration, *Karya Cipta Indonesia* performs its functions on the basis of an authorization or power-of-attorney agreement that legally binds the institution and the creator or copyright holder. The substance of this agreement consists of the delegation of authority to *Karya Cipta Indonesia* to protect and manage the economic rights in musical or song copyrights. Accordingly, the legal relationship established is one of agency or authorization, whereby, through a power of attorney and agreed standard forms, creators grant *Karya Cipta Indonesia* the authority to manage the exploitation of their works, including the professional, coordinated, and accountable collection and distribution of royalties (Munandar, 2008). In practice, the collection of royalties refers to standard practices established by *Karya Cipta Indonesia*, which bases its authority, among other things, on reciprocal agreements between *Karya Cipta Indonesia* and collecting societies around the world that are members of CISAC (International Confederation of Societies of Authors and Composers).

In accordance with the provisions of Article 8 paragraph (1) of the Copyright Law, creators have exclusive economic rights over their works, including the right to publish and/or reproduce them and to authorize other parties to undertake acts falling within the scope of those economic rights. Accordingly, a party intending to exploit the economic rights in another party's work must obtain authorization from the relevant creator or copyright holder where such authorization is required by law or agreement. Thus, the use of copyrighted works cannot be undertaken unilaterally where it implicates an exclusive economic right, but must be based on valid legal authorization that respects the economic rights of the creator (Sardjono, 2006). Furthermore,

Article 10 of the Copyright Law prohibits managers of commercial establishments from allowing the sale and/or reproduction of goods that are the result of copyright and/or related-rights infringement within the commercial premises they manage. This provision means that managers of trading centers, whether small or large, including modern shopping centers, have a responsibility under the Copyright Law to prevent the activities specified in Article 10. The provision was also interpreted by the Constitutional Court in Decision No. 84/PUU-XXI/2023 to include certain digital-platform circumstances involving User-Generated Content (UGC). With this regulation, a more effective protection mechanism is intended to be created for creators, related-rights owners, and copyright holders against various forms of unauthorized exploitation of works. Article 10 therefore places business and platform managers, within the scope specified by law, as an important part of the copyright-enforcement ecosystem.

The Copyright Law does not provide a comprehensive statutory definition of every operational aspect of royalties. However, provisions concerning royalties appear in several articles of the law. Article 35, for example, regulates copyright in works produced in an official relationship and provides that, unless otherwise agreed, copyright in works created in such circumstances may belong to the relevant government agency or other party specified by law, while creators and/or related-rights owners may be entitled to remuneration when such works are used commercially. The Copyright Law also provides that further provisions concerning the granting of royalties for commercial use are regulated by Government Regulation. With this legal construction, although the Copyright Law does not provide a detailed operational framework for every aspect of royalty management, it establishes a normative basis for the economic rights of creators, copyright holders, and related-rights owners and provides for further regulation through implementing legislation.

Therefore, creators or copyright holders need comprehensive legal protection, both in the form of preventive legal protection and repressive legal protection. Preventive legal protection is understood as anticipatory protection that provides space for legal subjects to submit objections, express opinions, or obtain legal clarity before a government decision or action is finalized. This mechanism aims to prevent violations of rights at an early stage through appropriate regulation and supervision. Meanwhile, repressive legal protection serves as a means of law enforcement after a violation of legal provisions has occurred or when a person believes that their rights have been infringed. This form of protection is realized through dispute-resolution mechanisms and the imposition of sanctions in accordance with applicable laws and regulations. With these two forms of protection, the legal interests of creators and copyright holders are expected to be protected in a balanced manner, both at the prevention stage and at the stage of responding to violations (Margono, 2002). Article 40 paragraph (1) of the Copyright Law expressly includes songs and/or music among the types of works protected by copyright. This normative recognition places musical works as objects of copyright protection possessing intellectual and economic value, so that their exploitation must comply with applicable legal provisions. Within the framework of managing these economic rights, *Karya Cipta Indonesia* (KCI) functions as a Collective Management Organization (LMK) established as a nonprofit foundation. Royalties collected by KCI from users of works are not treated as institutional profits but are distributed to the parties entitled to receive them in accordance with the applicable authorization and distribution arrangements. This distribution mechanism is carried out in accordance with the applicable copyright and collective-management framework, thereby supporting the protection and proportional distribution of creators' economic rights (Miladiyanto, 2015). Conversely, *Karya Cipta Indonesia* (KCI) also plays a role in ensuring that Indonesian creators or copyright holders whose works are managed under KCI's authority can receive their economic rights when their works are used abroad. Under reciprocal arrangements, royalties may be collected by sister societies, namely similar collective management organizations operating in various countries, and transferred to KCI for distribution to the entitled parties. Royalties collected from users of works are distributed to creators or copyright holders in accordance with KCI's distribution schedule and applicable rules. The amount of royalties received by each creator or rights holder is determined proportionally according to the level of utilization of the work and after deduction of applicable administrative costs. This mechanism is intended to support transparency,

accountability, and sustainability in the management of cross-border royalties (Subroto, 2008).

The obligation of a licensee to pay royalties to a copyright holder is expressly addressed in Article 80 of the Copyright Law as part of the legal framework governing the lawful exploitation of copyrighted works. This provision grants copyright holders or owners of related rights, unless otherwise agreed, the authority to grant licenses to other parties through written agreements to carry out acts relating to the exercise of economic rights. Such license agreements are valid for a specified period and may not exceed the duration of copyright or related-rights protection. Unless otherwise agreed, the implementation of a license is accompanied by the obligation of the licensee to pay royalties to the copyright holder or related-rights owner for the duration of the license. The amount of royalties and the procedures for payment are determined by agreement between the parties as set forth in the license agreement, with the requirement that such determination reflects prevailing practices and principles of fairness. Accordingly, the regulation of licensing and royalty payments not only provides legal certainty for the parties involved but also establishes a legal framework for the lawful and proportional exploitation of copyrighted works. Article 80 must, however, be interpreted in conjunction with the broader statutory framework. Article 8 establishes the economic rights of creators; Article 40 paragraph (1) identifies the categories of works protected by copyright; Article 87 establishes the role of Collective Management Organizations and the conditions concerning licensing and royalty collection; and Article 89 regulates the establishment of royalty rates within the collective-management framework. When read holistically, these provisions create an interconnected regulatory structure in which rights holders possess exclusive economic rights, retain authority to license the exploitation of those rights, and may receive royalty compensation pursuant to applicable licensing and collective-management arrangements. This integrative reading prevents the misinterpretation of Article 80 as standing alone and ensures that royalty obligations are understood within the context of the economic rights they protect.

In the Copyright Law, the regulation of royalties is not described in exhaustive technical detail but instead establishes the legal relationship between economic rights, licensing, and royalty obligations. Through the licensing mechanism, licensees may be required to pay royalties to copyright holders as a consequence of utilizing the economic rights in a creation. Thus, royalties are positioned as an important instrument in the legal relationship between the use of a work and the protection of the creator's economic rights. Furthermore, the practice of royalty payments may be carried out through relationships among users, copyright holders, and Collective Management Organizations. Article 87 of the Copyright Law establishes the role of Collective Management Organizations in collecting and distributing royalties on behalf of rights holders within the scope of the authority granted to them. With this role, Collective Management Organizations constitute an important element in ensuring that licensing and royalty-payment processes are carried out in an orderly and transparent manner and in accordance with applicable legal provisions.

The provisions on royalty payments, particularly Article 87 of the Copyright Law and the implementing regulations, affirm the existence of a structured institutional mechanism for the management of economic rights through Collective Management Organizations. This regulatory framework is designed to support the effective and equitable fulfillment of the economic rights of creators, copyright holders, and related-rights owners. Through Collective Management Organizations, rights holders may collectively consolidate their authority in order to collect remuneration from users who exploit copyrighted works and related rights, particularly in contexts involving commercial use. Furthermore, users of copyright and related rights who exploit works for commercial purposes may be subject to an obligation to pay royalties through the applicable collective-management mechanism. This obligation is implemented on the basis of the relevant licensing or collective-management arrangements, which establish the applicable royalty obligations according to the type and extent of use of the work. Article 87 also provides a legal framework under which the commercial use of works and/or related-rights products in accordance with the applicable licensing and collective-management arrangements does not constitute copyright infringement merely because the use is commercial. Through this normative construction, Collective Management Organizations function as legal instruments that bridge the

interests of creators and users while supporting the lawful, orderly, and transparent exploitation of copyrighted works.

Article 89 paragraph (4) of the Copyright Law stipulates that guidelines for determining royalty rates are established by the Collective Management Organization and ratified by the Minister of Law and Human Rights. This regulation demonstrates that uncertainty in determining royalty rates can, in principle, be addressed through normative mechanisms provided by law (Handradjasa et al., 2023). However, for the determination of royalty rates to reflect fairness and gain broad acceptance, the process should ideally involve dialogue and negotiations with the parties directly subject to royalty-payment obligations, namely users of copyrighted works for commercial purposes. Thus, the determination of royalties should not be understood as solely unilateral but rather as a process that may involve deliberation and agreement among the relevant stakeholders and that is ultimately reflected in the applicable legal and contractual framework. In this context, there should be a transparent and measurable royalty-calculation formula established in accordance with the applicable regulations and approved or ratified by the competent authority where required. Such arrangements should also take into account the interests of commercial users of songs or music. This framework enables stakeholders, including creators, copyright holders, related-rights owners, and users, to understand the basis for royalty obligations. With clarity and appropriate agreement, doubts arising from regulatory uncertainty can be minimized while providing clear recognition of the economic rights legally attached to creators, copyright holders, and related-rights owners. Royalties are distributed periodically to creators or copyright holders, both domestic and foreign, who have authorized *Karya Cipta Indonesia*(KCI) to manage their rights. Under this mechanism, KCI manages and distributes royalties for works within the scope of its authority and in accordance with its repertoire and membership or authorization arrangements. These royalties are distributed based on documented use of the relevant songs or musical works and the applicable licensing and distribution framework.

The distribution system used is known as the *follow-the-dollar* principle, which is a mechanism for distributing royalties based on the actual source of income obtained from particular categories of business activities, such as general licensing, broadcasting, concerts, and cinema screenings. Under this system, royalties received from a particular category of use are distributed proportionally to the songs used within that category of activity.

The amount of royalties received by each licensor is determined by several main factors, including, first, whether the song has been registered within the relevant repertoire; second, whether the song has actually been announced, performed, communicated, or otherwise used in licensed activities; third, the frequency of song playback or other forms of use, where more frequent use may result in greater royalty allocation; fourth, the amount of actual royalty income collected by KCI in the relevant period from the category of users who utilize the song; and fifth, the total frequency of use of all songs within the same usage category. With this approach, royalty distribution is intended to be objective, transparent, and reflective of the actual level of utilization of the work (Warasati, 2004).

Discussion

Legal Accountability for Royalty Distribution from the Perspective of Fairness under Law Number 28 of 2014 on Copyright for Songwriters

Copyright protection is not granted solely to someone who merely has an idea or concept but rather to creative works that have been expressed in a tangible form. A creation must have a distinctive form, be personal in nature, and reflect originality as a result of the creator's own abilities, creativity, or expertise. Thus, the creation must be capable of being expressed in a form that can be seen, read, heard, or otherwise perceived by others, thereby qualifying for legal protection as a copyrighted work.

Legal protection is essentially understood as an effort to provide legal guarantees and certainty for legal subjects, in this case, creators. Through the law, the relationship among creative works, creators or copyright holders, and parties who utilize these creations can be clearly defined. This clarity of legal relationships is an important prerequisite for effective and fair law

enforcement. Although the copyright legal regime adheres to the principle of automatic protection, namely, protection that arises as soon as a creation is realized in tangible form without requiring registration, the recording of creations still has strategic value. Recording provides additional evidentiary value for creators because it may serve as formal evidence concerning copyright ownership, subject to applicable evidentiary rules. In the event of plagiarism or unauthorized copying of a work, evidence of recording may assist creators in demonstrating their rights and pursuing legal remedies. Thus, although not mandatory for the existence of copyright, recording a creation can function as a preventive measure that strengthens the legal position of creators in protecting their intellectual works (Atmadja, 2004). The law serves as a normative instrument that regulates the rights and obligations of legal subjects while also functioning as a means of protecting their interests. In the context of copyright, when a creator successfully realizes their creative ideas in the form of an actual song, the work is legally classified as a creation. From that moment, the creator automatically obtains copyright over the song they have produced, together with the rights attached to and protected by the state. Thus, the law plays an important role in ensuring recognition and protection of the creator's intellectual creativity (Situmeang & Kusmayanti, 2020). Legal protection for creators is highly important, given that copyright infringement continues to occur and musical works and songs remain vulnerable to unauthorized use. Therefore, strong and effective legal protection is needed, particularly regarding the regulation and enforcement of economic rights in the form of royalties, to ensure that creators' rights are protected effectively and fairly (Harini et al., 2021).

Philipus M. Hadjon emphasizes that the essence of the rule of law lies in the provision of legal protection for citizens. Such protection does not merely rest on the fulfillment of formal legal aspects but also encompasses respect for human dignity and recognition of fundamental rights that inherently attach to every legal subject. Within this framework, law is understood as a system of norms that functions to regulate social relations while simultaneously safeguarding individual interests from potential infringements by others. In this theoretical perspective, legal protection is divided into two main concepts, namely, preventive legal protection and repressive legal protection, which can be explained as follows (Hadjon, 1987):

- a) Preventive Legal Protection. Legal protection provided to the public is realized, among other things, through opportunities for participation, such as the right to submit input, file objections (*inspraak*), and express opinions in the government's decision-making process, particularly before a decision is finalized. This participatory mechanism reflects the state's efforts to involve the public as active legal subjects in the governance process. In carrying out its legal-protection function, the government aims to prevent actions that have the potential to harm other parties, so that disputes can be minimized from the outset. The enforcement of laws and regulations is one of the preventive instruments used by the government in providing legal protection to the public. Through the existence of clear legal norms, it is hoped that guidelines and boundaries will be established for the exercise of the rights and obligations of legal subjects. Thus, dispute prevention is not carried out solely through law enforcement after a violation has occurred but also through granting the public the right to submit objections or opinions concerning planned government decisions before those decisions are ratified or definitively established. This approach emphasizes the role of legal protection as a preventive measure oriented toward justice and legal certainty.
- b) Repressive Legal Protection. Repressive legal protection aims to resolve disputes that have already occurred through law-enforcement mechanisms, including the handling of cases through judicial institutions. In this context, members of the public or legal subjects who feel that their rights have been violated are given access to file claims or requests for compensation through applicable legal procedures. Thus, repressive legal protection serves as a means of redress for losses incurred as a result of legal violations. The use of repressive legal instruments is essentially a last resort (*ultimum remedium*) in the legal-protection system. It can take the form of fines, imprisonment, or other sanctions deemed necessary in accordance with applicable law. The

application of these sanctions is intended not only to punish but also to uphold justice and prevent the recurrence of legal violations in the future. More broadly, the legal protection provided to the community or legal subjects is a concrete manifestation of the principle of recognition and respect for human dignity as derived from the values of Pancasila and the principle of a state based on the rule of law founded on Pancasila. Therefore, legal protection is a fundamental right for every citizen. Within the framework of the rule of law, the government is obliged to provide legal protection for the entire community as a means of limiting the potential abuse of power, as well as a guarantee of respect for and protection of human rights.

In the Indonesian copyright legal system, the protection of intellectual works is conceptually divided into two principal domains, namely, the protection of moral rights as stipulated in Article 5 paragraph (1) of the Copyright Law and the protection of economic rights as regulated in Article 8 of the same Law. This dichotomy emphasizes that copyright is not solely oriented toward economic interests but also embodies a personal dimension closely associated with the integrity, identity, and dignity of the creator. Moral rights are rights that attach inherently and permanently to the creator and are not limited by a specific period of time. These rights continue to subsist even after the expiration of economic rights, subject to the statutory provisions governing their exercise and succession after the creator's death. As affirmed in Article 5 of the Copyright Law, moral rights confer a range of prerogatives upon the creator, including the right to have their name indicated or omitted on copies of the work used for public purposes; the right to use an alias or pseudonym; the right to make alterations to the work insofar as such changes conform to prevailing standards of propriety in society; the right to change the title and subtitle of the work; and the right to safeguard their honor and reputation in the event of distortion, mutilation, modification, or other treatment of the work that is prejudicial to their honor or reputation. Through this normative construction, moral rights function as an instrument for recognizing the inseparable personal relationship between the creator and their work. At the same time, this regulatory framework provides legal guarantees for the protection of the integrity of the work and the dignity of the creator in every form of exploitation, thereby affirming that copyright is understood not merely as an economic right but also as a right that upholds human values and the creator's personal identity.

Moral rights are essentially rights that are personally inherent in the creator and confer authority concerning the integrity and attribution of their work. These rights also function as a protective mechanism against acts that may potentially harm the creator's honor, integrity, or identity in relation to the copyrighted work. Accordingly, moral rights affirm the existence of an inseparable personal relationship between the creator and their creation, thereby entitling the creator to preserve the dignity, reputation, and integrity of the work they produce. Conversely, economic rights are rights that attach to the creator or copyright holder and provide legal authority to obtain economic benefits or financial gains from the exploitation of the work. Economic rights encompass various modes of exploitation, including publication of the work; reproduction in any form; translation; adaptation, arrangement, or transformation; distribution of the work or its copies; public performance; communication to the public; and rental of the work, subject to the specific rights enumerated in the Copyright Law. Through the regulation of economic rights, the law not only recognizes the economic value of intellectual creations but also ensures that creators are afforded an opportunity to benefit from the outcomes of their creativity. Accordingly, the balance between moral rights and economic rights constitutes a fundamental foundation of copyright protection while simultaneously fostering the sustainability of creativity and reinforcing appreciation for the role of creators in social and cultural life (Purnama, 2022).

Any other party intending to exercise, or that has exercised, the economic rights described above must obtain the requisite authorization from the creator or copyright holder where such authorization is required by law. This obligation is a logical consequence of the status of economic rights as exclusive rights legally attached to the creator or copyright holder. Thus, any use of economic rights by other parties must be based on valid authorization from the rights holder, as a form of respect for the creator's exclusive rights. The exclusive economic rights held by copyright holders include, among others, the right to reproduce the work; the right to distribute

the work or copies thereof; the right to rent the work or copies thereof; the right to publicly perform the work; and the right to communicate the work to the public, as applicable to the relevant creation. Copyright holders may also transfer or license their economic rights to other persons or parties in accordance with the law. This regulation affirms the central position of the creator or copyright holder in controlling the lawful and fair exploitation of copyrighted works (Satria Dewi, 2017).

Aristotle distinguishes justice into two main categories, namely, distributive justice and corrective justice. Distributive justice operates primarily in the realm of public law and focuses on the proportional distribution of honor, wealth, and various other social resources to members of society. This principle requires that distribution be based on a relevant measure of merit or contribution, thereby creating balance in the social order. Meanwhile, corrective justice focuses on efforts to remedy injustices arising from mistakes or violations. In this context, justice is realized through compensation to the injured party or the imposition of appropriate sanctions on the perpetrator. Therefore, the mechanisms of compensation and sanctions can be understood as concrete manifestations of corrective justice in Aristotle's thinking. Unlike Aristotle, John Rawls's theory of justice emphasizes how society should regulate the distribution of resources and opportunities fairly for all individuals, with particular attention to those who are in the weakest or most disadvantaged positions. This theory is built on two fundamental principles of justice. First, the Principle of Equal Basic Liberties, which asserts that every individual has an equal claim to a fully adequate scheme of basic liberties compatible with a similar scheme of liberties for others. Second, the Difference Principle, which states that social and economic inequalities are permissible only when they are arranged to the greatest benefit of the least advantaged members of society. This principle acknowledges the reality of differences in income, wealth, and opportunities but demands that these differences be structured in such a way as to improve the position of the least advantaged. Thus, justice according to Rawls does not necessarily eliminate inequality but directs the basic structure of society toward fair opportunities and the protection of those who are least advantaged (Faiz, 2017).

The theory of justice proposed by John Rawls aims to establish a more equitable social order, with strong emphasis on protecting individual rights and improving the position of disadvantaged groups. Within his framework, Rawls asserts that economic and social inequalities cannot be accepted unconditionally but must have a rational and moral justification within the principles of justice. Such inequality can be justified under Rawls's framework only when it benefits the least advantaged members of society. This approach places justice not merely in equality of outcome but in the arrangement of the basic structure of society in a manner that guarantees fair opportunities and protection for all. Therefore, Rawls's theory has become an important reference in academic debates on justice while also providing a normative basis for discussions of public policy in various social and political contexts oriented toward equity and inclusiveness.

Copyright protection has increasingly assumed a strategic position at both the national and international levels. This development is reflected in various global agreements and forums, including the discourse held in Geneva in September 1990 within the *Intellectual Property in Business Briefing* forum, which highlighted the urgency of intellectual property protection and was subsequently institutionalized through the TRIPS (*Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights*) regime. Alongside the intensification of globalization, particularly following the implementation of the GATT (*General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade*) and the establishment of the *World Trade Organization* (WTO), the protection of intellectual property rights was explicitly integrated into the institutional structure and agenda of the WTO through the TRIPS Agreement. The existence of TRIPS signifies a paradigmatic shift in the international trading system, which is no longer confined solely to the exchange of goods and services but also encompasses cross-sectoral issues that were previously considered beyond the scope of trade, including the protection of intellectual property rights and other matters connected to international economic relations. Accordingly, the protection of intellectual property rights is positioned as an integral component of the international economic system (Gautama, 1990). This recognition underscores that creativity, innovation, and the products of human intellect have become integral components

of the global economic system, thereby necessitating robust, consistent, and sustainable legal protection.

The Copyright Law provides a legal basis for the Minister responsible for communications and information technology in preventing and combating certain copyright infringements that occur through the internet. The strengthening of the government's role is explicitly regulated in Article 54 of the Copyright Law, which addresses the prevention of copyright and related-rights infringement through information technology. Under this provision, the government is mandated to prevent the infringement of copyright and related rights by monitoring the creation and dissemination of content that violates copyright and related rights and by coordinating with various parties, both at the national and international levels. Furthermore, Article 54 provides for monitoring of the recording of works and related-rights products at performance venues, using any media. This regulation shows that the state not only acts as a law enforcer after a violation has occurred but also as a preventive actor in creating a digital environment that respects intellectual property rights.

The explanation of Article 54 of the Copyright Law emphasizes that content refers to creative works available and accessible through various media, including analog and digital media. The dissemination of such content includes various activities in cyberspace, including the uploading of creative works through internet platforms that allow the works to be accessed by the general public. In the context of rapid technological development, this practice poses challenges to copyright protection, particularly for songs that are reused in the form of covers, remixes, or other adaptations without clear licensing mechanisms and economic-rights compensation. Therefore, the protection of songwriters' rights in cover practices cannot be understood solely as an administrative issue but rather as a legal and structural issue that requires consistent and effective law enforcement. On the one hand, cover practices can serve as a medium for creative expression and cultural participation; on the other hand, without adequate authorization and compliance with copyright law, such practices may affect the economic and moral rights of the original creators. In this situation, the law is required to balance the interests of freedom of expression with the protection of intellectual property rights. This view is in line with Roscoe Pound's concept of law as a tool of social engineering. According to this perspective, law does not function only as a set of repressive norms but also as a means of social engineering aimed at shaping patterns of behavior in society toward a more just and civilized order. In the context of copyright protection in the digital age, law plays a role in encouraging social awareness so that the use of creative works, including song covers, is carried out responsibly, respects the rights of creators, and is based on the principle of justice. Thus, the regulation and enforcement of copyright law is not merely a restrictive tool but also a mechanism for building a digital culture that values creativity while supporting the sustainability of the arts and creative-industry ecosystem (Pound, 1958).

In an effort to strengthen the management of copyright in the field of songs and/or music, the government enacted Government Regulation Number 56 of 2021 on the Management of Royalties for Copyright in Songs and/or Music on March 30, 2021. This regulation provides a more structured operational framework for royalty management in the music sector. Article 1 point 3 of Government Regulation Number 56 of 2021 defines royalty management as activities involving the collection, pooling, and distribution of royalties derived from copyright in songs and/or music. Government Regulation Number 56 of 2021 serves as an implementing regulation of the Copyright Law, particularly in relation to the statutory framework concerning royalty management. Under Government Regulation Number 56 of 2021, the National Collective Management Organization (LMKN) plays a central role in the national management of royalties for songs and/or music. LMKN represents the interests of creators and related-rights owners in collecting, pooling, and distributing royalties from persons who make commercial use of songs and/or music. The regulation is supported by a song-and/or-music database and the Royalty Information System (SILM), which provide information relevant to royalty management and distribution. As the implementing framework has subsequently been updated, the current implementing regulation is Minister of Law Regulation Number 27 of 2025, which replaced Minister of Law and Human Rights Regulation Number 9 of 2022.

The Copyright Law regulates the types of copyright, the manner in which copyright arises, the scope of protection, and the legal sanctions for copyright infringement. Within this framework, the production or commercial exploitation of song covers without the required authorization may constitute copyright infringement where it implicates the exclusive economic rights of the creator or copyright holder. Depending on the specific conduct, infringement of economic rights may be subject to the criminal provisions of Article 113 of the Copyright Law. In particular, unauthorized reproduction, distribution, public performance, communication, or other exploitation of a work for commercial purposes may fall within the relevant provisions of Article 113. Accordingly, Article 113 functions as a criminal-law instrument for protecting creators' and copyright holders' economic rights and reinforcing copyright enforcement in the field of music.

Civil-law instruments can be applied to parties who cover songs without permission on the basis of unlawful acts. In civil-law doctrine, an unlawful act (*perbuatan melawan hukum*) may arise where an act violates another person's subjective rights or otherwise satisfies the elements established under Article 1365 of the Indonesian Civil Code. Using or commercially exploiting a song without the required authorization may constitute a violation of the economic rights of the copyright holder, who legally possesses exclusive rights over the exploitation of the work. The basis for filing a civil lawsuit refers to Article 1365 of the Civil Code, which provides that an unlawful act that causes harm to another person gives rise to an obligation to compensate for the harm. When linked to the elements of an unlawful act, unauthorized exploitation of a song may satisfy these qualifications where it violates the economic rights of the creator or copyright holder and causes legally cognizable loss. On this basis, the songwriter or other entitled rights holder may have the right to claim compensation for losses incurred.

Damages in the context of copyright protection are understood as an obligation to pay a sum of money imposed on a party proven to have infringed the economic rights of the creator, copyright holder, and/or owner of related rights, based on a court decision in a civil case. The filing of a civil lawsuit grounded in an unlawful act is principally aimed at obtaining compensation for losses suffered by the song creator or other rights holder as a result of the infringement. Furthermore, the Copyright Law provides avenues for copyright disputes to be resolved through alternative dispute resolution, arbitration, mediation, or the Commercial Court, as stipulated in Article 95. Article 99 paragraph (1) of the Copyright Law also affirms the right of creators or copyright holders to file claims for damages with the Commercial Court for copyright or related-rights infringement. Through this normative construction, civil-law instruments function as protective mechanisms that provide legal remedies for song creators and rights holders in enforcing and restoring their economic rights.

CONCLUSION

To ensure that the economic rights of creators, copyright holders, and related-rights owners are fulfilled, they may authorize a Collective Management Organization to manage those rights collectively. Through this mechanism, remuneration can be collected from users who utilize copyright and related rights, particularly in the context of commercial public use, in an organized manner. Royalty payments to creators and copyright holders may likewise be administered through Collective Management Organizations as authorized intermediaries, so that the collection and distribution process can be carried out more efficiently and accountably. The collective management of royalties for the use of copyrighted works developed in response to the practical limitations faced by individual creators in monitoring the use of their works and converting such use into economic benefits. This is due to the breadth and dynamism of the use of works across various sectors, which, under the applicable legal framework, may require authorization from the relevant rights holder. Therefore, collective management constitutes a practical and efficient mechanism for administering rights on behalf of creators and other rights holders. Legal protection for musical and song creations in Indonesia is primarily based on Law Number 28 of 2014 on Copyright, which recognizes royalties as compensation for the utilization of economic rights in a creation or related-rights product. The obligation to pay royalties stems from the recognition that songs and/or music are intellectual works possessing economic value and protected by law. Although the Copyright Law establishes the legal framework for licensing and

royalty management, the technical implementation of royalty collection and distribution is supplemented by implementing regulations and the rules of authorized collective-management institutions. In this context, *Karya Cipta Indonesia* (KCI) functions as a Collective Management Organization that manages collective rights administration, particularly in the field of songs and music. *Karya Cipta Indonesia* has a strategic role in the management and exploitation of song and music copyrights for creators, copyright holders, artists, broadcasting institutions, and record producers, particularly in the collection and distribution of royalties relating to public performance and other forms of exploitation within the scope of its authority. Thus, collective management constitutes an important mechanism for supporting the fair and sustainable protection of economic rights for stakeholders in the music industry.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors would like to express their sincere gratitude to all parties who provided academic support, valuable input, and assistance during the preparation of this manuscript. The authors also appreciate the institutional support provided throughout the research and manuscript preparation process.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTION STATEMENT

Orpa Juliana Nubatonis, Chatryen M. Dju Bire, and Yossie Maria Yulianty Jacob contributed to the conceptual development of the study, collection and examination of relevant legal materials, normative legal analysis, interpretation of the findings, and preparation of the manuscript. All authors contributed to the refinement of the manuscript and approved the final version for publication.

REFERENCES

- Atmadja, H. T. (2004). *Perlindungan Hak Cipta Musik atau Lagu*.
- Audah, H. (2004). *Hak cipta & karya cipta musik*. Litera AntarNusa.
- Djumhana, M. and R. D. (1993). *Hak milik intelektual: Sejarah, teori, dan praktiknya di Indonesia*.
- Faiz, P. M. (2017). Teori Keadilan John Rawls (John Rawls' Theory of Justice). *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2847573>
- Gautama, S. (1990). *Segi-segi hukum hak milik intelektual*. Eresco.
- Hadjon, P. M. (1987). *Perlindungan hukum bagi rakyat di Indonesia: sebuah studi tentang prinsip-prinsipnya, penanganannya oleh pengadilan dalam lingkungan peradilan umum dan pembentukan peradilan administrasi negara*. Bina Ilmu.
- Hendra, T. A. (2003). *Hak Cipta Musik atau lagu*. Jakarta: UI Fakultas Hukum.
- Maramis, R. L. (2014). Perlindungan Hukum Hak Cipta Atas Karya Musik dan Lagu Dalam Hubungan Dengan Pembayaran Royalti. *Lex Privatum*, Vol. 2,(No. 2).
- Margono, S. and A. A. (2002). *Komersialisasi aset intelektual aspek hukum bisnis*. Gramedia Widiasarana Indonesia.
- Miladiyanto, S. (2015). Royalti Lagu/Musik Untuk Kepentingan Komersial Dalam Upaya Perlindungan Hak Cipta Lagu/Musik. *Rechtidee*, 10(1). <https://doi.org/10.21107/ri.v10i1.1136>
- Munandar, H. and S. S. (2008). *Mengenal HAKI, hak kekayaan intelektual: hak cipta, paten, merek dan seluk-beluknya*. Esensi.
- Nainggolan, B. (2011). *Pemberdayaan hukum hak cipta dan lembaga manajemen kolektif*.
- Pound, R. (1958). *The ideal element in law*.
- Pratiwi, E., Irianto, K. D., & Nazar, J. (2024). PEMBAYARAN ROYALTI ATAS PEMANFAATAN HAK CIPTA LAGU YANG DIMAINKAN GRUP BAND DI KAFE. *Sakato Law Journal*, 2(1).
- Purnama, W. W. (2022). IMPLEMENTASI PENDISTRIBUSIAN ROYALTI: STRATEGI INOVATIF UNTUK PEMENUHAN HAK EKONOMI PENCIPTA LAGU DAN MUSIK. *Jurnal Hukum Media Justitia Nusantara*, 12(1).
- Sardjono, A. (2006). *Hak kekayaan intelektual dan pengetahuan tradisional*.
- Satria Dewi, A. A. M. (2017). PERLINDUNGAN HUKUM HAK CIPTA TERHADAP COVER VERSION LAGU DI YOUTUBE. *Jurnal Magister Hukum Udayana (Udayana Master Law Journal)*, 6(4).

- <https://doi.org/10.24843/jmhu.2017.v06.i04.p09>
- Soelistyo, H. (2011). *Hak cipta tanpa hak moral*.
- Subroto, M. A. (2008). *Pengenalan HKI (Hak Kekayaan Intelektual): konsep dasar kekayaan intelektual untuk penumbuhan inovasi*.
- Suciadi, W. S., Lihu, P. D. A., & Gunawan, A. T. (2024). Aspek Perlindungan Hukum Hak Royalti Atas Hak Cipta Lagu Di Industri Musik Digital Indonesia Serta Perkembangannya. *Anthology: Inside Intellectual Property Rights*, 2(1).
- Supramono, G. (2010). *Hak cipta dan aspek-aspek hukumnya*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.
- Sutedi, A. (2009). *Hak atas kekayaan intelektual*.
- Warasati, Y. A. (2004). *Analisis Normatif Tanggung Jawab Perdata Karya Cipta Indonesia (YKCI) terhadap Musisi Dalam Perjanjian Lisensi Hak Cipta* . Program Sarjana Universitas Brawijaya Malang. Malang.
- Yossie M. Y. Jacob et al. (2023). THE EFFORTS OF THE ALOR REGENCY GOVERNMENT IN IMPLEMENTING GUIDANCE AND EMPOWERMENT OF COMMUNITIES PROTECTION OF GEOGRAPHICAL INDICATIONS. *Russian Law Journal*, 11(3).
<https://doi.org/10.52783/rlj.v11i3.1992>