

# Ideal Model of Gorontalo Regional Land Asset Management to Prevent Disputes and Ensure Legal Certainty

Julia Kristi Karepoan<sup>1</sup> | Zamroni Abdudussamad<sup>1</sup> | Erman I. Rahim<sup>1</sup>

1. Universitas Negeri Gorontalo, Kota Gorontalo, Gorontalo, Indonesia

Correspondence regarding this article should be addressed to:

Julia Kristi Karepoan, Universitas Negeri Gorontalo, Kota Gorontalo, Gorontalo, Indonesia

Email address: [karepoanyopi@gmail.com](mailto:karepoanyopi@gmail.com)

**Abstract.** Regional property (BMD) plays a strategic role in governance and fulfilling constitutional rights, yet in Gorontalo province, land assets frequently become dispute objects, threatening governance stability and development. This study critically analyzes BMD land asset management regulations within the legislative hierarchy and formulates an ideal dispute prevention model based on good governance principles. Using a juridical-normative method with statutory, conceptual, and case approaches examining disputes over Djalaluddin Airport and the Student Education and Training Center, plus BPK audit results the research reveals that current regulations remain administrative and fragmentary. They fail to mandate binding deadlines for land certification, require integrated databases between local governments and BPN, or establish preventive asset audits as security instruments, enabling recurring, costly disputes. This article proposes a four-pillar model: mandatory certification with deadlines, a digital Integrated Asset Information System, annual preventive audits, and massive legal counseling. Normatively compatible with existing laws, this model offers practical potential to reduce disputes, ensure legal certainty, and optimize regional land asset utilization.

**Keywords:** Land asset management; regional property; dispute prevention

## Introduction

Land, as a vital resource regulated in Article 33 paragraph (3) of the 1945 Constitution, serves not only as the physical foundation of the state but also as a primary production asset for development. However, the dynamics of development and population growth often create an imbalance between land availability and societal needs, making it a vulnerable object of dispute. In the context of regional governance, land recorded as Regional Property (BMD) holds a strategic role, yet ironically, in Gorontalo province, these assets frequently become sources of conflict that threaten governance stability and regional development. This phenomenon indicates a fundamental problem in BMD land asset management that requires immediate resolution (Pango, 2024).

The legal framework for managing BMD land assets is actually quite comprehensive, ranging from the Basic Agrarian Law (UUPA) as the foundation of national land law, to technical regulations such as Government Regulation (PP) Number 24 of 1997 on land registration, PP Number 27 of 2014 jo. PP Number 28 of 2020 on BMD management, and Minister of Home Affairs Regulation (Permendagri) Number 19 of 2016 jo. Number 7 of 2024 as technical guidelines. At the local level, Gorontalo Regional Regulation Number 2 of 2022 has also adopted this mandate. However, the existing framework remains administrative and fragmentary. The main normative gap lies in the absence of strict provisions on: (1) the obligation for certification of BMD land assets with binding deadlines; (2) land database integration between Regional Governments (Pemda) and the National Land Agency (BPN); and

(3) preventive asset audits as a primary security instrument. This normative vacuum causes management practices in regions, such as Gorontalo, to be vulnerable to disputes (Zamdedy, 2024).

The consequences of these normative weaknesses are evident in Gorontalo province. BMD land asset management practices still face classic problems such as delayed certification, inaccurate inventory data, overlapping ownership, and weak inter-agency coordination. This condition contradicts the principles of good governance which demand legal certainty, transparency, and accountability. The Audit Board of the Republic of Indonesia (BPK) Representative of Gorontalo, in various opinions, has consistently highlighted the high litigation risk of regional land assets due to these weaknesses. Two concrete cases reinforce this urgency: first, the Djalaluddin Airport land dispute covering 7,448 m<sup>2</sup>, which was won by residents against the Regional Government and the Ministry of Transportation up to the Supreme Court level; and second, the Student Education and Training Center (PPLP) case, where its 2005 purchase led to a lawsuit for rights cancellation and a claim for billions of rupiah in compensation. Both cases represent massive administrative, financial, and reputational losses resulting from failure to prove valid ownership.

Previous studies have extensively discussed agrarian dispute resolution. Several studies in Scopus-indexed journals, such as those by Khaerunnisa et al. (2024) and Wirawan et al. (2021), have largely focused on reactive approaches such as mediation and legal reconstruction of conflict resolution. Meanwhile, studies on regional assets by Krisindarto (2012) and Lakoro (2024) emphasize the importance of periodic inventory to reduce disputes. However, most existing literature remains partial and reactive emphasizing post-dispute resolution rather than systematic prevention. To date, a significant research gap remains, particularly in formulating a preventive dispute model that is holistic, technology-based, and integrated with regional asset management systems. The novelty of this article lies in its integrative approach, combining in-depth normative analysis of the legislative hierarchy (from the 1945 Constitution to Regional Regulations) with empirical case studies in Gorontalo, to construct a prevention model that not only fills the normative vacuum but is also applicable for policymakers (Noho & Lumbanraja, 2023a).

To address the normative gap and challenges in Gorontalo, this study aims to formulate an ideal preventive model for BMD land asset management. This model is built on four main pillars: (1) mandatory certification with strict deadlines; (2) a digital Integrated Asset Information System integrating Pemda and BPN data; (3) annual preventive asset audits; and (4) massive legal counseling. This model is normatively compatible with the existing legal framework and holds practical potential to reduce dispute rates a claim based on the success of similar programs in national pilot areas as reported in the study by Aksinudin (2023). Thus, this article contributes to the constitutional law discourse on responsible regional autonomy, while providing applicable policy recommendations for optimizing public assets for the greatest prosperity of the people.

## Method

This research employs a normative juridical method supported by empirical data, categorized as doctrinal legal research reinforced by empirical context (Ali, 2021). The approach focuses on analyzing legal norms governing regional land asset management through secondary data, including primary, secondary, and tertiary legal materials. The legislative hierarchy examined ranges from the 1945 Constitution to Gorontalo Regional Regulation Number 2 of 2022, analyzed using systematic, grammatical, and interpretive techniques to identify normative gaps in dispute prevention. Court decisions on Djalaluddin Airport and PPLP cases, along with BPK audit opinions, complement the normative analysis. Empirical data obtained through interviews with key informants from BPKAD, BPN Gorontalo, and legal academics serve to verify implementation gaps and provide contextual grounding for model formulation. Data analysis employs qualitative content analysis with triangulation to ensure validity, resulting in a preventive asset management model based on good governance principles that is legally coherent and practically applicable.

---

## Discussion

### Regulation of Land Asset Management of Regional Property

The management of regional property land assets (BMD) of Gorontalo province is a clear manifestation of the principle of state control over strategic natural resources as expressly mandated in Article 33 paragraph (3) of the Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia in 1945, which affirms that "the Earth and water and Natural Resources contained therein are controlled by the state and used for the greatest prosperity of the people". This fundamental constitutional provision is not only a philosophical, but also a hierarchical basis for the entire procedure for legislation in the field of agrarian and Public Asset Management, where BMD land assets are not simply viewed as economic resources that can be measured monetary, but as a vital instrument of autonomous regional government to support quality public services, increasing local revenue (PAD) through optimization of utilization, as well as accelerating the development of strategic infrastructure such as education, health, and transportation facilities. An in-depth normative juridical analysis of this regulatory framework reveals a structure that formally appears comprehensive and systematic, but substantially still requires radical preventive refinements to prevent recurrent agrarian disputes, as empirically proven in Gorontalo province BMD management practices characterized by massive litigation cases and significant financial losses (Sukorina & Mayasari, 2025).

The peak of a solid national regulatory pyramid is Law No. 5 of 1960 on basic agrarian principles (UUPA), which historically ended the dualism of Dutch colonial law such as Agrarisch Besluit 1870, Agrarisch Wet 1870, and the provisions of Burgerlijk Wetboek that is discriminatory against national interests, thus becoming the foundation of Indonesian agrarian law based on the personality of the nation with the principle of customary rights of indigenous peoples, the social function of land, and legal certainty (Basyarudin dkk., 2025). Article 19 of the UUPA explicitly and imperatively requires the registration of land as a whole throughout Indonesia to ensure certainty and legal protection for rights holders, including local governments as holders of management rights to BMD, with the main purpose of providing strong and authentic evidence of Rights, providing accurate information for interested parties, and organizing orderly land administration which includes the collection of comprehensive physical data (geometric boundary mapping, precision measurement letters, aerial photos) and complete juridical data (absolute rights status, legal rights/legal burdens, historical rights transition history).

The technical implementation of this imperative is described in detail in Government Regulation No. 24 of 1997 on Land Registration, which operationally defines registration as a series of ongoing activities carried out by the National Land Agency (BPN) through the Local Land Office, assisted by land deed making officials (PPAT) and related parties, with the division of the process into the first registration times both systematic (sequential regions) and sporadic (individual requests) as well as continuous data maintenance through mutations, changes, and certificate breaks. The object of registration covers a broad spectrum ranging from property rights, building rights, usage rights, state/Regional Land Management rights, Waqf land, to state land not yet entitled, with centralized accounting in the main land book and the issuance of certificates as absolute proof of rights as long as the data entered is correct, valid, and not contrary to law (Judijanto, 2025).

This fundamental regulation continues to experience adaptive improvements through Government Regulation Number 18 of 2021 concerning management rights, Land Rights, apartment units, and Land Registration, which is explicitly a partial change to PP number 24 of 1997 to accommodate modern land dynamics such as management rights that are officially delegated by the state to local governments as the embodiment of substantive autonomy. Articles 4 to 15 PP 18/2021 grammatically regulate the right of management as a strategic and delegated right of state power, with comprehensive rights holders (local governments) including planning the allocation and layout of land, using it directly or through cooperation with third parties, establishing and collecting annual mandatory

---

money as a source of PAD, and conducting strict supervision of the utilization of land (Makhrus dkk., 2025).

Cooperation agreements on land management rights are required to include crucial elements such as the complete identity of the parties, the exact extent and coordinates of the land, the type of rights granted and the exact time period, progressive default provisions, and provisions for post-expiration repossession of rights to prevent permanent control by the private sector, all based on the 3R ( *Right exploitation, Restriction on use, Responsibility for maintenance* ) for the sake of a balance between ease of doing business and state supervision. Although aimed at optimizing state/local lands for the wider public interest, this regulation still inherently emphasizes reactive aspects such as post-incident dispute resolution rather than preventive prevention through real-time digital data integration between agencies, making it vulnerable to field maladministration (Petrolika dkk., 2024).

Meanwhile, the BMD management dimension is generally and comprehensively regulated in Government Regulation No. 27 of 2014 concerning the management of State/Regional Property as amended through Government Regulation No. 28 of 2020, which methodically defines the complete cycle of Public Asset Management starting from planning needs based on SKPD Renja, procurement through tenders or legal grants, the optimal use by asset users, economic utilization through rent/cooperation, security / routine maintenance, periodic reassessment of asset value, transfer between SKPD or to third parties, destruction of damaged goods, to administrative from the regional balance sheet (Nurfauziah dkk., 2022). Especially for BMD, the provincial governor as the holder of management powers as Article 5 is authorized to set regional strategic policies, while BMD managers (usually BMD or related SKPD offices) are fully responsible for preparing the needs plan, periodic physical inventory, coordination of transfers, and mandatory reporting semiannually and annually to the DPRD and the Ministry of Home Affairs (Medaline dkk., 2024). The use of BMD can be transferred between SKPDS with the written approval of the governor (Article 21), while commercial use is carried out by managers with formal approval to avoid abuse and maximize PAD, with a strong emphasis on digital bookkeeping and transparent reporting for regional financial accountability in accordance with Law Number 17 of 2003 on State Finance and Law Number 1 of 2004.

Precise operational derivatives are provided by regulation of the Minister of Home Affairs number 19 of 2016 concerning guidelines for the management of regional property goods as amended through Permendagri number 7 of 2024, which in detail provides technical guidance starting from the definition of BMD as goods purchased on the regional budget or other legal acquisition (Article 3), determination of the management of at the suggestion of the user (Article 16), to the planning needs carried out post-preparation of the Work Plan and Budget (Article 16). Renja ) on education with reference to national standard norms, the basis for the regional property needs plan (RKBMD) integrated in KUA-PPAS (Sitanggang dkk., 2025). Permendagri 7/2024 progressively strengthens the governor's broader authority to approve, supervise, or terminate private-public cooperation (KSP) and goods social assistance (BGS/BSG), adding key performance indicators (IKU) of BMD management related to national bureaucratic reform, securing documents of proof of ownership both physical and digital through hybrid archiving, periodic reassessment of asset values by independent appraisals, as well as central vertical supervision for high-value transactions such as sales or strategic BMD grants (Sudiadi & Yanatama, 2025). This innovation is explicitly a response to the phenomenon of Agrarian disputes due to missing documents, inventory maladministration, and weak coordination between SKPDS, as often happens in autonomous regions.

In the contextual local realm, Gorontalo provincial regulation Number 2 of 2022 concerning the adaptive management of regional property goods implements the national mandate above with comprehensive provisions including the definition of management officials (users, managers, administrators), planning need based on existing asset data, internal use of SKPD, utilization external benefits of PAD, security / maintenance preventive, assessment economy annual, transfer with due diligence, destruction goods No worthy, deletion administrative, bookkeeping SIMDA BMD based,

---

inventory physique annual, real-time reporting to governor /DPRD, coaching technical for user, control quality assets, internal supervision by inspectorate, management House service governor / regent, system integrated BMD information, incentives performance for exemplary SKPD, coordination cross agencies, funding from the APBD, the mechanism change make a loss lost / damaged, and provision closing adaptive (Nurahmani, 2023). This regulation philosophically emphasizes total transparency, full accountability, and public participation to support regional autonomy as Article 31 paragraph (2) of Law No. 23 of 2014 concerning regional government which targets implementation effectiveness, community welfare, superior public service quality, excellent governance, and regional competitiveness.

Although formally it appears comprehensive and multilayered, the reality of this regulation is partial administrative and reactive without operational explicit preventive provisions, such as the mandatory mandate of the BMD land asset certification deadline of a maximum of 6-12 months post-procurement / grant to close the gap behind the name delay, the integration of the BPN- pemda central database for real-time verification of overlapping rights, or preventive audit mechanism based on GIS / technology to anticipate early litigation (Rizkiatanta & Djasuli, 2023). Consequence weakness structural This, the management of BMD Gorontalo becomes prone to dispute agrarian chronic, such as case Airport Djalaluddin in the Village Tolotio Subdistrict Arrive covering an area of 7,448 m<sup>2</sup> where the Government Gorontalo Province and Ministry Transportation totally defeated by the opponent residents of Pang Moniaga through Decision Court Great Number 3009 K/ Pdt /2023 due to failure proof mastery valid, and PPLP case with loss Rp. 2.3 billion post- Supreme Court Decision Number 502 K/ Pdt /2015 due to disabled procedural transition right from purchase Rp. 271 million in 2005 (Yansen & Al-Amin, 2025). Opinion of the Supreme Audit Agency (BPK) Ri Gorontalo representatives consistently highlighted the high risk of BMD land assets due to weak inventory, out-of-sync data, and negligent legal safeguards, often leading to *disclaimer opinion* of Local Government Financial Statements (LKPD). This systemic weakness is juridically contrary to the doctrine of *good governance* which demands prudence ( *prudential management* ), efficiency ( *value for money* ), and legal certainty ( *legal certainty* ), thus demanding reconstruction of comprehensive preventive regulations for the stability of BMD as a vital asset of regional autonomy (Zulfikar dkk., 2022).

In-depth logical consequence analysis shows that without immediate preventive reforms, Gorontalo provincial BMD management will continue to be trapped in a cycle of destructive litigation that massively harms PAD (estimated IDR 5-15 billion/year from compensation), disrupts essential public services, lowers regional competitiveness, and weakens the legitimacy of autonomy according to Article 18 of the 1945 Constitution. Normative-actual recommendations include: (1) amendment to regional Regulation Number 2 of 2022 through emergency draft law with mandatory preventive clauses such as certification deadlines and digital integration; (2) strategic synergy between BPN and local governments through a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) for an Integrated data platform; (3) continuous mandatory training for asset managers/users based on Permendagri 7/2024; and (4) the establishment of a multiparty BMD dispute Prevention Task Force. This reconstructive approach is in perfect harmony with the spirit of Permendagri number 7 of 2024 for effective, transparent, and people's prosperity-oriented BMD governance, realizing Article 33 of the 1945 Constitution substantively in the realm of Gorontalo regional autonomy.

### **The Ideal Model of Dispute Prevention Based on Good Governance**

The ideal model of Gorontalo provincial land and property asset management should be based on a proactive and systematic dispute prevention paradigm, by adopting the principles of *good governance* as recognized in modern constitutional law doctrine which includes information transparency, accountability of public officials, inclusive community participation, consistent rule of law, and responsiveness to the dynamics of local agriculture continues to grow. Paradigm This No just rhetoric administrative, but rather construction rooted normative on Article 33 paragraph (3) of the Law The 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia, which firm put land as asset public strategically controlled country for prosperity people as much as possible, at once Article 18 paragraph (5) which

---

delegates autonomy area in management source Power local through principle decentralization fiscal And deconcentration functional (Dairi dkk., 2025).

Fundamentally different from existing regulations that tend to be reactive and administrative, such as Article 19 of Law No. 5 of 1960 on basic agrarian principles (UUPA), Government Regulation no. 24 of 1997 jo. No. 18 of 2021 on land registration, as well as Gorontalo Provincial Regional Regulation No. 2 of 2022 on Regional Property Management this ideal model formulates four integrative pillars that precisely address the structural roots of Agrarian disputes: weak legal safeguards through timely certification, inaccuracies and fragmentation of asset data, and lack of public legal awareness of social functions BMD land. Construction normative-empirical This No only fulfil standard law agrarian coherent national, but also harmonious with international benchmarks like *Land Administration Guidelines* from the International Federation of Surveyors (FIG) and UN-HABITAT (2014) which emphasizes digitalization integrated, stakeholder participation, and *secure land tenure* as prerequisite stability socio-economic (Alatas dkk., 2025).

The first fundamental pillar of this ideal model is the obligation to certify new BMD land assets with a maximum time limit of 6-12 months from the acquisition through procurement mechanisms, grants, or other legal submissions, which directly implements the imperatives of Article 19 of the UUPA which requires the registration of land as a whole throughout Indonesia in order to ensure certainty and legal protection for rights holders, including local governments as management rights holders (Puspawati, 2022). This preventive provision effectively closes a crucial regulatory gap in Government Regulation Number 24 of 1997 which only mandates systematic or sporadic registration processes without strict and operational tempo sanctions, as tragically proven in the case of the Gorontalo provincial student education and Training Center ( Pplp ), where the delay behind the name of certificate number 957 / Pulubala after the official purchase of Rp. 271,125,000 in July 2005 triggered a convoluted lawsuit from Ir. Keppe Lamadlauw, led to the Supreme Court Decision No. 502 K/ Pdt / 2015 which canceled the entire transfer of rights and led to claims for compensation reaching IDR 2,309 billion (Pranata dkk., 2025). The operational mechanism of this pillar is designed in detail for high feasibility: (1) the establishment of a multiparty rapid certification (TSC) team under the Coordination of the Regional Property Management Office (BMD) which regularly coordinates with the Gorontalo Regency/City Land Office; (2) the absolute priority of geometric measurements and sporadic registration for strategic assets such as airports, educational facilities, hospitals, and government offices; (3) direct synchronization with the National complete systematic land registration (PTSL) Program which has covered 1.2 million hectares per year; and (4) progressive gradation of administrative sanctions for negligent asset users, ranging from 10-25% operating budget reduction to temporary revocation of Use Authority. Grammatical and systematic analysis of Article 99 of Government Regulation Number 18 of 2021 further confirms the legitimacy of this approach, because the management rights delegated by the state to local governments must be documented through certificates to prevent juridical conflicts with individual rights, building rights, or private use rights. The empirical impact has been proven in Banyuwangi Regency as a national benchmark, where the achievement of 90% BMD certification in an average of 9 months has succeeded in reducing the frequency of Agrarian disputes by 62% during the period 2020-2024, while increasing the value of public assets through clarity of legal status. This pillar in a way absolute fulfil principle *legal certainty* as guaranteed Article 28D paragraph (1) of the 1945 Constitution, makes certificate as *prima facie evidence* absolute in litigation agrarian And reduce burden justice overloaded.(Noho & Lumbanraja, 2023b)

The second pillar of the ideal model proposes the development of a *Land Asset Management System* (LAMS) as a state-of-the-art integrated digital platform based on blockchain or Geographic Information System (GIS) that connects the Gorontalo provincial BMD office, all Local Land Offices, and the central National Land Agency (BPN), enabling real-time verification of ownership data to prevent overlapping rights that become chronic diseases such as in the case of Djalaluddin Airport in Tolotio Village, Tibawa

---

District (Supreme Court decision number 3009 K/ Rev /2023) (Khalimi dkk., 2025). This system operationally implements the mandate of the Minister of Home Affairs Regulation Number 7 of 2024 concerning BMD information systems with additional innovations in the form of API gateways for two-way synchronization with the National *Land Registry Base database* (BRP) of the Ministry of ATR/BPN, including multidimensional data: physical (precise geo-tagging coordinates, 3D drone mapping, satellite photos), juridical (complete rights status, legal rights/expenses, historical transaction history), and economic (assessment of the selling value of the current tax object/NJOP, projection of potential regional original income/PAD from Rent/investment) (Prasetyo dkk., 2025). Revolutionary key features include: an artificial intelligence (AI)-based predictive analytics dashboard for early detection of dispute risk through anomalous patterns; automatic push notifications 30 days prior to expiration of entitlement term or mandatory audit; as well as *limited read-only public access* for accountability transparency without compromising data security. Normatively, this construction complements Article 48 of Government Regulation Number 27 of 2014 concerning preventive security of digital assets, while fully complying with Law Number 11 of 2008 concerning Electronic Information and transactions. Government Regulation Number 71 of 2019 concerning the implementation of electronic systems and transactions, with end-to-end encryption to prevent *cyber squatting* (Rosmiati & Anggrani, 2025). Empirical benchmarks from Central Java province attest to the effectiveness of similar integration, which managed to reduce duplication of double certificates by 78% and agrarian litigation related to public assets by 45% within 3 years of full implementation. Superiority juridical main located on principle *single source of truth* that eliminates maladministration like disappearance proof mastery physique in case Tolotio covering an area of 7,448 m<sup>2</sup>, at once support *the e-Government* agenda national in Long-Term Development Plan National Medium Term Development Plan (RPJMN) 2020-2024 as priority digital transformation of government autonomous region.

The third pillar places strategically the annual preventive audit as an instrument of independent internal supervision by the Gorontalo provincial Inspectorate apparatus, with intensive coordination with the Gorontalo representative of the Supreme Audit Agency (BPK) RI, which focuses on physical verification of asset locations, certification compliance levels, and the latest economic valuation of BMD to anticipate depreciation in value. Different diametrical from reactive audit conventional BPK which often produce opinion *with disclaimer* (WDP) on report finance Gorontalo region for the 2022-2024 period due to risk asset land that is not detected early, preventive audit This nature proactive with comprehensive checklist instrument based *COSO Framework* (Committee of Sponsoring Organizations of the Treadway Commission) for control risk agrarian structured : examination 100% physical against asset land above 1,000 m<sup>2</sup>, *stress-test* simulation litigation potential based on historical data, as well as mandatory remedial recommendations followed up in 30 days work (Rosmiati & Anggrani, 2025).

The Legal Foundation is solid through Law No. 15 of 2004 on State Financial Management and responsibility examination Article 8 which requires preventive examinations, and Chapter VIII of the Minister of Home Affairs Regulation No. 19 of 2016 jo. Number 7 of 2024 concerning BMD supervision which emphasizes sustainable development. Tripartite coordination with the CPC ensures absolute independence through *quarterly peer review mechanisms* and auditor rotation, complemented by tiered disciplinary sanctions for maladministration officials in accordance with Government Regulation No. 42 of 2004 on the management of civil servants. Empirical evidence from the Sleman regency of the Special Region of Yogyakarta shows that a similar preventive audit model has *consistently produced unqualified opinions* in a row since 2021, accompanied by the achievement of zero BMD disputes thanks to the early detection of anomalies (Rachman dkk., 2025). This pillar in a way effective strengthens accountability vertical (to center) and horizontal (to society), in harmony with Article 378 of the Law Number 23 of 2014 concerning Regional Government that regulates supervision autonomy substantive and administrative.

fourth pillar involving counseling law massive And sustainable to public through *the Legal Awareness Campaign* (LAC) program based on an inclusive community, with emphasis main on function

---

---

social BMD land according to Article 6 of the UUPA and reiteration constitutional Article 33 of the 1945 Constitution, in particular direct prevent occupation illegal which accounts for 70% of cases dispute agrarian national based on Consortium data Updates Agrarian. This program is designed holistically to include: door-to-door socialization at the village/ kelurahan level in collaboration with traditional leaders and Gorontalo customary law communities; *interactive live streaming webinars* through the WhatsApp Group platform, YouTube Live, and TikTok education; and *mobile legal clinics* by the BMD-BPN joint team coordinating the State Prosecutor's office with free certificate consultation service (Resadkk., 2024). The core material includes the juridical limits of local government management rights, strict criminal sanctions of Law Number 5 of 1960 Article 44 (maximum imprisonment of 5 years for illegal possession), as well as real incentives for the community such as the allocation of PAD for village infrastructure (roads, irrigation, posyandu ) for the sake of social legitimacy (Fitri, 2025). The legal basis is guaranteed by Law Number 16 of 2011 on Legal Aid and Ministerial Regulation of ATR/BPN Number 16 of 2021 on agrarian preventive mediation. Field benchmarks from Wonokerto village in Central Java recorded a 55% decrease in illegal occupation after the implementation of intensive LAC in 2023, with an increase in community compliance of 72% with BMD zone boundaries. This participatory approach precisely fulfills the *public principle participation* of essential public participation in the doctrine of *good governance* of the World Bank (1992), as well as building social capital and constitutional legitimacy over the control of local governments as state representatives (Turnip & Simamora, 2025).

The implementation of the four-pillar model gradually complies with the principles of prudence, efficiency, accountability, and effectiveness required by Article 10 of Law Number 23 of 2014, with a structured roadmap: Phase 1 (January-June 2026) *pilot project* on 20% of priority strategic assets such as airports and educational facilities; Phase 2 (2027) *full rollout* to all BMD inventory with an APBD budget of 2-3%; Phase 3 (2028) *strict Key Performance Indicators (KPI) evaluation* includes a minimum dispute reduction of 50%, a certification rate of 95%, and a PAD increase of 25%. Potential long-term financial impacts include litigation cost savings of IDR 5-10 billion per year based on accumulated Gorontalo historical case losses, plus PAD optimization of IDR 20-30 billion through strategic lease schemes, *build-operate-transfer (BOT)*, and idle asset green investments. Technical Feasibility is proven through the success of the National PTSL Program which certifies 1.2.2 million hectares per year with collaborative APBN-APBD support and ATR/BPN technical assistance. The main advantages of this model are comprehensive normative-empirical synergy to overcome critical gaps in regional Regulation Number 2 of 2022, ensuring absolute legal certainty for BMD as *a prima facie title*, and accountable responsibility in accordance with Law Number 17 of 2003 on State Finance. Operational recommendations include: (1) initiation of amendments to local regulations through draft local regulations with mandatory four-pillar clauses; (2) signing of *Memorandum of Understanding (MoU)* BPN-Gorontalo for the development of the initial phase of LAMS; (3) special allocation of 1% annual PAD for sustainable LAC funds; and (4) *soft law* in the form of *instructions Governor* for the acceleration of execution at the level of SKPD. Overall, this model not only contributes significantly to the discourse of contemporary agrarian law in Indonesia but also realizes the constitutional vision of "land for the people without conflict" through adaptive, sustainable, and socially just governance.

## Conclusion

This study concludes that the management of regional land assets in Gorontalo province faces serious challenges due to vulnerability to disputes arising from weak legal safeguards and partial preventive regulations within the existing normative framework. The hierarchical analysis of regulations from the UUPA to Gorontalo Regional Regulation Number 2 of 2022 reveals systemic normative gaps, particularly the absence of mandatory certification deadlines, integrated data mechanisms between local governments and BPN, and preventive audit instruments. The Djalaluddin Airport and PPLP cases, resulting in billions of rupiah in losses, empirically demonstrate how these

---

normative weaknesses manifest in judicial and financial losses, contradicting the constitutional mandate of Article 33 paragraph (3) of the 1945 Constitution and good governance principles.

The scientific contribution of this article lies in the formulation of an integrative preventive model comprising four pillars: mandatory certification with six-to-twelve-month deadlines accompanied by administrative sanctions; a digital land asset management platform integrating GIS and blockchain technology for real-time verification; annual preventive audits involving the Inspectorate and BPK; and massive legal counseling for the community. This model fills the normative vacuum by integrating legal certainty, technological accountability, institutional oversight, and legal culture simultaneously. Phased implementation from 2026 to 2028 offers substantial potential to reduce litigation, minimize financial losses, and optimize regional revenue through accountable asset utilization.

The study recommends amending Regional Regulation Number 2 of 2022 to incorporate preventive norms, establishing a formal memorandum of understanding between BPN and local government for data integration, allocating one percent of regional revenue for legal awareness programs, and issuing gubernatorial instructions to accelerate certification. This normative-empirical approach contributes to the discourse on responsible regional autonomy by demonstrating how preventive legal frameworks can transform vulnerable assets into instruments for public prosperity.

## References

- Alatas, M. H. N., Hafidz, M., & Said, M. F. (2025). Tindakan Pertanahan Nasional dalam Menerapkan Asas Mutakhir Untuk Mengurangi Potensi Timbulnya Sertifikat Ganda atas Tanah. *Legal Dialogica*, 1(1), 1–10.
- Ali, Z. (2021). *Metode penelitian hukum*. Sinar Grafika.
- Basyarudin, B., Syahidah, A., Siregar, J. D. S., & Surtiyah, S. (2025). Penguatan Pemahaman Hukum Perdata Pertanahan Di Kelurahan Banjar Agung Upaya Pencegahan Dan Penyelesaian Sengketa Tanah. *MAJU: Indonesian Journal of Community Empowerment*, 2(1), 131–146. <https://doi.org/10.62335/ysawzf86>
- Dairi, Rindiani, A., & Dewi, V. (2025). Penguasaan Tanpa Izin atas Aset Lahan Sitaan Kejaksaan: Studi Yuridis terhadap Celah Penegakan Hukum Pidana. *Legal Standing: Jurnal Ilmu Hukum*, 9(5), 1137–1154. <https://doi.org/10.24269/ls.v9i5.12402>
- Fitri, L. (2025). Optimalisasi Aset Wakaf Kabupaten Pakpak Bharat: Kebijakan Peningkatan Kesadaran Masyarakat dan Pembentukan Lembaga Pengelola Profesional. *Jurnal Ilmiah Gema Perencana*, 4(2), 1547–1564. <https://doi.org/10.61860/jigp.v4i2.281>
- Judijanto, L. (2025). Optimalisasi Pemanfaatan Aset Tanah Dalam Meningkatkan Pendapatan Daerah: Tinjauan Ekonomi. *BORJUIS: JURNAL OF ECONOMY*, 2(4), 218–277.
- Khalimi, K., Widjaja, G., & Suhardiman, C. (2025). Analisis Pengaruh Sertifikasi Tanah Terhadap Peningkatan Nilai Ekonomi Tanah Melalui Kepastian Status Hukum: Kajian Literatur. *Borjuis: Jurnal Of Economy*, 2(4), 178–187.
- Makhrus, M., Prasmayanti, W. P., Khoirunnisa, A., Johari, D., Ilhamsyah, R., & Hamed, M. F. A. (2025). Regulasi dan Praktik Penyelesaian Sengketa Wakaf di Indonesia. *Litera Inti Aksara*. <https://lib.literaaksara.com/lib/article/view/43>
- Medaline, O., Nurhilmiah, & Syafriana, R. (2024). Analisis Implementasi Pensertifikatan Aset Tanah Pemerintah Daerah Kabupaten Langkat. *Jurnal Ilmiah Penegakan Hukum*, 11(1), 45–55. <https://doi.org/10.31289/jiph.v11i1.11830>
- Noho, M. D. H., & Lumbanraja, A. D. (2023a). Perlindungan Hukum Public Private Partnership (PPP) Melalui Lembaga Penyelesaian Perselisihan Independen Di Indonesia. *CREPIDO*, 5(2), 146–160. <https://doi.org/10.14710/crepido.5.2.146-160>
- Noho, M. D. H., & Lumbanraja, A. D. (2023b). Perlindungan Hukum Public Private Partnership (PPP) Melalui Lembaga Penyelesaian Perselisihan Independen Di Indonesia. *CREPIDO*, 5(2), 146–160. <https://doi.org/10.14710/crepido.5.2.146-160>
- Nurahmani, A. (2023). Kajian Kebijakan Pengendalian Di Bidang Pertanahan Dalam Mencegah Dan Memberantas Para Spekulasi Dan Mafia Tanah Di Ibu Kota Nusantara. *Bina Hukum Lingkungan*, 7(3), 290–309.
- Nurfauziah, R. M. A., Gunawan, W., & Lesmana, A. C. (2022). Pengamanan Aset Tanah Di Uptd Pengamanan Dan Pemanfaatan Aset Bpkad Provinsi Jawa Barat Tahun 2021. *Jurnal Administrasi Pemerintahan (Janitra)*, 2(2), 172–185. <https://doi.org/10.24198/janitra.v2i2.45158>
- Pango, U. (2024). Pengelolaan Aset Tanah Dan Bangunan Pemerintah Daerah Kabupaten Gorontalo. *Jurnal Ekonomi, Manajemen, Ilmu Sosial Dan Politik*, 1(2), 56–70. <https://doi.org/10.69623/j-emspol.v1i2.7>
- Petrolika, P., Fendri, A., & Hasbi, H. (2024). Pelaksanaan Pendaftaran Tanah Barang Milik Daerah Pemerintah Kota Padang. *UNES Law Review*, 6(4), 11962–11979. <https://doi.org/10.31933/unesrev.v6i4.2205>
- Pranata, A., Surahman, S., Elviandri, E., & Alhadi, M. N. (2025). Problematika Tanggung Jawab Pejabat Pembuat Akta Tanah dalam
-

- 
- Peralihan Hak Atas Tanah di Provinsi Kalimantan Timur. *Jurnal Tana Mana*, 6(2), 258–276. <https://doi.org/10.33648/jtm.v6i2.1177>
- Prasetyo, Y. O., Herani, A. P., Maharani, M. T., & Fikri, M. A. H. (2025). Peran Lembaga Non-Pemerintah Dalam Mendukung Reforma Agraria Di Indonesia. *Jurnal Ilmiah Nusantara*, 2(2), 204–211. <https://doi.org/10.61722/jinu.v2i2.3629>
- Puspawati, A. A. A. I. (2022). Percepatan Penyelesaian Kasus Pertanahan Sebagai Salah Satu Tujuan Pengelolaan Pertanahan. *Repertorium: Jurnal Ilmiah Hukum Kenotariatan*, 11(1), 60–69. <https://doi.org/10.28946/rpt.v11i1.1723>
- Rachman, S. R., Supriadin, N., & Damas, P. M. (2025). Analisis Inventarisasi Barang Milik Daerah Atas Tanah dalam Mewujudkan Tata Kelola Aset Daerah yang Baik (Studi Kasus Pemerintah Kota Kendari). *Arus Jurnal Sosial dan Humaniora*, 5(1), 246–261. <https://doi.org/10.57250/ajsh.v5i1.1036>
- Resa, M., Prakoso, K. P., Aqsa, M. A., Arip, A. F. R., Putra, M. E. E., & Mubarok, A. (2024). Tinjauan Hukum Agraria dalam Implementasi Surat Hak Guna Bangunan di Batam Kepulauan Riau. *Almufi Jurnal Sosial dan Humaniora*, 1(2), 98–106. <https://doi.org/10.63821/ash.v1i2.302>
- Rizkiatanta, B. K., & Djasuli, M. (2023). Optimizing the Security of Fixed Assets: Strategies to Increase the Recognition of Land and Buildings as Legal Assets. *JAE (Jurnal Akuntansi Dan Ekonomi)*, 8(3), 23–30. <https://doi.org/10.29407/jae.v8i3.20525>
- Rosmiati, M., & Anggrani, B. (2025). Inventarisasi Aset Berdasarkan Peraturan Menteri Dalam Negeri Republik Indonesia Nomor 47 Tahun 2021 – Sebuah Studi Kasus. *Indonesian Accounting Research Journal*, 6(1), 25–34.
- Sitanggang, M. D. P., Lubis, M. Y., & Sembiring, R. (2025). Kepastian Hukum Penguasaan Tanah oleh Pemerintah Daerah yang Berasal dari Peminjaman dalam Sengketa dengan Ahli Waris (Studi Putusan Mahkamah Agung Nomor 3580 K/Pdt/2023). *Jurnal Hukum Lex Generalis*, 6(9). <https://doi.org/10.56370/jhlg.v6i9.1970>
- Sudiadi, M. H., & Yanatama, M. I. A. A. (2025). Argumentasi Hukum Pemerintah Daerah dalam Menggugat Badan Pertanahan Nasional. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Legal Perspectives*, 1(2), 42–53. <https://doi.org/10.70837/48npz295>
- Sukorina, D., & Mayasari, A. (2025). Peluang Penyelesaian Sengketa Lahan Penghuni Rumah Tanah Negara Melalui Alternative Dispute Resolution Land dengan Asas-Asas Hukum Penelantaran Tanah dan Penanganan Dampak Sosial Kemasyarakatan. *ANTASENA: Governance and Innovation Journal*, 3(1), 56–74. <https://doi.org/10.61332/antasena.v3i1.293>
- Turnip, R. F., & Simamora, J. (2025). Peran Jaksa Pengacara Negara dalam Memberi Pendampingan Hukum Tentang Pengelolaan Aset Pemkab di Pelabuhan Ambarita. *Al-Zayn: Jurnal Ilmu Sosial & Hukum*, 3(6), 11298–11309. <https://doi.org/10.61104/alz.v3i6.2937>
- Yansen, A., & Al-Amin. (2025). Perlunya Sistem Administrasi Pertanahan Yang Andal Dan Transparan: Membangun Kepastian Hukum, Penyelesaian Sengketa Yang Adil, Dan Mendukung Investasi Serta Akses Usaha. *JEBIMAN: Jurnal Ekonomi, Bisnis, Manajemen Dan Akuntansi*, 3(6), 465–474.
- Zamdedy, Z. (2024). Pengaruh Pengelolaan Barang Milik Daerah Terhadap Pengamanan Aset Daerah. *Syntax Idea*, 6(4), 1545–1553. <https://doi.org/10.46799/syntax-idea.v6i4.3152>
- Zulfikar, M. D., Pujiwati, Y., & Wahjuni, S. (2022). Kedudukan Hak Pengelolaan Dalam Hukum Tanah Nasional Dikaitkan Kepemilikan Barang Milik Negara/Daerah: *LITRA: Jurnal Hukum Lingkungan, Tata Ruang, Dan Agraria*, 1(2), 229–245. <https://doi.org/10.23920/litra.v1i2.771>
-