

Legal Frameworks for Mitigating Monopoly Practices Adverse to MSMEs in Indonesia

Tomy Indarto, Dharma Setiawan Negara, Didit Darmawan

Sunan Giri University of Surabaya, Indonesia

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 2 September 2022

Revised 5 November 2022

Accepted 8 December 2022

Key words:

Legal protection,
MSMES,
Monopoly,
Business competition,
KPPU,
Government framework,
Regulation.

ABSTRACT

This research aims to explore the current legal protections, as well as the government's role in tackling monopoly practices that harm Micro, Small, and Medium Enterprises (MSMEs). In the face of monopoly threats, the government, through Law Number 5 Year 1999, provides protection to MSMEs to ensure the creation of a healthy and fair market. The KPPU (Business Competition Oversight Commission) plays an important role in competition oversight and legal enforcement relating to monopolies. The government also provides frameworks to support the development of MSMEs, including easy access to financing and incentives. The implementation of these frameworks must be supported by more effective oversight and justice arrangements between large and small businesses. It is hoped that with maximum legal protection, MSMEs can develop in a climate of healthy competition, and not be eroded by monopoly practices. In the future, improvements to regulations and frameworks that prioritize a balance of interests need to be made so that MSMEs can be competitive and contribute optimally to the national economy.

INTRODUCTION

The MSMEs play an important role in the Indonesian economy because in addition to serving as a major contributor to the Gross Domestic Product (GDP), this sector also absorbs a lot of labor. MSMEs operate across diverse sectors include trade, agriculture, and creative industries, positioning them as key pillars of national economic stability and growth (Mardikaningsih et al., 2022). According to Todaro and Smith (2015), the informal and micro sectors have great potential in strengthening the economy through a bottom-up approach. Schumpeter (1934) also emphasized the importance of MSMEs as the main driver of economic dynamics and structural transformation. The MSMEs face various challenges in running a business, one of which is the occurrence of monopoly practices that can threaten the continuity of their business.

The monopoly practice in a free market is often detrimental to small business actors, where one or a few dominant parties control the market and arranging prices, making it difficult for small business actors to compete. It is also difficult for MSMEs business actors to get opportunities in market control and access to capital that can be obtained in financial institutions such as banks.

Conversely, large business actors can freely control all sources of the public economy, resulting in reduced opportunities for small and medium business actors (Rahayu, 2019). This has the potential to create inequality in the business world which will further reduce product diversity and worsen the business climate at the local level (Fajar et al., 2022). In many cases, MSMEs do not have the power or resources to fight existing monopoly practices, threatening their survival in the market (Sulasno, 2022). The dominance of large players that is not balanced with fair regulations will reduce product diversity, kill local innovation, and worsen the business climate, especially at the regional level. government intervention and the strengthening of antitrust regulations are very important.

Legal regulations related to business competition in Indonesia, especially those regulated by Law Number 5 Year 1999 on the Prohibition of Monopoly Practices and Unfair Business Competition, are expected to provide protection for MSMEs from these harmful practices. The aim of the formation of Law Number 5 Year 1999 is to safeguard the public interest and increase national economic efficiency as one of the efforts to increase society well-being.

* Corresponding author, email address: dr.diditdarmawan@gmail.com

realize a climate of fair business competition, so as to ensure equal business opportunities for large business actors, medium business actors, and small business actors. Based on Article 14 of Law Number 5 Year 1999, "business actors are prohibited from entering into agreements with other business actors aimed at controlling the production of a number of products included in the production series of certain goods and or services in which each production series or the results of management or further processes. Either in one series directly or indirectly, which may result in unfair business competition and or harm the public. The implementation and oversight of these regulations are sometimes still not optimal, both in terms of implementation and the effectiveness of legal enforcement in the field.

For example, some monopoly practices that occur in the market often go undetected due to difficulties in identification and adequate evidence. Many of these practices are carried out through control of the distribution chain, hidden pricing agreements, or exclusive control of certain raw materials and markets. Lack of information disclosure and weak supervision are the main factors why such practices often go unnoticed by authorities. Due to a lack of concrete evidence or reporting from MSMEs, monopoly cases are not widely uncovered or prosecuted despite their impact on the ground. The imbalance in the control of resources and technology between large companies and MSMEs also makes it more difficult for MSMEs actors to compete fairly (Rahayu, 2019). This raises the question of how effective the existing legal protection is in preventing monopoly practices and whether MSMEs have received proper attention in business competition frameworks.

The role of government is vital in creating a healthy and fair business climate for all parties, including MSMEs. The government has the responsibility to establish regulations and policies that encourage equal business competition, and prevent market dominance by large businesses that could potentially harm MSMEs. Appropriate government frameworks can prevent monopoly practices that can harm MSMEs actors. Many frameworks are not in favor of MSME actors or are not even implemented consistently. Some regulations tend to favor large businesses, particularly in licensing, financing access, and control of infrastructure. Policy implementation is often inconsistent, with many MSME support programs underperforming due to poor inter-agency coordination, weak oversight, and limited outreach to small businesses. The research on the role of government in overcoming monopoly is very important in the context of this research.

The government through the KPPU has the duty to oversee and enforce laws regarding fair business competition, but the effectiveness of oversight and legal enforcement is often questioned. The existence of this institution is a legal instrument to ensure that the market runs fairly and openly, so that every business actor has an equal opportunity to compete (Mulyadi & Rusydi, 2017). Weak oversight and limited resources mean that many monopoly practices go undetected or cannot be eradicated completely. Coordination between KPPU and other agencies is also not optimal, so supervision at the regional level is still weak and prone to practices that harm MSMEs. This research will examine the extent to which the government has carried out its role and what are the obstacles faced in tackling monopoly practices that harm MSMEs.

The government frameworks that provide facilities or protection to MSMEs also need more attention. MSMEs as one of the main pillars of the national economy require concrete support in order to survive and thrive amidst intense market competition. The government needs to be actively present in ensuring that MSME players are not only complementary, but also an integral part of national economic growth. For example, in terms of access to capital, marketing facilities, to capacity building and competitiveness. Without strong frameworks to support MSMEs in facing unfair competition, their existence will continue to be threatened by monopoly practices carried out by large companies (Shahrullah & Cokro, 2020).

The challenges faced by MSMEs in business competition come not only in terms of financial resources or production capacity, but also in terms of existing regulations and frameworks. The existence of laws arranging monopoly practices, even though they already exist, is not enough to provide a sense of security for MSMEs. Evaluation and renewal of existing frameworks are needed, so that legal protection of MSMEs in the context of business competition can be optimized.

For this reason, this research aims to explore more deeply how the current legal protection, as well as the role of the government in tackling monopoly practices that harm MSMEs. MSMEs are a pillar of the economy that should not be ignored, and legal protection and the active role of the government in tackling monopoly practices are important steps to maintain the sustainability and competitiveness of MSMEs. With a better understanding of the challenges faced by MSMEs in the monopoly sphere, it is hoped that this research can make a significant contribution to the development of frameworks that are more favorable to MSMEs in Indonesia.

RESEARCH METHOD

In this research, the type of research applied is normative juridical research, or better known as library legal research or document study. This research chose a normative legal approach because its main focus is on written regulations and other relevant legal materials. Normative legal research is developed based on the discipline of law, which produces research with distinctive characteristics in legal research. As normative legal research, the types and sources of data used are secondary data. Secondary data consists of legal materials obtained from written sources such as books, journals, and previous research results, which serve to strengthen or support information obtained from primary data. This research also utilizes legal principles, doctrines, and expert opinions as secondary legal materials to support the analysis. In this context, secondary data is very important to explore the legal aspects relevant to the topic under research.

The secondary legal materials used in this research include various references that explain and elaborate on existing regulations, as well as legal theories that can assist in analyzing the issues discussed. These sources help researchers understand the applicable legal context and provide a theoretical framework to analyze the issue of legal protection for MSMEs from a competition law perspective. There are also tertiary legal materials used to enrich insight and deepen understanding of the topic being analyzed. By using secondary data consisting of these three types of legal materials, this research seeks to provide a comprehensive understanding of the legal protection of MSMEs from the perspective of business competition legal.

Primary legal materials used in this research consist of various relevant laws and regulations and are the main reference in analyzing legal protection of MSMEs and monopoly practices. Among the primary legal materials are: 1) The 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia, as the constitutional basis of the state that arranging all legal principles in Indonesia; 2) Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 5 Year 1999 on the Prohibition of Monopoly Practices and Unfair Business Competition, which is the legal basis for arranging fair business competition; 3) Law Number 20 Year 2008 on MSMEs, which arranging the rights and protections for MSMEs; 4) Presidential Regulation of the Republic of Indonesia Number 17 Year 2013 on the Implementation of Law Number 20 Year 2008 on MSMEs, which provides technical guidance related to the implementation of the law; 5) Law Number 5 Year 1984 on Industry, which arranging industry and related sectors; 6) Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 1 Year 1995 on Limited Liability Companies,

which arranging the establishment and management of limited liability companies in Indonesia; 7) Presidential Regulation of the Republic of Indonesia Number 112 Year 2007 on Guidelines for Structuring and Coaching Traditional Markets, Shopping Centers, and Modern Stores, which deals with the structuring of markets in relation to MSMEs; 8) Regulation of the Minister of Trade of the Republic of Indonesia Number 53/M-DAG/PER/12/2008, which arranging domestic trade guidelines; and 9) Regulation of the KPPU Number 01 Year 2014 on the Organization and Work Procedures of the KPPU, which stipulates the oversight of monopoly practices.

The data collection method in this research uses library research, where the author collects information from relevant books, articles, and scientific works to explore the facts and concepts underlying the research. This process aims to expand knowledge related to the topic being analyzed. The data analysis method used is qualitative juridical analysis, which categorizes and selects data based on its quality and truth, then connects it with relevant laws and regulations. This analysis aims to describe the data systematically, facilitate interpretation, and produce conclusions that answer research problems. With this approach, this research aims to describe the role of legal in protecting MSMEs from monopoly practices and assess the effectiveness of existing regulations in preventing monopoly. Hopefully, this analysis can provide insights into the dynamics of business competition and the role of the government in creating a fair business climate for MSMEs.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Legal Protection for Small and Medium Business Related to the Occurrence of Monopoly Trade Practices in the Perspective of Business Competition Legal

Legal protection for MSMEs is very important, especially in the face of the threat of monopoly practices that can harm them in trade competition. MSMEs as part of the national economic structure have limitations in terms of capital, technology, and market access, making them vulnerable to unfair business practices, especially monopolistic practices (Gamage, 2020). Monopoly trade practices have the potential to reduce the opportunity for MSMEs to develop and compete fairly, as large companies tend to control the market and set unfair prices. This causes MSMEs to be unable to compete, both in terms of price and product distribution. Monopolies also reduce consumer choice and limit the diversity of products produced by small businesses. regulations that protect MSMEs from the dominance of large businesses are needed so that they have the space to grow and contribute to the economy optimally.

The Law Number 5 Year 1999 on the Prohibition of Monopoly Practices and Unfair Business Competition is designed to provide legal protection for MSME actors. This law aims to prevent monopolistic practices, oligopoly, and other forms of unfair competition that may harm small businesses. This law is a manifestation of economic democracy based on the principles of equity and justice (Sirait, 2022). This law also reflects the state's commitment to creating an inclusive and equitable economic order. By guaranteeing the protection of small businesses, the state seeks to avoid economic concentration in certain groups or entities. The existence and implementation of Law Number 5 Year 1999 is key in ensuring that economic growth is not only enjoyed by a handful of large business actors, but can also be widely felt by MSMEs as an integral part of national economic development. Through this regulation, it is expected that MSMEs can develop in a climate of healthy competition, without economic domination by large entrepreneurs that can harm small business (Arliman, 2017).

The current situation provides opportunities for small-scale entrepreneurs to boost their business activities and increase access to business for Indonesian society (Susanty, 2017). Increased awareness of the importance of the people's economy and more open access to technology and information are important assets for MSMEs to develop. With the support of the right regulations and a conducive business environment, small businesses can increase their contribution to the national economy, while opening more business and employment opportunities for the wider community. This is important so that there is no centralization of economic power that only benefits a handful of large entrepreneurs, but harms small business actors who should get equal opportunities in the market (Rahayu, 2019). With Law Number 5 Year 1999, the main objectives are to create fair competition, protect consumer interests, and provide protection for small business so that they can develop without harmful monopoly practices.

Business actors, as stipulated in Article 1 of Law Number 5 Year 1999, include every individual or business entity, both in the form of a legal entity and not a legal entity, established and operating in the jurisdiction of Indonesia. Business actors can carry out economic activities both individually and jointly through agreements, with the aim of organizing various business activities (Sulasno, 2022). The role of business actors in the economic system is very strategic and strictly regulated to avoid unilateral market domination or control.

To maintain fair competition among business actors, Law Number 5 Year 1999 arranging the duties and authorities of the commission responsible for oversight of business competition. Article 30 to Article 37 of this law explicitly arranging the establishment of KPPU, which functions to oversee and ensure that monopoly practices or unfair business competition do not occur. KPPU was established to ensure that there is no unfair market dominance by one or several business actors that can harm other actors, especially small and medium enterprises. KPPU is independent and was established based on Presidential Decree Number 75 Year 1999 on KPPU, which aims to support the creation of fair business competition in Indonesia (Riva'i & Erhandy, 2014). The existence of KPPU also serves as a form of state commitment in implementing the principle of economic democracy, where all business actors, large and small, have equal opportunities to develop in an environment of fair and transparent competition.

KPPU is an institution that has a multifunctional role and special expertise, which allows this institution to resolve and accelerate the process of handling business competition cases. The KPPU not only acts as a supervisor, but also as an implementer of various important functions in the competition law enforcement process. Based on the mandate of Law Number 5 Year 1999, KPPU is given broad authority, covering executive, legislative, judicial, and consultative areas. This broad authority aims to make KPPU a comprehensive institution in handling all aspects related to business competition violations. In carrying out its functions, KPPU's authority often seems to overlap, because this institution can act as an investigator, investigator, examiner, prosecutor, decision maker, and also as an institution that provides consultation.

Regarding the oversight of partnerships between MSMEs and large business actors, KPPU has the responsibility to oversee and enforce the applicable provisions (Riva'i & Erhandy, 2014). This oversight task consists of two main aspects. First, the oversight of partnership agreements made between large business actors and/or medium business actors and MSMEs (Afriana et al., 2020). The main focus of oversight here is to ensure that such partnership agreements exist, as well as fulfill the specified requirements. Second, oversight of the implementation of partnerships, where KPPU focuses its oversight on the potential for allegations of unauthorized ownership or control, as well as the potential for abuse of bargaining positions that can harm MSMEs.

In Article 34 of KPPU Regulation Number 1 Year 2015, further authority is given to the Partnership Implementation Monitoring Team (TPPK). Besides to the authorities listed in Article 33, the TPPK has a number of additional authorities which include: (a) inviting and requesting information from business actors, the government, or other stakeholders; (b) conducting correspondence with related parties to obtain data and information required in the research; (c) obtaining data, letters, documents, and related information from MSMEs, the government, or other stakeholders; (d) obtaining data, letters, documents, and information from other work units within the commission; (e) coordinating with related institutions or agencies; (f) collecting information from academics and independent sources; (g) collecting data and information from consumers; (h) processing and analyzing data and information; and (i) cooperating with third parties for data collection and processing.

After the TPPK has completed its oversight, the results of the oversight are reported at the KPPU Commission meeting. This meeting is an important forum to examine whether there are any violations of the principles of fair partnership and compliance with laws and regulations. This process ensures that any decisions are made transparently and based on objective evidence. Based on the report, KPPU can provide recommendations in the form of guidance, registration of partnership agreements, revocation of business licenses by the authorized agency, advice or consideration, and follow-up of initiative cases in accordance with KPPU Regulation Number 1 Year 2019 concerning Procedures for Handling Partnership Implementation Cases (Perkom Number 1 Year 2019). This means that KPPU can initiate a formal examination process without having to wait for a report from an outside party, if during supervision there are indications of serious violations of the partnership principle.

Preventive legal protection for MSME actors is regulated in the Business Competition Law to prevent practices that can harm them in the market. Legal protection is preventive in nature because it is designed to avoid the occurrence of harmful actions before the impact is felt directly by MSMEs. Some of these preventive measures include: (a) prevention of business actors who enter into agreements to fix prices unreasonably, (b) prevention of business actors who discriminate in price against consumers, (c) prevention of business actors who set prices below market prices, and (d) prevention of business actors who enter into agreements to fix prices for goods and/or services that will be resold at prices lower than those agreed upon.

Besides to preventive protection, there is also repressive legal protection given to MSME actors under the Business Competition Law. Repressive protection is a form of law enforcement that is carried out after a violation of the principle of fair competition. Repressive law acts as a corrective instrument that guarantees justice and provides real protection to aggrieved business actors. This protection includes several types of sanctions, namely: (a) administrative sanctions, (b) main criminal sanctions, and (c) additional criminal sanctions. With this preventive and repressive legal protection, it is expected that MSMEs can operate in a fairer competitive environment and avoid monopoly practices or unfair business competition that is detrimental to them. With strong legal guarantees, MSMEs have the confidence to develop and innovate, while contributing more to national economic growth.

Legal protection of MSMEs is crucial in maintaining their sustainability and development in the midst of monopoly practices and unfair business competition (Fajar et al., 2022). MSMEs are often at a disadvantage in the market structure, especially when they have to compete with large businesses that have greater resources and influence. When monopolistic practices or unfair business competition occur, MSMEs are the most vulnerable to being harmed. Legal protection is needed to ensure the existence and continuity of MSMEs are maintained amid increasingly fierce competition. Through Law Number 5 Year 1999, the government provides a solid legal foundation to create a fair business climate and support fair competition. With this regulation, it is expected that MSMEs can compete with large entrepreneurs without being hampered by market dominance that is detrimental to them (Shahrullah & Cokro, 2020).

This legal protection is divided into two approaches, namely preventive and repressive, which aim to prevent market abuse while providing strict sanctions for parties who violate legal provisions. With clear and consistent legal action, MSMEs are assured of protection, as well as confidence that violations of fair competition principles will be taken seriously. The commitment of the government through institutions such as KPPU is very important in oversight and enforcement of regulations that protect MSMEs. KPPU not only functions as a supervisor, but also as an institution that can provide recommendations or sanctions against business actors who violate the rules. The existence of KPPU with its broad authority guarantees that business competition can take place in a fair and justice (Riva'i & Erhandy, 2014).

Ultimately, to achieve economic equality and create social justice for all business actors, especially MSMEs, sustainable oversight and strict legal enforcement against monopoly practices and unfair business competition are needed. With the support of comprehensive legal protection, MSMEs can further develop and contribute significantly to the national economy, create jobs, and increase the overall welfare of the society.

The Role of the Government in Overcoming the Occurrence of Monopoly Against Small and Medium Business in Business Competition

To maximize the role of MSMEs in the national economy, the government seeks to create supportive conditions so that MSMEs can continue to develop, especially in facing the free market era. One of the steps suggested by KPPU is the improvement and strengthening of frameworks and procedures covering various aspects, such as business location, spatial planning, legality, social environment, and operating hours. This improvement is expected to increase the effectiveness of policy implementation that supports MSMEs (Sukman, 2021).

The KPPU also urges the Central Government and Regional Governments to be more active in protecting MSMEs amid the rapid development of modern markets. This protection is important so that MSME actors are not eroded by the dominance of large markets. The government is expected to provide the need guidance to strengthen the competitiveness of MSMEs, while encouraging them to be able to collaborate and compete fairly with large entrepreneurs. MSMEs will be better equipped to compete in an increasingly open market, as well as play a greater role in the national economy (Ramadhan, 2022).

To support the sustainability of MSMEs, both the Central and Local Governments have an important role in providing facilities and incentives that can help the development of these business. This is regulated in Article 124 of Government Regulation Number 7 Year 2021, which includes various frameworks and facilities that can be provided to MSMEs (Hadi et al., 2022).

The article states that MSMEs are given facilities in terms of tax administration to facilitate the application for financing facilities from the Central Government, in accordance with statutory provisions in the field of taxation. Certain micro and small businesses can obtain income tax incentives in accordance with the provisions of the applicable tax regulations. These incentives are provided based on a single database listed in Article 58. MSMEs are also given incentives in the form of reduction, relief,

or exemption from regional taxes and/or regional retribution, which are adjusted to the provisions of laws and regulations.

This incentive only applies to MSMEs that meet certain requirements, such as having justice started production or operations, having an annual business turnover of at most IDR 7,500,000,000, and running a business in certain sectors such as agriculture, plantations, animal husbandry, industry, services, transportation, 1-star hotels, restaurants, shops, and others. MSMEs that also participate in electronic procurement of government goods and services are also eligible to receive these incentives.

The incentives include reductions in rural and urban land and building taxes, land and building acquisition duties, and local retributions, which can ease the operational burden for MSMEs and support their business sustainability. This framework is expected to accelerate the growth and competitiveness of MSMEs in the economy, as well as create a more inclusive and justice business ecosystem (Shahrullah & Cokro, 2020).

In an effort to support the development of MSMEs, the Central Government and Local Governments play an active role in overcoming the limited capital often faced by MSMEs. One of the steps taken is to provide financing that is easily accessible and at an affordable cost. Besides to increase the ability of MSMEs to manage finances and utilize financing properly, the Government also provides training to improve financial literacy and assistance in accessing financing. These steps are regulated in Article 28 of Government Regulation Number 7 Year 2021.

In the partnership aspect, the Central Government and Regional Governments also have an important role in arranging partnerships between Large and Medium Business and MSMEs. Provisions regarding this can be found in Article 118 of Government Regulation Number 7 Year 2021. In the implementation of the partnership, KPPU is tasked with oversight its implementation, as stipulated in Article 119 of GR No. 7 of 2021. This oversight aims to ensure that the partnerships formed take place justice and do not harm MSMEs, as well as to prevent monopoly practices or unfair business competition that may hinder the development of MSMEs.

Central and local governments have an important role in creating a conducive business sector, which can not only create jobs and increase income, but also encourage society groups to participate in building social interactions, economic activities, and politics. Public frameworks issued by these two parties are very influential in facilitating fairly market mechanisms,

so that potential deviations that can harm the economy can be minimized (Apriani & Syafrinaldi, 2022). Legal frameworks made by the government, especially in terms of licensing regulations, should consider the principle of balance between the interests of various parties and the business sector (Mardikaningsih & Arifin, 2021; Hapsari et al., 2022).

To increase the skills and capabilities of MSME actors, both the Central Government and Local Governments are obliged to organize incubation programs. This program aims to create new business, strengthen, and develop the quality of MSMEs that have high economic value and strong competitiveness. Incubation also aims to optimize the utilization of educated human resources, which can contribute to driving the economy by utilizing science and technology. Institutions that can organize this incubation are incubator institutions, which can cooperate with parties both from within the country and abroad. The scope of incubation activities is further regulated in Article 133 of Government Regulation Number 7 Year 2021.

In the Regulation of the Minister of Trade of the Republic of Indonesia Number 53/M-Dag/PER/12/2008 on Guidelines for Structuring and Coaching Traditional Markets, Shopping Centers, and Modern Markets, Article 2 paragraph (1) arranging that the government has established zoning as a guideline for the establishment of modern markets. This regulation confirms that the location of the establishment of traditional markets, shopping centers, and modern markets must follow the Regency/City Regional Spatial Plan, as well as the applicable detailed spatial plan, including zoning regulations. This shows that the government pays serious attention to the arrangement and utilization of space to support the existence of traditional markets and modern markets, such as Alfamart and Indomaret, so that they can grow and develop in healthy competition. This effort also aims to empower MSME players to be able to compete justice, both in traditional markets and in modern markets, in the face of the rapid development of the trade sector in Indonesia.

The Central and Local Governments have a very important role in creating a conducive business sector, which is able to generate employment, increase income, and encourage active society participation in building social interactions, economic activities, and politics. For this reason, public frameworks taken by both governments determine the sustainability and justice of the market mechanism. These frameworks are expected to ensure that the market functions properly, so that deviations that can harm various parties,

including small and medium business actors, can be avoided. One of the steps that must be considered in frameworks-making is the arrangement of licensing regulations that must continue to consider the balance between the interests of the society, business actors, and the economic sector as a whole. Legal frameworks issued by the government can support the creation of a fair and justice market.

CONCLUSION

Based on the discussion that has been conducted, it can be concluded that legal protection of MSMEs, especially in the context of monopoly practices and unfair business competition, is very important in ensuring the sustainability of small and medium business. Law Number 5 Year 1999 on the Prohibition of Monopoly Practices and Unfair Business Competition is a strong legal basis to protect MSMEs from being trapped in competitive injustice caused by monopoly practices carried out by large business. The KPPU has a central role in oversight and legal enforcement, ensuring that the market continues to function justice. Central and local governments also play a role in creating a conducive business climate for MSMEs, through frameworks that provide easy access, training, and incentives that can increase the competitiveness of small business actors.

To achieve the aim of maximum protection, the government needs to increase coordination and effectiveness in frameworks implementation, and pay more attention to the balance between the interests of large and small business. One step that needs to be taken is to improve existing regulations and strengthen oversight of monopoly practices that can harm MSMEs. The government also needs to ensure that the frameworks issued support the sustainability and development of MSMEs, while preventing the centralization of economic power that only benefits a handful of large business actors. With these measures, MSMEs can develop more in a climate of fair and sustainable competition.

REFERENCES

- Afriana, A., Karsona, A. M., & Putri, S. A. (2020). Kemitraan dalam Perspektif Persaingan Usaha dan Penyelesaian Sengketa. *Jurnal Ilmu Hukum Kenotariatan*, 4(1), 1-17.
- Apriani, D., & Syafrinaldi, S. (2022). Konflik Norma antara Perlindungan Usaha Kecil Menurut Hukum Persaingan Usaha Indonesia dengan Perlindungan Konsumen. *Jurnal Pembangunan Hukum Indonesia*, 4(1), 14-33.

- Arliman, L. (2017). Perlindungan Hukum UMKM dari Eksploitasi Ekonomi dalam Rangka Peningkatan Kesejahteraan Masyarakat. *Jurnal Rechts Vinding: Media Pembinaan Hukum Nasional*, 6(3), 387-402.
- Fajar, D. A., Fauziah, F. N., & Mutrofin, K. (2022). Predatory Pricing Melumpuhkan UMKM Indonesia: Studi Kasus Tiktok Shop. *El-Mahasaba*, 2(1), 19-24.
- Gamage, N. S. K., Ekanayake, E. M. S., Abeyrathne, G. A. K. N. J., Prasanna, R. P. I. R., Jayasundara, J. M. S. B., & Rajapakshe, P. S. K. (2020). A Review of Global Challenges and Survival Strategies of Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs). *Economies*, 8(4), 79-102.
- Hadi, S., BF, A. R. H., & Mulada, D. A. (2022). Perlindungan Hukum Usaha Mikro Kecil dan Menengah (UMKM) terhadap Praktik Monopoli Dilihat dari Perspektif Hukum Persaingan Usaha. *Commerce Law*, 2(1), 39-46.
- Hapsari, R. A., Satria, I., & Hesti, Y. (2022). Perspektif Hukum dalam Kebijakan Relaksasi Pengenaan Hukum Persaingan Usaha dan Pengawasan Kemitraan UMKM. *Jurnal Pengabdian UMKM*, 1(2), 115-120.
- Hardyansah, R., N. H. Pakpahan, A. S. Wibowo. (2021). The Ramifications of Banking Monopoly on Consumer Trust, Customer Satisfaction, and Industry Competition Dynamics, *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 1(2), 105 - 110.
- Mardikaningsih, R., Azizah, E. I., Putri, N. N., Alfian, M. N., & Rudiansyah, M. M. D. H. (2022). Business Survival: Competence of Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises. *Journal of Social Science Studies (JOS3)*, 2(1), 1-4.
- Mardikaningsih, R., & S. Arifin. (2021). Study on Education Level and Consequences of Licensing and Interest in Making Small Business Licensing. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 1(1), 19-24.
- Mulyadi, D., & Rusydi, I. (2017). Efektivitas peran Komisi Pengawas Persaingan Usaha (KPPU) dalam Penanganan Kasus Persaingan Usaha Tidak Sehat. *Jurnal Ilmiah Galuh Justisi*, 5(1), 81-95.
- Negara, D. S., D. Darmawan, B. Gardi. (2021). The Approach of Consumer Reviews to Product Competitiveness and Management Strategies, *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 1(2), 149 - 154.
- Putra, A.R., & D. Darmawan. (2022). Competitive Advantage of MSMEs in Terms of Technology Orientation and Entrepreneurship Competence. *International Journal of Service Science, Management, Engineering, and Technology*, 2(1), 15-20.
- Rahayu, I. A. (2019). Kehadiran Usaha Waralaba Alfamart dan Indomart terhadap Warung-Warung Kecil Ditinjau dari Undang-Undang Nomor 20 Tahun 2008. *Lex Et Societatis*, 7(7), 170-180.
- Ramadhan, V. J. O. (2022). Konflik Pasar Monopoli terhadap Pelaku Usaha. *Jurnal Pendidikan dan Konseling (JPDK)*, 4(6), 4925-4933.
- Riva'i, M., & Erhandy, D. (2014). Peranan KPPU bagi Pemangku Kepentingan dalam Menegakkan Undang-Undang Larangan Praktik Monopoli di Indonesia. *Liquidity: Jurnal Riset Akuntansi dan Manajemen*, 3(2), 190-200.
- Schumpeter, J. A. (1934). *The Theory of Economic Development*. Harvard University Press.
- Shahrullah, R. S., & Cokro, H. H. (2020). Penegakan Hukum bagi Pedagang Usaha Mikro, Kecil dan Menengah terhadap Para Pelaku Usaha Monopoli. *Journal of Law and Policy Transformation*, 5(2), 113-127.
- Sirait, R. M. (2022). Eksistensi Komisi Pengawas Persaingan Usaha dalam Pencegahan Praktik Monopoli dan Persaingan Usaha Tidak Sehat di Indonesia dalam Perspektif Undang Undang Nomor 5 Tahun 1999. *Jurnal Konseling Pendidikan Islam*, 3(1), 343-358.
- Sukman, S. (2021). Pemberdayaan Usaha Mikro Kecil Menengah (UMKM) Syariah di Kota Balikpapan. *Ullumul Syar'i: Jurnal Ilmu-Ilmu Hukum dan Syariah*, 10(2), 63-83.
- Sulasno, S. (2022). Implikasi Kebijakan Persaingan Usaha Produk Usaha Mikro Kecil Menengah (UMKM) untuk Meningkatkan Perekonomian di Kabupaten Serang. *Sketsa Bisnis*, 9(2), 165-185.
- Susanty, A. P. (2017). Perlindungan Hukum terhadap Kelangsungan Usaha Mikro, Kecil, dan Menengah atas Pemberlakuan Masyarakat Ekonomi Asean. *Jurnal Hukum Respublica*, 16(2), 313-332.
- Todaro, M. P., & Smith, S. C. (2015). *Economic Development (12th ed.)*. Pearson.
- Udjari, H., S. Suwito, & Jahroni. (2021). The Social Dynamics and Psychological Wellbeing of Discrimination in Society. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 1(1), 123 - 128.