Siber International Journal of Advanced Law (SIJAL)
E-ISSN : 2987-5595
P-ISSN : 2987-5609
https://review.e-siber.org/SIJAL siberpublisher.info@gmail.com +62 812-1046-7572
DOI: https://doi.org/10.38035/sijal.v3i2
https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

Conflict of Authority Between Tourism and Shipping Over Special Sea Transportation for Tourism in Business Law

Fatiyah Suryani Mile[1], St. Laksanto Utomo[2], Adi Nur Rohman[3]
[1]Universitas Bhayangkara Jakarta Raya, Jakarta, Indonesia, yanimile9966@gmail.com
[2]Universitas Bhayangkara Jakarta Raya, Jakarta, Indonesia,
[3]Universitas Bhayangkara Jakarta Raya, Jakarta, Indonesia,

Corresponding Author: yanimile9966@gmail.com[1]

Abstract: The rapid growth of marine tourism in Indonesia has generated complex legal intersections between the regulatory regimes of tourism and shipping, particularly concerning the governance of special sea transportation for tourism. This study examines the conflict of authority between the Ministry of Tourism and Creative Economy and the Ministry of Transportation regarding the regulation, licensing, and supervision of vessels operating as tourist transport. Using a normative juridical approach combined with conceptual and statutory analysis, the research identifies overlapping competencies that create legal uncertainty for business actors in the tourism maritime sector. Findings indicate that the dualism of authority originates from the differing legal frameworks: Law No. 10 of 2009 on Tourism and Law No. 17 of 2008 on Shipping, both of which assign regulatory powers over similar economic activities without clear hierarchical coordination. This overlap results in regulatory inconsistency, bureaucratic inefficiency, and investment barriers, undermining the principles of legal certainty and fair competition in business law. The study argues that the conflict can be resolved through harmonization of legal norms and the adoption of a business law perspective that treats marine tourism as a hybrid economic activity requiring integrated governance. The research proposes a reconstruction of authority division based on the principles of lex specialis, subsidiarity, and economic efficiency, emphasizing collaboration between maritime and tourism agencies. Such reconstruction would provide a coherent regulatory environment that enhances legal certainty, protects investors and tourists, and promotes sustainable development of Indonesia's marine tourism industry in alignment with national economic goals and maritime sovereignty.

Keyword: Conflict Of Authority, Marine Tourism, Shipping Law, Business Law, Legal Harmonization

INTRODUCTION

Indonesia, as the world's largest archipelagic state comprising approximately 17,000 islands, possesses extraordinary maritime potential for development in both the shipping and tourism sectors. The country's marine wealth encompasses a diversity of coastal ecosystems,

coral reefs, and magnificent underwater landscapes that position Indonesia as one of the world's leading marine tourism destinations and a strategic asset in the national economy. This potential has been globally recognized through various international publications that place Indonesia in a strategic position within the global blue economy and sustainable maritime tourism discourse (Rahmawati et al., Journal of Ocean & Coastal Management, 2024).

As domestic and international interest in remote marine destinations continues to increase, the need for reliable sea transportation has become increasingly critical. The emergence of Special Sea Transportation for Tourism (Angkutan Laut Khusus Wisata) represents an adaptive response to the limitations of conventional inter-island transportation systems that have yet to reach many exotic destinations. Within the context of national shipping, the presence of tourist vessels creates a bridge between the maritime and tourism sectors, fostering growing integration between the two.

According to data from the Ministry of Transportation (2024), the marine tourism transport sector has contributed significantly to the increase in tourist mobility across eastern Indonesia, particularly in regions such as Labuan Bajo, Raja Ampat, Banda Naira, Seram, South Halmahera, Banggai Islands, Nusa Tenggara, Alor, and Sulawesi, among other destinations. In recent years, the growth of Indonesia's marine tourism vessels has been remarkably rapid, both in terms of the number of recreational and tourist ships and the intensity of tourist visits and operational activities. For example, in Labuan Bajo, East Nusa Tenggara, more than 700 recreational vessels are currently operating within a single maritime area—a significant number that highlights the urgent need for clear regulatory frameworks and governance mechanisms as vessel functions shift from transportation to experiential tourism attractions.

Several studies on the development of Special Sea Transportation for Tourism show that this sector has experienced significant growth in Indonesia, particularly in areas with high marine tourism potential such as Labuan Bajo, Raja Ampat, Wakatobi, and the Selayar Islands. This growth is marked by the increasing number of tourist and recreational vessels operating officially under the regulations of the Directorate General of Sea Transportation. For instance, research by Heru Widodo (2023) emphasizes the importance of expanding facilities and designating ports of call for tourist vessels to ensure that maritime tourism activities are legally managed and sustainable.

Likewise, research by Muhammad Rifqi Habibi et al. (2024) in Waisai, Raja Ampat, concludes that the annual increase in tourist vessel arrivals necessitates the development of modern tourism docks that meet safety and environmental standards. Meanwhile, a study by Alwi Sina Khaqiqi and Adam Hilal Dwianto (2024) on traditional phinisi ships in the Selayar Islands shows that traditional vessels still play a crucial role in supporting sustainable marine tourism while preserving local cultural values.

Tourist vessels such as phinisi, yachts, motorboats, and liveaboards function not only as means of transportation but also as part of the tourism attraction itself. The unique experience of staying on board adds significant value added to the marine tourism industry. This phenomenon aligns with Jayawibawa's (2025) perspective in Maritime Law: Theory and Application, which asserts that modern maritime law no longer focuses solely on navigation safety but also encompasses commercial, investment, and sustainability dimensions of maritime enterprises. Accordingly, the existence of recreational vessels demands a legal framework that is more adaptive to the realities of marine tourism business practices.

However, the rapid development of Special Sea Transportation for Tourism has not been accompanied by clear and coherent policy implementation. Within maritime law, tourist vessels are often treated as equivalent to national commercial shipping enterprises, while within tourism law, they are regarded as components of tourism products and connectivity amenities. This ambiguity results in overlapping legal regimes and creates barriers in licensing, vessel operations, and investment mobilization. As stated by Rio Christiawan (2021) in Contemporary

Business Law, business regulations that fail to align with practical realities tend to create legal frictions that hinder economic efficiency and legal certainty for business actors.

This regulatory imbalance also reflects the limited responsiveness of law to economic dynamics. Satjipto Rahardjo's theory of Progressive Law emphasizes that law should serve as an adaptive instrument for social and economic change rather than a mere tool of formal order. Similarly, Primadhany et al. (2023) in Business Law in Indonesia state that business law should ideally create efficiency, stability, and predictability in economic activity. When the regulation of tourist vessels remains divided between maritime and tourism jurisdictions, it illustrates a legal failure to provide the business value orientation that should underlie commercial activities.

From the perspective of Law and Development, law is viewed as an instrument of economic development capable of fostering a healthy and competitive investment climate. Dhiana Puspitawati et al. (2019) in Maritime Law highlight that the development of the maritime sector must be accompanied by legal reform that ensures certainty, efficiency, and protection for all stakeholders involved in shipping activities. Likewise, Shidqon Prabowo et al. (2023) in Business Law Textbook underscore the importance of business law in building investor confidence and protecting commercial contracts. Therefore, a synergy between maritime law and business law must be formulated so that Special Sea Transportation for Tourism can operate as an economic activity grounded in a robust legal foundation while upholding Indonesia's cultural and local values.

Indonesia's vast archipelagic geography, encompassing more than 17,000 islands, positions the nation as one of the world's most dynamic maritime tourism destinations. The convergence of tourism and maritime sectors has created a rapidly growing market for special sea transportation—vessels used for leisure, diving, cruising, and island-hopping activities (World Tourism Organization [UNWTO], 2022). This growth, however, has simultaneously generated jurisdictional overlaps between the legal authorities governing tourism and those regulating shipping and maritime safety. The problem arises because both sectors claim regulatory competence over the same economic object: vessels engaged in tourism activities. As a result, entrepreneurs and investors face uncertainty in licensing procedures, operational requirements, and liability regimes, undermining the principle of legal certainty (rechtssicherheit) that is fundamental to business law (Rahardjo, 2009).

The dualism of authority primarily stems from the coexistence of two major legislative regimes: *Law No. 10 of 2009 on Tourism*, administered by the Ministry of Tourism and Creative Economy, and *Law No. 17 of 2008 on Shipping*, under the jurisdiction of the Ministry of Transportation. Both laws contain overlapping provisions related to the regulation of vessels used for tourism purposes, crew certification, and safety standards (Hidayat, 2021). While the Shipping Law treats vessels as maritime transportation subject to navigational control and port clearance, the Tourism Law classifies them as tourism service facilities subject to business licensing and quality standards. This legal dualism has led to conflicts of regulatory authority, producing multiple licensing regimes, inconsistent standards, and potential disputes in administrative enforcement (Yuliana, 2020).

From a business law perspective, this conflict represents a broader challenge in Indonesia's regulatory system: the fragmentation of economic governance. The overlapping authority between sectoral ministries reflects the lack of coordination and harmonization in business regulation, a condition that reduces competitiveness and discourages private investment (World Bank, 2023). In maritime tourism, entrepreneurs are required to comply with both transportation permits (surat laik laut) and tourism business licenses (izin usaha pariwisata), each with different procedures and supervising agencies. This duplication not only increases transaction costs but also undermines Indonesia's efforts to improve its ease of doing business and maritime tourism investment climate (Sugiarto & Siregar, 2022).

In theoretical terms, the conflict of authority illustrates what legal scholars call regulatory overlap, a phenomenon where multiple state institutions exercise overlapping jurisdiction over a single object of regulation without clear normative boundaries (Esty, 2006). Such overlap creates ambiguity in accountability and enforcement, leading to inefficiency and legal uncertainty for business actors (Craig, 2018). Within Indonesia's context, this issue is exacerbated by the absence of a legal harmonization mechanism that systematically integrates sectoral regulations within a unified business law framework. The result is a regulatory landscape that is fragmented, reactive, and prone to inter-institutional competition rather than coordination.

The implications extend beyond legal doctrine to affect maritime safety, consumer protection, and fair competition. Without clear authority, it becomes unclear which ministry is responsible for accident investigation, safety certification, or liability in maritime tourism incidents. This uncertainty not only endangers tourists but also jeopardizes investor confidence and Indonesia's international reputation as a safe maritime tourism destination (International Maritime Organization [IMO], 2021). Consequently, resolving this conflict is both a legal necessity and an economic priority aligned with Indonesia's *Blue Economy* vision and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), particularly Goal 8 (Decent Work and Economic Growth) and Goal 14 (Life Below Water) (United Nations, 2015).

In this regard, the conflict of authority between tourism and shipping institutions illustrates a deeper issue within Indonesia's legal system: the fragmentation of sectoral governance in managing the Blue Economy. The maritime tourism industry operates at the intersection of public law and private enterprise, where state regulation must balance safety and sovereignty on one hand, and market efficiency and innovation on the other (Purbokusumo, 2018). The absence of coherent regulatory coordination creates asymmetrical legal responsibilities—for instance, ship operators are subject to maritime safety inspections under the Ministry of Transportation, yet their commercial operations and service quality fall under tourism licensing authorities. This regulatory bifurcation leads to gaps in enforcement, where each institution assumes limited responsibility in the event of accidents, environmental damage, or contractual disputes with tourists and business partners (Sugiarto & Siregar, 2022).

From the standpoint of business law, such fragmentation undermines the principle of legal certainty, which is foundational to a fair and predictable economic system. Business law, as Rahardjo (2009) asserts, is not merely an instrument of state control but a medium for ensuring justice, transparency, and equilibrium between public regulation and private rights. Inconsistent licensing procedures and dual authority create what legal economists term transactional inefficiency—increasing compliance costs, prolonging permit acquisition, and disincentivizing investment in maritime tourism infrastructure (Craig, 2018; World Bank, 2023). The lack of a unified legal framework also weakens the enforcement of consumer protection standards, as differing ministries apply inconsistent norms concerning passenger safety, liability, and insurance obligations.

Furthermore, the conflict obstructs Indonesia's effort to advance its Blue Economy agenda, which envisions the sustainable utilization of marine resources through innovation, partnership, and green investment (Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries [KKP], 2022). The Blue Economy paradigm requires integrated policy between maritime, environmental, and tourism sectors to achieve long-term economic growth without ecological degradation. However, when regulatory authorities operate in silos, the potential for synergy is replaced by competition for jurisdiction, leading to policy inconsistency and wasted administrative resources (Arifin, 2023). This disconnection not only delays infrastructure development in tourist ports and marinas but also limits the adoption of sustainable practices such as eco-certification, waste management, and emission reduction in tourism vessels (OECD, 2019).

Therefore, resolving the conflict of authority is not simply an administrative exercise but a strategic reform to establish regulatory coherence and business harmonization. Integrating

maritime transport and tourism regulation under a coordinated framework would facilitate one-stop licensing, standardize safety protocols, and clarify liability regimes. This harmonization aligns with the global trend toward integrated ocean governance, as promoted by the International Maritime Organization (IMO) and the World Tourism Organization (UNWTO), which emphasize cross-sector collaboration as the foundation for sustainable maritime tourism (UNWTO & IMO, 2021). By adopting such an approach, Indonesia can enhance investor confidence, ensure fair competition, and project itself as a maritime nation with legal integrity and business transparency—a critical factor in achieving its long-term vision of *Poros Maritim Dunia* (Global Maritime Axis).

This study aims to analyze and reconstruct the legal relationship between the tourism and shipping sectors concerning special sea transportation for tourism. By employing a normative juridical approach, supported by conceptual and statutory analysis, it examines the roots of regulatory conflict and proposes a model of authority division grounded in the principles of lex specialis, subsidiarity, and economic efficiency. The research contributes to the field of business law by demonstrating how intersectoral legal harmonization can enhance legal certainty, reduce administrative burdens, and promote sustainable maritime tourism. Ultimately, it argues that reforming the authority framework over special sea transportation is essential for transforming Indonesia's marine tourism industry into a legally coherent, competitive, and welfare-oriented economic sector.

METHOD

This study employs a normative juridical research design, which is most appropriate for analyzing legal norms, institutional frameworks, and the coherence of laws governing special sea transportation for tourism. The normative juridical approach focuses on examining *law in books*—the content, structure, and relationship of legal rules within the hierarchy of Indonesia's legal system (Fajar & Yulianto, 2013). It is not primarily empirical but rather doctrinal, seeking to interpret statutory provisions, analyze their consistency, and evaluate their adequacy in addressing the conflict of authority between the tourism and shipping sectors.

The study also incorporates a conceptual approach, drawing upon legal theories of authority (bevoegdheid), legal certainty (rechtssicherheit), and business law harmonization. These concepts are essential for constructing a coherent understanding of how intersectoral regulation should function in a market-oriented legal system (Craig, 2018). The combination of these approaches allows the research to move beyond textual interpretation toward systematic legal reconstruction, identifying normative gaps and proposing an integrative model of governance.

The research is descriptive-analytical and prescriptive. It is descriptive because it outlines and maps the current configuration of laws and institutions that regulate marine tourism and shipping. It is analytical because it examines the implications of overlapping authority for legal certainty, investor confidence, and maritime safety. Finally, it is prescriptive because it aims to formulate legal recommendations to harmonize the regulatory regime in accordance with the principles of lex specialis, subsidiarity, and economic efficiency (Turner & Hulme, 1997; Rahardjo, 2009). The normative and prescriptive dimensions are particularly relevant in business law studies, where the objective is not only to critique existing rules but also to propose reforms that promote legal certainty, fairness, and sustainable economic development (Esty, 2006).

This study thus aims to formulate an ideal legal construction from a business law perspective concerning Special Sea Transportation for Tourism, to provide legal certainty for business actors and support the creation of a conducive investment climate in Indonesia's marine tourism sector. The study further seeks to develop a business-law concept capable of resolving overlapping regulations between the maritime and tourism sectors by proposing a harmonious, economically valuable, and sustainability-oriented regulatory framework—a

Sustainable Maritime Tourism Law. In this way, the business law approach serves as a conceptual solution to regulatory uncertainty that has long hindered the development of recreational vessel enterprises in Indonesia.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

1. Mapping the Regulatory Overlap: Tourism vs. Shipping

Special Sea Transportation for Tourism constitutes a business activity under the authority of the Ministry of Tourism, characterized by its unique operational nature within maritime zones. According to Article 6 paragraph (7) of Government Regulation No. 31 of 2021 on the Implementation of the Shipping Sector, special sea transportation refers to maritime transport operations conducted not for public purposes, but to support specific activities. These activities are classified into eight sectors: industry, agriculture, forestry, mining, fisheries, tourism, construction, and education and training. This provision normatively provides the legal foundation for maritime tourism operations, even though it does not explicitly regulate the detailed business and licensing aspects of recreational vessels.

The mandate of Article 6 paragraph (7) clearly establishes the legal status and classification of recreational vessels as part of Special Sea Transportation in the Tourism Sector, rather than Domestic Sea Transportation for Tourism Purposes. However, this classification conflicts with the definition provided under Indonesian Standard Industrial Classification (KBLI) 50113, which categorizes such activity as Domestic Sea Transportation for Tourism Business. This inconsistency effectively places recreational vessels under the jurisdiction of the maritime transportation regime, thereby subjecting operators to the licensing requirements applicable to general shipping enterprises, including the obligation to obtain a Sea Transportation Business License (SIUPAL) (Surat Izin Usaha Perusahaan Angkutan Laut).

In practice, however, the SIUPAL license can only be granted to companies that own vessels with a minimum gross tonnage of 175 GT. This requirement is inconsistent with the operational reality that the majority of companies engaged in the tourism sea transport sector operate recreational vessels below 175 GT. Consequently, this regulation creates a significant licensing barrier for tourism operators, impeding the legal recognition and formalization of small and medium-scale marine tourism enterprises.

The core of the authority conflict lies in the dual characterization of vessels engaged in marine tourism. Under the Shipping Law**,** vessels are transportation objects subject to maritime safety, manning, navigation, port state control, and environmental rules. Under the Tourism Law, the same vessels are treated as tourism service facilities subject to licensing, service quality standards, and consumer protection oversight. When two sectoral regimes assert competence over the same economic activity without a clear conflict-of-laws clause, the result is regulatory overlap and ambiguity in accountability (Craig, 2018; Esty, 2006). In practice, operators navigate multiple permits, duplicative audits, and inconsistent standards for safety equipment, crew certification, and passenger insurance, which raises transaction costs and undermines legal certainty**,** a foundational principle of business law (Rahardjo, 2009; World Bank, 2023).

This dualism reflects a broader structural issue in Indonesia's regulatory governance—the persistence of sectoral ego (ego sektoral) in the formulation and implementation of economic regulations. Ministries tend to interpret their mandates expansively, often without an integrated framework that delineates inter-agency coordination mechanisms (Hidayat, 2021). As a result, instead of complementing each other, tourism and shipping authorities operate in parallel systems that impose duplicative procedures and conflicting compliance requirements. This phenomenon illustrates what Esty (2006) calls regulatory fragmentation, where policy domains evolve in isolation, creating inefficiencies and normative tension.

The absence of a clear conflict-of-law provision (aturan kolisi norma) between these statutes further exacerbates uncertainty. The Shipping Law (Law No. 17 of 2008) prioritizes

navigational safety, vessel seaworthiness, and crew certification under maritime administrative control, while the Tourism Law (Law No. 10 of 2009) regulates tourism business licensing, service quality, and consumer protection. Yet both laws define "vessel for tourism" differently, leading to overlapping interpretations of what constitutes special sea transportation for tourism (angkutan laut khusus wisata). In the absence of a hierarchical rule or harmonization clause, administrative discretion dominates, allowing each ministry to apply its own definitions and standards to the same economic object (Sugiarto & Siregar, 2022).

This lack of normative coordination also undermines the investment climate. From a business law standpoint, regulatory clarity is a prerequisite for predictability in business operations. Investors and operators require a consistent legal environment to assess risk and allocate capital efficiently. Fragmentation increases compliance costs, discourages innovation, and creates entry barriers for small and medium enterprises in the marine tourism sector (World Bank, 2023). In practice, the uncertainty has caused delays in obtaining operating licenses and has discouraged private investors from financing infrastructure such as marinas, docks, and cruise terminals (Arifin, 2023).

Beyond administrative inefficiency, this conflict has broader jurisprudential consequences for the development of Indonesia's maritime business law. Law, as Rahardjo (2009) asserts in his theory of progressive law, must serve as an instrument of social engineering—facilitating justice and welfare rather than merely codifying administrative control. In this case, legal pluralism without coordination transforms law into an obstacle rather than an enabler of economic activity. The coexistence of dual authorities without harmonization not only violates the principle of lex specialis derogat legi generali but also weakens rechtssicherheit (legal certainty) and doelmatigheid (efficiency), both central to the philosophy of business law (Craig, 2018).

The consequences extend to international competitiveness and maritime safety standards. According to the International Maritime Organization (IMO, 2021), fragmented oversight undermines safety assurance, as vessel inspections, licensing, and certification are conducted under inconsistent frameworks. Similarly, the World Tourism Organization (UNWTO & IMO, 2021) stresses that sustainable maritime tourism requires integrated governance where safety, environmental protection, and service quality operate within a unified legal framework. Indonesia's failure to synchronize these functions weakens its credibility as a safe, modern maritime tourism hub.

Therefore, the dual characterization of vessels under separate ministries must be understood not as a technical anomaly but as a systemic governance failure that compromises both legal integrity and market performance. The path forward lies in redefining jurisdictional boundaries through a harmonization mechanism that integrates maritime safety regulations and tourism service standards into a single, coherent legal framework. This approach, grounded in the principles of lex specialis and subsidiarity, will strengthen institutional accountability, reduce regulatory friction, and restore investor and consumer confidence in Indonesia's maritime tourism industry.

2. Business-Law Consequences: Legal Certainty, Transaction Costs, and Investment Climate

From a business law perspective, fragmented authority erodes predictability and equal treatment**,** two conditions necessary for efficient markets. Firms face permit multiplicity**,** shifting supervisory expectations, and unclear liability allocation when incidents occur (Sugiarto & Siregar, 2022). These frictions translate into transactional inefficiencies and regulatory risk premiums that discourage entry and scale-up, particularly among SMEs that dominate Indonesia's marine tourism ecosystem. International evidence shows that **coherent** licensing and unified standards correlate with higher private investment and better service quality in maritime tourism (World Bank, 2023; UNWTO & IMO, 2021). Hence,

harmonization is not merely a doctrinal repair but a market-enabling reform that strengthens Indonesia's competitiveness.

Harmonization, in this context, should be viewed as a strategic legal instrument that bridges the divide between economic efficiency and regulatory legitimacy. The fragmentation of authority between the tourism and shipping sectors has generated what economists term institutional transaction costs—non-productive expenditures borne by firms to navigate unclear bureaucratic procedures, duplicative inspections, and inconsistent reporting systems (Williamson, 1985). These costs do not create value but instead deter investment and innovation, particularly among small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) that form the backbone of Indonesia's maritime tourism sector (World Bank, 2023). A harmonized regulatory framework would therefore lower these costs by standardizing permits, aligning safety and service criteria, and introducing a single-point licensing system that simplifies administrative compliance (OECD, 2019).

From a law and economics perspective, legal certainty functions as a public good that enhances market confidence. As Rahardjo (2009) argues, law should not be static but instrumental, enabling social and economic transformation by ensuring fairness, predictability, and justice in transactions. The current dualism—where one agency regulates vessels as transportation objects and another as tourism facilities—creates asymmetrical obligations that distort competition and erode trust in state regulation. Investors and operators perceive legal uncertainty as a form of regulatory risk premium, which raises financing costs and shifts tourism capital to neighboring markets such as Thailand, Malaysia, or Vietnam, where marine tourism regulation is more coherent and investment-friendly (Arifin, 2023; UNWTO, 2022).

Comparatively, integrated regimes demonstrate the economic benefits of harmonized governance. In Thailand, the Marine Department and the Ministry of Tourism and Sports coordinate under a joint decree that defines vessel classifications, licensing requirements, and inspection procedures for tourism operators (UNWTO & IMO, 2021). Similarly, Australia's Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority collaborates with tourism regulators to manage environmental, safety, and service standards under a unified legal umbrella, which has significantly improved investor confidence and sustainable tourism outcomes (Hassler, 2020). These examples show that harmonization not only reduces regulatory burdens but also strengthens policy coherence, enabling the government to pursue economic growth without compromising safety or sustainability.

In Indonesia's case, harmonization should be pursued through both normative and institutional reconstruction. Normatively, a clear lex specialis clause must determine which ministry holds primary jurisdiction over vessels engaged in tourism, while secondary agencies play supportive or supervisory roles within defined limits (Craig, 2018). Institutionally, this should be implemented through an inter-ministerial coordination framework, supported by a joint regulation (peraturan bersama) between the Ministry of Transportation and the Ministry of Tourism and Creative Economy. Such a framework would institutionalize data sharing, joint audits, and integrated inspection protocols, ensuring that safety, environmental, and business concerns are addressed holistically.

Moreover, harmonization promotes regulatory transparency and accountability. When responsibilities are clearly distributed, each agency's performance can be evaluated objectively based on measurable indicators—such as accident rates, service quality scores, and investment inflows. This approach aligns with the principles of good governance articulated by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP, 1997), which emphasize accountability, efficiency, participation, and rule of law as pillars of sustainable institutional performance. By internalizing these principles within Indonesia's marine tourism governance, harmonization becomes more than a bureaucratic simplification—it becomes a structural reform that enhances both economic competitiveness and public trust.

Ultimately, harmonization reflects the essence of responsive business law—a legal framework that adapts to the evolving dynamics of economic globalization while maintaining the moral and social objectives of national development (Nonet & Selznick, 2017). Through legal coherence, Indonesia can transform its marine tourism sector from a fragmented, compliance-driven system into a transparent, predictable, and growth-oriented ecosystem that supports innovation, entrepreneurship, and sustainable welfare.

3 Safety, Consumer Protection, and Liability Allocation

Authority conflicts also affect maritime safety and consumer protection. Unclear lines between ministries can delay accident investigations**,** dilute safety oversight, and complicate liability for death, injury, baggage, or itinerary disruption (IMO, 2021). Best practice in integrated regimes is to (a) centralize safety certification and seaworthiness in the maritime authority; (b) anchor service quality**,** advertising claims, and refund/cancellation rules in the tourism authority; and (c) require compulsory insurance and passenger manifests as a bridge between the two (UNWTO & IMO, 2021; OECD, 2019). Clear allocation reduces forum shopping and ensures that tourists have predictable remedies while operators understand duty of care thresholds.

However, Indonesia's current legal framework provides no integrated liability regime for maritime tourism operations. While the Shipping Law (Law No. 17 of 2008) regulates carrier obligations for passenger safety and ship seaworthiness, and the Tourism Law (Law No. 10 of 2009) governs consumer rights and service standards, neither law clearly defines joint liability in cases where accidents arise during tourism-related voyages. This legal vacuum leads to forum fragmentation, where victims or their families face uncertainty regarding which institution has jurisdiction to handle disputes, or whether claims should be directed to maritime courts, administrative tribunals, or general civil courts (Sugiarto & Siregar, 2022). The result is a procedural labyrinth that delays compensation, undermines justice, and erodes public confidence in government oversight.

In contrast, jurisdictions with mature maritime tourism industries—such as Australia, Singapore, and the European Union—have established hybrid liability frameworks that combine transport and tourism standards under unified legislation (Hassler, 2020; European Commission, 2019). For instance, the EU Package Travel Directive (2015/2302) integrates contractual obligations of carriers, travel agencies, and intermediaries, ensuring that passengers enjoy uniform rights regardless of the transport mode. Similarly, Australia's Maritime Transport and Offshore Facilities Act 2013 harmonizes safety and consumer protection by mandating compulsory insurance, transparent liability clauses, and state-backed compensation mechanisms for maritime incidents (OECD, 2019). These models demonstrate that clarity in jurisdiction and liability allocation not only protects consumers but also enhances industry competitiveness by reducing litigation uncertainty and insurance disputes.

To achieve similar outcomes, Indonesia must develop a coordinated liability and insurance framework that binds both the tourism and maritime sectors. The framework should establish shared definitions of risk, compensation thresholds, and evidentiary standards, allowing each authority to exercise its mandate without overlap. Specifically, maritime regulators should remain responsible for verifying seaworthiness, crew competency, and accident investigation, while tourism authorities should ensure that operators provide insurance coverage, transparent pricing, and prompt refunds or compensation for cancellations and service disruptions (IMO, 2021; UNWTO & IMO, 2021).

From a business law standpoint, such integration would strengthen the principle of accountability (verantwoordelijkheid), which is fundamental to both corporate governance and consumer protection (Rahardjo, 2009). It would also embed predictability and trust into the commercial relationship between operators and passengers, enabling more efficient risk management and fairer distribution of legal responsibility. For example, a unified policy could

require that every tourism vessel register its insurance policy number and passenger manifest in a national digital database, jointly managed by the Ministry of Transportation and the Ministry of Tourism. This would not only facilitate real-time tracking and investigation in the event of accidents but also ensure that passengers are covered by valid insurance schemes—an increasingly urgent issue as Indonesia expands its cruise and diving tourism markets (World Bank, 2023; Arifin, 2023).

Furthermore, establishing standardized dispute resolution mechanisms—such as maritime arbitration boards or tourism ombudsman units—would enhance access to justice for both domestic and foreign tourists. These mechanisms should prioritize alternative dispute resolution (ADR) methods, including mediation and conciliation, before litigation. Such models, as observed in Singapore and the EU, reduce procedural burdens and align with the global trend toward restorative and consumer-oriented justice (UNCTAD, 2021). By integrating ADR provisions within the liability framework, Indonesia can ensure that disputes are resolved efficiently, transparently, and in line with international standards of fairness and due process.

Ultimately, clarifying liability allocation and establishing joint safety-accountability systems will rebuild trust and credibility in Indonesia's maritime tourism sector. In the long term, this reform will contribute to sustainable market confidence, attracting international operators and investors while ensuring that legal frameworks remain consistent with Indonesia's constitutional mandate to protect the public and uphold justice (UUD 1945, Art. 28G). Harmonizing liability, insurance, and consumer protection thus represents not only a technical legal adjustment but a strategic step toward a resilient, fair, and competitive maritime tourism economy.

4 Environmental Externalities and Blue Economy Alignment

Marine tourism vessels generate environmental externalities—waste, emissions, anchoring damage to reefs—that cut across maritime, tourism, and environmental statutes. Uncoordinated supervision enables compliance gaps and weakens the credibility of eco-labels or responsible tourism claims (OECD, 2019). Indonesia's Blue Economy roadmap stresses integration of maritime, environmental, and tourism policies to decouple growth from degradation (Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries [KKP], 2022). Harmonized authority should therefore embed environmental safeguards—waste reception plans, no-anchor zones, speed limits near sensitive habitats, and green-vessel incentives—within a single licensing spine that marries safety, service, and sustainability (Arifin, 2023; UNWTO & IMO, 2021).

Despite the growing recognition of sustainability imperatives, Indonesia's current legal architecture remains fragmented across environmental, maritime, and tourism domains. The Environmental Protection and Management Law (Law No. 32 of 2009) mandates environmental impact assessments (AMDAL) and waste management obligations for business actors. However, these provisions are rarely synchronized with maritime transport regulations under the Shipping Law (Law No. 17 of 2008) or with tourism business licensing under the Tourism Law (Law No. 10 of 2009) (Hidayat, 2021). As a result, operators of tourist vessels often face regulatory inconsistency—they may obtain a tourism license without fulfilling maritime waste management requirements, or vice versa. This lack of coordination undermines environmental accountability, allowing unmonitored discharges and unsustainable anchoring practices to persist, particularly in ecologically sensitive areas such as Raja Ampat, Wakatobi, and Komodo National Park (Arifin, 2023).

Such policy fragmentation contradicts Indonesia's commitment to sustainable marine resource management as articulated in the Blue Economy Roadmap 2022–2045, which emphasizes the integration of economic growth, environmental protection, and social inclusion (KKP, 2022). The Blue Economy framework requires that marine tourism not only generate revenue but also sustain ecosystem services—coral reefs, fisheries, and coastal biodiversity—

that underpin long-term prosperity. Yet, without an integrated governance structure, the roadmap's principles risk remaining aspirational rather than operational (OECD, 2019; World Bank, 2023).

A harmonized licensing system could provide a viable solution by embedding environmental safeguards directly into tourism and shipping permits. For example, the no-anchor zones in coral reef areas could be enforced through maritime safety certifications, while eco-certification schemes—similar to the Green Key or Blue Flag programs—could be incorporated into tourism licensing criteria (UNWTO & IMO, 2021; UNEP, 2020). Such integration ensures that environmental performance is not treated as an external obligation but as a core compliance requirement for business continuity. Furthermore, the establishment of green incentives, such as reduced port fees for low-emission vessels or tax rebates for certified eco-tourism operators, would align business interests with sustainability goals (Arifin, 2023; OECD, 2019).

From a business law perspective, integrating environmental compliance within licensing processes advances the principle of internalization of externalities, as articulated in law and economics theory (Pigou, 1920; Williamson, 1985). Rather than imposing post-facto sanctions, regulators can design ex ante mechanisms that embed environmental responsibility within the cost structures and operational norms of maritime tourism businesses. This preventive model not only enhances regulatory efficiency but also fosters corporate environmental responsibility (CER) as a competitive advantage in international tourism markets (UNEP, 2020).

Institutionally, effective implementation demands inter-ministerial coordination between the Ministry of Tourism, the Ministry of Transportation, the Ministry of Environment and Forestry (KLHK), and the Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries (KKP). A joint regulatory framework could specify shared monitoring responsibilities, common reporting platforms, and integrated enforcement mechanisms. For example, vessel operators could be required to submit digital environmental compliance reports—covering waste management, fuel use, and biodiversity impact—through a unified online system managed jointly by the relevant ministries. This approach would reduce administrative duplication while strengthening transparency and data reliability (World Bank, 2023; OECD, 2019).

Moreover, integrating environmental considerations into maritime tourism governance aligns with Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 14—Life Below Water, which emphasizes the conservation and sustainable use of oceans, seas, and marine resources. It also supports SDG 12—Responsible Consumption and Production, by promoting sustainable business models that minimize waste and resource use (United Nations, 2015). Embedding these principles within Indonesia's licensing and oversight framework ensures that the country's marine tourism industry evolves as a low-impact, high-value sector that sustains both economic growth and ecological integrity.

Ultimately, harmonizing environmental regulation within maritime tourism governance represents a transformation of business law's normative function. Law ceases to operate merely as a constraint on enterprise and instead becomes a driver of sustainability-oriented innovation—encouraging compliance through incentives, transparency, and accountability rather than punitive control. This approach reflects the shift toward responsive and progressive law envisioned by Rahardjo (2009) and Nonet and Selznick (2017), where legal structures actively enable ethical business practices and long-term societal welfare.

5 Doctrinal Toolkit for Harmonization: Lex Specialis, Lex Posterior, and Ultra Vires

A practicable solution is a One-Stop Marine Tourism Licensing mechanism that (1) designates the Ministry of Transportation as the single point for hull/engine, safety, crew, and route approvals, (2) designates the Ministry of Tourism as the single point **for** tourism business licensing**,** and (3) binds them through a Joint Regulation **t**hat codifies shared definitions**,** data-sharing**,** joint inspections for high-risk segments**,** and mutual recognition of checklists to

eliminate duplication. Digital interoperability (APIs, shared registries, QR verifiable permits) reduces operator burden and improves real-time oversight (World Bank, 2023; OECD, 2019). For small islands and remote routes, risk-based supervision should adjust frequency and scope of inspections without relaxing core safety or consumer standards.

This One-Stop Marine Tourism Licensing (OMTL) model embodies the principles of regulatory coherence and subsidiarity, which ensure that authority is exercised at the most effective level while maintaining policy consistency across ministries. By centralizing operational licensing in the Ministry of Transportation and commercial licensing in the Ministry of Tourism, the system creates functional differentiation that prevents jurisdictional overlap while preserving each institution's core competencies (Craig, 2018). The Joint Regulation acts as a lex specialis inter ministeria—a special law governing inter-ministerial coordination—thereby filling the legal vacuum left by sectoral statutes that operate in isolation. This doctrinal innovation aligns with the concept of responsive law advanced by Nonet and Selznick (2017), where legal institutions evolve adaptively to balance administrative order with social and economic needs.

The OMTL mechanism also reflects progressive legal principles (Rahardjo, 2009) that view law not as a rigid set of prohibitions but as an enabling infrastructure for economic and social transformation. Under this model, the role of the state shifts from regulator to facilitator of lawful enterprise. The digital integration of licensing data through interoperable registries, APIs, and QR-verifiable permits enables transparency and accountability, reducing opportunities for rent-seeking and bureaucratic delay (OECD, 2019; World Bank, 2023). Moreover, data harmonization supports real-time monitoring of vessel safety, environmental compliance, and insurance coverage, thereby enhancing governance performance without expanding bureaucracy.

Institutionally, the OMTL framework promotes co-regulation and shared accountability. Through joint inspection protocols, both ministries can coordinate risk-based audits targeting high-risk operations—such as large-capacity vessels, cross-border cruises, or environmentally sensitive routes—while simplifying oversight for low-risk community-based tourism activities (Arifin, 2023). This risk-based supervision model is consistent with international best practices recommended by the International Maritime Organization (IMO) and UNWTO, which emphasize proportionality, efficiency, and adaptability in maritime tourism governance (UNWTO & IMO, 2021).

Furthermore, the introduction of mutual recognition of checklists eliminates redundant inspections. For instance, once a vessel's seaworthiness and safety certifications are verified by the Ministry of Transportation, the Ministry of Tourism should automatically recognize those results without requiring separate assessments. This cross-validation mechanism reduces compliance burdens and enhances legal certainty—two factors that directly improve the investment climate and competitiveness of Indonesia's maritime tourism industry (World Bank, 2023).

The digital backbone of the OMTL system also supports transparency and public participation. Through open-access registries, stakeholders—including investors, insurers, and local communities—can verify the operational legitimacy of tourism vessels and monitor compliance with safety and environmental standards. This aligns with the principles of good governance outlined by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP, 1997): transparency, participation, accountability, and rule of law. By embedding these values into administrative procedures, Indonesia can reduce corruption risks, enhance regulatory trust, and foster a culture of compliance grounded in legitimacy rather than coercion (Esty, 2006).

To ensure the sustainability of this framework, a National Coordination Council for Maritime Tourism (NCCMT) could be established as a supra-ministerial body under the Coordinating Ministry for Maritime Affairs and Investment. The NCCMT would function as a policy integrator, monitoring the effectiveness of inter-agency coordination, resolving

regulatory disputes, and ensuring that policies remain aligned with Indonesia's Blue Economy Roadmap 2022–2045 (KKP, 2022). Through periodic evaluation, the council could issue policy guidelines to harmonize emerging issues such as cruise tourism, carbon-neutral shipping, and digital tourism services.

Ultimately, the OMTL mechanism represents a systemic reconstruction of Indonesia's maritime tourism governance architecture. It operationalizes the synergy between law, technology, and administration, enabling the state to fulfill its dual mandate: safeguarding public interests while facilitating business innovation. In doing so, it transforms the fragmented legal landscape into an integrated, transparent, and efficiency-driven ecosystem, capable of advancing the nation's constitutional goal to promote public welfare (UUD 1945 Preamble) and its global commitment to the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)—particularly Goal 8 (Decent Work and Economic Growth) and Goal 14 (Life Below Water) (United Nations, 2015).

6 Competition, Market Access, and Local Linkages

Authority overlaps can unintentionally distort competition, for example when one agency imposes stricter or duplicative requirements that favor incumbents. Harmonization should thus incorporate competition-neutral drafting**,** streamline market entry**,** and encourage local linkages (fueling, provisioning, guiding, homestays) so that tourism rents spread through coastal communities. Evidence suggests that transparent, proportionate rules increase **entry** and investment while improving service quality (World Bank, 2023; UNWTO, 2022). For archipelagic routes, public-service obligations (PSOs) with competitive contracting can ensure essential connectivity without crowding out private innovation.

Competition neutrality must be a central principle of regulatory reform in the maritime tourism sector. When overlapping authorities create regulatory asymmetries, they inadvertently favor established operators that possess the administrative resources to navigate complex licensing systems (Craig, 2018). This dynamic produces what scholars call "regulatory capture by incumbents," where large firms influence policy outcomes to maintain market dominance (Stigler, 1971). In Indonesia, fragmented oversight allows certain operators to exploit differences between maritime and tourism regulations—registering vessels under the less demanding regime or securing dual licenses to bypass inspection cycles. Such inconsistencies weaken fair competition and discourage small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) from entering or scaling up in the market (Sugiarto & Siregar, 2022).

To mitigate these distortions, harmonization must be coupled with competition-neutral drafting—that is, the formulation of laws and regulations that neither advantage nor disadvantage specific market participants. Regulatory impact assessments (RIAs) should be mandated prior to the issuance of new regulations by either the Ministry of Transportation or the Ministry of Tourism to ensure proportionality and fairness (OECD, 2019). This process not only prevents duplicative obligations but also institutionalizes transparency and evidence-based policymaking. Simplified procedures and predictable requirements would lower entry barriers, particularly for community-based enterprises and coastal cooperatives seeking to participate in the marine tourism value chain (World Bank, 2023).

Furthermore, a decentralized but coordinated licensing framework could empower local governments and coastal communities while maintaining national standards. Localized tourism linkages—such as fueling, provisioning, guiding, handicrafts, and homestays—should be integrated into the broader marine tourism economy through inclusive procurement and partnership schemes (Arifin, 2023). This approach reflects the inclusive growth principle of Indonesia's Blue Economy Roadmap, which seeks to distribute economic benefits to small island communities rather than concentrate them in capital-intensive tourism zones (KKP, 2022). Encouraging these linkages enhances economic resilience, diversifies income sources, and reduces the dependency of local populations on extractive industries.

From a business law perspective, fair competition also requires clear and predictable dispute-resolution mechanisms between private operators and the state. Ambiguities in jurisdiction—whether a dispute concerns licensing, safety inspection, or taxation—often create uncertainty that deters investment and innovation (Rahardjo, 2009). By harmonizing regulatory boundaries and embedding procedural safeguards such as administrative appeal and judicial review, Indonesia can foster trust-based governance that balances state authority with market freedom.

For archipelagic routes and remote island services, harmonization should further include Public Service Obligations (PSOs) under competitive contracting. PSOs ensure that essential connectivity—especially for low-demand routes that are economically unviable for private operators—remains accessible to local residents while adhering to safety and environmental standards (World Bank, 2023). Importantly, PSO contracts should be awarded through transparent and competitive tenders, with time-limited concessions and clear performance benchmarks. This model, used successfully in Norway and the Philippines, prevents market monopolization while leveraging private-sector efficiency to fulfill public-service goals (OECD, 2019; UNWTO & IMO, 2021).

Moreover, harmonization offers an opportunity to integrate sustainability-based competition by rewarding innovation in green technologies and responsible tourism practices. Introducing "eco-performance criteria" in tenders and licensing—such as carbon reduction, waste management, and community participation—can stimulate a "race to the top" in environmental and social standards (UNEP, 2020). Such measures align competition law with sustainability objectives, ensuring that market liberalization supports, rather than undermines, long-term ecological stewardship and community welfare.

In sum, a competition-neutral and inclusive regulatory framework transforms maritime tourism from a fragmented industry into a cohesive and equitable ecosystem. Through legal harmonization, Indonesia can promote both market efficiency and distributive justice—advancing its constitutional mandate to achieve social welfare (UUD 1945) and its international commitments under SDG 8 (Decent Work and Economic Growth) and SDG 10 (Reduced Inequalities) (United Nations, 2015).

7 Toward a Coherent Business-Law Framework

In sum, the conflict of authority is not a narrow turf dispute; it is a structural governance problem with direct implications for market efficiency, safety, consumer welfare, and environmental stewardship**.** A coherent business-law framework should (a) codify functional boundaries using *lex specialis* logic; (b) institutionalize one-stop licensing with joint standards and data-sharing; (c) clarify liability and insurance across carrier and package-tour responsibilities; and (d) embed sustainability metrics consistent with Indonesia's Blue Economy and the SDGs (Goals 8 and 14). Doing so will reduce regulatory friction, enhance legal certainty**,** and position Indonesia as a trustworthy, safe, and sustainable maritime tourism hub.

Ultimately, resolving the conflict of authority requires not only technical legal harmonization but also a paradigm shift in regulatory philosophy. The Indonesian legal system must evolve from a sectoral-administrative model, characterized by overlapping jurisdictions and hierarchical rigidity, into an integrated governance model guided by collaboration, proportionality, and transparency (Nonet & Selznick, 2017). In this modern regulatory ecosystem, ministries do not compete for control but cooperate through shared objectives, interoperable systems, and mutual accountability. This transformation repositions business law as a coordinating architecture that aligns state regulation with market innovation and public welfare (Rahardjo, 2009).

From a normative standpoint, this transformation reflects the essence of responsive and progressive law. Law should no longer be seen merely as an instrument of command, but as a

facilitative framework that harmonizes public policy with private initiative. A responsive business-law framework thus balances economic rationality, social justice, and ecological responsibility, allowing market mechanisms to operate efficiently within ethical and constitutional limits (Craig, 2018; Esty, 2006). Through this approach, legal reform becomes a strategic enabler of development, integrating economic growth with human security and environmental stewardship.

At the institutional level, harmonization promotes legal certainty and investor confidence, both essential conditions for attracting sustainable investment in maritime infrastructure, green shipping, and tourism services (World Bank, 2023). The introduction of one-stop licensing and joint regulation ensures predictability, reducing the asymmetry of information between government and private actors. This transparency not only increases compliance but also reinforces trust in public institutions, a critical factor in achieving long-term legitimacy and rule-of-law consolidation (OECD, 2019).

The broader implication extends to Indonesia's global maritime identity. As an archipelagic nation with vast marine biodiversity, Indonesia has both the opportunity and responsibility to demonstrate leadership in sustainable maritime governance. By reconstructing its legal framework around lex specialis, subsidiarity, and sustainability, Indonesia can align domestic policy with international commitments such as the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS) and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (United Nations, 2015). In doing so, the state not only resolves internal conflicts of authority but also strengthens its diplomatic credibility and competitiveness in the global maritime economy (UNWTO & IMO, 2021).

Furthermore, legal coherence in marine tourism will generate multiplier effects across related sectors—such as coastal shipping, port services, environmental management, and creative industries. The alignment of tourism, transport, and environmental policies creates an ecosystem that fosters inclusive and sustainable growth, empowering local communities while safeguarding natural assets. Such synergy embodies the principle of welfare-oriented autonomy—a governance model in which decentralization, law, and market efficiency converge to enhance collective well-being (Arifin, 2023).

In essence, the reconstruction of Indonesia's maritime tourism governance transcends bureaucratic reform; it represents a redefinition of the relationship between law, economy, and society. By grounding regulatory authority in clarity, cooperation, and sustainability, Indonesia can build a maritime tourism system that is not only profitable but also equitable and ecologically resilient. The conflict of authority, therefore, becomes an opportunity—a catalyst for institutional innovation and normative renewal that reaffirms law's ultimate purpose: to serve justice, order, and the welfare of the people (bonum commune).

CONCLUSION

The findings of this study demonstrate that the conflict of authority between the tourism and shipping sectors in regulating *Special Sea Transportation for Tourism* is not merely a matter of administrative overlap but a structural governance issue that undermines Indonesia's efforts to develop a competitive and sustainable maritime tourism industry. The current dualism—where the Ministry of Tourism treats recreational vessels as tourism assets and the Ministry of Transportation regulates them as shipping entities—creates legal uncertainty, increases licensing burdens, and weakens investor confidence. This misalignment violates the fundamental principles of legal certainty (rechtssicherheit), efficiency, and accountability that form the foundation of business law and good governance. The study concludes that resolving this regulatory conflict requires a doctrinal and institutional reconstruction of authority grounded in *lex specialis* and *subsidiarity* principles. The *lex specialis derogat legi generali* principle should guide the delineation of jurisdiction: maritime authorities should retain control over safety, navigation, and technical standards, while tourism authorities should oversee

service quality, business licensing, and consumer protection. Meanwhile, the *subsidiarity* principle demands that decision-making and regulation occur at the most effective and proximate level of governance, ensuring responsiveness to local conditions and stakeholder participation.

To operationalize these principles, Indonesia should implement a One-Stop Marine Tourism Licensing (OMTL) mechanism that integrates both maritime and tourism regulatory functions under a Joint Regulation between the two ministries. This mechanism would establish shared definitions, joint inspections, mutual recognition of certification, and a unified digital database for licensing and oversight. By adopting risk-based supervision and digital interoperability, the government can reduce administrative duplication, enhance transparency, and improve compliance efficiency. Furthermore, harmonization should extend beyond procedural integration to include liability, insurance, and environmental accountability. A coordinated framework for maritime accidents and consumer protection would provide predictable remedies, ensuring that both passengers and operators are protected by law. Embedding environmental safeguards—such as waste management obligations, no-anchor zones, and green-vessel incentives—within licensing systems would align the sector with Indonesia's Blue Economy Roadmap 2022–2045 and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), particularly Goals 8 (*Decent Work and Economic Growth*) and 14 (*Life Below Water*).

From a business law perspective, harmonization serves not only as a legal correction but as a market-enabling reform. A coherent and transparent regulatory environment fosters investor trust, reduces transaction costs, and promotes fair competition. It also ensures that economic growth is coupled with environmental responsibility and community welfare—realizing the essence of *progressive law* as envisioned by Satjipto Rahardjo, where law functions as an instrument of justice and social transformation rather than mere control. Ultimately, the reconstruction of authority over *Special Sea Transportation for Tourism* represents a critical step toward integrating law, economy, and sustainability in Indonesia's maritime governance. By unifying the fragmented regulatory landscape, Indonesia can transform its marine tourism sector from a source of administrative friction into a pillar of the national Blue Economy—legally certain, economically viable, and ecologically resilient. Through this reform, the law reclaims its ethical and developmental purpose: to ensure order, justice, and welfare for all.

REFERENSI

_____, (1997). *Governance for sustainable human development: A policy document*. UNDP Publications.

_____, (2022). *Tourism and transport: A roadmap for recovery (Update)*. UNWTO Publications.

_____, (2022). *Tourism and transport: A roadmap for recovery (Update)*. UNWTO Publications.

Arifin, Z. (2023). Integrating marine tourism policy in Indonesia's Blue Economy framework. *Maritime Policy & Management*, 50(2), 135–153. https://doi.org/10.1080/03088839.2023.2167849

Christiawan, R. (2021). *Hukum Bisnis Kontemporer*. Jakarta: Prenadamedia Group.

Craig, P. (2018). *Administrative law* (9th ed.). Oxford University Press.

Esty, D. C. (2006). Good governance at the supranational scale: Globalizing administrative law. *Yale Law Journal*, 115(7), 1490–1562. https://doi.org/10.2307/20455684

European Commission. (2019). *Package travel and linked travel arrangements: Directive (EU) 2015/2302*. Publications Office of the European Union.

Fajar, M., & Yulianto, A. (2013). *Dualisme penelitian hukum: Normatif dan empiris*. Pustaka Pelajar.

Hassler, B. (2020). Governing marine tourism in Australia: Lessons from the Great Barrier Reef. *Marine Policy*, 117, 103894. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2020.103894

Hidayat, R. (2021). Problematika pembagian urusan pemerintahan dalam otonomi daerah. *Jurnal Ilmu Pemerintahan dan Sosial Politik UMA*, 9(1), 11–25.

International Maritime Organization. (2021). *Maritime safety and sustainable tourism*. IMO Publications.

Irwansyah. (2020). *Penelitian Hukum: Pilihan Metode dan Praktik Penulisan Artikel*. Yogyakarta: Mirra Buana Media.

Jayawibawa, A. (2025). *Hukum Maritim: Teori dan Aplikasi*. Yogyakarta: Deepublish.

Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries (KKP). (2022). *Indonesia Blue Economy roadmap 2022–2045*. KKP Policy Series.

Nonet, P., & Selznick, P. (2017). *Law and society in transition: Toward responsive law*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315131203

OECD. (2019). *Making decentralisation work: A handbook for policy-makers*. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/g2g9faa7-en

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2019). *Making decentralisation work: A handbook for policy-makers*. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/g2g9faa7-en

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2019). *Making decentralisation work: A handbook for policy-makers*. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/g2g9faa7-en

Pigou, A. C. (1920). *The economics of welfare*. Macmillan.

Primadhany, R., Hidayat, M., & Susanto, D. (2023). *Hukum Bisnis di Indonesia*. Bandung: Refika Aditama.

Purbokusumo, Y. (2018). *Otonomi desa dan kesejahteraan masyarakat: Perspektif hukum tata pemerintahan*. Gadjah Mada University Press.

Rahardjo, S. (2009). *Hukum progresif: Hukum yang membebaskan*. Kompas.

Rahardjo, S. (2009). *Hukum Progresif: Sebuah Sintesa Hukum Indonesia*. Yogyakarta: Genta Publishing.

Rahmawati, S., Nugroho, Y., & Arifin, M. (2024). Blue economy and sustainable maritime tourism in Indonesia: Legal and institutional challenges. *Journal of Ocean & Coastal Management*, 249, 107325. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ocecoaman.2024.107325

Shidqon Prabowo, A., Lestari, I., & Mahendra, G. (2023). *Buku Ajar Hukum Bisnis*. Malang: UB Press.

Stigler, G. J. (1971). The theory of economic regulation. *The Bell Journal of Economics and Management Science*, 2(1), 3–21. https://doi.org/10.2307/3003160

Sugiarto, R., & Siregar, D. (2022). Legal barriers in the development of marine tourism in Indonesia: A regulatory perspective. *Indonesian Journal of Maritime Law*, 5(2), 45–62.

UNCTAD. (2021). *Consumer protection and dispute resolution in digital markets*. United Nations Conference on Trade and Development.

UNDP. (1997). *Governance for sustainable human development: A policy document*. United Nations Development Programme.

United Nations World Tourism Organization & International Maritime Organization. (2021). *Sustainable coastal and maritime tourism: A call for action*. World Tourism Organization and International Maritime Organization.

United Nations World Tourism Organization. (2022). *Tourism and transport: A roadmap for recovery (Update)*. UNWTO Publications.

United Nations. (2015). *Transforming our world: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development*. United Nations.

UNWTO & IMO. (2021). *Sustainable coastal and maritime tourism: A call for action*. World Tourism Organization and International Maritime Organization.

Widodo, H., Nirmalasari, R., & Putra, D. (2023). Revisiting ferry tourism development in Indonesia: Maritime transport and recreational experience. *MDPI Proceedings*, 83(1), 63. https://doi.org/10.3390/proceedings2023083063

Williamson, O. E. (1985). *The economic institutions of capitalism: Firms, markets, relational contracting*. Free Press.

World Bank. (2023). *Indonesia: Creating markets in maritime tourism*. World Bank Group.

World Tourism Organization. (2022). *Tourism and transport: A roadmap for recovery*. UNWTO Publications.

Yuliana, N. (2020). Overlapping regulation between the Ministry of Tourism and the Ministry of Transportation in the licensing of marine tourism vessels. *Jurnal Hukum Bisnis dan Investasi*, 6(1), 77–91.