

Conservation of Cultural Heritage in Indonesia: A Review of Policy and Practice

Lunariana Lubis^{1*}, Bintoro Wardiyanto¹, Erna Setijaningrum¹

¹Doctoral Degree Sosial Science, Universitas Airlangga

*Correspondence Email: lunariana.lubis@hangtuah.ac.id

Received: 10 March 2024; Revised: 20 November 2024; Accepted: 28 November 2024

Abstract: Since 2010, the Indonesian government has given ministries and local governments the power to designate cultural heritage. However, there are still few clear policies and planning for cultural heritage conservation, so this study aims to find gaps in existing policy and planning and propose a revised policy framework. The method used a qualitative based on literature review. The examination of Indonesia's policy framework for cultural heritage conservation revealed a number of flaws that have an impact on the process. A heritage-owner approach to conservation, a lack of financial sources, a lack of incentives, a lack of openness, and poor coverage of the context of heritage are some of these shortcomings. The political structure should be revised, integrated conservation strategies and incentives should be offered, financing sources should be diversified, and public participation should be increased in order to address these deficiencies.

Keywords: Cultural Heritage; Conservation; Indonesia; Cultural Heritage Policy.

How to Cite:

Lubis, L., Wardiyanto, B., & Setijaningrum, E. (2024). Conservation of Cultural Heritage in Indonesia: A Review of Policy and Practice. *Journal of Governance*, 9(4), 567–578.
<https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.31506/jog.v9i4.24554>



[This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/)

Introduction

Indonesia is a country rich in cultural heritage, both material and non-material. The existence of cultural heritage, both material and non-material, has made a significant contribution in shaping the character of the nation as well as being a potential resource in sustainable development (Merciu et al., 2020). This cultural heritage not only reflects the long history of the Indonesian nation but also becomes an important identity in the national and international context (F. Lenzerini, 2011).

This wealth is reflected in thousands of cultural heritage sites scattered throughout the archipelago, which includes historical buildings, archaeological sites, and traditions that have been passed down from generation to generation. Preservation of cultural heritage is a state obligation as stipulated in Law No. 11/2010 on Cultural Heritage. This policy aims to protect, manage, and utilize cultural heritage as part of efforts to maintain the nation's identity. (Amboro, 2022).

Buildings, locations, statues, temples, and other historical or archaeological artifacts are examples of prehistoric and historical relics, which constitute material culture and are some of Indonesia's cultural assets that must be conserved. The existence of these artifacts, which are cultural heritage, is significant for history, science, education, religion, and culture (Arifin, 2018; Damiasih, 2023; Fitri et al., 2019; Rukayah et al., 2022; Setiawan & Sulistianingsih, 2013; Sinaga & Subiyanto, 2023; Surbakti, 2017).

With hundreds of cultural heritage sites and artifacts dispersed around the country, Indonesia's cultural heritage must be preserved and protected. According to information provided by the

Republic of Indonesia's Ministry of Education and Culture, as of August 2023, there were 9,099 different types of cultural heritage recorded, including buildings (48.10%), objects (3.99%), areas (1.24%), sites (28.38%), and structures (18.29%).

(<https://dapobud.kemdikbud.go.id/peta>, processed by researchers, 2023).

Law No. 11 of 2010 concerning Cultural Heritage (CB Law) and Government Regulation No. 1 of 2022 concerning the National Register and Preservation of Cultural Heritage are the two national rules of Indonesia that govern the conservation of cultural heritage. In addition to highlighting the importance of everyone's involvement and concern in cultural heritage preservation activities, the existence of these two regulations may have an impact on management efforts. In the meantime, the Indonesian government assigns its authority to the cultural ministries and local governments to carry out the establishment and preservation of cultural treasures.

Even with official restrictions in place, there is currently little protection for the local cultural heritage. A number of issues remain, including: (1) changes in Indonesia's institutions for managing cultural heritage; (2) data collection on who owns cultural heritage buildings in the various regions; (3) a lack of a robust legal framework for protecting cultural heritage at the provincial, district, and city government levels; (4) some cultural heritage that has been damaged and physical structural changes that have taken place in the region; and (5) the absence of legislation providing guidance on the valuation of cultural heritage, despite the fact that cultural heritage as a state asset is valued economically,

meaning that compensation is still not balanced with the cost of maintaining cultural heritage. This condition is also exacerbated by the pressures of modernization and economic exploitation, which often contradict the principle of conservation (Afnani et al., 2021; Akbar, 2014; Arfiansyah & Syam, 2021; Cookson & Stirk, 2022; Ekarini, 2015; Ekowati et al., 2019; Kahar & Muhaimin, 2022; Kausar et al., 2024; Lvping, 2021; Muryani, 2019; Rahman & Darwin, 2022; Rahmawati, 2017; Ritiduian & Megawati, 2021; Silaen, 2023; Sugiyanto, 2022; Wardani et al., 2021; Wibawa & Ali, 2020; Zulkarnain, 2015).

The purpose of this study is to assess Indonesia's cultural heritage conservation policy. To present a more complete view, this study employs a multidisciplinary methodology that blends policy, social, and economic analysis. Therefore, it is anticipated that this study will determine the degree to which cultural heritage conservation policies have been put into practice and offer suggestions for policy changes that will boost their efficacy and have a beneficial influence on Indonesia's cultural heritage preservation. Through this research, the government, particularly the culture and tourism agency, and the community can gain a better understanding of Indonesia's cultural heritage preservation techniques. This research is expected to make a positive contribution to cultural heritage conservation that maintains harmony between economic growth and environmental and cultural preservation at the national level.

Method

This research uses a qualitative approach based on a literature review to analyze cultural heritage preservation policies and practices in Indonesia. This

method was chosen because it allows researchers to conduct a comprehensive evaluation of cultural heritage protection policies based on theoretical studies, previous empirical research, and analysis of relevant documents.

The literature review process was conducted through database searches and literature citation indexes (Soelistyarini, 2013). Following the search, publications were screened, analyzed, and reviewed, with any necessary exceptions, before being utilized to discuss syntheses and generate findings. To gather scholarly literature, Google Scholar and Scopus searches were employed. Using problem-based keywords, databases from 2011 were searched using this strategy. This study reviews the literature on Indonesia's cultural heritage policy and identifies a number of flaws that impact several facets of the country's cultural heritage conservation effort.

Result and Discussion

Following a comprehensive analysis of Indonesia's current framework for cultural heritage conservation policies, it was discovered that there are six primary issues that impact different facets of the country's cultural heritage conservation process: insufficient coverage of the context of cultural heritage; insufficient institutional capacity; limited conservation strategies for privately owned buildings; insufficient incentives; a lack of funding sources; and a lack of transparency.

Inadequate coverage of cultural heritage in Indonesia

Cultural heritage typically ignores the physical environment, including landscapes and places, and focuses solely on structures. In actuality, this physical setting gives the monument artistic and

social significance as well, preventing ancient structures from appearing isolated. For instance, in 1991, UNESCO named the Borobudur Temple a World Heritage Site. Indonesia itself did not have an overall law or government policy on the conservation of cultural heritage sites before 1992; even in the Presidential Decree of the Republic of Indonesia Number 1 of 1992 concerning the Management of Borobudur Temple Tourism Park and Prambanan Temple Tourism Park and Environmental Control of the Area, the regulations that form the basis for the management of the Borobudur Temple area still use the Monument Ordinance (Staatsblad Year 1931 Number 238), a regulation made by the colonial government as a reference in making its regulations. Regulations regarding cultural heritage objects themselves were only issued by the Indonesian Government in March 1992, two months after Presidential Decree No. 1 of 1992 appeared. On the one hand, the Indonesian Tourism Regulation has appeared since 1990; this is a signal that the management of the Borobudur Temple area was initially more closely related to tourism activities than heritage preservation activities (Darmawan, 2023). As a result, development is only oriented towards tourism and not conservation, which can affect the maintainability of the protection zone and can affect the assessment from UNESCO.

In addition, the scope of cultural heritage also includes Intangible Cultural Heritage (ICH). ICH is an important part of human civilization (Su et al., 2019), and the universal value of the ICH convention is gradually being socially accepted (Federico Lenzerini, 2011). Indonesia has ratified the Convention for the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage in 2003 with the enactment of

Presidential Regulation No. 78 of 2007 on the Ratification of the 2003 UNESCO Convention on the protection of intangible cultural heritage (Zulkarnain, 2015). The ratification of the convention on the protection of intangible cultural heritage was strengthened by the revision of Law No. 5 of 1992 on Cultural Heritage Objects into Law No. 11 of 2010 on Cultural Heritage (Yuristiadhi, 2014).

Indonesia is among the top five countries in the world with the most diverse traditional ethnic wealth. Indonesia's batik motifs, dances, folklore, traditional architecture, and folk songs are estimated at more than 30,000 varieties (Ayu et al., 2017). Some traditional ethnic treasures, such as Batik, Keris, Wayang, Pendet Dance, Angklung, Noken, and Pinisi, have been registered as intangible cultural heritage (Purba et al., 2020). However, the protection of intangible cultural heritage in Indonesia through policies in force in Indonesia has not been able to maximize its protection, even though Indonesia has ratified the UNESCO Convention on cultural heritage.

Insufficient institutional capacity

The second issue that has been noted is the ambiguous work distribution among institutional authorities and the incomplete legislation that results in the execution of cultural heritage conservation failing. The CB Law states that the designation of cultural heritage must be in accordance with the jurisdiction of the Regency/City Government, the Provincial Government, and the Central Government. According to the CB Law, the first step in designating an object as cultural heritage is its registration. The Cultural Heritage Expert Team (TACB) next conducts research to determine whether or not the piece qualifies as cultural heritage. A cultural

heritage status determination is issued by the Regent/Mayor following receipt of a designation recommendation from the TACB (Sinaga & Subiyanto, 2023). The procedures and process for preparing recommendations from the TACB are very important in the determination of cultural heritage. Although the Directorate General of Culture has made provisions regarding the procedures for the work of the TACB, these provisions have not yet been established and legalized in an applicable policy or guideline. Regulations on the procedures and procedures for the work of the TACB related to the designation of cultural heritage have not been established, so there is non-uniformity in the implementation of the work of the TACB, both at the center and in the regions. Examples of non-uniformity in the implementation of work are the unequal format of the study paper, the mismatch of identity nomenclature, and the description of cultural heritage in the study paper, as well as the Decree of Determination of cultural heritage. The central government should make regulations in the form of ministerial regulations on TACB work procedures that contain TACB work guidelines, the number of TACBs at each level of government, and the format of study results in order to have standardized study results for each region in carrying out the assessment. So that the region has a legal basis in the appointment of TACB.

In 2022, changes occurred in government agencies engaged in cultural heritage management in Indonesia, both research issues and the preservation and management of cultural heritage (Sugiyanto, 2022). The National Archaeological Research Center (Puslit Arkenas) and 10 Archaeological Centers (Balar) that handle archaeological and cultural heritage research issues merged

into the National Research and Innovation Agency (BRIN), becoming the Archaeology, Language, and Literature Research Organization (OR Arbastra). This Research Organization has seven research centers, consisting of three research centers for archaeological research, and four research centers for language and literature research (Presidential Regulation 78/2021 on the National Research and Innovation Agency).

After the merger process, the cultural heritage management institution at the Ministry of Education, Culture, Research and Technology (Kemdikbudristek) also underwent changes. The Balai Pelestarian Cagar Budaya (BPCB), which is authorized to handle the preservation of cultural heritage, and the Balai Pelestarian Nilai Budaya (BPNB), which is authorized to handle cultural values, were merged into one new institution, the Balai Pelestarian Kebudayaan (BPK), with 23 operational work areas (Permendikbudristek No. 33 of 2022 concerning Balai Pelestarian Kebudayaan), whose authority includes the management of cultural heritage and cultural values. In carrying out its duties, it must comply with the CB Law and Law No. 5/2017 on the Promotion of Culture (PK Law). With this change process, it will certainly affect the current cultural heritage management scheme. In principle, the cultural heritage management scheme still starts from upstream research activities. Then the results of the research will be developed into cultural heritage, with a management and utilization plan based on preservation.

Organizational changes in research and preservation are expected to further enhance cooperation or partnerships in the management of cultural heritage in Indonesia. However, the institutions authorized to manage cultural heritage, be

it in the field of research, protection preservation, and utilization, have not yet coordinated and synergized well. The research recommendations submitted by the research to the preservation and protection sector have not all been followed up. Research parties often only plan research programs independently without trying to involve or share information with preservation and protection parties. The point is that research has its own plans, and preservation and protection also have their own cultural heritage management plans.

Limitations of Conservation Approaches

The Law of the Republic of Indonesia No. 5 of 1992 on Cultural Heritage Objects, which was later amended by the CB Law, continued to promote the need for conservation in Indonesia. The government bears the responsibility of preserving cultural heritage whose practices are largely inherited from the past. Officially named, there are two Indonesian government agencies that specifically deal with conservation: The Cultural Heritage Conservation Center (PKCB), which is responsible for the conservation of movable or immovable collectibles, and the Borobudur Conservation Center (BKB) (Bakhri, 2021). Although there are government agencies that handle cultural heritage, collaborative efforts from the government, academics, and professionals are needed to solve conservation-related problems.

Only government-owned cultural heritage in Indonesia is eligible for conservation measures; structures held by foundations, private businesses, or private persons are not. Conservation work cannot be done by the government unless

the building is bought from the owner. This contrasts with the situation in Australia. The business sector has access to a variety of conservation strategies. One example is Broken Hill's preservation effort, which was awarded the UNESCO Asia Pacific Heritage Award for Heritage Preservation, which used an integrated approach to preserve important buildings and renovate roads, including residential buildings in the town. The government has provided no-cost technical support, financial assistance, residential paint schemes, and building restoration programs to preserve the historic area (Talukdar, 2015).

Limitations of Incentives

According to Article 22 of the CB Law, the Government or Regional Government offers incentives to the owner of cultural heritage who has carried out Cultural Heritage Protection in compliance with the laws and regulations. These incentives take the form of a reduction in land and building tax and/or income tax (Surbakti, 2017). Although the existing regulations have detailed the form of incentives provided, further arrangements are still needed to determine the amount that should be received by cultural heritage owners (Rahman & Darwin, 2022; Rahmawati, 2017).

Limited Funds

Financial resources are needed for cultural heritage preservation, restoration, and upkeep. Due to its non-exclusivity and non-rivalry, cultural heritage is less appealing to the private sector for investment, which is why government support is necessary (Tišma et al., 2021). In accordance with the CB Law, the budget for cultural heritage management comes from the state and local budgets (Rosyadi, 2014; Silaen,

2023), although the amount is still limited (Achmadi, 2014; Naufal Faraj El Gibarj & Pratin, 2021). Therefore, the government needs to convince and cooperate with other parties to overcome these limitations (Boniotti, 2023; Christin & Petrus, 2022).

Lack of Transparency

The public is frequently kept in the dark about the decision-making process until the heritage building reuse decision is decided. There is a lack of clarity in the way cultural heritage conservation is being implemented. Adaptive reuse solutions for heritage buildings are rarely approved by citizens, according to relevant legislative agencies (Anugrah et al., 2024; Mahindra & Megawati, 2022; Panggabean, 2014; Rani et al., 2017).

The results of this study provide a comprehensive overview of the challenges and opportunities in cultural heritage preservation in Indonesia. Some significant points of this research are:

1. Highlighting the need to expand the scope of preservation to include elements of the surrounding environment, which can enhance the historical integrity of cultural sites.
2. Emphasizes the importance of strong institutional capabilities to support the implementation of preservation policies.
3. Pointed out the need for an inclusive conservation approach, involving the private sector and communities.
4. Identifies gaps in incentive and funding policies that need to be addressed to support sustainable heritage preservation.
5. Emphasize the importance of transparency and community

involvement in decision-making processes.

Conclusion

After identifying the shortcomings of the existing cultural heritage conservation policies and institutional arrangements, a new set of policies is recommended to remedy the shortcomings in the field. The recommended policy framework consists of four aspects: Revision of the political system; Provision of integrated conservation approaches and incentives; Diversification of funding sources; and Expansion of public participation.

The first aspect of the recommendations is the revision of the political system to address issues of institutional capacity and the scope of the cultural heritage context. The strategy to address these issues is structured with two main components focusing on institutional structuring and changing the context of cultural heritage.

The second aspect of the recommendations was formulated to address the issue of limited conservation approaches and incentives for privately owned cultural heritage. With an integrated approach, owners are encouraged to conserve their buildings in various ways. The city government will be responsible for the provision, implementation, and approval of incentive tools. At the same time, the criteria and selection process of incentives should also be open to the public so as to facilitate transparency in the process.

The third aspect of the recommendations was formulated to address the issue of lack of funding sources. The protection and maintenance of cultural heritage buildings as part of the cultural heritage preservation process often clash with many interests, such as

economic and spatial interests. The high budget for financing the maintenance of cultural heritage buildings often burdens the owners and managers of cultural heritage buildings (Ardiyanto et al., 2017). Efforts to utilize cultural heritage buildings, especially residential houses, are a form of indirect preservation of cultural heritage buildings because there is an effort to maintain the building while utilizing it as a place of business, such as a café or restaurant and shop. However, the development of business activities in cultural heritage buildings must be balanced with regulations in the management of cultural heritage buildings.

The fourth aspect of the recommendations was formulated to address the issue of lack of public participation in cultural heritage preservation in Indonesia. Strategies to address this issue are organized into two items. The first item aims to advance the level of transparency in the decision-making process, while the second item points out ways in which different sectors of society can participate in the preservation of cultural heritage in Indonesia. The preservation of cultural sites is not only done by the government, but there is community involvement. The role of communities in Indonesia in the preservation and protection of cultural heritage must be increased by giving them a portion to participate in determining the importance of a cultural heritage and making decisions for its utilization (Fitri et al., 2015). The government is no longer the main determinant in the process of preserving cultural heritage. Communities are also involved in the process of nominating cultural resources that are in the public domain as cultural heritage objects. If the nomination comes from the bottom up, it is applied, and the

community will not only passively wait but also actively participate in the process of preserving cultural heritage.

Community participation in Indonesia's urban areas towards the protection and preservation of cultural heritage is starting to become more visible after being motivated and accommodated by activists in NGOs in the field of cultural heritage preservation (Fitri, 2015). In Bandung, the Bandung Heritage Society (BHS) was established in 1987 and plays an active role in protecting and managing cultural heritage in Bandung. BHS motivated the establishment of similar NGOs in various cities in Indonesia, namely Badan Warisan Sumatra (BWS) in Medan in 1998. The role of BWS is to educate the people of Medan and surrounding areas on the importance of cultural heritage protection.

This research has several important implications, both for policymakers and the general public:

1. Implications for Public Policy

The government needs to develop more inclusive and comprehensive regulations to address challenges in cultural heritage preservation. This includes expanding the scope of conservation, improving incentives, and strengthening institutional capabilities.

2. Implications for Community Participation

Community involvement in cultural heritage preservation needs to be enhanced through education and awareness campaigns. A community-based approach, as proposed by Keitumetse (2013), can be an effective model.

3. Implications for Financial Management

Diversification of funding sources is needed to overcome government budget limitations. Partnerships with the private

sector and the development of community-based funding schemes can be sustainable solutions.

Acknowledgments

It must be your gratitude to anybody, institution or anything who help or contribute to author reseach, it can be one sentence or more.

References

- Achmadi, S. (2014). Pemeringkatan Cagar Budaya Tidak Bergerak. *Jurnal Konservasi Cagar Budaya Borobudur*, 8(1), 72–81. <https://doi.org/10.33374/jurnalkon-servasicagarbudaya.v8i1.126>
- Afnani, W. N., Wahyuningtyas, N., & Kurniawan, B. (2021). Analisis Pelestarian Situs Cagar Budaya Sekaran (Studi Kasus Situs Sekaran di Desa Sekarpuro Kabupaten Malang). *Jurnal Ilmu Sosial Dan Humaniora*, 10(3), 391–406. <https://doi.org/10.23887/JISH-UNDIKSHA.V10I3.34307>
- Akbar, D. (2014). Pelestarian Situs Cagar Budaya Plawangan Rembang Perspektif Undang-Undang Cagar Budaya. *Pandecta Research Law Journal*, 9(2), 186–206. <https://journal.unnes.ac.id/nju/index.php/pandecta/article/view/3444>
- Amboro, K. (2022). Analisis Signifikansi Taman Merdeka Kota Metro sebagai Objek Struktur Cagar Budaya. *Warisan: Journal of History and Cultural Heritage*, 2(3), 69–80. <https://doi.org/10.34007/warisan.v2i3.1030>
- Anugrah, F. C., Winarti, N., & Riyadi, S. F. (2024). Analisis Tata Kelola Cagar Budaya di Kabupaten Lingga. *Multidisciplinary Indonesian Center Journal (MICJO)*, 1(1).
- Ardiyanto, A., Susilo, R., Suroto, V., & Prawoto, H. (2017). Upaya Pemanfaatan Bangunan Kolonial untuk Usaha Mandiri. *Prosiding Seminar Nasional Arsitektur Populis*.
- Arfiansyah, & Syam, I. (2021). Permasalahan Pelestarian Cagar Budaya Di Kota Banda Aceh. *Jurnal Ekonomi Dan Pembangunan*, 12(1), 31–60. <https://doi.org/10.22373/jep.v12i1.146>
- Arifin, H. P. (2018). Politik Hukum Perlindungan Cagar Budaya Di Indonesia. *Dialogia Iuridica: Jurnal Hukum Bisnis Dan Investasi*, 10(1), 65–76. <https://doi.org/10.28932/di.v10i1.1034>
- Ayu, M. R., Permata, R. R., & Rafianti, L. (2017). Sistem Perlindungan Sumber Daya Budaya Tak Benda Di Palembang, Sumatera Selatan, Indonesia. *Mimbar Hukum*, 29(2). <https://doi.org/10.22146/jmh.16671>
- Bakhri, S. (2021). Konservasi Di Indonesia. *Jurnal Konservasi Cagar Budaya*, 15(1), 26–34. <https://doi.org/10.33374/jurnalkon-servasicagarbudaya.v15i1.253>
- Boniotti, C. (2023). The public-private-people partnership (P4) for cultural heritage management purposes. *Journal of Cultural Heritage Management and Sustainable Development*, 13(1), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JCHMSD-12-2020-0186>
- Christin, D., & Petrus, I. N. (2022). Implementasi Public-Private-Partnership (PPP) Dalam Pelestarian Kawasan Cagar Budaya Perkotaan. *Jurnal Potensi*, 2(1), 37–43. <https://doi.org/10.37776/JPOT.V2I1.831>
- Cookson, M. D., & Stirk, P. M. R. (2022).

- Analisa Yuridis Terhadap Pengalihfungsian Karya Arsitektur Bangunan Kolonial Sebagai Cagar Budaya Di Kota Semarang Ditinjau Dari Undang-Undang Nomor 28 Tahun 2014. *Diponegoro Law Journal*, 11(2).
- Damiasih, D. (2023). Implementation of Sustainable Tourism Policy in Indonesia. *Journal of Governance*, 8(4).
<https://doi.org/10.31506/jog.v8i4.22928>
- Darmawan, F. (2023). Konservasi vs Pariwisata Massal: Konflik Kebijakan dan Tantangan Borubudur sebagai Warisan Budaya Dunia UNESCO. *Jurnal Vokasi Indonesia*, 10(1), 22–28.
- Ekarini, F. D. (2015). Perizinan dalam Pelestarian Cagar Budaya. *Jurnal Konservasi Cagar Budaya*, 9(1), 29–48.
<https://doi.org/10.33374/jurnalkonservasicagarbudaya.v9i1.160>
- Ekowati, U., Ngonggoek, W., & Utomo, S. S. (2019). Persepsi dan Partisipasi Masyarakat Terhadap Peninggalan Situs Cagar Budaya Gua Jepang dan Upaya Pelestariannya. *Jurnal Historia*, 7(1), 131–138.
- Fitri, I. (2015). Partisipasi Masyarakat Lokal Medan : Sebuah Tinjauan Atas Kriteria Nasional Pada Proses Penetapan Sebagai Cagar Budaya. *Berkala Arkeologi*, 18(2).
- Fitri, I., Ahmad, Y., & Ahmad, F. (2015). Conservation of Tangible Cultural Heritage in Indonesia: A Review Current National Criteria for Assessing Heritage Value. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 184(May), 71–78.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.05.055>
- Fitri, I., Ahmad, Y., Ratna, R., Ratna, nfn, & Ratna, R. (2019). Local Community Participation in Establishing The Criteria For Heritage Significance Assessment Of The Cultural Heritage In Medan. *Kapata Arkeologi*, 15(1), 1–40.
<https://doi.org/10.24832/KAPATA.V15I1.523>
- Kahar, A., & Muhaimin, L. O. (2022). The Urgence of Establishing Sulawesi Regional Regulations in The Management and Conservation of Cultural Heritage. *Sang Pencerah, Jurnal Ilmiah Universitas Muhammadiyah Buton*, 8(3).
- Kausar, D. R., Damanik, J., & Tanudirjo, D. (2024). Borobudur as priority tourism destination: how political economy affects world cultural heritage site management and heritage preservation. *IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science*, 1366(1).
<https://doi.org/10.1088/1755-1315/1366/1/012057>
- Keitumetse, S. (2013). Cultural Resources as Sustainability Enablers: Towards a Community-Based Cultural Heritage Resources Management (COBACHREM) Model. *Sustainability*, 6(1), 70–85.
<https://doi.org/10.3390/su6010070>
- Lenzerini, F. (2011). Intangible Cultural Heritage: The Living Culture of Peoples. *European Journal of International Law*, 22(1), 101–120.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/ejil/chr006>
- Lenzerini, Federico. (2011). Intangible Cultural Heritage: The Living Culture of Peoples. *European Journal of International Law*, 22(1), 101–120.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/ejil/chr006>
- Lvping, S. (2021). Blockchain Technology for Management of Intangible Cultural Heritage. *Scientific Programming*, 2021, 1–7.
<https://doi.org/10.1155/2021/2613>

- 656
- Mahindra, D. A., & Megawati, S. (2022). Implementasi Kebijakan Revitalisasi Kawasan Cagar Budaya (Studi Pada Jalan Panggung Kota Lama, Surabaya). *Publika*, 10(1), 219–230. <https://doi.org/10.26740/publika.v10n1.p219-230>
- Merciu, F.-C., Ianoş, I., Cercleux, A.-L., & Merciu, G.-L. (2020). Evaluation of the Economic Values of Urban Heritage in the Central Area of Ploieşti Municipality. *International Conference KNOWLEDGE-BASED ORGANIZATION*, 26(2), 58–62. <https://doi.org/10.2478/kbo-2020-0053>
- Muryani. (2019). Economic Analysis of Heritage Tourism At Old Town Area Surabaya. *Journal of Developing Economies*, 4(1), 8. <https://doi.org/10.20473/jde.v4i1.11452>
- Naufal Faraj El Gibarj, M., & Pratin. (2021). Analisis Pengelolaan Benda Cagar Budaya Sebagai Kekayaan Dikuasai Negara Di Balai Pelestarian Cagar Budaya D.I.Yogyakarta. *Indonesian Rich Journal*, 2(1), 32–40. <https://doi.org/10.31092/irj.v2i1.15>
- Panggabean, S. A. (2014). Perubahan Fungsi dan Struktur Bangunan Cagar Budaya Ditinjau dari Perspektif Undang-Undang Cagar Budaya. *Pandecta Research Law Journal*, 9(2). <https://doi.org/10.15294/PANDECTA.V9I2.3443>
- Purba, E. J., Putra, A. K., & Ardianto, B. (2020). Perlindungan Hukum Warisan Budaya Tak Beda Berdasarkan Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage 2003 dan Penerapannya di Indonesia. *Journal of International Law*, 1(1), 90–117.
- Rahman, M. F., & Darwin, I. S. (2022). Persepsi Pemilik Bangunan dalam Melestarikan Bangunan Cagar Budaya di Kawasan Braga Kota Bandung. *Jurnal Riset Perencanaan Wilayah Dan Kota*, 2(1), 76–85. <https://doi.org/10.29313/jrpk.v2i1.1931>
- Rahmawati, Y. (2017). Permasalahan Cagar Budaya Living Monument Milik Perorangan di Perkotaan. *Seminar Ikatan Peneliti Lingkungan Binaan Indonesia (IPLBI)*. <https://doi.org/10.32315/sem.1.c089>
- Rani, P., Putri, C., & Devina, A. (2017). Transforming Heritage Building for Commercialisation. *Planning Malaysia: Journal of The Malaysian Institute of Planners*, 15(3), 135–146. <https://doi.org/10.21837/pmjournal.v15.i3.304>
- Ritiduan, D., & Megawati, S. (2021). Implementasi Kebijakan Pelestarian Bangunan Cagar Budaya (Studi Pada Bangunan Bekas Penjara Koblen Menjadi Pasar Buah Di Kota Surabaya). *Publika*, 9(5), 15–30. <https://doi.org/10.26740/publika.v10n1.p15-30>
- Rosyadi, K. (2014). Analisis Pengelolaan Dan Pelestarian Cagar Budaya Sebagai Wujud Penyelenggaraan Urusan Wajib Pemerintahan Daerah (Studi Pada Pengelolaan Dan Pelestarian Situs Majapahit Kecamatan Trowulan Kabupaten Mojokerto). *Jurnal Administrasi Publik Mahasiswa Universitas Brawijaya*, 2(5), 830–836.
- Rukayah, S., Juwono, S., & Etenia, A. (2022). Post Office and the Sustainability of Triangle Historical Area in Semarang From the Traditional Era To the Colonial Era. *Journal of Architecture and Urbanism*, 46(1), 20–32. <https://doi.org/10.3846/jau.2022.15>

- 242
- Setiawan, A., & Sulistianingsih, D. (2013). Harmonisasi UU No. 11 Tahun 2010 Tentang Cagar Budaya Dalam Upaya Pelestarian Benda Cagar Budaya Kota Semarang. *Abdimas*, 17(11), 69–78.
- Silaen, J. (2023). Efektivitas Peraturan Daerah Kota Medan Nomor 2 Tahun 2012 Tentang Perlindungan dan Pelestarian Bangunan Cagar Budaya (Studi tentang Bangunan Tjong A FIE). *Journal of Politic and Government Studies*, 12(4).
- Sinaga, E., & Subiyanto, A. E. (2023). Penetapan Cagar Budaya Ditinjau Dari Perspektif Kepastian Hukum Dalam Mewujudkan Kesejahteraan Umum. *Jurnal Pengabdian Kepada Masyarakat Nusantara (JPkMN)*, 4(4).
- Soelistyarini, T. D. (2013). Pedoman Penyusunan Tinjauan Pustaka dalam Penelitian dan Penulisan Ilmiah. In *Universitas Airlangga*. https://www.academia.edu/7304163/Pedoman_Penyusunan_Tinjauan_Pustaka_dalam_Penelitian_dan_Penulisan_Ilmiah
- Su, X., Li, X., & Kang, Y. (2019). A Bibliometric Analysis of Research on Intangible Cultural Heritage Using CiteSpace: *Sage Journal*, 9(2). <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244019840119>
- Sugiyanto, B. (2022). Era Baru Dalam Kemitraan Pengelolaan Cagar Budaya: Studi Kasus Kalimantan. *Naditira Widya*, 16(2), 165–176. <https://doi.org/10.24832/nw.v16i2.508>
- Surbakti, K. (2017). Kebijakan Pengelolaan Warisan Budaya Ditinjau dari Undang-Undang Nomor 11 Tahun 2010 (Perihal Pemberian Insentif dan Kompensasi). *Kapata Arkeologi*, 13(2), 141–150. <https://doi.org/10.24832/KAPATA.V13I2.397>
- Talukdar, M. M. H. (2015). Heritage Conservationin Hong Kong (Policy and Planning Context Review). *Internasional Journal of Architecture and Urban Development*, 5(1).
- Tišma, S., Mileusnić Škrtić, M., Maleković, S., & Jelinčić, D. A. (2021). Cost-Benefit Analysis in the Evaluation of Cultural Heritage Project Funding. *Journal of Risk and Financial Management*, 14(10). <https://doi.org/10.3390/jrfm14100466>
- Wardani, A. A. K., Suarna, I. N., & Sumantri, I. N. (2021). Perlindungan Hukum Terhadap Pura Taman Mayura Cakranegara Sebagai Kawasan Cagar Budaya Di Kota Mataram. *Widya Kerta: Jurnal Hukum Agama Hindu*, 4(1), 23–39. <https://doi.org/10.53977/wk.v4i1.285>
- Wibawa, I. P. S., & Ali, M. (2020). Efektivitas Hukum Pelestarian Bangunan Dan Lingkungan Cagar Budaya Di Kota Denpasar. *Jurnal Hukum Ius Quia Iustum*, 27(3), 615–638. <https://doi.org/10.20885/iustum.vol27.iss3.art9>
- Yuristiadhi, G. (2014). Kretek sebagai Warisan Budaya Tak Benda: Sebuah Tinjauan Sosiohistoris. *Wacana: Jurnal Transformasi Sosial*, 16(34), 11–38. <http://www.insist.or.id/%7Chttp://blog.insist.or.id/insistpress/%7Chttp://jurnalwacana.com>
- Zulkarnain, I. (2015). Pengelolaan Warisan Budaya Bangka: Inkonsistensi Kebijakan, Regulasi dan Partisipasi Publik. *Society*, 3(1), 39–50. <https://doi.org/10.33019/society.v3i1.50>

