

Effectiveness of Legal Protection for Farmers in Subsidized Fertilizer Distribution in Cikoro Village, Gowa Regency

Adelia Saputri¹, Muhammad Kamran², A.Afgan Nugraha³, Rahmad Masturi⁴

¹Faculty of law, Universitas Megarezky, Makassar, Indonesia,
adeliaputri.6923@gmail.com

²Faculty of law, Universitas Megarezky, Makassar, Indonesia,
adeliaputri.6923@gmail.com

³Faculty of law, Universitas Megarezky, Makassar, Indonesia,
adeliaputri.6923@gmail.com

⁴Faculty of law, Universitas Megarezky, Makassar, Indonesia,
adeliaputri.6923@gmail.com

Corresponding Author: adeliaputri.6923@gmail.com

Abstract

This study examines the effectiveness of legal protection for farmers regarding subsidized fertilizer allocation in Cikoro Village, Gowa Regency, based on the Regulation of the Minister of Agriculture of the Republic of Indonesia Number 15 of 2025. The study aims to analyze the regulation's implementation and identify factors influencing its capacity to safeguard farmers' rights. An empirical legal research method employing a socio-legal approach was utilized. Primary data were obtained through interviews with farmers, farmer group leaders, subsidized fertilizer retailers, and agricultural extension officers, while secondary data were gathered from legislation, legal literature, and other supporting materials. The findings indicate that the regulation establishes a legal framework covering beneficiary criteria, fertilizer distribution, and oversight, thereby providing legal protection for farmers. However, implementation has not been fully successful due to obstacles such as fertilizer shortages, weak oversight, farmers' lack of legal understanding, and the absence of a complaint mechanism. The effectiveness of legal protection is influenced by legal substance, law enforcement, supporting infrastructure, public participation, and legal culture. To ensure more effective legal protection in subsidized fertilizer distribution, the study highlights the need to improve the accuracy of the e-RDKK database, strengthen oversight, and enhance legal awareness.

Keywords: *Cikoro Village; Farmers; Subsidized Fertilizer Governance; Legal Protection; Legal Effectiveness; Empirical Legal Research.*

A. INTRODUCTION

The goal of the subsidized fertilizer program in Indonesia is not only to increase agricultural productivity but also to ensure farmers have fair and equitable access to necessary agricultural inputs. This policy represents a form of state protection for farmers from a legal perspective, as evidenced by regulations

governing beneficiary eligibility, fertilizer allocation, distribution protocols, and monitoring systems. Consequently, the effectiveness of legal protection depends on the existence of laws and their effective implementation.

Presidential Regulation No. 6 of 2025 concerning Subsidized Fertilizer Governance, which is also implemented by Minister of Agriculture Regulation No. 15 of 2025, regulates the administration of subsidized fertilizer distribution. Subsidized fertilizer is allocated to certified farmers who are members of farmer organizations and are registered in the Electronic Definitive Group Needs Plan (E-RDKK) in accordance with this regulation. This regulatory system is designed to protect farmers' rights while ensuring legal certainty, transparency, and accountability in fertilizer distribution.

Despite these legislative provisions, implementing legal protection in practice remains difficult. In fact, the distribution of subsidized fertilizer remains hampered by issues such as insufficient fertilizer availability, inaccurate beneficiary data, weak oversight, and irregularities in quota allocation. These circumstances can prevent farmers from fully exercising their legal right to subsidized fertilizer in accordance with applicable regulations, raising questions about the effectiveness of legal protection.

This problem can also be observed in Cikoro Village, Gowa Regency. According to preliminary findings, 661 farmers have been added to the E-RDKK system through 40 active farmer groups. The allocation received by Cikoro Village in one year consists of 11,520 sacks (576,000 tons) of urea and 13,000 sacks (650,000 tons) of NPK, distributed according to the needs of each farmer group as stated in the E-RDKK. However, some farmers stated that the fertilizer quotas provided were disproportionate to the area of land they cultivated, and

others claimed that quotas were often deducted without their knowledge or consent. Such situations demonstrate that merely having legal boundaries does not always guarantee the success of legal protection in practice.

Institutional authority, regulatory oversight, and the implementation of subsidized fertilizer policies have been the focus of previous research. Maula Malik Almuluk (2024) found that Minister of Trade Regulation No. 4 of 2023 remains ineffective because farmers have limited access to subsidized fertilizer, lack Farmer Cards, and lack legal understanding. Erwan Kemal (2023–2024) emphasized institutional oversight and reported that, despite the implementation of digital monitoring, its effectiveness was limited during the transition phase. Ratu Susanti (2023) examined legal protection against violations by sellers, specifically the sale of subsidized fertilizer at prices higher than the government-set retail price.

Unlike these studies, this study examines the implementation of regulations and organizational oversight. Instead, it assesses how well legal protection works by examining farmers' actual experiences in obtaining subsidized fertilizer. This study highlights empirical patterns of ineffective legal protection, such as discrepancies between planted area and fertilizer allocation, reported quota cuts without farmer consent, poor monitoring practices, and limited complaint channels. These findings provide empirical evidence of implementation gaps that have received little attention in previous research and contribute to a better understanding of the effectiveness of subsidized fertilizer governance in practice.

Therefore, the purpose of this study is to determine the effectiveness of the implementation of Minister of Agriculture Regulation No. 15 of 2025 in providing legal protection to farmers when distributing subsidized fertilizer, and to assess

the legal, institutional, and sociocultural aspects that influence its success in Cikoro Village, Gowa Regency.

B. RESEARCH METHOD

This study employed an empirical legal research method, encompassing conceptual, statutory, and sociological approaches. Because a large number of farmers in the village are registered in the Electronic Definitive Group Needs Plan (E-RDKK) system and have experienced problems related to subsidized fertilizer distribution, Cikoro Village in Gowa Regency was selected for this study due to its relevance to evaluating the effectiveness of legal protection. A total of 80 respondents, including farmers, farmer group leaders, fertilizer retailers, and agricultural extension officers directly involved in the subsidized fertilizer distribution process, were selected using a purposive sampling method. Primary data were collected through observation, interviews, and questionnaires. Legal literature, legislation, and similar materials were used to obtain secondary data. To support the qualitative findings, a questionnaire was developed using research indicators to obtain descriptive quantitative data. Descriptive analysis was conducted on the questionnaire data using percentage calculations based on a four-point Likert scale. The results were then combined with interview and documentary data through qualitative descriptive analysis to assess the effectiveness of legal protection in subsidized fertilizer distribution.

C. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

1. Implementation of the Minister of Agriculture Regulation Number 15 of 2025 in providing protection for the process of distributing fertilizer to farmers in Cikoro Village, Gowa Regency

a. Access to Subsidized Fertilizer

Access to subsidized fertilizer constitutes one of the indicators used to evaluate the effectiveness of legal protection for farmers under the Regulation of the Minister of Agriculture Number 15 of 2025. This indicator assesses whether eligible farmers are able to obtain subsidized fertilizer through the distribution mechanism stipulated in the applicable regulations. The evaluation is based on questionnaire responses, which are subsequently supported by interview findings to provide a more comprehensive assessment of the implementation of legal protection.

Based on the questionnaire results, the indicator of access to subsidized fertilizer received an effectiveness rating of 73.8% of farmers and 72.6% of farmer group leaders, thus categorizing it as effective. Overall, according to the majority of respondents, the protocol for obtaining subsidized fertilizer was followed in accordance with regulations. However, during certain planting seasons, some respondents reported issues related to administrative requirements, updating beneficiary data, and fertilizer availability.

The interview findings are in line with these conclusions. Farmers, farmer group leaders, fertilizer merchants, and agricultural extension professionals stated that the distribution of subsidized fertilizers

typically adhered to the processes specified in the relevant regulations. To redeem subsidized fertilizer, farmers had to join a farmer organization, register with the E-RDKK system, and confirm their National Identification Number (NIK) using the I-PUBERS application through authorized retailers. Nonetheless, interview respondents pointed out a number of implementation difficulties, such as modifications to farmer data, a lack of familiarity with administrative processes, and extended administrative procedures.

According to the Legal Protection Theory (Philipus M. Hadjon), E-RDKK, identity verification, and official kiosks constitute preventive legal protection. Legal Certainty Theory: Legal certainty has been established through regulations. Because of the administrative and data collection challenges, the utility and justice concerns are not ideal. The legal effectiveness theory (Soerjono Soekanto) states that the facilities and public knowledge are the main obstacles even if the laws are sufficient.

b. Fertilizer Availability

The availability of subsidized fertilizer is one indicator used to assess the implementation of Minister of Agriculture Regulation Number 15 of 2025. The study found that subsidized fertilizers available in Cikoro Village include urea, NPK, and organic fertilizers. Fertilizer provision refers to government allocations based on the Electronic Definitive Group Needs Plan (e-RDKK) data, ensuring that the administrative mechanism complies with applicable regulations.

However, based on the results of interviews with agricultural extension workers, retailers, heads of farmer groups, and farmers, the availability of fertilizer is not fully effective because it is caused by, First, the scarcity of fertilizer during the planting season is a supply chain problem because the availability of fertilizer depends on the amount of government allocation and the timeliness of delivery from distributors. Second, the delay in fertilizer reaching farmers is a distribution problem related to the implementation of distribution by retailers and distributors. These findings are supported by the results of the questionnaire which shows the percentage of effectiveness of farmers 26.1% and heads of farmer groups 27.2%, where these results indicate that the availability of subsidized fertilizer is less effective.

These research findings align with those of Fadli and Suryani (2023), who stated that the accuracy of e-RDKK data and smooth distribution are crucial factors in the availability of subsidized fertilizer. Based on Philipus M. Hadjon's legal protection theory, fertilizer provision is a form of preventative legal protection to guarantee farmers' rights. However, distribution delays and limited stock indicate that the implementation of Minister of Agriculture Regulation No. 15 of 2025 on fertilizer availability is not yet optimal. Therefore, increased coordination between the government, distributors, and retail outlets is needed to ensure fertilizer availability meets farmers' needs.

c. Fertilizer Prices

The price of subsidized fertilizer is one indicator used to assess the implementation of Minister of Agriculture Regulation No. 15 of 2025

because it is related to affordability for farmers. Observations in Cikoro Village indicate that the prices of subsidized fertilizer sold by retail kiosks are in accordance with the government-set Highest Retail Price (HET): IDR 1,800/kg for Urea, IDR 1,840/kg for NPK Phonska, and IDR 640/kg for organic fertilizer. Interviews with retailers, agricultural extension workers, farmer group leaders, and farmers also revealed no sales practices above the HET or levies outside the official price. These findings are supported by questionnaire results, which showed that 73.8% of farmers and 68.8% of farmer group leaders responded to the subsidized fertilizer price indicator, indicating that it is effective. The majority of respondents stated that fertilizer prices are in line with the HET and that there are no additional costs in the purchasing process.

The conclusion suggests that compliance with the Highest Retail Price (HET) should not be considered solely as an indicator of administrative compliance. Conversely, it directly impacts legal protection for farmers, as the HET is set to ensure that subsidized fertilizer remains affordable and accessible to eligible farmers. Compliance with the HET protects farmers from excessive pricing practices that can reduce their ability to access subsidized fertilizer and ultimately undermine the objectives of legal subsidy policies.

The findings of this study align with those of Sulaeman and Arifin (2023), who stated that compliance with the HET increases the accessibility of subsidized fertilizer and farmers' trust in the subsidy program. Based on Gustav Radbruch's Theory of Legal Purpose, price compliance with the HET reflects the values of justice, utility, and legal

certainty. Meanwhile, according to Philipus M. Hadjon's Theory of Legal Protection, the implementation of the HET is a form of preventive legal protection to protect farmers' rights from selling practices above the official price. Therefore, the implementation of Minister of Agriculture Regulation Number 15 of 2025 on subsidized fertilizer prices has been successful, although ongoing monitoring of HET compliance still requires ongoing monitoring.

d. Distribution and Supervision

Distribution and oversight are inseparable elements in the implementation of subsidized fertilizer policies. Distribution aims to ensure subsidized fertilizer reaches eligible farmers in accordance with existing regulations, while oversight aims to prevent irregularities in the distribution process. Supervision should be understood through two distinct dimensions, according to the interview's findings. Monitoring of the distribution process, verification of eligibility during fertilizer redemption, utilization of the E-RDKK database, and identity verification of farmers were all examples of administrative oversight. In general, these mechanisms operated in compliance with the relevant legislation. Conversely, field monitoring entailed supervising the activities carried out by the KP3, the Agriculture Office, and agricultural extension officers in order to guarantee that fertilizer reached qualified farmers and to pinpoint problems during distribution. While administrative oversight had been executed appropriately, field supervision was occasionally unable to avert fertilizer delivery delays and shortages during critical planting seasons. This conclusion implies

that administrative procedure compliance is insufficient unless it is accompanied by effective field supervision. The survey findings revealed that the monitoring indicator received 23. 8% of farmers and 27. 2% of farmer group leaders' effectiveness, indicating that this indicator is not yet effective.

The findings of the interview suggest that two distinct axes should be used to comprehend supervision. The verification of farmer eligibility, the usage of the E-RDKK database, identity verification during fertilizer redemption, and distribution records all demonstrated administrative oversight. In general, these mechanisms performed in accordance with the rules that were in effect. In contrast, field monitoring was used to observe the activities performed by the agricultural extension officers, the Agriculture Office, and the KP3 in order to make sure that fertilizer was delivered to the farmers who were qualified to get it and to identify problems that arose throughout the distribution process. Even though administrative oversight was usually applied appropriately, field supervision was not always successful in stopping shortages and delays in fertilizer distribution during peak planting seasons. This conclusion implies that administrative procedure adherence by itself is inadequate unless it is supported by strong field supervision.

These findings align with research by Misrah, Sudarmi, and Rahim (2020) and Foeh et al. (2022), which states that the effectiveness of fertilizer distribution is influenced by smooth supply, inter-agency coordination, and optimal supervision. Based on Philipus M. Hadjon's

Legal Protection Theory, distribution and supervision are forms of preventative legal protection to guarantee farmers' rights to subsidized fertilizer. Meanwhile, according to Gustav Radbruch's Legal Objective Theory, legal certainty has been realized through the e-RDKK mechanism and distribution through official kiosks, but the values of justice and utility have not been fully achieved due to persistent obstacles in distribution and supervision. Therefore, improved inter-agency coordination, regular updates of recipient data, and strengthened supervision are needed so that policy implementation can provide more effective legal protection for farmers.

e. Legal Protection

Legal protection is an important aspect in the implementation of Minister of Agriculture Regulation Number 15 of 2025 because it is intended to ensure the fulfillment of farmers' rights as recipients of subsidized fertilizer. The findings in Cikoro Village show that legal protection mechanisms have been established through farmer data collection using the Electronic Definitive Group Needs Plan (e-RDKK), farmer group membership, identity verification using identity cards, and assistance provided by agricultural extension workers. In addition, information regarding subsidized fertilizer distribution procedures has been delivered through farmer groups and agricultural extension activities.

However, the existence of these legal protection mechanisms does not necessarily indicate that legal protection has been effectively realized. Interviews with agricultural extension workers, retailers,

farmer group leaders, and farmers reveal that the implementation of these mechanisms remains suboptimal. Several obstacles were identified, including inconsistencies in e-RDKK data, limited fertilizer quotas, the absence of an accessible and effective complaint mechanism, and farmers' limited understanding of their rights and procedures for reporting distribution irregularities. These findings are supported by questionnaire results, which indicate that the legal protection indicator falls within the less effective category, as most respondents considered that government supervision and complaint mechanisms have not yet provided sufficient certainty and protection for farmers.

These findings are consistent with the studies of Herlambang et al. (2023) and Sujatmiko & Nurbaedah (2025), which emphasize that legal protection is not determined solely by the availability of regulations but also by the effectiveness of supervision, transparency, and complaint resolution mechanisms. Based on Philipus M. Hadjon's Legal Protection Theory, the implementation of e-RDKK, identity verification, and supervision represents preventive legal protection mechanisms; however, their effectiveness remains limited due to implementation constraints. Furthermore, according to Gustav Radbruch's Theory of Legal Purpose and Soerjono Soekanto's Theory of Legal Effectiveness, legal certainty has been provided through existing regulations, but the achievement of justice, usefulness, and effective implementation still requires improvement. Therefore, strengthening recipient data accuracy, developing accessible complaint

mechanisms, increasing farmer awareness, and ensuring consistent supervision are necessary steps to improve the effectiveness of legal protection for subsidized fertilizer recipients..

f. Policy Effectiveness

Based on research in Cikoro Village, Gowa Regency, the implementation of Minister of Agriculture Regulation No. 15 of 2025 has improved the governance of subsidized fertilizer distribution through the Electronic Definitive Group Needs Plan (e-RDKK) system, distribution through authorized retail kiosks, and supervision by agricultural extension workers, the Department of Agriculture, and the Fertilizer and Pesticide Supervision Commission (KP3). These mechanisms demonstrate the government's efforts to ensure more orderly and targeted fertilizer distribution. However, observations, interviews, and questionnaires indicate that policy implementation remains ineffective. Obstacles identified include limited fertilizer quotas, delayed distribution during the planting season, inconsistencies in recipient data in the e-RDKK system, and poor farmer understanding of rights and complaint mechanisms. These conditions mean that the policy's benefits have not yet been fully realized by all farmers.

These findings align with research by Foeh et al. (2022) and Herlambang et al. (2023) stated that the effectiveness of subsidized fertilizer policy is influenced by accurate allocation, smooth distribution, coordination between implementers, and effective oversight. Based on the analysis using the Theory of Legal Objectives, the implementation of the subsidized fertilizer policy has fulfilled the

aspect of legal certainty through the existence of the Minister of Agriculture Regulation Number 15 of 2025 and the E-RDKK system as an instrument for data collection and distribution of subsidized fertilizer. However, the aspects of justice and benefit have not been fully achieved because obstacles are still found in the form of limited quotas and delays in distribution that impact the fulfillment of farmers' rights. Furthermore, based on Philipus M. Hadjon's Theory of Legal Protection, legal protection for farmers is realized through data collection mechanisms, identity verification, and supervision in the process of distributing subsidized fertilizer. However, this protection mechanism has not been fully effective in guaranteeing the fulfillment of farmers' rights because there are still obstacles in its implementation. Meanwhile, based on Soerjono Soekanto's Theory of Legal Effectiveness, the existence of regulations and policy implementing officials indicates that the legal structure and substance aspects are available, but the effectiveness of implementation is still influenced by factors such as facilities and infrastructure, supervision, and the level of public understanding of the subsidized fertilizer distribution mechanism, so that the implementation of the policy has not run optimally.

Thus, the implementation of Minister of Agriculture Regulation Number 15 of 2025 has demonstrated improvements in the governance of subsidized fertilizer distribution, but its effectiveness still needs to be improved through updating recipient data, strengthening coordination and

supervision, and increasing outreach to farmers to optimally achieve the goal of legal protection.

2. Factors Influencing the Implementation of Legal Protection for Farmers in the Distribution of Subsidized Fertilizer Based on Minister of Agriculture Regulation Number 15 of 2025

The implementation of legal protection for farmers in the distribution of subsidized fertilizer is influenced by various factors that determine the effectiveness of regulatory enforcement. According to Soerjono Soekanto's Theory of Legal Effectiveness, legal effectiveness is influenced by five factors: legal factors, law enforcement, facilities, society, and legal culture. Based on research results in Cikoro Village, Gowa Regency, these five factors are interrelated and influence the effectiveness of the implementation of legal protection for farmers in obtaining subsidized fertilizer.

a. Legal Factors

In substance, Minister of Agriculture Regulation Number 15 of 2025 has a clear legal basis. This includes the requirements for fertilizer recipients, the data collection mechanism through the E-RDKK system, fertilizer redemption procedures, and distribution supervision. However, this regulation still fails to provide effective protection due to a gap between the clarity of the regulations and the understanding of those protected. Most farmers only generally know that they must be part of a farmer group and registered in the E-RDKK, but they do not understand their legal rights, the reasons for quota changes, or the provisions that ensure fair fertilizer distribution.

This lack of understanding makes the regulation merely an administrative tool, not a means of protecting their rights. Farmers cannot assert their rights if violations occur because they do not understand what they are entitled to under the regulation. A regulation that is well-substantiated will not be effective if it is not accompanied by widespread and easily understood socialization. The government must simplify the delivery of the regulation so that it is understandable not only by officials but also by farmers, the protected parties.

b. Law Enforcement Factors

Law enforcement factors also influence the implementation of legal protection. Agricultural extension workers, farmer group leaders, authorized retailers, the Department of Agriculture, and the Fertilizer and Pesticide Supervisory Commission (KP3) have essentially carried out their duties within their respective authorities. Extension workers provide assistance in the preparation of the E-RDKK, farmer groups assist with member data collection, and retailers distribute fertilizer according to the data recorded in the system. However, there are significant weaknesses in coordination and information delivery to farmers. When there are quota changes, data errors, or distribution delays, farmers often don't receive adequate explanations, leading to uncertainty about their entitlements.

Weak coordination means the information farmers receive doesn't align with established policies, leading to uncertainty and suspicion that their rights are being arbitrarily curtailed. This directly undermines the legal protections that law enforcement officials should guarantee. Law enforcement is not only about following procedures but also ensuring

transparency of information and accountability to affected parties. Any policy changes or technical obstacles must be communicated clearly and promptly to farmers, along with the rationale and proposed solutions..

c. Adequate Facilities and Infrastructure

Facilities and infrastructure remain a significant obstacle to the implementation of legal protection. The government has provided various supporting facilities, such as the E-RDKK system, the I-PUBERS application, official retail kiosks, and coordination mechanisms through agricultural extension workers and farmer groups. However, the availability of these facilities has not been matched by optimal functionality, particularly regarding the unknown and irregular complaint mechanisms. Most farmers are unaware of the official channels they can use if their rights are violated; complaints are simply submitted verbally to group leaders or extension workers without clear resolution procedures.

The absence of a clear and familiar complaint mechanism prevents violations or discrepancies in distribution from being properly investigated and resolved. Existing facilities serve only to channel funds, not to guarantee the restoration of rights in the event of violations. A comprehensive legal system must include repressive protection—namely, a complaint mechanism that is easily accessible, known, and has a clear resolution process. Without this, written legal guarantees are useless when farmers' rights are violated.

d. Community Factors

Community factors also influence the effectiveness of legal protection. Most farmers have made efforts to fulfill all administrative requirements by joining farmer groups, registering their land in the E-RDKK, and following the fertilizer redemption procedures as stipulated. However, the level of understanding regarding rights, obligations, and how to defend them remains very low. The majority of farmers rely more on information provided by agricultural extension workers and farmer group leaders than on understanding the regulations underlying these policies. As a result, they are unaware of whether the treatment they receive is in accordance with the regulations or whether it is actually violating their rights.

This lack of understanding prevents farmers from distinguishing between proper implementation of regulations and violations. This facilitates violations that go unreported and weakens farmers' position as parties who should be protected by the law. Compliance with regulations must be based on an awareness of rights and obligations, not simply compliance with the law to obtain fertilizer. Improving legal literacy among farmers is a state obligation so that the public can play an active role in monitoring policy implementation.

e. Legal Culture Factors

Furthermore, legal culture factors also influence the implementation of legal protection. Research shows that the community has developed a habit of following government-established fertilizer distribution procedures, such as collecting data, redeeming fertilizer through official

kiosks, and using a power of attorney if redemption is requested by a representative. These habits reflect compliance with applicable regulations. However, the current legal culture is still limited to administrative compliance and has not yet developed into a comprehensive legal awareness. Farmers follow regulations because they are required to obtain fertilizer, not because they understand that these regulations are designed to protect their rights.

A legal culture that focuses solely on procedural compliance makes farmers passive when violations occur. They tend to accept the situation without attempting to assert their rights, allowing violations to recur and go uncorrected. A sound legal culture must encompass an awareness that the law serves to protect the rights of all parties. Continuous development is needed so that compliance is not merely passive but is accompanied by the courage and ability of farmers to uphold their rights according to regulations.

These findings indicate that the effectiveness of legal protection depends not only on the existence of regulations, but also on the synergy between law enforcement, supporting institutions, the community, and legal culture, as argued by Soerjono Soekanto. Therefore, increased outreach, strengthened inter-agency coordination, the provision of easily accessible complaint mechanisms, and regular updates of recipient data are needed to ensure more effective legal protection for farmers in the distribution of subsidized fertilizer.

D. CONCLUSION

1. Conclusion

- a. The implementation of Minister of Agriculture Regulation No. 15 of 2025 in Cikoro Village has not yet provided effective legal protection for farmers in the distribution of subsidized fertilizer. Although the regulation has established a comprehensive legal framework regarding recipient requirements, distribution procedures, and supervision, its implementation in the field is still hampered by four main obstacles: fertilizer shortages during the planting season, weak field supervision, farmers' low legal understanding, and the absence of an easily accessible official complaint mechanism. While formal legal certainty has been achieved, the values of justice and utility that are the objectives of the regulation have not yet been fully realized.
- b. Based on Soerjono Soekanto's Theory of Legal Effectiveness, these less-than-optimal results are caused by a combination of five interrelated factors:
 - 1) Legal factors, The rules are clear but not accompanied by easy-to-understand socialization;
 - 2) Law enforcement factors, Administrative compliance is in place, but information transparency and responsive coordination are still lacking;
 - 3) Infrastructure factors, Digital systems and official distribution points exist, but there is no structured complaint channel;
 - 4) Community factors, Farmers meet administrative requirements but do not yet understand their legal rights;

- 5) Legal culture factors, Compliance is still based on procedural needs, not awareness of legally protected rights.

The failure of implementation is not due to the absence of rules, but to a disconnect between written norms and their implementation in the field.

2. Recommendations

To improve the effectiveness of legal protection for farmers in subsidized fertilizer distribution, recommendations are compiled based on the responsible parties for greater practicality and implementation:

- 1) For the Central Government (Ministry of Agriculture):
 - a) Regularly update and improve the e-RDKK system to ensure recipient data aligns with actual land area and fertilizer needs.
 - b) Ensure the availability and timeliness of subsidized fertilizer distribution ahead of the planting season, and establish a clear, easily accessible official complaint mechanism with a definite deadline.
 - c) Conduct regular studies and dissemination of regulations to ensure uniform implementation standards across all levels of government and stakeholders.
- 2) For the Regional Government (Gowa Regency Agriculture Office):
 - a) Strengthen integrated field supervision, including fertilizer availability, timely distribution, and compliance with established quotas and prices.
 - b) Improve inter-agency coordination between the agriculture office, supervisory agency (KP3), distribution agencies, and retailers to quickly address supply or distribution issues.

- c) Facilitate routine verification and correction of recipient data to prevent quota discrepancies or unauthorized deductions.
- 3) For Agricultural Extension Officers
 - a) Conduct ongoing outreach using easy-to-understand language regarding farmers' rights, recipient requirements, redemption methods, and existing complaint channels.
 - b) Assist farmer groups in updating land area and cropping plan data in the e-RDKK system, and promptly report any distribution irregularities to the authorities.
 - c) Be a clear information bridge: explain the reasons for quota changes, delivery delays, or policy changes accurately to affected farmers.
- 4) For Authorized Retail Kiosks
 - a) Fully comply with the Highest Retail Price (HET), distribution schedule, and redemption procedures stipulated in the regulations.
 - b) Record fertilizer receipt and distribution in an orderly and complete manner, and be willing to be audited during the verification and monitoring process.
 - c) Reject the practice of redemption through unauthorized intermediaries and ensure that fertilizer is only distributed to registered farmers or authorized representatives in accordance with regulations.
- 5) For Farmer Groups and Farmers
 - a) Play an active role in data verification to ensure accurate and complete records in the e-RDKK.
 - b) Conduct regular group meetings to increase understanding of regulations, rights, and how to report violations.

- c) Immediately report any shortages, quota cuts, price violations, or unfair treatment through existing official channels, and do not passively accept any deviations.

REFERENCES

- Almuluk, M. M. (2024). *Implementation of Minister of Trade Regulation No. 4 of 2023 to increase farmer productivity: A case study of retailers in Sunanrejo Village, Turen District, Malang Regency* [Undergraduate thesis]. UIN Maulana Malik Ibrahim.
- Embang Herlambang, G. D., & Abas, M. (2023). Optimizing supervision of subsidized fertilizer procurement and distribution in relation to Ministerial Regulation No. 4 of 2023. *Binamulia Hukum*, 12(1), 47–62.
- Erwan Kemal. (2024). *Implications of Minister of Trade Regulation No. 4 of 2023 concerning procurement and distribution of subsidized fertilizer for the agricultural sector on the authority and supervision of state-owned enterprise holding companies* [Undergraduate thesis]. Universitas Gadjah Mada.
- Fadli, & Suryani. (2023). Analysis of the role of the Definitive Group Needs Plan (RDKK) in ensuring subsidized fertilizer availability for farmers. *Jurnal Agribisnis Indonesia*, 11(2), 89–98.
- Fahri Ramadhan, Saputra, D., & Rifki, M. (2024). Evaluation of subsidized fertilizer distribution: Efforts to improve public services in the agricultural sector. *Jurnal Ilmu Pertanian dan Agribisnis*, 8(1), 34–45.
- Foeh, M. S., Nubatonis, A., Vianney Mambur, Y. P., & Putra Sipayung, B. (2022). Factors affecting the effectiveness of subsidized fertilizer distribution in the Indonesia–Timor Leste border area: A case study of Ponu Village. *Jurnal Agribios*, 20(2), 112–125.
- Maulana, A. W. (2020). Analysis of the tofu agroindustry in Cisadap Village. *Afroinfo Galuh Scientific Journal*, 7(1), 23–31.
- Misrah, Sudarmi, & Rahim. (2020). Supervision of subsidized fertilizer implementation by the Fertilizer and Pesticide Supervision Commission (KP3) in Pangkep Regency. *Jurnal Ilmu Hukum dan Sosial*, 5(2), 67–79.
- Soekanto, S. (2022). *Factors affecting law enforcement*. Rajawali Press.
- Sujatmiko, & Nurbaedah. (2025). Legal protection of farmers in subsidized fertilizer distribution. *Jurnal Hukum Pertanian*, 9(1), 1–14.
- Sulaeman, A., & Arifin, M. (2023). Effectiveness of the Highest Retail Price (HET) policy in distributing subsidized fertilizer to farmers. *Jurnal Agribisnis Indonesia*, 11(3), 102–114.