International Seminar on Sharia, Law, and Muslim Society
الندوة الدولية في الشريعة والقانون والمجتمع المسلم

International Seminar on Sharia, Law and Muslim Society
Vol. 1, Number 1, 2026, pp. 27-41

Empowering the Village Economy: The Urgency of Regulatory Integration of BUMDes, KDMP, and SPPG from Philosophical, Moral, and Human Rights Perspectives

Kholis Firmansyah [1*], Addinzanet Ceizar Nurlatif [2], Aly Mashar[3]

UIN Raden Mas Said Surakarta

*Corresponding author's email: kholis.firmansyah@staff.uinsaid.ac.id

Abstract

This article aims to analyze the urgency of regulatory integration between Village-Owned Enterprises (BUMDes), Red and White Village/Sub-district Cooperatives (KDMP), and Nutritional Fulfillment Service Units (SPPG) to realize equitable village food security. This study is normative legal research employing statutory and conceptual approaches, utilizing the theoretical frameworks of social control (Roscoe Pound) and development law (Mochtar Kusumaatmadja). The review results indicate that historically, the governance of village economic institutions from KUD, BUMDes, to KDMP has always faced challenges regarding decentralization, participation, and corporate governance. The presence of the Free Nutritious Meal (MBG) Program through SPPG demands a guarantee of a sustainable local food supply. Therefore, the regulatory integration of BUMDes, KDMP, and SPPG has become highly urgent. Philosophically, this provides a clear legal direction; morally, it prevents the circulation of economic benefits from leaving the village community; and from a human rights law perspective, it guarantees the fulfillment of the rights to food, welfare, and citizen participation. The successful implementation of this integration will provide comprehensive benefits, including improved efficiency and service capabilities of the economic supply chain, the inclusive handling of social inequality, and the realization of transparent institutional governance with integrity. In conclusion, an integrative legal reconstruction clarifies the division of institutional roles without merging them, thereby creating a village food security ecosystem based on a just economy and supporting the planned regulatory reconstruction

Keywords: *Village Economy; Regulation; Philosophical; Moral; Human Rights Law*

Submitted: 07 31, 2026 | Accepted: 08 26, 2026 | Published: 10 13, 2026

Introduction

The strengthening of the village economy in Indonesia is always caught in the tension between the idealism of the populist economy and the institutional realities that are not always ready to support this idealism. Villages can no longer be viewed solely as the lowest administrative units, but rather as social, economic, and legal spaces where the state tests the effectiveness of its development policies. In this framework, the Village Unit Cooperative (KUD), Village-Owned Enterprises (BUMDes), Red and White Village/Sub-district Cooperatives (KDMP), and Nutritional Fulfillment Service Units (SPPG) can be seen as policy instruments that carry the grand goals of strengthening the local economy, expanding citizen participation, improving welfare, and connecting economic development with the fulfillment of village communities' basic rights.

Philosophically, the discussion on the village economy cannot be separated from fundamental questions about the function of law in development. Law is not adequately understood merely as a set of written norms, but also as a means to organize social interests so that development does not stop at regulatory formalism. Roscoe Pound positions the law as an instrument of social control tasked with balancing individual, public, and social interests (Pound & Trevino, 2017). In the Indonesian context, this idea aligns with Mochtar Kusumaatmadja's theory of development law, which views law as a tool for social renewal, as well as the view that law must move alongside social dynamics, local values, and the concrete needs of society (Naiborhu, 2016). Thus, village economic policies need to be tested not only by the existence of their regulations but also by their ability to produce substantive social justice.

Normatively, KUD operates within the grand framework of cooperative law, primarily through Law Number 25 of 1992 concerning Cooperatives, and has a historical footprint in Presidential Instruction Number 4 of 1984 concerning the Fostering and Development of KUD, which was later revoked by Presidential Instruction Number 18 of 1998. BUMDes derives its primary basis from Law Number 6 of 2014 concerning Villages and Government Regulation Number 11 of 2021 concerning Village-Owned Enterprises. Meanwhile, KDMP was introduced as an agenda to accelerate the formation of village/sub-district cooperatives through Presidential Instruction Number 9 of 2025, supported by the technical regulations of the Ministry of Cooperatives. As for SPPG, it exists within the ecosystem of the Free Nutritious Meal (MBG) Program, which is related to the institutional framework of the National Nutrition Agency and the governance of MBG implementation through presidential regulations and regional technical execution policies. These four instruments demonstrate that village economic development no longer operates solely in the production sector, but also touches upon food, nutrition, public services, business institutions, and the social rights of villagers.

BUMDes is often positioned as a strategic institution to optimize local potential, strengthen village entrepreneurship, and serve as a liaison between village funds, community participation, and local economic growth. Research by (Brasit & Nursyamsi, 2025) shows that the management of village funds, labor-intensive cash programs, and community participation affect village economic growth through the mediating role of BUMDes. (Kania et al., 2021) also assert that BUMDes can drive village entrepreneurship through the exploration of local potential, empowerment, capacity building, and stakeholder support. However, this optimism cannot be separated from governance issues (Kania et al., 2021). (Dewi et al., 2024) point out that BUMDes often experiences a mismatch between village institutional design and the demands of corporate governance. (Febrina et al., 2024) also found suboptimal organizational structures, labor relations, technological capacity, and deliberative democracy in the development of BUMDes.

The experience of KUD becomes important to revisit in this context. KUD was once designed as a village economic instrument closely linked to agricultural production, distribution, and serving the economic needs of the community. However, its history also reveals the risks when cooperatives are too strongly formed from the top down and function more as an extension of state programs rather than member-owned economic organizations. Similar criticisms have emerged in the KDMP literature. Marta et al. (2025) position KDMP as a national strategy to promote environmental sustainability, village equality, and poverty reduction, but also point out that regulation does not automatically equate to operational activation and regional adaptation (Marta et al., 2025). Mauludin et al. (2025) explain that the centralistic and top-down design of KDMP risks reproducing the historical weaknesses of KUD, especially if it is not accompanied by regulatory clarity, human resource readiness, digital infrastructure, and member participation (Mauludin et al., 2025).

SPPG within the Free Nutritious Meal (MBG) Program adds a new dimension to the discourse on the village economy because it connects nutritional services with the food supply chain, local production, food security, and regional capacity. A study by Lubis et al. (2026) shows that the sustainability of the nutritious meal program depends on legal continuity, decentralized governance capacity, community participation, and food culture suitability (Lubis et al., 2026). Wijaya et al. (2025) found that the public discourse on MBG includes issues of school implementation, budgets, food quality, and political debates (Wijaya et al., 2025). Mas'amah et al. (2026) also showed that the implementation of MBG education in the regions has not run systematically, making public communication and local capacity crucial factors for the program's success (Mas'amah et al., 2026). Consequently, SPPG cannot be viewed solely as a technical

service unit, but must be seen as a socio-economic policy node concerning the right to food, the right to health, and the equitable distribution of development benefits.

Based on this description, this literature review is directed at examining the strengthening of the village economy as a meeting point between the idealism of development law and the reality of implementation. A philosophical review is used to understand the purpose of law and the meaning of the populist economy; a moral review is used to test the honesty of objectives, participation, accountability, and the distribution of benefits; while a human rights law review is used to ensure that KUD, BUMDes, KDMP, and SPPG do not merely become instruments for economic growth, but also means to protect the rights to welfare, food, participation, equality, and the dignity of villagers. From the perspective of development law, the protection of rights and the integration of social norms are prerequisites so that the law does not become an alien instrument to society, but truly serves as a means for just social development (Jessup, 2006).

The importance of reconstructing the integrated regulations for the MBG Program, KDMP, and BUMDes lies in the need to change the policy pattern, which has tended to be sectoral, into a legal framework that is integrated, participatory, and oriented towards village food security. MBG, through SPPG, requires a guarantee of food supply that is safe, nutritious, sustainable, and aligned with the socio-cultural context of local communities. In this regard, BUMDes can be positioned as the manager of village economic potential, bridging village funds, community participation, and local productive activities, while KDMP can serve as an institutional cooperative instrument that strengthens distribution, logistics, and member-based food supply chains. Regulatory reconstruction is crucial because literature indicates that the success of the nutritious meal program is determined not only by nutritional standards but also by legal continuity, decentralized governance capacity, community participation, and integration with local procurement structures (Lubis et al., 2026).

Integrative regulatory reconstruction is also necessary to ensure that the integration of MBG, KDMP, and BUMDes does not merely chase program efficiency, but also realizes a just economy. Without a clear legal design, such institutional integration risks creating overlapping authorities, dominance by certain actors, policy centralization, weak accountability, and low ownership among village communities. Studies on KDMP show that its integration with BUMDes, optimization of green supply chains, and monitoring frameworks based on environmental indicators, inclusivity, and governance are essential prerequisites for a sustainable and equitable transformation of the village economy (Marta et al., 2025). However, a KDMP model that is overly centralistic and top-down also risks repeating the historical weaknesses of KUD if not accompanied by regulatory clarity, human resource readiness, digital infrastructure, and member participation (Mauludin et al., 2025). Therefore, regulatory reconstruction needs to be

directed towards harmonizing the roles of SPPG as a nutritional service unit, BUMDes as a local economic manager, and KDMP as a member-based distribution-production cooperative, so that village food security is not only understood as food availability, but also as justice in access, justice in production, justice in distribution, and the protection of village communities' dignity.

This article, titled "Empowering the Village Economy: The Urgency of Regulatory Integration of BUMDes, KDMP, and SPPG from Philosophical, Moral, and Human Rights Perspectives " aims to examine the evolution of the village economy spanning KUDs, BUMDes, and Koperasi Desa Merah Putih (KDMP) and the urgency of integrating BUMDes, KDMP, and SPPG regulations through the lenses of philosophical, moral, and human rights aspects specifically in relation to Pound's theory and the Theory of Development Law as well as the benefits of successful regulatory integration.

Methods

The type of research used in writing this article is normative legal research focused on a literature review. The research approach includes a statute approach and a conceptual approach by examining the issue through the lenses of philosophical, moral, and Human Rights (HAM) aspects.

The data sources in this study utilize secondary data encompassing primary and secondary legal materials. Primary legal materials consist of regulations governing village institutions, cooperatives, and nutrition governance, including Law Number 25 of 1992 concerning Cooperatives, Law Number 6 of 2014 concerning Villages, Government Regulation Number 11 of 2021, Presidential Instruction Number 9 of 2025, Presidential Regulation Number 83 of 2024, and Presidential Regulation Number 115 of 2025. Secondary legal materials are obtained by tracing various literature, previous journal articles, and books discussing the track records of KUD, BUMDes, KDMP, and SPPG implementation.

The data analysis method applied is descriptive qualitative analysis. The collected legal materials and literature are reviewed and interpreted using the social engineering framework by Roscoe Pound and the development law theory by Mochtar Kusumaatmadja. This comprehensive analysis aims to unravel the inter-institutional threads and discover the urgency of integrative regulatory reconstruction between BUMDes, KDMP, and SPPG to create a just village food security ecosystem.

Results and Discussion

The Development Of The Village Economy From KUD, BUMDes, To The Red And White Village Cooperative (KDMP)

The economic development of villages in Indonesia shows a change in institutional direction from a village cooperative model relying on the Village Unit Cooperative (KUD), then moving to Village-Owned Enterprises (BUMDes), and now entering a new phase through the Red and White Village/Sub-district Cooperative (KDMP). This change does not merely indicate a shift in institutional names, but rather demonstrates the dynamics of village development law, from state-fostered economic institutions to village enterprises based on local authority, and then returning to a cooperative model projected as an instrument for economic equality, supply chains, and food security. This development needs to be read critically because each model carries the idealism of a populist economy, yet also faces issues of governance, human resource capacity, member participation, and business sustainability.

KUD is an important initial phase in the history of the village economy. Normatively, KUD once obtained legitimacy through Presidential Instruction Number 4 of 1984 concerning the Fostering and Development of KUD, which directed KUD as the center of economic activity services in rural areas. However, this position changed after Presidential Instruction Number 18 of 1998 concerning the Improvement of Fostering and Development of Cooperatives, which made KUD no longer the sole cooperative at the sub-district level. In practice, KUD once functioned as a provider of fertilizers, production facilities, savings and loan services, agricultural product marketing, and basic needs of village communities. Wulandari (2021) explains that KUD is still needed to assist the capital of farmers who find it difficult to access banking loans, primarily due to limited collateral and the risk of dependence on high-interest informal loans (Wulandari, 2021).

However, literature on KUD also reveals institutional fragility. A study by Maisar et al. (2020) on KUD Bulupoddo shows symptoms of financial distress and bankruptcy influenced by weak management, low member contributions, and numerous arrears (Ansar et al., 2020). Ariyani (2021) also found that the operational decline of KUD Super Ganesa was influenced by weak human resources, an inappropriate cooperative concept, financial limitations, low work ethic, and a lack of information technology utilization. These findings indicate that the failure of KUD was not solely caused by regulatory changes, but also by internal cooperative weaknesses in maintaining professionalism, member participation, and market adaptation (Ariyani, 2021).

On the other hand, KUD cannot be judged solely by its failures. Alfarizi and Ningrum (2024) show that the existence of KUD Sejahtera in Musi Banyuasin Regency had an impact on the socio-economic conditions of its members, especially in aspects of social interaction, education, livelihoods, and member economic improvement. This finding demonstrates that when a KUD has a real business base connected to local economic needs, the cooperative can still function as an instrument of empowerment. Therefore, the main lesson from KUD is that village

cooperatives require strong member governance, businesses relevant to local potential, and regulatory support that does not stifle cooperative autonomy (Alfarizi & Ningrum, 2024).

The next phase is BUMDes, which gained its legal basis through Law Number 6 of 2014 concerning Villages and Government Regulation Number 11 of 2021 concerning Village-Owned Enterprises. BUMDes was born in the spirit of village decentralization, aiming to manage local potential, increase village original income, and strengthen community welfare. BUMDes can act as a mediator between village funds, labor-intensive cash programs, community participation, and village economic growth (Brasit & Nursyamsi, 2025). Kania et al. (2021) also state that BUMDes can drive village entrepreneurship through the exploration of local potential, empowerment, capacity building, and stakeholder involvement (Kania et al., 2021).

BUMDes faces significant problems. Dewi et al. (2024) criticize the tendency of BUMDes to be placed within a return on investment logic without a governance design that suits the village's character. Febrina found that BUMDes development is not yet optimal due to issues with organizational structure, labor relations, technology, and weak deliberative democracy in policymaking (Dewi et al., 2024). Meliala et al. (2023) explain that the construction of BUMDes post-Omnibus Law tends to resemble capital-oriented business entities, hence it needs to be returned to democratic economic values and cooperativism. This criticism is important because BUMDes should not become a "village corporation" detached from its citizens, but rather a collective economic instrument based on deliberation (*musyawarah*) and social benefits (Meliala et al., 2023).

The emergence of KDMP marks a new phase attempting to revive the idea of village cooperatives on a national scale. Regulatively, KDMP is driven through Presidential Instruction Number 9 of 2025 concerning the Acceleration of the Formation of Red and White Village/Sub-district Cooperatives, supported by Minister of Cooperatives Regulation Number 1 of 2025 and Minister of Cooperatives Regulation Number 2 of 2025. Marta position KDMP as a national strategy to encourage environmental sustainability, village equality, and poverty reduction. However, the research also shows that the legalization of KDMP does not automatically guarantee operational activation and regional adaptation. The integration of KDMP with BUMDes, the optimization of green supply chains, and the use of governance indicators are important conditions for sustainable village economic transformation (Marta et al., 2025).

Mauludin et al. (2025) provide a critical note that KDMP risks repeating the historical weaknesses of KUD if it is too centralistic, top-down, and unsupported by human resource readiness, digital infrastructure, regulatory clarity, and member participation (Mauludin et al., 2025). Thus, the development from KUD to BUMDes and KDMP should not be read as an automatic line of progress. Instead, it must be understood as an institutional learning cycle. KUD

teaches the importance of member-based cooperatives, BUMDes teaches the importance of local authority and potential, while KDMP needs to combine both in a legal design that is participatory, accountable, and non-overlapping.

In the context of SPPG and the Free Nutritious Meal (MBG) Program, village economic development has broader relevance to food security. SPPG regulation falls within the ecosystem of the National Nutrition Agency and MBG governance, primarily through Presidential Regulation Number 83 of 2024 concerning the National Nutrition Agency and Presidential Regulation Number 115 of 2025 concerning the Governance of the Implementation of the Free Nutritious Meal Program. Lubis et al. (2026) assert that the sustainability of MBG requires legal continuity, decentralized governance capacity, community participation, and food culture suitability (Lubis et al., 2026). Therefore, KDMP and BUMDes can be positioned as village economic nodes supporting the local food supply chain for SPPG, as long as their integration does not ignore the principles of fair competition, accountability, and direct benefits for farmers, local producers, and village citizens.

The development of the village economy from KUD, BUMDes, to KDMP shows that the main issue is not merely forming institutions, but ensuring that these institutions are socially alive, economically healthy, and legally valid. Integrative regulatory reconstruction is needed so that KUD as a cooperative memory, BUMDes as a village economic instrument, KDMP as a new cooperative, and SPPG as a nutritional service node can complement one another. Without such integration, village economic policies risk stopping as institutional projects. Conversely, if designed based on member participation, professional governance, and an orientation towards food security, the village economy can move towards a just economy.

The Urgency of Integrating BUMDes, KDMP, And SPPG Regulations: A Review Of Philosophical, Moral, And Human Rights Aspects

In the context of legal and institutional development, "integrating" refers to the process of combining distinct and separate elements into a cohesive, unified, and synergistic whole. Regulatory integration means harmonizing various legal frameworks to eliminate overlapping authorities, normative conflicts, and sectoral silos, ensuring that different institutions work together towards a shared objective. For BUMDes, KDMP, and SPPG, integration does not imply merging these entities into a single institution, but rather constructing a structured legal ecosystem where the functions of local economic management (BUMDes), member-based production and distribution (KDMP), and nutritional fulfillment (SPPG) systematically support and reinforce one another.

Building upon this definition, the regulatory integration of BUMDes, the Red and White Village/Sub-district Cooperative (KDMP), and the Nutritional Fulfillment Service Unit (SPPG) needs to be read as a philosophical necessity in village legal development. The three cannot be positioned as standalone programs, because each operates in the same social space: the village, food, economic institutions, and community welfare. BUMDes operates as a village economic instrument based on local authority. KDMP operates as a member cooperative expected to strengthen the collective economy; whereas SPPG in the ecosystem of the Free Nutritious Meal Program relates to the fulfillment of food, nutrition, and local supply chains. If the three are not connected in a single regulatory design, the village merely becomes an arena for accumulating programs, rather than a directed development space.

Philosophically, law should not stop as an administrative technique for forming institutions. Law must answer fundamental questions: for whom are village economic institutions formed, who enjoys their benefits, and how does the state ensure that those benefits do not leave the village community. BUMDes literature shows that village institutions can act as liaisons between village funds, community participation, and local economic growth (Brasit & Nursyamsi, 2025). However, these findings simultaneously set a limit: BUMDes is only effective if local institutions are strong enough to transform fiscal resources into productive development outcomes. Without institutional strengthening, funds and programs can move without forming economic independence.

KDMP brings a philosophical dimension closer to cooperative principles. In the study by (Marta et al., 2025) , KDMP is positioned as a strategy to strengthen environmental sustainability, village equality, and poverty reduction. However, Mauludin remind us that an overly centralized KDMP framework risks repeating KUD's weaknesses, especially when member participation, managerial capacity, and infrastructure readiness are inadequate (Mauludin et al., 2025). From this, it is evident that the main issue is not the idea of a village cooperative itself, but how the law translates that idea into a living institutional structure.

From an integration perspective, BUMDes, KDMP, and SPPG must be placed as a single village food security ecosystem. BUMDes can manage village assets, facilities, and economic potential. KDMP can gather the production of farmers, breeders, fishers, and village MSMEs (Micro, Small, and Medium Enterprises), while SPPG can serve as an absorption channel for local food for the needs of nutrition programs. This idea aligns with the study by Lubis et al. (2026), which emphasizes that the sustainability of the nutritious meal program is determined by legal continuity, decentralized governance capacity, community participation, and food culture suitability (Lubis et al., 2026). Thus, philosophically, regulatory integration is needed so that

village food development is not consumptive in nature, but also productive, participatory, and equitable.

The moral aspect of regulatory integration lies in the obligation to ensure that village policies are not only legally valid but also fair in the distribution of benefits. In many development programs, village communities are often positioned as beneficiaries, not as main actors. Such a pattern is morally problematic because it ignores the capacity of villagers as producers, workers, managers, and economic stakeholders. The integration of BUMDes, KDMP, and SPPG offers a way out: the community not only receives nutritious food but can also supply food ingredients, manage the supply chain, and gain economic value from the program.

The morality of the village economy demands that money entering the village does not immediately exit to external actors. If SPPG obtains food ingredients from business networks outside the village, the nutrition program will indeed run, but its economic impact on the village community becomes limited. Conversely, if KDMP buys the produce of agriculture, livestock, fisheries, or local MSME products, and BUMDes then supports business infrastructure, program spending can create local economic circulation. In this scheme, farmers gain market certainty, MSMEs gain demand, cooperatives gain an economic function, and the village gains institutional strengthening.

Studies on BUMDes show that community participation is a crucial element in the success of village development. (Brasit & Nursyamsi, 2025) show that participation, village fund management, and labor-intensive programs have an influence on village economic growth through the role of BUMDes. However, other literature reminds us that BUMDes does not always run according to ideals. (Dewi et al., 2024) assess that BUMDes is often forced into a "return on investment" space without a governance design that fits the village character. (Febrina et al., 2024) also point out issues with organizational structure, technology, labor relations, and suboptimal deliberative democracy. This shows that institutional morality is not just about good intentions, but also about how to manage institutions so they do not deviate from the community's interests.

On the KDMP side, cooperative morality lies in membership, participation, and the distribution of benefits. If KDMP is formed merely to meet administrative targets, it loses the spirit of a cooperative. Mauludin emphasize the need to strengthen member-based governance, simplify overlapping regulations, and reduce excessive centralization. Therefore, regulatory integration must prevent KDMP from becoming a mere program tool. KDMP must function as a citizen's economic institution that buys, gathers, and markets village community products fairly (Mauludin et al., 2025).

From the human rights law aspect, the integration of BUMDes, KDMP, and SPPG is related to the fulfillment of economic, social, and cultural rights. SPPG is connected to the rights to food and health. BUMDes is related to the right to welfare and development; KDMP relates to the right to participate in economic life and the right to obtain benefits from member-based economic organizations. Thus, regulatory integration is not just an issue of institutional efficiency, but also a means of fulfilling basic rights.

Scheinin explains that international human rights law originates from treaties, customs, and general principles of law, but the main issue often lies in the effectiveness of fulfillment and supervision (Scheinin, 2016). In the village context, normative recognition of the right to food or welfare is insufficient if there are no institutions making those rights accessible. SPPG can provide nutritious food, but without local production support, the program will not necessarily strengthen the village community's economic rights. BUMDes can be a village enterprise, but without participatory governance, it can distance itself from the citizens. KDMP can be a village cooperative, but without certainty regarding member roles, it can turn into a formal structure that does not empower.

Jessup positions development law as a legal reform paradigm that assesses the effectiveness of law in political, economic, social, and cultural contexts, including the protection of minority groups and marginalized communities (Jessup, 2006). This view is relevant because the integration of BUMDes, KDMP, and SPPG must ensure vulnerable groups are not just program recipients but also gain access to economic benefits. Small farmers, MSME actors, women, poor families, and village communities that have historically been on the margins of the supply chain must be included in the regulatory design. Thus, the fulfillment of rights is not merely charitable, but transformative.

Studies on MBG also show that public food programs cannot be separated from social legitimacy. Wijaya point out that public discourse on MBG is related to school implementation, budgets, food quality, and political debate (Wijaya et al., 2025). Mas'amah found that the education of nutritious meal programs in regions has not run systematically, making public communication and local capacity crucial issues (Mas'amah et al., 2026). Therefore, from a human rights perspective, regulatory integration must include transparency, participation, accountability, food safety, and community supervision.

Pound's Theory And Development Law Theory

Roscoe Pound views law as a mechanism of social control that functions to organize individual, public, and social interests (Pound & Trevino, 2017). In the context of BUMDes, KDMP, and SPPG, individual interests are visible in the citizens' need to obtain food, work, and income;

public interests are seen in the state's obligation to run nutrition programs and village development; while social interests are apparent in the need to build food security, economic solidarity, and equitable benefits. Regulatory integration is needed because without regulations connecting these three interests, each institution could operate independently, or even negate one another.

Pound's idea of law as social engineering is also important. Law does not merely record social reality, but shapes institutional behavior so that social goals are achieved. In this issue, the law must measurably engineer the relationship between BUMDes, KDMP, and SPPG: who manages assets, who gathers citizen products, who guarantees food standards, who oversees procurement, and how economic benefits return to the community. Regulatory integration becomes an instrument to prevent overlapping authorities, institutional conflicts, and the dominance of specific actors in the village food supply chain.

Mochtar Kusumaatmadja's theory of development law deepens this analysis. Naiborhu explains that law in development law theory is not only in the form of norms but also institutions and processes required to create law in reality (Naiborhu, 2016). With this perspective, regulatory reconstruction must not stop at changing articles or adding technical rules. Reconstruction must touch the institutional architecture: the relationship between the village government, BUMDes, KDMP, SPPG, farmers, MSMEs, and beneficiary communities.

Satjipto Rahardjo's progressive legal view also provides a basis that law must move to follow the dynamics of society. Suartha assert that law is effective when it accommodates local values and social realities. Therefore, regulatory integration must not impose a uniform model that ignores local food conditions, village production patterns, consumption culture, and local institutional capacity. Regulations need to provide general standards while opening up space for adaptation based on village deliberations (*musyawarah*), member cooperatives, and local economic potential (Suartha et al., 2021).

Conclusion

Based on the literature review, the strengthening of the village economy through BUMDes, KDMP, and SPPG indicates that village development can no longer be placed within a sectoral and isolated policy framework. BUMDes holds a strategic position as a village enterprise that manages local potential, KDMP carries the spirit of a member-based cooperative to strengthen the production and economic distribution of village communities, while SPPG within the MBG Program ecosystem is directly related to fulfilling the food and nutritional needs of the community. All three have different functions but exist in the same policy space, namely the village as a center for production, distribution, social services, and the fulfillment of citizens'

basic rights. Therefore, the reconstruction of regulatory integration is a crucial necessity to prevent institutional overlapping, ambiguity of authority, role conflicts, and the loss of economic benefits that should rightly circulate within the village community.

From philosophical, moral, and human rights aspects, the regulatory integration of BUMDes, KDMP, and SPPG is necessary to ensure that the law does not merely function as an administrative text, but as an instrument of development that delivers substantive justice. Philosophically, this integration affirms the function of law as a means to organize social interests so that state programs, village institutions, and citizens' interests do not operate independently of one another. Morally, regulatory integration ensures that food and village economic programs do not simply become aid distribution projects, but also serve as empowerment mechanisms that provide space for farmers, MSME (Micro, Small, and Medium Enterprises) actors, cooperatives, and local communities to gain economic benefits. In terms of human rights law, this integration is important because it relates to the fulfillment of the right to food, the right to health, the right to welfare, the right to participate, and the right of village communities to enjoy the fruits of development equitably.

The successful implementation of this regulatory integration will produce comprehensive benefits in economic efficiency, social justice, and institutional governance. On an economic and operational level, a well-functioning supply chain integration among these institutions will significantly improve service capabilities, enabling a reliable, efficient, and flexible fulfillment of needs. Socially, this institutional synergy provides a strong foundation for addressing inequality, promoting equitable justice, and empowering marginalized groups through a collaborative and sustainable framework. In terms of institutional governance and politics, this integration provides a crucial reference framework for a transparent administration, encouraging stakeholders to prioritize public welfare, uphold integrity, and distance themselves from corrupt practices.

References

Alfarizi, S., & Ningrum, P. P. A. (2024). The Impact Of The Existence Of The Prosperous Village Unit Cooperative On The Socio-Economic Conditions Of Prosperous Village Unit Members In Musi Banyuasin Regency. *Societa*, *13*(2), 57–63.

Ansar, Maisar, & Rahman, A. (2020). Analisis Kebangkrutan Koperasi Unit Desa (KUD) Bulupoddo. *Asy-Syarikah*, *2*(2), 21–32.

Ariyani, F. (2021). *Problematika Penurunan Operasional Koperasi Unit Desa (KUD) Super Ganesa di Mariyai Kabupaten Sorong*. *1*(18), 17–28.

Brasit, N., & Nursyamsi, I. (2025). The Impact of Village Fund Management, Cash-Intensive Work, and Community Participation on The Rate of Village Economic Growth Through The

Development of village-Owned Enterprises (BUMDes) in Bone Regency. *International Journal of Accounting and Economics Studies*, *12*(4), 412–420. https://doi.org/10.14419/3amrp448

Dewi, A. S. K., Prasetyo, N. D., Rif'an, M., & Hanugrah Titi Habsari, S. (2024). Motion Sickness: Holding The Acupressure Point Of Village-Owned Business Entities On The Wheel Of "Good Corporate Governance." *Brawijaya Law Journal*, *11*(1), 48–71. https://doi.org/10.21776/ub.blj.2024.011.01.03

Febrina, R., Marta, A., Amin, R. M., & Hadi, S. (2024). Economic development and the rural environment: BUMDES development strategy. In F. R., H. Z., & P. T. (Eds.), *E3S Web of Conferences* (Vol. 506). EDP Sciences. https://doi.org/10.1051/e3sconf/202450602005

Jessup, G. (2006). Development Law: Squaring the Circle, Advancing Human Rights in Africa. *Human Rights Review*, *7*(3), 96–111. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12142-006-1024-5

Kania, I., Anggadwita, G., & Alamanda, D. T. (2021). A New Approach to Stimulate Rural Entrepreneurship Through Village-Owned Enterprises in Indonesia. *Journal of Enterprising Communities*, *15*(3), 432–450. https://doi.org/10.1108/JEC-07-2020-0137

Lubis, A., Engelen, A., Anggraini, C. N., Kurniawati, R., & Rahman, I. (2026). Makanan Bergizi Gratis (MBG) free nutritious meal programs: cultural and nutritional perspectives on public food policies in Indonesia. *Nutrire*, *51*(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s41110-026-00485-0

Marta, A., Ariffin, M. Y. M., Febrina, R., Amin, R. M., Hadi, S., Ferlan, M., & Mento, M. E. (2025). Integrating Inclusive Environmental Rural Development in the KDMP Cooperative Model. In Z. null, C. M.A., A. R., S. G., G. A., A. S., & T. W. S. (Eds.), *E3S Web of Conferences* (Vol. 671). EDP Sciences. https://doi.org/10.1051/e3sconf/202567105002

Mas'amah, M., Leuape, E. S., Meilawati, F. T., Adu, A. A., & Lumba, A. J. F. (2026). Dissemination of the Free Nutritious Meal Program for Students: Case Study in Rote-Ndao Regency – Indonesia. *Media Publikasi Promosi Kesehatan Indonesia*, *9*(4), 639–652. https://doi.org/10.56338/mppki.v9i4.9503

Mauludin, N. A., Wahyudi, A., & Ulum, H. (2025). Legal Policy Model of the Red and White Village Cooperative (KDMP): Implementation Factors and Comparative Insights from Brazil, Denmark, and Japan. *Jurnal IUS Kajian Hukum Dan Keadilan*, *13*(3), 682–707. https://doi.org/10.29303/ius.v13i3.1894

Meliala, A., Rifai, A., & Woods, J. A. (2023). Critique of the Indonesian Omnibus Law Regime: Misguided Interpretation in Narrating "Village Owned Enterprises." In *Advances in 21st Century Human Settlements: Vol. Part F2269* (pp. 81–100). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-99-7988-2_6

Naiborhu, N. S. R. (2016). Role of theory of law for protection systems development and environmental management in Indonesia. *International Journal of Applied Business and Economic Research*, *14*(6), 4801–4807. https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-84989288238&partnerID=40&md5=12bc364d35ac6eac2a35ce9daf4e4c04

Pound, R., & Trevino, A. J. (2017). *Social Control Through Law*. Taylor and Francis.

Scheinin, M. (2016). International Human Rights Law. In *A Companion to European Union Law*

and International Law (pp. 441–457). Wiley Blackwell. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119037712.ch29

Suartha, I. D. M., Martha, I. D. A. G. M., & Hermanto, B. (2021). Innovation Based On Balinese Local Genius Shifting Alternative Legal Concept: Towards Indonesia Development Acceleration. *Journal of Legal, Ethical and Regulatory Issues*, *24*(7), 1-9. https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85112667806&partnerID=40&md5=2d789ead7381088bfc9137fa4f13f476

Wijaya, H., Hok, J., Carment, M., & Irwansyah, E. (2025). Uncovering Public Discourse on the MBG Program. In W. F.W. (Ed.), *Proceedings - 2025 8th International Seminar on Research of Information Technology and Intelligent Systems, ISRITI 2025* (pp. 619–624). Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers Inc. https://doi.org/10.1109/ISRITI68345.2025.11393341

Wulandari, S. (2021). KUD Sebagai Badan Usaha Bagi Petani Sesuai Dengan Unsur Kearifan Lokal. *Perspektif*, *26*(3), 210–215.

Republik Indonesia. (1992). Undang-Undang Nomor 25 Tahun 1992 tentang Perkoperasian. Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 1992 Nomor 116.

Presiden Republik Indonesia. (1984). Instruksi Presiden Nomor 4 Tahun 1984 tentang Pembinaan dan Pengembangan Koperasi Unit Desa (KUD).

Presiden Republik Indonesia. (1998). Instruksi Presiden Nomor 18 Tahun 1998 tentang Peningkatan Pembinaan dan Pengembangan Perkoperasian.

Republik Indonesia. (2014). Undang-Undang Nomor 6 Tahun 2014 tentang Desa. Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 2014 Nomor 7.

Republik Indonesia. (2021). Peraturan Pemerintah Nomor 11 Tahun 2021 tentang Badan Usaha Milik Desa. Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 2021 Nomor 21.

Presiden Republik Indonesia. (2025). Instruksi Presiden Nomor 9 Tahun 2025 tentang Percepatan Pembentukan Koperasi Desa/Kelurahan Merah Putih.

Kementerian Koperasi Republik Indonesia. (2025). Peraturan Menteri Koperasi Nomor 2 Tahun 2025 tentang Pengembangan Usaha Koperasi Desa/Kelurahan Merah Putih. Berita Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 2025.

Presiden Republik Indonesia. (2024). Peraturan Presiden Nomor 83 Tahun 2024 tentang Badan Gizi Nasional. Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 2024 Nomor 173.

Presiden Republik Indonesia. (2025). Peraturan Presiden Nomor 115 Tahun 2025 tentang Tata Kelola Penyelenggaraan Program Makan Bergizi Gratis. Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 2025.