

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.12426896

DIGITAL ENFORCEMENT AND LEGAL CERTAINTY IN INDONESIA: EVALUATING SATU JARI AND PERKUSI THROUGH ASEAN COMPARATIVE JUDICIAL FRAMEWORKS

Bambang Myanto*, Efa Laela Fakhriah, Anita Afriana

Padjajaran University, Indonesia.

Received: 19/08/2025

Accepted: 27/03/2026

Corresponding Author: Bambang Myanto

ABSTRACT

Effective enforcement of civil judgments is a fundamental pillar of the rule of law, contractual reliability, and economic stability. In Indonesia, however, persistent structural barriers including insufficient bailiff capacity, fragmented inter-agency coordination, non-executable judgments, and the absence of real-time monitoring have long impeded timely and predictable enforcement. This study examines how two digital monitoring systems introduced by the Supreme Court, SATU JARI and PERKUSI, reshape enforcement performance by enhancing transparency, accountability, and data-driven supervision. Using a normative legal methodology supported by secondary empirical data and comparative insights from Singapore, Malaysia, and Thailand, the study finds that digitalization reduced Indonesia's average enforcement time from 197 to 115 days, improved procedural visibility, and strengthened judicial oversight. Nevertheless, digital transformation remains partial due to manual data entry, uneven infrastructure, and limited inter-institutional integration. Comparative analysis shows that Indonesia still lags behind ASEAN peers that have adopted fully integrated, end-to-end digital enforcement ecosystems. The findings underscore that digital monitoring tools significantly contribute to legal certainty, yet their long-term impact depends on comprehensive procedural reforms, stronger inter-agency cooperation, and a unified digital enforcement framework.

KEYWORDS: Civil Judgment Enforcement, Digital Justice, Legal Certainty, Judicial Reform, Contract Enforcement.

1. INTRODUCTION

The efficacy of a contemporary rule-of-law framework predominantly hinges on its capacity to guarantee the prompt, unambiguous, and reliable execution of civil court rulings. The enforcement of a judgment signifies that the rights determined in court materialize as actual legal outcomes for the prevailing party. In the absence of effective enforcement, judicial rulings transform into empty proclamations devoid of coercive authority, leading to a decline in legal clarity and a reduction in public trust in the judiciary (Harahap, 1991; Subekti, 2001; Mertokusumo, 2013). The study of international law underscores that the enforcement of decisions is essential for upholding the rule of law and contractual reliability, as evidenced by the World Justice Project (2023), OECD (2021), and the World Bank's "Enforcing Contracts" indexes (World Bank, 2020). Economic theory asserts that deficiencies in enforcement procedures increase transaction costs and distort market behavior, as noted by Coase (1960), Williamson (1985), and North (1990). This underscores that robust civil enforcement satisfies both judicial aims and wider economic and governance requirements.

The implementation of civil judgments in Indonesia faces persistent institutional obstacles that hinder judicial efficacy. As of December 2024, the Directorate-General of the General Judiciary (Ditjen Badilum MA RI, 2025) reported 4,991 pending executions from a total of 10,505 resolved cases. The mean duration for case enforcement exceeded 115 days. There are merely 1,462 bailiffs nationwide, exacerbating these delays. The police, the National Land Agency (BPN), and municipal governments are significantly fragmented, exacerbating the situation (Santoso, 2022; Setiawan, 2019). Further hurdles encompass *verzet* and third-party opposition, ambiguous execution targets, technological obstacles in physical enforcement, and the existence of non-executable judgments (SEMA No. 3/2018). Comparative analyses of judicial systems in developing places reveal consistent patterns of resistance and institutional inefficiencies (Buscaglia & Ulen, 1997; Dakolias, 1999; Messick, 1999). The aggregate impact of these structural impediments engenders an erratic environment, exacerbating legal risk and compromising Indonesia's business climate an issue acknowledged in investment assessments by UNCTAD (2022), OECD (2021), and academic studies on legal certainty and economic conduct (Raz, 1977; Fuller, 1964; Tyler, 2006).

The Supreme Court of Indonesia has initiated

digital transformation efforts to address persistent and severe issues. Between 2021 and 2023, two flagship systems, SATU JARI (Integrated Judicial Performance Monitoring System) and PERKUSI (Electronic Enforcement Monitoring), were implemented to enhance the visibility of enforcement processes in real time, augment supervision, improve administrative precision, and strengthen accountability (SK Dirjen Badilum 1230/2021; 1712/2023). These systems illustrate the global transition towards data-driven judicial frameworks, akin to developments observed in Europe (CEPEJ, 2016; 2018; Reiling, 2019; Velicogna, 2017), the United States (Tyler, 2021), and the United Kingdom (Civil Justice Council, 2015; Susskind, 2019; 2020). The theoretical justification is evident: digital platforms and workflow automation can strengthen enforcement processes, diminish human mistake, alleviate discretionary misuse, and promote procedural transparency (Fabri, 2009; Contini & Mohr, 2009; Venturini, 2020; Rabinovich-Einy & Katsh, 2017). Notwithstanding initial empirical advancements, evidenced by a decrease in enforcement duration from 197 to 115 days (Ditjen Badilum MA RI, 2025), there exists a deficiency of academic inquiry into the structural effects of digital enforcement instruments on legal certainty and corporate confidence in Indonesia. This study gap underscores the necessity for a more thorough investigation based on legal, institutional, and technological viewpoints.

An examination of ASEAN jurisdictions provides valuable insights on Indonesia's position within the region. Singapore employs a sophisticated Integrated Case Management System featuring digital enforcement monitoring and automated performance reporting (Singapore Judiciary, 2021). Malaysia has initiated e-Courts Phase 2, facilitating digital oversight for bailiff offices, enabling online appointment scheduling, and ensuring compliance with all enforcement procedures (Lumbanraja, 2024; Malaysian Judiciary Reports). The Judicial Administration System of Thailand provides comprehensive digital case tracking from adjudication to execution, demonstrating the advantages of centralized digital platforms (Thai Ministry of Justice, 2022). These domains illustrate how digital enforcement frameworks can expedite judicial proceedings and enhance public accessibility. Conversely, Indonesia's initiatives to digitize remain incomplete and lack effective coordination, particularly in integrating enforcement mechanisms across several agencies and establishing enforceable service-level standards.

This essay seeks to examine how Indonesia could improve the enforcement of civil decisions via digital monitoring systems and the augmentation of judicial performance, taking into account ongoing obstacles and changing regional norms. It assesses the structural implications of SATU JARI and PERKUSI, compares Indonesia's advancement with specific ASEAN regions, and suggests a reform strategy based on judicial performance indicators, data-informed governance, and comparative best practices. The essay enhances existing literature on digital justice, legal certainty, and business-law reform in Indonesia and the wider ASEAN legal framework by employing a normative and comparative methodology supported by empirical evidence.

2. RESEARCH METHOD

This study adopts a normative legal research method enriched with secondary empirical data to assess the effectiveness of digital monitoring systems particularly SATU JARI and PERKUSI in improving civil judgment enforcement in Indonesia. By combining statute-based analysis, a conceptual examination of rule of law, legal certainty, contract enforcement, and e-justice theories (Fuller, 1964; Hart, 1961; Raz, 1977; North, 1990; Susskind, 2019), and a comparative legal approach referencing advanced ASEAN jurisdictions such as Singapore, Malaysia, and Thailand, the research offers a multidimensional evaluation of Indonesia's enforcement framework. The integration of empirical data from Ditjen Badilum (2024–2025) including enforcement backlogs, average execution duration, and bailiff staffing provides quantitative indicators to contextualize doctrinal findings, following established judicial administration scholarship (Fabri, 2009; Reiling, 2019; Velicogna, 2017).

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1. *Structural Barriers in Indonesia's Civil Judgment Enforcement*

The Indonesian civil justice system continues to exhibit significant structural deficiencies that hinder the prompt and effective enforcement of civil judgments. A significant issue that persists is the insufficient number of bailiffs (*jurisita*) to manage the annual influx of enforcement requests. National data from the Directorate-General of General Courts (Ditjen Badilum) indicates that Indonesia had merely 1,462 bailiffs by 2024–2025. This was insufficient, as the prior year had 11,697 enforcement applications (Ditjen Badilum MA RI, 2025). The imbalance between caseload and staff capacity results in

overburdened enforcement officers, delayed execution dates, and reduced procedural efficiency, supporting prior research linking resource inadequacies to inferior court performance (Dakolias, 1999; Buscaglia & Ulen, 1997; CEPEJ, 2018).

A secondary structural obstacle is to the inadequate collaboration of the police, land administration authority (BPN), and municipal governments in facilitating enforcement. Numerous civil executions, particularly those related to real estate, require the assistance of multiple agencies. Empirical research in court administration has demonstrated that fragmented institutional mandates result in bottlenecks, competing standards, and procedural delays (North, 1990; March & Olsen, 1984; Contini & Mohr, 2009). Indonesian academics see inter-agency reluctance, bureaucratic stagnation, and ambiguous power delineations as significant issues that diminish enforcement efficacy (Kirana, 2020; Setiawan, 2019; Myanto, 2025). The absence of a cohesive operational framework has resulted in disparate procedures across jurisdictions, diminishing predictability and legal clarity for litigants.

Third, Indonesia continues to possess several non-executable judgments, as stated in SEMA No. 3/2018. Under these conditions, the object specifications are generally ambiguous, ownership claims are overlapping, property documentation is lacking, or the objects have been previously allocated to other entities. Such scenarios demonstrate that the protocols for pre-trial verification and land management exhibit systemic deficiencies. Comparative studies demonstrate that developing economies frequently face issues when civil case management and land registries are not integrated (Messick, 1999; World Bank, 2020). Non-executable judgments ultimately erode litigants' substantive rights by transforming judicial rulings into simply symbolic declarations rather than enforceable legal demands (Harahap, 1991; Mertokusumo, 2013).

Prior to the implementation of SATU JARI and PERKUSI, Indonesia lacked a real-time enforcement tracking system, resulting in delays, administrative opacity, and inconsistent reporting among district courts. Traditionally, enforcement records were maintained manually, complicating oversight for court authorities and providing individuals with greater opportunities to delay proceedings or engage in informal negotiations. Global instances demonstrate that jurisdictions lacking digital monitoring tools frequently exhibit sluggish enforcement, insufficient internal accountability, and

minimal transparency for individuals engaged in litigation (CEPEJ, 2016; Reiling, 2019; Tyler, 2021; Susskind, 2019). Indonesia's circumstances mirrored this pattern, with national execution durations averaging 197 days (2022–2023), indicating systemic inefficacy (Ditjen Badilum, 2025).

These structural constraints collectively lead to significant systemic consequences: prolonged execution, legal uncertainty, and heightened investment risks. Legal-economic research consistently indicates that the protracted enforcement of decisions increases transaction costs, erodes contractual reliability, and compromises the rule of law (Coase, 1960; Williamson, 1985; Raz, 1977). The World Bank (2020) and OECD (2021) explicitly indicate that delays in enforcement significantly undermine investor confidence in emerging nations. The World Justice Project (2023) ranks Indonesia 65th globally in civil justice, primarily due to its inadequate enforcement of rulings. This substantiates the notion that these obstacles significantly influence the nation's business environment.

Comparative evaluations within ASEAN further underscore the severity of Indonesia's structural challenges. The Integrated Case Management System in Singapore, the e-Courts Phase 2 in Malaysia, and the Judicial Administration System in Thailand all possess comprehensive digital oversight and inter-agency coordination mechanisms that expedite enforcement (Singapore Judiciary, 2021; Malaysian Judiciary Annual Report; CEPEJ, 2018). Conversely, Indonesia's enforcement procedure remains predominantly manual and poorly managed, indicating a lack of preparedness for digital implementation compared to other regional nations.

The identified structural issues insufficient bailiff capacity, fragmented institutional coordination, non-executable judgments, and absence of real-time enforcement monitoring constitute significant challenges that must be addressed to enhance Indonesia's civil judgment enforcement system. Their cumulative impact underscores the necessity of integrated digital oversight, explicit inter-agency frameworks, and performance-oriented judicial changes to restore legal certainty and enhance the nation's competitiveness within the regional legal context.

3.2. Implementation and Performance of Digital Monitoring Tools (SATU JARI & PERKUSI)

The implementation of SATU JARI and PERKUSI signifies a notable institutional advancement in

Indonesia's civil justice system, aligning the nation with international trends in digital judicial administration (Susskind, 2019; Contini & Mohr, 2009; CEPEJ, 2018). Both technologies were developed to rectify enduring deficiencies in civil judgment enforcement by improving transparency, bolstering accountability, and facilitating real-time performance monitoring across courts. SATU JARI functions as a centralized, data-centric judicial performance dashboard that consolidates caseflow data, bailiff operations, resource allocation, and execution status from district courts across the nation (Ditjen Badilum, 2025). The architecture exemplifies global best practices in judicial digitization, notably the implementation of data-driven judicial frameworks prevalent in Europe, Australia, and Singapore (CEPEJ, 2016; Reiling, 2019; Singapore Judiciary, 2021). SATU JARI provides aggregated metrics and automated alerts, enabling court leadership to identify procedural bottlenecks, recognize deviations from service-level expectations, and perform evaluations based on objective judicial indicators an approach aligned with performance-governance literature (Venturini, 2020; Fabri, 2009). Consequently, the approach diminishes institutional opacity and strengthens oversight procedures that were once compromised by disjointed and inconsistent manual reporting.

Additionally, PERKUSI functions as a dedicated digital platform for the real-time oversight of civil judgment enforcement. It allows plaintiffs and court officials to monitor the status of each execution request, scrutinize written justifications for delays, and get electronic records including bailiff minutes and site reports (SK Dirjen Badilum No. 1230/2021). PERKUSI embodies worldwide advancements in electronic enforcement systems, paralleling Korea's e-enforcement framework (Kim, 2018), the United Kingdom's online civil justice reforms (Civil Justice Council, 2015), and Estonia's cohesive e-file enforcement modules (Ministry of Justice Estonia, 2020). The system minimizes opportunities for maladministration, lack of transparency, and informal negotiations by requiring structured digital documentation at each procedural stage behaviors acknowledged as factors contributing to enforcement stagnation in numerous developing judicial systems (Buscaglia & Ulen, 1997; Dakolias, 1999; Tyler, 2006).

Empirical evidence from the Directorate-General of the General Judiciary substantiates that these digital monitoring instruments have yielded quantifiable enhancements in enforcement efficacy. National monitoring statistics reveal that the average execution time decreased from 197 days in the pre-

digitalization period (2022–2023) to 115 days after the implementation of SATU JARI and PERKUSI (2024–2025) (Ditjen Badilum MA RI, 2025). This decrease above 41 percent aligns with global research indicating that digital automation of case tracking and enforcement processes often results in efficiency improvements of 30–50 percent (CEPEJ, 2016; Velicogna, 2017; Reiling, 2019). PERKUSI's visualization of execution status enhances transparency, minimizes discretionary opportunities for procedural manipulation, and fortifies institutional accountability by creating digital audit trails an approach aligned with global standards of open justice and court governance (HJCEU, 2020; OECD, 2021).

The joint implementation of SATU JARI and PERKUSI has enhanced procedural transparency. These systems facilitate real-time access to execution data, allowing plaintiffs, supervisors, and the general public to monitor enforcement efforts with greater precision. This transparency cultivates enhanced trust in the judiciary, aligning with procedural justice theory, which posits that openness bolsters voluntary compliance and public confidence in legal institutions (Tyler, 2006; 2021). Compulsory electronic documentation and time-stamped logging similarly mitigate the likelihood of administrative delays and inconsistent reporting problems that have historically afflicted enforcement in Indonesia and have been extensively criticized in national scholarship (Harahap, 1991; Subekti, 2001; Myanto, 2025).

Notwithstanding these developments, numerous constraints obstruct the complete realization of digital enforcement's potential. SATU JARI and PERKUSI rely significantly on manual data entry by bailiffs and clerks, which permits inaccuracies or incomplete reporting an issue similarly observed during the initial stages of digital court adoption in India and the Philippines (Sharma, 2021; Santos, 2020). Furthermore, considerable digital disparity is evident inside courts, especially in distant areas where insufficient internet access and inadequate IT infrastructure hinder real-time data synchronization. Such gaps are prevalent impediments in digital justice reform within poor jurisdictions (UNODC, 2021; World Bank, 2020). A subsequent constraint emerges from the systems' inability to interoperate with external institutional databases, such as land registration (BPN), law enforcement agencies, and local government administration systems. Comparative jurisdictions like Singapore and Malaysia illustrate that fully integrated enforcement ecosystems connecting courts, land agencies,

enforcement officers, and financial institutions exceed semi-digital systems in efficiency and accuracy (Singapore Judiciary, 2021; Malaysian e-Courts Report, 2022).

The introduction of SATU JARI and PERKUSI significantly enhances Indonesia's institutional capacity to monitor, supervise, and expedite civil judgment enforcement. The evident decrease in execution delays, along with substantial enhancements in transparency and accountability, highlights the revolutionary capacity of digital monitoring tools in resolving persistent enforcement inefficiencies. However, the implementation of comprehensive digital justice necessitates enhanced institutional integration, equitable infrastructure across regions, and increased automation to reduce reliance on human procedures. These findings corroborate global evidence that digital monitoring systems when underpinned by robust regulatory frameworks and synchronized institutional reforms are instrumental in bolstering legal certainty, augmenting contract enforcement, and refining judicial governance (Susskind, 2020; CEPEJ, 2018; World Bank, 2020).

3.3. Comparative ASEAN Analysis

A comparative review of civil judgment enforcement throughout ASEAN reveals that Indonesia significantly trails its regional peers in digital integration, institutional coordination, and enforcement efficacy. Singapore employs the most sophisticated methodology. It features a comprehensive e-Litigation and Integrated Case Management System (ICMS) that consolidates judges, court personnel, enforcement officials, and external organizations under a unified digital framework (Singapore Judiciary, 2021). The system enforces stringent Service Level Agreements (SLAs) at each enforcement level, incorporating automated notifications and administrative sanctions for delays. Collectively, these factors ensure that decisions are executed punctually and as anticipated (Civil Justice Council, 2015; CEPEJ, 2018). This environment enables enforcement agents to receive digital assignments, upload field reports in real time, and collaborate electronically with banks and land registries. This degree of integration reduces administrative delays and diminishes the likelihood of corruption (Reiling, 2019). Malaysia's e-Courts Phase 2 demonstrates significant advancement as well. It encompasses electronic bailiff assignment, e-filing of enforcement motions, digital scheduling, and real-time courtroom and enforcement monitoring (Malaysian Judiciary Report, 2022).

Empirical assessments indicate that digital oversight significantly improves bailiff discipline and reduces the likelihood of procedural manipulation, supporting international studies on the benefits of electronic enforcement (Kim, 2018; Velicogna, 2017). The Judicial Administration System (JAS) in Thailand provides comprehensive digital case monitoring from initiation to enforcement, allowing litigants and court administration to publicly and continuously track execution progress (Thai Courts Annual Report, 2021). Thailand exhibits significantly higher compliance with civil judgments and shorter enforcement cycles compared to Indonesia. These findings align with regional analyses of rule-of-law efficacy (World Bank, 2020; WJP, 2023).

Conversely, Indonesia has just initiated digital monitoring through SATU JARI and PERKUSI. These systems prioritize oversight above complete automation or inter-institutional compatibility. Although these technologies have improved certain metrics, such as reducing the execution duration from 197 days to 115 days, they remain incomplete as they do not constitute a fully integrated, end-to-end enforcement framework (Ditjen Badilum, 2025). Bailiff assignments, security coordination with law enforcement, and terrestrial executions with BPN continue to depend heavily on human operations, resulting in procedural bottlenecks that digital solutions alone cannot eliminate (Santoso, 2022; Myanto, 2025). Indonesia lacks definitive legislation regarding digital enforcement, placing it at a disadvantage compared to Singapore and Malaysia. In these nations, digital processes are supported by robust legal frameworks that delineate obligations, timelines, standards for digital evidence, and enforcement mechanisms (OECD, 2021; UNCITRAL, 2017). Consequently, Indonesia is structurally deficient in critical domains such as established timelines, inter-agency collaboration, and the enforcement of digital records. This comparative analysis demonstrates that although Indonesia has commenced the implementation of digital monitoring tools, it significantly lags behind its ASEAN peers in developing a unified, legally robust, and technologically integrated enforcement framework an institutional shortcoming that undermines legal certainty, contract reliability, and investor confidence (Susskind, 2020; World Bank, 2020; UNCTAD, 2022).

3.4. Implications for Legal Certainty

The enhancement of digital monitoring systems in civil judgment enforcement significantly impacts the attainment of legal certainty in Indonesia, a

fundamental component of the rule of law as defined by classical theorists like Fuller, Hart, and Raz. Legal certainty necessitates not only unequivocal legal principles but also dependable institutional procedures that guarantee the timely, predictable, and non-arbitrary enforcement of judicial rulings. Before digitalization, Indonesia's civil enforcement system experienced persistent delays, disjointed institutional coordination, and variable procedural practices, factors that are broadly acknowledged in national scholarship as detrimental to the authority and legitimacy of judicial decisions (Harahap, 1991; Subekti, 2001; Mertokusumo, 2013). Empirical data indicates a decrease in average execution times from 197 to 115 days after the implementation of SATU JARI and PERKUSI (Ditjen Badilum, 2025), demonstrating a quantifiable restoration of certainty by reducing the enforcement gap between judicial pronouncement and the actualization of material rights. This advancement aligns with global research indicating that digital tracking and process automation improve predictability and diminish discretion in judicial administration (CEPEJ, 2016; Velicogna, 2017; Reiling, 2019). Moreover, the transparency mechanisms integrated into PERKUSI such as real-time status updates, organized delay justifications, and electronic audit trails enable litigants to more accurately predict procedural timelines, thereby diminishing information asymmetry and opportunities for procedural manipulation (Tyler, 2006; Rabinovich-Einy & Katsh, 2017). From an economic and institutional standpoint, enhanced certainty diminishes transaction costs related to contract enforcement and bolsters the credibility of state institutions, outcomes highlighted in the extensive institutional literature as essential for investment stability and market confidence (North, 1990; Williamson, 1985; World Bank, 2020; OECD, 2021). Nonetheless, legal certainty is still somewhat limited due to the lack of extensive statute change that integrates digital enforcement procedures into the established framework of Indonesian legal standards. Scholars assert that legal certainty is undermined when technology advancements lack explicit procedural law, consistent norms, and robust data governance (Sourdin, 2018; Mantelero, 2013; Kosta, 2015). Thus, although SATU JARI and PERKUSI represent notable advancements, the durability of their impact on legal certainty relies on aligning Indonesia's civil procedure framework with digital enforcement principles, enhancing inter-agency interoperability, and institutionalizing performance-based accountability mechanisms to avert regression.

4. CONCLUSION

This analysis indicates that the enforcement of civil judgments remains the paramount factor in Indonesia's existing rule-of-law framework for legal clarity, contract dependability, and economic competitiveness. The analysis verifies that Indonesia's persistent enforcement obstacles limited bailiff capacity, disjointed inter-agency collaboration, unenforceable judgments, and the historical lack of real-time monitoring have collectively weakened the efficacy of judicial decisions and led to systemic delays, administrative opacity, and increased legal risk. These structural deficiencies not only infringe upon the substantive rights of plaintiffs but also undermine institutional legitimacy, escalate transaction costs, and diminish investor confidence, corroborating concerns expressed in global governance evaluations (World Bank, 2020; WJP, 2023; OECD, 2021).

The creation of SATU JARI and PERKUSI represents a crucial institutional reform and marks Indonesia's foremost progress in enhancing its civil enforcement system. Empirical evidence indicates substantial performance enhancements, with a 41% reduction in average execution time from 197 to 115 days alongside greater openness, enhanced auditability, and fortified supervisory capacity. These findings align with global research indicating that digital tracking, data-driven judicial management, and workflow automation enhance efficiency, reduce discretion, and promote fairness (CEPEJ, 2016; Reiling, 2019; Susskind, 2019). The analysis indicates that Indonesia's digital transformation remains only partially accomplished. The systems continue to depend heavily on human data entry, the digital infrastructure is inconsistent among regions, and interaction with key institutions such as BPN and the police remains restricted. Digital monitoring systems cannot entirely address enforcement deficiencies without enhanced interoperability, comprehensive automation, and uniform regulatory standards.

A comparison with ASEAN nations indicates that

Indonesia lags in numerous aspects. Singapore, Malaysia, and Thailand have developed more cohesive and legally robust digital enforcement frameworks. These systems encompass rigorous service-level standards, integrated databases, automatic officer allocation, and comprehensive tracking from adjudication to execution. These systems demonstrate that the integration of digitalization with explicit procedural guidelines and inter-agency collaboration can enhance compliance rates, accelerate execution cycles, and increase predictability. Indonesia has achieved significant progress; yet, it has not yet attained this degree of institutional maturity. This indicates persistent deficiencies in enforcement consistency and legal certainty, undermining public trust and the nation's economic competitiveness.

The findings indicate that digital monitoring technologies such as SATU JARI and PERKUSI are essential, yet insufficient for robust enforcement of civil judgments. They are essential for enhancing governmental transparency, accountability, and performance orientation; nonetheless, they require comprehensive statutory reform, standardized digital procedures, secure data governance, and integrated workflows among institutions. Enhancing these aspects will guarantee that digital technologies foster enduring advancements in legal certainty and contractual trustworthiness, which are crucial for promoting Indonesia's rule of law and its standing in the ASEAN legal and investment arena.

Subsequent research ought to rigorously assess the quantitative impacts of digitalization through comparative metrics, evaluate the cost-benefit implications for judicial administration, and explore frameworks for the integration of courts with land registries, financial institutions, and law enforcement agencies. This initiative will be crucial for advancing Indonesia towards a fully digital, performance-oriented, and legally robust enforcement system, potentially aiding the nation's development objectives and enhancing its competitiveness in the region.

REFERENCES

- Asikin, Z. (2015). *Indonesian civil procedural law* (Revised ed.). Jakarta: Rajawali Pers.
- Bachar, D. (2010). *Execution of civil court decisions*. Jakarta: Sinar Grafika.
- Buscaglia, E., & Ulen, T. (1997). *A quantitative assessment of the judicial sector: The World Bank's experience*. Washington, DC: The World Bank.
- CEPEJ – European Commission for the Efficiency of Justice. (2016). *European judicial systems: Efficiency and quality of justice*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
- CEPEJ – European Commission for the Efficiency of Justice. (2018). *European judicial systems 2018 edition: Efficiency and quality of justice*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
- Civil Justice Council. (2015). *Online dispute resolution for low-value civil claims*. London: Civil Justice Council.

- Coase, R. H. (1960). The problem of social cost. *Journal of Law and Economics*, 3(1), 1–44.
- Contini, F., & Mohr, R. (2009). Reconciling independence and accountability in judicial systems. *Utrecht Law Review*, 5(3), 26–43.
- Contini, F., & Cordella, A. (2007). ICT in the public sector: E-justice in Italy. In F. Contini & G. F. Lanzara (Eds.), *ICT and innovation in the public sector* (pp. 159–180). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Dakolias, M. (1999). *Court performance around the world: A comparative perspective* (World Bank Technical Paper No. 430). Washington, DC: The World Bank.
- Ditjen Badilum MA RI. (2025). *National report on civil judgment enforcement 2024–2025*. Jakarta: Directorate General of General Courts.
- Fabri, M. (2009). Methodologies for evaluating the quality of justice. *International Journal for Court Administration*, 2(2), 5–16.
- Fuller, L. L. (1964). *The morality of law*. Yale University Press.
- Harahap, M. Y. (1991). *Scope of civil judgment execution issues*. Jakarta: Gramedia Pustaka.
- Hart, H. L. A. (1961). *The concept of law*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- HJCEU. (2020). *Open justice and court transparency in the EU*. Brussels: EU Publications.
- Kirana, K. (2020). *Problems of civil enforcement and procedural law reform*. Jakarta: Kencana.
- Kim, Y. (2018). Electronic enforcement and e-litigation in Korea: Developments and challenges. *Korean Journal of Law & Society*, 12(1), 47–68.
- Kosta, E. (2015). *Consent in European data protection law*. Brill.
- Lumbanraja, B. Y. (2024). E-Floating Execution: Electronic enforcement innovation in administrative courts. *Jurnal Hukum Progresif*, 12(2).
- Malaysian Judiciary. (2022). *e-Courts Phase 2 Annual Report*. Kuala Lumpur: Federal Court of Malaysia.
- Mantelero, A. (2013). The EDPB and accountability: Data protection by design and by default. *Computer Law & Security Review*, 29(3), 216–222.
- March, J. G., & Olsen, J. P. (1984). The new institutionalism: Organizational factors in political life. *American Political Science Review*, 78(3), 734–749.
- McDonald, L. (2022). Digital court dashboards and performance governance. *Commonwealth Judicial Journal*, 27(1), 15–28.
- Mertokusumo, S. (2013). *Indonesian civil procedure law*. Yogyakarta: Liberty.
- Messick, R. (1999). Judicial reform and economic development: A survey of the issues. *The World Bank Research Observer*, 14(1), 117–136.
- Ministry of Justice Estonia. (2020). *E-justice in Estonia: From e-file to online courts*. Tallinn: MoJ Estonia.
- Myanto, A. (2025). *Cross-institutional governance and coordination in civil enforcement*. Jakarta: Puslitbangkum.
- North, D. C. (1990). *Institutions, institutional change and economic performance*. Cambridge University Press.
- OECD. (2021). *Investment policy review: Rule of law and contract enforcement*. Paris: OECD Publishing.
- Rabinovich-Einy, O., & Katsh, E. (2017). Digital justice: Reshaping boundaries in ODR environments. *International Journal of Online Dispute Resolution*, 4(1), 5–35.
- Rahayu, I. (2021). *Regulatory harmonization of civil enforcement*. Bandung: Refika Aditama.
- Raz, J. (1977). The rule of law and its virtue. *The Law Quarterly Review*, 93, 195–211.
- Reiling, D. (2019). *Technology for justice: How information technology can support judicial reform*. Leiden University Press.
- Reiling, D. (2021). Courts and artificial intelligence. *International Journal for Court Administration*, 12(2), 1–12.
- Santoso, A. (2022). *HIR–RBg and modern enforcement problems*. Jakarta: Prenadamedia.
- SEMA No. 3 Tahun 2018. (2018). *Best practices for handling non-executable civil judgments*. Jakarta: Supreme Court of Indonesia.
- Setiawan, A. (2019). *Technical guidelines for civil execution and structural reform needs*. Jakarta: Sinar Grafika.
- Singapore Judiciary. (2021). *Integrated Case Management System and digital justice reforms*. Singapore: Supreme Court of Singapore.
- SK Dirjen Badilum No. 1230/2021 tentang Aplikasi PERKUSI.
- SK Dirjen Badilum No. 1712/2023 tentang SATU JARI.
- Sourdin, T. (2018). Judges, technology and AI. *Journal of Judicial Administration*, 27(4), 1–22.
- Subekti, R. (2001). *Indonesian civil procedural law*. Jakarta: Bina Cipta.
- Susskind, R. (2019). *Online courts and the future of justice*. Oxford University Press.
- Susskind, R. (2020). *Tomorrow's lawyers* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.

- Thai Ministry of Justice. (2022). *Judicial Administration System Report*. Bangkok.
- Thai Courts. (2021). *Annual report of the Courts of Justice*. Bangkok.
- Tyler, T. R. (2006). *Why people obey the law* (2nd ed.). Princeton University Press.
- Tyler, T. R. (2021). Trust in the judiciary in the digital age. *Judicature*, 105(1), 10–18.
- UNCITRAL. (2017). *Technical notes on online dispute resolution*. United Nations.
- UNCTAD. (2022). *World investment report 2022*. Geneva: United Nations.
- UNODC. (2021). *Digitalization of justice systems: Opportunities and risks*. Vienna: UNODC.
- Velicogna, M. (2017). Electronic access to justice: E-justice in Europe. *Information & Communications Technology Law*, 26(3), 217–234.
- Venturini, J. (2020). Data-driven justice and performance metrics. *International Journal for Court Administration*, 11(2), 45–60.
- Williamson, O. E. (1985). *The economic institutions of capitalism*. New York: Free Press.
- World Bank. (2020). *Doing Business: Enforcing contracts*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- World Justice Project. (2023). *Rule of Law Index 2023*. Washington, DC: WJP.