RECHTSVINDING
Vol. 4, 2 (July-December, 2026), pp. 311-324
EISSN: 2987-4424, DOI: https://doi.org/10.59525/rechtsvinding.2057

Development of an Integrity Zone to Create a Corruption-Free Area at the Simalungun District Court

Soraya Rizna Afrijal[1], Rony Andre C. Naldo[1], Muldri PJ Pasaribu[1]

[1] Universitas Simalungun, Indonesia

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

Development;
Integrity;
ZI

Article history:

Received 2025-07-02
Revised 2026-08-09
Accepted 2026-09-14

ABSTRACT

The government, through Regulation of the Minister of Administrative and Bureaucratic Reform (PermenPANRB) Number 5 of 2024, encourages bureaucratic reform and the development of Integrity Zones (ZI) to realize an accountable, effective, and integrity-based government towards the Corruption-Free Zone (WBK) predicate. The Simalungun District Court has implemented ZI development, but has not yet succeeded in obtaining the WBK predicate. This study aims to analyze the implementation of ZI development, obstacles to achieving WBK, and strategies to improve its success at the Simalungun District Court. The study uses an empirical juridical method with a statutory regulatory approach and field interview data from 2026. The analysis was conducted qualitatively using the Theory of Law and Development, the Theory of Legal Effectiveness, and the Theory of Legal Certainty. The results of the study indicate that ZI development has been implemented, but has not been fully effective due to ongoing internal and external obstacles. The most crucial factor causing the failure to achieve the WBK predicate is the existence of disciplinary violations by officials during the assessment period, which directly impacts aspects of integrity and organizational governance. Therefore, improvement strategies need to prioritize strengthening integrity, preventing disciplinary violations, internal supervision, and strengthening governance of sustainable ZI development.

This is an open access article under the CC BY license.

Corresponding Author:
Soraya Rizna Afrijal
Universitas Simalungun, Indonesia; sorayarizna@gmail.com

1. INTRODUCTION

Bureaucratic reform is a strategic government agenda to build effective, accountable, transparent, and integrity-based governance. In the context of eradicating corruption, bureaucratic reform is not only aimed at improving regulations and administrative procedures, but also at changing the work culture and behavior of civil servants. One of the main instruments of this policy is the development of Integrity Zones (ZI) towards Corruption-Free Areas (WBK) and Clean and Serving Bureaucracy Areas

(WBBM). Through the development of ZI, each work unit is encouraged to develop systems capable of preventing corruption while improving the quality of public services.

The development of the ZI currently refers to Regulation of the Minister of Administrative and Bureaucratic Reform Number 90 of 2021, as amended by Regulation of the Minister of Administrative and Bureaucratic Reform Number 5 of 2024. This policy positions integrity development as a process of organizational change through six areas of change: change management, governance arrangements, human resource management arrangements for civil servants, strengthening accountability, strengthening oversight, and improving the quality of public services. Therefore, the success of ZI development is not solely determined by the fulfillment of administrative documents or indicators, but also by the organization's ability to change work systems, civil servant behavior, and institutional culture in a sustainable manner.

This issue is becoming increasingly important within the judicial system. Courts are institutions that hold a strategic position in providing justice, legal certainty, and protection to the public. Therefore, the integrity of judges and judicial officials, transparency of service, effective oversight, and adherence to the code of ethics and discipline are inseparable elements of the quality of the administration of judicial power. Violations of integrity within the judiciary have broader implications than mere administrative violations because they can undermine public trust in the independence and objectivity of the judicial process.

The Supreme Court has strengthened the development of Integrity Zones within the judiciary through the Decree of the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court Number 58/KMA/SK/III/2019 concerning Guidelines for the Development of Integrity Zones Towards a Corruption-Free Area and a Clean and Serving Bureaucratic Area within the Supreme Court and its Subordinate Judicial Bodies. This policy demonstrates that Integrity Zone development is part of the institutional agenda to create a clean, professional, transparent, accountable, and service-oriented judiciary. Therefore, Integrity Zone development within the courts should not be understood merely as a program to obtain the WBK predicate, but as an institutional transformation mechanism aimed at building a culture of integrity.

Within this framework, the Simalungun District Court is one of the work units that has implemented the development of the ZI as part of efforts to improve the quality of governance and judicial services. Various ZI development instruments have been implemented through improvements in governance, service quality enhancements, utilization of information technology, strengthening oversight, human resource management, and various other reform programs. However, despite the ZI development and efforts to fulfill various documents and indicators, the Simalungun District Court has not yet succeeded in achieving the WBK (Wide-Bound) status.

This situation indicates a more fundamental problem than mere administrative incompleteness. Conceptually, this phenomenon can be understood as compliance without transformation, a situation where an organization has attempted to meet the requirements, documents, and indicators for ZI development, but these changes have not been fully accompanied by transformation in the behavior, work culture, and integrity of its personnel. In other words, there is a potential gap between compliance with ZI development instruments and transformation of organizational culture. This phenomenon is one of the main issues that needs to be examined in ZI development at the Simalungun District Court.

This issue is increasingly relevant because, based on the empirical conditions that are the focus of the research, disciplinary violations by officers were still found during the assessment period. The existence of these violations is a crucial factor because officer integrity and compliance are essential components of the assessment of ZI development. Therefore, the completeness of documents and the implementation of ZI programs do not automatically result in WBK predicate if, at the same time, there is still officer behavior that contradicts the principles of integrity, discipline, and good governance. This condition shows that ZI development must be assessed based on the conformity between the system developed and the actual behavior of officers in carrying out their duties.

Beyond disciplinary violations, the challenges of ZI development also relate to the level of understanding and involvement of all officials. ZI development will struggle to produce substantive

change if it is understood solely as the responsibility of the ZI development team or work unit leaders. Every judge and official must understand that integrity is part of their professional obligations and institutional ethics. Therefore, changes to work culture must be achieved through internalizing integrity values, strengthening leadership role models, consistent oversight, enforcing discipline, and ongoing evaluation.

This situation indicates a research gap in the study of ZI development. Normatively, government regulations and Supreme Court policies have provided a relatively clear framework for ZI development, assessment indicators, strengthened oversight, and improved service quality. However, empirically, the existence of this regulatory framework has not always resulted in changes in organizational culture and apparatus behavior. Therefore, the question that needs to be answered is not only whether ZI development has been implemented, but also why the fulfillment of various ZI development instruments has not resulted in adequate integrity transformation, thus failing to achieve the WBK predicate.

This research is novel because it not only examines the development of ZI from the aspect of regulatory compliance and administrative indicators, but also analyzes the gap between administrative compliance and substantive transformation in judicial work units. The case of the Simalungun District Court is important because it shows that ZI development can proceed institutionally, but still faces issues of integrity and discipline of the apparatus that directly impact the success of obtaining the WBK predicate. In addition, this study uses empirical data from field interviews in 2026 and analyzes it within the latest regulatory framework, specifically PermenPANRB Number 5 of 2024. Thus, this study does not stop at the administrative evaluation of ZI development, but seeks to explain the relationship between apparatus integrity, the effectiveness of ZI development, and the success of achieving WBK.

From an institutional development perspective, the success of the ZI should be reflected in tangible changes in apparatus behavior, effective oversight, compliance with discipline, transparency of service delivery, and increased public trust. The WBK (Corruption-Free, Non-Corruption-Free, and Non-Corruption-Free) designation is ultimately not an administrative goal, but rather an indicator that a work unit has established systems and an organizational culture capable of preventing corruption and providing clean and quality public services. Therefore, failure to achieve the WBK designation should be viewed as an evaluation tool to identify system weaknesses and formulate appropriate improvement strategies.

In the context of the Simalungun District Court, this strategy needs to be directed at strengthening the integrity of its personnel, preventing and enforcing discipline, strengthening internal oversight, increasing understanding of ZI development, strengthening leadership exemplary behavior, and improving governance and service quality. This strategy must be implemented sustainably so that ZI development does not stop at fulfilling documents but rather produces measurable changes in work culture that can be felt by the justice-seeking public.

Based on the above description, the problems in ZI development at the Simalungun District Court are not only related to the failure to obtain WBK status, but also to the effectiveness of institutional transformation in building integrity. Therefore, this research is important to analyze the implementation of ZI development, identify factors that have contributed to the failure to achieve WBK status, and formulate strategies that can strengthen ZI development substantively and sustainably.

Based on this background, the research raises the following problems: How is the implementation of the development of the Integrity Zone in realizing a Corruption-Free Area in the Simalungun District Court?; What factors cause the development of the Integrity Zone in the Simalungun District Court to not yet succeed in obtaining the title of Corruption-Free Area, especially in relation to the integrity and discipline of the apparatus?; What strategies can the Simalungun District Court implement to increase the success of the development of the Integrity Zone towards a Corruption-Free Area substantively and sustainably?

2. METHODS

This study uses an empirical juridical method with a descriptive-analytical nature to examine the development of the Integrity Zone (ZI) towards a Corruption-Free Zone (WBK) at the Simalungun District Court through the relationship between legal norms and their implementation in practice (Soekanto, 1986). The research approach includes a statute approach and a conceptual approach to analyze relevant legal provisions and concepts (Ibrahim, 2008). Primary data were obtained through interviews and observations, while secondary data were obtained through a literature study of primary, secondary, and tertiary legal materials (Sunggono, 2001). Informants were selected by purposive sampling, namely Ginting, Monica, Herawaty, Adrianto, and Sebayang, based on their involvement, knowledge, and experience in the implementation of ZI, WBK evaluation, and aspects of apparatus integrity. Soerjono Soekanto's Theory of Legal Effectiveness is operationalized through legal factors, law enforcement, facilities, society, and culture to identify obstacles to ZI implementation (Soekanto, 1986). Data validity was strengthened through source triangulation by comparing interview results, observations, and documents. Data were analyzed qualitatively to formulate barriers and strategies for strengthening ZI towards WBK.

3. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Stages and Mechanisms for Building an Integrity Zone at the Simalungun District Court

A. Legal Basis and Policy for the Development of an Integrity Zone at the Simalungun District Court

The development of the Integrity Zone (ZI) at the Simalungun District Court is part of bureaucratic reform aimed at realizing a clean, effective, transparent, accountable, and service-oriented organization. This policy is based on Presidential Regulation Number 81 of 2010 concerning the Grand Design of Bureaucratic Reform 2010–2025, which places institutional change, governance, human resources, and public services as the main components of bureaucratic reform (Government of the Republic of Indonesia, 2010). In the judicial environment, the development of the ZI has a special character because the court not only carries out administrative functions, but also judicial powers related to the protection of rights, legal certainty, and public access to justice. Therefore, judicial integrity must be realized through organizational governance, apparatus discipline, transparency, accountability, supervision, and professional service.

Normatively, the development and evaluation of the ZI is guided by Regulation of the Minister of Administrative and Bureaucratic Reform (PermenPANRB) Number 90 of 2021 as amended by Regulation of the Minister of Administrative and Bureaucratic Reform (PermenPANRB) Number 5 of 2024, while in the Supreme Court it is strengthened through KMA Number 58/KMA/SK/III/2019 (Ministry of PANRB, 2021, 2024; Supreme Court of the Republic of Indonesia, 2019). The development of the ZI encompasses six areas of change: change management, governance arrangements, human resource management arrangements, strengthening accountability, strengthening oversight, and improving the quality of public services (Ministry of PANRB, 2021). These six areas essentially constitute a single organizational change. Therefore, the success of the ZI cannot be measured solely by the completeness of documents and evidence, but must be evident in changes in apparatus behavior, certainty of work processes, effectiveness of supervision, quality of service, and increased public trust. This orientation is in line with Law Number 28 of 1999 concerning the principles of clean state administration and Law Number 20 of 2001 concerning the eradication of criminal acts of corruption which places prevention as an important part in eradicating corruption (Republic of Indonesia, 1999, 2001).

In its implementation, the Simalungun District Court has developed various ZI instruments through the formation of teams, the implementation of the six-area change program, strengthening supervision, and developing services such as PTSP, Posbakum, e-Court, information services, and complaints. However, research results indicate that this implementation has not fully resulted in substantive transformation. The main problem lies in the gap between administrative compliance and

organizational change (transformation). Interview results indicate that disciplinary violations by civil servants are one of the most crucial factors influencing the failure to obtain the WBK predicate in the previous assessment period (Ginting, 2026; Sebayang, 2026). These findings indicate that the existence of an integrity pact and ZI documents will not be effective if they are not followed by consistent behavior by civil servants in carrying out their duties.

In addition to integrity and discipline issues, limited human resources are also a barrier. Research indicates that the need for substitute clerks will reach 10 people based on the 2025 needs analysis, while only two will be available in 2026. This situation increases the workload and has the potential to make ZI development an additional task beyond the main task (Herawaty, 2026; Ginting, 2026). From a legal effectiveness perspective, these limited apparatus and facilities affect the ability of norms to work effectively in practice (Soekanto, 1986).

Another issue is the tendency toward an administrative burden in fulfilling e-evidence. Monica (2026) points out that some documents are still prepared primarily to meet the needs of the Financial Services Authority (LKE), while Adrianto (2026) highlights the burden of providing evidence, which can be time-consuming for officials. This situation indicates the risk of compliance without transformation, where organizations are more focused on proving that programs have been implemented than ensuring that the programs truly change the work culture. Therefore, ZI development needs to be guided by the principle of "evidence follows reform," meaning that evidence must be evidence of real change, not an end in itself.

Thus, the development of ZI at the Simalungun District Court needs to be directed from the paradigm of "fulfilling evidence to obtain WBK" to "making changes to prove readiness to obtain WBK." The strengthening strategy must prioritize strengthening the integrity and discipline of the apparatus, structuring human resources and workloads, risk-based supervision, simplifying administrative burdens, and outcome-based evaluation. With this approach, WBK is no longer positioned as an administrative target, but rather as a consequence of successfully building an organizational culture that is imbued with integrity, professionalism, accountability, and oriented towards public service.

B. Stages of Development of the Integrity Zone at the Simalungun District Court

Based on Regulation of the Minister of Administrative and Bureaucratic Reform (PermenPANRB) Number 90 of 2021, the development of an Integrity Zone (ZI) towards a Corruption-Free Zone (WBK) is implemented through four stages: launch, development, proposal, and determination and evaluation (Ministry of Administrative and Bureaucratic Reform of the Republic of Indonesia, 2021). At the Simalungun District Court (PN), the launch stage was realized through the signing of an integrity pact and a joint declaration by the Chief Justice, judges, and all employees as a form of initial commitment to the ZI development. This commitment was then strengthened through launch activities involving elements of the Simalungun Regency Regional Leadership Coordination Forum (Forkopimda) in 2021 and publication through the installation of banners and court social media. Although declarative in nature, the launch has a significant meaning because it serves as a moral and organizational basis for all officials to implement the principle of integrity consistently and sustainably.

The development phase is the core of ZI implementation because the declared commitments must be translated into concrete changes across six areas of change. The Simalungun District Court implements this through the formation of a ZI Development Working Team, the division of responsibilities based on areas of change, the preparation of work plans, and the implementation of periodic self-assessments through Evaluation Worksheets. Therefore, ZI development should not stop at fulfilling administrative documents, but must also foster a work culture that reflects integrity in the behavior of each apparatus. This view aligns with the results of interviews that emphasized that ZI should not be positioned merely as a slogan or administrative requirement, because the behavior of a small number of apparatus that does not reflect the value of integrity can affect public perception of the institution's credibility as a whole (Monica, 2026).

After construction is underway, the next stage is the proposal. In the general judicial environment, work unit proposals are conducted through a tiered assessment mechanism, starting with evaluators at the high court level, through the Supreme Court Internal Assessment Team, which is implemented by the Supreme Court Supervisory Agency, and finally through the National Assessment Team (TPN) in accordance with the mechanism stipulated in Regulation of the Minister of Administrative and Bureaucratic Reform (PermenPANRB) Number 90 of 2021. The Simalungun District Court has been proposed several times to participate in the assessment as a work unit candidate for the WBK predicate. This demonstrates the ongoing process of meeting ZI development standards while also opening up room for evaluation of any remaining shortcomings in its implementation.

The final stage is determination and evaluation, which is the assessment process to ensure that the documents and supporting evidence submitted truly reflect the conditions and practices occurring in the work unit. The assessment is not solely oriented towards administrative completeness, but also considers program implementation, consistency of change, and service outcomes perceived by the public (Ministry of Administrative and Bureaucratic Reform of the Republic of Indonesia, 2021). During the 2021–2025 period, the Simalungun District Court continuously implemented the ZI development, but has not yet succeeded in obtaining the WBK predicate. According to the Head of the Simalungun District Court, the evaluation process has a high level of objectivity because it assesses not only the supporting evidence uploaded through the ZI PMP application, but also the conformity between documents and actual implementation in the field. Thus, the failure to obtain the WBK predicate indicates that the success of ZI development is largely determined by the quality of supporting evidence, the consistency of work program implementation, and the ability of all officials to sustain changes (Ginting, 2026). This condition shows that the development of ZI at the Simalungun District Court still requires strengthening, particularly in ensuring that bureaucratic reform does not stop at the administrative aspect, but produces organizational changes that are measurable, consistent, and truly felt by the community.

C. Implementation of Six Areas of Change in the Development of Integrity Zones

a. Change Management (Area 1)

Change management is the primary foundation for developing the Integrity Zone (ZI) because it is aimed at creating systematic and sustainable changes to the work mechanisms, mindset, and culture of the civil service. These changes are aimed at developing human resources that are adaptive, innovative, responsive, professional, and possess integrity (Ministry of Administrative and Bureaucratic Reform of the Republic of Indonesia, 2021). This area's position is strategic because the success of the other five areas of change is fundamentally dependent on the quality of changes in civil service behavior. Therefore, the success of ZI development cannot be measured solely by the availability of documents, decisions, or work programs, but primarily by the extent to which integrity values have become part of daily work behavior.

At the Simalungun District Court (PN), change management is realized through several main instruments, namely the signing of an Integrity Pact by the Chief Justice, Judges, and all employees, which is carried out periodically; the formation of a ZI Development Working Team based on the decision of the Chief Justice of the Simalungun District Court; and the appointment of agents of change from among employees who are deemed to have integrity and the ability to be drivers of change. In addition, internalization of integrity values is carried out through coordination meetings, morning and afternoon roll calls, leadership briefings, and the delivery of anti-corruption commitments to the public through information media placed in the court service area.

Although various instruments are available, the fundamental problem in Area 1 lies in the gap between formal commitment and the internalization of integrity values. Signing an Integrity Pact can serve as administrative evidence of commitment, but it does not in itself prove that these values have become part of the organization's character and culture. In this context, integrity must be understood as a behavioral quality reflected in decision-making, task execution, service delivery, adherence to the

code of ethics, and the courage to reject all forms of intervention or gratification. Therefore, if change management instruments stop at fulfilling documents, then ZI development risks experiencing compliance without transformation, namely administrative compliance without substantive organizational change.

These findings are reinforced by the informant's perspective, which essentially emphasizes that integrity must be inherent in every employee and cannot be achieved solely through administrative instruments (Adrianto, 2026). This view suggests that establishing a culture of integrity requires a more in-depth process than simply declaring it. Organizations must be able to create a work environment that rewards behavior with integrity while simultaneously imposing firm consequences for behavior that contradicts integrity values.

The next weakness is seen in the suboptimal role of agents of change. Conceptually, change agents should function as a liaison between leadership policies and changes in employee behavior, including through role models, informal communication, education, and mentoring. However, at the Simalungun District Court, change agents still face time constraints because they must simultaneously carry out their respective core duties and functions. As a result, the change agent's function tends to be more visible in administrative aspects than as a driver of cultural transformation. This situation suggests that the appointment of change agents must be accompanied by the provision of clear space, targets, performance indicators, and institutional support so that their role does not stop at formal status (Herawaty, 2026).

Another issue is the lack of objective measurement of the exemplary leadership as role models. While exemplary leadership is indeed a crucial factor in building organizational culture, without clear behavioral and performance indicators, its impact on staff change is difficult to evaluate. Furthermore, there remains resistance from some employees accustomed to old work patterns. This resistance is not always overt but can be seen in low participation, reluctance to follow new procedures, or a lack of initiative in supporting the ZI program. Thus, Area 1 demonstrates that the primary challenge for the Simalungun District Court is no longer building formal change management tools, but rather ensuring that these tools produce consistent behavioral change.

b. Administrative Arrangement (Area 2)

Governance is directed at building effective, efficient, and measurable work systems, processes, and procedures, supported by the use of information technology (Ministry of Administrative and Bureaucratic Reform of the Republic of Indonesia, 2021). In its implementation, the Simalungun District Court has utilized various digital instruments, including the Case Tracking Information System (SIPP), e-Court, e-Berpadu, and the Electronic-Based Government System (SPBE), and implemented SOPs and service standards ranging from case registration to decision minutes and filing. SIPP provides public access to monitor case progress, e-Court supports electronic case administration, while e-Berpadu strengthens the integration of criminal case administration between agencies. However, the availability of technology does not automatically indicate effective governance, as there is still a gap between the available systems and the quality of their utilization. Limited digital literacy and telecommunications infrastructure in some jurisdictions means that some justice seekers still rely on face-to-face services. Therefore, optimizing digitalization needs to be accompanied by improvements in apparatus capabilities and public access.

Other issues relate to data accuracy and consistent procedural implementation. Information updates in the SIPP are not yet fully real-time, so if data updates are delayed or do not reflect actual case conditions, public trust in digital services may decline. Similarly, increasing case volumes and staff workloads can impact the consistency of SOPs and service standards. Under high workloads, there is a risk that administrative procedures will not be implemented optimally in order to achieve speedy completion. This situation demonstrates that the effectiveness of governance is determined not only by the availability of applications and SOPs, but also by staff discipline, adequate human resources, data

accuracy, and the organization's ability to maintain compliance with procedures under normal circumstances and work pressures.

Furthermore, the connection between SIPP and the public satisfaction measurement instrument through the si-SUPER application has not been fully integrated, so that information regarding complaints and user experiences has not optimally become the basis for improving governance. In fact, judicial modernization must produce services that are increasingly responsive, transparent, and oriented to the needs of the community, not simply the digitization of administrative processes (Supreme Court of the Republic of Indonesia, 2025). Thus, the challenge in Area 2 no longer lies in the lack of technology, but rather in the quality of utilization, system integration, data accuracy, digital literacy, and consistent implementation of SOPs. From the perspective of ZI development, new governance arrangements can be considered effective if technology truly simplifies processes, reduces unnecessary interactions, strengthens transparency, and produces services that are faster, more accurate, and more trustworthy to the public.

c. Human Resource Management System Arrangement (Area 3)

The human resource management system is aimed at developing a professional apparatus through transparent, competency-based, performance-based, and disciplined human resource management (Ministry of Administrative and Bureaucratic Reform of the Republic of Indonesia, 2021). This area is directly related to building integrity, as institutional quality is largely determined by the quality of the individuals performing judicial functions.

The Simalungun District Court has implemented civil servant performance assessments through Employee Performance Targets (SKP) and an e-performance application integrated with the national civil service system. Performance assessment results are used as a consideration in promotions, transfers, and awards. Competency development is also carried out through various training courses organized by the Supreme Court and the Medan High Court. In addition to technical judicial competencies, employees also receive training related to service and civil service ethics.

Competency development is increasingly important because civil servant professionalism is part of the institutional performance measurement. In a competency-based personnel system, capacity development should not be viewed as an additional activity, but rather as an organizational investment to improve the quality of service and civil servant integrity. However, the issues encountered at the Simalungun District Court indicate that the fulfillment of HR management instruments is not fully proportional to the quality of civil servant discipline and behavior.

This is reflected, among other things, in the number of judges and civil servants who received disciplinary action in the past two years. In fact, this situation was cited as one of the factors preventing the Simalungun District Court from continuing the ZI assessment process in 2024 and 2025, reaching the Ministry of Administrative and Bureaucratic Reform's assessment stage (Ginting, 2026). This finding is significant because it demonstrates that discipline is not merely an individual employee issue but has consequences for the credibility and integrity assessment of the organization as a whole.

Limited human resources are also a structural issue. Based on an analysis of staffing needs for 2025, the need for substitute clerks reached 10, while in 2026 only two were available. This imbalance has direct implications for the workload, the quality of case administration, and the space available for staff to participate in ZI development activities. Under high workloads, non-routine integrity programs can potentially be positioned as additional work, thus under-recognizing the need for optimal attention.

Beyond quantity, competency development also needs to be expanded. Training focused on judicial and administrative techniques needs to be supplemented with competencies relevant to the challenges of modern organizations, such as digital literacy, risk management, public communication, gratification control, conflicts of interest, and complaint handling. Thus, the Area 3 issue indicates that the Simalungun District Court faces two interrelated challenges: limited structural human resource capacity and suboptimal internalization of discipline and integrity competencies.

d. Strengthening Performance Accountability (Area 4)

Strengthening performance accountability aims to ensure that every resource and authority used by an organization is accountable through measurable planning, implementation, measurement, and performance reporting (Ministry of Administrative and Bureaucratic Reform of the Republic of Indonesia, 2021). In judicial institutions, accountability should not only be interpreted as the ability to resolve a certain number of cases, but must also encompass the quality of the process, compliance with the law, service integrity, and public trust.

The Simalungun District Court has compiled a LKjIP (Accounting Standards for Implementation of Justice), established Key Performance Indicators (KPI), and conducted periodic performance evaluations. Performance planning is aligned with the Supreme Court's Strategic Plan and translated into work unit targets. These periodic evaluations essentially provide the accountability framework necessary to measure organizational performance (Supreme Court of the Republic of Indonesia, 2025).

The problem is that a results-based performance culture has not been fully internalized. Some officials still tend to view accountability as merely meeting quantitative targets and completing documentation. In fact, accountability should serve as an instrument for assessing whether organizational resources are truly generating benefits and providing quality services. Therefore, the LKjIP should not be merely an administrative report, but rather an evaluation instrument for identifying weaknesses and formulating corrective actions.

Another weakness is the suboptimal measurement of the integrity dimension within the KPI. If indicators focus primarily on the number of cases resolved, there is a risk that the quality of the process and the integrity of case resolution will receive insufficient weight. From a public accountability perspective, public officials are required not only to respond to criticism as it arises but also to anticipate potential problems through proactive organizational strategies (Marwiyah, 2023). Therefore, the Simalungun District Court's accountability needs to be developed from an output-oriented model to one that also assesses the quality, integrity, and impact of services.

External challenges also cannot be ignored. Court decisions do not always meet the expectations of all parties. Those who disagree with a decision can resort to legal remedies or express criticism through social media. According to informants, this pressure is part of the external dynamics facing the court, but it should not affect the independence of judges in producing decisions that are legally certain, beneficial, and just (Ginting, 2026). Thus, the challenge of accountability does not mean that the court must meet all public demands, but rather ensures that every decision is legally, ethically, and institutionally accountable.

e. Strengthening Supervision (Area 5)

Strengthening oversight is the area most directly linked to corruption prevention, encompassing the control of gratification, SPIP (Information Processing System), public complaints, the Whistleblowing System, and conflict of interest management (Ministry of Administrative and Bureaucratic Reform of the Republic of Indonesia, 2021). Therefore, the effectiveness of this area determines an organization's ability to identify and prevent potential irregularities before they develop into violations.

The Simalungun District Court has established a Gratification Control Unit and provided a complaint mechanism through the Whistleblowing System and the Supreme Court's SIWAS. The mandatory reporting of LHKPN (State Officials) and LHKASN (State Officials) has also been implemented as part of its transparency and internal oversight mechanisms. Formally, these oversight tools demonstrate that the Simalungun District Court has the necessary instruments to establish a corruption prevention system.

However, the main issue lies in the effectiveness of these oversight instruments. Public utilization of the Whistleblowing System remains relatively low. This low utilization may indicate suboptimal public awareness, but it may also reflect ongoing concerns among both the public and employees regarding confidentiality and whistleblower protection. If whistleblowers perceive that reporting could

have social, professional, or career consequences, the formally established whistleblowing system will not function optimally.

Another weakness is the lack of full integration of SPIP with risk management. Supervision that only begins after a complaint arises tends to be reactive. Conversely, ZI development requires supervision capable of mapping vulnerable points, identifying potential conflicts of interest, and mitigating them before violations occur. Therefore, the orientation of supervision needs to shift from enforcement of violations to risk-based prevention.

The issue of conflicts of interest is also a significant concern. Conflicts of interest can stem from authority, dual positions, affiliations, gratuities, weaknesses in organizational systems, or personal interests. These various sources demonstrate that conflicts of interest do not always manifest as overt violations, but can develop from situations that appear administratively ordinary but have the potential to affect the objectivity of decision-making (Syauket et al., 2023). Therefore, controlling conflicts of interest requires the understanding and courage of officials to identify and disclose potential conflicts early.

Thus, Area 5 demonstrates that the Simalungun District Court has a supervisory architecture in place, but still faces challenges in terms of utilization, whistleblower protection, risk management integration, and internalization of conflict of interest controls. These weaknesses are crucial because supervisory effectiveness is an indicator directly related to the primary objectives of ZI development, namely preventing corruption and building public trust.

f. Improving the Quality of Public Services (Area 6)

Improving the quality of public services is a concrete measure of the success of ZI development because it is directly related to the public's experience as service users (Ministry of Administrative and Bureaucratic Reform, 2021). The Simalungun District Court has developed various innovations, such as e-Pelita, Brodi, si AYA, PTSP Online, e-Court, a technology-based queuing system, and Posbakum, as well as implementing SKM and SPAK. However, the existence of innovations does not fully guarantee service quality due to limited digital literacy, especially among residents in certain areas, and suboptimal follow-up of survey results. As stated by Monica (2026), public perception of services is influenced by direct experience, which is not fully reflected in survey instruments. Similarly, the limited reach of Posbakum indicates that the availability of services does not always mean equal access. Therefore, digitalization must be positioned as an instrument to expand access to justice, not merely an administrative indicator of ZI development.

Based on the analysis of the six areas of change, the problem of ZI development in the Simalungun District Court lies not in the absence of policies, programs, or formal instruments, but rather in the gap between administrative compliance and substantive change (transformation). Area 1 still faces issues of internalization of integrity; Area 2 faces constraints on access, accuracy, and system integration; Area 3 is related to discipline and limited human resources; Area 4 still tends to be oriented towards meeting administrative targets; Area 5 requires strengthening supervision and risk management; while Area 6 faces issues of equal access and follow-up of community evaluation results. Thus, ZI instruments are basically available, but not all of them have resulted in consistent changes in behavior, work processes, and service quality.

The findings indicate that the Simalungun District Court is in a state of "instruments are available, but transformation has not been fully consolidated." From a bureaucratic reform perspective, documents, applications, SOPs, and surveys are the means, while apparatus integrity, prevention of irregularities, accountability, service quality, and public trust are the ends. Therefore, the failure to obtain the WBK predicate does not merely indicate administrative deficiencies, but reflects the persistence of implementation gaps that need to be continuously addressed. The success of ZI requires integration between exemplary leadership, apparatus discipline, human resource adequacy, system effectiveness, supervision, accountability, and community experience, so that ZI development truly moves from administrative compliance to organizational cultural transformation.

D. The Development of an Integrity Zone at the Simalungun District Court Has Not Yet Succeeded in Achieving the Status of a Corruption-Free Area

The failure of the Simalungun District Court to obtain the WBK predicate does not indicate a total failure of ZI development, but rather demonstrates a gap between the fulfillment of formal instruments and the effectiveness of substantive implementation. Based on the results of research and analysis of Soerjono Soekanto's Theory of Legal Effectiveness, internal factors include limitations in the quantity and capacity of human resources, limited budget and infrastructure, violations of apparatus discipline, gaps between documents and practices, and a lack of uniform understanding of ZI (Soekanto, 1986). Ginting (2026) and Herawaty (2026) indicate that limited personnel cause the workload and tasks of ZI development to be carried out simultaneously with the main functions of the judiciary. This condition is exacerbated by limited facilities and budget, including adjustments to spatial planning and the need for digital infrastructure. The factor that most directly affects ZI achievement is disciplinary violations by ASN and judges; Ginting (2026) and Sebayang (2026) explain that the presence of apparatus receiving disciplinary sanctions was one of the factors that hampered ZI proposals in the previous period. Furthermore, Monica (2026) and Adrianto (2026) revealed a tendency for some documents to be prepared to meet the needs of financial institutions (LKE) and the high burden of providing evidence. This situation indicates a formal compliance risk, when administrative completeness does not fully reflect changes in work behavior and culture.

External factors also influence the success of ZI development, including public perception of the courts, unequal digital literacy and utilization of digital services, and suboptimal institutional development and synergy. Dissatisfaction with decisions can develop into negative perceptions through social media, while the utilization of SIPP, e-Court, e-Berpadu, and complaint channels is still influenced by the public's ability to access technology. Therefore, service success cannot be judged solely on system availability, but also on accessibility and user experience. Monica (2026) emphasized the need for more comprehensive evaluation and correction before further proposals, while Herawaty (2026) emphasized the importance of exemplary leadership and changes in work culture. Nevertheless, the Simalungun District Court has supporting capital in the form of leadership commitment, support from Supreme Court policies, and increased public awareness in conducting oversight. From Soekanto's perspective (1986), these conditions demonstrate that legal effectiveness is determined not only by the substance of norms, but also by law enforcement officials, facilities, society, and legal culture.

Thus, there is a gap between das sollen and das sein: normatively, ZI development requires an organization with integrity, discipline, professionalism, transparency, accountability, and service-oriented, while empirically, problems are still found in human resources, facilities, discipline, administrative burdens, work culture, supervision, and public perception. Therefore, ZI development needs to be directed from an evidence-fulfilling approach to substantive change, by prioritizing strengthening the integrity and discipline of the apparatus, structuring human resources and workloads, risk-based supervision, increasing capacity and facilities, and outcome-based evaluation. Evidence must be a consequence of existing governance, not the goal of ZI development. With this approach, the WBK predicate is no longer positioned as an administrative target, but as a consequence of the formation of a work culture with integrity, professionalism, accountability, transparency, and oriented towards quality public service (Supreme Court of the Republic of Indonesia, 2025).

4. CONCLUSION

The stages and mechanisms for developing the Integrity Zone (ZI) at the Simalungun District Court confirm that normatively and institutionally, the development of the ZI has been supported by an adequate legal framework and has been implemented through the stages of launching, developing, proposing, and evaluating, oriented towards six areas of change. However, the existence of various policies, instruments, systems, and service innovations has not been fully able to drive real organizational change, so that the Simalungun District Court has not succeeded in obtaining the title of

Corruption-Free Zone (WBK). This condition is influenced by a number of interrelated issues, including limitations in the number and competence of human resources, budget and facilities and infrastructure limitations, ongoing issues with apparatus discipline, an imbalance between document fulfillment and its implementation in work activities, and a lack of uniform understanding and appreciation of integrity values within the organization. In addition, external factors such as public perception, gaps in digital literacy and access, low participation in complaint mechanisms, and less than optimal guidance and synergy with related institutions also influence the achievement of ZI development. Thus, the main obstacle lies not in the absence of ZI development tools, but rather in the suboptimal integration of these tools into the work culture and organizational systems on a sustainable basis. Therefore, strengthening ZI development in the future needs to be directed at substantive changes through increasing the integrity and discipline of the apparatus, strengthening human resource capacity, optimizing risk-based supervision, improving governance and technology utilization, strengthening performance accountability, and improving the quality and equality of access to public services, so that the WBK predicate can be the result of successful organizational transformation, not just administrative achievements.

REFERENCES

Asshiddiqie, Jimly. (2005). The Indonesian Constitution and Constitutionalism. Constitution Press.

Asshiddiqie, Jimly. (2006). Introduction to constitutional law. Rajawali Pers.

Fuady, Munir. (2011). Theory of the modern legal state (rechtsstaat). Refika Aditama.

Ibrahim, Johnny. (2008). Normative legal research theory and methodology. Bayumedia Publishing.

Kansil, (1989). Introduction to Indonesian law and legal system. Balai Pustaka.

Ministry of Administrative and Bureaucratic Reform of the Republic of Indonesia. (2021). Regulation of the Minister of Administrative and Bureaucratic Reform Number 90 of 2021 concerning the development and evaluation of integrity zones towards corruption-free areas and clean and serving bureaucratic areas in government agencies.

Ministry of Administrative and Bureaucratic Reform of the Republic of Indonesia. (2024). Regulation of the Minister of Administrative and Bureaucratic Reform Number 5 of 2024 concerning amendments to Regulation of the Minister of Administrative and Bureaucratic Reform Number 90 of 2021 concerning the development and evaluation of integrity zones towards corruption-free areas and clean and serving bureaucratic areas in government agencies.

Lubis, Mhd. Ansor, Hera Fauziah Lubis, & Rizkan Zulyadi. (2024). Introduction to state science: Complete with classical to modern forms of state and government. Eureka Media Aksara. ISBN 978-623-120-465-3.

Lubis, Mhd. Ansor. (2025). PTUN procedural law: Administrative dispute mechanisms, concepts, theories and decisions. Eureka Media Aksara.

Supreme Court of the Republic of Indonesia. (2019). Decree of the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the Republic of Indonesia Number 58/KMA/SK/III/2019 concerning guidelines for developing an integrity zone towards a corruption-free area (WBK) and a clean and serving bureaucratic area (WBBM) at the Supreme Court and its subordinate judicial bodies.

Supreme Court of the Republic of Indonesia. (2025). Strategic plan of the Supreme Court of the Republic of Indonesia 2025–2029. Supreme Court of the Republic of Indonesia.

Margono. (2019). The principles of justice, utility, and legal certainty in judges' decisions. Sinar Grafika.

Marwiyah, S. (2023). Strategies for improving the quality of public services in the digital era. Mitra Ilmu.

Naldo, RAC, & Pasaribu, MPJ (2023). Strict liability of the corporation causes the fires of plantation land to pose a serious threat. International Journal of Humanities Education and Social Sciences, 2(4)

Prakoso, A. (2023). Understanding the law. LaksBang Justitia.

Rahardjo, Sacipto. (1979). Law and society. Space.

Rahardjo, S. (2009). Other sides of law in Indonesia. Kompas.

Republic of Indonesia. (1945). The 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia.
Republic of Indonesia. (1999). Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 28 of 1999 concerning state administration that is clean and free from corruption, collusion, and nepotism.
Republic of Indonesia. (2001). Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 20 of 2001 concerning amendments to Law Number 31 of 1999 concerning the eradication of criminal acts of corruption.
Republic of Indonesia. (2009a). Law Number 48 of 2009 concerning judicial power.
Republic of Indonesia. (2009b). Law Number 49 of 2009 concerning the second amendment to Law Number 2 of 1986 concerning general courts.
Republic of Indonesia. (2009c). Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 25 of 2009 concerning public services.
Republic of Indonesia. (2010). Presidential Regulation of the Republic of Indonesia Number 81 of 2010 concerning the Grand Design of Bureaucratic Reform 2010–2025.
Republic of Indonesia. (2021). Regulation of the Minister of Administrative and Bureaucratic Reform Number 90 of 2021 concerning the development and evaluation of integrity zones towards corruption-free areas and clean and serving bureaucratic areas in government agencies.
Republic of Indonesia. (2024). Regulation of the Minister of Administrative and Bureaucratic Reform Number 5 of 2024 concerning amendments to Regulation of the Minister of Administrative and Bureaucratic Reform Number 90 of 2021 concerning the development and evaluation of integrity zones towards corruption-free areas and clean and serving bureaucratic areas in government agencies.
Rahardjo, Satjipto. (1979). Law and society. Angkasa.
Rahardjo, Satjipto. (2009). Other sides of law in Indonesia. Kompas.
Soekanto, Soerjono. (1986). Introduction to legal research. University of Indonesia Press.
Sunggono, Bambang. (2001). Legal research methods: An introduction. RajaGrafindo Persada.
Yuhelson. (2017). Introduction to legal science. Ideas Publishing.
Yuniza, Mega E., et al. (2025). Administrative Court Law. Rajawali Press.

.