SIMBUR CAHAYA
Fakultas Hukum Universitas Sriwijaya
Alamat Redaksi: Fakultas Hukum Universitas Sriwijaya, Jalan Srijaya Negara, Bukit Besar, Palembang, Sumatera Selatan 30139, Indonesia.
Telepon: +62711-580063 Fax: +62711-581179
E-mail: simburcahaya@fh.unsri.ac.id
Website: http://journal.fh.unsri.ac.id/simburcahaya
ISSN : 1410-0614
E-ISSN : 2684-9941

Strengthening The Authority Of The Indonesian Ombudsman In The Public Service Sector

Saut P. Panjaitan[a]

[a] Fakultas Hukum, Universitas Sriwijaya, Indonesia, Email: ibaim201@gmail.com

Informasi Artikel

Histori Artikel:
Diterima : 14-09-2022
Direvisi : 15-11-2022
Disetujui : 20-11-2022
Diterbitkan : 31-12-2022

Kata Kunci:
Pelayanan Publik;
Penguatan Kewenangan;
Ombudsman.

DOI:
10.28946/sc.v29i2.2149

Abstrak

Di era disrupsi, sebagai akibat dari kemajuan teknologi komunikasi dan informasi, menyebabkan terjadi gangguan dalam penyelenggaraan pemerintahan, yang awalnya berbasis pada paradigma monopolik dan kekuasaan, menjadi paradigma pelayanan publik (*public services*) yang berbasis pada prinsip *good governance* melalui pelayanan *e-government.* Dalam melakukan tugas pengawasan pelayanan publik, hingga kini kewenangan Ombudsman Indonesia masih sangat terbatas, yang dapat diketahui dari produk hukum berupa rekomendasi yang tidak memiliki daya paksa secara hukum bagi para penyelenggara negara/pemerintahan yang melakukan maladministrasi. Atas dasar itu, Ombudsman Indonesia menerbitkan peraturan Ombudsman Indonesia yang memberi kewenangan terhadap putusannya yang bersifat final dan mengikat, dalam sengketa pelayanan publik melalui proses ajudikasi. Padahal, semestinya kedudukan Ombudsman Indonesia memang sebagai lembaga yang memberi pengaruh (*magistratur of influence*) saja kepada para penyelenggara negara/pemerintahan agar menghormati hak warga dalam pelayanan publik. Untuk memperkuat kewenangan Ombudsman Indonesia, dilakukan (a) memperkuat kedudukan ketatanegaraan Ombusman Indonesia secara konstitusional, (b) memperjelas ruang lingkup pengawasan oleh Ombudsman, baik mengenai hal apa saja yang dapat diawasai dan kepada siapa saja pengawasan itu dapat dilakukan, (c) merumuskan ancaman sanksi bagi para pejabat pelayanan publik yang tidak menjalankan rekomendasi Ombudsman dalam laporan pelanggaran pelayanan publik, (d) merumuskan kewenangan Ombudsman yang bersifat aktif-preventif, dan (e) merumuskan daya paksa terhadap rekomendasi Ombudsman sebagai upaya meningkatkan kualitas pelayanan publik.

Article Info

Article History:
Received : 14-09-2022
Revised : 15-11-2022

Abstract

In the era of disruption, because of advances in communication and information technology, causing disruptions in the administration of government, which was originally based on the monopoly and power

Accepted : 20-11-2022
Published : 31-12-2022

Keywords:
Public Services; Strengthening Authority; *Ombudsman.*

paradigm, became a public service paradigm based on the principle of good governance through e-government services. In carrying out the task of supervising public services, until now the authority of the Indonesian Ombudsman is still very limited, which can be seen from legal products in the form of recommendations that do not have legal coercion for state/government administrators who commit maladministration. On that basis, the Indonesian Ombudsman issues a regulation on the Indonesian Ombudsman which authorizes its decisions, which are final and binding, in public service disputes through an adjudication process. In fact, the position of the Indonesian Ombudsman should indeed be as an institution that only gives influence (magistratur of influence) to state/government officials in order to respect the rights of citizens in public services. To strengthen the authority of the Indonesian Ombudsman, it is carried out (a) strengthening the constitutional position of the Indonesian Ombusman, (b) clarifying the scope of supervision by the Ombudsman, both regarding what things can be monitored and to whom the supervision can be carried out, (c) formulating threats sanctions for public service officials who do not implement the Ombudsman's recommendations in reports of violations of public services, (d) formulate the Ombudsman's authority that is active-preventive, and (e) formulate coercive power against the Ombudsman's recommendations as an effort to improve the quality of public services.

BACKGROUND

One of the most popular terms today is disruption. Disruption as a noun is defined as a disturbance or disorder, due to a factor that becomes a nuisance. This term shows that everything that used to be institutional, agency and publicity, has now begun to shift and change towards as a process (engagement and relationship building), due to developments and advances in the field of information and digital technology. So that everything no longer must be done physically face to face according to the old (conventional) ways, but in new, innovative ways through on-line media.

This era makes it easy for anyone to do anything in cyberspace. Therefore, although at first the disruption occurred in the world of start-up businesses, in fact the disruption has now touched various fields of life, including economics, politics, education, construction, health services, urban planning, law and government so that it must change everything that is all physical to all digital, and therefore requires disruptive regulation, disruptive culture, and disruptive mindset.[1]

1 Rhenald Kasali. *Disruption*, (Jakarta. PT. Kompas Gramedia Utama,2017) [13].

Rhenald Kasali said that disruption is not just a phenomenon of today, but the phenomenon of tomorrow (the future), which is brought by reformers to the present.[2] According to Rhenald Kasali, it is necessary to understand several important things that characterize disruption as follows: [3] (a) result in cost savings through simpler business processes, (b) make the quality of whatever it produces better than before, (c) has the potential to create new markets, or make those who have been included so far included, make new markets more open, (d) the resulting product/service will become more accessible or accessible to its users, and (e) make everything smarter.

This era of disruption caused by advances in the field of information, communication, and technology (ICT) will bring fundamental changes in the public service sector in government administration. As a result, the authority of the Indonesian Ombudsman in supervising the quality of public services must certainly be carried out. Therefore, it is necessary to conduct a study on the progress of ICT and its relation to the quality of public services in the government administration sector, as well as strengthening the legal position and authority of the Indonesian Ombudsman.

RESEARCH METHODS

This article uses the juridical-normative method by emphasizing the statute approach and conceptual approach. In this analysis used primary legal materials and secondary legal materials, as well as by using deductive-qualitative analysis.

ANALYSIS

I. The Rapid Progress of ICT and Its Relation to Public Services

The increasing application of information and communication technology (ICT), especially through continuous telecommunication activities, has transformed the local, national, regional, and international economy into a networked economy, which is the basis for the formation of an information society, or according to Blainpain and Colucci[4] called it

[2] *Ibid*. p. 27
[3] *Ibid*.
[4] Blainpain and Colucci. *The Impact of the Internet and New Technologies on the Workplace.*(Kluwer Law International, 2002) [23].

the *virtualization of society*. It is known that ICT is a technology capable of storing, transmitting, and/or processing information and communications or data electronically, so that the understanding of ICT is more focused on computers, telecommunications, and their multimedia networks. This will accelerate the occurrence of globalization and a borderless world.[5]

The rapid progress of ICT certainly influences the patterns and processes of government and legal administration, especially those related to public services and the legal norms that regulate them. Referring to Torben Beck Jorgensen's opinion on the typology of government[6], thereis a pattern of public service delivery that is *power* (*the hierarchical state)* usually the complicated, bureaucratic, and closed process that is still felt so far, and now it must be replaced with a pattern that contains the values of *good governance* , *public servant*, and *openness* (as in *the autonomous state, the negotiating state, the responsive state,* or *the service state).* Otherwise, then the course of government will still be encountered by many administrative violations (*maladministration*), so that the citizens remain poorly served because many of their rights are violated.

In the TAP MPR Number VII/MPR/2001 concerning the Vision of Indonesia's Future, the Vision of Indonesia 2020 has been established, namely organizing good and clean government, which includes (a) the realization of the implementation of a professional, transparent, accountable, credible, and free from nepotism, corruption, and collusion, and also (b) the formation of a sensitive and responsive government officers to the interests and aspirations of the people, and the development of a culture and behavior of transparency in the administration of government. The implementation of *good governance* is a prerequisite for every government to realize the aspirations of the people in achieving the goals and ideals of the state.[7]

---

[5] Danrivanto Budhijanto, *Hukum Telekomunikasi, Penyiaran, dan Teknologi Informasi (Regulasi dan Konvergensi).* (Bandung, PT. Refika Aditama, 2010) [1-5 and p. 257-259].

[6] See : Kooiman, ed., *Modern Governance: New Government Society Interactions.* (London, Sage Publication, 1993) [33].

[7] Philipus M. Hadjon, et.al. (compiler). *Administrative Law and Good Governance.* (Jakarta, Trisakti University Publishers, 2010) [9 and p. 41-48]. See also: Sedarmayanti, *Good Governance.* Second Edition (Bandung, CV. Mandar Forward, 2012) [24].

In relation to the development of ICT, it demands the implementation of *electronic government (E-government)* to pursue the development of global and economic competition, so that the government must use information in various forms of its services[8]. This is because that the essence of government administration is to serve the people, and then the paradigm of government administration has changed from *rule government* to be *good governance.*

There are various considerations why public services are a strategic point to start *good governance*, namely (a) public services become the domain of the state, through the government, interacting with non-governmental institutions, (b) public services in various aspects of *good governance* can be easily articulated and assessed, (c) public services involve all elements of *good governance*, such as *the state, society*, and market mechanisms (*private sector).* Therefore, there are several essences in the implementation of public services that need to be considered, namely: (i) there is an obligation for state and governmental institutions to carry out their functions and authorities based on the principles of *good governance*, (ii) there is recognition of the human rights of citizens for governments' services, administrative behavior, and quality of service outcomes, and (iii) the diversity of types and areas of services that must be provided to the citizens.[9]

The issuance of Law Number 28 of 1999 concerning Clean and Free Government's Officers from Nepotism, Corruption, and Collusion, Law Number 14 of 2008 concerning Public Information Disclosure, Law Number 25 of 2009 concerning Public Services, and Law Number 30 of 2014 concerning Government Administration, as well as various other related laws and regulations, shows that the Government's desire to carry out *good governance* in the administration of government, especially the public service sector. Thus, if you look at it from a legal perspective, then the nature of the Public Services Law affirms that the government obliged to serve citizens to fulfill their basic rights and needs within the framework of public services, both of public goods and services, and administrative

[8] Jimly Asshiddiqie,, *Constitutional Law and the Pillars of Democracy.* (Jakarta, Sinar Grafika, 2011) [143-158].

[9] Sirajuddin, et.al, *Public Service Law (Based on Participation and Public Information Disclosure).* (Malang, Setara Press Publishers, 2012) [45]. See also: H. Juniarso Ridwan and Achmad Sodik Sudrajat in the book *Administrative Law and Public Service Policy*, (Bandung, NUANSA Publishers, 2010) [83-87].

services provided by Public Service Providers (institutions, corporations, independent institutions formed under the law for public service activities, and other legal entities formed solely for the activities of public services).

Related to the rapid progress of ICT as stated in the previous section, the government needs to adjust and adapt in the implementation of public services based on information and communication technology and its multimedia networks, to realize *e-government* oriented to public services, which is organized on the principle of good governance. In other words, the adjustment and adaptation of government administration in the era of disruption, is not just computerized government data (just typing) but rather takes advantage of ICT advances to improve public services in all its dimensions. For this reason, various steps are needed to innovate governments' services and adjust related legal norms, so that the legal norms articulated in the Public Service Law are not intended to provide and protect the government institutions or officers (*monopolic)*, but also are oriented to provide the people (*citizens oriented*).

In the era of disruption, the monopolistic orientation in public services characterized by (a) is formulated unilaterally by the government untransparently and is intended as a guideline for the government officials, (b) as a tool of government control, (c) regulates the obligations of services users. Therefore, the orientation of public services in the era of disruption and in the future, must be oriented to the citizens rights, which is characterized by (a) being formulated jointly openly, (b) being used as a public instrument to supervise government, (c) regulating rights and obligations more proportionally, and (d) public services are the joint responsibility bothof the government and citizens as a form of citizen participation in government.

II. Strengthening the Legal Status and Legal Authority of the Indonesian Ombudsman in the Public Service Sector

1. Condition of The Existing Indonesian Ombudsman

The establishment of the National Commission of Indonesian Ombudsman was motivated by the idea of increasing the empowerment of supervision by the public on the administration of a state and government that is more accountable, transparent, clean, and free of nepotism, corruption, and collusion, in order to improve services to the citizens. Therefore, the position of the Indonesian Ombudsman must be imparsial and independent.

The existence of the Indonesian Ombudsman was then strengthened again through Law Number 37 of 2008 concerning the Ombudsman of the Republic of Indonesia. In this Law, it is stated that the Indonesian Ombudsman is a state's institution that has the authority to supervise the implementation of public services organized by states and government officers, including state-owned enterprises, regional-owned enterprises, state-owned legal entities, private entities, or individuals who carry out certain public services whose part/all of the funds are sourced from the state/regional budget. In Law Number 37 of 2008, the legal position of the Ombudsman is an independent institution and has no organic relationship with other state institutions, and in carrying out its duties and authorities is free from interference with other powers. The Indonesian Ombudsman is a state's institution that is a *central strong ombudsman*: there is only one, national, and has a working area in all regions of the country. The Ombudsman is an independent state's institution both structurally, functionally, financially, and personally. Meanwhile, in carrying out their duties (receiving reports, conducting examinations, following up reports, conducting investigations, coordinating, building networks, and carrying out other duties ordered by the law), it turns out that the Ombudsman's authority in providing *recommendations* does not have binding power or legal coercion to state/government officers (as complainants/reported), because recommendations are not *legally binding.* This is understandable, because even if given very broad authority, almost all Ombudsman uses *power of persuasion*.[10]

Although according to the provisions of Law Number 25 of 2009 concerning Public Services, obligating Public Service Providers to follow up on the

10. Anton Sujata, et. al. (compiler). *Indonesian Ombudsman (Past, Present, and Future)*. (Jakarta, Publishers of the Indonesian Ombudsman Commission,2002) [117]..

recommendations of the Ombudsman, but in the said Law it does not provide a threat of sanctions when the recommendations of the Ombudsman are not obeyed. Meanwhile, the position of independent means that the state institution in question is outside the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of power, but can thus have a mixed function of the three, and not infrequently have *quasi-legislative*, *executive power*, and *quasi-judicial* power.[11]

Law Number 37 of 2008 gives *legislative power* and *executive power* to the Indonesian Ombudsman, but *quasi-judicial* power is actually granted through Law Number 25 of 2009 concerning Public Services through a special adjudication process, which resolves *disputes* public services between citizens and Public Service Providers specifically relating to claims for compensation due to maladministration in public services, whose implementing regulations are regulated through Indonesian Ombudsman Regulation. In Indonesian Ombudsman Regulation Number 31 of 2018 concerning Special Adjudication Mechanisms and Procedures, this special adjudication process is carried out because public reports cannot be completed through the mediation and conciliation process. In this special adjudication trial, the adjudicator takes a decision that is *final, binding,* and *must be carried out* by the Reported Party (Public Service Provider).

The decisions in the special adjudication process organized by the Indonesian Ombudsman, which are *final and binding*, can also certainly cause legal problems. These provisions should be regulated in laws, not autonomous regulations of state's institutions. At first glance, this can be understood, because the legal culture in Indonesia is still low and does not want to submit and does not want to obey legal norms (there is no awareness of *self-obidience, self-respect*, or *zelvbindung* on the provisions of legal norms), so all things must be forced, to the point that even court decisions are not obeyed by state administrators voluntarily (for example, the judges' decisions of administrative court). On the other hand, reports and recommendations (conclusions, opinions, and suggestions) given by the Indonesian Ombudsman as a

[11] See: Titik Triwulan T and Ismu Gunadi Widodo. *Administrative Law and Procedural Law of the Indonesian Administrative Court* (Jakarta, Kencana Publishers, 2014) [124].

product of the mediation and conciliation process, are not legally the product of court decisions that have *legal binding*, because the Indonesian Ombudsman plays more of a role as a *court of influence (magistratur of influence)* in order to touch the awareness and commitment of Public Service Providers to comply with principles, legal norms, procedures and public service systems, in order to improve the quality of good government administration. Historically and theoretically, the power of the Ombudsman should be based on the trust of all parties in its credible, fair, and impartial considerations, therefore the establishment of the Ombudsman institution began with a noble desire to improve the quality of public services and ensure the implementation of people's rights in law and government.

When compared to Law Number 14 of 2008 concerning Public Information Disclosure, in the process of public information disputes through the adjudication process, the decision of the Public Information Commission *is not final and binding*, because the decision can still be sued to the Court. However, the decision of the Public Information Commission (KIP or *Komisi Informasi Publik*) in public information disputes through a mediation process, is therefore final and binding because it is based on consideration of the agreement of the parties.

2. Strengthening the Legal Status and Legal Authority of the Indonesian Ombudsman

Contrary to the description stated, to strengthen the authority and institutional influence of the Ombudsman, efforts need to be made to strengthen the position and authority of the Indonesian Ombudsman, which can be done in the following ways:

2.1. Strengthening the constitutional position of the Indonesian Ombudsman into a *constitutional state's organ* or *primary state's organ,* which is included in the constitution. This is because the existence of the Ombudsman is now seen only as a state institution that is *auxialiary state's organ*. So that politically it can be viewed as *a second-class state institution or an additional/complementary state institution* only. Thus, its existence, politically, can be easily disbanded. This contrasts with the state institutions directly regulated in the constitution, which to dissolve them requires a constitutional mechanism that is heavy and politically

complicated. Although, Law Number 37 of 2008 gives a fairly strong position organically and functionally to the Ombudsman, in the sense of being outside the branches of executive, legislative, and judicial power, and therefore in carrying out its duties and authorities free from interference and power of these state institutions, so that it can be functionally aligned with other state institutions whose existence is regulated in the constitution, but legally and politically the existence of the Ombudsman can be viewed as merely facultative. With the strategic duties and authorities of the Ombudsman in realizing clean government and *good governance,* it is appropriate to think about upgrading the status of the Ombudsman to be a constitutional institution, in the sense that it is specifically regulated in the constitution.

2.2. Clarifying the scope of the Ombudsman's supervisory authority, because according to Law Number 37 of 2008, the Ombudsman is also authorized to supervise the implementation of public services organized by state organizers. The Ombudsman Act and the Public Service Act do not specifically and unequivocally regulate *what matters should be supervised,* and *which state administrators may be supervised* by the Ombudsman. This issue needs to be emphasized so that there is no overlap of the authority of the Ombudsman with other government supervisory agencies, which are internal and external. In the laws and regulations regarding state institutions, for example the Law on the MPR, DPR, DPD, DPRD, the Law on Constitution Tribunal, and the Law on Supreme Court, as well as the regulations contained in the 1945 Constitution related to the authority of the President, none of them mention the authority of the Ombudsman to supervise them. In the public service law, it is stated that *public service providers are state and government institutions that are specifically formed to provide public services.* The question that arises from this issue is whether the state institutions regulated in the 1945 Constitution can be categorized as Public Service Providers? Therefore, there are still vague legal norms related to state organizers who perform public services.

2.3. Formulate and impose sanctions on Public Service Providers who do not follow up on the recommendations of the Ombudsman, such as *exemption from office*. This needs to be brought up because the Public Service Act apparently does not formulate such a threat of sanctions. Whereas the Public Service Act obligate Public Service Providers to follow up on the recommendations of the Ombudsman. The threat of administrative sanctions contained in the Public Service Act is more directed at Public Service Providers who do not comply with provisions directly related to other rules contained in the Public Service Law, but not threats of sanctions that violate the provisions that require following up on the recommendations of the Ombudsman.

2.4. Give *active-preventive authority* to the Ombudsman in supervising public services. This needs to be stated because the nature of the Ombudsman's supervisory authority is *passive-repressive*, that is, waiting for reports/complaints from the public regarding maladministration that harms the rights of citizens (passive), and then take an action (repressive) in the form of recommendations in accordance with the provisions of laws and regulations. The active-preventive nature of the Ombudsman's authority will be easily implemented if there is a *Public Service Standard*, which can be easily accessed by implementing *e-government* to facilitate supervision.

2.5. Meanwhile, in carrying out their duties (receiving reports, conducting examinations, following up reports, conducting investigations, coordinating, building networks, and carrying out other duties ordered by the law), it turns out that the Ombudsman's authority in providing recommendations does not have legal binding or coercive power to state/government organizers (as complainants/reported), because recommendations are not a *legally binding* decision. Therefore, it is necessary to provide legal reinforcement so that the recommendations of the Ombudsman can be legally binding on the complainant/reported person.

3. Reinforcement Measures

Behind the rules of legal norms contained in the Indonesian Ombudsman Regulation Number 31 of 2018, it is suspected that there is so many efforts to strengthen the authority of the Indonesian Ombudsman to carry out external supervision of the administration of government, *good governance,* and public services. It's just that, legally, this is not appropriate when stated through Ombudsman autonomous regulation which is its position under the law. Therefore, in the era of disruption, steps and efforts must be considered to strengthen the external supervisory authority of the Ombudsman in the public services according to the provisions of Article 1 paragraph (1) jo Article 6 of Law Number 37 of 2008 and Article 35 paragraph (3) letter (b) of Law Number 25 of 2009.

The concept of external supervision carried out by the Indonesian Ombudsman on the implementation of public services, in accordance with its authority, relies on public participation, in the form of reports or complaints from the citizens. This makes it as a *mainstream* in external supervision carried out by the Indonesian Ombudsman. In other words, the basis of the supervision of the Indonesian Ombudsman is supervision by the citizens. Therefore, the performance of the Ombudsman in conducting external supervision will largely depend on the public's understanding of their rights and their understanding of the Ombudsman itself. Usually, after receiving a complaint in the form of a citizen's report, then through the mechanism of reviewing the completeness of the document, it can be continued to the step of requesting clarification to the officials of the Public Service Provider, then if it is deemed necessary to *cross-check* and investigation, then an analysis is carried out to formulate an opinion, which is ultimately poured into the recommendations. This process is admittedly not entirely easy, because starting from the request for clarification and investigation, the response received by the Ombudsman is not always conducive, so it takes time to analyze, formulate opinions, and make recommendations (both in relation to problem solving and related to proposed alternative sanctions). The external supervision carried out by the Indonesian Ombudsman is passive and carried out in the context of repressive supervision, in order

to find out whether the public services carried out are in accordance with the provisions of the laws.

Based on the description stated, it can be said that the weaknesses of the authority of the Ombudsman concerns about the nature of decisions in the special adjudication process and the authority of passive external supervision. Therefore, it is necessary to make legal efforts to strengthen the authority.

For this reason, it is necessary to make modifications by making a kind of legal *new design* to strengthen the authority of the Indonesian Ombudsman. Related to this issue, it is necessary to harmonize and synchronize various provisions of laws and regulations, so that legal remedies are not alienated from existing developments and demands. Existing laws and regulations should not be an obstacle to the fulfillment of people's rights in the public service sector.

The steps to strengthen the authority of the Ombudsman are carried out in the following ways:

1. Must have *government liability,* in the form of a clear and unequivocal *political-will* that: (a) requires all state organizers and government administrators, public officials, and other bodies that administer public services, from the highest officials in the state to low-level officials in the regions, to obey with the recommendations of the Ombudsman voluntarily, and by providing the threat of strict administrative sanctions in the form of *exemption from office*. This is necessary because of the low *self-obidience, self-respect,* or *zelvbindung* of state organizing officials and government organizers to voluntarily comply with the law, (b) factually must be realized by realizing *e-government* in order to make it easier and more openess in the implementation of public services , (c) harmonize, synchronize, and update laws regarding government administration, public information disclosure, prohibition of nepotism, collusion, and corruption, public participation, and human rights of citizens in order to anticipate the era of disruption in the government sector and public services*;*

2. Revise and synchronize the provisions of laws and regulations concerning the Indonesian Ombudsman and Public Services by (a) reformulating the Ombudsman's external supervision authority, not only passive but also active external supervision, to focus more on preventing maladministration. Through *e-government*, this active external supervision task will be easily carried out by the Ombudsman, because the Ombudsman can at any time monitor the compliance of Public Service Providers to meet Public Service Standards, whether the implementation of public services carried out is in accordance with the provisions of Article 21 of Law Number 25 of 2009 concerning Public Services and Article 7 letter (g) of Law Number 37 of 2008 concerning Indonesian Ombudsman. In both of these Acts the issue of efforts to prevent maladministration in public services is not legally regulated, even though this active supervision is a *corrective* instrument for Public Service Officers to comply with Public Service Standards. Thus, the Ombudsman does not always have to wait for complaints or reports from the citizens and then process them through mediation or conciliation mechanism, (b) reformulate into the Public Service Law that the nature of the decision of the Ombudsman in resolving disputes over maladministration of public services through a special adjudication process that is legally final and binding, as *an instrument of coercion* for Public Service Officers to obey the established Public Service Standards, (c) reformulate the mechanism for citizen's grievances or complaints or claims who feel aggrieved by public services. In the complaint mechanism, it must be interpreted as a clear regulatory system regarding the type of complaint, to whom the complaint is submitted, what the requirements are, what the grace period is, and until the complaint can be resolved by the Ombudsman, and so on. The clarity of the rules on this matter will certainly make it easier for the Ombudsman to carry out *external-passive-corrective* supervision through the mediation or conciliation process.

This is certainly different from the policy direction and strategic steps of the Indonesian Ombudsman for 2020-2024, inorder to support bureaucratic reform and governance in the

context of public services, namely (a) improving the public service supervision system, and (b) improving the quality of organizational governance and human resource development.[12]

CONCLUSION

Strengthening the legal position and authority of the Indonesian Ombudsman needs to be carried out so that the presence and existence of the Ombudsman is increasingly felt by the community, as an effective, trusted, and present state institution as a *magistratur of influence* in accelerating the realization of *clean government* and *good governance.* Facing the era of disruption, where the realization of *e-government* based on ICT is required, the government should be able to easily provide public services by utilizing the advancement of existing multimedia technology. With the realization of *e-government*, it will further pave the way for the realization of *good governance*, and in turn it will make it easier for the Ombudsman to carry out *external-active-corrective* supervision to prevent maladministration in the implementation of public services.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Arrigi, Giovanni and Silver, Beverly J. (1999). *Chaos and Governance In The Modern World System*. University of Minnesota Press.

Asshiddiqie, Jimly. (2011). *Constitutional Law and the Pillars of Democracy.* Jakarta, Sinar Grafika.

Blainpain, R and Colucci, M. (2002). *The Impact of The Internet and New Technologies on The Workplace.* Kluwer Law International.

Budhijanto, Danrivanto. (2010). *Law of Telecommunications, Broadcasting, and Information Technology (Regulation and Convergence).* Bandung, PT. Refika Aditama.

Hadjon, Philipus M, et.al. (2010). *Administrative Law and Good Governance*. Jakarta, Trisakti University Publishers.

[12] Ombudsman of the Republic of Indonesia. 2020. *Strategic Plan 2020-2024*. Jakarta, www.ombudsman.go.id., p. 43.

Kasali, Rhenald. (2017). *Disruption.* Jakarta, PT. Main Gramedia Compass.

Kooiman, Jan (ed). (19930. *Modern Governance : New Government Society Interactions.* London, Sage Publication.

Ombudsman of the Republic of Indonesia. (2020). *Strategic Plan 2020-2024.* Jakarta, www.ombudsman.go.id

Sedarmayanti. (2012). *Good Governance.* Second Edition, Bandung, CV.Mandar Maju.

Sirajuddin, et.al. (2012). *Public Service Law (Based on Participation and Public Information Disclosure).* Malang, Setara Press Publishers.

Sudrajat, Achmad Sodik and Ridwan, H. Juniarso.(2010). *Administrative Law and Public Policy Service.* Bandung, NUANSA Publishers.

Sujata, Anton, et.al. (2002). *Indonesian Ombudsman (Past, Present, and Future).* Jakarta, Publisher of the Indonesian Ombudsman Commission.

Triwulan T, Titik and Ismu Gunadi Widodo. (2014). *Administrative Law and Procedural Law of the Indonesian Administrative Court.* Jakarta, Kencana Publishers.