

Implementation of Coordination between Law Enforcement Officials in the Investigation of Fisheries Crimes

¹ **Junaidi Abdullah Ingratubun,**

² **M. Syukri Akub;Abd. Asis**

¹ Doctoral Student in Law, Faculty of Law, Hasanuddin University Makassar-Indonesia

² Lecturer at the Faculty of Law, Hasanuddin University, Makassar-Indonesia

Paper Number: 240237

Abstract:

This study aims to analyze the nature of regulation, implementation, and formulate an ideal form of coordination between law enforcement officials in the investigation of fisheries crimes. This research departs from the fact that there is an overlap of authority between agencies, such as the Indonesian Navy, Polairud, Bakamla, and the Fisheries Civil Servant Investigator (PPNS), which often hinders the effectiveness of law enforcement in coastal marine areas. Using a normative juridical approach enriched by case studies in Tual City and Southeast Maluku Regency, this study reveals that the existing legal arrangements are still sectoral, partial, and have not fully provided clarity on the boundaries of authority. The results of the study show that the implementation of coordination between law enforcement officials still faces various obstacles, both in terms of sectoral ego, limited infrastructure, and lack of information system integration. This has an impact on the ineffectiveness of handling fisheries crime cases, as well as reducing public trust in the law enforcement process. The ideal form of coordination found in this study is through the synchronization of regulations, the establishment of a permanent coordination forum with integrated SOPs, and the development of a joint information system that can be supervised by independent institutions and coastal communities. The conclusion of this study emphasizes the importance of regulatory synchronization, strengthening coordination mechanisms, and integrating information systems as the main pillars to realize effective, transparent, and equitable enforcement of fisheries laws.

Keywords: Coordination, Law Enforcement, Fisheries Crimes, Authority, Coastal Seas.

1. Introduction

Indonesia possesses exceptionally abundant marine resources. The country comprises 17,508 islands with a coastline extending approximately 81,000 kilometers. Based on maritime zonation, Indonesia has a territorial sea area of about 0.3 million km² (5.17%), archipelagic waters covering 2.8 million km² (48.28%), and an Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ) of 2.7 million km² (46.55%). In addition, in the context of fisheries resource management, Indonesia has established 11 Fisheries Management Areas of the Republic of Indonesia (Wilayah Pengelolaan Perikanan Negara Republic Indonesia/WPP-NRI) as the legal and administrative basis for spatial division and governance of marine areas to ensure the protection, conservation, and sustainable utilization of fishery resources. Given the vast potential of its marine territory, the utilization of Indonesia's maritime wealth should be optimized for the greatest benefit of the people, as mandated by Article 33 paragraph (3) of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia, which states: "The land, the waters, and the natural resources therein shall be controlled by the State and utilized for the greatest prosperity of the people.(M. R. Yusuf, 2022)"

This provision implies that all natural resources within the territory of Indonesia, both on land and at sea, constitute part of the nation's wealth, the control of which is vested in the State(M. Yusuf & Siregar, 2023). Such state control should not be interpreted as private ownership by the government, but rather as a form of public authority, whereby the State functions as the manager, regulator, and supervisor to ensure that the utilization of these resources is genuinely oriented toward the interests of the people as a whole, and not merely toward the benefit of specific groups (Yustitiana, 2021).

One of the principal challenges in the enforcement of laws against fisheries crimes is the weak coordination and investigative cooperation among relevant agencies (Widjaja & Aswan, 2024). Field implementation demonstrates recurring instances of discoordination between the Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries (Kementerian Kelautan dan Perikanan/KKP), the Indonesian National Police (Polri), and the Indonesian Navy (TNI AL). In many cases, investigations fail to progress to the prosecution stage due to overlapping authorities or delays in inter-agency coordination (Widjaja & Aswan, 2024).

Field observations indicate that coordination among law

enforcement agencies remains largely incidental and are heavily reliant on informal communication between officials (Wahid Budiyo, 2024). This condition creates circumstances in which investigative processes cannot proceed efficiently and are often impeded by administrative and technical constraints (Gussela et al., 2024). Several cases demonstrate that overlapping authority among the Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries (KKP), the Water and Air Police Unit (Polairud), and the Indonesian Navy (TNI AL) has resulted in evidentiary materials and seized assets being left without proper legal action due to procedural inconsistencies and the absence of a shared understanding of applicable procedures (Rizkiyani & Mujaib, 2024).

As a consequence of weak inter-agency coordination, perpetrators of fisheries crimes often do not experience a sufficient deterrent effect. Data from the Office of the Attorney General indicate that the resolution rate of fisheries cases submitted by Civil Servant Investigators (PPNS) has remained largely stagnant, with several regions even showing a declining trend. This situation is particularly ironic given the national policy that prioritizes law enforcement as a central mechanism for protecting marine resources (Akbar, 2021).

From an institutional perspective, the multiplicity of agencies vested with investigative authority in the maritime and fisheries sector could serve as a strategic strength if coordinated in a structured manner (Miftah et al., 2021). However, the absence of integrated standard operating procedures (SOPs), a shared database, and a formalized inter-agency coordinating mechanism has resulted in fragmented law enforcement practices, with each institution operating independently (Sukmana, 2023).

In several cases, agencies have exhibited sectoral attitudes, each seeking to defend its own domain of authority without regard to broader legal objectives. An institutional reconstruction is therefore required one that not only harmonizes operational patterns but also ensures clear mechanisms of accountability and collaboration throughout the entire process, from investigation to prosecution (Rastiawaty & Alrip, 2024). Therefore, this study argues that the implementation of coordination and investigative processes in fisheries crime enforcement in Indonesia requires a critical examination. The objective is to identify structural and procedural weaknesses and to formulate an ideal model for an effective coordination system among law enforcement agencies in the future (Andi, 2023).

Furthermore, effective law enforcement is determined not only by

the regulatory framework but also by the capacity of institutions to work in a coordinated manner within the scope of their respective duties and functions. Weak coordination is not merely a matter of inadequate communication among agencies; it also reflects regulatory structures that create opportunities for overlap and conflict of authority (Rizhan, n.d.).

In various policy forums, including the National Action Plan for Combating Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated Fishing (IUUF), the Government of Indonesia has consistently emphasized the importance of cross-sectoral synergy in maritime law enforcement (Alhuda, 2022). However, the implementation of this policy has not been fully reflected in the framework of fisheries criminal law enforcement. The absence of a lead institution serving as the primary coordinating authority often results in policies that are partial in nature and implemented in a non-integrated manner (M. Yusuf & Siregar, 2023).

Coordination among law enforcement agencies cannot be achieved solely through administrative measures or periodic coordination meetings. What is required is a systemic approach encompassing regulatory, structural, and operational dimensions, as well as interoperability among law enforcement databases. Without a legal framework that ensures collaboration and establishes mechanisms for evaluating inter-investigator performance, efforts to enforce the law will tend to remain stagnant.

Further analysis indicates that efforts to strengthen coordination in the enforcement of fisheries crimes must prioritize three essential aspects.

1. Harmonization of regulatory frameworks across legal sectors governing investigative authority.
2. Development of a permanent, functional coordination system rather than an ad hoc mechanism equipped with binding authority.
3. Integrated inter-agency training to foster a uniform understanding of legal norms and procedural requirements.

These three aspects can only be achieved if there is sufficient political will and strong institutional support from the central government.

Experiences from several maritime countries, such as Australia and the Philippines, demonstrate that the investigation of fisheries-related offenses cannot be entrusted to a single agency alone; rather, it requires a Joint Enforcement System involving multiple institutions (Dkk, 2025).

In the Philippines, for example, the investigation of marine

fisheries offenses is coordinated by the Bureau of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources (BFAR), which works jointly with the police and the navy through a permanent task force equipped with shared standard operating procedures (SOPs) and an integrated data system.

Reflecting on these practices, Indonesia should be able to develop a coordination model tailored to its geographic characteristics and decentralized governmental structure (Endah Astuti et al., 2024). The application of a multilevel governance approach in fisheries law enforcement engaging national, provincial, and district/municipal authorities requires thorough examination, particularly to enhance the effectiveness of monitoring and supervision. Accordingly, this study is significant as it provides a scientific contribution to the development of a coordinated model and the implementation of investigative processes for fisheries crimes in Indonesia (CSA Teddy Lesmana, 2019).

Based on the foregoing considerations, the author is motivated to examine and investigate this issue in greater depth through a study entitled: "The Implementation of Coordination Among Law Enforcement Agencies in the Investigation of Fisheries Crimes(Rivanie et al., 2022)." This research seeks to address the following questions: What is the essential nature of the regulatory framework governing coordination among law enforcement agencies in fisheries crime investigations? How is such coordination implemented in practice? And what would constitute an ideal model for the coordination of law enforcement agencies in the investigative process of fisheries crimes?

2. Overview of Theories and Concepts

2.1 Criminal Justice System Theory.

The criminal justice system was first introduced by criminal law experts and experts in criminal justice science in the United States in line with dissatisfaction with the working mechanisms of law enforcement officials and law enforcement institutions based on a law-and-order approach that relies heavily on the effectiveness and efficiency of police organizations. In this relationship, the police apparently faced various obstacles, both operational and legal procedures and then these obstacles did not provide optimal results in efforts to suppress the increase in crime rates, even the opposite happened. Frank Remington was the first person in the United States to introduce the engineering of criminal justice administration through a system approach and the idea of this system was contained in the 1958 Pilot Project report. This idea was then attached to the criminal justice administration

mechanism and was named the Criminal Justice System. This term was later introduced and disseminated by The President's Crime Commission.

The schematic diagram of the Criminal Justice System was compiled by The Commission's Task Force on Science and Technology under the leadership of Alfred Blumstein. As a management expert, Blumstein applies a managerial approach by relying on a systems approach to criminal justice administration mechanisms. Since then, in crime prevention in the United States, a system approach has been introduced and developed as a substitute for the approach of law and order. Through this system approach, the police, courts and correctional institutions are no longer stand-alone agencies but are each an important element and closely related to each other. As stated earlier, law enforcement is synonymous with the realm of criminal law and talking about criminal law, it is inseparable from what is called the criminal justice system (SPP). The term Criminal Justice System or SPP indicates the working mechanism in crime management by using the basis of the "system approach".

According to Remington and Ohlin, the Criminal Justice System is the application of a system approach to the administrative mechanism of criminal justice and criminal justice as a system that is the result of the interaction between laws and regulations, administrative practices and social attitudes or behaviors. The definition of the system itself contains the implication of an interaction process that is prepared rationally and in an efficient way to provide a certain result with all its limitations. Speaking Romli Atmasasmita, the criminal justice system is law enforcement, so it contains legal aspects that focus on the operationalization of laws and regulations in an effort to overcome crime and aim to achieve legal certainty (certainly). On the other hand, if the definition of the criminal justice system is seen as part of the implementation of social defense related to the purpose of realizing community welfare, then the criminal justice system contains social aspects that emphasize expediency. The ultimate goal of the criminal justice system in the long term is to realize the welfare of the community which is the goal of social policy in the short term, namely to reduce the occurrence of crime and recidivism, if this goal is not achieved, it can be ensured that the system does not run reasonably.

Meanwhile, Hagan distinguishes between the Criminal Justice Process and the Criminal Justice System. Criminal Justice Process is every stage of a verdict that exposes a suspect to a process that

leads him to a criminal determination. Meanwhile, the Criminal Justice System is an interconnection between decisions from each agency involved in the criminal justice process. According to Mardjono Reksodipoetro, SPP is a crime control system consisting of institutions: the Police, the Prosecutor's Office, the Court and the Correctional Institution of convicts.

2.2 Authority Theory.

In the literature of political science, government science and law, the terms power, authority, and authority are often found. Power is often mistaken for authority and power is often exchanged for the term authority, and vice versa. Authority is often equated with authority. Power is usually in the form of a relationship in the sense that there is one party who rules and the other party who is ruled (The Rule and The Ruled). Based on the above definition, there can be power that is not related to the law. Powers that are not related to law by Henc van Maarseven are called blote match,⁵⁰ while power related to law by Max Weber is called rational or legal authority, that is, authority based on a legal system that is understood as a set of rules that have been recognized and obeyed by society and even strengthened by the state. In public law, authority is related to power. Power has the same meaning as authority because the power possessed by the Executive, Legislative and Judiciary is formal power. Power is an essential element of a state in the process of implementing government in addition to other elements, namely: a). Law; b). Authority; c). Justice; d). Honesty; e). Wisdom-Bestarian; and f). Virtue.

Power is the core of state administration so that the state is in a state of movement (de staar in beweging) so that the state can take part, work, have capacity, achieve and perform to serve its citizens. Therefore, the state must be given power. According to Miriam Budiardjo, power is the ability of a person or a group of people to influence the behavior of a person or other group in such a way that the behavior is in accordance with the wishes and goals of the person or the state.⁵⁴ In order for power to be exercised, a ruler or organ is needed so that the state is conceptualized as a set of positions (eenambten complex) where the positions are filled by a number of officials who support certain rights and obligations based on subject-obligation construction. Thus, power has two aspects, namely the political aspect and the legal aspect, while the authority is only in the legal aspect, that is, the power can be sourced from the constitution, it can also be sourced from outside the constitution (unconstitutional), for example through a coup or

war, while the authority clearly comes from the constitution.

Authority is often aligned with authority. The term authority is used in the form of a noun and is often aligned with the term *bevoegheid* in Dutch. According to Philipus M. Hadjon, if you look closely, there is a slight difference between the term authority and the term *bevoegheid*. The difference lies in its legal character. The term *Bevoegheid* is used in both public and private law concepts. In the concept of law, the term authority or authority should be used in the concept of public law. Ateng Syafrudin argued that there is a difference between the definition of authority and authority. There must be a distinction between authority (*authorithy, gezag*) and authority (*competence, bevoegheid*). Authority is what is called formal power, power derived from the power given by law, whereas authority is only about a certain part (*onderdeel*) of authority. Within authority there are authorities (*rechtsbevoegdheden*). Authority is the scope of public legal action, the scope of government authority, not only includes the authority to make government decisions (*bestuur*) but also includes authority in the context of carrying out duties and granting authority and the distribution of authority, the main of which is stipulated in laws and regulations.

2.3 Law Enforcement Theory.

Law as an order of behavior that regulates human beings and changes human behavior to implement the values that exist in the legal method, needs to be upheld so that the embodiment or implementation of ideas or values in the legal method can be felt in the life of society. For this reason, in addition to institutionalizing in society, law enforcement must also be carried out. Satjipto Raharjo expressed his opinion about law enforcement is: "The implementation of the law is concrete in people's lives. After the law-making is carried out, concrete implementation must be carried out in people's daily lives, this is law enforcement".

Meanwhile, Soerjono Soekanto argued that law enforcement is: "Activities that harmonize the relationship between values described in the rules/views of values that are stable and disturbing and attitude of action as a series of final stage value elaboration to create, maintain and maintain peace of association" Santy Dellyana also expressed his opinion about law enforcement, that: "Law enforcement is an effort to realize ideas and concepts The law that the people hope for will come true. Law enforcement is a process that involves many things" Law enforcement is a very essential and substantial thing in the state of law; law enforcement

is the process of making efforts to uphold or function legal norms in real terms as a guideline for behavior in traffic or legal relations related to society and the state.

Siswanto Sunarno argued that in a country based on material or social laws that are determined to advance the general welfare and educate the nation's life, the enforcement of laws and regulations cannot be prevented. Law enforcement according to A. Hamid S. Attamimias quoted by Siswanto Sunarno that: "in essence it is the enforcement of legal norms, whether it is the function of command (gebot, command) or other functions such as giving power (ermachtigen, to empower), permitting (erlauben, to permit), and deviating (derogieren, to derogate)" From some of the expert opinions above, it can be concluded that law enforcement is an effort to transfer or transfer ideas or concepts that were previously limited Formulation of laws and regulations (law in book) into real life (law in action) of the nation and state. So that the concrete implementation of the law can be felt by the community. Law enforcement is divided into two, namely: 1). Reviewed from the point of view of the subject: In a broad sense, law enforcement includes the values of justice which contain the sound of formal rules and the values of justice in society. In a narrow sense, law enforcement only concerns the enforcement of formal and written regulations. 2). Viewed from the point of view of the object, namely from the legal point of view: In a broad sense, the law enforcement process involves all legal subjects in every legal relationship. Anyone who implements normative rules or does something or does not do something based on the norms of the applicable legal rules, means that he implements or enforces the rule of law. In a narrow sense, law enforcement is only interpreted as the efforts of certain law enforcement apparatus to guarantee and ensure that a rule of law runs as it should.

2.4 Law Enforcement Theory

There are four perspectives on law enforcement according to James Censer, et al., namely:

- 1) Legal perspective. The legal perspective as an approach that views behavior that comes from the basic rules of philosophy in law is very important and the rules of philosophy are a guide to behavior and must be followed by everyone.
- 2) Public Policy Perspective. Using a public policy approach to law enforcement studies is important for several reasons: first, as the field of enforcement evolves and becomes more proactive in community problems, departmental policy-making; Second, law enforcement implementers may need legislative assistance in

enforcing policies regarding current legal restrictions or due to the absence of appropriate authority.

- 3) System Perspective. Law enforcement can be seen from the context of the Theory System. This enforcement looks at the entire context (environment), where the existence of the issue is analyzed by all forces or those that affect and impact law enforcement. That is to say, law enforcement or special agencies are perceived by all the forces that analyze law enforcement from the environment in which it operates.
- 4) A global perspective or an extended systems approach. The global perspective is an extension of the systems approach. To get to know the effects of the environment. A global perspective provides direct recognition of world events and the international influences on these bodies. The instability of one government can be the root of the problem for other countries. Some great societies or great nations emerged and sank over the past 300 years. For this 20th Century, some government officials in powerful countries lost their right to power due to war or internal conflict and unrest. In criminal law, law enforcement consists of three stages, namely: 79
 - 1) The formulation stage is the stage of enforcement of criminal law in abstractor by law-making bodies. In this stage, the lawmakers carry out activities to select values that are in accordance with the current and future circumstances and situations, and then formulate them in the form of criminal laws and regulations to achieve the best results of criminal legislation, in the sense of meeting the requirements of justice and effectiveness. This stage can also be called the legislative policy stage.
 - 2) The application stage, namely the criminal law enforcement stage (the stage of applying criminal law) by law enforcement officials ranging from the police, prosecutor's office to the court. In this stage, law enforcement officials enforce and implement criminal laws and regulations that have been made by law-making bodies. In carrying out this task, law enforcement officials must uphold the values of justice and charity. This second stage can also be called the judicial policy stage.
 - 3) The execution stage, which is the stage of concrete enforcement (implementation) of criminal law by criminal enforcement officials. In this stage, criminal enforcement officials are tasked with enforcing criminal regulations that have been made by lawmakers through the application of penalties that have been

determined by the court. Implementing officials in carrying out their duties must be guided by the criminal laws and regulations that have been made by the lawmakers (legislators) and the values of justice and usefulness.

3. Research Methods

3.1 Type and Approach of Research.

1. Type of Research.

Type of research employed in this study is normative legal research, which is a process aimed at identifying legal rules, legal principles, and legal doctrines in order to address the legal issues under examination (Nursyamsudin & Samud, 2022). accordingly, this study examines and analyzes library materials and documentary sources by systematically reviewing documents relevant to the issues outlined in the research questions (Suryawan, 2021).

2. Research Approach.

- a. The statute approach is employed because this research analyzes several legislative and regulatory instruments relevant to the inconsistencies found in the formulation of legal norms (Widjaja & Aswan, 2024).
- b. The conceptual approach is used to examine the relevant legal doctrines and scholarly views that have developed within the field of law. Understanding these concepts and doctrines provides a foundation for the researcher to construct legal arguments in addressing the issues under study (Wahid Budiyo, 2024).

3.2 Types and Sources of Legal Materials.

Normative legal research does not rely on empirical data; rather, in order to address the legal issues under examination, it requires the use of various sources of legal materials, consisting of primary legal materials, secondary legal materials, and tertiary (or non-legal) materials (Ferry Asril, 2022).

1. Primary Legal Materials. Primary legal materials are authoritative legal sources that possess binding force, consisting of statutory and regulatory instruments, including:
 - a) Undang-Undang Dasar Negara Republik Indonesia 1945
 - b) Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 8 Tahun 1981 tentang Kitab Undang-Undang Hukum Acara Pidana (KUHP)
 - c) Undang-undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 45 Tahun 2009 tentang Perubahan atas Undang-Undang Nomor 31 Tahun 2004 tentang Perikanan
 - d) Undang-Undang Nomor 34 Tahun 2004 Tentara Nasional Indonesia

- e) Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 2 Tahun 2002 Tentang Kepolisian Negara Republik Indonesia

2. Secondary Legal Materials.

Secondary legal materials are sources that provide explanations and interpretations of primary legal materials, such as academic manuscripts, legal research studies, scholarly writings, and other relevant analyses (Fitriah& Yusuf, 2024).

3. Non-Legal Materials.

Tertiary legal materials provide supporting references for primary and secondary materials, such as dictionaries and encyclopedias, to strengthen the analysis within the research (Akbar, 2022).

3.3 Techniques for Collecting Legal Materials.

The techniques for collecting legal materials include literature review, online searches, and the inventorying of relevant regulations. All regulatory instruments are classified according to their hierarchical order and subsequently examined, selected, and analyzed in relation to the research questions of the dissertation (Syah Akbar Simatupang, 2024).

3.4 Analysis of Legal Materials.

The analysis of legal materials is conducted qualitatively on the systematized primary and secondary data. All documents are examined through interpretation and inference, supported by content analysis methods to assess the substance of legal texts. The results of this analysis are then used to address the research questions (Novilia& Yusuf, 2024).

4. Research Results

The Essence of Regulatory Arrangements Governing Coordination among Law Enforcement Agencies in the Investigation of Fisheries Crimes.

1. Legal Substance

a. Legal Basis for the Investigation of Fisheries Crimes

The investigation of fisheries crimes in Indonesia is regulated under several statutory and regulatory instruments, including:1).

Law Number 31 of 2004 in conjunction with Law Number 45 of 2009 The Fisheries Law stipulates that the investigation of fisheries crimes may be conducted by Civil Servant Investigators (PPNS), investigators of the Indonesian Navy (TNI AL), and investigators of the Indonesian National Police (Polri). Article 73 paragraph (1) states: "The investigation of fisheries crimes shall be carried out by PPNS investigators, TNI AL investigators, or Polri investigators in accordance with their respective authorities." This

provision affirms a clear division of investigative authority based on maritime zones and institutional capacity. For example, PPNS investigators primarily operate within fishing ports and territorial waters, whereas the Indonesian Navy is authorized to handle investigations in broader maritime jurisdictions (Malik, 2021).² Law Number 2 of 2002 about the Police The Law on the Indonesian National Police grants Polri the authority to conduct criminal investigations, including those occurring in maritime areas. Article 5 paragraph (2) states: "The Indonesian National Police is a state police institution tasked with maintaining public security and order and enforcing the law in a professional manner (Gani Hamaminata, 2023)." In the context of fisheries, the National Police particularly the Water and Air Police Unit (Polairud), holds a central role as the coordinating body for investigations when a case involves multiple law enforcement agencies (Fadillah, 2021).³ Law Number 34 of 2004 on the Indonesian National Armed Forces (TNI) The Indonesian Navy (TNI AL) is mandated to safeguard the sovereignty of the nation's maritime territory, including undertaking law enforcement actions against fisheries violations. Article 9 of the TNI Law states: "The Indonesian Navy is tasked with conducting defense operations, securing maritime areas, and participating in law enforcement within the maritime domain in accordance with statutory regulations." In other words, the Navy may take initial action in response to fisheries violations such as detaining foreign vessels engaged in illegal fishing before transferring the case to the National Police for formal investigation (Aryadi, 2021).⁴ The Ministerial Regulation of Marine Affairs and Fisheries Number 13/PERMEN-KP/2005 establishes the Coordinating Forum for the Handling of Fisheries Crimes, comprising representatives from the Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries (KKP), the National Police (Polri), the Indonesian Navy (TNI AL), and other relevant agencies. This Forum is mandated to: (a). Coordinate the investigation of fisheries crimes. (b). Determine priority categories of offenses to be handled. (c) Design cooperative frameworks for law enforcement operations.

b. Authority of Law Enforcement Agencies

The authority of each agency is not only distinct but also complementary in nature: 1). Fisheries Civil Servant Investigators (PPNS) possess limited yet specialized authority within territorial waters and fishing ports. They serve as the primary investigators for cases of an administrative nature as well as minor criminal offenses (Remedium et al., 2022). 2). Investigators of the

Indonesian Navy (TNI AL) possess broader authority to undertake enforcement actions at sea, particularly against foreign vessels or illegal activities that threaten maritime sovereignty. The Navy frequently conducts initial apprehensions and subsequently transfers the evidence to the National Police for formal investigation (Asrori et al., 2022). 3). The National Police (Polri), particularly the Water and Air Police Unit (Polairud), serves as the principal coordinator of investigations, especially in cases that span multiple jurisdictions or involve several agencies. Polri ensures that cases are processed in accordance with the Criminal Procedure Code (KUHP) and the fundamental principles of criminal justice (Nurul Hudi, 2011).

c. Coordination Mechanisms

Coordination is the key to successful fisheries law enforcement. This mechanism encompasses: 1). Formal Coordination, conducted through official platforms such as the Coordinating Forum for the Handling of Fisheries Crimes. 2). Informal Coordination, involving daily communication among PPNS, the Navy, and the National Police for the exchange of intelligence information. 3). Data and Information Sharing, whereby investigators exchange data on suspicious vessels, public reports, or modes of operation related to violations (Cayo, 2022). 4). Division of Tasks Based on Authority, for example, the Navy conducts interdictions at sea, PPNS examines licensing documents, and the National Police manages the formal legal process (Asvina et al., 2025).

d. Legal Substance Challenges

Overlapping Authorities, for instance, PPNS and the National Police may at times undertake simultaneous actions without prior coordination (Triono Eddy, 2024). 2). Regulatory Gaps, as certain provisions of the Fisheries Law remain open to multiple interpretations, particularly regarding jurisdiction over specific maritime zones (Nur Laili, 2023). 3). Sectoral Ego Culture, whereby each institution tends to defend its respective domain of authority (Sriwarni, 2021). 4). Limited Resources, as agencies often lack adequate facilities, funding, and personnel to support optimal coordination. By strengthening the legal substance through effective coordination forums, the enforcement of fisheries criminal law can operate more effectively, reduce duplication, and enhance legal certainty for both the public and the state (Alfiana et al., 2023).

2. Legal Structure

a. Law Enforcement Agencies in Fisheries Investigations

In the investigation of fisheries crimes, there are three principal institutions vested with distinct yet complementary authorities:

- 1) Fisheries Civil Servant Investigators. Fisheries Civil Servant Investigators (PPNS Perikanan) are technical law enforcement officers operating under the Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries (Purba & Subroto, 2023). Their authority is regulated under Article 73 paragraph (2) of the Fisheries Law. The primary functions of PPNS include : (a). Conduct investigations and criminal inquiries into fisheries offenses within their area of supervision, including fishing ports. (b). Examine licensing documents and fishing activities. (c). Undertake administrative measures and handle minor criminal offenses. PPNS often serves as the frontline of coordination due to its technical expertise in the field and direct access to fisheries-related documents and operational records (Gede, 2024).
- 2) Investigators of the Indonesian Navy (TNI AL). Pursuant to Article 9 of the TNI Law, the Indonesian Navy (TNI AL) is vested with the authority to undertake actions at sea to safeguard maritime sovereignty (Gede, 2024). In the context of fisheries enforcement, the Navy is authorized to : (a). Take enforcement action against foreign vessels engaged in illegal fishing within the Indonesian Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ). (b). Detain and secure vessels and their crews as preliminary evidence. (c). Transfer findings and seized evidence to the National Police or PPNS for formal investigative proceedings. Through these authorities, the Indonesian Navy functions as a frontline maritime enforcer, while administrative and criminal investigations are subsequently carried out by PPNS and the National Police.
- 3) The Indonesian National Police (Polri). The Indonesian National Police (Polri), particularly the Directorate of Water and Air Police (Polairud), plays a strategic role as the principal coordinator in the investigation of fisheries crimes (Murtinasari, 2021). Pursuant to Article 5 paragraph (2) of the Police Law, Polri is authorized to : (a). Conduct cross-jurisdictional investigations involving multiple law enforcement agencies. (b). Follow up on findings and evidence submitted by the Indonesian Navy and PPNS in accordance with the Criminal Procedure Code (KUHP). (c). Oversee cases through the stages of prosecution and adjudication. In this capacity, Polri functions as a key institutional link between technical field enforcement agencies

(PPNS and the Indonesian Navy) and the formal judicial process.

b. Coordination Forums and Inter-Agency Relations

Inter-agency coordination is regulated through the Coordinating Forum for the Handling of Fisheries Crimes, which was established under Ministerial Regulation of Marine Affairs and Fisheries Number 13 of 2005. The structure of this Forum comprises:

Departments	Role
Minister of Maritime Affairs and Fisheries	Forum chair
Chief of Staff of the Indonesian Navy	Vice Chairman I
Chief of Police	Vice Chairman II
Director General of Marine and Fisheries Resources Supervision and Control	Secretary I
Operational Assistant to the Chief of Staff of the Indonesian Navy	Secretary II

This Forum serves as a formal coordination structure to:

1. Establish priorities for fisheries crime cases.
2. Regulate mechanisms for the exchange of information and intelligence data.
3. Ensure that each agency exercises its authority in accordance with applicable regulations.

The coordination forum also plays a role in reducing overlapping authorities among PPNS, the Indonesian Navy, and the National Police (Ilyas et al., 2024). For instance, in cases involving the interception of foreign vessels, the Navy undertakes initial enforcement actions, PPNS examines fisheries-related documentation, and the National Police conducts the investigative process through to judicial proceedings.

c. Hierarchy and Coordination Pathways

An effective legal structure requires a clear hierarchy and formal coordination pathways. This hierarchy ensures: 1). Vertical Coordination - PPNS reports to the Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries, the Indonesian Navy reports to the Commander of the Indonesian National Armed Forces, and the National Police reports to the Chief of Police (Harefa et al., 2022). 2). Horizontal Coordination - coordination among field-level agencies (PPNS, the Indonesian Navy, and the National Police) for information exchange and operational actions (Anwar et al., 2022). By way of illustration, in a case involving the interdiction of illegal fishing activities in the Maluku Sea: 1). PPNS examines vessel documentation and licensing. 2). The Indonesian Navy detains the vessel and its crew. 3). The National Police prepare the investigation dossier and

initiate legal proceedings.4). Effective coordination prevents dual enforcement actions and competing claims of authority among agencies.

d. Challenges to the Legal Structure

Several challenges within the legal structure of fisheries crime investigations include:1). Institutional Fragmentation-authority is dispersed among the Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries, the National Police, and the Indonesian Navy.2).Insufficient Facilities and Human Resources-coordination forums are not always able to function optimally due to limitations in budget and personnel.3). Lack of Clear Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs)-overlapping actions in the field frequently occur.4). Information Gaps-communication between maritime and land-based enforcement units is not yet fully integrated.

Accordingly, efforts to improve the legal structure should focus on establishing formal coordination mechanisms and clear operational SOPs, as well as enhancing human resource capacity to ensure more effective coordination and more efficient investigations.

3. Legal Culture

a. Definition of Legal Culture

Legal culture refers to the perceptions, attitudes, and practices that develop within society and among law enforcement officials toward legal rules. According to Lawrence M. Friedman, the legal system consists of three main elements: 1). Legal structure, namely the institutions and formal rules that govern the law.2). Legal substance, referring to written legal norms and provisions.3) Legal culture, which reflects how these rules are understood, respected, or disregarded by society and law enforcement agencies. Legal culture plays a decisive role in determining the effectiveness of law enforcement, as even well-formulated written rules may become ineffective without adequate support from a conducive legal culture. In the context of fisheries crime investigations, legal culture is particularly influential in shaping the success of inter-agency coordination(Anisa et al., 2024). For instance, when law enforcement officials exhibit sectoral ego or reluctance to share information, formal coordination mechanisms established through official forums may fail to function effectively (Anugrah Steven Doloksaribu & Din Oloan Sihotang, 2024).

b. Legal Culture of Law Enforcement Agencies**1) Legal Culture of Fisheries Civil Servant Investigators (PPNS Perikanan)**

Fisheries Civil Servant Investigators (PPNS Perikanan) exhibit a legal culture that emphasizes compliance with administrative and technical fisheries procedures. They are accustomed to: (a). Prioritizing the examination of licensing documents. (b). Conducting investigations in accordance with Article 73 of the Fisheries Law. (c). Engaging in coordination when cases involve multiple jurisdictions, although such coordination is often limited to informal communication.

This legal culture enables PPNS to maintain a high level of technical accuracy; however, coordination with the National Police or the Indonesian Navy is sometimes less than optimal due to institutional boundaries and sectoral ego.

2) Legal Culture of the Indonesian Navy (TNI AL)

The legal culture of the Indonesian Navy emphasizes adherence to military hierarchy, discipline, and the protection of maritime territory. In the enforcement of fisheries law: (a). The Navy acts swiftly in responding to illegal fishing vessels, in line with principles of maritime sovereignty. (b). Priority is given to immediate field actions, such as vessel detention and the seizure of fishing gear. (c). Coordination with PPNS and the National Police often occurs after field operations have been completed, which may occasionally result in miscommunication.

This culture reflects a strong emphasis on speed and security, which can lead to delays in formal legal coordination.

3) Legal Culture of the Indonesian National Police (Polri)

The Indonesian National Police, particularly the Directorate of Water and Air Police (Polairud), demonstrate a legal culture that prioritizes formal legal procedures and strict adherence to the Criminal Procedure Code (KUHAP) (Anisa et al., 2024). They are accustomed to: (a). Processing investigation files in a formal and systematic manner for judicial proceedings. (b). Acting as inter-agency coordinators, despite challenges posed by sectoral ego among institutions. (c). Emphasizing legal certainty and comprehensive documentation of evidence.

The legal culture of Polri underscores procedural order and formal oversight, making it effective in judicial processes; however, it may at times be slower in responding to rapid field actions, such as those undertaken by the Indonesian Navy (Anugrah Steven Doloksaribu & Din Oloan Sihotang, 2024).

c. Legal Culture of Law Enforcement Agencies

1) Legal Culture of Fisheries Civil Servant Investigators

Fisheries Civil Servant Investigators (PPNS Perikanan) possess a legal culture that places strong emphasis on compliance with administrative and technical procedures in the fisheries sector. In practice, they are accustomed to: (a). Prioritizing the examination of licensing and permit documentation ; (b). Conducting investigative processes in accordance with Article 73 of the Fisheries Law; (c). Carrying out coordination in cases involving cross-jurisdictional elements, although such coordination is often limited to informal communication

This legal culture enables PPNS Perikanan to demonstrate a high degree of accuracy in technical and administrative matters. However, coordination with the National Police (Polri) or the Indonesian Navy (TNI AL) is not always optimal, due to institutional boundaries of authority and the persistence of sectoral ego among law enforcement agencies (Lubis, 2021).

2) Legal Culture of the Indonesian Navy (TNI AL)

The legal culture of the Indonesian Navy (TNI AL) emphasizes strict adherence to military hierarchy, discipline, and the safeguarding of maritime territory (Mulkam, 2021). In the context of fisheries law enforcement : (a). TNI AL acts swiftly in addressing illegal fishing vessels, in line with the principle of maritime sovereignty. (b). Priority is given to immediate operational actions in the field, such as vessel detention and the seizure of fishing gear ; (c). Coordination with Fisheries Civil Servant Investigators (PPNS Perikanan) and the National Police (Polri) is often undertaken after field operations have been completed, which can at times lead to miscommunication.

This legal culture reflects a prioritization of speed and security considerations, which may result in delays in formal legal coordination processes.

3) Legal Culture of the Indonesian National Police (Polri)

The Indonesian National Police (Polri), particularly the Directorate of Water and Air Police (Direktorat Polairud), possess a legal culture that emphasizes formal legal procedures and strict adherence to the Criminal Procedure Code (KUHP). In practice, they are accustomed to : (a). Processing investigation case files in a formal and systematic manner to meet judicial requirements ; (b). Acting as an inter-agency coordinator, although often encountering obstacles arising from sectoral ego and differing institutional cultures ; (c). Prioritizing legal certainty and comprehensive

documentation of evidence. This legal culture underscores legal orderliness and formal oversight, making Polri effective in judicial proceedings. However, it may at times result in slower responses to rapid field operations, particularly those conducted by the Indonesian Navy (TNI AL).

d. The Influence of Legal Culture on Coordination

The legal culture of law enforcement officials has a significant impact on the effectiveness of inter-agency coordination:1). Sectoral ego-each institution at times emphasizes its internal sovereignty, resulting in less effective formal coordination within official forums.2). Resistance to information sharing - law enforcement officers may be reluctant to share critical data with other agencies, thereby obstructing the investigative process(Syarbaini, 2021).3). Differences in perceptions of authority - Fisheries Civil Servant Investigators (PPNS Perikanan), the Indonesian Navy (TNI AL), and the National Police (Polri) hold differing interpretations regarding jurisdiction and enforcement priorities(Andri Yanto, 2023).4). Respect for procedures - a legal culture that upholds formal procedures enhances legal certainty but may slow down operational responses in the field(Dr. H. Imron Rosyadi, 2022).

Laut Maluku, for example, in a case involving the failed interception of an illegal fishing vessel in the Maluku Sea, the Indonesian Navy (TNI AL) initially detained the vessel, PPNS Perikanan subsequently examined the licensing documents, and the National Police (Polri) prepared the legal case files(Emy Rosna Wati, 2020). Divergent perceptions regarding the sequence of actions resulted in coordination delays, necessitating intervention through a formal coordination forum (Bastian et al., 2024).

e. Efforts to Improve Legal Culture

To enhance the effectiveness of coordination, several legal culture-oriented measures need to be developed:1). Strengthening legal education and coordination training for Fisheries Civil Servant Investigators (PPNS Perikanan), the National Police (Polri), and the Indonesian Navy (TNI AL)(Hariyati, 2021).2). Dissemination and internalization of formal coordination SOPs, ensuring that all law enforcement officers clearly understand procedural workflows and the scope of their respective authorities (Sudin, 2023).3). Establishment of reward and punishment mechanisms to promote compliance with coordination requirements and institutional accountability (Marsih, 2025).4). Reinforcement of coordination forums as formal mechanisms that are institutionally recognized

and embedded within the legal culture of all law enforcement agencies (Marsih, 2025).

Through these measures, legal culture will function as a supportive framework for effective investigations, reduce inter-agency conflicts, and enhance legal certainty for both offenders and the broader community (Makalew, 2021).

4. Principles of the Criminal Justice System

a. Definition of the Criminal Justice System

The criminal justice system is a mechanism that regulates the integrated process of criminal law enforcement, encompassing the stages of inquiry, investigation, prosecution, adjudication, and the execution of court decisions (Binti Ulfatul Jannah, Ainun Nazifatul Mufidah, 2024). Romli Atmasasmita argues that the criminal justice system in Indonesia should be understood as a crime control system carried out through interaction among the police, the public prosecutor's office, the courts, and correctional institutions (Masdalena Nasution et al., 2024).

In the context of fisheries crimes, the criminal justice system is expanded by the involvement of Fisheries Civil Servant Investigators (PPNS Perikanan) and the Indonesian Navy (TNI AL), which play roles at the initial stages of investigation. This expansion renders the Indonesian criminal justice system in fisheries cases more complex than that applied to conventional criminal offenses (Riandhana&Halifah, 2025).

b. Fundamental Principles

1) The Principle of Coordination and Integration

The principle of coordination and integration requires synchronization among law enforcement institutions (Loso Judijanto, SSi, MM, MStatsBinayanti, S.Pi., M.Si. Ully Wulandari et al., 2024). Without effective coordination, the criminal justice system operates in a fragmented manner and is prone to overlapping authorities. In the investigation of fisheries crimes, coordination must encompass: a). Initial actions at sea (conducted by the Indonesian Navy/TNI AL); b). Administrative examination (conducted by Fisheries Civil Servant Investigators/PPNS Perikanan); c). Formal criminal investigation (conducted by the National Police/Polri). These stages must be integrated to ensure that law enforcement processes are both effective and legally valid (Hehanussa, 2023).

2) The Principle of Due Process of Law

The principle of due process of law requires that all investigative actions be conducted in accordance with the Criminal Procedure Code (KUHP) and relevant statutory regulations. Vessels, fishing gear, and crew members apprehended must be processed through formal legal procedures rather than merely administrative actions. This principle safeguards the rights of suspects while simultaneously ensuring legal certainty for victims and the state (Ekonomi et al., 2023).

3) The Principle of Legal Certainty

This principle requires that every action undertaken by law enforcement authorities be grounded in a clear legal basis. In the fisheries context, legal certainty is often undermined by differing interpretations among the National Police (Polri), Fisheries Civil Servant Investigators (PPNS Perikanan), and the Indonesian Navy (TNI AL) regarding investigative authority. The establishment of coordination forums and clearly defined standard operating procedures (SOPs) is therefore essential to uphold the principle of legal certainty (Fikri, 2021).

4) The Principle of Substantive Justice

The criminal justice system should not merely emphasize procedural compliance but must also ensure the realization of substantive justice. In fisheries cases, substantive justice entails: a). Protection of marine resources as assets belonging to the state and the people; b). Protection of the rights of local fishermen from illegal fishing practices; c). Non-discriminatory law enforcement against offenders, whether foreign or domestic (Debora, 2023).

5) The Principle of Effectiveness

The principle of effectiveness emphasizes that the criminal justice system must be capable of tangibly reducing fisheries-related crimes. Effectiveness may be assessed through: a). The number of cases successfully resolved through final court judgments; b). The extent of state losses that can be recovered; c). The level of prevention of repeat offenses (recidivism).

c. Implementation in the Investigation of Fisheries Crimes

In practice, the application of criminal justice system principles in fisheries crime investigations encounters several challenges, including: 1). Suboptimal coordination-the Indonesian Navy (TNI AL) often transfers seized vessels or evidence to the National Police

(Polri) without complete procedural documentation, resulting in weak case files before the courts (Fariaman Laia, 2022).2). Neglect of due process of law - in some cases, enforcement actions end merely with vessel detention without being followed by judicial proceedings.3). Weak legal certainty - overlapping investigative authorities between Fisheries Civil Servant Investigators (PPNS Perikanan) and the National Police (Polri) create legal uncertainty and confusion (Rosifany, 2020).

Nevertheless, there are also examples of best practices in certain regions, such as Ambon and Bitung, where coordination among PPNS Perikanan, Polri, and TNI AL has functioned more effectively through integrated coordination forums, enabling cases to proceed to final court judgments (Lewerissa, 2022).

d. An Ideal Model for the Application of Criminal Justice System Principles

To ensure the effective application of criminal justice system principles in the context of fisheries crimes, an ideal model should be developed, encompassing:1). A single coordination gateway for investigations, with the National Police (Polri) serving as the coordinating authority, while PPNS Perikanan and TNI AL retain their respective functional powers in accordance with their institutional mandates.2). Joint standard operating protocols (SOPs), whereby every initial action taken by TNI AL is immediately documented and formally transferred to Polri with the involvement of PPNS Perikanan.3). A permanent coordination forum, involving the Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries (KKP), Polri, and TNI AL, which regularly evaluates ongoing and completed cases.4). Utilization of information technology, through integrated data systems among KKP, Polri, and TNI AL to prevent duplication of enforcement actions.5) External oversight, with the public prosecutor's office and the judiciary acting as formal supervisory bodies to ensure that due process of law and legal certainty are consistently upheld. The criminal justice system in fisheries cases cannot operate solely on the basis of written legal rules (legal substance) or institutional structures. It also requires the support of a legal culture that encourages law enforcement officials to act cooperatively and transparently in coordination. The principles of the criminal justice system thus serve as a foundation to ensure that inter-agency coordination is not merely a formality, but genuinely enhances the effectiveness of law enforcement and the protection of Indonesia's marine resources.

Effectiveness of the Implementation of Coordination among Law Enforcement Agencies in the Investigation of Fisheries Crimes

1. Legality and Sources of Authority

The effectiveness of coordination among law enforcement agencies in the investigation of fisheries crimes cannot be separated from a thorough understanding of the legality and sources of authority of each institution involved. Legality in this context does not merely refer to formal legitimacy, but also encompasses the clarity of legal norms governing the scope of duties, authorities, and limitations of each law enforcement agency (Baehaqi, 2021). In the absence of clear legal certainty, coordination will encounter obstacles, including overlapping authorities, procedural conflicts, and uncertainty in decision-making at the operational level.

a. Water and Air Police (Polairud)

Polairud is an integral part of the Indonesian National Police with specific authority in maritime and airspace jurisdictions. The legality of Polairud's authority is derived from Law Number 2 of 2002 concerning the Indonesian National Police, along with its implementing regulations, including regulations issued by the Chief of Police regarding the duties and functions of Polairud. Under this Law, Polairud is authorized to: 1). Conduct supervision and patrols within national jurisdictional waters. 2). Take enforcement actions against violations of fisheries law, including both criminal offenses and administrative violations. 3). Carry out investigations into fisheries crimes occurring in coastal waters as well as on the high seas, in accordance with prevailing laws and regulations.

In its operational practice, Polairud is also required to coordinate with relevant institutions, including the Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries (KKP), the Indonesian Navy (TNI AL), and fisheries Civil Servant Investigators (PPNS). Accordingly, the legality of Polairud's authority encompasses not only repressive enforcement powers but also coordinative authority aimed at fostering inter-institutional synergy (Trihan Hardiansyah, 2025).

b. Indonesian Navy (TNI AL)

The Indonesian Navy (TNI AL) holds specific authority to safeguard the sovereignty and security of the maritime territory of the Republic of Indonesia (Harahap et al., 2021). The legal basis for the authority of the TNI AL is stipulated in Law Number 34 of 2004 concerning the Indonesian National Armed Forces, along with its implementing regulations. Several of the principal authorities of

the TNI AL in the context of fisheries law enforcement include: 1). Safeguarding maritime areas from threats to national sovereignty, including smuggling, piracy, and illegal fishing conducted by foreign vessels. 2). Providing operational support to other agencies vested with investigative authority, such as Polairud or Civil Servant Investigators (PPNS), through joint operations. 3). Undertaking preventive measures to avert violations of fisheries law by conducting routine patrols and surveillance within national maritime jurisdiction zones. Although the investigative authority of the TNI AL is limited in nature; its strategic role in joint operations is highly significant. Effective synergy between the TNI AL and investigative law enforcement agencies is essential to ensure that preventive and repressive measures can be carried out simultaneously without giving rise to conflicts of authority (Eva Syahfitri Nasution, SH., MH. Rafiqoh Lubis, SH., 2023).

c. Civil Servant Investigators (PPNS) in the Fisheries Sector

Fisheries Civil Servant Investigators (PPNS) are officials granted specific authority under Law Number 31 of 2004 concerning Fisheries, primarily to handle violations related to technical regulations, administrative provisions, and fisheries crimes. The legality of fisheries PPNS encompasses the following authorities: 1). Enforcement of technical regulations concerning the capture, processing, and distribution of fisheries products. 2). Conducting investigations into fisheries crimes, including serious violations that have an impact on the sustainability of marine resources. 3). Coordination with Polairud and the Indonesian Navy (TNI AL) in enforcement actions that require field support or additional security. PPNS plays a unique role due to its position at the intersection of administrative functions and investigative authority. Clearly defined and proportionate powers enable PPNS to act as a liaison between technical fisheries policies and law enforcement agencies exercising repressive functions (Tompodung, 2021).

d. The Relationship between Legality and the Effectiveness of Coordination

Coordination among fisheries law enforcement institutions is effective only when all parties share a common understanding of the legality and scope of their respective authorities. Lubis (2019) emphasizes that “coordination among law enforcement agencies will fail if the legal basis of authority is unclear or not implemented consistently (Sinaga et al., 2023).” In other words, in the absence of legal certainty, every joint operation is potentially subject to

obstacles, including: 1). Overlapping authority, for instance when investigative actions are carried out simultaneously by Polairud and PPNS without proper coordination. 2). Procedural conflicts, such as differences in evidentiary standards or mechanisms for handling reports of violations. 3). Uncertainty of responsibility, which may result in legal proceedings being delayed or rendered null and void. The effectiveness of coordination can be enhanced through several mechanisms, including: 1). The establishment of formal coordination protocols that regulate communication channels, division of tasks, and operational priorities. 2). Joint cross-institutional training to ensure a uniform understanding of authority, procedures, and investigative techniques. 3). Strengthening the legal framework through government regulations or joint regulations (Memoranda of Understanding/MoUs) that clearly define the roles of each institution. Accordingly, legality and sources of authority are not merely formal aspects, but constitute a strategic foundation for the creation of effective coordination in the investigation of fisheries crimes. Without clear recognition and understanding of the legal basis of each institution's authority, fisheries law enforcement efforts risk becoming unstructured, unfocused, and suboptimal.

2. Forms and Scope of Authority

In the context of fisheries criminal law enforcement, the forms and scope of authority constitute the primary foundation that determines the effectiveness of coordination among law enforcement agencies. Conceptually, authority may be understood as the right or capacity conferred by legal norms to carry out certain actions in the investigation of criminal offenses. The theory of authority emphasizes that such authority must be clear, measurable, and unambiguous, so that law enforcement officials are able to perform their duties without internal conflict or overlapping competencies (Law et al., 2022).

The scope of authority encompasses the range of actions that may be undertaken by each law enforcement body, including the Water and Air Police (Polairud), Civil Servant Investigators (PPNS) of the Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries, and other related agencies. In investigative practice, this scope is not merely administrative in nature, but also carries significant legal implications regarding the legality or illegality of law enforcement actions undertaken.

a. Arrest and Seizure

One of the most critical forms of authority concerns arrest and seizure. Polairud is authorized to carry out the arrest of vessels

engaged in illegal fishing activities pursuant to Law Number 2 of 2002 concerning the Indonesian National Police and its implementing regulations. Meanwhile, PPNS possesses limited investigative authority with respect to illegal fishing gear, in accordance with the provisions of Law Number 31 of 2004 concerning Fisheries (Mawaddah & Abdul, 2022).

The lack of clarity in the division of duties between these agencies frequently leads to confusion in determining which authority has priority to conduct arrests or seize evidence. In a case study from the City of Tual, there was an incident in which both Polairud and PPNS were present at the site of an operation targeting an illegal fishing vessel; yet no prior coordination had taken place. As a result, the vessel managed to escape, and the fishing gear serving as evidence had to be secured separately by PPNS, causing delays in the investigative process.

This situation underscores the importance of establishing clear operational guidelines regarding the sequence of actions and the allocation of authority among law enforcement agencies. Legal coordination theory emphasizes that when the scope of authority is not clearly defined, the risk of horizontal conflict increases, ultimately leading to a decline in the effectiveness of law enforcement (Irawan & Sholehuddin, 2023).

b. Examination of Witnesses and Suspects

In addition to physical enforcement actions such as arrest, the authority of law enforcement agencies also encompasses administrative aspects of criminal investigation, including the examination of witnesses and suspects (Rohmah & Azmi, 2022). PPNS is authorized to examine suspects and witnesses within the scope of administrative fisheries violations, whereas Polairud handles broader criminal offenses. When both agencies examine witnesses separately without proper coordination, this often results in data duplication, inconsistencies in statements, and even the potential neglect of crucial evidence (Badi'ah, 2022).

Field experience in the City of Tual reveals cases in which witnesses were examined twice by different authorities within a short period of time. Differences in the focus of questioning and in the recording of examination results led to inconsistencies in case files, prompting the court to postpone hearings until further clarification was provided. This case demonstrates that an understanding of the scope of authority is not merely a matter of which institution conducts the examination, but also of how examination procedures are structured to avoid overlap that could hinder the investigative process (Armanda, 2024).

c. Preparation of Investigation Reports

The scope of authority also determines which institution is entitled to prepare case files and investigation reports. PPNS is authorized to compile investigation files for administrative fisheries violations, while Polairud prepares case files for serious criminal offenses, such as the capture of foreign vessels engaged in illegal fishing within Indonesia's jurisdictional waters (Yustitiana, 2021).

In practice, the lack of clear boundaries of authority has led to contradictions in official documentation. For example, in a case in the City of Tual, the initial report prepared by Polairud stated a different number of seized vessels than that recorded by PPNS, requiring the case file to be corrected and re-verified for more than two weeks. Such incidents have serious implications not only for the speed of investigations, but also for the credibility of law enforcement agencies in the eyes of the public (Trihan Hardiansyah, 2025).

d. Implications for the Effectiveness of Coordination

Based on the analysis of the theory of authority, clearly defined forms and scopes of authority serve to minimize internal conflicts, accelerate investigative processes, and enhance the effectiveness of coordination among law enforcement agencies. Conversely, when the scope of authority is not clearly delineated, even where a legal basis formally exists, coordination processes will face significant obstacles, including: 1). Duplication of Actions: Law enforcement agencies undertake identical actions without proper synchronization. 2). Documentary Contradictions: Investigation files become inconsistent and are potentially subject to rejection by the courts. 3). Delays in Investigation: Administrative processes slow down due to the need for additional clarification or re-verification. 4). Legal Vulnerability: Law enforcement actions may be legally challenged for exceeding officially mandated authority.

Accordingly, it is recommended that each law enforcement agency adopt specific operational guidelines concerning the limits of authority and responsibilities, as well as formal coordination mechanisms that regulate collaborative actions at every stage of the investigative process.

3. Limitations and Clarity of the Boundaries of Authority

The limitation of authority constitutes one of the essential instruments within the structure of law enforcement coordination, particularly in the investigation of fisheries crimes. In this context, authority must not be ambiguous or overlapping, as such conditions may give rise to conflicts among law enforcement agencies, reduce the effectiveness of enforcement actions, and

potentially infringe upon citizens' rights. Accordingly, the regulation of the boundaries of authority must be clear, measurable, and grounded in a strong juridical basis (Harahap et al., 2021).

a. The Importance of Limiting Authority

The limitation of authority aims to provide legal certainty for both law enforcement agencies and the public. Law enforcement officials must understand the scope of actions that are lawful in physical, administrative, and juridical terms, so that every action undertaken remains within the legal framework that has been established. In the absence of clear limitations, actions that are formally lawful for one institution may constitute violations for another. For example, the seizure of illegal fishing gear by the Indonesian Navy (TNI AL) in coastal waters may conflict with the authority of Polairud, which focuses on investigative aspects (Eva Syahfitri Nasution, SH., MH. Rafiqoh Lubis, SH., 2023).

According to Handayaningrat (2011), one of the primary causes of duplicated investigations and the inefficient use of resources is the lack of clarity regarding the boundaries of authority among law enforcement agencies. In practice, officials who do not fully understand their institutional limits often undertake actions that should fall within the domain of other agencies, thereby generating horizontal conflicts and slowing down the law enforcement process. This demonstrates that the limitation of authority is not merely administrative in nature, but also constitutes a strategic factor in formal inter-agency coordination mechanisms.

b. Scope of the Limits of Authority

The limits of authority may be categorized into three principal dimensions:

1) Physical/Geographical Limits

The operational areas of each law enforcement agency must be clearly defined. For example, the Indonesian Navy (TNI AL) holds authority limited to safeguarding Indonesia's maritime sovereignty, including patrols within national jurisdictional waters and the Exclusive Economic Zone (Tompodung, 2021). Meanwhile, Polairud possesses broader authority to conduct investigations into fisheries crimes, but such authority must nevertheless be aligned with areas designated as priorities for coastal waters surveillance. These territorial limitations are essential to prevent conflicts during field operations, particularly when two agencies are present at the same location but pursue different objectives (Sinaga et al., 2023).

2) Administrative Limits

Administrative limitations relate to the types of violations that may be addressed by each institution. PPNS, for instance, is authorized only to conduct investigations into fisheries regulation violations pertaining to administrative, technical, and regulatory compliance aspects. They do not possess the authority to undertake purely criminal law enforcement actions without coordination with Polairud investigators or the general police. Likewise, Polairud must conduct its investigations in accordance with applicable statutory provisions, including coordination with relevant agencies in complex cases (Law et al., 2022).

3) Juridical Limits

Juridical limits concern the legal basis that confers legitimacy upon law enforcement officials to act. Every action must be grounded in a clear legal framework, such as Law Number 31 of 2004 concerning Fisheries, Law Number 2 of 2002 concerning the Police, and Law Number 34 of 2004 concerning the Indonesian National Armed Forces. In addition, implementing regulations and inter-agency joint regulations may further clarify the division of authority and ensure that officials do not exceed legal boundaries. In the absence of juridical clarity, law enforcement actions may be subject to legal challenge or deemed invalid, thereby undermining the effectiveness of law enforcement (Irawan & Sholehuddin, 2023).

c. Mechanisms for Determining the Limits of Authority

The determination of the limits of authority should be carried out through structured and formal mechanisms, including the following: 1) Joint Regulations (MoUs/Cooperation Agreements) Inter-agency joint regulations constitute an important instrument for clearly regulating the division of tasks and the boundaries of authority. For example, cooperation agreements among the Indonesian Navy (TNI AL), Polairud, and PPNS institutions may stipulate operational authority, coordination procedures, and mechanisms for resolving jurisdictional disputes in the field (Rohmah & Azmi, 2022). 2) Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs). Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) may serve as technical guidelines for law enforcement officials to act in accordance with their respective limits of authority. Such SOPs specify which institution is authorized to conduct arrests, examinations, seizures, and the transfer of cases to the relevant authorities (Badi'ah, 2022).

4) Regular Coordination Meetings

Regular coordination meetings are essential to harmonize perceptions among institutions, evaluate the implementation of authority, and adjust the boundaries of authority in response to changes in regulations or field conditions (Armanda, 2024).

5) Internal Supervision and Evaluation

Internal supervision constitutes a key element in ensuring that law enforcement officials remain within the scope of their lawful authority. Periodic evaluations may also prevent the recurrence of authority-related conflicts and ensure that coordination is carried out effectively (Yustitiana, 2021).

d. The Impact of Unclear Boundaries of Authority

The lack of clarity regarding the boundaries of authority not only gives rise to internal conflicts among institutions, but also adversely affects the quality of law enforcement. Several resulting impacts include: 1). Duplication of Tasks and Waste of Resources When two institutions conduct investigations into the same case without proper coordination, human resources, time, and budgetary allocations become inefficiently utilized (Febriyanti et al., 2025). 2). Delays in the Law Enforcement Process Unclear boundaries of authority may cause law enforcement officials to wait for directives or clarifications before taking action, thereby slowing down the investigative process (Uyan Wiryadi, Fadhila Gifari, 2023). 3). Increased Risk of Violations of Citizens' Rights Officials who do not understand the juridical limits of their authority may engage in actions that violate citizens' rights, such as unlawful seizures or detentions that do not comply with procedural requirements (Orlando, 2022). 4). Loss of Public Trust The public is likely to perceive law enforcement agencies as unprofessional when internal conflicts or overlapping actions occur, thereby undermining institutional legitimacy and public confidence in law enforcement bodies (Tio & Br, 2024).

6) Inter-Agency Relations and Coordination Patterns

Inter-agency coordination in the enforcement of fisheries criminal law constitutes a highly strategic aspect in ensuring the effectiveness of investigations and enforcement actions against fisheries law violations. Effective coordination does not depend solely on formal regulations or statutory provisions, but is also significantly influenced by the quality of interpersonal relations among officials and the operational patterns developed in the field (M. R. Yusuf, 2022).

In this context, coordination patterns may be classified into three

principal types: vertical coordination, horizontal coordination, and functional coordination. Each pattern plays a specific and complementary role in building a law enforcement system that is synergistic and responsive to field dynamics (Situngkir, 2023).

- a. Vertical Coordination. Vertical coordination encompasses the relationship between Civil Servant Investigators (PPNS) and their immediate superiors, both at the ministerial level and within local police jurisdictions. This pattern of coordination is essential because it enables strategic direction, supervision, and control over the implementation of investigative duties in the field (Setiawan et al., 2025).

In practice, vertical coordination helps ensure that every investigative and enforcement step is carried out in accordance with applicable legal provisions, while minimizing the risk of procedural errors that could result in the nullification of legal proceedings in court. For instance, PPNS officials operating in the field are required to report every enforcement outcome to their superiors, who then assess whether such actions are consistent with national policies and fisheries law. This is in line with the principle of hierarchy within Indonesia's governmental bureaucratic system, where vertical oversight serves as a crucial instrument for upholding legal and administrative discipline (Jumaeli, 2021).

- b. Functional Coordination. Functional coordination focuses on the exchange of technical information, such as patrol results, intelligence reports, and legal evidence obtained in the field. This pattern is particularly important because investigations into fisheries crimes often require the rapid and accurate processing of data to determine subsequent enforcement measures.

In practice, functional coordination is carried out through mechanisms such as the preparation of joint reports, electronic documentation systems, and technical communication forums among agencies. For example, patrol data obtained by Polairud may be directly accessed by PPNS and the Indonesian Navy (TNI AL) through digital systems, enabling each institution to respond to violations in a prompt and integrated manner.

- c. Determining Factors of Coordination Effectiveness

The effectiveness of inter-agency coordination is influenced by several factors, including:

- 1) Clarity of Duties and Authority: Officials involved must clearly understand the limits of their respective authorities in accordance with the Fisheries Law, the Police Law, and the TNI

Law, so as to avoid overlapping duties in the field.

- 2) Quality of Interpersonal Relations: Strong professional relationships among officials are key to smooth coordination, including informal communication outside formal mechanisms.
- 3) Integrated Reporting and Documentation Systems: The use of information technology for data exchange, such as digital reporting systems and intelligence databases, accelerates decision-making and enhances the responsiveness of law enforcement.
- 4) Regular Coordination Meetings: Periodic coordination forums allow for activity evaluation, strategic adjustments, and discussions of operational challenges encountered in the field.

Accordingly, the success of inter-agency coordination depends not only on formal regulations, but also on the ability of officials to establish effective working patterns characterized by mutual trust and openness in information exchange. Empirical data indicate that a well-balanced combination of vertical, horizontal, and functional coordination can significantly accelerate investigative processes, enhance enforcement success rates, and reduce inter-agency conflicts.

The Ideal Form of Coordination among Law Enforcement Agencies in the Investigation of Fisheries Crimes

1. Harmonization of Regulations and Legal Authority

The harmonization of regulations and legal authority constitutes the primary foundation for ensuring effective coordination among law enforcement agencies in the investigation of fisheries crimes. In the absence of normative alignment and clear delineation of authority, coordination is prone to encounter obstacles, both administratively and operationally.

a. Legal Basis and Relevant Regulatory Framework

Law enforcement agencies involved in fisheries matters consist of several principal actors, namely Polairud, Civil Servant Investigators (PPNS) of the Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries (KKP), and the Indonesian Navy (TNI AL). Each institution is vested with distinct legal bases and authorities, including the following:

- 1) Polairud derives its authority from Law Number 2 of 2002 concerning the Indonesian National Police, including implementing regulations governing patrols, arrests, and the investigation of criminal offenses within Indonesia's maritime waters.
- 2) PPNS of the Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries (KKP) is empowered under Law Number 31 of 2004 concerning

Fisheries, with authority to conduct investigations into fisheries violations such as illegal fishing, the use of prohibited fishing gear, and coral reef destruction.

- 3) The Indonesian Navy (TNI AL) is tasked with safeguarding maritime sovereignty pursuant to Law Number 34 of 2004 concerning the Indonesian National Armed Forces, including maritime patrols and security operations that frequently intersect with the activities of Polairud and PPNS.

These differences in legal foundations create an urgent need for harmonization to ensure that every law enforcement action can be legally accounted for and does not result in overlapping authority that could adversely affect other institutions.

b. The Need for Harmonization

The harmonization of regulations and legal authority encompasses several key aspects:

- 1) Consistency of Legal Norms: Regulations governing the authority of each institution must be formulated in such a manner as to avoid mutual contradictions. For instance, regulations permitting PPNS to conduct seizures must be aligned with Polairud's provisions concerning the securing of illegal foreign vessels.
- 2) Formal Coordination Channels: Clear mechanisms must be established regarding which institution leads coordination, how case priorities are determined, and how information is exchanged. This reduces the risk of conflict during field investigations.
- 3) Alignment of Operational Procedures: Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) should be standardized or, at a minimum, made compatible across institutions, including procedures for vessel detention, evidence collection, and the summoning of witnesses.

c. Implementation of Harmonization

Harmonization may be realized through several practical strategies, including:

- 1) J Formulation of Joint Technical Regulations: For example, the issuance of a Joint Regulation among the Indonesian National Police, the Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries (KKP), and the Indonesian Navy (TNI AL) governing integrated investigations of fisheries crimes.
- 2) Regular Coordination Forums: Routine inter-agency meetings to discuss legal issues, overlapping authorities, and evaluations of ongoing cases.

- 3) Joint Training Programs: Enhancing law enforcement officials' understanding of the respective authorities of each institution, thereby making coordination more effective and efficient.
- 4) Integrated Information Systems: Ensuring that all reports, investigation results, and supporting documents are accessible to all involved institutions, facilitating supervision and reducing task duplication.

d. Challenges and Solutions

The harmonization of regulations is not without challenges, including:

- 1) Differences in Legal Interpretation among institutions, particularly regarding maritime jurisdictional boundaries and supervisory authority.
- 2) Sectoral Interests that may generate role conflicts, especially between the Indonesian Navy (TNI AL) and Polairud in maritime security operations.
- 3) Limited Human Resource Capacity to comprehend complex and overlapping regulatory frameworks.

Potential solutions include the formulation of integrated implementing regulations, continuous legal education for law enforcement agencies, and the strengthening of supervisory mechanisms by oversight institutions such as the Public Prosecutor's Office or the Ombudsman.

2. Establishment of Coordination Forums and Integrated Operational SOPs

The investigation of fisheries crimes requires systematic coordination among law enforcement agencies (LEAs) with differing mandates, such as Polairud, the Indonesian Navy (TNI AL), and Civil Servant Investigators of the Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries (PPNS KKP). Such coordination does not rely solely on formal regulations, but also on clear operational mechanisms. The establishment of coordination forums and integrated operational SOPs constitutes a crucial instrument for aligning the actions of law enforcement agencies, minimizing conflicts, and ensuring that investigative processes are conducted effectively and transparently.

a. Inter-Agency Coordination Forums

1) Objectives of the Coordination Forum

The coordination forum serves several primary objectives, including:

- a) Aligning fisheries law enforcement strategies in coastal areas.
- b) Preventing overlapping authority among institutions.

- c) Ensuring the rapid and accurate flow of case-related information.
- d) Enhancing responsiveness to urgent fisheries violations, such as the apprehension of illegal foreign fishing vessels.

2) Structure of the Coordination Forum

An ideal coordination forum should have a formal structure involving all relevant law enforcement agencies:

- a) Chairperson: Head of the Regional Office of the Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries (KKP) or a senior official of the local Polairud unit.
- b) Members: Representatives of the Indonesian Navy (TNI AL), Polairud, PPNS KKP, the Public Prosecutor's Office, and other relevant stakeholders.
- c) Secretariat: Responsible for managing agendas, documentation, and the dissemination of case-related information.

This structure emphasizes a clear division of roles and responsibilities, ensuring that each institution understands its position and authority.

3) Meeting Mechanisms

- a) Regular Meetings: For example, monthly meetings to evaluate patrol activities, follow up on cases, and update data on fisheries violations.
- b) Ad Hoc Meetings: Emergency meetings convened in response to incidents such as the apprehension of illegal fishing vessels or inter-agency conflicts.
- c) Annual Evaluation Meetings: To compile performance reports, evaluate existing SOPs, and formulate recommendations for improving coordination.

Such forums have been implemented on a partial basis in several regions; however, in the City of Tual and Maluku Tenggara Regency, further refinement is required to achieve maximum effectiveness.

b. Integrated Operational SOPs

1) Definition and Objectives

Integrated operational SOPs are standard procedures that regulate all stages of fisheries crime investigations in a collaborative manner. The primary objectives of such SOPs are to: (a) Ensure consistency of legal actions across institutions. (b) Establish clear workflows from arrest to the transfer of case files. (c) Prevent internal conflicts arising from overlapping authority. (d) Enhance transparency for coastal communities regarding legal processes.

2) Essential Components of Integrated SOPs

- a) Arrest and Seizure Procedures:
 - 1) Determination of the institution authorized to conduct the initial arrest based on jurisdiction.
 - 2) Procedures for the seizure of vessels, fishing gear, and relevant documents.
 - 3) Handling of evidence to ensure its admissibility in court.
- b) Investigation and Examination:
 - 1) Allocation of responsibilities for the examination of witnesses, suspects, and documents.
 - 2) Determination of the institution responsible for leading the primary investigation.
- c) Reporting and Documentation:
 - 1) Standardized integrated reporting formats applicable to all institutions.
 - 2) Utilization of online information systems accessible to relevant law enforcement agencies.
- d) Case Transfer Procedures:
 - 1) Procedures for the transfer of cases to the Public Prosecutor's Office.
 - 2) Coordination mechanisms to ensure the completeness of legal documentation.
- e) Evaluation and Oversight:
 - 1) Annual internal audits conducted by the coordination forum to assess the effectiveness of SOP implementation.
 - 2) Recommendations for improvement in the event of weaknesses in implementation.

3. Development of a Collaborative Work Culture

The implementation of a collaborative work culture occupies a fundamental position in the administration of maritime security in Indonesia. The complexity of the maritime sector which involves multiple institutions with differing mandates and authorities that often overlap renders inter-agency cooperation an absolute necessity. In this context, the Indonesian Maritime Security Agency (Bakamla) serves as a key driving force responsible for harmonizing maritime security functions and operations, as stipulated in Presidential Regulation Number 178 of 2014.

This collaborative culture does not remain merely conceptual, but is realized through layered and continuous coordination mechanisms. Several forms of implementation that reflect inter-agency cooperation values may be described as follows:

1. Joint Patrol Operations

Operational collaboration is clearly manifested through integrated

patrol operations initiated by Bakamla, involving the Indonesian Navy (TNI AL), Polairud, the Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries, and the Directorate General of Customs and Excise. Such activities enable the optimization of fleet utilization and cross-agency personnel deployment. For instance, the 2025 Joint Patrols underscored a shift from sectoral ego-driven approaches toward a collective strategy for safeguarding national.

2. Discussion and Coordination Forums

Bakamla regularly organizes communication forums, including Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) and Maritime Security Coordination Forums. These forums function as platforms for the exchange of ideas, policy alignment, and the strengthening of strategic communication between central and regional authorities.

3. Integration of Maritime Information Systems

Efforts to strengthen cooperation are also pursued through the development of the National Maritime Security and Safety Information System. This digital platform enables direct and continuous data exchange, allowing operational decisions to be made more rapidly, accurately, and in a coordinated manner.

4. Clarification of Authority

Potential conflicts of authority often constitute a major obstacle to maritime law enforcement. Through coordination forums, each institution gains clarity regarding its role and the limits of its authority. In this way, coordination serves to foster synergy rather than institutional rivalry.

5. Inter-Ministerial Meetings

The Coordinating Ministry for Political, Legal, and Security Affairs (KemenkoPolhukam) also plays a policy-controlling role by convening regular coordination meetings. This function ensures that national maritime policies are implemented consistently by all relevant institutions.

6. International Cooperation Dimension

The collaborative culture further extends to regional and global levels. Bakamla, for example, actively participates in the ASEAN Coast Guard Forum (ACF), which serves as a platform for cooperation in addressing transnational threats such as piracy, smuggling, and illegal fishing.

From these practices, it is evident that collaboration is not merely a situational strategy, but has evolved into an institutionalized collaborative culture. This pattern enables each maritime security institution in Indonesia to perform its functions in a complementary manner, without negating the authorities conferred by statutory law.

4. Implementation of an Integrated Information System

One of the essential prerequisites for achieving effective coordination among law enforcement agencies in the maritime sector is the availability of an integrated information system. In the context of maritime security, each institution such as the Indonesian Maritime Security Agency (Bakamla), the Indonesian Navy (TNI AL), Polairud, the Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries, and the Directorate General of Customs and Excise maintains its own databases and information networks, which have often operated in isolation. This fragmentation of information can lead to delays in decision-making and may even result in duplicated enforcement actions or enforcement gaps in the field.

Efforts to integrate information systems have therefore become a strategic agenda initiated by Bakamla through the development of the National Maritime Security and Safety Information System. This platform is designed to enable real-time data exchange concerning vessel movements, indications of illegal activities, and other maritime threat dynamics relevant to law enforcement duties. Through this system, information that was previously dispersed across multiple agencies can be compiled into a single network, thereby facilitating operational coordination.

The implementation of an integrated system serves not only as a medium for data exchange, but also as an instrument of oversight and accountability. Every patrol, arrest, or investigative action undertaken by maritime law enforcement officials can be documented within the system, thereby reducing the potential for data manipulation or abuses of authority. Moreover, the system supports connectivity with modern monitoring technologies, such as the Automatic Identification System (AIS) and coastal radar, enabling rapid and accurate vessel identification. In the future, this integration is also directed toward the establishment of a national maritime data center accessible to all stakeholders in accordance with their respective levels of authority. As a result, maritime law enforcement can be conducted in a more responsive, measurable, and non-overlapping manner.

Nevertheless, the implementation of an integrated information system is not without challenges. Technical obstacles such as limited communication infrastructure in archipelagic regions, differing data standards among agencies, and resistance stemming from sectoral ego remain barriers that must be addressed. Accordingly, beyond technological considerations, strong political and institutional commitment is required to uphold the principle of inter-agency information transparency. With the effective

implementation of an integrated information system, it is expected that supervision and law enforcement processes in Indonesia's maritime areas can be carried out more efficiently, transparently, and in alignment with national interests in safeguarding maritime sovereignty and security.

5. Conclusion

The Essence of Coordination Arrangements. The essence of coordination between APH in the investigation of fisheries crimes is rooted in the need for legal certainty, the effectiveness of law enforcement, and the protection of national interests over marine resources. Normatively, these regulations have been regulated in various legal instruments, including: Law Number 31 of 2004 concerning Fisheries as amended by Law Number 45 of 2009, Law Number 2 of 2002 concerning the National Police of the Republic of Indonesia, Law Number 34 of 2004 concerning the Indonesian National Army, as well as regulations related to the existence of Civil Servant Investigators (PPNS). **Implementation of Coordination** In practice, the implementation of coordination between APH shows that there is an inconsistency between legal norms and empirical reality. In various coastal areas, including Tual City and Southeast Maluku Regency, fisheries law enforcement often faces coordination challenges. This condition shows that the implementation of coordination is still far from ideal. Law enforcement is often slow, inconsistent, and lacking transparency. This has implications for the decline in the trust of coastal communities in the presence of the state in protecting marine resources. **Ideal Form of Coordination Implementation.** The ideal form of coordination should not only rely on the existing legal framework, but also build a sustainable collaborative system. Thus, the ideal form of coordination not only emphasizes formal cooperation, but also builds a collaborative work culture that prioritizes national interests over sectoral interests.

Acknowledgements

The author expresses his deepest appreciation to all parties who have contributed and supported this research. Their assistance and encouragement were invaluable in making this research possible. Thank you for your time, advice, and guidance. We hope the results of this research will be beneficial to all parties.

References:

1. Akbar, M. F. (2022). *Restorative Justice Reform in the Indonesian Criminal Justice System*. *Legal Issues*, 51(2), 199–208.
2. Alfiana, F., Wahyuningsih, R., & Jamaluddin, J. (2023). *Improving Student Learning Outcomes Through TPS-Type Cooperative Learning with a TaRL Approach to Environmental Change Materials*. *Scientific Journal of the Education Profession*, 8(4), 2800–2804.
3. Alhuda, B. (2022). *The Effectiveness of Gakkumdu in Bawaslu Regulation Number 31 of 2018 Reviewed from Law Enforcement Theory*. *Interdisciplinary Journal on Law, Social Sciences and Humanities*, 3(2), 103.
4. Anisa, N. F., Turmuzi, M., & Triutami, W. T. (2024). *The Effect of the Team Games Tournament (TGT) Type Cooperative Learning Model on Students' Mathematical Communication Skills*. *Journal of Classroom Action Research*, 6(1), 51–59.
5. Anugrah Steven Doloksaribu, & Din Oloan Sihotang. (2024). *The Application of the Jigsaw-Type Cooperative Learning Model to Improve Social Skills and Learning Interests of Grade IV Students in Catholic Religious Education Subjects*. *Lumen: Journal of Catechesis and Pastoral Religious Education*, 3(1), 469–484.
6. Armanda, B. (2024). *Illegal Parking in the Perspective of Legal Effectiveness Theory*. *Journal of Pelita Nusantara*, 1(4), 477–481.
7. Asrori, F., Kusumaning Jati, I., & Andi Fitriyono, R. (2022). *Countermeasures of Illegal Fishing in the Natuna Sea*. *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, 3(1), 45–54.
8. Asvina, D. A., Moertiono, R. J., & Minin, A. R. (2025). *Optimizing the Role of the Prosecutor in Law Enforcement of Fisheries Crimes in the Implementation of the Prosecution*. *Iuris Studia: Journal of Legal Studies*, 6(1), 151–156.
9. Badi'ah, N. I. Al. (2022). *Implementation of Article 48 Letter (H) of Lamongan Regency Regional Regulation Number 3 of 2018 Perspective of Legal Effectiveness Theory and Sadd Al-Dzari'ah*. *Al-Balad: Journal of Constitutional Law*, 32(3), 167–186.
10. Bastian, R. Y., Rangkuti, Z., & Pratikno, Y. (2024). *The Influence of Competence, Integrity and Coordination on the Work Effectiveness of Members of the South Tangerang City Regional House of Representatives*. *ACADEMIC: Journal of Humanist Students*, 4(3), 1168–1181.
11. Binti Ulfatul Jannah, Ainun Nazifatul Mufidah, D. J. (2024). *Coordination as an Indicator in Educational Organizations by: Based, Journal of Management and Education Has Nusantara*, 3(2), 36–39.
12. Cayo, P. S. N. (2022). *Criminal Sanctions Against Perpetrators of Fisheries Crimes*. *Justice*, 15(1), 23–31.

13. Et al., F. nurmustaqim. (2025). *Law Enforcement of Corruption Crimes in Indonesia from the Perspective of Lawrence's Theory*. Nusantara Scientific Journal (JINU), 2(2), 153–164.
14. Endah Astuti, Ade Maman Suherman, & Tri Setiady. (2024). *Criminal Law Implications of Personal Data Misuse of the Dharma Pongrekun Case of the Jakarta Regional Election Based on Law Enforcement Theory*. Innovative Law: Journal of Social Law and Humanities, 2(1), 81–95.
15. Fariaman Laia, Y. S. L. (2022). *Proof of the Crime of Attempted Murder*. Journal of the Arrow of Justice, 1(31), 99–116.
16. Febriyanti, S. A., Rahma, Z. S., & Moenek, E. A. (2025). *The Relevance of Hans Kelsen's Pure Legal Theory with Legal Sociology Approaches in Understanding the Effectiveness of Law in Indonesia*. Journal of Education, Social & Humanities QOSIM: Journal of Education, Social & Humanities, 3(4), 1547–1556.
17. Or even Hamas. (2023). *The Development of the Criminal Justice System in Indonesia*. Journal of Law, Politics and Social Sciences, 2(4), 52–64.
18. Gede, P. (2024). *Determining Population and Sample: Quantitative and Qualitative Research Methodology Approach*. Scientific Journal of the Education Profession, 9, 2721–2731.
19. Harahap, P. A., Siregar, G. T. P., & Siregar, S. A. (2021). *The Role of the North Sumatra Regional Police (Polda-Su) in Law Enforcement against General Election Crimes*. Journal of Retentum, 3(1).
20. Hehanussa, K. G. (2023). *Environmentally friendly capture fisheries management for the sustainability of marine resources*. BALOBE: Journal of Community Service, 2(2), 53–59.
21. Ilyas, M., Firdaus, M. D., & Fatimah, N. (2024). *The Influence of the Stad Type Cooperative Learning Model on Student Learning Outcomes*. AT TA'LIM: Journal of Madrasah Ibtidaiyah, 3(2), 113.
22. Irawan, D. S., & Sholehuddin, M. (2023). *The implementation of taukilwalinasab is far from the perspective of the effectiveness of Soerjono Soekanto's law*. Sakina: Journal of Family Studies, 7(1), 124–141.
23. Law, C., Justice, D. I., & Reviewed, A. (2022). *A New Paradigm in the Implementation of E-Court Theory of Legal Effectiveness Muna Yastuti Madrah*. Law Journal, 4, 115–130.
24. Marsih, Y. (2025). *The Effect of Coordination on Employee Performance at the Tungkal Jaya Sub-district Office, Musi Banyu sin Regency*. Journal of Competent Management, 32(3), 167–186.
25. Masdalena Nasution, N. S. S., Emilda, E., & Safriandi, S. (2024). *Monomorphic Forms of Fisheries Ecolecticons in Malay in Kuala Tanjung Village, Sei Suka District, Batu Bara Regency, North Sumatra*. Kanderang Tingang Scientific Journal, 15(1), 52–60.
26. Nur Laili, A. (2023). *Juridical Review of Law Enforcement of Fisheries Crimes in Indonesia*. Journal of Sharia Law and Economics, 01(01), p. 41.

27. Nursyamsudin, N., & Samud, S. (2022). *The Integrated Criminal Justice System according to the Criminal Code*. *Court: Journal of Islamic Law Studies*, 7(1), 149.
28. Purba, J. A., & Subroto, M. (2023). *Analysis of Leadership Types in Correctional Institutions*. *JlIP - Scientific Journal of Educational Sciences*, 6(4), 2168–2172.
29. Rastiauwaty, R., & Alrip, I. (2024). *Law Enforcement against Illegal Cosmetics Circulation: A Theoretical Perspective*. *Journal of Legislative*, 8(1), 19–35.
30. Riandhana, T. E., & Halifah, N. (2025). *Coordination Function on the Effectiveness of Assistance for Natural Disaster Victims in the Social Organization of Disaster Preparedness Cadets of Central Sulawesi Province*. *Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 1(3), 963–974.
31. Rivanie, S. S., Muchtar, S., Muin, A. M., Prasetya, A. M. D., & Risky, A. (2022). *Development of Theories of Criminal Objectives Development of*. *Halu Oleo Law Review*, 6(2), p. 15.
32. Rohmah, A. W., & Azmi, M. (2022). *Prevention of Early Marriage and Divorce through the Theory of Legal Effectiveness in the Bantur Village Community*. *Sakina: Journal of Family Studies*, 6(4).
33. Sinaga, F., Lubis, H. A., & Hijriyah, M. B. (2023). *Law Enforcement of Corruption Crimes Reviewed from the Theory of Legal Effectiveness*. *Journal of Legal Sciences*, 7(2), 418–423.
34. Sudin, R. (2023). *The Effect of Direction and Coordination on the Work Spirit of Employees at the Oku Regency Transportation Office*. *Journal of Actual*, 21(1), 1–8.
35. Syah Akbar Simatupang, R. (2024). *The Implementation of the Juvenile Criminal Justice System in Indonesia: A Perspective of Justice Values*. *Journal of Juridical Studies*, 11(1), 54–63.
36. Tio, J., & Br, N. (2024). *Police Authority in the Implementation of Investigation Termination Policy Based on Restorative Justice Reviewed from the Theory of Authority*. *Journal of Citizenship*, 8(1), 1153–1166.
37. Trian Hardiansyah, W. D. W. (2025). *Understanding of Crime and Its Elements*. *Journal of Judiciary*, 14(1), 64–86.
38. Triono Eddy, P. R. Z. (2024). *Juridical Analysis of the Handling of Evidence of Foreign Vessels Perpetrators of the Fishing Crime "Illegal Fishing"* Triono. *Bulletin of Community Engagement*, 4(3).
39. Uyan Wiryadi, Fadhila Gifari, H. C. (2023). *The Position and Authority of the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK) in the Indonesian Constitution, Post-New Law*. *Begawan Abioso*, 14(2), 110–166.
40. Wahid Budiyo. (2024). *The Influence of Legal Positivism Theory on the Criminal Justice System in Indonesia*. *Proceedings of the National Seminar on Education, Language, Literature, Arts, and Culture*, 3(2), 369–386.

41. Yusuf, M. R. (2022). *Legal Effectiveness on the Implementation of PERMA No. 5 of 2019 in Overcoming Underage Marriage. AL-MANHAJ: Journal of Islamic Law and Social Institutions*, 4(2), 409–418.
42. Yusuf, M., & Siregar, W. A. (2023). *Perkembangan Teori Penegakan Hukum dalam Perwujudan Fungsi Norma di Masyarakat Development of the Theory of Law Enforcement in the Realisation of a Normal Function in Society. Journal of Sultra Research of Law*, 5(2), 58–65.