



## Maritime Surveillance of Indonesian Waters by the Indonesian Maritime Security Agency (Bakamla RI): A National Law Perspective

Waode Novita Ayu Muthmainna<sup>1\*</sup>, Hayun<sup>2</sup>, LM. Rajab Ivan Syah<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1,2,3</sup> Law Faculty, Muhammadiyah Buton University

\*Correspondence: [waodenovitaayumuthmainna@gmail.com](mailto:waodenovitaayumuthmainna@gmail.com)

### ARTICLE HISTORY

Received: 07.06.2025

Accepted: 05.06.2025

Published: 29.06.2025

### ARTICLE LICENSE

Copyright © 2025 The Author(s): This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution ShareAlike 4.0 International (CC BY-SA 4.0)

### ABSTRACT

*Indonesia as an archipelagic state has extensive maritime waters that require effective security and surveillance to protect sovereignty and enforce maritime law. The Indonesian Maritime Security Agency (Badan Keamanan Laut Republik Indonesia/Bakamla RI) was established to strengthen maritime governance and overcome overlapping authority among maritime law enforcement agencies. This research examines the legal basis, authority, and implementation of maritime surveillance conducted by Bakamla RI from the perspective of national law. This study employs normative legal research using statutory and conceptual approaches. The results indicate that Bakamla RI holds a strategic role in maritime security; however, regulatory fragmentation and institutional coordination challenges still limit its effectiveness. Strengthening the legal framework and inter-agency synergy is essential to optimize maritime surveillance in Indonesian waters.*

**Keywords:** Maritime security; Bakamla RI; maritime surveillance; national law

### 1. Introduction

As the largest archipelagic state in the world, Indonesia places maritime space at the center of its sovereignty and national development. From a philosophical standpoint, control over maritime territory is not merely a matter of geographical possession, but reflects the state's authority to regulate, utilize, and protect its marine resources as part of its sovereign rights. This principle is firmly grounded in international law, particularly under the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS) 1982, which recognizes the legal status of archipelagic states and affirms their rights over internal waters, archipelagic waters, and territorial seas (Bueger, 2015; Klein, 2011). In this sense, maritime governance becomes an essential manifestation of state sovereignty, closely linked to national security, economic resilience, and territorial integrity.

Beyond its legal dimension, maritime security also carries significant sociological implications. Weak maritime surveillance does not only result in legal violations but also directly affects the welfare of coastal communities. Illegal fishing, for instance, has been widely reported to cause substantial economic losses for Indonesia, with estimates reaching billions of US dollars annually, while simultaneously reducing the income of local fishermen and threatening the sustainability of marine resources (Hidayat, 2020; OECD, 2020). In addition, maritime crimes such as smuggling and unauthorized entry into territorial waters may contribute to broader security disturbances, particularly in border and outer island regions. These conditions illustrate that maritime insecurity is not an abstract legal issue, but a concrete social problem with direct implications for economic stability and community well-being.

Empirical indications further highlight the urgency of strengthening maritime surveillance. Reports from the Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries consistently show that illegal, unreported, and unregulated (IUU) fishing remains a persistent challenge in Indonesian waters. Such activities not only undermine state revenue but also weaken the effectiveness of maritime law enforcement. This situation demonstrates that Indonesia continues to

face structural challenges in managing and securing its vast maritime domain, despite having a relatively comprehensive legal framework. In response to these challenges, the Indonesian government established the Indonesian Maritime Security Agency (Bakamla RI) through Law Number 32 of 2014 concerning Maritime Affairs. Normatively, Bakamla RI is assigned the role of conducting maritime security and safety patrols in an integrated manner. However, in practice, the effectiveness of this institution remains subject to debate, particularly due to overlapping authority and the absence of a clear institutional hierarchy (Afriansyah et al., 2024; Kurniaty et al., 2021). This condition raises fundamental questions regarding the adequacy of the existing legal framework in supporting effective maritime governance.

Maritime security challenges in Southeast Asia, including illegal fishing and transnational maritime crime, have been widely recognized as complex governance issues that require coordinated institutional responses (Liss, 2013; Storey, 2020). Illegal, unreported, and unregulated fishing has been identified as a major contributor to economic loss and resource depletion, particularly in developing maritime states such as Indonesia (OECD, 2020).

Based on this background, this study addresses two main issues: (1) how the legal basis of Bakamla RI's authority is structured within the Indonesian legal system; and (2) to what extent the implementation of maritime surveillance by Bakamla RI reflects effectiveness within the framework of national law. These questions are essential to clarify both the normative foundation and the practical implications of maritime security governance in Indonesia.

Previous studies on maritime security in Indonesia have generally focused on describing institutional roles or examining coordination mechanisms among agencies. While these studies provide valuable insights, they tend to overlook the issue of legal harmonization and the structural design of authority distribution. In particular, limited attention has been given to how overlapping regulations affect the effectiveness of maritime law enforcement. Therefore, there remains a gap in the literature regarding the need for a comprehensive normative analysis that integrates legal structure, institutional design, and regulatory coherence (Bueger, 2015; Bateman, 2010). The novelty of this research lies in its attempt to go beyond descriptive analysis by offering a normative reconstruction of maritime security governance. Rather than merely identifying institutional problems, this study seeks to analyze the legal fragmentation that underlies those problems and to propose a more coherent framework for strengthening Bakamla RI's role. This includes examining the possibility of harmonizing regulations and redefining institutional relationships to achieve a more integrated and effective maritime security system.

## **2. Method Research**

This research is a normative legal study employing statutory and conceptual approaches. Primary legal materials consist of laws and regulations governing maritime security and surveillance, while secondary materials include legal doctrines, books, and recent scholarly articles. Data analysis is conducted qualitatively using legal reasoning to assess the coherence and effectiveness of the regulatory framework.

## **3. Results and Discussion**

### **3.1 Results**

The regulation of maritime security in Indonesia demonstrates a complex normative arrangement in which authority is formally distributed across multiple legal instruments but lacks substantive integration. Within this framework, the Indonesian Maritime Security Agency (Bakamla RI) is established under Law Number 32 of 2014 concerning Maritime Affairs, particularly through Article 59, which mandates that maritime security and safety patrols be conducted in an integrated manner across Indonesian waters and jurisdiction. Normatively, this provision reflects the legislator's intention to create a coordinated maritime security system, positioning Bakamla RI as a central institutional actor. However, in practice, the institutional design has not fully resolved the problem of fragmented maritime governance, particularly in relation to overlapping authority among agencies (Afriansyah et al., 2024).

Nevertheless, a doctrinal interpretation of Article 59 indicates that the provision is formulated in broad and general terms without clearly defining the operational scope of Bakamla RI's authority. The emphasis on "integration" suggests a coordinating function, yet it does not explicitly confer law enforcement powers such as investigation, detention, or prosecution. This normative ambiguity raises fundamental questions regarding the legal status of Bakamla RI within the broader system of maritime law enforcement. As highlighted in maritime governance

studies, the clarity of institutional authority is a crucial factor in ensuring effective security operations (Bueger, 2015).

The limitations inherent in the statutory framework become more apparent when examined alongside Presidential Regulation Number 178 of 2014. While this regulation provides further elaboration on the organizational structure and functions of Bakamla RI, including patrol activities, early warning systems, and inter-agency coordination, it does not resolve the ambiguity concerning enforcement authority. Instead, the regulation reinforces Bakamla RI's role as a coordinating and monitoring body rather than an institution with independent coercive powers. This condition reflects a condition in which legal responsibilities are not supported by sufficient institutional authority, resulting in limited operational effectiveness (Kurniaty et al., 2021).

From a legal systems perspective, such a deficiency indicates a misalignment between legal substance and institutional structure. Effective law enforcement requires not only formal recognition but also operational authority supported by clear procedural rules. When an institution is tasked with maintaining security without possessing enforcement capacity, the result is often institutional dependency on other agencies. This dependency can weaken response time and reduce overall effectiveness, particularly in dynamic maritime environments where rapid decision-making is essential (Bateman, 2010). In addition to the limitations faced by Bakamla RI, the broader maritime security framework in Indonesia is characterized by overlapping authority among multiple institutions. The Indonesian Navy (TNI AL), under Law Number 34 of 2004, exercises authority in safeguarding national sovereignty and defense. Meanwhile, the Water Police operate within the criminal justice system, and sectoral agencies such as fisheries and customs authorities hold specific mandates related to maritime resources. Each institution derives its authority from different legal regimes, resulting in a pluralistic but fragmented governance structure (Klein, 2011).

This fragmentation reflects a lack of horizontal synchronization in the legal framework. Overlapping mandates create uncertainty in determining jurisdiction, particularly in cases involving multiple legal dimensions, such as illegal fishing or maritime smuggling. In such situations, the absence of a clearly defined institutional hierarchy may lead to competing claims of authority or, conversely, hesitation in taking action. As noted in maritime policy studies, fragmented governance structures often reduce the efficiency of enforcement and complicate coordination efforts (Bueger, 2015; Bateman, 2010). Vertical inconsistencies are also evident within the hierarchy of legal norms. Ideally, implementing regulations should provide detailed guidance to operationalize statutory mandates. However, Presidential Regulation Number 178 of 2014 does not fully elaborate the enforcement dimension implied in Law Number 32 of 2014. Instead, it maintains a coordinative approach without addressing the need for clearer enforcement authority. This indicates that the regulatory framework has not been fully harmonized, resulting in gaps between normative expectations and institutional capabilities (Hidayat, 2020). Similar patterns of fragmented maritime governance have been observed in Southeast Asia, where multiple agencies with overlapping mandates often reduce enforcement efficiency and create institutional ambiguity (Liss, 2013).

The implications of these normative inconsistencies are significant. The absence of a clear legal hierarchy and unified command structure means that maritime security operations depend heavily on inter-agency coordination mechanisms. While coordination is essential, reliance on coordination alone without a binding legal framework may not be sufficient to address complex maritime threats. In practice, this condition can lead to delays in enforcement actions and inconsistencies in the application of law. This condition can be observed in maritime law enforcement practices where overlapping authority often leads to delays in decision-making processes. In situations involving multiple agencies, the absence of a clearly designated lead institution may require prolonged coordination before action can be taken. Such delays can reduce the effectiveness of enforcement and undermine the objective of maintaining maritime security (Hidayat, 2020).

To provide a clearer understanding of how authority is distributed and structured within the existing legal framework, the following table presents the hierarchy of legal regulations governing maritime security institutions in Indonesia.

Table 1. Hierarchy of Legal Regulations Governing Maritime Security in Indonesia

Level	Legal Instrument	Institution	Scope of Authority	Nature of Authority
1	Law No. 32/2014	Bakamla RI	Maritime security coordination	Coordinative

2	Presidential Regulation No. 178/2014	Bakamla RI	Patrol & monitoring	Administrative
3	Law No. 34/2004	Indonesian Navy (TNI AL)	Defense & sovereignty	Enforcement
4	Criminal Procedure Code & Police Law	Water Police	Criminal law enforcement	Enforcement
5	Sectoral Regulations	Ministries/Agencies	Specific maritime sectors	Partial

The table above demonstrates that the distribution of authority in Indonesia's maritime security system is inherently fragmented. Bakamla RI, although positioned at the center of the regulatory framework, does not possess enforcement authority comparable to other institutions. Instead, its role is largely coordinative and administrative, which limits its ability to act independently in law enforcement situations.

In contrast, enforcement authority is vested in institutions such as the Indonesian Navy and the Water Police, each operating within distinct legal mandates. This division of authority indicates that maritime security governance in Indonesia does not follow a unified command model but rather a multi-agency approach. While such an approach may accommodate sectoral specialization, it also introduces challenges in achieving coherence and efficiency (Klein, 2011). From a normative standpoint, this structure reflects a lack of legal consolidation and raises concerns regarding the principle of legal certainty. The overlap of authority and the absence of a clear institutional hierarchy create potential for conflicting interpretations and inconsistent enforcement practices. Consequently, the effectiveness of maritime security governance is not only determined by institutional capacity but also by the clarity and coherence of the legal framework that governs it (Bueger, 2015).

These findings indicate that, despite the formal recognition of Bakamla RI as a central actor in maritime security, the existing legal framework has not yet provided a sufficiently integrated and authoritative structure. As a result, the realization of an effective maritime security system remains constrained by normative fragmentation and institutional ambiguity.

### 3.2 Discussion

The findings presented in the Results section demonstrate that the challenges of maritime security governance in Indonesia are not merely technical or operational, but are fundamentally rooted in the structure of the legal framework itself. The ambiguity of authority, the absence of enforcement capacity, and the fragmentation of institutional roles collectively indicate that the current system has not yet achieved normative coherence. This section aims to interpret these findings through a deeper analytical perspective, focusing on legal certainty, institutional effectiveness, and regulatory harmonization. The ambiguity of Bakamla RI's authority represents a central issue in the legal construction of maritime governance. As identified earlier, Article 59 of Law Number 32 of 2014 emphasizes the concept of integration without clearly defining the scope of authority attached to Bakamla RI. While the notion of integration suggests coordination among institutions, it does not automatically imply the existence of operational authority. In practice, such ambiguity can lead to uncertainty, particularly in determining which institution holds primary responsibility in law enforcement situations. According to (Bueger, 2015), effective maritime security governance requires clearly defined roles and responsibilities, as ambiguity may hinder coordination and reduce institutional responsiveness.

From the perspective of legal certainty, this condition raises significant concerns. Legal norms are expected to provide clear guidance so that institutions can act with confidence and consistency. When the formulation of norms is open-ended or incomplete, it creates space for multiple interpretations. In the context of maritime security, where rapid decision-making is often required, such uncertainty can have direct implications for enforcement effectiveness. The ambiguity surrounding Bakamla RI's authority therefore reflects a broader issue in legal drafting, where flexibility is not balanced with clarity. The problem becomes more pronounced when examining the relationship between responsibility and capacity. The Results section shows that Bakamla RI is formally assigned a central role in maintaining maritime security, yet it lacks the legal authority to enforce the law independently. This imbalance can be analyzed using the framework of legal effectiveness. Satjipto Rahardjo emphasizes that law must

function as an integrated system consisting of legal substance, legal structure, and legal culture. In this case, although the legal substance acknowledges the role of Bakamla RI, the structural component is insufficient, as the institution is not equipped with enforcement powers. This misalignment ultimately limits the effectiveness of the legal system.

The absence of enforcement authority also creates a dependency dynamic among institutions. Bakamla RI must rely on other agencies, such as the Indonesian Navy and the Water Police, to carry out enforcement actions. While coordination is an essential element of governance, dependency without clear authority can lead to inefficiencies. In urgent situations, the need to coordinate before taking action may result in delays, which can undermine the effectiveness of maritime security operations. As noted by (Bateman, 2010), maritime security challenges often require immediate and decisive responses, and delays caused by institutional fragmentation can significantly reduce the impact of enforcement measures.

In addition to ambiguity and limited authority, the fragmentation of maritime governance in Indonesia represents a major structural challenge. The existence of multiple institutions with overlapping mandates creates a complex regulatory environment in which authority is dispersed rather than consolidated. Each institution operates under its own legal framework, resulting in a system that lacks a unified command structure. Maritime security challenges are often categorized as complex or “wicked problems” due to their transnational nature and the involvement of multiple actors, which complicates institutional coordination and legal enforcement (Bateman, 2010; Hastings, 2009). From a legal systems perspective, fragmentation undermines coherence and consistency. A well-functioning legal system requires alignment between norms at different levels (vertical coherence) as well as consistency among institutions operating within the same level (horizontal coherence). However, as indicated in the Results section, Indonesia’s maritime security framework lacks both forms of alignment. Vertical inconsistencies occur when implementing regulations do not fully operationalize statutory mandates, while horizontal inconsistencies arise from overlapping authority among institutions. Klein (2011) emphasizes that without clear institutional structures supported by coherent legal norms, maritime governance is likely to face coordination challenges.

The consequences of fragmentation extend beyond legal theory and have practical implications for enforcement. First, it creates uncertainty in determining jurisdiction, particularly in cases involving multiple legal regimes, such as illegal fishing or maritime smuggling. Second, it increases the likelihood of institutional conflict, as agencies may interpret their authority differently. Third, it reduces efficiency, as coordination mechanisms become more complex and time-consuming. Hidayat (2020) notes that in Indonesia, overlapping authority among maritime institutions often leads to delays in enforcement and inconsistencies in implementation. Another important aspect to consider is the absence of a clear institutional hierarchy. In the current system, no single institution holds ultimate authority over maritime security operations. While Bakamla RI is positioned as a coordinating body, it does not have the power to direct other institutions in a binding manner. This creates a situation in which coordination depends largely on cooperation rather than authority. Although cooperation is valuable, it may not always be sufficient in situations that require decisive action. The lack of a clear command structure therefore represents a critical weakness in the system. In the Southeast Asian context, maritime governance is frequently characterized by institutional overlap and limited coordination, which can undermine the effectiveness of national maritime security strategies (Storey, 2020). The limitations of Bakamla’s authority reflect a broader regional pattern in which coast guard institutions face challenges in consolidating authority within multi-agency systems, particularly in developing maritime states (Afriansyah et al., 2024; Kurniaty et al., 2021).

The structural problems identified in this study are also supported by recent empirical research on maritime governance in Indonesia. The presence of multiple law enforcement agencies with overlapping mandates has been shown to create duplication of functions and weak coordination, ultimately reducing the effectiveness of maritime security operations (Sondakh et al., 2025). Furthermore, the role of Bakamla as a coast guard institution has not yet been fully realized in practice. The current multi-agency model continues to produce structural inefficiencies, where authority is dispersed rather than consolidated, leading to inconsistencies in enforcement practices (Kurniaty et al., 2021). In a broader institutional context, the establishment of Bakamla represents an attempt to integrate maritime security governance; however, its limited authority and institutional capacity indicate that such integration remains largely normative rather than operational (Afriansyah et al., 2024).

From a comparative perspective, many countries have addressed similar challenges by establishing a coast guard system with centralized authority. Such systems integrate various maritime functions within a single institution, allowing for clearer command structures, faster decision-making, and stronger accountability (Klein, 2011). While Indonesia’s multi-agency model reflects its institutional diversity, the absence of integration at the

legal level limits its effectiveness. The comparison highlights the importance of legal consolidation in achieving efficient maritime governance. The analysis also suggests that the current reliance on coordination as the primary mechanism of governance is insufficient. Coordination is often viewed as a solution to institutional fragmentation, but without a strong legal foundation, it may not produce the desired results. Effective coordination requires clear rules, defined authority, and binding mechanisms. In the absence of these elements, coordination may remain procedural rather than substantive, limiting its impact on enforcement outcomes.

Based on these considerations, it becomes clear that the core issue lies in the lack of legal harmonization. The existing regulatory framework does not provide a unified structure that clearly defines institutional roles and authority. This condition not only affects operational effectiveness but also undermines the principle of legal certainty. Without clear and consistent legal norms, it is difficult to ensure that maritime security policies are implemented in a coherent and effective manner. Addressing these challenges requires a comprehensive approach to legal reform. One important step is the harmonization of existing regulations to eliminate overlapping authority and clarify institutional roles. This may involve revising Law Number 32 of 2014 and its implementing regulations to provide a more precise and operational definition of Bakamla RI's authority. In addition, granting limited enforcement powers such as inspection, interception, and initial investigation within a clearly regulated framework could enhance institutional capacity while maintaining accountability.

At the same time, institutional restructuring may be necessary to strengthen coordination mechanisms. Rather than relying solely on informal cooperation, a more structured system with clear lines of authority and accountability should be established. This could include the development of a unified command system or the designation of a lead agency with binding authority in maritime security operations. Such measures would help reduce fragmentation and improve efficiency.

Furthermore, legal reform should also consider the broader context of maritime governance, including international obligations and best practices. As an archipelagic state recognized under UNCLOS, Indonesia has both rights and responsibilities in managing its maritime domain. Ensuring effective maritime security is therefore not only a national priority but also an international obligation. Aligning national regulations with international standards can contribute to a more coherent and effective governance framework (Bueger, 2015). Ultimately, the discussion confirms that the effectiveness of maritime security governance in Indonesia depends on the coherence of its legal framework. The ambiguity of authority, the absence of enforcement capacity, and the fragmentation of institutional roles are interconnected issues that cannot be addressed in isolation. A comprehensive and integrated approach is required to ensure that legal norms, institutional structures, and operational practices are aligned.

Without such reform, the current system is likely to remain fragmented, limiting its ability to respond effectively to maritime security challenges. Conversely, by addressing the structural issues identified in this study, Indonesia has the potential to develop a more coherent and effective maritime security system that supports both national interests and international commitments.

#### **4. Conclusion**

This study departs from a central question regarding how maritime security governance is structured within the Indonesian legal framework and to what extent such a structure supports the realization of an integrated security system. The analysis demonstrates that the issue is not primarily related to the absence of regulation, but rather to the way in which authority is conceptualized, distributed, and operationalized across institutions. In this regard, the existing framework reflects a condition in which legal norms are present but not fully aligned with institutional needs and operational realities. At the normative level, the idea of integration, as introduced in Law Number 32 of 2014, represents an important step toward strengthening maritime security governance. However, the concept itself is formulated in a manner that emphasizes coordination without sufficiently addressing the question of authority. As a result, integration is positioned more as a procedural objective than as a structurally supported system. This distinction is important, as effective integration requires not only coordination among institutions but also a clear allocation of authority that enables those institutions to act within a defined legal framework.

The position of Bakamla RI within this arrangement illustrates the broader structural issue. The institution is formally recognized as a central actor in maritime security, yet its role is predominantly limited to coordination and monitoring. This creates a situation in which the institution is expected to play a strategic role without being equipped with the necessary legal instruments to fulfill that role independently. The gap between responsibility and authority becomes particularly significant in the context of law enforcement, where the ability to act decisively is essential. In this sense, the current legal framework does not fully translate institutional expectations into

operational capacity. Beyond the issue of authority, the study also reveals that maritime security governance in Indonesia is shaped by a multi-institutional structure in which responsibilities are distributed across various agencies. While such a structure may reflect the complexity of maritime issues, it also introduces challenges related to coherence and coordination. Each institution operates within its own legal mandate, which may not always align with those of other institutions. This condition creates a fragmented system in which authority is dispersed rather than consolidated.

The reliance on coordination as the primary mechanism for managing this fragmentation further highlights the limitations of the current framework. Coordination, in itself, is an important element of governance, particularly in complex policy areas such as maritime security. However, coordination that is not supported by clear legal authority and institutional hierarchy tends to be fragile. It depends on cooperation rather than obligation, and as such, it may not always function effectively in situations that require rapid and decisive action. This suggests that coordination cannot substitute for structural clarity within the legal system.

Another important finding of this study is the lack of alignment between different levels of regulation. Ideally, statutory provisions should be supported by implementing regulations that provide detailed guidance for institutional action. In the case of maritime security, however, this alignment is not fully achieved. The implementing regulations do not sufficiently elaborate the authority implied in the primary legislation, resulting in a gap between normative intention and practical application. This gap reflects a broader issue of legal harmonization, where different layers of regulation do not operate as a coherent system. Taken together, these findings point to a fundamental conclusion: the effectiveness of maritime security governance in Indonesia is closely linked to the coherence of its legal design. A system that distributes responsibility without clearly defining authority, and that promotes coordination without establishing a clear structure, is inherently limited in its capacity to function effectively. The challenges identified in this study are therefore not isolated issues, but interconnected aspects of a broader structural problem. From a conceptual perspective, this study underscores the importance of aligning legal norms with institutional realities. Law, as an instrument of governance, must not only articulate objectives but also provide the means to achieve them. When legal norms are formulated without sufficient attention to institutional capacity, the result is often a gap between policy and practice. In the context of maritime security, this gap becomes particularly significant due to the dynamic and transboundary nature of maritime threats, which require coordinated yet decisive responses.

At the same time, the findings highlight the need to reconsider the relationship between coordination and authority. While coordination remains essential in a multi-agency environment, it must be supported by a framework that clearly defines roles, responsibilities, and lines of command. Without such a framework, coordination risks becoming a procedural formality rather than an effective mechanism of governance. This insight is particularly relevant for Indonesia, where the complexity of the maritime domain demands both flexibility and clarity in institutional arrangements. The study also contributes to a broader understanding of maritime governance by illustrating how legal fragmentation can affect institutional performance. Fragmentation is not merely a matter of having multiple actors, but of how those actors are connected within a legal system. When connections are weak or undefined, the system as a whole becomes less effective, regardless of the capacity of individual institutions. This suggests that improving maritime security governance requires attention not only to institutional strengthening but also to the relationships between institutions as defined by law. The analysis confirms that the current framework of maritime security governance in Indonesia has not yet achieved the level of coherence necessary to support an effective and integrated system. The ambiguity of authority, the imbalance between responsibility and capacity, and the fragmentation of institutional roles collectively limit the effectiveness of the system. Addressing these issues requires a more comprehensive approach that focuses on the quality of legal design, particularly in terms of clarity, consistency, and integration.

## **5. Speech Thank You**

This section contains sayings accepting love from sponsors, fund donors, resource persons, or parties urgently involved in the implementation study

## **Bibliography**

Afriansyah, A., Siregar, C. I., & Darmawan, A. R. (2024). Nurturing hero or villain: Bakamla as the Indonesian coast guard. *Politics and Governance*, 12.

- Asshiddiqie, J. (2019). *Pengantar ilmu hukum tata negara*. Rajawali Press.
- Azis, I. R., La Dee, M., Salam, S., & Kaswandi, K. (2023). Independence of The General Election Commission In Carrying Out Factual Verification of Political Parties General Election Participants. *Justitia Jurnal Hukum*, 7(1). <https://doi.org/10.30651/justitia.v7i1.18370>
- Bateman, S. (2010). Solving the “wicked problems” of maritime security. *Ocean Development & International Law*, 41(1), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00908320903285405>
- Bueger, C. (2015). What is maritime security? *Marine Policy*, 53, 159–164. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2014.12.005>
- Churchill, R. R., & Lowe, A. V. (2016). *The law of the sea* (3rd ed.). Manchester University Press.
- Guilfoyle, D. (2009). *Shipping interdiction and the law of the sea*. Cambridge University Press.
- Hastings, J. V. (2009). Understanding maritime piracy and its impact on global security. *Review of International Political Economy*, 16(3), 503–524. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09692290902839524>
- Hidayat, R. (2020). Penguatan kelembagaan Bakamla dalam sistem keamanan laut Indonesia. *Jurnal Hukum dan Pembangunan*, 50(2), 300–315.
- Klein, N. (2011). *Maritime security and the law of the sea*. Oxford University Press.
- Kurniaty, R., Suryokumoro, H., & Widagdo, S. (2021). The role of marine security agency (BAKAMLA) as sea and coast guard in Indonesian water jurisdiction. *Fiat Justisia*, 15(3). <https://doi.org/10.25041/fiatjustisia.v15no3.2017>
- Liss, C. (2013). New actors and the state: Addressing maritime security challenges in Southeast Asia. *Contemporary Southeast Asia*, 35(2), 141–162.
- Marzuki, P. M. (2017). *Penelitian hukum*. Kencana.
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). (2020). *Illicit trade in fisheries*. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/a52b6c6e-en>
- Peraturan Presiden Republik Indonesia Nomor 178 Tahun 2014 tentang Badan Keamanan Laut.
- Sari, D. (2021). Tumpang tindih kewenangan penegakan hukum di wilayah laut Indonesia. *Jurnal RechtsVinding*, 10(1), 45–60.
- Sondakh John David Nalasakti, Masroro Lilik Ekowanti, Sri Wahyuni & Sulistiyanto (2025). *Strengthening maritime security governance in Indonesia: A policy transformation of Bakamla toward a sea and coast guard model*. *Social Science and Humanities Journal*, 9(11).
- Storey, I. (2020). Maritime security in Southeast Asia: Challenges and prospects. *ISEAS Perspective*.
- Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 32 Tahun 2014 tentang Kelautan.
- Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 34 Tahun 2004 tentang Tentara Nasional Indonesia.
- United Nations. (1982). *United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS)*.