

## PREVENTION OF CORRUPTION CRIMES THROUGH THE CORRUPTION-FREE AREA INTEGRITY ZONE PROGRAM AT STATE OFFICES AND INSTITUTIONS

Abdul Kadir<sup>1\*</sup>, Fitri Ida Laela<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Law Faculty of Muhammadiyah Tangerang University, Indonesia

<sup>2</sup>Painan of Law High School, Indonesia

\*Corresponding Author:

[abdulkadir.usman87@gmail.com](mailto:abdulkadir.usman87@gmail.com)

---

### Abstract

Written between the increase in corruption cases that occurred in Indonesia released by Transparency International Indonesia (TII) increased the achievement of scores on the Corruption Perception Index (CPI). Although the increase is not significant, corruption is an extraordinary crime. The commitment to realizing corruption prevention are through an Integrity Zone (ZI) development in an integrated and planned corruption-free area. This study aims to analyze the prevention of criminal acts of corruption through the ZI corruption-free area program in state offices and institutions. 1. How is the implementation of corruption-free area integrity zones in state offices and institutions in preventing corruption in Indonesia? 2. What are the obstacles to the implementation of the corruption-free area integrity zone program in preventing corruption in state offices and institutions? This study uses normative research methods. The results of the study can be concluded that in the implementation of integrity zones towards corruption-free areas two types of components must be built in predetermined work units, namely lever components and outcome components where each component is interconnected and component development indicators through ZI Design, Development ZI, Proposal, Review, Determination. Corrupt actions will not just disappear without awareness of the moral behavior itself within the authority, power, and position it holds as an integrity pact. Integrity pact as a commitment must be carried out consistently and the need for maximum socialization is known to the general public so that the community can participate in implementing the ZI development program and not only limited to disseminating related information only to designated agencies/units.

Keywords : Prevention, Corruption, Integrity Zone

---

### 1. Introduction

Indonesia's Corruption Perception Index (CPI) in the last three years has increased, although not significantly. This increase can be seen from the achievement of the last score in 2019 which reached a score of 40, whereas in 2017, it received a score of 37. The achievement of this score also immediately increased the country's ranking, lastly being ranked 85 out of 180 countries (the lower the ranking the better the perception of corruption (Siadari, 2022).

This assessment is released by Transparency International Indonesia (TII) which conducts an annual review. Even though it has improved when compared to other ASEAN countries, the eradication of corruption in Indonesia is still considered not as good as in Singapore, Malaysia, and Brunei Darussalam whose index is above Indonesia. According

to Transparency International, corruption is the use of public authority and trust for personal benefit.

An illegal use of one's position, position, or authority to benefit oneself, another person, or a company is known as a corrupt act, and it can be harmful to the state and the nation's economy. Steps to prevent corruption are taken by first strengthening the prevention of maladministration actions, namely in enforcing public service standards. With the fulfillment of public service standards, every action of officials can be measured according to existing standards, and violations of service standards can be a signal of deviant behavior in the form of maladministration which will lead to corruption.

Procedure Mechanism as part of public service standards is a guarantee that the act of providing services is not carried out by justifying any means. The procedure is a benchmark, to determine the fulfillment of service recipient qualifications and service product requirements to guarantee the public service process according to quality standards.

In accordance with Perpres Number 81 of 2010, a regulation issued by the President of the Republic of Indonesia that governs the implementation of bureaucratic reform projects from 2010 to 2025. One of the first steps in creating an effective government administration system that can rapidly, precisely, and professionally serve the community is bureaucratic reform. Although there will be numerous challenges along the way, such as insufficient oversight, KKN practices, and misuse of power.

According to Weber, the bureaucracy is seen as a rational state administration organization based on authority (authority) that is dominant over other organizations. So in simple terms, the bureaucracy covers the entire state administration organization from the highest level to the lowest level. Bureaucracy here is used to regularly organize work that must be done and is the responsibility of many people. So do not be surprised if the bureaucracy is a type of administrative organization to provide the best service for the community in increasing public trust in public services

## **2. Theoretical Background**

Jeremy Pope places corruption prevention by emphasizing the national integrity system which is influenced by several variables, for example, the government's political will, and an independent anti-corruption body. Law Number 24 Prp. 1960 concerning Investigation, Prosecution, and Examination of Corruption Crimes formerly governed the legal and political eradication of illegal acts of corruption in Indonesia. The law has undergone various revisions as a result of Indonesia's commitment to eradicate corruption, which are currently governed by Law Number 19 of 2019 concerning the Second Amendment to Law Number 30 of 2002 concerning the Corruption Eradication Commission.

The Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK) was established in an endeavor to reduce or eradicate corruption by various state organizations. However, this of course will encounter many obstacles. So this bureaucracy still needs improvement and improvement from all aspects in the form of refinement. system improvement in the bureaucracy in Indonesia requires comprehensive and systemic reform. In simple terms, the purpose of administrative reform is to perfect unhealthy performance or not achieve optimal results.

The Ministry of State Apparatus Empowerment (PAN) and Public Reform (RB) issued a Regulation of the Minister of PAN and RB of the Republic of Indonesia Number 90 of 2021 (Permen PAN and RB No.90 Th) in an effort to prevent and eradicate corruption as well as to enhance or optimize the quality of public services. Concerning

Serving in Government Agencies and the Development and Evaluation of Integrity Zones Toward Corruption-Free Areas and Clean Bureaucratic Areas (2021).

Through Permen PAN and RB Number 20 of 2012 concerning General Guidelines for the Development of Integrity Zones Towards Corruption-Free Areas, which stated in the preamble that an Integrity Pact was implemented in the context of eliminating corruption, the creation of integrity zones was for the first time regulated. Regulations about General Guidelines for the Development of Integrity Zones Toward Corruption-Free Areas are outlined in order to carry out the Integrity Pact.

We can see and feel that the issue of corruption cases in Indonesia is very problematic with such high complexity that it is very challenging to eliminate. Concerning realizing a clean government, the government must have morals and act proactively and apply the principle of checks and balances. According to Rasyid, the government has three main functions, namely service, empowerment, and development. Service will produce justice for the community, empowerment will encourage independence, and development will create prosperity and prosperity for all Indonesian people.

Apart from hindering economic growth, corruption also impedes the development of a democratic government system. Corruption fosters a tradition of secretly doing self-serving actions, while at the same time closing the possibility for society to be able to enjoy development and a better quality of life. Prevention of corruption needs to be done more optimally so efforts are needed to be carried out jointly. To achieve the target results, state offices and institutions must develop the implementation of bureaucratic reform through efforts to develop an Integrity Zone. The creation of the Integrity Zone intends to create a place devoid of corruption and a spotless bureaucracy that will work with government agencies and other institutions.

### **Problem Formulation**

The author formulates the issue as follows in light of the background information provided above:

- a. How is the integrity zone of a corruption-free area implemented in state offices and institutions in preventing corruption in Indonesia?
- b. What are the obstacles to the implementation of the corruption-free area integrity zone program in preventing corruption in state offices and institutions?

### **3. Methods**

The study is descriptive in character yet employs normative research techniques, which uses secondary data. The data is obtained by analyzing laws and literature studies. The data is then analyzed through qualitative analysis.

### **4. Results and Discussion**

#### **Application of Integrity Zones of Corruption-Free Areas in State Offices and Institutions in Preventing Corruption Crimes in Indonesia**

Government agencies that have agreed to an integrity pact to realize a Corruption-Free Area (WBK) and a Clean and Serving Bureaucratic Area (WBBM) through bureaucratic reform, specifically regarding preventing corruption and raising the standard of public services, are referred to as Zones of Integrity (ZI). Integrity is characterized by wholeness, consistency, honesty, and resemblance of heart, speech, and deeds. While integrity is described as a quality, nature, or condition that exhibits total unity in the Big Indonesian Dictionary (KBBI), it also has the potential to emanate authority and honesty.

In the Regulation of the Minister of Administrative Reform and Bureaucratic Reform of the Republic of Indonesia (Permen PAN and RB) Number 90 of 2021 concerning the Development and Evaluation of Integrity Zones Towards Areas Free from Corruption and Clean Bureaucratic Areas and Serving in Government Agencies, the idea of creating ZI is itself explained, which was inspired from the concept of "island of integrity" which is a further practice from the existence of the scientific development of public administration and governance. An island of integrity is a condition where government agency work units are "immune" and able to provide the best governance even though the surrounding government agencies are dominated by poor management and governance.

Governmental organizations are responsible for carrying out the procedure for implementing ZI, specifically for ensuring that ZI development is implemented correctly. That is to say, several stages in the development of ZI need to be of concern to agencies and work units before carrying out internal assessments/evaluations and making proposals to the National Assessment Team (TPN), including:

1) Declaration of Integrity Zone;

The declaration is the first step in developing ZI, this is done with the stage of a declaration/statement from the head of a government agency or head of a work unit that the agency/work unit is ready to carry out the development of the ZI program. The development is carried out by government agencies/work units, both from the leadership and all or most of the employees who have signed the integrity pact document.

The signing of these documents can be carried out en masse/simultaneously at the time of inauguration, either as CPNS, PNS, or inauguration in the context of horizontal or vertical staffing mutations. Government agencies whose employees have not signed the Integrity Pact Document can continue/complement after the ZI development declaration. The declaration activity is the first step in ZI development.

Actually, in the development of ZI, the most important thing is the dissemination of information regarding agencies/work units that are making efforts to improve governance and quality of service through ZI development.

2) Work Unit Determination;

The determination of work units in ZI development is a follow-up to the declaration that has been carried out by every head of government agency. The specified work unit is a work unit that meets the following criteria:

- a. Work units that carry out the main services (core business) of government agencies;
- b. Work units that have high risk in the context of upholding an anti-corruption culture and excellent service;
- c. Work units that have a broad impact on society when carrying out ZI development;

3) Work Unit Development;

After each government agency has established a work unit, the next step that must be carried out is the development of the ZI change area. In each work unit, it is necessary to determine the ZI development program which must be adjusted to the results of the identification of the work unit's main service types, strategic issues, and risks faced by the work unit. And it is necessary to formulate various innovative solutions according to

the priorities of the existing problems. These work programs are then aligned with the six areas of change in ZI.

To ensure that each ZI work program runs well, the work unit needs to form a work team consisting of officials and employees in the work unit to carry out development in each area of change. The team then compiles and coordinates work plans/actions that are measurable and have clear targets in the development of ZI to be implemented by all units.

The things that need to be done and become a concern in the development of ZI in work units are:

- a. Building commitment between Leaders and employees in ZI development;
- b. Paying attention to and completing the ZI development elements as described in the lever element;
- c. Carry out independent surveys related to public services and anti-corruption perceptions in the proposed work unit;
- d. Make various innovations in efforts to improve public services and prevent corruption;
- e. Carry out programs or activities that are in direct contact with the community or stakeholders;
- f. Creating a media communication/management strategy to inform all changes made by the work unit to the public;
- g. Monitor and evaluate periodically the progress made by the proposed work unit.

#### 4) Monitoring the Development of the Integrity Zone;

The final stage in ZI development, namely monitoring ZI development in each work unit, requires assistance and monitoring by the Internal Assessment Team (TPI). It is done to ensure that the implementation of the ZI development program goes according to plan. Therefore, TPI in the development process also has a role too:

- a. Become a place of consultation for work units that are building ZI;
- b. Become a facilitator in assist and support in the context of developing ZI in work units so that work units have the same understanding and perception regarding the components of ZI development;
- c. Consult the National Assessment Team (TPN) regarding the ZI development process in work units;


The Ministry of Administrative Reform and Bureaucratic Reform (Kemen PAN and RB) must be consulted in order for TPI to evaluate the ZI development carried out by work units, and the results of the assessment are compiled in the form of recommendations to agency leaders regarding the viability of work units to be proposed.

From the development stage up to the evaluation of the development results, some areas need to be improved and optimized by both the ZI work team in work units and TPI. The development of these areas of change will help achieve ZI's goals, mainly to develop good public services and establish a transparent and accountable administration.

The development of ZI is certainly carried out based on certain components which are used as guidelines in the development process. Broadly speaking, the stages of ZI development are carried out through the stages of socialization and design. The design stage involves contributions from external parties (witnessed by Agencies, Ministries/Institutions, Forkopimda, Community Leaders, Religious Leaders, and Published), and Internal parties. The logical framework for ZI development includes two components, namely, the leverage component and the outcome component. The leverage

component is an aspect of the work unit's internal governance and the outcome component is how stakeholders feel the impact/result of the changes that have been made to the lever area.

The components that influence ZI development are depicted in Figure 1 below:



**Figure 1.** Logical Framework for the Development of Integrity Zones

Assuming from Figure 1, the lever component consists of six (6) subcomponents, namely: Enhancing Performance Accountability, Strengthening Oversight, Change Management, Management Arrangement, HR Management, and Improving the Quality of Public Services. Each sub-component is created to provide a standard reference that serves as a guideline for agencies in carrying out ZI development with objectives and targets and indicators of achievement of the development process. The six subcomponents which are aspects of ZI development are explained as follows:

First, change management relates to how to work units make changes systematically and consistently which consists of commitment, mindset, and work culture of all individual work units that are built to be better;

Second, management arrangements are related to how the work unit improves the efficiency and effectiveness of the work system and trans to the public;



Third, the arrangement of the HR management system relates to how the work unit improves the quality of the implementation of the human resource management system so that it can realize overall professionalism in the human resources of the apparatus;

Fourth, strengthening accountability relates to how to work units create a performance culture and organizational performance achievements in stages through the implementation of organizational performance management;

Fifth, through management compliance and the adoption of a system to prevent irregularities, the work unit can accomplish organizational work unit governance practices that are free from corruption, collusion, and nepotism (KKN);

Sixth, A key factor in raising the standard of public services is how often they are improved, innovated, and tailored to the needs and expectations of the community.

The whole sub-component is fundamentally one form of fulfilling the needs of citizens. Fulfilling citizens' needs through public services is an indication of whether a country has a strong commitment to building and maintaining state stability so that citizens' needs are met or not fulfilled.

The development of the ZI program is based on various regulations which are the basis for the implementation of prevention and eradication of criminal acts of corruption, including those regulated in:

- a. Guideline of the Leader of the Republic of Indonesia Number 81 of 2010 concerning the Stupendous Plan of Regulatory Change 2010 - 2025
- b. Guideline of the Leader of the Republic of Indonesia Number 54 of 2018 concerning the Public Methodology for Counteraction of Debasement
- c. Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 28 of 1999 concerning State Heads who are perfect and liberated from debasement, plot, and nepotism
- d. Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 19 of 2019 concerning the Second Revision to Regulation Number 30 of 2002 concerning the Debasement Annihilation Commission
- e. Guideline of the Pastor of Managerial Change and Administrative Change of the Republic of Indonesia Number 90 of 2021 concerning the Turn of events and Assessment of Uprightness Zones Towards Regions Liberated from Defilement and Clean Regulatory Regions and Serving in Government Organizations.

To speed up the improvement of ZI towards a Debasement Free Region/Clean Serving Regulatory Region (WBK/WBBM), on September 28-27 2022, the Coordinating Ministry for Human Development and Culture (Kemenko PMK) carried out a ZI evaluation. Observing and assessment of ZI are completed along with the Service of State Mechanical assembly Strengthening and Administrative Change (Kemenpan RB). The development of this ZI focuses on community satisfaction so that in the assessment process, it is not only assessed by internal and national assessment teams but also pays attention to the results of online surveys involving the community.

The Representative for Planning Wellbeing Quality Improvement and Populace Advancement at the Organizing Service for PMK, additionally said that the main stage in the Trustworthiness Zone is the advancement of the ZI itself. Advancement implies building respectability in government organization units through different arranged, coordinated, and precise changes and enhancements.

In this manner, respectability can be deciphered as a lifestyle that is spotless, sound, and in by and large harmony. All in all, respectability comes according to a few points of view, like the perspective of moral practice and moral connections. Integrity itself is a

part of a person's views that can be trusted and an honest attitude in explaining "trust" in an organizational context. Integrity is also a part that becomes the main core of ethics. Solomon initiated integrity by stating that integrity does not always concern the autonomy of each individual and one's togetherness but rather concerns loyalty, cooperation, trustworthiness, and harmony.

The above is a base essential for conduct that should be done by authorities and representatives of government offices as community workers, both in a hierarchical and cultural setting to show energy for killing and forestalling criminal demonstrations of defilement. One of the things that is also an emphasis on ZI is that it is very possible for the birth of new zones which also implement an integrity system within them.

The theory used to examine the problem of implementing ZI is the theory of legal effectiveness. While discussing the degree of the viability of the law, we should initially have the option to gauge the degree to which law and order is being agreed with or rebelled. On the off chance that a law and order is followed by the greater part of the objectives that are the objective of compliance, it will be said that law and order being referred to is viable.

Soerjono Soekanto said that viability is the degree to which a gathering can accomplish its objectives. The law is successful assuming there is a positive legitimate effect, around then, the law arrives at its objective in directing or changing human way of behaving so it becomes lawful way of behaving. The hypothesis of legitimate viability as indicated by Soerjono Soekanto is that regardless of whether a regulation is still up in the air by 5 (five) factors, i.e:

- a. The legitimate element itself (regulations and guidelines);
- b. Law authorization factors, in particular the gatherings that structure or apply the law;
- c. Factors of offices or offices that help policing;
- d. Community factors, specifically the climate in which the law applies or is applied;
- e. Cultural factors, to be specific because of work, imagination, and taste in view of human drive-in public activity.

The five variables above are firmly connected with one another, consequently they are the substance of policing, is likewise a benchmark for the viability of the law in demonstrations of defilement. In the turn of events and execution of ZI, the main thing that decides if the composed regulation can work appropriately or not is separated from the actual law, it likewise relies upon the way of behaving of the gatherings who structure or apply the law as a guarantee to an honesty settlement. Furthermore, consequently it is trusted that consistency of understanding and activity will be framed for government organizations and different partners in building respectability zones towards WBK/WBBM. With the existence of the ZI concept, it is hoped that Indonesia will be able to realize good governance and clean government.

### **Obstacles to the Implementation of the Corruption-Free Area Integrity Zone Program in Preventing Corruption Crimes in State Offices and Institutions**

The concept of bureaucracy is synonymous with the government having the authority to determine a policy relating to public services. Bureaucracy as stated by Blau and Meyer is a very strong institution with all the power to increase potential capacity because the bureaucracy is defined as an instrument of rational administration that is neutral on a massive scale. In other words, the bureaucracy can be interpreted as a government



organization run by salaried employees or a desk government system with rules that have been in effect.

In contrast to what David Osborne said, that bureaucracy means a method of organization in a rational and efficient administrative system-a method to replace the arbitrary exercise of power by an authoritarian regime. Ethics, Public Service, and Bureaucratic Reform influence the WBK/WBBM Integrity Zone. However, every employee should have ethics and a culture of serving within himself, because ethics and service will affect the quality of the planned Integrity Zone Development.

The improvement of the Trustworthiness Zone is done in light of different models as recently examined, such as the conditions that must be met before applying for the Integrity Zone title and development aspects that must be considered. Even though all of this has been considered, of course in the development of ZI there will be obstacles/obstacles in its application.

As found obstacles to the implementation of ZI, such as within the scope of the Secretariat General and the Directorate General of Marine Spatial Management (Ditjen PRL). The Inspectorate General of the Service of Sea Undertakings and Fisheries held a Center Gathering Conversation in regards to the subsequent consequences of the assessment of the work unit's ZI improvement towards WBK/WBBM in 2019. In view of the assessment results, the shortcomings in ZI advancement towards WBK/WBBM were tracked down in 4 areas, to be specific:

a. Commitment

Whereas not all employees are committed to realizing WBK in work units, the process of building integrity zones towards WBK/WBBM in work units is not continued, only carried out by certain people and focuses on fulfilling documents, and considers WBK as an additional task.

b. Budget support;

Budget support for the development of integrity zones that have not been optimal is also an obstacle to implementing ZI.

c. Monitoring and Evaluation;

Work units and echelon I units have not carried out monitoring and evaluation so that problems/obstacles have not been identified that could become obstacles in achieving the goal of developing integrity zones towards WBK/WBBM;

d. Documentation.

Documentation isn't yet deliberate, comprehension of the kind and nature of reports that should be finished is as yet various, and the assessment rules from the Service of Managerial and Administrative Change are as yet broad in nature so impression of record quality are as yet different.

Constraints in implementing ZI were also discovered by Mercel Hendrik Lahiang in a research journal entitled "Analysis of Obstacles Faced by the Internal Oversight Unit in Building an Integrity Zone at Prof. RSUP. Dr. R.D Kandou Manado. It was stated that there were several obstacles found in his research, namely:

- a. Inadequate competence;
- b. Organizational commitment;
- c. Budget;
- d. Work environment;
- e. Management policy; And
- f. Multiple positions.

Meanwhile, based on the results of research written by Ahmad Sirin with the title "Strategy for Implementation of Integrity Zone Development at the Office of the Ministry of Religion of Pekalongan Regency", it was found in previous studies stated that the inhibiting factors for the implementation of integrity zone development included socialization, human resources, commitment employees, budget, facilities and infrastructure, organizational structure, and complex evaluation mechanism.

In light of the portrayal above, on the off chance that it is connected to the hypothesis of legitimate viability will influence and impede the ZI improvement program. In accordance with Soerjono Soekanto's hypothesis of legitimate adequacy, which expresses that issues influencing the viability of composed regulation as far as the contraption will rely upon the accompanying:

- a. To what degree officials are limited by existing guidelines;
- b. How far officials are permitted to give caution;
- c. What sort of model should authorities provide for the local area;
- d. To what degree the level of synchronization of tasks given to officials to give firm limits to their power is.?

Negligence in paying more attention to development aspects, development mechanisms, and basic concepts is also the main factor causing this failure. Based on the aspects of the development of the Integrity Zone we can differentiate the specific factors behind the failure to achieve the Integrity Zone:

- a. Lack of public transparency in all elements including elements of public services;
- b. Lack of commitment to building and maintaining service performance based on the specified aspects;
- c. The low synergy of the Work Team, this is important because the public services carried out by work units are not carried out individually but are carried out by work units as a whole through solid cooperation;
- d. The IKM GPA survey conducted by BPS does not meet the requirements and the complaint channel is not active;
- e. There are still cases that are not in line with efforts to eradicate corruption;
- f. The condition of facilities and infrastructure is not good in the sense that they do not meet public service standards which cause disruption to the function of these services;
- g. The condition of facilities and infrastructure is not good;
- h. Lack of innovation in performing public services. Innovation in this field must be carried out to continuously improve the quality of work unit public services;

So, in general, the obstacle in implementing the Corruption-free Area Integrity Zone Program in state offices and institutions, apart from the strong commitment of the public officials themselves, is the encouragement of community participation. The people here are people who want to access public services easily, quickly, and concisely, who are sometimes not reluctant to give some money to public service officials, so those with an interest prefer to give facilitation payments so that their affairs can be expedited.

A solid responsibility is should have understood the Respectability Zone towards WBK/WBBM. Responsibility is required on the grounds that the improvement of the Trustworthiness Zone out in the open administrations requires consistency and progress toward a superior heading. Of the eight factors described above, basically, the commitment to keeping work units away from KKN is a challenge. Apart from that, many work units feel that doing what is written is sufficient to provide excellent public services

towards societies continues to increase, both in terms of quantity and level of difficulty, so that to fulfill these things constant innovation is required. It is said to be constant because these innovations are destined to move in a positive direction in the sense of improving public services to the community.

A bureaucrat or public official must have values or a code of ethics in carrying out their duties and responsibilities as public servants who are always oriented towards the functions of the institution/position they occupy. Changes were made to provide guarantees or guarantees in realizing a government with integrity and realizing WBK/WBBM. It is done in realizing a larger goal, namely bureaucratic reform.

Citizens as parties who receive services certainly have their perceptions of this acceptance. Citizen perceptions revolve around satisfaction and the level of citizen trust in public services. Citizens will have high satisfaction if they receive fast, precise, and professional services while still paying attention to service efficiency and effectiveness.

In view of the Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 28 of 1999 concerning State Coordinators who are Spotless and Liberated from Defilement, Plot, and Nepotism, Article 3 in regards to the overall standards of state organization incorporate:

- a. Principle of Legal Certainty;
- b. Principles of Orderly Administration of the State;
- c. Principle of Public Interest;
- d. Openness Principle;
- e. Principle of Proportionality;
- f. Principles of Professionalism, and
- g. Accountability Principle.

The above obviously gives a sign that each state overseer is expected to be proficient and stick to the overall standards of good state organization. These guidelines, obviously, normatively direct every step that produces astounding support of the local area. Out in the open administrations, significant demonstrations of defilement can begin from demonstrations of maladministration or one might say that maladministration is the base of criminal demonstrations of debasement in the domain of public administrations.

Law enforcement efforts in realizing the development of integrity zones include:

1) Evaluation

Assessment of the execution of the development of the Respectability Zone and the exhibition of the assigned WBK/WBBM should be done to decide the viability of this ZI improvement rule. Evaluation is carried out by the Ministry by reviewing reports received and processing information obtained directly in the field.

2) Reporting

a. Reporting by Government Agencies Leaders of government agencies are required to submit reports to the Minister regarding:

- (1) The statement of the development of the Uprightness Zone has been done at the applicable government organization;
- (2) Work units that are predicated towards WBK have been implemented; And
- (3) Other issues connected with the advancement interaction of the Honesty Zone.

Reporting by Services, Priests are expected to submit reports to the President with respect to the advancement of the execution of Honesty Zone improvement arrangements/programs towards the acknowledgment of WBK/WBBM intermittently toward the finish of every year and whenever if important.

## 5. Conclusion

Genuinely trustworthy in the execution zones towards defilement free regions, two types of components must be built in predetermined work units, namely lever components and outcome components where each component is interconnected and component development indicators through the mechanisms of ZI Design, ZI Development, Proposal, Review, and Determination. Corrupt actions will not just disappear without awareness of the moral behavior itself within the authority, power, and position it holds as an integrity pact. Although in implementing ZI, several obstacles were found that became inhibiting factors, the most important factor in implementing ZI was a strong commitment and consistency towards WBK/WBBM, because this will affect the effectiveness of the law itself. Obviously, it can't be isolated from the job of government partners and local area cooperation. The conclusion contains a brief summary of the research results and a discussion that answers the research objectives.

## References

- Al-Barry, M. Dahlan. 1994. Kamus Ilmiah Populer. Surabaya: Arkola.
- Atmosudirdjo, Prajudi. 1990. Hukum Administrasi Negara, Jakarta: Ghalia Indonesia.
- Blau, P.M, dan M.W Meyer. 1987. Bureaucracy In Modern Society. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Nurdjana, IGM. 2009. Sistem Hukum Pidana dan Bahaya Laten Korupsi. Yogyakarta: Total Media.
- Orborne, David, dan Ted Gaebler. 1993. Reinventing Government. New York: Plume.
- Purba, Darwin. 2016. Menuju Indonesia Baru Jilid 1. Bogor: Guepedia.
- Rasyid, M.R. 1997. Kajian Awal Birokrasi Pemerintahan dan Politik Orde Baru. Jakarta: Yasrif Watampone.
- H.S, Salim, and Erlis Septiana Nurbani. 2013. Penerapan Teori Hukum Pada Tesis dan Disertasi. Jakarta: Rajawali Press.
- Soekanto, Soerjono. 1985. Efektivitas Hukum dan Peranan Saksi. Bandung: Remaja Karya.
- Wibawa, Samodra. 1994. Evaluasi Kebijakan Publik. Jakarta: Grafindo Persada.
- Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 28 of 1999 Concerning State Organizers who are Clean and Free from Corruption, Collusion and Nepotism
- Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 19 of 2019 concerning the Second Amendment to Law Number 30 of 2002 concerning the Corruption Eradication Commission
- Regulation of the President of the Republic of Indonesia Number 81 of 2010 Concerning the Grand Design of Bureaucratic Reform 2010 – 2025
- Regulation of the President of the Republic of Indonesia Number 54 of 2018 concerning the National Strategy for Prevention of Corruption
- Regulation of the Minister of Administrative Reform and Bureaucratic Reform of the Republic of Indonesia Number 90 of 2021 concerning Development and Evaluation of Integrity Zones Towards Areas Free from Corruption and Clean Bureaucratic Areas and Serving In Government Agencies

- Anggraeni, Tyas Dian. "Menciptakan Sistem Pelayanan Publik Yang Baik: Strategi Reformasi Birokrasi Dalam Pemberantasan Korupsi." *Journal Rechts Vinding: Media Pembinaan Hukum Nasional* 3, no. 3 (31 December 2014): 417. Available in the website <https://doi.org/10.33331/rechtsvinding.v3i3.34>.
- Arimuladi, Setia Untung. "Zona Integritas : Konsep Penegakan dan Penerapan Asas Umum Pemerintahan yang Baik untuk Mewujudkan Good Governance and Clean Government." Malang: Setara Press, 2022.
- Balai Pengelolaan Sumberdaya Pesisir dan Laut Denpasar. "Focus Group Discussion Tindak Lanjut Hasil Evaluasi Pembangunan Zona Integritas Satuan Kerja Menuju WBK/WBBM," 2019. Available in the website <https://kkp.go.id/djprl/bpspldenpasar/artikel/11350-focus-group-discussion-tindak-lanjut-hasil-evaluasi-pembangunan-zona-integritas-satuan-kerja-menuju-wbk-wbbm>.
- Hanafi, Andhi Sukma. "Pelaksanaan Reformasi Birokrasi Dengan Pembangunan Zona Integritas Pada Kementerian Perindustrian." *JIKAP (Jurnal Informasi Dan Komunikasi Administrasi Perkantoran)* 4, no. 1 (13 Mei 2020): 31–37. Available in the website <https://doi.org/10.20961/jikap.v4i1.40661>.
- KBBI. "Integritas." Dalam *kbbi.web.id*, 2022. Available in the website <https://kbbi.web.id/integritas>.
- Lahiang, Mercel Hendrik, Lintje Kalangi, dan Linda Lambey. "Analisis Kendala-kendala yang dihadapi Satuan Pengawasan Internal dalam membangun Zona Integritas di RSUP Prof. Dr. R. D Kandou Manado." *Journal Riset Akuntansi Dan Auditing "Goodwill"* 9, no. 1 (17 January 2018). Available in the website <https://doi.org/10.35800/jjs.v9i1.19151>.
- Satria, Hariman. "Kebijakan Kriminal Pencegahan Korupsi Pelayanan Publik." *Integritas : Jurnal Antikorupsi* 6, no. 2 (2020). Available in the website <https://jurnal.kpk.go.id/index.php/integritas/article/download/660/110>.
- Shiddiqy, Rizky Aji. "Membangun Zona Integritas Sebagai Upaya Pemberantasan Korupsi." *Jurnal Ilmiah Mahasiswa FEB* 2, no. 2 (2013). Available in the website <https://jimfeb.ub.ac.id/index.php/jimfeb/article/view/1317>.
- Siadari, Lagat Parroha Patar. "Korupsi Lahir Dari Penyimpangan Standar Pelayanan Publik." *Ombudsman Republik Indonesia* (blog), July 2022. Available in the website <https://ombudsman.go.id/artikel/r/artikel--korupsi-lahir-dari-penyimpangan-standar-pelayanan-publik->.
- Sirin, Ahmad. "Strategi Implementasi Pembangunan Zona Integritas pada Kantor Kementerian Agama Kabupaten Pekalongan." *Journal Edutrained : Jurnal Pendidikan dan Pelatihan* 5, no. 2 (29 December 2021): 148–63. Available in the website <https://doi.org/10.37730/edutraind.v5i2.156>.
- Sucipto, Adi, Hasanuddin Remmang, dan Haeruddin Saleh. "Pengaruh Etika Pegawai, Pelayanan Publik Dan Reformasi Birokrasi Terhadap Penerapan Zona Integritas Pada Lapas Makassar." *Indonesian Journal of Business and Management* 2, no. 1 (2019): 13–15. Available in the website <https://doi.org/10.35965/jbm.v2i1.175>.



Syarifah. "Evaluasi Zona Integritas Kemenko PMK." *KEMENKO PMK* (blog), September 2022. Available in the website <https://www.kemenkopmk.go.id/evaluasi-zona-integritas-kemenko-pmk>.

Wisesa, Anggara. "Integritas moral dalam konteks pengambilan keputusan etis." *Journal of Technology Management* 10, no. 1 (2011): 119651.