



## The Effectiveness of the Plan-Do-Check-Act (PDCA) Cycle in Managing the Anti-Bribery Management System at the Yogyakarta State Administrative Court

Icha Febi Hana Rohmatul Zhaza<sup>1\*</sup>, Dewi Iriani<sup>2</sup>, Tegar Bintang Aji Putra<sup>3</sup>, Nabillah U. Khasanah<sup>4</sup>, Ambarwati<sup>5</sup>

<sup>12345</sup>Faculty of Sharia, Kiai Ageng Muhammad Besari State Islamic University of Ponorogo

<https://doi.org/10.65917/gjlae.v2.i2.42>

### ABSTRACT

This study comprehensively examines the effectiveness of the Plan-Do-Check-Act (PDCA) cycle in managing the Anti-Bribery Management System (ABMS) at the Yogyakarta State Administrative Court. Using a qualitative descriptive approach, data were collected through in-depth interviews with key stakeholders, direct observation of the implementation process, and a review of relevant documents and policies. The findings indicate that consistent and structured implementation of the PDCA cycle has significantly improved organizational awareness and individual compliance with anti-bribery requirements. Through systematic planning, implementation, evaluation, and continuous improvement, the Yogyakarta State Administrative Court has strengthened its internal-control, monitoring, and evaluation mechanisms, thereby improving its capacity to identify, prevent, and mitigate bribery risks. However, several challenges continue to hinder optimization of the PDCA framework, including a shortage of competent human resources, organizational resistance to cultural change, and limited managerial commitment to sustaining the process.

**Keywords:** Plan-Do-Check-Act (PDCA), Anti-Bribery Management System (ABMS), Yogyakarta State Administrative Court, effectiveness, transparency, accountability, good governance

Received: 13 November 2025

Revised: 27 July 2026

Accepted: 27 July 2026

Available online: 1 August 2026

Corresponding Author: Icha Febi Hana Rohmatul Zhaza

E-mail Address: [ichhaaja7@gmail.com](mailto:ichhaaja7@gmail.com)

**Copyright:** ©2026 The authors. This article is published by Cognispectra Publishing (<https://cognispectra.com/>)

### 1. INTRODUCTION

Corruption remains widespread across various state institutions in Indonesia, affecting not only the legislative and executive branches but also the judiciary and the courts. Courts should serve as institutions where people seek justice and as principal pillars that set an example of integrity and honesty for society. Regrettably, the reputation of the judiciary has been tarnished by judges, lawyers, prosecutors, and court clerks who have accepted or offered bribes and gratuities. The authors identified cases in which personnel within State Administrative Courts and District Courts received bribes and gratuities in the form of money and goods.

Haeruddin Massaro, an associate of lawyer OC Kaligis, acted on Kaligis's instructions to deliver bribe

money to the panel of judges and the court clerk of the Medan State Administrative Court, North Sumatra, on 2 July 2015. Haeruddin Massaro gave the money to a judge named Guntur, also known as Gerry. Gerry subsequently handed an envelope containing US\$5,000 to the President of the Medan State Administrative Court, Tripeni Irianto Putro. The Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK), which had conducted surveillance and wiretapping, caught Tripeni and Gerry in the act and seized US\$5,000 as evidence. Tripeni later admitted that OC Kaligis had provided money before the hearing commenced. The bribes received amounted to US\$10,000 and S\$5,000 from OC Kaligis (Agency, 2015) [1]. The KPK charged OC Kaligis together with M. Yagari Bhastara Guntur, also known as Gary, Gatot Pujo Nugroho, and Evy Susanti with bribing three judges of the Medan State Administrative



Court—Tripeni Irianto Putro, Dermawan Ginting, and Amir Fauzi—as well as court clerk Syamsir Yusfan. The payments consisted of S\$5,000 and US\$15,000 to Tripeni, US\$5,000 each to Dermawan and Amir, and US\$2,000 to Syamsir. When reading the indictment before the Jakarta Corruption Court, KPK prosecutor Yudi Kristana stated that OC Kaligis committed the acts jointly with Gary, Gatot, and Evy, whose prosecutions were conducted separately. OC Kaligis was primarily charged under Article 6 paragraph (1)(a) of the Corruption Eradication Law in conjunction with Article 55 paragraph (1)(1) and Article 64 paragraph (1) of the Indonesian Criminal Code, and subsidiarily under Article 13 of the Corruption Eradication Law in conjunction with Article 55 paragraph (1)(1) and Article 64 paragraph (1) of the Indonesian Criminal Code (Rahmi, 2015)[2]. The money was provided with the intention of influencing the judgment in a case entrusted to the judges for adjudication.

KPK investigators conducted searches before detaining three judges suspected of involvement in an acquittal in the crude palm oil (CPO) export-facility corruption case on Saturday, 12 April 2025. During a search involving Agam Syarif Baharuddin (ASB), investigators seized IDR 616.2 million. A search relating to Ali Muhtarom (AM), an ad hoc judge at the Central Jakarta District Court, uncovered, among other items, forty S\$100 notes and 125 US\$100 notes. Djuyamto (DJU), a judge at the South Jakarta District Court, allegedly received the equivalent of IDR 6 billion, of which IDR 300 million was subsequently distributed to a court clerk. Harli Siregar, Head of the Legal Information Center of the Attorney General's Office, also stated that investigators searched the residence of suspect Marcella Santoso (MS), an advocate, and seized S\$4,700. The Attorney General's Office also seized three cars—one Toyota Land Cruiser and two Land Rovers—together with twenty-one motorcycles and seven bicycles. ASB, a career judge at the Central Jakarta District Court, was named a suspect under Suspect Designation Letter No. TAP-25/F.2/Fd.2/04/2025 dated 13 April 2025 and Investigation Order No. PRIN-27/F.2/Fd.2/04/2025 dated 13 April 2025. AM, an ad hoc judge, was named a suspect under Suspect Designation Letter No. TAP-26/F.2/Fd.2/04/2025 dated 13 April 2025 and Investigation Order No. PRIN-28/F.2/Fd.2/04/2025 dated 13 April 2025. DJU, a career judge at the South Jakarta District Court, was named a suspect under Suspect Designation Letter No. TAP-27/F.2/Fd.2/04/2025 dated 13 April 2025 and Investigation Order No. PRIN-29/F.2/Fd.2/04/2025 dated 13 April 2025. ASB, DJU, and AM were suspected of violating Article 12(c) in conjunction with Article 12B, Article 6 paragraph (2), and Article 18 of Law No. 31 of 1999 concerning the

Eradication of Corruption Crimes, as amended by Law No. 20 of 2001, in conjunction with Article 55 paragraph (1)(1) of the Indonesian Criminal Code (Safitri & Carina, 2025)[3]. The alleged arrangement concerned the handling of a corruption case involving three cooking-oil corporations, with a request that the defendants be released from all legal charges (ontslag van alle rechtsvervolgung).

Against this background, the Supreme Court applies the Plan-Do-Check-Act (PDCA) cycle in managing the Anti-Bribery Management System (ABMS) throughout the courts. The system seeks to prevent bribery and gratuities involving judges, court clerks, prosecutors, lawyers, and other parties. The PDCA cycle and ABMS are also implemented at the Yogyakarta State Administrative Court. The PDCA cycle plays an important role in ensuring that each stage of anti-bribery activity is implemented systematically and measurably. The Plan stage focuses on policy planning and the identification of bribery risks; the Do stage concerns policy implementation and the dissemination of integrity values; the Check stage covers supervision and evaluation; and the Act stage concerns corrective action and system improvement (Byptun\_yogyakarta, 2025)[4].

PDCA is not merely an administrative procedure; it is also a strategic instrument for building a robust and adaptive internal control system. The application of PDCA in managing the Anti-Bribery Management System at the Yogyakarta State Administrative Court nevertheless faces various obstacles. These include limited human resources with competence in anti-corruption governance, organizational resistance to change, and insufficient managerial support and commitment to consistent program implementation (Permen PAN & RB No. 1 Tahun 2023, 2023)[5]. These factors hinder the optimization of PDCA as an instrument of control and continuous improvement.

The Check stage includes assessment and audit of implementation effectiveness, whereas the Act stage functions as a process of correction and system strengthening based on evaluation results. To distinguish the present study from previous research, the authors reviewed the following literature:

First, Damayanti conducted a study entitled 'Anti-Bribery Management Systems in State Administrative Courts.' The implementation of an ISO 37001:2016-based Anti-Bribery Management System within State Administrative Courts represents a strategic initiative of the Supreme Court of the Republic of Indonesia to develop a clean, transparent, and integrity-based judiciary. The study examined the operation of Anti-Bribery Compliance



Units (UKAP) and challenges affecting reporting mechanisms such as the Whistleblowing System (WBS) and the SIWAS application. It used a qualitative library-research method. The findings showed that: (1) ABMS implementation had been undertaken in several State Administrative Courts, including Jakarta, Serang, and Manado, through the establishment of Anti-Bribery Compliance Units, the preparation of risk registers, internal training, and the provision of reporting mechanisms such as the WBS and SIWAS; and (2) structural evaluation demonstrated compliance with ISO standards, although substantive effectiveness continued to face obstacles, including low levels of violation reporting, limited employee understanding, and the incomplete internalization of an anti-corruption culture. Successful implementation is therefore determined not only by administrative compliance, but also by the internalization of integrity values, the involvement of external audits, and strong leadership support. The continuous strengthening of an anti-bribery culture is consequently a prerequisite for building an accountable judiciary that enjoys public trust (Damayanti et al., 2025)[6]. The present research differs in its focus on the effectiveness of the Plan-Do-Check-Act (PDCA) cycle in managing the Anti-Bribery Management System at the Yogyakarta State Administrative Court, whereas Damayanti examined the regulation of ABMS within State Administrative Courts more generally.

Second, Krisnowo examined 'Violations of Legal Ethics and Professional Conduct in the Bribery Case Involving the Former President of the South Jakarta District Court: A Study of Central Jakarta District Court Decision No. 70/Pid.Sus-TPK/2025/PN.Jkt.Pst.' The effectiveness of law enforcement is shaped not only by statutory provisions, but also by moral integrity and judicial ethical accountability. The bribery case involving the former President of the South Jakarta District Court was adjudicated in Decision No. 70/Pid.Sus-TPK/2025/PN.Jkt.Pst, and the sentence was subsequently increased in Appellate Decision No. 4/PID.SUS-TPK/2026/PT DKI. The study examined the integration of criminal responsibility and ethical enforcement, as well as the characterization of serious violations of anti-corruption law and judicial ethical standards. It employed qualitative normative legal research based on a literature review and statutory and conceptual approaches. The analysis relied on primary legal materials, including anti-corruption legislation, the Judicial Power Law, the Judicial Code of Ethics, and relevant court decisions. The findings indicated that criminal prosecution serves not only as a punitive response but also as a mechanism for structurally correcting corruption within the judiciary. The appellate court's decision to increase the sentence, together with the

imposition of fines and restitution, reflected proportionality in sentencing and strengthened both general and specific deterrence. Ethical violations by judges also undermine institutional credibility and weaken public confidence in the judicial system. The study concluded that integrating criminal responsibility with ethical enforcement is essential to restoring judicial legitimacy and strengthening preventive oversight (Krisnowo & Jaang, 2026)[7]. The present study differs by examining public services at the Yogyakarta State Administrative Court in relation to an SNI ISO 37001-based Anti-Bribery Management System and the effectiveness of the PDCA cycle in managing that system. Krisnowo, by contrast, focused on the integration of criminal responsibility and ethical enforcement in relation to serious breaches of anti-corruption law and judicial ethical standards.

Third, Fanani examined the implementation of an anti-bribery management system in realizing good governance at the Bantul Religious Court. The Bantul Religious Court is a unit under the Supreme Court that took the initiative to implement the Supreme Court's Anti-Bribery Management System voluntarily in 2023. The study examined ABMS implementation at the Bantul Religious Court and its effect on compliance with the principles of good governance. It used a qualitative ethnomethodological field-research method. The findings showed that: (1) successful implementation depends on institutional motivation and needs, as well as the commitment of all parties, particularly leaders with a forward-looking vision and a focus on improving public services; and (2) understanding risk management remains a challenge requiring adequate planning and resources. The implementation of ABMS by the Supreme Court of Indonesia benefits the public by reducing bribery and gratuities through improved work processes and risk management, while also enhancing effectiveness, accountability, and inclusiveness in good governance (Fanani & Sunarsih, 2025)[8]. The present study differs by employing library research to examine case studies and doctrine using theories of judicial institutions.

The urgency of this research lies in examining public services at the Yogyakarta State Administrative Court in relation to the Anti-Bribery Management System based on Indonesian National Standard (SNI) ISO 37001, as well as the effectiveness of the Plan-Do-Check-Act (PDCA) cycle in managing the court's ABMS within a good-governance framework. The novelty of the research lies in its in-depth analysis of the effectiveness of the PDCA cycle in managing the Anti-Bribery Management System at the Yogyakarta State Administrative Court and



of its impact on institutional integrity and governance in accordance with the principles of good governance.

## 2. RESEARCH METHOD

This study employs a normative juridical approach, focusing on legislation, legal principles, and legal doctrines relevant to the effectiveness of Anti-Bribery Management System regulation within the State Administrative Court environment. This approach was selected because it is appropriate for examining the extent to which positive legal norms regulate and support the application of integrity principles and the prevention of bribery within judicial institutions. The research applies two principal approaches. First, the statute approach examines regulations such as Supreme Court Regulations, Decisions of the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, and Indonesian National Standard (SNI) ISO 37001:2016, which provides the basis for ABMS implementation within the judiciary. Second, the conceptual approach is used to understand theoretically the concepts of integrity, transparency, accountability, and corruption prevention as ethical and moral foundations of a just judicial system. The study is further supported by library research using secondary sources, including scholarly journals, books, institutional reports, and official documents relevant to ABMS implementation within State Administrative Courts. The analysis focuses on several sources, including evaluation reports on ABMS implementation at the Jakarta, Serang, and Manado State Administrative Courts, and compares them with data from other government institutions that have adopted SNI ISO 37001:2016. This combination of approaches is expected to provide a comprehensive account of the effectiveness and challenges of ABMS implementation as an instrument of judicial institutional reform in Indonesia.

## 3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### A. Public Services at the Yogyakarta State Administrative Court under the Anti-Bribery Management System Based on Indonesian National Standard (SNI) ISO 37001

Etymologically, the term 'public service' combines the concepts of service and the public. Service refers to an act, process, or method of providing assistance or convenience to others in meeting their needs, while the public refers to society at large or the broader community as the beneficiary of a particular activity or policy (Soetomo, 2024)[9]. Public service may therefore be understood as a process of interaction between government and society, through which the state, acting through its officials or institutions, provides services to meet public needs and interests comprehensively.

In a broader sense, public service encompasses more than the provision of goods or services; it reflects the state's responsibility to ensure the fulfillment of citizens' fundamental rights in a fair, efficient, transparent, and accountable manner (Dwiyanto & Agus, 2011)[10]. Public services cover important areas of social life, including population administration, education, health, transportation, licensing, law, and the judiciary (Keban & Yermias T., 2008)[11]. Within legal institutions, public service is an integral part of judicial bodies, including State Administrative Courts (MA RI 2020, n.d.)([12]. State Administrative Courts provide legal protection to members of the public whose rights are harmed by administrative actions of government authorities.

The principal objective of services at the Yogyakarta State Administrative Court is likewise to provide public services and to ensure that court users receive appropriate, high-quality services in accordance with applicable law (Ministry of Administrative and Bureaucratic Reform, 2023)[13]. National legislation, particularly Law No. 25 of 2009 concerning Public Services, affirms the state's obligation to guarantee the fulfillment of public rights, provide legal certainty, and prevent the abuse of authority in public-service delivery (Law No. 25 of 2009, n.d.)([14]. The public consequently has legitimate expectations concerning the quality of services provided by government officials and other public institutions.

Services provided by the Yogyakarta State Administrative Court encompass speed, accuracy, openness of information, and fairness in the service-delivery process. Achieving these objectives requires clear and measurable public-service standards that serve both as guidelines for service providers and as benchmarks of accountability and transparency for the public as service recipients (National Institute of Public Administration, 2018)([15].

Nevertheless, service delivery continues to face various practical obstacles, including complex bureaucracy, limited professionalism among officials, and insufficient supervision of compliance with service standards (Hardiyansyah, 2024)[16]. These conditions frequently create a gap between public expectations and the services actually received.

Improving the quality of public services is therefore essential to modern governance. Such efforts must be accompanied by systemic reform, stronger human-resource capacity (UNDP, 2021)[17], and sustained commitment from service providers so that public service can function as an



instrument for realizing good governance and social justice for all Indonesians.

Public-service delivery at the Yogyakarta State Administrative Court may encounter various forms of non-compliance with service standards established by government institutions. Such non-compliance may include slow, non-transparent, or discriminatory services, as well as illegal charges and abuse of authority by officials (National Institute of Public Administration, 2020)[18]. These practices not only violate the fundamental rights of members of the public as service recipients, but also erode public confidence in state institutions as public-service providers.

The Yogyakarta State Administrative Court applies service standards grounded in fairness, integrity, and legal certainty. If case-administration processes are not conducted professionally, transparently, and free from intervention, judicial independence may be threatened and opportunities may arise for bribery, gratuities, and other forms of corruption (Siregar, R., 2022)[19]. Every public-service institution must therefore ensure legal compliance with service standards through systematic and continuous supervision, assessment, and evaluation mechanisms.

One systemic approach considered effective in strengthening the integrity and accountability of public services at the Yogyakarta State Administrative Court is the implementation of an Anti-Bribery Management System based on Indonesian National Standard (SNI) ISO 37001 (National Standardization Agency, 2016)[20]. The standard was introduced by the National Standardization Agency (BSN) as a follow-up to Presidential Instruction No. 10 of 2016 concerning Actions for the Prevention and Eradication of Corruption (President of the Republic of Indonesia, 2022)[21], representing a systematic effort to prevent bribery in various sectors, including the judiciary.

SNI ISO 37001 provides organizational guidance for establishing control systems to prevent, detect, and address bribery effectively (OECD, 2019)[22]. Its implementation demonstrates an institution's commitment to an anti-corruption culture and integrity (Rahman, F., 2021)[23]. ISO 37001 therefore functions not only as a technical instrument for bribery-risk management, but also as a source of institutional, moral, and legal legitimacy.

Although the implementation of ISO 37001 cannot guarantee that a court will be entirely free from bribery, compliance with SNI ISO 37001 is an important indicator of a concrete, measurable, and

structured corruption-prevention system within judicial governance (KPK, 2022)[24]. Within State Administrative Courts, ABMS implementation reflects the commitment of the Supreme Court of the Republic of Indonesia to establishing a clean, transparent, accountable, and corruption-free judiciary (Supreme Court of the Republic of Indonesia, 2024b)[25]. This commitment is embodied in Decision of the Head of the Supreme Court Supervisory Agency No. 15/BP/SK/P1.1.1/11/2024 concerning Guidelines for Regulating ABMS in Courts, which describes four principal stages of implementation: planning (Plan), implementation (Do), evaluation (Check), and follow-up action (Act) (Decision of the Head of the Supreme Court Supervisory Agency No. 15/BP/SK/P1.1.1/11/2024 concerning Guidelines for Regulating ABMS in Courts, 2024)[26]. These four stages constitute the Plan-Do-Check-Act cycle, which serves as a continuous model for ensuring the effectiveness of anti-bribery management systems within the judiciary. The framework is presented in the following table:

#### **PDCA Framework for the Anti-Bribery Management System in the Courts**

**Plan:** Organizational context; ABMS organizational structure; stakeholder needs and expectations; ABMS scope and manual; anti-bribery policy; bribery risk assessment; objectives and work plans; and support through adequate resources, training, and communication.

**Do:** Visible leadership commitment; due diligence concerning relevant activities, transactions, and parties; and the application of operational controls to minimize bribery risks and implement established policies.

**Check:** Performance analysis; internal audits of compliance and effectiveness; FKAP review of the operation of ABMS; and management review to ensure alignment between organizational strategy, operations, and established objectives.

**Act:** Identification of nonconformities; corrective action to eliminate causes and prevent recurrence; continuous improvement; remedial action to correct problems that have occurred; and preventive action to address potential problems before they arise.

The implementation of the Anti-Bribery Management System within State Administrative Courts is not merely a means of satisfying administrative obligations under formal standards. It is also a concrete manifestation of efforts to establish an anti-bribery culture embedded in every judicial process (Ridlwani, 2011)[27]. This approach emphasizes that bribery prevention cannot be achieved solely through regulations and policy documents, but must be instilled as a fundamental institutional value reflected in



the conduct, procedures, and decisions of every judicial official.

ABMS also promotes bribery-risk assessment throughout every stage of service delivery, from case registration and administrative processing to the execution of judgments. Through risk identification, State Administrative Courts can map potential misconduct by irresponsible individuals and systematically minimize opportunities for abuse (Supreme Court Supervisory Agency, 2024b)[28]. ABMS implementation at the Yogyakarta State Administrative Court is consistent with the national bureaucratic-reform policy, which is directed toward establishing Integrity Zones and achieving the designations of Corruption-Free Zone (WBK) and Clean and Serving Bureaucratic Zone (WBBM) (Ministry of Administrative and Bureaucratic Reform, 2023)[29]. ABMS functions not only as an internal-control system against bribery, but also as a quality indicator for assessing whether judicial governance is accountable, professional, and founded on integrity.

The successful implementation of ABMS at the Yogyakarta State Administrative Court provides concrete evidence of the judiciary's commitment to clean and corruption-free governance (Rahardjo, B., 2023)[30]. ABMS implementation is not merely a symbol of compliance with anti-bribery standards; it can directly improve the quality of public legal services, particularly in relation to transparency, accountability, and the professionalism of judicial personnel.

Furthermore, ABMS serves not only as a preventive system but also as an early-warning mechanism for potential violations or irregularities in legal-service processes (OECD, 2024)[31]. With ABMS in place, the Yogyakarta State Administrative Court has stronger instruments for responding promptly to reports of violations, protecting whistleblowers, and ensuring that legal processes operate without pressure or intervention from any party.

The Yogyakarta State Administrative Court's successful implementation of ABMS and its achievement of the WBK and WBBM designations are expected to provide best practices for other courts throughout Indonesia (Supreme Court of the Republic of Indonesia, 2024b)[32]. Expanding ABMS implementation is expected to contribute to a cleaner, fairer, more transparent national judicial system that commands public trust.

The continued implementation of ABMS at the Yogyakarta State Administrative Court must therefore not be regarded merely as a formal obligation, but as an integral part of the Supreme Court's broader strategy to strengthen judicial integrity, improve governance, and rebuild public confidence in Indonesia's legal system.

## **B. Effectiveness of the Plan-Do-Check-Act (PDCA) Cycle in Managing the Anti-Bribery Management System at the Yogyakarta State Administrative Court within a Good-Governance Framework**

The implementation of ABMS at the Yogyakarta State Administrative Court forms an integral part of the judicial institutional-reform agenda, which is oriented toward strengthening integrity and transparency and improving good governance within the Indonesian judiciary (Supreme Court of the Republic of Indonesia, 2024a)[33]. ISO 37001:2016 was systematically designed to prevent, detect, and address bribery through measurable policies, procedures, and control mechanisms. ABMS implementation at the Yogyakarta State Administrative Court is intended not only to comply with technical standards, but also to serve as a strategic measure for establishing a clean, accountable, and high-integrity judicial environment. Through ABMS implementation, the court is expected to strengthen public confidence in the judiciary and reduce abuses of authority and improper practices in case administration and adjudication (International Organization for Standardization, 2016)[34].

The effectiveness of ABMS implementation can be measured through several institutional performance indicators: (1) the commitment and example demonstrated by leaders in internalizing anti-bribery values; (2) the implementation of clear and measurable policies and standard operating procedures; (3) continuous training and capacity development for judicial personnel; and (4) the availability of reporting and whistleblower-protection systems (Supreme Court Supervisory Agency, 2024a)[35]. Periodic internal audits, monitoring by supervisory units, and the imposition of disciplinary sanctions for violations are also essential to ensuring that the system operates effectively and sustainably (International Organization for Standardization, 2016)[36]. Successful ABMS implementation at the Yogyakarta State Administrative Court cannot be assessed solely on the basis of ISO 37001 certification (Rahmawati, S., 2023)[37], but must also be reflected in changes to institutional work culture, improvements in individual integrity, and a reduction in the risk of bribery within the court.

The effectiveness of ABMS implementation nevertheless depends on three principal factors: first, the commitment of institutional leaders as the primary drivers of change; second, consistent technical implementation at the operational level,



particularly in service procedures and case administration; and third, the active participation of all court personnel in upholding integrity and professionalism.

The Supervisory Agency of the Supreme Court of the Republic of Indonesia launched the ABMS implementation program at the Yogyakarta State Administrative Court, which has become one of the courts demonstrating a strong commitment to transparency, accountability, and institutional integrity (Supreme Court of the Republic of Indonesia, 2024c)[38]. This commitment is reflected in several strategic measures, including periodic monitoring and evaluation of ABMS effectiveness and the involvement of the Chair of the Supervisory Officials Communication Forum (FKAP), together with coordinators, in comprehensive evaluations measuring the compliance and commitment of judicial personnel (Transparency International Indonesia, 2023)[39]. These continuous efforts produced a significant achievement when the Yogyakarta State Administrative Court regained its ABMS certificate, demonstrating that the institution had fulfilled ISO 37001 requirements for an anti-bribery management system.

It must nevertheless be acknowledged that empirical and quantitative data clearly demonstrating the substantive impact of ABMS implementation on corruption prevention in public services, particularly within the judiciary, remain unavailable (Corruption Eradication Commission, 2023)[40]. This indicates that, although ABMS has been structurally implemented in accordance with the applicable standards, its substantive effectiveness in preventing bribery and strengthening a culture of integrity has not yet been convincingly established.

The implementation of SNI ISO 37001:2016 in several government institutions has demonstrated more positive effects. Institutions that have implemented the standard comprehensively, including units responsible for establishing functional positions within the state civil service, have reportedly experienced significant organizational-cultural change (Ministry of Administrative and Bureaucratic Reform, 2023)[41]. Employees have become more proactive in reporting suspicious activities, and a more open and transparent working environment has emerged. SNI ISO 37001:2016 has been shown to increase internal vigilance and anti-bribery awareness and to strengthen institutional commitment to integrity and accountability (Supreme Court of the Republic of Indonesia, 2025)[42]. These positive effects

contribute directly to greater public confidence and a more favorable institutional image.

A comparison between ABMS implementation at the Yogyakarta State Administrative Court and at other institutions indicates that success depends on the extent to which anti-bribery values are internalized within the working culture (Corruption Eradication Commission, 2024)[43]. State Administrative Courts that implement ABMS substantively demonstrate behavioral change, capacity improvement, and cultural reform (Lestari, A., 2024)[44]. Stronger internalization of integrity values, higher-quality personnel training, and the involvement of the public and external stakeholders are necessary to ensure that ABMS functions effectively and sustainably.

ABMS implementation within State Administrative Courts and courts of general jurisdiction has been effective at the structural and administrative levels, but has not yet demonstrated substantive effectiveness in preventing bribery in practice. Although the Yogyakarta State Administrative Court has affirmed its commitment through certification, training, and anti-bribery policies, evidence has not yet demonstrated a significant reduction in corrupt practices or a substantial improvement in the transparency of public services.

Comprehensive data concerning changes in judicial work culture following ABMS implementation are also unavailable. This condition indicates that ABMS implementation within State Administrative Courts may remain largely symbolic and has not yet been fully internalized in the mindset, ethics, and working behavior of judicial personnel.

A strategy for substantively strengthening ABMS implementation is therefore required. It should include improved human-resource capacity, optimization of reporting and whistleblower-protection systems, and the continuous integration of integrity values into the working culture. Through these measures, ABMS can function as an effective, measurable, and sustainable instrument for preventing bribery and can become an important foundation for building a clean, credible, and high-integrity judiciary.

#### 4. CONCLUDING REMARKS

##### a. Conclusion

Regarding the effectiveness of the Plan-Do-Check-Act (PDCA) cycle in managing the Anti-Bribery Management System at the Yogyakarta State Administrative Court within a good-governance



framework, the application of PDCA has proved to be an effective strategic instrument for improving transparency, accountability, and good governance within the judiciary. Consistent and structured implementation strengthens internal-control mechanisms and increases awareness of and compliance with anti-bribery requirements. Nevertheless, optimal effectiveness continues to be constrained by limited competent human resources, organizational resistance to cultural change, and insufficient managerial commitment. These obstacles require sustained attention and continuous improvement.

Regarding public services at the Yogyakarta State Administrative Court under the Anti-Bribery Management System based on SNI ISO 37001, successful implementation depends on human-resource capacity development, continuous professional training, and strong leadership commitment to establishing a culture of integrity. These measures are essential to ensure that the system does not merely satisfy administrative formalities, but can adapt to emerging challenges and contribute meaningfully to creating a judicial environment free from corrupt practices.

#### b. Recommendations

The Yogyakarta State Administrative Court should strengthen human-resource capacity through continuous training and education focused on anti-corruption principles and bribery-risk management. Leadership commitment should be enhanced so that leaders serve as role models in fostering a culture of integrity at every organizational level. The institution should also strengthen violation-reporting and whistleblower-protection systems to increase trust and participation in bribery-prevention efforts. Finally, internal evaluations and audits should be conducted periodically with the involvement of independent parties to ensure the continuity and comprehensive effectiveness of PDCA implementation.

Through these measures, ABMS at the Yogyakarta State Administrative Court is expected to function not only as an administrative-control instrument, but also as a strong foundation for realizing a clean, transparent, accountable, and publicly trusted judiciary. With robust institutional arrangements and a well-established culture of integrity, the Yogyakarta State Administrative Court can serve as an example for other judicial institutions in implementing an effective and sustainable anti-bribery management system and in strengthening public confidence in the rule of law and justice.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] Agency, A. N. (2015, July 25). Inilah Kronologis Suap Hakim PTUN Medan. Antara News Lampung. <https://lampung.antaranews.com/berita/283234/inilah-kronologis-suap-hakim-ptun-medan>
- [2] Badan Pengawasan Mahkamah Agung. (2024a). *Evaluasi Penerapan Smap Di Pengadilan Tata Usaha Negara Tahun 2024*. Bawas Ma.
- [3] Badan Pengawasan Mahkamah Agung. (2024b). *Laporan Evaluasi Implementasi Smap Di Pengadilan Tata Usaha Negara Tahun 2024*. Badan Pengawasan MA.
- [4] Badan Standarisasi Nasional. (2016). *Sni Iso 37001:2016 Sistem Manajemen Anti Penyuapan – Persyaratan Dengan Panduan Penggunaan* (SNI ISO 37001:16). Badan Standardisasi Nasional.
- [5] Byptun\_yogyakarta. (2025, February 11). PTUN Yogyakarta Gelar Sosialisasi Sistem Manajemen Anti Penyuapan untuk Wujudkan Peradilan Berintegritas – Pengadilan Tata Usaha Negara Yogyakarta. <https://ptun-yogyakarta.go.id/ptun-yogyakarta-gelar-sosialisasi-sistem-manajemen-anti-penyuapan-untuk-wujudkan-peradilan-berintegritas/>
- [6] Damayanti dkk., S. R. (2025). *Pengaturan Sistem Manajemen Anti Penyuapan (SMAP) Dalam Pengadilan Tata Usaha Negara*. Zenodo. <https://doi.org/10.5281/ZENODO.15619031>
- [7] Dwiyanto & Agus. (2011). *Reformasi Birokrasi Publik Di Indonesia*. Gadjah Mada University Press.
- [8] Fanani, M. I., & Sunarsih, U. (2025). Implementasi sistem manajemen anti penyuapan dalam mewujudkan good governance pada Pengadilan Agama Bantul. *Jurnal STEI Ekonomi*, 34(1), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.36406/jemi.v34i1.31>
- [9] Hardiyansyah. (2024). *Kualitas Pelayanan Publik: Konsep, Dimensi, Dan Indikator*. Gava Media.
- [10] International Organization For Standardization (ISO). (2016). *ISO 37001:2016 – Anti-Bribery Management Systems: Requirements With Guidance For Use (37001:2016)*. International Organization For Standardization (ISO).
- [11] Keban & Yermias T. (2008). *Enam Dimensi Strategis Administrasi Publik: Konsep, Teori, Dan Isu*. Gava Media.
- [12] Kementerian Panrb. (2023). *Evaluasi Efektivitas Penerapan Iso 37001:2016 Pada Instansi Pemerintah*. Kemenpan-Rb.
- [13] Kementerian Pendayagunaan Aparatur Negara Dan Reformasi Birokrasi (KEMENPANRB). (2023). *Laporan Kinerja Pelayanan Publik 2022*. KEMENPANRB.
- [14] Kementerian Pendayagunaan Aparatur Negara Dan Reformasi Birokrasi (Kemenpan-Rb). (2023). *Panduan Pembangunan Zona Integritas Menuju Wbk/Wbbm*. KEMENPAN-RB.
- [15] Keputusan Kepala Badan Pengawasan Ma Ri Nomor: 15/Bp/Sk/P1.1.1/11/2024 Tentang Pedoman Pengaturan Smap Di Pengadilan, 15/BP/SK/PW1.1.1.1/II/2024 (2024).



- [16] Komisi Pemberantasan Korupsi (KPK). (2023). *Analisis Implementasi Kebijakan Anti Penyuapan Di Lembaga Pemerintahan*. KPK.
- [17] Komisi Pemberantasan Korupsi (KPK). (2024). *Laporan Tahunan Pencegahan Korupsi 2024*. KPK.
- [18] KPK. (2022). *Panduan Praktik Penerapan Sistem Manajemen Anti Penyuapan (Smap)*. KPK.
- [19] Krisnowo, R., & Jaang, S. (2026). Pelanggaran Etika Dan Profesi Hukum Dalam Kasus Suap Eks Ketua Pengadilan Negeri Jakarta Selatan (Studi Putusan Pengadilan Negeri Jakarta Pusat Nomor 70/Pid.Sus-TPK/2025/PN.Jkt.Pst). *Yuriska: Jurnal Ilmiah Hukum*, 18(1), 31–44. <https://doi.org/10.24903/yrs.v18i1.3913>
- [20] Lembaga Administrasi Negara. (2020). *Pedoman Penyelenggaraan Pelayanan Publik Yang Berkualitas*. LAN RI.
- [21] Lembaga Administrasi Negara (LAN). (2018). *Pedoman Penyusunan Standar Pelayanan Publik*. LAN RI.
- [22] Lestari, A. (2024). Strategi Peningkatan Efektivitas Smap Dalam Lembaga Peradilan. *Jurnal Etika Dan Hukum Publik*, 7(1).
- [23] MA RI 2020. (n.d.). Retrieved July 26, 2026, from [https://badilum.mahkamahagung.go.id/images/SK\\_Pembaruan\\_Pedoman\\_PTSP\\_2024\\_sign\\_dae37.pdf](https://badilum.mahkamahagung.go.id/images/SK_Pembaruan_Pedoman_PTSP_2024_sign_dae37.pdf)
- [24] Mahkamah Agung Republik Indonesia. (2024a). *Laporan Reformasi Birokrasi Dan Pembangunan Zona Integritas Di Lingkungan Peradilan 2024*. MA RI.
- [25] Mahkamah Agung Republik Indonesia. (2024b). *Laporan Tahunan Ma Ri: Mewujudkan Peradilan Bersih Dan Berintegritas*. MA RI.
- [26] Mahkamah Agung Republik Indonesia. (2024c). *Pedoman Implementasi Sistem Manajemen Anti Penyuapan (Smap)*. Ma Ri.
- [27] Mahkamah Agung Republik Indonesia. (2025). *Rencana Strategis Pengadilan Tata Usaha Negara 2025–2029*. Ma Ri.
- [28] OECD. (2019). *Anti-Bribery Management Systems – Guidance For Iso 37001 Implementation*. Oecd Publishing.
- [29] OECD. (2024). *Anti-Bribery Management Systems – Guidance For Iso 37001 Implementation*. Oecd Publishing.
- [30] Permen PAN & RB No. 1 Tahun 2023. (2023). Database Peraturan | JDIH BPK. <http://peraturan.bpk.go.id/Details/240815/permen-pan-rb-no-1-tahun-2023>
- [31] Presiden RI. (2022, September 22). Instruksi Presiden Republik Indonesia Nomor 10 Tahun 2016 Tentang Aksi Pencegahan Dan Pemberantasan Korupsi. Sekretariat Negara. <https://peraturan.bpk.go.id/Details/77351/inpres-no-10-tahun-2016>
- [32] Rahardjo, B. (2023). Integritas Aparatur dan Peningkatan Kualitas Pelayanan Hukum Melalui Penerapan SMAP. *Jurnal Etika dan Integritas Pemerintahan*, 5(2).
- [33] Rahman, F. (2021). Implementasi Iso 37001 Sebagai Upaya Pencegahan Korupsi Di Instansi Pemerintah. *Jurnal Integritas Nasional*, 3(1).
- [34] Rahmawati, S. (2023). Pengaruh Implementasi Iso 37001 Terhadap Perubahan Budaya Organisasi Di Lingkungan Peradilan. *Jurnal Etika Dan Tata Kelola Pemerintahan*, 6(1).
- [35] Rahmi, N. (2015, August 31). OC Kaligis Didakwa Menyuap Hakim PTUN Medan. [hukumonline.com. https://www.hukumonline.com/berita/a/oc-kaligis-didakwa-menyuap-hakim-ptun-medan-lt55e40991a18e5/](https://www.hukumonline.com/berita/a/oc-kaligis-didakwa-menyuap-hakim-ptun-medan-lt55e40991a18e5/)
- [36] Ridlwan, Z. (2011). NEGARA HUKUM INDONESIA KEBALIKAN NACHTWACHTERSTAAT. *Fiat Justisia: Jurnal Ilmu Hukum*, 5(2). <https://doi.org/10.25041/fiatjustisia.v5no2.56>
- [37] Safitri & Carina. (2025, April 14). Kronologi Penahanan Tiga Hakim Tersangka Suap Vonis Lepas Ekspor CPO. Kompas.com. <https://nasional.kompas.com/read/2025/04/14/09042201/kronologi-penahanan-tiga-hakim-tersangka-suap-vonis-lepas-ekspor-cpo?page=all>
- [38] Siregar, R. (2022). Integritas Dan Transparansi Dalam Layanan Peradilan Di Indonesia. *Jurnal Hukum Dan Peradilan*, 08(2).
- [39] Soetomo. (2024). *Pelayanan Publik Dan Reformasi Birokrasi*. Pustaka Pelajar.
- [40] Transparency International Indonesia. (2023). *Anti-Bribery Management In Judicial Institutions: Challenges And Best Practices*. TII.
- [41] Undp. (2021). *Public Service Excellence And Good Governance Report*. Undp.
- [42] UU Nomor 25 Tahun 2009. (t.t.).