Journal of Law & Social Politics
Volume 4, Issue 5, 1433-1445
e_ISSN: 2807-6311
https://jolastic.id/index.php/jlsp/index
DOI: doi.org/10.59261/jlsp.v4i5.296

Evaluating PRESISI Implementation for a Just National Police in Impactful Bureaucratic Reform

Falah Ananda Febryan* Universitas Palangka Raya, Indonesia
Immanuel Jaya Universitas Palangka Raya, Indonesia
Yonatan Ari Santoso Universitas Palangka Raya, Indonesia

***Corresponding author:**
Falah Ananda Febryan, Universitas Palangka Raya, Indonesia. ✉
bravofalah03@gmail.com

Article Info:
***Article history*:**
Received: September 06, 2026
Revised: October 05, 2026
Accepted: October 06, 2026
Available Online: November 05, 2026

***Keywords*:**
Bureaucratic Reform;
Law Enforcement;
Police Science;
Polri PRESISI;
Public Service;

This is an open access article under the CC BY-SA license.

Copyright © 2026 by Author. Published by Sekolah Tinggi Agama Islam Kuningan

Abstract

Background: This study examines the Indonesian National Police (Polri)'s PRESISI approach—*Prediktif, Responsibilitas, dan Transparansi Berkeadilan* (Predictive, Responsibility, and Fair Transparency)—within the context of bureaucratic reform. In this article, just policing is operationally understood as policing that is legally compliant, procedurally fair, accountable, transparent, and respectful of human rights, rather than as a claim that justice has already been achieved.
Objective: The study evaluates how coherently the three PRESISI pillars are represented across legal mandates, institutional policy narratives, and documented outcomes, while identifying structural and regulatory gaps that limit their contribution to public trust and legal certainty.
Methods: A descriptive qualitative, document-based policy analysis was conducted using the legal and institutional materials explicitly identified in the manuscript, supplemented by peer-reviewed literature and published empirical studies. No interviews or direct field observations were conducted. The evidence was coded by PRESISI pillar and compared across legal mandate, institutional mechanism, documented outcome, and limitation.
Results: The documentary synthesis indicates that service digitalization, complaint mechanisms, and access to public information are visible directions of reform, but the available evidence is uneven regarding personnel-level internalization, sustained effects on public trust, and the operation of algorithmic predictive systems. The corpus does not provide reproducible, system-level documentation of algorithms, training data, validation procedures, or fairness safeguards.
Conclusion: PRESISI provides a useful policy architecture for integrating prevention, accountability, and transparency, but claims of substantive justice require stronger empirical verification and clearer governance safeguards.
Implication: Future evaluations should combine transparent institutional documentation with field-based and longitudinal evidence.

To cite this article: Febryan, F. A., Jaya, I., & Santoso, Y. A. (2026). Evaluating PRESISI implementation for a just National Police in impactful bureaucratic reform. *Journal of Law & Social Politics*, *4*(5), 1433-1445. https://doi.org/10.59261/jlsp.v4i5.296

INTRODUCTION

The Indonesian National Police (Polri) plays a central role in maintaining public security and order, enforcing the law, and providing protection and public services (Hasani et al., 2026; Silvana Bolang & Surya Perdhana, 2023; Yustinus Bowo Dwinugroho, 2024). Within the context of democratic accountability and information transparency, police performance is assessed not only through operational achievements but also through the legality, fairness, accountability, and transparency experienced by the public (Alikhademi et al., 2022; Hope, 2020; Ranta, 2025). The PRESISI framework, *Prediktif, Responsibilitas, dan Transparansi Berkeadilan* (Predictive, Responsibility, and Fair Transparency), was introduced as an institutional reform approach intended to integrate data-

supported prevention, professional responsibility, and transparent public service (Damayanti, 2026). In this study, just policing is understood in a limited evaluative sense as policing that complies with the law, applies fair procedures, ensures accountability in the exercise of authority, maintains transparency in service processes, and respects individual rights. This definition enables justice to be examined through specific criteria rather than treated as an assumed institutional condition. These criteria are assessed in relation to the legal mandates governing Polri, including MPR Decree No. VI/MPR/2000, MPR Decree No. VII/MPR/2000, Law No. 2 of 2002, and Law No. 25 of 2009. The post-Reform legal framework itself reflects the institutional separation of the police and military and the distinct role of Polri in maintaining security, public order, law enforcement, protection, and public service.

Previous studies have examined PRESISI and police reform from different perspectives. Syahputra et al. (2023) emphasize PRESISI as a form of organizational-culture transformation and argue that reform must be internalized beyond formal policy design. Hasibuan (2023) evaluates PRESISI from a normative and literature-based perspective, linking its success to public satisfaction, service systems, and institutional transformation. Rustandi et al. (2022), through a case study in South Sulawesi, focus on bureaucratic reform, public service, and police human resources, whereas Kushartiningsih & Riharjo (2021) provide broader public-administration evidence concerning the relationship between accountability, transparency, supervision, and service performance. International studies on predictive policing offer another perspective. Alikhademi et al. (2022) identify accuracy, bias, transparency, and fairness as key governance concerns, while Meijer & Wessels (2019) note that empirical evidence supporting many claimed benefits of predictive policing remains limited. Collectively, these studies provide important but fragmented insights into organizational culture, public service, accountability, and predictive technology.

The research gap therefore lies not in the absence of studies on PRESISI, but in the limited integration of these dimensions within a reproducible policy-coherence framework. Existing studies generally examine organizational culture, service reform, public accountability, or predictive policing separately, leaving the relationship between legal mandates, institutional mechanisms, and documented outcomes insufficiently explored. This gap is particularly important within the Predictive pillar. Based on the regulatory and documentary materials examined in this study, no sufficiently specific and reproducible information is presented regarding the algorithmic systems used, the types of data processed, the influence of analytical outputs on police decision-making, or the mechanisms for validation, bias testing, and independent auditing. Accordingly, this study does not assume the operational use or effectiveness of any particular artificial-intelligence system. Rather, the absence of system-specific documentation is treated as an issue of regulatory clarity and institutional accountability that must be distinguished from broader claims concerning digitalization.

The novelty of this study lies in its use of a three-stage policy-coherence framework to evaluate PRESISI as an integrated reform framework rather than as a collection of separate programs. First, each PRESISI pillar is examined against its relevant legal mandate. Second, the institutional mechanisms through which those mandates are translated into policies or service arrangements are identified. Third, the available documentary and empirical evidence is assessed to determine documented outcomes, limitations, and unresolved accountability issues. This sequence of legal mandate–institutional mechanism–documented outcome makes it possible to distinguish claims supported by evidence from those that remain descriptive or require further empirical verification. For the Predictive pillar, the framework also incorporates data provenance, validation, fairness, transparency, and auditability as necessary considerations before conclusions regarding algorithmic effectiveness can be made.

This study examines the coherence of the Predictive, Responsibility, and Fair Transparency pillars of PRESISI in linking Polri's legal mandates, institutional mechanisms, and documented outcomes. It also identifies structural, cultural, evidentiary, and regulatory gaps that may affect the contribution of these pillars to public trust, legal certainty, accountability, and just policing. In addition, the study develops an integrated police-science and political-science framework for assessing bureaucratic reform based on available documentary and empirical evidence, while avoiding conclusions that extend beyond the evidence examined.

Table 1 operationalizes the policy-coherence framework used throughout the analysis:

Table 1

Operational Policy-Coherence Framework for Evaluating PRESISI

PRESISI Pillar	Analytical Indicators	Documentary Evidence and Decision Rule
Predictive	Data-supported prevention; data governance; validation; fairness; transparency; auditability.	Assess only mechanisms documented in traceable sources; do not infer algorithmic performance where system, data, validation, or audit documentation is absent.
Responsibility	Personnel accountability; oversight and complaint mechanisms; professional ethics; rights protection.	Compare legal duties and institutional mechanisms with documented oversight or service evidence; distinguish formal rules from demonstrated behavioral internalization.
Fair Transparency	Access to service and case information; complaint channels; procedural fairness; public-trust indicators.	Triangulate public-service rules, documented digital services, and independent empirical evidence; do not treat association or descriptive trends as proof of causality.

The study is significant because it reframes the evaluation of PRESISI from a broad claim of institutional success toward a traceable assessment of what the available evidence can and cannot establish. This approach supports more precise recommendations for strengthening accountability, service transparency, data governance, and future empirical evaluation.

METHOD

This study employed a descriptive qualitative approach with a document-based policy analysis design focused on organizational transformation within Polri. The unit of analysis was the policy coherence of the three PRESISI pillars across legal mandate, institutional mechanism, and documented outcome. The study did not include interviews, direct observation, or other forms of primary field-data collection; therefore, all findings were interpreted as documentary and literature-based conclusions rather than as direct observations of personnel behavior.

The normative framework was anchored in the legal materials identified in the manuscript: MPR Decree No. VI/MPR/2000, MPR Decree No. VII/MPR/2000, Law No. 2 of 2002 concerning the Indonesian National Police, and Law No. 25 of 2009 concerning Public Services. These instruments provided the baseline for assessing institutional roles, accountability, public-service obligations, and transparency. Because the original manuscript did not provide a reproducible list, number, and year for every *Renstra* or *Perkap* mentioned generically, the revised analysis did not use an unspecified *Renstra* or *Perkap* as the sole evidentiary basis for any empirical conclusion.

Data were collected through structured document review and literature synthesis. No in-depth policy observation, field observation, or interview data were used in the study.

The primary documentary corpus consisted of the named legal instruments and traceable institutional materials explicitly discussed in the manuscript. Documents were included when they directly addressed Polri's institutional mandate, PRESISI-related reform, public-service accountability, transparency, or police organizational transformation and could be identified by title, issuing body, year, or retrievable publication source. Materials whose identity could not be established with sufficient specificity were retained only as contextual references and were not used to support stand-alone empirical claims.

Secondary sources were selected to contextualize, corroborate, or challenge the documentary findings. Priority was given to peer-reviewed research published within the preceding ten years for empirical claims concerning police reform, public trust, digital policing, accountability, and predictive policing; older works were used only when they served as

foundational conceptual references. Recent empirical studies were used as contextual benchmarks rather than as substitutes for direct measurement of the present study's documentary corpus.

The analytical indicators were derived from the operational framework presented in Table 1. The Predictive pillar was coded for prevention logic, data governance, validation, fairness, transparency, and auditability; the Responsibility pillar was coded for legal accountability, oversight and complaint mechanisms, professional ethics, and rights protection; and the Fair Transparency pillar was coded for information access, service-process openness, complaint accessibility, procedural fairness, and public-trust indicators. Across all pillars, the analysis distinguished formal policy design from documented implementation evidence.

The analysis followed an interactive process of data reduction, matrix-based presentation, comparison, and conclusion drawing. Relevant statements were first coded deductively under the three PRESISI pillars and the cross-cutting categories of legality, accountability, transparency, fairness, and public trust. Evidence was then compared across legal mandate, institutional mechanism, and documented outcome. Contradictory or mixed findings were retained rather than harmonized, and conclusions were limited to the level of evidence available. Triangulation therefore referred to comparison among legal documents, institutional materials, and independent scholarly or empirical sources; it did not refer to interview triangulation.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Results

The transformation of the police force into a just and equitable institution is a crucial part of efforts to strengthen the force so that it can meet the demands of a society that is increasingly complex, democratic, and critical. Shifts in the strategic environment, advances in information technology, rising public participation in political processes, and demands for clean and transparent public services require Polri to continuously undergo reform. In this context, PRESISI serves as a transformative paradigm that positions the police not merely as a law enforcement agency but also as a public service institution oriented toward prevention, justice, accountability, and public trust.

From the perspective of police science, this transformation signifies a shift in policing orientation from an approach that is solely reactive to security disturbances toward one that is more predictive and preventive. Meanwhile, from a political science perspective, the transformation of the police is closely linked to processes of democratization, good governance, accountability in the exercise of power, institutional legitimacy, and the relationship between the state and society. Therefore, the successful implementation of PRESISI must be evaluated not only on the basis of internal organizational performance but also according to the extent to which the policy produces tangible impacts on security, justice, public services, and public trust.

Internalizing the Mandate of MPR Decrees in Institutional Transformation

MPR Decrees No. VI/MPR/2000 and No. VII/MPR/2000 provide the constitutional and political background for separating Polri from the military structure and affirming its role as a civilian police institution. Within the present framework, these decrees are treated as legal and political reference points for institutional roles and accountability; they do not, by themselves, demonstrate the operational success of PRESISI. The relevant question is therefore whether subsequent reform mechanisms can be documented as being consistent with those mandates.

The Responsibility pillar is normatively consistent with the expectation that police authority be exercised under the law and be subject to accountability. However, the documentary evidence reviewed here cannot establish the degree to which these norms have been internalized by personnel across units. Claims about organizational culture are therefore treated as interpretive conclusions supported by prior studies rather than as direct observations generated by this research.

Aligning PRESISI with Law No. 2 of 2002 and the Public Service Law

Law No. 2 of 2002 defines core police functions that include maintaining security and public order, enforcing the law, and providing protection and services. The Predictive pillar can be interpreted as reflecting a preventive orientation consistent with those functions. Nevertheless, the available corpus does not identify a specific algorithm, model, training dataset, validation protocol, or decision rule used by Polri. Accordingly, this study does not claim that artificial intelligence or a particular predictive system has been empirically shown to improve prevention outcomes.

The Fair Transparency pillar is also consistent with the public-service obligations reflected in Law No. 25 of 2009. Digital service channels and online access to selected police information can be treated as observable mechanisms of administrative transparency when they are documented in traceable sources. However, access to information should not automatically be equated with procedural fairness or public trust; those outcomes require independent empirical indicators and, where causal claims are made, research designs capable of testing attribution.

Evaluating Impactful Bureaucratic Reform and Substantive Justice

Impactful bureaucratic reform should therefore be evaluated through documented changes rather than aspirational statements alone. Table 2 summarizes the evidence that can be supported by the present corpus and explicitly separates documented reform mechanisms from the limitations that remain unresolved.

Table 2
Documented Reform Mechanisms and Evidentiary Limitations in PRESISI

PRESISI Dimension	Documented Reform Mechanism	Evidentiary / Governance Limitation
Predictive	Preventive, data-supported policing is articulated in PRESISI-related discourse and recent digital-policing research.	The present corpus does not provide reproducible documentation of specific algorithms, training data, validation results, operational decision rules, or independent fairness audits.
Responsibility	Complaint and oversight mechanisms provide formal channels for accountability.	The documentary corpus does not quantify disciplinary consistency or demonstrate uniform personnel-level internalization across regional commands.
Fair Transparency	Digital service and information-access mechanisms support administrative openness.	Access and digitalization do not by themselves establish procedural fairness, equal reach, or a sustained causal increase in public trust.

PRESISI as a Paradigm for Police Transformation

Within the documentary framework, PRESISI can be understood as a policy architecture that connects prevention, responsibility, and transparency. Its analytical value lies in examining whether these elements are mutually reinforcing and whether the evidence supporting each element is sufficiently specific, traceable, and independently verifiable.

The Predictive pillar refers to anticipatory and evidence-informed policing rather than to any single technology. For this study, predictive capability is evaluated through the quality of data governance, the clarity of the prevention logic, and the presence of safeguards for validation, fairness, transparency, and auditability. In the absence of system-specific documentation, no inference is made about the accuracy or operational effectiveness of a particular predictive model.

Responsibility is evaluated as an accountability chain linking authority, professional standards, oversight, complaint mechanisms, and the protection of public rights. Formal

mechanisms are necessary evidence of institutional design, but they are not sufficient evidence of behavioral internalization; that question requires field-based or administrative outcome data beyond the scope of the present document review.

Fair Transparency is evaluated through access to service information, clarity of procedures, accessible complaint channels, and evidence concerning procedural fairness and public trust. The analysis therefore distinguishes administrative openness from substantive fairness and avoids treating digital access alone as proof of improved legitimacy.

The Predictive Approach from a Police Science Perspective

From a police-science perspective, predictive policing is most defensible when it is understood as evidence-informed prevention supported by transparent data practices rather than as an unexamined technological claim. Contemporary research warns that predictive systems can generate misleading or inequitable outputs when historical data, model assumptions, validation procedures, or oversight mechanisms are weak. The policy implication for PRESISI is that any future use of algorithmic prediction should be accompanied by documentation sufficient for technical validation, legal review, and independent accountability.

Accordingly, data integration should be treated as a governance task as well as a technical task. Relevant data may support situational analysis and prevention, but the evidentiary basis, lawful purpose, data quality, access controls, and decision consequences must remain auditable. This is especially important where analytical outputs could influence operational prioritization or discretionary police action.

This interpretation is consistent with evidence-based policing, which requires operational choices to be linked to verifiable evidence and assessed against outcomes. In the present manuscript, however, the available material is not sufficient to test the predictive accuracy of any Polri system; the contribution of this study is therefore to specify the governance conditions under which such evaluation should occur.

Responsibility as the Foundation of Police Professionalism and Fairness

The element of responsibility is crucial to realizing a professional and fair Polri. Every police officer exercises authority granted by the state to protect the public, maintain security, enforce the law, and provide services; consequently, every action must be carried out in accordance with established procedures, the law, professional ethics, and principles of human rights protection.

Responsibility also implies that police performance cannot be measured solely by the number of cases handled or the rate of law enforcement but also by the quality of service, the ability to prevent security disturbances, the fair resolution of issues, and the level of public satisfaction and trust. In the context of impactful bureaucratic reform, responsibility drives every work unit and individual officer to generate benefits that are directly felt by the community—faster service, streamlined processes, professional case handling, and a reduction in the abuse of authority.

Fairness is a vital element in the exercise of this responsibility. The police must treat all members of the public equally, without discrimination based on social or economic background, ethnicity, religion, or political interests. Law enforcement must be conducted on the basis of facts and legal regulations rather than pressure, the exercise of power, or specific vested interests.

Transparency and Strengthening Public Trust

Transparency is a key factor in building public trust in the police force. In a democratic system, state institutions have an obligation to be accountable to the public, and as an institution vested with significant authority in law enforcement, the police must establish effective mechanisms for openness and accountability.

Transparency can be implemented through clear service standards, transparent procedures, the provision of information on case progress in accordance with applicable regulations, and easy public access to complaint mechanisms. These measures can reduce public uncertainty and prevent negative perceptions arising from a lack of information. However,

transparency must be balanced against legal constraints and the requirements of investigations: not all information can be disclosed, particularly information concerning investigative confidentiality, witness safety, victim protection, and national security. When implemented consistently, transparency can enhance public trust; a lack of transparency without a valid justification can instead breed suspicion and undermine the institution's legitimacy.

PRESISI from a Political Science Perspective

From a political science perspective, the transformation of Polri into an institution that upholds justice is linked to concepts of democratic governance, state administration, legitimacy, accountability, and the control of power. In a democracy, the police force serves as a state instrument required to exercise its authority in accordance with the law and within the framework of the public interest.

Polri occupies a strategic position due to its direct involvement in the exercise of state power to maintain order and enforce the law. Every exercise of authority must derive legitimacy from a legal basis, proper procedure, and public acceptance—legitimacy gained not only through formal authority but also through the quality of service and the conduct of officers in the performance of their duties. The PRESISI concept aligns with principles of good governance, specifically effectiveness, accountability, responsiveness, and transparency: a predictive approach can enhance the effectiveness of security policies; the principle of responsibility strengthens accountability in the exercise of authority; and transparency facilitates public oversight.

From the perspective of democratic politics, transparency and accountability also serve as mechanisms to prevent the abuse of power. The greater an institution's authority, the more critical the oversight systems governing it become; therefore, Polri's transformation must be accompanied by strengthened internal and external oversight, as well as objective evaluation mechanisms.

The Relationship Between PRESISI, Neutrality, and Democracy

In a democratic society, Polri must maintain professionalism and neutrality when navigating various political interests. Democratic dynamics often give rise to competition, conflicting interests, polarization, demonstrations, and conflict, conditions that require a police institution capable of maintaining security without becoming aligned with specific political interests.

From a political science perspective, neutrality is crucial to upholding the quality of democracy; the police must provide equal protection to all citizens and guarantee the exercise of democratic rights, including freedom of speech and the expression of aspirations in accordance with the law. From a police science perspective, neutrality represents a form of professionalism in maintaining public order and security (Kamtibmas) and enforcing the law: personnel must base their actions on situational analysis, legal facts, established procedures, and public safety interests rather than on political partisanship. The PRESISI approach can reinforce neutrality through the use of data and objective analysis in decision-making processes: Predictive policing helps establish priorities based on risk levels; Responsibility ensures that actions are accountable; and Transparency allows for oversight to verify that actions are carried out objectively and fairly.

Evaluating the Implementation of PRESISI in Impact-Oriented Bureaucratic Reform

Evaluating the implementation of PRESISI requires looking beyond mere program execution to assess tangible impacts. Regarding the Predictive aspect, the evaluation should assess Polri's capacity for early detection, speed in responding to information, accuracy in mapping areas of vulnerability, and success in preventing disturbances before they escalate; challenges include inconsistent data quality, varying analytical capabilities across regions, and the need for information-system integration. Regarding the Responsibility aspect, the evaluation focuses on personnel professionalism, adherence to procedures, service quality, and accountability for actions; the challenge lies in ensuring that responsibility is not merely viewed as an administrative obligation but becomes an ingrained work culture. Regarding the Fair

Transparency aspect, the evaluation examines the ease with which the public can access information, the effectiveness of complaint mechanisms, the openness of service processes, and follow-up on public criticism; the challenge is maintaining a balance between information transparency, data protection, and the requirements of law-enforcement processes.

Overall, the evaluation of PRESISI must utilize indicators that focus not only on outputs but also on outcomes and impacts. Outputs may consist of the volume of activities or services performed; outcomes relate to changes in the quality of service and security; and impacts pertain to long-term effects such as enhanced public safety, public trust, fairness, and the legitimacy of the National Police.

The Link Between PRESISI and the Concept of a Just National Police Force

A just National Police force is one capable of balancing the application of the law with the provision of public services. Justice entails not only imposing sanctions on offenders but also ensuring that police procedures are objective, proportionate, and humane while respecting the rights of every citizen. The Predictive approach fosters justice by prioritizing prevention, thereby protecting the public before they fall victim to harm; Responsibility ensures that the exercise of authority is conducted professionally and remains accountable; and Transparency guarantees openness and provides the public with opportunities to understand and oversee police service processes. When implemented in an integrated manner, these three elements can shape a more modern policing model—one that moves beyond merely responding to crimes to understanding community issues, predicting risks, preventing conflicts, resolving problems professionally, and delivering services fairly.

Strategies to Strengthen the Implementation of PRESISI

To enhance the effectiveness of PRESISI in supporting impactful bureaucratic reform, several key strategies are required: strengthening data and analysis systems through information integration that supports evidence-based decision-making; enhancing personnel competence in analysis, public service, communication, technology utilization, and professional ethics; strengthening internal oversight and accountability mechanisms to ensure that every police action can be evaluated objectively; increasing service transparency through the use of information technology and accessible complaint channels; strengthening communication and collaboration with the community, since security is a shared responsibility requiring public participation; and implementing impact-based reform evaluations so that each program is assessed on the basis of the changes it produces in service quality, security, justice, and public trust.

The Synthesis of Police Science and Political Science in the Transformation of Polri

The transformation of Polri through PRESISI essentially represents a convergence of Police Science and Political Science. Police Science provides the foundation for how police functions are professionally executed—encompassing crime prevention, the maintenance of public order and security, public service delivery, law enforcement, and community policing—while Political Science provides an understanding that Polri is an integral part of a democratic state system, requiring the exercise of authority in a manner that is lawful, accountable, transparent, and oriented toward the public interest. Thus, the success of the transformation toward a just and equitable Polri does not rely solely on technological modernization or bureaucratic reform; it must encompass shifts in paradigms and organizational culture, enhancements in the quality of human resources, and the strengthening of the relationship between Polri and the community.

Discussion

The document and literature synthesis indicates that PRESISI is better understood as an organizational reform framework than as a single administrative program. Baek et al. (2019), Schulman (2020) and Syahputra et al. (2023) similarly emphasize organizational culture and the need for reform to be internalized beyond formal structures. Hasibuan (2023) also links the

success of PRESISI to service systems, public satisfaction, and institutional change, but its normative and literature-based design does not establish direct causality. Read together, these studies support a cautious interpretation: persistent implementation gaps should be analyzed as a problem of policy coherence and organizational internalization rather than attributed automatically to the presence or absence of technology.

The Predictive pillar requires particular caution because claims about digital or algorithmic policing can exceed the evidence available in policy documents. Berk (2021) and Mugari & Obioha (2021) show that accuracy, bias, transparency, and the limited empirical base of predictive policing are central concerns. Recent Indonesian research also provides a more specific empirical context: Asmara1 et al. (2026) examine digital policing and police legitimacy through a mixed-method case study of Jakarta Smart City Policing. This newer evidence reinforces the need to evaluate technology through observable practices and outcomes, but it does not justify assuming that all PRESISI predictive activities use the same systems or produce the same effects. The present study therefore treats algorithmic fairness and auditability as governance requirements to be tested, not as conclusions about an undocumented system.

For the Responsibility pillar, the key analytical distinction is between the existence of formal oversight mechanisms and evidence that accountability is consistently realized in practice. The manuscript documents complaint and oversight channels as institutional mechanisms, but it does not contain a complete administrative dataset on disciplinary cases, sanctions, regional variation, or case resolution. Consequently, the discussion does not infer system-wide disciplinary effectiveness and instead identifies the absence of comparable outcome data as a priority for future evaluation.

The Fair Transparency pillar can be linked more directly to available public-service and trust indicators while still avoiding causal overstatement. Arfiko & Sari (2026), Birdayanthi et al. (2025) and Kushartiningsih & Riharjo (2021) show in a broader public-service setting that accountability, transparency, and supervision are positively associated with service performance. A recent Polri-specific empirical benchmark is provided by Saputra (2024), who reported a 2023 Public Trust Index of 85.77 based on quantitative and qualitative assessments of operational police functions. This figure is useful as a contextual outcome indicator, but it should not be interpreted as the causal effect of PRESISI because the study design does not isolate the program from other determinants of trust. The implication is that future PRESISI evaluation should connect transparent service indicators to repeated, independently interpretable trust measures rather than relying on isolated descriptive claims.

The broader significance of these findings is that they change the evaluation question from whether PRESISI can be described as successful to whether each reform claim can be traced from a legal mandate, through an identifiable institutional mechanism, to a documented outcome. This framework makes visible the points at which evidence is strong, descriptive, mixed, or absent. It also clarifies why organizational culture, oversight, digital service design, data governance, and community legitimacy cannot be evaluated as separate reform domains: each affects the credibility of the others. The contribution of this study is therefore methodological as well as substantive, because it provides an evidence-bounded way to assess PRESISI without converting policy aspirations into empirical conclusions.

CONCLUSION

This study concludes that PRESISI offers a coherent reform architecture for linking preventive policing, institutional responsibility, and fair transparency, although the strength of evidence varies across these pillars. Documentary and literature-based evidence supports the existence of reform directions, including digital service development, complaint and oversight mechanisms, and improved information access. However, the available evidence does not establish uniform personnel-level internalization, the causal effect of PRESISI on public trust, or the operational performance of specific algorithmic predictive-policing systems. Accordingly, a defensible assessment of just policing must remain grounded in legality, procedural fairness, accountability, transparency, rights protection, and independently verifiable evidence. Future evaluations should specify the institutional documents and periods analyzed, apply comparable

administrative indicators to assess oversight and service performance, and incorporate field-based evidence when examining personnel behavior. For predictive or AI-supported policing, evaluations should also document data sources, model purposes, validation procedures, decision-making applications, bias testing, and independent audit mechanisms, while longitudinal data on public trust and service quality would help distinguish descriptive associations from changes plausibly attributable to specific PRESISI interventions.

Operationally, Polri should strengthen PRESISI through transparent data governance, documented validation of digital and predictive tools, consistent internal and external oversight, accessible complaint mechanisms, equitable access to digital services, and systematic publication of comparable service and accountability indicators. These measures should function as governance safeguards and evaluation requirements rather than as evidence that the intended outcomes have already been achieved. Their implementation should be accompanied by measurable performance indicators and independent verification to support a more transparent, accountable, and evidence-based assessment of policing reforms.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The author extends gratitude to the leadership, instructors, resource persons, and all parties who provided guidance, information, and support in the preparation of this study on police transformation and the implementation of PRESISI. Such support has played a vital role in enriching the perspectives of both Police Science and Political Science.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

All authors contributed to the development of this research. Falah Ananda Febryan, as the first author, was responsible for initiating the research concept, developing the research framework, collecting and analyzing the data, interpreting the results, and preparing the initial manuscript draft. Immanuel Jaya and Yonatan Ari Santoso contributed to the development of the research ideas, academic supervision, methodological refinement, critical review of the manuscript's content, validation of the research findings, and final revision of the manuscript. All authors have read and approved the final version of the manuscript for publication and take responsibility for the integrity, accuracy, and transparency of all aspects of the research.

REFERENCES

Alikhademi, K., Drobina, E., Prioleau, D., Richardson, B., Purves, D., & Gilbert, J. E. (2022a). A review of predictive policing from the perspective of fairness. *Artificial Intelligence and Law*, *30*(1), 1–17. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10506-021-09286-4

Arfiko, A. D., & Sari, F. P. (2026). Accountability, Supervision, and Transparency as Determinants of Public Service Performance: Empirical Evidence from a Frontline Local Government Institution. *Economics and Digital Business Review*, *7*(1).

Asmara[1], A., Mubarok[2], J., Sianturi[3], K. D., Eliasta, A., Meliala[4], S., & Siregar[5], R. B. (2026). Digital Policing Models Transform Law Enforcement Practices, Impacting Public Trust and Legitimacy. *Jurnal Ilmu Kepolisian*, *20*(1).

Baek, P., Chang, J., & Kim, T. (2019). Organizational culture now and going forward. In *Journal of Organizational Change Management* (Vol. 32, Number 6). https://doi.org/10.1108/JOCM-05-2018-0121

Berk, R. A. (2021). Artificial Intelligence, Predictive Policing, and Risk Assessment for Law Enforcement. In *Annual Review of Criminology* (Vol. 4, Number 1). https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-criminol-051520-012342

Birdayanthi, B., Yusriadi, Y., & Ikmal, I. (2025). Accountability and transparency in public administration for improved service delivery. *Journal Social Civilecial*, *3*(1), 34–47. https://doi.org/10.71435/610633

Damayanti, N. and B. R. (2026). ANALISIS MODEL PELAYANAN KEPOLISIAN PRESISI (PREDIKTIF, RESPONSIBILITAS DAN TRANSPARANSI BERKEADILAN) DI POLRES KOTA TASIKMALAYA . *Jurnal Ilmiah Koordinasi* , *4*(2), 75–86.

Hasani, I., Halili, & Yosarie, I. (2026). Police transformation within constitutional democracy design: Evidence from Indonesia. *Jurnal Civics: Media Kajian Kewarganegaraan*, *23*(1). https://doi.org/10.21831/jc.v23i1.96514

Hasibuan, E. S. (2023). Reformasi Polri: Menilik Keberhasilan Program Presisi Polri. *KRTHA BHAYANGKARA*, *17*(3). https://doi.org/10.31599/krtha.v17i3.3086

Hope, K. R. (2020). Civilian Oversight for Democratic Policing and its Challenges: Overcoming Obstacles for Improved Police Accountability. *Journal of Applied Security Research*. https://doi.org/10.1080/19361610.2020.1777807

Kushartiningsih, R., & Riharjo, I. B. (2021). Pengaruh Akuntabilitas, Transparansi dan Pengawasan Terhadap Kinerja Pelayanan Publik. *Jurnal Ilmu Dan Riset Akuntansi*.

Meijer, A., & Wessels, M. (2019). Predictive Policing: Review of Benefits and Drawbacks. *International Journal of Public Administration*, *42*(12). https://doi.org/10.1080/01900692.2019.1575664

Mugari, I., & Obioha, E. E. (2021). Predictive Policing and Crime Control in The United States of America and Europe: Trends in a Decade of Research and the Future of Predictive Policing. *Social Sciences*, *10*(6). https://doi.org/10.3390/socsci10060234

Ranta, V. (2025). *Policing performance: Performance measurement and institutional logics in law enforcement.* University of Turku.

Rustandi, Abduh Thamrin, & Suriani Seri. (2022). Reformasi Birokrasi Polri Terhadap Pelatyanan Publik dalam Rangka Meningkatkan Kualitas Sumber Daya Manusia Kepolisian pada Kepolisian Daerah Sulawesi Selatan. *Paradigma Administrasi Negara*, *4 (2)*(4).

Saputra, A. (2024). Analisis, Analisis Tingkat Kepercayaan Masyarakat terhadap Kinerja Polri Tahun 2023. *Jurnal Litbang Polri*, *27*(2). https://doi.org/10.46976/litbangpolri.v27i2.237

Schulman, P. R. (2020). Organizational structure and safety culture: Conceptual and practical challenges. *Safety Science*, *126*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssci.2020.104669

Silvana Bolang, J., & Surya Perdhana, M. (2023). The Effectiveness of Human Resources Performance from the Indonesian National Police Organization in Maintaining Regional Security and Public Order in Indonesia. *Quantitative Economics and Management Studies*, *4*(2). https://doi.org/10.35877/454ri.qems1473

Syahputra, A. R., Gani, Y., & De Fretes, Y. L. (2023). Transformasi Organisasi pada Budaya Organisasi Polri Menuju Polri Presisi. *Jurnal Manajemen Dan Ilmu Administrasi Publik (JMIAP)*, *5*(4). https://doi.org/10.24036/jmiap.v5i4.851

Yustinus Bowo Dwinugroho. (2024). Transformation Strategy: Indonesian National Police in Coordinating Crime in The Digital Era. *International Journal of Integrated Science and Technology*, *2*(5). https://doi.org/10.59890/ijist.v2i5.1904

Appendix

Proposed Interview Guide for Future Field Validation (Not Administered in This Study)

No.	Proposed Interview Question	Intended Analytical Purpose
1	How does the implementation of the PRESISI approach within the National Police's bureaucratic reform enhance the quality of policing services prioritizing justice, legal certainty, and the public interest?	To examine whether service improvements attributed to PRESISI are experienced as fair, lawful, and responsive by stakeholders.
2	To what extent does the application of the Predictive Policing approach leveraging data, technology, and intelligence analysis improve the National Police's capacity to predict and prevent potential threats to public security and order (kamtibmas)?	To explore how data-supported prevention is understood and whether system purpose, data sources, validation, and safeguards can be described by informed participants.
3	How do National Police personnel apply the principle of Responsibility in the execution of their duties, particularly regarding professionalism, accountability, respect for human rights, and answerability to the public?	To assess how personnel responsibility is understood in relation to professionalism, accountability, human rights, and answerability.
4	To what extent has the principle of Transparency within PRESISI fostered information openness, public oversight, and public trust in the National Police institution?	To explore whether transparency mechanisms are experienced as accessible, understandable, and capable of supporting public oversight.
5	From the perspective of Police Science, how does the implementation of PRESISI shift policing patterns from a reactive approach toward policing that is predictive, preventive, responsive, and oriented toward solving community problems?	To identify perceived gaps between formal PRESISI policy and operational practice.
6	From a Political Science perspective, how does the National Police maintain institutional independence and neutrality amidst democratic political dynamics, while simultaneously fulfilling its function as a state institution accountable to both the public and the government?	To examine how internal oversight and complaint mechanisms function from the perspective of relevant stakeholders.
7	How does PRESISI-based bureaucratic reform influence the relationships among the National Police, the government, political institutions, and civil society in realizing democratic and equitable governance?	To explore whether digital-service access is equitable across user groups and locations.
8	What are the primary obstacles to implementing PRESISI regarding human resources, organizational culture, regulations, technology, budget, and bureaucratic resistance	To identify factors that shape public trust without assuming that PRESISI is the sole cause of observed trust levels.

	and what strategies can be employed to overcome them?	
9	How can internal and external oversight mechanisms regarding PRESISI implementation be strengthened to ensure police authority operates effectively without compromising the principles of accountability, transparency, democracy, and human rights protection?	To examine organizational-culture factors that facilitate or constrain reform internalization.
10	In your view, what is the most effective strategy to optimize the implementation of PRESISI so that the National Police's bureaucratic reform truly delivers impactful public services, boosts public trust, and creates a police force that is professional, modern, transparent, and equitable?	To obtain field evidence that can be compared with documentary findings in a future mixed-method validation study.