MAVISHA
Law and Society Journal

Beyond the One-Stop Counter: Authority Fragmentation, Data Interoperability, and Administrative Burden in Marriage Registration Services

© The Author(s) 2026
https://ejournalhub.org/index.php/mavisha
E-ISSN: 3064-4437

Corresponding Email:
pamulangmugi@gmail.com

Muhammad Girang Buana & Windy Triana
UIN Syarif Hidayatullah Jakarta

Abstract

One-Stop Integrated Service (PTSP) is often understood as centralizing service access at a single point, whereas simplifying administrative services also depends on coordination of authority, data interoperability, organizational capacity, and procedural certainty. This article examines why PTSP has not been implemented in marriage registration services at the Religious Affairs Office (KUA) of Ciputat and Pamulang Districts, South Tangerang. The research uses an empirical legal approach with a qualitative-comparative design. Data are sourced from observations, interviews with marriage registrars at both KUAs on June 9, 2023, as well as relevant documentation and legal materials. Findings show that routine administrative services have been carried out, but the use of SIMKAH and officers' understanding of access to population data are not yet uniform. Neither KUA has implemented PTSP as an integrated service system. Obstacles include dependence on administrative stages outside the KUA's authority, inconsistent access and data exchange, limited competencies and staffing, lack of special budgets, and limited space and building status. This article argues that service integration cannot be reduced to providing a single counter or digital application. PTSP requires aligned cross-agency procedures, legitimate and secure data-exchange governance, executor capacity, and service design that reduces administrative burdens on citizens. The article contributes empirical explanations of the relationship between authority fragmentation and data integration gaps in marriage registration bureaucratic reform.

Abstrak

Pelayanan Terpadu Satu Pintu (PTSP) kerap dipahami sebagai pemusatan akses layanan pada satu titik, padahal penyederhanaan layanan administrasi bergantung pula pada koordinasi kewenangan, interoperabilitas data, kapasitas organisasi, dan kepastian prosedur. Artikel ini mengkaji mengapa PTSP belum terlaksana dalam pelayanan pencatatan perkawinan di Kantor Urusan Agama (KUA) Kecamatan Ciputat dan Pamulang, Tangerang Selatan. Penelitian menggunakan pendekatan hukum empiris dengan desain kualitatif-komparatif. Data bersumber dari observasi, wawancara terhadap penghulu di kedua KUA pada 9 Juni 2023, serta dokumentasi dan bahan hukum yang relevan. Temuan menunjukkan bahwa pelayanan administrasi rutin telah berlangsung, tetapi praktik penggunaan SIMKAH dan cara petugas memahami akses data kependudukan belum seragam. Kedua KUA belum menyelenggarakan PTSP sebagai sistem layanan terintegrasi. Hambatannya mencakup ketergantungan pada tahapan administrasi di luar kewenangan KUA, tidak konsistennya akses dan pertukaran data, keterbatasan kompetensi dan jumlah petugas, belum tersedianya anggaran khusus, serta keterbatasan ruang dan status gedung. Artikel ini berargumen bahwa integrasi layanan tidak dapat direduksi menjadi penyediaan loket tunggal atau aplikasi digital. PTSP membutuhkan keselarasan prosedur lintas instansi, tata kelola pertukaran data yang sah dan aman, kapasitas pelaksana, dan desain layanan yang mengurangi beban administratif warga. Kontribusi artikel terletak pada penjelasan empiris mengenai hubungan antara fragmentasi kewenangan dan kesenjangan integrasi data dalam reformasi birokrasi pencatatan perkawinan.

Keywords: One-stop public service; KUA; Marriage registration; Bureaucratic reform

How to Cite:
Buana, M. G & Triana, W, (2026). Beyond the One-Stop Counter: Authority Fragmentation, Data Interoperability, and Administrative Burden in Marriage Registration Services. Mavisha: Law and Society Journal, 3(2).

Introduction

Marriage registration occurs at the intersection of family law, population administration, and public services. For Muslim couples, the Office of Religious Affairs (KUA) is a state institution that directly interacts with citizens in the marriage registration process, including examination, implementation, and registration. This role does not stop at issuing documents. Orderly administration provides certainty regarding marital status and provides necessary evidence when citizens interact with other institutions, including population administration and the judiciary. Therefore, the quality of marriage registration services also determines how easily citizens access administrative recognition of family events important to their legal lives.

Within the Indonesian legal framework, marriage registration is part of marriage governance established through Law Number 1 of 1974 concerning Marriage as amended by Law Number 16 of 2019. For service providers, these administrative obligations must be carried out with understandable service standards, proportional procedures, and protection of personal data. Law Number 25 of 2009 concerning Public Services also affirms the state's obligation to provide quality public services. This law places procedural certainty, timing, costs, service products, and complaint mechanisms as part of the organizer's accountability. Thus, assessing KUA services is not sufficient merely by looking at whether the marriage document is finally issued. The processes that citizens must go through, inter-institutional connectivity, and the reliability of document checks are also part of service quality.

Bureaucratic reform in marriage registration faces specific problems. The administrative process that appears simple at the counter level actually depends on documents and information managed by several institutions. Population identity is handled by the Population and Civil Registration Office (Dukcapil); divorce status requires documents and, in certain circumstances, verification with religious courts; and some administrative stages take place through village or urban village governments and regional structures. The KUA has no hierarchical authority over these actors. As a result, simplifying one office does not automatically shorten the entire process prospective brides and grooms must go through.

One policy intended to organize cross-unit services is the One-Stop Integrated Service (PTSP). This idea promises easier access, simpler flows, transparency, certainty, and less contact with multiple service desks. Within the Ministry of Religious Affairs, Minister of Religious Affairs Regulation Number 65 of 2016 regulates integrated services within the ministry. However, the term "one door" should not be interpreted as a single desk that only receives documents. Centralized access is the first step in integration. To truly shorten the process, the back end must also be connected: data can be checked legally, documents are not requested repeatedly without reason, inter-unit tasks are clear, and staff have sufficient support to complete applications.

Centralizing counters is not the same as integrating processes. Residents still have to visit other agencies if documents and data remain separate, even if officers are in the same room. Whole-of-government literature and policy coordination show that integration requires cross-organizational working mechanisms, not just shared goals (Christensen & Lægreid, 2007; Trein et al., 2021). Therefore, PTSP in KUA should be understood as a matter of cross-agency governance.

Digitalization is another part of that agenda. The Marriage Management Information System (SIMKAH) supports marriage registration administration. This system can support registration and data management, but its benefits depend on procedural suitability, user capability, and connectivity with databases managed by other institutions. A well-functioning internal system may not be able to directly check population status or divorce documents if

inter-agency data access is unavailable. A study on the interoperability of digital services explains that the benefits of electronic services for citizens are determined by the ability of different systems to exchange and use data consistently, with clear governance and security rules (Campmas et al., 2022). In the Indonesian context, the Electronic-Based Government System (SPBE) framework and the One Data Indonesia policy also emphasize integration and data-exchange standards (Presidential Regulation Number 95 of 2018; Presidential Regulation Number 39 of 2019).

However, digitalization does not automatically eliminate administrative barriers. The use of applications can shift part of the workload from officers to applicants, especially if citizens are asked to enter data themselves and then still have to be checked manually. Moynihan et al. (2015) explain administrative burdens through learning costs, compliance costs, and psychological costs that arise when citizens interact with the state. This framework helps explain the marriage registration process: repeatedly visiting neighborhood units (RT/RW), urban villages, sub-districts, and KUA can increase time and compliance costs, while online forms that are difficult to fill out can add burdens for citizens who are not accustomed to using digital services. Therefore, reform success should be measured not by the number of applications or counters, but by the reduction in steps citizens must take, without sacrificing inspection accuracy.

This integration becomes even more important when marriage registration services also function as identity checkpoints. KUA checks documents such as electronic ID cards, family cards, birth certificates, and divorce certificates as needed. Administrative checks that rely solely on physical documents have limitations when document data is inconsistent or when status changes are not yet reflected in other systems. On the other hand, personal data exchange cannot be carried out without limits. Law Number 27 of 2022 concerning Personal Data Protection regulates the principles and obligations of personal data processing. This means that preventing identity forgery must be carried out alongside fundamental certainty in processing, access restrictions, security, and accountability in data use. Integration that neglects data protection can actually create new risks.

This article is based on field research at the Ciputat District KUA and Pamulang District KUA in South Tangerang City on June 9, 2023. The study examined the implementation of PTSP as part of the bureaucratic reform of marriage services. Initial findings showed an inconsistent situation. Routine administrative services at both KUAs were considered operational, but neither had implemented PTSP. Pamulang KUA reportedly encouraged early registration through SIMKAH, while Ciputat KUA mostly assisted with input when prospective brides and grooms came bringing documents. Another difference arose in the information about Dukcapil data access: Ciputat officers stated they could check data based on NIK. In contrast, Pamulang officers stated that cooperation access was no longer available. These differences raised questions about internal coordination and the extent to which identity verification can truly be carried out consistently.

The condition of the two offices provides a useful comparison. Ciputat is located around Ciputat Market with limited buildings and relocation plans that have not yet been realized; Pamulang is in the district government center but still faces constraints in resources, budget, facilities, and procedures. Therefore, physical conditions alone cannot explain the lack of PTSP implementation.

Previous research on Islamic marriage administration reform in Indonesia shows that top-down regulatory changes are not enough to ensure change at the KUA level. Kharlie et al. (2021), through empirical studies at several KUAs in Denpasar, emphasize the importance of grassroots initiatives, leadership, and local innovation. These findings help explain why practices among KUAs can differ even within a single national policy framework. However,

the study does not examine how data-exchange constraints and dependence on local governments affect the possibility of PTSP in two KUAs within one city.

More specific studies on SIMKAH show that digitalization can improve several administrative aspects, but its effectiveness still depends on user coverage, socialization, features, and operational support. Fiscal and Handayani (2024), who studied online-based SIMKAH in South Tangerang City, found that the system's socialization has not reached all layers of society and that service effectiveness is still hindered by feature limitations and limited monitoring of user feedback. Syafira and Siahaan (2024) also see SIMKAH as a public sector service innovation, focusing on the shift from manual to online processes. Meanwhile, comparative research in several more recently published cities shows that implementing SIMKAH at the counter level does not automatically synchronize with population administration systems or religious courts (Lahilote et al., 2026). Thus, the problems found in Ciputat and Pamulang are not merely local issues but intersect with issues that still arise in studies on the digitalization of marriage administration.

The literature on PTSP and integrated service centers also reminds us that centralized physical services do not always result in organizational or operational integration. Studies on public service centers in Kendari, for example, found gaps between formal standards and practices, especially regarding digital connectivity, inter-agency coordination, administrative capacity, and complaint follow-up (Sartono et al., 2026). These results align with the view that policy implementation is shaped by organizational structure, authority relations, and actions taken by executors in the field (Sager & Gofen, 2022). However, KUA has a special character: the marriage registration process combines family legal interests, population data, and religious administration. Therefore, lessons from general PTSP need to be re-examined by paying attention to the administrative nature of marriage.

Based on these debates, this article identifies a scope for study. First, studies of marriage bureaucracy reform have emphasized local leadership and innovation. At the same time, discussions of PTSP in KUA need greater attention to the relationship between marriage registration procedures and the division of authority across agencies. Second, SIMKAH studies often focus on registration ease or application effectiveness, but services accessible through applications are not the same as data exchanges that enable accurate status verification. Third, integrated service studies need to distinguish between the existence of a single point of acceptance and the substantive integration behind it. Comparing two KUAs within the same administrative area provides an opportunity to show how variations in practices, data access, and organizational conditions affect the implementation of the same policy.

On that basis, this article raises three questions. First, how were administrative services for marriage registration and identity checks carried out at the Ciputat and Pamulang KUA during the 2023 research? Second, why has PTSP not been implemented in both KUAs, especially given the relationship between marriage registration procedures and other agencies' authority? Third, how do limitations in data integration, human resource capacity, budget, and facilities create a gap between PTSP objectives and service practices in the field?

This article explains the implementation of administrative services and identity verification in two KUAs, identifies factors hindering PTSP implementation, and explains the relationship between fragmented authority and data integration. The article's empirical contribution is a comparative reading of practices in two KUAs in one city, including differences in staff statements showing that data access and understanding of procedures are not yet fully uniform. Its analytical contribution is to distinguish three layers of integration: service access at the front, coordination of procedures between agencies, and data interoperability at the back. The article's novelty does not lie in claiming that PTSP or

SIMKAH has never been researched, but in synthesizing the relationship between these three layers and the organizational capacity and administrative burden of prospective brides and grooms. The scope of findings is limited to two units and data collection in 2023; this article does not assume that this condition automatically represents all KUAs in Indonesia.

Methods

This research is empirical legal research with a qualitative approach and a limited comparative case study design. The choice of approach follows the characteristics of the research object: what is examined is not only the content of norms regarding marriage registration and integrated services, but also how norms and policies are implemented by KUA officers in daily work situations. Empirical legal research allows researchers to assess the relationship between rules, implementing institutions, and social practices that develop when the rules are applied (Ali, 2013; Fajar & Achmad, 2010). This article uses an empirical approach to examine conformity and the gap between the PTSP's objectives and the procedures at the two KUA offices.

A comparative design was used because the study covers two service units within one city, namely the Ciputat District KUA and the Pamulang District KUA. The comparison is not intended to determine which office is more successful overall, but rather to identify variations in the registration process, data access, staff understanding, and organizational readiness. Both locations are within the same national policy environment but have different physical contexts and service practices. This setting provides a basis for exploring how organizational factors and inter-agency relationships can produce variations in implementation.

The analysis was conducted qualitatively and descriptively by comparing information from both locations, linking it with observation results and documents, then placing it within the legal framework of public services and marriage registration. The comparison was directed at four groups of issues: administrative service procedures, mechanisms for data inspection and synchronization, implementation or lack of implementation of PTSP, and organizational capacity. Normative materials were used to assess the context of authority and service standards. In contrast, implementation and interoperability theories were used to develop explanations regarding the causes of the policy-practice gap.

The study describes qualitative data analysis but does not detail the coding stages, analytical tools, or formal triangulation procedures. This article does not claim that the researcher carries out a documented thematic coding process. The article's grouping of themes is an analytical arrangement of the material recorded in the research. This limitation is important to maintain methodological transparency and distinguish the original research procedure from the editing and synthesis processes carried out when the research is converted into an article.

The validity of findings is maintained through comparisons between the statements of two informants, observation notes, and available documents. Differences in information are not eliminated to produce a uniform narrative. Conversely, these differences are retained as findings that need explanation, especially regarding Dukcapil data access and the ability to detect identity forgery. When information comes only from a single informant's statement, the article refers to it as such and does not present it as an independently verified institutional fact.

This study has limitations. First, the field data mainly relies on two informants from the penghulu elements, so it does not fully reflect the views of SIMKAH operators, KUA heads, Dukcapil officers, religious courts, village officials, or prospective brides and grooms.

Second, interviews were conducted on a single date, so changes in practices over time cannot be mapped. Third, the study notes limited openness from KUA Ciputat staff during interviews. Fourth, claims regarding the termination of cooperation or suspected data leaks were not confirmed through official Dukcapil documents or system security audits. Fifth, the study does not include user experience surveys or measurement of service time. Therefore, the article does not present quantitative conclusions regarding satisfaction, efficiency, or prevalence of identity forgery.

The research manuscript includes informants' names and positions in the interview excerpts. In this article, citations are identified primarily based on position and work location to maintain the analytical focus on institutional findings. The article does not add claims regarding formal ethical consent or written consent procedures because such information is not included in the research documents. Citations are adjusted to the available material and do not alter the substance of the informant's statements.

Marriage Registration Administrative Services: Ongoing Procedures, Service Experience Is Not Yet Uniform

Field findings show that marriage registration administrative services at the Ciputat and Pamulang KUA continue to operate. Officers inspect documents submitted by prospective brides and grooms, request corrections for discrepancies, and direct applicants to complete data updates with the authorized agency. Within the framework applicable at the time of the study, the procedure was referred to the Minister of Religious Affairs Regulation Number 20 of 2019 concerning Marriage Registration. In other words, the absence of PTSP does not mean both offices have stopped providing marriage registration services. What has not yet been achieved is integrating processes into a one-stop management system that enables a simpler, more coordinated service flow.

The two offices differed in how they managed initial registration. During the study, KUA Ciputat mostly used a direct service pattern: prospective brides and grooms brought documents, and officers helped input the data into the system. This pattern was considered easier for applicants who were not accustomed to filling out digital forms. Conversely, KUA Pamulang stated that prospective brides and grooms were directed to fill in data through SIMKAH online first before coming to the office for verification. After the data was entered, officers still needed to compare the information in the application with physical documents. According to the Pamulang informant, some applicants entered their identity numbers incorrectly, for example by using the NIK number in the family card number column or vice versa, so officers had to conduct checks and corrections again.

These differences show that digitalization does not always reduce work at every stage. In the Pamulang case, self-filling by applicants can indeed move some of the initial process out of the office, but input errors can create additional verification work. For officers, the online system has not fully replaced manual processes because the data entered must still be matched with documents. For applicants, the online process can be easier if instructions are clear and assistance is available when errors occur. However, without such support, digitalization can increase learning costs and compliance costs, as explained in the concept of administrative burden (Moynihan et al., 2015).

These two patterns cannot be assessed solely by the dichotomy between manual and digital. Direct services assisted by officers can reduce input errors but may increase waiting time and officers' workload. Online registration can reduce initial visits but requires digital literacy, devices, networks, and an understanding of the types of data requested. A study on SIMKAH in South Tangerang City, conducted after this study, also reported that

socialization has not reached all layers of society and that the system's effectiveness is still influenced by features and mechanisms for monitoring user input (Fiscal & Handayani, 2024). These findings add context that the existence of platforms does not mean all citizens can use them equally.

Differences in practice between two KUA offices within the same city also indicate the importance of process standardization. If applicants face different experiences solely because of the KUA location, then service certainty depends on local customs and how officers interpret instructions. Some variations may be necessary to match the community's capacity and character, but variations in key information, process sequences, or document-checking methods can create uncertainty. Service reform therefore requires minimum standards, with clear and accountable room for adaptation.

Documents prospective brides and grooms collect in the practice described in the study include personal identity documents, family cards, birth certificates, and previous marital status documents, if relevant. Additional documents may be required depending on the applicant's situation, such as parental consent, court permission, death certificates of previous spouses, or marriage recommendations when the marriage is conducted outside the region. These documents are not merely a checklist. Each document serves a different verification function: identity documents confirm basic data, divorce or death certificates confirm marital status, and court permission addresses specific legal circumstances. Document management therefore requires accuracy and access to reliable information.

In the practice recorded by the researcher, data discrepancies are directed to be corrected through Dukcapil. Ciputat officers explained that incorrect data must be corrected, and applicants are asked to return after receiving information from Dukcapil. Pamulang informants also conveyed that status changes must be supported by appropriate documents; for example, status changes to widower or widow, whether divorced alive or dead, and for polygamy, the necessary permits must be available. This procedural similarity shows that the KUA does not assume authority to update population data. The KUA checks conformity for marriage registration purposes, while the authorized agency handles population data corrections.

At this point, the gap between the procedures that must be met and the KUA's ability to check data becomes the main issue. Applicants can be directed to manage data updates to other agencies, but the process adds to the administrative burden. For the state, dividing authority may be necessary to maintain data accuracy and prevent unverified changes. For citizens, this division can feel like repetitive bureaucracy if documents or data already held by the government cannot be reused by other agencies. The challenge is not to eliminate all stages of auditing, but to ensure each stage has a clear purpose and does not require applicants to act as manual intermediaries.

Data synchronization and identity verification: differences in access, differences in knowledge

One of the most important findings was the difference in statements from officers from both KUAs regarding access to Dukcapil data. An informant from Ciputat stated that when officers enter the prospective bride's NIK, the linked data can display information such as marital status. He believes this mechanism helps KUA detect data discrepancies. Conversely, informant Pamulang stated that the data-access cooperation with Dukcapil and the Ministry of Home Affairs, which previously ran around 2019 or 2020, is no longer available. According to his statement, access was stopped after data leak issues arose. The

informant also said that when he asked Dukcapil, he did not receive a clear explanation for the termination.

This difference must be read carefully. The Ciputat officers' statements describe their experience or understanding of the system used. In contrast, the Pamulang officers' statements describe informants' knowledge of the cooperation relationship they believe has ended. The study does not access system logs, cooperation agreements, or written confirmation from Dukcapil. Therefore, this article does not conclude that, as of June 2023, all Ciputat KUA had the same active access, nor that the termination of access in Pamulang was proven to be caused by data leaks. What can be confirmed from the research data is that officers at the two KUA have different understandings and experiences regarding the availability of that access.

The information gap does not stop at external relations. The Pamulang informant explained that operators usually know about data access, while penghulu do not always get the latest information if they do not communicate with operators. This explanation is important because it shows that system integration from outside the office is not automatically followed by knowledge integration within the organization. Officers dealing with prospective brides and grooms need to know the system's capabilities, but technical information can be concentrated on the operator. If internal communication fails, officers may give applicants different information about whether data can be checked directly.

These knowledge gaps are organizational governance issues, not merely technological ones. The available data system must be accompanied by internal procedures regarding who can access it, what information can be viewed, how audit results are recorded, and how other officers use those results. Without clear internal SOPs, information about system capabilities can depend on individual experience. From a street-level bureaucratic perspective, frontline officers interpret policies through routine decisions and practices when serving citizens (Lipsky, 2010). When technical knowledge is not shared, administrative decisions that should be uniform can differ depending on who receives the request.

Another finding emerged during the examination of divorce certificates. A Pamulang informant noted that forgery is possible not only on ID cards or family cards but also on divorce certificates. To reduce this risk, officers can check copies of decisions or contact religious courts to ensure the divorce documents are recorded. This information broadens understanding of identity verification: validating marital status alone is not enough; it requires linking the KUA with Dukcapil. Relevant information can be spread across several systems with different authorities and recording purposes. To check population status, Dukcapil data is required, while the authenticity of the decision or divorce certificate falls under court administration.

Manual examination of divorce documents can be a security measure when system integration is not yet available. However, this mechanism has limitations in terms of time, dependence on inter-agency communication, and process consistency. If officers must contact the court or manually request a copy of the decision for each case requiring examination, service capacity will depend on the other party's response time. Conversely, electronic access without clear protocols is also insufficient. Data must be verifiable at the source, kept up to date, and used for legitimate purposes. In other words, data integration demands institutional governance and security, not just technical connections.

This need becomes even more apparent when findings are placed within the legal framework of personal data protection. Law Number 27 of 2022 defines personal data processing as an activity that must have a legal basis and meet protection obligations. In marriage registration services, the personal data processed can include identity information, marital status, and family documents. Strengthening KUA's access to population or judicial

data needs purpose limitations, clear roles for controllers and data processors, access controls, system security, and auditable activity logs. The goal of preventing forgery cannot be used as a general reason to open all data without limits.

The alleged leak mentioned by the Pamulang informant also needs to be placed in the proper epistemic position. The study lacks documents proving that the leak occurred, which institution confirmed it, or how the leak was related to the termination of access. Therefore, the suspicion is not used as a verified causal fact. However, the statement indicates that trust in data security can affect the continuation of inter-agency cooperation. In policy design, uncertainty regarding responsibility for data security can encourage agencies to avoid data exchange. If this happens without recovery mechanisms and alternative verification, the impact is directly felt by officers and citizens.

Interoperability requires institutional agreements, consistent data definitions, technical standards, and trustworthy protection (Campmas et al., 2022). OECD (2026) adds that integrated services depend on shared systems across institutions and organizational capacity. The findings of the two KUAs show that external access, internal knowledge, and examination procedures are not yet consistent. The availability of SIMKAH or NIK connections alone does not prove that identity verification is integrated.

The relationship between SIMKAH, Dukcapil data, and religious court data in this article is a functional need arising from findings, not evidence that the three are technically connected. Integration must provide accurate and valid confirmation of the required information without exceeding each institution's limits of authority.

One Gateway as Destination, Not Just a Service Space

Both KUAs stated that they had not yet implemented PTSP at the time of the review. KUA Ciputat still operates a religious service pattern that allows prospective brides and grooms to submit documents to officers according to the applicable process. KUA Pamulang also emphasized that having offices in the sub-district center does not mean PTSP has been implemented. This matters because a more strategic location or the presence of several computer devices cannot be the only indicator that the integrated service system is running. In a substantive sense, PTSP requires changes in process flow and the division of responsibilities so applicants do not have to find each officer or agency related to their application themselves.

Ciputat informants emphasized that building conditions, locations around the market, and limited space are obstacles. Pamulang informants highlighted shortages of human resources, facilities, and infrastructure, as well as policy misalignments. These differences in emphasis show that implementation obstacles differ between the two locations. Ciputat emphasizes the office's physical limitations, while Pamulang cites policy issues as fundamental problems that cannot be solved by improving facilities alone. Nevertheless, both informants agree that PTSP cannot yet be implemented.

One common reason in interviews is the introduction stage from neighborhood units (RT/RW) and the village office before the prospective bride and groom submit documents to the KUA. According to the Pamulang informant, this process requires applicants to visit parties outside the KUA's authority repeatedly. From the officer's perspective, this situation contradicts the idea of a one-stop shop because the KUA cannot guarantee the timing and procedures at other institutions. From the residents' perspective, each transfer adds time, transportation costs, and the possibility of informal costs. The informant even estimated the costs residents incur to process the referral letter. However, these figures are estimates

provided by the informants, not the results of official cost measurements or surveys of the applicants.

Legal analysis needs to distinguish between national norms and local administrative practices. Interviews linked the need for RT/RW and urban village referral letters with PMA Number 20 of 2019. However, the article does not conclude that all these RT/RW stages are explicitly ordered by the PMA. In practice, the requirements for referral letters from villages or urban wards can interact with local administrative procedures involving RT/RW structures. Therefore, the discrepancies revealed are better understood as gaps between the KUA service design, marriage registration provisions during the study period, and the local procedures residents must follow. This distinction matters so criticism of bureaucracy is not wrongly directed at a single regulation without examining the source of procedural obligations in more detail.

PMA Number 20 of 2019 is the marriage registration framework that applied when the field research was conducted in June 2023. The regulation was later declared no longer in accordance with legal developments and community needs, and was replaced by PMA Number 22 of 2024. PMA Number 22 of 2024 was subsequently revoked by PMA Number 30 of 2024, effective from December 30, 2024. Thus, at the time this article was written, PMA Number 30 of 2024 was the applicable reference, and PMA Number 20 of 2019 was used only to provide historical context for the 2023 research. These changes did not change the field data obtained, but showed that the policy recommendations from this study need to be aligned with current regulations.

Similarly, the organizational regulation of the KUA referenced in the study, namely PMA Number 34 of 2016, has been updated through PMA Number 24 of 2024 concerning the Organization and Work Procedures of the Office of Religious Affairs. This article uses the 2016 provisions only to explain the institutional context during the research period, not to state that these provisions still form the basis of the KUA organization today. The renewal of organizational regulations and marriage registration must be read together so the PTSP design is not built on assumptions about an institution that has changed.

Minister of Religious Affairs Regulation Number 65 of 2016 concerning Integrated Services at the Ministry of Religious Affairs serves as the policy basis referenced in this study to explain the concept of integrated services. The relationship between KUA as a technical unit of the Ministry of Religious Affairs and integrated service policies provides the basis for discussion of implementation. However, the operational scope of PTSP in each unit still requires elaboration on the types of services, contact points, persons in charge, time standards, system support, and relationships with external agencies. Ministry-level regulations do not automatically resolve detailed work processes at the sub-district office level. This aligns with policy implementation studies that view implementation gaps as resulting from interactions among policy design, organizational capacity, and institutional arrangements (Hudson et al., 2019; Sager & Gofen, 2022).

From an administrative perspective, PTSP at KUA needs to be divided into at least three forms. First, access integration or *front-office integration*, where residents receive information, submit applications, and receive service updates through a single clear point of contact. Second, process integration, or *back-office coordination*, where the units involved manage document transfers and work without forcing residents to act as couriers between units. Third, data integration, where authorized officers can access the information they need through legitimate, secure channels. All three are interconnected but do not replace each other. One document acceptance point without data exchange still leaves a manual process; registration applications without a clear division of labor still require ad hoc coordination;

and data integration without easily accessible services can still create confusing experiences for residents.

Field findings show that these three forms of integration have not been fully formed. Neither KUA has yet had a PTSP model recognized as an integrated service system. Certain stages still involve institutions outside the KUA, data access is not consistently understood, and officers identify limitations in space, budget, and competence. Therefore, the problem is not merely the lack of a dedicated counter. Providing new counters without improving cross-agency processes risks concentrating queues in one place while still burdening applicants with the same process.

These findings also help correct the assumption that PTSP is always identical to services completed entirely in a single building. In public services involving different authorities, a single gateway is more realistically understood as a single access point responsible for coordinating resolution, rather than transferring all authority of other institutions into the KUA. KUA does not need to take over the functions of Dukcapil or religious courts to provide integrated services. What is needed is an agreed division of labor and confirmation mechanisms so citizens do not have to review data the state already has repeatedly. The *whole-of-government approach* emphasizes the importance of cross-sector coordination when public issues extend beyond a single organization (Christensen & Lægreid, 2007).

Organizational Capacity: HR, Budget, Space, and Building Status

The limitation of human resources appeared in the statements of both informants. Ciputat informants assessed that the number of available officers was sufficient to carry out routine tasks but was not yet ready to run PTSP under the building's condition at that time. The researcher also noted that some employees were considered elderly and less familiar with technology. These notes are the researcher's observations in the study, not the results of formal competency assessments. Because the article provides no quantitative data on total employees, age, or digital skill levels, it does not support the conclusion that KUA Ciputat's human resources as a whole are incompetent. However, these observations remain relevant as indications that digital capabilities and division of labor need to be considered in service change plans.

An informant from Pamulang mentioned that two operators handle systems and documents, but that number is sometimes insufficient when many applicants arrive. He assessed that implementing PTSP requires officers who can communicate, understand procedures, and implement integrated service operational standards. This explanation distinguishes between adequacy for routine work and adequacy to implement new service models. A unit can carry out its daily activities with its current staffing levels. However, it does not necessarily have the backup capacity to add functions such as centralized reception, complaint management, document coordination, and process monitoring.

In the implementation literature, resources refer not only to the number of people or budget but also to the competence, information, time, and organizational support needed by policy implementers (Sager & Gofen, 2022). KUAs required to operate digital systems, check data, serve citizens, and coordinate with other agencies require clear task division. Without this, service innovation can increase the workload of officers who are already performing routine duties. PTSP, which is only built through additional obligations without training and workload structuring, has the potential to become an additional procedure, not a simplification.

Budget issues were also revealed by both informants. Ciputat officers stated that the budget for routine activities is sufficient, but there is no specific allocation yet for implementing PTSP. An informant from Pamulang estimated operational costs at around Rp2.6 million per month and compared them to around Rp5 million the previous year. He assessed that this amount is insufficient for electricity, internet, water, and other needs, especially to build new services. These two figures are from interviews in 2023, not official budget data verified through DIPA documents or financial reports. The article uses them as officers' perceptions of funding adequacy, not as exact figures for KUA expenditure.

Although both informants differ on the adequacy of routine operational budgets, they both mention the absence of a dedicated PTSP budget. The difference between routine costs and transformation costs needs to be considered. Offices may have funds to maintain basic activities but lack resources to add service space, upgrade devices, improve networks, train employees, and develop complaint systems. Bureaucratic reform requires upfront and ongoing maintenance costs. If funding is only provided for program launches, service continuity will depend on the office's ability to cover those costs from sources not designed for that purpose.

The condition of facilities and infrastructure clarifies this issue. Both offices said they have computers for routine activities but do not yet have rooms and facilities specifically prepared for PTSP. An informant from Ciputat mentioned two computers, which he considers sufficient for daily activities. An informant from Pamulang also said the office has two operators and two computers, but a dedicated PTSP room is not yet available. The acknowledgment that routine devices already exist cannot be equated with the readiness of integrated service infrastructure. PTSP requires an easily accessible reception room, visible procedural information, applicant facilities, a stable network, supporting devices, archive management, and spatial planning that allows service work to proceed openly and accountably.

Building status is a particular obstacle at both locations. The study describes the Ciputat KUA building, located around Ciputat Market, and mentions relocation plans that have not been realized since information about the plan emerged in 2021. Ciputat informants consider the building's condition and location the main reasons service development has not been prioritized. In Pamulang, the building is located within the subdistrict government center, but informants said the building's ownership status is still tied to the local government. Concerns about building PTSP space arise because building investment could be wasted if the office is later asked to move. Thus, asset status and location certainty are part of institutional capacity, not merely technical construction issues.

Physical conditions also affect queues, document review privacy, and workflow clarity. However, dedicated spaces do not automatically create transparency. Facility planning must follow process design: document receipt, verification, status information, document storage, and recording of every transaction.

The study also includes Pamulang informants' concerns that an unintegrated service pattern could create opportunities for illegal levies or payments to expedite matters. This statement reflects the informant's perception of risks in services that are not yet transparent, not evidence that illegal levies have occurred in either KUA. Responsible analysis should not turn these concerns into factual accusations against officers or the office. However, these findings show a relationship between procedural transparency, certainty of timing, and the risk of uncontrolled discretion. The more unclear the application stages and status, the more room residents have to feel the need to find shortcuts or pay certain parties.

Therefore, PTSP investment is not measured solely by building space or computer procurement. Components to be financed include SOP preparation, staff training, operator

support, system connection and maintenance, data protection, information media, accessibility facilities, and complaint mechanisms. Financing must also consider residents' actual workload and visiting patterns. KUA serving areas with different demographic characteristics and density may require different staff and space configurations, but minimum standards of transparency, certainty, data protection, and access must remain the same.

Fragmentation of authority and gaps in policy implementation

Findings in Ciputat and Pamulang show that the main obstacles of PTSP cannot be explained solely by a lack of resources. Informants from Pamulang specifically assessed that some obstacles, such as staff or facilities, can still be fixed. However, policy and cross-agency authority misalignments are harder for the KUA to resolve on its own. Procedures involving RT/RW and urban villages place parts of the marriage registration process in the hands of actors outside the Ministry of Religious Affairs hierarchy. Likewise, access to Dukcapil and verification of religious court documents depend on decisions, systems, and standards of other institutions. KUA serves as a service point that must explain the process to residents but does not control it end to end.

Fragmentation of authority does not always mean that the division of functions between institutions is a mistake. Separation of authority can maintain specialization and accountability; for example, Dukcapil handles population data, and religious courts manage divorce decisions. Problems arise when this division is not balanced by cooperation protocols, information-exchange standards, or resolution mechanisms for when access is unavailable. Citizens ultimately have to carry documents from one agency to another as manual links. This makes service simplification difficult without changing each institution's core authority.

The *whole-of-government approach* helps explain this situation. Christensen and Lægreid (2007) show that the government integration agenda emerged in response to organizational fragmentation, overly separate specializations, and weak coordination. In the KUA context, marriage registration cannot be managed as a closed process because data accuracy depends on other agencies. Coordination needs to be built horizontally between the KUA, Dukcapil, and religious courts, and vertically between the KUA, the Ministry of Religious Affairs offices at the regency/city level, and the ministry's policy units. Without this relationship, the mandate for integrated services can easily stop functioning as a formal policy.

Kharlie et al.'s (2021) research found that top-down reform policies are not sufficient to guarantee changes across all KUAs; local initiatives and leadership play a major role in shaping innovation. The findings from Ciputat and Pamulang show another side of this issue. Local innovation can indeed result in variation, such as different SIMKAH registration methods, but local initiatives cannot replace data access controlled by other agencies or provide unallocated budgets. Reforms that rely solely on officers' creativity risk creating dependency on figures and cannot be replicated sustainably. Therefore, the system must be designed to combine central policies, cross-agency coordination, and local adaptation.

Differences in officers' information about Dukcapil access also reveal internal organizational issues. If operators know that data access has changed, that information must be forwarded to the marriage registrar and service-receiving officers. If this knowledge is not shared, one office may say marital status can be viewed through the NIK, while another officer says that access is no longer available. Inconsistent information not only reduces public trust but can also affect audit decisions. In some cases, officers may consider verification complete even when the system no longer provides the required data. Therefore, internal communication and SOP updates are important parts of interoperability.

The policy-practice gap is also related to how PTSP is interpreted by implementers. On one hand, PTSP is understood as a mechanism to streamline procedures and complete services through a single gateway. On the other hand, the obligation to review documents and dependence on other agencies lead officers to believe services cannot be simplified as long as external stages remain in place. This difference suggests a lack of shared understanding of what should be integrated and which authority limits must still be respected. Strengthening policy implementation requires a design that translates into action, not just a broad statement of purpose (Hudson et al., 2019).

Sager and Gofen (2022) remind us that policy implementation is influenced by the institutional structure that forms the implementing action space. In this study, KUA officers have the authority to regulate how documents are received, assist in data entry, and decide when applicants need to correct data. However, officers do not have direct authority to force RT/RW or urban villages to speed up letter issuance, reopen access to Dukcapil data, or change court procedures. This discretion is therefore limited. When residents ask why the process requires many steps, officers must explain procedures that are not entirely designed or controlled by their office.

One important implication is the need to build a cross-agency service process map. This map needs to distinguish mandatory legal requirements, administrative requirements derived from regional policies, documents verifiable through the system, and documents that still require manual inspection. Without this distinction, each unit may add procedures based on local customs and treat them as legal obligations. Process mapping will also help identify stages that can be done in parallel, information that can be reused, and points when residents must be present in person. A common standard can then align practices that have differed among KUAs within one area.

In addition, coordination must be built into work-related rules that can be implemented. Data exchange agreements should state the purpose of use, the types of data accessible, authorized officials or officers, update mechanisms, procedures when the system is unavailable, response time limits, and parties responsible for errors. Informal cooperation that relies solely on technical access or personal communication risks being interrupted due to staff changes or security concerns. With the agreed protocol, the KUA can still conduct inspections even if the main system is disrupted through recorded alternative mechanisms.

SIMKAH, SIMPONI, and the Need for Secure Digital Service Integration

The study identifies data synchronization, SIMKAH, and SIMPONI as important components that must be available for integrated services to support the prevention of identity forgery. These three components do not have the same function. SIMKAH relates to marriage registration administration, while SIMPONI, in the research description, is positioned as an online payment facility. Data synchronization refers to the ability to align identity information originating from different agencies. The mention of these three as a single unit should be understood as a mutually supportive service system, not as proof that the application was technically connected at the time of the study.

The success of a single application does not guarantee that all service flows are integrated. SIMKAH supports registration administration, SIMPONI handles payments, and data synchronization supports identity verification. All three require access governance and data protection; digital transformation must therefore start from functional needs, not just adding applications.

A SIMKAH study in South Tangerang City by Fiscal and Handayani (2024) found that public socialization is not yet optimal and that system features do not fully support

operational efficiency. This research reinforces the importance of user and staff support in determining system effectiveness. Research by Syafira and Siahaan (2024) also highlights SIMKAH as a public service innovation that drives the shift from manual to online processes. However, more recent research by Lahilote et al. (2026) shows that implementing SIMKAH at the counter level does not automatically connect the system with SIAK or religious court data. This comparison shows that the digitalization of marriage services still needs to move from automating internal processes to interoperability across institutions.

This shift demands strengthening data governance. Within the One Data Indonesia framework, government data must meet standards, metadata requirements, interoperability, and a clear division of management roles (Presidential Regulation Number 39 of 2019). SPBE also provides a framework to organize an integrated electronic government system (Presidential Regulation Number 95 of 2018). This policy does not automatically grant every KUA access to all databases. However, both can serve as a basis for drafting agreements and data-exchange architectures based on each agency's authority. Access should be given to information needed for marriage registration tasks, with appropriate controls.

Data security needs to be part of design from the start. Pamulang informants linked the end of access to suspected leaks, although research could not verify the event. Even if these assumptions are untrue, the experience shows that trust in systems and clarity of security responsibilities affect institutions' willingness to share data. Every integration plan must answer who controls the data, who the processor is, the basis and purpose of processing, what data is needed, how long information is stored, who can access it, and how incidents are handled. Data minimization is important so the verification process does not turn into excessive information gathering.

Security should also not be understood solely as restricting access. A system that is too closed can stop verification and force officers to revert to manual checks. Conversely, overly open systems increase the risk of abuse. Effective policies must balance service needs with data subject protection. For example, officers checking marital status may only require certain confirmation results, not the entire population data history. Access can be role-based, every check can be recorded, and results can be used solely for marriage registration purposes. These arrangements reduce risk while maintaining service functions.

OECD (2026) emphasizes that interoperability requires governance, data standards, technical tools, and shared system usage. Therefore, integrating KUA with Dukcapil and religious courts must be accompanied by training, maintenance, access supervision, and alternative procedures when the system is unavailable. SIMKAH is one component, not the sole solution.

Administrative Burden on Citizens and User-Centered Service Principles

Pamulang officers' criticism of the RT/RW and kelurahan introduction process can be analyzed through the concept of administrative burden. Residents who want to register a marriage need to know the required documents, understand the stages, allocate time to visit several offices, and ensure each document is correct. This process creates learning and compliance costs. When residents do not understand the requirements or receive different information from one office to another, psychological costs such as uncertainty, anxiety, or dependence on officers can also arise. Moynihan et al. (2015) show that administrative burden is not just the number of forms, but the total effort residents must make to obtain rights or services.

This burden can increase when digital services are introduced without adequate support. Registration through SIMKAH can reduce the need to come in early. However,

residents must have devices, internet access, the ability to read instructions, and an understanding of the identity fields. If the information entered is wrong and applicants need to come to correct it, travel costs and time are not lost. Findings by Fiscal and Handayani (2024) regarding SIMKAH socialization that has not reached all groups provide context that digital design needs to be accompanied by communication and user support. Because the 2023 study did not interview prospective brides and grooms, this article does not conclude the community's digital literacy level in Ciputat or Pamulang. The analysis only shows a reasonable potential burden based on process patterns and input difficulties conveyed by officers.

User-centered services must distinguish procedural simplification from reducing verification standards. Cutting out stages does not mean eliminating checks needed to prevent recording based on incorrect documents. Reduce unnecessary repetition, limit data requirements to what the state can legally verify, and clarify which unit is responsible. If a document is still required to be submitted due to applicable norms, officers need to explain the basis and how to obtain it. If information can be exchanged through a secure system, citizens should not be repeatedly asked to be data carriers.

Transparency requires clear information on requirements, costs, timelines, reasons for delay, and application status. A single point of contact must continue to provide information and complaint management even if resolution involves multiple agencies. The study by Sartono et al. (2026) also shows that physical centralization does not automatically result in adequate operational integration or complaint follow-up.

User-centered services also demand alternative channels for groups struggling to use the application. Assistance with filling out at the office, easy-to-read information, assistance for residents less familiar with technology, and procedures when network disruptions occur need to be provided as standard parts. Digital and face-to-face channels do not have to be mutually exclusive. The main goal is to ensure that access to marriage registration does not rely excessively on the applicant's digital capabilities. This can also reduce the possibility of officers informally re-entering without clear recording procedures.

From a bureaucratic reform perspective, reduced administrative burden is a more meaningful measure than the number of channels or applications. One additional application can add steps if it is not connected to other processes. One additional counter can create new queues if authority is not clearly delegated. Conversely, aligned requirements, legitimate data exchange, consistent information, and clear responsible parties can reduce citizen workload even when multiple institutions remain involved. Success measures should include the number of visits needed, document recurrence frequency, completion time, complaints, data error rates, and user access requiring assistance.

Analytical synthesis: three layers of integration and five prerequisites of PTSP

Based on findings from the two KUAs and the literature used, PTSP implementation can be understood through three interdependent layers of integration. The first layer is access integration, which is the applicant's ability to obtain information, submit applications, submit documents, and track status through a single contact point. The second layer is process integration, which involves coordinating internal activities and working relationships with other agencies so residents do not bear the full burden of transferring and confirming documents. The third layer is data integration, which is the ability of authorized officers to obtain and use information from other systems legally, securely, and auditably. The comparison between Ciputat and Pamulang shows that the access layer has not yet been

realized as PTSP, process integration is still fragmented, and data integration is not yet consistent.

These three layers cannot be built without five prerequisites. First, regulatory and procedural coherence: a clear explanation of national requirements, local procedures, each institution's authority, and officers' discretion. Second, data governance and interoperability, including the basis for data exchange, information standards, access arrangements, security, and alternative procedures when systems are unavailable. Third, organizational capacity, which includes the number and competence of officers, division of tasks, leadership, internal communication, and training. Fourth, financial and physical resource support, including special budgets, service space, devices, networks, and certainty about asset status. Fifth, user orientation and accountability, including information standards, access for citizens with different digital capabilities, clarity of costs and time, and complaint mechanisms.

Table 1 summarizes the comparison results based on the information available in the study. This comparison is not a quantitative performance assessment, but rather a mapping of practices and constraints reported in interviews and observations.

Table 1.
Comparison of service implementation findings at Ciputat KUA and Pamulang KUA (field data as of June 9, 2023)

Reported registration patterns	The applicant came bringing the documents; the officer assisted with the input	Initial registration is done through SIMKAH online, then documents are verified at the office
Access to Dukcapil data	The penghulu stated that the NIK data can be displayed when input	The penghulu stated that cooperation access is no longer available; alleged leaks mentioned but not verified
Divorce document examination	The focus of the information is on data verification and corrections through Dukcapil	It is said that there is an examination of divorce certificates/copies of decisions through the religious court
Status PTSP	Notyet implemented	Not yet implemented
Most emphasized obstacles	The condition of the building and location, limited facilities, and PTSP budget	Fragmentation of policies, human resources, budgets, facilities, and building status
Daily capacity	Two computers are said to be sufficient for routine work; PTSP readiness is not yet available	Two operators and two computers are said to be available, but they are not yet sufficient for the needs of PTSP and the surge in applicants

This matrix shows that the variation in practice does not eliminate the similarity in results, namely the absence of a PTSP. Ciputat and Pamulang offer different explanations for their limitations, but both face limitations in data and resource integration. This strengthens the argument that the one-door policy cannot be implemented by merely imitating other offices' layouts. Organizational readiness must be assessed as a combination of internal conditions and external relations. KUA with better buildings still requires data

agreement; KUA with operators with better digital capabilities still requires cross-agency procedures; and offices with applications do not automatically reduce the administrative burden on applicants.

This three-layered and five-prerequisite model is an analytical synthesis derived from limited findings, not a causal model that has been comparatively tested on a large population of KUAs. Its value lies in its ability to organize issues that are often discussed separately. Discussion of facilities, for example, can be linked to access integration; discussion of RT/RW and sub-district authority is included in process integration; while access to Dukcapil and religious courts includes data integration. The five prerequisites indicate the conditions each layer needs to operate. This synthesis can be used as a diagnostic framework for further studies, but its application to other KUAs needs to be tested through more diverse data.

Policy Implications and Improvement Agenda

The first implication is the need to remap the marriage registration procedure at the operational level. The Ministry of Religious Affairs, together with local governments, needs to clearly separate requirements originating from national regulations from those at local administrative stages. This mapping must explain each document's function, the authorized official who issues it, the time required, and whether the system can verify the same information. The results should be translated into service standards that prospective brides and grooms can easily read and that the Office of Religious Affairs (KUA) applies consistently. When regulations change, operational standards must be updated and socialized so practices do not fall behind applicable provisions.

The second implication relates to strengthening data cooperation. The Ministry of Religious Affairs, Dukcapil, and the Supreme Court or religious courts need to develop specific information-exchange mechanisms for marriage registration examinations. These mechanisms must include access authority, data types, identification standards, update speed, usage logging, security, and responsibility in case of errors or incidents. Formal agreements and technical governance are needed so that access does not depend on informal relationships among officers. When the system is unavailable, a manual confirmation procedure with time limits and administrative traces is needed so services do not stop without certainty.

The third implication is strengthening implementers' capacity. Training should not be limited to operating SIMKAH. Officers also need to understand the legal basis for marriage registration, the limits of authority to correct data, document verification procedures, personal data protection, service communication, and complaint management. Technical knowledge of operators needs to be shared with marriage registrars and service-receiving officers through regular briefings or SOP updates. Task arrangement should also account for periods when request volumes increase. Without adequate addition or redistribution of personnel, PTSP can actually increase the workload of the same officers.

The fourth implication is providing financing and facilities that match asset condition. The PTSP budget needs to separate initial expenditures—such as spatial planning, equipment, and networks—from operating and maintenance costs. For offices whose building status or relocation location is uncertain, the government needs to finalize asset status or provide a design for movable facilities. Facility procurement must also follow the service flow, including reception areas, private consultation rooms, information boards, access routes for persons with disabilities, and queue and complaint systems. Thus, service rooms are not built as symbols of reform but to support simplified work processes.

The fifth implication concerns measuring success. PTSP indicators need to include residents' experience and process effectiveness, not just the number of counters or applications. Indicators that can be considered include the number of visits required until registration is completed, waiting time at each stage, frequency of file returns, percentage of data verifiable without repeated documents, number of system disruptions, clarity of cost information, as well as the number and resolution of complaints. These measurements need to be conducted regularly and involve service users. With consistent evaluation data, KUA can distinguish issues originating from regulations, systems, capacity, and implementers' behavior.

The sixth implication concerns renewing the legal framework. Because PMA Number 20 of 2019 has been replaced through a series of regulations in 2024 culminating in PMA Number 30 of 2024, PTSP evaluation after 2024 needs to reassess the conformity of standard procedures and requirements based on the latest provisions. Likewise, changes in KUA organizational regulations through PMA Number 24 of 2024 need to be considered when determining responsibilities, service structure, and supervision flow. This article does not assess the implementation of these new regulations in Ciputat and Pamulang because field data comes from 2023. Further research should examine whether the norm updates have reduced the stages officers complain about and whether organizational structure changes are followed by better service integration.

Conclusion

This study shows that administrative services for marriage registration at the Ciputat and Pamulang KUA in June 2023 continued but were not yet integrated into the PTSP model. Both offices run administrative processes with patterns that are not entirely the same. Ciputat relies more on direct services and officer assistance for data entry, while Pamulang encourages initial entry through SIMKAH before office verification. Differences also appear in information about Dukcapil data access: Ciputat informants said NIK data could be displayed, while Pamulang informants said previously available access no longer works. These differences indicate inconsistencies in information about the system and the need for better internal coordination.

PTSP has not been implemented due to several interrelated issues. Informants said the recording procedures still depend on stages outside KUA's authority, especially administration at the RT/RW and village levels. Data exchange with Dukcapil and verification of religious court documents have not yet established a consistent mechanism. At the organizational level, both offices face limitations in the number and competence of officers, the lack of a dedicated PTSP budget, limited space and facilities, and uncertainty about the building's status or location. The differences in conditions between Ciputat and Pamulang show that implementation obstacles cannot be explained solely by physical or regulatory factors.

The article's main contribution is to explain that PTSP must be read through three layers of integration: service access at the front, process coordination between agencies, and data interoperability at the back. All three require regulatory coherence, governance for secure data exchange, organizational capacity, budget and facility support, and a user-experience orientation. A single counter or digital application without cross-agency process improvements risks shifting queues or administrative tasks, rather than eliminating them. Conversely, data integration without privacy protection and clear division of authority can create new risks.

The practical implication is that the Ministry of Religious Affairs and related agencies need to align recording procedures, build data-exchange protocols with Dukcapil and religious courts, strengthen internal communication, provide training and budgeting, and design facilities around service-flow needs. PTSP evaluation should use measures citizens experience, such as the number of visits, resolution time, document repetition, accessibility, cost clarity, and complaint resolution. Legal updates after 2023, especially PMA Number 30 of 2024 concerning Marriage Registration and PMA Number 24 of 2024 concerning the Organization and Work Procedures of KUA, must inform the current service arrangement.

This study has limitations because field data comes only from two KUAs and two main informants interviewed on one date. The views of operators, KUA heads, prospective brides and grooms, Dukcapil, religious courts, and village offices are not directly represented. Information regarding alleged data leaks and budget values has also not been verified through official documents. Further research needs to expand informants, conduct repeated observations, review cooperation documents and systems, and measure user experience. Post-2024 studies are also needed to determine whether regulatory and system changes have narrowed the gap between PTSP objectives and service practices at KUA.

Author Contributor

Dwifa Nusantara Putri: conceptualization, methodology, investigation, data curation, writing—original draft. Mohamad Mujibur Rohman: conceptualization, methodology, validation, formal analysis, writing—review & editing, supervision.

Declaration of Generative AI

This manuscript received limited assistance from an AI-based language tool (Grammarly and ChatGPT) for language refinement and grammar checking. The authors critically reviewed and finalised all content and accept full responsibility for the published work. No AI tools were used for data analysis or interpreting findings.

Declaration of Competing Interest

The authors report no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have influenced the work presented in this paper.

Reference

Ali, Z. (2013). *Legal Research Methods* (4th Ed.). Sinar Grafika.

Buana, M. G. (2023). *Implementation of one-stop integrated services in bureaucratic reform efforts at KUA* [Undergraduate research, Syarif Hidayatullah State Islamic University Jakarta].

Campmas, A., Iacob, N., & Simonelli, F. (2022). How can interoperability stimulate the use of digital public services? An analysis of national interoperability frameworks and e-Government in the European Union. *Data & Policy, 4*, Article e19. https://doi.org/10.1017/dap.2022.11

Christensen, T., & Lægreid, P. (2007). The whole-of-government approach to public sector reform. *Public Administration Review, 67*(6), 1059–1066. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2007.00797.x

Fajar, M., & Achmad, Y. (2010). *Dualism of normative and empirical legal research*. Student Library.

Fiscal, M. A., & Handayani, N. (2024). Effectiveness of the online-based marriage management information system (SIMKAH) in South Tangerang City. *Switch: Journal of Science and Information Technology, 2*(5), 40–55. https://doi.org/10.62951/switch.v2i5.183

Hudson, B., Hunter, D., & Peckham, S. (2019). Policy failure and the policy-implementation gap: Can policy support programs help? *Policy Design and Practice, 2*(1), 1–14. https://doi.org/10.1080/25741292.2018.1540378

Kharlie, A. T., Fathudin, F., & Triana, W. (2021). Reforming Islamic marriage bureaucracy in Indonesia: Approaches and impacts. *Al-Jami'ah: Journal of Islamic Studies, 59*(2), 255–286. https://doi.org/10.14421/ajis.2021.592.255-286

Lahilote, H. S., Bachdar, A. Z., Hasan, F., & Kolopita, A. F. (2026). Web-based SIMKAH implementation at KUA: A multi-city comparative study of legal effectiveness in Indonesia. *Al-Ahkam, 36*(1), 133–164. https://doi.org/10.21580/ahkam.2026.36.1.28241

Lipsky, M. (2010). *Street-level bureaucracy: Dilemmas of the individual in public services* (30th anniversary expanded ed.). Russell Sage Foundation.

Moynihan, D. P., Herd, P., & Harvey, H. (2015). Administrative burden: Learning, psychological, and compliance costs in citizen-state interactions. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 25*(1), 43–69. https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/muu009

OECD. (2026). *Digital Government Outlook 2026: Indonesia*. OECD Publishing. https://www.oecd.org/en/publications/digital-government-outlook-2026_d46c0555-en/indonesia_3d267146-en.html

Republic of Indonesia. (1974). *Law Number 1 of 1974 concerning Marriage*.

Republic of Indonesia. (2009). *Law Number 25 of 2009 concerning Public Services*.

Republic of Indonesia. (2016a). *Minister of Religious Affairs Regulation Number 34 of 2016 concerning the Organization and Work Procedures of the Subdistrict Religious Affairs Office*.

Republic of Indonesia. (2016b). *Minister of Religious Affairs Regulation Number 65 of 2016 concerning Integrated Services at the Ministry of Religious Affairs*.

Republic of Indonesia. (2018). *Presidential Regulation Number 95 of 2018 concerning the Electronic-Based Government System*.

Republic of Indonesia. (2019a). *Minister of Religious Affairs Regulation Number 20 of 2019 concerning Marriage Registration*.

Republic of Indonesia. (2019b). *Presidential Regulation Number 39 of 2019 concerning One Data Indonesia*.

Republic of Indonesia. (2019c). *Law Number 16 of 2019 concerning Amendments to Law Number 1 of 1974 concerning Marriage*.

Republic of Indonesia. (2022). *Law Number 27 of 2022 concerning Personal Data Protection*.

Republic of Indonesia. (2024a). *Minister of Religious Affairs Regulation Number 22 of 2024 concerning Marriage Registration*.

Republic of Indonesia. (2024b). *Minister of Religious Affairs Regulation Number 24 of 2024 concerning the Organization and Work Procedures of the Office of Religious Affairs*.

Republic of Indonesia. (2024c). *Minister of Religious Affairs Regulation Number 30 of 2024 concerning Marriage Registration*.

Sager, F., & Gofen, A. (2022). The polity of implementation: Organizational and institutional arrangements in policy implementation. *Governance, 35*(2), 347–364. https://doi.org/10.1111/gove.12677

Sartono, S., Alam, S., Taufik, T., & Liwaul, L. (2026). Governing public service integration: Implementation gaps at the Kendari city public service mall, Indonesia. *Otoritas: Journal of Government Science, 16*(2). https://doi.org/10.26618/ojip.v16i2.19695

Syafira, Z., & Siahaan, A. Y. S. (2024). Public sector innovation through web marriage management information system. *Scientific Journal of Public Administration Science, 14*(1), 321–330. https://doi.org/10.26858/jiap.v14i1.62059

Trein, P., Biesbroek, R., Bolognesi, T., Cejudo, G. M., Duffy, R., Hustedt, T., & Meyer, I. (2021). Policy coordination and integration: A research agenda. *Public Administration Review, 81*(5), 973–977. https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.13180