Journal of International Islamic Law, Human Rights, and Public Policy
(JISHUP Journal) | ISSN(e): 3031-2280
Website https://jishup.org/index.php/ojs/index | Volume 4 No. 1 (2026)

IMPLEMENTATION OF SEA PORT MANAGEMENT POLICIES BY THE PORT MASTER AND CLASS 1 BITUNG PORT AUTHORITY OFFICE

Sanchez Roy Tantu, Theodorus Pangalila, Jetty E. H. Mokat.
Universitas Negeri Manado, Indonesia
Coresponding email : sancheznathan653@gmail.com

Received: 02/04/2026 | **Revised:** 04/05/2026 | **Accepted:** 11/06/2026 | **Published:** 16/06/2026

Abstract

This study aims to analyze the implementation of the policy on duties and functions of seaport management by the Bitung Class I Harbormaster and Port Authority Office (KSOP) and to identify the determinants influencing the implementation of the policy. This study uses a qualitative approach with descriptive methods. The research location was at the Bitung Class I KSOP. Data collection techniques were carried out through in-depth interviews, observation, and documentation. Research informants consisted of KSOP officials, operational employees, port service users, and other related parties. Data analysis was carried out through the stages of data reduction, data presentation, and conclusion drawing, while data validity was tested through source and technique triangulation. The results of the study indicate that the implementation of the policy on duties and functions of seaport management by the Bitung Class I KSOP has not been running optimally. In its regulatory function, there are still inconsistencies in the application of regulations and delays in port administration processes. In its supervisory function, limited human resources and supporting facilities have resulted in less than optimal supervision of port activities. Meanwhile, in the function of port service providers, the quality of task implementation has not fully met the principles of speed, accuracy, transparency, and responsiveness as mandated by Law Number 25 of 2009. The determinant factors that influence policy implementation include aspects of communication, human resources, apparatus disposition, and bureaucratic structure. This study concludes that the effectiveness of the implementation of seaport management policies at KSOP Class I Bitung requires strengthening inter-agency coordination, increasing human resource capacity, simplifying administrative procedures, and optimizing technology-based work systems.

Keywords: *policy implementation, KSOP, seaport management, port services, operational performance.*

INTRODUCTION

Seaports are transportation infrastructure that play a strategic role in the national connectivity system. As the world's largest archipelagic nation, Indonesia positions ports as the backbone of inter-island freight and passenger flows, as well as gateways to international trade. The importance of ports is constitutionally recognized through Article 33 of the 1945 Constitution, which mandates that national wealth and resources, including waters and ports as public infrastructure, are controlled by the state and utilized for the greatest possible prosperity of the people. As a follow-up to this constitutional mandate, the government issued Law Number 17 of 2008 concerning Shipping, which expressly regulates the operation of seaports in Indonesia. Article 47 of this law affirms that the government holds the function of regulating, controlling, and supervising ports. More specifically, Article 48 stipulates that port operators have the following duties and functions: providing and maintaining the suitability of port facilities; providing services to ships, passengers, and goods; ensuring the safety and security of shipping; carrying out the function of regulating, controlling, and supervising port activities; and ensuring the smooth flow of goods. This normative mandate was then elaborated operationally through Government Regulation No. 61 of 2009 concerning Ports and Minister of Transportation Regulation No. 36 of 2012, which explicitly delegate the implementation of these three functions to the Harbormaster and Port Authority Office (KSOP).

KSOP, based on PM No. 36 of 2012, carries out three main functions which are the sub-focus of this research, namely: (1) Regulator function, namely regulation, control, and supervision of port activities; (2) Supervisory function, namely supervision and law enforcement in the field of shipping safety and security; and (3) Service Function Organizer function, namely the implementation of port service activities to service users. These three functions must be implemented in accordance with public service standards as regulated in Law No. 25 of 2009 concerning Public Services, which stipulates the principles of legal certainty, professionalism, openness, accountability, timeliness, and speed and convenience as the basic principles of implementing government services.

Bitung Class I Port Authority (KSOP) is a technical implementation unit of the Ministry of Transportation that carries out these three functions at Bitung Port, North Sulawesi. Bitung Port holds a strategic position as one of the main ports in Eastern Indonesia, serving the flow of exports and imports of goods, passengers, and the fishing industry in North Sulawesi. This significant operational responsibility demands the implementation of effective, measurable port management policies that comply with applicable regulatory mandates. However, various empirical data and phenomena indicate an implementation gap between the normative mandates set by regulations and the actual implementation capacity of the Bitung Class I KSOP. In the Regulator function dimension, inconsistencies in the application of procedures and regulations at the implementing level are still found, which indicates that the socialization of policies — especially PM No. 36 of 2012 as an operational elaboration of Article 48 of the Shipping Law — has not been implemented effectively and sustainably. In the Supervisory function dimension, the scope of supervision over all port activities is considered less than optimal, partly due to limitations and imbalances in human resource capacity. In the Service Provider function dimension, there are still complaints from service users regarding delays in document completion, lack of transparent information, and the lack of integration of service flows between units that contradict the principles of timeliness, speed, and openness mandated by Article 4 of Law No. 25 of 2009.

The implementation gaps that occur in these three functions are not isolated. Determining factors exist, including policy communication, human resources, staff disposition, and bureaucratic structure, which significantly influence the effectiveness of port management policy implementation. A comprehensive understanding of these determinants is essential so that the policy recommendations generated by this research can address the root of the problem, not just the symptoms. Research on policy implementation in government technical organizations such as the Port Authority (KSOP) remains very limited, even though Law No. 17 of 2008 has been in effect for more than a decade. Previous studies generally focused on the technical aspects of port operations (loading and unloading speed, dock capacity) or general user satisfaction, without systematically linking these to policy implementation in the three normative functions of the KSOP as stipulated in Article 48 of the Shipping Law and Article 2 of PM No. 36/2012. This represents a significant research gap. Based on the description above, this research is important and relevant to be carried out. By analyzing the implementation of the policy of duties and functions of seaport management by KSOP Class I Bitung, and identifying the determinant factors that influence it, this research is expected to: (1) provide an empirical picture of the extent to which the mandate of Article 48 of Law No. 17/2008 and Article 2 of PM No. 36/2012 is implemented in practice; (2) identify determinant factors that hinder or encourage the effectiveness of implementation; and (3) formulate evidence-based policy recommendations for improving port management by KSOP Class I Bitung.

METHOD

This study uses a qualitative approach with a descriptive research type. The qualitative approach was chosen because the research object is natural and in accordance with the facts in the field, with the researcher as the key instrument. As stated by Sugiyono (2016), "Problems in qualitative research are temporary, tentative and will develop or change after the researcher is in the field." Descriptive research aims to reveal, describe, and depict facts in a comprehensive, structured, factual, and accurate manner regarding the facts in the field. Moleong (2019) stated that "descriptive research is a method in examining the status of a group of people, an object, a condition, a system of thought or in a class of events in the present." Thus, this study is directed at describing the implementation of the policy of duties and functions of seaport management by KSOP Class I Bitung. The focus of this research is on the implementation of the policy of duties and functions of seaport management by KSOP Class I Bitung, which is described in three main sub-focuses based on Article 48 of Law No. 17 of 2008 concerning Shipping, namely Regulator, Supervisor, and Service Function Organizer, as well as one additional sub-focus regarding the determinants of policy implementation. Each sub-focus has measurable research indicators. The Regulator sub-focus has the following indicators: (a) preparation and implementation of port regulations; (b) granting of port activity permits; (c) inter-agency coordination; and (d)

OPEN ACCESS

enforcement of regulations and handling of violations. The Supervisor sub-focus has the following indicators: (a) supervision of ship seaworthiness and safety; (b) supervision of loading and unloading activities and dock operations; and (c) handling of violation findings and follow-up. The Service Function Organizer sub-focus has the following indicators: (a) ship document administration services; (b) speed, accuracy, and transparency of services; (c) responsiveness to service user needs; and (d) integration of services between agencies at the port. The determinant factors analyzed include human resources, communication and socialization, disposition of the apparatus, and bureaucratic structure.

The research location was determined in Bitung City, North Sulawesi Province, with the research site being an officer at the Bitung Class I KSOP. Research informants were determined by purposive sampling as explained by Sugiyono (2016), namely "selecting informants who are truly relevant and competent in their fields with the research problem so that the data obtained can be used to build conclusions" (page 69). The informants interviewed included the Head of the Sea Transportation Traffic and Port Business Division, the Head of the Sea Transportation Traffic Section, the Head of the Personnel and Finance Sub-Section, the Head of the Planning and Development Section, and the Head of the Sailing Safety Section. The research data sources consisted of three types: informants, places and events (direct observation at the Bitung Class I KSOP), and research documents in the form of laws and regulations, internal notes, photographs, and images.

Data collection techniques were carried out through documentation (reviewing supporting documents, taking pictures and voice recordings), observation (observing behavior, work processes, and symptoms in the field), and in-depth interviews with informants. Data analysis used the interactive model of Miles and Huberman (2017) which consists of four stages: *data collection* , *data condensation* (data condensation through selection and simplification), *data display* (presenting data in the form of narrative text and tables), and *conclusion drawing/verifying* (drawing conclusions and verification). To ensure the validity of the data, this study applies four criteria according to Lincoln and Guba as quoted by Moleong (2019), namely credibility through triangulation of sources, methods, and theories; transferability so that research results can be applied in other contexts; dependability by maintaining consistency throughout the research process; and certainty (confirmability) through audit trials to ensure the objectivity of research results.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

1. Implementation of the Policy on Duties and Functions of Seaport Management by KSOP Class I Bitung

a. Regulator

The implementation of the regulatory function by the Harbormaster's Office and the Bitung Class I Port Authority still faces various significant empirical problems. Based on the interview results, informant "IS" stated that supervision of incoming and outgoing ships, inspection of shipping documents, and control of loading and unloading activities have been carried out, however, administrative violations by service users and delays in the inter-agency coordination process were still found. Informant "YT" revealed that the limited number of supervisory personnel compared to the high port activity was the main obstacle that prevented optimal supervision of shipping safety. Informant "SM" added that inter-agency coordination involving many parties such as port operators, customs, quarantine, and immigration often took quite a long time, thus affecting the smooth service at the port. Another problem related to the limited means and supporting facilities for supervision, so that the implementation of monitoring of port activities was not fully effective. This condition overall indicates that the implementation of the regulatory function has not been running optimally and still requires strengthening in various aspects.

From the perspective of George C. Edwards III's (1980) policy implementation theory, regulatory function issues can be analyzed through four main variables: communication, resources, disposition, and bureaucratic structure. From a resource perspective, the limited number of supervisory personnel, as expressed by informants YT and IS, confirms Edwards III's proposition that without sufficient resources, policy implementation will be ineffective even if the regulations are clear. Edwards III emphasized that inadequate human resources (both in number and capability) result in the inability to implement programs effectively because they cannot properly supervise. From a communication perspective, differences in working mechanisms between agencies indicate that the flow of information and cross-agency coordination have not been running smoothly. Van Meter and Van Horn (1975) emphasized that interorganizational communication is a key variable influencing the success of policy implementation, and the greater the communication gap, the greater the likelihood that implementation will not run as expected.

OPEN ACCESS

This connection with previous research reinforces the finding that regulatory issues at the Class I Bitung Port Authority (KSOP) share a similar pattern with other ports in Indonesia. Research by Mursalin, Heriyanto, and Yuliani (2021) shows that public service performance at the Class IV Bagansiapiapi Port Authority (KSOP) has generally been good, but challenges remain in terms of service environment comfort and limited operational facilities. The study found that of 14 service indicators, 13 demonstrated good performance, but one indicator, environmental comfort, was suboptimal due to limited facilities at several port locations. This aligns with conditions at the Bitung Port Authority (KSOP), where limited supervisory support facilities hinder the implementation of regulatory functions. Research by Taharuddin, Fatimah, and Masimin (2021) also found that operational performance at Malahayati Port is still affected by limited facilities, service hours, and other supporting aspects that impact operational performance and user satisfaction. These two studies provide empirical justification that the effectiveness of the regulatory function is significantly influenced by the readiness of facilities and institutional capacity to support the implementation of public service policies. A more in-depth analysis using Richard Matland's (1995) implementation model shows that the implementation of the regulatory function at the Bitung Class I Port Authority (KSOP) can be categorized as a combination of *administrative implementation* and *political implementation* . Normatively, the supervisory procedures are clearly regulated in Law Number 17 of 2008 concerning Shipping and Regulation of the Minister of Transportation No. 36 of 2012, which means that policy ambiguity is relatively low. However, in practice, there are conflicts of interest and suboptimal coordination between agencies, which shifts implementation towards *political implementation* . Matland (1995) explains that *political implementation* occurs when policies have low ambiguity but high conflict, so that implementation is determined by power and negotiation between actors. The implication is that strengthening the regulatory function is not sufficient only through improving the internal procedures of the KSOP, but also requires more structured management of inter-agency relations and effective conflict resolution mechanisms.

Based on this analysis, it can be concluded that the implementation of the regulatory function by the Bitung Class I Port Authority (KSOP) still faces serious challenges in the areas of supervision, coordination, and regulatory enforcement. Normatively, Article 48 of Law Number 17 of 2008 mandates that the KSOP has full authority to regulate, control, and supervise all port activities. However, the gap between this normative mandate and its implementation on the ground remains quite wide. This situation strengthens the argument that the implementation of the regulatory function is not sufficient to be supported by strong regulations alone, but also requires strengthening human resource capacity, improving coordination mechanisms, and providing adequate supervisory support facilities. Efforts that can be made include adding supervisory personnel, improving competency through ongoing training, and strengthening the information technology-based cross-agency coordination system.

b. Supervisor

The main problem in the implementation of the supervisory function by the Bitung Class I Port Authority (KSOP) is the suboptimal scope of supervision of all port activities. Based on the interview results, informant "RK" stated that supervision of ship activities entering and leaving the port, including inspections of ship seaworthiness and shipping documents, cannot be carried out optimally due to the high activity of ships and the limited number of supervisory officers. Informant "MK" revealed that the supervisory mechanism is carried out through administrative supervision and direct supervision in the field, but still needs improvement, especially in controlling loading and unloading activities and compliance of service users. Informant "SM" added that the KSOP responds to every supervisory obstacle by coordinating with relevant agencies, but the coordination process is often slow due to differences in work mechanisms between agencies. In addition, limited supporting facilities for supervision such as communication equipment and patrol transportation are also factors that limit the scope of supervision. As a result, there is still the potential for violations and disruptions to shipping safety that are not detected early.

Analysis using Edwards III's (1980) policy implementation theory shows that weaknesses in the supervisory function are reflected in all four dimensions simultaneously. From the resource dimension, the limited number of supervisory personnel and supporting facilities are the main obstacles to implementation. Edwards III (1980) emphasized that even if the policy content has been communicated clearly and consistently, if the implementer lacks the resources to implement it, implementation will not be effective. From the communication dimension, the obstacles to inter-agency coordination expressed by informant SM indicate that the flow of information within the supervisory framework has not been running effectively and consistently. From the bureaucratic structure dimension, the lack of integration of supervisory mechanisms between the KSOP and customs, quarantine, and immigration indicates that inter-agency Standard Operating

Procedures have not been well integrated. Van Meter and Van Horn (1975) emphasized that the characteristics of implementing agents and inter-organizational communication are the main weaknesses in policy implementation, which in this context is reflected in the lack of uniformity in understanding regulations at the implementing level. Previous research indicates that the supervisory issues at the Class I Bitung Port Authority (KSOP) are not isolated phenomena. Research by Mursalin et al. (2021) demonstrated that although public service performance at the KSOP has generally been quite good, limitations remain in the facilities and service environment, which are indirectly related to supervisory effectiveness. This research reinforces the notion that weaknesses in facilities and the environment can impact the suboptimal performance of supervisory functions in the field. Research by Taharuddin et al. (2021) also found that the *Customer Satisfaction Index* (CSI) evaluation showed a satisfactory level of user satisfaction, but left room for improvement, particularly regarding service times and coordination. This finding aligns with conditions at the Bitung Port Authority (KSOP), where supervision of loading and unloading activities and shipping safety still faces coordination challenges and resource constraints. Therefore, previous research justifies the effectiveness of supervision significantly influenced by the readiness of the port's overall service and operational systems.

Analysis using Richard Matland's (1995) implementation model shows that the implementation of the supervisory function at the Bitung Class I Port Authority (KSOP) can be categorized as a combination of *administrative implementation* and *political implementation* . Administratively, supervision should be carried out routinely and in a structured manner, but in practice it is hampered by resource limitations and the high volume of port activity. Matland (1995) explains that *administrative* implementation occurs when policies have low ambiguity and conflict, so that implementation is determined by available resources. Meanwhile, from a political perspective, the involvement of many actors in port supervision requires strong coordination and synchronization, but this has not been fully effective. This condition indicates that the implementation of the supervisory function is still in a condition influenced by operational pressures and limited organizational capacity. The implication is that strengthening the supervisory function requires a comprehensive approach, including increasing resource capacity, improving the coordination system, and strengthening control mechanisms.

Based on the overall analysis, it can be concluded that the supervisory function at the Bitung Class I Port Authority (KSOP) still requires significant strengthening. Normatively, Minister of Transportation Regulation PM No. 36 of 2012 has established clear supervisory SOPs, but their implementation has been inconsistent due to limited resources and suboptimal coordination. Possible improvements include increasing the number of supervisory personnel, increasing technical competency through regular training, providing supporting facilities such as communication equipment and patrol transportation, and strengthening cross-agency coordination mechanisms through regular forums and integrated information systems. Furthermore, it is necessary to develop technology-based surveillance systems such as *Vessel Traffic Service* (VTS) and *CCTV* at strategic points in the port to expand the scope of surveillance without having to rely entirely on physical patrols. With these steps, it is hoped that the surveillance function can run more effectively and sustainably.

c. Service Function Organizer

The main problem in the implementation of service functions by KSOP Class I Bitung is the occurrence of queues and delays in the administrative service process and port operations. Based on the interview results, informant "MK" stated that under certain conditions there are still delays in service due to high ship activity and many service users who require services simultaneously. Informant "RK" revealed that service users still expect an increase in service speed so that ship operational processes do not experience delays, because long waiting times have an impact on ship operational costs and logistics efficiency. Informant "SM" added that service implementation still faces obstacles such as limited service officers and high service volumes that affect the speed of the service process. In addition, informant "IS" highlighted that the transparency of service information is still limited, so that service users are often unaware of the progress of the ongoing administrative process. The suboptimal integration of services between agencies is also a complaint, where service users have to go back and forth to several agencies because the information received is not synchronized. From the perspective of Edwards III's (1980) policy implementation theory, service issues at the Bitung Class I KSOP reflect weaknesses in all four implementation variables. From the communication variable, information regarding service procedures and schedules has not been fully conveyed to service users, as reflected in the findings of limited information transparency. Edwards III (1980) emphasized that clarity of policy information is crucial for implementers to accurately understand the policy's dimensions and objectives. From the resource variable, the limited

OPEN ACCESS

number of service personnel causes service capacity to be disproportionate to the volume of requests, resulting in queues and delays. From the disposition variable, the high workload during peak hours has the potential to impact responsiveness and service quality. From the bureaucratic structure variable, the lack of integration of service procedures between agencies is a major source of delays. Normatively, Law Number 25 of 2009 concerning Public Services requires every public service provider to provide services that are fast, accurate, transparent, non-discriminatory, and user-satisfying (Indonesia, 2009), but empirical findings indicate that these four standards have not been fully met.

Links to previous research reinforce the finding that service issues at KSOP Bitung are similar to those at other ports in Indonesia. Research by Mursalin et al. (2021) showed that of 14 service indicators, one, namely the comfort of the service environment, was suboptimal due to limited facilities. The study also found that although most indicators had performed well, there was still room for improvement, particularly in the physical aspects and service environment. Research by Taharuddin et al. (2021) found that the *Customer Satisfaction Index* (CSI) evaluation showed a satisfactory level of user satisfaction but left room for improvement, particularly regarding service times and inter-agency coordination. The study also identified that *the Berth Occupancy Ratio* (BOR), *Yard Occupancy Ratio* (YOR), and *Berth Throughput* (BTP) were still affected by limited facilities and other supporting aspects. These two studies provide an empirical basis that improving service quality requires strengthening institutional capacity, improving integrated service systems, and increasing responsiveness in policy implementation at ports.

Analysis using the Van Meter and Van Horn (1975) implementation model reinforces these findings through interorganizational communication and socio-economic conditions. The high volume of ship and service user activity at Bitung Port, one of the busiest ports in Eastern Indonesia, creates high operational pressure. Van Meter and Van Horn (1975) emphasized that the characteristics of the implementation environment significantly influence policy implementation outcomes. This condition, if not balanced with adequate service capacity and coordination systems, will always result in a gap between actual service performance and user expectations. Mazmanian and Sabatier (1983) referred to this condition as partial implementation failure, which occurs not because of unclear policies but because of limited capacity of the implementing organization. This is evident in the gap between the normative mandate of the Public Service Law and the reality of service delivery on the ground, where procedures are clear but implementation is hampered by limited resources and coordination.

Based on this analysis, it can be concluded that the implementation of service functions at the Bitung Class I Port Authority (KSOP) still requires significant improvements in terms of speed, transparency, and service integration. Efforts that can be made include increasing the number of service officers during peak hours, developing an electronic queuing system to reduce waiting times, and utilizing information technology to expedite administrative processes. The implementation of a one-stop service system *that* integrates all relevant agencies at the port is an urgent need to address service fragmentation. In addition, it is necessary to socialize service standards and a clear complaint mechanism so that service users can easily access information and submit complaints if services do not meet standards. With these steps , it is hoped that the quality of port services can improve and meet the standards mandated by Law Number 25 of 2009 concerning Public Services.

2. **Determinant Factors in the Implementation of the Policy on Duties and Functions of Seaport Management by KSOP Class I Bitung**

a. **Human Resources**

Human resource issues are one of the most significant determinants in the implementation of port management policies by the Bitung Class I Port Authority (KSOP). Based on the interview results, informant "IS" stated that the limited number of available supervisory personnel is not commensurate with the high volume of activity at the port, so that supervision cannot be carried out comprehensively at all times. Informant "IS" emphasized that this condition has a direct impact on the effectiveness of the implementation of KSOP's duties and functions, especially in terms of monitoring shipping safety and controlling loading and unloading activities. Informant "MK" added that in terms of human resources, the capacity of existing personnel is still not ideal to accommodate the entire operational workload at Bitung Port. In addition to quantity, the technical competence of the apparatus also needs to be continuously improved considering the development of port regulations and service technology that are constantly changing. Informant "MK" emphasized that training and capacity development of the apparatus are urgent needs so that policy implementation can run more optimally.

OPEN ACCESS

From the perspective of Edwards III's (1980) policy implementation theory, resources are a crucial factor because policy implementation will not be effective without the support of adequate personnel, information, authority, and facilities. Edwards III (1980) divides resources into three main components: human resources (staff and expertise), financial resources, and supporting facilities. Research findings showing disparities in HR competency and limited personnel indicate that the resource aspect does not fully support optimal policy implementation. This is in line with Edwards III's statement that if the number of policy implementing staff is limited, then the thing that must be done is to improve *the skills* /abilities of the implementers to carry out the program. In the context of KSOP Bitung, the inability of program implementers is due to the continued development of port policies and the need for specialized technical capabilities, particularly in mastering technology-based service systems and complex shipping safety regulations.

Previous research indicates that human resource issues at KSOP Bitung share a similar pattern with other ports in Indonesia. Research by Mursalin et al. (2021) found that although most public service indicators have performed well, some aspects remain suboptimal due to limited facilities and operational conditions, which are indirectly related to the availability and competence of human resources. Research by Taharuddin et al. (2021) also emphasized that port operational performance is influenced by factors such as facility availability, service times, and other supporting aspects, with human resources playing a key role. This research indicates that high operational costs without adequate resource capacity will directly impact the effectiveness of policy implementation and service quality. Thus, previous research reinforces the finding that strengthening human resources is an absolute prerequisite for improving the performance of public organizations in the port sector.

Normatively, strengthening human resources in port management is regulated in Law Number 17 of 2008 concerning Shipping, which emphasizes that shipping operations must be supported by professional, competent human resources with technical skills in the field of shipping safety and security. Government Regulation Number 31 of 2021 concerning Shipping Management also emphasizes the importance of staff competence in supporting effective and efficient maritime transportation services. However, based on field data, the need to increase staff capacity remains a major challenge due to the rapid development of port service regulations and technology. This situation indicates a gap between normative policies mandating quality human resources and the reality of limited numbers and competencies in the field. Therefore, improving the quality of human resources through education and training is a strategic necessity in supporting the implementation of port management policies.

Based on the analysis, it can be concluded that the limitations in the quantity and competence of human resources are the main obstacles in the implementation of port management policies at KSOP Class I Bitung. Improvement efforts that can be made include: first, conducting a workload analysis *to* determine the ideal number of personnel according to the volume of port activities; second, conducting regular technical training for supervisory and service officers, especially regarding the latest regulations and the use of technology-based systems; third, developing *on-the-job training* and *mentoring programs* to equalize competencies among officers; fourth, recruiting new personnel with appropriate qualifications; and fifth, establishing a competency-based performance assessment system to ensure continuous improvement in human resource quality. With these steps, it is hoped that the human resource capacity of KSOP Class I Bitung can be increased so that the implementation of port management policies can run more effectively and professionally.

b. **Communication and Socialization**

Communication and socialization issues are the second determining factor influencing the implementation of port management policies by the Bitung Class I Port Authority (KSOP). Based on the interview results, informant "MK" stated that understanding of port regulations among implementing officials is still not uniform, and when there are changes or updates to policies, the socialization does not always reach all officers evenly and in a timely manner. Informant "MK" emphasized that this leads to differences in interpretation in the application of procedures in the field, which ultimately can lead to inconsistencies in service to service users. Informant "SM" added that coordination and communication between agencies within the port environment remains a challenge, because each agency has different working mechanisms and procedures. Informant "SM" also revealed that there is no integrated communication *platform* to synchronize the entire service process, so service users often have to go back and forth to several agencies because the information received from one agency is not always synchronized with the other. As a result, there is time and cost inefficiency for service users and the potential for conflict between agencies due to differences in understanding.

OPEN ACCESS

From the perspective of Edwards III's (1980) policy implementation theory, communication is a fundamental variable that must fulfill three main elements: *transmission* , *clarity* , and *consistency* . Edwards III (1980) explained that implementation will be effective if the policy measures and objectives are understood by the individuals responsible for achieving the policy objectives. Research findings indicate that these three elements have not been optimally fulfilled. From the *transmission aspect* , the distribution of policy communication from the center to implementers in the field often experiences distortion because it passes through several levels of bureaucracy. From the *clarity aspect* , policy information is not entirely clear and is confusing for some implementers. From the *consistency aspect* , the instructions or information given sometimes change, causing confusion. Van Meter and Van Horn (1975) also emphasized that inter-organizational communication is one of the key variables influencing the success of policy implementation, and in the context of KSOP Bitung, unintegrated communication is a serious obstacle in the provision of port services.

Previous research indicates that communication and dissemination issues in the implementation of public policies in the port sector are quite common. Research by Mursalin et al. (2021) identified that despite good public service performance, there are still challenges in inter-unit coordination caused by differences in understanding of procedures. Research by Taharuddin et al. (2021) also found that inter-agency coordination is a factor affecting the smooth operation of ports, and the lack of dissemination of new policies often leads to confusion at the implementation level. This research confirms that the effectiveness of public services at ports is greatly influenced by the synergy between internal organizational factors and external factors, with communication acting as a bridge. Thus, previous research reinforces the finding that unintegrated communication can be a serious obstacle in the delivery of port services, and a standardized communication system is needed to address differences in policy interpretation.

Normatively, the importance of coordination and integration of port services has been regulated in the Minister of Transportation Regulation Number PM 157 of 2015 concerning the Implementation of Inaportnet, which aims to create integrated ship and cargo services through an electronic system. This policy is essentially aimed at accelerating services, increasing transparency, and strengthening synchronization between port agencies. However, research results show that the implementation of cross-agency coordination at Bitung Port still faces technical and administrative obstacles, so that the goal of service integration has not been fully achieved. This indicates a gap between normative policies and implementation in the field. Contributing factors include the unavailability of adequate technological infrastructure, the lack of joint commitment between agencies, and the absence of a mechanism for regular evaluation of coordination effectiveness. Therefore, strengthening regulations that are more binding regarding the obligation of each agency to participate in the integrated system is needed.

Based on this analysis, it can be concluded that communication and policy dissemination at the Bitung Class I Port Authority (KSOP) still require significant strengthening. Possible improvements include: first, establishing a systematic and tiered policy dissemination mechanism, starting from the central level to the field implementation level; second, developing an integrated digital communication *platform* accessible to all relevant port agencies; third, holding regular coordination forums (e.g., monthly or quarterly) to discuss implementation challenges and establish a common understanding; fourth, developing a guidebook or *standard operating procedure* (SOP) agreed upon by all agencies; and fifth, conducting regular evaluations of the effectiveness of communication and dissemination through surveys of staff understanding and feedback from service users. With these steps, it is hoped that differences in policy interpretation can be minimized and port services can be run more consistently and integrated.

c. Disposition of Apparatus

The issue of apparatus disposition is the third determinant factor influencing the implementation of port management policies by the Bitung Class I Port Authority (KSOP). Based on the interview results, informant "RK" stated that in general, the commitment of KSOP Class I Bitung apparatus in carrying out their duties is quite good, however, the high workload and operational pressure during peak port activity hours has the potential to affect the consistency of attitudes and responsiveness of officers in providing services. Informant "RK" added that a more structured reward and coaching system is needed so that the commitment and motivation of the apparatus can be maintained consistently. This condition indicates that although individually the apparatus has a good will to carry out its duties, external factors in the form of a high workload can reduce the quality of service. In addition, the lack of a clear reward system is also a factor that influences the motivation of the apparatus to work optimally. In some situations, the apparatus tends to be reactive to service user complaints rather than proactively taking steps to prevent problems, which reflects that the service orientation has not been fully internalized.

OPEN ACCESS

From the perspective of Edwards III's (1980) policy implementation theory, disposition relates to the character, commitment, and willingness of policy implementers to implement policies in accordance with established objectives. Edwards III (1980) emphasized that competence alone is insufficient without the willingness and commitment to implement policies. If implementers have a positive attitude toward policies, implementation will be more effective. Research findings indicate that the disposition of Bitung KSOP officials is generally positive, but needs to be supported by a management system capable of maintaining the consistency of this disposition. Edwards III also identified that disposition can be influenced by three factors: understanding of the policy, the direction of the response (acceptance or rejection), and the intensity of the response. In the context of Bitung KSOP, the officials' understanding of the policy was quite good, but the direction and intensity of the response were still influenced by workload and operational pressure. Van Meter and Van Horn (1975) also emphasized that the attitude of implementers is one of the variables influencing policy implementation, where a positive attitude will encourage successful implementation.

Previous research indicates that the issue of staff disposition in public policy implementation is not unique to the Bitung KSOP. Research by Mursalin et al. (2021) found that although public service performance was generally good, there were still challenges in terms of the comfort of the service environment, partly due to the unresponsiveness of staff during peak hours. Research by Taharuddin et al. (2021) also identified that service user satisfaction is influenced by staff attitudes and behaviors in providing services. This research indicates that staff disposition is a crucial factor in determining the quality of public services, as staff are the spearhead of direct interaction with the public. Furthermore, research in public administration shows that staff work motivation is strongly influenced by a clear reward system and career development. Thus, previous research reinforces the finding that staff disposition is inseparable from the human resource management system that supports it.

Normatively, Law Number 25 of 2009 concerning Public Services mandates that public service providers must place competent implementers with high integrity. Article 15 letter c of the Law requires providers to "place competent implementers" (Indonesia, 2009). In addition, the principle of professionalism as stipulated in Article 4 letter e requires public service officials to work professionally, which includes aspects of competence, integrity, and commitment. However, in the field, there is still a gap between these normative demands and reality, especially regarding the consistency of service attitudes in high-pressure situations. This condition indicates that improving the disposition of officials is not sufficient only through technical training, but also requires a more holistic approach including mental development, development of work culture, and improvement of the performance management system. Therefore, systemic intervention is needed to address the root causes that affect the disposition of officials.

Based on this analysis, it can be concluded that the disposition of KSOP Class I Bitung officers is generally positive but is still influenced by workload and operational pressure. Improvement efforts that can be made include: first, developing a transparent and performance-based *reward system* to motivate officers; second, organizing mental development programs and developing a service culture oriented towards user satisfaction; third, implementing rotation and more equitable assignments to avoid work fatigue (*burnout*) in certain officers; fourth, providing adequate support facilities to reduce operational pressure; and fifth, conducting periodic performance evaluations that involve feedback from service users. In addition, it is important to establish an internal monitoring mechanism that is not punitive but rather focuses on continuous coaching and improvement. With these steps, it is hoped that the disposition of officers can be maintained consistently and the implementation of port management policies can run more effectively.

d. Bureaucratic Structure

Bureaucratic structural issues are the fourth determining factor influencing the implementation of port management policies by the Bitung Class I Port Authority (KSOP). Based on the interview results, informant "SM" stated that there are challenges in terms of synchronizing SOPs between agencies operating at the port, where each agency has its own Standard Operating Procedures that are not always aligned with each other, resulting in sometimes overlapping authority or gaps in handling a problem. Informant "SM" emphasized that the integration of SOPs across agencies is an urgent need to improve the effectiveness of port policy implementation. Informant "MK" added that the fragmentation of authority that occurs in the port environment is a significant structural obstacle, because although the KSOP normatively plays a coordinating role, in practice the formal coordination mechanism is not fully effective. Informant "MK" illustrated that this is reflected in the existence of processes that are still running partially and not integrated, so that service users experience duplication of requirements and the length of time for overall service completion. As a result, there are inefficiencies in time and costs, as well as potential conflicts between agencies in claiming authority.

OPEN ACCESS

From the perspective of Edwards III's (1980) policy implementation theory, bureaucratic structure encompasses two main aspects: *Standard Operating Procedures* (SOPs) and organizational fragmentation. Edwards III (1980) explains that SOPs are guidelines that provide clarity for implementers in carrying out their duties, while organizational fragmentation refers to the distribution of responsibilities between units or agencies that can hinder coordination. Research findings indicate that both aspects remain obstacles to policy implementation at the Bitung KSOP. From the SOP aspect, the lack of uniform procedures between agencies causes confusion for implementers and service users. From the fragmentation aspect, too many agencies involved with overlapping authority cause coordination to be complex and slow. Edwards III emphasized that organizational fragmentation can lead to ineffective policy implementation due to a lack of coordination and cooperation between agencies. In Indonesia, ineffective policy implementation often occurs due to a lack of coordination and cooperation among state and/or government institutions, as reflected in the findings of this study.

Previous research indicates that bureaucratic structure and fragmentation of authority in port administration are quite common issues in Indonesia. Research by Mursalin et al. (2021) identified that inter-agency coordination is one of the obstacles to public services at the Port Authority (KSOP), as each agency has different procedures and authorities. Research by Taharuddin et al. (2021) also found that synchronization between relevant agencies at the port is still suboptimal, which impacts long service times and user dissatisfaction. This research confirms that the effectiveness of public services at the port is greatly influenced by the extent to which the bureaucratic structure can be integrated. Furthermore, research in public administration shows that simplifying the bureaucratic structure and harmonizing standard operating procedures (SOPs) between agencies are crucial steps in improving the quality of public services. Thus, previous research reinforces the finding that fragmentation of authority and lack of synchronization of standard operating procedures (SOPs) are structural barriers that require comprehensive policy intervention.

Normatively, Law Number 25 of 2009 concerning Public Services mandates that public service delivery must be carried out in an integrated manner and oriented towards public satisfaction. Article 4 letters i and l of the Law emphasize the principles of accountability as well as speed, convenience, and affordability in public services (Indonesia, 2009). However, the fragmentation of authority that occurs at Bitung Port contradicts these principles. Furthermore, Minister of Transportation Regulation Number PM 157 of 2015 concerning the Implementation of Inaportnet has actually led to an integration of service systems, but its implementation still faces technical and administrative obstacles. This indicates a gap between normative policies that require integration and the reality of fragmentation on the ground. The root of the problem includes the absence of regulations that explicitly regulate cross-agency coordination mechanisms with clear sanctions for agencies that do not participate, and the failure to develop a collaborative work culture between agencies. Therefore, strengthening more binding regulations and incentive-disincentive mechanisms is needed to encourage integration.

Based on this analysis, it can be concluded that the fragmented bureaucratic structure and the lack of synchronization of SOPs between agencies are significant obstacles in the implementation of port management policies in the Bitung Class I Port Authority (KSOP). Improvement efforts that can be made include: first, harmonizing SOPs between agencies through a coordination forum facilitated by the local government or the Ministry of Transportation; second, developing an integrated one - *stop service system* that integrates all procedures and requirements from various agencies; third, drafting joint regulations or memorandums of understanding (MoUs) between agencies that clearly regulate coordination mechanisms and division of authority; fourth, implementing an integrated management information system that enables *real-time data sharing between agencies* ; and fifth, conducting regular evaluations of the effectiveness of cross-agency coordination through measurable performance indicators. With these steps, it is hoped that fragmentation of authority can be reduced and the port service process can run more effectively, efficiently, and integrated.

CONCLUSION

1. The implementation of the policy on the duties and functions of seaport management by the Bitung Class I Port Authority (KSOP) has not been optimal in the three sub-focuses studied. As a regulator, in accordance with the mandate of Articles 48(b) and 48(c) of Law No. 17/2008, and PM No. 36/2012, the implementation of port regulatory and coordination policies still faces inconsistent regulatory implementation and weak synchronization between agencies. As a supervisor based on Article 48(a), the scope of supervision of ships and loading and unloading activities is not optimal due to limited personnel that is not commensurate with

OPEN ACCESS

the volume of port activities. As the organizer of service functions mandated by Law No. 25/2009, service completion times have not consistently met the established Service Time Standards (SLA), accompanied by low service integration between agencies. Overall, there is a clear implementation gap between the regulatory mandate and the actual implementation capacity of KSOP Class I Bitung .

2. Based on the research results, the implementation of port management policies at the Bitung Class I Port Authority (KSOP) is influenced by four main factors: human resources, communication, staff disposition, and bureaucratic structure. From a human resources perspective, limited personnel and suboptimal technical competency of staff are obstacles to implementation. port supervision and services. From a communication perspective, regulatory dissemination and inter-agency coordination have not been effective and integrated, leading to differing understandings and inconsistent service delivery. From a dispositional perspective, officials are generally committed, but their high workload impacts the consistency and responsiveness of services. Meanwhile, from a bureaucratic structural perspective, fragmented authority and a lack of synchronization of standard operating procedures (SOPs) between agencies have resulted in partial, ineffective service processes and duplication of procedures in port service delivery.

REFERENCES

Edwards III, G. C. (1980). *Implementing public policy*. Congressional Quarterly Press.
Indonesia. (2008). Undang-Undang Nomor 17 Tahun 2008 tentang Pelayaran. Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 2008 Nomor 64. Jakarta: Sekretariat Negara.
Indonesia. (2009). Undang-Undang Nomor 25 Tahun 2009 tentang Pelayanan Publik. Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 2009 Nomor 112. Jakarta: Sekretariat Negara.
Kairupan, S. B. (2023). *Fungsionalisasi privatisasi sektor pariwisata: Suatu fenomenologi kebijakan*. Deepublish.
Kairupan, S. B., & Mowilos, R. (2025). *Analisis kebijakan publik*. Tahta Media Group.
Matland, R. E. (1995). Synthesizing the implementation literature: The ambiguity-conflict model of policy implementation. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 5(2), 145-174.
Mazmanian, D. A., & Sabatier, P. A. (1983). *Implementation and public policy*. Scott Foresman.
Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2017). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
Moleong, L. J. (2019). *Metodologi penelitian kualitatif* (Edisi revisi). Remaja Rosdakarya.
Mursalin, Heriyanto, & Yuliani. (2021). Kinerja pelayanan publik KSOP Kelas IV Bagansiapiapi. *Jurnal Propatria*.
Sugiyono. (2016). *Metode penelitian manajemen*. Alfabeta.
Taharuddin, Fatimah, & Masimin. (2021). Evaluasi kinerja operasional Pelabuhan Malahayati dalam mendukung program Tol Laut. *Jurnal Transportasi Laut*.
Tarore, S. V. (2022). *Dimensi administrasi pemerintah dan restrukturisasi organisasi pemerintah daerah (Konsep, teori dan pemikiran praktis)*. CV. Literasi Nusantara Abadi.
Tumbel, G. H. (2024). *Kebijakan publik: Konsep dan model formulasi, implementasi dan evaluasi kebijakan*. Tangguh Denara Jaya Publisher.
Van Meter, D. S., & Van Horn, C. E. (1975). The policy implementation process: A conceptual framework. *Administration & Society*, 6(4), 445-488.

OPEN ACCESS