



IMPLEMENTATION OF GENERAL PRINCIPLES OF GOOD GOVERNMENT IN THE PROVISION OF PUBLIC SERVICES IN THE CITY OF BANDUNG

Firdaus Arifin

Universitas Pasundan Bandung, Indonesia

Firdaus.Arifin@gmail.com

Received: 03/03/2023 | Revised: 10/03/2023 | Accepted: 25/03/2023 | Published: 30/03/2023

Abstract

This study examines the implementation of the general principles of good governance in public service delivery in Bandung City and formulates an operational model for strengthening legal compliance and service quality. It employs normative legal research using statutory, conceptual, and case approaches, supported by document analysis of national legislation, Bandung municipal legal instruments, public-service standards, and oversight reports. The analysis shows that legal certainty, public interest, impartiality, accuracy, non-abuse of authority, openness, proportionality, professionalism, and accountability must operate as mutually reinforcing standards throughout the service cycle. Bandung has developed digital services, integrated service mechanisms, information disclosure, and complaint channels; However, implementation remains vulnerable to fragmented service standards, unequal digital access, weak feedback loops, and output-oriented accountability. The study proposes an AUPB-based service control model that links published standards, traceable administrative decisions, inclusive access, complaint resolution deadlines, and corrective follow-up. The AUPB model shifts from an abstract ethical reference into measurable legal safeguards for citizens and an internal control framework for municipal agencies.

Keywords : Accountability; Administrative Law; Bandung City; Good Governance; Public Services

INTRODUCTION

Public service is the most tangible form of relationship between government and citizens. The quality of this relationship is determined not only by the speed of service delivery, but also by the legality of decisions, equality of treatment, transparency of information, procedural accuracy, and the availability of corrective mechanisms when citizens are harmed. In a welfare state based on the rule of law, local governments have a positive obligation to ensure that the use of authority produces public benefits while remaining within legal limits. Therefore, the General Principles of Good Governance (AUPB) must be read as a legally binding standard for every stage of service delivery, from establishing requirements to resolving complaints.

The normative basis of the AUPB is primarily found in Law Number 30 of 2014 concerning Government Administration. Article 10 identifies the principles of legal certainty, benefit, impartiality, accuracy, non-abuse of authority, openness, public interest, and good service. Law Number 25 of 2009 concerning Public Services complements it with the principles of public interest, legal certainty, equal rights, balance of rights and obligations, professionalism, participation, equal treatment, openness, accountability, facilities for vulnerable groups, timeliness, as well as speed, ease, and affordability. These two regimes form benchmarks that can be used to assess the legitimacy of actions and the quality of services.

Bandung faces a complex service delivery context as a metropolitan city, a hub for education, commerce, the creative economy, and regional mobility. The diversity of citizen needs makes digitalization and service integration crucial, but technology alone does not guarantee good governance. Digital systems can speed up processes while simultaneously creating exclusion for residents with limited devices, literacy, language, age, or disabilities. Face-to-face services can also leave behind issues of undocumented discretion, differing standards across units, and complaints that fail to lead to systemic improvements. A study by Solechan (2019) positions the AUPB as a legal norm and a tool for protecting citizens in public services. Putrijanti, Leonard, and Utama (2018) show that the AUPB also serves as a testing parameter in state administrative courts. Muhaimin (2018) emphasizes the link between

IMPLEMENTATION OF GENERAL PRINCIPLES OF GOOD GOVERNMENT IN THE PROVISION OF PUBLIC SERVICES IN THE CITY OF BANDUNG

Firdaus Arifin

information transparency and strengthening public service delivery. This literature explains the doctrinal position of the AUPB, but a model is still needed that translates each principle into operational indicators within the city government service cycle. The research problem is how the AUPB is implemented in the provision of public services in Bandung City, what gaps hinder its implementation, and what strengthening model can ensure the AUPB works as legal protection for citizens. The research aims to analyze the relationship between government administration norms and regional service management practices and offer a measurable control framework. The novelty of the research lies in mapping the AUPB based on service stages: standard formation, application receipt, inspection, decision-making, delivery of results, complaints, and corrective follow-up.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The AUPB evolved from an unwritten principle limiting government freedom of action into a positive norm and a basis for testing administrative actions. Its function is dual. For officials, the AUPB serves as a guideline for exercising authority; for citizens, it serves as a basis for demanding explanations, objections, or redress. Legal certainty demands consistency between the basis for authority, procedures, and outcomes. Accuracy requires the examination of facts and relevant documents. The prohibition on abuse of authority prevents the use of competence for deviant purposes. Transparency and impartiality ensure decisions are understandable and non-discriminatory (Solechan, 2019; Suratno, 2017).

The concept of good service is not synonymous with staff friendliness. Legally, good service requires announced standards, relevant requirements, legitimate fees, definite timeframes, competent staff, and effective complaints procedures. Accountability does not stop at reporting service volumes; providers must be able to explain the reasons for decisions, track processes, resource use, and corrective actions. Performance measurement supports good governance when performance information can be used by the public and decision-makers to assess the alignment between mandates, processes, and outcomes (Ulum, 2011).

Digital government transforms the medium of service delivery, but it does not eliminate legal obligations. Electronic systems need to be designed with the principle of legality by design, ensuring that the basis for authorization, authentication, data protection, accessibility, notification, and audit records are embedded in the process. Openness must be distinguished from unrestricted data disclosure; information relevant to applicants needs to be available, while personal data must be protected. Non-digital channels are still needed as reasonable accommodations for groups unable to use applications.

The effectiveness of AUPB can be analyzed through three layers. The first layer is formal compliance, which involves the availability of rules and service standards. The second layer is process compliance, which involves the consistency of officers and systems in implementing standards. The third layer is outcome fairness, which involves accessible services, reasoned decisions, and tangible remedies. This distinction is important because a service unit can have complete documentation but still experience delays, discrimination, or unclear decisions.

The research framework links AUPB norms with service user rights and control mechanisms. Implementation is deemed robust if each principle has indicators, evidence of implementation, responsible parties, and corrective pathways. Thus, assessments rely not on general claims about innovation but rather on auditable evidence and citizen experiences.

METHOD

This research uses a normative juridical method with a statutory, conceptual, and policy case approach. Primary legal materials include the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia, Law Number 25 of 2009, Law Number 30 of 2014, Law Number 23 of 2014 and its amendments, Law Number 14 of 2008, and Bandung City legal products related to service standards. Secondary materials consist of journal articles, public service monitoring reports, and relevant institutional publications.

Data collection was conducted through document analysis. The analysis employed grammatical and systematic interpretation to compare elements of the AUPB with the obligations of service providers. Document data from Bandung City was used to identify institutional design and service instruments, not to claim satisfaction levels that were not tested through surveys. The validity of the analysis was maintained through triangulation of norms, doctrines, and supervisory documents. The results were presented in a prescriptive-analytical manner in a matrix of principles, indicators, risks, and strengthening actions.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The Position of AUPB in the Bandung City Service Cycle

Implementation of the AUPB must begin before citizens submit a request. During the design phase, city governments are required to ensure that the type of service, authorized officials, requirements, costs, timeframes, and service products are legally based. Requirements that are not directly related to the service's purpose violate the principles of legal certainty, utility, and proportionality. Standards must be published in clear and consistent language at counters, websites, and applications to prevent citizens from receiving conflicting information across channels.

At the admissions and verification stage, the principles of impartiality and due diligence demand equal treatment and traceable examinations. Electronic queuing and registration systems can reduce the scope for preferential treatment, but exceptions for vulnerable groups should be framed as legitimate accommodations, not favoritism. Any missing documents should be communicated promptly, along with the reasons and basis for the requirements, to avoid repeated visits due to incomplete information.

At the decision-making stage, officials must act within the limits of attribution, delegation, or mandate. Decisions to reject require specific factual and legal justification. Providing justifications strengthens accountability, allows citizens to exercise their right to object, and facilitates internal and external oversight. Automated actions by digital systems must still be attributable to the responsible official or government agency; algorithmic errors should not negate the right to human correction.

At the stage of delivering results and complaints, timeliness must be linked to status notifications and automatic escalation when deadlines are missed. Complaints are not just a communication channel, but also a legal control instrument. Each report should have a registration number, problem classification, response deadline, responsible official, reason for resolution, and a complaint mechanism. Repeated complaint patterns should be used to improve system standards and design.

Table 1. Operationalization of AUPB in Bandung City Public Services

Principle	Operational Indicator	Primary Risk	Control
Legal certainty	The basis for authority, conditions, costs, and time of publication are consistent.	Additional terms and conditions subject to change without notice	Single standard list and version audit
Accuracy	Verification of documented facts and the applicant receives a list of deficiencies at once	Decisions based on incomplete data	Checklist, peer review, and audit records
Impartiality	Transparent queues and equal treatment with accommodation for vulnerable groups	Informal discrimination or priority	Queue log and access equality test
Openness	Status, decision reasons, and objection channels are easily accessible.	Information differs between channels	Synchronization of information and notifications
Do not abuse authority	Decisions in accordance with the purpose of granting authority	Discretion for personal/group interests	Declaration of conflict of interest and supervision
Accountability	Responsible parties, result indicators, and corrections can be traced	Reporting only counts output	Complaint results and follow-up dashboard

Institutional Achievements and Vulnerability Points

The Bandung City service ecosystem demonstrates a direction of integration through the use of service websites, information channels, open data, and integrated services. This direction supports transparency and convenience, especially if residents can check requirements and status without repeated visits. However, the existence of a platform alone is not sufficient to demonstrate the implementation of the AUPB. Quality is determined by data consistency, interoperability, security, accessibility, and the ability of officers to resolve cases that do not follow standard procedures.

The first vulnerability is fragmentation. Each regional government can develop its own standards, applications, and terminology, resulting in a heterogeneous citizen experience. Fragmentation creates uncertainty and shifts the burden of coordination to the requester. City governments need to establish a common standard service architecture: a single service identity, data catalog, decision reasoning format, and complaint service level.

The second vulnerability is the access gap. Digital services need to provide disability-friendly designs, staff assistance, alternative counters, and secure authorization mechanisms. The principle of equal rights does not mean everyone is forced to use the same channels, but rather that everyone has an equal opportunity to achieve service outcomes. Performance measurement therefore needs to disaggregate completion times by channel and user group to identify hidden barriers.

The third vulnerability is accountability focused on output. The number of completed applications does not address the extent to which rejections are justified, complaints are resolved, and recurring issues are addressed. The Indonesian Ombudsman noted nationally that local governments were the most frequently complained-about agency group in 2024, with prolonged delays, failure to provide services, and procedural irregularities dominating the types of maladministration resolved. This national data cannot be equated with the conditions in Bandung City, but it is relevant as a risk map that the city government must anticipate.

The fourth vulnerability is weak learning from complaints. Complaint units are often separated from the service process owners, so individual resolutions do not result in procedural changes. The AUPB demands corrective accountability: agencies must not only respond to the complainant but also identify the root cause, improve standards, test the effectiveness of the improvements, and announce changes that impact the public.

AUPB-Based Service Control Strengthening Model

The proposed model consists of five elements. First, legal standardization that maps each service to the basis of authority, purpose, requirements, costs, time, officials, and administrative effort. Second, traceability using service case numbers, change logs, decision rationales, and communication records. Third, inclusion testing before implementing system or procedural changes to assess their impact on people with disabilities, seniors, applicants without devices, and language groups.

Fourth, a complaint-to-reform loop that links complaint classification with process owners, resolution deadlines, root cause analysis, and verification of corrective actions. Fifth, a public accountability dashboard that does not reveal personal data but displays compliance timelines, reasons for delays, appeal success rates, repeat complaints, and improvements made. The dashboard should include indicator definitions for understandable and comparable figures.

Internal oversight is conducted by officials' superiors, the inspectorate, and the service compliance unit; external oversight is conducted by the Regional People's Representative Council (DPRD), the Ombudsman, the judiciary, the media, and the public. This division should be complementary. Ombudsman findings and court decisions need to be translated into standard updates across all units facing similar risks. The DPRD can use complaint data and service performance in budget discussions and policy evaluations without delving into individual technical decisions.

Theoretically, this model combines rule-based and outcome-based approaches. Compliance with procedures remains crucial because it protects citizens from arbitrariness, while evaluation of outcomes ensures procedures do not become mere formalities. The AUPB serves as a bridge: the principle allows for contextual assessment while simultaneously limiting discretion through reason, evidence, proportionality, and corrective mechanisms.

Integration of AUPB with Service Standards and Protection of Citizens' Rights

Service standards are the intersection of administrative norms and user experience. Standard documents should outline the legal basis, requirements, procedures, timeframes, fees, service products, complaint channels, and security guarantees. From an AUPB perspective, each component serves a protective function. The legal basis limits authority; requirements prevent arbitrary document requests; deadlines protect citizens from delays; cost information blocks the opportunity for unauthorized charges; and complaint mechanisms provide avenues for correction. Standards that are kept solely as administrative documents do not meet the principles of transparency and good service if they cannot be found or understood by users.

Legal certainty also demands alignment between standards across channels. Information listed on websites, apps, counters, social media, and officer explanations must be sourced from the same database. If procedures change, the old version should be withdrawn and the new version's effective date announced. Version control is crucial because discrepancies in information can result in travel costs, lost work time, and delays in fulfilling rights. In this context, citizen losses are not always direct financial losses, but also administrative burdens that could have been prevented. The principle of accuracy requires data quality and adequate auditing. City governments need to ensure that population, licensing, tax, social assistance, education, and health data are used for their intended purpose and updated

IMPLEMENTATION OF GENERAL PRINCIPLES OF GOOD GOVERNMENT IN THE PROVISION OF PUBLIC SERVICES IN THE CITY OF BANDUNG

Firdaus Arifin

through legitimate mechanisms. Decisions based on inaccurate data can lead to undue exclusion or rejection. Therefore, applicants should be given the opportunity to correct data, provide clarification, and receive an explanation of the source of the information used to base their decisions, provided it does not include excluded information. The principle of impartiality relates to both procedural design and officer behavior. The risk of discrimination can arise from seemingly neutral requirements that have a more severe impact on certain groups. Required repeated attendance, for example, places a greater burden on people with disabilities, daily workers, the elderly, or those living far from service centers. City governments should conduct equality impact assessments of new procedures and provide proportionate accommodations. Preferential treatment aimed at achieving equal access does not conflict with impartiality as long as the criteria are objective, transparent, and accountable.

The principle of public interest requires the government to balance organizational efficiency with citizen rights. Reducing physical counters may reduce costs, but it could disadvantage groups unable to access digital services. Such decisions should be preceded by user mapping, accessibility testing, a transition period, and the provision of assistance. Benefit must be assessed from the public's perspective, not solely from the agency's internal convenience. Efficiency that shifts burdens to citizens cannot be considered a successful service.

Transparency must be implemented alongside personal data protection. Citizens have the right to know the procedures, application status, responsible officials, reasons for decisions, and how to file objections. However, transparency does not justify the disclosure of applicants' personal data or sensitive information. City governments should implement role-based access restrictions, internal user activity logging, data retention periods, and incident handling procedures. Thus, transparency is directed at processes and accountability, while confidentiality is directed at data that must be protected.

Good service also depends on the competence and ethics of staff. Training should not only cover application usage but also cover the basics of authority, conflicts of interest, decision communication, handling vulnerable groups, and complaints procedures. Employee evaluations should measure decision accuracy and problem-solving ability, not just speed and volume of service. Unrealistic time targets can encourage superficial examinations, while volume targets can overlook the complexity of cases. Performance systems must maintain a balance between speed, accuracy, and fairness.

From a redress perspective, complaints need to be differentiated into requests for information, quality complaints, objections to decisions, reports of alleged maladministration, and reports of integrity violations. Each category requires different officials, procedures, and deadlines. Combining all reports under one general category results in legal issues being treated as ordinary service complaints. Proper classification helps the government determine whether resolution requires explanations, data corrections, the issuance of new decisions, internal audits, or referrals to other agencies.

Table 2. Stages of AUPB-Based Service Control

Service Stage	Legal Safeguard	Evidence of Compliance	Corrective Mechanism
Design	Relevant terms, valid costs, proportional time	Standard scripts and impact tests	Revise standards before implementation
Application	Complete registration and deficiency information	Receipt and checklist	File repair without repetition is not necessary
Assessment	Careful and conflict-free examination	Conflict declaration and verification log	Re-examination by different officials
Decision	Factual and legal reasons can be understood	Decision and record of approval	Objection or correction of decision
Complaint	Deadlines, responsible persons, and tracked results	Register and evidence of follow-up	Individual recovery and process reform

Implications of Performance Monitoring and Evaluation

Evaluation of AUPB implementation requires both quantitative and qualitative indicators. Quantitative indicators can include timeliness, reapplication rate, percentage of rejections with reasons, number of objections granted, and repeat complaints. Qualitative indicators assess the clarity of information, access to vulnerable groups, relevance of requirements, quality of justification, and effectiveness of remedies. The combination of the two prevents erroneous conclusions based solely on speed or satisfaction level. Regional inspectorates can develop risk-based service audits. Audits should include not only document compliance but also sample decision files, inter-channel consistency, accessibility, and the effectiveness of follow-up. Findings should be categorized according to the level

IMPLEMENTATION OF GENERAL PRINCIPLES OF GOOD GOVERNMENT IN THE PROVISION OF PUBLIC SERVICES IN THE CITY OF BANDUNG

Firdaus Arifin

of impact on citizens' rights. Violations that demonstrate patterns, conflicts of interest, or abuse of authority require stronger correction than administrative errors that can be quickly corrected. Public participation should be integrated into the design and evaluation stages, not just when complaints arise. Public consultation forums can assess whether requirements are easily understood, the timeline is realistic, and the channels are usable. Consultation results should be accompanied by a response matrix detailing accepted or rejected proposals and the reasons for those decisions. This mechanism transforms participation from a ceremonial activity into an integral part of service policy accountability.

CONCLUSION

The implementation of the AUPB in Bandung City's public services must be understood as a legal obligation that operates throughout the service cycle, not simply an ethical value or innovation slogan. Digitalization, integrated services, information transparency, and complaint channels are essential infrastructure, but their effectiveness depends on consistent standards, reasoned decisions, protection of vulnerable groups, audit records, and corrective follow-up. Key risk points lie in fragmentation between units, the digital divide, output-based accountability, and the disconnect between complaints and process reform.

The Bandung City Government needs to develop a single standard catalog, decision-making rationale format, inclusion test, complaint deadline, and public accountability dashboard. The Inspectorate should audit process compliance and correction quality, not just document completeness. The Regional People's Representative Council (DPRD) and the public can use the same indicators to objectively monitor services. This strengthening will ensure that the AUPB can be tested using the same evidence by officials, supervisors, and service users.

The legal implication is that service violations cannot always be viewed as managerial deficiencies. Unclear authority, additional requirements, unjustified delays, unequal treatment, inaccurate decisions, or unfounded denials can constitute violations of the AUPB and public service obligations. City governments need to ensure that administrative remedies are available as early as possible so that citizens can recover losses without always having to wait for resolution through external institutions or the courts.

The practical implications of this research place regional government leaders as service risk owners. Each leader needs to assess information consistency, decision-making patterns, access to vulnerable groups, complaint performance, and the causes of recurring problems. The Inspectorate's role is to test the effectiveness of controls; the technology unit ensures system traceability and security; and the service unit is responsible for providing explanations and remediation. A clear division of roles prevents complaints from being redirected to frontline officers who lack the authority to fix the system.

This research is limited to normative analysis and available documents, so it does not measure actual user experiences in each regional government agency. Further research should incorporate file audits, user surveys, interviews with vulnerable groups, observations of digital and in-person channels, and analysis of appeal decisions. Such empirical testing can determine indicator weights and compare disparities across service types. Nevertheless, the formulated framework provides a basis for evaluation that can be used without waiting for larger disputes or maladministration.

REFERENCES

- Ibad, S. (2021). Hukum administrasi negara dalam upaya penyelenggaraan pemerintahan yang baik. *HUKMY: Jurnal Hukum*, 1(1), 55–72. <https://doi.org/10.35316/hukmy.2021.v1i1.55-72>
- Muhaimin, M. (2018). Penguatan penyelenggaraan pelayanan publik melalui penyelesaian sengketa informasi publik. *Jurnal Ilmiah Kebijakan Hukum*, 12(2), 213–226. <https://doi.org/10.30641/kebijakan.2018.v12.213-226>
- Ombudsman Republik Indonesia. (2024). Ringkasan eksekutif hasil penilaian kepatuhan penyelenggaraan pelayanan publik tahun 2024.
- Ombudsman Republik Indonesia. (2025). Jumlah laporan masyarakat ke Ombudsman RI meningkat.
- Putrijanti, A., Leonard, L. T., & Utama, K. W. (2018). Peran PTUN dan AUPB menuju tata kelola pemerintahan yang baik. *Mimbar Hukum*, 30(2), 277–290. <https://doi.org/10.22146/jmh.33056>
- Republik Indonesia. (1945). Undang-Undang Dasar Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 1945.
- Republik Indonesia. (2008). Undang-Undang Nomor 14 Tahun 2008 tentang Keterbukaan Informasi Publik.
- Republik Indonesia. (2009). Undang-Undang Nomor 25 Tahun 2009 tentang Pelayanan Publik.
- Republik Indonesia. (2014). Undang-Undang Nomor 23 Tahun 2014 tentang Pemerintahan Daerah.
- Republik Indonesia. (2014). Undang-Undang Nomor 30 Tahun 2014 tentang Administrasi Pemerintahan.

IMPLEMENTATION OF GENERAL PRINCIPLES OF GOOD GOVERNMENT IN THE PROVISION OF PUBLIC SERVICES IN THE CITY OF BANDUNG

Firdaus Arifin

- Solechan, S. (2019). Asas-asas umum pemerintahan yang baik dalam pelayanan publik. *Administrative Law and Governance Journal*, 2(3), 541–557. <https://doi.org/10.14710/alj.v2i3.541-557>
- Suratno, S. B. (2017). Pembentukan peraturan kebijakan berdasarkan asas-asas umum pemerintahan yang baik. *Lentera Hukum*, 4(3), 164–174. <https://doi.org/10.19184/ejlh.v4i3.5499>
- Tumuhulawa, A., & Moonti, R. M. (2021). The authority of government officials in delegating and mandating. *Unnes Law Journal*, 7(1). <https://doi.org/10.15294/ulj.v7i1.38705>
- Ulum, A. S. (2011). Peran pengukuran kinerja dalam mendukung good governance dalam perspektif agency theory. *Jurnal Dinamika Akuntansi*, 3(1). <https://doi.org/10.15294/jda.v3i1.1945>
- Widjiastuti, A. (2017). Peran AAUPB dalam mewujudkan penyelenggaraan pemerintahan yang bersih dan bebas dari KKN. *Perspektif*, 22(2), 96–110.