

The Role of Intelligence-Led Policing in Combating Transnational Crime in Indonesia

Putri Anindita*

Universitas Islam Bandung, Bandung, Indonesia
putrianinditas_mhsunisba@gmail.com

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.65815/sm5kbg50>

Submitted: 29-08-2025

Revised: 12-09-2025, 20-11-2025

Accepted: 28-12-2025

*Corresponding Author

Abstract

Transnational crime presents complex challenges for law enforcement because criminal networks increasingly operate across jurisdictions and exploit technological, geographical, and institutional vulnerabilities. Intelligence-led policing offers a strategic approach by integrating information analysis, risk assessment, and operational decision-making. This study examines the role of intelligence-led policing in addressing transnational crime in Indonesia. Using qualitative analysis of institutional frameworks, policy documents, and selected law enforcement practices, the study explores how intelligence contributes to crime detection, prevention, and operational prioritisation. The analysis identifies the importance of information sharing, analytical capacity, inter-agency cooperation, and coordination across national borders. At the same time, institutional fragmentation, uneven technological capabilities, information-sharing constraints, and concerns regarding data governance may limit the effectiveness of intelligence-led approaches. The study argues that intelligence-led policing should be developed as an integrated organisational model rather than simply as the expansion of intelligence capabilities. Effective implementation requires analytical professionalism, clear governance arrangements, inter-agency coordination, and appropriate safeguards for individual rights. The study contributes to research on policing and transnational crime by examining how intelligence-led approaches can be adapted to Indonesia's geographical and institutional context.

*[Kejahatan transnasional menghadirkan tantangan kompleks bagi penegak hukum karena jaringan kriminal semakin beroperasi melintasi yurisdiksi serta memanfaatkan kerentanan teknologi, geografis, dan kelembagaan. Pemolisian berbasis intelijen (*intelligence-led policing*) menawarkan pendekatan strategis dengan mengintegrasikan analisis informasi, penilaian risiko, dan pengambilan keputusan operasional. Studi ini mengkaji peran pemolisian berbasis intelijen dalam menangani kejahatan transnasional di Indonesia. Melalui analisis kualitatif terhadap kerangka kelembagaan, dokumen kebijakan, dan praktik penegakan hukum tertentu, studi ini*

mengeksplorasi bagaimana intelijen berkontribusi pada deteksi kejahatan, pencegahan, dan penentuan prioritas operasional. Analisis ini mengidentifikasi pentingnya pertukaran informasi, kapasitas analitis, kerja sama antarlembaga, dan koordinasi lintas batas negara. Di sisi lain, fragmentasi kelembagaan, kemampuan teknologi yang tidak merata, kendala pertukaran informasi, dan kekhawatiran terkait tata kelola data dapat membatasi efektivitas pendekatan berbasis intelijen. Studi ini berargumen bahwa pemolisian berbasis intelijen sebaiknya dikembangkan sebagai model organisasi yang terintegrasi, bukan sekadar sebagai perluasan kemampuan intelijen. Implementasi yang efektif memerlukan profesionalisme analitis, pengaturan tata kelola yang jelas, koordinasi antarlembaga, serta perlindungan yang memadai bagi hak-hak individu. Studi ini memberikan kontribusi pada penelitian mengenai pemolisian dan kejahatan transnasional dengan mengkaji bagaimana pendekatan berbasis intelijen dapat disesuaikan dengan konteks geografis dan kelembagaan Indonesia.]

Keywords: intelligence-led policing, transnational crime, police intelligence, law enforcement, Indonesia

Introduction

Transnational crime has become increasingly difficult to address through conventional policing because criminal activity can be organized, financed, communicated, and executed across multiple jurisdictions. Global mobility and digital connectivity have reduced the significance of territorial boundaries for criminal networks while leaving law-enforcement authority largely organized around national jurisdictions. In Southeast Asia, these conditions are particularly significant because criminal activities such as narcotics trafficking, human trafficking, migrant smuggling, money laundering, cyber-enabled fraud, and maritime smuggling operate through interconnected regional networks. Indonesia occupies an important position within this environment because of its extensive archipelagic geography, major ports, international transportation links, and proximity to several regional trafficking corridors. Research on Indonesian transnational crime has identified narcotics trafficking, human trafficking, money laundering, and terrorism among the major forms of organized transnational criminality affecting the country (Harkrisnowo 2021; Naseh et al. 2019).

The changing structure of criminality creates a fundamental problem for police organizations: information is increasingly abundant, but actionable knowledge remains scarce. Intelligence-led policing responds to this problem by distinguishing raw information from evaluated intelligence and by connecting intelligence analysis to strategic and operational decision-making. Ratcliffe conceptualizes ILP as a policing framework in which intelligence and analysis influence decisions concerning crime problems, offenders, risks, and resource

allocation (Ratcliffe 2016). The significance of the approach therefore lies not simply in collecting more information but in establishing an organizational process through which information is assessed, interpreted, prioritized, and translated into action. Contemporary research reinforces this distinction. A scoping review of experimental and quasi-experimental ILP research found that much of the empirical literature concentrates on using crime intelligence to improve deployment and crime-reduction interventions, while relatively less attention has been devoted to broader organizational and secondary effects (Khalifa and Hardyns 2024).

For Indonesia, the relevance of ILP is also embedded in the country's legal and institutional framework. Law No. 2 of 2002 establishes the Indonesian National Police as an institution responsible for maintaining public security and order, enforcing the law, and providing protection and services to society, while Law No. 17 of 2011 establishes a broader national intelligence framework emphasizing early detection, early warning, professionalism, democratic values, legality, and respect for human rights (Republic of Indonesia 2002; Republic of Indonesia 2011). Indonesia's ratification of the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime through Law No. 5 of 2009 further recognizes international cooperation as an important component of combating organized transnational criminality (Republic of Indonesia 2009). These legal foundations indicate that intelligence, policing, and international cooperation cannot be treated as isolated institutional functions. Instead, they form interconnected components of a broader governance architecture for responding to criminal threats that move across organizational and national boundaries.

Despite this institutional foundation, the implementation of intelligence-led policing in Indonesia requires further analytical examination. The central issue is not whether police intelligence is necessary, but whether intelligence is sufficiently integrated into organizational decision-making and cross-border operational cooperation. Indonesia's experience also demonstrates that transnational crime cannot be addressed solely through domestic enforcement because criminal networks exploit differences in legislation, jurisdiction, border control, investigative capacity, and information systems. ASEAN frameworks have consequently emphasized intelligence exchange, inter-agency coordination, joint investigations, mutual legal assistance, and capacity building as essential components of regional responses to transnational crime. The 2025 ASEAN Plan of Action in Combatting Transnational Crime continues this trajectory by emphasizing enhanced cooperation and institutional capacity among member states (ASEAN 2025). The research problem addressed in this study is therefore how ILP can function as an integrated mechanism connecting intelligence production, police decision-making, institutional coordination, and international cooperation within Indonesia's specific security environment.

Literature Review

Intelligence-led policing emerged as a response to limitations associated with reactive and incident-driven policing. Rather than waiting for crimes to occur and subsequently responding to reported incidents, ILP emphasizes the systematic identification of threats, risks, criminal networks, and recurring patterns. Ratcliffe's 3-i model conceptualizes ILP through the interaction of interpretation, influence, and impact, emphasizing that intelligence must be interpreted analytically, influence decision-makers, and ultimately contribute to measurable changes in criminal activity or harm (Ratcliffe 2016). This theoretical perspective is particularly relevant to transnational crime because the objects of policing are often networks rather than isolated offenders. Criminal intelligence can reveal relationships between actors, financial structures, transportation routes, communication patterns, and geographical vulnerabilities that may not be visible through individual case investigation. ILP therefore provides a conceptual bridge between fragmented information and strategic intervention. Its analytical value lies in changing the question from "what crime has occurred?" to "what criminal threat is developing, how is it organized, and where can intervention produce the greatest disruption?"

The empirical literature, however, cautions against treating ILP as automatically effective. Khalfa and Hardyns' review of 38 experimental and quasi-experimental studies found that ILP research has frequently concentrated on spatial and temporal intelligence used to improve deployment, while fewer studies examine the full organizational intelligence cycle or broader measures of disruption (Khalfa and Hardyns 2024). Earlier scholarship similarly observed a persistent gap between the rhetoric of intelligence-led policing and its actual organizational implementation, particularly when policing models developed in one institutional context are transferred to another without sufficient adaptation (Ratcliffe 2002). This observation is important for Indonesia because institutional structures, legal arrangements, geographical conditions, organizational cultures, and inter-agency relationships differ significantly from those of the jurisdictions in which many ILP models were originally developed. The analytical implication is that ILP should not be understood as a standardized technological package. Instead, it should be regarded as an organizational philosophy whose effectiveness depends on institutional capacity, analytical competence, leadership, information quality, and the ability to connect intelligence with operational decisions.

Information sharing represents another central dimension of contemporary ILP. Transnational criminal networks are inherently capable of exploiting information asymmetries between agencies and jurisdictions, meaning that an agency may possess only a fragment of a criminal network's activities. Research on intelligence sharing in transnational serious and organized crime emphasizes that globalization, digital communication, international mobility, and increasingly complex criminal networks require stronger collaboration among police, intelligence, border, customs, financial, and justice institutions (Phythian and Kirby

2025). ASEAN policy frameworks have similarly emphasized information and intelligence exchange, inter-agency coordination, and cooperation with international organizations as components of regional transnational crime prevention. The 2025 ASEAN Plan of Action provides a contemporary institutional framework for this direction, while Indonesia's role in the 2023 ASEAN Ministerial Meeting on Transnational Crime demonstrated the country's commitment to information exchange, joint investigations, mutual legal assistance, and other cooperative mechanisms (ASEAN 2025; Indonesian National Police 2023).

Methods

This study employs a qualitative documentary research design to examine the role of intelligence-led policing in combating transnational crime in Indonesia. The research does not attempt to measure the statistical effect of ILP on crime rates; rather, it analyzes how intelligence functions within the institutional, legal, and cooperative architecture of law enforcement. The primary analytical materials consist of Indonesian legislation concerning policing, intelligence, and transnational organized crime; ASEAN policy documents concerning transnational crime cooperation; official materials published by Indonesian law-enforcement institutions; and peer-reviewed academic literature concerning ILP, criminal intelligence, information sharing, and transnational organized crime. The analysis covers materials available through 2025 in accordance with the study's temporal limitation. Particular attention is given to the relationship between intelligence production and operational decision-making, the role of information exchange in cross-border enforcement, and institutional factors affecting implementation. This documentary strategy is appropriate because ILP is simultaneously an organizational concept, an operational practice, and a governance mechanism requiring analysis across institutional levels.

The analytical procedure follows a thematic approach. Relevant documents were examined to identify recurring concepts concerning intelligence collection, analysis, prioritization, inter-agency cooperation, international information exchange, operational decision-making, and governance safeguards. These themes were subsequently interpreted through the conceptual framework of ILP and the institutional context of Indonesian policing. The analysis also distinguishes between the existence of formal cooperation mechanisms and their practical capacity to generate actionable intelligence. This distinction is necessary because legal instruments and institutional agreements can establish channels for cooperation without necessarily guaranteeing rapid, reliable, or interoperable information exchange. The study therefore evaluates ILP not simply according to whether intelligence functions exist, but according to whether intelligence can move effectively from collection to analysis, from analysis to decision-making, and from national institutions to international partners. The resulting interpretation is

designed to identify both the strategic potential and institutional limitations of ILP as an approach to transnational crime in Indonesia.

Analysis and Discussion

A. Intelligence-Led Policing as a Strategic Architecture for Transnational Crime

The first finding is that ILP can provide Indonesia with a strategic architecture for moving from reactive law enforcement toward anticipatory and risk-oriented policing. Transnational criminal organizations often operate through distributed networks in which planners, financiers, facilitators, transporters, intermediaries, and local actors perform different functions. Conventional case-based policing may successfully identify individual offenders without fully revealing the structure connecting them. Intelligence analysis can address this limitation by integrating information from investigations, border control, financial transactions, immigration records, cyber investigations, community reports, and international partners. The purpose is not simply to produce larger quantities of data but to identify relationships and patterns that can inform prioritization. Ratcliffe's framework is useful here because intelligence becomes meaningful only when interpretation influences decision-makers and produces an operational impact (Ratcliffe 2016). In the Indonesian context, this means that police intelligence should contribute to strategic assessments of criminal networks and emerging threats rather than remain separated from investigative and operational structures.

The strategic value of ILP becomes particularly evident in relation to narcotics trafficking and maritime crime. Indonesia's geographical characteristics create numerous opportunities for criminal networks to exploit maritime routes, unofficial landing points, and jurisdictional boundaries. Research on narcotics smuggling between Indonesia and Malaysia has identified maritime routes, informal ports, limited surveillance, and operational vulnerabilities as factors facilitating cross-border trafficking (Prayuda 2020). Such conditions illustrate why intelligence-led approaches are relevant: the police response cannot depend exclusively on discovering narcotics after they enter Indonesian territory. Intelligence can instead support the identification of trafficking routes, recurring logistical patterns, intermediaries, financial relationships, and potential points of disruption. The objective is therefore to shift enforcement attention from isolated seizures toward the broader criminal ecosystem that makes trafficking possible. This does not eliminate the need for conventional investigation or patrol activity; rather, it provides a strategic basis for determining where those activities should be concentrated and how separate cases can be connected into a broader understanding of organized criminal networks.

The same logic applies to cyber-enabled transnational crime, where traditional geographical indicators become less useful. Criminal groups can recruit victims, communicate with collaborators, transfer funds, and manage illicit operations through digital platforms while their members remain dispersed across

jurisdictions. Indonesia's own statements to the United Nations have recognized the exploitation of digital technologies by criminal groups, including online scams, ransomware, illicit drug marketing, and other cyber-enabled offenses (Government of Indonesia 2023). Under such circumstances, intelligence analysis must combine traditional police information with digital and financial intelligence. The role of the analyst becomes increasingly important because the central challenge is not merely obtaining digital evidence but determining which fragments of information indicate an organized network, repeated modus operandi, or emerging threat. The growing mobility and technological sophistication of transnational offenders similarly require law-enforcement organizations to develop new approaches to information sharing and analytical integration (Phythian and Kirby 2025). ILP therefore provides an institutional mechanism for integrating these heterogeneous forms of intelligence into operational priorities.

B. Information Sharing and Cross-Border Cooperation as the Operational Core

The second finding is that information sharing constitutes the operational core of ILP in transnational crime enforcement. A criminal network rarely exists entirely within the jurisdiction of one police organization. Information concerning a suspect may be held by an immigration authority, financial intelligence institution, customs agency, local police unit, foreign police organization, or international coordination mechanism. If these information fragments remain institutionally isolated, the resulting intelligence picture is incomplete. ASEAN's transnational crime framework has long recognized this problem by emphasizing information exchange, intelligence sharing, institutional networking, joint investigations, and cooperation among police, customs, immigration, and other agencies. The 2025 ASEAN Plan of Action continues to frame regional cooperation and institutional capacity as necessary responses to transnational crime (ASEAN 2025). For Indonesia, this means that ILP should be designed around interoperable information relationships rather than a single centralized intelligence capability. The strategic advantage of intelligence emerges precisely when different institutional fragments can be connected lawfully, securely, and rapidly.

Indonesia's participation in ASEAN and international policing mechanisms provides an institutional foundation for this model. During the 17th ASEAN Ministerial Meeting on Transnational Crime in 2023, Indonesian authorities emphasized information exchange, technology integration, capacity building, police cooperation, joint investigations, mutual legal assistance, and extradition as components of regional action against transnational crime. The Labuan Bajo Declaration further emphasized direct cooperation among law-enforcement agencies and mechanisms such as police-to-police cooperation and evidence transfer (Indonesian National Police 2023). These mechanisms are consistent with the logic of ILP because intelligence-led enforcement requires timely access to information beyond the immediate jurisdiction of the investigating agency.

However, cooperation should not be evaluated solely by the number of agreements or meetings established. Its practical value depends on whether information can be transformed into actionable intelligence and whether agencies have sufficient trust, compatible procedures, trained personnel, and technical capacity to use shared information effectively.

Cross-border intelligence cooperation also requires attention to the difference between information exchange and intelligence integration. Information exchange may involve transmitting a name, document, alert, or investigative request, whereas intelligence integration requires assessing the reliability, relevance, context, and implications of information for operational decision-making. This distinction becomes important when information originates from different legal systems and institutional cultures. Pythian and Kirby argue that the increasing mobility of criminal actors requires new paradigms of information sharing, including greater use of technological tools and analytical capabilities, while also recognizing the cultural challenges created by such changes (Pythian and Kirby 2025). Indonesia therefore requires not only communication channels but also institutional arrangements capable of interpreting information consistently across agencies. National Central Bureau mechanisms, ASEAN cooperation, bilateral police relationships, and mutual legal assistance arrangements can provide channels, but analysts and operational commanders must still determine how intelligence is evaluated and converted into action. ILP consequently functions as a coordination philosophy linking information, analysis, and intervention across institutional boundaries.

C. Institutional Constraints, Professional Capacity, and Governance Safeguards

The third finding concerns the institutional limitations that may constrain ILP implementation in Indonesia. Intelligence-led policing requires more than databases, surveillance technologies, or intelligence units; it requires organizational integration and analytical professionalism. Previous research has shown that intelligence-led approaches can encounter resistance when institutional practices, organizational cultures, or established decision-making routines do not correspond with the requirements of intelligence-based policing (Ratcliffe 2002). Indonesian research published in 2025 similarly identified weaknesses in the regulation of police intelligence as a factor limiting the optimization of intelligence functions in combating transnational organized crime (Wirandy and Syaafi 2025). These observations suggest that institutional fragmentation is not merely an administrative inconvenience but a substantive limitation on intelligence effectiveness. If information remains concentrated within separate organizational silos, if analytical products are not incorporated into operational planning, or if intelligence personnel lack specialized analytical skills, the existence of intelligence infrastructure may produce limited operational value. Institutional reform must therefore focus on processes, competencies, and accountability as well as technology.

Technological modernization should consequently be accompanied by investment in human analytical capacity. Contemporary criminal intelligence increasingly involves large and heterogeneous datasets, digital communication, financial transactions, geospatial information, biometric information, and open-source intelligence. Yet greater data availability does not automatically improve police decision-making. The 2024 scoping review of ILP research indicates that the empirical literature itself contains methodological limitations and insufficient attention to broader measures of disruption, demonstrating that intelligence systems require clear analytical objectives and evaluation criteria (Khalifa and Hardyns 2024). For Indonesia, professional development should therefore emphasize analytical reasoning, network analysis, source evaluation, digital investigation, financial intelligence, geographic analysis, and the communication of intelligence to operational commanders. Analysts must also understand the limitations and uncertainty associated with intelligence products. This is important because an intelligence-led organization can become vulnerable to confirmation bias if commanders interpret intelligence only as justification for pre-existing operational priorities. Professional intelligence practice should instead encourage structured assessment, competing hypotheses, source evaluation, and explicit differentiation between verified information and analytical inference.

Finally, the expansion of intelligence capabilities must be accompanied by clear governance and rights safeguards. Intelligence-led policing can involve the collection, analysis, and sharing of sensitive personal information, making legality, proportionality, accountability, and data protection central institutional concerns. Indonesia's Law No. 17 of 2011 explicitly connects intelligence professionalism with democratic values, legal compliance, and respect for human rights, indicating that intelligence effectiveness is legally situated within a broader accountability framework (Republic of Indonesia 2011). The same principle should guide police intelligence used against transnational crime. Effective ILP cannot be measured solely through arrests, seizures, or disrupted networks; it must also be evaluated through the legality and reliability of intelligence processes. Excessive data collection, uncontrolled information sharing, weak audit mechanisms, or poorly validated analytical systems can create institutional risks while undermining public confidence. The appropriate model is therefore not intelligence without constraints, but intelligence governed by transparent institutional rules, authorized access, documented procedures, professional standards, and mechanisms for accountability.

Conclusion

Intelligence-led policing offers Indonesia a framework for responding to the organizational and geographical complexity of transnational crime by connecting information collection, intelligence analysis, risk assessment, operational prioritization, and strategic decision-making. Its significance lies less in the

expansion of intelligence capabilities themselves than in the transformation of intelligence into organizational knowledge that can guide preventive and investigative action. The analysis demonstrates that this approach is particularly relevant to transnational narcotics trafficking, human trafficking, maritime smuggling, cyber-enabled crime, and other network-based criminal activities because these threats operate through relationships that extend beyond individual jurisdictions. The Indonesian legal framework already provides important foundations for policing, intelligence, and international cooperation, while ASEAN mechanisms create opportunities for cross-border information exchange and coordinated enforcement. Nevertheless, formal institutional arrangements do not automatically produce effective intelligence-led policing. The operational value of ILP depends on whether intelligence can move efficiently between collection, analysis, decision-making, and intervention.

The principal implication is that Indonesia should conceptualize ILP as an integrated organizational model rather than a narrow intelligence function. Such an approach requires stronger analytical professionalism, interoperable information systems, institutional coordination, international information-sharing mechanisms, and governance safeguards. Cooperation with ASEAN partners, INTERPOL, foreign police agencies, immigration authorities, customs institutions, financial intelligence bodies, and other relevant organizations should be connected to a coherent national intelligence cycle. At the same time, technological development should not substitute for human analytical competence or institutional accountability. Future empirical research should examine the implementation of ILP within specific Indonesian police units and evaluate whether intelligence products actually influence resource allocation, investigative outcomes, network disruption, and crime prevention. Such research would complement the predominantly conceptual and documentary literature and provide stronger evidence concerning the conditions under which intelligence-led policing can contribute to effective and lawful responses to transnational crime in Indonesia. The broader contribution of ILP is therefore its capacity to connect fragmented information with coordinated action while preserving legality, proportionality, and institutional accountability.

References

- ASEAN. 2025. *ASEAN Plan of Action in Combatting Transnational Crime 2026–2035*. Jakarta: Association of Southeast Asian Nations.
- Dewi, Chloryne. 2019. "Combating Transnational Organized Crimes within ASEAN Waters: ASEAN Way vs. Rule of Law." *Padjadjaran Journal of International Law* 3 (1): 29–48. <https://doi.org/10.23920/pjil.v3i1.334>.
- Gabriella, Sara. 2019. "The Kerja Sama Indonesia-Interpol dalam Menangani Isu Penyelundupan Narkoba di Wilayah Perbatasan Indonesia." *Intermestic: Journal of International Studies* 3 (2). <https://doi.org/10.24198/intermestic.v3n2.4>.

- Government of Indonesia. 2023. "Statement of the Republic of Indonesia on Transnational Organized Crime and Cybercrime." United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime.
- Harkrisnowo, Harkristuti. 2021. "Transnational Organized Crime: Dalam Perspektif Hukum Pidana dan Kriminologi." *Indonesian Journal of International Law* 1 (2). <https://doi.org/10.17304/ijil.vol1.2.408>.
- Indonesian National Police. 2023. "INP Chief Highlights Collaboration Against Transnational Crimes in 17th AMMTC." Indonesian National Police.
- Khalifa, Robin, and Wim Hardyns. 2024. "'Led by Intelligence': A Scoping Review on the Experimental Evaluation of Intelligence-Led Policing." *Evaluation Review* 48 (5): 797–847. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0193841X231204588>.
- Naseh, Muhammad, Ikhwanuddin, Faizal Ramadhani, Agung Kusprabandaru, and Beny Bathara. 2019. "Karakteristik Pelaku Kejahatan Transnasional Terorganisasi di Indonesia dan Eropa." *Jurnal Hubungan Internasional*. <https://doi.org/10.18196/hi.81144>.
- Phythian, Rebecca, and Stuart Kirby. 2025. "Intelligence-Led Policing in the 21st Century: How Increased Mobility Requires New Paradigms of Information Sharing." *The Police Journal* 98 (3): 601–617. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0032258X241309479>.
- Prayuda, Rendi. 2020. "Kejahatan Transnasional Terorganisir di Wilayah Perbatasan: Studi Modus Operandi Penyelundupan Narkotika Riau dan Malaysia." *Andalas Journal of International Studies* 9 (1): 34–47. <https://doi.org/10.25077/ajis.9.1.34-47.2020>.
- Ratcliffe, Jerry H. 2002. "Intelligence-Led Policing and the Problems of Turning Rhetoric into Practice." *Policing and Society* 12 (1): 53–66. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10439460290006673>.
- Ratcliffe, Jerry H. 2016. *Intelligence-Led Policing*. 2nd ed. London: Routledge.
- Republic of Indonesia. 2002. *Law No. 2 of 2002 concerning the Indonesian National Police*. Jakarta: Government of Indonesia.
- Republic of Indonesia. 2009. *Law No. 5 of 2009 concerning the Ratification of the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime*. Jakarta: Government of Indonesia.
- Republic of Indonesia. 2011. *Law No. 17 of 2011 concerning State Intelligence*. Jakarta: Government of Indonesia.
- Wirandy, Muhammad Abrori, and Ahmad Syaafi. 2025. "Optimalisasi Fungsi Intelijen Kepolisian Dalam Penanganan Kejahatan Terorganisir Transnasional." *Jurnal Kolaboratif Sains* 8 (6). <https://doi.org/10.56338/jks.v8i6.7871>.

Acknowledgment

None

Funding Information

None

Conflicting Interest Statement

The authors state that there is no conflict of interest in the publication of this article.

Publishing Ethical and Originality Statement

All authors declared that this work is original and has never been published in any form and in any media, nor is it under consideration for publication in any journal, and all sources cited in this work refer to the basic standards of scientific citation.

Generative AI Statement

N/A