Collaboration between Immigration and Key Stakeholders in Overseeing National Entry Points

Rahma Dyah Widyaningrum¹*, Fedianty Augustinah², Eny Hartati³

1-3 Faculty of Administrative Sciences, Universitas Dr. Soetomo, Indonesia
* Corresponding Author: rahmaadyaah@gmail.com

Abstract: This study aims to explore the institutional governance and collaboration mechanisms at Indonesia's entry points, emphasising both formal arrangements, such as Memoranda of Understanding, and informal communication channels that facilitate daily operations among Immigration, Customs, Port Authorities, Law Enforcement, and Health Agencies. The research employed qualitative methods, including interviews, observations, and document analysis, grounded in Policy Network theory, to analyse the dynamics of institutional collaboration at entry points. The findings highlight that border oversight effectiveness hinges on inter-agency synergy quality, trust, and the ability to overcome technical and procedural barriers, whilst significant challenges include technological disparity, particularly incompatible data platforms hampering real-time information sharing, and silo mentalities driven by security concerns that impede operational harmonisation, resulting in delays and inefficiencies. Trust mechanisms such as informal communication groups, regular meetings, and leadership support significantly improve coordination and operational performance. The study concludes that sustainable and adaptive governance models characterised by mutual trust, effective communication, and technological integration are essential for enhancing border security and facilitating legal movement. The research underscores the importance of integrating technological systems to ensure interoperability, developing clear cross-agency SOPs, and fostering a collaborative culture that prioritises shared goals over organisational ego. Strengthening institutional collaboration at border crossings will bolster Indonesia's national security, economic growth, and international reputation, and contribute to resilient, efficient border management systems capable of addressing contemporary threats.

Keywords: Border Security, Data Interoperability, Institutional Collaboration, Interagency Cooperation, Policy Network.

1. Introduction

A country's entry points, whether by land, sea, or air, are the heart of its defence and security, as well as the primary gateway to economic growth and tourism. These areas serve as crucial points where state sovereignty is enforced through various strict regulations and procedures, ensuring that the movement of people and goods aligns with national interests. (Kurniavan & Priadarsini, 2025; Supriyanto & Hartawan, 2025). The complexity of

surveillance at ports of entry presents a monumental challenge. The primary task of surveillance at these vital points extends beyond preventing unauthorised entry or smuggling, but also includes facilitating the swift and efficient passage of law-abiding travellers. This multifaceted function inherently demands the involvement and interaction of various state institutions with varying jurisdictions and authorities. Purnama et al. (2025), the effectiveness and success of supervision at the country's entry points absolutely depend on the level of synergy and institutional collaboration established between the relevant agencies, where the Immigration Office plays a central role as the vanguard in enforcing immigration law and securing state borders from the aspect of human movement.

The Immigration Office, under the Ministry of Law and Human Rights, has primary responsibility for checking travel documents, granting entry permits, issuing refusals (Tolak Tangkal), and enforcing immigration laws (Sivakka & Anggusti, 2023; Putri et al., 2025). Immigration operations in the field cannot stand alone. They interact closely with key stakeholders to form an integrated oversight ecosystem. The Indonesian National Armed Forces (TNI) and the Indonesian National Police (POLRI) play a vital role in security and sovereignty; Customs and Excise focuses on monitoring goods and state levies; Health and Animal/Plant Quarantine (KKP and Barantan) protect the country from biological threats; and port/airport authorities (e.g., the Airport Authority or Harbormaster) regulate traffic and infrastructure (Fadhlurrahman et al., 2025). Each stakeholder has a specific legal mandate, but all operate at the same physical location, process the same subjects (people/goods), and share a similar end goal: securing the state and facilitating lawful movement (Prasetyawan et al., 2025). Without strong collaboration mechanisms, overlapping authority, duplication of work, and service bottlenecks will be inevitable (Al-Dafi et al., 2025). The demands of the times and global dynamics further reinforce the urgency of this institutional collaboration. Issues such as transnational terrorism, cybercrime affecting border systems, human trafficking, and the increasing volume of tourist traffic following the COVID-19 pandemic demand a coordinated and integrated response (Yurizal & Aripin, 2025). The silo approach (working alone) is no longer adequate to address increasingly sophisticated and complex cross-border threats (Malik et al., 2024). The use of information technology, such as Immigration's Border Control Management (BCM), must be able to be integrated or at least interoperated with systems owned by the Police (DPO/Red Notice), Customs (Manifest), and the Intelligence Agency (Information Security) (Hanyfa & Rustianingsih, 2024). Collaboration is not only about sharing databases or information, but also involves harmonising standard operating procedures (SOPs), implementing joint patrols, and conducting joint training to improve cross-understanding of each agency's mandate and challenges (Effendi, 2022).

Therefore, research on institutional collaboration between the Immigration Office and key stakeholders at the country's entry points is highly relevant. This study aims to analyse and evaluate the effectiveness of both formal (through regulations or Memoranda of Understanding/MoUs) and informal (day-to-day communication) collaboration mechanisms. Dorisman et al. (2025) note that it is necessary to identify inhibiting factors (such as sectoral egos, budget or technological limitations, or differences in legal interpretation) and driving factors (such as central policies, regional leadership commitment, or technological innovation) that influence the quality of synergy. By understanding the dynamics of this collaboration, it is hoped that a more efficient, effective, and adaptive governance model for monitoring entry

points can be formulated to address contemporary threats while simultaneously supporting the government's vision of creating a conducive investment and tourism climate through fast, integrated public services. The success of this collaboration will ultimately be an important indicator of national resilience and of Indonesia's positive image in the international community.

2. Literature Review

Research on institutional collaboration between the Immigration Office and key stakeholders in overseeing national entry points requires a comprehensive theoretical framework to analyse the complexity of interactions between actors. Collaboration at the border is not only administrative but also involves political, managerial, and technological dimensions. Therefore, this research is based on four main theoretical concepts: Public Policy Network Theory, Collaborative Governance Theory, System Integration and Interoperability Concepts, and Organisational Theory, which explains the phenomenon of Sectoral Ego (Silo Mentality) (Abdillah, 2024; Sarsito & Fitriati, 2023). Border control is a public issue within the policy network domain, where the effectiveness of Immigration relies heavily on the exchange of resources and information with other institutions, such as Customs, Quarantine, and security forces. The success of collaboration must be measured through a Collaborative Governance approach, which focuses on building trust, shared commitment, and integrated decision-making. At the operational level, technological system integration is a crucial prerequisite for ensuring real-time data flow. Finally, a Silo Mentality analysis will identify internal barriers arising from cultural differences and institutional orientations, which often pose the most significant challenge to achieving optimal and integrated oversight synergy.

Public Policy Network Theory

Policy Network Theory argues that decision-making and implementation of public policy, including border control policies, are rarely carried out by a single institution. Instead, they involve a web of interactive relationships between various actors: government agencies (Immigration, Customs, Quarantine), non-governmental organisations, the private sector (ground handling, airlines), and interest groups (Ardiansyah et al., 2024).

Key Concept: In the context of the country's entry points, the Immigration Office is a central actor, but its effectiveness is determined by the level of resource dependence and coordination needs with other stakeholders (for example, Immigration needs manifest data from the Airport Authority and needs security from the Police/TNI). This theory helps analyse the structure of collaboration (who interacts with whom), the balance of power between agencies, and the exchange mechanisms (information, resources, and authority) that occur in the field. Collaboration failures are often caused by sectoral egos or resource imbalances within the network.

Collaborative Governance Theory

Collaborative Governance is an approach in which one or more public institutions directly engage non-governmental stakeholders and other governmental stakeholders in a formal, consensus-oriented, collective decision-making process aimed at addressing complex public issues. The essence of collaborative governance is joint decision-making, not simply the coordination of information. This model emphasises the need for shared goals and outcomes (e.g., high border security and rapid trade facilitation). The level of trust between

institutions is crucial. Low trust will hinder the sharing of sensitive information. The presence of a party capable of mediating and directing the collaboration process without dominating. This theory is suitable for analysing the quality and depth of Immigration collaboration with stakeholders. Research can measure the extent to which collaboration is limited to administrative coordination or has reached the level of procedural integration and authentic risk/responsibility sharing (Bayuaji, 2024).

System Integration and Interoperability Concept

While not a standalone theory, the concept of System Integration and Interoperability is crucial as an operational foundation in the digital surveillance era. System Integration refers to the unification of various operational components or functions into a coherent whole. In the context of Immigration, this means that the Immigration (BCM) system is directly connected and works seamlessly with other stakeholder systems (e.g., the Police profiling system or the Customs manifest system). Interoperability is the ability of different information systems (belonging to Immigration, Customs, Quarantine, etc.) to exchange data accurately, effectively, and consistently, and enable that data to be used together. This focuses on technical standards and data exchange protocols. Modern collaboration at points of entry relies heavily on real-time data streams. Analysis needs to measure how these technical aspects support or hinder collaboration. Interoperability failures (e.g., different data formats or incompatible platforms) can render all non-technical collaboration efforts ineffective (Helistiawan & Tjenreng, 2025).

Organisational Theory and Sectoral Ego (Silo Mentality)

Organisational theory provides a framework for understanding why inter-institutional collaboration is often difficult to achieve. One of the biggest obstacles is sectoral ego or silo mentality (Sandi et al., 2025). Silo Mentality is a condition in which an organisational unit (or, in this case, an agency/institution) focuses exclusively on its own goals, interests, and operations, thereby neglecting or limiting communication and collaboration with other units. This is often reinforced by differences in organisational culture, separate budget mechanisms, and misaligned key performance indicators (KPIs). In border control, Sectoral Ego manifests as a reluctance to share sensitive information, maintaining rigid procedures, or inter-agency competition for recognition of success. Research needs to identify the extent to which Immigration or stakeholder Silo Mentality is a significant obstacle to effective synergy.

3. Method

This research adopts a descriptive qualitative approach with a focused case study design (A'yun et al., 2025). The qualitative approach was specifically chosen because the research objective is to explore in-depth and interpret the complex phenomenon of institutional collaboration, namely the interactions, dynamics, and meanings formed between the Immigration Office and other key stakeholders in implementing the supervisory function at the country's entry points (Zaluchu, 2020). Phenomena such as sectoral ego, trust, and inter-institutional communication are essential aspects that can only be uncovered through rich narrative data. The main objective of this design is to produce a holistic description of the applied synergy model, identify formal and informal coordination mechanisms in the field, and analyse the extent to which Collaborative Governance Theory is applied in border control practices. The research location will focus on one or several major Immigration Checkpoints

(TPIs), such as large international airports or seaports with high stakeholder complexity (Abubakar, 2021). The focus of this case study is crucial to capturing the unique context of the TPI, including the operational environment, local policies, and history of inter-agency interactions, all of which influence the quality of synergy. Thus, the research results will not only describe what occurred but, more importantly, explain why and how the collaboration was formed, sustained, or hindered.

The data sources in this study are classified into primary and secondary sources to ensure rich, in-depth information. Primary data will be obtained directly from key informants who are actively involved and have direct experience in the supervision and collaboration process (Agustini et al., 2023). The technique for selecting informants uses purposive sampling, in which informants are selected based on specific criteria: having in-depth knowledge of supervisory procedures, being involved in decision-making or implementing collaborative operations, and holding strategic positions in their agencies. Key informants include: Immigration Office Officials and Executives (Head of Division/Section and officers at TPI) Key Stakeholder Representatives such as Customs, Health Quarantine (KKP), Police (such as Aviation Security or Port Security), TNI, and Airport or Port Management Authorities as well as Non-Governmental Actors who have significant roles (for example, airline representatives or logistics agents) (Purwanza et al., 2022). Secondary data includes relevant official and non-official documents, such as inter-agency Memoranda of Understanding (MoUs), regional-level Cooperation Agreements (PKS), joint Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs), supervisory performance reports, and laws and regulations governing the specific authority of each agency at the border.

Data collection will be conducted through method triangulation, using three main techniques to increase the validity and reliability of the findings: In-depth Interviews, Limited Participatory Observation, and Documentation Studies (Tarigan et al., 2024). In-depth interviews were conducted in a semi-structured manner using an interview guide that focused on the dimensions of Collaborative Governance, including perceptions of shared goals, communication and information-sharing mechanisms, levels of trust between institutions, and sectoral egos as obstacles (Sugiyono, 2022). Limited Participatory Observation will be conducted to directly observe the work processes and daily interactions between Immigration officers and stakeholders in operational areas (e.g., inspection counters, integrated CCTV monitoring rooms, or routine coordination meetings). This observation is crucial for verifying the alignment of normative statements with actual practices in the field. Finally, Documentation Study involves in-depth content analysis of formal documents and informal records to map the legal framework, organisational structure, and history of established collaboration. The collected qualitative data will be analysed using an interactive model that integrates the processes of data reduction, data presentation, and conclusion drawing simultaneously, as proposed by Miles, Huberman, and Saldaña. The process begins with Data Reduction, which involves selecting, focusing, simplifying, and abstracting raw data from interview transcripts and field notes. Data will be categorised and coded (e.g., Trust Level, Silo Mentality, Joint Decision-Making) according to the theoretical framework. Next, Data Display is performed, where the reduced data is presented in the form of a structured narrative, comparison matrix, or flowchart to facilitate understanding of the relationships between variables and concepts, as well as visualising the collaboration model found. The

final stage is Conclusion Drawing/Verification, where the preliminary conclusions are repeatedly verified against primary and secondary data (Purwanza et al., 2022). The conclusion should be substantive, answer the research questions, provide an in-depth interpretation of the quality of synergy, and ultimately formulate an ideal, sustainable collaboration model to improve the effectiveness of national entry control.

4. Results and Discussion
Dynamics of Policy Networks and Levels of Trust Between Institutions

Entry control is a public issue within the framework of Public Policy Network Theory, where the Immigration Office serves as the central node with a primary mandate to regulate human movement. Analysis shows that this network is interdependent, meaning that Immigration's effectiveness in its security and facilitation functions is highly dependent on the rapid exchange of resources and information with other key stakeholders, such as Customs, Quarantine, the Police, and Port/Airport Management Authorities (Darmawan & Idawati, 2023). This network structure is supported by formal mechanisms (MoUs and Joint Regulations) that govern the division of authority. However, the smooth running of day-to-day operations is often determined by informal mechanisms, namely non-structural communication and coordination built on personal closeness and understanding of the situation on the ground.

A crucial dynamic determining the success of this network is the level of trust between agencies, which is an essential non-material prerequisite in the Collaborative Governance model. High levels of trust are critical because modern surveillance demands the real-time sharing of sensitive information, including high-risk passenger intelligence data (profiling), criminal records, or information related to biological threats. When trust is high, this information exchange can occur without bureaucratic hurdles, enabling a rapid collective response to threats. Conversely, low levels of trust foster a silo mentality, where each agency tends to hoard information (withhold data) and focus exclusively on its own objectives and Key Performance Indicators (KPIs). The main obstacles to this silo mentality lie in disparities in KPIs and differences in organisational culture. For example, the Immigration Department's focus on security versus the Airport Authority's emphasis on rapid service throughput can create conflicts of interest and tensions on the ground, slowing down the collaborative oversight process (Kusuma, 2025). This conflict is exacerbated by concerns over data integrity and the potential misuse of information if shared freely, pushing each agency to maintain its own systems and procedures, and hindering the integration of systems that should be key to operational synergy. To overcome the barriers of trust and sectoral egos, effective Facilitative Leadership is required. This leadership must be able to mediate conflict, build a collective vision, and strengthen shared commitment among stakeholders. Through consistent leadership, trust can be built, shifting collaborative practices from mere administrative coordination to proper procedural integration, ensuring efficient, secure, and adaptive border surveillance in response to the dynamics of global threats.

Table 1: Stakeholder Involvement in Public Collaboration Based on the Themes of Trust, Sectoral Ego, and Policy Networks

Key Themes/ Concepts	Informant Code	Informant's Statement	Initial Interpretation (Theoretical Relevance)
Trust Level	Immigration-1 (Head of Supervision)	"Trust was built through our frequent joint patrols. We knew their intelligence was accurate, so we didn't hesitate to act on their information."	High trust facilitates the exchange of sensitive information and accelerates collective decision-making (Collaborative Governance).
	Customs-2 (Executor)	"If it's just regular manifest data, we'll provide it. But for confidential risk profiling data, we're still selective. We're afraid it could be leaked to unauthorised parties or misused."	Low (selective) trust limits the depth of information integration and indicates a risk of data hoarding.
Sectoral Ego (Silo Mentality)	Quarantine-1 (KKP Doctor)	"Sometimes we feel that Immigration processes passengers too quickly without waiting for health clearance. We have our own legal mandate and cannot be controlled by other agencies."	Conflicts of authority and sectoral egos, reinforced by differences in legal mandates and SOPs, hinder the harmonisation of procedures.
	Airport Authority-1 (Manager)	"Our systems are integrated for efficiency. If Immigration or Customs cause delays, it immediately impacts our KPIs. So, we tend to prioritise speed of service."	The existence of KPI disparities (security vs. speed) between institutions is the root of conflicts of interest and the cause of Silo Mentality.
Policy Network	Immigration-2 (TPI Officer)	"Our formal mechanism is monthly meetings. But the WhatsApp group is more effective. Within five minutes, we can get emergency information, much faster than writing an official letter."	Evidence of Informal Mechanisms (non-structural communication) being more effective than formal ones in the day-to-day operations of the Policy Network.
	Police-1 (Avsec)	"We realise that Immigration needs our security backup, and we also need Immigration check-in data to profile suspicious passengers. There's a mutual dependency."	Confirmation of Resource Interdependence (mutual dependency), a characteristic of the Policy Network structure.
Facilitative Leadership	Customs-1 (Head of Administration Sub-Division)	"When the Head of Immigration or Customs is willing to regularly invite us to coffee morning meetings and listen to our concerns, collaboration becomes very smooth. Leadership commitment is crucial."	The need for Facilitative Leadership that acts as a mediator and driver of trust to achieve shared collaborative goals.

(Research Source 2025)

Based on Table 1, it can be concluded that the effectiveness of state entry control is highly dependent on the quality of institutional synergy and collaboration operating within an interdependent Public Policy Network framework. While the Immigration Office serves as a central node, its success ultimately depends on the smooth exchange of resources and information with other key stakeholders, such as Customs, Quarantine, and security forces. This network structure is formally regulated, but its daily operations are driven more by informal mechanisms (such as emergency communication groups), demonstrating that the flexibility of non-structured communication is often superior to rigid bureaucratic procedures. The biggest challenges facing this collaboration are issues of trust and Sectoral Ego (Silo Mentality). While high trust facilitates the exchange of sensitive information (profiling) for rapid response, the discovery of a Silo Mentality rooted in disparities in Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) between institutions (e.g., security vs. service speed) is a significant obstacle. This Silo Mentality triggers a reluctance to share data fully and hinders information system integration and procedural interoperability in the field, resulting in less efficient services. Furthermore, this collaboration is vulnerable to differing interpretations of legal mandates in unique cases, leading to last-minute negotiations rather than integrated joint decision-making. Therefore, the key to achieving ideal Collaborative Governance lies in committed Facilitative Leadership. This leadership must be able to mediate sectoral conflicts of interest, consistently

build trust, and encourage harmonisation of SOPs beyond mere paper. Success in fostering trust and shared commitment will shift working practices from minimal coordination to full procedural integration, resulting in a border control model that is more robust in maintaining national security while being efficient in facilitating the legitimate movement of people and goods.

System Integration Challenges and Procedural Interoperability Gaps

Contemporary border control relies heavily on Information Technology (IT) to balance optimal security with efficient traffic facilitation. Although Immigration Offices and other key stakeholders (such as Customs and Quarantine) have individually implemented sophisticated systems, such as Border Control Management (BCM), the primary challenge is the gap between the capabilities of individual systems and the need for end-to-end system integration within the surveillance network. Because these systems are often developed in silos to meet the needs of their respective sectors, instead of achieving complete System Integration (where other agencies can automatically access data and operational functions), only Basic Interoperability (minimal data exchange) or even manual mechanisms are achieved. This situation creates significant obstacles to effective synergy and rapid response to transnational threats.

The most crucial barriers stem from technical issues and data exchange protocols. Information systems belonging to different agencies are often built on fundamentally different architectures, platforms, and data formats (e.g., the Immigration system vs. the Customs logistics system). These differences make it difficult to achieve uniform classification standards and communication protocols. As a result, passenger data processed by Immigration may not be immediately compatible with the formats required by security or health stakeholders, requiring time-consuming manual conversion or adjustment processes. This phenomenon creates latency in the exchange of emergency information, weakening risk detection capabilities. Furthermore, integration initiatives are hampered by data ownership issues and cybersecurity concerns, which make agencies cautious about opening access to Application Programming Interfaces (APIs), thus limiting the depth and breadth of System Interoperability that can be achieved. (Sivakka & Anggusti, 2023).

Beyond technical issues, there are serious gaps in Procedural Interoperability, the ability of agencies to work together seamlessly through harmonised, joint SOPs. Despite formal collaboration agreements (MoUs), SOPs at the implementing level are often misaligned, particularly when dealing with cases that require cross-authority decisions. When Immigration detains an individual, and Customs simultaneously finds related illegal goods, the joint enforcement process often lacks a clear path. This lack of clarity forces field officers to conduct ad-hoc (spontaneous) negotiations or refer issues to management, causing service bottlenecks and increasing the risk of missing potential enforcement actions. This procedural gap is exacerbated by Sectoral Egos, which make each agency reluctant to sacrifice its single-purpose procedures for more efficient, multi-purpose procedures for the overall network. The combination of a lack of System Integration and Procedural Interoperability produces a detrimental double-whammy Widiantoro (2025). found that latency and the need for manual data verification weaken the network's ability to perform joint risk profiling, increasing vulnerability to transnational threats. From a facilitation perspective, overlapping procedures significantly reduce the efficiency of public services and hinder the growth of tourism and

logistics. Therefore, collaborative solutions must focus on harmonising technical standards and integrating data platforms to enable collective decision-making and implementing unified standard operating procedures that simultaneously prioritise security without sacrificing service speed.

Table 2. Barriers to System Integration and Procedural Interoperability in Sectoral Immigration Agencies and Working Partners.

Key Themes /Concepts	Informant Code	Quote (Informant Statement)	Initial Interpretation (Theoretical Relevance)
System Integration / Interoperability	Immigration-1 (Head of IT)	"Our BCM system is indeed sophisticated, but the Application Programming Interface (API) open to other stakeholders is still limited. If we open it too widely, the cybersecurity risks to Indonesian and foreign citizens' data will be high."	System Integration Barriers caused by cybersecurity concerns and data ownership issues limit the depth of Interoperability that can be achieved.
	Customs-1 (Data Manager)	"The passenger manifest data from Immigration and Customs is actually the same, but the data format is different in our system. We have to import and convert it manually first. This creates a crucial 15-30 minute latency."	Evidence of technical barriers (platform differences and data formats) that slow down the exchange of real-time information for joint risk profiling.
Procedural Interoperability (SOP)	Quarantine-1 (Executive Officer)	"Inter-agency MoUs are common. But when there's a sick passenger and problematic documentation, there's often no standard operating procedure (SOP) for who gets priority. In the end, we decide individually and then report it."	Procedural Interoperability Gaps at the implementation level, forcing ad hoc negotiations on the ground rather than following clear, unified SOPs.
	Police-1 (Avsec Officer)	"We have a risk profiling system, and Immigration has a risk profiling system. No system automatically combines the profiling results. So we have to contact Immigration separately to compare the findings."	The lack of Joint Risk Profiling Integration across platforms hinders Integrated Risk Detection and leads to duplicate work.
Impact on Service (Bottleneck)	Port Authority-1 (General Manager)	"As soon as a joint Immigration and Customs Enforcement action occurs, all our logistics procedures come to a complete halt, sometimes for up to two hours. Their enforcement procedures are inefficient and not separate from normal service flows."	The impact of Procedural Gaps that create significant service bottlenecks indicates that combined procedures are not designed for public efficiency.
Technical Sectoral Ego	Immigration-2 (Computer Section Head)	"Other agencies often ask us to share data according to their standards, not ours. If we followed all of them, our core systems would constantly change. So we have to maintain our own technical standards."	The manifestation of Technical Sectoral Ego, in which agencies are reluctant to adopt common standards, hinders the harmonisation of data exchange protocols.

(Research Source 2025)

Table 2 concludes that the primary obstacle to synergy at national entry points no longer lies solely in policy issues, but rather in gaps in technology and operational procedures. These findings indicate that despite formal collaboration commitments (MoUs), their implementation is hampered by two crucial issues: the failure of Technical System Integration and the Procedural Interoperability Gap. On the technical side, quotes from Customs and Immigration informants make clear that differences in platforms and data formats between sophisticated systems (such as BCM) create latency and force manual data conversion. This directly undermines the network's ability to perform real-time joint risk profiling, which should be at the heart of modern oversight. Furthermore, Immigration's objection to fully opening its API due to cybersecurity concerns and data ownership issues demonstrates the existence of Technical Sectoral Ego, where agencies prioritise the security of their internal systems over the efficiency of collective data exchange. This effort to maintain their own technical standards is a manifestation of the Silo Mentality in the digital realm, hindering the harmonisation of exchange protocols (Athallah et al., 2025). On the procedural side, the

quotes from Quarantine and the Police highlight a severe Procedural Interoperability Gap. Despite the existence of a Policy Network, the combined SOPs are not detailed enough to handle complex cross-authority cases (Widiantoro, 2025). As a result, field officials are forced to conduct ad hoc negotiations rather than following a straightforward process. This practice directly causes significant service bottlenecks, as the Port Authority has complained. These delays not only compromise public efficiency and hamper logistical facilitation but also increase the risk of joint enforcement failure. Overall, the interview data confirms that current collaboration remains stuck at basic coordination and has not yet reached a level of proper functional integration.

5. Conclusion

Entry control at Indonesia's national ports is a strategic aspect in maintaining sovereignty and national security, as well as supporting economic growth and tourism. The effectiveness of this control relies heavily on synergistic institutional collaboration among the Immigration Office and other key stakeholders, including the Indonesian National Armed Forces (TNI), the Indonesian National Police (POLRI), Customs and Excise, Quarantine, and port or airport authorities. Optimal control relies not only on formal procedures but also on informal communication and flexible, non-structural mechanisms, given the field's complexity and dynamics. In practice, the main challenges are technical barriers stemming from different platforms and data formats across institutions that hinder real-time information exchange, as well as issues of trust and sectoral egos that slow coordination. In addition, different legalities and SOPs, as well as a fragmented work culture, often serve as internal barriers that hinder effective synergy. Bureaucratic rigidity and a silo mentality also become internal obstacles that reduce smooth collaboration. This study emphasises that successful control relies heavily on building inter-institutional trust and shared commitment, which can be supported through formal mechanisms such as Memorandums of Understanding (MoUs) and regulations, as well as informal mechanisms such as emergency communication and personal closeness in the field. Technology systems and data interoperability must also be fully integrated as a prerequisite for ensuring fast, accurate data flow. At the operational level, joint patrols and training improve security effectiveness. Overall, successful surveillance at entry points is a key indicator of national resilience and Indonesia's international image. This study confirms that sustained collaborative efforts that adapt to contemporary challenges are crucial. Utilising technology, harmonising procedures, and strengthening trust are key to ensuring effective and efficient surveillance that can address cross-border threats such as terrorism, cybercrime, human trafficking, and pandemics. Therefore, creating an integrative and inclusive surveillance governance model is key to ensuring security and sustainable national development.

References

Abdillah, F. R. (2024). The urgency of stakeholder collaboration in increasing the quality of public services. *Journal of Social and Development Intervention (JISP), 5*(1), 98–109.

Abubakar, R. (2021). *Introduction to research methodology* (1st ed.). SUKA-Press UIN Sunan Kalijaga.

Agustini, G., Grashinta, A., Putra, S., Sukarman, G., Guampe, F. A., Akbar, J. S., Lubis, M. A., Maryati, I., Ririnisahawaitun, R., Romi, M., Mesra, S., Sari, M. N., Tuerah, P. R., Rahmadhani, M. V., & Rulanggi, R. (2023). *Qualitative research methods (Theory and practical guide to qualitative data analysis)* (1st ed.). PT. Mifandi Mandiri Digital.

Al-Dafi, M. F., Pujonggo, S. S., & Mastur, A. S. R. (2025). Passport service implementation at the immigration office from a dynamic governance perspective. *Citizen: Indonesian Multidisciplinary Scientific Journal, 5*(4), 1222–1229. https://doi.org/10.53866/jimi.v5i4.985

Ardiansyah, A., Pratama, A. N., & Salsabila, A. P. (2024). Legal review of collaboration between immigration and the Ministry of Protection of Indonesian Migrant Workers in assisting Indonesian migrant workers based on the perspective of legal protection theory. *JLBP, 6*(2), 61–72. https://doi.org/10.52617/jlbp.v6i2.630

Athallah, Z., Suhartono, M., Illiyyin, S., Lisdayanti, E., & Isabella, R. (2025). Analysis of stakeholder performance motivation in the sustainable waste management program (Study in RW 3 Kampung Terapi, Sukun District). *Immigration Journal, 4*(7), 496–511. https://doi.org/10.58411/d1wrf222

A'yun, S. Q., Habsy, B. A., & Nursalim, M. (2025). Qualitative research models: Literature review. *Indonesian Journal of Educational Research, 4*(2), 341–354.

Bayuaji, W. S. (2024). Institutional cooperation between BP2MI and the Directorate General of Immigration in preventing non-procedural Indonesian migrant workers at Soekarno Hatta Airport. *Syntax Admiration, 5*(10), 4011–4023. https://doi.org/10.46799/jsa.v5i10.1668

Darmawan, M. D., & Idawati, W. (2023). The effect of stakeholder pressure and shareholding structure on sustainability report quality. *Journal of Management, 20*(2), 22–42. https://doi.org/10.25170/jm.v20i2.4990

Dorisman, A., Muhammad, A. S., & Setiawan, R. (2025). Collaboration between stakeholders in traffic accident management. *JIANA: Journal of Public Administration, 19*(1), 70–83. https://doi.org/10.46730/jiana.v19i1.7966

Effendi, T. D. (2022). Strategies for engaging the Indonesian diaspora in public diplomacy. *Journal of Diplomacy and Security Studies, 14*(1), 18–42.

Fadhlurrahman, D., Amini, D. S., Wiratma, H. D., Nuswantoro, B. S., & Subandi, Y. (2025). The role of DIY National Unity and Political Agency collaboration with stakeholders in monitoring and oversight of foreigners (OA) in 2021–2022. *Journal of Public Administration, 6*(8), 917–926. https://doi.org/10.60126/maras.v3i3.1119

Hanyfa, M. R., & Rustianingsih, E. (2024). Collaborative governance in population administration services for poor communities in Kesamben Kulon Village. *Journal Publicuho, 7*(3), 1471–1488. https://doi.org/10.35817/publicuho.v7i3.507

Helistiawan, A., & Tjenreng, Z. (2025). Analysis of the implementation of foreign surveillance policy. *Journal La Sociale, 6*(6), 1734–1742. https://doi.org/10.37899/journal-la-sociale.v6i6.2568

Kurniavan, A. M. Y., & Priadarsini, N. W. R. (2025). Efforts of the immigration office as a stakeholder in preventing human smuggling and trafficking based on the Palermo Protocol (Study at the Class 1 TPI Denpasar Immigration Office). *JIKK, 1*(1), 53–60. https://doi.org/10.52617/jikk.v8i1.677

Kusuma, R. (2025). Evaluation of the implementation of the immigration management information system (Simkim) of the Yogyakarta Class I Immigration Office: A qualitative approach. *Business Journal, 1*(1), 1–10.

Malik, M. M. H. A., Taufik, A., Syafri, M., Mustari, S., Irwan, & Yusrianto. (2024). Collaboration between central and regional governments in handling social problems of immigrants in Makassar City. *JoHARMA Journal of Hospital Administration Research and Management, 3*(1), 10–20.

Prasetyawan, C. T., Supriyono, B., & Sentanu, I. G. P. S. (2025). Stakeholder analysis in the implementation of one-stop integrated services for Indonesian migrant workers. *Journal of Public Administration (JAP), 5*(6), 413–419.

Purnama, D. H., Mulyawan, B., & Ardi, I. Y. (2025). The role of immigration officers' service in community education and collaboration in the Indonesia–Malaysia border area. *JaIM: Immigration Community Service Journal, 1*(4), 4–6. https://doi.org/10.52617/jaim.v6i1.750

Purwanza, S. W., Aditya, W., Ainul, M., Yuniarti, R. R., Adrianus, K. H., Jan, S., Darwin, A., Atik, B., Siskha, P. S., Maya, F., Rambu, L. K. R. N., Amruddin, G., Gazi, S., Tati, H., Sentalia, B. T., Rento, D. P., & Rasinus. (2022). Quantitative, qualitative, and combination research methodology. *In Media Sains Indonesia* (Issue March).

Putri, N. J., Togatorop, E. N., Jasmon, A. Z. A., Sapitri, E. K., Saputra, R. Z., & Kustiawan. (2025). The role of immigration regarding the repatriation of Indonesian migrant workers in Tanjung Pinang City, the Indonesian Archipelago Province. *Jpehi (Journal of Indonesian Legal Research), 6*(1), 46–60.

Sandi, F. A., Putro, Y. L. C. A., Afriyanti, R., Parassa, H. S., & Priyanto, A. (2025). Collaboration between stakeholders in developing the Payungi People's Market in Metro City. *Journal Publicuho, 8*(1), 39–56. https://doi.org/10.35817/publicuho.v8i1.623

Sarsito, A., & Fitriati, R. (2023). Building a strategic governance model in the strategy to improve immigration information through expos and conferences in Indonesia, a soft system methodology approach. *Scientific Journal of Legal Policy, 17*(11), 289–308. https://doi.org/10.30641/kebijakan.2023.V17.289-308

Sivakka, S., & Anggusti, M. (2023). The role of Medan immigration detention homes in increasing the capacity of the Medan city community. *Scientific Journal of Law Enforcement, 10*(2), 191–200.

Sugiyono. (2022). *Quantitative, qualitative, and R&D research methodology*. Alfabeta.

Supriyanto, H., & Hartawan, W. (2025). Towards synergistic protection: Diagnosis of collaborative governance gaps for Indonesian migrant workers in Central Java. *Journal of Politics and Policy (JPPOL), 7*(1), 40–59. https://doi.org/10.21776/ub.jppol.2025.7.1.3

Tarigan, A., Saragih, A. Y., Hasibuan, R. Y., Risa, E. N., Marpaung, R., Naibaho, V. M. O., Marpaung, R., Naibaho, V. M. O., & Manurung, Y. (2024). The impact of global warming on the environment in Medan City: A review of mitigation policies and community responses. *Atmosfer: Journal of Education, Language, Literature, Arts, Culture, and Social Humanities, 2*(3), 33–46. https://doi.org/10.59024/atmosfer.v2i3.873

Widiantoro, A. (2025). Analysis of performance measurement and improvement efforts using the performance prism method and traffic light system. *Scientific Journal of Industrial Engineering, 4*(1), 110–120.

Yurizal, R., & Aripin, S. (2025). Inequality in immigration service provision in remote areas: Collaborative decision-making process in vertical collaborative governance towards improving the quality of public services. *Good Governance, 10*(19), 20–30.

Zaluchu, S. E. (2020). Qualitative and quantitative research strategies in religious research. *Evangelical: Journal of Evangelical Theology and Congregational Development, 4*(1), 28–38