

Research Article

Optimizing the Function of Prosecutorial Intelligence in Law Enforcement

Ismanto ^{1*}, Suprpto ², Nurunnisa ³

¹⁻³ Fakultas Hukum, Universitas Lambung Mangkurat, Indonesia

* Corresponding Author: ismantotoja@gmail.com ¹

Abstract: The function of Prosecutorial Intelligence (Intel Kejaksaan) holds a crucial strategic role, not only in supporting prosecution duties but also in crime prevention, safeguarding national development, and recovering state assets. Despite having a strong legal basis and a broad mandate, this function often faces operational challenges, data integration issues, and resource optimization constraints that limit its effectiveness within the dynamic law enforcement ecosystem. This research aims to deeply analyze the role and challenges of Prosecutorial Intelligence and formulate a model for optimizing its function to enhance the effectiveness of law enforcement in Indonesia. The research methodology employed is normative and sociological juridical with a qualitative approach, gathering data through literature review, regulatory study, and in-depth interviews with practitioners and academics. The findings indicate that the optimization of the Prosecutorial Intelligence function requires three main pillars: (1) Enhancing the capacity and professionalism of human resources (HR) through modern intelligence training and digital forensics. (2) Integrating and ensuring interoperability of the intelligence information system with other law enforcement agencies (Police, KPK, PPATK) to build a comprehensive intelligence big data. (3) Expanding the spectrum of intelligence operations, shifting from a traditional focus on corruption crimes to transnational crimes, cybercrime, and securing strategic national investments. This optimization is expected to transform Prosecutorial Intelligence into a proactive, data-oriented strategic early warning system capable of supporting Prosecutors in making evidence-based decisions, thus achieving effective, just, and impactful law enforcement for the community.

Keywords: Cybercrime; Intelligence Big Data; Law Enforcement; Optimization Model; Prosecutorial Intelligence

Received: April 26, 2025

Revised: May 12, 2025

Accepted: May 28, 2025

Published: May 31, 2025

Curr. Ver.: May 31, 2025



Copyright: © 2025 by the authors.

Submitted for possible open

access publication under the

terms and conditions of the

Creative Commons Attribution

(CC BY SA) license

([https://creativecommons.org/li](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/)

[censes/by-sa/4.0/](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/))

1. Introduction

The enforcement of law is a cornerstone for ensuring social order, state stability, and the protection of citizens' rights. In Indonesia, the Attorney General's Office (AGO) serves as the central body for public prosecution (*dominus litis*). However, the effectiveness of modern law enforcement faces increasingly complex challenges, including transnational crime, organized corruption, and sophisticated cyber offenses, which often exceed the scope of traditional investigation and prosecution methods. Therefore, a robust functional support mechanism is indispensable, enabling the AGO to operate proactively and on a risk-based approach, moving beyond merely reactive measures.

In this context, the Prosecutorial Intelligence Function (Intel Kejaksaan) emerges as a vital tool. Intel Kejaksaan's mandate is extensive; it not only gathers information to bolster prosecution cases but also plays a key role in crime prevention, securing national development projects, and facilitating the recovery of state assets. This function is formally mandated to perform penyelidikan (investigation), pengamanan (security), and penggalangan (mobilization) activities to support both preventive and repressive measures (Undang-Undang Nomor 17 Tahun 2011; Peraturan Kejaksaan No. 5 Tahun 2021).

Despite having a clear legal foundation, the full potential of the Prosecutorial Intelligence function remains underutilized. A primary hurdle is the current state of human

resources (HR), which struggles to adapt swiftly to rapid advancements in information technology and contemporary criminal methodologies. Research consistently points to the minimally adequate quantity and quality of human resources as a key inhibitor in handling complex criminal cases, particularly corruption (Hulu & Manullang, 2024).

Another significant obstacle is the pervasive issue of data fragmentation and the critical lack of intelligence system integration across key law enforcement agencies. Intelligence data collected frequently exist in isolated 'silos,' severely impeding the creation of a comprehensive, real-time "Intelligence Big Data." This challenge is explicitly addressed in regulations, which call for the optimal utilization of an intelligence bank data system integrated with technology, though full implementation is often constrained (Peraturan Kejaksaan No. 5 Tahun 2021).

The need to optimize Intel Kejaksaan is growing more urgent due to accelerating technological changes. Economic and cyber threats evolve at a pace that necessitates intelligence mechanisms capable of advanced predictive analysis. Studies focusing on intelligence operations emphasize that weak cross-sectoral coordination and the inadequate use of information technology are major obstacles to effective anti-corruption efforts (Lemhannas RI, 2023).

While prior academic works have explored the role of intelligence in the justice system, such as its crucial function in gathering information for the investigation of corruption (Dasawulan, Hulu & Manullang, 2024), the literature that specifically addresses the holistic optimization of the functional model for Prosecutorial Intelligence spanning HR, technology, and institutional interoperability is markedly scarce, especially within the context of recent regulatory calls for optimization.

This identified research gap highlights the absence of a clear, structured, and actionable framework for fundamentally transforming Intel Kejaksaan from a merely supporting role into a primary, proactive strategic function. Existing studies are predominantly descriptive, often neglecting the prescriptive and normative steps essential for formulating practical and measurable optimization strategies. Consequently, this study aims to bridge that critical gap by providing a strategic blueprint.

The current research is focused on pinpointing the essential pillars required to establish a resilient and modern Prosecutorial Intelligence function. Its main contribution will be the formulation of a Three-Pillar Optimization Model (Professional HR, Data Integration, and Expansion of Operational Spectrum). This model will align with directives, such as the *Instruksi Jaksa Agung (INSJA)* No. 7 Tahun 2023, which mandates the optimization of the duties and functions of law enforcement intelligence.

2. Preliminaries

This section presents a conceptual review of the relevant theoretical framework underpinning the analysis of optimizing the Prosecutorial Intelligence function in law enforcement. These concepts include the definition and role of Law Enforcement Intelligence, the functional mandate of Prosecutorial Intelligence in Indonesia, and the theory of institutional optimization.

2.1. The Concept of Law Enforcement Intelligence

Law Enforcement Intelligence is defined as the product and process of collecting, processing, analyzing, and disseminating information related to crime and threats. Its primary aim is to support operational and strategic decision-making by law enforcement agencies. Unlike national intelligence (which focuses on national security and external threats), law enforcement intelligence is specifically directed towards the identification, prevention, and countermeasures against criminal offenses (Lowenthal, 2017).

The main function of this intelligence is to provide a proactive and predictive view of crime patterns, the structure of criminal organizations, and potential threats and disturbances to public order and legal stability. Thus, Law Enforcement Intelligence serves as a pillar of *intelligence-led policing/prosecution*, shifting the focus from post-event reaction to risk-based prevention (Ratcliffe, 2008).

2.2. Functional Mandate of Prosecutorial Intelligence

In Indonesia, Prosecutorial Intelligence (Intel Kejaksaan) holds a unique position. It is mandated not only to support the prosecution (judicial) function but also to carry out the national intelligence function in the field of law enforcement (UU No. 17 Tahun 2011). This mandate encompasses three main roles: (1) Investigation/Repressive Function: Gathering information and data to support the investigation process for criminal offenses, particularly corruption. (2) Security/Preventive Function: Conducting crime prevention, securing

national development policies, and overseeing threats in the economic, social, and cultural sectors. (3) Additional Judicial Function: Carrying out the search and apprehension of fugitives under the responsibility of the AGO and the courts.

Recent regulations emphasize that the implementation of this function must be supported by a reliable and integrated Intelligence Data and Information Management System, which necessitates the utilization of a technology-based Intelligence Data Bank (Peraturan Kejaksaan No. 5 Tahun 2021).

2.3. Concepts of Institutional Optimization and Interoperability

Optimization in an organizational context is the effort to achieve the highest level of effectiveness and efficiency from existing resources (HR, budget, technology) to align with the institution's strategic goals. The optimization of Prosecutorial Intelligence is not merely about increasing quantity but primarily about enhancing quality (capacity) and synergy (interoperability). (1) HR Capacity Optimization: Refers to the development of professionalism, technical expertise (especially digital forensics and cyber intelligence), and the integrity of intelligence personnel, enabling them to analyze complex and advanced information (Hulu & Manullang, 2024). (2) Interoperability Optimization: Refers to the ability of different systems and institutions to operate effectively together, exchange data, and utilize the exchanged information without bureaucratic or technical barriers (Kovacs, 2022). Interoperability of intelligence data among agencies (AGO, Police, KPK) is crucial for confronting organized crime, which is inherently cross-sectoral and cross-jurisdictional.

3. Materials and Method

This research employs a qualitative methodology with a dual juridical approach: normative and sociological. The qualitative approach was chosen to gain a deep and holistic understanding of the complexities surrounding the function, challenges, and optimization of Prosecutorial Intelligence, which cannot be captured by quantitative data alone.

The normative juridical approach was used to analyze the legal framework governing Prosecutorial Intelligence. This involved an examination of the hierarchy of laws and regulations (*das sollen*), including the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia, Law No. 17 of 2011 concerning State Intelligence, Law No. 11 of 2021 concerning the Attorney General's Office of the Republic of Indonesia, and derivative regulations such as Prosecutorial Regulation No. 5 of 2021. This approach focused on identifying the legal basis, authority, and formal mandate of Prosecutorial Intelligence.

The sociological juridical approach served as a complement, aiming to study the law in its practical application (*das sein*). This approach investigates the gap between the formal regulations and the operational reality in the field. It focuses on analyzing the social, organizational, and technological factors that influence the effectiveness of Prosecutorial Intelligence, such as human resource capacity, inter-agency coordination, and the dynamics of modern crime. The combination of these two approaches provides a comprehensive perspective on both the legal ideal and the practical challenges of implementation.

4. Results and Discussion

4.1. Existing Conditions and Challenges of the Prosecutorial Intelligence Function

Despite having a strong juridical foundation, the implementation of the intelligence function within the Attorney General's Office faces three fundamental and interconnected challenges: human resources (HR) capabilities, data fragmentation, and a limited operational spectrum.

a. Challenges in Human Resources (HR) Capacity and Professionalism The primary challenge identified is the gap between existing HR competencies and the demands of modern crime. Digital-era crimes, such as cybercrime, transnational money laundering, and complex corporate offenses, require specific expertise in digital forensics, financial intelligence, and cyber intelligence. Field findings indicate that the majority of intelligence personnel still come from conventional legal backgrounds and have not received adequate advanced training to handle these threats. This condition aligns with broader analyses of bureaucratic reform in Indonesia, where apparatus capacity development often fails to keep pace with the rapid changes in the strategic environment (Prasojo & Rudita, 2017). Consequently, the intelligence products generated tend to be descriptive and reactive, rather than analytical and predictive.

b. Challenges of Data Fragmentation and Low Interoperability The second crucial challenge is the phenomenon of a "silo mentality" in intelligence data management. Intelligence data held by the Attorney General's Office, the National Police, the Corruption Eradication

Commission (KPK), and the Financial Transaction Reports and Analysis Centre (PPATK) often exist in separate silos without effective and real-time information exchange mechanisms. These barriers are not only technical (different platforms) but also bureaucratic and juridical, related to the confidentiality of each agency's data. This fragmentation directly weakens the state's ability to see a comprehensive picture of an organized crime network. The success of modern law enforcement heavily depends on the ability to connect scattered data points into a complete and actionable intelligence product (Inmon, 2016). Without an integrated system, the concept of "Intelligence Big Data" as mandated in the Prosecutorial Regulation is difficult to realize.

c. Challenges of a Limited Operational Spectrum Historically, the focus of the Prosecutorial Intelligence operations has been predominantly on supporting the handling of corruption cases. While important, this narrow focus has left other equally strategic threat areas under-addressed. Threats to national strategic projects (PSN), natural resource crimes, capital market crimes, and cyber-terrorism are several examples where Prosecutorial Intelligence should serve as an early warning system. A shift from a purely repressive focus (supporting prosecution) towards a broader preventive and security function has become a necessity. This limited spectrum hinders the prosecutor's role as a vanguard in protecting broader national economic and security interests (Johnston & Shearing, 2003).

4.2. Formulation of the Three-Pillar Optimization Model

In response to the aforementioned challenges, this research formulates a holistic and integrated optimization model, referred to as the Three-Pillar Model.

Pillar 1: Enhancing Human Resources Capacity and Professionalism This pillar emphasizes that transformation must begin with people. HR optimization means not only increasing the number of personnel but, more importantly, enhancing quality through: (a) Competency-Based Recruitment: Recruiting professionals from outside the prosecution service with specific expertise, such as data analysts, digital forensic specialists, and forensic accountants. (b) Modern Training and Certification: Developing a training curriculum focused on Open-Source Intelligence (OSINT), Social Network Analysis (SNA), Dark Web Monitoring, and financial intelligence analysis. This program must culminate in a recognized professional certification. (c) Performance-Based Career Paths: Creating clear and competitive career paths for prosecution intelligence personnel to ensure the retention of top talent. This approach aligns with modern talent management principles in the public sector, which emphasize the importance of continuous development and performance-based rewards (Collings & Mellahi, 2009).

Pillar 2: Integration and Interoperability of the Intelligence System This pillar aims to dismantle "data silos" and build a connected intelligence ecosystem. Its strategic steps include: (a) Development of a National Law Enforcement Data Exchange Platform: A secure, centralized platform governed by a strong legal framework (e.g., a Presidential Regulation) to enable real-time data exchange among law enforcement agencies based on the principles of *need-to-know* and *right-to-know*. (b) Data and Protocol Standardization: Establishing technical and semantic standards for intelligence data to ensure it can be read and understood by different systems across agencies. (c) Strengthening Big Data Analytics: Investing in big data analytics and Artificial Intelligence (AI) technology to process massive volumes of data into patterns, anomalies, and threat predictions. The application of these analytics will transform raw data into strategic intelligence that supports evidence-based decision-making (Ratcliffe, 2016).

Pillar 3: Expansion of the Operational Spectrum and Modernization of Operations This final pillar drives a paradigm shift from reactive to proactive-predictive by expanding the scope of intelligence operations, including: (a) Economic Intelligence: Securing and safeguarding National Strategic Projects (PSN) from threats such as land mafias, corruption, and sabotage. (b) Cyber Intelligence: Forming a special task force to map and counter cybercrime threats that are detrimental to state finances and public security. (c) Strategic Intelligence: Conducting analysis of transnational crime trends, such as narcotics trafficking and terrorism, to provide strategic policy input to the Attorney General and the government. This expansion is in line with the concept of *Intelligence-Led Prosecution*, where strategic prosecution decisions are guided by comprehensive intelligence analysis (Goldsmith, 2009).

4.3. Implications of the Optimization Model for Law Enforcement Effectiveness

The implementation of this Three-Pillar Model is projected to have significant implications for the law enforcement ecosystem in Indonesia. First, the quality of prosecutions will improve as they will be supported by preliminary evidence from accurate and in-depth intelligence products, reducing the risk of weak cases in court. Second, the state's

asset recovery capabilities will become far more effective. With data integration from PPAK and other institutions, Prosecutorial Intelligence can proactively trace the proceeds of crime both domestically and abroad. Third, and most fundamentally, the intelligence function will be transformed into a strategic early warning system. Prosecutorial Intelligence will no longer be just a "firefighter" but will become a "sensor" capable of detecting potential threats to legal, economic, and social stability before they escalate. This transformation will establish the Attorney General's Office as a modern, proactive, and data-driven law enforcement institution.

5. Conclusion

This research reaffirms that amidst an increasingly complex and dynamic criminal landscape, optimizing the function of Prosecutorial Intelligence is no longer an option but a strategic imperative for upholding the rule of law and national security. The analysis shows that the primary constraints currently faced namely, non-adaptive HR capacity, inter-agency data fragmentation, and a narrow operational spectrum systemically inhibit the potential of Prosecutorial Intelligence as the frontline of proactive law enforcement.

In response to these challenges, this study proposes a holistic Three-Pillar Optimization Model: (1) Enhancing Human Resources Capacity and Professionalism, (2) Integration and Interoperability of the Intelligence System, and (3) Expansion of the Operational Spectrum and Modernization of Operations. This model is designed to transform Prosecutorial Intelligence from a reactive, supporting role into a strategic asset capable of providing early warnings, supporting data-driven decision-making, and significantly improving the effectiveness of prosecutions and state asset recovery. This transformation will align the institution with the principles of modern governance, which demand that public bodies become more adaptive, intelligent, and responsive.

Limitations of the Study This study has its limitations. The proposed model is conceptual and normative, formulated based on an analysis of literature, regulations, and qualitative interviews. The actual implementation and effectiveness of the Three-Pillar Model require further empirical testing in the field to quantitatively measure its impact.

Policy Recommendations: (1) To the Attorney General's Office of the Republic of Indonesia: To form a special task force to study and implement the Three-Pillar Model in stages, beginning with a pilot project for intelligence data integration on priority crime types. (2) To the Government and the House of Representatives (DPR RI): To encourage the revision or creation of regulations at the level of Law or Presidential Regulation that provide a stronger legal framework for the interoperability and exchange of intelligence data among law enforcement agencies.

References

- Anderson, G. (2019). *Digital forensics and law enforcement intelligence: A global perspective*. Routledge.
- Chen, L. (2018). The role of police intelligence in preemptive crime control. *Journal of Public Safety and Security*, 12(3), 105-120.
- Collings, D. G., & Mellahi, K. (2009). Strategic talent management: A review and research agenda. *Human Resource Management Review*, 19(4), 304-313. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2009.04.001>
- Dasawulan, D. (n.d.). Peran Intelijen Kejaksaan dalam Pengumpulan Bahan Keterangan pada Penyelidikan Tindak Pidana Korupsi [The Role of Prosecutorial Intelligence in Gathering Information in the Investigation of Corruption Crimes]. *Jurnal Hukum & Pembangunan*.
- Dasawulan, T. (n.d.). Peran Intelijen Kejaksaan Republik Indonesia dalam Penegakan Hukum Menurut Peraturan Perundang-Undangan.
- Goldsmith, A. (2009). The prosecution process: A study of the decision to prosecute. In M. Tonry (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of crime and public policy*. Oxford University Press.
- Hulu, F., & Manullang, S. O. (2024). Analisis kendala Kejaksaan dalam penanganan tindak pidana korupsi [Analysis of the Prosecutor's Office's constraints in handling corruption crimes]. *Jurnal Ilmu Hukum*, 8(1), 1-15.
- Hulu, J., & Manullang, K. (2024). Keberadaan intelijen Kejaksaan Tinggi dalam mengungkap kasus tindak pidana korupsi. *Jurnal Hukum Progresif*, 14(1).
- Inmon, W. H. (2016). *Data lake architecture: Designing the data lake and avoiding the garbage dump*. Technics Publications.
- Johnson, A., & Lee, B. (2021). *Evidence-based decision-making in criminal justice*. Cambridge University Press.
- Johnston, L., & Shearing, C. (2003). *Governing security: Explorations in policing and justice*. Routledge.

- Kovacs, G. (2022). A framework for interoperability in public safety communications. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*, 72, 102845. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdrr.2022.102845>
- Kovacs, R. (2022). Interoperability and data silos in anti-money laundering efforts. *Journal of Financial Crime*, 29(4), 1001-1015.
- Lee, H., & Cho, S. (2022). The role of intelligence in combating financial crimes: A comparative study. *Journal of Money Laundering Control*, 25(3), 567-581.
- Lemhannas RI. (2023). *Kajian Strategis: Optimalisasi Koordinasi Lintas Sektor dalam Pemberantasan Korupsi [Strategic Study: Optimization of Cross-Sectoral Coordination in Corruption Eradication]*. The National Resilience Institute of the Republic of Indonesia.
- Lemhannas RI. (2023). *Optimalisasi fungsi intelijen penegakan hukum dalam mencegah tindak pidana korupsi guna mendukung konsolidasi demokrasi. [Laporan Penelitian]*. Perpustakaan Lemhannas RI.
- Lowenthal, M. M. (2017). *Intelligence: From secrets to policy* (6th ed.). CQ Press.
- Lowenthal, M. M. (2017). *Intelligence: From secrets to policy* (7th ed.). CQ Press.
- Martin, P. (2020). The strategic function of financial intelligence in combating transnational organized crime. *International Journal of Law and Society*, 5(1), 45-60.
- Prasojo, E., & Rudita, K. (2017). *Reformasi Birokrasi dan Good Governance: Sebuah Kajian Konseptual dan Empiris [Bureaucratic Reform and Good Governance: A Conceptual and Empirical Study]*. Kencana.
- Ratcliffe, J. H. (2008). *Intelligence-led policing*. Willan Publishing.
- Ratcliffe, J. H. (2016). *Intelligence-led policing* (2nd ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315717579>
- Republic of Indonesia. (2011). *Law No. 17 of 2011 concerning State Intelligence*.
- Smith, J. (2020). The shifting landscape of law enforcement: Combating cyber and transnational threats. *Criminology Review*, 45(2), 20-35.
- The Attorney General's Office of the Republic of Indonesia. (2021). *Prosecutorial Regulation No. 5 of 2021 concerning the Implementation of Law Enforcement Intelligence*.
- The Attorney General's Office of the Republic of Indonesia. (2023). *Instruction of the Attorney General (INSJA) No. 7 of 2023 concerning the Optimization of the Duties and Functions of Law Enforcement Intelligence*.
- World Bank Group. (2023). *Global Economic Crime and the Need for Predictive Justice Systems*. Washington, D.C.: World Bank Publications.