A peer-reviewed journal published by Faculty of Law Universitas Negeri Semarang, Indonesia. The title has been indexed by SCOPUS, SINTA, GARUDA, BASE, OneSearch.
ISSN 2654-8313 (Print) 2654-8305 (Online)
Online at https://journal.unnes.ac.id/journals/JPHI/index
DOI: https://doi.org/10.15294/jphi.v9i2.61538

JURNAL PENGABDIAN HUKUM INDONESIA
Indonesian Journal of Legal Community Engagement

Submitted : July 31, 2026
Revised : October 6, 2026
Accepted : October 6, 2026
Published : November 2, 2026
Available Online : November 2, 2026

Ombudsman On the Spot as a Proactive Service Model for Expanding Access to Public Service Complaint Mechanisms in Central Java

Elyna Noor Dina Nazla [a] ✉, Martitah Martitah [b], Dani Muhtada [c], Yurida Zakky Umami [d]

[a] Ombudsman of the Republic of Indonesia, Central Java Province, Indonesia
[b] Faculty of Law, Universitas Negeri Semarang, Indonesia
[c] Faculty of Law, Universitas Negeri Semarang, Indonesia
[d] Faculty of Law, Universitas Wahid Hasyim, Indonesia

✉ Corresponding email: elyna.nazla@ombudsman.go.id

Abstract

Unequal access to complaint mechanisms may prevent members of the public from obtaining remedies for maladministration when distance, limited information, digital barriers, disability, age, or confidentiality concerns restrict contact with oversight institutions. This article examines Ombudsman On the Spot, implemented by the Central Java Representative Office of the Ombudsman of the Republic of Indonesia, as a proactive complaint access

Copyrights © Author(s). This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC 4.0). All writings published in this journal are personal views of the author and do not represent the views of this journal and the author's affiliated institutions.

service. Using a descriptive evaluative community engagement approach, the study analyses five internal activity reports covering seven service points from April to September 2025, supported by institutional records, SIMPeL 4.0 administrative data, programme guidelines, and legislation. Across the seven service points, eight non-report consultations and six registered complaints were directly recorded through OTS, together with one recommendation for service improvement. The six registered complaints subsequently received institutional follow-up through examination and/or coordination with the reported institutions and were administratively closed. These are administrative outputs, not evidence of user satisfaction or causal effects. The findings identify three complementary modalities: facility-based service booths, community education and consultation, and targeted visits for users requiring accessibility or confidentiality adjustments. They also identify four dimensions of access: physical, informational, procedural, and relational. The article develops a six-stage framework consisting of access mapping, targeted outreach, rights education, consultation and preliminary verification, registration, referral or coordination, and monitoring and evaluation. Four stages are practice-derived, while two are normatively completed by the 2025 programme guideline. The framework offers a replicable structure for proactive complaint access while retaining privacy safeguards and cautious limits on claims of effectiveness.

KEYWORDS *Ombudsman, Proactive Services, Public Service Complaints, Public Access, Maladministration.*

Introduction

Public services constitute one of the principal points of interaction between citizens and the state. Through administrative, social, and essential services, including education, healthcare, and food provision, citizens exercise their rights to obtain legal documents, such as land certificates and permits, access social protection, and receive decisions that directly affect their daily lives. Public information disclosure is an essential element of good governance, as it promotes transparency, accountability, public participation, and government responsiveness. These principles ensure that

citizens have access to relevant information and opportunities to express their concerns regarding government actions. Consequently, public institutions are expected to remain accountable to the communities they serve. In this context, Indonesian law treats public service delivery not merely as a managerial activity but as a legal obligation accompanied by established service standards, accountability requirements, public participation, and accessible complaint mechanisms.[1] The Ombudsman of the Republic of Indonesia provides an independent external oversight mechanism through which members of the public can report alleged maladministration and seek administrative remedies. Law No. 25 of 2009 concerning Public Services requires public service providers to establish complaint-handling mechanisms, ensure accountability in service delivery, and protect the rights of service users. Complementing this framework, Law No. 37 of 2008 concerning the Ombudsman of the Republic of Indonesia establishes the Ombudsman's authority to receive and examine public complaints, investigate alleged maladministration, request clarification from relevant authorities, and issue recommendations within its statutory mandate. Taken together, these legal frameworks establish public complaint mechanisms as an essential instrument for strengthening institutional accountability, protecting citizens' rights, and improving the quality of public service delivery.

The availability of complaint channels does not necessarily mean that they are genuinely accessible. Members of the public may be aware of an institution's existence. Still, they may not yet understand its authority, reporting requirements, supporting documents, or the obligation to first submit a complaint to the relevant public service provider. Distance from the Ombudsman's office, travel costs, limited digital skills, disability, age, unequal access to information, and concerns that their identity may be disclosed can also discourage people from filing complaints. Yet public participation is essential, as members of the public serve as external monitors of the administration of the state and government. These barriers may be understood as forms of administrative burden, including learning costs incurred when individuals must seek information and understand

[1] Rofi Wahanisa et al., "Achieving Public Information Transparency in The Dissemination of Local Regulations," *Yuridika* 38, no. 3 (2023), https://doi.org/10.20473/ydk.v38i3.48345.

procedures, compliance costs associated with meeting service requirements, and psychological costs such as anxiety, stigma, and diminished self-confidence when dealing with public institutions. The use of telephones and the internet can indeed reduce administrative costs while expanding the reach of services, but it does not always lessen the burden borne by users. An experimental study by Linos et al. found that disadvantaged groups were far more likely to use postcards than telephone or email services to obtain information about free public services. This preference was influenced, among other factors, by limited confidence in using new communication technologies and concerns about making mistakes when communicating with public officials.[2] Technological innovation and legal literacy are essential to improving the accessibility and effectiveness of public services. While digitalization facilitates administrative efficiency, it must be accompanied by non-digital service alternatives and direct assistance to ensure that technological limitations do not create additional barriers for the public. Integrating these approaches supports the development of proactive, inclusive, and responsive public service models that address community needs.[3]

The digitalization of public services is important because it can improve efficiency, service quality, transparency, and inter-organizational service integration. However, digitalization may also create new barriers for vulnerable groups. Liu, Zhou, and Liang explain that digital inclusion should not be understood merely as the availability of devices or internet connectivity; it also encompasses people's capabilities, knowledge, attitudes, and opportunities to benefit from digital technologies. Even some vulnerable groups with basic internet skills may still encounter difficulties in understanding and assessing information, articulating their needs, and

[2] Pamela Herd and Donald P. Moynihan, "Administrative Burden: Policymaking by Other Means," in *New York: Russell Sage Foundation*, 2018, https://www.russellsage.org/publications/book/administrative-burden; Katerina Linos et al., "How Do Disadvantaged Groups Seek Information about Public Services? A Randomized Controlled Trial of Communication Technologies," *Public Administration Review* 82, no. 4 (2022): 708–20.

[3] Suhadi Suhadi et al., "Advances in Technology and the Future of Publication Systems in Land Registration in Indonesia," in *AIP Conference Proceedings*, vol. 2573, 2022, https://doi.org/10.1063/5.0104112; Suhadi Suhadi et al., "Enhancing Nazir Capacity through Legal Literacy of Land Trust to Ensure Legal Certainty in Waqf Land Management," *Jurnal Pengabdian Hukum Indonesia* 7, no. 2 (2024), https://doi.org/10.15294/jphi.v7i2.6693.

aligning the problems they face with bureaucratic procedures in online services. Based on a systematic review of 98 articles, the study conceptualizes digital inclusion as a multidimensional issue encompassing both technical and social aspects and requiring interconnected measures at the levels of governance, service delivery, and user support. Therefore, the development of digital public services should be accompanied by service designs and assistance mechanisms that take into account differences in users' capabilities and circumstances, rather than being based on the assumption that all members of the public can independently access services through a single digital channel.[4]

The concept of proactive public services provides a relevant framework for addressing these various barriers to access. Unlike passive service delivery, which waits for members of the public to contact the relevant institution, proactive service delivery places public organizations in the position of approaching prospective service recipients first, based on their needs, circumstances, preferences, life events, or location. Under this model, access to services does not depend entirely on individuals' ability to identify the services they need, understand the applicable procedures, and submit requests on their own initiative. Pawlowski and Scholta developed a taxonomy of proactive public services comprising 23 characteristics across eight dimensions. The taxonomy demonstrates that proactivity does not take a single uniform form, but may be designed at different levels and in different forms according to the characteristics of the service and the position of the service recipient. Scholta and Lindgren further explain that proactivity shifts service delivery from a pull approach, in which members of the public must approach public organizations, to a push approach, in which organizations actively offer or deliver services to the public. In its most proactive form, individuals may not even be required to take any particular action to receive services to which they are entitled. Conceptually, this approach has the potential to promote more equitable access to certain types of services and reduce the administrative burdens borne by the public. However, its implementation requires integrated

[4] Hui Liu, Qingshan Zhou, and Shuang Liang, "Digital Inclusion in Public Services for Vulnerable Groups: A Systematic Review for Research Themes and Goal-Action Framework from the Lens of Public Service Ecosystem Theory," *Government Information Quarterly* 42, no. 2 (2025): 102019.

systems and may also reshape the role of the public in the process of public service value co-creation.[5]

These concepts form a connected explanatory chain rather than four parallel labels. Administrative burden identifies where complaint access becomes costly for users through learning, compliance, and psychological demands. Proactive public service explains the institutional response: part of the effort required to locate information, understand procedures, and reach the complaint body is shifted from the user to the institution through targeted outreach. Street-level bureaucracy then identifies frontline discretion as the mechanism through which formal rules may either alleviate or reproduce those burdens in actual encounters. Accessibility provides the observable dimensions—physical, informational, procedural, and relational—through which that response can be assessed. The six-stage framework therefore operates as a mechanism-oriented interpretive model for complaint access, not as a tested causal theory of programme effectiveness.

Complaint handling by the Ombudsman performs distinctive legal and institutional functions. This mechanism provides a relatively informal avenue for seeking administrative justice, creates space for clarification between members of the public and public service providers, and enables individual complaints to be transformed into input for improving public administration. Comparative studies generally regard independence, impartiality, procedural fairness, and accessibility as essential elements of an effective Ombudsman complaint-handling system. Studies in Indonesia likewise recognize complaint mechanisms as a form of public participation in overseeing the quality of public services, while also emphasizing the Ombudsman's responsibility to ensure that every complaint receives an appropriate and meaningful response. Nevertheless, the existing literature has focused primarily on the legal status of Ombudsman Recommendations, complaint-resolution procedures, or the development of digital complaint systems. Studies examining the Ombudsman's efforts

[5] Caroline Pawlowski and Hendrik Scholta, "A Taxonomy for Proactive Public Services," *Government Information Quarterly* 40, no. 1 (2023): 101780; Hendrik Scholta and Ida Lindgren, "Proactivity in Digital Public Services: A Conceptual Analysis," *Government Information Quarterly* 40, no. 3 (2023): 101832.

to proactively reach members of the public who face difficulties in, or are unable to use, conventional complaint channels remain relatively limited.[6]

International Ombudsman practice provides a useful comparative frame for proactive complaint access. In Ireland, regional Complaint Clinics enable people to make complaints in person in their local area. At the same time, outreach through Public Participation Networks is used to reach community, voluntary, and social-inclusion groups that may need the Ombudsman service most. Australia's Commonwealth Ombudsman similarly combines information sessions with drop-in complaint clinics in regional and remote First Nations communities and expressly treats outreach as a way to improve accessibility regardless of location.[7]

Additional outreach forms are visible in Tonga and the Philippines. The Office of the Ombudsman Tonga treats community outreach as an institutional function for bringing information and engagement closer to people across island communities. At the same time, the Philippine Ombudsman has established assistance centres outside the central office to receive complaints and provide frontline services. These examples reinforce a common principle: accessibility may require the complaint institution to move closer to users rather than relying exclusively on office-based or digital intake. Compared with these practices, the Central Java model combines temporary service booths, community education, and confidentiality-sensitive home visits within one staged pathway linking access mapping, preliminary verification, complaint intake or referral, follow-up, and privacy safeguards.[8]

Administrative data from the Ombudsman of the Republic of Indonesia indicate that outreach programmes constitute an important part of efforts to expand public access to complaint mechanisms. The 2023 Annual Report of the Ombudsman of the Republic of Indonesia records

[6] Susi Dwi Harijanti, "Complaint Handling Systems in the Public Sector: A Comparative Analysis between Indonesia and Australia," *Indonesian Comparative Law Review* 3, no. 1 (2020): 1–24; Krismena Tovalini, "Partisipasi Masyarakat Dan Mekanisme Komplain Dalam Penyelenggaraan Pelayanan Publik," *Jurnal Ilmu Administrasi Negara (JUAN)* 2, no. 1 (2014): 1–8.

[7] Office of the Ombudsman (Ireland), "Annual Report 2024," *Dublin: Office of the Ombudsman*, 2025; Commonwealth Ombudsman, "Innovate Reconciliation Action Plan 2025–2027," *Canberra: Office of the Commonwealth Ombudsman*, 2025.

[8] Office of the Ombudsman Tonga, "Annual Report FY 2023/2024," *Nuku'alofa: Office of the Ombudsman*, 2024.

that the Access Programme was implemented in 52 regencies and municipalities across 17 provinces, particularly in areas where access to complaint mechanisms was classified as low or very low. Within the programme's intervention areas, the number of recorded accesses increased from 2,131 in 2022, comprising 1,291 non-report consultations, 779 public reports, and 61 Ombudsman Rapid Responses, to 4,706 in 2023, including 3,784 non-report consultations, 870 public reports, and 52 Ombudsman Rapid Responses. These figures indicate increased use of Ombudsman services in the programme's target areas. However, because the data are administrative in nature and were not generated through a causal impact evaluation, the increase cannot be interpreted as evidence that the outreach programme was the sole factor responsible for the expansion of access. Nevertheless, the data demonstrate that consultations and services delivered closer to communities play an important role in extending the reach of Ombudsman services.[9]

The Central Java Representative Office of the Ombudsman of the Republic of Indonesia implements a proactive approach through Ombudsman on the Spot, an outreach service that brings complaint-handling and consultation services closer to the public, particularly vulnerable groups and individuals who experience difficulties in using online services. The programme is also used to enhance public understanding of the Ombudsman's duties and functions. In 2024, the Central Java Representative Office reported eight activities in Semarang City and ten activities outside Semarang City. These activities demonstrate that direct outreach has become an important part of the Office's strategy to expand public access to public service complaint mechanisms. In 2025, the implementation of the programme was guided by Regulation of the Chairperson of the Ombudsman of the Republic of Indonesia Number 5 of 2025 on Guidelines for the Implementation of the Public Service Complaint Access Programme. The Regulation is intended to serve as a reference for programme implementation while increasing public

[9] Ombudsman Republik Indonesia, "Laporan Tahunan Ombudsman Republik Indonesia 2023," *Jakarta: Ombudsman Republik Indonesia*, 2023.

knowledge and awareness of public service complaints. Its scope covers indicators for determining target locations, programme preparation and forms of activity, collaboration with local governments, documentation, programme outputs, budgeting, monitoring, reporting, and activity evaluation. The Guidelines, as stipulated in the Regulation of the Chairman of the Ombudsman of the Republic of Indonesia Number 5 of 2025 concerning Guidelines for the Implementation of the Public Service Complaint Access Program, affirm that the Access Programme is intended not only to expand public access to complaint mechanisms but also to proactively carry out complaint-receipt and verification functions, particularly in regencies or municipalities where public access remains low or very low.[10]

This article examines five reports on Ombudsman On the Spot activities conducted in 2025. The activities included the establishment of service booths at public service units, community-based outreach, and targeted visits to complainants' residences. Because the documents analyzed contain confidential information, this article does not disclose names, addresses, document numbers, or detailed personal chronologies. Complaints are presented under general service categories, while direct visits are described according to their function in expanding access rather than by reference to the complainants' identities. These limitations are applied to ensure that the discussion of access to complaint mechanisms does not create new risks to the privacy of individuals whose personal information should be protected.

Previous community engagement studies indicate that public legal understanding is strengthened when information is accompanied by discussion, assistance, and procedural guidance. Natamiharja et al. combined socialization, discussion, assistance, and education, while Mukminto et al. emphasized assistance for communities with limited knowledge and access to e-government services. Studies that formulate an Ombudsman outreach framework from field implementation remain

[10] Ombudsman Republik Indonesia Perwakilan Jawa Tengah, "Laporan Tahunan 2025," *Semarang: Ombudsman Republik Indonesia Perwakilan Jawa Tengah*, 2026; Ombudsman Republik Indonesia Perwakilan Jawa Tengah, "Ombudsman Jateng Terima 663 Aduan Sepanjang 2025," 2025.

limited. This article therefore examines: first, the implementation of Ombudsman On the Spot as a proactive service in Central Java; and second, a service framework for expanding complaint access while safeguarding confidentiality and institutional accountability. The proposed six-stage framework is practice-derived from documented field activities and normatively completed by the 2025 programme guideline, and is assessed through physical, informational, procedural, and relational access.[11]

Methods

This article is based on community engagement activities conducted by the Central Java Representative Office of the Ombudsman of the Republic of Indonesia. The authors were involved in the planning, implementation, documentation, and evaluation of the activities in accordance with their respective roles. The community engagement activities were carried out through the Ombudsman On the Spot programme using a proactive legal service model and a descriptive-evaluative approach. The activities were designed to bring information services, consultations, complaint reception, and preliminary verification closer to members of the public who encounter barriers in accessing the Ombudsman's service channels. The evaluation focused on the implementation process, forms of interaction, immediate outputs, and service elements that could be replicated. The assessment was not intended to determine the legal merits of each complaint. Accordingly, the unit of evaluation in this article was the activity conducted at each service point, rather than the individual complainant.

The primary field corpus covers April to September 2025 and consists of five internal activity reports encompassing seven service points: a motor vehicle tax service unit in Semarang; Public Service Malls in Pekalongan,

[11] Rudi Natamiharja et al., "Socialization Regarding Community Rights to Company Obligations in Lempuyang Bandar Village, Central Lampung," *Jurnal Pengabdian Hukum Indonesia (Indonesian Journal of Legal Community Engagement)* 5, no. 2 (2022): 303–16; Eko Mukminto et al., "Public Services Versus Covid-19: Participation of Villagers in Public Service Based on E-Government in Pandemic," *Jurnal Pengabdian Hukum Indonesia (Indonesian Journal of Legal Community Engagement)* 6, no. 1 (2023): 1–16.

Surakarta, and Purbalingga; a community venue in Pagerbarang Subdistrict, Tegal; and two targeted home visit sites in different regencies. These seven points constitute the analytical corpus, not the complete universe of Ombudsman On the Spot activities conducted by the office during 2025. They represent three modalities: facility-based service booths, community-based outreach, and targeted visits for users requiring accessibility or confidentiality adjustments.

The five reports were selected purposively because each documented a completed Ombudsman On the Spot activity within the defined April–September period, identified the service location and outreach modality, and contained sufficient information on public interactions, issues, or immediate outputs for structured analysis. The unit of coding was the service point and the documented interaction or output, not the identity of an individual complainant. The design therefore supports analytical comparison across different service configurations while avoiding a claim that the corpus is statistically representative of all Ombudsman outreach activity.

Participants varied by setting and included users of public service facilities, members of the Pagerbarang Subdistrict youth organization (Karang Taruna), persons seeking consultation or complaint assistance, complainants reached through targeted home visits, and public service officers involved in clarification or coordination. Community members participated by raising questions and service problems, discussing or submitting documents, and seeking procedural guidance. At service locations, Ombudsman officers also interacted directly with users who had not necessarily approached the complaint desk, provided brief explanations about the Ombudsman and complaint mechanisms, and distributed brochures as public information materials. The programme is therefore treated as community engagement linked to service delivery. Participants shaped the substance of consultation and outreach encounters, but they did not co-design the research or act as co-researchers.

At each activity, the Ombudsman team provided information on the Ombudsman's duties and authority, education on maladministration and complaint requirements, individual consultations, and preliminary verification of issues raised by members of the public. At booth and

community locations, officers also conducted face-to-face socialisation, interacted with service users in the surrounding service area, and distributed brochures. Based on the verification results, a complaint could be accepted for further processing, the complainant could be directed to complete the required documents, the matter could be referred to the competent institution, or it could be coordinated directly with the relevant public service provider where circumstances permitted. Targeted home visits were used when accessibility or confidentiality considerations required a more individual form of service.

The primary evaluation materials consisted of five internal activity reports prepared by the Central Java Representative Office of the Ombudsman of the Republic of Indonesia. The reports documented the timing and form of each activity, team composition, general categories of public service issues, observation findings, forms of coordination, and immediate outputs. Supporting materials included the annual report of the Ombudsman of the Republic of Indonesia, the annual report of the Central Java Representative Office, the 2025 programme implementation guidelines, and literature on proactive public services, administrative burden, complaint handling, digital inclusion, and legal community engagement. Four quarterly PVL reports for 2025 and the Central Java 2025 annual report were additionally used as supplementary institutional records to contextualise programme intensity, complaint-channel utilisation, resource constraints, and programme-level monitoring. These records were not coded as additional activity cases and did not expand the primary unit of analysis.[12]

To strengthen traceability of the empirical record, a structured administrative matrix was prepared at the seven service point level. For each point, it recorded non-report consultations, registered complaints, referrals or directions, direct coordination or on-site resolution, recommendations for service improvement, issue categories, and follow-up status. Values were retained only when traceable to the source identified in the matrix, and unrecorded values were not estimated. Complaint follow-up was checked against the institutional records used for this article and was treated as

[12] Ombudsman Republik Indonesia Perwakilan Jawa Tengah, "Laporan Triwulan I–IV 2025 Keasistenan Penerimaan Dan Verifikasi Laporan," *Empat Dokumen Internal. Semarang*, 2025.

process information rather than an outcome measure. Where SIMPeL 4.0 data for 2024 and 2025 were compared, the same January to December observation period was used, and the comparison was descriptive only. SIMPeL 4.0, quarterly reports, and annual reports are institutional administrative records. They strengthen the auditability of the analysis but do not independently validate service user experience.[13]

To make the analytical procedure reproducible, the five reports were re-read using a structured extraction matrix and manually coded in two cycles. First-cycle descriptive codes captured: (1) service point and target group; (2) outreach modality; (3) access barrier or vulnerability; (4) type of interaction; (5) public-service or complaint issue; (6) immediate output; (7) privacy or accessibility adjustment; and (8) documented follow-up or coordination. Second-cycle pattern coding grouped recurring codes into the three implementation modes, the four dimensions of access, and candidate stages of the proactive complaint-access process. The four access dimensions were applied deductively from the conceptual framework, while service modalities, outputs, and recurrent process steps were identified inductively from the reports.[14]

The evaluation proceeded through four linked analytical steps. First, each report was mapped by location, target group, outreach modality, interaction, and output. Second, issue categories and quantitative output fields were harmonised in the structured matrix so that the seven service points could be compared on the same terms. Third, recurring qualitative patterns were identified and compared with the 2025 programme guideline to distinguish field-derived practice from normatively required steps. Fourth, the resulting framework was assessed through physical, informational, procedural, and relational access. This sequence keeps descriptive counts, qualitative interpretation, and normative completion analytically distinct.

The six-stage framework was constructed by first applying a retention rule to candidate stages. A stage was retained when it was supported by

[13] Ombudsman Republik Indonesia, "SIMPeL 4.0 (Sistem Informasi Penyelesaian Laporan)," *Internal Administrative Database; Central Java Data Extracts Used for January–December 2024 and January–December 2025*, 2025.

[14] Johnny Saldaña, *The Coding Manual for Qualitative Researchers. 4th Ed*, *London: SAGE*, 2021.

recurring evidence across at least two service settings or when it constituted a necessary procedural or accountability step under the 2025 programme guideline for connecting field outreach with formal complaint handling. The second criterion was deliberately used to accommodate steps required by the programme guideline; stages retained principally on that basis were classified as normative components rather than field-derived findings. Applying this rule produced two analytical layers. Four stages—targeted outreach, rights education, consultation and preliminary verification, and registration, referral, or coordination—were identified from recurring patterns in the five activity reports. Two additional stages—access mapping and monitoring and evaluation—were incorporated to connect those field practices into a complete service cycle, drawing principally on the 2025 programme guideline and only partially on the activity documentation. The framework is therefore practice-derived and normatively completed, rather than a purely inductive model generated from the five reports. The evidentiary status of each stage is presented later in Table 4.

The evaluation did not employ pre-tests and post-tests, a control group, or instruments for causal impact measurement. Administrative follow-up status was therefore treated as process information rather than an effectiveness measure, and for this article, administratively closed means that a registered complaint had received institutional follow-up through examination and/or coordination with the reported institution and was subsequently recorded as closed. This status does not by itself establish that maladministration was found, that the complainant's request was granted, that the remedy was adequate, or that Ombudsman On the Spot caused the outcome. The analysis is limited to whether the activities expanded practical opportunities to obtain information, consultation, preliminary procedural assistance, and entry into the complaint handling mechanism.

Administrative data provide useful output baselines but do not measure user-level outcomes. Future evaluation should therefore supplement activity and complaint counts with prospective measures of change in user understanding, the proportion of contacts that become complete complaints or appropriate referrals, time from first contact to the next procedural step, follow-up to coordination or recommendations, and perceived accessibility and privacy. Table 3 operationalises these indicators.

Stronger claims about effectiveness would still require a longitudinal or comparative design with outcome data collected directly from service users.

The first author participated directly in the Ombudsman On the Spot activities analysed and in their institutional documentation. This insider position provided operational context but creates a risk of confirmation bias in evaluating a programme in which the author was involved. To mitigate that risk, the analysis was restricted to documented records, applied a structured extraction scheme, and distinguished field-documented elements from guideline-derived elements in Table 4. Nevertheless, the study did not use an independent evaluator, service-user interviews, independent observation, participant validation, or external coding checks. Annual reports, regulations, guidelines, and academic literature were used to contextualise the internal reports rather than to triangulate users' experiences. The proposed framework therefore remains provisional and requires external validation across users, practitioners, and other settings. Because the quarterly and annual records were produced by the same institution, they broaden the documentary basis of the study but do not constitute independent triangulation of service-user experience.

Privacy and institutional-use safeguards were applied before analysis and publication. The data instrument excludes names, addresses, registration numbers, detailed personal chronologies, and other direct identifiers; small-count home-visit information is presented only in aggregate in the article. Institutional permission to use and summarise internal reports for publication was confirmed, and no activity photographs are reproduced in this manuscript. An anonymity checklist was completed before the data were used. The primary case-level evidence nevertheless remains limited to five internal activity reports, seven service points in one province, and six months of implementation, supplemented by administrative and aggregate records produced by the same institution. The findings are therefore not presented as representative of nationwide Ombudsman On the Spot practice.

Results and Discussion

A. Ombudsman On the Spot as a Proactive Service

Conventional complaint mechanisms place much of the initial burden on users: identifying maladministration, determining jurisdiction, understanding requirements, and submitting the matter through office or digital channels. Ombudsman On the Spot shifts part of that burden to the institution by bringing information, consultation, and preliminary assistance closer to target locations and groups. Its relevance therefore lies not simply in moving the service outside the office, but in reducing informational and procedural barriers at the point of access.

The five reports document three outreach modalities: service booths at public service facilities, community-based education and consultation, and targeted home visits for users facing mobility, vulnerability, or confidentiality constraints. Their functions differ: booths provide broad access and facilitate coordination with service providers, community activities emphasize rights education and consultation, and targeted visits adapt access to individual circumstances. The variation supports a differentiated rather than uniform approach to proactive complaint access.

This approach also reshapes the role of frontline Ombudsman officers. Officers do not merely receive complaints that are already complete, but also provide preliminary guidance to members of the public. Such guidance includes explaining the Ombudsman's authority, identifying procedural steps that have not yet been taken, distinguishing public service issues from other legal disputes, and determining the actions that need to be pursued, such as completing supporting documents, submitting an objection to the service provider, registering a complaint, or contacting the competent institution. Assistance provided by officers at this initial stage can reduce the confusion and procedural burdens faced by the public. Therefore, in the implementation of Ombudsman On the Spot,

the ability of officers to provide clear and accurate explanations constitutes an important element in expanding access to complaint services.[15]

The shift from passive complaint handling to proactive service delivery is consistent with the evolving functions of the Ombudsman in Indonesia. Maulana, Wahyudi, and Rosidin explain that the Ombudsman not only plays a role in resolving public complaints, but also serves as an accountability forum and performs a preventive function to promote improvements in public service governance. In this context, Ombudsman On the Spot constitutes a concrete manifestation of the Ombudsman's preventive function. The direct presence of Ombudsman officers at service locations enables the institution to identify problems, provide information, and encourage improvements before the issues develop into formal complaints. Accordingly, the Ombudsman does not merely wait for members of the public to submit complaints, but also actively reaches locations or groups that face barriers to access and are potentially exposed to maladministration.[16]

The role of complaint-receiving officers in delivering this service extends beyond administrative duties. Durose and Lowndes explain that the manner in which officers exercise discretion is influenced by the social circumstances of the communities they serve. Accordingly, applying the same procedures does not necessarily produce the same service experience for every group within society. Differences in levels of knowledge, communication abilities, social circumstances, and specific needs may affect the ease with which people access services. This finding indicates that Ombudsman officers must apply procedures carefully and responsively so that the services provided correspond to the needs of the public without disregarding the applicable rules.[17] The success of Ombudsman On the

[15] Elizabeth Bell and Kylie Smith, "Working within a System of Administrative Burden: How Street-Level Bureaucrats' Role Perceptions Shape Access to the Promise of Higher Education," *Administration & Society* 54, no. 2 (2022): 167–211.

[16] Jaka Maulana, Heru Wahyudi, and Angga Rosidin, "Legal and Administrative Analysis of Ombudsman ' s Role in Resolving Public Service Maladministration in Indonesia," *Legal Brief* 15, no. 2 (2026): 144–55, https://doi.org/10.35335/legal.v15i2.1647.

[17] Catherine Duroseh and Vivien Lowndesh, "Gendering Discretion: Why Street-Level Bureaucracy Needs a Gendered Lens," *Political Studies* 72, no. 3 (2024): 1026–49, https://doi.org/10.1177/00323217231178630; Bayu Dwi Anggono et al., "Interrogating the Legal Foundations of Digital Transformation: Balancing Economic Growth and Social Welfare in the Era

Spot is determined not only by the policies that provide the basis for its implementation, but also by the ability of officers to understand the circumstances of the communities they serve. Members of the public differ in the nature of the problems they face, their levels of legal literacy, and their psychological conditions. Therefore, officers need to provide explanations and assistance tailored to individual needs without disregarding the applicable procedures. When exercised appropriately, discretion can help narrow the gap between legal rules and the public's experience of obtaining services. Conversely, where officers lack adequate capacity and sensitivity, the service may instead create additional barriers for the public.

The implementation of On-the-Spot Complaint Reception and Verification (PVL OTS) has also been examined at the Bali Provincial Representative Office of the Ombudsman of the Republic of Indonesia. Kusumadewi, Wirantari, and Prabawati found that PVL OTS services had been implemented reasonably well across five dimensions of accountability. However, their implementation continued to face several constraints, including limited public awareness of the programme, insufficient human resources, inadequate supporting facilities, and limited time for conducting the activities. The study recommended strengthening public outreach, particularly for communities with limited internet access, enhancing human resource capacity, providing adequate facilities, and conducting public satisfaction surveys.[18] These findings provide a relevant point of comparison for the implementation of Ombudsman On the Spot in Central Java, as they demonstrate that the success of proactive services is determined not only by the existence of the programme, but also by the readiness of officers, the availability of supporting facilities, the scope of public outreach, and the evaluation of service delivery.

The role of officers in proactive service delivery is not limited to receiving and following up on complaints, but also includes providing

of Disruption," *Volksgeist: Jurnal Ilmu Hukum Dan Konstitusi* 8, no. 1 (2025): 191–211, https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.24090/volksgeist.v8i1.12211.

[18] Pande Kadek Kusumadewi, I Dewa Ayu Putri Wirantari, and Putu Anik Prabawati, "Akuntabilitas Pelayanan Penerimaan Dan Verifikasi Laporan On The Spot (PVL OTS) Dalam Pencegahan Maladministrasi Penyelenggara Pelayanan Publik Oleh Ombudsman Republik Indonesia Perwakilan Provinsi Bali," *Ethics and Law Journal: Business and Notary (ELJBN)* 2, no. 1 (2024): 20–32, https://doi.org/10.61292/eljbn.149.

information that helps members of the public understand the complaint mechanism. In their study of the handling of alleged maladministration in the 2023 New Student Admission System (PPDB), Sugiarto et al. found that the Central Java Representative Office of the Ombudsman of the Republic of Indonesia had demonstrated effective performance and fulfilled five dimensions of service quality based on the services perceived by the public. However, administrative burdens continued to affect public participation in submitting complaints, while communication and public outreach remained areas requiring further improvement. These findings indicate that proactive services should be accompanied by clear information regarding the Ombudsman's authority, complaint requirements, and the stages of the complaint process. Accordingly, Ombudsman On the Spot not only serves to extend the reach of services, but may also improve public understanding of rights and procedures relating to public service complaints.[19]

B. Activity Locations and Documented Outputs

The activity report is intentionally presented at the activity level. Table 1 summarizes the service locations, forms of proactive engagement, and documented outputs without disclosing the identities of the complainants.

[19] Laga Sugiarto et al., "Analisis Efektivitas Kinerja Ombudsman RI Perwakilan Jateng Dalam Penanganan Dugaan Maladministrasi PPDB 2023," *JATISWARA* 39, no. 1 (2024): 95–109.

TABLE 1

Service Locations, Forms of Proactive Service, and Activity Outputs

Service Location	Form of Proactive Service	Direct OTS Contacts	Other Documented Outreach or Service Activity
Semarang Samsat	Service booth and service observation	2 non-report consultations; no registered complaint	Socialisation, brochure distribution, service observation, public information and clarification, and one recommendation for service improvement.
Public Service Mall, Pekalongan	Open service booth	No consultation; 2 registered complaints	Socialisation, interaction with service users, complaint intake, and public information.
Targeted home visit A	Targeted visit with accessibility or confidentiality adjustment	No consultation; 1 registered complaint	Individual complaint assistance and follow-up.

Service Location	Form of Proactive Service	Direct OTS Contacts	Other Documented Outreach or Service Activity
Public Service Mall, Surakarta	Open service booth	1 non-report consultation; 1 registered complaint	Socialisation, procedural guidance, preliminary verification, and brochure distribution.
Targeted home visit B	Targeted visit with accessibility or confidentiality adjustment	No consultation; 1 registered complaint	Individual complaint assistance and follow-up.
Community venue, Tegal	Community education and consultation	4 non-report consultations; 1 registered complaint	Rights education, procedural guidance, discussion of service problems, and public information materials.

Service Location	Form of Proactive Service	Direct OTS Contacts	Other Documented Outreach or Service Activity
Public Service Mall, Purbalingga	Public information services and complaint intake	1 non-report consultation; no registered complaint	Socialisation on maladministration and complaint requirements, and brochure distribution.

Sources: Authors' analysis of internal activity reports of the Central Java Representative Office of the Ombudsman of the Republic of Indonesia, 2025.

Across the seven service points, the structured matrix recorded eight non-report consultations and six registered complaints, together with one recommendation for service improvement. These 14 direct OTS contacts are distinct from broader administrative records that include reports and consultations submitted through other Ombudsman channels. In addition to receiving consultations and complaints, Ombudsman officers conducted socialisation, interacted directly with service users, explained the Ombudsman's mandate and complaint procedures, and distributed brochures. All six registered complaints subsequently received institutional follow-up through examination and/or coordination with the reported institutions and were administratively closed. Closure is treated here as process information and not as evidence of user satisfaction, substantive remedy, or causal programme effectiveness. Referral and coordination processes are discussed only where they are documented in the underlying activity reports.[20]

[20] "Authors' Structured Extraction Matrix Based on the Five Ombudsman On the Spot Activity Reports and the Source Records Identified in the Matrix; Complaint Follow-up Status Assessed at the 31 December 2025 Cut-off Using Institutional Administrative Records,".

One activity also documented the immediate resolution of a complaint concerning access to social health insurance benefits after the Ombudsman team coordinated with officers at the Public Service Mall. This finding does not imply that all complaints can be resolved at the activity site. Rather, the co-location of the Ombudsman and public service providers facilitates communication, shortens the clarification process, and enables members of the public to obtain an initial follow-up on the issues they have raised.[21]

Activities conducted at the Semarang Samsat generated findings that extended beyond public complaints to encompass opportunities for improving service quality. The Ombudsman team observed several aspects of service delivery, including the availability of dedicated service facilities, the accessibility of supporting infrastructure, the clarity of service procedures, public understanding of service fees, and inefficiencies arising from movement between service units. Based on these observations, the team provided recommendations to the service provider as input for service improvement. These findings demonstrate that outreach activities not only expand access to complaint mechanisms but also support efforts to prevent maladministration. Recurring inquiries from members of the public, together with field observations, can be utilized to identify service-related issues and formulate more comprehensive service improvements.[22]

Community-based outreach served an educational as well as a complaint-access function. Participants raised issues that did not always meet formal complaint requirements but received explanations on maladministration, jurisdiction, reporting requirements, and available assistance. This supports interactive consultation rather than one-way dissemination as the more appropriate form of legal outreach in this setting.

The contrast among settings suggests a location–function relationship. Public Service Malls create opportunities for rapid clarification with multiple providers; the Semarang Samsat setting combines complaint access with observation of service procedures; the

[21] Ombudsman Republik Indonesia Perwakilan Jawa Tengah, "Laporan Kegiatan Ombudsman On the Spot April–September 2025," lima dokumen internal yang tidak dipublikasikan, 2025.

[22] Ombudsman Republik Indonesia Perwakilan Jawa Tengah, "Laporan Kegiatan Internal Ombudsman On the Spot Pada Unit Pelayanan Pajak Kendaraan Di Semarang," 2025.

community venue in Tegal favours education and consultation; and targeted home visits prioritise accessibility or confidentiality. Modality therefore affects not only who can be reached but also the type of lawful and practical response that can be produced at the point of contact.

Natamiharja et al. demonstrated that outreach activities involving public awareness programs, discussions, assistance, and educational initiatives can enhance rural communities' understanding of their rights concerning the implementation of corporate social responsibility, as well as the legal avenues available when those rights are not fulfilled. These findings indicate that legal community engagement should extend beyond the mere dissemination of information by also providing opportunities for dialogue and procedural assistance.[23] A similar pattern was observed in the implementation of Ombudsman On the Spot. Community-based outreach activities in Tegal primarily resulted in public education on citizens' rights, consultation services, and procedural guidance. By contrast, activities conducted at public service units and the Public Service Mall facilitated preliminary verification, clarification, and direct coordination with public service providers. These differences demonstrate that the selection of service locations constitutes an essential component of activity design, as it influences both the nature of interactions and the service outputs generated.

The diversity of outputs, including the provision of information, consultation, complaint intake, and recommendations for service improvement, also demonstrates that Ombudsman On the Spot can contribute to broader improvements in public service delivery. Article 8(2) of Law Number 25 of 2009 on Public Services recognizes service delivery, complaint management, information management, internal oversight, public education, and consultation services as integral components of public service administration. When the Ombudsman is present at service locations and communicates its observations to public service providers, these activities can complement the complaint management and internal oversight mechanisms for which service providers are responsible. Accordingly, activities conducted at the Semarang Samsat not only expand

[23] Natamiharja et al., "Socialization Regarding Community Rights to Company Obligations in Lempuyang Bandar Village, Central Lampung."

access to individual complaint mechanisms but also generate recommendations that may be utilized to prevent the recurrence of service-related problems.

From an institutional perspective, the variation in the implementation of Ombudsman On the Spot is consistent with Regulation of the Chairperson of the Ombudsman of the Republic of Indonesia Number 5 of 2025. The guideline stipulates that activity locations may be determined based on data from the Integrated Complaint Management Information System (SIMPeL), trends in the methods by which members of the public submit complaints, the results of coordination with the examination unit, and other approaches, including thematic activities. The selection of activity locations is prioritized for regencies or municipalities with very low levels of access, followed by areas with low access and subsequent categories. Activities may take the form of discussions, seminars, workshops, public service festivals, other activities tailored to local needs, as well as the establishment of consultation and complaint service booths. Accordingly, the variation reflected in the five activity reports demonstrates that the forms of service delivery were adapted to community needs and local accessibility conditions, rather than applying a uniform service model across all locations.

C. Four Dimensions of Expanded Access

The activities are analysed through four dimensions of access. Physical access concerns the effort required to reach complaint services; service booths reduce travel to the Ombudsman office, while targeted visits address mobility or other special constraints. The evidence therefore supports proximity as an access mechanism, although the reports do not quantify changes in travel time or cost.

Second, informational access concerns the ability of members of the public to obtain and understand information regarding their rights, the Ombudsman's mandate, the requirements for filing complaints, and the distinctions among consultation, complaints, objections, and other available legal remedies. In the implementation of Ombudsman On the

Spot, officers assist members of the public in articulating their concerns, identifying the competent authority, and understanding the procedural steps that need to be taken. This approach is consistent with the concept of proactive public service, which positions public institutions as actively reaching out to service users based on their needs, circumstances, and locations, rather than merely waiting for them to seek services on their own.[24]

Third, procedural access concerns users' ability to navigate complaint requirements. Preliminary verification helps identify jurisdiction, prior complaint steps, and missing documents, after which users may be guided toward registration, document completion, another competent authority, or an available administrative remedy. The relevant outcome is procedural clarity, even when a consultation does not become a formal complaint.

Fourth, relational access concerns trust and interpersonal support. Face-to-face interaction allows officers to hear concerns, clarify expectations, and explain the Ombudsman's mandate, which is particularly relevant for older persons, persons with disabilities, users with limited digital literacy, or complainants concerned about identity disclosure. Digital access therefore remains important but does not replace secure and responsive interpersonal assistance. These four dimensions, the access barriers they address, and the corresponding programme responses are summarized in Table 2.

TABLE 2

Dimensions of Access in Ombudsman On the Spot

Dimension	Access Barriers Addressed	Program Response
Physical	Distance, mobility constraints, and travel costs	Service booths at public service facilities and targeted outreach visits

[24] Pawlowski and Scholta, "A Taxonomy for Proactive Public Services."

Informational	Uncertainty regarding rights, the Ombudsman's mandate, and complaint mechanisms	Public education and individualized guidance
Procedural	Incomplete documentation and unclear procedural pathways	Preliminary verification, complaint registration, guidance on documentary requirements, referral, or direction to the competent authority
Relational	Low levels of public trust, anxiety, concerns about identity disclosure, or difficulties in explaining the issue	Direct engagement, confidentiality-sensitive assistance, and direct coordination

Sources: Authors, 2026.

D. Inclusiveness, Confidentiality, and Service Differentiation

Equal access is not necessarily achieved by providing identical forms of service to all members of the public. In the activities analyzed, targeted outreach visits were conducted when services delivered through service booths or conventional complaint mechanisms were not appropriate to the complainants' circumstances. In one activity, the Ombudsman team visited an older complainant with a disability who experienced difficulties in accessing complaint-handling services independently.[25] In another activity,

[25] Ombudsman RI Perwakilan Jawa Tengah, "Laporan Kegiatan Internal Mengenai Penjangkauan Terarah Di Kendal Dan Klaten," 2025.

a home visit was conducted because the complainant's identity needed to remain confidential to ensure the individual's safety. In this article, descriptions of the complainants' personal circumstances are intentionally limited in order to protect their privacy. These findings demonstrate that inclusive service delivery requires adaptations in service locations, communication methods, and documentation practices based on the needs and vulnerability levels of service users.

The programme also exposes a tension between visibility and privacy. Open booths improve visibility but may allow sensitive conversations to be overheard, while home visits can reveal a complainant's location or circumstances. Field implementation should therefore provide private consultation options, consent procedures, secure document handling, and controlled photography, while separating publishable aggregate programme data from protected operational case data.

The distinction between data that may be published and protected operational data is consistent with the need to expand access without compromising the protection of service users. The Venice Principles identify independence, objectivity, transparency, fairness, and impartiality as the fundamental principles governing Ombudsman institutions. Principle 15 affirms that every individual and legal entity, including non-governmental organizations, must be able to access the Ombudsman and submit complaints freely, without impediment, and free of charge. Principle 16 further requires the Ombudsman to provide particular attention and protection to whistleblowers within the public sector.[26] In the implementation of Ombudsman On the Spot, these principles should be upheld by ensuring that expanding access does not create new risks for members of the public. Accordingly, accessible complaint-handling services should be accompanied by safeguards for complainants' identities, secure document management, and consultation facilities that protect the privacy of complainants.

The tension between service visibility and the protection of privacy is also grounded in Law Number 37 of 2008 on the Ombudsman of the

[26] European Commission for Democracy through Law, "(Venice Commission), Principles on the Protection and Promotion of the Ombudsman Institution (The Venice Principles), Opinion No. 897/2017, CDL-AD(2019)005 (Strasbourg: Council of Europe, 2019)," 2019.

Republic of Indonesia. Article 30(1) requires the Ombudsman to maintain confidentiality in the conduct of investigations, except where disclosure is required in the public interest. This obligation continues to apply even after an Ombudsman has resigned or been removed from office, as stipulated in Article 30(2). These provisions demonstrate that confidentiality is not merely an element of professional service ethics but also a legal obligation governing the performance of the Ombudsman's duties. Accordingly, Ombudsman On the Spot activities should be implemented with due regard for the privacy of consultation facilities, document security, restrictions on the taking and use of photographs, and the protection of information that may reveal the identities of complainants.

Operationally, confidentiality requires more than anonymisation in the published article. Field implementation should use a minimum privacy protocol: a pre-site privacy-risk assessment; a screened or separate consultation space for sensitive matters; explicit explanation of how personal information will be used; collection of only information necessary for complaint handling; use of official access-controlled devices and, where digital field forms are used, encryption or equivalent technical safeguards; secure transfer of supporting documents through authorised institutional systems; and a prohibition on photographing complainants, case documents, device screens, home addresses, or other identifying details for publicity purposes without explicit and documented consent. These measures are intended to operationalise the Ombudsman's duty to maintain confidentiality and comply with risk-based security obligations in processing personal data, in accordance with Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 27 of 2022 concerning Personal Data Protection. This legal framework requires personal data controllers to implement appropriate measures to protect personal data against unauthorized access, disclosure, alteration, or misuse.

The principle of adapting public services to the needs of vulnerable groups is grounded in Article 29(1) of Law Number 25 of 2009 on Public Services. This provision requires public service providers to deliver services with special treatment to certain members of the public in accordance with the applicable laws and regulations. The explanatory memorandum to this article identifies vulnerable groups as including persons with disabilities,

older persons, pregnant women, children, and victims of natural and social disasters, with such special treatment being provided without additional charges. This provision provides the normative basis for the implementation of targeted outreach visits by the Central Java Representative Office of the Ombudsman of the Republic of Indonesia to complainants experiencing barriers to accessing complaint-handling services. One outreach visit was conducted for an older complainant with a disability, while another was undertaken to safeguard the complainant's safety and the confidentiality of the complainant's identity. These differences in the forms of service delivery do not constitute a departure from the principle of equality; rather, they represent an effort to ensure that individuals with different circumstances continue to enjoy equal access to public services.

From the perspective of street-level bureaucracy, Bell and Smith demonstrate that administrative burdens established through public policy are translated by frontline officials into everyday service delivery practices. Public officials' perceptions of their roles influence the exercise of discretion, either as a means of assisting and empowering service users or, conversely, as an action that restricts their access to public programs.[27] These findings are relevant to the implementation of Ombudsman On the Spot, as Ombudsman officers not only carry out complaint intake procedures but also reduce the barriers encountered by members of the public through the provision of information, preliminary verification, and the adaptation of service delivery to users' needs. To strengthen program accountability while safeguarding complainants, activity data should be distinguished between aggregated data that may be disclosed publicly and operational data that must remain confidential. Aggregated data are used to demonstrate the program's coverage, the forms of services provided, and the general categories of complaints, whereas operational data contain complainants' identities, supporting documents, and case-related information that may be used solely for the performance of the Ombudsman's official duties.

[27] Bell and Smith, "Working within a System of Administrative Burden: How Street-Level Bureaucrats' Role Perceptions Shape Access to the Promise of Higher Education."

The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) emphasizes the importance of openness, integrity, accountability, feedback, and evaluation in public participation processes. These principles are essential for maintaining public trust and ensuring that public participation generates meaningful follow-up actions and institutional learning. In the context of Ombudsman On the Spot, however, the implementation of these principles must be accompanied by the protection of personal data, complainants' identities, and the confidentiality of complaint-related information. [28] Accordingly, this article does not disclose the names, addresses, or detailed personal circumstances of complainants. This limitation reflects both a prudent approach to academic reporting and compliance with the statutory obligation to maintain confidentiality as stipulated in Article 30 of Law Number 37 of 2008 on the Ombudsman of the Republic of Indonesia.

E. Institutional Challenges and Areas for Improvement

Several implementation limitations remain. First, retrospective standardisation improves comparability but does not eliminate variability in the underlying documentation. The structured matrix now applies the same output fields across all seven service points, yet the analysis still depends on what institutional records captured at the time of each activity. Future Ombudsman On the Spot reporting should therefore use a prospective standard log that distinguishes visitors or education participants, consultations, formal complaints, referrals or directions, direct coordination, service-improvement recommendations, and follow-up status using common definitions and a fixed reporting cut-off.

Second, reach should not be equated with outcome. Activity or consultation counts show contact with the public but do not establish increased understanding, completed procedural steps, or sustained service improvement. Future evaluation should therefore measure user understanding, the next step taken after consultation, document

[28] OECD, "Guidelines for Citizen Participation Processes," *Paris: OECD Publishing*, 2022.

completion, referral outcomes, and follow-up to coordination or recommendations.

Direct OTS outputs and broader administrative trends should be read at different levels. The seven analysed service points produced 14 directly recorded contacts, consisting of eight consultations and six registered complaints. SIMPeL 4.0 data for the same seven areas show that registered public reports increased from 64 during January to December 2024 to 90 during January to December 2025. Six areas recorded increases, while Semarang declined from 39 to 22 reports. These area level figures include reports submitted through Ombudsman channels other than the seven OTS service points and are therefore not direct OTS outputs. The 2025 annual report also identifies several factors that may have influenced reporting, including the student admission complaint post, wider public awareness, socialisation, and other outreach activities. The SIMPeL comparison is therefore used only as contextual evidence of changing access and reporting activity. It does not demonstrate that OTS caused the increase.[29]

Third, outreach is resource-intensive because it requires staff time, travel, coordination, equipment, and post-activity data management. Location selection should therefore be needs-based and consider low access, recurring service problems, vulnerable groups, distance, and opportunities for useful coordination, rather than maximizing the number or visibility of activities.

The quarterly records make this resource constraint observable across 2025. No OTS activity was recorded in the first quarter because budget-efficiency measures constrained travel and accommodation. The second quarter recorded six OTS activities (four in Semarang and two outside the city), the third quarter recorded four outside-city activities after field implementation intensified, and the fourth quarter recorded one activity in Boyolali. The office also documented adaptations through cross-unit integration, combining OTS with other field activities, online consultation, and collaboration with public communication channels. These records

[29] Ombudsman Republik Indonesia Perwakilan Jawa Tengah, "Laporan Tahunan 2025."

support treating mobility and operating resources as implementation conditions rather than merely prospective risks.[30]

The fourth limitation concerns the integration of complaint-handling channels. Ombudsman On the Spot should be positioned as a complement to walk-in services, WhatsApp, websites, email, and other complaint-handling channels. Wulandari found that efforts to improve public service quality through SP4N-LAPOR! have not yet been implemented optimally. The challenges identified include incomplete guidance for submitting complaints via SMS, users' dependence on internet connectivity or mobile credit, complaint management practices that have not been fully aligned with the applicable regulatory framework, and the continued exclusion of certain public institutions due to network limitations. On the other hand, the protection of complainants' data security and confidentiality has been strengthened through multi-stakeholder involvement and the provision of dedicated security features.[31] These findings indicate that the availability of digital complaint channels does not, in itself, guarantee ease of access or effective complaint resolution. Under such circumstances, face-to-face services can assist members of the public in understanding procedural requirements, completing the necessary documentation, and selecting the complaint-handling channel that best suits their needs. Accordingly, inclusiveness, confidentiality, and service differentiation should be understood as mutually reinforcing components of the Ombudsman On the Spot service model: expanding access must be accompanied by service adaptation and the protection of complainants' identities, privacy, dignity, and safety.

Potential unintended consequences also require attention. A booth inside the complained-about provider may deter disclosure; public queues can compromise privacy; outreach may create expectations of immediate resolution beyond the Ombudsman's authority; and travel-intensive activities can reduce time for examination and follow-up. Frontline

[30] Ombudsman Republik Indonesia Perwakilan Jawa Tengah, "Laporan Triwulan I–IV 2025 Keasistenan Penerimaan Dan Verifikasi Laporan."

[31] Serly Wulandari, "Peningkatan Kualitas Pelayanan Publik Melalui Aplikasi Pengaduan Sp4n Lapor! Pada Kementerian Pendayagunaan Aparatur Negara Dan Reformasi Birokrasi," *Jurnal Ilmiah Wahana Bhakti Praja* 13, no. 2 (2023): 152–66.

discretion may also produce inconsistent triage. These are potential risks, not observed outcomes of the five reports, and call for private consultation options, clear mandate explanations, standardized triage, supervision, and workload planning.

TABLE 3

Proposed Output and Outcome Indicators for Future Evaluation

Evaluation level	Proposed measurable indicators	Suggested measurement
Reach / output	Number of service points by modality; consultations; registered complaints; referrals or directions; on-site coordination or resolution; recommendations for service improvement; and share of complaints entering through OTS. The seven point baseline consists of 8 non-report consultations, 6 registered complaints, and 1 recommendation for service improvement. Broader SIMPeL trends are analysed separately and are not treated as direct OTS outputs.	Prospective standardised activity log, source traceable extraction matrix, and periodic SIMPeL aggregation using the same observation period and clearly stated denominators.
Immediate user outcome	Change in the proportion of users who correctly identify the Ombudsman's jurisdiction, complaint requirements, and next procedural step; proportion reporting that the service was accessible and sufficiently private.	Brief pre-/post-consultation questions and an anonymous exit item.

Process / follow-up outcome	Proportion of consultations that become complete complaints or appropriate referrals; median days from first OTS contact to registration/referral and first follow-up; proportion followed within the defined monitoring period.	Link de-identified OTS contact codes to complaint/referral follow-up records.
Medium-term institutional outcome	Proportion of coordination or service-improvement actions with documented follow-up; recurrence of the same service problem at the same location; change over time in access originating from previously low-access target areas.	Periodic follow-up matrix and longitudinal comparison. Causal attribution requires a stronger impact design.

Sources: Authors, 2026.

Table 4 distinguishes recurring field practices from stages supplied principally by the 2025 programme guideline and now adds the administrative output/status evidence available from the structured matrix. This strengthens traceability without collapsing different evidentiary levels: complaint counts and status data show administrative processing, whereas access mapping and systematic outcome monitoring remain more strongly guideline-led. The six stages therefore do not carry identical empirical weight.

TABLE 4

Evidentiary Basis for the Six-Stage Proactive Complaint-Access Framework

Stage	Evidence from activity reports and/or 2025 guideline	Evidentiary status
Access mapping	The activity corpus spans Semarang Samsat, three Public Service Malls, a community venue, and two targeted home visits. The reports show differentiated locations and privacy/accessibility needs. Supplementary institutional records also state that target selection may draw on SIMPeL statistics, complainant domicile, reporting trends, coordination with the examination unit, and other approaches. However, those records do not establish that each of the seven analysed service points was selected through the same documented mapping process.	Normatively completed; programme-level documentary support, but limited site-specific traceability.
Targeted outreach	Three recurring modalities were documented: facility-based booths, community education/consultation, and targeted home visits.	Strong recurring field evidence.
Rights education	All five reports document socialisation or explanation of the Ombudsman's mandate; Tegal and Purbalingga expressly record education on maladministration and complaint requirements.	Strong recurring field evidence.
Consultation and	Consultations and complaint intake were documented at service facilities	Recurring field evidence;

preliminary verification	and community activities; officers clarified issues, competent institutions, prior steps, and documentary requirements.	verification detail varies by report.
Registration, referral, or coordination	Activity reports document complaint intake, procedural guidance, direct coordination in specific cases, and one recommendation for service improvement. The structured matrix records 6 registered complaints across the seven service points. Referral and direct coordination events were not separately quantified in the matrix, so branching outputs are supported qualitatively rather than by inferred counts.	Recurring field evidence strengthened by administrative complaint counts; branching outputs are unevenly quantified.
6. Monitoring and evaluation	The follow-up records show that all 6 registered complaints received institutional follow-up through examination and/or coordination with the reported institutions and were administratively closed. Quarterly and annual records also provide programme level information on OTS targets, activity intensity, and complaint channel use. This status information does not measure service user satisfaction, remedy quality, or causal impact, while the 2025 guideline remains the principal basis for systematic monitoring and evaluation.	Guideline-led with administrative status and aggregate monitoring support; user-level outcome evidence remains limited.

Sources: Authors' analysis, 2026.

Table 4 also shows that the framework is not a uniform linear sequence. The registration/referral/coordination stage may branch according to jurisdiction, document completeness, accessibility needs, and opportunities for lawful on-site coordination, while access mapping and systematic monitoring are more strongly guideline-based.

F. Six-Stage Proactive Complaint Access Model

Drawing on recurring field practices and the 2025 programme guideline, this article proposes a six-stage proactive complaint-access framework. Four stages are strongly practice-derived, while access mapping and systematic monitoring/evaluation complete the service cycle normatively. The framework does not assume that every contact becomes a formal complaint; information, guidance, referral, coordination, and service-improvement recommendations may also be legitimate outputs.

The first stage is access mapping. This guideline-led stage identifies areas or groups with low access, distance, limited use of digital channels, recurring service problems, or vulnerability. Administrative data may be combined with information from complaint examination and maladministration-prevention functions to select locations on a needs basis.

The second stage is targeted outreach. The modality—service booth, community activity, thematic outreach, or direct visit—is selected according to location, mobility, privacy needs, issue characteristics, and opportunities for coordination with service providers.

The third stage is rights education. Officers explain public-service rights, maladministration, the Ombudsman's mandate, complaint requirements, available assistance, and confidentiality safeguards through interactive communication tailored to the issues raised.

The fourth stage is consultation and preliminary verification. Officers identify the issue, relevant institution, previous complaint steps, available documents, and the user's expected outcome, thereby clarifying jurisdiction and outstanding procedural requirements.

The fifth stage is registration, referral, or coordination. Eligible matters may enter the formal complaint mechanism; incomplete matters

receive guidance; matters outside jurisdiction may be directed or referred to the competent authority; and, where lawful and practical, on-site coordination may address an immediate service problem without removing access to formal complaint procedures.

The sixth stage is monitoring and evaluation. Quarterly and annual records provide programme level monitoring through targets, activity counts, and complaint channel data, while the structured follow-up records add a status snapshot for the six registered complaints. All six received institutional follow-up through examination and/or coordination with the reported institutions and were administratively closed. This improves administrative traceability but still does not measure satisfaction, remedy quality, or longer term service improvement. Systematic user outcome monitoring therefore remains a guideline based requirement for future implementation.

Privacy protection operates across all stages. Mapping and outreach should assess privacy risks and provide private consultation options; consultation and verification should use consent, data minimisation, and secure forms or devices; referral and coordination should use authorised channels and need-to-know disclosure; and evaluation should rely on de-identified programme data. Photographs or social-media material should not reveal complainants, case documents, screens, or addresses without explicit documented consent.




Figure 1

Six-Stage Proactive Public Service Complaint Access Framework

The proposed framework is conceptually useful in two respects. It applies proactive-service reasoning to an independent complaint-handling institution, where the intervention is not the underlying public service itself but assistance in reaching a remedy mechanism. It also connects individual encounters with institutional learning by treating recurring consultations, complaints, and field observations as potential inputs for service-improvement recommendations.

The article's theoretical contribution is therefore design-oriented: it translates abstract concepts into observable service choices. Access mapping and targeted outreach respond to distance, information gaps, and other access burdens; rights education addresses learning costs; preliminary verification reduces procedural uncertainty; registration, referral, or coordination turns frontline discretion into an accountable branching decision; and monitoring tests whether initial access is followed by traceable action. This translation from theory to service design, rather than a claim of causal effect, is the principal conceptual contribution of the six-stage framework.

The model is also consistent with the characteristics of legal community service, which is implemented through structured, participatory, and evaluable stages of activity. Pratiwi and Sunaryo, for example, implemented the Human Rights Defender School through discussions, debates, advocacy skills training, tutorials, and field visits. The outcomes of the program were evaluated using pre-tests and post-tests and resulted in a human rights education curriculum and a community of human rights defenders that could be further developed at other higher education institutions.[32] Based on this comparison, Ombudsman On the Spot would possess greater community service value if it were implemented as a continuous service cycle that begins with access mapping and concludes with monitoring and evaluation, rather than merely as the temporary establishment of complaint-handling service booths.

[32] Cekli Setya Pratiwi and Sidik Sunaryo, "Empowering University Students : Advancing Human Rights Knowledge and Advocacy Through Human Rights Defender Schools," *Indonesian Journal of Legal Community Engagement* 8, no. 2 (2025): 493–516, https://doi.org/10.15294/jphi.v8i2.20653.

Conclusion

The five reports covering seven service points show that Ombudsman On the Spot operated through three complementary modalities: facility-based booths, community education and consultation, and targeted home visits for users facing accessibility or confidentiality barriers. The structured matrix records eight non-report consultations and six registered complaints, together with one recommendation for service improvement. All six registered complaints received institutional follow-up through examination and/or coordination with the reported institutions and were administratively closed. These figures demonstrate direct service activity and complaint processing, but they are not treated as proof of satisfaction, substantive remedy, or causal effectiveness.

Across the three modalities, access is best understood through four dimensions: physical proximity, understandable information, procedural guidance, and relational support. The evidence shows how different service settings can reduce particular barriers, while also revealing trade-offs involving privacy, staff capacity, travel resources, and the limits of on-site problem solving. Proactive access should therefore complement, rather than replace, walk-in and digital complaint channels.

The resulting six-stage framework comprises access mapping, targeted outreach, rights education, consultation and preliminary verification, registration/referral/coordination, and monitoring and evaluation. Four stages are strongly grounded in recurring field practice, while access mapping and systematic monitoring/evaluation normatively complete the cycle under the 2025 guideline. Its practical value lies in connecting outreach with formal complaint handling, privacy safeguards, source-traceable documentation, and measurable follow-up rather than treating Ombudsman On the Spot as a stand-alone publicity activity.

The framework remains provisional because the primary case-level evidence comes from five internal reports in one province and the supporting administrative records are produced by the same institution. Independent observation, service-user feedback, external validation, and multi-site comparison are still required. Future studies should collect prospective outcome data—especially changes in user understanding,

procedural completion, timeliness, perceived privacy, and follow-up to service-improvement actions—before making stronger claims about effectiveness, generalisability, or longer-term institutional impact.

References

Anggono, Bayu Dwi, Rofi Wahanisa, Aulia Oktarizka Vivi Puspita Sari AP, and Septhian Eka Adiyatma. "Interrogating the Legal Foundations of Digital Transformation: Balancing Economic Growth and Social Welfare in the Era of Disruption." *Volksgeist: Jurnal Ilmu Hukum Dan Konstitusi* 8, no. 1 (2025): 191–211. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.24090/volksgeist.v8i1.12211.

"Authors' Structured Extraction Matrix Based on the Five Ombudsman On the Spot Activity Reports and the Source Records Identified in the Matrix; Complaint Follow-up Status Assessed at the 31 December 2025 Cut-off Using Institutional Administrative Records," n.d.

Bell, Elizabeth, and Kylie Smith. "Working within a System of Administrative Burden: How Street-Level Bureaucrats' Role Perceptions Shape Access to the Promise of Higher Education." *Administration & Society* 54, no. 2 (2022): 167–211.

Commonwealth Ombudsman. "Innovate Reconciliation Action Plan 2025–2027." *Canberra: Office of the Commonwealth Ombudsman*, 2025.

Duroseh, Catherine, and Vivien Lowndesh. "Gendering Discretion: Why Street-Level Bureaucracy Needs a Gendered Lens." *Political Studies* 72, no. 3 (2024): 1026–49. https://doi.org/10.1177/00323217231178630.

European Commission for Democracy through Law. "(Venice Commission), Principles on the Protection and Promotion of the Ombudsman Institution (The Venice Principles), Opinion No. 897/2017, CDL-AD(2019)005 (Strasbourg: Council of Europe, 2019)," 2019.

Harijanti, Susi Dwi. "Complaint Handling Systems in the Public Sector: A Comparative Analysis between Indonesia and Australia." *Indonesian*

Comparative Law Review 3, no. 1 (2020): 1–24.

Herd, Pamela, and Donald P. Moynihan. "Administrative Burden: Policymaking by Other Means." In *New York: Russell Sage Foundation*, 2018. https://www.russellsage.org/publications/book/administrative-burden.

Kusumadewi, Pande Kadek, I Dewa Ayu Putri Wirantari, and Putu Anik Prabawati. "Akuntabilitas Pelayanan Penerimaan Dan Verifikasi Laporan On The Spot (PVL OTS) Dalam Pencegahan Maladministrasi Penyelenggara Pelayanan Publik Oleh Ombudsman Republik Indonesia Perwakilan Provinsi Bali." *Ethics and Law Journal: Business and Notary (ELJBN)* 2, no. 1 (2024): 20–32. https://doi.org/10.61292/eljbn.149.

Linos, Katerina, Melissa Carlson, Laura Jakli, Nadia Dalma, Isabelle Cohen, Afroditi Veloudaki, and Stavros Nikiforos Spyrellis. "How Do Disadvantaged Groups Seek Information about Public Services? A Randomized Controlled Trial of Communication Technologies." *Public Administration Review* 82, no. 4 (2022): 708–20.

Liu, Hui, Qingshan Zhou, and Shuang Liang. "Digital Inclusion in Public Services for Vulnerable Groups: A Systematic Review for Research Themes and Goal-Action Framework from the Lens of Public Service Ecosystem Theory." *Government Information Quarterly* 42, no. 2 (2025): 102019.

Maulana, Jaka, Heru Wahyudi, and Angga Rosidin. "Legal and Administrative Analysis of Ombudsman ' s Role in Resolving Public Service Maladministration in Indonesia." *Legal Brief* 15, no. 2 (2026): 144–55. https://doi.org/10.35335/legal.v15i2.1647.

Mukminto, Eko, Martitah Martitah, Ratih Damayanti, and Bayangsari Wedhatami. "Public Services Versus Covid-19: Participation of Villagers in Public Service Based on E-Government in Pandemic." *Jurnal Pengabdian Hukum Indonesia (Indonesian Journal of Legal Community Engagement)* 6, no. 1 (2023): 1–16.

Natamiharja, Rudi, Muhammad Fakih, Elman Eddy Patra, and Muhammad Febriyan Saputra. "Socialization Regarding Community Rights to Company Obligations in Lempuyang Bandar Village,

Central Lampung." *Jurnal Pengabdian Hukum Indonesia (Indonesian Journal of Legal Community Engagement)* 5, no. 2 (2022): 303–16.

OECD. "Guidelines for Citizen Participation Processes." *Paris: OECD Publishing*, 2022.

Office of the Ombudsman (Ireland). "Annual Report 2024." *Dublin: Office of the Ombudsman*, 2025.

Office of the Ombudsman Tonga. "Annual Report FY 2023/2024." *Nuku'alofa: Office of the Ombudsman*, 2024.

Ombudsman Republik Indonesia. "Laporan Tahunan Ombudsman Republik Indonesia 2023." *Jakarta: Ombudsman Republik Indonesia*, 2023.

———. "SIMPeL 4.0 (Sistem Informasi Penyelesaian Laporan)." *Internal Administrative Database; Central Java Data Extracts Used for January–December 2024 and January–December 2025*, 2025.

Ombudsman Republik Indonesia Perwakilan Jawa Tengah. "Laporan Kegiatan Internal Ombudsman On the Spot Pada Unit Pelayanan Pajak Kendaraan Di Semarang," 2025.

———. "Laporan Tahunan 2025." *Semarang: Ombudsman Republik Indonesia Perwakilan Jawa Tengah*, 2026.

———. "Laporan Triwulan I–IV 2025 Keasistenan Penerimaan Dan Verifikasi Laporan." *Empat Dokumen Internal. Semarang*, 2025.

———. "Ombudsman Jateng Terima 663 Aduan Sepanjang 2025," 2025.

Ombudsman RI Perwakilan Jawa Tengah. "Laporan Kegiatan Internal Mengenai Penjangkauan Terarah Di Kendal Dan Klaten," 2025.

Pawlowski, Caroline, and Hendrik Scholta. "A Taxonomy for Proactive Public Services." *Government Information Quarterly* 40, no. 1 (2023): 101780.

Pratiwi, Cekli Setya, and Sidik Sunaryo. "Empowering University Students : Advancing Human Rights Knowledge and Advocacy Through Human Rights Defender Schools." *Indonesian Journal of Legal Community Engagement* 8, no. 2 (2025): 493–516. https://doi.org/10.15294/jphi.v8i2.20653.

Saldaña, Johnny. *The Coding Manual for Qualitative Researchers. 4th Ed. London: SAGE*, 2021.

Scholta, Hendrik, and Ida Lindgren. "Proactivity in Digital Public Services:

A Conceptual Analysis." *Government Information Quarterly* 40, no. 3 (2023): 101832.

Sugiarto, Laga, Arif Hidayat, Raihan Muhammad, and Bintang Rafli Ananta. "Analisis Efektivitas Kinerja Ombudsman RI Perwakilan Jateng Dalam Penanganan Dugaan Maladministrasi PPDB 2023." *JATISWARA* 39, no. 1 (2024): 95–109.

Suhadi, Suhadi, Dani Muhtada, Asmarani Ramli, Imam Baehaqie, Isnani Isnani, Ardi Sirajudin Rauf, Lucky Andinna Santyoko, and Muhammad Ridha. "Enhancing Nazir Capacity through Legal Literacy of Land Trust to Ensure Legal Certainty in Waqf Land Management." *Jurnal Pengabdian Hukum Indonesia* 7, no. 2 (2024). https://doi.org/10.15294/jphi.v7i2.6693.

Suhadi, Suhadi, Sudijono Sastroatmodjo, Rofi Wahanisa, and Aprila Niravita. "Advances in Technology and the Future of Publication Systems in Land Registration in Indonesia." In *AIP Conference Proceedings*, Vol. 2573, 2022. https://doi.org/10.1063/5.0104112.

Tovalini, Krismena. "Partisipasi Masyarakat Dan Mekanisme Komplain Dalam Penyelenggaraan Pelayanan Publik." *Jurnal Ilmu Administrasi Negara (JUAN)* 2, no. 1 (2014): 1–8.

Wahanisa, Rofi, Benny Riyanto, Septhian Eka Adiyatma, Uche Nnawulezi, and Muhammad Abdul Rouf. "Achieving Public Information Transparency in The Dissemination of Local Regulations." *Yuridika* 38, no. 3 (2023). https://doi.org/10.20473/ydk.v38i3.48345.

Wulandari, Serly. "Peningkatan Kualitas Pelayanan Publik Melalui Aplikasi Pengaduan Sp4n-Lapor! Pada Kementerian Pendayagunaan Aparatur Negara Dan Reformasi Birokrasi." *Jurnal Ilmiah Wahana Bhakti Praja* 13, no. 2 (2023): 152–66.

***

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The first author is employed by the Ombudsman of the Republic of Indonesia and participated in the OTS activities analysed in this article. This institutional role is disclosed because it may shape researcher positionality. The authors report no financial conflict of interest.

Funding Information

None.

Acknowledgment

The authors express their sincere appreciation to the Ombudsman of the Republic of Indonesia and the Central Java Representative Office of the Ombudsman of the Republic of Indonesia for their institutional support in the implementation of the Ombudsman On the Spot program. The authors also extend their gratitude to the public service providers and members of the public who facilitated access to consultation and complaint-handling services. All information relating to service recipients has been presented in anonymized or aggregated form to protect the confidentiality of complainants.

Generative AI Statement

The authors declare that no generative artificial intelligence (AI) tools were used to generate the scientific content, data analysis, interpretations, or conclusions presented in this manuscript. If AI-assisted tools were used, they were limited to language editing, grammar checking, or improving readability under the authors' full supervision. The authors take full responsibility for the originality, accuracy, and integrity of the manuscript.