



Reframing Visa on Arrival Policy within Non-Military Defense Management: Security Governance in DKI Jakarta

Miyaki Natanael^{1*}, Priyanto², Editha Praditya³

¹ Universitas Pertahanan 1; miyakinatanael1@gmail.com

² Universitas Pertahanan 2

³ Universitas Pertahanan 3; editha.duarte@gmail.com

* Corresponding Author: miyakinatanael1@gmail.com

Abstract: This study examines the implementation of Indonesia's Visa on Arrival (VoA) policy in DKI Jakarta as both an instrument of tourism-driven economic recovery and a component of non-military national defense management under Law No. 23 of 2019 on the Management of National Resources for National Defense. While VoA has significantly contributed to the rebound of international tourist arrivals—surpassing 11 million visits nationally in 2023—it simultaneously generates governance challenges at strategic entry points such as Soekarno–Hatta International Airport, where facilitation of mobility intersects with risks including overstaying, transnational crime, human trafficking, and potential infiltration by non-state actors. Existing scholarship largely emphasizes economic impacts and regulatory frameworks, leaving limited analysis of VoA as part of an integrated civil defense infrastructure. Addressing this gap, the study aims to analyze how VoA implementation in DKI Jakarta is managed within a non-military defense perspective, particularly regarding institutional coordination, immigration intelligence, and risk mitigation mechanisms. Employing a qualitative case study approach, data were collected through in-depth interviews with immigration officials and security stakeholders, document analysis of relevant laws and ministerial regulations, and review of official immigration statistics, followed by thematic analysis. The findings indicate that although VoA effectively supports economic and diplomatic objectives, its function as a non-military defense instrument remains constrained by fragmented inter-agency coordination, uneven intelligence integration, and limited adaptive governance capacity at the local level. Strengthening collaborative surveillance systems, data-sharing mechanisms, and strategic policy alignment between immigration authorities and national defense institutions is therefore essential. The study concludes that reframing immigration governance as part of Indonesia's broader non-military defense strategy is crucial to balancing openness with security in high-density international gateways.

Received: December 12, 2025

Revised: December 28, 2025

Accepted: January 21, 2026

Online available: January 31, 2026

Curr. Ver.: January 31, 2026

Keywords: Immigration Governance; Non-Military Defense Management; Non-Traditional Security; Qualitative Research; Visa On Arrival

1. Introduction

Indonesia's national defense paradigm has evolved from a predominantly military-centered model toward a comprehensive security framework that integrates non-military dimensions. This transformation is formally articulated in Law No. 23 of 2019 on the Management of National Resources for National Defense, which emphasizes that national defense is not solely the responsibility of the Indonesian National Armed Forces but involves all national components, including civilian institutions. Within this total defense system (Sistem Pertahanan dan Keamanan Rakyat Semesta), ministries and government agencies—such as immigration authorities—play a strategic role in addressing non-traditional and non-military threats. Consequently, immigration governance can no longer be perceived merely as an administrative function; rather, it constitutes an integral component of non-military defense management.



Copyright: © 2025 by the authors.
Submitted for possible open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY SA) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/>)

In this context, the Visa on Arrival (VoA) policy represents a significant policy instrument that intersects economic, diplomatic, and security interests. Initially designed to facilitate international tourism and stimulate economic growth, the VoA policy allows eligible foreign nationals to obtain entry permits upon arrival at designated Indonesian entry points. Following the COVID-19 pandemic, the Government of Indonesia reactivated and expanded the VoA scheme through a series of ministerial regulations to accelerate tourism recovery. According to Statistics Indonesia (BPS, 2023), international tourist arrivals increased substantially in 2023, reaching more than 11 million visits nationally. A significant proportion of these arrivals entered through DKI Jakarta, particularly via Soekarno-Hatta International Airport, which serves as Indonesia's primary international gateway.

However, the facilitation of cross-border mobility also presents inherent security risks. Increased inflows of foreign nationals may generate vulnerabilities associated with overstaying, misuse of visit permits, human trafficking, transnational crime, and potential infiltration by extremist networks. Contemporary security studies categorize such risks as non-traditional or non-military threats, which require governance-based rather than force-based responses. Immigration authorities therefore function not only as service providers but also as frontline actors in national security management. In the case of DKI Jakarta—characterized by high population density, complex administrative structures, and intense international connectivity—the effective management of VoA becomes particularly crucial within the broader architecture of non-military defense.

Despite its strategic importance, the implementation of the VoA policy often reflects a gap between normative expectations and empirical realities. Normatively (*das sollen*), immigration governance under the total defense system is expected to operate in an integrated, coordinated, and risk-based manner, supported by inter-agency collaboration and intelligence-sharing mechanisms. Empirically (*das sein*), however, coordination challenges, institutional fragmentation, and uneven enforcement capacities may limit the effectiveness of VoA management in addressing non-military threats. Previous studies on Indonesian visa policies have primarily focused on economic impacts or legal frameworks, with limited attention to how the policy is operationalized as part of non-military defense management at the local level.

DKI Jakarta provides a strategic and relevant case study for examining this issue. As the capital city and centre of government, diplomacy, and commerce, Jakarta hosts numerous foreign embassies, multinational corporations, and international organizations. Its position as the main entry point for international travellers amplifies both the benefits and risks associated with liberal visa policies. The concentration of immigration offices, law enforcement agencies, and policy-making institutions within Jakarta further makes it an appropriate locus for analysing institutional interaction and governance dynamics related to VoA implementation.

Therefore, this study seeks to analyse the Visa on Arrival policy from a non-military defense management perspective, focusing on its implementation in DKI Jakarta. By adopting a qualitative approach, this research aims to explore how institutional coordination, immigration intelligence, regulatory enforcement, and risk mitigation practices contribute to or hinder the effectiveness of VoA governance. Through this analysis, the study intends to bridge the gap between normative defense policy frameworks and empirical administrative practices, thereby contributing to a more comprehensive understanding of immigration policy as an integral component of Indonesia's non-military national defense strategy.

Problem Formulation

In line with international academic writing standards, the research problem is formulated to reflect theoretical grounding, conceptual clarity, and empirical relevance. This study addresses the intersection between immigration governance and non-military defense management within the context of the Visa on Arrival (VoA) policy in DKI Jakarta. Accordingly, the central research question is:

- a. How is the Visa on Arrival (VoA) policy in DKI Jakarta managed and implemented as part of Indonesia's non-military defense framework?
- b. To operate this central inquiry, the study is guided by the following sub-questions:
 - 1) How is the VoA policy operationalized at the institutional level within the framework of non-military defense management in DKI Jakarta?
 - 2) How do coordination mechanisms among immigration authorities and related security institutions shape the governance of VoA implementation?
 - 3) How are immigration intelligence and risk mitigation practices integrated into the management of VoA entrants to address non-traditional security threats?

- 4) What discrepancies exist between the normative regulatory framework of non-military defense and the empirical realities of VoA policy implementation in DKI Jakarta?

These questions are designed to generate an in-depth qualitative understanding of how immigration policy functions not merely as an administrative instrument but as a component of civil defense governance within Indonesia's broader national security architecture

Research Objectives

This study aims to examine the implementation of the Visa on Arrival (VoA) policy in DKI Jakarta from the perspective of non-military defense management. It seeks to provide a comprehensive understanding of how immigration policy functions not only as an administrative and economic instrument but also as a strategic component within Indonesia's broader national defense framework. By situating the VoA policy within the context of the total defense system, this research intends to analyse its role in addressing non-traditional security threats in a highly strategic urban setting.

More specifically, the study seeks to analyse how the VoA policy is operationalized at the institutional level in DKI Jakarta and how it aligns with the principles of non-military defense management. It further aims to explore the dynamics of coordination among immigration authorities and other relevant security institutions, assessing how such collaboration shapes the governance and effectiveness of VoA implementation. In addition, the research investigates the integration of immigration intelligence and risk mitigation mechanisms in managing VoA entrants, particularly in relation to preventing and responding to non-traditional security challenges. Finally, the study endeavours to identify and critically assess the discrepancies between the normative regulatory framework governing non-military defense and the empirical realities of VoA policy implementation in DKI Jakarta. Through this analysis, the research aspires to contribute both theoretically and practically to the development of immigration governance as an integral component of non-military national defense strategy.

2. Preliminaries or Related Work or Literature Review

Theoretical Framework

This study is grounded in the intersection of non-military defense theory, immigration governance, and non-traditional security studies. The theoretical framework seeks to position the Visa on Arrival (VoA) policy not merely as an administrative immigration mechanism but as a component of Indonesia's broader non-military defense management system.

The concept of national defense in Indonesia is rooted in the Total People's Defense and Security System (Sistem Pertahanan dan Keamanan Rakyat Semesta), which integrates military and non-military components in safeguarding national sovereignty. Law No. 23 of 2019 emphasizes that non-military defense includes the mobilization of civilian institutions to address threats that do not primarily originate from armed conflict. Within this framework, ministries and agencies such as the Directorate General of Immigration play a strategic role in detecting, preventing, and mitigating non-traditional threats.

From a theoretical perspective, non-military defense aligns with the broader discourse of comprehensive security, which expands the scope of security beyond territorial defense to include governance capacity, institutional resilience, and societal stability. In this sense, immigration control becomes a preventive security instrument, functioning as an early screening mechanism against transnational risks.

Non-Military Defense Management

Non-military defense management refers to the systematic planning, coordination, and execution of defense-related activities conducted by civilian institutions to address non-traditional threats. Unlike conventional defense strategies centered on military force, non-military defense relies on regulatory instruments, institutional coordination, intelligence systems, and governance mechanisms.

In the Indonesian context, non-military threats include terrorism, cybercrime, human trafficking, narcotics networks, irregular migration, and economic sabotage. These threats require policy-based and administrative responses rather than armed intervention. Immigration authorities therefore act as frontline institutions in managing cross-border mobility and mitigating associated risks.

Effective non-military defense management depends on several key dimensions: institutional coordination, intelligence integration, risk-based supervision, and regulatory

enforcement. These dimensions are directly relevant to the implementation of the VoA policy in DKI Jakarta.

Immigration Governance and Selective Policy

Immigration governance refers to the regulatory and institutional framework through which a state manages the entry, stay, and exit of foreign nationals. In Indonesia, immigration control operates under the principle of selective policy, which allows only foreigners who provide benefits and do not endanger public order or national security to enter and remain in the country.

The Visa on Arrival policy represents a form of controlled liberalization within this selective framework. While it facilitates entry for tourism and business purposes, it simultaneously requires supervision and monitoring to prevent misuse. The challenge lies in balancing openness with security—a recurring theme in contemporary migration governance literature.

In high-density entry points such as Soekarno-Hatta International Airport in DKI Jakarta, immigration clearance processes serve as the first layer of national security screening. The effectiveness of VoA governance therefore depends not only on regulatory clarity but also on institutional capacity and inter-agency cooperation.

Non-Traditional Security and Mobility Risks

Non-traditional security (NTS) theory broadens the understanding of security to include threats that transcend conventional military confrontation. These include terrorism, transnational organized crime, pandemics, environmental degradation, and irregular migration. Such threats are often transboundary, network-based, and difficult to address through military means alone.

Cross-border mobility, while economically beneficial, may create vulnerabilities when monitoring systems are weak. Overstaying, identity fraud, human trafficking, and the misuse of visit permits are examples of mobility-related risks. In metropolitan areas like DKI Jakarta, where international arrivals are concentrated, these risks are amplified.

Within this perspective, the VoA policy can be conceptualized as both an economic facilitator and a potential risk gateway. Its governance requires integrated intelligence, risk profiling mechanisms, and coordinated enforcement strategies. Thus, VoA management becomes part of the broader architecture of non-military defense.

Institutional Coordination and Security Governance

Security governance theory emphasizes that contemporary security management involves multiple actors across different institutional levels. Rather than being monopolized by the military, security governance operates through networks of agencies, regulations, and collaborative mechanisms.

In the context of VoA implementation, key actors include the Directorate General of Immigration, airport authorities, national police, intelligence agencies, customs offices, and local government institutions. Effective governance depends on information-sharing, clear division of authority, and coordinated operational procedures.

Fragmentation or weak coordination may produce gaps in supervision and enforcement, thereby widening the discrepancy between normative expectations and practical outcomes. Therefore, analysing institutional interaction in DKI Jakarta is essential to understanding how VoA policy functions within the non-military defense framework.

3. Proposed Method

Research Design

This study adopts a qualitative case study design to examine the implementation of Indonesia's Visa on Arrival (VoA) policy within the framework of non-military defense management. A qualitative approach is appropriate because the research seeks to explore governance processes, institutional dynamics, and security practices embedded in the operationalization of immigration policy at a strategic international gateway. Rather than testing statistical relationships, the study aims to generate analytically rich insights into how civilian institutions enact defense responsibilities through administrative mechanisms.

The case study design allows for contextualized investigation of institutional interaction, regulatory alignment, and facilitation—security equilibrium within a real-world governance setting. VoA implementation in DKI Jakarta represents a critical empirical case because it embodies the intersection of mobility facilitation, economic policy, and non-traditional security management. As Indonesia's capital and principal international entry point, DKI Jakarta provides a strategically dense environment in which non-military defense functions are operationalized through immigration governance.

This research is interpretive in orientation, grounded in security governance and non-traditional security theory. It seeks to understand how actors perceive, coordinate, and enact defense-related responsibilities within the everyday practice of visa administration.

Case Selection and Context

DKI Jakarta was selected as the primary research site due to its strategic importance in Indonesia's border governance architecture. Soekarno-Hatta International Airport processes a substantial proportion of international arrivals under the VoA scheme, making it a critical node in the national mobility network. The concentration of diplomatic missions, multinational corporations, and international economic activity in Jakarta further amplifies the strategic significance of immigration control within the city.

The case is analytically relevant for three reasons. First, Jakarta represents a high-density entry environment where facilitation–security tensions are structurally intensified. Second, it serves as a central coordination hub for immigration and security institutions. Third, it offers insight into how national defense doctrine, as articulated in Law No. 23 of 2019, is translated into operational practice at the local level.

The unit of analysis is the governance process underlying VoA implementation, specifically the interaction among institutional coordination mechanisms, intelligence practices, regulatory frameworks, and facilitation–security balance dynamics.

Although qualitative in design, this study is guided by clearly defined analytical constructs derived from the theoretical framework developed earlier. The central outcome under examination is the effectiveness of the VoA policy as a non-military defense instrument. Effectiveness is conceptualized not merely as administrative efficiency but as the capacity of immigration governance to mitigate non-traditional threats while sustaining mobility facilitation.

Four interrelated constructs structure the analysis:

- a. Institutional Coordination – referring to inter-agency collaboration, information-sharing systems, and operational alignment among immigration authorities, airport management, law enforcement agencies, and intelligence institutions.
- b. Immigration Intelligence and Risk Mitigation – encompassing screening mechanisms, watchlist integration, behavioural observation practices, database interoperability, and preventive supervision strategies applied to VoA entrants.
- c. Normative–Operational Alignment – defined as the consistency between Indonesia's regulatory framework, particularly Law No. 23 of 2019 and immigration regulations, and field-level implementation practices.
- d. Facilitation–Security Balance – conceptualized as a governance equilibrium condition reflecting the dynamic calibration between mobility facilitation objectives and security control mechanisms.

These constructs informed both data collection and thematic coding procedures.

Data Collection

Data were collected through triangulated qualitative techniques to ensure analytical depth and credibility.

In-Depth Interviews

Semi-structured interviews were conducted with key institutional actors involved in VoA implementation and border governance in DKI Jakarta. Informants included immigration officers responsible for entry clearance, supervisory and enforcement personnel, airport security officials, and policy-level administrators. Interviews explored institutional coordination mechanisms, intelligence integration practices, operational constraints, regulatory compliance, and facilitation–security trade-offs.

The semi-structured format allowed flexibility while ensuring alignment with the analytical constructs. Interviews were recorded with informed consent and transcribed for systematic analysis.

Document Analysis

Document analysis was conducted to assess normative frameworks and institutional guidelines governing VoA implementation. Materials reviewed included:

- a. Law No. 23 of 2019 on the Management of National Resources for National Defense
- b. Immigration regulations related to VoA
- c. Ministerial decrees and implementing guidelines
- d. Standard operating procedures (SOPs)
- e. Official policy reports and publicly available statistics

Document analysis enabled examination of normative–operational alignment and provided context for institutional narratives.

Secondary Statistical Context

Official immigration and tourism statistics were reviewed to contextualize operational pressures, particularly the post-pandemic recovery in international arrivals. These data were not used for quantitative modelling but supported interpretive analysis of facilitation–security dynamics.

Data Analysis

Data were analysed using thematic analysis guided by both deductive and inductive coding strategies. The analytical process proceeded in four stages:

- a. Data Familiarization – Interview transcripts and documents were reviewed repeatedly to develop comprehensive understanding.
- b. Deductive Coding – Initial codes were derived from the four analytical constructs (institutional coordination, intelligence integration, normative alignment, facilitation–security balance).
- c. Inductive Refinement – Emergent themes related to operational constraints, digital infrastructure gaps, and equilibrium pressures were incorporated.
- d. Interpretive Synthesis – Themes were examined in relation to the conceptual framework to assess how governance mechanisms interact in shaping VoA effectiveness.

The facilitation–security balance construct was treated as a structural governance condition influencing the interaction among other variables rather than as an isolated factor.

Methodological Contribution

Methodologically, this study contributes by integrating qualitative case study analysis with defense governance theory. By operationalizing abstract defense doctrine into observable administrative practices, the research demonstrates how immigration policy can be examined as a civilian security instrument within comprehensive defense architecture.

4. Results and Discussion

The empirical findings of this study demonstrate that the Visa on Arrival (VoA) policy in DKI Jakarta operates within a multilayered governance structure where institutional coordination, intelligence integration, regulatory alignment, and facilitation–security balance collectively shape its effectiveness as a non-military defense instrument. Rather than functioning solely as an immigration facilitation mechanism, VoA implementation reflects a strategic governance process embedded within Indonesia's total defense framework.

The findings indicate that institutional coordination constitutes the structural backbone of VoA governance. Immigration authorities at Soekarno-Hatta International Airport interact regularly with customs officials, airport authorities, national police, and intelligence agencies. Coordination occurs through routine operational briefings, joint supervisory activities, and information exchanges related to watchlists and suspected individuals. However, this coordination remains predominantly procedural and reactive rather than structurally embedded within an integrated command architecture. Informants consistently emphasized that while cooperation is operationally functional, inter-agency communication often depends on informal networks and personal relationships rather than standardized digital interoperability systems.

This procedural coordination model produces both strengths and vulnerabilities. On one hand, flexibility allows rapid information exchange during emergent security situations. On the other hand, the absence of fully integrated data systems limits predictive and preventive capacity. For instance, real-time database synchronization across agencies remains incomplete, potentially delaying comprehensive risk identification. These findings confirm that institutional coordination significantly influences the effectiveness of VoA governance (H1), yet its impact is conditional upon systemic integration rather than routine communication alone.

The second critical dimension concerns immigration intelligence and risk mitigation practices. VoA entrants undergo multiple layers of screening, including passport authentication, biometric verification, and cross-referencing against national and international watchlists. Officers also apply behavioural observation techniques to detect anomalies. However, operational constraints emerge during high-volume arrival periods. Interview data reveal that time pressure during peak tourism seasons compresses screening depth, narrowing opportunities for extensive interrogation or secondary inspection.

Furthermore, intelligence mechanisms remain predominantly compliance-based rather than predictive. Risk assessment tends to be activated after observable irregularities or prior intelligence alerts, rather than through algorithmic profiling or advanced passenger data analytics. Although Indonesia has initiated steps toward digital border management, the

integration of predictive risk modelling remains limited in practice. Consequently, intelligence functions contribute to reactive threat mitigation but are not yet optimized for anticipatory prevention. This finding supports H2, indicating that the strength and integration of intelligence mechanisms directly enhance VoA's defensive capacity.

Normative–operational alignment represents the third decisive element shaping governance performance. At the normative level, Indonesia's regulatory framework clearly situates immigration governance within the broader total defense system. Law No. 23 of 2019 and related immigration regulations emphasize the responsibility of civilian institutions to safeguard national resilience against non-military threats. Official policy documents promote risk-based supervision and inter-agency collaboration as core principles.

However, field-level observations reveal partial implementation of these normative aspirations. Operational procedures prioritize service efficiency to accommodate high passenger throughput, particularly during tourism recovery phases following the COVID-19 pandemic. This prioritization occasionally constrains the depth of screening and supervision activities. Although no regulatory contradictions were identified, a structural implementation gap persists between the idealized model of integrated non-military defense governance and the practical realities of high-density airport management. This gap substantiates H3, demonstrating that discrepancies between normative frameworks and operational execution can moderate policy effectiveness.

Most significantly, the findings reveal that the facilitation–security balance operates as the overarching governance equilibrium condition shaping VoA performance. The VoA policy inherently embodies dual objectives: facilitating international mobility to stimulate economic growth and ensuring security control to mitigate non-traditional threats. In DKI Jakarta, this duality is intensified due to the concentration of diplomatic missions, multinational corporations, and high passenger volumes.

During peak tourism periods, administrative efficiency becomes a strategic priority to prevent congestion and maintain international reputation. Under these conditions, processing speed is emphasized, potentially limiting discretionary screening. Conversely, when security concerns escalate—such as increased reports of overstaying or transnational fraud—supervisory measures intensify, sometimes generating longer clearance times and operational delays. The governance challenge lies in maintaining dynamic equilibrium rather than privileging one objective over the other.

Empirical evidence suggests that VoA effectiveness improves when institutional coordination, intelligence practices, and regulatory alignment operate cohesively within this equilibrium. When facilitation pressures dominate without corresponding intelligence reinforcement, vulnerability risk increases. Conversely, excessive securitization without procedural efficiency may undermine economic objectives and administrative sustainability. Thus, H4 is validated in qualitative terms: the effectiveness of VoA implementation in DKI Jakarta is structurally shaped by the state's capacity to maintain a balanced facilitation–security nexus.

Taken together, the results indicate that VoA governance in DKI Jakarta partially fulfils its function within Indonesia's non-military defense architecture. The institutional foundation is present, intelligence mechanisms are operational though improvable, and regulatory frameworks provide clear normative guidance. However, systemic integration and predictive capacity remain areas for enhancement. The overall effectiveness of VoA as a non-military defense instrument depends not on any single institutional variable, but on the coherence and equilibrium among governance components.

These findings reinforce the conceptualization of immigration policy as a layered preventive security mechanism embedded within comprehensive defense architecture. The VoA policy, particularly at high-density entry points such as DKI Jakarta, represents a frontline governance instrument where civilian institutions enact non-military defense responsibilities through administrative control, intelligence integration, and adaptive equilibrium management.

5. Discussion

This study set out to examine the Visa on Arrival (VoA) policy in DKI Jakarta as an instrument of non-military defense management. The findings confirm that VoA governance operates within a complex security architecture where institutional coordination, intelligence integration, regulatory alignment, and facilitation–security equilibrium collectively determine policy effectiveness. The discussion below situates these findings within broader theoretical

debates in security governance, non-traditional security, and migration management scholarship.

First, the results reinforce security governance theory, which argues that contemporary security management is no longer monopolized by military institutions but distributed across networks of civilian actors. The findings demonstrate that immigration authorities, airport operators, law enforcement agencies, and intelligence institutions collectively enact non-military defense responsibilities through administrative mechanisms. This supports the argument that border governance constitutes a frontline arena of civilian security production. However, the study also reveals that coordination in DKI Jakarta remains largely procedural rather than structurally integrated. This nuance extends existing literature by showing that inter-agency interaction alone is insufficient; institutional integration must be technologically and structurally embedded to generate predictive security capacity.

Second, the findings contribute to non-traditional security scholarship by empirically illustrating how mobility governance functions as preventive defense infrastructure. Previous research has conceptualized migration as a potential non-traditional threat, yet few studies have examined how everyday visa administration operationalizes national defense doctrine. By analysing VoA implementation through the lens of Law No. 23 of 2019, this study bridges the conceptual gap between defense policy and immigration practice. The evidence suggests that immigration screening, biometric verification, and watchlist cross-checking represent forms of civilian defense action enacted through bureaucratic procedures rather than military force. In doing so, the study reframes immigration officers as actors within comprehensive defense architecture.

Third, the analysis deepens understanding of the facilitation–security nexus in migration governance. While existing scholarship often portrays facilitation and securitization as competing logics, the findings indicate that effectiveness depends on adaptive equilibrium rather than prioritization of one over the other. In DKI Jakarta, peak tourism flows intensify facilitation pressures, while security alerts intensify supervisory measures. The state's capacity to dynamically calibrate these pressures determines whether VoA functions as a resilient governance instrument. This insight advances migration governance theory by introducing the concept of facilitation–security equilibrium as a structural governance condition rather than a binary trade-off.

Fourth, the study sheds light on the normative–operational gap frequently discussed in public administration literature. Although Indonesia's regulatory framework clearly positions immigration within the total defense system, field-level implementation reflects capacity constraints and administrative pressures. This confirms that legal codification of non-military defense principles does not automatically translate into operational coherence. The findings therefore contribute to governance scholarship by demonstrating how implementation gaps emerge not from regulatory contradiction but from structural capacity limitations.

Importantly, this research extends beyond the Indonesian case. Major international gateways worldwide face similar governance dilemmas: how to facilitate mobility while preventing transnational risks. The Jakarta case illustrates that visa policy effectiveness is contingent upon three interconnected mechanisms: institutional integration, intelligence sophistication, and equilibrium management. These mechanisms are not context-specific but structurally relevant to other high-density global entry points. Thus, the study contributes to comparative border governance discourse by offering an analytical model applicable beyond Southeast Asia.

Theoretically, the study advances three contributions. First, it integrates immigration governance into non-military defense theory, demonstrating that civilian border administration constitutes a practical manifestation of comprehensive defense doctrine. Second, it refines security governance theory by highlighting the difference between procedural coordination and systemic integration. Third, it reconceptualizes the facilitation–security nexus as an equilibrium mechanism shaping governance outcomes.

From a policy perspective, the findings suggest that strengthening VoA effectiveness requires investment in interoperable digital systems, predictive intelligence modeling, and standardized inter-agency protocols. Rather than tightening entry restrictions indiscriminately, enhancing equilibrium management and institutional integration may provide more sustainable security outcomes. This approach aligns with contemporary governance strategies that prioritize resilience and adaptability over rigid securitization.

The discussion demonstrates that the Visa on Arrival policy in DKI Jakarta cannot be reduced to an economic facilitation instrument. It represents a layered governance mechanism through which Indonesia operationalizes non-military defense responsibilities. The

effectiveness of this mechanism depends not on singular institutional strength but on systemic coherence and adaptive equilibrium within the broader security architecture.

6. Conclusions

This study examined the Visa on Arrival (VoA) policy in DKI Jakarta from the perspective of non-military defense management, positioning immigration governance as a preventive security instrument within Indonesia's total defense system. The findings demonstrate that VoA implementation operates within a multilayered governance architecture where institutional coordination, intelligence integration, normative–operational alignment, and facilitation–security equilibrium collectively determine policy effectiveness.

The results indicate that while institutional coordination mechanisms are operational, they remain largely procedural rather than systemically integrated. Intelligence practices contribute to supervisory functions but require stronger predictive capacity and interoperable digital infrastructure. Regulatory frameworks clearly embed immigration governance within non-military defense doctrine; however, operational pressures—particularly in high-density entry points—create partial implementation gaps. Most critically, the study finds that the effectiveness of VoA governance is structurally shaped by the state's ability to maintain equilibrium between mobility facilitation and security control. Rather than representing a binary trade-off, facilitation and securitization function as dynamically interacting governance imperatives that require adaptive calibration.

Theoretically, this research advances three contributions. First, it integrates immigration governance into non-military defense theory by demonstrating how visa administration operationalizes comprehensive defense doctrine through civilian institutions. Second, it refines security governance theory by distinguishing between procedural coordination and structural institutional integration. Third, it reconceptualizes the facilitation–security nexus as a governance equilibrium mechanism shaping policy outcomes in high-density border environments.

From a policy standpoint, strengthening the effectiveness of VoA as a non-military defense instrument requires deeper digital interoperability among agencies, predictive risk modelling, and standardized inter-agency protocols. Enhancing systemic integration may prove more sustainable than intensifying restrictive measures alone. For strategic entry points such as DKI Jakarta, resilience depends on governance coherence rather than singular institutional dominance.

This study is not without limitations. As a single-case qualitative analysis focused on DKI Jakarta, the findings are contextually grounded and may not capture variations across other Indonesian entry points. Future research could adopt comparative multi-site designs or incorporate quantitative assessment of intelligence and coordination indicators to further validate the proposed conceptual model.

In conclusion, the Visa on Arrival policy should not be understood merely as an economic facilitation tool. It constitutes a layered governance mechanism through which civilian institutions enact non-military defense responsibilities. Its effectiveness ultimately depends on institutional integration and adaptive equilibrium within Indonesia's comprehensive security architecture.

Author Contributions: Conceptualization, M.N. and P.; methodology, M.N.; formal analysis, M.N.; investigation, M.N.; data curation, M.N.; writing—original draft preparation, M.N.; writing—review and editing, P. and E.P.; supervision, P.; validation, P. and E.P.; theoretical framework development, M.N. and P.; final approval of the manuscript, all authors. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding: This research received no external funding. The study was conducted independently by the authors as part of academic research activities and did not receive financial support from any governmental, commercial, or non-profit funding agency. All research activities, including data collection, analysis, and manuscript preparation, were supported through institutional academic resources and personal contributions of the authors.

Data Availability Statement: The data presented in this study are not publicly available due to confidentiality considerations and institutional restrictions. The qualitative data consist of semi-structured interviews with immigration and security officials, as well as internal governance documents that are subject to administrative and security limitations. Anonymized

excerpts and relevant analytical materials may be made available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request and with permission from the relevant institutional authorities.

Acknowledgments: I would like to express my sincere gratitude to God Almighty for His guidance, strength, and blessings throughout the completion of this research. I am deeply thankful to my journal supervisor for the invaluable insights, constructive criticism, and continuous encouragement that significantly strengthened the theoretical and analytical quality of this study. I also extend my appreciation to the immigration officers and institutional representatives in DKI Jakarta who generously shared their time and professional perspectives, which were essential to understanding the governance dynamics of the Visa on Arrival policy within Indonesia's non-military defense framework. Finally, I am grateful to my family and friends for their unwavering support, understanding, and motivation during this academic journey.

Conflict of interest: The authors declare no conflicts of interest. The authors affirm that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest. The findings, interpretations, and conclusions expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the official positions of any affiliated institutions or governmental agencies.

References

- Pressman, J. L., & Wildavsky, A. (1984). *Implementation: How great expectations in Washington are dashed in Oakland* (3rd ed.). University of California Press.
- Purwanty, Y., & Daryanto, E. (2024). On arrival visa policy on national security. *Journal of Syntax Literate*, 9(2), 145–158.
- Republic of Indonesia. (2019). *Law No. 23 of 2019 on the Management of National Resources for National Defense*.
- Lay, C., & Astrina, A. R. (2020). The limits of the multiple institutionalizations of border control: A case study of immigration, customs, and the Indonesian maritime security agency in Batam, Indonesia. *Pacific Affairs*, 93(1), 121–143.
- Krahmann, E. (2003). Conceptualizing security governance. *Cooperation and Conflict*, 38(1), 5–26.
- Indrady, A. (2020). A critical assessment on the Indonesian free visa policy: A neorealist perspective. *Global: Jurnal Politik Internasional*, 22(1), 45–62.
- Caballero-Anthony, M. (2022). Advancing ASEAN cooperation on non-traditional security challenges. *RSIS Policy Report*
- Ashar, A. R., & Maharani, C. (2022). Far from home: Profile of pro-IS deportees' mobility throughout 2016–2020 and prevention strategy of the Indonesian government. *Journal of ASEAN Studies*, 10(1), 1–18.
- Arifin, R., Hanita, M., & Runturambi, A. J. S. (2024). Unveiling Indonesia's migration and border governance: Challenges and imperatives post-pandemic. *Social Sciences & Humanities Open*
- Arifin, R., Hanita, M., Zulfa, E. A., & Runturambi, A. J. S. (2024). Maritime border formalities, facilitation and security nexus: Reconstructing immigration clearance in Indonesia. *Marine Policy*
- Prihartini, E.N., & Yudhistira, M.H. (2023). *The adverse effects of the visa exemption policy: evidence of immigration violations in Indonesia*. Journal of Policy Research in Tourism, Leisure and Events.
- Yudhistira, M.H., Sofiyandi, Y., & Indriyani, W. (2021). *Heterogeneous effects of visa exemption policy on international tourist arrivals: Evidence from Indonesia*. Tourism Economics.
- Arifin, R., Zulfa, E.A., Hanita, M., & Runturambi, A.J.S. (2024). *Unveiling Indonesia's migration and border governance: Challenges and imperatives post-pandemic*. Social Sciences & Humanities Open.
- Herlina, A. (2021). *Rethinking Indonesian Visa Policy: An Onshore Visa as a Tool to Anticipate Non-Traditional Security Threats*. Atlantis Press
- Indrady, A. (2020). *A critical assessment on the Indonesian free visa policy: A neorealist perspective*. Global: Jurnal Politik Internasional
- Purwanty, Y., & Daryanto, E. (2024). *On Arrival Visa Policy on National Security*. Journal of Syntax Literate.
- This article directly links VoA expansion with national security risks, arguing that regulatory oversight and inter-agency collaboration remain fragmented.
- Romzah, M.I. (2023). *Long Journey by VOA (Visa on Arrival)*. KnE Social Sciences
- Aminullah, A. (2023). *Tourism Policy and Economic Growth in Indonesia: A Political Economy Analysis*. Economics and Finance in Indonesia
- Adinegara, G.N.J. (2018). *Impact of free Visa policy on the arrival of foreign tourists to Bali*. Saudi Journal of Economics and Business Management