



JLPH: Journal of Law, Politic and Humanities

E-ISSN: 2962-2816
P-ISSN: 2747-1985<https://dinastires.org/JLPH> [✉ dinasti.info@gmail.com](mailto:dinasti.info@gmail.com) [☎ +62 811 7404 455](tel:+628117404455)DOI: <https://doi.org/10.38035/jlph.v6i3>
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

Formation of Laws Based on The Omnibus Method that Meet Standards of Meaningful Participation

Marsudi Dedi Putra^{1*}, Heristiawan Aryo Wirotomo²¹ Wisnuwardhana University, Malang, Indonesia, marsudiputra1976@gmail.com² Wisnuwardhana University, Malang, Indonesia, watunaryo@gmail.com*Corresponding Author: watunaryo@gmail.com

Abstract: The formation of laws based on the omnibus method attempts to combine various themes in one law and accelerate the legislative process, but has the potential to reduce the quality of participation. Using a legislative approach, comparative study, and a conceptual approach, this article analyzes how the concept and practice of community participation are implemented, as well as the standards used as benchmarks for meaningful participation in law-making through the omnibus method. The conceptual approach is employed to construct the analytical framework for assessing participation principles and democratic legitimacy in the legislative process.. As a result, a country that adheres to the concept of people's sovereignty must fulfill the principle of openness with community participation as its main pillar. Omnibus as a method in the formation of laws often reaps controversy because it does not provide sufficient public access and participation space for the community. The active involvement of the community and stakeholders or related parties affected to provide input and suggestions through a public consultation mechanism at the stages of submitting draft laws, discussions and joint approvals is a standard of meaningful participation that must be met in the formation of laws based on the omnibus method.

Keywords: Omnibus Method, Formation Of Laws, Meaningful Participation.

INTRODUCTION

This research aims to explore in depth the omnibus law as a method for establishing legal and legislative systems. This issue is interesting to examine because the practice of drafting laws using the omnibus method often generates controversy and even tends to ignore participation as a pillar of democracy. The formality and efficiency that are the primary goals of the omnibus method, combined with its haphazard implementation, pose dangers not only to lawmakers but also to society, resulting in a decline in the quality of participatory democracy. This article demonstrates how the practice of drafting laws using the omnibus method undermines public participation, and therefore requires standards for meaningful participation that must be met in drafting laws based on the omnibus method.

The formation of laws must adhere to the principle of transparency and involve public participation. Laws that inadequately incorporate the principle of transparency risk undermining legal legitimacy, weakening public trust, and potentially contributing to

governance or regulatory challenges (Bodnar & Gliszczynska-Grabias, 2023). Doctrinally, the principles of transparency and public participation have been repeatedly affirmed by the Constitutional Court in various judicial review decisions. The Constitutional Court emphasized that the formation of laws must adhere to the principles of openness and meaningful participation as part of the due process of law in legislation. Failure to meet these principles not only implies procedural flaws but also potentially undermines the constitutional legitimacy of legal products. In practice, several judicial reviews have demonstrated that flaws in public participation can form the basis for formal judicial review of laws, thus establishing a doctrinal link between transparency and the stability of the legal system (Sari & Wiraguna, 2025). Empirically, some legislative processes perceived as lacking transparency have triggered social resistance and a decline in public trust. For example, in the dynamics of changing political and election regulations, public criticism and demonstrations emerge when the public perceives the legislative process as non-participatory. International reports indicate tensions between legal policies and freedom of public participation, including repressive measures against demonstrations regarding certain legal policies in Indonesia. This suggests that a lack of participation and transparency can trigger social conflict and a crisis of legal policy legitimacy (Damanik *et al*, 2025). In a democratic state based on law, legal products in the form of laws are portrayed as being able to encompass and answer all national problems that are intertwined with the political interests of political parties in representative institutions (Buana, 2017).

Democratic legal understanding requires that every law be enacted with the consent of the people. The argument is that enacted laws can enforce their rules by threatening sanctions, limiting, reducing, and taking away some of the people's basic rights (Indrati, 2021). The implication of adopting the concept of a democratic state based on the rule of law is that every formation of laws concerning anything and for any purpose requires the fulfillment of the fundamental principle of state administration, namely openness, which enables every citizen to participate (Redi & Chandranegara, 2021).

The theory of participation put forward by Sherry R. Arnstein in her work "A Ladder of Citizen Participation", teaches that in the formation of laws, we must open up the widest possible space for public participation, from the lowest level of manipulation to efforts to achieve genuine participation (Arnstein, 1969). Meanwhile, regarding the procedure for forming laws, Lon L. Fuller in *The Morality of Law* emphasizes the principle of publicity, meaning that laws must be properly promulgated and accessible to the public as part of the requirements of legal validity. However, this principle primarily concerns the obligation of the state to publish and make legal rules known, rather than mandating direct public participation in the drafting process. Therefore, while publicity supports transparency and legal certainty, meaningful public participation in law-making should be grounded in separate democratic and constitutional principles governing participatory governance. The process of forming laws that are kept secret in stages will experience failure, and such laws are not worthy of being called laws and do not even need to be obeyed (Fuller, 1963).

In Indonesia, the regulation of public participation in the formation of laws has made significant progress. Philosophically, the fourth principle of Pancasila, "Democracy guided by the wisdom of ...", which is also stated in the fourth paragraph of the Preamble to the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia (hereinafter abbreviated as the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia), is the basic foundation for the adoption of the concept of democracy. Meanwhile, Article 1 paragraph (2) and paragraph (3) of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia, serve as authentic constitutional evidence confirming the democratic rule of law (Yuliandri, 2014), which requires that every legal formation must take into account the voice of the people.

Nowadays, participation has been institutionalized, but at the same time it is accompanied by implementation challenges that are not easy, such as the active participation

of the community in every stage of the formation of laws which still requires improvement (Sy & Irawan, 2022). This is evident from the legal breakthrough involving the DPR and the President in the formation of laws based on the omnibus method (Chandranegara, 2021). In the last three years, there have been at least three acts that have used the omnibus method, which are: (1) Act Number 11 of 2020 concerning Job Creation (*Cipta Kerja*), (2) Act Number 3 of 2022 concerning the Indonesian Capital City (*IKN*), and (3) Act Number 17 of 2023 concerning Health. All three acts, which were enacted using the omnibus method, demonstrated a relatively rapid process. In fact, the enactment of the National Capital City Act only took one month and twelve days (Paputungan & Bachri, 2023).

The choice of a fast process brings its own advantages in the form of state budget savings. However, the creation of omnibus-based laws too quickly without public participation poses dangers, not only for the lawmakers but also for the public. The danger is that lawmakers could lose public trust, and as a result, weaken their legitimacy (Porrás-Gómez, 2023). Meanwhile, the danger to society can be in the form of losing momentum to communicate, provide input, and discuss matters according to the interests of society (Krajewski, 2019).

Public participation is not the ultimate goal of the law-making process (Kristiyanto, 2020) and laws are not merely the result of agreements of their creators (MD, 2019), but the formation of laws without participation affects the quality of the laws. Therefore, it is necessary to ensure that the legal process for forming laws is carried out within a constitutional framework (Fadli, 2021), because the law has an important role as the legality of managing the country, organizing the life of society in an orderly and regular manner (Faizal, 2021). This process starts from the planning stage to the promulgation, and is carried out transparently and openly (Hebert et al, 2022). From a philosophical perspective, the formation of laws is all in order to respect human dignity and protect legitimate hopes (Sodiki, 2014), and aims to realize prosperity within the framework of justice, as well as civilizing citizens (Gijbels et al, 2021). Most recently, following the Constitutional Court Decision Number 91/PUU-XVIII/2020 concerning the Formal Review of Law Number 11 of 2020 concerning Job Creation against the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia, a strong foundation has been laid to ensure the implementation of meaningful participation.

However, Constitutional Court Decision No. 91/PUU-XVIII/2020 raises new issues, as it does not explicitly define comprehensive parameters that lawmakers can use to ensure meaningful participation, creating legal uncertainty. Therefore, clear standards are needed regarding the requirements for meaningful participation. This research is intended to contribute ideas to lawmakers in forming laws based on the omnibus method to fulfill meaningful participation. There are two legal problems analyzed, which are: (1) How is the practice of forming laws based on the omnibus method? and (2) What standards of meaningful participation must be met in the formation of omnibus-based laws in Indonesia?

METHOD

This research employs a normative legal research method to examine the formation of legislation using the omnibus method that fulfills the standards of meaningful public participation. Normative legal research is chosen because the study focuses on analyzing legal norms, principles, doctrines, and regulatory frameworks governing legislative processes, rather than empirical social behavior. The research is primarily based on secondary legal materials, consisting of primary, secondary, and tertiary sources.

Primary legal materials include constitutional provisions, statutes, and regulations related to law-making procedures, particularly those governing the use of the omnibus method and public participation in legislative drafting. These materials encompass the Constitution, laws on the formation of legislation, parliamentary rules of procedure, and relevant court decisions that interpret participation rights and legislative standards. Secondary legal materials

consist of legal doctrines, scholarly articles, books, and comparative studies on omnibus legislation, democratic law-making, and the concept of meaningful participation in constitutional and administrative law. Tertiary legal materials, such as legal dictionaries and encyclopedias, are used to clarify legal terminology and concepts.

The research adopts a statutory approach, a conceptual approach, and a comparative approach. The statutory approach is used to systematically examine existing legal norms regulating the legislative process and public participation. The conceptual approach analyzes key legal concepts such as the omnibus method, meaningful participation, transparency, inclusiveness, and accountability, drawing from legal theories and judicial interpretations. Meanwhile, the comparative approach is applied to assess legislative practices in selected jurisdictions that have implemented omnibus legislation with participatory mechanisms, in order to identify normative benchmarks and best practices.

Legal materials are analyzed using qualitative and prescriptive analysis, focusing on consistency, coherence, and conformity with constitutional principles and democratic standards. The analysis aims to formulate normative recommendations for a legislative framework that integrates the omnibus method with meaningful participation, ensuring legal certainty, legitimacy, and protection of participatory rights in the law-making process.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Omnibus-Based Law Formation Practice

Public participation at the practical level should not stop at involvement in the process of forming laws, but is expected to determine the final results and impacts arising from the birth of a law (Arnstein, 1969). In terms of which communities should be involved in participating, Bagir Manan stated, "Stakeholders have the right to actively participate in determining laws." (Manan, 2004). Laws made unilaterally by the legislature can be rejected because they do not fulfill the sense of justice in society (Huntington & Nelson, 1994) and tends to cause controversy, because basically laws are a sediment of conflicts in society (Hidayat & Arifin, 2019).

Due to the potential for controversy surrounding legislation, lawmaking must be carried out carefully and with due diligence, ensuring public participation. This provision also applies to legislation created using omnibus laws. Omnibus laws, defined as "one for everything," allow a single law to amend or repeal several laws simultaneously, and are defined by O'Brien and Bosc as "...seeks to amend, repeat, or enact several acts..." (Massicotte, 2021), and by Jimly Asshiddiqie it is defined as a technique for forming laws with the intention of making changes simultaneously to several laws that exist and were previously in force (Asshiddiqie, 2020), it brings advantages and disadvantages in practice.

The advantages of the omnibus law if implemented include: (1) time efficiency because in a single process of forming laws many needs can be met; (2) laws and regulations can be organized and made more harmonious; (3) there is legal certainty for the business and employee world (Asshiddiqie, 2020). However, besides the advantages, there are also disadvantages to implementing the omnibus law, namely: (1) the material discussed becomes thick and results in discussions lacking in-depth analysis; (2) time is very limited, often bypassing predetermined stages; (3) community involvement is hampered both in terms of formality and substance; and (4) it can damage the democratic process (Asshiddiqie, 2020). Patrick Keyzer put forward various problems that must be faced in the formation of omnibus law-based legislation, including: (1) very difficult to draft; (2) limited opportunities for debate and scrutiny; (3) may make consultation very difficult; (4) may be hard to implement; (4) can add to the complexity, rather than remove it (Keyzer, 2020).

The absence of public participation in the formation of laws is clearly a potential source of controversy that will arise later, including laws that use the omnibus method (Bariun, 2021),

as was used in the formation of Law Number 11 of 2020 concerning Job Creation (*Cipta Kerja*). The practice of forming this law has not fulfilled the principle of openness and participation at the stages of submission, discussion and ratification (Firdaus, 2020). In fact, lawmakers have attempted to provide space for participation. For example, the amendments to Law No. 18 of 2017 concerning the Protection of Indonesian Migrant Workers involved various community groups in the deliberation process, although it must be acknowledged that the specifics of the legislative changes to be incorporated into the Job Creation Law have not yet been discussed (The legal basis for the Constitutional Court Judge's considerations in Constitutional Court Decision Number 91/PUU-XVIII/2020).

This provision is understood as a process that does not meet the requirements regarding procedures for forming laws and does not fulfill the principle of openness in the formation of laws, so that the Job Creation Law using omnibus must be declared conditionally unconstitutional (Asshidiqie, 2021), through Constitutional Court Decision Number 91/PUU-XVIII/2020.

In its ruling, the Constitutional Court stated that the Job Creation Law is in conflict with the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia and does not have conditional binding law as long as it is not interpreted as "no improvements are made within 2 (two) years from the date this ruling was pronounced" (Minutes of the Hearing for Case Number 91/PUU-XVIII/2020, concerning the Formal Review of Law Number 11 of 2020 concerning Job Creation against the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia, Decision in the Main Petition Number 3). This Constitutional Court decision has the following meanings: first, the Job Creation Law remains in effect until improvements are made within the timeframe specified in the decision; second, it orders the legislators to make improvements within a maximum period of 2 (two) years from the date the decision was pronounced and if improvements are not made within that timeframe, the Job Creation Law will become permanently unconstitutional; and third, if within the 2 (two) years period the legislators are unable to complete improvements to the Job Creation Law, the law or articles or the contents of the law that have been revoked or amended by the Job Creation Law are declared to be in effect again.

In the United States, the practice of creating omnibus laws is often controversial, as they are perceived to sacrifice participation. The 2018 omnibus spending bill sparked debate due to its size and broad scope (Juwana, 2020). The omnibus spending bill regulates various political issues such as border security, general elections, technological modernization, efforts to counter Russian influence, and the Taylor Force Act (a law that regulates United States aid to Palestine) (Hayati & Warijiyati, 2021).

Along the way, the United States has been able to address the omnibus law issue by involving public participation. There are no fewer than five models of public participation in the law-making process (ParlAmericas, 2025), among others: (1) citizen participation offices, by establishing parliamentary offices outside the capital to facilitate citizen access; (2) ad-hoc meetings or workshops with civil society organizations, which parliament can establish training or workshops in the areas of expertise of citizens; (3) institutional bodies, parliament can appoint representatives from civil society organizations who are integrated into institutional bodies on a temporary or permanent basis; (4) public outreach, parliament can implement public outreach programs to share information and gather feedback; and (5) town hall meetings, citizens are invited to dialogue about various concerns regarding the impact of the enactment of laws (Academic Paper of the Draft Law on the Second Amendment to Law Number 12 of 2011 concerning the Formation of Legislation, 2022).

Even the United States dreams of all problems being solved academically, a scientific government, including finding a way out of the omnibus law problem (Anggono & Firdaus, 2020). Finally, the United States is developing more accessible forms of public participation.

Lawmakers not only provide draft legislation but also supplement it with cost-benefit analysis models and regulatory impact assessments (Shapiro & Murphy, 2013).

In UK, the process of forming laws using the omnibus method is relatively conducive. The UK Parliament ensures that all citizens have equal and full access to information, by safeguarding personal data in accordance with regulations such as the 2005 Act, the Protection and Freedom Act 2012, and the Data Protection Act 1998. Information related to parliament is disseminated through official government channels. Parliament also provides an e-petition mechanism, which can be submitted by a minimum of five UK citizens, which will then receive a response from parliament and the government (Mandak, 2024). Petitions that garner 100,000 signatures from citizens can be considered in the policy-making process. Citizens can also provide input through government consultation forums held over four months. The policy deliberation process is explained by parliament through its website, social media, and live broadcasts on parliamentary TV. All information is freely and easily accessible through the parliament's official website.

The results of a comparative study with other countries on the omnibus-based legislative process have raised awareness among lawmakers in Indonesia. Lawmakers have taken various strategic steps to increase participation. The House of Representatives (*DPR*) has no less than three types of electronic media as a means to accommodate public participation, including (Sy & Irawan, 2021): (1) Legislation Information System (SILEG) which is an information platform about parliament to monitor all legislative processes in the *DPR*, (2) Community Participation (SIMAS) which is a platform to realize the formation of participatory, transparent, accountable, with integrity, efficient, and effective laws through the compilation of a database, and (3) PARTISIPASIKU which is a Government platform to support the arrangement of laws and regulations. The PARTISIPASIKU platform is an application designed by the Government through the National Legal Development Agency (BPHN). The purpose of creating the PARTISIPASIKU application is to capture community participation in legal analysis and evaluation activities for the arrangement of laws and regulations and the preparation of academic papers.

The strategic steps above are in accordance with Lon L. Fuller's theory that success in the formation of laws requires an announcement or at least providing participation to the community affected by the enactment of the law (Herlina, 2023). The creation of laws that involve public participation has high legitimacy and meets moral criteria, meaning that the creation has implemented moral procedures. Laws produced through moral procedures and meeting legal criteria by opening up participation can lead to successful lawmaking as a legal rule.

Standards for Meaningful Participation in the Formation of Omnibus-Based Laws

The formation of laws based on the omnibus method is so complex and complicated, so it requires stronger participation that is carried out with full awareness of the impacts that arise (Ebner et al, 2022). Legally, there are no less than 4 (four) laws and regulations that regulate public participation in the formation of laws, including: (1) Law/Act, (2) Presidential Regulation, (3) Regulation of the Minister of Law and Human Rights, and (4) *DPR* Rules of Procedure.

Act Number 13 of 2022 strengthens public involvement and participation in the formation of laws (Consideration, considering letter b, Act Number 13 of 2022). Article 5 letter g of Act Number 13 of 2022 in its explanation expands openness in accepting public participation (Explanation of Article 5 letter g of Act Number 13 of 2022). Meanwhile, Article 96 paragraph (1) and paragraph (3) of Act Number 13 of 2022 stipulates that individuals or groups of people who are directly affected and/or have interests have the right to provide input verbally and/or in writing at every stage of the formation of statutory regulations. The progress

of Act Number 13 of 2022 also shows that public input is provided online and/or offline. Furthermore, Article 96 paragraph (6) emphasizes that to fulfill the public's right to provide input verbally and/or in writing, lawmakers can conduct public consultations through public opinion meetings, working visits, outreach, and/or seminars, workshops, and/or discussions. To support the input provision process, every draft legislation must be easily accessible to the public.

Presidential Regulation Number 87 of 2014 concerning the Implementing Regulations of Act Number 12 of 2011 concerning the Formation of Legislation contains provisions regarding public participation. This provision can be found in Article 188 paragraph (1) and paragraph (2) which in principle stipulates: "The public has the right to provide input verbally and/or in writing in the formation of legislation and the process of providing such input is carried out through public consultation."

A closer look at Presidential Regulation Number 87 of 2014 reveals a lack of uniformity or change in the nomenclature regarding participation. Act Number 12 of 2011 explicitly uses the nomenclature of public participation. On the other hand, the form of participation is limited to public consultation only in Presidential Regulation Number 87 of 2014. In fact, the form of public participation can be diverse. In other words, Presidential Regulation Number 87 of 2014 is unable to further explain the weaknesses in the provisions of Act Number 12 of 2011, and even tends to reduce the meaning of public participation to public consultation. Similarly, Article 96 paragraph (6) of Act Number 13 of 2022, which is currently in effect, regulates the form of participation through public consultation. Regarding the form of participation through public consultation itself, no further explanation was found.

The procedures for implementing public consultation in the formulation of legislation became clearer and more certain when the Minister of Law and Human Rights issued Regulation Number 11 of 2021 concerning Procedures for Implementing Public Consultation in the Formulation of Legislation. This Regulation of the Minister of Law and Human Rights is an implementing regulation related to participation in Presidential Regulation Number 87 of 2014. Based on Regulation of the Minister of Law and Human Rights Number 11 of 2021, public participation is realized through a public consultation forum. The public consultation forum is conducted through electronic media provided by the Directorate General of Legislation and non-electronic media. The public can participate by providing responses and/or input in the planning, drafting, and discussion of draft legislation.

Public consultation in the preparation of the academic text of the draft law is regulated in Article 5 paragraph (2) of the Minister of Law and Human Rights Regulation, which is carried out by the Minister by disseminating the draft law concept to the public by: (1) uploading it to the statutory regulations information system; (2) sending official letters to certain stakeholders containing information on the concept along with requests for responses or input; and (3) conveying it through other methods or media that are easily accessible to the public according to their conditions and needs.

Article 5 paragraph (2) of the Minister of Law and Human Rights Regulation still has a weakness, which is the Minister only has the task of disseminating and requesting responses or input. This is not balanced with follow-up on requests for responses or input used as consideration in deciding the formation of laws. It is mandatory that affected communities are provided with a concept of the draft law to be drafted along with its academic text. Opinions and suggestions from affected communities can later complement or reduce the existing draft law concept. Furthermore, the relevant Minister must record and process these responses so that they can be discussed in the drafting of the draft law.

Public participation has been conducted from the outset through methods and media that are easily accessible to affected communities. This ease of access naturally varies across affected communities, necessitating standardized and established mechanisms. Public

consultations are not simply about providing information; they must be accompanied by interaction (Chandra & Irawan, 2021). Public consultation at the next stage is carried out at the drafting stage with the dissemination of the draft law. The provisions regarding this provision are regulated in Article 13 paragraph (2) of the Minister of Law and Human Rights Regulation, as follows: The dissemination of the draft law is carried out by the Government through electronic or non-electronic media. The dissemination of the draft law through electronic media is carried out by uploading it to the public participation information system for statutory regulations managed by the Directorate General of Legislation. Meanwhile, the dissemination of draft laws through non-electronic media is carried out by: (1) providing information about draft laws in print media such as post, newspapers, bulletin boards; and (2) carrying out public tests, concept tests, socialization, discussions, lectures, workshops, seminars or other meetings.

Indonesian House of Representatives Regulation Number 1 of 2020 concerning the House of Representatives' Rules of Procedure allows the public to provide input into the formation of laws. Furthermore, Article 243 stipulates: "Such responses and/or input may be submitted verbally or in writing during the stages of (a) drafting and establishing the National Legislation Program (*Prolegnas*); (b) preparing and discussing draft laws; and (c) discussing draft laws and the State Budget." This is in line with Article 246 of the Republic of Indonesia House of Representatives Regulation Number 1 of 2020, which stipulates that the heads of supporting bodies that collect public opinion must convey information related to developments in these opinions to the public, either by letter or using online or electronic media.

The Constitutional Court of the Republic of Indonesia's Decision Number 91/PUU-XVIII/2020 explicitly refers to it as meaningful public participation. The Court's decision outlines at least three main prerequisites for fulfilling meaningful public participation: first, the right to be heard; second, the right to be considered; and third, the right to be explained (Explanation of Act Number 13 of 2022, Number I General, sixth paragraph). If placed in the five stages of law formation, more meaningful public participation must be carried out in at least 3 (three) stages: (i) submission of draft laws; (ii) joint discussion between the House of Representatives (*DPR*) and the President, as well as joint discussion between the *DPR*, President, and *DPD* as long as it is related to Article 22D paragraph (1) and paragraph (2) of the 1945 Constitution; and (iii) joint approval between the *DPR* and the President (Legal considerations of the Constitutional Court decision Number 19/PUU-XVIII/2020 paragraph 3.17.8).

The problem arises, when the formation of laws based on the omnibus method truly meets the standards of meaningful participation, then the following provisions should be considered: Theoretically, the highest ethical value of participation is the right of the people to have their opinions heard (Aryani et al, 2022). This right is exercised by involving and providing opportunities to the community and various stakeholders or related parties affected by the regulations to provide input and suggestions on the draft to be submitted, through a public consultation mechanism and adequate access to information (Arifin, 2021). The standard for published information includes: (a) all documents and/or written responses and documented information; (b) transcripts of public hearings; (c) all important documents in the drafting of laws; (d) draft laws before public consultation; and (e) all published documents have been peer-reviewed to enhance scientific integrity in the formation of laws. The aim is to protect the rights of people affected by state policies and to ensure justice in government by listening to the voice of the people (Palguna, 2019).

Creating legislation based on the omnibus method that meets the standards of meaningful participation is certainly a shared desire. However, achieving the highest level of participation, as Sherry R. Arstein points out, is no easy feat in practice. The four laws and regulations discussed above are realistic enough to serve as legal guidelines for

implementation. At the very least, this approach will assist in producing quality legislation, even when using the omnibus method.

CONCLUSION

Based on the above explanation, the following conclusions can be drawn: (1) The practice of forming laws based on the omnibus method often causes controversy. Strategic steps have been taken by lawmakers to increase public participation through electronic systems such as the Legislation System (SILEG), the Community Participation System (SIMAS) and PARTISIPASIKU. Its relevance to Lon L. Fuller's theory is that laws must contain truths that are placed on social legitimacy. Fulfilling the criteria of publicity in the formation of laws is the highest good value (*finis et principium*). (2) The standard of meaningful participation can be met if the stages of submitting draft laws, discussions, and joint approval using the omnibus method must involve the wider community, both through public consultation, discussion forums, and providing access to clear information about the content and impacts of changes to laws.

As a recommendation, it is necessary to improve the regulation of public participation which includes: (a) Involving people who have concerns, (b) Having a mechanism for representation of participation, and (c) Determining the minimum number of affected people who are harmed in public consultations.

REFERENCE

- Anggono, B. D., and F. R. Firdaus. "Omnibus Law in Indonesia: A Comparison to the United States and Ireland." *Lentera Hukum*, HeinOnline, 2020. https://heinonline.org/hol-cgi-bin/get_pdf.cgi?handle=hein.journals/lenth7§ion=23.
- Arifin, S. "Illiberal Tendencies in Indonesian Legislation: The Case of the Omnibus Law on Job Creation." *The Theory and Practice of Legislation*, ahead of print, Taylor & Francis, 2021. <https://doi.org/10.1080/20508840.2021.1942374>.
- Arnstein, S. R. "A Ladder Of Citizen Participation." *Journal of the American Institute of Planners* 35, no. 4 (1969): 216–24. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01944366908977225>.
- Aryani, N. M., & Danyathi, A. P. L. "Quo Vadis Protection of The Basic Rights of Indonesian Workers: Highlighting The Omnibus Legislation and Job Creation Law." *Pandecta Research Law* ..., journal.unnes.ac.id, 2022. <https://journal.unnes.ac.id/nju/pandecta/article/view/34948>.
- Asshiddiqie, J., *Konstitusi dan Konstitusionalisme Indonesia*, Jakarta: Konstitusi Press, 2006.
- Asshiddiqie, J., *Omnibus Law dan Penerapannya di Indonesia*, Cetakan Kedua, Jakarta: Konstitusi Press, 2020.
- Bariun, L. E., *Masa Depan Otonomi Daerah Terhadap Keberlakuan Undang-Undang Cipta Kerja (Sentralisasi Ataukah Desentralisasi)*, Jakarta: Laporan Penelitian Kerjasama Fakultas Hukum Universitas Sulawesi Tenggara dengan Mahkamah Konstitusi Republik Indonesia, 2021.
- Bodnar, A., & Gliszczyńska-Grabias, A., "Strategic Lawsuits against Public Participation (SLAPPs), the Governance of Historical Memory in the Rule of Law Crisis, and the EU Anti-SLAPP Directive." *European Constitutional Law Review* 19, no. 4 (2023): 642–63. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1574019624000063>.
- Buana, M. S., *Menakar Omnibus Law dan Consolidation Law untuk Harmonisasi Peraturan Perundang-undangan Indonesia*, Pendekatan Perbandingan Hukum Tata Negara, Prosiding Konferensi Nasional Hukum Tata Negara Ke-4, Jember, 2017.
- Chandranegara, I. S., "Pengadopsian Mekanisme Fast-Track Legislation dalam Pengusulan Rancangan Undang-Undang oleh Presiden." *Jurnal Penelitian Hukum De Jure* 21, no. 1 (2021): 123. <https://doi.org/10.30641/dejure.2021.V21.123-140>.

- Damanik, E.R., Farina, T., & Nugraha, S., "Krisis Partisipasi Publik dalam Pembentukan Undang-Undang di Indonesia: Problematika Hak Konstitusional dan Pengabaian Aspirasi Rakyat", (2025, 5(2):2830), <https://j-innovative.org/index.php/Innovative/article/view/18664>
- de Cruz, P., *Comparative Law in A Changing World*, London: Cavendish Publishing Limited, 1999.
- Ebner, B., Liebenberg, S. C., and Visagie, I. J. H., "A New Omnibus Test of Fit Based on a Characterization of the Uniform Distribution." *Statistics*, ahead of print, Taylor & Francis, 2022. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02331888.2022.2133121>.
- Fadli, M., *Perkembangan Peraturan Delegasi di Indoensia (The Development of Delegated Legislation in Indonesia)*, Ringkasan Disertasi, Bandung: Fakultas Hukum, Universitas Padjajaran, 2012.
- Fadli, M., *Putusan Mahkamah Konstitusi Dalam Optik Politik Hukum*, Malang: Nuswantara, 2021.
- Faizal, Z. P. "Strict Liability in Environmental Dispute Responsibility before and after the Enabling of Omnibus Law." *Administrative and Environmental Law Review*, jurnal.fh.unila.ac.id, 2021. <https://jurnal.fh.unila.ac.id/index.php/aclr/article/view/2318>.
- Firdaus, F. R., "Pencegahan Korupsi Legislasi Melalui Penguatan Partisipasi Publik Dalam Proses Pembentukan Undang-Undang." *Jurnal Legislasi Indonesia* 17, no. 3 (2020): 282. <https://doi.org/10.54629/jli.v17i3.679>.
- Gijbels, I., Omelka, M., and Veraverbeke, N., "Omnibus Test for Covariate Effects in Conditional Copula Models." *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, Elsevier, 2021. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0047259X21000828>.
- Hayati, N. N. S., and Warjiyati, S., "Analisis Yuridis Konsep Omnibus Law Dalam Harmonisasi Peraturan Perundang-Undangan Di Indonesia." *Jurnal Hukum Samudra Keadilan*, ejournalunsam.id, 2021. <https://ejournalunsam.id/index.php/jhsk/article/view/2631>.
- Hébert, F., Causeur, D., and Emily, M., "Omnibus Testing Approach for Gene-based Gene-gene Interaction." *Statistics in Medicine*, ahead of print, Wiley Online Library, 2022. <https://doi.org/10.1002/sim.9389>.
- Herlina, M. "Implementation Of Omnibus Model Regulations In The Establishment Of Regional Regulations" *Fox Justi: Jurnal Ilmu Hukum*, ejournal.seaninstitute.or.id, 2023. <https://ejournal.seaninstitute.or.id/index.php/Justi/article/view/1906>.
- Hidayat, A., & Arifin, Z., "Politik Hukum Legislasi Sebagai Socio-Equilibrium Di Indonesia" *Jurnal Ius Constituendum* 4, no. 2 (2019): 133. <https://doi.org/10.26623/jic.v4i2.1654>.
- Huda, N., *Presiden & Pembantu Presiden Dalam Sistem Ketatanegaraan Indonesia*, Yogyakarta: FH UII Press, 2019.
- Indrati, M. F., *Kumpulan Tulisan A. Hamid S. Attamimi: "Gesetzgebungswissenschaft sebagai salah satu upaya menanggulangi hutan belantara peraturan perundang-undangan"*, Depok: Fakultas Hukum Universitas Indonesia, 2021.
- Juwana, S., *Sistem dan Praktik Omnibus Law di Berbagai Negara dan Analisis RUU Cipta Kerja dari Perspektif Good Legislation Making*, Yogyakarta: Indonesia Ocean Justice Initiative, 2020.
- Keyzer, P., "La Trobe Law School, La Trobe University", Australia, Materi Kuliah Tamu, *The Indonesian Omnibus Law: Opportunities and Challenges*, Universitas Brawijaya, Malang, 29 Januari 2020.
- Krajewski, M., "The Many-Faced Court: The Value of Participation in Annulment Proceedings." *European Constitutional Law Review* 15, no. 2 (2019): 220–46. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S157401961900018X>.

- Kristiyanto, E. N., "Urgensi Omnibus Law dalam Percepatan Reformasi Regulasi dalam Perspektif Hukum Progresif." *Jurnal Penelitian Hukum De Jure* 20, no. 2 (2020): 233. <https://doi.org/10.30641/dejure.2020.V20.233-244>.
- Manan, B., *Menyongsong Fajar Otonomi Daerah*, Yogyakarta: Pusat Studi Hukum FH UII, 2004.
- Mandak, A. P. A., Penerapan Partisipasi Masyarakat Bermakna Dalam Pembentukan Undang-Undang Pascaputusan Mahkamah Konstitusi Nomor 91/PUU-XVIII/2020. 13 (2024).
- Massicotte, L., *Omnibus Bills in Theory and Practice*. n.d.
- Naskah Akademik Rancangan Undang-Undang Tentang Perubahan Kedua Atas Undang-Undang Nomor 12 Tahun 2011 tentang Pembentukan Peraturan Perundang-Undangan, Badan Keahlian DPR RI, 2022.
- Palguna, I.D.G., *Konstitusi Rakyat: Partisipasi Masyarakat dalam Perubahan Undang-Undang Dasar*, Depok: RajaGrafindo Persada, 2019.
- Paputungan, M., & Bakhri, S., "Menyoal Pemenuhan Partisipasi Masyarakat Yang Bermakna Dalam Pembentukan Undang-Undang Tentang Ibu Kota Negara" *Al-Qisth Law Review* 6, no. 2 (2023): 274. <https://doi.org/10.24853/al-qisth.6.2.274-300>.
- Porras-Gómez & Antonio-Martín. "The EU Recovery Instrument and the Constitutional Implications of Its Expenditure." *European Constitutional Law Review* 19, no. 1 (2023): 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1574019622000323>.
- Redi, A. & Chandranegara, I. S., *Omnibus Law Diskursus Pengadopsiannya ke Dalam Sistem Perundang-Undangan Nasional*, Depok: RajaGrafindo Persada, 2020.
- Republik Indonesia. Putusan Mahkamah Konstitusi Nomor 91/PUU-XVIII/2020 tentang Pengujian Formil Undang-Undang Nomor 11 Tahun 2020 tentang Cipta Kerja terhadap Undang-Undang Dasar Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 1945.
- Republik Indonesia. Sekretariat Jenderal dan Kepaniteraan Mahkamah Konstitusi. *Undang-Undang Dasar Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 1945*, Jakarta: MKRI, 2011.
- Republik Indonesia. Undang-Undang Nomor 12 Tahun 2011 tentang Pembentukan Peraturan Perundang-undangan, Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 2011 Nomor 82, Tambahan Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Nomor 5729, sebagaimana telah diubah beberapa kali dan terakhir dengan Undang-Undang Nomor 13 Tahun 2022 tentang Perubahan Kedua Atas Undang-Undang Nomor 12 Tahun 2011 tentang Pembentukan Peraturan Perundang-undangan, Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 2022 Nomor 143, Tambahan Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Nomor 6801.
- Sari, K.Y., & Wiraguna, S.A., "DINAMIKA YURIDIS PROSES PERKARA PENGUJIAN FORMIL UNDANG-UNDANG DI MAHKAMAH KONSTITUSI INDONESIA", *Jurnal Konteksualisasi Hukum dan Masyarakat*, (2025, 6(2):29), <https://ijurnal.com/1/index.php/jkhm/article/view/788>
- Shapiro, S., & Murphy, R., "Public Participation without a Public: The Challenge for Administrative Policymaking." *Missouri Law Review* 78 (2013).
- Sodiki, A. *Dari Dissenting Opinion Menuju Living Constitution (Pemikiran Hukum Prof. Dr. Achmad Sodiki, S.H. Hakim Konstitusi Periode 2008-2013)*, Malang: Universitas Brawijaya Press, 2014.
- Strong, C. F., *Modern Political Constitutions*, the English Language Book Society and Sidwick & Jackson, Limited, London, 1966.
- Sy, C., Helmi, and Irawan, S. P., "Perluasan Makna Partisipasi Masyarakat dalam Pembentukan Undang-Undang Pasca Putusan Mahkamah Konstitusi." *Jurnal Konstitusi* 19, no. 4 (2022): 766–93.
- Yuharningsih, "Laporan Aksi Perubahan Pelatihan Kepemimpinan Pengawas Angkatan CXCIV Tahun 2021 Tentang Pengembangan Fitur Aplikasi Partisipasiku untuk

Optimalisasi Fungsi Analisis dan Evaluasi Peraturan Perundang-Undangan pada Pusat Analisis dan Evaluasi Hukum Nasional” Jakarta, 2021.

Yuliandri, Laporan Akhir Pengkajian Hukum tentang Partisipasi Masyarakat dalam Penentuan Arah Kebijakan Prioritas Penyusunan Peraturan Perundang-undangan, Jakarta: Pusat Penelitian dan Pengembangan Sistem Hukum Nasional, Badan Pembinaan Hukum Nasional Kementerian Hukum dan Hak Asasi Manusia RI, 2014.