



JLPH: Journal of Law, Politic and Humanities

<https://dinastires.org/JLPH> ✉ dinasti.info@gmail.com ☎ +62 811 7404 455

E-ISSN: 2962-2816
P-ISSN: 2747-1985

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.38035/jlph.v5i2>
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

Deed Signing in Front of PPAT: Feasibility Evaluation (Study of PPAT Working Area of West Jakarta Administrative City)

Bintang Parashtheo¹.

¹Universitas Terbuka, theo@ecampus.ut.ac.id.

Corresponding Author: theo@ecampus.ut.ac.id¹

Abstract: The signing of a deed before a Land Deed Official (PPAT) is one of the important stages in the process of transferring land rights regulated by Indonesian agrarian law. This study aims to evaluate the feasibility of the deed signing process before a PPAT in the working area of West Jakarta Administrative City. This evaluation includes compliance with legal procedures, the quality of PPAT services, as well as the suitability of documents and the legality of the deed made. Through a qualitative approach with descriptive analysis, this research examines the various factors that influence the feasibility of deed signing, including the PPAT's role in ensuring the validity and legality of the deed, as well as the challenges faced by the parties involved in the process. The results show that although most PPATs in West Jakarta have carried out their duties in accordance with applicable regulations, there are some obstacles related to the public's limited knowledge of legal procedures, as well as potential problems in document verification that affect the feasibility of signing the deed. Recommendations are given to improve the quality of PPAT services through regulatory development and increasing public legal awareness.

Keyword: Feasibility, PPAT, Deed Signing, West Jakarta.

INTRODUCTION

The practice of transferring rights in Indonesia to date requires a PPAT who acts as an official with the authority to make an authentic deed of the land asset in question. The authentic deed is explained in Oktavianti (2021) as a form of protection for the deed holder and is a written evidence with a position as perfect evidence of ownership of the asset (land) in question. In Indonesia itself, the practice of using PPAT services then becomes even worse when some transferred assets face violations, especially when the bureaucratic process requires a long and winding process so that it can allow opportunities for fraud, especially from the government and PPATs who play an active role in the process of transferring assets in the form of property rights. PPAT is also emphasized to have a role in maintaining the honesty of the process of transferring rights (Nabilasari Lesmana & Yustiawan, 2023), especially the sale and purchase

of land so as to minimize the practice of money laundering that may occur from the practice of buying and selling land assets.

In Indonesia itself, in the practice of transferring assets in the form of land, there is the role of PPAT (Land Deed Making Officer) as one of the stakeholders of the land regulation system in Indonesia. Based on Government Regulation No. 24 of 2016, PPAT or Land Deed Making Officer is mentioned as a public official who is authorized to make authentic deeds regarding certain legal actions regarding land rights or Property Rights Over Flat Housing Units. The practice of transferring land rights in Indonesia requires a PPAT in the process of validating the deed that has been made and will be signed as a form of validity. Furthermore, it is explained in the regulation article 1 paragraph 4 that a land deed is a deed made by a PPAT as evidence that certain legal actions have been carried out regarding land rights or property rights over apartment units. As a government official, a PPAT is required to carry out the duties and obligations inherent in him properly and correctly and must not take actions that violate the regulations and professional ethics that govern it.

Deeds made by PPATs have several requirements as stipulated in Government Regulation No. 24 of 1997 concerning Land Registration, Article 37 (1) Jo Article 38 paragraph (1), where it is clearly written "The making of a deed (in the case of transfer of land rights and ownership rights over apartment units) is attended by the parties to the legal action concerned...". This technical requirement is also explained in Article 22 of Government Regulation No. 37 of 1998 on the Regulation of the position of Land Deed Maker, which reads that the Deed of PPAT must be read out/explained to the parties ... before it is signed immediately by the parties ..."

In relation to the ethics and professionalism of PPATs, several findings on the practice of signing this deed have shifted, as previously it had to be signed in the presence of a PPAT in several cases that are currently rolling, it was found that the process of signing a deed of transfer of land rights was not carried out in the presence of a PPAT. Of course, this is very contrary to the governing regulations, namely based on Government Regulation No. 24 of 1997 concerning Land Registration, Article 37 (1) Jo Article 38 paragraph (1).

The practice of signing deeds not in the presence of a PPAT is certainly not only categorized as a violation because it is not in accordance with the regulations governing it but can also harm one or more of the relevant stakeholders. The widespread practice of signing deeds not in the presence of PPATs then raises the main question of this research, are the above-mentioned Regulations which are then related to the process governing the implementation of signing deeds of transfer of land rights in the presence of PPATs still relevant and feasible in practice in the eyes of stakeholders, especially the wider community? Researchers consider this issue important because it is considered not optimal in its implementation, considering that many of the systems used have changed from conventional to more modern.

The practice of signing before a PPAT not only requires time and energy that needs to be set aside but can actually lead to mal-administration and become a separate legal gap in the sub-field of land law. When looking at similar research findings, Christin (2017) states that there are four elements in a land sale and purchase agreement that must be fulfilled, including: (1) the agreement of those who bind themselves, (2) the ability to make an agreement, (3) a certain thing and (4) a halal or unprohibited cause. In addition, Christin (2017) also added that not only the elements of the formal requirements but also the elements of the material requirements must be met.

Researchers in this case also found that the practice of signing deeds not in the presence of a PPAT can cause conflict that leads to the filing of a lawsuit, as stated in Decision No. 17/Pdt.G/2012/PT.TK and Decision No. 518 PK.Pdt.2020, both cases centered on disputes over land sales and purchases that were considered legally defective because they did not meet the formal requirements. In Decision Number 17/Pdt.G/2012/PT.TK, the landowner felt that he had never sold his land, despite the existence of a deed of sale. The original land certificate

was always in the possession of the owner, and the sale and purchase deed was deemed defective because it was not signed in the presence of a Land Deed Official (PPAT).

Meanwhile, in Decision No. 518 PK.Pdt.2020, the landowner, Ibrahim Bin Kaoy, denied ever selling his land to Rita Diana Binti Abdul Rasyid, despite the existence of a sale and purchase deed listing the transaction. Witnesses also confirmed that the signing of the deed was not done in the presence of a PPAT, so the deed was deemed legally flawed. These two decisions emphasize the importance of land sale and purchase processes that meet the characteristics of light and cash and are carried out in accordance with applicable legal provisions. Deeds that do not meet these requirements cannot be used as a valid basis for the transfer of land rights.

Based on the Supreme Court Decision above, it can be understood that the practice of signing deeds not in the presence of a PPAT can then lead to conflicts between stakeholders such as PPATs and the Asset Owners themselves. Therefore, it is important to further examine the regulations governing the signing of deeds in the presence of PPAT, the obstacles to the implementation of the practice of signing deeds in the presence of PPAT, its relevance to the situation and conditions in the current era. This research is expected to contribute to the understanding of the importance of the role of PPAT in maintaining legal certainty in property transactions, as well as providing recommendations to improve the legal administration process in this sector.

METHOD

This research adopts an empirical juridical approach which is then explained as an approach that has the characteristics of examining applicable legal provisions and what happens in society (Suharsimi, 2012). The same concept is also widely used in economic and social science research which emphasizes interpretative concepts that tend to see how researchers as individuals see phenomena and interpret the findings as stated based on the theory used (Symon & Cassell, 2017). As explained above, this research emphasizes how a situation actually occurs in the community, especially in the practice of transferring rights and the role of PPAT in it. The findings of the research are then collected so that researchers can identify the real problems that lead to solving existing problems in the community.

This research also uses descriptive analytical research methods to then collect research data in the form of primary and secondary data. Primary data referred to in this research is collected from the results of in-depth interviews with stakeholders as well as implementers of the requirement itself, namely PPAT.

Besides, this research uses the concept of triangulation of data sources in research that is widely used in other qualitative social science research (Denzin, 1978; Patton, 1999). The practice of field observation, especially in seeing how the practice of transferring land rights occurs between the parties who play an active role in it, the use of data collection methods in the form of observation is used by researchers in order to explore information that is considered deep enough without being able to interfere with the dynamics of land rights transfer practices so as to minimize biased information conveyed in the research findings (Adler, 1994; McKechnie, 2008).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Results

After obtaining approval from stakeholders, in this case PPATs, interviews were conducted to obtain primary data. The interview was conducted on October 14, 2024 with a PPAT who has a working area in West Jakarta. Before conducting the interview, it was explained to the PPAT that the outline of the discussion of this interview was:

1. The application of the rule of “signing the deed before the PPAT” in practice.
2. Views on Technology and Regulations related to “signing deeds in front of PPAT”.

3. The need for renewal of the “deed signing before PPAT” regulation. Based on the outline of the discussion, a list of questions was developed to dig deeper into each outline of the discussion into several questions as follows:

Table 1. List of Questions and Indicators

Indicator	No	Questions
Implementation of the rules for signing deeds in the presence of PPAT	1.1	Have you ever experienced difficulties in having the parties involved in the signing of deeds present before you?
	1.2	Do you always inform the parties about their obligation to be present for the signing in front of the PPAT?
	1.3	Do you always inform the parties that representatives can sign the PPAT deeds using a power of attorney?
	1.4	How often do the parties involved in the deed have difficulty physically attending before you?
	1.5	Are there any other methods used to enforce the rules for signing deeds directly in front of the PPAT?
	1.6	In practice, have you ever granted exceptions for not signing directly in front of the PPAT?
Views on Technology and Regulation	2.1	Do you see technological advancements as a solution to replace physical signing of deeds in front of the PPAT?
	2.2	In your opinion, can the use of technology, such as video meetings/video conferences for identity verification and deed signing, be applied safely and effectively?
	2.3	What is your opinion on the need for regulatory updates that allow online deed signing without physical presence in front of the PPAT?
Need for Regulatory Reform	3.1	In your view, are the current rules still effective in ensuring the legality of the deeds?
	3.2	Do you feel that the rules regarding physical presence before the PPAT are no longer suitable for current conditions?
	3.3	Do you believe there is a need for more flexible regulatory updates that allow the deed signing process to be conducted online with guaranteed security?
	3.4	If the rules are updated, what aspects should be considered in creating new regulations?

The results of interviews with PPATs in charge of the West Jakarta working area show that there are various obstacles in presenting the parties related to the signing of the deed before the PPAT. Many parties are difficult to attend in person, either due to distance, busyness, or other technical reasons. This causes the signing process to be delayed or requires a more flexible time adjustment. This situation is a challenge in itself in ensuring the validity and accuracy of the deed signing procedure in accordance with the applicable legal rules.

Although there are obstacles in presenting the parties for the signing of the deed before the PPAT, this does not pose a serious problem. PPAT has alternative solutions that still ensure a smooth process. One example of a case that has occurred is when the relevant party is unable to attend due to an unfavorable health condition. As a solution, PPAT made adjustments by visiting the party at their location. This step is taken to ensure that the signing still takes place in accordance with applicable legal provisions.

The second obstacle that PPATs commonly face is the significant distance between parties and the PPAT office, making in-person attendance difficult. To address this, PPAT offers two solutions: first, parties may authorize representatives to appear on their behalf; second, the PPAT or their representative can travel to the parties' locations to conduct the signing process. These accommodations ensure the procedure remains compliant with applicable legal provisions.

The third obstacle is dealing with multiple sellers, along with the challenge of coordinating their different schedules for joint attendance. Some sellers may live far away from each other. The solution is to gather as many sellers as possible who are able to meet together. If there are those who are constrained by distance, authorization can be given to other selling parties. Another condition if it is not possible for all selling parties at the same time, then the signing can be done separately or not at the same time.

The fourth obstacle arises when buyers request that the PPAT deed be registered under a different name than their own. This commonly occurs with married individuals who wish to gift property to their spouse as a surprise. While oral power of attorney is a possible solution, it is legally vulnerable. However, since this arrangement typically causes no harm to either party, buyers often accept this approach.

Nevertheless, based on the results of the interview, PPAT procedurally always provides information to the parties about the obligation for the presence of the parties to sign the deed before the PPAT as question number 1.2 as explained. In addition, the West Jakarta PPAT when experiencing obstacles to attend/present the parties in front of him is given information to the parties that it is allowed to have a representative by using a power of attorney to sign the PPAT deed. For sellers, the power of attorney must be a power of attorney signed before a notary. As for the buyer, the power of attorney is sufficiently made under hand. In certain cases, the buyer's power of attorney can be done with an oral power of attorney, but this goes back to the discretion of the BPN which changes according to the official.

Furthermore, regarding how often parties are constrained to appear, the PPAT with the West Jakarta working area argues that in approximate numbers, there are still more deeds signed in the presence of the PPAT than those that experience constraints, but based on the level of practical difficulty and completion time, the conditions for parties who have constraints to appear are noticeably more than those who appear in the presence of the PPAT. Even so, PPATs always recommend being present for the signing of deeds over other methods that have been used for the safety of the parties.

The second indicator discussed is the views related to technology and regulations in the process of signing deeds in the presence of PPATs. Before the interview session began, PPATs were given an explanation of technological developments in modern administration. Technological advances have had a significant impact, especially in facilitating transactions and document processing, so that time and space barriers are no longer an obstacle in administrative activities. One example of innovations that have been legally used is digital signatures, e-stamps, and document sharing platforms such as Google Docs.

Communication technologies such as video calls and video conferencing are also increasingly commonly used to facilitate remote interaction between the parties involved. The use of this technology facilitates the deed signing process, especially when the parties involved cannot be physically present before the PPAT. However, the application of such technology must still follow applicable regulations in order to maintain the validity and legality of the documents produced.

The interview results regarding the second indicator, namely views related to technology and regulations in signing deeds before PPATs, show that PPATs in the West Jakarta working area consider technology to offer convenience and flexibility as an alternative to physical signing. Technologies such as digital signatures, video conferencing, and e-stamps are considered to increase efficiency, especially in facilitating the identity verification process and communication between parties. However, PPATs still have concerns regarding the level of security of using these technologies as a full replacement for physical signing.

The security and legal validity of physical signatures are still considered superior, especially in the context of signing deeds that have significant legal implications. Therefore, although technology has provided a promising alternative, PPATs in the West Jakarta working area tend

to be more cautious in fully implementing it, particularly regarding the legal validity and security of documents produced through digital media. The implementation of this technology is considered more appropriate at the verification or meeting stage, rather than at the formal signing stage.

The interview results regarding the third indicator, namely the need for regulatory updates related to the signing of deeds in the presence of PPATs, show that PPATs in the West Jakarta area assess that the conventional method of physical signing still has advantages in terms of security and legal certainty. This method is considered stronger in protecting the interests of the parties, because it ensures the physical presence of each party in the signing process which provides certainty of identity and agreement. However, this conventional method is also considered to have weaknesses, especially in terms of ease and flexibility of implementation, given geographical challenges or certain situations that may hinder the presence of the parties. Based on this, PPAT believes that the current regulations are less effective in providing solutions that are responsive to practical challenges in the field.

PPAT emphasized the importance of updating regulations that allow alternative methods of signing deeds with technological support, such as digital signatures or video conferencing, provided that the regulations still provide security guarantees and legal certainty equivalent to conventional methods. With more adaptive regulations, technology-based alternatives can be well received by all stakeholders, including sellers, buyers, and PPATs. This update will bridge the practical need for efficiency and flexibility, without compromising the legal principles that protect the interests of the parties to the transaction. As such, the new regulation should ensure that the use of technology in deed signing can still provide maximum legal protection.

Regulation of Administrative Requirements for Signing a Deed Before a PPAT

Government Regulation No. 37 of 1998 serves as the main guideline for Land Deed Officials (PPAT) in carrying out deed-making procedures at the PPAT Office. As a guideline that must be followed, this regulation establishes operational standards that must be implemented without exception in the process of making a Land Deed.

Implementation is an action or implementation of a plan that has been prepared in a mature and detailed manner, implementation is usually carried out after the plan is considered ready (Sonia & Handrian, 2023). According to G. R Terry in Sonia and Handrian (2023), implementation is an activity that includes determining, classifying, achieving goals, assigning people by paying attention to the physical environment, in accordance with the authority delegated to each individual to carry out these activities. Majone and Wildavsky in Eko Hardian (2020), suggest implementation as an evaluation. Meanwhile, Browne and Wildavsky in Eko Hardian (2020) suggest that implementation is an expansion of mutually adjusting activities.

Arianti (2016) states that procedures are a series of methods that have become fixed steps in completing a job in the field of administration, which generally involves more than one person. The benefits of procedures include facilitating the determination of future activity steps, turning repetitive work into routine and structured so as to simplify its implementation, and providing clear work instructions that must be obeyed by all implementers. Procedures also help increase work productivity effectively and efficiently, as well as prevent deviations, thereby facilitating supervision and allowing improvements if necessary (Mulyadi, 2001).

PPAT has several definitions in the legislation, namely:

1. Article 1 point 4 of Law Number 4 of 1996, PPAT is a public official who is authorized to make deeds of transfer of land rights, deeds of encumbrance of Mortgage Rights according to applicable laws and regulations.
2. Article 1 point 5 of Government Regulation Number 40 of 1996. PPAT is a public official who is authorized to make land deeds.

3. Article 1 point 24 of Government Regulation Number 24 of 1997, PPAT is a public official who is authorized to make certain land deeds.

4. Article 1 point 1 of Government Regulation No. 37 of 1998, PPAT is a public official who is authorized to make authentic deeds regarding certain legal acts concerning land rights or property rights over apartment units.

According to the provisions of Article 22 of Government Regulation Number 37 of 1998, concerning the Regulation of the Position of Land Deed Maker, the PPAT Deed must be read / explained to the parties in the presence of at least 2 (two) witnesses before it is signed immediately by the parties, witnesses and PPAT. Based on the results of research through interviews conducted by Eko Hardian (2020) with the Head of the Sintang Land Office of the Land Law Relations Section on the Staff of the Section of Analysis of Rights Application and Land Registration of the Sintang Regency National Land Agency Office, the procedure for making a deed of transfer of land is as follows.

1. The parties attend in person at the PPAT Notary Office, bringing the required documents.

2. The PPAT Notary checks the Certificates and Land and Building Tax of the object to be transferred.

3. If the requirements are met, the process of creating the deed is carried out.

4. Signing of the deed; and

5. Registration of the transfer deed with the National Land Agency Office.

Furthermore, an interview conducted with Zippo Surya, a Land Law Analyst at the Dispute Control and Handling Section of the Madiun District Land Office, through an online platform on October 16, 2024, provided clarification regarding Article 22 of Government Regulation Number 37 of 1998. It was explained that the signing process of the PPAT deed must be attended by both parties, witnesses, and the PPAT itself simultaneously and at one location, after which the content of the deed to be signed should be read and explained beforehand.

After the content of the deed has been read and explained sufficiently by the PPAT, the parties and witnesses provide their initials on each page of the deed as a sign that they have understood its contents. Only after all pages have been initialed by the parties and witnesses is the deed signed. This entire procedure is necessary because the legal act of signing the deed results in an authentic document, which means it is perfect.

Implementation of Administrative Requirements for Signing Deeds in Front of the PPAT

Normatively, the signing of a deed in front of the PPAT is a fairly strict regulation in its implementation. All parties with an interest in the deed are required to be present together in one place for the signing of the PPAT deed. This is based on the principle of security in land registration as stated in Government Regulation Number 24 of 1997 concerning Land Registration, specifically in Article 2.

It raises significant questions if the implementation of the PPAT deed does not follow the mandate of Article 22 of Government Regulation Number 37 of 1998, as well as the consequences for such deeds. According to interviews conducted by PPATs in the West Jakarta area, various methods have been used by PPATs to carry out deed signings, such as having the PPAT represented by their staff with an official assignment letter, allowing the seller to be represented by a power of attorney in front of the notary, and the buyer being represented by at least verbal authority. Parties may sign the deed at different times, among other methods deemed compliant with the rules for signing deeds in front of the PPAT.

Zippo Surya, a Land Law Analyst at the Dispute Control and Handling Section of the Madiun District Land Office, expressed the view that alternatives used by the PPAT cannot be entirely deemed wrong as long as the parties have been informed beforehand. With explanations

provided and evidenced by initials from the parties on each page of the deed, it can be said that the parties understand the situations of other parties and do not contest it.

Furthermore, the BPN (National Land Agency) does not have the authority to materially examine whether the deed was created in accordance with Article 22 of Government Regulation Number 37 of 1998. Formal examinations are only conducted to determine whether the concerned PPAT has violated the PPAT code of ethics.

When the deed signed by the parties, witnesses, and the PPAT is submitted to the BPN, the BPN will consider it a finished, authentic product. Whether or not the procedural requirements were met in front of the PPAT is not within the authority of the BPN. Thus, it can be concluded that Article 22 of Government Regulation Number 37 of 1998 will only become problematic if a party contests the agreed alternative procedures, meaning there is a party that files a lawsuit.

Obstacles to Administrative Requirements for Signing Deeds in Front of the PPAT

Based on the research findings discussed in the previous section, there are several obstacles faced by the Land Deed Official (PPAT) in carrying out their duties, namely distance, time, and special requests. Distance obstacles often occur when the parties involved in the land deed creation process do not reside in the same area as the land object that is the subject of the deed. This condition makes coordination and physical meetings to finalize administrative matters more challenging. For example, if one party is out of town or even abroad, the PPAT must adjust schedules and communicate remotely, which can sometimes take longer and incur additional travel or document shipping costs. Furthermore, the involvement of third parties such as witnesses or notaries in the parties' locations can also extend the process.

Time obstacles also present a significant issue. Time is often a hindrance due to the busy schedules of both the PPAT and the parties involved. In some cases, the completion time for creating the deed can take longer than expected because the parties cannot be present at the same time for signing or ratifying the deed. Additionally, delays in gathering supporting documents, such as land certificates, inheritance letters, or permits from relevant authorities, can also prolong the deed completion process.

In addition to distance and time obstacles, special requests often become a hindrance for the PPAT. These special requests usually come from certain parties that require different treatment, such as the use of foreign languages in documents, requests for signing locations outside the PPAT office, or specific legal provisions related to inherited land. The PPAT must be careful in accommodating these requests to ensure compliance with applicable legal provisions without violating administrative rules.

Overall, these obstacles require the PPAT to have a high degree of flexibility, good time management skills, and a deep understanding of the relevant regulations to ensure the deed creation process runs smoothly.

Feasibility of Administrative Requirements for Signing Deeds in Front of the PPAT

This section considers several important aspects from the perspectives of regulation, implementation, and field practice. The rules for signing deeds in front of the PPAT pose practical challenges in their implementation, particularly concerning the difficulties in having the parties present in person at the PPAT office. Factors such as distance, busyness, and technical reasons often result in delayed signings or the need for flexibility in scheduling.

Several key obstacles have been identified that frequently occur in the deed signing process. These obstacles demonstrate that although the existing regulations aim to protect the validity of the deeds, in practice there are difficulties that affect the smoothness of the procedures, such as distance and time constraints, the number of parties involved, and special requests from certain parties. Despite these challenges, the PPAT is still able to seek solutions that maintain

the legitimacy of the process. These obstacles do not directly invalidate the deeds, as long as all parties have been informed about the contents of the deeds and have given their approval. One increasingly relevant development to discuss in the context of signing deeds is the use of technology. PPATs in West Jakarta are beginning to recognize the potential of using technology such as digital signatures, e-stamps, and video communication as solutions to overcome geographical and time barriers. This technology enables remote interactions between the PPAT and the parties without requiring physical presence. Although this technology offers many conveniences, the PPAT still faces concerns regarding security, particularly in ensuring the validity and legality of documents produced through digital media.

Regulations regarding the use of technology in the deed signing process are still considered unclear and do not fully support alternative practices for implementing deed signing in front of the PPAT. Based on the practical obstacles faced by the PPAT in the field and the rapid technological developments, there is an urgent need to update regulations related to deed signing. The existing regulations still lean toward conventional methods, which, while strong in legal validity, are deemed less flexible in addressing practical challenges that arise in the field.

PPATs in the West Jakarta area believe that existing regulations should be more responsive to the needs of the times, especially in accommodating the use of technology. With regulatory updates that support the use of digital signatures, e-stamps, and remote communication, the deed signing process can be conducted more efficiently without compromising security and legal certainty.

These regulatory updates must ensure that alternative signing methods still provide legal protection equivalent to conventional methods. This is important to maintain the trust of the parties in every transaction and to prevent potential disputes in the future. Overall, the rules for signing deeds in front of the PPAT, as regulated by Government Regulation Number 37 of 1998, remain relevant in terms of security and legal validity. However, in terms of feasibility, these rules require adjustments to be more flexible in facing practical challenges in the field, especially with the development of technology.

CONCLUSION

This research has several limitations that need to be acknowledged. First, time constraints have been a major obstacle in the execution of this study. The short timeframe has prevented the researcher from organizing meetings and interviews with a larger number of participants. This has impacted the amount of data obtained, considering that broader interviews with various potential participants could provide a deeper understanding of the issues being investigated.

Additionally, budget limitations in this research have also affected the scope of the study. With a limited budget, the research could only involve a small number of participants, making the results less generalizable to the broader area of the Land Deed Official (PPAT) work. Given that the scope of PPAT work in Indonesia is highly diverse and varied, the findings of this research are more relevant to specific contexts and cannot be used as a general representation for all PPATs under the Ministry of Agrarian Affairs.

Therefore, this study only provides an initial overview of the problems faced by PPATs, and further research is needed with a broader participant scope and more adequate time and budget support to achieve more comprehensive generalizations.

REFERENCE

- Adler, P. A. (1994). *Observational techniques*. Handbook of Qualitative Research/Sage.
- Arianti, M. S. (2016). *Studi Tentang Prosedur Pembuatan Akta Kelahiran Pada Dinas Kependudukan dan Pencatatan Sipil Kota Samarinda*. Skripsi FIS Dan Ilmu Politik Universitas Mulawarman Samarinda.

- Cristin, D. (2017). Analisis Atas Diketuinya Cacat Yuridis Pada Akta Jual Beli Tanah Dan Rumah Yang Dibuat Oleh PPAT (Vol. 14, Issue 17) [Universitas Sumatera Utara]. <http://repositori.usu.ac.id/handle/123456789/20566>
- Denzin, N. K. (1978). *The research act: A theoretical introduction to sociological methods*. Routledge.
- Eko Hardian, M. (2020). Pelaksanaan Pasal 22 Peraturan Pemerintah Nomor 37 Tahun 1998 Pada Pembuatan Akta Tanah Di Kantor Pejabat Pembuat Akta Tanah (PPAT). *Perahu (Penerangan Hukum): Jurnal Ilmu Hukum*, 8(1).
- McKechnie, L. E. F. (2008). Observational research. *The Sage Encyclopedia of Qualitative Research Methods*, 1, 573–575.
- Mulyadi. (2001). *Sistem Akuntansi*. Salemba Empat.
- Nabilasari Lesmana, E., & Yustiawan, D. G. P. (2023). Civil Law Analysis of Unwritten Agreements in Business Activities. *Policy, Law, Notary And Regulatory Issues*, 2(2), 109–116. <https://doi.org/10.55047/polri.v2i2.568>
- Oktavianti, P. C. (2021). Kedudukan Saksi Instrumenter Dalam Merahasiakan Akta Otentik Dan Perlindungan Hukum Bagi Saksi Instrumenter. *Syntax Literate; Jurnal Ilmiah Indonesia*, 6(5), 2408–2417.
- Patton, M. Q. (1999). Enhancing the quality and credibility of qualitative analysis. *Health Services Research*, 34(5 Pt 2), 1189.
- Sonia, G., & Handrian, E. (2023). Monitoring Pelaksanaan Tujuan Pembangunan Berkelanjutan Oleh Badan Perencanaan Pembangunan Daerah Penelitian Dan Pengembangan Provinsi Riau (Studi Tujuan Pertama Kemiskinan Di Kota Pekanbaru). *Yudabbiru Jurnal Administrasi Negara*, 5(2), 69–81.
- Suharsimi, A. (2012). *Metodelogi Penelitian*. Bina Aksara.
- Symon, G., & Cassell, C. (2017). Qualitative Organizational Research: Core Methods and Current Challenges. In *Qualitative Organizational Research: Core Methods and Current Challenges*. Sage. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781526435620>