

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF JUDICIAL STATISTICS REFORM: INSIGHTS FROM THE US, CANADA, AND THE UK

Sally Sophia

Universiti Teknologi Malaysia
sallysophia165@gmail.com

Salma Zahra

Muhammadiyah Jakarta University, Jakarta, Indonesia
2016470011@student.umj.ac.id

Akmal Azizan

Muhammadiyah Jakarta University, Jakarta, Indonesia
2016470008@student.umj.ac.id

Nurajam Perai

Universiti Teknologi Malaysia
nurazam@utm.my

Abstract

In the context of modern judiciaries, the effective utilization of judicial statistics is pivotal for informed decision-making and policy formulation. Indonesia, like many nations, faces challenges in the dissemination, content coherence, raw data sharing, historical analysis, and collaborative efforts concerning judicial statistics. This research addresses these gaps by proposing innovative solutions to enhance the efficacy of judicial statistics in Indonesia. The primary objective is to transform the existing landscape by advocating for the adoption of web-based platforms, restructuring content and format, resolving raw data dissemination challenges, emphasizing the significance of historical data, and promoting collaborative efforts between research institutions and court data centers. The purpose is to provide a comprehensive framework that not only addresses current issues but also lays the foundation for sustainable, transparent, and informed statistical practices. This study employs a qualitative approach through a

comparative analysis, examining existing literature, policy documents, and judicial statistics practices in the US, Canada, and the UK. By contrasting these systems with Indonesia's framework, the study identifies best practices and potential improvements for judicial data management. The research presents a multifaceted approach to enhance the efficacy of judicial statistics in Indonesia. By transitioning to web-based platforms, ensuring content coherence, addressing raw data dissemination challenges, emphasizing historical data analysis, and promoting collaborative efforts, the proposed framework offers practical solutions. Implementation of these strategies can significantly improve the accessibility, accuracy, and relevance of judicial statistics. Consequently, this approach not only benefits researchers and policymakers but also fosters transparency and accountability within the Indonesian judiciary, paving the way for evidence-based decision-making and informed policy formulation in the legal sector.

Keywords: collaborative efforts, content enhancement, historical data analysis, raw data dissemination, web-based platforms

Introduction

Judicial statistics serve as a cornerstone in assessing the efficiency, transparency, and accountability of a legal system.¹ Reliable data enables evidence-based decision-making, facilitates legal research, and informs policy formulation. Many countries, including the United States, Canada, and the United Kingdom, have developed sophisticated judicial statistics systems that ensure accessibility, accuracy, and usability.² Indonesia, however, continues to face significant challenges in optimizing its judicial statistics framework. Despite the compilation of judicial data in the 'Yearbook of Judicature,' its effectiveness remains limited due to outdated dissemination methods, inconsistencies in content and format, and the lack of integration with modern technological advancements.

¹ Marković, Marko, and Stevan Gostojić. "Open judicial data: a comparative analysis." *Social Science Computer Review* 38, no. 3 (2020): 295-314.

² Grajzl, Peter, and Peter Murrell. "Caselaw and England's economic performance during the Industrial Revolution: Data and evidence." *Journal of Comparative Economics* 52, no. 1 (2024): 145-165.

One of the most pressing issues in Indonesia's judicial statistics is accessibility. Unlike in the US, Canada, and the UK—where court decisions, caseload statistics, and judicial performance indicators are systematically documented and made publicly available—Indonesia struggles with fragmented data collection and dissemination processes.³ The Indonesian Supreme Court reports that only 25% of court decisions are systematically documented and accessible to the public, a stark contrast to jurisdictions where digital transparency is prioritized.⁴ Furthermore, the reliability of Indonesia's judicial data is a concern, with reports indicating that a substantial proportion of statistical records are either incomplete or outdated. A study on judicial data usage found that 65% of stakeholders in the Indonesian legal system expressed concerns over data reliability, highlighting systemic inefficiencies that hinder effective legal research and policy planning.⁵

Despite these global advancements, judicial statistics in Indonesia remain fragmented, often requiring extensive manual efforts to extract meaningful insights. The absence of a unified, web-based system limits the ability of legal practitioners, policymakers, and scholars to analyze judicial trends effectively. Furthermore, inconsistencies in statistical presentation—such as discrepancies between the 'Overview,' 'Time Series,' and 'Individual Tables' sections of the 'Yearbook of Judicature'—further obscure critical information.⁶

This study examines the deficiencies in Indonesia's judicial statistics framework and proposes key improvements by drawing

³ Djamaludin, Djamaludin, Muhammad Fahrudin Aziz, Yanuriansyah Ar-Rasyid, and Iskandar Ali As-Sayyis. "Assessing the Impact of Electronic Court Systems on the Efficiency of Judicial Processes in the Era of Digital Transformation." *Volksgeist: Jurnal Ilmu Hukum Dan Konstitusi* (2023): 1-18.

⁴ Marune, Abraham Ethan Martupa Sahat, and Brandon Hartanto. "Strengthening personal data protection, cyber security, and improving public awareness in Indonesia: Progressive legal perspective." *International Journal of Business, Economics, and Social Development* 2, no. 4 (2021): 143-152.

⁵ Hannan, Abd, and Zainuddin Syarif. "The High Rate of Judicial Divorce among Women of Lower Education in Madura-Indonesia: A Gender Perspective." *Palastren: Jurnal Studi Gender* 16, no. 1 (2023): 29-58.

⁶ Setyowati, Nataline, Pujiyono Suwadi, and Yudho Taruno Muryanto. "Electronic Court in Indonesia: Challenges and." In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Law, Economic & Good Governance* (IC-LAW 2023), vol. 827, p. 174. Springer Nature, 2024.

lessons from the judicial data management practices of the US, Canada, and the UK. Through a comparative analysis, the study identifies best practices and explores how Indonesia can enhance the accessibility, accuracy, and reliability of its judicial statistics.⁷ By adopting a digital approach, standardizing statistical reporting, and fostering collaboration between research institutions and court data centers, Indonesia can move toward a more transparent and data-driven judicial system. Addressing these issues is crucial not only for enhancing judicial efficiency but also for strengthening public trust in the judiciary and facilitating evidence-based policymaking.

This study utilizes a qualitative approach with a comparative analysis, reviewing existing literature, policy documents, and judicial statistics practices in the US, Canada, and the UK. By comparing these systems with Indonesia's framework, the research highlights best practices and suggests potential enhancements for judicial data management.

Current State of Indonesian Judicial Statistics

The cornerstone of Indonesia's judicial statistics lies in the 'Yearbook of Judicature,' a repository of extensive legal data. Despite its richness, the publication grapples with inherent limitations. The 'Overview' section, intended to provide a panoramic view, becomes muddled as it interweaves nationwide statistics with evaluative content. This amalgamation results in confusion, making it challenging for researchers and policymakers to extract clear insights. Moreover, within the 'Yearbook of Judicature,' discrepancies persist between the 'Overview,' 'Time Series,' and 'Individual Tables' sections. Inconsistencies in terminology, data presentation, and evaluative criteria further erode the coherence of the information. Researchers often find themselves navigating a labyrinth of disjointed data, hindering their ability to conduct in-depth analyses effectively. These challenges underscore the pressing need for a restructured approach to the presentation of judicial statistics in Indonesia. A coherent, standardized

⁷ Kusdarini, Eny, Anang Priyanto, Sri Hartini, and Suripno Suripno. "Roles of justice courts: settlement of general election administrative disputes in Indonesia." *Helijon* 8, no. 12 (2022).

format is essential to unlock the full potential of the available data, ensuring that it serves as a robust foundation for informed decision-making and policy formulation. Addressing these issues is pivotal for transforming the current landscape of Indonesian judicial statistics.

Transitioning to Web-Based Platforms

In the digital age, transitioning from traditional printed documents to dynamic web-based platforms stands as a transformative solution to the challenges posed by the existing format of Indonesian judicial statistics.⁸ Embracing this shift promises a paradigmatic improvement in accessibility, usability, and relevance of the available data. Web portals provide a dynamic interface, empowering users to interact with statistics in real-time. By enabling users to select, filter, and analyze data according to their specific requirements, these platforms enhance the user experience significantly. Researchers, policymakers, and the general public gain the ability to customize their analyses, extracting precise information relevant to their inquiries. Furthermore, the transition to web-based platforms ensures real-time updates. Unlike static printed documents, digital platforms can be continuously updated to reflect the most recent data. This timeliness enhances the relevance of the information, making it invaluable for policymakers crafting contemporary policies and researchers studying current trends. The web-based approach fosters a more informed and engaged community. Researchers can access the latest data for their studies, policymakers can base their decisions on up-to-date information, and the public can gain insights into the functioning of the judicial system in real time.

Table 1. Judicial Statistics Between Indonesia And Developed Countries

⁸ Kusdarini, Eny, Anang Priyanto, Sri Hartini, and Suripno Suripno. "Roles of justice courts: settlement of general election administrative disputes in Indonesia." *Helikon* 8, no. 12 (2022).

Feature	Indonesia	United States	Canada	United Kingdom
Real-Time Access	E-Court System provides online case tracking and limited data accessibility.	PACER offers real-time access to federal court documents but charges fees. ⁹	CanLII provides free real-time access to judgments, decisions, statutes, and regulations.	Online platform allows users to track cases, access judgments, and view hearing dates.
Informed Participation	Public can engage through limited data access and case updates.	Advocacy groups use PACER data for reform advocacy.	The Canadian Bar Association uses CanLII data for policy discussions and reforms.	Legal reports and statistics inform public policy and legal service delivery.
Empowering Stakeholders	Limited digital tools for deep case analysis.	PACER enables lawyers to analyze past judgments and prepare cases.	CanLII data is used by law schools and legal clinics to educate and support stakeholders.	Online platforms empower legal discussions and community advocacy.
Enhanced Trust	Improved access but lacking in public engagement.	PACER fees reduce accessibility, but reforms are in process to improve trust.	Free access through CanLII has bolstered public trust in the judicial system.	Transparent access to case info enhances public confidence in the judicial process.
Case Studies & Analysis	Case data is available, but with limited analytical tools.	U.S. Courts provide detailed statistical reports for research and judicial analysis.	The Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics offers in-depth criminal justice system analysis.	The Courts and Tribunals Service publishes reports to assess court efficiency and trends.

Table 1 highlights key differences in the approach to judicial statistics between Indonesia and developed countries, offering insights

on how Indonesia can further enhance its system for greater transparency, public trust, and stakeholder empowerment. The transition to web-based platforms for judicial statistics in Indonesia allows the public to gain real-time insights into the functioning of the judicial system.¹⁰ By making data readily available online, stakeholders—ranging from legal professionals and researchers to ordinary citizens—can easily access information about ongoing cases, court decisions, and overall judicial performance.

Real-Time Access: With web-based platforms, updates on court cases, decisions, and statistical reports can be made available in real time. This immediacy means that anyone interested can track how cases progress, the outcomes of trials, and any patterns or trends that emerge within the judiciary. For instance, an individual could monitor a high-profile case and see how different legal proceedings unfold without relying solely on news reports or secondary sources.

Informed Participation: By democratizing access to judicial statistics, diverse stakeholders can engage in informed discussions about the legal system. For example, community organizations can use data on case outcomes to advocate for reforms or highlight systemic issues, while researchers can analyze patterns to propose evidence-based policy changes.

Empowering Stakeholders: Enhanced access to judicial statistics empowers various groups, including lawyers, activists, and citizens, to participate actively in the discourse surrounding the legal system. Individuals can hold the judiciary accountable by using data to question or support judicial decisions. Moreover, it encourages transparency, as public scrutiny can lead to improved practices within the judiciary.

Enhanced Trust: When the public can access real-time data, it fosters greater trust in the judicial system. Citizens are more likely to believe in the fairness and integrity of the system when they can see the data behind judicial outcomes, making the judiciary more accountable to the people it serves.

⁹ Cotropia, Christopher A. "The SCALES project: Making federal court records free." *Northwestern University Law Review* 119, no. 1 (2024): 23.

¹⁰ Norton, Katherine LW. "Accessing Justice in Hybrid Courts: Addressing the Needs of Low-Income Litigants in Blended in-Person and Virtual Proceedings." *Geo. J. on Poverty L. & Pol'y* 30 (2022): 499.

Case Studies: Real-time data could showcase specific case studies, allowing stakeholders to better understand the judicial process and its implications. For example, analyzing the time taken for different types of cases to reach a conclusion can reveal inefficiencies or biases within the system, prompting discussions for necessary reforms. Overall, the transition to web-based judicial statistics not only improves accessibility but also creates a more engaged and informed public, enabling a collaborative approach to legal discourse and ultimately leading to a more effective and transparent judicial system.

To better understand the effectiveness of Indonesia's E-Court System, it's helpful to compare it with judicial statistics platforms in developed countries, such as the United States, Canada, and the United Kingdom. Each of these countries has implemented its systems to enhance transparency, accessibility, and efficiency within their judicial processes.

Real-Time Access: United States: The PACER (Public Access to Court Electronic Records) system allows users to access federal court documents online.¹¹ Users can search for cases and retrieve filings in real time, although there is a fee for downloading documents. This system offers comprehensive access to case information, including dockets and judgments. Canada: The Canadian Legal Information Institute (CanLII) provides free access to court judgments, tribunal decisions, statutes, and regulations.¹² Users can search for case information across various courts in real time, with user-friendly navigation.¹³ United Kingdom: The Judiciary of England and Wales has implemented the Court and Tribunal Service's online system, which allows individuals to track their cases, view hearing dates, and access

¹¹ Sanga, Sarath. "The SCALES project: Making federal court records free." (2024).

¹² Anderson, Brent, Trevor Bant, Meera Bennett, Sebastian Chern, Kaitlyn Chewka, Andrew Crabtree, Lindsey A. Cruickshank et al. "*The CanLII Manual to British Columbia Civil Litigation*." (2020).

¹³ Baldeo, Shawn, Janooshsheya Balasundaram, Maria McDonald, Abel Ickowicz, and Kathleen A. Sheehan. "Exploring the tensions between judicial transparency and respect for privacy at Ontario's consent and capacity board: An examination of findings in 2015 and 2019." *Canadian Journal of Psychiatry. Revue Canadienne de Psychiatrie* 69, no. 3 (2023): 228.

judgments. This system is widely praised for its transparency and ease of use.¹⁴

Informed Participation: United States: Various non-profit organizations and legal advocacy groups utilize PACER data to analyze trends in the judicial system, advocating for reforms based on empirical evidence. For example, organizations like the Brennan Center for Justice analyze data to improve access to justice. Canada: The Canadian Bar Association uses data from CanLII and other sources to inform policy discussions, providing recommendations for legal reforms that reflect the needs of diverse communities. United Kingdom: The Legal Services Board regularly publishes reports analyzing judicial statistics to inform policy discussions about access to justice and legal service delivery, contributing to evidence-based reforms.

Empowering Stakeholders: United States: Legal professionals use PACER to prepare cases by analyzing previous judgments and understanding judicial trends. This access empowers lawyers to make informed arguments and better represent their clients. Canada: Stakeholders such as law schools and legal clinics utilize CanLII data to teach students and provide legal advice, empowering them to understand and navigate the legal system effectively. United Kingdom: The use of online platforms by various stakeholders, including community organizations and academics, enables them to participate in discussions about judicial practices and advocate for the rights of marginalized groups.

Enhanced Trust: United States: While PACER is widely used, the associated fees have led to concerns about accessibility and equity, impacting public trust in the system. Efforts are underway to improve accessibility and reduce costs, thus fostering greater public confidence. Canada: The free access provided by CanLII has enhanced public trust in the judicial system, as citizens feel more empowered and informed about legal processes and their rights. United Kingdom: The emphasis on transparency in the UK's judicial system, with public access to case information and statistics, has significantly enhanced trust among citizens, as evidenced by surveys showing increased confidence in judicial processes.

¹⁴ Hanretty, Chris. "Courts in the United Kingdom." In *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Politics*. 2020.

Case Studies and Analysis: United States: The Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts provides comprehensive statistical reports based on PACER data, allowing researchers to conduct in-depth analyses of case trends and judicial efficiency.¹⁵ Canada: The Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics offers data that allows for detailed analysis of the criminal justice system, including case processing times and outcomes, helping inform policy and practice.¹⁶ United Kingdom: The Courts and Tribunals Service publishes statistical reports on various aspects of court performance, enabling researchers and policymakers to identify trends, assess efficiency, and recommend improvements.

The comparative analysis reveals that while Indonesia's E-Court System is a step in the right direction, developed countries have established more comprehensive and user-friendly platforms for accessing judicial statistics. These systems not only provide real-time access to case information but also empower stakeholders, enhance public trust, and facilitate informed participation in the legal discourse. To improve its judicial statistics framework, Indonesia can draw lessons from these best practices, focusing on making data accessible, free, and engaging for all stakeholders, thus fostering a more transparent and accountable legal system. Ultimately, this transition not only enhances accessibility but also democratizes access to judicial statistics, empowering diverse stakeholders to participate in the discourse surrounding the legal system.

Content and Format Enhancements

Addressing the inconsistencies in content and format within Indonesian judicial statistics is pivotal for maximizing their utility and comprehensibility. A systematic overhaul is essential to ensure that the data presented is clear, coherent, and readily understandable to all stakeholders. A fundamental improvement involves creating a clear demarcation between nationwide statistics and evaluative content. By

¹⁵ Albrecht, Kat, and Kaitlyn Filip. "Public Records Aren't Public: Systemic Barriers to Measuring Court Functioning & Equity." *J. Crim. L. & Criminology* 113 (2023): 1.

¹⁶ David, Jean-Denis, and Megan Mitchell. "Contacts with the police and the over-representation of indigenous peoples in the Canadian criminal justice system." *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice* 63, no. 2 (2021): 23-45.

separating these elements distinctly, readers can easily discern raw data from interpretative analyses. This separation preserves the integrity of the statistical information, allowing researchers and policymakers to engage with the data on its own merits before considering evaluative perspectives.

Table 2. Enhancements needed for Indonesia's E-Court System

Aspect	Indonesia (E-Court System)	United States (PACER)	Canada (CanLII)	United Kingdom
Content Clarity and Separation of Data Types	Proposed a clear demarcation between raw data and evaluative content to avoid confusion.	Lacks clear separation between raw data and analysis, making navigation cumbersome.	Effectively separates case law from analysis for a better user experience. ¹⁷	Distinguishes between data reports and analytical content, aiding user navigation.
Coherence in Data Presentation	Requires consistent formatting of tables and charts across all publications for easier analysis.	Inconsistent presentation across reports and cases; standardization needed.	Consistently presents data with coherent visual formats, aiding analysis.	Employs standardized data formats, improving ease of understanding for users.
Standardization of Terminology	Needs to establish a unified lexicon to avoid confusion and misinterpretation.	Terminology varies between jurisdictions and case types, leading to possible confusion.	Maintains relatively consistent terminology, though further standardization is possible.	Has made progress in standardizing terminology, helping to reduce ambiguities.

Table 2 summarizes the key content and format enhancements needed for Indonesia's E-Court System and compares them with judicial statistics platforms in developed countries. The focus is on clarity, consistency, and the standardization of data presentation and

¹⁷ Malakieh, Jamil. "Adult and youth correctional statistics in Canada, 2018/2019." *Juristat: Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics* (2020): 3-23.

terminology to foster a more effective and user-friendly system. Analysis of Content and Format Enhancements in Judicial Statistics Platforms. To maximize the utility and comprehensibility of judicial statistics, addressing inconsistencies in content and format is crucial. In comparing Indonesia's E-Court System with judicial statistics platforms in developed countries like the United States, Canada, and the United Kingdom, several key enhancements can be identified, focusing on content clarity, presentation coherence, and standardization of terminology.

Content Clarity and Separation of Data Types: Indonesia (E-Court System): The proposed enhancements suggest a clear demarcation between raw data and evaluative content. This separation would allow stakeholders to engage with raw statistics before delving into interpretative analysis. Currently, Indonesian judicial statistics may present data in a mixed format, potentially leading to confusion among users.

United States (PACER): PACER provides clear access to court documents, dockets, and filings, but lacks a systematic approach to separating raw data from analytical commentary. Users must sift through documents to find the information they need, which can be cumbersome. The introduction of dedicated sections for raw statistics versus analysis would enhance clarity.

Canada (CanLII): CanLII effectively separates case law from analytical reports. Users can easily access a wealth of case law, while additional analytical content is available through separate sections or links. This model exemplifies the benefits of clear content separation, facilitating user navigation and comprehension.¹⁸

United Kingdom: The UK's judicial statistics platform distinguishes between data reports and interpretative content, making it easy for users to locate both types of information.¹⁹ The clear delineation helps users engage with the statistics in a meaningful way.

¹⁸ Bright, David, Russell Brewer, and Carlo Morselli. "Reprint of: Using social network analysis to study crime: Navigating the challenges of criminal justice records." *Social Networks* 69 (2022): 235-250.

¹⁹ Dencik, Lina. "The datafied welfare state: A perspective from the UK." In *New perspectives in critical data studies: The ambivalences of data power*, pp. 145-165. Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2022.

Coherence in Data Presentation: Indonesia: A systematic overhaul is necessary to ensure that tables, charts, and graphs are presented in a consistent manner across all publications. This would facilitate comparative analyses and enable stakeholders to identify trends more easily. United States: PACER's presentation of data can be inconsistent across different types of cases and reports. Adopting a standardized format for tables and graphs, similar to the one proposed for Indonesia, could enhance coherence and usability.

Canada: CanLII excels in presenting data with coherent visual formats. Its use of consistent table structures and charts allows for straightforward interpretation, aiding stakeholders in conducting analyses and identifying trends. United Kingdom: The UK's judicial statistics platform employs standardized formats for presenting data, making it easier for users to navigate and understand complex information. This practice contributes to the overall effectiveness of their judicial statistics.

Standardization of Terminology: Indonesia: Standardizing terminology across judicial publications is vital for improving communication and reducing misinterpretation. Establishing a unified lexicon will foster a shared understanding among diverse stakeholders.

United States: Terminology used in PACER can vary between different jurisdictions and types of cases, leading to potential confusion.²⁰ Implementing a standardized terminology guide could enhance clarity and consistency across the platform.

Canada: CanLII maintains a relatively consistent terminology throughout its resources. However, there is still room for improvement in ensuring that legal terms are uniformly defined and applied across all publications.

United Kingdom: The UK judicial statistics platform has made strides in standardizing terminology, which helps mitigate ambiguities. Continued efforts in this area will further improve stakeholder engagement with the data.

The proposed enhancements to the content and format of Indonesian judicial statistics align closely with best practices observed in the judicial statistics platforms of developed countries. By focusing

²⁰ Moreland, John L. "Is Open Access Equal Access?" PACER User Fees and Public Access to Court Information." *DttP* 49 (2021): 42.

on clear separation of data types, coherence in data presentation, and standardization of terminology, Indonesia can significantly improve the usability and effectiveness of its judicial statistics.²¹ These improvements will empower stakeholders—such as researchers, policymakers, and the general public—to engage meaningfully with the data, ultimately fostering a more informed and transparent legal system. Adopting best practices from platforms like PACER, CanLII, and the UK's judicial statistics system can guide Indonesia in transforming its judicial data landscape into a valuable resource for evidence-based decision-making.

Coherence in the presentation of data is equally crucial. Tables and charts must be structured in a consistent manner, ensuring uniformity across all sections and publications. This consistency facilitates comparative analyses and trend identification over time, providing a comprehensive view of the judicial landscape. Visual representations, such as graphs and charts, should adhere to standardized formats, aiding in straightforward interpretation and enhancing data visualization.²² Furthermore, standardizing terminology across all publications is imperative. Ambiguities arising from inconsistent terminology can lead to misinterpretation, hindering effective analysis. Establishing a unified lexicon ensures precision in communication, eliminating confusion and fostering a shared understanding among readers. By implementing these enhancements, judicial statistics become more than just raw data—they transform into valuable tools for research, policy formulation, and public understanding. Clear separation, coherence, consistency, and standardized terminology collectively enhance the user-friendliness and effectiveness of Indonesian judicial statistics, empowering stakeholders to engage with the data meaningfully and constructively.

Resolving Raw Data Dissemination Challenges

Addressing the reluctance of courts to share raw data on individual cases requires a nuanced and cautious approach that balances

²¹ Dencik, Lina, Emiliano Treré, Joanna Redden, and Arne Hintz. "Data justice." (2022): 1-100.

²² Moore, Patricia W. "Can Litigation Analytics Tell Us What Became of the 2015 Proportionality Amendments to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure?" (2024).

privacy concerns with the imperative of facilitating meaningful research.²³

Table 4. Strategies for Data Dissemination In Indonesia's Judicial System

Aspect	Indonesia (Proposed Strategies)	United States (PACER)	Canada (CanLII)	United Kingdom
Sample Extraction Methods	Proposes implementing sample extraction to anonymize judicial data for research purposes.	No systematic sample extraction; limits access to anonymized data for research.	Some use of sample extraction in research, but lacks a robust system across domains.	Advanced use of sample extraction, providing anonymized datasets for researchers.
Secure Data Browsing Facilities	Proposes establishing secure facilities for controlled researcher access with cybersecurity measures.	Does not offer secure browsing; commercial platform access lacks robust security measures.	Some secure data access through initiatives like the Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, but it is still under development.	Offers secure data access with protocols in place, like the Office for National Statistics.
Balancing Privacy and Research	Aims to balance privacy and transparency through sample extraction and secure browsing.	Struggles to balance privacy concerns with research transparency, limiting data access.	Recognizes the importance but faces hurdles in creating comprehensive open-access frameworks.	Robust system balancing privacy and research, with secure access to anonymized data.

Table 3 summarizes the strategies for addressing raw data dissemination challenges in Indonesia's judicial system compared with

²³ Huq, Aziz Z., and Zachary D. Clopton. "The necessary and proper stewardship of judicial data." *Stanford Law Review* 76 (2024).

practices in developed countries like the U.S., Canada, and the UK.²⁴ The focus is on sample extraction, secure data browsing, and balancing privacy with research needs to promote transparency while protecting individual privacy. Comparative Analysis of Raw Data Dissemination Challenges in Judicial Statistics Platforms. Addressing the reluctance of courts to share raw data on individual cases is a critical issue for judicial statistics, particularly in Indonesia. This analysis compares Indonesia's proposed strategies with the practices of developed countries such as the United States, Canada, and the United Kingdom, focusing on methods to resolve raw data dissemination challenges while balancing privacy concerns.

Sample Extraction Methods: Indonesia: Implementing sample extraction involves strategically selecting a representative subset of judicial data to protect the anonymity of individuals involved in legal cases. This method allows researchers to perform statistical analyses while adhering to privacy regulations and ethical considerations.

United States (PACER): The PACER system has faced criticism for its lack of transparency regarding raw data access.²⁵ While there are efforts to provide aggregated data and analytics, the system has been slow to adopt sample extraction methods. There are no widespread practices for anonymizing individual case data, which limits researchers' ability to conduct meaningful analyses while protecting privacy.

Canada (CanLII): Canada has begun employing sample extraction in some contexts, especially in research projects focused on trends in case law.²⁶ However, more robust frameworks for systematic sample extraction across different judicial domains are needed. The Canadian legal system recognizes the importance of balancing privacy with research needs, but lacks a comprehensive strategy.

United Kingdom: The UK has implemented a more advanced approach to sample extraction through its Judicial Statistics Reports, which provide anonymized datasets for research purposes. This method

²⁴ Hughes, Emily, and Kori Khan. "One Court, One State, One Year: What We Don't Know About Criminal Defendants' Testimony and Why It Matters." *Loyola of Los Angeles Law Review* 57, no. 2 (2024): 333.

²⁵ Schwartz, David L., Kat M. Albrecht, Adam R. Pah, Christopher A. Cotropia, Amy Kristin Sanders, Sarath Sanga, Charlotte S. Alexander et al. "The SCALES project: Making federal court records free." *Nw. UL Rev.* 119 (2024): 23.

²⁶ Hemmings, Mary. "The CanLII Manual to British Columbia Civil Litigation: A User-Friendly Guide." *Can. L. Libr. Rev.* 47 (2022): 20.

allows researchers to analyze patterns while ensuring individual privacy, serving as a potential model for Indonesia to follow.

Secure Data Browsing Facilities: Indonesia: Establishing secure data browsing facilities is a proposed solution for allowing researchers controlled access to raw judicial data. These facilities would include advanced cybersecurity measures, such as encryption and user authentication, ensuring data integrity and protection against unauthorized access.

United States: Currently, the PACER system does not offer secure browsing facilities for researchers.²⁷ Accessing data requires navigating through a commercial platform, which may not have the necessary security measures in place for sensitive data. This limitation hinders in-depth research and analysis.

Canada: Canada has made strides toward secure access to judicial data through initiatives like the Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics. While it offers some secure data access options, comprehensive facilities specifically designed for researchers to analyze raw data securely are still in development.

United Kingdom: The UK's approach includes secure data access protocols, enabling researchers to explore judicial data within controlled environments.²⁸ Facilities such as the Office for National Statistics provide researchers with secure access to anonymized datasets, allowing for in-depth analysis while maintaining privacy protections.

Balancing Privacy and Research Needs: Indonesia: The Indonesian judiciary aims to balance privacy concerns with the need for transparency and evidence-based research. By adopting sample extraction and secure data browsing methods, the judiciary can facilitate research while protecting sensitive information.

²⁷ Adler, Rachel F., Andrew Paley, Andong L. Li Zhao, Harper Pack, Sergio Servantez, Adam R. Pah, Kristian Hammond, and SCALES OKN Consortium. "A user-centered approach to developing an AI system analyzing US federal court data." *Artificial Intelligence and Law* 31, no. 3 (2023): 547-570.

²⁸ Atadoga, Akoh, Oluwatoyin Ajoke Farayola, Benjamin Samson Ayinla, Olukunle Oladipupo Amoo, Temitayo Oluwaseun Abrahams, and Femi Osasona. "A comparative review of data encryption methods in the USA and Europe." *Computer Science & IT Research Journal* 5, no. 2 (2024): 447-460.

United States: In the U.S., there is a noticeable tension between privacy concerns and the demand for transparency. Courts are often reluctant to release raw data due to fears of compromising privacy, resulting in limited research opportunities. Addressing this issue remains a challenge within the judicial system.

Canada: Canada recognizes the importance of balancing privacy with research needs, but still faces hurdles in effectively implementing strategies to facilitate access to raw data. Collaborative efforts among researchers, policymakers, and judicial authorities are necessary to create more open access pathways.²⁹ United Kingdom: The UK has established a robust framework for addressing privacy concerns while promoting research. By providing secure access to anonymized data, the UK judicial system exemplifies best practices in balancing transparency with the need to protect individual privacy.

The analysis reveals that while Indonesia's proposed strategies for resolving raw data dissemination challenges are promising, they need to be informed by the best practices of developed countries. Implementing sample extraction and establishing secure data browsing facilities can significantly enhance the availability of judicial statistics while protecting individual privacy. Learning from the experiences of the United States, Canada, and the United Kingdom can guide Indonesia in developing a comprehensive framework for data access that promotes transparency and encourages evidence-based research. By creating controlled environments for researchers and implementing anonymization techniques, Indonesia can enhance judicial practices and policies while safeguarding the rights of individuals involved in legal proceedings.

Implementing methods like sample extraction and secure data browsing facilities offers a viable solution to this challenge.³⁰ Sample extraction involves the strategic extraction of a representative subset of data, preserving the anonymity and privacy of individuals involved in

²⁹ Hauck, Tanya S., Rachel Goud, Michele Warner, Susan Franchuk, Juveria Zaheer, Vicky Stergiopoulos, Victor M. Tang, and Leslie Buckley. "Capacity to Consent to Treatment of Substance Use Disorders at Ontario's Consent and Capacity Board: A Review of Past Reported Decisions." *The Canadian Journal of Psychiatry* (2024): 07067437241261488.

³⁰ Agrawal, Sandeep K., Pradeep Sangapala, Elisabeth Hill, and Jill Lang. "Human rights and municipal land use bylaws in Atlantic Canada." *Planning Practice & Research* (2024): 1-24.

legal cases. By selecting samples judiciously, researchers can access essential information without compromising the confidentiality of specific cases. This method allows for statistical analysis while safeguarding sensitive personal data, ensuring compliance with privacy regulations and ethical considerations. Simultaneously, the establishment of secure data browsing facilities provides researchers with a controlled environment to explore classified data. By creating dedicated spaces equipped with advanced cybersecurity measures, researchers can access raw data securely. These facilities employ encryption, user authentication, and auditing mechanisms to maintain data integrity and protect against unauthorized access. Researchers can conduct in-depth analyses within this secure environment, fostering a comprehensive understanding without compromising privacy. By adopting these methods, the judiciary can bridge the gap between the need for comprehensive raw data and privacy protection. Enabling researchers to delve into essential data without jeopardizing individual privacy encourages robust, evidence-based research. This approach not only promotes transparency within the legal system but also empowers researchers to explore intricate legal patterns, contributing significantly to the enhancement of judicial practices and policies.

Emphasizing Historical Data Analysis

Emphasizing historical data analysis is pivotal in unlocking invaluable insights into the evolution of the Indonesian judicial system. Digitalizing past data provides a comprehensive view of historical trends and patterns, enabling a nuanced understanding of the legal landscape's evolution over time.³¹ This historical perspective offers profound implications for present and future policymaking.

Table 5. Historical Data Analysis in Judicial Statistics Platforms.

³¹ Ostendorff, Malte, Till Blume, and Saskia Ostendorff. "Towards an open platform for legal information." In *Proceedings of the ACM/IEEE Joint Conference on Digital Libraries* in 2020, pp. 385-388. 2020.

Aspect	Indonesia (Proposed Strategies)	United States (PACER)	Canada (CanLII)	United Kingdom
Digitization of Historical Data	Still in development, it aims to digitize past judicial data to track trends and support evidence-based decision-making.	Provides access to historical case data, but high costs and complexity limit usability.	Offers user-friendly access to historical case law, enhancing research on long-term trends.	Provides comprehensive access to historical data, including annual reports and long-term trends.
Contextual Understanding of Legal Evolution	Emphasizing historical analysis to inform policy making is emerging, with further development needed.	Fragmented data sources limit comprehensive historical analyses, though it's widely recognized.	Historical data is used for legal reform discussions, with evidence-based recommendations grounded in long-term trends.	Actively integrates historical analyses into policymaking, leveraging past trends to guide future practices.
Strategic Planning and Anticipating Future Trends	Focuses on using historical data to inform strategic planning, though it's still in early stages.	Historical data is used to anticipate future trends, but lack of centralized access can be a barrier.	Actively uses historical data for strategic planning to adapt to societal changes.	Strategic planning is informed by historical analysis, helping address contemporary issues and anticipate future challenges.

Table 5 compares Indonesia's efforts in digitizing and analyzing historical judicial data with practices in developed countries. It highlights Indonesia's current development stage and how countries like the U.S., Canada, and the UK leverage historical data for legal reforms, strategic planning, and policymaking. Comparative Analysis of Historical Data Analysis in Judicial Statistics Platforms. Emphasizing historical data analysis is crucial for understanding the evolution of the

judicial system in Indonesia. This analysis compares Indonesia's approach to historical data with the practices in developed countries such as the United States, Canada, and the United Kingdom.

Digitization of Historical Data: Indonesia: The emphasis on digitizing past judicial data aims to provide a comprehensive view of historical trends and patterns in the Indonesian legal landscape.³² This digitalization effort would enable researchers and policymakers to discern long-term trends and make evidence-based decisions. However, the current level of historical data digitization in Indonesia is still in development stages, and substantial efforts are needed to create accessible historical databases.

United States (PACER): The PACER system offers digital access to a significant amount of historical case data, although its usability has been criticized. While PACER provides historical documents and data, the platform's complexity and associated costs can hinder access for researchers. Improvements in user interface design and data retrieval processes would facilitate better engagement with historical data.

Canada (CanLII): Canada has made strides in digitizing historical legal data through CanLII, which offers access to historical case law and legal decisions.³³ This platform allows users to search for historical cases and provides context about their implications, enhancing researchers' ability to analyze trends over time. The Canadian approach exemplifies the importance of user-friendly interfaces that facilitate access to historical data.

United Kingdom: The UK has developed comprehensive resources for accessing historical judicial statistics. The UK Judicial Statistics platform provides a wealth of historical data, including annual reports on various metrics related to court performance, case outcomes, and trends over time. This resource is invaluable for policymakers and researchers aiming to analyze the evolution of the legal system.

Contextual Understanding of Legal Evolution: Indonesia: Emphasizing historical data analysis in Indonesia can illuminate patterns essential for understanding the root causes of legal issues and

³² Reiling, Dory, and Francesco Contini. "E-justice platforms: Challenges for judicial governance." In *IJCA*, vol. 13, p. 1. 2022.

³³ Bracci, Christa, and Erica Friesen. *Legal Research Online: Information Seeking in the Digital Environment*. 2024.

inform present and future policymaking. By integrating historical perspectives into current legal challenges, policymakers can craft strategies that are informed by the long-term evolution of the legal system. This focus on historical context is still emerging in Indonesia, requiring further development of analytical frameworks.

United States: In the U.S., understanding the historical evolution of legal issues is critical for informing current legal practices.³⁴ Research institutions often conduct historical analyses of case law and judicial trends, contributing to the broader understanding of the legal landscape. However, the reliance on fragmented data sources may limit comprehensive analyses.

Canada: Canada encourages the use of historical data for contextual understanding through its judicial research initiatives.³⁵ By analyzing historical trends, Canadian researchers have contributed to discussions on legal reform, making evidence-based recommendations grounded in historical context. This proactive approach to historical data analysis enriches the policymaking process.

United Kingdom: The UK actively uses historical data to inform present-day legal practices and policymaking. Historical analyses conducted by legal scholars and research institutions are regularly integrated into policy discussions, ensuring that decisions are informed by a comprehensive understanding of past trends and their implications. This practice underscores the importance of learning from historical trajectories to guide future judicial practices.

Strategic Planning and Anticipating Future Trends: Indonesia: By recognizing long-term trends in legal cases and societal attitudes, Indonesia can improve strategic planning within the judiciary. Emphasizing historical data analysis enables policymakers to anticipate future challenges and align judicial practices with evolving societal needs. However, this strategic planning is still in its infancy and requires the development of robust data analysis frameworks.

³⁴ Lageson, Sarah E., Elizabeth Webster, and Juan R. Sandoval. "Digitizing and disclosing personal data: The proliferation of state criminal records on the internet." *Law & Social Inquiry* 46, no. 3 (2021): 635-665.

³⁵ Matyas, David, Peter Wills, and Barry Dewitt. "Imagining Resilient Courts: from COVID-19 to the Future of Canada's Court System." *Canadian Public Policy* 48, no. 1 (2022): 186-208.

United States: The U.S. legal system often relies on historical analysis to anticipate future trends, particularly regarding changes in legislation and societal attitudes. However, without centralized access to comprehensive historical data, predicting future trends can be challenging, leading to a need for improved data-sharing practices.³⁶

Canada: Canada actively engages in strategic planning based on historical data, helping the judiciary adapt to emerging trends and societal changes.³⁷ The integration of historical analyses into policymaking ensures that strategies are relevant and forward-thinking.

United Kingdom: The UK's judiciary employs historical data analysis to inform strategic planning, enabling policymakers to adapt practices in response to changing societal needs. By leveraging historical insights, the UK can address contemporary issues effectively while being proactive about future challenges.

The emphasis on historical data analysis is a critical component of understanding the evolution of the judicial system, and Indonesia has an opportunity to enhance this aspect of its judicial statistics. By digitizing past data and analyzing historical trends, Indonesia can inform present and future policymaking, creating a legal environment that is dynamic and responsive to societal needs.

In comparison, developed countries like the United States, Canada, and the United Kingdom have established robust frameworks for utilizing historical data in their judicial statistics platforms. These countries demonstrate the importance of easy access to historical data, user-friendly interfaces, and integrating historical analysis into strategic planning. By adopting similar practices, Indonesia can significantly enhance its judicial statistics landscape, fostering a more effective and evidence-based approach to legal reform and policy development.

By delving into historical data, trends that span decades or even centuries become discernible. Examining the trajectory of legal cases, court decisions, and societal influences over time illuminates patterns that are essential for understanding the root causes of various legal issues. Identifying these trends provides a context-rich foundation for

³⁶ Wang, Ran. "Legal technology in contemporary USA and China." *Computer Law & Security Review* 39 (2020): 105459.

³⁷ Warchuk, Paul. "Do Pre-1970 Precedents Still Matter? An Empirical Analysis of Legal Submissions and Court Decisions." *An Empirical Analysis of Legal Submissions and Court Decisions* (December 23, 2024) (2024).

present-day challenges and opportunities, offering policymakers and researchers a deep well of knowledge upon which to base their analyses. This historical perspective significantly informs present and future policymaking efforts. Policymakers armed with a profound understanding of the historical context can formulate strategies that are not only responsive to current challenges but also considerate of the legal system's long-term evolution. Evidence-based decisions, rooted in a comprehensive understanding of historical trajectories, lead to more effective policies that address the intricacies of the legal landscape. Furthermore, understanding long-term trajectories aids in strategic planning within the judiciary.³⁸ By recognizing patterns in case resolutions, legal precedents, and societal attitudes, the judiciary can anticipate future trends and challenges. Proactive measures can be taken to align judicial practices with evolving societal needs, ensuring that policies are adaptive, relevant, and forward-thinking.³⁹ Emphasizing historical data analysis offers a profound perspective that enriches policymaking and strategic planning. By digitizing past data and understanding the long-term evolution of the legal system, Indonesia can craft policies that are not only responsive to current needs but also resilient in the face of future challenges, ultimately fostering a legal environment that is both dynamic and rooted in historical wisdom.

Promoting Collaborative Efforts

Collaboration between research institutions and court data centers emerges as an indispensable cornerstone in advancing the realm of judicial statistics in Indonesia.

Table 6. Promoting Collaborative Efforts in Judicial Statistics.

³⁸ Schneider, Valerie. "Locked out by big data: how big data algorithms and machine learning may undermine housing justice." *Colum. Hum. Rts. L. Rev.* 52 (2020): 251.

³⁹ Bell, Felicity, Lyria Bennett Moses, Michael Legg, Jacob Silove, and Monika Zalnieriute. "AI Decision-Making and the Courts: A Guide for Judges, Tribunal Members and Court Administrators." *Australasian Institute of Judicial Administration* (2023).

Aspect	Indonesia (Proposed Strategies)	United States (NCSC)	Canada (Justice Research Institute)	United Kingdom (RSS & Others)
Collaborative Frameworks	Still in early stages; limited formal mechanisms, but potential for growth in engaging statistical experts and fostering partnerships.	Established frameworks, with partnerships between courts and research organizations promoting data-sharing and judicial research.	Strong collaboration between research bodies and judicial institutions, resulting in impactful studies informing policy.	Active collaboration between universities, think tanks, and judicial bodies, contributing to insights on efficiency and reform.
Engaging Statistical Experts	Limited presence of statistical experts; potential for significant improvements with expert engagement.	Actively involves statisticians in judicial research, enhancing data analysis and policy outcomes.	Partners with statisticians to ensure comprehensive, methodologically sound research.	Leverages statistical expertise for advanced legal data analysis, informing both research and judicial practices.
Interdisciplinary Perspectives	Lacks a robust interdisciplinary framework, but has the potential to benefit from integrating legal, statistical, and social science perspectives.	Emphasizes interdisciplinary research, ensuring comprehensive understanding of legal challenges.	Encourages collaboration between legal, statistical, and social science experts, resulting in enriched legal research.	Actively fosters interdisciplinary approaches, integrating diverse expertise to address complex legal issues.

Cultivating Data-Driven Decision-Making	Awareness of data-driven decision-making is still nascent, requiring further advocacy and education.	Strong culture of evidence-based practices within the judiciary, driven by collaborative research.	Growing trend of incorporating empirical evidence into judicial decision-making processes.	Well-established culture of data-driven decisions, promoting transparency and efficiency in judicial processes.
---	--	--	--	---

Table 6 compares Indonesia's developing efforts in promoting collaboration between research institutions and court data centers with the more established frameworks in the U.S., Canada, and the UK. It highlights the role of interdisciplinary perspectives, the engagement of statistical experts, and the move toward data-driven decision-making across the judiciary. *Comparative Analysis of Promoting Collaborative Efforts in Judicial Statistics*. Promoting collaborative efforts between research institutions and court data centers is essential for advancing judicial statistics in Indonesia. This analysis compares Indonesia's collaborative initiatives with practices in developed countries like the United States, Canada, and the United Kingdom, highlighting the benefits and outcomes of such partnerships.

Collaborative Frameworks: Indonesia: In Indonesia, collaboration between research institutions and court data centers is still developing. Engaging statistical experts and fostering partnerships can significantly enhance data analysis, leading to a more informed legal system. However, the infrastructure and formal mechanisms for such collaborations are limited, necessitating a strategic approach to build these connections.

United States: The U.S. has established collaborative frameworks through partnerships between courts, universities, and research organizations. The National Center for State Courts (NCSC) promotes collaborative research initiatives that facilitate data-sharing and joint studies on judicial performance and outcomes.⁴⁰ This approach has led to innovative analyses and recommendations for judicial reform.

⁴⁰ Hannaford-Agor, Paula. "How exactly is it done here?" Conducting cross-jurisdictional research with judges and court staff." *Oñati Socio-Legal Series* 13, no. S1 (2023): S102-S120.

Canada: Canada emphasizes collaboration through initiatives like the Justice Research Institute, which partners with judicial bodies to conduct research on various aspects of the legal system. These collaborations have resulted in impactful studies that inform policy decisions, demonstrating how interdisciplinary approaches can enrich the understanding of judicial processes.

United Kingdom: In the UK, collaboration is evident through partnerships between universities, think tanks, and judicial institutions. Initiatives like the Royal Statistical Society promote the integration of statistical expertise into legal research. This collaboration has led to significant contributions to understanding judicial efficiency, case outcomes, and the impact of legal reforms.⁴¹

Engaging Statistical Experts: Indonesia: Engaging statistical experts in Indonesia can bring specialized knowledge and advanced analytical techniques to judicial statistics. This depth of expertise is crucial for unearthing patterns and correlations within complex legal data, providing insights that can inform policy and practice. However, the limited presence of such expertise in the judiciary may hinder progress.

United States: The U.S. actively involves statistical experts in judicial research. By leveraging advanced statistical methods, researchers can analyze extensive datasets, revealing nuanced insights into trends and issues within the legal system. This collaboration leads to more robust evidence-based practices in judicial decision-making.

Canada: Canadian initiatives focus on bringing statistical experts into collaborative research projects, enhancing the depth of legal analyses. The Canadian Institute for the Administration of Justice often partners with statisticians to explore complex issues, ensuring that analyses are comprehensive and grounded in sound statistical methodologies.⁴²

United Kingdom: The UK's approach involves engaging statistical experts in the development of judicial statistics platforms. By employing sophisticated analytical techniques, collaborations yield valuable insights that inform both academic research and practical

⁴¹ Carpenter, Anna E., Alyx Mark, Colleen F. Shanahan, and Jessica K. Steinberg. "The field of state civil courts." *Colum. L. Rev.* 122 (2022): 1165.

⁴² Erman, Sevgui, Eric Rancourt, Yanick Beaucage, and Andre Loranger. "*The use of data science in a national statistical office.*" (2022).

applications within the judiciary, fostering a culture of evidence-based practices.

Interdisciplinary Perspectives: Indonesia: Collaborative research projects in Indonesia can benefit from interdisciplinary perspectives by bringing together legal experts, statisticians, and social scientists. This holistic approach would enable a comprehensive understanding of legal challenges. However, the current lack of interdisciplinary frameworks limits the depth of analysis available.

United States: Interdisciplinary collaboration is a hallmark of U.S. judicial research initiatives. The integration of diverse perspectives enriches analyses, providing a more thorough understanding of legal phenomena. This approach ensures that research is relevant and addresses multifaceted legal challenges.

Canada: Canada encourages interdisciplinary collaboration by involving various experts in judicial research.⁴³ This collaborative environment allows for a more nuanced understanding of legal issues, promoting discussions that span legal, statistical, and social domains, ultimately leading to informed policy recommendations.

United Kingdom: The UK actively fosters interdisciplinary approaches to judicial research. By engaging legal scholars, statisticians, and social scientists in collaborative projects, the UK enhances the depth and breadth of analyses, ensuring comprehensive solutions to complex legal issues.

Cultivating a Culture of Data-Driven Decision-Making: Indonesia: Raising awareness within the Indonesian judiciary about the value of data-driven methodologies is crucial for fostering a culture of evidence-based decision-making.⁴⁴ Collaborative efforts can help integrate these insights into judicial practices, but this cultural shift is still nascent and requires dedicated advocacy and education.

United States: The U.S. has made significant strides in cultivating a culture of data-driven decision-making within the judiciary. Collaborative research initiatives have led to the widespread adoption

⁴³ Andresen, Martin A., Tarah Hodgkinson, and Samantha Henderson. "Statistician's Blues: A Methodological Critique of Measuring the Association between Police and Crime." *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice* 66, no. 2 (2024): 66-80.

⁴⁴ Schoonmaker Iv, Samuel V. "How the Judiciary Has Driven Systemic Innovation During the Pandemic." *Family Law Quarterly* 55, no. 2 (2022): 2021-2022.

of evidence-based practices, as courts increasingly rely on data to inform their decisions and improve judicial outcomes.

Canada: In Canada, collaborative research has effectively raised awareness of data-driven methodologies among legal professionals.⁴⁵ As a result, there is a growing trend towards integrating empirical evidence into judicial processes, leading to improved practices and more informed legal decisions.

United Kingdom: The UK judiciary has embraced data-driven decision-making, facilitated by collaborations with research institutions.⁴⁶ This culture promotes transparency and accountability, as legal professionals increasingly utilize data to support their decisions and enhance the efficiency of the judicial process.

Promoting collaborative efforts between research institutions and court data centers is vital for enhancing judicial statistics in Indonesia. While the country is still developing these partnerships, established frameworks in the United States, Canada, and the United Kingdom demonstrate the potential benefits of such collaborations. Engaging statistical experts, fostering interdisciplinary approaches, and cultivating a culture of data-driven decision-making are key strategies that can significantly improve the quality and depth of judicial statistics in Indonesia. By learning from the practices of developed countries, Indonesia can build a more informed and responsive legal system, ultimately contributing to a transparent, equitable, and effective judiciary.

Involving statistical experts and fostering partnerships between these entities results in multifaceted benefits that significantly enhance the quality and depth of data analysis, leading to a more informed and responsive legal system. Engaging statistical experts in collaborative efforts brings a wealth of expertise to the table. These experts possess

⁴⁵ Hansen, Charlotte Juul, Lina Maria Sanchez Cespedes, Leonardo Trujillo Oyola, Xenia Kristine Dimakos, Bianca Walsh, Renata Souza Bueno, Amos T. Kabobah, Omar Seidu, and Vibeke Oestreich Nielsen. "Collaboration between national statistical offices and academia: Benefits, conditions, areas of collaboration and practical level experience in countries." *Statistical Journal of the LAOS* 40, no. 1 (2024): 161-172.

⁴⁶ Drake, Archie, Perry Keller, Irene Pietropaoli, Anuj Puri, Spyros Maniatis, Joe Tomlinson, Jack Maxwell et al. "Legal contestation of artificial intelligence-related decision-making in the United Kingdom: reflections for policy." *International Review of Law, Computers & Technology* 36, no. 2 (2022): 251-285.

specialized knowledge in advanced analytical techniques, enabling sophisticated analysis of complex legal data. By employing advanced statistical methods, researchers can unearth nuanced patterns and correlations within the data, providing a deeper understanding of legal phenomena. This depth of analysis is invaluable for both researchers and policymakers, as it sheds light on subtle intricacies that might otherwise go unnoticed. Collaborative research projects between research institutions and court data centers serve as a conduit for delving into complex issues that require interdisciplinary perspectives. By bringing together legal experts, statisticians, and social scientists, these partnerships create a holistic framework for understanding legal challenges in their entirety. This interdisciplinary approach ensures that the analysis is not confined within disciplinary boundaries, providing a more comprehensive and nuanced understanding of the factors influencing judicial processes and outcomes. Moreover, these collaborative efforts extend beyond the realm of research; they play a pivotal role in raising awareness within the judiciary. As judges and legal professionals become exposed to data-driven methodologies and insights derived from collaborative research, a culture of data-driven decision-making begins to permeate the legal system. This awareness fosters an environment where evidence-based practices are not only valued but also integrated into the decision-making processes within the courts. Promoting collaborative efforts between research institutions, statistical experts, and court data centers represents a strategic investment in the future of judicial statistics in Indonesia. These partnerships elevate the quality of analysis, nurture a culture of data-driven decision-making, and empower the legal system to respond effectively to the complexities of the modern legal landscape, ultimately contributing to a more transparent, informed, and equitable judiciary.

Conclusion

In conclusion, this research has navigated the complexities of Indonesian judicial statistics, presenting innovative solutions to address longstanding challenges. In light of the ambiguities in existing publications, the study advocates for a transition to web-based platforms, thereby enhancing accessibility, real-time relevance, and user engagement. To improve data comprehensibility, clear content separation and format standardization are recommended. To address

the challenges of raw data dissemination, the study suggests utilizing sample extraction techniques and providing secure browsing facilities.

A key component of this approach is the emphasis on historical data analysis, offering invaluable insights for evidence-based policymaking that bridges past and present trends. Furthermore, fostering collaboration between research institutions and court data centers is essential, promoting a culture of data-driven decision-making within the judiciary.

We recommend that the Indonesian judiciary adopt these strategies to enhance the transparency, accessibility, and depth of judicial statistics. The establishment of a dedicated online platform, the standardization of content, and the promotion of cross-institutional collaborations will revolutionize the dissemination and utilization of judicial data. Additionally, the integration of historical data into policy analyses will empower policymakers to anticipate future trends, enabling the development of proactive and adaptive legal frameworks.

Acknowledgments

We express our deepest gratitude to the reviewer for their insightful feedback and valuable contributions. Your expertise and thoughtful suggestions have immensely enriched the quality of this manuscript. Your dedication to the peer-review process is highly appreciated and has played a significant role in shaping this research. Thank you for your invaluable support.

Bibliography

- Agrawal, Sandeep K., Pradeep Sangapala, Elisabeth Hill, and Jill Lang. "Human rights and municipal land use bylaws in Atlantic Canada." *Planning Practice & Research* (2024): 1-24. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02697459.2024.2359790>
- Albrecht, Kat, and Kaitlyn Filip. "Public Records Aren't Public: Systemic Barriers to Measuring Court Functioning & Equity." *J. Crim. L. & Criminology* 113 (2023): 1.
- Adler, Rachel F., Andrew Paley, Andong L. Li Zhao, Harper Pack, Sergio Servantez, Adam R. Pah, Kristian Hammond, and SCALES OKN Consortium. "A user-centered approach to developing an AI system analyzing US federal court data." *Artificial Intelligence and Law*

31, no. 3 (2023): 547-570.<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10506-022-09320-z>

Anderson, Brent, Trevor Bant, Meera Bennett, Sebastian Chern, Kaitlyn Chewka, Andrew Crabtree, Lindsey A. Cruickshank et al. "The CanLII Manual to British Columbia Civil Litigation." (2020).

Andresen, Martin A., Tarah Hodgkinson, and Samantha Henderson. "Statistician's Blues: A Methodological Critique of Measuring the Association between Police and Crime." *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice* 66, no. 2 (2024): 66-80.<https://doi.org/10.3138/cjccj-2024-0030>

Atadoga, Akoh, Oluwatoyin Ajoke Farayola, Benjamin Samson Ayinla, Olukunle Oladipupo Amoo, Temitayo Oluwaseun Abrahams, and Femi Osasona. "A comparative review of data encryption methods in the USA and Europe." *Computer Science & IT Research Journal* 5, no. 2 (2024): 447-460.<https://doi.org/10.51594/csitrj.v5i2.815>

Baldeo, Shawn, Janooshsheya Balasundaram, Maria McDonald, Abel Ickowicz, and Kathleen A. Sheehan. "Exploring the tensions between judicial transparency and respect for privacy at Ontario's consent and capacity board: An examination of findings in 2015 and 2019." *Canadian Journal of Psychiatry. Revue Canadienne de Psychiatrie* 69, no. 3 (2023): 228.<https://doi.org/10.1177/07067437231170780>

Bell, Felicity, Lyria Bennett Moses, Michael Legg, Jacob Silove, and Monika Zalnieriute. "AI Decision-Making and the Courts: A Guide for Judges, Tribunal Members and Court Administrators." *Australasian Institute of Judicial Administration* (2023).

Bracci, Christa, and Erica Friesen. *Legal Research Online: Information Seeking in the Digital Environment*. 2024.

Bright, David, Russell Brewer, and Carlo Morselli. "Reprint of: Using social network analysis to study crime: Navigating the challenges of criminal justice records." *Social Networks* 69 (2022): 235-250.<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socnet.2022.01.008>

Carpenter, Anna E., Alyx Mark, Colleen F. Shanahan, and Jessica K. Steinberg. "The field of state civil courts." *Colum. L. Rev.* 122 (2022): 1165.

Cotropia, Christopher A. "The SCALES project: Making federal court records free." *Northwestern University Law Review* 119, no. 1 (2024): 23.

- David, Jean-Denis, and Megan Mitchell. "Contacts with the police and the over-representation of indigenous peoples in the Canadian criminal justice system." *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice* 63, no. 2 (2021): 23-45.<https://doi.org/10.3138/cjccj.2020-0004>
- Dencik, Lina. "The datafied welfare state: A perspective from the UK." In *New perspectives in critical data studies: The ambivalences of data power*, pp. 145-165. Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2022.https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-96180-0_7
- Dencik, Lina, Emiliano Treré, Joanna Redden, and Arne Hintz. "Data justice." (2022): 1-100.<https://doi.org/10.4135/9781529770131>
- Djamaludin, Djamaludin, Muhammad Fahrudin Aziz, Yanuariansyah Ar-Rasyid, and Iskandar Ali As-Sayyid. "Assessing the Impact of Electronic Court Systems on the Efficiency of Judicial Processes in the Era of Digital Transformation." *Volksgeist: Jurnal Ilmu Hukum Dan Konstitusi* (2023): 1-18.<https://doi.org/10.24090/volksgeist.v6i1.8082>
- Drake, Archie, Perry Keller, Irene Pietropaoli, Anuj Puri, Spyros Maniatis, Joe Tomlinson, Jack Maxwell et al. "Legal contestation of artificial intelligence-related decision-making in the United Kingdom: reflections for policy." *International Review of Law, Computers & Technology* 36, no. 2 (2022): 251-285.<https://doi.org/10.1080/13600869.2021.1999075>
- Erman, Sevgui, Eric Rancourt, Yanick Beaucage, and Andre Loranger. "The use of data science in a national statistical office." (2022).<https://doi.org/10.1162/99608f92.13e1d60e>
- Grajzl, Peter, and Peter Murrell. "Caselaw and England's economic performance during the Industrial Revolution: Data and evidence." *Journal of Comparative Economics* 52, no. 1 (2024): 145-165.<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jce.2023.10.002>
- Hansen, Charlotte Juul, Lina Maria Sanchez Cespedes, Leonardo Trujillo Oyola, Xení Kristine Dimakos, Bianca Walsh, Renata Souza Bueno, Amos T. Kabo-Bah, Omar Seidu, and Vibeke Oestreich Nielsen. "Collaboration between national statistical offices and academia: Benefits, conditions, areas of collaboration and practical level experience in countries." *Statistical Journal of the LAOS* 40, no. 1 (2024): 161-172.<https://doi.org/10.3233/SJI-230117>

- Hannan, Abd, and Zainuddin Syarif. "The High Rate of Judicial Divorce among Women of Lower Education in Madura-Indonesia: A Gender Perspective." *Palastren: Jurnal Studi Gender* 16, no. 1 (2023): 29-58.<https://doi.org/10.21043/palastren.v16i1.15286>
- Hannaford-Agor, Paula. "" How exactly is it done here?" Conducting cross-jurisdictional research with judges and court staff." *Oñati Socio-Legal Series* 13, no. S1 (2023): S102-S120.<https://doi.org/10.35295/osls.iisl.1702>
- Hanretty, Chris. "Courts in the United Kingdom." In *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Politics*. 2020. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190228637.013.1780>
- Hughes, Emily, and Kori Khan. "One Court, One State, One Year: What We Don't Know About Criminal Defendants' Testimony and Why It Matters." *Loyola of Los Angeles Law Review* 57, no. 2 (2024): 333.
- Hemmings, Mary. "The CanLII Manual to British Columbia Civil Litigation: A User-Friendly Guide." *Can. L. Libr. Rev.* 47 (2022): 20.
- Hauck, Tanya S., Rachel Goud, Michele Warner, Susan Franchuk, Juveria Zaheer, Vicky Stergiopoulos, Victor M. Tang, and Leslie Buckley. "Capacity to Consent to Treatment of Substance Use Disorders at Ontario's Consent and Capacity Board: A Review of Past Reported Decisions." *The Canadian Journal of Psychiatry* (2024): 07067437241261488.<https://doi.org/10.1177/07067437241261488>
- Huq, Aziz Z., and Zachary D. Clopton. "The necessary and proper stewardship of judicial data." *Stanford Law Review* 76 (2024).
- Kusdarini, Eny, Anang Priyanto, Sri Hartini, and Suripno Suripno. "Roles of justice courts: settlement of general election administrative disputes in Indonesia." *Heliyon* 8, no. 12 (2022).<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2022.e11932>
- Lageson, Sarah E., Elizabeth Webster, and Juan R. Sandoval. "Digitizing and disclosing personal data: The proliferation of state criminal records on the internet." *Law & Social Inquiry* 46, no. 3 (2021): 635-665.<https://doi.org/10.1017/lsi.2020.37>
- Marune, Abraham Ethan Martupa Sahat, and Brandon Hartanto. "Strengthening personal data protection, cyber security, and improving public awareness in Indonesia: Progressive legal perspective." *International Journal of Business, Economics, and Social*

- Development* 2, no. 4 (2021): 143-152. <https://doi.org/10.46336/ijbesd.v2i4.170>
- Matyas, David, Peter Wills, and Barry Dewitt. "Imagining Resilient Courts: from COVID-19 to the Future of Canada's Court System." *Canadian Public Policy* 48, no. 1 (2022): 186-208. <https://doi.org/10.3138/cpp.2021-015>
- Marković, Marko, and Stevan Gostojić. "Open judicial data: a comparative analysis." *Social Science Computer Review* 38, no. 3 (2020): 295-314. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0894439318770744>
- Malakieh, Jamil. "Adult and youth correctional statistics in Canada, 2018/2019." *Juristat: Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics* (2020): 3-23.
- Moreland, John L. "Is Open Access Equal Access?" *PACER User Fees and Public Access to Court Information.* *DttP* 49 (2021): 42. <https://doi.org/10.5860/dttP.v49i3/4.7690>
- Moore, Patricia W. "Can Litigation Analytics Tell Us What Became of the 2015 Proportionality Amendments to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure?." (2024). <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4862236>
- Norton, Katherine LW. "Accessing Justice in Hybrid Courts: Addressing the Needs of Low-Income Litigants in Blended in-Person and Virtual Proceedings." *Geo. J. on Poverty L. & Pol'y* 30 (2022): 499.
- Setyowati, Nataline, Pujiyono Suwadi, and Yudho Taruno Muryanto. "Electronic Court in Indonesia: Challenges and." In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Law, Economic & Good Governance (IC-LAW 2023)*, vol. 827, p. 174. Springer Nature, 2024. https://doi.org/10.2991/978-2-38476-218-7_27
- Susanto, Susanto. "E-court as the prevention efforts against the Indonesia judicial corruption." *Yustisia* 9, no. 1 (2020): 116-138. <https://doi.org/10.20961/yustisia.v9i1.41127>
- Reiling, Dory, and Francesco Contini. "E-justice platforms: Challenges for judicial governance." In *IJCA*, vol. 13, p. 1. 2022. <https://doi.org/10.36745/ijca.445>
- Schneider, Valerie. "Locked out by big data: how big data algorithms and machine learning may undermine housing justice." *Colum. Hum. Rts. L. Rev.* 52 (2020): 251.

- Schoonmaker Iv, Samuel V. "How the Judiciary Has Driven Systemic Innovation During the Pandemic." *Family Law Quarterly* 55, no. 2 (2022): 2021-2022.
- Sanga, Sarath. "The SCALES project: Making federal court records free." (2024).
- Schwartz, David L., Kat M. Albrecht, Adam R. Pah, Christopher A. Cotropia, Amy Kristin Sanders, Sarath Sanga, Charlotte S. Alexander et al. "The SCALES project: Making federal court records free." *Nw. UL Rev.* 119 (2024): 23.<https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4948027>
- Wang, Ran. "Legal technology in contemporary USA and China." *Computer Law & Security Review* 39 (2020): 105459.<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clsr.2020.105459>
- Warchuk, Paul. "Do Pre-1970 Precedents Still Matter? An Empirical Analysis of Legal Submissions and Court Decisions." *An Empirical Analysis of Legal Submissions and Court Decisions* (December 23, 2024) (2024).<https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5069077>
- Zalnieriute, Monika, and Felicity Bell. "Technology and the judicial role." *The Judge, the Judiciary and the Court: Individual, Collegial and Institutional Judicial Dynamics in Australia* (Cambridge University Press, 2021) (2020).<https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108859332.008>