

From Activation to Use: Governing Digital Population Identity in Ambon City

Jean Huliselan^{1*}, Pieter Sammy Sospelisa², La Madjid³

^{1,2,3} Pattimura University, Ambon, Indonesia

Correspondence: jeanhuliselan20@gmail.com

Informasi Artikel

Riwayat artikel:

Received Sept 10th, 2026

Revised Oct 17th, 2026

Accepted Oct 24th, 2026

Keyword:

Digital population identity; Digital public service; Utilization; Population administration; Ambon City.

ABSTRAK

This study examines Digital Population Identity (Identitas Kependudukan Digital/IKD) governance in Ambon City by shifting the analytical focus from account activation to actual service use. A qualitative secondary-data design was employed through document analysis of national regulations, government information, verified news reports, and scholarly publications from 2022–2026. The available evidence shows that Ambon expanded access through outreach activation services to villages and urban communities and recorded 44,313 IKD activations by 10 July 2026. However, publicly available indicators remain dominated by activation counts and do not yet provide disaggregated evidence on post-activation use, successful verification transactions, or standardized user experience. The analysis identifies three governance stages: activation readiness, service opportunity, and functional use. The article argues that activation is a necessary output but should not be treated as equivalent to utilization. Effective IKD governance requires a broader ecosystem of accepting institutions, traceable service opportunities, assistance for citizens with different digital capabilities, and aggregate indicators that measure whether digital identity works when administrative needs arise. The proposed activation-to-use governance framework provides a practical basis for evaluating digital identity beyond account creation and toward functional public-service outcomes.



© 2026 The Authors. Published by Punggawa Legacy Center. This is an open access article under the CC BY license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>)

PENDAHULUAN

Digital transformation in public administration cannot be evaluated solely by the presence of applications. Administrative value appears when digital systems are able to solve concrete citizen needs, reduce unnecessary transactions, simplify verification, and improve the reliability of service processes. Digital Population Identity (Identitas Kependudukan Digital/IKD) provides a useful case because it changes how citizens store, present, and verify population identity documents. Indonesia's Ministry of Home Affairs Regulation Number 72 of 2022 formally regulates the hardware, software, blank identity documents, and implementation of IKD. Since the regulation was introduced, local governments have expanded activation as the main entry point to digital identity use (Kementerian Dalam Negeri Republik Indonesia, 2022).

Activation, however, is not the same as utilization. Activation indicates that a citizen has completed the initial registration process and has access to an IKD account. Utilization occurs when the digital identity is used again in a service transaction, for identity presentation, verification, access to administrative services, or another institutional process that recognizes IKD. This distinction is central for program evaluation. A government may achieve a large number of activated accounts while still lacking sufficient evidence about whether citizens can use the identity when an administrative need arises. The source article therefore treats activation as an output indicator and functional use as a more substantive outcome of digital identity governance.

This analytical distinction is consistent with the broader literature on technology adoption and digital public services. Research on Digital ID in Indonesia suggests that a gap may remain between formal digital-transformation agendas and broad, routine use (Zainudin, 2025). Studies in several local settings have also identified issues related to digital literacy, infrastructure, public acceptance, data-security concerns, technical capacity, and cross-sector integration (Arsella & Kismartini, 2025; Krishna et al., 2025; Syafitri et al., 2025). These findings show that adoption cannot be explained only by whether citizens have downloaded or activated an application. The institutional environment must also make digital identity usable.

Ambon City offers a relevant setting for examining this shift. The city government has promoted IKD as part of the modernization of population-administration services, while the Population and Civil Registration Office has expanded outreach activation to villages and urban communities. By 10 July 2026, public information reported that 44,313 residents had activated IKD. The same public communication also associated IKD with needs involving education, BPJS Kesehatan, BPJS Ketenagakerjaan, and other administrative services (ANTARA, 2026a; ANTARA, 2026b). These achievements demonstrate active expansion of initial access, yet they do not by themselves show how many activated accounts have subsequently been used in real service transactions.

The distinction matters because the value of a digital identity depends on the service ecosystem surrounding it. A citizen may possess an active IKD account but still be required to present a physical document if an institution does not have a verification mechanism, if officers are unfamiliar with the digital identity, if connectivity is unreliable, or if service procedures have not been adjusted. Studies from Surabaya, Semarang, Palu, Malang, Pekanbaru, Sikka, and other locations cited in the source manuscript reveal recurring governance issues related to institutional coordination, infrastructure, implementation capacity, digital readiness, and acceptance (Alhasni et al., 2025; Diwanti et al., 2025; Krishna et al., 2025; Retu et al., 2026; Suprojo et al., 2025). These patterns support a governance perspective that considers both citizens and service-providing institutions.

Existing IKD research has developed rapidly, but it remains fragmented across several perspectives. Technology-acceptance studies examine readiness, perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, and intention to use. Prasasti and Saeroji (2026), for example, apply the Technology Readiness Acceptance Model to digital population administration, while Yulianti et al. (2025) use a technology-acceptance perspective to examine IKD implementation in Garut. Other studies focus on policy implementation, communication, resources, bureaucratic structure, innovation, or program effectiveness (Alhasni et al., 2025; Diwanti et al., 2025; Fauziah et al., 2026). A further body of research examines dynamic governance, coordination, service quality, human-resource readiness, and cross-sector integration (Saepudin, 2024; Syafitri et al., 2025; Wati et al., 2024).

These approaches are valuable, but they leave room for a different question: what happens after activation? Public-sector evaluation frequently privileges indicators that are easy to count. In digital identity programs, the number of activated accounts is visible and administratively convenient, but it may not reflect whether digital identity functions in citizens' actual service journeys. Treating activation and utilization as the same phenomenon can therefore create an evaluation gap. The program may appear to have achieved broad reach while the institutional capacity to accept and verify IKD remains uneven or undocumented.

The research gap addressed in this article concerns the difference between administrative program output and service functionality. Account activation is an initial output. The opportunity to use IKD depends on the availability of accepting services, verification procedures, infrastructure, information, and user assistance. Functional use is demonstrated when the identity is successfully used for a real administrative need. Publicly available evidence for Ambon is strongest at the first stage and more limited at the later stages. This gap does not mean that IKD is unused. It means that the available public evidence is insufficient to measure utilization directly.

The article proposes an activation-to-use governance framework with three analytical layers. The first, activation readiness, concerns the ability of citizens to obtain initial access through convenient registration, outreach, compatible devices, and assistance. The second, service opportunity, concerns the institutional conditions that allow an activated account to be used, including the number of accepting services, cross-agency integration, verification mechanisms, information, and support. The third, functional use, concerns whether IKD actually works when a citizen needs to complete a transaction. The framework shifts the evaluation question from 'How many accounts have been created?' to 'Can digital identity be used successfully when it is needed?'

This study has three objectives. First, it describes the development of IKD implementation in Ambon based on the secondary evidence available. Second, it identifies governance factors that shape the transition from activation to utilization. Third, it proposes indicators that can strengthen evaluation beyond account

counts. The article does not attempt to infer individual user experiences that have not been directly measured. Instead, it analyzes the documentary architecture of implementation and the information gaps that remain visible in public data. This position also differentiates the article from individual-level acceptance studies by focusing on program governance and service functionality.

RESEARCH METHODS

The study used a qualitative approach with a secondary-data analysis design. The object of analysis was the governance of Digital Population Identity utilization in Ambon City after the national IKD policy was implemented. A secondary-data design was selected because the research question concerns the relationship between policy design, activation achievements, service opportunities, and patterns reported in previous studies. The design also avoids making unsupported claims about citizens' direct experiences that would require primary survey or interview data.

The evidence base consisted of four groups of documents. First, the study used the national regulatory framework, particularly Ministry of Home Affairs Regulation Number 72 of 2022. Second, it used government information and verified news reporting on IKD implementation in Ambon during 2026, including information on outreach activation and the reported number of activated residents. Third, it reviewed scholarly articles published mainly between 2024 and 2026 that discuss technology acceptance, policy implementation, service effectiveness, innovation, digital literacy, human-resource readiness, infrastructure, coordination, and cross-service integration. Fourth, it considered articles from Efisiensi: Kajian Ilmu Administrasi to clarify the position of the study in relation to prior technology-readiness research.

Document retrieval used combinations of the terms 'Identitas Kependudukan Digital', 'IKD', 'digital public service', 'population administration', 'IKD activation', and 'Ambon City'. Documents were retained when they contributed evidence to at least one of three analytical stages: initial access or activation; opportunity to use IKD; or actual use in a service transaction. News items or documents that merely reproduced claims without an identifiable source were not treated as primary evidence for the main findings.

Analysis proceeded through reduction, grouping, comparison, and pattern interpretation. Evidence was coded into three categories. Activation included account creation, outreach strategies, and expansion of initial access. Opportunity to use included the availability of accepting services, integration, verification mechanisms, devices, connectivity, information, and assistance. Actual service use referred to evidence that IKD had been used to present identity, complete verification, or satisfy an administrative requirement. Evidence from other regions was used as an analytical comparison, not as proof of conditions in Ambon.

The study applied a conservative interpretation rule. Missing public data were not converted into negative findings about government performance. For example, the absence of publicly disaggregated data on post-activation transactions was interpreted as an evidence gap, not as proof that citizens had failed to use IKD. This rule is important for secondary-data research because public reporting practices vary across agencies and time. The analytical contribution therefore lies in identifying what can be concluded from the available evidence and what requires additional data collection.

The principal limitation is that the available public record does not provide a disaggregated measure of how many activated IKD accounts in Ambon have subsequently been used in service transactions, how often verification succeeds, what service types are most common, or why some citizens may not use the application again. The study consequently cannot calculate a real activation-to-use conversion rate. Its contribution is to develop an evaluation framework that specifies the additional indicators required for such an assessment.

Table 1 Analytical Categories and Evidence Requirements

Analytical Stage	Main Question	Evidence Used/Required
Activation readiness	Can citizens obtain initial digital identity access?	Activation counts; outreach services; registration access; device and assistance conditions
Service opportunity	Where and under what conditions can IKD be used?	Accepting institutions; verification procedures; integration; information; connectivity; user assistance
Functional use	Does IKD work when a service need occurs?	Successful verification transactions; service type; completion outcome; support needs; complaints

Source: analytical construction based on the secondary-data design of this study.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1. Expansion of Activation in Ambon

The clearest public evidence on IKD implementation in Ambon concerns expansion of initial access. The city's Population and Civil Registration Office used outreach services that extended activation beyond the office environment to villages and urban communities. By 10 July 2026, 44,313 residents were reported to have activated IKD (ANTARA, 2026a). From a governance perspective, outreach reduces the transaction cost of activation because citizens do not have to rely solely on office-based registration. It also indicates that the local government is actively broadening the potential user base rather than waiting for citizens to approach the service independently.

The activation figure is an important achievement indicator, but its meaning must be bounded carefully. It describes the stock of accounts that have passed the activation stage. It does not describe how many citizens have subsequently presented the digital identity to another service, how many transactions were successfully verified, or whether users encountered technical or procedural obstacles. Calling all activated residents 'active users' would therefore blur the distinction between access and use. The evidence supports a statement about expanded access, not yet a statement about sustained utilization.

This distinction is especially important because identity documents are not typically used every day. Unlike social-media or payment applications, an identity document is used when a particular administrative or verification need appears. A citizen may use IKD only once or twice in a year and still receive substantial value if those transactions are completed successfully without the need to carry or reproduce physical documents. Frequency by itself is therefore an incomplete measure. A governance-oriented evaluation must connect use to the context and outcome of the service transaction.

3.2. Service Opportunity and the Institutional Ecosystem

The second layer of the framework concerns opportunity to use. Public communication in Ambon has associated IKD with education, BPJS Kesehatan, BPJS Ketenagakerjaan, and other administrative needs (ANTARA, 2026a; ANTARA, 2026b). This information suggests that IKD is being positioned as an identity instrument that can support services beyond the Population and Civil Registration Office. The key governance question is not only whether these connections are announced, but whether service points consistently recognize the digital identity and have workable verification procedures.

Comparative findings from other local settings help explain why this institutional layer matters. Krishna et al. (2025) identify cross-sector integration as an important challenge in IKD-based e-government services in Surabaya. Arsella and Kismartini (2025) report external issues in Semarang such as public resistance, concern over data leakage, and the need for cross-sector synergy. Saepudin (2024) explicitly examines coordination in IKD public services. These studies cannot be treated as direct evidence about Ambon, but they reveal a recurrent implementation pattern: digital identity use depends on organizational acceptance and coordination as much as on citizen activation.

Service opportunity can be understood as the bridge between account ownership and functional use. If citizens have an IKD account but service institutions continue to request photocopies or physical identification, activation has little practical effect on the service journey. Conversely, when organizations provide clear verification procedures, officers understand the process, and citizens know where IKD is accepted, the probability of functional use increases. Governance must therefore address both the demand side—citizen readiness and understanding—and the supply side—organizational readiness and acceptance.

The role of user assistance is also important. Research on human-resource readiness and technology acceptance shows that differences in digital capability can shape whether people are comfortable with a new service (Prasasti & Saeroji, 2026; Syafitri et al., 2025; Yulianti et al., 2025). Assistance after activation may be as important as assistance during activation. A citizen who successfully activates IKD may later need support to recover access, understand verification, update information, or use the application at a service counter. Without post-activation assistance, initial access may not translate into confident use.

3.3. The Evidence Gap in Actual Service Use

The third layer is functional use. The available public record reviewed for this article does not provide a disaggregated figure showing how many activated Ambon accounts have been used after activation, what services were involved, how many verifications succeeded, or how many transactions required additional assistance. This is the main evidence gap identified by the study. The gap should not be read as proof of non-use. It indicates that the public indicators currently available are stronger for activation than for utilization.

This evidence problem affects program interpretation. If evaluation relies only on account counts, policymakers can observe the scale of initial reach but cannot see whether the identity is functioning across the service ecosystem. A stronger evaluation system would distinguish an activation stock from a utilization

flow. Activation stock is the cumulative number of accounts that have been activated. Utilization flow refers to aggregate service transactions during a defined period—for example, successful IKD verifications by service type or district. These two measures answer different questions and should not be combined into a single performance indicator.

The same logic applies to user experience. Publicly available evidence for Ambon does not yet provide a standardized measure of ease of use, perceived usefulness, technical failure, service refusal, recovery difficulty, or the reasons an activated account is not used again. Technology-acceptance research provides useful constructs for measuring these experiences, but governance evaluation needs to connect them with administrative data. Surveys can explain why citizens use or avoid IKD, while transaction data can show whether services are actually receiving and verifying digital identities.

Table 2 Evidence on IKD Implementation in Ambon

Dimension	Available Evidence	Analytical Meaning	Data Status
Activation	44,313 residents had activated IKD by 10 July 2026; outreach reached villages and urban communities.	Initial access has been actively expanded by the local government.	Available
Opportunity to use	IKD was publicly linked to education, BPJS Kesehatan, BPJS Ketenagakerjaan, and other administrative needs.	Utilization depends on a wider ecosystem of accepting institutions and verification procedures.	Descriptively available
Actual service use	No disaggregated public figure was identified for accounts reused in service transactions after activation.	An activation-to-use conversion rate cannot yet be calculated from public data.	Not publicly available
User experience	No standardized Ambon indicator was identified for ease, usefulness, technical barriers, or reasons for non-reuse.	User-experience indicators are needed to complement administrative outputs.	Not publicly available

Source: synthesized from Ministry of Home Affairs Regulation No. 72/2022 and public information on IKD implementation in Ambon in 2026, as reported in the source manuscript.

3.4. Why Activation and Utilization Must Be Separated

The first major finding is the need to separate activation from utilization. Technology-acceptance studies already distinguish readiness, perceptions, intention, and behavior. Prasasti and Saeroji (2026) show that optimism, innovativeness, discomfort, and insecurity are related to perceived ease and usefulness and to the intention to use digital population administration. Yulianti et al. (2025) similarly examine acceptance variables in IKD implementation. From a program-governance perspective, the distinction must be translated into administrative indicators: having an account is not the same as successfully using the account in a service.

This distinction prevents two opposite errors. The first error is overstatement: assuming that every activation automatically produces a service benefit. The second error is understatement: assuming that low usage frequency necessarily indicates program failure. Identity use is event-driven. What matters is whether a citizen can rely on IKD when a legitimate need arises and whether the service recognizes it without unnecessary friction. Program evaluation should therefore combine reach, opportunity, transaction success, and user support.

A more precise evaluation language is also useful for public accountability. Reporting '44,313 activations' is clear and verifiable. Reporting '44,313 users' can be ambiguous if user status is not defined. A governance dashboard should use explicit terms such as cumulative activated accounts, unique accounts used in at least one service transaction during the period, number of successful verifications, failed or repeated verifications, and number of service institutions accepting IKD. Clear definitions reduce the risk of conflating different stages of implementation.

3.5. Activation-to-Use Governance Framework

The activation-to-use governance framework organizes IKD implementation into three linked stages. Activation readiness focuses on inclusive entry into the digital identity system. The relevant governance tasks are outreach, accessible registration, device compatibility, identity verification during activation, and assistance for citizens who need help. Ambon's outreach strategy fits this stage because it extends access geographically and reduces reliance on a single office location.

Service opportunity is the institutional middle layer. It asks whether citizens have meaningful places and circumstances in which IKD can be used. Governance at this stage includes mapping accepting institutions,

defining verification procedures, ensuring connectivity, communicating acceptance rules, coordinating across agencies, and providing service-counter guidance. Expansion of activation without expansion of service opportunity can create a dormant user base: citizens possess digital identities but continue to depend on physical documents.

Functional use is the outcome layer. It concerns whether IKD can actually complete or support a service transaction when needed. Indicators should capture successful verification, type of service, completion status, assistance required, complaints, and recurring technical problems. Because identity use is situational, the framework does not require frequent daily use. A single successful transaction can represent meaningful public value if it removes an administrative burden or simplifies verification.

The framework also clarifies institutional responsibility. Citizens are responsible for maintaining access to their account and using it appropriately, but government agencies are responsible for creating a usable service environment. A narrow behavioral explanation that attributes limited use only to citizens' reluctance would overlook the possibility that institutions have not fully integrated IKD. Conversely, an institutional explanation that ignores literacy, trust, or device constraints would also be incomplete. Functional digital identity emerges from the interaction between citizen capability and organizational readiness.

Table 3 Proposed Activation-to-Use Governance Framework

Stage	Governance Focus	Suggested Indicators	Risk if Evaluation Stops at Activation
Activation readiness	Access, registration, outreach, device requirements, initial assistance	Number and distribution of activations; activation success rate; outreach coverage; assistance provided	Program reach may appear high without knowing whether access continues into use
Service opportunity	Accepting institutions, integration, verification procedures, information, connectivity, support	Number of accepting services; verified integration points; availability of QR/verification; published use procedures	Citizens may have accounts but still be asked for physical documents
Functional use	Successful use when an administrative need occurs	Unique accounts used; successful verifications; service types; completion rate; assistance; complaints	It remains unknown whether digital identity generates actual service value

Source: author's analytical construction based on synthesis of the secondary evidence.

3.6. Indicators for a More Functional Evaluation

The third major finding concerns indicator design. Activation targets remain useful because they show policy reach and provide a denominator for later analysis. The problem arises when activation is treated as the final success measure. A stronger dashboard would retain activation while adding conversion and functionality indicators. Examples include the percentage of activated accounts that have completed at least one verification, the number of verification transactions by service category, the number of institutions that accept IKD, the success rate of verification attempts, and the proportion of transactions requiring assistance.

These indicators should be aggregated to protect personal information. A dashboard does not need to expose identifiable citizen-level histories. It can report monthly or quarterly counts by service type, district, or institutional category. Aggregate data would allow the city government to identify where activation outreach is translating into use, where integration remains weak, and where additional training or technical support may be needed. This approach aligns evaluation with service performance while respecting the sensitivity of identity data.

A useful dashboard should also distinguish transaction failure from low demand. If a service is rarely needed, low transaction volume may be normal. If citizens attempt to use IKD but verification fails repeatedly, the same low completion volume has a very different meaning. For this reason, success rates and assistance requests may be more informative than raw frequency. The objective is not to maximize how often citizens open the application, but to ensure that the identity works reliably when it is required.

User-experience measures should complement administrative data. Short service-exit questions can ask whether the citizen could use IKD successfully, whether officers accepted it, whether physical documents were still required, and whether assistance was needed. Periodic surveys can examine trust, perceived usefulness, usability, and digital confidence. These measures connect institutional performance with citizen experience and help explain why utilization varies across groups or services.

Table 4 Suggested Monitoring Indicators for Ambon

Indicator Group	Example Indicator	Purpose
Reach	Cumulative activated accounts; activation coverage by village/urban community	Measure breadth of initial access
Service ecosystem	Number of institutions/services that formally accept IKD; availability of verification mechanism	Measure opportunity to use
Functional use	Unique activated accounts used at least once; successful verification transactions by service type	Measure conversion from access to service use
Reliability	Verification success rate; repeated attempts; system or connectivity interruption	Identify technical friction
Assistance	Share of transactions requiring officer or technical assistance	Identify digital-capability and support needs
User experience	Ease of use, acceptance by service officers, physical-document substitution, complaints	Assess practical service value

Source: proposed by the authors based on the activation-to-use governance framework.

3.7. Implications for Local Digital-Service Governance

For Ambon, the available evidence indicates that the city has already built an important foundation through outreach activation and public communication about IKD. The next governance challenge is to make that foundation visible in service transactions. This requires an inventory of which municipal and partner services currently accept IKD, what verification method is used, whether acceptance is consistent across service points, and what obstacles lead officers or citizens to revert to physical documents.

Coordination across institutions is therefore central. Saepudin (2024) highlights coordination as a specific issue in IKD-based public services, while studies in other regions repeatedly identify cross-sector collaboration and institutional readiness as implementation factors. Local government can use a service map to clarify responsibilities: which institution is responsible for identity verification, which units require data exchange, what happens if connectivity fails, and how a citizen receives assistance. Such clarity turns digital identity from a standalone application into part of an administrative ecosystem.

The framework also has implications for inclusion. Outreach activation improves access, but different citizens have different levels of device ownership, digital confidence, connectivity, and familiarity with application-based identity. Governance should therefore preserve assistance channels rather than treating digital self-service as the only acceptable pathway. Support can include guided activation, post-activation help, clear printed and digital instructions, accessible complaint channels, and service alternatives for situations where digital use is temporarily impossible.

Data governance must remain central because identity information is sensitive. The source literature includes public concern about data security and privacy as a factor affecting acceptance. Utilization monitoring should therefore rely on aggregate indicators and minimum necessary data. The objective is to understand service performance, not to construct unnecessary behavioral profiles of citizens. Clear data-retention rules, access controls, and transparent communication about how transaction data are used can support trust in the system.

Finally, the activation-to-use perspective can improve policy learning. If the city records where transactions succeed and where assistance is needed, implementation can be adjusted based on evidence. Training can be directed to service points with repeated verification problems, integration can prioritize high-demand services, and outreach can be paired with information about concrete use cases. Evaluation then becomes a feedback mechanism for service improvement rather than only a report of cumulative account creation.

3.8. Position within the IKD Literature

The activation-to-use approach complements rather than replaces technology-acceptance research. Acceptance models are valuable because they explain how citizens perceive usefulness, ease, risk, innovativeness, and readiness. These perceptions can influence whether citizens are willing to activate or try a digital identity. Yet a citizen may be willing to use IKD and still face limited opportunities if service institutions do not accept it consistently. Conversely, institutional readiness may be strong while some citizens need additional assistance. A complete explanation of utilization therefore requires both individual and institutional levels of analysis.

The framework also differs from conventional implementation studies that focus primarily on communication, resources, disposition, and bureaucratic structure. Those variables remain relevant, but activation-to-use governance organizes them around the sequence of service functionality. Communication can support activation and explain where IKD is accepted; resources can affect registration, connectivity, and verification; bureaucratic structure can shape coordination across institutions; and implementation disposition can influence whether officers encourage or resist digital verification. The framework adds an outcome-oriented question: do these implementation conditions culminate in a usable identity at the moment of service?

Dynamic-governance and coordination studies provide another complementary perspective. Wati et al. (2024) emphasize governance adaptation in IKD implementation, while Saepudin (2024) highlights coordination in public services. The activation-to-use model translates these ideas into a practical monitoring sequence. Adaptive governance is visible when procedures are revised in response to user difficulties or changing service needs. Coordination is visible when multiple service providers recognize the same digital identity and follow compatible verification practices. These institutional capacities determine whether access can be converted into functionality.

The framework also clarifies the contribution of usability studies such as Ridwan and Budiarti (2024). Usability can explain whether an application is easy to operate, but usability alone does not guarantee that the identity will be accepted by a service institution. Similarly, policy implementation can be administratively compliant without generating a seamless service experience. The proposed model therefore treats usability, acceptance, implementation, coordination, and institutional integration as mechanisms that operate within a broader pathway from initial access to actual service value.

This positioning is particularly relevant to Ambon because the publicly visible achievement currently lies at the activation stage. Rather than interpreting the absence of utilization statistics as a failure, the framework identifies the next empirical questions. Which services accept IKD? How many verification events occur? Are those events successful? Do citizens still need physical documents? Which groups require help? Answering these questions would allow future research to move from program reach toward service effectiveness.

3.9. A Phased Governance Agenda for Ambon

A phased governance agenda can translate the analytical framework into practical action. The first phase is mapping. The city can identify every municipal, provincial, national, and partner service in Ambon that currently accepts IKD, the method used for verification, the service location, and whether a physical document is still required. This inventory should be updated periodically because the service ecosystem can expand over time. Mapping provides a baseline for distinguishing announced integration from operational acceptance.

The second phase is standardization. Service points that accept IKD need clear operational instructions covering identity display, QR or other verification mechanisms, handling of connectivity problems, procedures for users who cannot access their account, and escalation when verification fails. Standardization reduces variation between service counters and prevents citizens from receiving conflicting instructions. It also helps frontline officers understand that digital identity is part of an administrative process rather than an optional technological add-on.

The third phase is measurement. After the service map and procedures are in place, aggregate transaction data can be recorded. The purpose is not to monitor individual citizens but to observe service performance. Monthly counts can show successful and unsuccessful verification, service categories, requests for assistance, and recurring technical obstacles. A simple reporting standard can be integrated into existing administrative monitoring rather than creating a parallel reporting burden.

The fourth phase is learning and adjustment. Periodic review can compare activation coverage with service use and identify mismatches. A district with many activations but few service transactions may simply have low demand, but it may also have limited accepting institutions or weak communication. A service with repeated assistance requests may require clearer instructions or staff training. The value of the dashboard lies in generating questions that can be investigated rather than mechanically ranking service units.

The fifth phase is inclusion and trust. Digital identity governance should maintain channels for citizens who face device, connectivity, accessibility, or confidence barriers. Public communication should explain both the benefits and the limits of IKD, including when alternative identification procedures remain available. Trust can also be supported by explaining what transaction data are collected, why they are collected, and how privacy is protected. This phase is essential because the long-term legitimacy of digital identity depends on citizens perceiving the system as useful, safe, and fair.

Table 5 Phased Governance Agenda for Strengthening IKD Utilization

Phase	Main Action	Expected Governance Output
1. Mapping	Identify accepting institutions, service points, verification methods, and continued physical-document requirements	A verified map of real service opportunities
2. Standardization	Establish common procedures for verification, connectivity problems, access recovery, and failed transactions	More consistent frontline implementation
3. Measurement	Record aggregate verification success, service type, assistance, and technical interruptions	A utilization-flow dataset that complements activation stock
4. Learning	Review mismatches between activation, service opportunity, and actual use	Targeted improvements based on evidence
5. Inclusion and trust	Provide assistance, accessible alternatives, privacy communication, and complaint channels	More equitable and trusted digital-identity use

Source: proposed by the authors based on the analytical findings of this study.

CONCLUSION

IKD implementation in Ambon City demonstrates substantial progress in the expansion of initial access. Outreach activation reached villages and urban communities, and 44,313 residents were reported to have activated IKD by 10 July 2026. The secondary evidence available for this study, however, is considerably stronger for activation than for post-activation utilization. Publicly available indicators do not yet permit a direct calculation of how many activated accounts have been used in actual service transactions, what types of services receive the most IKD use, or what proportion of verification attempts succeed.

The study therefore proposes that digital identity governance be evaluated through three stages: activation readiness, service opportunity, and functional use. Activation remains necessary, but it should be interpreted as an entry point rather than a final outcome. Service opportunity requires an ecosystem of institutions that accept IKD, clear verification procedures, integration, connectivity, information, and assistance. Functional use requires evidence that digital identity successfully supports a real administrative need.

For Ambon, a practical next step is to complement activation data with aggregate indicators on accepting services, successful verifications, service categories, support needs, and user complaints. Such indicators would allow the city to distinguish account ownership from actual service value without exposing personal transaction histories. The framework also supports a more balanced interpretation of citizen behavior because low use may reflect infrequent administrative needs, limited service opportunities, technical barriers, or user-support requirements rather than a single problem of public willingness.

The study is limited by its reliance on secondary data and by the absence of disaggregated public transaction data for IKD in Ambon. Future research should combine administrative transaction records with surveys or interviews of citizens and service officers. This would make it possible to test whether expanded activation has translated into functional use, identify differences across population groups and service types, and evaluate how digital identity changes the actual burden of accessing public services.

REFERENCES

- Alhasni, R. A., Onibala, N., & Assa, N. (2025). Implementasi Identitas Kependudukan Digital melalui digitalisasi pelayanan di Dinas Kependudukan dan Catatan Sipil Kota Manado. *Jurnal Administrasi, Kebijakan, dan Kepemimpinan Pendidikan*, 6(1). <https://doi.org/10.26858/jak2p.v6i1.73996>
- ANTARA. (2026a, July 10). Tingkatkan kualitas layanan publik, Disdukcapil Ambon gencarkan aktivasi IKD hingga desa dan kelurahan. *ANTARA News Ambon*.
- ANTARA. (2026b, June 23). Pemkot Ambon gencarkan penggunaan identitas kependudukan digital. *ANTARA News Ambon*.
- Arsella, D. P., & Kismartini. (2025). Analisis lingkungan internal dan eksternal dalam meningkatkan capaian Identitas Kependudukan Digital (IKD) di Dinas Kependudukan dan Pencatatan Sipil Kota Semarang. *Journal of Management and Public Policy*, 14(3), 497–513. <https://doi.org/10.14710/jppmr.v14i3.53538>
- Diwanti, J. O., Riadi, S., & Salingkat, S. P. (2025). Inovasi Identitas Kependudukan Digital di Dinas Kependudukan dan Pencatatan Sipil Kota Palu. *Journal of Publicness Studies*, 2(1), 29–36.
- Fauziah, R., Kusnandar, I., & Miati, I. (2026). Efektivitas implementasi inovasi Identitas Kependudukan Digital (IKD) pada layanan KTP-el di Dinas Kependudukan dan Pencatatan Sipil Kota Tasikmalaya.

- Matra Pembaruan: Jurnal Inovasi Kebijakan, 10(1), 15–28. <https://doi.org/10.21787/mp.10.1.2026.15-28>
- Fitriani, N. I., Sunariyanto, & Abidin, A. Z. (2025). Efektivitas implementasi program aplikasi Identitas Kependudukan Digital (IKD) dalam pelayanan administrasi kependudukan. *Respon Publik*, 19(1).
- Kementerian Dalam Negeri Republik Indonesia. (2022). Peraturan Menteri Dalam Negeri Republik Indonesia Nomor 72 Tahun 2022 tentang standar dan spesifikasi perangkat keras, perangkat lunak, dan blangko KTP-el serta penyelenggaraan Identitas Kependudukan Digital.
- Krishna, I. A., Sagita, N. I., & Centia, S. (2025). Penerapan e-government dalam layanan Identitas Kependudukan Digital di Kelurahan Ampel Kota Surabaya. *Responsive: Jurnal Pemikiran dan Penelitian Administrasi, Sosial, Humaniora dan Kebijakan Publik*, 8(3).
- Nafisah, A. Z. (2024). Analisis implementasi kebijakan Identitas Kependudukan Digital perspektif teori pilihan publik di Kutai Kartanegara. *Jurnal Administrative Reform*, 12(2).
- Pradika Dhevi, A., & Imawan, S. A. (2026). Implementasi kebijakan Identitas Kependudukan Digital (IKD) di Dinas Kependudukan dan Pencatatan Sipil Kabupaten Kulon Progo. *Journal of Management and Public Policy*, 15(3), 42–56. <https://doi.org/10.14710/jmpp.v15i3.59832>
- Prasasti, D. E., & Saeroji, A. (2026). Penerapan Technology Readiness Acceptance Model (TRAM) dalam mengukur kesiapan administrasi digital kependudukan. *Efisiensi: Kajian Ilmu Administrasi*, 23(1), 74–93. <https://doi.org/10.21831/efisiensi.v23i1.94975>
- Retu, M. K., Mustafa, I., Blandina, M. E., & Kedoh, L. N. (2026). Identitas Kependudukan Digital (IKD) sebagai inovasi pelayanan administrasi kependudukan di Kabupaten Sikka. *Arus Jurnal Sosial dan Humaniora*, 6(1), 130–136. <https://doi.org/10.57250/ajsh.v6i1.2287>
- Ridwan, F. D., & Budiarti, Y. (2024). Analisis aplikasi Identitas Kependudukan Digital pada Dukcapil Kelurahan Kamal Muara dengan metode System Usability Scale (SUS). *JIKO (Jurnal Informatika dan Komputer)*, 8(2).
- Rifqi, H., & Wijaya, M. (2025). Digitalisasi layanan kependudukan: Studi kasus implementasi aplikasi Identitas Kependudukan Digital di Dinas Kependudukan dan Pencatatan Sipil Kota Pekanbaru. *Jurnal Mahasiswa Pemerintahan*, 2(2), 283–290.
- Saepudin, W. (2024). Koordinasi Identitas Kependudukan Digital (IKD) dalam pelayanan publik. *Imperium: Jurnal Kajian Pemerintahan dan Kebijakan Publik*, 1(2), 64–76. <https://doi.org/10.70825/imperium.v1.i2.163>
- Suprojo, A., Rena, M. F., & Rohman, A. (2025). Efektivitas pelayanan program Identitas Kependudukan Digital (IKD) pada Dinas Kependudukan dan Pencatatan Sipil Kota Malang. *Anterior Jurnal*, 24(1), 96–102. <https://doi.org/10.33084/anterior.v24i1.8533>
- Syafitri, I., Nurman, Mardatillah, A., & Hefriyenni, R. (2025). Peningkatan layanan administrasi kependudukan melalui Identitas Kependudukan Digital (IKD): Studi kesiapan SDM dalam era transformasi digital di Provinsi Riau. *PUBLIKA: Jurnal Ilmu Administrasi Publik*. <https://doi.org/10.25299/jiap.2025.24856>
- Wati, V. C., Rizkita, T. W., Sajiwa, B., Silawarti, R., & Prasetyo, E. (2024). Penyelenggaraan pelayanan go digital pada Identitas Kependudukan Digital (IKD) dalam perspektif dynamic governance di Dinas Kependudukan dan Pencatatan Sipil Kabupaten Tangerang. *Public Service and Governance Journal*, 5(2), 233–247. <https://doi.org/10.56444/psgj.v5i2.1806>
- Wilis, M. N., & Febrian, R. A. (2026). Inovasi pelayanan E-KTP berbasis aplikasi Identitas Kependudukan Digital (IKD) pada UPTD Kecamatan Binawidya Kota Pekanbaru. *Jurnal Mahasiswa Pemerintahan*, 3(2), 211–220. <https://doi.org/10.25299/JMP.2025.27597>
- Yulianti, N. A., Illahi, R. N., & Cantika, B. (2025). Model penerimaan teknologi dalam layanan kependudukan: Studi empiris terhadap implementasi Identitas Kependudukan Digital di Kabupaten Garut. *Jurnal Administrasi Publik*, 21(1). <https://doi.org/10.52316/jap.v21i1.588>
- Zainudin. (2025). Kebijakan Digital ID dalam mendukung transformasi digital di Indonesia. *Jurnal Bina Praja*, 17, 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.21787/jbp.17.2025.1-18>