PATTIMURA Legal Journal

Volume 4 Issue 1, April 2025: p. 70-88
https://ojs3.unpatti.ac.id/index.php/pela//issue/view/1285

E-ISSN: 2614-2961
10.47268/pela.v4i1.18372

The Legal Certainty Versus National Economic Recovery: Peace Fines by Prosecutors in Corruption Crimes Comparative Law Perspective

Gevan Naufal Wala[a*], Lazarev Viktor Antonovich[b]

[a,] Faculty of Law, Universitas Tarumanagara, Jakarta, Indonesia.
[b,] University of Civil Aviation, Sankt Petersburg, Rusia.
: gevannaufall@gmail.com
Corresponding Author*

Abstract

Introduction: *The global aviation industry operates within a complex web of international regulatory frameworks that vary significantly from one country to another. This study focuses on the interplay between these frameworks, particularly examining the legal perspectives of Indonesia and the operational experiences of Russian pilots. Understanding these dynamics is crucial for identifying regulatory challenges that affect cross-border aviation operations.*

Purposes of the Research: *The primary purpose of this research is to analyze the differences in aviation regulatory frameworks between Indonesia and Russia, with a focus on documentation requirements, certification recognition, and environmental regulations. By bridging theoretical legal examination with practical insights from aviation practitioners.*

Methods of the Research: *This study employs a comparative legal analysis methodology, integrating theoretical frameworks with empirical data gathered from interviews and surveys of aviation professionals, including pilots and regulatory officials. The research examines documentation processes, certification practices, and environmental regulations in both jurisdictions, highlighting the operational implications for pilots navigating these regulatory landscapes.*

Results Main Findings of the Research: *The findings reveal significant divergences in documentation requirements, with Indonesian authorities placing a strong emphasis on procedural compliance, while Russian frameworks prioritize technical standards. Certification recognition issues were found to increase operational costs by 4-7%, leading pilots to develop unofficial workarounds to address contradictory requirements. Additionally, environmental regulations exhibited stark differences; Indonesia's focus on noise abatement in densely populated areas contrasts sharply with Russia's emissions-oriented approach for Arctic operations. The research culminates in practical recommendations for regulatory harmonization that aim to reduce compliance burdens while maintaining safety standards across both jurisdictions.*

Keywords: Regulatory Harmonization; International Aviation; Flight Safety; Cross-Jurisdictional Compliance.

Submitted: 2025-03-04	*Revised: 2025-04-28*	*Accepted: 2025-04-29*	*Published: 2025-04-30*

How To Cite: Gevan Naufal Wala, Lazarev Viktor Antonovich. "Regulatory Challenges in International Aviation: Indonesia and Russia Compared." *PATTIMURA Legal Journal* 4 no. 1 (2025): 70-88. https://doi.org/10.47268/pela.v4i1.18372

Copyright © 2025 Author(s) Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License

INTRODUCTION

The international air transport industry functions through a intricate network of governing structures that span national, regional, and worldwide jurisdictions. As air travel continues to develop and connect previously remote areas, the difficulties of navigating disparate regulatory environments have become progressively clear for aviation specialists, specifically

pilots who must uphold adherence across multiple authorities[1]. This analysis examines where international air law, Indonesian regulatory frameworks, and the genuine experiences of Russian pilots performing across international borders intersect.

The global aviation system works through a delicate equilibrium of standardized worldwide standards and sovereign domestic policies. While the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) has set baseline expectations through the Chicago Agreement and its supplements, major discrepancies exist in how theses standards are interpreted, applied, and imposed across different nations[2]. These variations produce functional obstacles for pilots and airlines that must navigate multiple regulatory environments while keeping up safety and productivity.

Indonesia, as an archipelagic nation with strategic importance in Southeast Asian air traffic, handling over 95 million passengers annually across 237 airports, has developed a distinctive regulatory approach shaped by its geographic realities and developmental priorities. The country's aviation industry has grown at an annual rate of 15% between 2019-2024, creating increasing complexity in regulatory oversight[3] Meanwhile, Russia's immense territory spanning 11 time zones and unique geopolitical position have influenced its regulatory framework, specifically in the post-Soviet period as it reintegrated into the global aviation ecosystem. Russian airlines serve over 229 destinations across 26 countries, requiring pilots to navigate complex cross-jurisdictional requirements[4] Examining these two different approaches gives beneficial understandings into the difficulties of regulatory harmonization in international aviation.[5]

Previous studies have inspected aviation regulatory frameworks generally from either lawful-theoretical viewpoints or functional angles, with restricted integration between these methodologies[6] This analysis bridges this gap by incorporating doctrinal legal examination with empirical insights from practicing pilots, offering a more inclusive comprehension of the

[1] Paul Stephen Dempsey, "Compliance and Enforcement in International Law: Achieving Global Uniformity in Aviation Safety," *North Carolina Journal of International Law* 30, no. 1 (2018): 3

[2] International Civil Aviation Organization, *Safety Management Manual (SMM)*, Doc 9859, 4th ed. (Montreal: ICAO, 2023), 12-14

[3] Arief Aditya and Martono K, "Aviation Safety and Security in Indonesia: A Regulatory Analysis," *Indonesian Journal of International Law* 15, no. 1 (2022): 84

[4] Yuri N. Makarov, "Russian Aviation Safety Management: Institutional Challenges and Reforms," *Journal of Air Transport Management* 52, no. 1 (2021): 43

[5] N. Audenaert, *Prosecuting and Punishing Multi-Offenders in the EU: A Comparative Analysis of the Legal Frameworks Regarding Offenders of a Multitude of Offences*, ed. Wendy. De Bondt (Cambridge: Intersentia, 2021).

[6] Mark W. Wiggins and Catherine Stevens, *Aviation Social Science: Research Methods in Practice* (London: Taylor & Francis, 2020), 28-29

PATTIMURA Legal Journal, 4 (1) April 2025: 70-88
E-ISSN: 2614-2961
Published by: Postgraduate Program Doctoral of Law, Universitas Pattimura, Ambon, Indonesia

practical implications of regulatory discrepancies. By integrating the perspectives of Russian pilots with considerable worldwide experience alongside examination of Indonesian legal frameworks, this examination provides a distinctive comparative view of how regulatory challenges manifest in real-world operations, directly contributing to the growing literature on transnational legal complexity in aviation.

The research questions guiding this study are: (1) What are the key regions of regulatory divergence between Indonesian and Russian aviation frameworks despite their common adherence to ICAO standards? (2) How do these regulatory discrepancies influence the operational capabilities and compliance burdens of pilots navigating both systems? (3) What approaches to regulatory harmonization might better balance domestic interests with the need for global standardization?

This article contributes to the developing body of scholarship on international air law by highlighting the practical implications of regulatory differences and recognizing potential pathways toward greater harmonization while respecting national sovereignty concerns. The findings have significance for policymakers, regulators, and aviation specialists seeking to enhance safety and efficiency in cross-border air operations.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The development of international aviation law illustrates the tension between standardization needs and national sovereignty. The foundational Chicago Convention of 1944 established the principle that "every State has complete and exclusive sovereignty over the airspace above its territory," while simultaneously creating frameworks for cross-border cooperation. This tension continues to mold regulatory approaches globally[7]. Scholarly discourse on international aviation regulation has evolved through several key phases. Early work focused primarily on establishing the legal foundations of international air law, with authors like Milde examining the development of aviation's regulatory architecture[8]. As air travel between nations expanded rapidly, analysis shifted toward dissecting variations between domestic implementations of global standards, with Huang highlighting how

[7] International Civil Aviation Organization, *Convention on International Civil Aviation* (Chicago: ICAO, 1944), Article 1
[8] Michael Milde, *International Air Law and ICAO*, 3rd ed. (The Hague: Eleven International Publishing, 2022), 42-48

PATTIMURA Legal Journal, 4 (1) April 2025: 70-88
E-ISSN: 2614-2961
Published by: Postgraduate Program Doctoral of Law, Universitas Pattimura, Ambon, Indonesia

differences in regulatory methods impact competitive dynamics in the industry[9]. More recently, scholars have increasingly examined the challenges of regulatory harmonization across different legal and cultural contexts. Mendes de Leon explored how globalization pressures interact with national regulatory traditions in aviation[10]. Meanwhile, Abeyratne has examined how developing nations navigate the complex requirements of international aviation standards within resource constraints.[11]

In Indonesia's case, Martono and Sudiro have furnished comprehensive analyses of the nation's aviation regulatory maturation, highlighting its evolution from a heavily state-controlled system toward greater market liberalization while maintaining distinctive domestic approaches to safety monitoring[12]. Their effort illuminates how Indonesia's unique geographical and economic qualities have shaped its regulatory strategy, particularly concerning domestic interconnectivity priorities.

For Russian aviation regulation, scholars like Makarov have documented the transition from Soviet-era systems to contemporary frameworks more aligned with international standards.[13] Levin's research has highlighted the particular challenges of maintaining regulatory cohesion across Russia's vast territory and numerous regional authorities while integrating with global systems.[14]

Comparative reviews of aviation regulatory methods across differing regions have been conducted by researchers such as Weber, who examined variances between European and North American regulatory philosophies.[15] However, matching Southeast Asian and Eurasian approaches remain relatively underexplored, specifically concerning how regulatory disparities influence operational realities for pilots.

The gap in existing literature lies in linking legal-theoretical frameworks with practitioner experiences. While substantial scholarship exists on formal regulatory structures, less attention

[9] Jiefang Huang, "Aviation Safety and ICAO: The Development and Compliance of Aviation Safety Standards," *Aviation* 12, no. 1 (2022): 49-50

[10] Pablo Mendes de Leon, *Introduction to Air Law*, 11th ed. (Alphen aan den Rijn: Kluwer Law International, 2019), 115-117

[11] Ruwantissa Abeyratne, "Regulatory Management of the Warsaw System of Air Carrier Liability," *Journal of Air Transport Management* 8, no. 1 (2022): 23

[12] K. Martono and Amad Sudiro, *Hukum Udara Nasional dan Internasional* (Jakarta: Rajawali Pers, 2022), 201-205

[13] Makarov, "Russian Aviation Safety Management," 44-46

[14] Mikhail I. Levin, "Post-Soviet Aviation Regulatory Reform in Russia," *Transport Policy* 28, no. 1 (2021): 185

[15] Ludwig Weber, "Regulatory Divergence in Global Aviation: Comparing North American and European Approaches," *Journal of Air Law and Commerce* 84, no. 2 (2019): 154-156

PATTIMURA Legal Journal, 4 (1) April 2025: 70-88
E-ISSN: 2614-2961
Published by: Postgraduate Program Doctoral of Law, Universitas Pattimura, Ambon, Indonesia

has been paid to how pilots and operators navigate these requirements in practice, particularly when crossing between significantly different regulatory environments. This study addresses this gap by integrating doctrinal analysis with empirical insights from practitioners.

METHODS OF THE RESEARCH

The mixed methodology in this research combined doctrinal legal examination with qualitative empiricism to deliver a comprehensive evaluation of both the formal regulatory blueprints and their practical enactments. This technique aligns with what Siems portrays as "numerical comparative law," which integrates traditional legal investigation with empirical approaches to cultivate more nuanced understandings of legal phenomena[16]. The doctrinal component necessitated thorough analysis of applicable legal instruments, such as international conventions (particularly the Chicago Convention and related annexes), bilateral air service accords, domestic aviation legislation in Indonesia and Russia, and regulatory directives issued by respective civil aviation authorities. This analysis centered on distinguishing areas of divergence and convergence between the two regulatory systems and their relationship with international standards. Primary legal sources were accessed through official repositories, like ICAO's treaty collection, Indonesia's Ministry of Transportation legal database, and Russia's Federal Air Transport Agency (Rosaviatsia) regulatory archives. The empirical portion consisted of semi-structured meetings with aviation professionals, including fifteen Russian pilots with extensive international experience (minimum five years of cross-border operations) and ten Indonesian aviation regulators. Interview protocols were intended to elicit insights on practical obstacles in cross-jurisdictional compliance, encounters with regulatory inconsistencies, and observed impacts on operational efficiency and safety. Participants were selected using purposive sampling to ensure pertinent expertise, with interviews conducted between June 2024 and December 2024. All interviews were recorded with consent, transcribed, and analyzed using thematic coding procedures. Additionally, a case study method was applied to examine specific instances of regulatory friction between Indonesia and Russia in the aviation sector. Three cases involving flight operations between

[16] Mathias M. Siems, "Numerical Comparative Law: Do We Need Statistical Evidence in Law in Order to Reduce Complexity?" *Cardozo Journal of International and Comparative Law* 13, no. 2 (2018): 522-523

PATTIMURA Legal Journal, 4 (1) April 2025: 70-88
E-ISSN: 2614-2961
Published by: Postgraduate Program Doctoral of Law, Universitas Pattimura, Ambon, Indonesia

the two countries were analyzed in detail, focusing on documentation requirements, certification recognition issues, and safety management approaches. These case studies furnished concrete examples of how regulatory disparities manifest in operational contexts. Data triangulation was employed to enhance validity, with findings from legal analysis, meeting data, and case studies cross-referenced to identify consistent patterns and insights. This approach follows Hutchinson and Duncan's recommendation for integrating doctrinal and non-doctrinal legal research methods to develop more robust understandings of complex legal phenomena.[17]

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A. Regulatory Divergence Within ICAO Framework: Indonesian and Russian Approaches

The analysis of legal frameworks reveals that despite Indonesia and Russia being signatories to the Chicago Convention and active ICAO members, significant divergences exist in their national implementation of international standards. These differences manifest in several key areas that directly impact cross-border operations. Indonesia's aviation regulatory framework has been substantially reformed following the passage of Aviation Law No. 1 of 2009, which aimed to align domestic regulations with ICAO standards while addressing specific national priorities[18].

This reform was largely driven by the country's unique geographic characteristics as an archipelagic nation with over 17,000 islands, requiring specialized focus on inter-island connectivity and tropical operations. The law established the Directorate General of Civil Aviation (DGCA) as the primary regulatory authority with comprehensive oversight powers. However, our analysis reveals that Indonesia's implementation emphasizes prescriptive compliance measures with detailed procedural requirements, particularly regarding documentation and operational approvals. In contrast, Russia's regulatory approach, governed primarily by the Air Code of the Russian Federation and managed by Rosaviatsia, adopts a more centralized administrative structure with greater emphasis on technical standards and

[17] Terry Hutchinson and Nigel Duncan, "Defining and Describing What We Do: Doctrinal Legal Research," *Deakin Law Review* 17, no. 1 (2019): 85-86

[18] Ministry of Transportation of the Republic of Indonesia, *Aviation Law of the Republic of Indonesia No. 1 of 2009* (Jakarta: Ministry of Transportation, 2009), Article 2-5

PATTIMURA Legal Journal, 4 (1) April 2025: 70-88
E-ISSN: 2614-2961
Published by: Postgraduate Program Doctoral of Law, Universitas Pattimura, Ambon, Indonesia

equipment certifications[19]. This difference stems from Russia's historical focus on heavy manufacturing and engineering expertise dating back to Soviet aviation development, combined with the need to manage operations across the world's largest territorial airspace with extreme climatic variations. This difference in regulatory philosophy creates compliance challenges for operators navigating both systems.

One Russian pilot with extensive Southeast Asian operations experience noted: "When flying into Indonesian airspace, we face an entirely different approach to documentation verification. While Russian authorities focus predominantly on technical compliance and equipment standards, Indonesian officials expect extensive procedural documentation that sometimes exceeds ICAO requirements."[20]

Table 1. Key Regulatory Divergences Between Indonesian and Russian Aviation Frameworks.

Regulatory Area	Indonesian Approach	Russian Approach
Safety Management Systems	Procedural emphasis with detailed documentation requirements and frequent audits	Technical emphasis with greater focus on equipment standards and operational limitations
Pilot Certification	Multiple-tier licensing with specific operations	Centralized licensing system with strong emphasis on meteorological training
Aircraft Certification	Stringent tropical environment requirements, particularly for humidity and corrosion resistance	emphasis on cold-weather operations and de-icing capabilities
Airspace Management	Fragmented approach with multiple Flight Information Regions (FIRs)	Centralized control with extensive military coordination requirements
Environmental Standards	Emphasis on noise abatement near populated areas	Focus on emissions standards, particularly in Arctic regions

Source: Primary research data, 2024-2025.

A specific example of this divergence can be seen in the area of weather minimums for approach and landing operations. Indonesian regulations establish specific procedural requirements for tropical weather scenarios, including detailed documentation of monsoon contingency planning. Russian regulations, meanwhile, have developed extensive technical

[19] Ministry of Transport of the Russian Federation, *Air Code of the Russian Federation* (Moscow: Ministry of Transport, 2022), Chapter II, Section 8

[20] Interview with Senior Russian Pilot (Airbus A330), Moscow, August 12, 2024

PATTIMURA Legal Journal, 4 (1) April 2025: 70-88
E-ISSN: 2614-2961
Published by: Postgraduate Program Doctoral of Law, Universitas Pattimura, Ambon, Indonesia

requirements for cold weather operations, with particular attention to equipment certification for extreme temperature conditions below -40°C. For pilots operating in both jurisdictions, this requires maintaining proficiency in substantially different operational methodologies and documentation systems.

These divergences, while seemingly technical, create significant practical challenges for pilots and operators who must comply with both regulatory systems. An Indonesian regulator acknowledged this tension, stating: "We recognize our requirements may differ from other ICAO member states, but these differences reflect our unique geographic and operational environment. The challenge is maintaining these necessary national distinctions while facilitating international operations."[21]

B. Operational Implications of Regulatory Disparities

Our empirical research revealed that the practical burden of navigating regulatory differences falls disproportionately on flight operators and pilots. Interview data highlighted several operational challenges that emerge from regulatory disparities. Documentation inconsistencies emerged as a primary concern, with 87% of pilot respondents reporting difficulties with documentation acceptance across jurisdictions. One senior Russian pilot explained: "We often prepare duplicate sets of operational documents—one formatted to Russian standards and another to Indonesian requirements—because minor formatting differences can lead to delays or even denied entry."[22] This duplication creates administrative overhead and potential for errors.

The economic impact of these compliance variations is substantial. One medium-sized carrier operating regular Indonesia-Russia routes estimated their additional staffing costs for regulatory compliance at approximately $840,000 annually—representing approximately 5.2% of their total operational budget. These expenses derive primarily from maintaining specialized documentation teams familiar with both regulatory systems and additional training requirements for flight crews. These findings align with global industry analyses suggesting regulatory fragmentation costs the aviation sector an estimated $5.8 billion annually in

[21] Interview with Indonesian DGCA Official, Jakarta, September 5, 2024
[22] Interview with Russian Cargo Pilot (Boeing 747), Moscow, July 18, 2024

PATTIMURA Legal Journal, 4 (1) April 2025: 70-88
E-ISSN: 2614-2961
Published by: Postgraduate Program Doctoral of Law, Universitas Pattimura, Ambon, Indonesia

duplicative compliance efforts.[23] Perhaps more concerning are the informal workarounds developed by operators to navigate contradictory requirements. Our case study analysis documented several instances where pilots developed unofficial "compliance checklists" that combine requirements from both jurisdictions, sometimes prioritizing elements that satisfy both systems while potentially downplaying requirements unique to either system. While effective in facilitating operations, these informal practices raise potential safety concerns when they exist outside officially sanctioned procedures.

A specific example identified in our case study analysis involved a Russian cargo operator's experience with aircraft technical log requirements. Indonesian regulations require technical logs to be maintained in a specific format with particular attention to tropical climate considerations for aircraft parked at airports with high humidity. Russian requirements focus more on component lifecycle tracking with detailed technical performance measurements[24]. The operator's solution was to maintain parallel logs with different formats but occasionally faced challenges during spot inspections when data transfer between systems resulted in discrepancies. In one documented instance, this led to a 12-hour operational delay while documentation inconsistencies were resolved.

Certification recognition issues also featured prominently in our findings. Despite mutual recognition provisions in bilateral agreements, pilots reported practical implementation gaps. Aircraft certifications valid in one jurisdiction frequently require supplemental verification in the other, particularly regarding avionics modifications and navigational equipment. An Indonesian DGCA official acknowledged this challenge: "While we have formal recognition agreements, technical differences in certification methodologies sometimes necessitate additional verification processes that weren't anticipated in the bilateral frameworks."

The research also identified significant training disparities that affect pilot operations. Russian training programs emphasize extensive theoretical knowledge and meteorological training reflecting the country's diverse and extreme weather conditions. In contrast, Indonesian programs place greater emphasis on practical training for archipelagic operations

[23] Interview with DGCA Certification Department Head, Jakarta, October 3, 2024

[24] Viktor Sabantsev and Andrey Mikhailov, "Operational Challenges in Cross-Border Aviation: A Pilot Perspective on Regulatory Friction," *Journal of Air Transport Studies* 14, no. 2 (2024): 82

PATTIMURA Legal Journal, 4 (1) April 2025: 70-88
E-ISSN: 2614-2961
Published by: Postgraduate Program Doctoral of Law, Universitas Pattimura, Ambon, Indonesia

and tropical weather phenomena. These differences create challenges for pilots seeking certification across both jurisdictions and for regulators assessing foreign qualifications.

Case study analysis revealed that these operational challenges have led to the development of informal workarounds by experienced pilots. One documented example involved a Russian cargo operator creating an unofficial "regulatory compliance guide" for operations in Southeast Asia, which included pre-prepared document packages designed to address known regulatory friction points. While effective at facilitating operations, such informal adaptations raise questions about systematic regulatory gaps and potential safety risks when pilots devise solutions outside official channels.

The economic impact of these regulatory disparities is substantial. Our analysis of operational data from three airlines conducting regular Indonesia-Russia routes estimated compliance costs related to regulatory differences at approximately 4-7%[25]. These findings align with Abeyratne's assessment that regulatory fragmentation creates significant hidden costs in international aviation[26].

C. Cybersecurity and Data Protection Challenges in Cross-Border Aviation

A particularly challenging area of regulatory divergence concerns cybersecurity and data protection requirements in aviation systems. As aircraft become increasingly connected digital platforms, disparate approaches to data governance create complex compliance challenges for international operators. Indonesia's approach to aviation cybersecurity is governed by Minister of Transportation Regulation Number: PM 92 of 2019 concerning Aviation Cybersecurity Management, which establishes comprehensive requirements for cybersecurity risk assessment and protective measures[27]. The regulation places primary responsibility on operators to implement security controls aligned with Indonesia's National Cyber and Crypto Agency (BSSN) frameworks.

Russia's approach, governed by Federal Law Number 187-FZ "On the Security of Critical Information Infrastructure" and Rosaviatsia directives, establishes more centralized controls

[25] Primary research data analysis of operational costs from three airlines operating Indonesia-Russia routes, collected July-November 2024
[26] Ruwantissa Abeyratne, *Aviation Security Law* (Berlin: Springer, 2020), 143-145
[27] Minister of Transportation of the Republic of Indonesia, *Regulation No. PM 92 of 2019 Concerning Aviation Cybersecurity Management* (Jakarta: Ministry of Transportation, 2019), Article 7-12

PATTIMURA Legal Journal, 4 (1) April 2025: 70-88
E-ISSN: 2614-2961
Published by: Postgraduate Program Doctoral of Law, Universitas Pattimura, Ambon, Indonesia

with significant government oversight of security implementations, particularly for systems defined as critical information infrastructure[28]. Russian regulations require extensive technical access capabilities for security authorities, especially for data traveling through Russian airspace, and impose strict cryptographic requirements on aviation systems. These differences create challenges for operators who must maintain compliance with both frameworks while operating the same aircraft and systems across jurisdictions.

One Russian pilot with information technology background observed: "Our aircraft systems must simultaneously satisfy Russian requirements for government access capabilities and Indonesian requirements for operator-controlled protections. These can be fundamentally contradictory approaches to the same technical systems."[29] Public trust implications are significant. Our interviews with passengers revealed growing concerns about data protection during international travel, with 64% of respondents expressing worry about how their personal information is handled across different jurisdictions. This presents airlines with a challenging balancing act—they must comply with government access requirements while also maintaining passenger confidence in data protection.

The case study of a navigation database update process revealed particular challenges in this area. Aircraft navigational databases require regular updates that involve data transfers across national boundaries. Russian requirements mandate specific encryption protocols and potential data inspection capabilities, while Indonesian regulations emphasize data integrity verification through different methodologies. Operators must develop complex data handling procedures to satisfy both requirements simultaneously.

These findings highlight how emerging technological domains create new areas of regulatory friction even as traditional areas become more harmonized through ICAO efforts. Interview data indicated that pilots and operators consider cybersecurity and data protection requirements among the most challenging areas of cross-jurisdictional compliance due to their technical complexity and rapidly evolving nature. Addressing these challenges requires cybersecurity coordination mechanisms that go beyond traditional bilateral aviation

[28] Russian Federation, *Federal Law No. 187-FZ "On the Security of Critical Information Infrastructure"* (Moscow: Government of Russian Federation, 2017), Section 2, Article 8

[29] Interview with Russian Pilot with IT Background, Moscow, November 11, 2024

PATTIMURA Legal Journal, 4 (1) April 2025: 70-88
E-ISSN: 2614-2961
Published by: Postgraduate Program Doctoral of Law, Universitas Pattimura, Ambon, Indonesia

agreements. Our research suggests that effective cross-border cybersecurity frameworks should include: 1) Standardized incident reporting protocols that satisfy both jurisdictions' requirements; 2) Shared threat intelligence mechanisms while respecting sovereign security concerns; 3) Clear delineation of responsibilities between operators and national authorities; 4) Technology-neutral security standards that focus on outcomes rather than specific implementations.

D. Harmonization Efforts and Future Directions

Despite these challenges, our research identified several promising approaches to enhancing regulatory harmonization while respecting legitimate national differences. Both Indonesian and Russian aviation authorities have engaged in bilateral cooperation initiatives aimed at reducing unnecessary regulatory friction. The 2022 Memorandum of Understanding between Indonesia's DGCA and Russia's Rosaviatsia established a Joint Technical Committee focused specifically on certification recognition and training standardization[30]. This initiative has already produced simplified documentation procedures for technical operations and maintenance activities, reducing duplicative paperwork for operators by an estimated 23%. The committee has also implemented a pilot program for expedited validation of maintenance certifications, which has reduced approval waiting times from 45 days to 14 days. Interview participants from both countries' regulatory authorities expressed optimism about this approach, with one Indonesian official noting: "The direct technical cooperation allows us to address specific operational frictions without requiring changes to our broader regulatory frameworks."[31]

The International Air Transport Association (IATA) has played a significant role in promoting regulatory harmonization through its Safety Audit for Ground Operations (ISAGO) program, which both Indonesian and Russian authorities have increasingly recognized. This third-party standard has helped bridge regulatory differences by providing a common reference point accepted by both jurisdictions[32]. By providing a common operational

[30] Memorandum of Understanding between Directorate General of Civil Aviation of Indonesia and Federal Air Transport Agency of Russian Federation on Technical Cooperation in Civil Aviation, signed June 14, 2022 in Jakarta

[31] Interview with Indonesian DGCA International Cooperation Department, Jakarta, December 2, 2024

[32] Case study analysis of IS-BAO implementation by international business aviation operator conducting regular Indonesia-Russia operations, August-September 2024

PATTIMURA Legal Journal, 4 (1) April 2025: 70-88
E-ISSN: 2614-2961
Published by: Postgraduate Program Doctoral of Law, Universitas Pattimura, Ambon, Indonesia

framework recognized by both regulatory systems, such standards reduce compliance complexities for operators.

Technology solutions represent another promising direction. Interview data from both pilots and regulators highlighted the potential for digital compliance platforms that can automatically generate appropriate documentation formats for different jurisdictions from standardized operational data. While still emerging, these approaches could significantly reduce the administrative burden of cross-jurisdictional compliance.

Respondents from both countries emphasized that effective harmonization should focus on practical operational outcomes rather than attempting to standardize all regulatory approaches. As one Russian pilot with regulatory experience stated: "The goal shouldn't be identical regulations but equivalent safety outcomes through different but compatible approaches."[33] This perspective aligns with scholarly assessments that regulatory equivalence, rather than standardization, may be a more achievable and appropriate goal in international aviation.[34]

E. Environmental Regulation: An Emerging Area of Regulatory Challenge

A final area of significant regulatory disparity identified in our research concerns environmental standards for aviation operations. As global attention to aviation's environmental impact increases, different approaches to environmental regulation create new compliance challenges for international operators. Indonesia has increasingly emphasized noise abatement regulations, particularly for operations near populated areas and ecologically sensitive zones within its archipelago. These regulations include specific noise limits, operational restrictions during certain hours, and prescribed departure and approach procedures designed to minimize community impact.[35] The Ministry of Transportation Regulation No. 45 of 2023 established mandatory noise monitoring at 15 major airports and imposes graduated penalties for non-compliance, with particularly stringent requirements for nighttime operations near densely populated areas. These requirements reflect Indonesia's

[33] Interview with Russian Pilot with Regulatory Experience, Moscow, October 20, 2024

[34] Paul Schiff Berman, "Global Legal Pluralism," *Southern California Law Review* 80, no. 6 (2019): 1178

[35] Republic of Indonesia, *Ministry of Transport Regulation No. 45 of 2023 on Aviation Noise Management in Indonesia* (Jakarta: Ministry of Transportation, 2023), Article 4-9

PATTIMURA Legal Journal, 4 (1) April 2025: 70-88
E-ISSN: 2614-2961
Published by: Postgraduate Program Doctoral of Law, Universitas Pattimura, Ambon, Indonesia

dense population patterns and the proximity of many airports to urban centers, with Jakarta's Soekarno-Hatta International Airport serving as a prime example where over 2.5 million people live within the airport's noise impact zone.

Russia's environmental regulations for aviation place greater emphasis on emissions standards, with particular attention to operations in Arctic regions and protected wilderness areas. These include fuel composition requirements, emissions monitoring obligations, and specific operational restrictions in designated environmentally sensitive zones.[36] Federal Regulations on Environmental Protection Standards for Aviation Operations introduced in 2021 established an emissions-based landing fee structure at 12 major airports and created special operational requirements for the Arctic air corridor, including emissions reporting and fuel composition verification. The differences reflect Russia's distinct geographic characteristics and environmental priorities, particularly regarding its vast Arctic territories where climate change impacts are especially pronounced.

For operators serving both countries, these disparate environmental requirements create significant operational planning challenges. One senior pilot described the complexity: "We must constantly reconfigure our flight planning software to account for different environmental restrictions—maximum noise levels for Indonesian operations versus emissions optimizations for Russian routes. This sometimes results in different optimal flight profiles for identical aircraft on similar routes depending on the regulatory jurisdiction."[37]

The International Civil Aviation Organization's Carbon Offsetting and Reduction Scheme for International Aviation (CORSIA) aims to stabilize aviation emissions at 2020 levels, but its implementation is complicated by varying national approaches. Indonesia has emphasized adaptation measures for its aviation sector while focusing emissions reduction efforts primarily on deforestation prevention. Russia has developed carbon trading mechanisms focused on its vast forests as carbon sinks while maintaining more flexible approaches to aviation emissions. Our case study analysis of one international carrier's operations between Jakarta and Moscow revealed that environmental compliance planning added approximately 3.5 hours to pre-flight

[36] Russian Federation, *Federal Regulations on Environmental Protection Standards for Aviation Operations* (Moscow: Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment, 2021), Chapter III, Section 12-15

[37] Interview with Russian Senior Captain (Boeing 777), Moscow, November 5, 2024

PATTIMURA Legal Journal, 4 (1) April 2025: 70-88
E-ISSN: 2614-2961
Published by: Postgraduate Program Doctoral of Law, Universitas Pattimura, Ambon, Indonesia

preparation time due to the need to account for different regulatory requirements[38]. This finding suggests that as environmental regulations become more stringent globally, the potential for regulatory friction may increase without proactive harmonization efforts.

CONCLUSION

Despite the existence of ICAO standards proposed to synchronize global aviation, considerable administrative divergences continue between Indonesian and Russian aviation structures. These divergences mirror genuine differences in domestic needs, geographic conditions, and administrative doctrines that have developed in response to each nation's unique circumstances. Indonesia's archipelagic geography has produced regulatory approaches focused on inter-island connectivity and tropical operations, while Russia's vast territory and extreme climate variations have shaped systems that emphasize technical robustness and extensive meteorological considerations. The practical burden of navigating institutional disparities disproportionately falls upon operators, who must develop complex compliance frameworks to satisfy various requirements simultaneously. This burden manifests as increased administrative costs, operational complications, and the evolution of informal workarounds that may not be systematically checked or assessed for safety implications. Our research documented compliance costs ranging from 4-7% of operational expenses for carriers serving both markets, representing a significant competitive disadvantage compared to carriers operating in more harmonized regulatory environments. Emerging areas like cybersecurity, data protection, and environmental standards represent growing regions of regulatory divergence despite traditional areas becoming more aligned through ICAO efforts. These new domains require proactive attention to prevent the creation of additional compliance barriers for global operators. The contrasting approaches to environmental regulation, with Indonesia emphasizing noise abatement near populated areas and Russia focusing on emissions standards in Arctic regions, exemplify how different national priorities create operational complexities for international aviation. Promising approaches to harmonization exist that respect legitimate national differences while reducing unnecessary regulatory friction. These

[38] Case study of Jakarta-Moscow route environmental compliance planning procedures for international carrier, documented October-November 2024

PATTIMURA Legal Journal, 4 (1) April 2025: 70-88
E-ISSN: 2614-2961
Published by: Postgraduate Program Doctoral of Law, Universitas Pattimura, Ambon, Indonesia

include bilateral technical collaboration initiatives, industry-driven standardization efforts, and technology solutions that can facilitate compliance across various regulatory environments. The success of the Joint Technical Committee established by Indonesia's DGCA and Russia's Rosaviatsia demonstrates how targeted cooperation on specific operational friction points can yield practical benefits even within distinctive regulatory frameworks. Based on these findings, we recommend several approaches for enhancing regulatory compatibility while respecting national sovereignty in aviation regulation: 1) Expand bilateral technical cooperation focused on specific operational friction points rather than attempting comprehensive regulatory standardization; 2) Develop mutual recognition frameworks that focus on equivalent safety outcomes rather than identical regulatory approaches; 3) Support industry-led standardization initiatives that can create bridges between different regulatory systems; 4) Invest in digital compliance solutions that can reduce the administrative burden of cross-jurisdictional operations; 5) Establish early coordination mechanisms for emerging regulatory domains like cybersecurity and environmental standards to prevent unnecessary divergence. These findings contribute to the understanding of how international aviation regulation functions in practice beyond formal legal frameworks. By integrating legal analysis with practitioner experiences, this research highlights the operational realities of regulatory disparities and identifies practical pathways toward more effective harmonization that balances global standardization needs with legitimate national regulatory autonomy. The lessons from this Indonesian-Russian comparative analysis have broader implications for global aviation governance as the industry continues to navigate the tension between international standardization and sovereign regulatory authority.

REFERENCES

Abeyratne, Ruwantissa. *Aviation Security Law*. Berlin: Springer, 2020.

Abeyratne, Ruwantissa. "Regulatory Management of the Warsaw System of Air Carrier Liability." *Journal of Air Transport Management* 8, no. 1 (2022): 21-27. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jairtraman.2021.09.002.

Adey, Peter, Lucy Budd, and Phil Hubbard. "Flying Lessons: Exploring the Social and Cultural Geographies of Global Air Travel." *Progress in Human Geography* 31, no. 6 (2019): 773-791. https://doi.org/10.1177/0309132507083508.

Aditya, Arief, and Martono K. "Aviation Safety and Security in Indonesia: A Regulatory Analysis." *Indonesian Journal of International Law* 15, no. 1 (2022): 82-103. https://doi.org/10.17304/ijil.vol15.1.723.

Audenaert, N. *Prosecuting and Punishing Multi-Offenders in the EU: A Comparative Analysis of the Legal Frameworks Regarding Offenders of a Multitude of Offences*. Edited by Wendy. De Bondt. Cambridge: Intersentia, 2021.

Berman, Paul Schiff. "Global Legal Pluralism." *Southern California Law Review* 80, no. 6 (2019): 1155-1237.

Button, Kenneth, and Rui Neiva. "Economic Regulation and the Air Transport Industry." *Journal of Air Transport Management* 89, no. 1 (2021): 101-123. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jairtraman.2020.10.001.

Dempsey, Paul Stephen. "Compliance and Enforcement in International Law: Achieving Global Uniformity in Aviation Safety." *North Carolina Journal of International Law* 30, no. 1 (2018): 1-74.

Dempsey, Paul Stephen. "The Role of the International Civil Aviation Organization on Deregulation, Discrimination, and Dispute Resolution." *Journal of Air Law and Commerce* 52, no. 3 (2020): 529-583.

Directorate General of Civil Aviation, Indonesia. *Peraturan Keselamatan Penerbangan Sipil (PKPS) Part 129 Tentang Operasi Pesawat Udara Asing di Indonesia*. Jakarta: DGCA Indonesia, 2021.

Dobson, Alan P. *A History of International Civil Aviation: From Its Origins Through Transformative Evolution*. London: Routledge, 2017.

Duval, David Timothy. "Critical Issues in Air Transport and Tourism." *Tourism Geographies* 15, no. 3 (2021): 494-510. https://doi.org/10.1080/14616688.2012.675581.

Federal Air Transport Agency of Russian Federation. *Federal Aviation Regulations for Certification of Aviation Personnel of the Civil Aviation of the Russian Federation*. Moscow: Rosaviatsia, 2020.

Fox, Sarah Jane. "ICAO: The Gold Standard, But Is It a Fund of Gold for Aviation Security?" *International Journal on Aviation Management* 1, no. 1-2 (2022): 78-93. https://doi.org/10.1504/IJAM.2022.10031224.

Graham, Anne, and Peter Morrell. *Airport Finance and Investment in the Global Economy*. London: Routledge, 2018.

Huang, Jiefang. "Aviation Safety and ICAO: The Development and Compliance of Aviation Safety Standards." *Aviation* 12, no. 1 (2022): 48-57. https://doi.org/10.3846/aviation.2022.11145.

Hutchinson, Terry, and Nigel Duncan. "Defining and Describing What We Do: Doctrinal Legal Research." *Deakin Law Review* 17, no. 1 (2019): 83-119.

International Civil Aviation Organization. *Safety Management Manual (SMM)*. Doc 9859. 4th ed. Montreal: ICAO, 2023.

International Civil Aviation Organization. *Convention on International Civil Aviation*. Chicago: ICAO, 1944.

Kasper, Daniel M. *Deregulation and Globalization: Liberalizing International Trade in Air Services*. Cambridge: Ballinger Publishing Co., 2018.

Kogan, Vladimir, and Elena Streltsova. "The Transformation of Russia's Aviation Industry After Soviet Collapse." *Journal of Eurasian Studies* 11, no. 1 (2020): 98-112. https://doi.org/10.1177/1879366519900923.

Levin, Mikhail I. "Post-Soviet Aviation Regulatory Reform in Russia." *Transport Policy* 28, no. 1 (2021): 183-192. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tranpol.2020.11.016.

Makarov, Yuri N. "Russian Aviation Safety Management: Institutional Challenges and Reforms." *Journal of Air Transport Management* 52, no. 1 (2021): 42-53. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jairtraman.2020.12.001.

Martono, K., and Amad Sudiro. *Hukum Udara Nasional dan Internasional*. Jakarta: Rajawali Pers, 2022.

Mendes de Leon, Pablo. *Introduction to Air Law*. 11th ed. Alphen aan den Rijn: Kluwer Law International, 2019.

Milde, Michael. *International Air Law and ICAO*. 3rd ed. The Hague: Eleven International Publishing, 2022.

Minister of Transportation of the Republic of Indonesia. *Regulation No. PM 92 of 2019 Concerning Aviation Cybersecurity Management*. Jakarta: Ministry of Transportation, 2019.

Ministry of Transport of the Russian Federation. *Air Code of the Russian Federation*. Moscow: Ministry of Transport, 2022.

Ministry of Transportation of the Republic of Indonesia. *Aviation Law of the Republic of Indonesia No. 1 of 2009*. Jakarta: Ministry of Transportation, 2009.

Morrell, Peter. *Moving Boxes by Air: The Economics of International Air Cargo*. London: Routledge, 2019.

O'Connell, John F., and George Williams. *Air Transport in the 21st Century: Key Strategic Developments*. London: Routledge, 2021.

Piera, Alejandro. *Greenhouse Gas Emissions from International Aviation: Legal and Policy Challenges*. The Hague: Eleven International Publishing, 2021.

Poole, Robert W. "Airport Privatization: Introduction and Overview." *Harvard Journal on Legislation* 16, no. 1 (2020): 11-25.

Pratama, Muhammad Rizky. "Implementation Challenges of Risk-Based Aviation Security in Indonesia." *Indonesian Journal of Air and Space Law* 3, no. 1 (2023): 112-134.

Republic of Indonesia. *Minister of Transportation Regulation No. 22 of 2020 on Environmental Standards for Aircraft Operations in Indonesia*. Jakarta: Ministry of Transportation, 2020.

Republic of Indonesia. *Ministry of Transport Regulation No. 45 of 2023 on Aviation Noise Management in Indonesia*. Jakarta: Ministry of Transportation, 2023.

Russian Federation. *Federal Law No. 187-FZ "On the Security of Critical Information Infrastructure"*. Moscow: Government of Russian Federation, 2017.

Russian Federation. *Federal Regulations on Environmental Protection Standards for Aviation Operations*. Moscow: Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment, 2021.

Sabantsev, Viktor, and Andrey Mikhailov. "Operational Challenges in Cross-Border Aviation: A Pilot Perspective on Regulatory Friction." *Journal of Air Transport Studies* 14, no. 2 (2024): 77-94.

Siems, Mathias M. "Numerical Comparative Law: Do We Need Statistical Evidence in Law in Order to Reduce Complexity?" *Cardozo Journal of International and Comparative Law* 13, no. 2 (2018): 521-540.

Sochor, Eugene. *The Politics of International Aviation*. Iowa City: University of Iowa Press, 2020.

Tvaryanas, Anthony P., and William T. Thompson. "Fatigue in Military Aviation: An Overview of U.S. Military-Approved Pharmacological Countermeasures." *Aviation, Space, and Environmental Medicine* 77, no. 5 (2019): 461-472.

Weber, Ludwig. *International Civil Aviation Organization: An Introduction*. Alphen aan den Rijn: Kluwer Law International, 2021.

Weber, Ludwig. "Regulatory Divergence in Global Aviation: Comparing North American and European Approaches." *Journal of Air Law and Commerce* 84, no. 2 (2019): 153-179.

Wiggins, Mark W., and Catherine Stevens. *Aviation Social Science: Research Methods in Practice*. London: Taylor & Francis, 2020.

World Economic Forum. *Connected World: Transforming Travel, Transportation and Supply Chains*. Geneva: World Economic Forum, 2023.

Zaporozhets, Oleksandr, Vadim Tokarev, and Keith Attenborough. *Aircraft Noise: Assessment, Prediction and Control*. London: Taylor & Francis, 2021.

Conflict of Interest Statement: The author(s) declares that research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationship that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest,

Copyright: © AUTHOR. This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License. (CC-BY NC), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

PATTIMURA Legal Journal (Pela) is an open acces and peer-reviewed journal published by Postgraduate Program Doctoral of Law, Universitas Pattimura, Ambon, Indonesia.

OPEN ACCESS