JURNAL KONSTATERING
published by
Master of Notary Law, Faculty of Law
Sultan Agung Islamic University

ISSN: 2828-4836
https://garuda.kemdiktisaintek.go.id/journal/view/43046

Validity of Authentic Deeds for Cryptocurrency Transactions in Indonesia

Fadhil Muhammad Rafi
Faculty of Law, Universitas Islam Sultan Agung, Semarang, Indonesia E-mail: faadhaw@gmail.com

Abstract. *The rapid development of information and communication technology has given rise to cryptocurrency as a decentralized, blockchain-based digital financial instrument. In Indonesia, the adoption of crypto assets has grown very rapidly, yet this growth has not been matched by adequate legal clarity, raising questions about the validity of authentic deeds as an evidentiary instrument in cryptocurrency transactions. This article aims to analyze the implementation of authentic deed-making for cryptocurrency transactions and the resolution mechanisms for the juridical and technical obstacles involved. The research employs a normative juridical method with a statutory and conceptual approach, supported by a literature study of relevant laws, regulations, academic literature, and court decisions. The findings show that although cryptocurrency has not been recognized as a legitimate means of payment, its status as intangible movable property opens the possibility for notaries to draw up authentic deeds as long as the formal and material requirements of the Notary Position Law are met. The main obstacles include the duality of regulation, a legal vacuum (rechtsvacuum), difficulties in verifying ownership due to the pseudonymous nature of blockchain, and the limited technological competence of notaries. The recommended resolution mechanism is multidimensional, covering the harmonization of cross-institutional regulations, the drafting of technical guidelines and standard operating procedures for crypto-asset deeds, improving notaries' competence through education and certification, the use of digital verification technology, and strengthening nonlitigation dispute resolution channels. Through these measures, authentic deeds can be optimally utilized as evidence that provides legal certainty for parties in cryptocurrency transactions in Indonesia.*

Keywords: *Authentic; Cryptocurrencies; Deed; Legal; Validity.*

1. Introduction

The development of information and communication technology over the past two decades has brought about a paradigmatic shift in the fabric of society, including in economic and financial transactions. Cryptocurrency emerges as a manifestation of the digital revolution in the global financial system, challenging conventional concepts of money, ownership, and transaction mechanisms. The emergence of these digital assets raises fundamental questions about the relevance of traditional legal instruments, particularly authentic deeds, in accommodating virtual, decentralized, and cross-border transactions.

Philosophically, law is required to provide certainty (*rechtssicherheit)*, justice (*gerechtigkeit*), and utility *(zweckmassigkeit*), as proposed by Gustav Radbruch through the theory of three basic legal values. These three values are relevant as a basis for assessing the validity of authentic deeds for cryptocurrency transactions, because legal certainty is necessary for parties transacting using digital assets to obtain adequate protection, justice is necessary for all parties to obtain equal rights, and utility is necessary for the law to adapt to the pace of technological development without hindering digital economic innovation. Notaries, as public officials authorized to create authentic deeds, play a strategic role in realizing these three values.

From a legal and normative perspective, the status of cryptocurrency in Indonesia is subject to dual regulatory constraints, creating legal uncertainty. On the one hand, Bank Indonesia, through Bank Indonesia Regulation Number 19/12/PBI/2017 concerning the Implementation of Financial Technology, expressly prohibits the use of cryptocurrency as a means of payment, in line with the provisions of Law Number 7 of 2011 concerning Currency, as amended by Law Number 4 of 2023 concerning the Development and Strengthening of the Financial Sector, which affirms that the Rupiah is the sole legal tender in Indonesia. On the other hand, crypto assets are recognized as tradable commodities through Commodity Futures Trading Supervisory Agency Regulation Number 5 of 2019, which was later updated by Regulation Number 8 of 2021.

Recent regulatory developments indicate efforts at harmonization. Government Regulation Number 49 of 2024 transferred the regulatory and supervisory authority for digital financial assets, including crypto assets, from Bappebti to the Financial Services Authority (OJK) effective January 10, 2025. This was then followed up by Financial Services Authority Regulation Number 27 of 2024 concerning the Implementation of Digital Financial Asset Trading, Including Crypto Assets. However, there is no single provision in Law Number 2 of 2014 concerning Amendments to Law Number 30 of 2004 concerning the Position of Notary (UUJN) that specifically regulates the preparation of deeds for digital asset transactions, creating a legal vacuum that needs to be bridged through in-depth legal review.

In fact, cryptocurrency adoption in Indonesia has grown rapidly. Chainalysis' Global Crypto Adoption Index ranked Indonesia eighth in the world in 2023, rising to third in 2024, with a total transaction value of USD 157.1 billion. Financial Services Authority (OJK) data shows that as of December 2024, the number of crypto asset customers had reached 22.91 million, with a transaction value of IDR 650.61 trillion throughout 2024, a 335.91 percent year-on-year increase. This rapid growth has not been matched by clear legal status and adequate protection instruments for transacting parties.

In practice, many large-value cryptocurrency transactions are conducted without strong legal support, relying solely on digital evidence in the form of screenshots, emails, or transaction records on exchange platforms that are vulnerable to manipulation. The urgency of this issue is illustrated by the Wates Religious Court's decision No. 222/Pdt.G/2024/PA.Wt dated July 18, 2024, in which joint assets in the form of cryptocurrency investments worth over IDR 1.7 billion were the subject of a joint property dispute without adequate authentic documentation. This case confirms that the issue of the validity of authentic deeds for cryptocurrency transactions is not merely academic discourse but a pressing practical need.

Based on this description, this article is written to address two main questions: first, how authentic deeds for cryptocurrency transactions are implemented in Indonesia, from the perspective of the legal status of crypto assets and the authority of notaries; and second, how the legal and technical obstacles encountered in ensuring the validity of authentic deeds for cryptocurrency transactions in Indonesia are resolved. The purpose of this paper is to provide a comprehensive understanding of the legal basis, practices, and challenges of authentic deeds for cryptocurrency transactions, while also formulating solution recommendations for notaries, regulators, and other stakeholders.

The research underlying this article employs a normative juridical method with a statutory and conceptual approach. Legal materials were collected through a literature review, encompassing relevant laws and regulations, academic literature, scientific journals, and court decisions. They were then analyzed descriptively and qualitatively to obtain a comprehensive picture of the legal validity issues facing cryptocurrency transactions in Indonesia.

The novelty of this article lies in its attempt to integrate three areas of study that have tended to be discussed separately: notarial law, digital financial law, and the technical aspects of blockchain technology. Most previous literature primarily discusses the legal status of cryptocurrency from the perspective of banking and capital markets law, or discusses notary authority in general without specifically linking it to blockchain-based transactions. This article seeks to fill this gap by positioning authentic deeds as the meeting point between conventional legal certainty and digital financial innovation, while simultaneously formulating an applicable resolution mechanism for notaries in carrying out their duties and authorities.

This article is structured as follows. The second section discusses the implementation of authentic deeds for cryptocurrency transactions, covering the legal status of cryptocurrency, its classification as an object of civil law, the authority and requirements of notaries in drafting deeds, and their implementation practices in the field. The third section discusses the mechanisms for resolving the legal, technical, and practical obstacles encountered, encompassing regulatory, institutional, technological, and dispute resolution approaches. The fourth section contains conclusions and recommendations to conclude this article.

2. Implementation

The Legal Status of Cryptocurrency in the Indonesian Legal System

Discussions regarding the implementation of authentic deeds for cryptocurrency transactions should begin with a comprehensive mapping of the applicable regulatory framework, given the complexity of the regulations involving more than one state institution. This mapping is crucial so that notaries, as the parties preparing the deeds, have a complete understanding of the limitations and authority of each regulator before proceeding with the technical verification process for the transaction object.

The creation of authentic deeds for cryptocurrency transactions is inextricably linked to the clarity of the legal status of cryptocurrency itself. To date, cryptocurrency is not recognized as legal tender in Indonesia, as stipulated in Law Number 7 of 2011 concerning Currency and Bank Indonesia Regulation Number 19/12/PBI/2017. However, the recognition of cryptocurrency as a tradable commodity through futures exchanges opens up the opportunity for crypto assets to be treated as legitimate legal objects, provided they meet the administrative and technical requirements set by the competent authorities.

The transfer of supervisory authority from Bappebti to the Financial Services Authority (OJK) through Government Regulation No. 49 of 2024 represents a significant step toward strengthening the legal framework for crypto assets, as the OJK has more comprehensive supervisory instruments than Bappebti, which previously focused more on commodity futures trading. Financial Services Authority Regulation No. 27 of 2024 further strengthens this framework by regulating the implementation of digital financial asset trading in greater detail, including the obligation for providers to implement "know-your-customer" principles and record transactions. These provisions indirectly provide a database that notaries can utilize to verify identity and ownership of crypto assets when drafting deeds.

Cryptocurrency as a Legal Object from a Civil Law Perspective

From a civil law perspective, cryptocurrency can be categorized as an object within the meaning of Article 499 of the Civil Code (KUHPerdata), namely anything that can be owned, whether tangible or intangible. The lack of a physical form of cryptocurrency does not preclude its status as an intangible movable property that can be the object of a transaction, as long as its economic value can be identified and ownership can be proven. This classification forms the basis of the legal argument that cryptocurrency can be the object of an authentic deed as long as it meets the element of object certainty as required in the creation of agreements in general.

The experiences of several jurisdictions can serve as a comparison for the implementation of cryptocurrency regulations. Japan, through its Financial Services Agency regulations, has recognized Bitcoin as legal tender since 2017, along with mandatory registration for exchange operators and strict oversight to prevent money laundering. The United States, through the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, treats cryptocurrency as a commodity, thus subjecting it to the futures trading legal regime. The European Union is developing a harmonized legal framework through the Markets in CryptoAssets (MiCA) regulation, which aims to create legal certainty and consumer protection across all member states. This comparison demonstrates that clarity of legal status is a fundamental prerequisite for the optimal implementation of legal instruments such as authentic deeds.

Notary's Authority and Requirements for Making Authentic Deeds

Article 1, number 1 of the UUJN defines a notary as a public official authorized to draw up authentic deeds as long as the deed is not specifically intended for other public officials. Article 15 of the UUJN stipulates that a notary's authority includes drawing up deeds concerning all acts, agreements, and determinations required by statutory regulations or desired by interested parties. This provision is open-ended, so it does not preclude the possibility of a notary drawing up deeds for cryptocurrency transactions, even though the UUJN does not explicitly regulate digital objects.

The formal and material requirements for creating an authentic deed are regulated in Articles 38 to 65 of the UUJN, which include, among other things, clarity of the identity of the parties, clarity of the object of the agreement, agreement of the parties, and compliance with the deed format stipulated by law. In the context of cryptocurrency transactions, fulfilling the requirement for clarity of object is a particular challenge because cryptocurrency is virtual and stored in a digital wallet represented by a pseudonymous private key and public key. Notaries are required to be able to translate this digital representation into a clear, measurable, and verifiable deed description, for example by including the digital wallet address, the number and type of crypto assets, transaction history on a blockchain explorer, and statements from the parties regarding the origin of ownership.

Article 1868 of the Civil Code defines an authentic deed as one drawn up in a form prescribed by law by or before an authorized public official at the location where the deed is drawn up. An authentic deed provides perfect evidentiary power (*volledig bewijskracht*) between the parties and their heirs. This perfect evidentiary nature makes authentic deeds highly relevant as a risk mitigation instrument in cryptocurrency transactions, which have largely relied on non-authentic electronic evidence that is vulnerable to manipulation.

The evidentiary power of an authentic deed basically includes three aspects, namely the external evidentiary power (*uitwendige bewijskracht*) which states that a deed that appears to be an authentic deed is considered authentic until proven otherwise, the formal evidentiary power (*formele bewijskracht)* which guarantees the accuracy of the date, signature, and presence of the parties, and the material evidentiary power (*materiele bewijskracht*) which guarantees the accuracy of the information contained in the deed. These three aspects are relevant in cryptocurrency transactions, because an authentic deed that contains accurate information about a digital object will provide a much stronger evidentiary guarantee than ordinary electronic documents which only have evidentiary power as initial evidence.

Implementation Practices for Making Deeds in the Field

The practice of creating authentic deeds for cryptocurrency transactions in Indonesia remains largely case-by-case and is not yet uniform across notary offices. Some notaries with adequate technological understanding have begun developing their own approaches to drafting deeds involving cryptocurrency, for example, by including a printed copy of the transaction history from a blockchain explorer, signed by the parties, as an integral part of the deed. However, this approach is not yet based on generally accepted standard guidelines, so the quality and level of care applied can vary between notaries, depending on their level of technological understanding.

In practice, cryptocurrency transactions are generally conducted through exchange platforms that facilitate the buying and selling of crypto assets for fiat currencies. However, these transactions are rarely accompanied by the creation of authentic deeds, thus preventing the creation of legal documents that can serve as strong evidence in the event of a future dispute. However, several transactions involving significant value, such as the division of joint assets, gifts, or joint investment agreements that use cryptocurrency as the object, require legal instruments that provide certainty, such as land sale deeds or company establishment deeds.

ISSN: 2828-4836 Volume ... No..., ... 2025: ...-...

Notaries wishing to authenticate cryptocurrency transactions need to undertake additional verification steps not typical for conventional deeds, including: verifying digital wallet ownership through a cryptographic signature that proves control of the private key; tracing transaction history on a distributed ledger to ensure the legitimacy of the asset's origin; and coordinating with OJK-registered crypto asset trading providers to obtain relevant supporting data. This verification requires notaries to have a technical understanding of blockchain technology, at least sufficient to read and interpret digital transaction data.

The evidentiary value of an authentic deed is crucial in resolving disputes involving crypto assets, as illustrated in the joint property case decided by the Wates Religious Court. The absence of an authentic deed in this case necessitated proving ownership and value of the crypto assets through more complex and time-consuming evidentiary mechanisms, unlike when the parties had possessed an authentic deed that clearly outlined the object, value, and agreement regarding the crypto assets from the outset.

The Role of Notaries in the Digitalization of Notarial Services

The creation of authentic deeds for cryptocurrency transactions is inextricably linked to the general digitalization policy for notarial services. The long-standing discourse on cyber notaries in Indonesian notarial law finds new relevance in the context of digital assets, as cryptocurrency transactions are inherently born and operate entirely within a digital ecosystem. Notaries are required to act not only as passive recorders of agreements between parties but also as active participants in the search and verification of digital data to ensure that the documents contained in the deed accurately reflect the actual situation.

This active role aligns with the prudential principle inherent in the notary profession when drafting conventional deeds, such as land sale deeds, which require certificate verification at the land office. In the cryptocurrency context, similar verification can be achieved by tracing digital wallet addresses on a public, publicly verifiable distributed ledger. Therefore, notaries have adequate tools for verification, provided they possess sufficient technical knowledge.

Furthermore, the digitalization of notarial services is supported by the recognition of certified electronic signatures and electronic documents as valid evidence under the Electronic Information and Transactions Law. This recognition provides a legal basis for notaries to integrate electronic-based supporting documents, such as authenticated transaction history captures on a blockchain explorer, as attachments to authentic deeds, corroborating the parties' statements.

3. Resolution Mechanism

Legal Obstacles in the Implementation of Authentic Deeds for Cryptocurrency Transactions

This section outlines the obstacles encountered in implementing authentic deeds for cryptocurrency transactions, as identified in the previous section, and also formulates an applicable resolution mechanism. These obstacles can be grouped into three main dimensions: the legal dimension, which relates to regulatory clarity; the technical dimension, which relates to the characteristics of blockchain technology; and the institutional dimension, which relates to the readiness of notaries and related institutions to respond to developments in digital assets.

The first obstacle faced in implementing authentic deeds for cryptocurrency transactions is regulatory ambiguity. Although Bank Indonesia and the Financial Services Authority have issued several related regulations, loopholes remain, making it difficult for notaries and business actors to determine proper legal compliance. Existing regulations tend to address aspects of crypto asset trading and oversight, but they do not address the technical aspects of creating authentic deeds as legal instruments.

private.

The second obstacle is the duality of regulations that creates confusion regarding the status of cryptocurrencies, whether they are commodities, digital assets, or investment instruments. This uncertainty over classification raises the risk that transactions documented in authentic deeds could be challenged in the future if there are changes in policy or legal interpretation. The third obstacle is the legal vacuum (rechtsvacuum) regarding the procedures for resolving disputes arising from cryptocurrency transactions, including the absence of standard guidelines regarding deed formats, mandatory clauses, and the verification mechanism for digital objects in notarial deeds.

Technical and Practical Constraints

In addition to legal constraints, the creation of authentic deeds for cryptocurrency transactions also faces technical challenges. These challenges stem primarily from the fundamental characteristics of blockchain technology itself, which is designed to operate decentralized without a central authority managing user identities, unlike conventional financial systems that always require a link between an account and its owner's official identity. This difference in design philosophy is at the root of most of the technical difficulties notaries face in verifying cryptocurrency transactions.

In addition to legal constraints, the creation of authentic deeds for cryptocurrency transactions also faces technical challenges. Identification of ownership is a major challenge because the decentralized nature and pseudonymity inherent in blockchain technology mean that ownership of digital assets cannot always be proven in the same way as physical assets. Transaction verification also requires time and a thorough understanding of blockchain mechanisms, including the concept of transaction confirmation and the potential for chain forks that could impact the validity of ownership history.

Documenting cryptocurrency transactions also presents a challenge because available evidence generally consists of app screenshots, confirmation emails, or printed transaction histories on exchange platforms, which may not meet the evidentiary standards required for authentic deeds. Notaries are required to prepare supporting documents that not only meet legal requirements but are also understandable to all parties involved, necessitating cross-disciplinary skills across legal and information technology.

Notary competence is an equally significant practical obstacle. A survey conducted by the Indonesian Notaries Association/Association showed that only around 30% of notaries feel they have an adequate understanding of blockchain and cryptocurrency technology, potentially leading to inaccuracies in deed preparation and legal risks for the parties. This obstacle is exacerbated by the limited technological infrastructure in most notary offices, which lack adequate access to blockchain verification tools.

Legal Risks for Notaries and Parties

Legal risks for notaries in preparing cryptocurrency transaction deeds can include lawsuits due to errors in the deed or non-compliance with applicable regulations, especially if the facilitated transaction results in financial loss for one of the parties. For the parties, legal risks can arise from the uncertainty of the legal status of cryptocurrency itself; if a transaction is deemed invalid by the court, all parties involved could potentially suffer significant losses. Another risk to be aware of is the potential misuse of cryptocurrency transactions for money laundering or funding illegal activities, which requires notaries to apply the principle of prudence and stricter due diligence.

From a professional responsibility perspective, notaries are subject to the principle of professional responsibility as stipulated in the UUJN, which requires notaries to act honestly, carefully, independently, and impartially in carrying out their duties. If it is later discovered that the notary's deed contains material errors due to a lack of verification of cryptocurrency assets, the notary can be held liable, either civilly through a lawsuit for damages or administratively through the oversight mechanism of the Notary Supervisory Board. This situation emphasizes the importance of notaries having clear and documented verification standards before signing deeds involving cryptocurrency assets.

For transacting parties, legal risks can also arise from the highly volatile value of cryptocurrencies, which, if not addressed in the deed clauses, can lead to disputes regarding the value of the object at the time of execution of the obligation compared to when the deed was signed. Therefore, an authentic deed for cryptocurrency transactions should ideally contain clear clauses regarding the method for determining the conversion value, the timeframe for determining the value, and the legal consequences if significant changes in value occur before the parties' obligations are fully fulfilled.

Settlement Mechanism through a Regulatory Approach

Resolving these legal challenges requires cross-institutional regulatory harmonization, particularly between the Financial Services Authority (OJK), the Ministry of Law and Human Rights, Bank Indonesia, and notary professional organizations. This harmonization is crucial to prevent overlapping authority, which could exacerbate legal uncertainty. The government and regulators need to develop regulations specifically addressing the legal status of cryptocurrency, transaction procedures, and the creation of accompanying authentic deeds, so that notaries and parties have a clear understanding of their respective rights and obligations.

Developing technical guidelines or standard operating procedures (SOPs) for authenticating deeds for cryptocurrency transactions by professional notary organizations, in collaboration with regulators, could be a medium-term solution before legislation is enacted. These guidelines would at least include a standard deed format, mandatory clauses regarding digital object identification, ownership verification mechanisms, and provisions regarding notary responsibilities in the event of future disputes.

Consumer Protection and the Precautionary Principle

The consumer protection aspect is an inseparable dimension of the mechanism for resolving the validity of authentic deeds for cryptocurrency transactions. As parties who are in a more vulnerable position than business actors or platform organizers, consumers or cryptocurrency users require adequate protection, both in the form of an information disclosure obligation (transparency obligation) from exchange organizers and in the form of an obligation for notaries to provide legal counseling to the parties regarding the risks of cryptocurrency transactions before the deed is signed, as mandated by Article 15 paragraph (2) letter e of the UUJN concerning the obligation of notaries to provide legal counseling.

The precautionary principle applied by a notary in making a cryptocurrency transaction deed ideally includes checking the legality of the platform organizer used by the parties, including ensuring that the platform is registered and has obtained permission from the Financial Services Authority as required by

Financial Services Authority Regulation Number 27 of 2024. Transactions conducted through unlicensed platforms have a much higher legal risk, so the notary needs to provide a written note or warning to the parties if the object of the deed comes from a platform whose legality is unclear.

Settlement Mechanism through Institutional and Competency Strengthening

Improving notary competency through ongoing education and training on blockchain and cryptocurrency technology is a strategic step to overcome technical challenges. Educational programs involving collaboration between notary higher education institutions, notary professional organizations, and regulators need to be systematically developed, for example through specialized notary certification in the field of digital assets. With this increased competency, notaries are expected to be able to verify transaction objects more accurately and minimize legal risks for all parties involved.

Developing a specific authentic deed model or format for cryptocurrency transactions is also essential to provide notaries with a common reference when drafting deeds and to facilitate the parties' understanding of the contents of the deeds they sign. Ideally, the deed model should include elements of digital wallet identification, the type and amount of crypto assets, the conversion value at the time of the transaction, the transaction history on the blockchain, and a statement of responsibility from the parties for the accuracy of the submitted data.

Settlement Mechanism through the Use of Technology

The use of digital verification technology, including the concept of cyber notary, which has begun to be explored within the Indonesian notary law framework, could provide a solution to the challenges of verifying crypto asset ownership. Notaries can utilize blockchain explorer software to verify transaction history and asset ownership more efficiently, and integrate certified electronic signatures, as stipulated in Law Number 19 of 2016 concerning Amendments to Law Number 11 of 2008 concerning Electronic Information and Transactions, to strengthen the evidentiary aspect of electronic documents supporting deeds.

Additionally, notaries can consider collaborating with crypto asset trading providers registered and supervised by the Financial Services Authority to obtain officially verified transaction data, thereby minimizing reliance on one-sided statements from parties. Utilizing application programming interfaces (APIs) provided by licensed crypto asset exchanges can also assist notaries in cross-checking ownership information and transaction history submitted by the parties before the deed is signed.

Strengthening cybersecurity in notary office information systems is also a crucial part of technology-based settlement mechanisms, given that data regarding crypto asset ownership and the public keys of the parties listed in deeds is sensitive and potentially vulnerable to cybercrime if not managed with adequate security standards. Notaries need to implement data security practices that align with the principles of personal data protection as stipulated in applicable laws and regulations concerning personal data protection in Indonesia.

Dispute Resolution Mechanism

In the event of a dispute arising regarding a cryptocurrency transaction that has been outlined in an authentic deed, resolution can be pursued through litigation in court or non-litigation channels such as mediation, negotiation, or arbitration, as is customary in civil disputes in general. An authentic deed containing a clear description of the object, value, and agreement of the parties will greatly assist the evidentiary process before a judge or mediator, because the perfect evidentiary power inherent in an authentic deed reduces the need for additional, complex evidence as occurs in cases that rely solely on non-authentic electronic evidence.

Strengthening non-litigation dispute resolution channels, for example through a dedicated digital financial mediation agency coordinated by the Financial Services Authority (OJK), can also be considered a faster and more efficient mechanism than conventional judicial processes, given the often cross-jurisdictional nature of cryptocurrency transactions and the need for responsive handling to technological developments.

Lessons from Comparative Practice and Multi-Stakeholder Roles

The experiences of Japan, the United States, and the European Union in regulating cryptocurrencies demonstrate that resolving legal challenges cannot be achieved by any single institution alone, but rather requires synergy between financial sector regulators, market supervisory authorities, law enforcement officials, and relevant professional organizations. Japan, for example, has established a regulatory regime that involves the Financial Services Agency as the primary regulator, but still coordinates with the police and anti-money laundering authorities in overseeing exchange operators. This collaborative model is relevant for the Indonesian context, given the complexity of cryptocurrency regulation, which intersects with various legal fields, ranging from financial law and cyber law to notary law.

In Indonesia, this synergy can be realized through a cross-agency coordination forum involving the Financial Services Authority, Bank Indonesia, the Ministry of Law and Human Rights, the Indonesian Notaries Association, and representatives from the crypto asset industry. Such a forum can serve as a platform for formulating policies responsive to technological developments, including the previously outlined technical guidelines for creating authentic deeds for cryptocurrency transactions, while also serving as a means for ongoing monitoring of the effectiveness of issued regulations.

Multi-stakeholder involvement is also crucial in building public trust in the legitimacy of cryptocurrency transactions documented in authentic deeds. Public education regarding the importance of authentic deeds as a legal protection instrument needs to be promoted extensively through seminars, workshops, and information campaigns involving notaries, regulators, and academics. This will help the public better understand the legal risks that arise when cryptocurrency transactions are based solely on non-authentic electronic evidence.

4. Conclusion

Based on the discussion, it can be concluded that the creation of authentic deeds for cryptocurrency transactions in Indonesia is normatively possible even though cryptocurrency is not yet recognized as legal tender. The status of cryptocurrency as an intangible movable object under civil law, coupled with the open authority of notaries as stipulated in Article 15 of the UUJN, opens up space for notaries to create authentic deeds for cryptocurrency transactions as long as the formal and material requirements stipulated by law are met, including clear identification of the digital object and verification of ownership. However, the implementation still faces various legal and technical obstacles, including regulatory ambiguity, dualistic regulations, legal vacuums, difficulties in verifying ownership due to the pseudonymous nature of blockchain, limited documentation that meets evidentiary standards, and the low technological competence of some notaries. Possible resolution mechanisms are multidimensional, including cross-institutional regulatory harmonization, the development of technical guidelines and standard deed formats, improving notary competency through education and certification, utilizing digital verification technology, strengthening the principles of prudence and consumer protection, and strengthening non-litigation dispute resolution channels. With these steps, authentic deeds have the potential to function optimally as an instrument of legal certainty that protects the interests of all parties in cryptocurrency transactions in Indonesia. These findings also confirm that the issue of the validity of authentic deeds for cryptocurrency transactions is not merely a technical administrative issue, but is closely related to efforts to realize the basic legal values of certainty, justice, and utility, as stated by Gustav Radbruch. Notaries, in their capacity as public officials entrusted by the state to create authentic deeds, bear a crucial responsibility in bridging the gap between the pace of digital financial technology innovation and the need for stable legal certainty for the public.

5. References

Journals:

Abdullah, Marlina, "Aspek Hukum Notaris dalam Transaksi Elektronik", Jurnal Akta, Vol. 4, No. 4, Fakultas Hukum Universitas Islam Sultan Agung, Semarang, 2017.

Afifah, Wiwik, "Kedudukan Notaris sebagai Pejabat Umum dalam Pembuatan Akta Otentik", Jurnal Repertorium, Edisi 2, Fakultas Hukum Universitas Sebelas Maret, Surakarta, 2014.

Anand, Vikas, "A Comparative Analysis of Blockchain Technology and Bitcoin", International Journal of Engineering Research & Technology, Vol. 7, Issue 4, 2018.

Aprilianti, Eka Yuli, "Analisis Yuridis Penggunaan Cryptocurrency sebagai Alat Pembayaran di Indonesia", Jurnal Hukum Bisnis Bonum Commune, Vol. 2, No. 1, Fakultas Hukum Universitas Katolik Parahyangan, Bandung, 2019.

Dewi, Shinta Agustina dan Desak Putu Dewi Kasih, "Aspek Hukum Cryptocurrency sebagai Alat Transaksi Pembayaran Ditinjau dari Undang-Undang Nomor 7 Tahun 2011 tentang Mata Uang", Kertha Semaya: Journal Ilmu Hukum, Vol. 7, No. 11, Fakultas Hukum Universitas Udayana, Denpasar, 2019.

Fatmawati, Ninis Nugraheni, "Peran Notaris dalam Memberikan Perlindungan Hukum terhadap Para Pihak dalam Transaksi Jual Beli", Jurnal Akta, Vol. 5, No. 1, Fakultas Hukum Universitas Islam Sultan Agung, Semarang, 2018.

Harjiyatni, Francisca Romana dan Christina Enny Kustiyanti, "Tanggung Jawab Notaris terhadap Akta Otentik yang Penghadapnya Mempergunakan Identitas Palsu di Kota Semarang", Jurnal Akta, Vol. 4, No. 4, Fakultas Hukum Universitas Islam Sultan Agung, Semarang, 2017.

Julyano, Mario dan Aditya Yuli Sulistyawan, "Pemahaman terhadap Asas Kepastian Hukum melalui Konstruksi Penalaran Positivisme Hukum", Jurnal Crepido, Vol. 1, No. 1, Fakultas Hukum Universitas Sebelas Maret, Surakarta, 2019.

Kurniawan, Teguh, "Peranan Akta Notaris dalam Penyelesaian Sengketa Perjanjian", Jurnal Repertorium, Edisi 5, Fakultas Hukum Universitas Sebelas Maret, Surakarta, 2018.

Latifah, Emmy, "Urgensi Pembaharuan Hukum Notaris dalam Menghadapi Era Teknologi Digital", Jurnal Akta, Vol. 6, No. 2, Fakultas Hukum Universitas Islam Sultan Agung, Semarang, 2019.

Najih, Mokhammad dan Soimin, "Pengantar Hukum Indonesia: Sejarah, Konsep Tata Hukum, dan Politik Hukum Indonesia", Setara Press, Malang, 2012.

Nasution, Bismar, "Urgensi Pengaturan Cryptocurrency sebagai Salah Satu Alat Transaksi Pembayaran di Indonesia", Jurnal Rechts Vinding: Media Pembinaan Hukum Nasional, Vol. 8, No. 3, Badan Pembinaan Hukum Nasional, Jakarta, 2019.

Nurhaliza dan Erni Agustin, "Analisis Yuridis Cryptocurrency sebagai Alat Pembayaran di Indonesia", Jurnal Hukum & Pembangunan, Vol. 49, No. 2, Fakultas Hukum Universitas Indonesia, Depok, 2019.

Pramono, Nindyo, "Implementasi Cyberlaw dalam Aktivitas E-Commerce", Jurnal Hukum Bisnis, Vol. 22, No. 1, Yayasan Pengembangan Hukum Bisnis, Jakarta, 2003.

Pratama, I Gede Gita Graha dan I Nyoman Putu Budiartha, "Implikasi Hukum Penggunaan Cryptocurrency sebagai Alat Transaksi di Indonesia", Kertha Semaya: Journal Ilmu Hukum, Vol. 7, No. 3, Fakultas Hukum Universitas Udayana, Denpasar, 2019.

Rizal, Muhammad, "Akta Notaris sebagai Alat Bukti dalam Peristiwa Hukum Perdata", Jurnal Ilmiah Hukum Dirgantara, Vol. 11, No. 1, Fakultas Hukum Universitas Dirgantara Marsekal Suryadarma, Jakarta, 2020.

Sari, Dwi Tatak Subagiyo, "Blockchain Technology: The Structure of Decentralization and Its Implementation in Cryptocurrency", Journal of Law and Legal Reform, Vol. 1, No. 2, Faculty of Law Universitas Negeri Semarang, Semarang, 2020.

Situmorang, Victor, "Kekuatan Pembuktian Akta Notaris sebagai Akta Otentik", Jurnal Hukum dan Pembangunan, Vol. 23, No. 3, Fakultas Hukum Universitas Indonesia, Depok, 1993.

Sjaifurrachman dan Habib Adjie, "Aspek Pertanggungjawaban Notaris dalam Pembuatan Akta", Mandar Maju, Bandung, 2011.

Suhariyanto, Budi, "Urgensi Pembaharuan Hukum Pidana Materiil Indonesia Berdasarkan Nilai-Nilai Ketuhanan Yang Maha Esa", Jurnal Rechts Vinding: Media Pembinaan Hukum Nasional, Vol. 1, No. 2, Badan Pembinaan Hukum Nasional, Jakarta, 2012.

Syahruddin, "Kedudukan dan Fungsi Notaris sebagai Pejabat Umum dalam Membuat Akta Otentik", Jurnal Hukum, Fakultas Hukum Universitas Islam Sultan Agung, Semarang, 2012.

Trisnawati, Anna, "Tanggung Jawab Notaris terhadap Akta yang Dibuat Dihadapannya", Jurnal Repertorium, Edisi 4, Fakultas Hukum Universitas Sebelas Maret, Surakarta, 2017.

Widowati, Henny Marlyna dan Gunarto, "Implementasi Cyber Notary dalam Pembuatan

Akta Ditinjau dari Undang-Undang Jabatan Notaris dan Undang-Undang Informasi

dan Transaksi Elektronik", Jurnal Akta, Vol. 5, No. 3, Fakultas Hukum Universitas Islam Sultan Agung, Semarang, 2018.

Wijaya, Darmawan Ari, "Mengenal Bitcoin dan Cryptocurrency", Penerbit Informatika, Bandung, 2018.

Yudistira, Iqbal Taufik, "Analisis Yuridis Penggunaan Akta Notaris sebagai Alat Bukti di Pengadilan", Jurnal Hukum Acara Perdata Adhaper, Vol. 4, No. 1, Fakultas Hukum Universitas Tarumanagara, Jakarta, 2018.

Books:

Hadjon, Philipus M., Perlindungan Hukum Bagi Rakyat Indonesia, Bina Ilmu, Surabaya, 1987.

HS, H. Salim dan H. Abdullah, Perancangan Kontrak & Memorandum of Understanding (MoU), Sinar Grafika, Jakarta, 2007.

Lessig, Lawrence, Code and Other Laws of Cyberspace, Basic Books, New York, 1999.

Lumban Tobing, G.H.S., Peraturan Jabatan Notaris, Erlangga, Jakarta, 1999.

Marzuki, Peter Mahmud, Penelitian Hukum, Kencana Prenada Media Group, Jakarta, 2014. Mertokusumo, Sudikno, Hukum Acara Perdata Indonesia, Liberty, Yogyakarta, 2009.

Notodisoerjo, R. Soegondo, Hukum Notariat di Indonesia: Suatu Penjelasan, Raja Grafindo Persada, Jakarta, 1993.

Otto, Jan Michiel, Rule of Law Promotion, Land Tenure and Poverty Alleviation:

Questioning the Assumptions, Leiden University Press, Leiden, 2009.

Radbruch, Gustav, Einfuhrung in die Rechtswissenschaft, K.F. Koehler Verlag, Stuttgart, 1961.

Rahardjo, Satjipto, Ilmu Hukum, Citra Aditya Bakti, Bandung, 2000.

Soekanto, Soerjono dan Sri Mamudji, Penelitian Hukum Normatif: Suatu Tinjauan Singkat, RajaGrafindo Persada, Jakarta, 2001.

Subekti, R., Hukum Pembuktian, Pradnya Paramita, Jakarta, 2008.

Subekti, R. dan R. Tjitrosudibio, Kitab Undang-Undang Hukum Perdata, Pradnya Paramita, Jakarta, 2014.

Utrecht, E., Pengantar Hukum Administrasi Negara Indonesia, Ichtiar, Jakarta, 1962.

Werbach, Kevin, The Blockchain and the New Architecture of Trust, MIT Press, Cambridge, 2018.

Regulation:

Indonesia, Civil Code (Burgerlijk Wetboek voor Indonesie), translated by R. Subekti and R. Tjitrosudibio, Pradnya Paramita, Jakarta.

The 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia.

Law Number 30 of 2004 concerning the Position of Notary, State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia 2004 Number 117, Supplement to the State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia Number 4432.

Law Number 11 of 2008 concerning Electronic Information and Transactions, State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia 2008 Number 58, Supplement to the State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia Number 4843.

Law Number 7 of 2011 concerning Currency, State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia 2011 Number 64, Supplement to the State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia Number 5223.

Law Number 12 of 2011 concerning the Formation of Legislation, State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia 2011 Number 82, Supplement to the State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia Number 5234.

Law Number 2 of 2014 concerning Amendments to Law Number 30 of 2004 concerning the Position of Notary, State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia 2014 Number 3, Supplement to the State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia Number 5491.

Law Number 19 of 2016 concerning Amendments to Law Number 11 of 2008 concerning Electronic Information and Transactions, State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia 2016 Number 251, Supplement to the State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia Number 5952.

Law Number 13 of 2022 concerning the Second Amendment to Law Number 12 of 2011 concerning the Formation of Legislation, State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia 2022 Number 143, Supplement to the State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia Number 6801.

Law Number 4 of 2023 concerning the Development and Strengthening of the Financial Sector, State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia 2023 Number 23, Supplement to the State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia Number 6857.

Bank Indonesia Regulation Number 18/40/PBI/2016 concerning the Implementation of Payment Transaction Processing, State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia 2016 Number 295, Supplement to the State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia Number 5972.

Bank Indonesia Regulation Number 19/12/PBI/2017 concerning the Implementation of Financial Technology, State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia 2017 Number 245, Supplement to the State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia Number 6142.

Regulation of the Commodity Futures Trading Supervisory Agency Number 5 of 2019 concerning Technical Provisions for the Implementation of the Physical Market for Crypto Assets on the Futures Exchange, State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia 2019 Number 490.

Regulation of the Commodity Futures Trading Supervisory Agency Number 8 of 2021 concerning Guidelines for Organizing Physical Market Trading of Crypto Assets on Futures Exchanges, State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia 2021 Number 1053.

Government Regulation Number 49 of 2024 concerning the Transfer of Duties for the Regulation and Supervision of Digital Financial Assets, Including Crypto Assets and Financial Derivatives, from the Ministry of Trade and the Commodity Futures Trading Supervisory Agency to the Financial Services Authority, State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia 2024

Number 208, Supplement to the State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia Number 6994.
Financial Services Authority Regulation Number 27 of 2024 concerning the Implementation of Digital Financial Asset Trading Including Crypto Assets, State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia 2024 Number 245, Supplement to the State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia Number 7012.

Internet:
Asosiasi Blockchain Indonesia, Laporan Tahunan 2022, Jakarta, 2022.
Badan Pengawas Perdagangan Berjangka Komoditi, Statistik Pasar Aset Kripto Periode Januari-April 2024, Jakarta, 2024.
Chainalysis, "The 2023 Global Crypto Adoption Index", https://www.chainalysis.com/blog/2023-global-crypto-adoption-index/, diakses 17 Oktober 2024.
Chainalysis, "The 2024 Global Crypto Adoption Index", https://www.chainalysis.com/blog/2024-global-crypto-adoption-index/, diakses 17 Oktober 2024.
Otoritas Jasa Keuangan, Laporan Perkembangan Aset Keuangan Digital Termasuk Aset Kripto Tahun 2024, Jakarta, 2024.
Ikatan Notaris Indonesia, Survei Kompetensi Notaris dalam Transaksi Cryptocurrency, 2021.
Pengadilan Agama Wates, Putusan Nomor 222/Pdt.G/2024/PA.Wt, tanggal 18 Juli 2024.
https://www.bi.go.id/ https://bappebti.go.id/ https://www.ojk.go.id/ https://bitcoin.org/