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Abstract. As a global platform, the United Nations’ Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) have reinforced country’s institutional capacity to meet the international standard compliance. Creative city concept is one among those linking the SDGs targeting agenda to the local development policy. This study investigates if the implementation of creative city concept may succeed the fulfilment of SDGs targets. We selected three cities in Indonesia for comparative study: Pekalongan, Yogyakarta, and Surakarta. Our observation completed during the Covid-19 pandemic in 2020. We combined targeted questionnaire to academics, business, community, and government (ABCG) stakeholders with content analysis of the government publications and regulations. The result shows that Pekalongan City Government has managed well in actualising creative city concept from the policymaking to program implementation. The Yogyakarta City Government seems inconvenience in specifying targeted creative industry to promote local economy. For the Surakarta case, the targeted creative industry has little support in the local development policy. Lack of institutional capacity and trained staffs might be the main reasons for slow implementation of these ideas into local government context. Consequently, creative city concept and SDGs agenda are more favoured as a short- to medium-term project rather than a long-lasting city development vision.
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1. Introduction

As a global platform, the United Nations’ Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) have reinforced the country’s institutional capacity to meet the international standard compliance when leveraging adjusted local and regional developments. The government of Indonesia (GOI) adopted it through the enactment of Presidential Regulation Number 59 of 2017 about the Implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals Achievement to provide a regulatory framework for achieving SDGs targets at the national level. In practice, the Ministry of National Development Planning (Bappenas) takes the lead in coordinating provincial and local governments to mainstream the SDGs targeting agenda into local and regional development contexts. Transforming such a global plan into the localized SDGs-driven development policy has created a challenge for local government. Target indicator alignment causes a troublesome adjustment in the local development planning routine even though the central government,
through the Ministry of Home Affairs (Kemendagri) has accommodated the SDGs target indicators by stipulating Ministerial Regulation Number 86 of 2017 about Mechanism in Planning, Controlling, and Evaluation for Short-, Medium-, and Long-term Local and Regional Development.

In the meantime, many city development concepts have been introduced in recent decades, bringing distinguished target indicators. The creative city concept was one among others that focused on a subject-specific project to drive city development. It addressed a paradigm shift from the neoclassical physical capital accumulation strategy to the contemporary human and knowledge capital empowerment strategy. It criticized the former city development strategy, which causes degradation of urban quality of life as the negative externalities of urban manufacturing and service dominance [1]. Instead of promoting materialistic fabrication, the concept encouraged human creativity and innovation for shaping the urban environment and citizen prosperity. Initially, creative space formation became the main agenda of urban revitalization by exhibiting cultural attractions and activities as a medium of human freedom expression in performing new ideas and thoughts for a liveable urban environment [1,2]. Since human creativity and innovation did not merely contribute to improving social life but also income generation, the rise of the creative class and cultural and creative industry (CCI) became pivotal to the urban economy [2,3]. Later, the application of the creative city concept was inseparable from – or even got confused with – the creative class and CCI.

Either the notion of sustainable development or creative city originated from different contextual settings. If two different concepts collide in the policymaking arena nowadays, it may cause various possibilities in the process and outcome. ‘Sustainable development’ concept covers a broad range of ideas that define “development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs”. Driven by the massive global concern on environmental degradation since the late 1960s, a policy report “Our Common Future” published in 1987 by the World Commission on Environment and Development, also known as the Brundtland Commission, provided a global framework to cope with environmental issues worldwide. The framework addressed three interlocking pillars of sustainable development, i.e., environmental protection, economic growth, and social equity [4]. However, this earliest framework design did not set out cross-country measures clearly, causing ambiguities in evaluating its achievement as an end-product [5]. After years of a series of meetings involving state government leaders, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), business leaders, and various interest groups and organizations, the United Nations introduced the initial comprehensive sustainable development measures in 2000 covering eight Millenium Development Goals (MDGs). The MDGs framework gained global consensus from top leaders of various interest groups and organizations in the Global North and Global South for acting together to achieve specified goals and indicators through the preparation of national sustainable development strategies [6]. At this point, people-centered development became the primary objective of the so-called ‘sustainable development’ (6 goals), shifting the former environmental concerns (1 goal). After that, the environmental concerns regained greater attention in the SDGs framework since 2015. This recently updated and more comprehensive version of the ‘sustainable development’ policy offered more integrated and effective implementation by linking cross-sectoral measures and extended scoping of interventions from the state governments and many other development agencies. The SDGs framework extended to list out 17 goals with more detailed and specific targeted indicators and measures. However, there remained missing ‘hard targeting’ progress indicators in environmental objectives rather than increased interest in social and economic improvements. Thus, the notion ‘sustainable development’ has become a buzzword to refer to many things instead of environmental issues [5].

‘Creative city’ is not a new concept despite its global popularisation commenced in 2004 since the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) launched the UNESCO Creative Cities Network (UCCN) [7]. The creative city concept can be dated back to the initial work of Bianchini and Landry (1995) in their book “The Creative City” [8][9]. Their work examined the new repositioning of cultural industries and urban regeneration in UK cities between the late 1980s and the early 1990s. Creativity was believed to unleash innovation required by citizens to tackle their daily problems. In turn, innovation will encourage human capital accumulation to shift the old-fashioned
(physical and financial) capital accumulation strategy in search of limitless ways to fulfilling basic needs, lifestyle, and social welfare. This research aims to investigate the implementation of the creative city concept in fulfilling of SDGs targeting agenda. We focus on assessing the performance of creative city implementation which is linked to the achievement of SDGs-11 objectives.

2. Theoretical Foundation

2.1. Creative City, Creative Class, and Creative Industry

The creative city concept originated from the initial works of [1] in the mid-1990s. It suggested current urban development and management should be more creative and innovative in tackling the degradation of urban environment quality and citizen prosperity. His work emerged as a response against externalities of the major industrial cities in UK due to long-lasting economic recession and massive manufacturing sector decline. He suggested the formation of creative urban space is necessary to support human self-development including their dreams, thoughts, and aspirations which allows them to contribute directly in (re-)shaping better urban livelihood. Arguably, a city is viewed as a medium for nurturing new ideas to transform a cityscape more liveable, attractive, and convenient for citizen to live.

Some preconditions to support creative city implementation are: i) use of standardisation and effective law enforcement to protect intellectual property rights, ii) availability of competitive business climate, iii) stability in economic, law, and social investments, iv) sustainable research and development in basic infrastructure, v) availability of policy and interface promotion mechanism for knowledge innovation, vi) practice of business and social ethics, and vii) concern on lifelong education at all levels. Therefore, the initial creative city concept encourages liberation of human capital expression through cultural attractions and activities beneficial to income generation and citizen prosperity. Soon the concept adoption spread across the major cities in Europe and US. UNESCO came later to popularise the extension of UCCN Program since 2004. Recently, there has been 180 creative city members joined the network which share and work together in mainstreaming creative city concept for achieving SDGs 2030 [7].

Coincidently, the creative city concept got more popularised in line with the rise of Florida’s notion about creative class in 2002 [3,10]. Definition of creative class refers to an interest group in society which shows common dedication specific to fields of science and techniques, architecture and design, education, arts, music, and entertainment. More broadly, the occupational fields of creative class also include professionals in business and finance, law, health, and other creative sectors. Its emergence is associated with the ongoing shift of development paradigm from fabrication of natural and artificial resources towards mobilisation of human capabilities, specialisation, and innovation as the key drivers of social welfare achievement [11]. Creative class plays a pivotal role in city advancement because of their functions as structural change machine, economic revitalisation catalyst, facilitator of public-private partnership, and source of inspiration to city development success.

Institutionally, the existence of creative class is associated with creative industry. The creative industry notion was firstly introduced by the Australian Government in the public document “Creative Nation: Commonwealth Cultural Policy” in 1994 [12][13][14]. The proposal allocated AUD250 million to support development of cultural institutions for achieving social welfare. This initiative was subsequently followed by the UK Government through its arm-length agency Department for Culture, Media, and Sport (DCMS) to release public policy “Creative Industries Mapping Document 1998”. The policy emphasised the pivotal role of talented individuals and communities, particularly in arts and cultural fields, as useful sources for social welfare and employment creation. According to [15], definition of creative industry includes “those industries which have their origin in individual creativity, skill and talent and which have a potential for wealth and job creation through the generation and exploitation of intellectual property”. These industries cover 13 types of industry, i.e., advertising, arts and antiquity market, architecture, craft, design, fashion, film and video, interactive entertainment software, music, performing arts, publishing, software and computer service, and television and radio. In practice, such industrial classification changes over time and may differ across countries depending
on the prevailing cultural tradition and policy direction. This raises difficulties in creating general measurement and indicators to evaluate the performance of creative cities.

2.2. Indicators of Creative City Development

To date, there are no definite indicators of creative city development measurable comparatively between countries and regions. Landry introduced ‘urban innovations matrix’ as a kind of self-assessment tool and benchmarking device not for claiming truth representation, but providing reflexive understanding and learning to aid judgement for creative city projects [1]. Since human creativity and innovation became a central point of his argumentation, their influence on any city development projects cannot be simplified to ‘tangible numbers’ of performance benchmarking. Often new ideas come across time and space recursively, making a cyclical and complex loop of thinking without following a fixed linear progression. They may appear ‘in and out’ unprecedently along the decision-making process. Their presence is embedded to cultural tradition and social norms so that the mobilisation of urban creativity requires an active public engagement. To measure performance benchmarking of creative cities, Landry highlighted the importance of institutional framework in supporting urban creativity as manifested in seven preconditions aforementioned.

Similarly, the UCCN has paid attention to institutional concern with emphasis on the building of cooperation and partnerships between public, private, and civil society actors for promoting cultural activities and products sustainably. All the UCCN member countries share a common objective in “placing creativity and cultural industries at the heart of their development plans at the local level and cooperating actively at the international level”. This objective is derived into the following actions:

- Strengthen the creation, production, distribution and dissemination of cultural activities, goods and services;
- Develop hubs of creativity and innovation and broaden opportunities for creators and professionals in the cultural sector;
- Improve access to and participation in cultural life, in particular for marginalized or vulnerable groups and individuals; and
- Fully integrate culture and creativity into sustainable development plans [7].

The manifestation of such general objective framework may vary between countries. UNESCO only provides application guidelines for UCCN membership inclusion by assessing the proposed city’s assets and capacity in culture and creativity, and the content, impact, and outreach of its proposed action plan. However, there is no universal toolkit for assessing creative city performance around the world. Rather, some countries have introduced their own version of performance measurement. For instance, European Commission introduced an assessment tool namely the Cultural and Creative Cities Monitor in 2017 consisting of three main facets, nine dimensions, and 29 indicators (Figure 1) [16]. In Indonesia, the Creative Economy Agency (Bekraf) introduced a self-assessment tool for local governments to submit a proposal of inclusion into the national creative cities/regencies database. It covers four assessment elements, i.e., i) representation of one out of 16 creative sector classification, ii) evident partnership of academics, business, community, and government (ABCG) stakeholders, iii) practice of five creative economy development stages covering creation, production, distribution, consumption, and conservation processes, and iv) presence of both backward and forward linkages which connect the proposed creative sector with the conventional sectors. Then the result will be verified by Bekraf’s independent assessment team [17].
3. Research Methods

The research applied mixed methods design by combining survey and comparative case study methods. Survey method was assigned for understanding perceptions of ABCG stakeholders towards the implementation of creative city concept in local development. To measure their perceptions, we conducted online questionnaire during the spread of pandemic Covid-19 in 2020. Their inputs were analysed based on their responses towards a set of creative city development indicators provided by the Ministry of Tourism and Creative Economy (Kemenparekraf) of Indonesia through its arm-length Bekraf agency. Our research focused on three municipal cities, i.e., Pekalongan, Yogyakarta, and Surakarta. Their selection considered the following criteria:

- Each location must be officially registered as a creative city in Kemenparekraf database. According to [18], Pekalongan was registered in 2016 with craft industry, Yogyakarta in 2017 with application and game developer industry, and Surakarta in 2016 with performing arts industry;
- Each location must represent different local uniqueness and creative industry base. Such uniqueness could be recognised from geographical location, population characteristics, customary tradition, and economic profile. Pekalongan is broadly known as the World City of Batik and enlisted in the UCCN database in 2014. Both Yogyakarta and Surakarta are recognised as the principal origins of Javanese culture inherited with rich local traditions and cultural attractions;
- Each location must represent growth centre for local/regional development. Pekalongan locate in the busiest and fast-growing development corridor in the northern Java Island which connects the nation’s capital Jakarta and the second largest metropolis Surabaya. Both Yogyakarta and Surakarta locate in the leading growth triangle of Central Java Province namely Joglosemar Growth Triangle. This growth region connects the province’s capital Semarang in the north section and Yogyakarta and Surakarta in the southeast section.
As for comparative case study purpose, we explored any potentials and problems experienced by ABCG stakeholders during the creative city implementation. We attempted to identify common variables and local endogenous factors necessary to the city’s creative industry growth. These variables include the local economic profile, the characteristics of local creative industry, and the availability of supporting facilities and infrastructure. To analyse the persistence of local endogenous factors, we focused on exploring local policy and institutional framework to support creative city development. In doing so, we combined various data collection methods including semi-structured interview with the key informants, field observation, and content analysis of any government reports and news related to creative city development in each location.

4. Results and Discussion

4.1. Contesting Preferences

Despite formal recognition of creative city implementation, not all suggested CCI sector has met preference of local stakeholders. Pekalongan, the first Indonesian city registered in UCCN in 2014 for craft and folk-art industry, has fully satisfied public expectation. It was also recognised in Bekraf creative cities database in craft industry category in 2016 and confirmed by most of the local public perception (Figure 2). Pekalongan is one among a few cities in Indonesia with both international and national recognition. In contrast, declaration of Yogyakarta as a creative city in application and game developer industry in 2017 differs from the public expectation which suggested culinary industry. A contesting preference is showed in the Surakarta case where about of one-third public expectation prefers craft industry against the Bekraf’s recognition in performing arts industry.

![Figure 2. Public Perception on the Preferred CCI Sector Development.](image)

There are some reasons to explain why such contesting preferences occurred. First, the persistence of CCI base determines the local urban economy. Creative city implementation in Pekalongan fits the local industrial base. Craft industry underpins Pekalongan’s urban economy where about 86% of more than 1,500 CCI firms are able to create more than 12,000 jobs [19]. The industry has dominated about 60% of national batik market. It has leveraged 12 industrial supply chains ranging from cloth and equipment to fashion industry. Batik craft industry has also supported the city branding as the World City of Batik and urban tourism with many batik markets and creative urban neighbourhoods and communities widely dispersed in the city. In Yogyakarta, the proposal submission has merely focused on the growth of application and game developer business start-ups recently. Promotion of application and game developer industry refers to the local government policy in pursuit of alternative CCI sector other than the broadly known and dominating industrial base. In 2017, the industry was able to create more than 3,000 jobs with annual turnover of more than USD12 million (at current exchange rate). The establishment of Jogja Digital Valley Lounge has been a hallmark of the industrial rise with massive
promotion of more than 24 CCI events a year [20]. A different situation is found in Surakarta. The local government responded the call for application of Bekraf’s creative city program by establishing a creative city institution namely Solo Creative City Network (SCCN) in 2013. The declaration of Surakarta as a creative city in performing arts industry in 2016 actually has raised tensions between the local ABCG stakeholders. In 2018, the dominating CCI sectors were of craft industry with 1,065 firms (34%) and culinary industry with 936 firms (30%) while the performing arts industry comprised 203 firms only (7%). The local craft industry, which was mostly represented by batik industry, contributed more than USD15 million in 2016 (at current exchange rate) to the urban economy compared to the performing arts industry nearly USD690 thousand [19].

Second, the local government’s political economy stance drives the CCI development. Generally, a formal government support can be found in various government policies and regulations. In chronological order, creative city implementation in Pekalongan commenced with the city branding “Pekalongan Kota Batik” which existed earlier a decade before the rise of creative cities notion. It was the local government regulation Peraturan Daerah Kotamadya Daerah Tingkat II Pekalongan Nomor 5 Tahun 1992 about Pekalongan Kota Batik (Pekalongan as the City of Batik) which initiated the city branding and CCI development. In 2002, Mayor Decree Number 530/2016 of 2002 about Local Competitive Products regulated the development of competitive products including batik craft industry, fishery processing industry, garment industry, non-machinery and machinery weaving industry, and water hyacinth and natural fibre-based craft industry. The long-term local development vision has confirmed the creative city implementation through the enactment of Local Government Regulation Number 5 of 2009 about the Long-term Local Development Plan of Pekalongan Municipality 2005-2025 which addressed batik industry as a key driver for achieving the city’s long-term development vision to become an advanced, independent, and prosperous city. Moreover, the Local Government Regulation Number 30 of 2011 about the Spatial Plan of Pekalongan Municipality 2009-2029 specified spatial allocation of batik and textile industry development concentrated in 15 kelurahan (urban village administration unit). The regulation also directed the building of creative spaces and shopping tourism destination spots in the city development. Finally, Mayor Regulation Number 30 of 2011 about City Branding for Pekalongan Municipality as the World City of Batik and Mayor Regulation Number 47 of 2012 about Labelling of Batik Pekalongan marked the city positioning in promoting creative city and CCI sector at the heart of city development. Not surprisingly, such long-standing efforts have blended entirely the government will with broader aspirations from the CCI communities.

In Yogyakarta, neither sectoral nor spatial government regulations have clearly specified the implementation of creative city and CCI concepts. The Local Government Regulation Number 1 of 2007 about the Long-term Local Development Plan of Yogyakarta Municipality 2005-2025 envisioned city development by fostering local tradition, custom, art performance, and cultural heritage preservation. Manifestation of this vision was translated into the development of cultural tourism city where creative economic sectors may take part synergistically with tourism sectors. The supporting role of CCI sectors may present by creating local innovative products and promoting tourism attractions interactively with the local cultural exhibitions. The building of creative urban kampongs and Rumah Kreatif (Creative Hub) could provide creative spaces for multiple functions including creative products display and promotion, consultation meeting, and creative production and research and development (R&D) activities. The spatial allocation of CCI development was not identified clearly in the Local Government Regulation Number 2 of 2012 about the Spatial Plan of Yogyakarta Municipality 2010-2029. The regulation only stipulated the development of strategic functional urban areas contributing to economic growth, social equity, cultural preservation, and environmental conservation. Those related to the CCI development included batik heritage area in Mantrijeron Subdistrict and cultural tourism areas in Pakualaman Subdistrict, Kraton Subdistrict, and Kotagede Subdistrict. In 2020, the local government signed a memorandum of understanding (MoU) with the community-driven organisation Jogja Creative Society (JCS) to prepare “Jogja Kreatif” roadmap document and cooperate in establishing Jogja Creative Hub facility. Such circumstance shows that the notion creative cities and CCI is considerably ‘new’ and not get popularised in the recent city development. Therefore, most public expectation has favored
culinary industry, not the declared application and game developer industry, to represent the city branding and cultural heritage tradition associated with the creative city implementation and people’s daily life.

For the Surakarta case, initiatives toward the creative city implementation did not only come from the local government but also the central government. Presidential Regulation Number 28 of 2012 about the Spatial Plan of Java-Bali has directed Surakarta as one of the National Growth Centres to function as a centre for competitive and eco-friendly creative industry. The regulation was referred to the Local Government Regulation Number 1 of 2012 about the Spatial Plan of Surakarta Municipality 2011-2031 which allocated functional areas specific to CCI sector across the city. It has not recommended the establishment of urban creative spaces but a techno park facility to support high-tech integrated education and R&D activities. The Local Government Regulation Number 9 of 2016 about the Mid-term Local Development Plan of Surakarta Municipality 2016-2021 has directed city development to support creative economy growth in order to become an arts and cultural tourism city. More explicitly, this plan has adopted creative city concept by promoting strategies to establish an urban creative ecosystem supported with adequate facilities and infrastructure. In addition, the enactment of Mayor Regulation Number 15 of 2017 about Creative Economy Development Action Plan of Surakarta Municipality 2017-2021 has highlighted three prioritised CCI grouping sectors to achieve city’s development vision to become a culturally and ecologically based creative city: i) performing arts, design, craft, culinary, and fashion; ii) arts and antiques market, R&D, video, film and photography, advertising, and music; and iii) television and radio, computer service and software, architecture, interactive games, publishing and printing. Accordingly, a balanced public perception between the performing arts and craft industries is understandable since both are grouped into the first prioritised action plan.

4.2. Supporting Facilities and Infrastructure
Public facilities and infrastructure for supporting creative city implementation in Pekalongan are sufficient to foster batik craft industry as well as city branding. Most facilities rely on independent procurement by batik craft communities and locate in urban kampong neighbourhoods. Since the batik craft industry originates from home-based family business, batik production until marketing activities are done at home workshops. Currently, there are 12 out of 18 public facilities associated with batik craft industry and city branding, including creative space (3 units), trading marketplace (4 units), batik community office (1 unit), museum (1 unit), broadcasting service (2 units), thematic open space (1 unit). The rest consists of arts performance space (1 unit), techno park (1 unit), public open space (2 units), and landmark (2 units) (Figure 3). Access to all these facilities and batik workshops are linked to road network with support of public transportation system. Thus, such conditions have intensified growing activities of batik craft industry within community-based kampong neighbourhoods.
In Yogyakarta, there are more public facilities and infrastructure available to support creative city implementation. At least there are 22 art galleries, 27 co-working spaces, five creative marketplaces, one cyber kampong, and one landmark to support CCI sector growth and city branding as a cultural tourism city. However, since the city was declared as a creative city in application and game developer industry away from its CCI base, these facilities seem lack of relevance. Only a few of facilities such as Jogja Digital Valley Lounge, cyber kampongs, and creative hubs and co-working spaces which contribute directly to the declared CCI sector (Figure 4). Despite such contradiction, the provision of soft and hard infrastructure in the city is sufficient to support both the more traditional and the high-tech based CCI sectors. This exemplifies how the envisioned cultural heritage preservation has not been consistently treated as the primary objective in creative city and city branding implementation.

Like the Pekalongan case, most facilities for promoting cultural production, distribution, and exhibition of CCI sector in Surakarta depend on the initiatives of local creative communities. Of the
available 26 public facilities, there are five traditional arts production houses, five exhibition halls and open spaces, and one recording company related to the promotion of performing arts industry (Figure 5). In fact, craft industry is the city’s leading CCI sector which is related to the mid-term development vision to become the arts and cultural tourism city. However, the local government preferred the other CCI sector to sustain cultural heritage preservation comprehensively. The arts performing industry has leveraged urban economic growth by promoting intensified backward linkages through the growth of gamelan – a Javanese traditional orchestra instrument set – production industry, as well as the forward linkages through culinary industry. Annually, there are about a hundred performing arts events hosted in Surakarta such as Kirab Pusaka (sacred heirloom carnival), Grebeg (Royal Palace special charity to the entire society), Sekaten (traditional rite for commemorating the birthday of Prophet Muhammad), Solo Batik Carnival, Solo International Performing Arts, and Solo International Ethnic Music Festival. With many cultural events, the engagement of performing arts industry is beneficial to promoting creative city implementation and city branding.

![Facilities and Infrastructure for Creative City Development in Surakarta Municipality.](image)

4.3. Performance of CCI Sector During the Covid-19 Pandemic

During the Covid-19 pandemic in 2020, all economic sectors were suffered from drastic economic slowdown due to mobility restriction policies by the central and local governments. CCI sector, which heavily relies on human interactions, was one of those severely affected by these lockdown policies. Since then, they were forced to move online activities for survival [21]. Among three cities observed, perhaps only CCI sector in Yogyakarta, particularly the application and game developer industry, which has been impacted less than others. However, since economic growth fell into more than -5% per year, the cultural production, distribution, and consumption activities also collapsed dramatically even though some CCI sectors had shifted their activities online by producing online learning courses, live streaming performance, promotion, and marketing. Still, this shift had impacted little to and been advantageous for a few numbers of CCI sectors particularly those have been accustomed to interacting with virtual meetings and any other online activities.

To measure the performance of CCI sector during the Covid-19 pandemic accurately was very difficult, particularly because of the missing quantitative database locally. Previous empirical studies for measuring creative city and CCI sector performance were very limited. Popular approaches to meet this objective are by deconstructing statistical dataset published by the Central Bureau of Statistics, for examining general performance profile or measuring directly from the grassroots by involving limited numbers of respondents in specific CCI sector. Since our study was not dedicated to this discovery, we
attempted to understand the big picture of the CCI performance based on perceptions of respondents’ own assessment. Following the Bekraf’s performance indicators, we focused on the backward and forward effects of the city’s CCI sector towards the local economy. We identified 22 backward and forward industries closely related to the CCI sector declared in each city.

In general, the result shows a moderate linkage state of the city’s CCI sector towards the backward industries at an average level of 3.28. Pekalongan performs the highest (3.65), followed by Yogyakarta (3.17) and Surakarta (3.03). The most connected sectors are of basic infrastructure (3.79), promotion and marketing service (3.61), logistic, distribution, and courier service (3.60), and ICT support (3.59). The lowest performance is showed by headhunting, job seeking consultancy, and HRD management (2.80), public library and digital reference provision (2.86), and worship, cemetery, and funeral service (2.94). The Pekalongan case shows a higher performance compared to two other cities, particularly in basic infrastructure (4.67), ICT support (4.33), logistic, distribution, and courier service (4.33), promotion and marketing service (4.33), banking and financial service (4.33), raw materials supply (4.00), machinery, equipment, and technology (4.00), and educational school, training centre, R&D institution, and workshop (4.00) (Figure 6). This implies that the backward linkages state in Pekalongan is strong enough to support the craft industry as the CCI sector base for creative city implementation and city branding as well.

On the other hand, the performance of the city’s CCI sector in creating forward linkages is similar to the backward linkages state. Looking at both graphical spiderweb patterns of analysis, we can see that the Pekalongan case performance is still higher than Surakarta and Yogyakarta in general. The CCI sector in Surakarta exceeds the Pekalongan achievement in several forward industries, i.e., amenities, public space, museum, art gallery, and convention hall (3.80), hotel, rental housing, accommodation, and convention hall (3.60), beauty clinic/salon, barbershop, and lifestyle (3.60), security service (3.60), hospital, pharmacy, fitness centre, and traditional healing service (3.40), and restaurant, catering service, bakery, and organic food (3.40). The Yogyakarta case is only better-off in hospital, pharmacy, fitness centre, and traditional healing service (3.17) and security service (3.33) (Figure 7). Interesting to notice that the performance of CCI sector in Yogyakarta in generating both backward and forward linkages is the lowest because of the mismatch of the declared CCI sector in the Bekraf’s creative cities/regencies database against the locally rooted cultural tradition and CCI sector base. Such contradicting results embark public resistance against the initial creative city proposal submitted to Bekraf.
4.4. Linking Creative City Implementation to SDGs Targeting

This could be the most difficult part of analysis when we attempted to link creative city implementation to specific SDGs targeting agenda. We focused on SDGs-11: Make cities inclusive, safe, resilient, and sustainable which is closely related to the creative city implementation. It includes 10 objectives as follows:

- By 2030, ensure access for all to adequate, safe and affordable housing and basic services and upgrade slums;
- By 2030, provide access to safe, affordable, accessible and sustainable transport systems for all, improving road safety, notably by expanding public transport, with special attention to the needs of those in vulnerable situations, women, children, persons with disabilities and older persons;
- By 2030, enhance inclusive and sustainable urbanization and capacity for participatory, integrated and sustainable human settlement planning and management in all countries;
- Strengthen efforts to protect and safeguard the world’s cultural and natural heritage;
- By 2030, significantly reduce the number of deaths and the number of people affected and substantially decrease the direct economic losses relative to global gross domestic product caused by disasters, including water-related disasters, with a focus on protecting the poor and people in vulnerable situations;
- By 2030, reduce the adverse per capita environmental impact of cities, including by paying special attention to air quality and municipal and other waste management;
- By 2030, provide universal access to safe, inclusive and accessible, green and public spaces, in particular for women and children, older persons and persons with disabilities;
- Support positive economic, social and environmental links between urban, peri-urban and rural areas by strengthening national and regional development planning;
- By 2020, substantially increase the number of cities and human settlements adopting and implementing integrated policies and plans towards inclusion, resource efficiency, mitigation and adaptation to climate change, resilience to disasters, and develop and implement, in line with the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030, holistic disaster risk management at all levels;
- Support least developed countries, including through financial and technical assistance, in building sustainable and resilient buildings utilizing local materials.

These objectives are so complex and complicated covering multifaceted sectors and indicators that many local governments and institutions experiencing difficulties in synchronising to current development practices. The central government has stipulated Presidential Regulation Number 59 of 2017 about Implementation on the Sustainable Development Goals Achievement comprising the National SDGs...
Roadmap and Action Plan to direct the manifestation of SDGs targeting agenda inclusion to national and regional/local developments. Bappenas plays coordinating leadership for succeeding such a global platform to the national planning and budgeting system thoroughly through the enactment of Ministerial Regulation of National Development Planning Number 7 of 2018 about Coordination, Planning, Monitoring, Evaluation, and Reporting of Sustainable Development Goals Achievement. As for more practical administrative concern, Kemendagri has stipulated Ministerial Regulation Number 86 of 2017 about Mechanism in Planning, Controlling, and Evaluation for Short-, Medium-, and Long-term Local and Regional Development.

These regulations, however, are still not enough to ensuring the fulfilment of SDGs targeting agenda satisfactorily. The key problems relate to different measurement of local development indicators, absence of data availability and proper analytical methods, and the lack of local government capacity to comply with the SDGs targeting agenda. Based on perception of ABCG stakeholders in three cities, we found that the creative city implementation has achieved a moderate level of the overall SDGs-11 objectives (3.80). The largest contributions are showed in the achievement of following objectives: i) strengthen efforts to protect and safeguard the world’s cultural and natural heritage (3.92), ii) support positive economic, social and environmental links between urban, peri-urban and rural areas by strengthening national and regional development planning (3.92), iii) by 2030, provide universal access to safe, inclusive and accessible, green and public spaces, in particular for women and children, older persons and persons with disabilities (3.90), iv) by 2030, provide access to safe, affordable, accessible and sustainable transport systems for all, improving road safety, notably by expanding public transport, with special attention to the needs of those in vulnerable situations, women, children, persons with disabilities and older persons (3.84), and v) by 2030, significantly reduce the number of deaths and the number of people affected and substantially decrease the direct economic losses relative to global gross domestic product caused by disasters, including water-related disasters, with a focus on protecting the poor and people in vulnerable situations (3.80).

Interestingly, the SDGs achievement figure shows contradictions when Pekalongan performance is the lowest for all SDGs-11 objectives. Its average score is 3.20 compared to Surakarta (3.71) and Yogyakarta (4.06). On the contrary, Yogyakarta shows the highest performance even though the CCI sector performance is the lowest. Such circumstances lead us to examine the mismatch of synchronising the creative city implementation with the SDGs achievement in the next section.
4.5. Discussion

To examine the linking contribution of creative city implementation to the achievement of SDGs-11 objectives, we have mapped out their connection in Table 1. In fact, there are 16 CCI supporting sectors and eight SDGs-11 objectives connected one another. This synchronisation should be interpreted as ‘an indicative correlation’ rather than a measure of relationship between variables. For one reason, we identified that the left column represents industry specific variable while the right column covers a broadly targeted condition variable which may include lots of industry specific performance variables. Secondly, the scope of performance assessment is different. When assessing the CCI sector interindustry linkages, the ABCG stakeholders are confined to value the degree of interindustry linkages. In contrast, when assessing the achievement of SDGs-11 objectives, the ABCG stakeholders have to bring forward such a broadly conceptual targeted condition into the actual condition, involving multifaceted sectoral performance as well as multiple indicators of achievement. Thirdly, the ABCG stakeholders who participated in the research are not limited to those who have been experiencing directly either in the creative city projects or the local SDGs task force. As a result, all perceptions of the ABCG stakeholders represent a common public understanding instead of a statistically tested numerical data.

Table 1. Linking CCI Sector Interindustry Linkages to SDGs-11 Objectives.

| CCI Sector Interindustry Linkages | SDGs-11 Objectives                                                                 |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Raw materials supply             | By 2030, ensure access for all to adequate, safe and affordable housing and basic services and upgrade slums |
| Machinery, equipment, and technology | By 2030, provide access to safe, affordable, accessible and sustainable transport systems for all, improving road safety, notably by expanding public transport, with special attention to the needs of those in vulnerable situations, women, children, persons with disabilities and older persons |
| Conventional and renewable energy supply | By 2030, enhance inclusive and sustainable urbanization and capacity for participatory, integrated and sustainable human settlement planning and management in all countries |
| Repair and maintenance service   | Strengthen efforts to protect and safeguard the world’s cultural and natural heritage |
| ICT support                      | By 2030, significantly reduce the number of deaths and the number of people affected and substantially decrease the direct economic losses relative to global gross domestic product caused by disasters, including water-related disasters, with a focus on protecting the poor and people in vulnerable situations |
| Logistic, distribution, and courier service | By 2030, reduce the adverse per capita environmental impact of cities, including by paying special attention to air quality and municipal and other waste management |
| Promotion and marketing service  | By 2030, provide universal access to safe, inclusive and accessible, green and public spaces, in particular for women and children, older persons and persons with disabilities |
| Business development and entrepreneurship service | Support positive economic, social and environmental links between urban, peri-urban and rural areas by strengthening national and regional development planning |
| Headhunting, job seeking consultancy, and HRD management | By 2020, substantially increase the number of cities and human settlements adopting and implementing integrated policies and plans towards inclusion, resource efficiency, mitigation and adaptation to climate change, resilience to disasters, and develop and implement, in line with the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030, holistic disaster risk management at all levels |
| Transportation and rental service | Support least developed countries, including through financial and technical assistance, in building sustainable and resilient buildings utilizing local materials |
| Banking and financial service     |                                                                                  |
| Basic infrastructure             |                                                                                  |
| Hotel, rental housing, accommodation, and convention hall |                                                                                  |
| Restaurant, catering service, bakery, and organic food |                                                                                  |
| Hospital, pharmacy, fitness centre, and traditional healing service |                                                                                  |
| Educational school, training centre, R&D institution, and workshop |                                                                                  |
| Amenities, public space, museum, art gallery, and conventional hall |                                                                                  |
| Public library and digital reference provision |                                                                                  |
| Beauty clinic/salon, barbershop, and lifestyle |                                                                                  |
| Worship, cemetery, and funeral service |                                                                                  |
| Security service                 |                                                                                  |

Note: The bold-written phrases indicate those connected cross-sectoral variables

Despite such limitations, we still could have figured out that there are no clear connections between the creative city implementation and the achievement of SDGs targeting agenda. If we elaborate the
indicators of the SDGs-11 objectives, we cannot claim the condition achieved is a result of CCI sector performance. For instance, one of indicators related to the attainment of adequate, safe, and affordable housing and basic services in the first SDGs-11 objectives measures the number of metropolitan regions served in compliance with urban service standards. On the other hand, the CCI sector performance also requires the provision of basic infrastructure. Even though we might have agreed upon the possible connection between these two, we cannot measure accurately the performance achievement in one part is directly linked to the other part’s performance.

The difference of creative city implementation in three cities is influenced by three sources at least, i.e., CCI sector base, local government political will, and public recognition. Creative city promotion should not only consider the potential CCI sector types, but more importantly, the proposed CCI sector must have multiplier effects to the local economy [22–24]. As shown by the Pekalongan case, the creative city implementation originated from within the locally embedded home-based craft industry to sustain urban economic growth. Craft industry has become the key drivers of income generation and social welfare to the entire society across generations – the important role that any CCI sector must perform to promote creative city implementation (3,15). In contrast, the Surakarta case actually has a great potential in so many traditionally rooted craft industries, but the local economic development relies on trade and service sectors. Similarly, the Yogyakarta case also belongs to rich cultural tradition and CCI sectors, but the local government has preferred to utilise the CCI sectors for underpinning tourism sector development instead of placing them at the forefront of local economic development.

Secondly, the local government political will is crucial to directing the creative city implementation and so as the achievement of localised SDGs targeting agenda [2,5,25–27]. The role of local government is not limited as the policymaker but should become the policy leader and enabler too. Pekalongan City Government could be a role model in practising such a comprehensive governance. Far before the inception of creative city concept (1) or creative industry sector (12–14), Pekalongan City Government has been working together with the local CCI communities in effectuating policy intervention for promoting batik craft industry in local development. Unfortunately, since the batik craft industry has also become the major river pollutant source, it is not surprising that the achievement of SDGs-11 objectives is the lowest compared to Yogyakarta and Surakarta. However, neither Yogyakarta nor Surakarta governments have shown strong commitment to creative city implementation, particularly because of the missing derivative policies and action plans. As a result, many the so-called creative city projects are viewed as the short- to medium-term city branding projects for satisfying the mayor’s political agenda and government routines instead of aligning to the SDGs agenda [28–30].

Thirdly, public recognition cannot simply be understood in relation to the presence of CCI sector signage, landmark, and activities, but more importantly, an active engagement of ABCG stakeholders in creative city development [28,31–33]. The cases of Pekalongan and Surakarta could be of a good example as manifested in the establishment of Pekalongan Creative City Forum (PCCF) and Surakarta Creative City Network (SCCN). This institution is a multistakeholder forum for accommodating aspirations from ABCG stakeholders to advance creative city development. At the upper hierarchical coordination lines, there is a quasi-governmental organisation called as Municipal Creative Economy Committee (MCEC). MCEC functions as a think-tank institution responsible to the mayor in prompting policy advice related to creative city development based on aspirations from below (PCCF or SCCN). In Yogyakarta, there is a multistakeholder forum namely Jogja Creative Society (JCS) with similar function but directly under coordination of the local government, so that it also plays as a mayor’s think-tank institution. Through the building of formal institutions, aspirations from below could be directly channelled into the policymaking process, so that public recognition may be accumulated quickly.

5. Conclusions
To conclude, we may find that each city government has different viewpoint regarding creative city implementation but similar response towards the SDGs targeting agenda. Pekalongan City Government has managed well in actualising creative city concept from the policymaking to program implementation. In contrast, the Yogyakarta City Government seems inconvenience in specifying
targeted creative industry to promote local economy. For the Surakarta case, the targeted creative industry has little support in the local development policy. As for the fulfilment of (localised) SDGs targets, each city government follows directive central government framework organised by Bappenas. However, their current achievement has not satisfied yet. The bottom line is that the problematic rigidity and responsiveness in the local government agencies has impeded the pursuit of either creative city or SDGs targets. Lack of institutional capacity and trained staffs might be the main reasons for slow implementation of these ideas into local government context. Consequently, creative city concept and SDGs agenda are more favoured as a short- to medium-term project rather than a long-lasting city development vision.
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