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Abstract

This paper shares the experience of an ongoing research on stakeholder-based planning and development in Solo City. The goal of the research is to find the connectivity among actors and the aspect that makes collaboration in Solo City happened. What makes the collaboration happened is hypothetically a growing trust and a good leadership with sense of entrepreneurship. The objective of the paper is to externalize and share the documentation of collaborative practices in city planning and development process, as lessons learned for other Indonesian cities. The observation indicates that trust from the community to the city hall is acquired as the city hall is consistent to the collaboration process in carrying the plan into implementation. The willingness of local community to participate and to deliver innovation in the process indicates a supportive foundation for the growing collaboration.

1. Background

Since 2012, the planning and implementation of city development in Solo has become an example for Indonesian cities. Starting from 2005, Solo has made persistent progress towards its vision of being an Eco-Cultural City. The progress covers socio-cultural, economic, and physical aspects and collaboration of stakeholders in planning and development process. As a result, the collaboration and action-based development in Solo City has enabled
knowledge sharing among academician, government, consultant, and local community. It has also enabled the growing trust and networking among stakeholders. Nevertheless, to which extent Solo City has been progressing, and who the actors that have enabled the collaboration. The achievement and its impacts have never been measured yet. For this reason, it is necessary to study the actual process in Solo City, as it is relevant to other Indonesian cities, for its lesson on integrative and collaborative development.

This paper states hypothetically that the enabler of collaboration process in Solo City is trust and charisma of its leaders, which is entangled with the sense of entrepreneur of the society. It is also supported by the innovative action that has been part of the nurtured manner of Solo society. Having good leadership, willingness, and innovative culture, the good governance in Solo city has been built based on ethics to serve people and commitment to carry plan into actions. To testify this hypothesis, more detailed research is conducted by externalizing researcher experiences in several Solo City’s events and actions from 2008 until today in 2014. The research is focused on the collaboration for housing and urban development and the experiences are analyzed using collaboration theory by Himmelman (2002) and trajectory method.

2. Collaboration theory

A research for Sustainable Development and Collaborative Planning in Guatemala City mentions that research on collaborative planning that facilitate participation of multidisciplinary teams and stakeholders are important in improving the practice of planning to favor sustainable development (Morales, 2013). To identify whether the practice is running in a collaborative manner, following theory can be applied.

2.1. Definition, attributes, and process of collaboration

Hanneman et al. (1995) in Carnwell and Carson addresses that planning and decision-making are events where collaboration takes place. Within which, collaborators are willing to participate, considering themselves to be the member of team working towards a common goal while sharing expertise and responsibility for the outcome. The fundamental of collaboration relationship are non-hierarchical and power sharing based on knowledge and expertise rather than role or title (Hanneman et al., 1995 in Carnwell and Carson). D’Amour et al. (2005) in Carnwell and Carson mentions repeatedly collaboration as includes sharing, partnership, and interdependency. Carnwell and Carson summarized the defining attributes of collaboration as intellectual and cooperative endeavor, knowledge and expertise rather than role or title, joint venture, team working, participation in planning and decision-making, non-hierarchical relationship, sharing of expertise, willingness to work together towards an agreed purpose, trust and respect in collaborators, partnership, inter-dependency, highly connected network, and low expectation of reciprocation. Himmelman (2002) put collaboration in general term of working together. He described collaboration as having relation to other, working together relation, networking, coordinating, and cooperating. He mentioned that strategies are built upon each other along a developmental continuum, which means when moving to the next strategy the previous strategy is included.

2.2. Roles in the collaborative process

Himmelman mentioned ten roles that commonly played by organization (actors) in collaborative process. These roles, he said, not mutually exclusive. Instead, one often leads to or is integrated into another. To some extent, all roles can be played by any stakeholder engaging in collaborative efforts. Several of the roles are mostly played by larger governmental, philanthropic, or non-profit institutions. Type and description of each role are: convener, catalyst, conduit, funder, advocate, community organizer, technical assistance provider, capacity builder, partner, and facilitator.
3. Solo City collaboration trajectory

3.1. Pre-Observation (2005-2008): Solo City since decentralization

Solo City, formally known as Surakarta, was one of the best local governance, market management, and higher education in the national record at the time. Evaluated by many international agencies and media, they agreed that Solo City performed its best in leadership and consistency for city management. Several progresses claimed as a success are traditional market management, street vendor management, heritage building preservation, city greening program, and children-friendly city program. This reputation brought Solo City’s recognition on the national level as a potential candidate to collaborate in the national to global agenda. Because of this reputation too, the author and Solo City was firstly worked together to introduce Solo City in the Asia-Pacific event, APMCHUD (Asia Pacific Ministerial Conference of Housing and Urban Development).

As trust had been built between the author and Solo City government since the first event, the author continuously supports the development process in Solo City until today. However, this paper will only use collaboration process in Solo City, where the author could attend housing and urban development from 2008 to 2014 as observer of events. The events are divided into three periods, each related to events’ setting and position and role of researcher. They are: (1) Period 1, 2008-2010, for the event of APMCHUD 3, (2) Period 2, 2010-2013, for Solo City development concept: the Eco-Cultural City, and (3) Period 3, 2013-2014, for implementation of development concept and local initiated event Bamboo Biennale.

3.2. Period 1 (2008-2010): towards APMCHUD 3

The author was one of the representatives of the Indonesian Ministry of Housing, who was presented Solo City as one of the best practices for urban development in APMCHUD 2 second Bureau Meeting in Delhi, October 2008. The meeting ended with a suggestion to hold the next APMCHUD 3rd event in Indonesia. As a follow-up, three cities were suggested for APMCHUD 3 host, but only Mayor of Solo City (at the time) who directly responded.

The approval for collaboration proposal in conducting APMCHUD 3 was challenging, high cost, and high risk. Yet, it brought a huge opportunity to gather supports and networks for the city development and for the citizen. The logic for the approval, as explained by the Mayor, was, “as long as for the welfare of the people and the support for Solo City marketing, it is my responsibility to work and collaborate with everybody”. In 2008 to 2010 Solo City Mayor, local government, and the Indonesia Ministry of Housing started to work together to hold APMCHUD 3. As part of the governmental body at the national level, the author has worked to facilitate international framework to local practice (Table 1).

| Objective | Actions | Output | Outcomes |
|-----------|---------|--------|----------|
| Join National Government to be host city for APMCHUD 3, as an effort to improve Solo community welfare and to support Solo City marketing. | Goal: APMCHUD 3 Preparation - Local preparation presentation in APMCHUD Burro meeting, a parallel event with Governing Council UN Habitat in Nairobi, 2009. - Cultural performer for Solo gala dinner in Nairobi, Kenya 2009. - Local preparation of agenda and best practice showcase in APMCHUD Burro meeting in Jakarta, 2010. | Solo presented as best practice of Housing and Development in Indonesia as well as having precious culture and tradition. | Solo City as host of APMCHUD 3 event Commitment to give effort on: 1. Putting Indonesia’s importance within Asia-Pacific Housing and Urban Development context. 2. Acquire opportunities, benefit, and networks of housing and urban development in Indonesia. - Solo enter housing and urban development debate in international level. |
| Prepare Solo City as Indonesia best practice on housing and urban development. | Goal: APMCUHD 3 Event Host - Cultural performance at opening ceremony. | APMCHUD 3 in Solo | Solo Declaration (commitment towards sustainable development (SD) and sustainable urbanization (SU) as well as to promote utilization of knowledge hub for community |

Table 1. Notes on the participation of Solo City in APMCHUD 3
Solo City was stood as a best practice in formal and top-down cooperation. Identifying of what are shown at this period, working team of Solo City, national government of Indonesia, APMCHUD and UN representatives for APMCHUD 3 had developed coordination for the event’s preparation to cooperation for APMCHUD 3. It was indicated by several activities such as exchanging information related to housing and urban development, altering activities, sharing resources for mutual benefit and achieving a common purpose: the APMCHUD 3, SD, and SU. Solo Declaration and Solo Implementation Plan are written agreement to close the event and to proceed as next agenda.

3.3. Period 2 (2010-2013): towards Eco-Cultural City

The first success of the working team on APMCHUD 3 event was followed by growing trust among key actors and opportunity for new networking. Meanwhile, power shifting due to City Mayor election urges the need to support continuity of policies and programs. The advanced role and political situation brought Solo City to the new collaboration initiated by local actors, which objective was to prepare and implement a concept for mid-term and long-term development of Solo City (Table 2).

| Objective | Actions | Output | Outcomes |
|-----------|---------|--------|----------|
| Support policies and programs continuity; and prepare strategy to guard good governance and guarantee community participation along the development process. | Goal: initiation of Solo City mid-term and long-term development concept. | Draft concept of Solo City’s mid-term development: the Eco Cultural City of Solo. | Initial idea of Solo City Gallery. |
| Plan support for SD and SU as base of development plan. | Goal: obtain grant to implement integrated water reservoir-drainage plan. | Failed to obtain the grant. | Concept of community-based urban sustainable water management, the integrated water reservoir and drainage system in community level. |
| Elaboration and comprehension of the development concept, the Eco-Cultural City of Solo, with existing plan, policy, and regulation, including strategy to deliver it to local community. | Goal: comprehensive development concept, the Eco-Cultural City of Solo. | Eco-Cultural City of Solo in 2015 is fostered as city’s vision and big idea of Solo City’s formal mid-term development planning. | Local media participation to share the vision to local community and perform actions to support framework operation. |
- Actualize the mid-term development plan through socialization and knowledge sharing for the strategic city’s stakeholders: the technical offices, and sub-district communities.

Objective: implementation and delivering of urban development concept to technical offices and community levels through: (1) sectoral project for technical offices; and (2) site-scale projects at community level.

- Plan for Pucang Sawit urban forest and evaluation regarding riverside regulation.
- Community level competition for sub-district eco-improvement, held two times in two years in a row.
- Solo city chose to be national pilot project for implementing riverfront greening rule (PP 38 2011).
- Solo city to be a creative city by UNESCO regarding its ecological and cultural heritage to be sited next to Bengawan Solo and richness of bamboo industry.

Internal matters and technical events became most of the subjects in this collaboration period. Actors involved were mostly local level actors, both private and public stakeholders, while national to global level actors subsequently involved were Bengawan Solo River Basin Authority, KOICA, and Asia Carbon Consultant. Cooperation was held in local government bodies, between city’s stakeholders and networked actors. At this collaboration period, relationship between actors was both formal and informal. Knowledge was shared internally among city’s stakeholders, by the local government body, academician, and private sectors, reciprocal with the sub-district communities, through action-based planning towards the Eco-Cultural City of Solo 2015.

3.4. Period 3 (2013-2014): towards Bamboo Biennale and Creative City

Power shifting and rearrangement of governmental body happened in 2013. The previous city mayor was elected to be governor of the capital region of Jakarta. As a result, parts of the development process were evaluated. Nevertheless, the need to guarantee continuity for on-going policies and programs is still undertaken. The situation is advanced by the need to inspire citizen with new best practice as an exit strategy for Mayor and Vice Mayor in-charged. Along with local political situation, new events are being initiated. Creative community, entrepreneur, academician, and artist, together with government bodies of Solo City put their effort to hold an international event, Bamboo Biennale. An international event designated to boost up city and citizen creativity through exploration of bamboo material which is known as basic material of Solo society’s cultural industry.

From the bigger political context, a power dynamic brought additional support for Solo City. Ministry of Tourism and Creative Economy, who has given support in improving traditional market in Solo City as she was Minister of Trade, offered to propose Solo City as one of the three Indonesian creative cities to UNESCO. Along with dossier submission process to UNESCO and the preparation for Bamboo Biennale, the city government, which is supported by creative actors, is obliged to stimulate Solo Creative City Network (SCCN) to function and accelerate the creative support for city regeneration (Table 3).

In this period, collaboration happened for the growing and strengthened networking mainly among local actors, also with their network in national level. These local actors include local academic institutions i.e. University of Sebelas Maret (UNS), University of Muhammadiyah Surakarta, and Cultural Institute of Indonesia Surakarta; local NGO on river awareness, entrepreneur, artist, and professionals. The author at this time took part as an independent researcher facilitating cooperation between local government and Bengawan Solo River Basin, to open new network for the events and share research findings to initiate city gallery.

Table 3. Notes on internal planning and development process in Solo City, 2013-2014

| Objective | Actions | Output | Outcomes |
|-----------|---------|--------|----------|
| Carry urban development concept implementation and central government mandate for riverfront greening rule. | Goal: priority plan for Kali Pepe revitalization - FGD of Kali Pepe riverside revitalization implementation plan - FGD of action plan in sub-district level. | - Pepe River revitalization physical plan - Concept of stakeholder collaboration for Pepe River revitalization. | Community action competition on sub-district scale towards Pepe River revitalization. |
- Continue to carry strategic plan to support the continuity of on-going policies, programs, and good governance.
- Knowledge transfer to society and next generation as an effort to guard good governance through Solo City regeneration.
- Introducing Eco-Cultural City as Solo City identity to local and global society.
- Initiate eco-socio-cultural connectivity and indigenous knowledge sharing from local to global scale.
- Urban regeneration and young stakeholders’ capacity building.

Goal: City gallery
Stimulation of Solo Creative City Network (SCCN)

Ongoing processes of setting up city gallery as tools for urban management accountability and platform for stakeholders collaboration in the Solo City development process.

Goal: Bamboo biennale event.
Bamboo biennale initiation and preparation.

Bamboo biennale event.
Collaboration of local government, creative community, academician-entrepreneurs, artisan, citizen, private community, and Solo City community.

4. Solo City collaboration actors and their roles

Using Collaboration theory (Himmelman, 2002), actors that are classified by its authority level and their roles in each observed collaboration period can be described as follows.

Table 4. Matrix of collaboration actors and their roles

| Actors | Period 1 (2008-2010): Towards APMCHUD 3 | Period 2 (2010-2013): Towards Eco-Cultural City of Solo | Period 3 (2014): Towards Bamboo Biennale and Creative City Acknowledgement |
|--------|----------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| INTERNATIONAL AGENCY | UN Habitat | Convener, Catalyst, Funder for global policy through special event | Convener, Catalyst, Funder for global policy* | Convener, Catalyst, Funder for global policy* |
| | KOICA | - Convener, Catalyst, Funder, Technical assistance provider, capacity builder on city transportation development | - | - |
| | GTZ | - | - | - |
| | The Asia Carbon consultant, Singapore | - | - | - |
| CENTRAL GOVERNMENT BODY | Coordinator of Minister of Welfare | Convenor, Catalyst for national policy as set up by law and other regulation and special event (APMCHUD) | Convenor, Catalyst for national policy as set up by law and other regulation* | Convenor, Catalyst for national policy as set up by law and other regulation* |
| | Minister of Public Work and Minister of Housing | Partner, Convener, Catalyst for national issues, policies and programs on Urban and housing development and special event (APMCHUD) | Partner, Convener, Catalyst for national issues, policies and programs on Urban and housing development | Partner, Convener, Catalyst for national issues, policies and programs on Urban and housing development |
| | Minister of Trade (2004 – 2009) | Partner, Convener, Catalyst for national issues, policies and programs on urban traditional market | Partner, Convener, Catalyst for national issues, policies and programs on urban traditional market* | Partner, Convener, Catalyst for national issues, policies and programs on urban traditional market* |
| | Minister of Tourism (2004 – 2009) | Partner, Convener, Catalyst for national issues, policies and programs on Solo as MICE city | - | - |
| | Minister of Tourism and Creative Economy (2009-2014) | - | - | Partner, Convener, Catalyst for national issues, policies and programs on tourism and creative economy |
| | Director General of Human Settlement MPW as deputy of MH | Partner, Convener, Catalyst for national issues, policies and programs, and local preparation for urban and | Partner, Convener, Catalyst for national issues, policies and programs for urban and | Partner, Convener, Catalyst for national issues, policies and programs for urban and housing development |
| **Directors of Human Settlement MPW as deputy of MH** | housing development Facilitator, technical assistance, funder, capacity builder of local preparation for urban and housing development | housing development Facilitator, technical assistance, funder, capacity builder for urban and housing development | Facilitator, technical assistance, funder, capacity builder for urban and housing development |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| the project officers at central, provincial and local offices of MPW and MH | Funder Technical assistance of local preparation | Funder Technical assistance urban and housing development | Funder Technical assistance urban and housing development |
| Bengawan Solo River basin authority at Ministry of Public Works | - | Catalyst, Partner, technical assistant provider | Catalyst, Partner, technical assistant provider |
| **PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT** | Central Java Governor Central Java Governor (2008 – 2013) | Formal support as stated in law and regulation | Conflict on conservation of public own building |
|  | Central Java Governor (2013 – 2018) | - | Support for conservation of heritage building and areas |
| **CITY LEVEL** | Major and Vice of Surakarta | Partner, Convener, Catalyst for city issues, policies and programs on Urban development and special event (APMCHUD) | Convener, Catalyst, community organizer for city issues, policies and programs on Urban development |
|  | Related technical offices | Community organizer Technical assistant provider and capacity builder for a community | Community organizer, Technical assistant provider and capacity builder for a community |
|  | District local authorities | Facilitator on city policy implementation Community organizer | Facilitator on city policy implementation Partner |
|  | Sub-district local authorities | Community organizer | Community organizer, Technical assistant provider, capacity builder, partner |
|  | Community champions; Local champions at sub-district level | Partner | Partner |
| **ACADEMICIAN** | University of SebelasMaret Surakarta (UNS) | Facilitator, convener, Community organizer Technical assistant provider and capacity builder for community | Catalyst, community organizer, technical assistant provider, partner |
|  | University of Muhammadiyah Surakarta Cultural Institute of Indonesia | - | Facilitator Partner |
|  | Cultural Institute of Indonesia | - | Facilitator, convener Partner |
| **PRIVATE COMMUNITY** | The Solokotakita organization | Community organizer Technical assistant provider and capacity builder for community | Catalyst, partner, Community organizer |
|  | Local, regional and national private sectors Surakarta Local NGO on river awareness | Funder, Partner | Catalyst, practitioner, Community organizer |
|  | Local social entrepreneur Local artist and professionals | Catalyst, community organizer, technical assistant provider, capacity builder, partner, facilitator | Catalyst, community organizer, technical assistant provider for community, capacity builder, partner, facilitator |
|  | Private research-design body Independent researcher | Catalyst, stakeholder mediator, technical assistant provider, capacity builder, | Catalyst, advocate, partner |
|  | | | |
5. Conclusion

5.1. Factors enable collaboration process in Solo City

Trajectory analysis of events showed consistency to continue commitment from one period to another. It also appeared consistency on putting effort to integrate the development issues, to facilitate collaboration between wide scale of actors, authorities, and disciplines, and to actualize the common purpose. Commitment on SU and SD as the outcome of the first period was continued by fostering vision Eco-Cultural City of Solo. The latest is to realize city gallery as a tool to assists good governance.

The matrix of collaboration actors also shows that local level actors i.e. the local government – major and vice, related technical offices, district and sub-district local authorities, and UNS are the most consistent participation. The role of local government grows intensively from cooperating technical assistant to convener, catalyst, initiator, partner, funder, community organizer, and facilitator.

Development plan also implemented through community partnership using competition of action plan at the district and sub-district level, as well as, regular FGD. Direct observation shows enthusiasm of the community to participate while the bottom-up actions enable trust building, knowledge sharing, and role sharing.

As the conclusion, several things that enable collaboration to happen in Solo City are: local government consistency to carry plan into implementation, local government initiative to welcome development actors and to carry out collaboration process, citizen willingness to participate towards development process, reciprocal trust of local government and citizen built by bottom-up development and community participation, society tolerance and willingness to collaborate, to innovate, and to be progressive.

5.2. Highlight from Solo City collaboration process

The trajectory analysis shows growing initiative of Solo City from the first collaboration period to the next. Starting with an event, the first collaboration put Solo City as a case that is obliged to attend global event. The next collaboration is initiated by local level actors and dedicated to Solo City community. Initiative in the last collaboration shows Solo City as a subject and initiator that allows expanding network stating Solo City as member of global society (Figure 1).
Fig. 1 The growing initiative schemes of Solo City in the collaboration practices from 2005 to 2014 (a) Pre-observation (2005-2008) initiative; (b) Period 1 (2008-2010) initiative; (c) Period 2 (2010-2013) initiative; (d) Period 3 (2013-2014) initiative.

The matrix of collaboration actors and its roles shows consistent and persistent participation of several actors, who work for two different authorities in the different period. Their shifted authority allows Solo City network to sustain and expand to bigger challenge and opportunity. Meanwhile, UNS, other academic institution, and private community are actors that have less restriction to move from one authority to another. These actors grab opportunity of their expertise and knowledge accumulation to bridge development process.

As conclusion, several things that need to be highlighted as Solo City progress through the collaboration are that the city had grew initiative from object of global agenda to initiator towards global issue, and that academic institution and private community put their initiative to bridge development process regardless level of authority. Other finding from this research is that events can be taken as opportunity and effective entry point to start collaboration, and that trust is attached more to personal performance rather than to authority or institution.
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