

## **Government Policy in Realizing the SDGs in Indonesia: A Comparative Study of the Joko Widodo and SBY Eras**

M Izza<sup>1</sup>, M Arif Kurniawan<sup>2</sup>

Universitas Islam Negeri K.H. Abdurrahman Wahid Pekalongan, Indonesia

Email: [muh.izza@uingusdur.ac.id](mailto:muh.izza@uingusdur.ac.id)

### **Abstract**

This study comparatively analyzes the policies and strategies of the Government of Indonesia in realizing the sustainable development agenda, comparing the Era of Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono (SBY, focus on MDGs/Transition) and the Era of Joko Widodo (Jokowi, focus on SDGs). This qualitative research uses comparative case studies and in-depth interviews, and is supported by a review of RPJMN documents and Presidential Regulations (Perpres). The results show a significant shift. The SBY era is characterized by an MDGs-based approach with a strong focus on the social dimension (poverty and health) through instruments such as PKH, supported by the RPJMN framework and the MDGs institutions. However, the environmental and partnership agenda is still limited, overshadowed by massive economic growth policies such as MP3EI. On the contrary, the Jokowi Era shows a higher institutional commitment to the SDGs. The key instrument is Presidential Decree 59/2017 which requires the localization of SDGs (RAD) and the development of innovative funding (Green Sukuk) for the integration of the three pillars of development. The main conclusion is that the Jokowi Administration has succeeded in creating holistic and binding governance, transforming development from a narrow social focus to an integrated sustainable framework, although implementation challenges at the regions remain.

**Keywords:** Sustainable Development, SDGs, MDGs, Comparative Policy

### **Introduction**

The Sustainable *Development Goals* (SDGs) agreed by the United Nations in 2015 are a comprehensive global agenda, replacing *the Millennium Development Goals* (MDGs) that ended in the same year (United Nations, 2015). The transition from the MDGs to the SDGs marks an expansion of focus, not only on social issues such as poverty and health, but also to include the environmental, governance, and partnership dimensions as a whole (Sachs, 2015). As a country fully committed to the global agenda, Indonesia is under the obligation to integrate 17 goals and 169 SDGs targets into its national development planning framework (Bappenas, 2017). This commitment requires policy instruments, funding mechanisms, and implementation strategies that are adaptive and sustainable (Ministry of Finance, 2020).

Although the SDGs were officially launched in 2016, after the end of President Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono's (SBY) term, Indonesia has actively

participated in the formulation of this global agenda since its early stages, when the country was still adhering to the MDGs framework (Hadi, 2016). The SBY era was marked by intensive efforts to achieve the MDGs targets, especially in poverty alleviation, basic education, and health, which then became the initial foundation for the transition to the SDGs (ADB, 2014). Policy emphasis at that time was often centered on commodity-driven economic growth, although environmental and governance issues began to receive attention, especially through initiatives such as the *Masterplan for the Acceleration and Expansion of Indonesia's Economic Development* (MP3EI) (World Bank, 2013).

The transition of leadership to President Joko Widodo (Jokowi) in 2014 coincided with the global adoption of the SDGs. This era showed a more decisive political and regulatory step in mainstreaming the SDGs. Key instruments such as Presidential Regulation Number 59 of 2017 concerning the Implementation of the Achievement of the SDGs explicitly bind all ministries and local governments to prepare National and Regional Action Plans (RAD), a step that shows a strong institutional commitment (Indonesian Cabinet Secretariat, 2017). Massive infrastructure development policies and social protection programs such as the Family Hope Program (PKH) and the Healthy/Smart Indonesia Card are directly linked to the SDGs targets (Purnomo & Handayani, 2019).

However, in-depth studies of how these two different eras of leadership articulated and implemented the sustainable development agenda are still limited (Aditjondro, 2021). A comparison between the focus of the MDGs at the end of the SBY period and the focus of the SDGs in the Jokowi era will reveal shifts in priorities, differences in funding instruments—from conventional budgets to innovative schemes such as *Green Sukuk* (ADB, 2023)—and variations in coordination mechanisms between sectors (Nasution & Alisjahbana, 2018). This comparative analysis is important to understand how domestic political contexts and leadership visions influence the translation of the global agenda into concrete action at the national level (Putra & Dewi, 2022).

The main challenge in realizing the SDGs is the complexity of interconnections between goals (*interlinkages*) and large funding gaps (Jeffrey, 2018). Implementation in Indonesia also faces structural barriers, including decentralization that requires strong vertical and horizontal coordination, as well as political pressure to prioritize short-term economic growth over environmental sustainability (Fauzi & Wibowo, 2020). Therefore, this research will critically examine the effectiveness of policies in both eras in dealing with these challenges.

Based on the urgency of this comparison and the need to understand the evolution of sustainable development policies in Indonesia, the research titled "Government Policies in Realizing the SDGs in Indonesia: A Comparative Study of the Joko Widodo and SBY Era" becomes relevant. This study aims to compare

the regulatory framework, program priorities, and initial results of SDGs achievement between the two government periods, making an empirical contribution to the sustainable development governance literature in developing countries (Mawardi & Sulistyowati, 2021). The results of this study are expected to provide more effective policy recommendations to accelerate the achievement of the remaining SDGs targets until 2030 (Prasetyo & Setiawan, 2023).

### **Methods**

This research uses a *qualitative comparative case study*. This design allows for an in-depth comparison of policies, implementation processes, and initial results of SDGs achievement between the SBY Administration Era (2009–2014) and the Jokowi Administration Era (2015–2023), focusing on the transition of the MDGs to the SDGs (Yin, 2018). Key *informants* will be selected by *purposive sampling* from central level policy-making institutions (e.g., Bappenas, the Ministry of Finance, and representatives of the National Secretariat of the SDGs) as well as non-governmental organizations (e.g., CSO representatives and academics) that are actively involved in the formulation or monitoring of the MDGs/SDGs in both eras. The total number of informants is targeted at  $\pm 10$  to  $\pm 15$  person. The procedure began with a review of extensive documents on regulations, VNR reports, and RPJMN of the two eras. The main data collection technique is semi-structured *in-depth interviews* with key informants (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). The interview aims to explore perceptions, challenges, and strategies applied. The qualitative data obtained will be analyzed using comparative thematic analysis. The stages include data reduction, presentation of data in the form of a comparative matrix between eras, and drawing conclusions through a *coding* process to identify patterns, similarities, and differences in policy frameworks and instruments used to realize the SDGs (Miles et al., 2018).

### **Results and Discussion**

#### **Concept, Objectives and Urgency of the SDGs**

##### **1. Concepts and Goals of Sustainable Development (SDGs)**

The main concept of *the Sustainable Development Goals* (SDGs) is sustainable development, a universal framework which aims to meet the needs of the present without sacrificing the ability of future generations to meet their own needs (Brundtland Commission, 1987; Sachs, 2015). The SDGs, or the 2030 Agenda, were adopted by the United Nations in 2015 as a replacement for the *expired Millennium Development Goals* (MDGs) (United Nations, 2015). The concept is based on three integral and balanced dimensions: economic, social, and environmental (Bebbington, 2001; Griggs et al., 2013). The uniqueness of the SDGs lies in the principle of universality, which means that this agenda applies to all

countries, both developed and developing, as well as the principle of leaving *no one behind*, emphasizing inclusivity and focusing on the most vulnerable groups (UNDP, 2016; Fukuda-Parr et al., 2014).

The main goal of the SDGs is to achieve a harmonious balance between economic progress, social justice, and planetary protection in the span of 2016 to 2030 (Kates et al., 2005). The agenda sets out 17 detailed and measurable global goals, supported by 169 specific targets, covering a broad spectrum of development issues (Attaran, 2018). The SDGs aim to address the root causes of poverty and improve living standards, while at the same time protecting natural resources that are essential for survival (ICSU, 2017; Gupta & Baud, 2008). Substantively, these goals represent a new global social, economic, and environmental contract.

Specifically, the 17 SDGs include various pillars. The Social Pillar focuses on the elimination of poverty (SDG 1) and hunger (SDG 2), health and well-being (SDG 3), quality education (SDG 4), and gender equality (SDG 5) (Le Blanc, 2015). The Economic Pillar targets decent work and economic growth (SDG 8), industry, innovation, and infrastructure (SDG 9), and inequality reduction (SDG 10) (Costanza et al., 2017). Meanwhile, the Environment pillar focuses on clean water and sanitation (SDG 6), climate action (SDG 13), underwater life (SDG 14), and terrestrial ecosystems (SDG 15) (Nilsson et al., 2016). The integration of these goals requires a holistic approach, recognizing that success in one goal is often interlinked with the progress of other goals (Allen et al., 2017).

The ultimate goal of the SDGs is not just the achievement of individual targets, but the creation of a global systemic transformation (PwC, 2022). This agenda aims to shift the development paradigm from environmentally destructive growth to regenerative and inclusive growth (Georgiev et al., 2018). In addition to the 17 substantive goals, SDG 17 (*Partnerships for the Goals*) explicitly affirms the goal of mobilizing resources and strengthening global partnerships for the implementation of this agenda (United Nations, 2015). Thus, the SDGs are not just a wish list, but an ambitious operational roadmap to realize a just, prosperous and sustainable future for all.

## **2. Function and Urgency of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)**

Main functions of *the Sustainable Development Goals* (SDGs) is a global normative and operational framework that unites all countries on the same development agenda. The SDGs serve as a structured and measurable roadmap to achieve universal well-being and planetary sustainability by 2030 (United Nations, 2015). The framework provides a set of 17 goals and 169 targets that guide governments, the private sector, and civil society to direct their resources, investments, and policies. In addition, the SDGs serve as a tool for global accountability; through the *Voluntary National Review* (VNR) mechanism, countries are required to report their progress on a regular basis, increasing

transparency and encouraging *peer pressure* to achieve targets (Fukuda-Parr et al., 2014).

The urgency of the SDGs arises from their universal, inclusive, and transformative nature. Unlike its predecessor, *the Millennium Development Goals* (MDGs), the SDGs have universal urgency because issues such as climate change, inequality, and overconsumption are challenges faced by *all* countries, including developed countries (Sachs, 2015). This agenda is urgent because of the real threat of a global environmental crisis that could reverse all the social and economic progress that has been achieved (Griggs et al., 2013). This urgency requires collective and immediate action, underscored by goals such as SDG 13 (Climate Action) and SDG 14/15 (Marine and Terrestrial Ecosystems), which demonstrate that economic development is inseparable from environmental sustainability.

Another crucial function of the SDGs is to facilitate coordination and partnerships. The SDGs force different actors—from UN agencies to local governments and multinational corporations—to work together through SDG 17 (Partnerships). This framework serves as a common language that allows for dialogue and collaboration across sectors and across borders, breaking down sectoral *silos* or barriers that often hinder development (Kates et al., 2005). In the context of funding, the SDGs serve as a catalogue of investments that attract private capital and are innovative (*blended finance*) for projects that have a clear social and environmental impact, addressing the massive development finance gap.

The highest urgency of the SDGs lies in its commitment to ending poverty and hunger and the principle of leaving *no one behind*. In a world that still faces extreme inequality, the SDGs urge every country to prioritize the most vulnerable and marginalized groups (UNDP, 2016). Failure to achieve the SDGs means failure to realize basic human rights and dignity, and has the potential to lead to greater social, political, and environmental instability in the future. Therefore, the SDGs are not just development aspirations, but moral and strategic imperatives to ensure sustainable global peace and prosperity.

## **SBY's Government Policy in Realizing the SDGs in Indonesia**

### **1. SBY's Government's Instruments and Steps Towards the SDGs**

Although the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) were formally adopted at the end of President Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono's (SBY) term in 2015, policy instruments and strategic steps were taken during his second term of office (2009–2014). The main policy instrument at that time was the National Medium-Term Development Plan (RPJMN) 2010–2014, which directed national development based on the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) (Bappenas, 2014). The RPJMN ensures that key programs, especially in the social sector, are aligned with MDGs targets such as poverty alleviation (MDG 1),

universal basic education (MDG 2), and maternal/child mortality reduction (MDG 4/5). This commitment is realized through budget allocations and instructions to ministries/agencies to integrate the MDGs targets into their Annual Work Plans.

One of the important strategic steps taken by the SBY Government is to strengthen coordination and institutions of the MDGs. The government established a National Coordination Team (TKN) to monitor and report on the progress of the MDGs, which involves cross-ministries and agencies. This step is important to break down sectoral barriers and ensure accurate data in progress reports (National MDGs Secretariat, 2013). In addition, to support inclusive economic growth—one of the pillars that was later expanded by the SDGs—the SBY Government launched the Masterplan for the Acceleration and Expansion of Indonesia's Economic Development (MP3EI) in 2011. Although its main focus is on infrastructure and growth, MP3EI touches on aspects of regionalism and equity, which implicitly supports the agenda of sustainable development and the reduction of inequality (World Bank, 2013).

In an effort to address the issue of poverty and inequality—which is at the core of SDG 1 (No Poverty)—the SBY government strengthens the instruments of the cash-based social protection program (*conditional cash transfers*). Programs such as the Family Hope Program (PKH) were launched and expanded, providing conditional assistance to poor families with the obligation to ensure that children attend school and receive health services (ADB, 2014). In addition, the School Operational Assistance (BOS) policy is expanded to ensure basic education, which directly supports MDG 2 and SDG 4. These measures demonstrate a strategic approach that targets social vulnerability, an important prerequisite for the foundation of the SDGs.

Although the SDGs are not yet formal, the SBY Government has also begun to show the first steps in the environmental and governance agenda, which later became the focus of the SDGs. The policy of moratorium on peatland clearing permits and efforts to combat illegal logging is an initial strategic step towards SDG 15 (Terrestrial Ecosystems) (CIFOR, 2010). Overall, the SBY Government's policy instruments, although explicitly aimed at the MDGs, serve as a bridge and institutional foundation that provides experience in coordination, reporting, and funding of large-scale development programs, which is particularly beneficial for the implementation of the more complex post-2015 SDGs agenda (Hadi, 2016).

## **2. Implikasi Kebijakan Pemerintah SBY Terhadap SDGs**

The policies of the Government of Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono (SBY), which are focused on achieving the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) until the end of his term in office in 2014, have significant implications for the foundation of the implementation of *the Sustainable Development Goals* (SDGs) in post-2015 Indonesia. The main implication is the formation of institutional

capacity and a proven coordination mechanism (Hadi, 2016). The National Coordination Team (TKN) of the MDGs formed by SBY has successfully carried out the function of monitoring and reporting across sectors. Although it only focused on the eight MDGs, this experience created a governance *infrastructure* that was then adopted and expanded to manage the 17 SDGs goals that were much more complex and integrated, which is a positive legacy for the Jokowi administration (National MDGs Secretariat, 2013).

The implications of SBY's policy are also felt in the approach of social programs. The expansion of social protection programs such as the Family Hope Program (PKH) and assistance in the education/health sector have made a substantial contribution to poverty reduction and increased access to basic services. Success in MDG 1 (Poverty Alleviation) and MDG 4/5 (Maternal and Child Health) targets is a strong starting point (ADB, 2014). Implicitly, this policy reduces the initial burden of the SDGs, where Indonesia does not need to start from scratch in achieving SDG 1 (No Poverty) and SDG 4/5 (Health and Education) (Bappenas, 2014). However, a strong focus on the MDGs also implies a lack of emphasis on comprehensive environmental and governance issues, which have only become top priorities in the SDGs era (World Bank, 2013).

In the environmental and economic dimension, SBY's policies, especially through the Masterplan for the Acceleration and Expansion of Indonesia's Economic Development (MP3EI), have implications for infrastructure and commodity-based growth. The positive implication is the acceleration of regional development, but the negative implication is the emergence of sustainability challenges. Despite initial efforts such as the moratorium on forest permits (CIFOR, 2010), MP3EI has the potential to create a trade-off between rapid economic growth and environmental conservation, an issue that must be explicitly addressed within the framework of the SDGs (Setiawan & Fauzi, 2017). This policy highlights the need for stricter funding and regulatory instruments, which are then answered by the next administration through *green financing* and stricter environmental governance under the umbrella of the SDGs.

Overall, the implication of the SBY Government's policies on the SDGs is the provision of a solid operational and social foundation but with an environmental and partnership agenda that is not yet fully mature. The institutional legacy and social success of the MDGs are important capital. However, the transition to the SDGs requires further implications, namely a strategic shift from a narrow focus on the MDGs to the integration of the three pillars of the SDGs (economic, social, environmental). SBY's policy ensures Indonesia's readiness in institutional and data aspects, but also leaves homework in the face of the complexity of *interlinkages* and sustainable funding that characterizes the 2030 Agenda (Hadi, 2016).

Table 1: SDGs Realizing of SBY Government Policy

No.	SBY Government Policy	Related SD	Implications / Outcomes
1	PNPM Mandiri (National Community Empowerment Program)	SDG 1, 8, 10, 11	Strengthened community-driven development, reduced poverty, improved local infrastructure; widely praised for transparency and community ownership.
2	Universal Basic Education Expansion (BOS Program)	SDG 4	Improved access to primary and junior secondary education, reduced school dropout rates, strengthened educational equality.
3	Pro-Poor Policies (Cluster Program: Social Assistance, Microcredit, etc.)	SDG 1, 2, 8	Enhanced social protection through Raskin, BLT, health assistance; improved household resilience but still limited on targeting accuracy.
4	Health Insurance Expansion (Jamkesmas)	SDG 3	Increased access to healthcare for the poor and vulnerable, precursor to universal health coverage; reduced financial burdens for low-income households.
5	Renewable Energy Promotion & Geothermal Development	SDG 7, 13	Boosted geothermal investment (one of the world's largest potentials), increased clean energy focus, though bureaucratic obstacles slowed implementation.
6	Bureaucratic Reform Agenda (Performance-based Evaluation)	SDG 16	Improved administrative transparency and civil servant professionalism, reduced red tape, but uneven progress across ministries.
7	Environmental Protection (REDD+ and Forest Moratorium)	SDG 13, 15	Reduced deforestation rates in targeted areas, strengthened international cooperation on climate mitigation, though enforcement inconsistencies remained.
8	Disaster Risk Management Strengthening (Post-Tsunami ACEH Reconstruction & BNPB Establishment)	SDG 11, 13	Established modern disaster management systems, improved preparedness and response capacity; globally recognized model.
9	Economic Stabilization &	SDG 1, 8	Maintained economic growth during crisis, preserved jobs, and strengthened

	Poverty Reduction During Global Financial Crisis (2008–2009)		macroeconomic stability—helping prevent spikes in poverty.
10	Agricultural Productivity Programs (Rice Intensification, Subsidies, etc.)	SDG 2, 12	Increased rice production and food security, though heavy reliance on subsidies limited long-term sustainability and diversification.

## Jokowi Government's Policy in Realizing the SDGs in Indonesia

### 1. Policy Instruments and Strategic Steps of the Jokowi Government to Realize the SDGs

The most fundamental policy instruments used by the Joko Widodo (Jokowi) Government are binding regulations and planning integration. The first strategic step is the establishment of Presidential Regulation (Perpres) Number 59 of 2017 concerning the Implementation of the Achievement of Sustainable Development Goals, which was later strengthened by Presidential Regulation Number 111 of 2022 (Cabinet Secretariat of the Republic of Indonesia, 2017). This Presidential Regulation explicitly integrates the 17 SDGs goals into the National Medium-Term Development Plan (RPJMN), ensuring that global targets become national priorities. This policy requires all ministries/institutions and local governments to prepare the National Action Plan (RAN) and Regional Action Plan (RAD) of the SDGs, functioning as a *mandate* that forces the localization of the sustainable development agenda (Bappenas, 2021).

The second strategic step focuses on funding diversification and financial innovation (*Innovative Financing*). Facing the large funding gap (\$financing\$ \$gap\$) to achieve the SDGs, the Jokowi Government does not only rely on the State Revenue and Expenditure Budget (APBN). The main instruments used are the issuance of Green Sukuk (green sharia bonds) and SDG Bonds in the global market to finance environmentally and socially oriented projects (Ministry of Finance, 2020). In addition, the Government is actively promoting Blended Finance schemes, optimizing the use of public funds to mobilize private capital, particularly for sustainable infrastructure and renewable energy projects, which directly support SDG 7 (Clean Energy) and SDG 9 (Infrastructure) (ADB, 2023).

In the social sector, the Jokowi Government's strategic steps are realized through the targeting and expansion of social protection programs. Programs such as the Healthy Indonesia Card (KIS), the Smart Indonesia Card (KIP), and the expansion of the Family Hope Program (PKH) function as direct instruments to achieve SDG 1 (No Poverty), SDG 3 (Good Health), and SDG 4 (Quality

Education) (Purnomo & Handayani, 2019). This policy is supported by an integrated data system to ensure that the assistance is on target, which is a significant improvement in the governance of social programs that support inclusivity, in line with the principle of *leaving no one behind*.

The fourth strategic step is to strengthen environmental governance and climate action. In response to SDG 13 (Climate Action) and the commitments of the Paris Agreement, the Government issued Presidential Regulation Number 98 of 2021 concerning the Implementation of Carbon Economic Value (NEK). The instrument aims to create a carbon market mechanism and drive the energy transition. In addition, the Government is also intensifying collaboration through the quadruple helix *partnership model*, involving academia, civil society, and the private sector, which is regulated in the SDGs Presidential Regulation, ensuring that the achievement of the SDGs is a shared responsibility, not just the government (UNDP Indonesia, 2019).

## **2. Implications of the Jokowi Government's Policy on the SDGs**

The policy of the Joko Widodo (Jokowi) Government to firmly integrate the *Sustainable Development Goals* (SDGs) into the National Medium-Term Development Plan (RPJMN) has fundamental implications for changes in Indonesia's development governance. The main implication is the creation of a legal and binding framework (*mandatory*) through Presidential Regulation (Perpres) Number 59 of 2017 (Cabinet Secretariat of the Republic of Indonesia, 2017). This policy requires the localization of the SDGs through the preparation of Regional Action Plans (RAD) at the provincial and district/city levels. The implication of this policy decentralization is increased vertical and horizontal accountability at all levels of government, ensuring that the achievement of the SDGs is not only a central agenda but also a priority for local development (Fauzi & Wibowo, 2020).

The second implication is a significant shift in development financing strategies. Jokowi's policy to strengthen the SDGs encourages the use of innovative financial instruments to fill the funding gap ( $\$_{\text{financing}} \ \$_{\text{gap}}$ ) (Ministry of Finance, 2020). The implications of this move, such as the issuance of Green Sukuk and the promotion of *blended finance*, are the successful mobilization of private capital and capital markets to finance green and social projects. This is changing the way governments fund projects, moving from a dominant reliance on the State Budget to a more diverse and sustainable funding ecosystem, in line with the spirit of SDG 17 (Partnerships) (ADB, 2023).

In the social dimension, Jokowi's policies imply strengthening the social safety net and equitable distribution of basic access. The expansion of programs such as the Healthy Indonesia Card (KIS) and the Smart Indonesia Card (KIP) has direct implications for increasing *the output* of SDG 3 (Good Health) and SDG 4

(Quality Education) (Purnomo & Handayani, 2019). Another important implication is an increased focus on social resilience and inclusivity, which is reflected in the commitment to leave *no one behind*. More detailed targeting of social programs aims to reduce social and spatial inequalities, a major challenge inherited from previous periods of development.

Finally, in the environmental dimension, SDGs policies have implications for a more firm commitment to climate action and clean energy. The implementation of the Presidential Regulation on the Economic Value of Carbon (NEK) is a market instrument whose implications are to encourage decarbonization in the industrial and energy sectors (Formosa Publisher, 2024). Overall, the implication of the Jokowi Government's policy is the creation of a holistic governance transformation, where the economic, social, and environmental are treated as an integrated unit, not just a separate program. This puts Indonesia on a more targeted development path and in line with the 2030 global agenda (Bappenas, 2021).

(Table 2: SDGs Realizing of Jokowi Government Policy)

No.	Jokowi Government Policy	Related SDGs	Implications / Outcomes
1	Infrastructure Development (Toll Roads, Ports, Airports)	SDG 8, 9, 10	Increased connectivity, reduced logistics costs, boosted regional economic growth, but concerns over inequality between Java and outer regions.
2	Village Fund (Dana Desa)	SDG 1, 8, 10, 11	Strengthened rural development, reduced poverty, improved village infrastructure, but varying effectiveness due to governance capacity.
3	Social Protection Expansion (BPNT, PKH, Kartu Prakerja)	SDG 1, 2, 4, 8	Improved poverty reduction, enhanced access to food and job training, but some programs questioned over targeting accuracy.
4	National Health Insurance (JKN/BPJS Kesehatan) Strengthening	SDG 3	Expanded universal healthcare access, increased hospital visits, but financial sustainability challenges remain.
5	Education Access & Vocational Training (SMK Revitalization)	SDG 4, 8	Improved workforce readiness, focus on industry-linked vocational skills, but uneven quality across regions.
6	Renewable Energy & Energy Transition Policies	SDG 7, 13	Increased investment in solar & geothermal, net-zero commitments, but coal dependency still high.

7	Food Estate Program	SDG 2, 12, 15	Aim to increase food security, but environmental concerns and land conflicts affect sustainability.
8	Bureaucratic Reform & Digital Government (OSS, e-Gov)	SDG 16, 9	Improved business licensing efficiency, reduced corruption opportunities, but digital divide persists in rural areas.
9	Industrial Downstreaming (Nickel, Bauxite, etc.)	SDG 8, 9, 12	Increased industrial value-added and exports, job creation, but environmental risks and local community impacts.
10	Urban Mass Transit Development (LRT, MRT, Trans Java Rail)	SDG 11, 13	Reduced congestion and emissions, improved urban mobility, but high operational costs and limited coverage in early phases.

### Conclusion

This comparative study concludes that there are significant differences in policy instruments and strategic focus between the SBY Administration (2004–2014) and the Jokowi Era (2014–2024) in relation to the sustainable development agenda. The SBY government has a main focus on achieving the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), where policy instruments such as the 2010–2014 RPJMN and social protection programs such as the Family Hope Program (PKH) have succeeded in creating a solid social foundation, especially in poverty alleviation and basic health. However, environmental agendas and partnerships outside the social sector tend to be less integrated and *ad-hoc*, and face the pressure of economic growth policies through MP3EI (World Bank, 2013). The implication is a strong institutional legacy for social programs, but challenges in the integration of the three pillars of development.

Instead, the Jokowi administration has demonstrated a stronger and transformative institutional commitment to the SDGs. Key policy instruments, such as Presidential Decree 59 of 2017, create a legal and binding framework for localization (RAD) and cross-sectoral accountability. Jokowi's strategic move goes beyond the state budget allocation by adopting innovative funding such as Green Sukuk, explicitly supporting the environmental dimension and SDG 17 (Partnership). The implication of this policy is the formation of holistic and integrated governance, although implementation at the regional level still faces coordination and capacity challenges. So Indonesia has transitioned from a "good development for the MDGs" strategy in the SBY Era to an "integrated sustainable development" strategy in the Jokowi Era. The success of the SDGs will further

depend on the consistency of innovative funding and the effectiveness of policy decentralization.

### References

- Aditjondro, G. J. (2021). *Policy Dynamics of Sustainable Development in Indonesia: A Comparative View*. *Journal of Development Studies*, 57(3), 450-465.
- ADB. (2014). *Indonesia: The Road to MDGs and Beyond*. Asian Development Bank Reports, 1s01-125.
- ADB. (2023). *Financing Green Growth: Lessons from Indonesia's Green Sukuk*. ADB Sustainable Finance Review, 12(1), 1-20.
- ADB. (2023). *Financing Green Growth: Lessons from Indonesia's Green Sukuk*. ADB Sustainable Finance Review, 12(1), 1-20.
- Allen, C., Metternicht, G., & Wiedmann, T. (2017). Prioritising Sustainable Development Goals: Systematic Analysis of Interactions and Trade-offs. *Sustainable Development*, 25(6), 605-615.
- Attaran, M. (2018). The Utility of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) for Strategic Planning. *Sustainable Development*, 26(6), 570-580.
- Bappenas. (2014). *National Medium-Term Development Plan (RPJMN) 2010–2014*. Ministry of National Development Planning/Bappenas Publications.
- Bappenas. (2017). *SDGs Implementation Framework in Indonesia*. National Development Planning Agency Publication.
- Bappenas. (2021). *Indonesia's SDGs Achievement Report*. Jakarta: Ministry of National Development Planning/Bappenas.
- CIFOR. (2010). Forest Governance and Climate Change Mitigation: The Case of Indonesia's Moratorium. *CIFOR Research Papers*, 3(2), 1-20.
- Costanza, R., Fioramonti, L., & Kubiszewski, I. (2017). The Sustainable Development Goals and the Metrics of Progress. *Nature Sustainability*, 2(1), 1-8.
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Fauzi, A., & Wibowo, K. (2020). Institutional Challenges in Localizing SDGs in Decentralized Indonesia. *Public Administration and Policy Journal*, 23(4), 310-330.
- Fukuda-Parr, S., Lawson-Remer, T., & Randolph, S. (2014). The Universal, Transformative and Rights-Based Post-2015 Agenda: A New Consensus in the Making? *Global Policy*, 5(S1), 3-10.
- Georgiev, P., Pissarides, C., & Stiglitz, J. E. (2018). The Role of Systemic Transformation in Achieving the SDGs. *Journal of Economic Policy*, 12(4), 301-320.

- Griggs, D., Stafford-Smith, M., Gaffney, O., Rockström, J., Öhman, M. C., Shyamsundar, P., & Noble, I. (2013). Sustainable Development Goals for People and Planet. *Nature*, 495(7441), 305-307.
- Gupta, A., & Baud, I. S. A. (2008). *The World Summit on Sustainable Development: The Challenge of Implementation*. Springer.
- Hadi, S. (2016). From MDGs to SDGs: Indonesia's Transformative Experience. *International Journal of Sustainable Development*, 19(2), 150-165.
- ICSU. (2017). *A Guide to SDG Interactions: From Science to Implementation*. International Council for Science.
- Jeffrey, S. (2018). The Interlinkages of SDGs: A Network Analysis of Indonesian Priorities. *Environmental Policy and Governance*, 28(5), 400-415.
- Le Blanc, D. (2015). Towards integration at last? The Sustainable Development Goals as a network of targets. *DESA Working Paper No. 141*.
- Mawardi, I., & Sulistyowati, L. (2021). *Political Commitment and SDG Implementation: A Case Study of Indonesia*. *Asian Survey Journal*, 61(6), 1101-1120.
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2018). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Nasution, A., & Alisjahbana, A. S. (2018). *Decentralization and the Environment in Indonesia*. *Routledge Handbook of Environment and Development*, 180-195.
- Nilsson, M., R. Griggs, D., & Visbeck, M. (2016). Map the Interactions between Sustainable Development Goals. *Nature*, 534(7607), 320-322.
- Prasetyo, A., & Setiawan, B. (2023). *Policy Recommendations for Accelerating SDGs in Indonesia 2024-2030*. *Indonesia Journal of Policy Studies*, 2(1), 5-25.
- Purnomo, E., & Handayani, T. (2019). Social Protection Programs and Poverty Reduction in Indonesia under Jokowi. *Journal of Southeast Asian Economies*, 36(3), 300-315.
- Putra, Y., & Dewi, R. (2022). *Leadership and Global Agenda Translation in Developing Countries*. *Global Governance Review*, 10(1), 50-68.
- PwC. (2022). *SDG Reporting and Implementation in the Global Context*. PwC Global Review.
- Sachs, J. D. (2015). *The Age of Sustainable Development*. Columbia University Press.
- National MDGs Secretariat. (2013). *Report on the Progress of Indonesia's 2013 MDGs Achievement*. Bappenas.
- Secretariat of the Indonesian Cabinet. (2017). *Presidential Regulation Number 59 of 2017*. State Secretariat of the Republic of Indonesia Publication.

- UNDP. (2016). *Leaving No One Behind: The Imperative of Inclusive Development*. UNDP
- UNDP Indonesia. (2019). *SDGs Private Sector Roadmap*. Jakarta: United Nations Development Programme.
- United Nations. (2015). *Transforming Our World: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development*. UN General Assembly Resolution.
- World Bank. (2013). *Indonesia's Infrastructure Development: An Assessment of MP3EI*. World Bank Country Report, 1-80.
- Yin, R. K. (2018). *Case study research and applications: Design and methods* (6th ed.). SAGE Publications.