ISSN: 3165-0635
ADMINOVA
Journal of Administrative Science and Innovation
Volume 1, Issue 3, 2026
e-ISSN: 3165-0635

Governance of Gender-Responsive Planning and Budgeting (PPRG) in the Surabaya City Government: An Analysis of Actors, Power, and Collaboration

Nabilatus Sa'diyah[1]*, Devi Artika Sari[2], Farah Ardelia Ambarwati[3], Hamida Rizky Amalia[4], Muhammad Shulthon Ferdiansyah[5], Suci Megawati[6]

[1,2,3,4,5,6]*Public Administration, Universitas Negeri Surabaya, Indonesia*

Email: [1]24040674293@mhs.unesa.ac.id, [2]24040674260@mhs.unesa.ac.id, [3]24040674264@mhs.unesa.ac.id, [4]24040674269@mhs.unesa.ac.id, [5]24040674276@mhs.unesa.ac.id, [6]sucimegawati@unesa.ac.id

**Corresponding author: 24040674293@mhs.unesa.ac.id*

ARTICLE INFO

Article History
Received:
10 November 2026
Accepted:
11 December 2026
Publication:
12 December 2026

Keywords
Gender Responsive Budgeting
Sustainability Governance
SDG 5
Surabaya
Collaboration

Kata Kunci
PPRG
Tata Kelola Keberlanjutan
SDG 5
Kota Surabaya
Kolaborasi

ABSTRACT

Gender Responsive Planning and Budgeting (GRPB, or PPRG) is a bureaucratic instrument for translating gender equality commitments (SDG 5) into local planning and budget documents. This article analyses the governance of PPRG in the City of Surabaya using five perspectives from the Integrative Sustainability Governance framework: transition governance, metagovernance, polycentricity, network governance, and experimentalist governance, complemented by the pillars of power, knowledge, and norms. The study is a qualitative case study based on document analysis of local regulations, institutional decrees, the 2025 gender profiles of local agencies, and prior literature. The findings show that Surabaya's legal and institutional framework for PPRG is comprehensive and hierarchy-dominated, supported by collaboration with universities, women's studies centres, and women's forums. Evidence of substantive change, however, remains limited: some Gender Budget Statements lack budget figures or authorisation, trained staff are scarce in one agency examined (4 of 125 employees), and the gender-responsive budgets in both examples mostly reflect coordination and general operations rather than targeted gap reduction. The reviewed documents contain no evidence that evaluation results led to rule changes. The article concludes that PPRG governance in Surabaya is institutionally strong but only partly substantive.

ABSTRAK

Perencanaan dan Penganggaran Responsif Gender (PPRG) adalah instrumen birokrasi untuk menerjemahkan komitmen kesetaraan gender (SDG 5) ke dalam dokumen perencanaan dan anggaran daerah. Artikel ini menganalisis tata kelola PPRG di Pemerintah Kota Surabaya melalui lima perspektif dalam kerangka Integrative Sustainability Governance, yaitu transition governance, metagovernance, polisentrisitas, tata kelola jaringan, dan tata kelola eksperimentalis, serta tiga pilar kekuasaan, pengetahuan, dan norma. Studi ini menggunakan desain studi kasus kualitatif berbasis analisis dokumen terhadap regulasi daerah, keputusan kelembagaan, profil gender perangkat daerah 2025, dan literatur terdahulu. Hasilnya menunjukkan kerangka hukum dan kelembagaan PPRG Surabaya tergolong lengkap, didominasi mode hierarki, dan dilengkapi jejaring kolaborasi dengan perguruan tinggi, pusat studi wanita, dan forum perempuan. Namun, bukti perubahan substantif masih terbatas. Sebagian dokumen Gender Budget Statement belum memuat besaran anggaran atau pengesahan, rasio SDM terlatih rendah pada salah satu perangkat daerah (4 dari 125 pegawai), dan anggaran responsif gender pada kedua contoh lebih mencerminkan kegiatan koordinasi dan operasional umum daripada penutupan kesenjangan gender yang spesifik. Dalam dokumen yang dikaji belum ditemukan bukti bahwa hasil evaluasi mengubah desain aturan. Artikel menyimpulkan tata kelola PPRG Surabaya kuat secara institusional tetapi baru sebagian substantif, dan merekomendasikan penguatan kualitas GBS, kapasitas SDM, indikator hasil, serta kolaborasi yang lebih inklusif.

INTRODUCTION

Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 5 aims to achieve gender equality and empower all women and girls (United Nations, 2015). In Indonesia, the primary approach is gender mainstreaming (PUG), which was implemented through Presidential Instruction No. 9 of 2000. This was subsequently elaborated upon for local governments through Ministry of Home Affairs Regulation No. 15 of 2008 in conjunction with No. 67 of 2011, and its oversight is carried out in accordance with Ministry of Home Affairs Regulation No. 4 of 2014, which sets forth guidelines for monitoring gender-responsive planning and budgeting. In this approach, the PPRG serves as a tool within the bureaucracy. The Surabaya Mayor's Regulation describes this as a tool to address disparities in access, participation, control, and the benefits of development for women and men in order to achieve a more equitable budget (Mayor of Surabaya, 2020, Article 1, point 8).

Surabaya is often regarded as a model region. The city has Local Regulation No. 4 of 2019 on Gender Mainstreaming, supplemented by its implementing regulations

(Mayor of Surabaya, 2020), and was recognized as the recipient of the Parahita Ekapraya Award in the Mentor category under Ministerial Decree No. 246 of 2023 issued by the Ministry of Women's Empowerment and Child Protection. The city's Gender Development Index (GDI) rose from 93.58 in 2020 to 95.56 in 2023 (Kinasih et al., 2025). However, gaps in gender equality remain evident. Women's participation in the labor force stood at 59.48 percent, while that of men reached 81.92 percent (Surabaya City BPS, 2023, as cited by Kinasih et al., 2025). The Gender Mainstreaming (PUG) profile from the Surabaya City Regional Development Planning, Research, and Development Agency (Bappedalitbang) for 2025 even indicates that the low level of gender awareness among civil servants risks reducing the implementation of PUG to mere formal procedures that fail to address substantive issues. Previous evaluations have also highlighted the need to increase the number of and improve the skills of PUG agents, as well as to supplement disaggregated data (Ilham & Velianto, 2022).

Previous research has generally evaluated PUG using seven criteria or outcome indices. Research on how actors, forces, and forms of collaboration influence the effectiveness of PPRG remains quite limited. Data from the city of Padang indicate that the level of PPRG oversight is influenced by auditors' limited understanding of gender issues, the scarcity of gender-responsive audit indicators, and suboptimal commitment from relevant institutions (Zolila & Misra, 2025). This article addresses this gap by employing Monkelbaan's (2019) sustainability governance framework to analyze PPRG in Surabaya.

This article addresses four key questions: (1) who are the actors and institutions involved, and how are roles and power distributed among them; (2) what are the patterns of communication, coordination, collaboration, and cooperation among the actors; (3) what are the strengths and weaknesses of this governance model; and (4) does this governance model bring about significant change, or is it merely a formal collaboration? This issue is also related to SDG 8 (participation and equal employment opportunities for women) and SDG 17 (partnerships and policy coherence), which will be briefly discussed in the implications section.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Gender Responsive Planning and Budgeting (GRPB) as a Governance Tool

Gender Responsive Planning and Budgeting (GRPB) does not mean allocating a special budget for women or dividing the budget equally between men and women.

Pursuant to Surabaya Mayor's Regulation No. 43 of 2020, the gender-responsive budget is designed to ensure that policies and the use of the local budget take into account the different needs and issues faced by men and women. Thus, the gender-responsive budget serves as one of the government's tools for reducing gender disparities through the development planning and budgeting process. The implementation of the PPRG is supported by several key instruments, including the Gender Analysis Pathway (GAP) as a method for identifying gender gaps; the Gender Budget Statement (GBS), which outlines programs, activities, desired outcomes, gender conditions, action plans, and budgetary needs, and the Terms of Reference (TOR), which are drafted with a gender perspective in mind. In addition, the implementation of Gender Mainstreaming (PUG) is supported by seven prerequisites, including policy, commitment, institutional framework, resources and budget, disaggregated data, analytical tools, and community involvement. Because its implementation involves various local government agencies ranging from planning to financial management and technical implementation the PPRG requires coordination and integration among government units.

Kerangka *Integrative Sustainability Governance*

Monkelbaan (2019) developed the concept of Integrative Sustainability Governance (ISG) as an approach that combines five governance perspectives to understand sustainable development issues more comprehensively. These five perspectives are interrelated and can be used simultaneously because each has a different analytical focus. This approach is also underpinned by three main pillars power, knowledge, and norms which play a role in shaping the governance process. The pillar of power relates to leadership, relationships among actors, and providing opportunities for various parties to participate in decision-making. The pillar of knowledge emphasizes the importance of adaptability, information sharing, and evaluation processes to improve policies. Meanwhile, the pillar of norms encompasses the values of justice, trust, and openness to the participation of various community groups.

Table 1
Analysis Matrix: Theoretical Perspectives and Questions on Gender-Responsive Planning and Budgeting (GRPB) in Surabaya

Perspective	Focus of the analysis	Questions for the Surabaya PPRG
Metagovernance	Configuration of a combination of hierarchy, network, and market	Who sets the rules for PPRG, and which mode is dominant?
Polycentricity	Many interconnected decision-making centers	How are responsibilities divided among the central government, provinces, cities, local government agencies, and sub districts?
Network governance	Relationships among actors in the policy network	What is communication, coordination, and collaboration among stakeholders like?
Experimental governance	The dynamic cycle of learning and accountability	Did the evaluation lead to improvements in rules and practices?
Transition governance	Long term structural changes	Does the PPRG change the way the bureaucracy operates, or does it just add more paperwork?
Pillars of power	Leadership, relationships, empowerment	Who is in charge, and what is the role of women in leadership?
Pillars of Knowledge	Data, Capacity, Reflection	Do the disaggregated data and human resources capacity support budget decisions?
Normative pillar	Justice, trust, inclusivity	Is the process inclusive and fair to vulnerable groups?

Source: Adapted by the author from Monkelbaan (2019, Chapters 2, 5, and 7).

RESEARCH METHODS

This study employed a qualitative method using a case study design. Data were collected through document analysis and a literature review, without interviews or field observations. This study focuses on the governance of Gender-Responsive Planning and Budgeting (GRPB) in the Surabaya City Government for the 2019–2025 period, beginning with the enactment of the Local Regulation on Gender Mainstreaming (PUG) through the most recent available documents. The documents used include Surabaya Mayor's Regulation No. 43 of 2020 and its legal basis including Local Regulation No. 4 of 2019; Decision of the Head of DP3APPKB No. 400.2.2.2/6800/436.7.8/2025 on the Forum for Gender Mainstreaming (PUG) and Gender-Responsive Budgeting (PPRG) Facilitators; the 2025 PUG Profile from Bappedalitbang and Dr. M. Soewandhie Regional General Hospital; Decision of the Minister of Women's Empowerment and Child Protection No. 246 of 2023; as well as scientific literature on PUG in Surabaya and PPRG oversight. These two regional

agencies were selected because they perform distinct functions: planning and service delivery.

The analysis was conducted by grouping the document's content based on the eight aspects examined: actors and institutions; the division of roles and power; communication patterns; coordination; cooperation; collaboration; strengths and weaknesses; and the resulting changes. To assess the results of the PPRG's implementation, six indicators were used that refer to the "Learning" stage in the ISG cycle and Article 13 of the Mayor's Regulation, namely: the comprehensiveness of the policy framework; integration into budget documents; the quality of gender analysis; human resource capacity; lessons learned from evaluations; and program outcomes.

This study has limitations because the data were obtained solely from documents, making it impossible to directly observe communication and power dynamics among the actors. Additionally, the Gender Equality Profile is a self-reported document prepared by local government agencies. The appendices including the GAP and GBS documents and the disaggregated data included in the profile are also not yet accessible. The study covered only Bappedalitbang and Dr. M. Soewandhie Regional General Hospital; therefore, the results do not yet reflect the conditions of all regional government agencies in the City of Surabaya. Consequently, the study's findings are used to explain the governance of the PPRG based on available documents, not to statistically represent all regional government agencies.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Actors and Institutions Involved in Surabaya's PPRG

Surabaya's institutional framework for gender responsive planning and budgeting (PPRG) comprises several layers of actors and institutions established under different legal instruments (Table 2).

Table 2
Actors, Legal Basis, and Roles in Surabaya's PPRG

Actor or institution	Legal basis	Main responsibilities
Mayor	Regional Regulation No. 4/2019 Mayoral Regulation No. 43/2020	a. Establishes the Gender Mainstreaming Working Group (Pokja PUG) and the Gender Mainstreaming Driving Team (Tim Penggerak PUG). b. Receives reports from the Working Group every six months (Articles 19,20,and 22).

Actor or institution	Legal basis	Main responsibilities
Pokja PUG	Mayoral Decree No. 188.45/146/436.1.2/2022	a. Serves as a cross agency consultation forum b. Prepares the city's gender profile and the Regional Action Plan for gender mainstreaming, conducts monitoring, formulates recommendations (Article 19). c. The 2025 decree establishing the Facilitator Forum identifies Bappeda as Chair of PUG and DP3APPKB as secretary.
Tim Penggerak PUG	Mayoral Decree No. 188.45/221/436.1.2/2022 as amended by No. 100.3.3.3/160/436.1.2/2023	a. Reviews regional planning and budgeting b. Members come from planning,women's empowerment,development administration, organization,public wefare,finance and oversight units (Article 22)
PUG Focal Point	Mayoral Decree No. 100.3.3.3/57/436.1.2/2024 Decrees issued by agency heads	Facilitates PPRG implementation,training,and the provision of gender related data within each work unit (Article 23)
Bappeda / Bappedalitbang	Mayoral Regulation No. 43/2020 Article 4 (d)	Coordinates,aligns, and harmonizes the preparation of PPRG
DP3APPKB	Mayoral Regulation No. 43/2020 Article 4 (e) and (f)	a. Provide assists in preparing PPRG and establishes formats for the GAP,GBS,Terms of Reference (KAK), and monitoring
PUG and PPRG Facilitator Forum	Decree of the Head of DP3APPKB No. 400.2.2.2/6800/436.7.8/2025	a. Comprises 22 facilitators from city and provincial DP3APPKB offices, universities,women's studies centres,women's forums,Bappeda,and the Inspectorate b. supports agencies down to the urban village (kelurahan) level
Inspectorate	Minister of Home Affairs Regulation No. 4/2014 Monitoring and evaluation in 2023 and 2024	Conducts PPRG monitoring, evaluation, and assistance
PUSPA Srikandi Forum, universities, women's organisations	Mayoral Decree 100.3.3.3/208/436.1.2/2023 Mayoral Regulation Article 24	Serve as partners in facilitating Public participation

Source: Walikota Surabaya (2020),DP3APPKB Kota Surabaya (2025), Bappedalitbang Kota Surabaya (2025), RSUD dr. M. Soewandhie (2025), processed by the authors.

The framework demonstrates formal commitment, but its institutions derive authority from instruments of different legal ranks. This affects their capacity to direct or bind other agencies and shapes the governance dynamics examined below.

Analysis Based on Five Governance Theories

Metagovernance: The Dominant of Hierarchy

Actors and institutions. The framework demonstrates formal commitment, but its institutions derive authority from instruments of different legal ranks. This affects

their capacity to direct or bind other agencies and shapes the governance dynamics examined below.

Roles and power. Authority is unevenly distributed. Although Bappeda coordinates PPRG (Article 4(d)), DP3APPKB controls key technical procedures and formats for GAP, GBS, KAK, monitoring, and evaluation (Article 4(f), Article 15(3), Article 16(5), and Article 25(6)). The finance agency is only a member of the Driving Team. Agencies must consider PPRG (Article 4), while public participation and university cooperation are optional (Articles 4(c), 24(1), and 25(4)). Businesses are merely potential partners (Article 24(2)). Thus, hierarchy dominates, networks support implementation, and market-based governance is largely absent.

Communication, coordination, and collaboration. Coordination is mainly vertical. The Working Group reports to its chair, who reports to the Mayor every six months; the Mayor reports to the Governor on the same schedule (Article 20(3) and (4)).

Strengths and weaknesses. Clear mandates and standardized tools, including the nine-step GAP and GBS, are strengths. However, the rule that ARG cannot justify requests for additional budget (Article 12(d) and (e)) may weaken advocates' bargaining power, while technical authority remains concentrated in DP3APPKB.

Substantive or merely formal? The regulatory framework is strong, but hierarchy may prioritize administrative compliance over change. Monkelbaan (2019, pp. 42–44) notes that this perspective has limited capacity to explain how governance arrangements generate change.

Polycentricity: Multiple Decision-Making Centres, Uneven Capacity

Actors and institutions. Decision-making spans national ministries (KemenPPPA and the Ministry of Home Affairs), the East Java provincial government, Surabaya City Government, individual agencies, and sub-district,urban villages through focal points (Article 23(2)).

Roles and power. Agencies prepare their own GAP and GBS, decentralizing implementation but producing uneven scale and quality. In 2025, Bappedalitbang identified 11 gender-responsive sub-activities worth Rp13.45 billion. RSUD dr. M. Soewandhie identified two worth Rp297.25 billion; 99.5 percent (Rp295.8 billion) funded BLUD services and support. Although Article 23(2) places focal points at

secretary, division head, or section head level, Bappedalitbang appointed 19 officials from agency head to team-leader level, potentially strengthening authority while concentrating responsibility in structural staff.

Communication, coordination, and collaboration. The Facilitator Forum is mandated to assist agencies down to the urban-village level, but the reviewed documents provide no evidence of implementation at that level.

Strengths and weaknesses. Decentralization can foster agency ownership and contextual adaptation, but expertise remains concentrated. Only 4 of 125 Bappedalitbang employees (3.2 percent) hold PUG and PPRG training certificates; its profile incorrectly reports 0.032 percent, indicating data-quality problems. At the hospital, 3 of 7 planning team members (43 percent) have relevant training (Monkelbaan, 2019, pp. 42–44).

Substantive or merely formal? Although planning responsibilities are decentralized, unequal capacity risks reducing PPRG to document completion rather than substantive analysis.

Network Governance: Institutionalized Collaboration, Limited Influence

Actors and institutions. The documented network includes the 22-member Facilitator Forum (city and provincial DP3APPKB, universities, women's and human-rights study centers, women's forums, Bappeda, and the Inspectorate), PUSPA Srikandi, women's participation in the 2025 RKPD musrenbang, inclusive sub-district consultations, and discussions with BPS on the Gender Development Index (IPG) (Bappedalitbang Kota Surabaya, 2025).

Roles and power. The Facilitator Forum disseminates, advocates, trains, mentors, and reports (Second Dictum), but formal decisions remain with the Working Group and Driving Team. Because the forum was created by an agency-head decree lower in legal rank than a mayoral decree its authority to bind other agencies is limited.

Communication, coordination, and collaboration. Reporting remains hierarchical: facilitators report to DP3APPKB as PUG secretariat, which forwards information to Bappeda's PUG chair; no systematic public-feedback mechanism is documented. Cooperation includes the 2025 BKPSDM East Java BPSDM PUG and PPRG training, DP3APPKB's PUG internalization, and university cooperation under Articles 4(c) and 25(4).

Strengths and weaknesses. Universities and women's studies centers contribute expertise and knowledge sharing. However, marginalized women and persons with disabilities are not clearly represented. Bappedalitbang recommends broader cooperation with NGOs, businesses, and media, alongside community based working groups, indicating that participation remains narrow.

Substantive or merely formal? Collaboration is institutionally established but appears focused on technical assistance, not meaningful public influence over budget decisions.

Experimentalist Governance: Learning Through Evaluation,but Limited Evidence of Regulatory Change

Actors and institutions. The learning cycle involves the Working Group, Driving Team, Inspectorate, DP3APPKB, and potentially universities (Article 25(4)).

Roles and power. The Driving Team evaluates PUG against the RPJMD and agency Renja and reports to the Mayor at least annually (Article 25(3), (5)). The Inspectorate monitored PPRG in 2023 and 2024. An Inspector's letter of 31 July 2024, cited in the hospital's 2025 profile, records 652 GBS documents and a gender responsive budget of Rp7.04 trillion. Most were adequate, but some priority activities lacked allocations and some documents lacked agency head approval. The Inspectorate called for prior year baseline data, authorized approval, and compliance with regional PUG guidelines.

Communication, coordination, and collaboration. Annual agency gender profiles also support learning. Bappedalitbang's 2025 profile cites limited gender understanding, ineffective dissemination, low public awareness, and inconsistent regulatory changes; it recommends real-time disaggregated data, wider partnerships, and community working groups. The hospital profile instead emphasizes national health priorities and institutional functions, without identifying specific gender gaps.

Strengths and weaknesses. Multilevel monitoring within agencies, by the Driving Team, and by the Inspectorate and acknowledgement of challenges are strengths. Yet evaluation emphasizes administrative completeness (budget details, authorization, and baselines) more than outcomes for women and men. Similar concerns about weak gender-responsive audit indicators were reported in Padang (Zolila & Misra, 2025).

Substantive or merely formal? Evaluation mechanisms exist, but the documents show no resulting regulatory or budget changes. Ilham and Velianto's (2022) concerns

about limited PUG staffing/capacity and incomplete disaggregated data also persist in 2025.

Transition Governance: Integration into Budget Documents, Transformative Impact Yet to Be Established

Actors, roles, and power. PPRG seeks structural change by integrating GAP, GBS, and KAK into RKA/DPA (Articles 4, 15, and 16). The 652 GBS documents prepared in 2024 were used as a basis for RKA and DPA.

Budget composition. Budget totals require caution. Bappedalitbang's gender responsive activities largely cover planning coordination, data analysis, monitoring, evaluation, and research; research, development, and engineering alone accounts for Rp4.46 billion (33.2 percent) of its Rp13.45 billion. At the hospital, 99.5 percent of the Rp297.25 billion is for BLUD services and support. The reviewed documents provide no specific gender gaps, baselines, or performance indicators linking these allocations to reduced disparities. A large budget therefore does not prove impact. Because the authors could not access the underlying GAP and GBS, this assessment is provisional.

Activities and normative framing. Bappedalitbang reports women's empowerment outputs such as MSME training, charitable activities, and infak distribution. Dharma Wanita activities on family well-being and violence prevention include cooking and parenting classes. These activities are weakly linked to identified gender gaps and may reinforce women's domestic roles. Likewise, no reported violence cases may indicate underreporting rather than effective prevention.

Development outcomes. Surabaya's IPG rose from 93.58 (2020) to 95.56 (2023), while female labor-force participation (59.48 percent) remained below men's (81.92 percent) (Kinasih et al., 2025). The reported correlation between IPG improvement and PPRG does not establish causation. Kinasih et al. also note that the 2022 IPG figure was unavailable in official publications and detailed IDG data were not public, limiting assessment.

Strengths, weaknesses, and assessment. PPRG is verifiably embedded in budget documents, but evidence of changed bureaucratic practice or budget decisions remains limited. Its integration into routine procedures has not yet demonstrated transformative impact.

Analysis of the Three Pillars: Power,Knowledge, and Norms Power. Bappedalitbang's 2025 disaggregated data provide an overview of women's representation in structural positions (Table 3).

Table 3
Gender Composition of Structural Positions at the Surabaya City Bappedalitbang, 2025

Position	Males	Female
Agency Head and Secretary	2	0
Division Heads (5 positions)	1	4
Head of Finance Subdivision	0	1
Team Leaders (11 positions)	5	6
Total (19 positions)	**8**	**11**

Source: Bappedalitbang Kota Surabaya (2025), compiled and analyzed by the authors.

Women hold 11 of 19 positions (58 percent), including 4 of 5 division-head posts, but both top leadership positions are held by men. Representation is therefore stronger in middle management than at the top. As Monkelbaan (2019, p. 116, Box 5.1) suggests, representation is an indicator but not proof of capacity: only 4 of 125 employees are PUG and PPRG trained, and the agency acknowledges limited gender understanding. Women comprise 15 of 48 non ASN staff (31 percent), compared with 30 of 58 ASN staff (52 percent), showing relevant to SDG 8 that gender equality in formal positions may not extend to employment status.

Knowledge. The nine step GAP and gender data provisions in Articles 5–9 provide analytical tools; agency profiles also report sex-disaggregated data, including hospital patient data for 2022–2025. However, capacity is limited, detailed outcome data remain unavailable (Kinasih et al., 2025), and the Inspectorate calls for baseline data. Bappedalitbang reflects on implementation challenges, whereas the hospital profile does not.

Norms. The Mayoral Regulation emphasizes justice, access, participation, control, and benefits, alongside deliberation, gotong royong, and mentoring (Article 24(4)). Inclusive consultations involve women, older people, persons with disabilities, and children; the hospital also provides disability facilities and recruitment. Yet participation is sometimes optional, ARG cannot support additional budget requests, and some activities retain domestic role framing. Transformative justice is therefore not yet strongly reflected in practice.

Synthesis: Substantive Change or Merely Formal Cooperation?

Table 4
Assessment of six Indicators of substantive Change in Surabaya's PPRG Governance

Indicator	Main finding	Assessment
Completeness of the legal and institutional framework	Regional Regulation No. 4/2019, Mayoral Regulation 43/2020, Working Group, Driving Team, Focal Points, and the 2025 Facilitator Forum	Strong institusional foundation
Integration into budget documents	The 652 GBS documents prepared in 2024 served as a basis for the RKA and DPA; some GBS documents lack budget figures or formal authorization.	Partial
Quality of gender analysis	GAP and GBS documents are reported as available, but their contents were not accessed; the examples of ARG are dominated by coordination and general operational activities.	Cannot yet be assessed, some indications of weakness
Staff capacity	4 of 125 employees at Bappedalitbang and 3 of 7 employees at the hospital have received training; similar issues were identified by Ilham and Velianto (2022).	Weak and persistent capacity constraints
Learning from evaluation	Layered monitoring and evaluation and profiles with challenge analysis,no evidence of rule changes.	Limited
Development outcomes	The IPG has increased, but the labor force participation gap persists; the improvement cannot yet be attributed to PPRG.	Improving, but attributed remains unproven

Sourcer:Authors' synthesis based on the analysis of actors and institutions,the five governance theories,and the three pillars.

Overall, Surabaya's PPRG governance is institutionally and procedurally established, but substantive effects remain partial. Collaboration has produced documents, training, and technical assistance, yet the reviewed evidence does not show influence on budget decisions or reductions in specific gender gaps. In Monkelbaan's (2019) terms, progress is clearer in Seeing and Connecting mapping actors and building relationships than in Changing and Creating and Learning.

Implications and Recommendations

For SDG 5, formal instruments have not yet translated consistently into tangible gender-equality outcomes. For SDG 8, persistent labor-force and non ASN employment gaps indicate that PPRG must address wider employment conditions, not only business training. For SDG 17, partnerships should be judged by their influence on decisions, not merely their existence. The following recommendations follow from the reviewed evidence.

1. Improve GBS quality assurance by checking alignment among gender analysis, performance indicators, and budget allocations not only document completeness and authorization. Publish GAP and GBS summaries to support public scrutiny.
2. Set measurable PUG and PPRG training targets for planners, budget staff, and focal points; correct reporting errors, including the 0.032 percent figure.
3. Require each gender responsive sub activity to include baseline data and sex disaggregated targets under Article 13(2) and GAP steps eight and nine, linked to city indicators such as IPG, IDG, and labor-force participation.
4. Strengthen the Facilitator Forum through a mayoral decree and broader representation of grassroots women's groups, persons with disabilities, and other vulnerable groups,establish a clear feedback and response mechanism.
5. Review ARG classification: operational budgets should count as gender responsive only when supported by clear gender gap analysis.
6. Systematically record how Inspectorate findings and agency gender profiles lead to changes in regulations, implementation guidelines, or budget allocations.

CONCLUSION

First, the governance actors of GRPB in Surabaya encompass the Mayor, the Gender Mainstreaming Working Group (Pokja PUG), DP3APPKB, the Driving Team, Focal Points, the Facilitator Forum, and the Inspectorate, with a power distribution characterized by a hierarchical approach and decentralized implementation. Second, the patterns of communication and coordination predominantly flow vertically upwards, whereas collaborations with external entities, such as universities and women's forums, remain confined to technical assistance and have yet to influence strategic decision-making. Third, this governance model excels in regulatory completeness and document integration; however, its weaknesses lie in inadequate human resource capacity, evaluation mechanisms that focus heavily on administrative compliance, and activity framing that lacks sharp alignment with gap analyses. Fourth, overall, the governance of GRPB in Surabaya is proven to be institutionally established, yet its impact is only partially substantive, as there is currently no direct evidence that it alters budget allocation decisions to specifically target gender disparities.

This study acknowledges certain limitations, as it relies exclusively on document analysis without direct interviews, lacks detailed access to the contents of the GAP and

GBS documents, and is based solely on the profiles of two local government agencies. Future research is recommended to supplement these findings by conducting interviews with key stakeholders (Bappeda, DP3APPKB, BPKAD, and the Inspectorate), examining the contents of GAP and GBS documents across multiple fiscal years, tracking gender-responsive budget trends by program, and comparing the effectiveness of this governance model with other cities.

REFERENCES

Badan Perencanaan Pembangunan Daerah, Penelitian dan Pengembangan (Bappedalitbang) Kota Surabaya. (2025). *Profil perangkat daerah responsif gender bersinergi dengan daerah ramah perempuan dan peduli anak*. https://dp3appkb.surabaya.go.id/sigas/upload/file_profile_gender/profile_gender_1759456779688.pdf

Dinas Pemberdayaan Perempuan dan Perlindungan Anak serta Pengendalian Penduduk dan Keluarga Berencana (DP3APPKB) Kota Surabaya. (2025). *Keputusan Kepala Dinas Nomor 400.2.2.2/6800/436.7.8/2025 tentang Forum Fasilitator Pengarusutamaan Gender (PUG) dan Perencanaan Penganggaran Responsif Gender (PPRG) Kota Surabaya Tahun 2025*. https://dp3appkb.surabaya.go.id/sigas/upload/dasar_hukum/dasar_hukum_1772431849738.pdf

Ilham, T., & Velianto, A. U. (2022). Belajar dari yang terbaik: Evaluasi pengarusutamaan gender di Kota Surabaya, Indonesia. *Jurnal Ilmu Pemerintahan Widya Praja, 48*(1), 127–140. https://doi.org/10.33701/jipwp.v48i1.2556

Kementerian Pemberdayaan Perempuan dan Perlindungan Anak. (2023). *Keputusan Menteri Pemberdayaan Perempuan dan Perlindungan Anak Nomor 246 Tahun 2023 tentang Penerima Penghargaan Parahita Ekapraya Tahun 2023*. https://jdih.kemenpppa.go.id/dokumen-hukum/produk-hukum/1000/download

Kinasih, S. E., Romadhona, M. K., & Oktafenanda, R. D. (2025). Menuju kesetaraan gender di Surabaya, Indonesia. *Jurnal Registratie, 7*(2), 158–175. https://doi.org/10.33701/jurnalregistratie.v7i2.5564

Menteri Dalam Negeri. (2011). *Peraturan Menteri Dalam Negeri Nomor 67 Tahun 2011 tentang Perubahan atas Peraturan Menteri Dalam Negeri Nomor 15 Tahun 2008 tentang Pedoman Umum Pelaksanaan Pengarusutamaan Gender di Daerah*. Berita Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 2011 Nomor 927.

Menteri Dalam Negeri. (2014). *Peraturan Menteri Dalam Negeri Nomor 4 Tahun 2014 tentang Pedoman Pengawasan Pelaksanaan Perencanaan dan Penganggaran yang Responsif Gender untuk Pemerintah Daerah*. Berita Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 2014 Nomor 1346.

Monkelbaan, J. (2019). *Governance for the Sustainable Development Goals: Exploring an Integrative Framework of Theories, Tools, and Competencies*. Springer.

Pemerintah Kota Surabaya. (2019). *Peraturan Daerah Kota Surabaya Nomor 4 Tahun 2019 tentang Pengarusutamaan Gender*. Lembaran Daerah Kota Surabaya Tahun 2019 Nomor 4.

Presiden Republik Indonesia. (2000). *Instruksi Presiden Nomor 9 Tahun 2000 tentang Pengarusutamaan Gender dalam Pembangunan Nasional*.

RSUD dr. M. Soewandhie Kota Surabaya. (2025). *Profil pengarusutamaan gender (PUG) organisasi perangkat daerah RSUD dr. M. Soewandhie Kota Surabaya tahun 2025*. https://dp3appkb.surabaya.go.id/sigas/upload/file_profile_gender/profile_gender_1760406757297.pdf

United Nations. (2015). *Transforming our world: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development* (A/RES/70/1). United Nations.

Walikota Surabaya. (2020). *Peraturan Walikota Surabaya Nomor 43 Tahun 2020 tentang Pelaksanaan Peraturan Daerah Kota Surabaya Nomor 4 Tahun 2019 tentang Pengarusutamaan Gender*. Berita Daerah Kota Surabaya Tahun 2020 Nomor 44. https://jdih.surabaya.go.id/uploads/peraturan/3917_perwali_43-2021.pdf

Zolila, Z., & Misra, F. (2025). Analisis peran Inspektorat dalam pengawasan perencanaan dan penganggaran yang responsif gender (PPRG): Studi kasus di Inspektorat Kota Padang. *COSTING: Journal of Economic, Business and Accounting, 8*(5). https://doi.org/10.31539/fbfwh840