

CHAPTER V CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR MAINSTREAMING RESILIENCE INTO SEMARANG CITY'S DEVELOPMENT PLANNING POLICIES

This chapter explains the conclusions and recommendations for mainstreaming resilience in Semarang City development planning policies. These conclusions are derived from the analysis already conducted in the previous chapter.

5.1 Conclusions

Two methods of resilience assessment in Semarang City, i.e., CRI and UCRA, use a different approach and aim difference scopes for measuring resilience. CRI consists of resilience indicators to measure resilience at the city's scale. Meanwhile, UCRA focuses on resilience indicators to assess resilience at the community's scale. Content analysis of resilience indicators on the documents of RPJMD highlights the similarities and differences between those two methods. It also uses to identify that between CRI and UCRA, CRI's resilience indicators are compatible, applicable, and suitable for RPJMD in Semarang City based on as follows:

1. The complete appearance of all 52 CRI's indicators within two documents of RPJMD implies that all CRI's indicators can be applied for RPJMD in Semarang City. Meanwhile, three of 55 UCRA's indicators aren't being mentioned in two documents of RPJMD (i.e., a) Informal Social Networks, b) Neighborhood Preference, and c) Trust in Community Leader). Also, CRI's indicators have higher frequencies than UCRA's. Moreover, the trend of resilience indicators reveals that we accept hypothesis researches in this study. There is no significant difference in the frequencies of CRI's and UCRA's resilience indicators within The 2016-2021 Semarang RPJMD and Revision of The 2016-2021 Semarang RPJMD. It indicates no significant improvement related to resilience indicators in the new version of document RPJMD, i.e., Revision of The 2016-2021 Semarang RPJMD.

2. There are eight clusters of CRI's and UCRA's resilience indicators within two documents of Semarang RPJMD to compare resilience indicators between CRI and UCRA. These eight clusters represent all of the city aspects. We can find out that CRI's indicators are present in all of eight clusters, while UCRA's indicators don't appear in one cluster, i.e., the economy cluster. Thus, the appearance of CRI's resilience indicators in all of eight clusters indicates that CRI encompasses all of the city aspects. Furthermore, based on the typology of indicator, CRI's indicators in each cluster are outcome indicators. In contrast, UCRA's indicators in each cluster divide into outcome and output indicators. The outcome indicators are more compatible with RPJMD since it has a more extended range than the output indicator and can accommodate several output indicators. All of these comparisons between CRI and UCRA reveals the compatibility and suitability of CRI's resilience indicators with RPJMD.
3. The content analysis describes the consistency of resilience indicators in each chapter within two documents of RPJMD. The consistency of resilience indicators represents how the Semarang Municipality applied resilience indicators in their policy as decision-makers. Good consistency indicates that resilience indicators aren't just a meaningful concept but already implemented in their strategies, programs, and budget allocation. Meanwhile, poor consistency implies that resilience indicators are just seen as a meaningful concept or due to lack of data. Thus, it can't be applied in their strategies, programs, and budget allocation. In terms of consistency, CRI's resilience indicators have better consistency rather than UCRA's in each cluster. Hence, it indicates that CRI's resilience indicators are in line with RPJMD rather than UCRA's.
4. Moreover, how the Semarang municipality explores and discusses those resilience indicators into three types (i.e., specific, comprehensive, and unclear) also represent the government approach in implementing resilience thinking in their strategies and policies. The content analysis presents that the Semarang municipality tends to frame resilience indicators comprehensively and broadly rather than in specific and

technical details. It is in line with the CRI approach that also implies the compatibility between CRI and RPJMD.

Although CRI is more compatible with RPJMD, by combining CRI and UCRA as one set indicator, we can have more complete resilience indicators, and we can use it for a different purpose. It also can complement each other since both CRI and UCRA have their strengths and weaknesses. CRI's resilience indicators include all of the city's aspects and help to determine city's strengths and weaknesses. However, due to its comprehensiveness, the local government has difficulty providing the required data related to resilience indicators due to the local government's limited authorities. On the other hand, since UCRA focuses on community resilience, it helps determine community's strengths and weaknesses and what kind of public policies and concrete actions needed to enhance community resilience. However, UCRA neglects the government and economic aspects of the city.

To combine CRI's and UCRA's resilience indicators as one set indicator, it needs several steps. At first, we classify CRI's and UCRA's resilience indicators with a similar characteristic into one group. Since CRI's indicators are more comprehensive and broadly manner, it can accommodate similar indicators in UCRA. Thus, we can use CRI's indicators in that group as the main indicators at the city's level. Meanwhile, we can use UCRA's indicators in that group to support CRI's indicators.

Therefore, we can use CRI's resilience indicators to assess Semarang City's resilience. CRI's resilience indicators also play as a policy's guideline to identify sources of resilience and strengthen city's capacities. On the other hand, we can use UCRA's resilience indicators to compare the level of resilience between communities in the city and what actions needed to enhance community resilience. Therefore, UCRA's resilience indicators helps cities determine what kind of public policies and concrete actions that suitable based on the specific characteristics of each community, including geography, history, culture, and habits.

As a tool, the combination of CRI's and UCRA's indicators help to evaluate the indicators within the development planning policies, i.e., RPJMD.

The application of this combination of CRI's and UCRA's indicators are not limited in Semarang City. Since all local governments in Indonesia use RPJMD as their development planning policies, they can also use this combination of CRI's and UCRA's indicators to develop better development planning policies. CRI's indicators can cross-check if the government overlooks some aspects when formulating the strategies, programs, and indicators within RPJMD because CRI's indicators are comprehensive. On the other hand, we can use UCRA's indicators to evaluate indicators within the regional apparatus programs, the programs at the sub-district level or the programs at the community level since UCRA's indicators are specific and detailed.

5.2 Recommendation

After learning from two methods of resilience assessment and drawn conclusion of it, several recommendations can be derived for future implementation of mainstreaming resilience into development planning policies in Semarang City or as a recommendation for other similar cases in increasing city resilience which are:

1. Mainstreaming resilience into development planning policies in Semarang City involves many actors. Identifying the actors is essential because resilience thinking contains many aspects, and the city is a complex system. Those actors play essential roles as agents to promote and implement the idea of resilience in their communities, which leads to the faster application of resilience to development planning policies.
2. The implementation of mainstreaming resilience into development planning policies requires the same perspective among stakeholders and decision-makers. The definition of "resilience for whom and against what?" should be defined clearly to build and provide the required data in terms of resilience. Therefore, those resilience indicators can be used by decision-makers to develop better policies and strategies for the city.
3. Building a network with global networking plays a significant role in increasing city resilience. In the case of resilience in Semarang City, it proves that building resilience can happen because there is a collaboration

with global networking such as ACCCRN and 100RC program. Moreover, it encourages sharing knowledge and cooperation between members in those networks, which enriches the experience and learning regarding city resilience.

Regarding the result and recommendation of this research, regardless of the researcher's limitation in digging more about city resilience in Semarang City, it is admitted that this research is still far from perfect. Thus to enrich the knowledge and learning regarding city resilience in Semarang City, there are several recommendations for future research which are related to:

1. Elaboration on to what extend resilience indicators can affect the performance of governance?
2. To what extend the networking and collaboration of the local government can affect the level of city resilience?
3. To what extend resilience indicators can be integrated into the apparatus program of the government's institutions?