



An Evaluation of the Integrated Entrepreneurship Development Program (PKT) in Supporting Jakarta's Development Agenda

Ika Sartika^{1*}, Nur Saribulan², Saddam Rasanjani³

¹ Government Science, School of Postgraduate, Institut Pemerintahan Dalam Negeri, South Jakarta 12560, Indonesia

² Department of Governance Policy Studies, Faculty of Political Science, Institut Pemerintahan Dalam Negeri, South Jakarta 12560, Indonesia

³ Department of Government Studies, Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Universitas Syiah Kuala, Banda Aceh 23111, Indonesia

Corresponding Author Email: ika_sartika@ipdn.ac.id

Copyright: ©2024 The authors. This article is published by IETA and is licensed under the CC BY 4.0 license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

<https://doi.org/10.18280/ijstdp.190433>

ABSTRACT

Received: 10 August 2023

Revised: 14 November 2023

Accepted: 23 November 2023

Available online: 28 April 2024

Keywords:

evaluation, enterprise policy, MSMEs

As a flagship program of DKI Jakarta, the Integrated Entrepreneurship Development Program (PKT) has been established since 2017. Even though the program has been established for about four years, the impact or the implementation of the program is very limited and has not been much analyzed in recent studies. This article aims to describe and analyze the Context, Input, Process, and Product of formative and summative program evaluation. The methodology used is the mixed method with quantitative and qualitative approaches. Data were collected by using in-depth interviews, Focus Group Discussions with stakeholders, observation, spreading questionnaires for respondents, and analysis on the website and other sites relevant to the program. 352 responses were received and analyzed through a simple descriptive statistic. The result shows that the level of achievement of the development of PKT is still in the category of moderately good with an average of 3.95 out of 5. DKI Jakarta government has considered some actions to enhance the quality of PKT by redesigning the program. However, the modification is still facing difficulties in practice, especially in terms of Input, Process, and Product since the alteration on the program is still focused on policy context. The findings have important implications for effective management in delivering entrepreneurs for the government.

1. INTRODUCTION

Micro, Small, and Medium Enterprises (MSMEs) arguably have a pivotal role in dealing with empowerment to tackle unemployment and poverty issues [1]. However, the presence of enterprise in solving social issues is still questionable. Enterprises are certainly related to economic growth due to their impact on competitiveness [2], but it is arguably meaningless when pursuing jobless or vulnerable groups into entrepreneur sector without finance, knowledge, or other supports. This implies that entrepreneurship will contribute to solving social affairs when it is managed properly [3].

Managing MSMEs is challenging, especially in relation to the difficulty in transforming a creative economy concept into practices due to a lack of capacity, commitment, pro-business policy, and coordination on the technical level of local authorities [4]. Organizing public entrepreneurs is different from managing pure economic activities which resources of the private sector is more abundant, especially in skills, knowledge and commercial aspect.

The sustainable of MSMEs development is influenced by three aspects namely government policy, coaching, and partnership [1]. Entrepreneurship management should be

captured under a legal policy to support the existence of entrepreneurs. Enterprise policy manages both new businesses and ongoing Small and Medium-sized Enterprises. By regulating the entrepreneur sector, it means that the government has supported the increase of entrepreneurial activities to contribute to society's improvement within the country [2, 5].

Government is defined as a regulator, controller, supervisor, or even a facilitator in bridging with other non-government institutions especially for local government as a prime mover to regulate, facilitate and empower industrial creativity [6, 7]. Government as a legal institution has to create a business climate for entrepreneur actors, although in fact institutional rules and rationale commonly function as myths and end as routine ceremonial procedures [8].

MSMEs mismanagement as a part of public sector innovation is usually related to a lack of personnel knowledge on enterprise advancement, primary product selection, financial cooperation, technology, the database of training types, capital loans of financial institutions, coaching, and model improvement [9, 10]. In addition, the changing behavior of customers also should be taken into account. Customers nowadays are more preferable to digital marketing on e-

commerce platforms thanks to promotion, security, and easiness [11, 12].

MSMEs are potentially expanded, although finance and government regulation loaded down its growth. The local authorities also have contributed to the barriers to enterprise growth, in which most local officials are still focused more on administrative-oriented, routine-minded and inflexible Fields [4].

The establishment of Government Regulation Number 46 Year 2013 has had a positive effect on MSMEs' development of income and capital improvement and tax simplification for taxpayers in the Indonesian context [13]. One of the following programs held due to the regulation is the Integrated Entrepreneurship Development Program or known as *Pengembangan Kewirausahaan Terpadu* (PKT). PKT is one of the entrepreneur-based programs held by Jakarta authorities. It is an entrepreneurial development program that is mainly designed for those who are willing to run MSMEs which was originally known as One in One Centre of Entrepreneurship (OK OCE) and is currently known as JakPreneur [14]. The main aim of this program is to encourage new entrepreneurs and to support MSMEs [15]. Since the beginning, this program is expected to be a solution to the three problems that often occur in empowering medium and small businesses. Firstly, it will be able to create and also to train the new entrepreneur. Secondly, it will assist the entrepreneur in accessing the market. Lastly, it will give participants to access the capital. One example of capital access is through providing credit for women without assurance [16].

Some prior research and reviews have been carried out on Jakarta's local government policy on entrepreneurship especially for MSMEs. However, as an initial sustainable entrepreneur program, the evidence in the literature shows that research about PKT Jakarta is few in numbers, so it is obviously difficult to gain data or information about the program. The study on MSMEs development in Jakarta was dominated by OK OCE research based on family welfare, start-up business, collaborative governance and policy framework and stakeholder partnership [17, 18]. It showed that OK OCE has been recognized as a public interest that transformed into policy [19], although in its implementation, the sectoral ego of regional authority has impacted on fracture of the program [20]. As the program has been modified and expanded, the study of PKT as a comprehensive study is very limited. Therefore, within this rationale, the study of PKT Jakarta evaluation needs to be carried out to provide new knowledge and perspective on how local government performs their policy on entrepreneurship programs.

Policy evaluation is primarily focused on outcomes and identification of the implications that which has come up from the fact of implementation, it also produces feedback on the future of policies or programs. Ghazinoory and Aghaei [21] are also questioning whether evaluation and assessment are the same thing, while in fact, they found that even though that terminology is used on different occasions, while assessment is related to prior evidence in supporting the next agenda of evaluation, evaluation is a set of inventories and actions to judge whether the objective of policy or program has been accomplished and the solution is right on the table.

In terms of policymaking evaluation, stakeholders must carry out actions both in past and ongoing activities. For the government, evaluation is a necessity to create openness, liabilities and enhance performances on policy and program

measurement. Although as a policy measurement tool, evaluation also faces difficulties in practice which is primarily linked with a political party and political bureaucracy [22].

Evaluating the public sector is intriguing. Some aspects should be undertaken such as control of the quality of the evaluation process, evaluator selection and training, ethical concerns and standards and objectivity in using evaluation outcomes for policy/program improvement [23].

Stufflebeam and Coryn [24] have introduced model implementation based on Context, Input, Process and Product (CIPP) measurement which is used to evaluate the formative and summative assessment. Thus, the CIPP model will be used to assess the PKT which is carried out in five cities in Jakarta Provinces (except for Kepulauan Seribu). By evaluating the program, it is beneficial to provide new knowledge and perspective on how local government performs their policy on entrepreneurship programs and how to handle the potential problems in the future. Furthermore, by doing this research, it is expected to be a novel contribution to academics, research, policy and practice.

2. METHODS

This study is carried out using a mixed-method qualitative and quantitative approach. This method is suitable for addressing the level of achievement of the PKT program based on open-ended and close-ended data. It is also suited for drawing comparison findings from different approaches [25]. The qualitative approach is conducted through interviews and Focus Group Discussion (FGD) with the stakeholders namely business, government, citizens, academician, and media [26], while for quantitative, is carried out using statistic descriptive with a simple random sampling method.

In carrying out this research, we understand that ethical aspects are very important. Therefore, we have taken various steps to ensure that this research is conducted with high ethical integrity. First, we have ensured that every participant involved in this study gave informed consent voluntarily. This means that they fully understand the research objectives, potential consequences, and how their data will be used. We have explained to them their right to refuse to participate or withdraw at any time without consequences.

Second, we are also committed to taking the privacy and confidentiality of participant data very seriously. Any information obtained from participants will be kept confidential and will not be used for any purpose other than this research. Participants' data will be identified by a unique code or number, not by their full name or information that could personally identify them. We will ensure that only members of the research team have access to the data and that the data will be stored securely.

The questionnaire consists of CIPP Indicators using a Likert scale with a range of 1 (very low) to 5 (Very high). The questionnaires have been spread to the employers or prospective employers that are being or have followed one to seven stages (registration, training, assistance, licensing, marketing, financial reporting) as well as capital users by using the online form. Based on the feedback of online questionnaires, 352 employers participated in this research. The operational concept in answering the level of achievement using CIPP indicators is shown in the table below:

Table 1. Concept of CIPP evaluation

Concept	Dimension	Indicator
Evaluation on PKT Program	Context	a. Policy;
		b. Mission and goals;
		c. Preparedness of agencies;
		d. Target determination.
	Input	a. SOPs;
		b. Human resources;
		c. Budget allocation;
		d. Facilities.
	Process	a. Registration;
		b. Training;
		c. Mentoring;
		d. Licensing/Permit;
		e. Marketing;
		f. Financial report assistance;
	Product	g. Capital provision.
		a. Target achievement;
	b. Program impact.	

Source: Stufflebeam and Coryn [24]

Table 1 shows the CIPP indicators have been used for this research based on four dimensions of context, input, process and products. Those indicators then stated in the questionnaires.

CIPP Model is a comprehensive evaluation framework to evaluate the formative and summative of the program, project, personnel, products, organization, policy, and evaluation system. This model was chosen because it is doable to evaluate the ongoing programs that would be able to analyze every stage of the program. Also, this model has not been applied to evaluate entrepreneurship programs before. By choosing this model, it is arguable could capture comprehensive data within the 7 steps of the program.

Based on the distribution of the questionnaires, the answer of the respondents collected was analyzed by counting the average score. To calculate the value of these, the program average is composed according to the scale that is divided into 5 (five) scales with the highest category within the range 4.60 – 5.00, while the lowest is 0 – 1.59 [27] (see Table 2).

Table 2. The scale of measurement questionnaire

Value	The Level of Achievement
4.60 – 5.00	Very High
4.00 – 4.59	High
2.60 – 3.59	Sufficient
1.60 – 2.59	Low
0 – 1.59	Very Low

3. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

3.1 Overview

The initial formation of the entrepreneurship program was established through Governor Instruction of Jakarta number 152 Year 2017 on Formation and Development of Entrepreneurship. The main focus of this regulation is an appointment as well as the delegation of duties and functions of management agencies on the formation of entrepreneurship. This regulation also used to support the priority programs of Jakarta in 2017-2022. As a new program, PKT is arguable as a program that has been transformed dynamically. During its

implementation, there were changes to the program in the last 2 years (2018 & 2020).

PKT that has been implemented in the year 2018 is a continuation of pioneer the formation and development program in Jakarta. This program is implemented under Governor Regulation of Jakarta Number 102 Year 2018 on Development Integrated Entrepreneurship Program. The introduction of PKT 2018 is more highlighted on targeting determination. The target goals of PKT 2018 are to produce new entrepreneurs with a total of at least 200,000 individuals during 2018-2020 with targeted groups namely Job seekers, new entrepreneurs and advanced entrepreneurs.

The program is carried out through entrepreneurial capacity building, provision of the facilities and infrastructures, forming a network, provision of incentives on fiscal regions, collaboration, monitoring and evaluation. To improve the capacity of entrepreneurs in its implementation, the program was designed with 7 (seven) steps that should be done based on a hierarchy system. The program has consisted of the following steps namely Registration (P1); Training (P2); Mentoring (P3); Licensing (P4); Assistance (P5); Assistance of Financial Report (P6); and Capital Provision (P7). In this scheme, participants must follow the program in a sequence and did not allowed to jump into the next level of stages before finishing the stage before.

Table 3. Jakarta regional authorities responsible for delivering PKT

No.	Jakarta Regional Authorities
1	Department of Cooperative, Small and Medium Enterprises and Trade
2	Department of Industry and Energy
3	Department of Food Security, Maritime Affairs and Agriculture
4	Department Provincial Manpower and Transmigration
5	Department of Provincial Tourism and Culture Office
6	Department of Empowerment, Child Protection, and Population Control Agency
7	Department of Provincial Social Service Jakarta

Source: Jakarta Governor Regulation Number 2 Year 2020 [28]

Due to the improvement of the concept and target of PKT, there was an alteration of PKT in 2020. The changed was under the Governor Regulation Number 2 Year 2020 on Delivery of Development Integrated Entrepreneurship Program that is better known as JakPreneur as a brand jargon. In this new concept of PKT, the alteration is highlighted into two main ideas. Firstly, the steps of the program are designed based on needs. Secondly, the distribution of functions of local agencies is mentioned and the concept of collaboration is established.

(1) Hierarchy Based Program vs Needs Based Program.

While PKT 2018 arranged 7 (seven) stages based on hierarchy, on the other hand, PKT 2020 is focused on the needs of participants. The program is remodified as a flat mode. Instead of continuing the step hierarchically, the procedure of PKT 2020 is more flexible. It means that participants must not follow all phases in but they can choose a series of activities to be followed by the needs of each of their participants.

(2) Distribution of Functions of Local Agencies and Collaboration.

In PKT 2020, the government has been trying to run PKT by cooperating with other institutions such as educational organizations, businesses, communities, and/or other institutions or parties that are related to entrepreneur

affairs. Also, in this new PKT, there are 7 (seven) local agencies mentioned as a core organization and other additional institutions that have responded in delivering PKT as seen in Table 3. Their main duty is to facilitate forming a network and markets under the authorities of the Assistant Regional Secretariat. Besides forming a network and a common market local agencies can also collaborate with institutions and/or other parties in the stage of activity.

3.2 Evaluation of PKT based on CIPP

Evaluation is one of the crucial elements to measure the effectiveness of policies or programs. It focuses on outcomes and identification of the implications of a policy that help policymakers in deciding the next policies. Conducting an evaluation program means providing a set of systematic tools or methods to measure the process of ongoing programs and/or the result on program impacts using social studies methodologies and professional-based standards [23]. Evaluation is about the extent to which the purpose of achieved and to see the extent to which existing gap between expectation and actual condition.

Based on the scoring of the respondent responses, the results of the level of achievement of PKT Jakarta are elicited through Table 4.

Table 4. The average of CIPP dimensions

Dimention	Average	Level of Achievement
Context	4.06	High
Input	3.88	Sufficient
Process	3.96	Sufficient
Product	3.88	Sufficient
Total	3.95	Sufficient

The result of participant responses shows that in general, the implementation of PKT Jakarta has worked fairly well with an average value of 3.95. Each breakdown of each dimension will be explained below.

3.2.1 Context

In this context, the term is defined as a set of policies/regulations, goals, preparedness measures, and targets for managing and delivering programs.

Table 5. Average score of indicator's context

Aspects	Indicators	Average	Scale
Policy	A policy for developing PKT	4.21	High
	Supporting Regulation PKT	4.10	High
	Mision And Goals	4.25	High
Goals	Goals/Purposive clarity	4.23	High
	Level of achievement	4.03	High
Preparedness of Agencies	Strategic Planning	4.00	High
	The availability of Successful indicator	3.91	Sufficient
	The government accountability report	3.90	Sufficient
Target Determination	The determination on entrepreneur quantity	3.89	Sufficient

In general, the context has an average score of 4.06 as the highest value than other dimension scores. It seems that the authorities have maintained the program based on regulation with consideration on vision, mission, and target determination. However, it shows that the preparedness of agencies has a lack of marking (see Table 5).

In terms of policy and goals, the government determines the clarity of the goals of the program by modifying regulations and rules in delivering the services based on demand. When the prior program only concentrates on hierarchy, the new scheme emphasizes its purposes on needs-based performance. Undoubtedly, this aspect gained a high score due to its flexibility and closeness to target-oriented. It is argued that authorities considered targeting-based outcomes.

Another movement is the system developed its scheme by inviting non-government institutes to participate. In this new scheme, private sectors and academicians are also being included in this program. However, while the regulations clearly regulate every provision, in fact, the instruction only applies to the roles and the functions of each local agency in implementing the PKT, while clauses on cooperation and the names of the collaborators are only mentioned in the regulation without any technical additional duties related to the role and the functions of each collaborator. It seems that lack of preparedness for stakeholders' collaboration is a highlight topic in regional innovation [29].

For the Preparedness of agencies, Strategic planning also is still questionable. Since the successful indicators of program accomplishments are not provided. The report on program accountability when this study is carried out also does not cover it. It seems that local agencies lack on preparedness on SMEs strategy (policy and capital) and model development on SMEs [30]. Target determination also gains higher marks. It seems that the government has already achieved the targeted group in number. However, the findings show that there is a slight issue that occurred while looking at the number of total participants (see Table 6). Even though the target of participants has reached above half percent of the target, it seems P1-P3 stages are the most dominant compared to the next stages of PKT. It is assumed that the target's program is mainly focused on the total number of participants only, meanwhile, the part of stages is not defined comprehensively.

Table 6. The number of total participants (2020)

No.	Stages	Total (Participants/Persons)
1	P1	56708
2	P2	22680
3	P3	37691
4	P4	8209
5	P5	4558
6	P6	2300
7	P7	566
	Total	132712

Source: [14]

3.2.2 Input

Input on this program relates to resources that have been used to succeed this program such as the availability of procedures and resources. There are four aspects used in measuring the input on this program namely Standard Operational Procedures (SOPs), human resources, budget allocation and facilities as seen in Table 7.

Table 7. Input indicator's average score

Aspects	Indicators	Average	Scale
SOPs	SOPs Availability	4.01	High
	SOPs Implementation	3.96	Sufficient
Human Resources	Quantity	4.08	High
	Quality	4.09	High
Budget Allocation	Budget Availability	3.70	Sufficient
	Budget Accessibility	3.65	Sufficient
	Budget Transparency	3.69	Sufficient
Facilities	Facilities and Infrastructure	3.86	Sufficient
	Sufficiency		
	Facilities and Infrastructure Quality	3.88	Sufficient
	Average	3.88	Sufficient

Based on the table, it seems that SOPs and human resources have the highest score among other input indicators. Standard Operational Procedures (SOPs) as guidance are supporting documents that assisted the implementation of PKT. Unsurprisingly, the score of SOPs indicators is relatively high due to their availability. Some of SOP's programs are SOP on developed integrated entrepreneurship for data monitoring on compliment indicators, SOP on Event Indicator dashboard by Local Agencies, SOP Event Indicator Dashboard by Local Agencies collaboration with external stakeholders. These SOPs' assist both employers and members of PKT in dealing with PKT implementation.

Human resource is scored above 4.05 which is seen as quantity and quality. From the aspect of quantity, the program is supplied with many parties ranging from the regional Jakarta city administration which covers 7 (seven) the local office of origin, and other agencies that are related to the PKT program and non-government sector. Also, this program is supported by external mentors that are spread in 42 districts in DKI Jakarta plus 2 Districts in Kepulauan Seribu. In terms of quality, the inclusion of collaboration with the private sector, banking and capital investors, academic institutions, and e-commerce enhances the quality of the program. The participation of the participants Jakpreneur is also increased from the human resource quality indicators, especially in the skill from making products, packaging, marketing, to financial management.

Budget Allocation and facilities were the two aspects with the lowest scores respectively. Budget allocation is measured through its availability, accessibility and transparency. The availability of the budget to support the implementation of PKT is based on the local budget (APBD) of DKI Province. The allocation has been set on local agencies (OPD). In addition, the city administration also coordinates with bank and capital institutions such as Bank DKI and the organization of Wakaf (non-bank institutions). Bank DKI has launched a total budget of IDR 100 billion in assisting PKT program (and it is still being expanded). Bank DKI as one of the cooperation partners with the Jakarta Provincial Government to develop PKT, especially during stage P7 (capital) plays a very important role especially in the context of the supplier of the budget in supporting this program. The role of Bank DKI as the only capital giver will provide funds for new entrepreneurs that already pass stages P1 and P4. The problem in this indicator is Bank DKI is the only bank that is in corporate in assisting capital for members.

In terms of accessibility, within the changes in PKT regulations, the participants as investors continue to get ease and accessibility. Due to its flexibility, participants have been

facilitated by giving can be directly capital by the prerequisite of 2 (two) products program have been launched by the Bank DKI namely Monas Product for New Comers and Monas Product for Jakpreneur. Even before to a process of validation by the party a bank against recipients' capital should be with a certificate and official statements, but now it is can be in access by filling up the form which has been provided online is of websites which have provided in through: www.jakpreneur.jakarta.go.id. In filling form on the website is quite give evidence scanning ID card, family and marriage certificates, Micro Small Business License (IUMK)/business license (SKU) from the permit that taken from stages P4.

3.2.3 Process

In this dimension, the process is referred to seven stages of PKT namely registration, training, mentoring, licensing/permit, marketing, financial report and capital assistance.

Table 8. Process indicator's score

Aspect	Indicators	Average	Scale
Registration	Registration procedure	4.22	High
	Availability of information on registration	4.07	High
	The accuracy of the application period	4.07	High
Training	Registration Facility	4.19	High
	Training Procedure	4.18	High
	Material	4.18	High
	Schedule	4.12	High
	Instructors	4.20	High
	Atmosphere	4.21	High
Mentoring	Facilities	4.14	High
	Procedure	4.13	High
	Time/Period	4.07	High
License/ Permit	Material/content	4.11	High
	Readiness	4.09	High
	The licensing procedure	4.12	High
Marketing	Time Spent	3.96	Sufficient
	The conditions that must be fulfilled	4.10	High
	Availability of marketplace information	3.82	Sufficient
	Ease marketing	3.75	Sufficient
	Assistance from local authorities	3.67	Sufficient
	Availability on online marketing	3.80	Sufficient
Financial Report Assistance	Availability on financial regulations	3.79	Sufficient
	Procedure of preparing related financial report	3.79	Sufficient
	Information given on financial reporting	3.78	Sufficient
	Application of financial reporting availability	3.77	Sufficient
Capital	Access to capital given	3.55	Sufficient
	Capital amount	3.44	Sufficient
	Capital scheme	3.49	Sufficient
Average		3.96	Sufficient

Table 8 shows the average score of process dimension. It can be seen that during its implementation, registration – licensing/permit (P1-P4) have a higher number compared to the rest of stages P5-P7. Out of seven stages, the fourth prior of stage gained a higher score above 4.5. For the registration stage, it is noticeable that the availability on online through registration jakpreneur.jakarta.go.id and the availability of facilitators to assist ease participants to join the community. Training also has its easiness, since both the quantity and quality of instructors/mentors have met the minimum criteria. The collaboration among government, professional and college facilitators has provided courses on hard and soft skills in entrepreneurship. The model of training is coaching-based. The mentoring also gained a positive review from participants. Based on interviews and observation, mentoring is a stage of interaction between participants and mentors in knowledge transferring such as packaging, marketing and other relevant skills in conventional and digital-based apps (WhatsApp group, Instagram, Facebook and so on). In addition, in some subunits/agencies, there are online bazaars supporting entrepreneurs.

In licensing/permit aspects, procedure, time spent and requirements have been used to measure the permit stage on PKT. Two indicators on License/permit have a high score by 4.10 above namely its procedure and terms and conditions required, while the time that has been spent only gained an average score of 3.96. Based on the results and interview, it is undeniable that one of the strongest motifs of the reason society joins PKT is thanks to the availability of permit easiness. Since the amendment, the licensing stage has changed its procedure to simplify the mechanism of the program. The concept of change is supported by facilitating more proactive service for the permit by the motor license shuttle service (AJIB) [31]. The AJIB team by the use of specialized applications will help those in completion form and all application processes. Before AJIB was introduced, the licensing progress from January to June 2020 has been produced 6952 permits, while within the presence of AJIB, there were 50902 permits for SMEs has been launched by the investment and One Door Integrated Service Agency (PMPTSP Agency) [32].

Marketing is one of the aspects of receiving a lower grade compared with the aspects on the other dimensions with a range of average of 3.67 to 3.82. The research carried out by Bandung Institute of Technology (ITB) also states that apart from issues surrounding human resources capital, other MSMEs' main problems are marketing and entrepreneurial capital [33]. This is also recognized both by the government and participants. MSMEs nowadays, still rely on public servants as primary target consumers, and it is difficult to achieve sustainability when focusing only on one primary target, even though marketing also has been introduced in events, online marketing, market shows, exhibitions and workshops on SMEs [34].

Financial Report Assistance has gained scores in the range of 3.77 to 3.79. In PKT, literature on finance is vital to measure the ability of participants to dealing with final report production which will be used as a standard to grant access for participants to achieve a higher level on PKT. It is a primary skill for entrepreneurs for accessing capital from sponsors. In financial reporting, the provincial government city has cooperated with PT Fintek Natural Sharia and PT Lunaria Annua Technology, and other social institutions. The purpose of the implementation of this activity is to assist the

collaborator in choosing capital donations, training and also marketing [14].

Capital provision is the last step of PKT. Ever since the year 2020, authorities have given flexibility for the member in choosing the stage in accordance with their needs, but to be able to get capital assistance, participants are required to finish registration and already has a business and licensing (P1 and P4). In capital, city government is cooperating with Bank DKI as a banking institution that facilitates for MSMEs enterprisers. There are two types namely Monas for New Entrepreneur and Monas 25. Monas for new entrepreneur is a capital credit for working capital or investing which are the maximum productive loans IDR 10 million, within a period rest reached 18 months with 7% interest rate equivalent with interest on Credit on Society Business (KUR) based on government regulation [35]. While Monas 25 is working capital and additional capital working with the amount of IDR 5 to 25 million for entrepreneurs under PPKUKM agency, Industrial and Trade Agency supervisor in Jakarta Local Corporation Pasar Jaya [36].

Of all evaluation aspects, the capital is the lowest given by participants average by 3.49. This capital is not without reason get relatively low compared to all aspects. With the burden in marketing, entrepreneurs will ultimately hope to receive funds in an effort to expand. However, surprisingly, although participants know that PKT has seven stages in total, they are not necessarily will participate until the stage of capital provision. They are preferable to get a mortgage instead of borrowing capital through financial institutions that have been appointed by the government. Most of them only need to secure on business permit.

3.2.4 Product

There are two aspects of product dimension in explaining the level of achievement of PKT namely target achievement and the impact of the program. From all indicators asked for respondents, only impact for people that indicated high score namely 4.05, while the rests are still sufficient. It seems that PKT is assumed success in delivering welfare improvement for society through an entrepreneur program (see Table 9).

Table 9. Product indicator's score

Aspect	Indicators	Average	Scale
Target achievement	The number of new entrepreneurs	3.85	Sufficient
	Realization of target	3.70	Sufficient
	Impact for people	4.05	High
	Impact for local agencies	3.96	Sufficient
	Impact for entrepreneurs	3.96	Sufficient
Program Impact	Impact for school and high school	3.83	Sufficient
	Impact for banking and investors	3.81	Sufficient
	Impact for entrepreneurship atmosphere in Jakarta	3.90	Sufficient
	Average	3.88	Sufficient

The total number of participants based on the stage of activity in each stage has experienced a fall. It can be said from P4 to P7 that the decline was significantly high. Of the total registered participants by 56.708 participants, only around 8209 people continue to the licensing and 566 participants

have reached capital stages (P7) (again see Table 6). In terms of target achievement, the score indicates that the target on creating new entrepreneurs and realization on target is relatively close to being achieved, even though as mentioned earlier that target setting was still being focused for the initial stage. Although the success of registration is not followed by the next process, participants who had joined in the next stages have declined.

It could be seen from the increase of the number of participants every year which were proven by perceived good on registration procedures, availability of information on registration, timeliness of registration, while for advance stages (P4-P7) have decreased. This issue, need the attention of the government so that the benefits of the program can be will be conducted for long term. It is not enough to revise the registration stage, but the most important is how to create a sustainable business climate for entrepreneurs.

The impact of the program on other parties, including the local government, entrepreneurs, banking and investors, schools and colleges, and entrepreneur climate Jakarta has attracted value sufficient either by virtue of the perception of respondents with values that are almost the same within range of 3.8 – 3.9 This indicates that the involvement of related parties in PKT considered had not yet been optimal. Actually, the government was encouraged collaboration from other parties in succeeding this program not only through the acceleration of command PPKUKM agency team development be directly responsible to the city governor. Local agencies engagement is considered insufficient without involving other parties. So far, the program PKT related parties were involved, however, it seems that it has not been worked optimally. It needs clearer and practicable collaboration with stakeholders so the impact of the program the organization felt by all parties.

The level of achievement of PKT in terms of four aspects of evaluation (Context, Input, Process, and Product), only one dimension of context has good merit, while the rest need to be optimized. It seems that the authorities have maintained the program based on regulation with consideration of vision, mission, and target determination. In terms of policy and goals, the government determines the clarity of the goals of the program by modifying regulations and rules in delivering the services based on demand. In this new scheme, the private sector and academicians are also included in this program. It is assumed that the target's program is mainly focused on the total number of participants only, meanwhile, the part of stages is not defined comprehensively.

4. CONCLUSIONS

The level of achievement of PKT in terms of four aspects of evaluation (Context, Input, Process and Product), only one dimension of context has good merit, while the rest need to be optimized. In terms of context, the initial blueprint or strategic of entrepreneur programs are still lack of preparation and execution. It then implied on how government more focus on target not for its sustainability, such as lack of collaboration with other stakeholders. By only focus on target determination, there is huge disparities between the number of participants in each stage from P1 – P7.

For input, indicators that have the lowest score is related to the budget and also the availability of facilities and infrastructure. It shows that alongside with the local agencies

budget, for external budget recourses, Jakarta only has one Bank DKI as the primary capital giver. In the process, the problems that generally showed up on this dimension is on the stages, marketing financial reporting and capitalization at the earliest phase including enrollment, while for training assistance and participants licensing is relatively easy to access.

The last dimension, the product is a dimension with a lower score for each aspect compared to other dimensions. Both target achievement and its impacts have limitation on its sustainability for next stages.

The emergence of PKT has presented some attempts by the local government to use entrepreneurship as a solution to social issues such as poverty and unemployment. Even though there are still some flaws during the process of its implementation, DKI Jakarta government has considered some actions to enhance the quality of PKT by redesigning the program over the years. The alteration of procedures or stages brings ease for participants, while the changes in new policy need to be more explored. Since the alteration brings the terms of collaboration, unfortunately, the names of the collaborators are only mentioned in the regulation without any theories technical additional related to the role and the functions of each collaborator. This collaboration issue needs to be explored more to have a comprehensive view of PKT program in Jakarta.

Due to its complexity, we understand that it is difficult to gain all of the information on PKT program. So that, we acknowledge some limitations in this project which is only evaluates PKT from the context, input, process, and product aspects based on the participants' perceptions. Some of the weaknesses and limitations of this research include: it has not explored further the difficulties in obtaining business permits, marketing products, and increasing access to capital. This research has also not been able to identify the actors involved and the role of each actor in the PKT. This weakness can be an opportunity for further research in the field of entrepreneurship which is a development agenda in Jakarta.

Based on our limitation, it is suggested that future research can be more focus on how the environment and design of business permits, marketing, and capital that should captured by government sectors using descriptive qualitative through in-depth interviews with all parties involved in the PKT, as well as observations in each process. Furthermore, it is necessary to carry out in-depth research on the role of actors involved in the CIPP. In this way, collaboration in the PKT can reduce various difficulties experienced by participants, so that the PKT can run according to the expectations of all parties.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The authors would like to express gratitude to the Research and Study of Governance Strategy Institute (Lemrisika) of Institut Pemerintahan Dalam Negeri for providing the opportunity and funds to carry out this research. We Also would like to thank all parties who helped this research especially for DKI Government, PKT stakeholders, mentors and Participants who provide relevant information and for the Editorial team and reviewer of International Journal of Sustainable Development and Planning who helped to complete this article.

REFERENCES

- [1] Handoyo, A., Rahman, Y. (2020). Effectiveness and strategy policy of micro business license through online. *Efficient: Indonesian Journal of Development Economics*, 3(2): 726-740. <https://doi.org/10.15294/efficient.v3i2.39294>
- [2] Bennett, R.J. (2014). *Entrepreneurship, Small Business and Public Policy: Evolution and Revolution*. Routledge.
- [3] Smith, A.M.J., Galloway, L., Jackman, L., Danson, M., Whittam, G. (2019). Poverty, social exclusion and enterprise policy: A study of UK policies' effectiveness over 40 years. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation*, 20(2): 107-118. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1465750318809803>
- [4] Rosyadi, S., Kusuma, A.S., Fitriah, E., Zayzda, N.A. (2022). Barriers of public policy faced by SMEs of creative economy in Indonesia. *International Journal of Law and Management*, 64(1): 32-48. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJLMA-02-2020-0061>
- [5] Acs, Z.J., Szerb, L. (2007). Entrepreneurship, economic growth and public policy. *Small Business Economics*, 28(2): 109-122. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11187-006-9012-3>
- [6] Wapshott, R., Mallett, O. (2017). Small and medium-sized enterprise policy: Designed to fail? *Environment and Planning C: Politics and Space*, 36(4): 750-772. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2399654417719288>
- [7] Roziqin, A., Retnandari, N., Fajrina, A., Sihidi, I., Kamil, M. (2021). The local government and creative industry: Experience from Batik Tulis Lasem Industries. *Jurnal Bina Praja: Journal of Home Affairs Governance*, 13(3): 419-429. <https://doi.org/10.21787/jbp.13.2021.419-429>
- [8] Xheneti, M. (2017). Contexts of enterprise policy-making-an institutional perspective. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 29(3-4): 317-339. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08985626.2016.1271021>
- [9] Desmaryani, S. (2017). The role of regional government in growing small and medium enterprises' performance towards creative industry in Jambi province. *Jurnal Bina Praja: Journal of Home Affairs Governance*, 9(1): 159-169. <https://doi.org/10.21787/jbp.09.2017.159-169>
- [10] Naibaho, M. (2021). Regional innovation policy in encouraging regional competitiveness in South Tangerang City. *Jurnal Bina Praja: Journal of Home Affairs Governance*, 13(2): 269-279. <https://doi.org/10.21787/jbp.13.2021.269-279>
- [11] Sugiarti, Y., Sari, Y., Hadiyat, M.A. (2020). Peranan E-commerce untuk meningkatkan daya saing usaha mikro kecil dan menengah (UMKM) sambal di Jawa Timur [The role of e-commerce to increase the competitiveness of micro small and medium business (MSMEs) chili sauce in East Java]. *Jurnal Pengabdian Kepada Masyarakat*, 3(2): 298-309.
- [12] Sukarnoto, T., Nurjati, N., Rani, V. (2021). Era digitalisasi media pemasaran online pengembangan usaha mikro kecil [The digitalization era of online media marketing development microsmall businesses]. *Etos: Jurnal Pengabdian Masyarakat*, 3(1): 1-13.
- [13] Syafiqurrahman, M. (2017). Analisis pengaruh PP 46 tahun 2013 terhadap upaya pemerintah dalam meningkatkan perekonomian Indonesia melalui sektor UMKM [An analysis of the Government Regulation number 46 years 2013 of efforts to improve indonesia economy through the micro small and medium enterprises]. *Journal of Applied Accounting and Taxation*, 2(2): 75-82.
- [14] PPKUKM Agency (2020). *Evaluasi Penyelenggaraan Pengembangan Kewirausahaan Terpadu [Evaluation of integrated entrepreneurial development arrangements]*.
- [15] Wicaksono, B., Asta, R., Rafi, M. (2021). Comparative study: Dimension policy of smart people in metropolitan city of Bandung, Jakarta, and Pekanbaru. *Jurnal Bina Praja*, 13(1): 93-103. <https://doi.org/10.21787/jpb.13.2021.93-103>
- [16] Sartika, I. (2018). Quo vadis "OK OCE": Collaborative governance sebuah solusi. *Jurnal Ilmu Pemerintahan*, 54.
- [17] Septyastuti, I.R. (2019). Implementasi Program OK OCE Bagi Kesejahteraan Keluarga (Studi Kasus OK OCE Kecamatan Kembangan, Jakarta Barat). *Universitas Islam Negeri Syarif Hidayatullah Jakarta*.
- [18] Sukmayadi, S., Bakrie, B., Desmiwati, D. (2019). Effect of entrepreneurial orientation, interest, and training on the success of start-up business in the "OK OCE" program in Cipayung district of East Jakarta Administrative City. *International Journal of Multicultural and Multireligious Understanding*, 6(1): 159-172. <http://dx.doi.org/10.18415/ijmmu.v6i1.520>
- [19] Pamungkas, B. (2017). One kecamatan one center for entrepreneurship (OK-OCE) dalam ekosistem kewirausahaan kota jakarta: kerangka kebijakan dan kemitraan stakeholders. *Jurnal Universitas Paramadina*, 14: 1563-1575.
- [20] Wachid, N., Tuti, R.W.D. (2020). Quality analysis of service "one kecamatan one center of entrepreneurship" (OK OCE) in East Jakarta. *Journal of Governance and Public Policy*, 7(3): 214-230. <https://doi.org/10.18196/jgpp.73135>
- [21] Ghazinoory, S., Aghaei, P. (2021). Differences between policy assessment & policy evaluation; A case study on supportive policies for knowledge-based firms. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*.
- [22] Wholey, J.S. (2015). Use of evaluation in government. In *Handbook of Practical Program Evaluation*. Wiley Press Room.
- [23] Newcomer, K.E., Hatry, H.P., Wholey, J.S. (2015). *Handbook of Practical Program Evaluation: Fourth Edition*. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119171386>
- [24] Stufflebeam, D.L., Coryn, C.L.S. (2014). *Evaluation Theory, Models, & Application*. John Wiley & Sons.
- [25] Creswell, J.W., Creswell, J.D. (2017). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*. Sage Publications.
- [26] Muhyi, H.A., Chan, A., Sukoco, I., Herawati, T. (2017). The penta helix collaboration model in developing centers of flagship industry in Bandung City. *Review of Integrative Business & Economics Research*, 6(1): 412-417.
- [27] Divayana, D.G.H., Sanjaya, D.B., Marhaeni, N., Sudirtha, I.G. (2017). CIPP evaluation model based on mobile phone in evaluating the use of blended learning platforms at vocational schools in Bali. *Journal of Theoretical and Applied Information Technology*, 95(9): 1983-1995.
- [28] Governor Regulation Jakarta Governor Regulation Number 2 Year 2020 about Delivering Integrated Entrepreneur Program. (2020). <https://peraturan.bpk.go.id/Home/Details/131346/pergub-prov-dki-jakarta-no-2-tahun-2020>.

- [29] Aminah, S., Wardani, D.K. (2018). Readiness analysis of regional innovation implementation. *Jurnal Bina Praja: Journal of Home Affairs Governance*, 10(1): 13-26. <https://doi.org/10.21787/jbp.10.2018.13-26>
- [30] Hariyoko, Y. (2018). Pengembangan UMKM di Kabupaten Tuban. *JPAP: Jurnal Penelitian Administrasi Publik*. <http://jurnal.untagsby.ac.id/index.php/jpap/article/view/1286>.
- [31] Rahmawati F. (2020) Pengajuan izin UMKM di DKI Jakarta dipercepat [The MSMEs license application in Jakarta has been accelerated]. <https://www.ayojakarta.com/bisnis/pr-76754216/Pengajuan-Izin-UMKM-di-DKI-Jakarta-Dipercepat>.
- [32] Yuliani, A.P. (2020). DKI Terbitkan 50 Ribu Izin UMKM [DKI issued 50 thousand MSMEs permits]. <https://mediaindonesia.com/read/detail/344134-dki-terbitkan-50-ribu-izin-umkm>.
- [33] Susanti, R. (2020). ITB Sebut Tiga Masalah Utama yang Dihadapi UMKM [ITB mentioned three major issues faced by MSMEs]. <https://bandung.kompas.com/read/2020/03/02/06091961/itb-sebut-tiga-masalah-utama-yang-dihadapi-umkm-indonesia?page=all>.
- [34] Ariantara, A. (2021). TL rapim gub tentang kewirausahaan.
- [35] Bank, DKI. (2018). Bank DKI - Bank DKI kembali salurkan kredit ke umkm ok oce. <https://www.bankdki.co.id/id/investor-relations/2013-07-19-10-32-49/release/457-bank-dki-kembali-salurkan-kredit-ke-umkm-ok-oce#:~:text=Berkomitmen untuk terus mengembangkan UMKM,juta dengan tingkat bunga 7%25>.
- [36] Bank DKI. (2020). Bank DKI - Monas 25. <https://bankdki.co.id/id/product-services/micro-sme/2016-11-24-20-19-47/monas-25>.