

## BEYOND GENDER MAINSTREAMING: RECLAIMING THE BEIJING PLATFORM FOR ACTION IN INDONESIA'S RPJMN 2025–2029

Rizky Bangun Wibisono<sup>1\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>University of Glasgow

\*rbangunwibisono@gmail.com

\*Correspondence

Received: 23-09-2025; Accepted: 19-10-2025; Published: 27-11-2025

**Abstract:** This article critically examines Indonesia's National Medium-Term Development Plan (RPJMN) 2025–2029 within the broader vision of Indonesia Emas 2045 through a feminist policy analysis. It addresses the gap between global normative commitments to gender equality, particularly the Beijing Platform for Action (BPfA), and their translation into national development planning. The study argues that the RPJMN reproduces an instrumental form of gender mainstreaming, wherein gender equality is framed primarily as a means to enhance economic productivity and policy efficiency rather than as a commitment to structural justice. Drawing on qualitative document analysis, the findings demonstrate that gender functions largely as a policy add-on rather than as a structuring principle across four domains: poverty reduction, industrial development and land conflict, climate governance, and the Indonesia Emas 2045 vision. Women are positioned mainly as program targets, vulnerable groups, or human capital resources, while issues of power relations, unpaid care work, redistribution, and political agency remain marginal. The article contributes to feminist political economy and gender and development scholarship by showing how national planning regimes can institutionalize gender rhetorically while limiting its transformative potential. It proposes reclaiming the BPfA as a normative roadmap for advancing substantive gender justice within national development planning.

**Keywords:** *RPJMN; Beijing Platform for Action; Gender and Development.*

**Abstrak:** Artikel ini mengkaji secara kritis Rencana Pembangunan Jangka Menengah Nasional (RPJMN) 2025–2029 dalam kerangka visi Indonesia Emas 2045 melalui pendekatan analisis kebijakan feminis. Kajian ini menyoroti kesenjangan antara komitmen normatif global terhadap kesetaraan gender, khususnya Beijing Platform for Action (BPfA), dan penerjemahannya dalam perencanaan pembangunan nasional. Artikel ini berargumen bahwa RPJMN mereproduksi bentuk pengarusutamaan gender yang bersifat instrumental, di mana kesetaraan gender diposisikan terutama sebagai sarana untuk meningkatkan produktivitas ekonomi dan efisiensi kebijakan, bukan sebagai komitmen terhadap keadilan struktural. Berdasarkan analisis kualitatif dokumen kebijakan, temuan menunjukkan bahwa gender lebih berfungsi

sebagai tambahan kebijakan (policy add-on) daripada sebagai prinsip yang membentuk arah pembangunan di empat ranah utama: penanggulangan kemiskinan, pembangunan industri dan konflik lahan, tata kelola perubahan iklim, serta visi Indonesia Emas 2045. Perempuan cenderung diposisikan sebagai sasaran program, kelompok rentan, atau sumber daya manusia, sementara relasi kuasa, kerja perawatan tak dibayar, redistribusi sumber daya, dan agensi politik perempuan relatif terpinggirkan. Artikel ini berkontribusi pada perdebatan ekonomi politik feminis dan studi gender dan pembangunan dengan menunjukkan bagaimana perencanaan nasional dapat menginstitutionalisasi bahasa kesetaraan gender secara retorik namun membatasi potensi transformasinya, serta mengusulkan BPfA sebagai peta jalan normatif menuju keadilan gender yang substantif.

**Kata kunci:** RPJMN, Beijing Platform for Action, Gender dan Pembangunan.

## 1. Introduction

National development planning constitutes a central political instrument through which states articulate strategic priorities, allocate resources, and define the boundaries of social inclusion. In Indonesia, the *Rencana Pembangunan Jangka Menengah Nasional (RPJMN) 2025–2029*, formalized under *Peraturan Presiden Nomor 12 Tahun 2025*, marks the first implementation phase of the long-term *Rencana Pembangunan Jangka Panjang Nasional (RPJPN) 2025–2045*, aligned with the vision of *Indonesia Emas 2045* (Badan Pemeriksa Keuangan, 2025). Positioned as a decisive period for consolidating post-pandemic recovery, accelerating industrial transformation, navigating demographic transition, and strengthening climate resilience, the RPJMN 2025–2029 serves as a critical arena in which the state’s developmental commitments to inclusion, equity, and justice can be assessed.

At the global level, gender equality is firmly established as a foundational pillar of sustainable development. The Beijing Platform for Action (BPfA) and Sustainable Development Goal 5 (SDG 5) frame gender equality not as a marginal social concern, but as a structural transformation agenda encompassing economic redistribution, political representation, legal reform, and the reconfiguration of social norms. SDG 5 explicitly calls for the elimination of discrimination, violence, and systemic barriers that constrain women’s participation across economic, political, and social domains (Bantekas & Seatzu, 2023). Yet global assessments reveal persistent stagnation. At the current pace, closing gaps in legal protection and eliminating discriminatory laws could take centuries, while achieving parity in leadership and decision-making may require more than a century (Korb & Bornman, 2021; Yinuo, 2022; United Nations, 2025). These projections underscore a widening disjuncture between normative commitments and substantive policy transformation.

Indonesia formally aligns itself with these global frameworks. The RPJMN 2025–2029 references inclusive development and gender mainstreaming within its strategic pillars, signaling recognition of gender equality as a cross-cutting concern. However, prior analyses of Indonesia’s gender mainstreaming trajectory suggest that such commitments often remain procedural rather than transformative (Dhewy, 2017). Gender considerations tend to be incorporated through sector-specific initiatives or performance indicators, rather than deployed as an analytical lens capable of reshaping the logic of national planning. Within the RPJMN 2025–2029, gender is frequently

articulated alongside priorities such as economic growth, human capital development, industrial expansion, and climate resilience (Misiyah et al., 2025; Perpres No. 12 Tahun 2025). In this configuration, gender equality risks being framed primarily in terms of efficiency gains—such as increasing female labor force participation—or targeted welfare interventions, rather than as a structural commitment to redistributive justice and power transformation.

This tendency reflects a broader global shift toward what critical scholarship identifies as instrumental gender mainstreaming: a policy orientation in which gender equality is treated as a means to enhance development outcomes rather than as an end grounded in rights and justice. When gender is instrumentalized, women are positioned as contributors to productivity or beneficiaries of service delivery, while the structural power relations that produce gendered inequalities remain insufficiently interrogated. International assessments attribute slow progress not only to socio-cultural constraints but also to weak political will and limited structural reform (Yinuo, 2022; United Nations, 2025). Within the Indonesian context, this raises a crucial question: does the RPJMN integrate gender as a transformative framework, or does it deploy gender as a technocratic supplement to an otherwise growth-oriented development paradigm?

The stakes of this question become particularly visible in four strategic domains central to the RPJMN's agenda: poverty reduction, industrial development and land governance, climate change policy, and the long-term vision of Indonesia Emas 2045. Poverty alleviation strategies may include gender-disaggregated indicators without confronting the structural drivers of women's disproportionate concentration in informal labor markets and unpaid care work. Industrial and infrastructure expansion may proceed without systematic safeguards for women's land rights and community governance. Climate adaptation policies may identify women as vulnerable populations while failing to recognize them as agents of environmental governance. Meanwhile, long-term visions emphasizing demographic dividends and economic competitiveness may understate persistent gender disparities in political authority, asset ownership, and decision-making power.

While scholarship has examined gender mainstreaming within Indonesia's policy architecture (Dhewy, 2017) and broader global debates on SDG implementation (Bantekas & Seatzu, 2023; Korb & Bornman, 2021; Yinuo, 2022; United Nations, 2025), limited research has systematically interrogated how the RPJMN 2025–2029 constructs gender within its overarching developmental logic, particularly in relation to the Beijing Platform for Action as a normative benchmark. Existing analyses tend to focus on the presence or absence of gender provisions, rather than on the deeper epistemic framing through which gender is operationalized in national planning. Moreover, there has been insufficient attention to how the marginalization of BPfA principles may contribute to structural blind spots across key development sectors—especially in areas where growth-oriented policies intersect with land governance, environmental risk, and distributive justice.

This article addresses that gap by shifting the analytical focus from policy inclusion to policy construction. Rather than asking whether gender appears in the RPJMN, it asks how gender is conceptualized, operationalized, and potentially depoliticized within Indonesia's contemporary

developmental state. By foregrounding the BPfA as a normative–operational framework, the study evaluates whether national planning aligns with a transformative gender justice agenda or reproduces instrumental logics embedded within technocratic development. The objective of this study is to critically examine the construction and operationalization of gender within Indonesia’s RPJMN 2025–2029 and to assess the implications of its alignment—or misalignment—with the transformative commitments of the Beijing Platform for Action.

To achieve this objective, the article addresses three interrelated research questions: (1) How is gender constructed within the RPJMN 2025–2029, and in what forms does the instrumentalization of gender manifest in national development policy. (2) How does the marginalization or absence of BPfA principles shape structural shortcomings in key development domains (poverty reduction; industrial development and land conflict; climate change governance, and the long-term vision of Indonesia Emas 2045). (3) How can the Beijing Platform for Action be reclaimed as a transformative development roadmap capable of reorienting Indonesia’s national planning toward substantive gender justice. By situating the RPJMN within feminist political economy and critical development scholarship, this article advances the argument that moving beyond instrumental gender mainstreaming requires repositioning the BPfA from symbolic endorsement to operational framework.

## **2. Methodology**

### ***2.1. Research Design***

The analysis draws on three main categories of qualitative data. First, the primary source is the RPJMN 2025–2029, which articulates Indonesia’s development priorities, strategic directions, and performance indicators. As a legally binding planning instrument, the RPJMN provides an authoritative basis for examining how gender is integrated across sectors and policy objectives.

Second, the Beijing Platform for Action is used as a normative reference framework. The BPfA is treated not merely as an international commitment but as an analytical benchmark against which the gender responsiveness and transformative ambition of the RPJMN are evaluated. Its emphasis on structural change, accountability, and women’s rights provides criteria for assessing alignment or divergence.

Third, supporting documents, including national gender equality policies, gender mainstreaming guidelines, and relevant regulatory frameworks are used to contextualize the RPJMN within Indonesia’s broader gender policy architecture. These materials enable the identification of coherence, inconsistencies, or gaps between sectoral commitments and overarching development strategies.

### ***2.2. Data Sources***

The analysis draws on three main categories of qualitative data. First, the primary source of analysis is the RPJMN 2025–2029, which serves as the central policy document articulating Indonesia’s development priorities, strategies, and performance indicators for the period under study. As a legally binding national planning instrument, the RPJMN provides an authoritative basis for examining how gender is integrated across development sectors and policy objectives.

Second, the study utilizes the Beijing Platform for Action as a normative reference framework. The BPfA is treated not merely as a background international commitment, but as an analytical benchmark against which the gender responsiveness of national development planning is assessed. Its emphasis on structural transformation, women's rights, and accountability provides a critical lens for evaluating whether gender mainstreaming in the RPJMN aligns with internationally recognized standards of gender justice.

Third, the analysis is supplemented by supporting policy documents, including national gender equality policies, gender mainstreaming guidelines, and relevant regulatory frameworks. These documents are used to contextualize the RPJMN within Indonesia's broader gender policy architecture and to assess coherence or disjuncture between sectoral commitments and overarching development strategies.

### **2.3. Analytical Strategy**

The study applies a structured feminist document analysis combined with policy mapping. The analysis proceeded through three stages: coding, interpretation, and evaluative comparison. First, a qualitative coding process was conducted on the RPJMN text. Relevant sections referring to gender, women, inclusion, human capital, labor participation, poverty, industrialization, land governance, climate resilience, and demographic strategy were identified and coded thematically. Codes were developed deductively from feminist political economy concepts—instrumentalization, silencing, and depoliticization—and applied systematically across chapters and policy pillars.

Second, interpretive analysis examined how gender was framed within policy narratives, how these narratives translated into strategic priorities, and how they were operationalized through indicators and targets. This narrative–strategy–indicator mapping enabled assessment of whether gender commitments were substantively embedded or reduced to peripheral references.

Third, the findings were evaluated against the normative principles of the BPfA. This evaluative comparison identified areas of convergence, partial alignment, or omission, particularly in domains related to structural inequality, redistribution, political participation, and environmental governance.

The three analytical lenses were operationalized through a systematic reading of the RPJMN text that identified how gender was framed, where it was absent, and how structural issues were translated into policy language. Instrumentalization was identified in instances where gender equality was presented primarily as a means to enhance economic productivity, policy efficiency, demographic advantage, or social stability, rather than as an objective grounded in redistribution, rights, and structural justice. Silencing was traced through omissions or marginal treatment of issues central to feminist political economy, including unpaid care work, informal labor precarity, land dispossession, environmental vulnerability, and women's political agency. Finally, depoliticization was observed where structural and relational inequalities were reframed as neutral managerial challenges, reduced to technical indicators, administrative targets, or sectoral programs in ways that obscured underlying power relations and conflicts over resources and authority.

### **3. Theoretical Framework**

#### ***3.1. Feminist Political Economy of Development***

Feminist political economy conceptualizes development not as a neutral or technical process, but as a deeply political project shaped by power relations, social hierarchies, and unequal distributions of resources and labor. From this perspective, development outcomes are inseparable from gendered structures that organize production, reproduction, and social reproduction (Benería, 2003; Elson, 1995). Feminist scholars have long argued that mainstream development paradigms systematically privilege market-oriented growth while marginalizing the social relations and unpaid labor that sustain economic systems (Rai et al., 2014).

One of the central contributions of feminist political economy is its critique of the feminization of poverty, a concept that highlights women's disproportionate exposure to poverty due to structural inequalities in labor markets, access to assets, and social protection (Chant, 2006; Razavi & Hassim, 2006). Feminization of poverty is not merely a demographic trend, but a reflection of gendered power relations that assign women to low-paid, informal, or precarious forms of work, while simultaneously holding them responsible for unpaid care and household labor (Chant, 2006). Development policies that focus narrowly on income-based poverty reduction often fail to address these structural conditions, thereby reproducing gendered vulnerabilities rather than alleviating them. This critique is directly relevant to Indonesia's poverty reduction and labor market strategies within the RPJMN, where aggregate growth targets may obscure gendered inequalities embedded in informalization and care burdens.

Closely linked to this critique is feminist scholarship on the care economy and unpaid labor. Scholars such as Folbre (2001) and Bhattacharya (2017) emphasize that care work, predominantly performed by women, constitutes a foundational yet systematically undervalued component of economic systems. By excluding unpaid care labor from economic accounting and policy design, development planning renders women's contributions invisible while intensifying their workload through market expansion and welfare retrenchment (Bhattacharya, 2017, pp. 1–20). In the context of national development planning, this perspective invites scrutiny of whether the RPJMN recognizes care as a structural component of the economy or continues to treat it as a private responsibility external to policy concern.

Within this framework, development is understood as a contested process in which gendered power relations are reproduced or transformed through policy choices. This analytical orientation provides the structural foundation for examining how gender is subsequently mainstreamed in policy processes. It also establishes the conceptual link to instrumental gender mainstreaming, since the reduction of gender to efficiency concerns reflects the very market-centered logic that feminist political economy critiques.

#### ***3.2. Instrumental Gender Mainstreaming***

Gender mainstreaming emerged in the 1990s as a transformative strategy aimed at integrating gender perspectives into all stages of policy-making, with the explicit goal of reshaping institutions and power relations (Walby, 2005; True & Mintrom, 2001). Originally articulated as

a departure from women-in-development approaches, gender mainstreaming sought to embed gender analysis across policy domains in order to alter structural inequalities.

However, feminist scholarship has documented how gender mainstreaming has increasingly shifted from a transformative agenda to an instrumental and technocratic practice. As gender became institutionalized within bureaucratic systems, its political content was often diluted, resulting in what scholars describe as gender mainstreaming lite (Mukhopadhyay, 2004) or depoliticized gender equality (Bacchi, 2010). In this form, gender is incorporated as a managerial tool to improve policy efficiency, economic performance, or service delivery, rather than as a means to challenge unequal power relations.

This shift reflects a convergence with the growth-oriented paradigms critiqued by feminist political economy. When gender equality is justified primarily in terms of productivity gains or human capital enhancement, it becomes subordinated to macroeconomic priorities rather than embedded as a redistributive principle. This instrumentalization is particularly evident in development planning frameworks that frame gender equality as a driver of economic growth, such as increasing women's labor force participation or enhancing competitiveness (Chant & Sweetman, 2012). While such objectives may generate measurable outputs, they risk reinforcing existing hierarchies by integrating women into unequal systems without transforming the structures that disadvantage them.

In relation to the RPJMN 2025–2029, this conceptual distinction provides an analytical tool for assessing whether gender mainstreaming operates as a structural lens across policy pillars or as a supporting instrument attached to growth, industrialization, and demographic objectives. The framework thus bridges abstract theory and the Indonesian policy context by examining how gender is positioned within national planning logics.

### ***3.3. Beijing Platform for Action as a Feminist Development Framework***

Adopted at the Fourth World Conference on Women in 1995, the Beijing Platform for Action (BPfA) represents one of the most comprehensive global commitments to gender equality. Unlike narrower policy instruments, the BPfA articulates a holistic and explicitly political vision of development that recognizes gender inequality as structural and systemic, rooted in unequal power relations (UN Women, 2015). It identifies twelve critical areas of concern that link economic justice, political participation, human rights, and environmental sustainability within an integrated framework.

Feminist scholars emphasize that the BPfA functions not merely as a symbolic declaration, but as a normative roadmap for gender-just development (Fraser, 2013). Its significance lies in its insistence that gender equality requires institutional transformation, accountability mechanisms, and the redistribution of power and resources. Importantly, the BPfA foregrounds women's agency, positioning women not only as beneficiaries of development but as political actors capable of shaping development trajectories.

Despite its normative strength, implementation at the national level has been uneven. Studies show that states often selectively adopt elements of the BPfA that align with prevailing development priorities, while sidelining its more transformative demands (Moser & Moser, 2005).

This selective incorporation mirrors the dynamics of instrumental gender mainstreaming identified above.

In this study, the BPfA is operationalised as an evaluative benchmark through three core normative principles derived from its framework: structural redistribution of resources and opportunities, recognition of unpaid care and social reproduction, and institutional accountability for women's political participation and rights. These principles are used to assess whether the RPJMN integrates gender in a manner consistent with transformative commitments or reduces it to sectoral inclusion. By applying the BPfA in this structured way, the analysis moves beyond symbolic reference and enables systematic comparison between Indonesia's national planning priorities and internationally recognized standards of gender justice.

Reclaiming the BPfA as a guiding framework therefore provides not only normative grounding but also analytical coherence. It connects feminist political economy's structural critique with the practical evaluation of gender mainstreaming in Indonesia's development planning, allowing the study to assess whether the RPJMN advances substantive transformation or reproduces existing inequalities under the language of inclusion.

### ***3.4. Developmental Nationalism and Technocratic Planning***

National development planning in many postcolonial states has been shaped by traditions of developmental nationalism, in which economic growth, industrialization, and national competitiveness are framed as central to state legitimacy (Evans, 1995; Woo-Cumings, 1999). Within this paradigm, the state assumes a central role in directing development through technocratic planning instruments, often prioritizing macroeconomic targets and infrastructure expansion.

While developmental states have been credited with achieving rapid economic growth, feminist and critical development scholars argue that such models frequently marginalize social justice concerns, particularly those related to gender and care (Elson, 1995; Rai, 2008). Technocratic planning tends to privilege quantifiable outcomes and efficiency metrics, rendering relational and distributive dimensions of inequality less visible. As a result, social reproduction and gendered labor are treated as externalities rather than integral components of development.

In the Indonesian context, the RPJMN reflects this technocratic and developmentalist tradition, positioning growth, productivity, and human capital as primary objectives. The tension between economic growth and social justice is not incidental but structural, as gender equality is often subordinated to national competitiveness and fiscal priorities. Feminist scholars caution that without explicit mechanisms to address power asymmetries, developmental nationalism risks reinforcing patriarchal structures while mobilizing gender equality rhetoric to legitimize state-led development agendas.

This theoretical lens is essential for understanding why gender mainstreaming within national development plans often remains limited in scope. It situates the RPJMN within broader political and historical dynamics that shape how gender equality is framed, operationalized, and constrained within state planning processes.

## **4. Findings & Analysis: Manifestations of Instrumental Gender Mainstreaming**

### ***4.1. Women and Poverty: Gender-Neutral Metrics, Gendered Realities***

The RPJMN 2025–2029 presents poverty reduction as one of the central achievements and ongoing priorities of Indonesia’s national development agenda. The document highlights a significant decline in poverty rates over recent years, attributing this progress to the expansion and consolidation of social protection schemes, including social assistance, social security, and graduation-based welfare programs (Kementerian Perencanaan Pembangunan Nasional, 2025). These interventions are framed as structured and sustainable efforts to protect vulnerable populations, reduce inequality, and mitigate the socioeconomic impacts of recurring crises (Kementerian Perencanaan Pembangunan Nasional, 2025). Within this narrative, poverty is primarily understood as an income-based condition that can be addressed through targeted transfers, improved access to basic services, and incremental economic inclusion.

However, beneath this ostensibly neutral framing lies a profound gendered reality that remains largely unacknowledged within the RPJMN. When poverty data are disaggregated by sex, women consistently exhibit higher poverty rates than men (Chant, 2006). At the same time, women in Indonesia have a significantly higher life expectancy than men, meaning that they experience longer durations of life under conditions of economic precarity (The World Bank, 2019). This intersection between higher life expectancy and higher poverty rates underscores a structural condition in which women are more likely to endure prolonged exposure to poverty, insecurity, and social vulnerability. Yet this feminized experience of poverty is not problematized within the RPJMN’s analytical framework.

The reliance on aggregate and gender-neutral poverty indicators effectively obscures the structural drivers of women’s poverty (Chant, 2006). By prioritizing income thresholds and household-based targeting mechanisms, the RPJMN implicitly assumes that poverty is experienced uniformly within households and that resources distributed to households will automatically benefit all members equally. Feminist political economy scholarship has long challenged this assumption, demonstrating that intra-household power relations often result in unequal access to resources, decision-making, and welfare benefits, particularly for women (Elson, 1995; Chant, 2006). The absence of this analytical lens in the RPJMN reflects a broader depoliticization of poverty that renders gendered inequalities invisible.

This gender blindness is further evident in the treatment of unpaid reproductive and care work. Women’s disproportionate responsibility for domestic labor, childcare, elder care, and community care remains absent from the poverty analysis underpinning the RPJMN. Social protection programs are designed to alleviate income poverty without addressing the time poverty and care burdens that constrain women’s ability to engage in paid employment or education. As a result, women are positioned as passive recipients of assistance rather than as subjects whose labor sustains both households and the broader economy. This omission reinforces the instrumental logic identified earlier, where women’s roles are acknowledged only insofar as they contribute to policy efficiency and development targets (Folbre, 2001; Fraser, 2013).

The same pattern is evident in the RPJMN's approach to stunting reduction. The document frames stunting as a gender-neutral child welfare issue, emphasizing the expansion of national safety net programs such as conditional cash transfers, food assistance, and health insurance subsidies. While these interventions are important, the analysis disconnects stunting from the structural conditions faced by women, particularly mothers. Issues such as maternal health during pregnancy, early and forced marriage, exposure to domestic violence, and chronic maternal undernutrition are not foregrounded as central determinants of child stunting (Li et al., 2020). By failing to situate stunting within women's lived experiences of poverty and inequality, the RPJMN treats women primarily as instruments for achieving child development outcomes rather than as rights-bearing individuals whose wellbeing is intrinsically valuable (Razavi & Hassim, 2006).

Educational indicators provide another illustration of gender-neutral metrics masking gendered realities. The RPJMN notes improvements in average years of schooling among the population aged 15 years and above, presenting this trend as evidence of progress in human capital development. However, disaggregated data reveal persistent gender gaps, with women's average years of schooling remaining lower than men's. This disparity is not merely a statistical anomaly but reflects deeply embedded patriarchal norms, gendered expectations, and practices such as child marriage that disproportionately curtail girls' access to education (Federici, 2021). Yet these structural and cultural determinants are absent from the RPJMN's problem diagnosis, which frames educational attainment primarily as a supply-side issue to be addressed through service expansion.

Taken together, these findings demonstrate that the RPJMN's poverty framework operates through gender-neutral metrics that systematically fail to capture gendered realities. Women appear in policy narratives largely as beneficiaries or targets of programs, recipients of cash transfers, caregivers responsible for child nutrition, or contributors to household welfare, rather than as agents of empowerment whose structural disadvantages require transformative intervention (Rai, 2008). This constitutes a clear manifestation of instrumental gender mainstreaming, in which gender is acknowledged at the level of implementation but excluded from the conceptualization of poverty itself (Woo-Cumings, 2019).

The absence of a gendered poverty analysis also signals a broader failure to align national development planning with the normative commitments of the Beijing Platform for Action. The BPfA explicitly recognizes poverty as a gendered phenomenon rooted in unequal access to economic resources, education, health, and decision-making power. By contrast, the RPJMN's approach reproduces a technocratic understanding of poverty that prioritizes measurable outcomes while neglecting the structural power relations that sustain women's poverty over the life course.

In this sense, women and poverty are not treated as a distinct or isolated issue within the RPJMN, but rather as an empirical entry point into a wider pattern of depoliticization. The feminization of poverty is rendered statistically visible yet politically invisible, reinforcing a development model that integrates women into existing systems of inequality without challenging the relations of power that produce them.

#### ***4.2. Industrial Development, Land Conflict, and the Gendered Costs of Growth***

Industrial development occupies a central position within the RPJMN 2025–2029 as a key engine of economic growth, structural transformation, and Indonesia’s transition toward high-income status under the vision of Indonesia Emas 2045. The expansion of industrial estates, downstreaming of natural resources, and acceleration of infrastructure development are framed as strategic imperatives to enhance competitiveness, attract investment, and create employment (Agarwal, 2003). Within this developmental narrative, land is predominantly conceptualized as an economic asset, while industrial zones are portrayed as neutral sites of progress and modernization (Agarwal, 2003).

Yet, similar to the poverty framework discussed earlier, the RPJMN’s industrialization agenda is characterized by a striking absence of gender analysis. The document does not systematically assess how industrial expansion, land conversion, and resource extraction differentially affect women and men, nor does it articulate mechanisms to protect women from the social, economic, and environmental disruptions that often accompany large-scale development projects. This omission is not incidental; rather, it reflects a technocratic planning logic that prioritizes growth metrics over social relations and power asymmetries.

Feminist political ecology and agrarian studies have consistently demonstrated that land and resource governance are deeply gendered processes. Elmhirst et al. (2017), in their work on agrarian transitions in Southeast Asia, show that industrialization and land commodification frequently undermine women’s access to land, forests, and common resources, even when women play central roles in subsistence production and household survival. As land is reclassified for industrial use, women’s customary and informal land rights—often weakly recognized by statutory systems—are disproportionately erased (Elmhirst et al., 2017). These processes are rarely captured by formal compensation mechanisms, which tend to recognize male household heads as primary rights holders.

In the RPJMN, land acquisition for industrial estates and strategic projects is framed primarily as an administrative and legal process, with an emphasis on regulatory streamlining and investment facilitation. Gendered land tenure systems, intra-household inequalities, and women’s differentiated reliance on land-based livelihoods are not integrated into impact assessments or mitigation strategies (Elmhirst et al., 2017). As a result, women’s losses remain largely invisible within official development narratives, even as they bear some of the most severe consequences of dispossession (Elmhirst et al., 2017).

The gendered costs of industrial development extend beyond the loss of land and livelihoods. De Vos & Delabre (2018) highlights how extractive and industrial projects restructure local economies in ways that intensify women’s unpaid care burdens. Environmental degradation, declining access to water and food sources, and increased male labor migration often compel women to assume additional responsibilities for household provisioning, health care, and community survival (De Vos & Delabre, 2018). These expanding care obligations are rarely acknowledged as development costs, yet they constitute a hidden subsidy that sustains growth-oriented development models.

In the RPJMN, industrial development is justified through promises of job creation and economic spillovers. However, the quality and accessibility of these jobs for women remain unexamined. Feminist research indicates that industrial zones frequently reproduce gendered labor segmentation, with women concentrated in low-paid, insecure, and informal positions, while managerial and technical roles remain male-dominated (Elmhirst et al., 2017). Without explicit safeguards, skills training, and labor protections tailored to women's needs, industrialization risks reinforcing rather than dismantling gendered inequalities in the labor market.

The RPJMN's treatment of land conflict remains largely gender-neutral, focusing on legal resolution, investment certainty, and administrative efficiency. There is little recognition of how conflict and displacement affect women differently, including increased risks of gender-based violence, loss of social networks, and erosion of customary support systems. Nor does the RPJMN articulate gender-responsive accountability mechanisms to ensure women's access to justice in land and resource disputes.

Taken together, these findings reveal that industrial development within the RPJMN reproduces a model of growth that systematically externalizes its gendered costs. Women are not positioned as rights-bearing stakeholders in development decisions, but rather as residual actors who absorb the social and reproductive burdens generated by industrial expansion. Gender mainstreaming, where present, is limited to peripheral references and lacks the analytical depth required to address the structural roots of inequality.

This pattern mirrors the instrumental logic identified in the poverty framework: women are implicitly expected to adapt, cope, and compensate for development-induced disruptions, while the development model itself remains unquestioned. Industrialization thus becomes not only a site of economic transformation, but also a mechanism through which gendered inequalities are reconfigured and intensified under the banner of national progress.

As with poverty reduction, the absence of the Beijing Platform for Action as a guiding framework is significant. The BPfA explicitly calls for gender-responsive land reform, equitable access to natural resources, and women's participation in environmental and economic decision-making. The failure to integrate these principles into industrial development planning underscores a broader structural disconnect between global gender justice commitments and national development practices.

### ***4.3. Gender and Climate Change***

Climate change occupies an increasingly prominent place in the RPJMN 2025–2029, framed as a critical challenge to sustainable development, economic stability, and national resilience. The document emphasizes mitigation and adaptation strategies such as emissions reduction, climate-resilient infrastructure, disaster risk management, and technological innovation (Kementerian Perencanaan Pembangunan Nasional, 2025). These priorities reflect a technocratic approach to climate governance, in which climate change is treated primarily as an environmental and technical problem requiring managerial solutions.

Within this framework, gender appears only marginally and almost exclusively through the language of vulnerability. Women are implicitly categorized as part of “vulnerable groups” alongside children, the elderly, and persons with disabilities, without a deeper examination of the social relations and power structures that produce differential climate impacts (Kementerian Perencanaan Pembangunan Nasional, 2025). This framing reduces gender to a demographic variable rather than a structural axis of inequality, reinforcing a pattern in which women are recognized as affected populations but not as agents of adaptation, resilience, or climate governance.

The Gender and Climate Change Alliance has demonstrated that women’s vulnerability to climate change is not inherent, but socially produced through unequal access to resources, decision-making power, land, and information (Sellers, 2016). Gendered divisions of labor, particularly in agriculture, fisheries, and water management, place women at the frontlines of climate impacts while simultaneously excluding them from policy processes that shape adaptation strategies (Sellers, 2016). By failing to integrate this analytical insight, the RPJMN reproduces a depoliticized understanding of climate vulnerability that obscures its gendered foundations.

This depoliticization is particularly evident in the RPJMN’s treatment of coastal and rural communities, which are among the most exposed to climate risks. Recent studies on women in coastal areas in Indonesia, including the work of Rosalinda et al. (2024), illustrate how women play critical roles in sustaining household economies, managing food security, and organizing community-based responses to environmental change. Despite their central role, women’s knowledge and adaptive strategies remain largely unrecognized in formal climate policies. Instead, adaptation is framed as a top-down process driven by infrastructure projects and technological interventions, leaving little space for women’s agency or local knowledge systems (Rosalinda et al., 2024).

The erasure of women as climate actors is further compounded by the RPJMN’s narrow focus on resilience as a technical outcome rather than a social process. Feminist climate scholars argue that resilience must be understood as relational and political, shaped by access to resources, social networks, and decision-making power (Resurrección, 2013). When resilience is reduced to infrastructure readiness or disaster response capacity, the everyday practices through which women sustain communities under climate stress are rendered invisible (Resurrección, 2013).

The cumulative effect of these omissions is a shift from recognizing women’s differentiated vulnerabilities to effectively erasing their political and economic agency. Gender mainstreaming in climate policy becomes symbolic rather than substantive, limited to rhetorical acknowledgments that do not translate into transformative planning. This reflects a broader pattern of instrumental gender mainstreaming, in which gender considerations are included only insofar as they do not disrupt technocratic policy logics or challenge existing power relations.

Moreover, the RPJMN’s climate framework remains disconnected from the normative commitments articulated in the Beijing Platform for Action. The BPfA explicitly calls for women’s full participation in environmental decision-making and recognizes environmental degradation as a gender justice issue. By contrast, the RPJMN treats climate change as a sectoral challenge rather

than a cross-cutting issue that intersects with poverty, land rights, and social reproduction (Wibisono, 2024). This fragmentation undermines the potential for integrated and gender-transformative climate strategies.

In this sense, climate change becomes a critical site where the limits of technocratic development planning are laid bare. The reduction of gender to vulnerability, coupled with the exclusion of women's agency, reveals how national development frameworks can simultaneously acknowledge and erase gender concerns. Climate policy thus mirrors the patterns identified in poverty reduction and industrial development: women are visible as problems to be managed, yet invisible as political subjects capable of shaping development pathways.

#### ***4.4. Women in Indonesia Emas: Vision without Gender Justice***

The RPJMN 2025–2029 is nested within a broader long-term development framework articulated in the Rencana Pembangunan Jangka Panjang Nasional (RPJPN) 2025–2045, commonly referred to as Indonesia Emas 2045. This long-term plan represents a foundational political commitment by the Indonesian state toward achieving high-income status, demographic dividend benefits, and global competitiveness by the centenary of independence in 2045 (Kementerian Perencanaan Pembangunan Nasional, 2025). Official documents and statements from the Ministry of National Development Planning emphasize strategic priorities such as productivity enhancement, human capital development, technological innovation, infrastructure expansion, and equitable welfare improvement as central pillars of the Vision Indonesia Emas 2045 agenda (Kementerian Perencanaan Pembangunan Nasional, 2025).

Across these narratives, gender equality is rhetorically positioned as part of inclusive development, with references to women's education, labor force participation, and health outcomes. However, a critical reading of the official Indonesia Emas 2045 documentation reveals a fundamental disjunction between the high-level vision of national progress and the structural conditions that underpin gender inequality. While the vision articulates broad aspirations for improved welfare and human development, it fails to critically engage with the power relations, institutional barriers, and social structures that obstruct women's full participation and leadership within economic, political, and social spheres.

This disjunction mirrors the patterns identified in Sections 4.1 through 4.3, where gender is repeatedly included as a peripheral consideration rather than as a foundational driver of national development priorities. In the context of Indonesia Emas 2045, women are frequently framed as beneficiaries of human capital investments—such as education and health—without an attendant analysis of the constraints that limit their agency, access to opportunities, and equitable participation in development benefits.

A persistent theme across the long-term vision and its five-year operationalization in the RPJMN is the prioritization of aggregate economic growth and national competitiveness. The underlying assumption is that improvements in macroeconomic indicators, coupled with incremental gains in social services, will generate “trickledown” benefits for all citizens, including women. However, this logic discounts how growth dynamics are mediated by gendered social

relations that shape access to assets, decision-making power, and socio-economic mobility. Feminist political economy critiques emphasize that growth per se does not automatically translate into gender justice; instead, it can reproduce and even intensify inequalities when structural barriers remain unexamined and unaddressed.

The instrumentalization of gender within the Indonesia Emas framework is evident in its emphasis on human capital as a pathway to national advancement. Although increasing women's educational attainment and labor market participation is undeniably important, these objectives are embedded within a developmental narrative that treats gender as a resource to be optimized rather than as a dimension of justice to be realized. This framing risks subsuming women's empowerment under productivity metrics, thereby reinforcing the very power asymmetries that normative commitments—such as those articulated in the Beijing Platform for Action—seek to transform.

Central to this critique is the absence of mechanisms within both the long-term vision and its operational counterparts to interrogate how structural inequalities are reproduced across intersecting domains of class, ethnicity, region, and gender. While Indonesia Emas 2045 acknowledges the importance of equitable development, it lacks explicit frameworks for redistributing power, challenging patriarchal norms, or restructuring institutional practices that disadvantage women in land governance, formal employment, political representation, and social protection. For instance, women's systemic exclusion from high-level leadership roles remains unaddressed in strategic objectives that prioritize quantitative indicators—such as average years of schooling or labor force participation rates—without corresponding qualitative commitments to transform gendered norms and institutional cultures.

The Vision Indonesia Emas 2045 documents also remain largely silent on the intersection between gender, care work, and social reproduction within the national division of labor. As noted earlier, unpaid care burdens represent a significant constraint on women's ability to participate equitably in economic and civic life. Yet, these considerations do not feature prominently in strategic planning documents that frame human capital development primarily in terms of formal education, skill acquisition, and productivity enhancement. By treating gender disparities through narrow economic lenses, the long-term vision elides the relational and structural dimensions of inequality that are critical for genuine empowerment.

Furthermore, the translation of Indonesia Emas 2045 into actionable policy via the RPJMN reveals persistent depoliticization of gender concerns. Women's issues are frequently positioned within sectoral silos—such as health, education, or social welfare—rather than as cross-cutting imperatives that must inform the core logic of national development planning. This compartmentalization reinforces the instrumental logic previously identified: gender equality serves primarily as a support to broader development goals, rather than as an autonomous objective with its own normative weight.

In this sense, the Vision Indonesia Emas 2045 functions less as a transformative roadmap for gender justice and more as a legitimizing narrative for neoliberal developmental priorities that privilege economic growth. Gender appears as a supplement to, rather than a driver of, the vision's strategic pathways. This dynamic has significant implications: it suggests that even long-term

planning mechanisms with broad societal mandates can replicate the same patterns of exclusion and depoliticization noted in shorter-term planning documents like the RPJMN.

The critical lacuna in both the long-term vision and its operationalization underscores the urgency of integrating frameworks such as the Beijing Platform for Action into national planning regimes. The BPfA provides a normative compass that centers women's agency, structural justice, and redistribution as core components of sustainable development. Without such grounding, national development strategies risk prioritizing macroeconomic growth while leaving entrenched gender inequalities intact.

For national development planning, this implies embedding gender analysis at the level of macroeconomic strategy, industrial policy, land governance, and climate planning rather than limiting it to sectoral programs or symbolic commitments. Planning instruments such as the RPJMN should incorporate clear redistributive objectives, recognition of unpaid care work, protection of women's resource rights, and institutional accountability for women's participation. Making these elements structurally integral to planning processes is essential to aligning long-term national transformation with substantive gender justice.

Taken together, Sections 4.1 through 4.4 reveal a consistent cross-sectoral pattern: national development planning under Indonesia Emas and the RPJMN reflects an instrumental and technocratic approach to gender, one that acknowledges women primarily in relation to predetermined development targets. Across poverty policy, industrial expansion and land governance, climate adaptation, and long-term national visioning, gender is incorporated as a variable to be managed rather than as a structural axis of power shaping access to resources, representation, and decision-making authority.

This recurring logic indicates that the marginalization of gender is not confined to a single sector but embedded within the broader architecture of planning itself. Growth imperatives, productivity metrics, and performance indicators function as organizing principles across policy domains, while redistributive justice, care responsibilities, land rights, and political agency remain secondary or fragmented concerns. As a result, gendered power relations are obscured, women's lived realities are selectively represented, and opportunities for structural transformation are constrained.

In this sense, the Vision Indonesia Emas 2045 exemplifies how large-scale development imaginaries can articulate inclusive rhetoric without embedding substantive institutional mechanisms for gender justice at their core. The pattern that emerges is not merely one of omission, but of systemic alignment between technocratic developmentalism and instrumental gender integration, revealing the need for a more explicitly transformative framework to reorient national planning toward structural equality.

## **5. Conclusion**

This article has critically examined the RPJMN 2025–2029 within the broader framework of Indonesia's long-term development vision, Indonesia Emas 2045, through a feminist political economy lens. By situating gender mainstreaming within national development planning, the

analysis demonstrates that gender is consistently incorporated in an instrumental, technocratic, and depoliticized manner. Across poverty reduction, industrial development and land governance, climate change adaptation, and the overarching vision of national progress, gender equality functions not as a transformative framework but as a policy add-on—subordinate to growth-oriented and productivity-driven objectives.

The empirical findings reveal a coherent pattern of structural failure rather than isolated policy gaps. In the domain of poverty reduction, gender-neutral metrics obscure the feminization of poverty and women's prolonged exposure to economic insecurity, while unpaid care work and intra-household power relations remain analytically invisible. In industrial development and land-based investments, women disproportionately bear the social and reproductive costs of growth, including dispossession, livelihood loss, and intensified care burdens, yet remain excluded from decision-making and access to justice. In climate governance, women are reduced to a category of vulnerability, while their agency, knowledge, and leadership in adaptation and resilience-building are systematically erased. Finally, within the Indonesia Emas 2045 vision, women are positioned as human capital inputs rather than as political subjects whose empowerment requires structural transformation.

Taken together, these findings confirm that the RPJMN 2025–2029 reproduces a model of instrumental gender mainstreaming that prioritizes efficiency, measurability, and policy manageability over justice, redistribution, and power reconfiguration. Gender equality is mobilized to legitimize development strategies, not to challenge the social relations that underpin inequality. This instrumentalization reflects a deeper tension between technocratic developmentalism and feminist demands for structural change, a tension that remains unresolved within Indonesia's current planning architecture.

The absence of the Beijing Platform for Action as an operative framework is particularly significant. While Indonesia remains formally committed to global gender equality norms, the BPfA's transformative vision—centered on women's agency, intersectionality, and accountability—has been fragmented and diluted in national planning processes. Rather than functioning as a normative compass, the BPfA is sidelined in favor of development narratives that prioritize economic growth and national competitiveness. This disjuncture underscores how global commitments to gender justice can coexist with, and even be neutralized by, domestic policy frameworks that lack political will and institutional mechanisms for implementation.

This article contributes to feminist development scholarship by demonstrating how national development plans can simultaneously claim inclusivity while reproducing gendered power asymmetries. It highlights the need to move beyond counting women in development toward interrogating how development itself is structured, governed, and justified. For policymakers, the findings point to the urgency of re-politicizing gender mainstreaming by embedding gender analysis at the level of problem definition, policy design, and institutional accountability—rather than relegating it to implementation stages or sectoral silos.

Reclaiming the Beijing Platform for Action as a development roadmap offers a critical pathway forward. Doing so would require reorienting national planning toward structural justice:

recognizing unpaid care work as a central economic concern, ensuring women's substantive participation in land and climate governance, and aligning growth strategies with redistribution and rights-based frameworks. Without such a shift, the promise of Indonesia Emas 2045 risks becoming a vision of national prosperity built upon the continued marginalization of women's labor, voices, and political agency.

Ultimately, the question is not whether gender equality is mentioned in development plans, but whether it is allowed to reshape the very foundations of development itself. As this study has shown, without confronting the gendered power relations embedded in national planning, visions of inclusive development will remain rhetorically compelling yet substantively hollow.

## References

- Agarwal, B. (2003). Gender and Land Rights Revisited: Exploring New Prospects via the State, Family and Market. *Journal of Agrarian Change*, 3(1-2), 184–224. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1471-0366.00054>
- Bacchi. (2010). *Mainstreaming Politics: Gendering Practices and Feminist Theory*. University Of Adelaide.
- Badan Pemeriksa Keuangan. (2025). *Perpres No. 12 Tahun 2025*. Database Peraturan | JDIH BPK. <https://peraturan.bpk.go.id/Details/314638/perpres-no-12-tahun2025>
- Bantekas, I., & Seatzu, F. (2023). *The UN Sustainable Development Goals*. Oxford University Press.
- BeneríaL. (2003). *Gender, development, and globalization : economics as if all people mattered*. Routledge.
- Bhattacharya, T. (2017). *Social Reproduction Theory: Remapping Class, Recentring Oppression* (pp. 1–20). Pluto Press.
- Chant, S. (2006). Re-thinking the “Feminization of Poverty” in Relation to Aggregate Gender Indices. *Journal of Human Development*, 7(2), 201–220. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14649880600768538>
- Chant, S., & Sweetman, C. (2012). Fixing women or fixing the world? “Smart economics”, efficiency approaches, and gender equality in development. *Gender & Development*, 20(3), 517–529.
- De Vos, R., & Delabre, I. (2018). Spaces for participation and resistance: gendered experiences of oil palm plantation development. *Geoforum*, 96, 217–226. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2018.08.011>
- Dhewy, A. (2017). Gender Perspective as Formality: Feminist Policy Analysis toward RPJMN 2015-2019 and Strategic Plan of KPPPA 2015-2019. *Jurnal Perempuan*, 22(1), 55–64. <https://doi.org/10.34309/jp.v22i1.163>
- Elmhirst, R., Siscawati, M., Basnett, B. S., & Ekowati, D. (2017). Gender and generation in engagements with oil palm in East Kalimantan, Indonesia: insights from feminist political

- ecology. *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, 44(6), 1135–1157. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03066150.2017.1337002>
- Elson, D. (1995). Gender Awareness in Modeling Structural Adjustment. *World Development*, 23(11), 1851–1868. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0305-750x\(95\)00087-s](https://doi.org/10.1016/0305-750x(95)00087-s)
- Evans, P. B. (1995). *Embedded Autonomy: States and Industrial Transformation*. Princeton University Press.
- Federici, S. (2021). *Caliban and the Witch : women, the Body and Primitive Accumulation 2nd Edition*. Penguin Books.
- Folbre, N. (2001). *The invisible heart : economics and family values*. The New Press.
- Fraser, N. (2013). *Fortunes of Feminism: From State-Managed Capitalism to Neoliberal crisis*. Verso Books.
- Govindarajan, V. (2025). The SDGs journey : from learning to knowing to disseminating to mentoring. *SDGs Studies Review*, 6, e028. <https://doi.org/10.37497/sdgs.v6istudies.28>
- Kementerian Perencanaan Pembangunan Nasional. (2025). *RPJMN TAHUN 2025–2029*.
- Korb, B., & Bornman, D. (2021). Mentoring Women in the Resources Sector: A Leadership Case Study on Mentorship Practices for Effective SDG 5 Implementation. *Sustainable Development Goals Series*, 93–106. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-70948-8\\_7](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-70948-8_7)
- Li, Z., Kim, R., Vollmer, S., & Subramanian, S. V. (2020). Factors Associated With Child Stunting, Wasting, and Underweight in 35 Low- and Middle-Income Countries. *JAMA Network Open*, 3(4), e203386. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2020.3386>
- Misiyah, Agustiana, E. T., & Utami, B. (2025). Dari Pinggiran ke Arus Utama: Partisipasi Bermakna, Suara, dan Advokasi Perempuan serta Kelompok Marginal dalam Perjuangan untuk Kesetaraan Gender, Penyandang Disabilitas, dan Inklusi Sosial dalam Kebijakan Nasional Indonesia—RPJPN 2025–2045 dan RPJMN 2025–2029. *Jurnal Perempuan*, 29(3), 189–205. <https://doi.org/10.34309/jp.v29i3.1191>
- Moser, C., & Moser, A. (2005). Gender mainstreaming since Beijing: A review of success and limitations in international institutions. *Gender & Development*, 13(2), 11–22. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13552070512331332283>
- Mukhopadhyay, M. (2004). Mainstreaming Gender or “Streaming” Gender Away: Feminists Marooned in the Development Business. *IDS Bulletin*, 35(4), 95–103. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1759-5436.2004.tb00161.x>
- Rai, S. (2008). *The gender politics of development : essays in hope and despair*. New York.
- Rai, S. M., Hoskyns, C., & Thomas, D. (2014). Depletion: the cost of social reproduction. *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, 16(1), 86–105. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14616742.2013.789641>
- Razavi, S., & Hassim, S. (2006). *Gender and social policy in a global context : uncovering the gendered structure of “the social.”* Palgrave Macmillan.
- Resurrección, B. P. (2013). Persistent women and environment linkages in climate change and sustainable development agendas. *Women’s Studies International Forum*, 40(1), 33–43. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wsif.2013.03.011>

- Rosalinda, H., Hadi, R., & Andini, A. N. (2024). The Ecofeminist Perspective on The Impact of Climate Change on Women's Health: Study Case of Coastal Women in Sendang Biru Hamlet, Indonesia. *Jurnal Ilmiah Hubungan Internasional*, 1(1), 32–46. <https://doi.org/10.26593/jihi.v1i1.7832.32-46>
- Sellers, S. (2016). *GENDER AND CLIMATE CHANGE 1 Gender and Climate Change: A Closer Look at Existing Evidence Global Gender and Climate Alliance GENDER AND CLIMATE CHANGE 3 2 GENDER AND CLIMATE CHANGE Acknowledgements*. <https://wedo.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/11/GGCA-RP-FINAL.pdf>
- The World Bank. (2019). *Life expectancy at birth, total (years) - Indonesia | Data*. Worldbank.org. <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SP.DYN.LE00.IN?locations=ID>
- True, J., & Mintrom, M. (2001). Transnational Networks and Policy Diffusion: The Case of Gender Mainstreaming. *International Studies Quarterly*, 45(1), 27–57. <https://doi.org/10.1111/0020-8833.00181>
- UN Women. (2015). *Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action, Beijing +5 Political Declaration and Outcome*. UN Women. <https://www.unwomen.org/en/digital-library/publications/2015/01/beijing-declaration>
- United Nations. (2025). *DESA Highlights Report 2025 | United Nations*. United Nations. <https://www.un.org/en/desa/highlights-report-2025>
- Walby, S. (2005). Gender mainstreaming: Productive tensions in theory and practice. *Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State & Society*, 12(3), 321–343. <https://doi.org/10.1093/sp/jxi018>
- Wibisono, R. B. (2024). KEADILAN IKLIM DAN HAM DI INDONESIA: MEWUJUDKAN PEMBANGUNAN BERKELANJUTAN MELALUI PERLINDUNGAN LINGKUNGAN. *Jurnal Politik Pemerintahan Dharma Praja*, 17(2), 95–125. <https://doi.org/10.33701/jppdp.v17i2.5017>
- Woo-Cumings, M. (2019). *The Developmental State*. Cornell University Press.
- Yinuo. (2022, September 7). *Press Release: Achieving full gender equality is still centuries away, warns the UN in new report - United Nations Sustainable Development*. United Nations Sustainable Development. <https://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/blog/2022/09/achieving-full-gender-equality-is-still-centuries-away-warns-the-un-in-new-report>



© 2025 by the authors. Submitted for possible open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY SA) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/3.0/>).