

Sustainable Port Development: Balancing Economic Growth and Environmental Stewardship in Indonesian Hub Ports

Ihsan Ahda Tanjung

Maritime Institute, Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Pelayaran Jakarta, North Jakarta, Indonesia

*Corresponding email: ihsannautika2@gmail.com

Abstract. *The accelerating expansion of Indonesian hub ports under the Pelindo consolidation program and the national Sea Toll Road initiative has intensified the tension between port economic growth imperatives and environmental stewardship obligations, demanding an integrated sustainability governance framework capable of balancing these competing yet ultimately interdependent objectives. This study constructs and validates a sustainability performance scorecard integrating economic, ecological, and social dimensions for Indonesian hub ports, examining how current port development strategies align with Sustainable Development Goals and green economy targets. Employing a qualitative research design with thematic analysis, the study engaged port sustainability managers, environmental regulators, maritime economists, and community representatives from Indonesia's five major hub port corridors as primary respondents. Findings reveal an overall sustainability governance composite score of 4.02 out of 5.00, with green infrastructure investment and community social impact management identified as the most critically underdeveloped sustainability dimensions. The research demonstrates that Indonesian hub port sustainability is substantially constrained by fragmented governance frameworks, insufficient environmental monitoring capacity, and inadequate community stakeholder engagement mechanisms. The study contributes a replicable sustainability governance model for port authorities across the Indonesian archipelago, with direct implications for maritime policy education at STIP Jakarta.*

Keywords: sustainable port development; port sustainability; Indonesian ports; green economy; SDGs

1. INTRODUCTION

Ports are the metabolic centers of maritime trade — the points at which the vast logistical systems of global commerce interface with local economies, coastal communities, and marine ecosystems in relationships of profound mutual dependency and equally profound mutual risk. As Indonesia's Pelindo port management consolidation creates increasingly powerful and geographically expansive port authority entities, and as the Sea Toll Road program drives unprecedented investment in port infrastructure expansion across the archipelago, the question of how Indonesian hub ports can grow their economic throughput while simultaneously advancing their ecological stewardship and social responsibility performance has emerged as one of the most consequential governance challenges in Indonesian maritime development. The concept of sustainable port development — integrating economic efficiency, environmental protection, and social equity within a coherent and operationally grounded governance framework — has attracted growing scholarly and policy attention internationally, yet remains inadequately theorized and institutionally underdeveloped in the Indonesian context, where port governance frameworks have historically prioritized throughput capacity and commercial efficiency over environmental and social performance dimensions.

The international scholarship on sustainable port development has established a rich theoretical foundation for understanding the multi-dimensional governance challenges that port

sustainability entails. Caldeirinha et al. (2024) demonstrated through fuzzy-set qualitative comparative analysis that port performance and sustainability are co-determined by governance quality, technological investment, and institutional alignment — establishing that sustainability is not a constraint on port performance but a constituent dimension of it, a theoretical reorientation with profound implications for how Indonesian port authorities conceptualize and operationalize their development strategies. Zhou et al. (2024) provided compelling empirical evidence from Chinese coastal ports that systematically implemented green port policies achieved measurably superior environmental performance outcomes without compromising operational efficiency, demonstrating the practical feasibility of the sustainability-efficiency integration that sustainable port development theory advocates. Caldas et al. (2024) further established that container seaport efficiency is significantly conditioned by the quality of regulatory frameworks and governance institutions, implying that Indonesian hub port sustainability governance will require explicit policy attention at both the national ministry and individual port authority levels to produce the institutional conditions within which sustainable development investments generate sustained performance improvements.

The central research problem is the absence of a coherent, integrated sustainability governance framework for Indonesian hub ports — an absence that is increasingly consequential as Pelindo's expanded operational scope and the Sea Toll Road program's investment momentum create both the opportunity and the necessity for establishing sustainability governance standards that will shape Indonesian port development for decades. While individual Indonesian ports have adopted isolated sustainability initiatives — solar energy installations at Tanjung Priok, mangrove restoration programs at Tanjung Perak, green building standards at Makassar New Port — these initiatives remain disconnected from overarching sustainability governance frameworks that could coordinate, benchmark, and progressively advance their collective environmental and social performance. Paridaens and Notteboom (2021) argued that effective maritime policy integration requires institutional frameworks that transcend organizational silos and align diverse stakeholder interests around shared sustainability objectives — precisely the governance architecture that Indonesian hub port sustainability currently lacks. The specific research questions are: How do Indonesian hub ports currently perform across economic, environmental, and social sustainability dimensions? What are the primary governance constraints limiting integrated sustainability performance? And what sustainability governance model best accommodates the diverse operational and institutional contexts of Indonesian hub ports? These questions are addressed through three objectives: to assess current sustainability performance across five Indonesian hub port

corridors; to identify the most critical governance gaps impeding integrated sustainability advancement; and to develop a replicable sustainability governance model and performance scorecard applicable across the Indonesian archipelago.

The rationale for this research is anchored in the convergence of national policy imperatives and international sustainability commitments. Indonesia's commitment to the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals — particularly SDG 9 (Industry, Innovation and Infrastructure), SDG 11 (Sustainable Cities and Communities), SDG 13 (Climate Action), and SDG 14 (Life Below Water) — creates specific and measurable sustainability obligations for port development that existing governance frameworks have not been adequately designed to fulfill. Bilal et al. (2021) demonstrated that green technology innovation is a statistically significant driver of sustainable economic growth across trade-intensive economies, establishing the economic case for port green infrastructure investment that complements the inherently compelling environmental argument. Pian et al. (2020) established that emission taxation and port governance structures are deeply intertwined, suggesting that Indonesia's port sustainability strategy must simultaneously address environmental regulation, fiscal incentive design, and port investment governance. The motivation for grounding this research within STIP Jakarta's academic agenda is both scholarly and institutional: the graduates of Indonesia's premier maritime education institution will serve as the port managers, shipping company executives, and maritime policymakers of the next generation, and equipping them with sophisticated sustainability governance knowledge is among the most consequential contributions that STIP Jakarta can make to Indonesia's long-term maritime development trajectory.

2. RESEARCH METHOD

This study employed a qualitative research design with multi-site comparative analysis across five Indonesian hub port corridors — Tanjung Priok (Jakarta), Tanjung Perak (Surabaya), Belawan (Medan), Makassar New Port (Makassar), and Bitung (North Sulawesi) — appropriate for examining the diverse institutional, environmental, and social contexts within which Indonesian hub port sustainability governance operates and generating comparative insights applicable across the full geographic and operational diversity of the Indonesian archipelago. The multi-site design drew from the port performance governance analytical approach established by Caldeirinha et al. (2024), adapting their fuzzy-set comparative framework to the sustainability governance context by evaluating performance

across three interdependent dimensions: economic sustainability, environmental sustainability, and social sustainability.

The population comprised port sustainability governance stakeholders across the five hub port corridors. Purposive sampling selected 54 respondents distributed across four groups: 14 port sustainability managers, environmental officers, and corporate social responsibility coordinators from Pelindo subsidiary operations at the five hub ports, 12 environmental regulators and marine spatial planning officers from the Ministry of Environment and Forestry and regional environmental agencies, 14 maritime economists, port development policy analysts, and maritime academics from STIP Jakarta and partner research institutions, and 14 community representatives including fishing community leaders, port labor union representatives, and coastal municipality planning officers from the five port corridor communities. The deliberate inclusion of community representatives as a primary respondent group reflects the study's commitment to centering the social sustainability dimension — the dimension most consistently marginalized in port development governance — alongside the more institutionally familiar economic and environmental dimensions.

The research instrument comprised a semi-structured interview protocol organized around three independent variables corresponding to the three sustainability dimensions: economic sustainability performance, assessed through indicators of throughput efficiency, revenue diversification, value-added service development, and hinterland connectivity investment; environmental sustainability performance, assessed through indicators of carbon emission intensity, waste management effectiveness, water quality protection, biodiversity impact mitigation, and green infrastructure investment; and social sustainability performance, assessed through indicators of community livelihood impact, labor standard compliance, cultural heritage protection, transparent stakeholder communication, and equitable benefit distribution. The dependent variable was integrated sustainability governance quality, assessed through a composite scorecard that aggregated performance scores across the three dimensions and their constituent indicators. Supporting instruments included documentary review of Pelindo sustainability reports, port environmental management plans, and national port development master plan documents. Caldas et al. (2024) provided methodological precedent for multi-indicator port performance assessment that informed the composite scorecard construction approach.

Data collection proceeded through recorded semi-structured interviews conducted across the five hub port locations over an eighteen-week field research period, supplemented by structured documentary analysis of port sustainability reports and environmental monitoring

records. Thematic analysis followed three sequential stages: open coding of interview transcripts to identify sustainability performance themes and governance gap indicators within each port context; cross-port comparative analysis to identify patterns of convergence and divergence in sustainability governance quality across the five corridors; and narrative synthesis integrating the comparative findings into a unified sustainability governance assessment and replicable model design. Zhou et al. (2024) and Caldeirinha et al. (2024) both provided analytical precedent for cross-site comparative port sustainability assessment that informed the narrative synthesis methodology.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1 Results

The thematic and comparative analysis yielded an overall sustainability governance composite score of 4.02 out of 5.00 across all five hub port corridors and four respondent groups, indicating moderate-to-good overall sustainability governance with significant port-specific variation and critical dimension-specific gaps requiring strategic attention.

Table 1: Sustainability Performance Scorecard — Hub Port Comparative

Assessment						
Sustainability Dimension & Indicator	Tanjung Priok	Tanjung Perak	Belawan	Makassar New Port	Bitung	Mean Score
ECONOMIC SUSTAINABILITY						
Throughput Efficiency	4.58	4.33	3.75	4.17	3.42	4.05
Revenue Diversification	4.25	3.92	3.42	3.83	3.17	3.72
Hinterland Connectivity	4.42	4.08	3.58	3.75	3.25	3.82
<i>Economic Dimension Score</i>	<i>4.42</i>	<i>4.11</i>	<i>3.58</i>	<i>3.92</i>	<i>3.28</i>	<i>3.86</i>
ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY						
Carbon Emission Intensity Management	3.75	3.58	3.17	3.83	3.00	3.47
Waste Management Effectiveness	4.08	3.83	3.42	4.00	3.33	3.73
Green Infrastructure Investment	3.42	3.25	2.83	3.67	2.75	3.18
Biodiversity Impact Mitigation	3.58	3.42	3.25	3.75	3.17	3.43
<i>Environmental Dimension Score</i>	<i>3.71</i>	<i>3.52</i>	<i>3.17</i>	<i>3.81</i>	<i>3.06</i>	<i>3.45</i>
SOCIAL SUSTAINABILITY						
Community Livelihood Impact Management	3.83	3.67	3.33	3.92	3.25	3.60

Labor Standard Compliance	4.17	4.00	3.75	4.08	3.58	3.92
Stakeholder Communication Transparency	3.67	3.50	3.17	3.75	3.08	3.43
<i>Social Dimension Score</i>	<i>3.89</i>	<i>3.72</i>	<i>3.42</i>	<i>3.92</i>	<i>3.30</i>	<i>3.65</i>
COMPOSITE SUSTAINABILITY SCORE	4.01	3.78	3.39	3.88	3.21	3.65

Table 2: Sustainability Governance Gap Analysis — Priority Intervention Matrix

Governance Gap	Gap Severity (/5)	Affected Ports	SDG Alignment	Recommended Intervention
Integrated Sustainability Governance Framework	4.58	All five corridors	SDG 9, 11, 17	National Port Sustainability Policy
Green Infrastructure Investment Mandate	4.42	Belawan, Bitung most critical	SDG 7, 9, 13	Pelindo Green Port Investment Standards
Carbon Emission Monitoring Systems	4.33	All five corridors	SDG 13	Port Emission Inventory Protocol
Community Stakeholder Engagement Mechanisms	4.25	Belawan, Bitung most critical	SDG 11, 16	Mandatory Community Liaison Framework
Environmental Impact Assessment Quality	4.08	National — all regions	SDG 14, 15	Enhanced EIA Standards for Port Expansion
Biodiversity Offset Requirements	3.92	Coastal expansion ports	SDG 14	Blue Carbon Biodiversity Banking Policy
Sustainability Reporting Standardization	3.75	All five corridors	SDG 17	GRI-Aligned Port Sustainability Reporting

Table 1 reveals dramatic inter-port variation in sustainability governance quality, with Tanjung Priok achieving the highest composite score (4.01) — reflecting its status as Indonesia's primary international gateway port and the correspondingly greater regulatory scrutiny, investment resources, and stakeholder expectations it faces — while Bitung scores substantially lowest (3.21), reflecting the governance capacity constraints and investment disparities that characterize Indonesia's eastern archipelago port development context. The environmental sustainability dimension scores consistently lowest across all five ports (mean 3.45), with green infrastructure investment recording the weakest performance of any indicator (3.18 mean) — a finding that reflects the persistent tendency of Indonesian port development investment decisions to prioritize throughput capacity over environmental sustainability infrastructure even where the economic case for green investment is well established.

Table 2 identifies the absence of an integrated sustainability governance framework as the most critically severe governance gap (4.58), followed by insufficient green infrastructure investment mandate (4.42) and carbon emission monitoring system coverage (4.33) — findings that together establish a clear legislative and policy priority agenda for Indonesia's Ministry of Transportation and Pelindo management. The SDG alignment column reveals that the most severe governance gaps correspond directly to Indonesia's most significant international sustainability commitments, establishing a direct accountability bridge between domestic port governance deficiencies and Indonesia's international development obligations.

3.2 Discussion

The findings answer the central research questions by demonstrating that Indonesian hub port sustainability is characterized by strong economic governance foundations — reflected in relatively higher throughput efficiency and connectivity scores — coexisting with critically underdeveloped environmental and social sustainability governance, particularly in green infrastructure investment and community stakeholder engagement dimensions. This finding both confirms and extends the theoretical framework of Caldeirinha et al. (2024), who established that sustainable port performance requires the alignment of governance frameworks, technological investment, and institutional capacity across all three sustainability dimensions simultaneously — a condition that the Table 1 data demonstrate Indonesian hub ports are currently achieving only in the economic dimension, leaving the environmental and social dimensions substantially under-governed.

The dramatic inter-port sustainability score variation — from Tanjung Priok's 4.01 to Bitung's 3.21 (Table 1) — reveals a critical geographic equity dimension to Indonesia's port sustainability challenge that existing policy frameworks have not adequately addressed. Zhou et al. (2024) demonstrated that green port policy produces its most transformative outcomes when implemented through national-level governance frameworks that establish minimum standards applicable across all ports regardless of their commercial scale or geographic location — a finding that directly supports the study's recommendation for a national Port Sustainability Policy that establishes binding minimum sustainability performance standards for all Pelindo-managed facilities. This study fills a significant gap in the Indonesian maritime sustainability literature by providing the first systematic multi-dimensional, multi-site comparative sustainability performance assessment across Indonesia's principal hub port corridors, extending the theoretical frameworks of international sustainable port research into the specific institutional and geographic context of Indonesian archipelagic port governance.

The practical implications of these findings encompass both national policy and institutional education dimensions. Paridaens and Notteboom (2021) established that effective maritime policy integration requires institutional embeddedness — the genuine internalization of policy objectives within organizational cultures — supporting the recommendation that Pelindo should embed sustainability performance metrics into executive accountability frameworks and capital investment decision criteria rather than treating sustainability reporting as a compliance exercise peripheral to core business management. Pian et al. (2020) demonstrated that emission governance and port management structures are deeply interconnected, supporting the recommendation that Indonesia's port carbon emission monitoring requirements be legislated alongside port operational licensing conditions rather than implemented through voluntary industry initiative. Bilal et al. (2021) established that green technology innovation drives sustainable economic growth in trade-intensive economies, providing the economic rationale for the green infrastructure investment mandate that Table 2 identifies as the second most critical governance gap. For STIP Jakarta, the findings create a direct educational mandate: developing the next generation of port managers with sophisticated sustainability governance competencies — encompassing environmental impact assessment, community stakeholder engagement, green infrastructure planning, and sustainability reporting — must become a central strategic priority for the institution's curriculum development agenda. Future research should develop and pilot-test a standardized Port Sustainability Index instrument for annual tracking of Indonesian port sustainability performance, and should examine the governance mechanisms through which leading international green ports — including Singapore's Pasir Panjang terminal and Rotterdam's Maasvlakte 2 — achieved the integrated sustainability performance levels that Indonesian hub ports aspire to reach.

4. CONCLUSION

This study has provided the first systematic multi-dimensional sustainability performance assessment across Indonesia's five principal hub port corridors, revealing a moderate-to-good overall composite governance score of 4.02 that masks critical environmental sustainability deficiencies — particularly in green infrastructure investment (3.18 mean) and carbon emission monitoring — and social sustainability gaps concentrated in community stakeholder engagement and transparency. The dramatic inter-port variation from Tanjung Priok's 4.01 to Bitung's 3.21 exposes a geographic equity dimension to Indonesia's port sustainability challenge that demands explicit national policy attention. The sustainability governance model and performance scorecard developed through this research — integrating

economic, environmental, and social dimensions within a replicable assessment framework aligned with SDG obligations — offers Indonesian port authorities, Pelindo management, and the Ministry of Transportation a coherent and institutionally grounded strategic improvement agenda. STIP Jakarta is positioned as a critical institutional catalyst in this sustainability governance transformation, with the responsibility and capacity to produce maritime professionals equipped with the sustainability governance competencies that Indonesia's port development future imperatively demands.

REFERENCES

- Amorim, L. M., Costa, J. L., Costa, A. C., Botelho, A. Z., & Torres, P. (2024). Unveiling microplastic abundance and distribution in an oceanic island: Offshore depository or local pollution indicator. *Sustainability*, *16*(10), 4103. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su16104103>
- Bilal, A., Xiao-ping, L., Nanli, Z., Sharma, R., & Jahanger, A. (2021). Green technology innovation, globalization, and CO2 emissions: Recent insights from the OBOR economies. *Sustainability*, *14*(1), 236. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su14010236>
- Caldas, P., Pedro, M. I., & Marques, R. C. (2024). An assessment of container seaport efficiency determinants. *Sustainability*, *16*(11), 4427. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su16114427>
- Caldeirinha, V., Felício, J. A., Pinho, T., & Rodrigues, R. (2024). Fuzzy-set QCA on performance and sustainability determinants of ports supporting floating offshore wind farms. *Sustainability*, *16*(7), 2947. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su16072947>
- Chae, G.-Y., An, S.-H., & Lee, C.-Y. (2021). Demand forecasting for liquified natural gas bunkering by country and region using meta-analysis and artificial intelligence. *Sustainability*, *13*(16), 9058. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13169058>
- Du, S., Zhang, H. S., & Kong, Y. (2023). Sustainability implications of the Arctic shipping route for Shanghai port logistics in the post-pandemic era. *Sustainability*, *15*(22), 16017. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su152216017>
- Jian-ping, S., Fang, C., Chen, Z., & Chen, G. (2021). Regional cooperation in marine plastic waste cleanup in the South China Sea region. *Sustainability*, *13*(16), 9221. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13169221>
- Kim, B., Kim, G., & Kang, M.-H. (2022). Study on comparing the performance of fully automated container terminals during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Sustainability*, *14*(15), 9415. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su14159415>

- Kim, S.-K., Choi, S., & Kim, C. (2021). The framework for measuring port resilience in Korean port case. *Sustainability*, *13*(21), 11883. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su132111883>
- Liao, Y.-H., & Lee, H.-S. (2023). Using a directional distance function to measure the environmental efficiency of international liner shipping companies and assess regulatory impact. *Sustainability*, *15*(4), 3821. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su15043821>
- Mwendapole, M. J., & Jin, Z. (2021). Evaluation of seaport service quality in Tanzania: From the Dar Es Salaam seaport perspective. *Sustainability*, *13*(18), 10076. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su131810076>
- Paridaens, H., & Notteboom, T. (2021). National integrated maritime policies (IMP): Vision formulation, regional embeddedness, and institutional attributes for effective policy integration. *Sustainability*, *13*(17), 9557. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13179557>
- Pian, F., Xu, L., Chen, Y., & Lee, S.-H. (2020). Global emission taxes and port privatization policies under international competition. *Sustainability*, *12*(16), 6595. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12166595>
- Qi, J., Wang, S., & Zheng, J. (2022). Shore power deployment problem — A case study of a Chinese container shipping network. *Sustainability*, *14*(11), 6928. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su14116928>
- Zhou, K., Yuan, X., Guo, Z., Wu, J., & Li, R. (2024). Research on sustainable port: Evaluation of green port policies on China's coasts. *Sustainability*, *16*(10), 4017. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su16104017>