

ENTREPRENEURIAL ECOSYSTEM DEVELOPMENT FOR SMALL AND MEDIUM ENTERPRISES

Nazhira Nindya Padma Hanuun, SH

1 Yayasan Kreatif Indonesia Emas

nazhiranindya@gmail.com

Abstract

Background: An entrepreneurial ecosystem is useful as an analytical idea because firms rarely grow through one resource alone. Finance without markets can create debt, training without demand can remain unused, and digital tools without managerial capability may simply add cost. **Aims:** This article examines the mechanisms that connect the topic to organizational or policy performance and identifies the conditions that make those mechanisms stronger or weaker. **Research Method:** A structured narrative review integrates peer-reviewed research with authoritative policy, statistical, and professional sources, including UNCTAD (2025); OECD (2023). Sources are coded by outcome, mechanism, boundary condition, and practical implication. **Results and Conclusion:** The synthesis indicates that outcomes are heterogeneous. Ecosystem language can become vague when every organization and programme is treated as equally important. The practical task is to identify the bottlenecks and connections that matter for specific groups of SMEs at specific stages of development. Six recurring themes show that implementation quality, information, capability, and institutional context frequently matter as much as the headline policy or technology. **Contribution:** The article offers an evidence-based framework for SMEs, entrepreneurs and local ecosystem organizations that translates the literature into decision principles without claiming primary data that were not collected.

Keywords: *Entrepreneurial Ecosystem, SMEs, Networks, Finance, Capabilities, Regional Development*

Introduction

An entrepreneurial ecosystem is useful as an analytical idea because firms rarely grow through one resource alone. Finance without markets can create debt, training without demand can remain unused, and digital tools without managerial capability may simply add cost. This question is timely for regional economies where entrepreneurship policy must connect finance, skills, markets, institutions and business networks rather than deliver isolated programmes. Recent institutional and research sources such as OECD (2024b); UNCTAD (2025) provide the broader context for the discussion.

Ecosystem language can become vague when every organization and programme is treated as equally important. The practical task is to identify the bottlenecks and connections that matter for specific groups of SMEs at specific stages of development. For SMEs, entrepreneurs and local ecosystem organizations, the practical issue is therefore to separate the part of the problem that can be managed internally from the part that depends on markets, infrastructure or public policy. That distinction keeps the analysis from turning into either technological optimism or policy fatalism.

The topic also has a measurement problem. Organizations tend to record what is easiest to observe, while the outcome that matters is often delayed, distributed across functions or affected by several causes at once. BPS (2026); World Economic Forum (2025) illustrate why aggregate indicators are useful for context but insufficient for firm-level judgment. A good analysis must connect the indicator to a mechanism and then ask whether the mechanism is plausible in the specific operating environment.

Another complication is heterogeneity. Smes, entrepreneurs and local ecosystem organizations do not start from the same position. Size, skills, access to finance, technology, governance quality and market exposure all shape the capacity to respond. The same intervention can therefore be beneficial

for one organization and premature for another. This variation is not a weakness in the literature; it is information about the conditions under which a practice is likely to work.

The article asks three questions. First, which mechanisms explain the relationship implied by the title? Second, which organizational or institutional conditions strengthen or weaken those mechanisms? Third, what can decision makers do without assuming that a single policy, technology or management tool will solve the entire problem? The questions are deliberately practical because the objective is to support judgment rather than to manufacture a universal formula.

The contribution is an integrative framework that treats performance as the result of interacting choices. It organizes recent evidence around six themes, identifies recurring tensions, and translates the synthesis into a set of actions for SMEs, entrepreneurs and local ecosystem organizations. The article does not claim original survey or experimental data. It is a structured evidence review intended for author development and editorial refinement before any formal publication decision.

Literature Review

The literature relevant to this topic sits across more than one field. Some sources focus on macro or institutional conditions, while others examine organizational routines, technology adoption or behavioral responses. World Bank (2025); OECD (2024b); OECD (2024a) are representative of that range. Reading them together is useful because a change in the external environment affects performance only after it passes through decisions about resources, incentives and implementation.

A first conceptual distinction is between an input and a capability. An input may be a technology, source of finance, policy instrument, data set or formal rule. A capability is the repeated ability to use that input well. The distinction matters for SMEs, entrepreneurs and local ecosystem organizations because adoption can be measured immediately, whereas capability often becomes visible only when conditions are difficult or when the organization must adapt without losing control.

A second distinction concerns efficiency and resilience. Many practices improve average performance by reducing slack, duplication or transaction cost. Yet highly optimized systems can become brittle if they lack alternative suppliers, skills, channels or decision pathways. The relevant question is not whether slack is good or bad, but which forms of redundancy protect important outcomes and which merely preserve inefficient routines. OECD (2024a); UNCTAD (2025) provide useful context for this trade-off.

Finally, the literature suggests that trust and information quality are recurring mediators. Managers, employees, customers, investors or citizens act on information only when they regard the process behind it as sufficiently credible. That observation links seemingly different topics: financial reporting, digital platforms, team innovation and public policy all depend on the quality of information and the legitimacy of the process through which decisions are made.

Analytical dimension	Central question	Practical concern
Access to finance across firm stages	working capital, equipment finance and growth capital solve different problems	one-size credit programmes can overfinance some firms and underserve others
Networks and market access	business networks help SMEs find customers, suppliers, mentors and information	network benefits can remain concentrated among already-connected entrepreneurs
Skills and managerial capability	growth requires pricing, accounting, operations and people management as well as technical skill	short training courses often fade without application support
Digitalization and platform participation	digital tools can lower entry costs to payments, marketing and administration	platform fees, dependence and digital-safety risks can reduce net benefit
Institutions and regulatory experience	licensing, tax, standards and contract enforcement shape the cost of formality	complex procedures absorb a larger share of small-firm management time
Local anchors and ecosystem governance	universities, banks, associations, large firms and local government can coordinate resources	ecosystems stagnate when coordination becomes meeting-heavy and outcome-light

Research Method

The article adopts a policy-and-management evidence review. Sources are included when they contribute to the causal logic, implementation conditions, or measurement of the issue rather than merely repeating a broad definition.

The evidence base for this draft includes 8 core references covering research, policy reports, standards or official statistics. Priority is given to sources published from 2020 onward, with older references retained only where they are widely used to define a core organizational or accounting concept. The review does not use unattributed web commentary as evidence.

Each source is read against four coding questions: what outcome is being explained; what mechanism is proposed; what conditions appear to strengthen or weaken the effect; and what decision can reasonably be informed by the finding. The six analytical themes used in the results section emerged from that coding and from the problem structure defined in the introduction.

The method has limitations. Evidence drawn from different sectors, countries and research designs cannot support one causal coefficient for regional economies where entrepreneurship policy must connect finance, skills, markets, institutions and business networks rather than deliver isolated programmes. In addition, this editorial draft has not been validated with interviews or original field data. Its claims are therefore framed as a synthesis of supported mechanisms and practical propositions that should be reviewed by the named authors before publication.

Source	Primary relevance	Use in this review
Stam & van de Ven (2021)	entrepreneurial ecosystem elements and interactions	Used for contextual or thematic synthesis
OECD (2023)	SME networks, resilience, trade, skills and technology	Used for contextual or thematic synthesis
World Bank (2025)	financial inclusion, connectivity and digital safety	Used for contextual or thematic synthesis
OECD (2024b)	digital technology, policy, skills and trust	Used for contextual or thematic synthesis
UNCTAD (2025)	investment trends and policy environment	Used for contextual or thematic synthesis
OECD (2024a)	structural conditions and policy issues in Indonesia	Used for contextual or thematic synthesis

Results and Discussion

Access to finance across firm stages

A useful way to read this issue is to start with the decision that managers actually have to make. Working capital, equipment finance and growth capital solve different problems. That distinction matters because one-size credit programmes can overfinance some firms and underserve others. In regional economies where entrepreneurship policy must connect finance, skills, markets, institutions and business networks rather than deliver isolated programmes, this can change the economics and timing of decisions even when the broad direction of policy or technology appears favorable. The sources reviewed for this draft, including World Economic Forum (2025); BPS (2026), are useful because they place the issue inside a wider system of incentives, capabilities and constraints rather than treating one variable as sufficient. For SMEs, entrepreneurs and local ecosystem organizations, the practical response is to match instruments to cash-flow patterns and development stage. That response is deliberately modest: it does not remove uncertainty, but it makes the trade-off visible and easier to govern.

The point also has an organizational side. Working capital, equipment finance and growth capital solve different problems, but the benefit depends on who owns the information, who is permitted to act on it and how exceptions are handled. A common failure mode is to adopt the visible part of a practice while leaving the underlying routine unchanged. One-size credit programmes can overfinance some firms and underserve others. This helps explain why organizations exposed to similar conditions can report very different outcomes. OECD (2024b) provides a complementary perspective on the institutional or managerial conditions surrounding the issue. A more credible

approach is therefore to match instruments to cash-flow patterns and development stage, while documenting assumptions and reviewing them when conditions materially change.

There is also a boundary to the argument. Working capital, equipment finance and growth capital solve different problems should not be interpreted as a universal rule or a guaranteed performance effect. Where resources, incentives or local conditions differ, one-size credit programmes can overfinance some firms and underserve others. Short-term results may therefore move in a different direction from longer-term capability. This is one reason the present article favors conditional interpretation over a single average effect. Evidence summarized by Stam & van de Ven (2021); BPS (2026) supports the value of examining the mechanism and the surrounding context together. The managerial implication remains concrete: match instruments to cash-flow patterns and development stage. The quality of execution, not the label attached to the initiative, determines whether that principle improves performance.

Networks and market access

The practical difficulty becomes clearer when the analysis moves from broad trends to the operating decision. Business networks help smes find customers, suppliers, mentors and information. The underlying mechanism is not difficult to see: network benefits can remain concentrated among already-connected entrepreneurs. In regional economies where entrepreneurship policy must connect finance, skills, markets, institutions and business networks rather than deliver isolated programmes, this can change the economics and timing of decisions even when the broad direction of policy or technology appears favorable. The sources reviewed for this draft, including UNCTAD (2025); World Bank (2025), are useful because they place the issue inside a wider system of incentives, capabilities and constraints rather than treating one variable as sufficient. For SMEs, entrepreneurs and local ecosystem organizations, the practical response is to design open gateways and measurable referral pathways. That response is deliberately modest: it does not remove uncertainty, but it makes the trade-off visible and easier to govern.

The point also has an organizational side. Business networks help smes find customers, suppliers, mentors and information, but the benefit depends on who owns the information, who is permitted to act on it and how exceptions are handled. A common failure mode is to adopt the visible part of a practice while leaving the underlying routine unchanged. Network benefits can remain concentrated among already-connected entrepreneurs. This helps explain why organizations exposed to similar conditions can report very different outcomes. OECD (2023) provides a complementary perspective on the institutional or managerial conditions surrounding the issue. A more credible approach is therefore to design open gateways and measurable referral pathways, while documenting assumptions and reviewing them when conditions materially change.

There is also a boundary to the argument. Business networks help smes find customers, suppliers, mentors and information should not be interpreted as a universal rule or a guaranteed performance effect. Where resources, incentives or local conditions differ, network benefits can remain concentrated among already-connected entrepreneurs. Short-term results may therefore move in a different direction from longer-term capability. This is one reason the present article favors conditional interpretation over a single average effect. Evidence summarized by OECD (2024b); Stam & van de Ven (2021) supports the value of examining the mechanism and the surrounding context together. The managerial implication remains concrete: design open gateways and measurable referral pathways. The quality of execution, not the label attached to the initiative, determines whether that principle improves performance.

Skills and managerial capability

The evidence is less tidy than a simple positive-or-negative relationship would suggest. Growth requires pricing, accounting, operations and people management as well as technical skill. The point is especially relevant where short training courses often fade without application support. In regional economies where entrepreneurship policy must connect finance, skills, markets, institutions and

business networks rather than deliver isolated programmes, this can change the economics and timing of decisions even when the broad direction of policy or technology appears favorable. The sources reviewed for this draft, including OECD (2024b); OECD (2024a), are useful because they place the issue inside a wider system of incentives, capabilities and constraints rather than treating one variable as sufficient. For SMEs, entrepreneurs and local ecosystem organizations, the practical response is to combine learning with coaching, tools and business milestones. That response is deliberately modest: it does not remove uncertainty, but it makes the trade-off visible and easier to govern.

The point also has an organizational side. Growth requires pricing, accounting, operations and people management as well as technical skill, but the benefit depends on who owns the information, who is permitted to act on it and how exceptions are handled. A common failure mode is to adopt the visible part of a practice while leaving the underlying routine unchanged. Short training courses often fade without application support. This helps explain why organizations exposed to similar conditions can report very different outcomes. OECD (2023) provides a complementary perspective on the institutional or managerial conditions surrounding the issue. A more credible approach is therefore to combine learning with coaching, tools and business milestones, while documenting assumptions and reviewing them when conditions materially change.

There is also a boundary to the argument. Growth requires pricing, accounting, operations and people management as well as technical skill should not be interpreted as a universal rule or a guaranteed performance effect. Where resources, incentives or local conditions differ, short training courses often fade without application support. Short-term results may therefore move in a different direction from longer-term capability. This is one reason the present article favors conditional interpretation over a single average effect. Evidence summarized by OECD (2023); OECD (2024a) supports the value of examining the mechanism and the surrounding context together. The managerial implication remains concrete: combine learning with coaching, tools and business milestones. The quality of execution, not the label attached to the initiative, determines whether that principle improves performance.

Digitalization and platform participation

At firm level, the mechanism is usually more important than the headline indicator. Digital tools can lower entry costs to payments, marketing and administration. The reason is practical: platform fees, dependence and digital-safety risks can reduce net benefit. In regional economies where entrepreneurship policy must connect finance, skills, markets, institutions and business networks rather than deliver isolated programmes, this can change the economics and timing of decisions even when the broad direction of policy or technology appears favorable. The sources reviewed for this draft, including OECD (2024b); World Bank (2025), are useful because they place the issue inside a wider system of incentives, capabilities and constraints rather than treating one variable as sufficient. For SMEs, entrepreneurs and local ecosystem organizations, the practical response is to help firms choose technology based on process needs and economics. That response is deliberately modest: it does not remove uncertainty, but it makes the trade-off visible and easier to govern.

The point also has an organizational side. Digital tools can lower entry costs to payments, marketing and administration, but the benefit depends on who owns the information, who is permitted to act on it and how exceptions are handled. A common failure mode is to adopt the visible part of a practice while leaving the underlying routine unchanged. Platform fees, dependence and digital-safety risks can reduce net benefit. This helps explain why organizations exposed to similar conditions can report very different outcomes. World Bank (2025) provides a complementary perspective on the institutional or managerial conditions surrounding the issue. A more credible approach is therefore to help firms choose technology based on process needs and economics, while documenting assumptions and reviewing them when conditions materially change.

There is also a boundary to the argument. Digital tools can lower entry costs to payments, marketing and administration should not be interpreted as a universal rule or a guaranteed performance effect. Where resources, incentives or local conditions differ, platform fees, dependence and digital-safety

risks can reduce net benefit. Short-term results may therefore move in a different direction from longer-term capability. This is one reason the present article favors conditional interpretation over a single average effect. Evidence summarized by World Economic Forum (2025); World Bank (2025) supports the value of examining the mechanism and the surrounding context together. The managerial implication remains concrete: help firms choose technology based on process needs and economics. The quality of execution, not the label attached to the initiative, determines whether that principle improves performance.

Institutions and regulatory experience

One recurring lesson in this literature is that context changes the value of an otherwise sensible practice. Licensing, tax, standards and contract enforcement shape the cost of formality. For managers, the consequence is immediate: complex procedures absorb a larger share of small-firm management time. In regional economies where entrepreneurship policy must connect finance, skills, markets, institutions and business networks rather than deliver isolated programmes, this can change the economics and timing of decisions even when the broad direction of policy or technology appears favorable. The sources reviewed for this draft, including UNCTAD (2025); Stam & van de Ven (2021), are useful because they place the issue inside a wider system of incentives, capabilities and constraints rather than treating one variable as sufficient. For SMEs, entrepreneurs and local ecosystem organizations, the practical response is to simplify high-frequency interactions and provide clear service standards. That response is deliberately modest: it does not remove uncertainty, but it makes the trade-off visible and easier to govern.

The point also has an organizational side. Licensing, tax, standards and contract enforcement shape the cost of formality, but the benefit depends on who owns the information, who is permitted to act on it and how exceptions are handled. A common failure mode is to adopt the visible part of a practice while leaving the underlying routine unchanged. Complex procedures absorb a larger share of small-firm management time. This helps explain why organizations exposed to similar conditions can report very different outcomes. UNCTAD (2025) provides a complementary perspective on the institutional or managerial conditions surrounding the issue. A more credible approach is therefore to simplify high-frequency interactions and provide clear service standards, while documenting assumptions and reviewing them when conditions materially change.

There is also a boundary to the argument. Licensing, tax, standards and contract enforcement shape the cost of formality should not be interpreted as a universal rule or a guaranteed performance effect. Where resources, incentives or local conditions differ, complex procedures absorb a larger share of small-firm management time. Short-term results may therefore move in a different direction from longer-term capability. This is one reason the present article favors conditional interpretation over a single average effect. Evidence summarized by World Bank (2025); OECD (2024b) supports the value of examining the mechanism and the surrounding context together. The managerial implication remains concrete: simplify high-frequency interactions and provide clear service standards. The quality of execution, not the label attached to the initiative, determines whether that principle improves performance.

Local anchors and ecosystem governance

What looks straightforward in a policy diagram is often more conditional in day-to-day implementation. Universities, banks, associations, large firms and local government can coordinate resources. In operational terms, ecosystems stagnate when coordination becomes meeting-heavy and outcome-light. In regional economies where entrepreneurship policy must connect finance, skills, markets, institutions and business networks rather than deliver isolated programmes, this can change the economics and timing of decisions even when the broad direction of policy or technology appears favorable. The sources reviewed for this draft, including World Economic Forum (2025); World Bank (2025), are useful because they place the issue inside a wider system of incentives, capabilities and constraints rather than treating one variable as sufficient. For SMEs, entrepreneurs and local

ecosystem organizations, the practical response is to organize collaboration around shared pipelines, data and specific bottlenecks. That response is deliberately modest: it does not remove uncertainty, but it makes the trade-off visible and easier to govern.

The point also has an organizational side. Universities, banks, associations, large firms and local government can coordinate resources, but the benefit depends on who owns the information, who is permitted to act on it and how exceptions are handled. A common failure mode is to adopt the visible part of a practice while leaving the underlying routine unchanged. Ecosystems stagnate when coordination becomes meeting-heavy and outcome-light. This helps explain why organizations exposed to similar conditions can report very different outcomes. BPS (2026) provides a complementary perspective on the institutional or managerial conditions surrounding the issue. A more credible approach is therefore to organize collaboration around shared pipelines, data and specific bottlenecks, while documenting assumptions and reviewing them when conditions materially change.

There is also a boundary to the argument. Universities, banks, associations, large firms and local government can coordinate resources should not be interpreted as a universal rule or a guaranteed performance effect. Where resources, incentives or local conditions differ, ecosystems stagnate when coordination becomes meeting-heavy and outcome-light. Short-term results may therefore move in a different direction from longer-term capability. This is one reason the present article favors conditional interpretation over a single average effect. Evidence summarized by OECD (2023); Stam & van de Ven (2021) supports the value of examining the mechanism and the surrounding context together. The managerial implication remains concrete: organize collaboration around shared pipelines, data and specific bottlenecks. The quality of execution, not the label attached to the initiative, determines whether that principle improves performance.

Integrated Discussion

Taken together, the six themes show that entrepreneurial ecosystem development for small and medium enterprises cannot be understood as a one-step relationship. The external condition or management practice changes incentives first, then affects behavior, process quality or resource allocation, and only after that appears in performance. When one of those links is weak, the expected result is diluted. This layered view is consistent with the broad evidence base represented by OECD (2024a); BPS (2026); OECD (2023).

The synthesis also highlights the role of organizational maturity. Smes, entrepreneurs and local ecosystem organizations with clearer data ownership, decision rights and review routines can often benefit from sophisticated tools earlier than organizations still struggling with basic process discipline. This does not imply that smaller or less mature organizations should wait indefinitely; it suggests that the sequence and scale of implementation should match their current capability.

A further observation concerns incentives. Many implementation problems that appear technical are actually incentive problems: people protect departmental targets, delay bad news, optimize visible metrics or avoid decisions whose accountability is unclear. Technical design therefore needs to be accompanied by governance that makes expected behavior and escalation routes explicit.

Finally, the value of standardization depends on where it is applied. Definitions, controls and core data often benefit from standardization, while customer responses, regional implementation or work design may require adaptation. The stronger approach is to standardize the principles that protect quality and then allow local variation in the method when that variation is visible and reviewable.

Managerial and Policy Implications

The synthesis suggests that management should begin with a small number of decisions rather than a large transformation programme. For SMEs, entrepreneurs and local ecosystem organizations, the first step is to identify the exposure or performance outcome that matters most, the information

needed to judge it, and the person who is accountable for acting. This creates a baseline against which later investment can be evaluated.

The second principle is sequencing. Capabilities that improve measurement, role clarity and process discipline usually make later technology or policy interventions more effective. When organizations reverse that sequence, they often spend on tools first and discover later that data ownership, workflows or incentives are unresolved.

Third, leaders should make trade-offs explicit. The six themes point to recurring tensions between short-run efficiency and resilience, speed and control, access and protection, or standardization and local adaptation. A decision memo that states which trade-off is being accepted is often more useful than a dashboard that presents dozens of indicators without a decision rule.

Fourth, monitoring should combine outcomes with leading indicators. Outcome measures confirm whether value was created, while leading indicators show whether the mechanism is being implemented. The sources reviewed here, including World Bank (2025); OECD (2024a), support the broader argument that capability and institutional quality matter alongside headline performance measures.

Finally, periodic review is essential. A practice that was appropriate during implementation may become unnecessary, too costly or too restrictive after the organization has learned. Review should therefore ask what changed, whether the original risk still exists, and whether the control or investment continues to earn its place in the operating model.

Priority	Recommended action	Reason for inclusion
1	Match instruments to cash-flow patterns and development stage	One-size credit programmes can overfinance some firms and underserve others
2	Design open gateways and measurable referral pathways	Network benefits can remain concentrated among already-connected entrepreneurs
3	Combine learning with coaching, tools and business milestones	Short training courses often fade without application support
4	Help firms choose technology based on process needs and economics	Platform fees, dependence and digital-safety risks can reduce net benefit
5	Simplify high-frequency interactions and provide clear service standards	Complex procedures absorb a larger share of small-firm management time
6	Organize collaboration around shared pipelines, data and specific bottlenecks	Ecosystems stagnate when coordination becomes meeting-heavy and outcome-light

Limitations and Future Research

The article is an evidence synthesis and does not estimate a new causal model. Findings from different contexts are therefore used to identify mechanisms and boundary conditions, not to claim that one effect size applies uniformly to regional economies where entrepreneurship policy must connect finance, skills, markets, institutions and business networks rather than deliver isolated programmes.

A second limitation is source availability. Institutional reports are valuable for recent context, while peer-reviewed research provides stronger methodological detail, but the two forms of evidence answer different questions. Future work should connect the framework with original firm-level, regional or longitudinal data and pre-specify the outcomes to be tested.

Research could also examine sequencing more directly. Many studies evaluate whether a practice is present, yet organizations may obtain different results depending on what was implemented first, how long capability building took, and whether supporting processes were stable. Longitudinal designs would be especially useful for separating initial disruption from durable performance effects.

Directions for Empirical Validation

The framework developed for entrepreneurial ecosystem development for small and medium enterprises would benefit from being tested against operational records rather than aggregate

indicators alone. A useful empirical design would distinguish access to finance across firm stages from networks and market access and trace how each mechanism changes over time. Researchers should establish a pre-intervention baseline, document the timing of relevant decisions, and use outcome measures that managers actually monitor. Where a comparison group is feasible, matched organizations or regions would improve interpretation. Where it is not, interrupted time-series or carefully documented longitudinal case evidence may provide a more credible account than a single cross-sectional survey.

Sampling deserves equal attention. Findings associated with skills and managerial capability may not transfer directly to settings dominated by digitalization and platform participation, particularly when firm size, institutional capacity, market exposure, or access to finance differs. Future studies should therefore report the characteristics of participating organizations in enough detail to make those boundaries visible. Rather than treating heterogeneity as a statistical nuisance, researchers can use it to explain why apparently similar interventions produce different outcomes. Subgroup analysis should be theory-led and specified before results are known, especially when sample sizes are modest.

Finally, empirical work should retain negative, null, and delayed effects. In studies of entrepreneurial ecosystem development for small and medium enterprises, pressure to demonstrate an immediate benefit can encourage overly narrow outcome selection. A stronger design would combine short-term process indicators with longer-term performance measures and would report implementation costs alongside benefits. Sensitivity checks, alternative model specifications, and transparent treatment of missing data would make the findings easier to assess. These steps would also help separate genuine effects from improvements that simply reflect better documentation, temporary attention, or changes in the external environment.

A publication-oriented test of entrepreneurial ecosystem development for small and medium enterprises should also document data provenance and analytical choices in a form that another researcher could follow. Variable definitions, exclusions, coding decisions, and changes made after initial analysis should be recorded rather than reconstructed at the end of the project. When confidentiality prevents public release of raw organizational data, authors can still provide a data dictionary, sampling logic, model specification, and summary diagnostics. This level of transparency does more than satisfy reporting conventions; it makes disagreement productive because readers can identify whether competing conclusions arise from theory, measurement, sample composition, or analytical choice.

Conclusion

This article examined entrepreneurial ecosystem development for small and medium enterprises through a structured review of recent research and institutional evidence. The central conclusion is that the relationship in the title is conditional rather than automatic. Performance changes when external conditions interact with organizational capability, incentives, information quality and implementation discipline.

Across the six themes, a consistent pattern emerges: ecosystem language can become vague when every organization and programme is treated as equally important. The practical task is to identify the bottlenecks and connections that matter for specific groups of SMEs at specific stages of development. The practical implication is not to reject ambitious policy or management interventions, but to connect them to the mechanism through which they are expected to work and to the constraints faced by SMEs, entrepreneurs and local ecosystem organizations.

The review also points to a more disciplined use of evidence. Aggregate trends establish context, standards define expectations, and empirical studies reveal relationships, but none of these removes the need for local diagnosis. Decision makers should therefore combine external evidence with their own operating data and document where assumptions remain uncertain.

Future research can strengthen the framework by testing the proposed mechanisms with firm-level, regional or longitudinal data appropriate to the topic. For publication, the named authors should verify the source set, refine the contextual examples and add original evidence where available. That author-led step would convert the present editorial draft into a research article with a clearer empirical contribution.

Acknowledgement

This document is an editorial research draft prepared from the title, author information and issue metadata supplied by the KISA Institute production list. The named authors should review the argument, references, affiliations, email addresses and any contextual claims before submission or publication. No uncollected survey, interview or experimental data are represented as author-generated evidence.

References

- Stam, E., & van de Ven, A. (2021). Entrepreneurial ecosystem elements. *Small Business Economics*, 56, 809-832. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11187-019-00270-6>
- OECD. (2023). *OECD SME and Entrepreneurship Outlook 2023*. Paris: OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/342b8564-en>
- World Bank. (2025). *The Global Findex Database 2025*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- OECD. (2024). *OECD Digital Economy Outlook 2024 (Volume 1): Embracing the Technology Frontier*. Paris: OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/a1689dc5-en>
- UN Trade and Development. (2025). *World Investment Report 2025*. Geneva: United Nations.
- OECD. (2024). *OECD Economic Surveys: Indonesia 2024*. Paris: OECD Publishing.
- World Economic Forum. (2025). *The Future of Jobs Report 2025*. Geneva: World Economic Forum.
- BPS-Statistics Indonesia. (2026). *Statistical Yearbook of Indonesia 2026*. Jakarta: BPS-Statistics Indonesia.