Doing business in Indonesia: What your Scandinavian business instincts won't tell you about Indonesia
Same goals - different playbook.

Many Swedish and Scandinavian companies arrive in Indonesia well prepared. They have studied the market, familiarised themselves with the regulatory environment, and established clear objectives for growth. Yet despite this preparation, many discover that the most significant challenges they face are not related to laws, permits, taxes, or market conditions. They arise from the human dimensions of business: how trust is built, how decisions are made, how communication is interpreted, and how relationships develop over time.

The objectives of Swedish and Indonesian companies are rarely different — growth, profitability, innovation, operational efficiency, and long-term partnerships. The path to achieving those goals, however, can differ considerably. Assumptions that work well in Stockholm do not always translate seamlessly to Jakarta. Direct communication, flat hierarchies, individual accountability, and rapid decision-making are often understood differently in an Indonesian context, where relationships, consensus, hierarchy, and contextual communication frequently play a larger role.

To explore these dynamics, SwedCham Indonesia, in collaboration with DanCham and the Indonesia-Norway Business Council, organised a seminar focused specifically on the cultural and interpersonal dimensions of doing business in Indonesia — the aspects rarely covered in market-entry guides, yet often determining whether partnerships succeed.

> *Indonesia is not necessarily difficult — it is different. Understanding that difference is often the difference between frustration and success.*

The discussion brought together two complementary perspectives. Terje Nilsen, CEO of Seven Stones Indonesia, drew on more than three decades of building businesses and advising investors in Indonesia. Veve Hitipeuw, CEO of Kiroyan Partners and Managing Partner of KREAB Worldwide in Indonesia, provided insights into how Indonesian professionals interpret Western management styles, communication patterns, and decision-making approaches. Together, they illuminated what happens when different business cultures meet — and how successful companies navigate that reality.

1. Different Operating Systems, Same Destination

Scandinavian companies typically bring management philosophies shaped by high-trust societies with flat structures, collaborative decision-making, and distributed accountability. Employees are encouraged to contribute ideas regardless of seniority, challenge assumptions, and take ownership of their work. Transparency, empowerment, and personal responsibility are deeply embedded — and so taken for granted that they are often not recognised as cultural characteristics at all. It is only when these assumptions encounter a different business culture that their distinctly Scandinavian nature becomes apparent.

Indonesian organisations, while equally professional and often highly entrepreneurial, frequently operate according to a different logic. Many workplaces remain more hierarchical and relationship-oriented. Respect for seniority and social harmony plays an important role in how information flows, how decisions are made, and how people interact. This is not a lack of initiative or creativity — it is a different set of cultural norms through which those qualities are expressed.

Where Scandinavians may instinctively prioritise directness and transparency, Indonesians may place greater emphasis on context, relationships, and the broader implications of a conversation. Where a Scandinavian manager expects open debate, Indonesian participants may be paying close attention to hierarchy and the appropriate way to express their views. Where Scandinavians often draw a clear line between professional and personal relationships, Indonesians frequently view trust and personal rapport as integral to successful business cooperation rather than separate from it.

Neither approach is inherently superior. Both have evolved in response to different historical, institutional, and social contexts. The challenge for international companies arises when one system is applied to another without adaptation — not because the goals differ, but because the operating assumptions do.

The most successful organisations tend to be those that combine the strengths of both. They retain the Scandinavian emphasis on transparency, accountability, and long-term thinking while developing a genuine appreciation for the importance of relationships, context, and trust-building in Indonesia.

2. Communication Beyond Words

Reading between the lines

Perhaps no aspect of doing business in Indonesia generates more misunderstanding for Scandinavian companies than communication. Meetings are cordial, discussions appear constructive, participants seem engaged — yet outcomes frequently do not match expectations. A proposal that seemed well received does not move forward. A meeting that appeared successful produces no concrete action. A conversation that seemed to end in agreement later reveals that key questions remain open.

In Scandinavian organisations, questions are expected to receive direct answers, feedback is given openly, and disagreement is viewed as healthy. A direct conversation is efficient, transparent, and respectful. In Indonesia, communication simultaneously serves additional purposes: preserving relationships, demonstrating respect, maintaining social harmony, acknowledging hierarchy, and avoiding unnecessary confrontation. The meaning of a conversation is therefore not always contained within the words spoken. Context, tone, timing, relationships, and what remains unsaid can be just as significant as the message itself.

Yes, noted, and we will try

One of the most frequently discussed examples in the seminar concerned phrases such as "yes," "noted," or "we will try." In many Western business environments, these are understood as commitments. In Indonesia, they may instead represent an acknowledgement of the conversation rather than a definitive agreement. The "yes" heard in the room may be entirely genuine — while the decision-making process is still continuing behind the scenes.

Silence presents a similar challenge. In some cultures, silence implies disagreement or lack of engagement. In Indonesia, silence may indicate careful consideration, respect for hierarchy, a desire to avoid premature commitment, or even a way of expressing concern without creating confrontation. It should not automatically be interpreted as either agreement or opposition.

False alignment

This communication dynamic underpins one of the most valuable concepts to emerge from the seminar: false alignment. False alignment occurs when all parties leave a conversation believing they are in agreement while, in reality, holding significantly different interpretations of the same situation. Everyone may feel the meeting was successful. Everyone may believe objectives are understood. Yet beneath the surface, assumptions, expectations, and interpretations remain fundamentally different.

A common scenario: a foreign executive leaves a meeting believing a project has been approved and implementation can begin. Simultaneously, Indonesian counterparts regard the proposal as promising but still under consideration — additional consultations are required, other stakeholders need to be informed. Neither side is intentionally misleading the other. Neither necessarily believes there is a disagreement. Both genuinely believe they share the same understanding of what has been decided. The problem is that they do not.

Many business problems that appear to be execution failures are in fact alignment failures. Projects are delayed not because people lack competence or commitment, but because key stakeholders never reached a genuinely shared understanding of what was agreed, who is responsible, what the timeline is, or what decisions remain outstanding.

The practical lesson: never assume that agreement means alignment. Actively test assumptions, verify interpretations, and create opportunities for clarification. Asking participants to summarise next steps, confirming who is responsible for specific actions, and revisiting key decisions all help reduce the risk of misalignment. For many Scandinavian executives, this may feel repetitive — but apparent agreement is not always the same as genuine alignment.

3. Leadership, Hierarchy, and Ownership

Leadership in a hierarchical context

Many Scandinavian managers arrive in Indonesia with leadership styles built around participation, facilitation, and egalitarianism. Questions such as "What do you think?" or "Please challenge my assumptions" are standard management tools — intended to encourage engagement and ensure different perspectives are heard. The expectation is that team members will contribute actively, challenge proposals, and take ownership of their areas of responsibility.

In an Indonesian context, the results are often unexpected. Invitations to participate may generate little response. Capable team members may hesitate to challenge a proposal in a group setting. Open invitations for feedback may receive very little of it. This is rarely a sign of disengagement or lack of competence. Employees may be carefully assessing how best to communicate their views within a cultural environment where respect for hierarchy and social harmony remain important. In many Indonesian workplaces, openly disagreeing with a manager — particularly in a formal setting — can feel uncomfortable or inappropriate, even when the employee has valuable insights.

Trust often needs to be established before open discussion becomes possible. Psychological safety cannot simply be announced. It develops gradually through repeated interactions and consistent behaviour. Employees need to see that feedback is genuinely welcomed, that alternative viewpoints are respected, and that raising concerns carries no negative consequences. This process takes time. Managers who expect immediate openness may become disappointed; employees may remain cautious until they have sufficient experience working with a particular leader.

On the question of authority: in Scandinavian organisations, authority is often deliberately downplayed to create an atmosphere of equality. In Indonesia, authority can carry different expectations. Employees may look to leaders for guidance and clear direction in ways Scandinavian managers are not accustomed to. Attempts to eliminate hierarchy entirely can sometimes create uncertainty rather than empowerment, particularly if employees are unclear about where decision-making authority actually resides. Effective leadership in this context often means maintaining openness and encouraging participation while also providing the clarity and structure that employees may expect.

Freedom with accountability

Freedom with accountability — giving employees latitude over how work is done while holding them responsible for results — is a principle at the heart of many Scandinavian organisations. For many Scandinavians, it feels entirely natural. But it is a system that depends on specific underlying conditions: employees must clearly understand what is expected of them, responsibilities must be well defined, decision-making authority must be understood, and people must feel safe making decisions even when outcomes are imperfect.

These conditions cannot be assumed in Indonesia. Foreign managers who encourage local employees to make decisions independently often find that employees continue seeking approval, escalate decisions that seem straightforward, or hesitate to take responsibility for areas managers consider clearly within their remit. The seminar challenged the common interpretation of this behaviour as a lack of ownership. In environments where authority is not clearly defined, or where mistakes may carry significant personal consequences, caution is a rational response. Taking initiative is not only an opportunity; it is also a risk.

Ownership must be developed deliberately rather than delegated through a single statement. The most successful organisations treat autonomy as a capability built over time. Responsibility is expanded gradually as individuals gain experience and confidence. Managers provide guidance and feedback while progressively extending decision-making authority. Clear structures — standard operating procedures, defined reporting lines, performance expectations — reduce uncertainty and make independent decision-making easier rather than more difficult. Paradoxically, greater freedom often requires greater structural clarity. When expectations are ambiguous, employees become cautious. When authority is unclear, decisions are escalated unnecessarily.

4. Speed, Alignment, and Decision-Making

One of the most common observations among foreign executives in Indonesia is that decision-making appears slow. Projects that seem straightforward require multiple meetings. Discussions continue long after a foreign manager believes a decision should have been made. For executives arriving from Scandinavia, where efficiency and decisive action are highly valued, this can be one of the more frustrating aspects of operating in Indonesia.

The seminar offered a different frame. Rather than viewing these situations primarily as inefficiency, participants argued that many apparent delays reflect a different approach to decision-making: while Scandinavian organisations often prioritise speed, Indonesian organisations frequently prioritise alignment before action.

In many Indonesian organisations, decisions are rarely purely technical or operational. They involve relationships, internal and external stakeholders, formal authority structures, and informal networks of influence. Before a decision can be implemented successfully, multiple parties may need to understand it, support it, or at least be comfortable with its implications. What appears from the outside to be a simple decision may involve consultations that are not immediately visible: additional briefings for senior stakeholders, internal discussions, assessments by different departments, and a process of consensus-building that takes place largely behind the scenes.

Time invested in building understanding and consensus before implementation often prevents problems later. Stakeholders who have been consulted are more likely to support a decision; individuals who understand the rationale are more likely to implement it effectively. A rapidly made decision that encounters resistance may ultimately take longer to execute than one that required more consultation upfront. What appears to be slowness may actually be a form of risk management.

Pressure does not necessarily accelerate this process. In some situations it has the opposite effect. Stakeholders who feel rushed may become more cautious. Individuals may hesitate to commit before they feel comfortable with the implications. Attempts to force rapid decisions can create uncertainty, resistance, or disengagement — and may ultimately slow rather than accelerate progress.

> *Indonesia can move remarkably fast when alignment exists. Once key stakeholders understand and support an initiative, implementation often proceeds with impressive speed and flexibility.*

The difference lies in what creates that speed. In Scandinavian environments, speed is often generated through delegation and rapid decision-making. In Indonesia, speed frequently emerges as a consequence of alignment. The practical implication: companies should recognise that efficiency and alignment are not always the same thing. What initially appears to be a delay may be an investment. Conversations that seem repetitive may be building consensus. Informal discussions may be resolving concerns that would otherwise emerge later as formal objections.

5. Trust, Systems, and Organisational Design

Trust is foundational to Scandinavian business culture. In Sweden, Norway, and Denmark, employees trust managers, managers trust employees, and both trust that institutional systems will function largely as intended. For many Scandinavian leaders, trust is not simply desirable — it is the operating assumption on which organisations are built.

When establishing operations in Indonesia, Scandinavian companies often attempt to replicate this model. The intention is positive: create empowered teams, avoid unnecessary bureaucracy, demonstrate confidence in people. What participants observed, however, is a recurring pattern: organisations built on trust and unwritten assumptions often struggle with consistency over time. Tasks get interpreted differently. Responsibilities overlap. Deadlines slip. Important information fails to reach the right people. When this happens, the typical response is to move in the opposite direction — centralise processes, increase reporting requirements, introduce additional approvals. Neither extreme tends to work well.

The seminar pointed toward a third approach: building systems that support trust rather than replacing it. Strong organisations are not created by trusting people, nor by controlling them. They are created by establishing clear frameworks within which trust can operate effectively. Standard operating procedures, reporting structures, project management tools, performance measurement systems, and clearly defined responsibilities all play an important role — not as monitoring mechanisms, but as tools for creating shared understanding.

When responsibilities are clearly defined, employees are less likely to duplicate efforts or overlook important tasks. When reporting structures are understood, communication becomes more efficient. When expectations are explicit rather than assumed, misunderstandings become less frequent. In multicultural organisations, this clarity is particularly valuable: it reduces the risk that people with different cultural backgrounds will interpret instructions, responsibilities, or objectives differently.

There is also a direct link between clear systems and confidence. Employees are more willing to take initiative when they understand the boundaries within which they can operate. Well-designed systems create the conditions that make autonomy possible. People are more likely to exercise independent judgement when they know where their authority begins and ends. Trust without structure can create confusion. Structure without trust can create rigidity. The strongest organisations combine both.

6. Stakeholder Engagement and Social Licence

Many foreign companies devote considerable attention to permits, licences, and regulatory compliance when entering Indonesia. This is entirely understandable. But participants argued that legal compliance alone is rarely sufficient for long-term success. A company may possess every required permit and still encounter significant difficulties — not because of regulatory issues, but because of social ones.

This distinction led to a discussion of what is commonly referred to as a social licence to operate. Unlike formal licences issued by government authorities, a social licence cannot be obtained through an application process. It represents the broader acceptance and support a company earns from the stakeholders affected by its activities. In Indonesia — a vibrant democracy with a complex and evolving stakeholder landscape — this concept is particularly important. Local communities, industry associations, media, civil society, professional organisations, religious leaders, business networks, and local governments all play roles in shaping perceptions and influencing decisions. As Indonesia has become more democratic and decentralised, the number of stakeholders involved in major projects has expanded significantly.

A common assumption among foreign investors is that once regulatory approval has been secured, implementation should proceed smoothly. In reality, regulatory approval often represents only one stage of a much larger process. Stakeholders who have not been consulted may raise concerns later. Communities may seek additional information. Local organisations may wish to understand how a project affects their interests. These dynamics do not typically indicate opposition to investment; they reflect a desire among stakeholders to understand how decisions affect them and to ensure their perspectives are considered.

Stakeholder engagement should be integrated into business strategy from the beginning, not treated as a communications exercise that takes place after key decisions have been made. Successful companies often reframe the question from "Who do we need to inform?" to "Who do we need to understand?" and "Who needs to understand us?" People are generally more willing to support outcomes when they believe they have been treated with respect and given an opportunity to participate in the conversation before decisions became final.

Trust is as central in external stakeholder relationships as it is within organisations. It develops gradually through consistent engagement, transparent behaviour, and the ability to follow through on commitments. Companies that engage only when problems arise tend to find they have little goodwill to draw on when challenges emerge. For industries with long investment horizons — mining, infrastructure, energy, natural resources — long-term stakeholder relationships are every bit as important as technical or financial considerations.

7. Engaging Government and Regulatory Institutions

Indonesia has made significant progress in improving its investment climate over the past decade. Regulatory reforms, digital licensing systems, and the Online Single Submission (OSS) platform have simplified many procedures that were previously cumbersome. Today's Indonesia is considerably easier to navigate than it was twenty years ago, and there is clear awareness within government that improving the ease of doing business remains an important national priority.

Nonetheless, government engagement remains complex — particularly for companies unfamiliar with Indonesia's institutional landscape. Indonesia is a vast and highly decentralised country, with authority distributed across national ministries, provincial governments, regulatory agencies, and state-owned institutions. Depending on the nature of a project, companies may need to engage multiple layers of government simultaneously. Formal authority and practical influence do not always reside in the same organisation, and understanding where decision-making power actually lies is often critical.

Foreign companies frequently approach government engagement in the same way they approach commercial negotiations, focusing on technical arguments and regulatory requirements. While these are important, effective engagement often requires a deeper understanding of institutional structures, stakeholder interests, and decision-making processes — the same themes that run throughout the cultural dimensions of the seminar. Hierarchy plays a role here too: government officials often expect engagement at a corresponding level of seniority. A senior official may expect to meet with a company representative of similar standing, particularly on strategic investments or policy matters. Sending a senior representative can signal commitment and respect for the counterpart institution.

Government engagement in Indonesia is rarely transactional. Many foreign companies approach it with a problem-solving mindset: identify the issue, obtain a decision, and move on. Indonesia tends to reward a more relationship-oriented approach. Trust develops gradually through repeated interactions and demonstrated long-term commitment to Indonesia as a market and investment destination. Companies that engage only when they need something are often at a disadvantage compared to those that invest in relationships over time.

As with business decisions, government processes frequently involve multiple stakeholders and layers of review. What appears to be delay from the outside often reflects consultation and coordination happening within the institution. Patience, realistic expectations, and an appreciation of how decisions are made tend to produce better outcomes than pressure. Scandinavian companies that maintain core values of transparency and professionalism while adapting their engagement style to Indonesia's institutional realities generally find access more available and processes more predictable than they initially anticipated.

8. Understanding Modern Indonesia

Transformation

The Indonesia many foreign observers imagine is often very different from the Indonesia they encounter when they arrive. Over the past generation, the country has undergone one of the most significant economic and social transformations in Asia. Millions of people have entered the middle class. Infrastructure has expanded dramatically. Cities have grown and modernised. Digital technologies have reshaped how Indonesians communicate, conduct business, and access services. Jakarta has evolved into one of Southeast Asia's most important business centres, and Indonesia has become one of the world's largest digital markets.

Education levels have improved substantially. Indonesian universities are producing growing numbers of highly qualified graduates, many of whom have studied or worked internationally. A younger generation of professionals is increasingly global in outlook, familiar with international business norms, and comfortable operating in both local and international environments.

Diversity within modernisation

Despite rapid modernisation, Indonesia remains one of the world's most diverse countries — an archipelago of more than 17,000 islands, home to hundreds of ethnic groups, languages, and local cultures. Business practices that work in Jakarta may not produce the same results in Surabaya, Medan, Makassar, or smaller provincial cities. Regional differences continue to matter: local cultures influence communication styles, leadership expectations, stakeholder relationships, and business practices. Success in one part of Indonesia does not automatically transfer elsewhere.

What makes Indonesia's current moment particularly interesting is that global exposure has not weakened local cultural values. Many younger Indonesians remain deeply connected to the cultural norms that shape Indonesian society — respect for relationships, family, community, and social harmony — even as they embrace international business practices. The Indonesian workforce is neither wholly traditional nor wholly Westernised. Employees may be comfortable in multinational environments while maintaining cultural expectations that differ from those of their foreign colleagues. Companies that recognise this complexity, rather than viewing modernisation and tradition as opposing forces, tend to be better positioned for sustainable success.

The opportunity

Indonesia possesses many of the characteristics that long-term business investors actively seek. More than 280 million people, an expanding middle class, a young and growing workforce, rising education levels, increasing urbanisation, and a geographic position at the crossroads of major global trade routes. Domestic consumption provides a level of economic resilience less dependent on export markets than many comparable economies.

The country's resource base is also significant. Indonesia holds substantial reserves of nickel, copper, cobalt, bauxite, and other critical minerals increasingly important to the global energy transition and electric vehicle supply chains. Government policy has increasingly focused on encouraging downstream processing and value creation within Indonesia rather than raw material exports — a direction that creates opportunities for companies with relevant technology and expertise.

Many of these growth sectors align closely with Scandinavian strengths: energy transition, industrial technology, infrastructure, manufacturing, digital services, healthcare, and professional services. Indonesia has also demonstrated repeated resilience — navigating financial crises, political transitions, and commodity cycles while maintaining a consistent long-term development trajectory. Yet the country remains underappreciated in many parts of Europe, where media coverage tends to focus on political developments, natural disasters, or tourism rather than the scale of economic transformation underway. Companies that take the time to understand the market may encounter less competition than in more heavily publicised destinations.

9. Work Culture and Expectations

Differences in expectations surrounding work itself can create misunderstandings that are easy to overlook. Scandinavian organisations have placed a strong emphasis on work-life balance, with managers expected to respect boundaries between professional and personal time. Flexibility is interpreted as giving employees greater control over when and how they work. Employees are evaluated primarily on outcomes rather than availability.

In many Indonesian industries — particularly service-oriented sectors — responsiveness and flexibility carry different expectations. Business communication may occur outside traditional office hours. Relationships extend beyond formal workplace settings. Clients may expect rapid responses regardless of time of day. For newcomers to Indonesia, this can create the impression that work never truly stops.

The situation is not uniform. Expectations vary considerably between industries, companies, generations, and individual managers. Technology companies operate differently from government institutions. Multinational corporations may establish cultures that differ significantly from local organisations. The influence of hybrid work arrangements and increasing digital connectivity has also shifted expectations across many sectors.

The central conclusion from the discussion was not that one model is better, but that the most common source of frustration is ambiguity rather than the model itself. If employees are expected to respond outside office hours, that expectation should be communicated openly. If work-life boundaries are important, they should be clearly defined. If flexibility is offered, employees should understand how it affects accountability and performance expectations. When expectations are unclear, uncertainty becomes the source of friction. When they are transparent and consistently applied, cultural differences become much easier to navigate — regardless of which model an organisation chooses.

Conclusions: Same Goals, Different Playbook

Success in Indonesia is not determined solely by market knowledge, regulatory expertise, financial resources, or technical competence. Equally important is an organisation's ability to understand people — their motivations, expectations, communication styles, and ways of working.

A recurring theme throughout the seminar was that many of the challenges Scandinavian companies encounter are not fundamentally business problems. They are interpretation problems. Projects stall not because strategies are flawed but because people approach the same situation with different assumptions about communication, leadership, trust, accountability, hierarchy, and decision-making. A Scandinavian manager may interpret silence as agreement when it is actually reflection. An Indonesian employee may interpret an invitation to challenge a manager as a polite gesture rather than a genuine request. A foreign executive may believe a decision has been made when local stakeholders believe the discussion is still ongoing. None of these situations arise from bad intentions. They arise because people are operating according to different cultural frameworks.

The companies that tend to perform best over the long term are rarely those that attempt to impose one business culture on another. Instead, they develop hybrid approaches that draw on the strengths of both. They maintain the Scandinavian emphasis on structure, transparency, accountability, and systematic ways of working. At the same time, they develop a genuine appreciation for the Indonesian strengths of relationship-building, adaptability, stakeholder management, resilience, contextual awareness, and social intelligence.

Scandinavian companies often bring internationally respected expertise in technology, innovation, organisational design, governance, sustainability, and operational excellence. Indonesia offers a dynamic and rapidly growing market, entrepreneurial energy, an increasingly sophisticated workforce, and a business culture that places great value on relationships, trust, and long-term commitment. Neither side possesses all the answers. The greatest opportunities often emerge when both sides are willing to learn from one another.

Many of the capabilities discussed in the seminar — building trust, developing local leadership, creating stakeholder alignment, understanding government structures, establishing credibility — cannot be achieved quickly. They are built gradually through experience, consistency, and sustained engagement. Indonesia is not a market that rewards impatience. It is a market that rewards understanding.

> *The goals are often the same. The playbook, however, may be different. Understanding that difference may be one of the most valuable investments any company can make.*

Indonesia remains one of the world's most significant long-term growth markets. The same qualities that make it challenging at times — scale, diversity, complexity, and rapid development — are also the qualities that create its opportunities. The challenge is not whether opportunities exist. The challenge is whether companies are prepared to understand the environment well enough to capture them.

Speakers

Terje Nilsen — CEO, Seven Stones Indonesia

Terje is a Norwegian entrepreneur, investor, and business advisor who has spent more than three decades living and working in Indonesia. As founder of Seven Stones Indonesia, a member of SwedCham, he combines extensive practical experience with a deep understanding of Indonesian business culture, regulatory frameworks, and stakeholder dynamics. He is widely recognised for his ability to bridge Scandinavian and Indonesian business perspectives and provide practical guidance on market entry, leadership, investment, and long-term business development.

Veve Hitipeuw — CEO, Kiroyan Partners; Managing Partner, KREAB Worldwide Indonesia

Kiroyan Partners, a member of SwedCham, is one of Indonesia's leading public affairs and strategic communications consultancies. With extensive experience advising multinational corporations, industry associations, government stakeholders, and international organisations, Veve works at the intersection of business, policy, communications, and stakeholder engagement. Through Kiroyan Partners' affiliation with KREAB Worldwide — a global communications and public affairs advisory network founded in Stockholm — she brings a valuable perspective on cross-cultural leadership and doing business in Indonesia.

SwedCham Indonesia

SwedCham Indonesia is a non-profit, member-driven organisation that strengthens trade, investment, and business relations between Sweden and Indonesia. As a bridge between Swedish and Indonesian stakeholders, we connect companies, professionals, institutions, and entrepreneurs through networking, knowledge-sharing, advocacy, and business dialogue. Our members include Swedish companies operating in Indonesia, organisations exploring market opportunities, Indonesian companies with ties to Sweden, and professional service providers supporting international business.

SwedCham Indonesia is an independent and neutral business platform. We do not represent any individual company, commercial provider, or private interest. Governed by an elected board, SwedCham operates independently of commercial interests, enabling us to serve as a trusted platform for cooperation, advocacy, and engagement between the Swedish and Indonesian business communities.