REDESIGNING CONSOLIDATED DATA FOR HANDLING EXTREME POVERTY IN RURAL AREAS BASED ON SDGS DESA

Abdul Halim ISKANDAR1
Achmad Faidy SUJA'IE2
Ivanovich AGUSTA³

Abstract: *Responses to extreme poverty include ensuring the authenticity of related data. Therefore, studies of data consolidation on handling extreme poverty in rural areas are important. The integration of poverty studies into social science and development fields is crucial for advancing knowledge in these disciplines. This study aims to describe data inequality and collection accuracy in Indonesia. It used a data consolidation approach based on SDGs Desa to explore the disparity in central and regional poverty data collection, which impacts the loss of access to basic rights. Furthermore, this study relied on survey data from 100 villages in 4 of the 5 regencies piloting the projects to tackle extreme poverty in East Java, Indonesia. The results showed that the accuracy of the data influenced the poor categorization, social assistance distribution, and the seriousness of the state in alleviating extreme poverty. Therefore, it becomes the basis for further study in unravelling the dynamics in the design of data collection in rural areas.*

Keywords: *poverty alleviation, extreme poverty, SDGs Desa*

Introduction

The validity of data collection is important (Pantel et al., 2005; Wilson, 2020). Data that is not integrated within the government impacts the unfair distribution of social and

---

[1] Minister of Village, Development of Disadvantaged Regions and Transmigration, Indonesia, e-mail: abdulhalimiskandar@kemendes.go.id

[2] Student of Doctoral Program in Administration Science, Universitas Brawijaya, Malang, Indonesia, e-mail: afyspascal@student.ub.ac.id, ORCID: 0000-0003-2910-7939.

[3] Head of Development and Information Agency, Ministry of Village, Development of Disadvantaged Regions and Transmigration, Indonesia, e-mail: ivanovich.agusta@kemendesa.go.id

economic rights (Agnia Dwi Khasanah & R.A.E Virgana Targa Sapanji, 2021; Blumenstock, 2016; Ibrahim et al., 2021; Leidig & Teeuw, 2015). The data depends on the indicators used to predict community poverty (Benedetti et al., 2020; Herrero, 2017; Pienkhuntod et al., 2020; Siksnelyte-Butkiene et al., 2021; Susilowati, 2010). On a global scale, poverty also depends on state investment volatility (Gnangnon, 2021). Extreme poverty is measured as the number of people living on less than US$1.90 per day (Lakner et al., 2020). Liberal economists have assumed the decline in the world poverty rate as another factor in the distribution of mutual benefits. Meanwhile, the world bank is hesitant to reduce extreme poverty among 97.5% of the world's population data (Lakner et al., 2020; Wade, 2004). In Indonesia, 19.7 million people are predicted to be poor (Suryahadi et al., 2020). The highest poverty is in rural areas, where three-quarters are farmers (Arulpragasam et al., 2007; Oktavianti et al., 2010; Pudjianto & Syawie, 2015; Sukmana, 2018). The village has managed social assistance through, first, the readiness of institutions and the commitment of village actors. These assistants are directly involved in collecting data on prospective recipients and distributing social assistance. Second, the criteria for prospective beneficiaries are clear, measurable, and verified. Third, the prospective beneficiaries are determined with the community involvement (Agusta, 2020; Kurniawan, 2020b, 2020a).

During this time, studies on inequality in poverty data collection tend to analyze the contemporary approach (Buheji, 2019; SMERU, 2004). Programmatic poverty alleviation helps increase per capita income according to SDGs standards in rural areas (Effendi et al., 2020). The dynamics on a global scale continue to change in developing countries (Mahembe & Odhiambo, 2018). First, according to Smeru Institute (2004) and Buheji (2019), it is important to broaden scholars' understanding of the developments needed in current poverty management models (SMERU, 2004). Second, Effendi et al. (2020) showed that the cash-for-work program is an innovation from the central and village governments to provide productive activities, reduce poverty, implement global goals, and develop sustainable development. Third, Mahembe and Odhiambo (2018) showed that sustainable programs could reduce poverty internationally. In addition, the composition of global poverty across regions has changed significantly. From the three trends above, the study of these issues is related to the government's approach, the programs dealing with poverty problems, and international programs that support each other's global poverty alleviation agenda. This trend has not reviewed the problem of inequality in the poverty data subject. The validity of the poor subject and overlapping recipients of social assistance is still a serious problem when referring to the case in Indonesia.

This study aims to complement the limitations of existing results, which do not explain why there are differences in data collection on poor subjects, even though the determination affects the economic status of families in their categorization and distribution of social assistance. Therefore, it solves the problem of poverty data that are not integrated between the central and regional governments, as well as analyzes the impact of data inequality among low-income families. The answer to this question allows in-depth knowledge of the different indicators applied in Indonesian government institutions and the approach to categorizing poor or extremely low-income families. This knowledge can be a broad social and political science perspective

in exploring the integration of poverty data collection at the national and regional scales. Furthermore, it impacts the process of distributing social rights or public access in the framework of policies.

Extreme poverty can be reduced by increasing income factors and global trade volumes (Dollar & Kraay, 2000; Miranti, 2017), increasing job creation, and maintaining social assistance programs (bansos) that provide the poor with access to education and health services, food and cash assistance, and grants for villages (Suryahadi & Al Izzati, 2018). The standard of the poverty line affects the status of the poor condition of the community (Swastika & Supriyatna, 2008). The level of individual expenditure does not represent the level of income. There may be latent facts indicating that an individual earns income above the Foster-Greer-Thorbecke poverty line (FGT index). However, the individual selects to save and invest or allocates the remaining income to a reserve fund. This means people have different definitions of poverty (Alatas et al., 2012). To explore differences in comparing poor status, in-depth observations are needed regarding the factors and impacts when there are differences in category occupation in individual poor statuses.

Materials and Methods

This study consolidates SDGs Desa-based data on handling extreme rural poverty in East Java. It is important to focus on the consolidation due to the correlation between objective poverty indicator variables and the distribution of rights in the form of social assistance. The momentum is obtained when the facts show contradictory evidence of who is categorized as the extremely poor group. A qualitative approach was used with a non-positivist orientation, logic from practice, and non-linear (Neuman, 1991). The data collection process was carried out in two stages. The first is a primary data survey to collect data directly through face-to-face or telephone. Interviews were conducted with stakeholders involved in data consolidation activities for handling extreme poverty in East Java. The survey involved stakeholders from 100 villages in Bangkalan, Bojonegoro, Lamongan, and Probolinggo Regencies. Other stakeholders involved are the Department of Community and Village Empowerment (DPMD). The second stage includes, firstly, literature study, namely collecting data from books, journals, and studies related to the object, and secondly, data collection from related agencies through relevant government documents. Data analysis used the ROCCIPI method (Rules; Opportunity; Capacity; Communication; Interest; Process; Ideology). This method describes repetitive behavior or circumstances to understand and solve the object's problem (Seidman & Seidman, 2011).

Literature Review

Poverty Alleviation

Poverty alleviation is used as an abbreviation to permanently promote economic growth to lift poor people past the poverty line (Barder, 2009). It has been on the main agenda in

developing countries (Wang et al., 2020). This includes empowering the poor and providing services for opportunities to live more valuable lives (Wong, 2012). The concept cannot be understood singly, where the solution only relies on improving economic growth and increasing capital. This concept reviewed through multiple dimensions produced targeted policies, and government intervention will be more accurate (Carr, 2008). Poverty alleviation can be started with the identification of factors and then fundamentally solving the problem of poverty (Alam, 2018). Therefore, countries should focus on policies and institutions that promote growth in average incomes (Kraay, 2006).

Poverty alleviation based on a human rights approach no longer stems from poor people's needs. However, people also have rights that create legal obligations on the part of others. Poverty is a denial of human rights, where relationships characterized by domination and control make people lose the fulfilment of rights (Dibaba, 2019). The problem is more focused on the data's accuracy and the concept's ability to become a phenomenon of backwardness in the village (Iskandar, 2020). The stage in poverty alleviation is to identify the number of poor individuals in an area and then record the result accurately. Leadership, budget availability, program implementation, and human resource commitment are keys in poverty alleviation efforts (Arifah et al., 2020).

Extreme Poverty

Poverty is a failure to meet basic needs (Edwards, 2011) caused by the absence of basic rights and limited access (entitlement) to resources. Hunger does not occur due to insufficient food and the fulfilment of basic rights in an area but because of the limited access of the poor to these rights (A. Fischer, 2002; Sen, 1976; Suharto, 2009). Extreme poverty in the community is mostly found in rural areas with marginal land, low quality of human resources, difficult access to cash capital sources, and poor infrastructure conditions (Swastika & Supriyatna, 2008). Poverty is a loss of resources for welfare. There is a lack of access to health and education services and public rights, such as clean water, safety, and inadequate nutrition (Toye, 2007).

Poverty can be seen from three approaches, and the first is culture. This approach emphasizes that the concept is a product of the civilizing process due to long-standing extreme economic conditions. The second is the situational approach, where the situation in the social environment causes poverty in the community. The third is the interactional approach, where the behavior of the poor is the result of the interaction between cultural factors embedded in the lives of individuals (Suryono, 2010). Poverty encompasses human needs, which is understood as the lack of means, access to some minimum social or subsistence standards, and norms for human survival (A. M. Fischer, 2018).

SDGs Desa Concept

Each country is responsible for localizing and adapting the target indicators of Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) within the national framework. The SDGs Desa is structured as an integrated effort to accelerate the achievement of SDGs as

stipulated in the Presidential Regulation of Indonesia Number 59 of 2017 (Iskandar, 2020). Furthermore, development has been localized by involving citizen participation.

Public participation refers to community involvement in planning and administration processes to influence policies and actions (Cornwall, 2008). This idea received great attention through SDGs published by the United Nations (UN) in 2015 (Ludwig, 2017). The participation paradigm becomes a bridge to emphasize locality and its translation into development at the village level (Iskandar, 2020). Meanwhile, this participatory paradigm does not emphasize the substance of development. The Participatory Model will raise the motivation of the community to be involved in every stage of the implementation of the village development program (Nain, 2019).

In participatory practice, experts recommend using visualized data, such as maps to integrate various kinds of spatial knowledge of stakeholders. They facilitate communication among diverse participants with different backgrounds, interests, influences, and knowledge (McCall, 2003; Mccall & Dunn, 2012; Shrestha et al., 2017). A Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA) approach was proposed for rural stakeholders in data collection and map-making (Chambers, 1994). The mapping methods have been widely used in development contexts because they do not limit the resulting maps to geographic information and include social, cultural, and historical knowledge of local communities (Chambers, 2006). This approach is effective for solving the problem of data scarcity and mapping rural resource problems (Ahamed et al., 2006).

Participatory practices in achieving the SDGs Desa are realized through a census that activates 1,622,861 Village Data Collection Volunteers working groups. This working group collects information on all villagers, families, neighborhood associations, and the government. Accuracy of data discrepancies is achieved by consolidation at the village level (Iskandar, 2020).

Results and Discussion

In September 2021, the poverty line was recorded at IDR 486,168,-/capita/month with the composition of IDR 360,0007,- (74.05%) and the non-food poverty line of IDR 126,161,- (25.95%). In September 2021, poor households had 4.50 members, hence, the average poverty line per house is IDR 2,187,756/poor household/month (Central Statistics Agency, 2022). Indonesia's poor population reaches 10.14% or 27.54 million people. The percentage in urban and rural areas is only 7.89% and 13.10%. Extreme poverty reaches 4% or covers 10.9 million people, and around 7.3 million extremely poor people live in villages (Kemendes PDTT, 2021).

The Poverty Data Accuracy Has an Impact on the Categorization of the Poor

Data from the Indonesian Central Statistics Agency showed that in 2020, the number and the percentage of poor people in several areas in East Java were within the poverty line. The areas with consistent poverty are presented in Table 1.

Table 1: Poverty Based on the Indonesian Central Statistics Agency

Area	Line of poverty (rupiah per month)	Number of Poor Population (in thousand)	Percentage of Poor Population (%)
Lamongan	IDR. 419.309	166,82	13,86
Probolinggo	IDR. 451.395	223,32	18,91
Bojonegoro	IDR. 380.653	166,52	13,27
Bangkalan	IDR. 432.046	215,97	21,57

Source: Processed from East Java BPS data, and Regent's Decree on extreme poverty data (BPS, 2021)

The difference in poverty data in the four regions will be seen when compared with the number and percentage of poor people with data on recipients of extreme poverty rates in each regency/city recorded in the Regent's Decree.

Table 2: Extreme Poverty Based on Regent's Decree

Area	Total Population	Extremely poor	Extremely poor Percentage
Lamongan	166.820	1,191	0.7%
Probolinggo	223.320	3,672	1.6%
Bojonegoro	166.520	7,162	4.3%
Bangkalan	215.970	10,617	4.9%

Source: Processed from East Java BPS data, and Regent's Decree on extreme poverty data (BPS, 2021)

Income below the purchasing power parity standard with the monthly poverty line in the four regions shows an average figure below IDR 500,000 per month or equivalent with USD 34,8061.

Table 3: Poverty Line Data Version of The Central Statistics Agency among Regions

Area	Monthly income	Equal to
Lamongan	IDR. 419.309	USD 29.2371
Probolinggo	IDR. 451.395	USD 31.3951
Bojonegoro	IDR. 380.653	USD 26.4526
Bangkalan	IDR. 432.046	USD 30.0725
Average	**IDR. 420.850**	**USD 29.2963**

Source: Processed from East Java BPS data, and Regent's Decree on extreme poverty data (BPS, 2021)

The daily average of the poverty line data from the Central Statistics Agency version is IDR 14,028, equivalent to USD 0.9765. The SDGs version of extreme poverty has an

income below the purchasing power parity standard of USD 1.91 per day or equivalent to IDR 27,303.

According to the Central Statistics Agency's version, the poverty line occurs in almost all East Java regencies/cities, below IDR 500,000 per month. The data shows a disparity in the calculation of poverty standards from the Central Statistics Agency and the SDGs obtained were different.

Data from the Ministry of National Development Planning (PPN)/National Development Planning Agency (Bappenas) showed that the chronic poverty rate before the pandemic (2015-2019) experienced a downward trend, and the average decline is around 800 thousand people per year. Bappenas targets extreme poverty to decline significantly by the end of 2024, with a range of 0–1% or an estimated 3 million extremely poor people. Population data categorized below the extreme poverty line in Indonesia reaches 10.41% of the total population of as many as 27.5 million people (Said, 2022). Furthermore, the extremely poor category is 4% of the total population of as many as 10.86 people (tnp2k.go.id, 2021). This is a categorization issued by Bappenas as a reference in determining the character of the extremely poor.

The initial poverty data set by the Regent of each region refers to several provisions of laws and regional regulations, such as Regulation of the Minister of Home Affairs Number 32 of 2011 concerning Guidelines for Grants and Social Assistance Sourced from Regional Revenue and Expenditure Budgets (State Gazette of Indonesia Year 2011 Number 450) as amended several times, as well as Regulation of the Minister of Home Affairs 123 of 2018 (State Gazette of Indonesia of 2019 Number 15), Regulation of the Minister of Home Affairs Number 20 of 2020 concerning the Acceleration of Handling Corona Virus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) in Regional Governments, Minister of Social Affairs Regulation Number 3 of 2021 concerning integrated social welfare data management (Indonesian State Gazette of 2021, No. 578), and each relevant regional regulation. The regional head can decide the poor category through the decree and who is entitled to receive social assistance without involving the local village head.

Therefore, the poverty line standards per district are only half times smaller than the purchasing power parity standard that is the reference for extreme poverty. Through the Foster-Greer-Thorbecke (FGT Index) formula, it can be concluded that all data on the number of poor people in each district/city are essentially classified as extremely poor.

Poverty Data Accuracy Has an Impact on the Distribution of Social Assistance

As can be seen in Table 4, overlap and data validation always occur in the process of distributing social assistance.

Table 4: Extremely Poor Character

Variable	No	Extremely Poor Profile
Social Assistance	1	Around 69.8% of the extremely poor have received 1 social assistance program
	2	The extremely poor should receive the Family Hope Program (PKH) funds, necessities, education subsidy funds, electricity subsidies, LPG, and Contribution Assistance Recipients - National Health Insurance
Age group	1	Around 50.64% are in the young age group (<24 years)
Education level and Health	1	Highest education of Head of Household = Elementary School (41.4%), Did not pass Elementary School (28%)
	2	The high infant mortality rate
Work	1	46.91% working (informal sector 72.3%, formal sector 27.6%)
	2	The top three sectors of extremely poor work: Agriculture, Trade, Industry
Residence	1	61.4% live in the village
	2	38.6% live in cities
Basic infrastructure	1	42% of households do not have proper sanitation
	2	53% do not have access to proper drinking water

Source: National Socio-Economic Survey March 2020, Bappenas (Bappenas, 2020)

In 2021 assistance for social protection, Family Hope Program (PKH), Basic Food Card, Cash Social Assistance (BST), Pre-Employment Card, Direct Cash Assistance from Village Fund, and other assistance will reach IDR 157.41, IDR 28.71, IDR 45.12, IDR 12, IDR 20, IDR 14.4, and IDR 37.18 trillion (Kemenkeu, 2020; Nugroho, 2021; Pebrianto, 2021). Data on social assistance recipients in East Java is invalid and not integrated with the Family Identification Number (Merdeka, 2020) (Handayani, 2020). In the distribution of social assistance, the data used is inaccurate and not integrated (Wahyuni, 2021). Emil Dardak as deputy governor of East Java, stated that:

> *"There is still many overlapping data on social assistance recipients. There are 3.8 million families out of 5.2 million social assistance recipients from the Ministry of Social Affairs, whose assistance is stuck at IDR 200,000/month. In contrast, the 1.4 million from the ministry received IDR 600,000 per month for 3 months until December. It turns out that many Family Identification Numbers are entered into the social assistance recipient data. After checking the database, the Family Identification Number was not found because it was written or typed wrongly. Therefore, the question is, who receives this assistance?"* (Lidyana, 2020)

The overlapping of data collection has an impact on distribution. Coordination at the local government and ministry levels, as well as the Corruption Eradication Commission, are carried out to synergize aid (Candra, 2020). In the agricultural sector, the Ministry of Agriculture coordinates the Social Affairs and the Villages,

Development of Disadvantaged Regions, and Transmigration to verify data on the number of poor farmers (Saputra, 2021).

There are four bansos from the East Java Provincial Government, namely PKH plus assistance worth IDR 2,000,000/person/year, Compensation assistance for victims who died due to Covid-19 worth IDR 5,000,000,-/heirs, Social assistance for persons with disabilities worth IDR 3,600,000/person/year, and Social safety net assistance worth IDR 200,000,-/person with targets outside the recipients of Non-Cash Food Social Assistance (BPNT), BST, PKH, as well as Village Fund Direct Cash Assistance (BLTDD). During the pandemic, the government issued a policy of providing social assistance to affected communities. These include the assistance program from the Ministry of Social Affairs, consisting of food, basic food programs, bansos for families of hope, and BST for PKH, Beneficiary Families (KPM), Integrated Data on Social Welfare (DTKS) (non-PKH, and Non-Cash Food Aid) according to the regency/city proposal worth IDR 300,000,-/Beneficiary from January to July 2021, an additional 10 kg of rice social assistance for beneficiary families receiving PKH, BST, and BPNT, as well as 5 kg rice social assistance with targets outside DTKS (kominfo.jatimprov.go.id, 2021).

The accuracy of the recipients of social assistance depends on the accuracy of the data held by each ministry, social service, regional government, and village government. The problem of receiving aid occurs due to updating poverty data in the community.

The Accuracy of Poverty Data Has an Impact on the Country's Seriousness in Eradicating Extreme Poverty

According to the Indonesia Political Opinion (IPO) survey, 51.3% of the public felt that the social assistance provided by the government was not on target. A total of 29.9% considered it right on target, while 18.8% selected not to answer (Aditya, 2021). Vice President of Indonesia, K.H. Ma'ruf Amin, stated that:

> "*In 2022, the plan is to tackle extreme poverty in 212 districts/cities. Furthermore, it turns out that the city's 212 regencies, 147 of which are equal to 69.34%, are coastal areas. Social assistance is added to reduce the burden on the extremely poor and increase access to basic services, regional connectivity, and collaboration (required) to minimize poverty enclaves. The poverty rate in coastal areas is 4.19%, higher than the national average. About 12.5% or 1.3 million of the 10.86 million people of the extremely poor category are in coastal areas*" (kominfo.go.id, 2021).

Coordinating Minister for Human Development and Culture (Menko PMK) Muhadjir Effendy stated that:

> "*It is not enough to handle extreme poverty with social assistance schemes, but it should also be handled with an environmental approach. It was explained that people with extreme poverty tend to form groups and live in one slum area. According to Muhadjir, to eradicate extreme poverty, it is necessary to develop the region by building a livable environment*" (Kemenkopmk.go.id, 2021).

Studies from the London School of Economics and Political Science and the Australian National University stated that:

> "*The government needs to increase social assistance to protect the informal sector and the lower middle class as well as prevent unemployment in the formal sector. The loss of this sector could result in a domino effect. First, laid-off workers will enter the informal sector to compete with those who have possessed difficulties from the start. Second, low purchasing power due to unstable income will reduce the expenditure of these laid-off workers. As a result, there will be a reduction in the money meant for the informal sector*" (Permana & Fadly, 2021).

The PUSKAPA (Center on Child Protection and Wellbeing) study stated that the government's responsibility is strengthening social assistance and welfare protection. This is preceded by strengthening methods for identifying vulnerable individuals and data management:

> "*Not all vulnerable individuals are registered in the population administration system. This could hinder their access to services and assistance. In 2019, it was estimated that nearly 6 million children under 5 years old lacked birth certificates, and around 1 million elderly and 400,000 people with disabilities did not have a Population Identification Number (NIK). These two documents are interrelated because, for newborn individuals, the NIK will be issued together with the birth certificate. On the database side, individuals without NIK are most likely invisible to any system. Unregistered children may not be registered in the Family Card (KK). At the same time, the KK is the basis for data collection in most government programs, including social assistance*" (Febrianto et al., 2021).

Data collection and the determination of poor people, the poverty depth index, and the poverty severity index are serious problems in alleviating poverty (Fajriyah et al., 2016; Saefuddin et al., 2012). These require a more specific and accurate approach with the "one name one address" model and are connected to the global concept of SDGs, as conducted by the Ministry of Villages, Development of Disadvantaged Regions, and Transmigration (sdgsdesa.kemendesa.go.id, 2021; Shofihara, 2021). The Ministry of Village Data Center stated that 38% of the beneficiary groups are female heads of households (PEKKA). Meanwhile, the distribution mechanism is 87% cash and 13% transfers to Beneficiary Family (KPM) accounts (Iskandar, 2021). The beneficiary groups of social assistance in rural areas include:

Table 5: Beneficiary Groups of Social Assistance in Rural Areas

No	Occupation	%
1	Farmer	37,66%
2	Farm worker	21,40%
3	Fisherman	1,50%
4	Fishing worker	1,14%
5	Factory worker	1,28%
6	Teacher	0,28%
7	Seller and MSME	36,73%

Source: Source: Ministry of Village Data Center (Iskandar, 2021)

Discussion

Accuracy of Poverty Data and Decent Living Opportunities

Through national policies, developing countries place poverty alleviation on the main agenda (Wang et al., 2020). This includes empowering the poor and providing services for opportunities to live a more valuable life (Wong, 2012). The accuracy of data collection on low-income families is the key to determining poor individuals. One of the efforts for the accuracy and validity of the poor category is implemented through the program and human resource commitment (Arifah et al., 2020). In this context, the disparity in calculating different poverty standards has been obtained in a non-single way. This condition is increasingly losing control with the regional head being able to decide who is categorized as a low-income family without needing and involving the local village head. The determination control is based on the legality of the Minister of Home Affairs Regulation Number 32 of 2011 concerning Guidelines for Providing Grants and Social Assistance Sourced from Regional Revenue and Expenditure Budgets (State Gazette of Indonesia Year 2011 Number 450). This was amended several times, most recently by the Minister of Home Affairs Regulation Number 123 of 2018 (Indonesian State Gazette of 2019 Number 15); the Minister of Home Affairs Regulation Number 20 of 2020 concerning the Acceleration of Handling Corona Virus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) in Regional Governments; and the Minister of Social Affairs Regulation Number 3 of 2021 concerning integrated data management of social welfare (Indonesian State Gazette of 2021 Number 578).

The accuracy of data collection on poor individuals and families impacts the categorization of the poor. The number of poverty data on a regional, national, and international scale depends on the categorization of the accuracy. It depends on the indicators used in predicting community poverty (Benedetti et al., 2020; Herrero, 2017; Pienkhuntod et al., 2020; Siksnelyte-Butkiene et al., 2021; Susilowati, 2010). The Ministry of National Development Planning/National Development Planning Agency has set a standard based on purchasing power parity (PPP) set by the World Bank at USD 1.91 per capita per day. Therefore, when the dollar exchange rate is USD 1 = IDR 14,370 (as of December 12, 2021), individuals can be categorized as extremely with a daily income of less than IDR 27,303 per day or IDR 820,000/month. This assumption can be based on the need to buy food with a minimum standard calorie of 2100 kilo calories per day plus other basic non-food needs. Furthermore, when referring to regional head regulations, the average income is IDR 500,000 per month, equivalent to USD 34,8061. The Regent Decree in Lamongan, Bojonegoro, Bangkalan, and Probolinggo is 1191, 7162, 10,617 and 3672 people (Probolinggo), respectively.

The percentage of extremely poor people from each regency included in the data on beneficiaries is only around 0.7% to 4.9% (Table 2). The policy in determining the number of beneficiaries of extreme poverty also has inequality when viewed from the distribution of the beneficiary population. This is because the beneficiaries are only taken from 5 sub-districts and 5 villages each, with a total number of villages set at 25 per regency. Therefore, the number of extremely poor people is more than the data stated in the Regent Decree. The inequality is caused more by the uncertain use of the basic indicators and the dynamics of interests through regional head decrees.

SDGs Desa-Based Data Consolidation

The accuracy of poverty data seriously impacts determining the category of poor people and the distribution of social assistance. This is due to differences in data, overlap, and less accurate validation. Each institution has different data collection system standards and validity. Therefore, the result obtained is not the same and is not balanced. Data collection validity in the government system is important (Wilson, 2020) with the verification systems. Arham et al. (2019) stated that data on village potential originating from the National Statistics Agency and used to measure village progress is still far from accurate. There are still some problems related to scientific principles in extracting village data with a high level of accuracy and can be accounted for their validity. Moreover, updating is still far from expectations (Arham et al., 2019; Sjaf, 2018).

The Ministry of Villages, Development of Disadvantaged Regions, and Transmigration have an objective participatory data collection system. This system is stated in the Minister of Villages, Development of Disadvantaged Regions, and Transmigration Regulation Number 21 of 2021 concerning General Guidelines for Village Development and Community Empowerment.

Data is obtained and processed directly from the village, which is inputted by the volunteer working group (Wilson, 2020). It is self-measured at the village level, then collected for development as well as accumulated into regional and national indicators. Furthermore, data collection emphasizes citizenship (sisik melik warga). This system develops the importance of individuals, families, and small groups to increase development effectiveness.

Village sovereignty is shown starting from "data from the village", namely information collected from the government, neighborhoods, and families of villagers. Furthermore, "data by village" is realized by establishing the Village Data Collection Volunteer Working Group, namely data collectors from residents in the same neighborhood. This participatory census ensures data validity. Meanwhile, "data for the village" is realized by placing only guardians in the village, as well as information on neighborhoods and the village environment. SDGs Desa-based data on potential information, problems, and recommendations become the basis for development planning according to villagers' needs (Iskandar, 2021).

SDGs Desa-based data verification is carried out by collecting and comparing information from credible sources (the Central Statistics Agency Survey Results, Ministry Data). The data obtained is then analyzed to determine the level of differences. Consolidation is conducted when contradictory differences are found in some data. The stage is checking and updating the data directly to each village.

Targeted Social Assistance

The limited access of the poor is the root of the unresolved poverty problem (A. Fischer, 2002; Sen, 1976; Suharto, 2009). Social assistance is a supporting factor in alleviation since basic needs are not fulfilled. Targeted policies and government interventions are created from a multidimensional approach that will become more accurate in the distribution of social assistance (Carr, 2008). In this context, it arises

from data inequality in low-income families, and verifying the accuracy is considered difficult. According to the Central Statistics Agency, the regional head's decree that sets the percentage between 0.7% to 4.9% is insufficient compared to the poverty data. This fact has been verified with findings in the field in some extremely low-income families who have difficulty accessing the information on receiving social assistance.

Poverty related to basic needs is caused by a lack of facilities, access to some social standards, or minimum subsistence and norms for survival (A. M. Fischer, 2018). Without monitoring and validating data collection in the field, the accuracy of the information in rural areas has opened up opportunities for loss of control over the distribution of social assistance. The data collection overlap factor causes the beneficiaries to fall on the wrong recipients. This condition proves that in the process of distributing basic rights, access, and social assistance in alleviating poverty, data accuracy and tiered control are needed, hence aid can be right on target.

Billing the Government's Role

From the survey agency, 51.3% of the public assumes that the social assistance provided by the government is not on target (Aditya, 2021). The responsibility of the social assistance and the government is to strengthen the welfare protection system. The system is preceded by strengthening the methods of identifying vulnerable individuals and data management (Febrianto et al., 2021). The distribution of social assistance is still considered to be off-target (Saputra, 2021). In this context, data collection without verification of recipients can be a reason to question the seriousness of the state in alleviating poverty. Meanwhile, the poverty rate in rural and coastal areas needs to be re-assessed for accuracy. Dynamic poverty has urged the government's vital role in regularly updating existing data before distributing it to the rightful parties.

In the process, collecting poverty data and determining the category of extremely poor requires a more specific and accurate approach with the "one name one address" model and connected to the global concept of SDGs, as accomplished by the Ministry of Villages, Development of Disadvantaged Regions, and Transmigration (PDTT) (sdgsdesa.kemendesa.go.id, 2021; Shofihara, 2021). However, using the "one name one address" method does not apply to data collection on access and social assistance rights distribution when using a regional head decree. This means the seriousness of the state in alleviating poverty, apart from referring to the categorization of low-income families, data validation and verification of recipients also demands intense control over the novelty of poor families in the field. Through this process, the seriousness of the state in alleviating and reducing extreme poverty can be more effective and efficient.

Conclusions

This study confirmed the data consolidation model based on SDGs, which the Ministry of Villages started, PDTT related to the verification and validation approach. The existing data gaps promote open analysis of the interests of local elites in social

assistance. This study provides scientific contributions to the field of social sciences, particularly sociology and development studies. Finally, it has limitations in several aspects; first, of the five regions that became the pilot project for poverty alleviation, only four were taken from these areas. Second, there is a lack of in-depth analysis of the rural political economy, and the use of temporary data can change. Therefore, further study is needed to accommodate knowledge about disparities in poverty data collection through various approaches, such as minority groups and gender.

Acknowledgements

Funding

Declaration of conflicting interests

The authors declare no conflicting interests.

References

Aditya, N. R. (2021). *Survei IPO Sebut Program Bansos Tunai Tak Tepat Sasaran, KSP Sebut Jokowi Langsung Turun Mengecek*. Nasional.Kompas.Com. https://nasional. kompas.com/read/2021/04/10/16265271/survei-ipo-sebut-program-bansos-tunai-tak-tepat-sasaran-ksp-sebut-jokowi?page=all

Agnia Dwi Khasanah, & R.A.E Virgana Targa Sapanji. (2021). Implementation of Geographic Information System for District and City Poverty Data Distribution Using the Rational Unified Process in West Java. *Journal of Computing Research and Innovation*. https://doi.org/10.24191/jcrinn.v6i2.185

Agusta, I. (2020). *Tanggapan atas Penelitian Smeru: BLT Dana Desa Sebagai Penanganan Dampak Pandemi Covid-19* (Tanggapan Catatan Penelitian Smeru). https://smeru.or.id/sites/default/files/events/covidwebinar3_20200717_ivanov ich.pptx.

Ahamed, T., Takigawa, T., Koike, M., Hossain, M. M., Huq, M. M., & Faruk, M. O. (2006). Assessment of energy status for irrigation technology in Bangladesh: A GIS approach. *Energy*, *31*(14), 3017–3040. https://doi.org/10.1016/ j.energy.2005.11.011

Alam, K. (2018). Poverty reduction through enabling factors. *World Journal of Science, Technology and Sustainable Development*, *34*(1), 1–5. https://doi.org/ 10.1108/WJSTSD-07-2016-0049

Alatas, V., Banerjee, A., Hanna, R., Olken, B. A., & Tobias, J. (2012). Targeting the poor: Evidence from a field experiment in Indonesia. *American Economic Review*, *102*(4), 1206–1240. https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.102.4.1206

Arham, I., Sjaf, S., & Darusman, D. (2019). Strategi Pembangunan Pertanian Berkelanjutan di Pedesaan Berbasis Citra Drone (Studi Kasus Desa Sukadamai Kabupaten Bogor). *Jurnal Ilmu Lingkungan*, *17*(2), 245. https://doi.org/10.14710/jil.17.2.245-255

Arifah, U., Suwitri, S., Larasati, E., & Yuwanto. (2020). Contributing factors: implementation of poor population data collection. *Management and Entrepreneurship: Trends of Development*, *2*(12), 59–73. https://doi.org/10.26661/2522-1566/2020-2/12-05

Arulpragasam, J., Alatas, V., Aran, M., Macpherson, K., McCulloch, N., Nachuk, S., Packard, T., Plummer, J., Pradhan, M., & Timmer, P. (2007). *Era Baru dalam Pengentasan Kemiskinan di Indonesia*. World Bank. https://documents1.worldbank.org/curated/en/897131468038955494/pdf/373490v10revis1100PA0Report0English.pdf

Bappenas. (2020). *Perkembangan Ekonomi Makro Maret 2020*. https://perpustakaan.bappenas.go.id/e-library/file_upload/koleksi/migrasi-data-publikasi/file/Unit_Kerja/Deputi_Bidang_Ekonomi/Direktorat-Perencanaan-Makro-dan-Analisis-Statistik/Bulanan/Perkembangan Ekonomi Makro Bulan Maret 2020.pdf

Barder, O. (2009). *What Is Poverty Reduction?* (No. 170; Issue 170). https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.1394506

Benedetti, I., Crescenzi, F., & Laureti, T. (2020). Measuring uncertainty for poverty indicators at regional level: The case of mediterranean countries. *Sustainability (Switzerland)*. https://doi.org/10.3390/su12198159

Blumenstock, J. E. (2016). Fighting poverty with data. *Science*. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aah5217

BPS. (2021). *Jumlah Penduduk Miskin menurut Kabupaten/Kota di Jawa Timur (Ribu Jiwa), 2019-2021*. Badan Pusat Statistik Jawa Timur. https://jatim.bps.go.id/indicator/23/421/1/jumlah-penduduk-miskin-menurut-kabupaten-kota-di-jawa-timur.html

BPS. (2022). *Persentase Penduduk Miskin September 2021 turun menjadi 9,71 persen*. Bps.Go.Id. https://www.bps.go.id/pressrelease/2022/01/17/1929/persentase-penduduk-miskin-september-2021-turun-menjadi-9-71-persen.html#:~:text=Jumlah penduduk miskin pada September,60 persen pada September 2021.

Buheji, M. (2019). Re-Defining Our Approaches To Extreme Poverty: an Attempt To Disrupting Contemporary Poverty Alleviation Approaches Through Inspiration Economy Project- a Case Study. *International Journal of Economics and Financial Issues*, *9*(4), 80–89. https://doi.org/10.32479/ijefi.8053

Candra, S. A. (2020). *Tindak Lanjuti Tumpang Tindih Penerima Bansos, Wagub Jatim Emil Dardak Rakor dengan KPK*. TribunJatim.Com. https://jatim.tribunnews.com/2020/06/29/tindak-lanjuti-tumpang-tindih-penerima-bansos-wagub-emil-dardak-rakor-dengan-kpk

Carr, E. (2008). Rethinking poverty alleviation: A "poverties" approach. *Development in Practice*, *18*(6), 726–734. https://doi.org/10.1080/09614520802386363

Chambers, R. (1994). Participatory rural appraisal (PRA): Challenges, potentials and paradigm. *World Development*, *22*(10), 1437–1454. https://doi.org/10.1016/0305-750X(94)90030-2

Chambers, R. (2006). Participatory Mapping and Geographic Information Systems: Whose Map? Who is Empowered and Who Disempowered? Who Gains and Who Loses? *The Electronic Journal of Information Systems in Developing Countries*, *25*(1), 1–11. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1681-4835.2006.tb00163.x

Cornwall, A. (2008). Unpacking "Participation" Models, meanings and practices. *Community Development Journal*, *43*(3), 269–283. https://doi.org/10.1093/cdj/bsn010

Dibaba, S. D. (2019). Human Rights, Poverty Reduction, and Environment: Are They Complementary or Competing Concepts? *International Affairs and Global Strategy*, *71*, 8–17. https://doi.org/10.7176/IAGS

Dollar, D., & Kraay, A. (2000). *Trade , Growth , and Poverty* (Poverty and the International Economy, Issue Poverty and the International Economy).

Edwards, M. (2011). *The Oxford Handbook of Civil Society* (M. Edwards (ed.)). Oxford University Press.

Effendi, G. N., Purnomo, E. P., & Malawani, A. D. (2020). Cash For Work? Extreme Poverty Solutions Based on Sustainable Development. *Jejak*, *13*(2), 381–394. https://doi.org/10.15294/jejak.v13i2.25448

Fajriyah, N., Rahayu, P., Statistika, J., Matematika, F., Alam, P., Teknologi, I., Nopember, S., Arief, J., Hakim, R., & Indonesia, S. (2016). Pemodelan Faktor-Faktor yang Mempengaruhi Kemiskinan Kabupaten / Kota di Jawa Timur Menggunakan Regresi Data Panel. *SAINS DAN SENI ITS*, *5*(1). https://doi.org/DOI: 10.12962/j23373520.v5i1.14368

Febrianto, R., Adhi, A. A., Agastya, N. L. P. M., & Kusumaningrum, S. (2021). *Bansos Tak Cukup Atasi Dampak COVID-19, Saatnya Pemerintah Perkuat Sistem Perlindungan dan Kesejahteraan Sosial*. Theconversation.Com. https://theconversation.com/bansos-tak-cukup-atasi-dampak-covid-19-saatnya-pemerintah-perkuat-sistem-perlindungan-dan-kesejahteraan-sosial-158432

Fischer, A. (2002). Poverty by Design : The Economics of Discrimination in Tibet. In *Canada Tibet Committee* (Issue August). https://www.researchgate.net/publication/37245382_Poverty_by_Design_The_Economics_of_Discrimination_in_Tibet/link/5666d56708ae192bbf92b236/download

Fischer, A. M. (2018). *Poverty As Ideology: Rescuing Social Justice From Global Development Agendas*. Zed Books.

Gnangnon, S. K. (2021). Poverty volatility and poverty in developing countries. *Ecoomic Affairs*, *41*, 84–95. https://doi.org/10.1111/ecaf.12445

Handayani, M. (2020). *Pembagian Bansos Berantakan, Emil Dardak Akui Data Penerima Tak Valid*. Voi.Id. https://voi.id/berita/11062/pembagian-bansos-berantakan-emil-dardak-akui-data-penerima-tak-valid

Herrero, S. T. (2017). Energy poverty indicators: A critical review of methods. *Indoor and Built Environment*. https://doi.org/10.1177/1420326X17718054

Ibrahim, H., Liu, X., Zariffa, N., Morris, A. D., & Denniston, A. K. (2021). Health data poverty: an assailable barrier to equitable digital health care. In *The Lancet Digital Health*. https://doi.org/10.1016/S2589-7500(20)30317-4

Iskandar, A. H. (2020). *SDGs Desa: Accelerating The Achievement Of National Sustainable Development Goals*. Yayasan Pustaka Obor Indonesia.

Iskandar, A. H. (2021). *Pejalanan Desa: Daerah Tertinggal, dan Transmigrasi 2021*.

Kemendes PDTT. (2021). *Kontribusi BUMDES Tingkatkan Ekonomi Desa Hingga Tuntaskan Kemiskinan Ekstrim*. Www.Kemendesa.Go.Id. https://www.kemendesa.go.id/berita/view/detil/3991/kontribusi-bumdes-tingkatkan-ekonomi-desa-hingga-tuntaskan-kemiskinan-ekstrim

Kemenkeu. (2020). *BLT Desa Tak Boleh Tumpang Tindih*. Kemenkeu.Go.Id. https://www.kemenkeu.go.id/publikasi/berita/blt-desa-tak-boleh-tumpang-tindih/

Kemenkopmk.go.id. (2021). *Menko PMK, Pengentasan Miskin Ekstrim, Tak Cukup dengan Bansos*. Www.Kemenkopmk.Go.Id. https://www.kemenkopmk.go.id/menko-pmk-pengentasan-miskin-ekstrim-tak-cukup-dengan-bansos

kominfo.go.id. (2021). *Pemerintah Targetkan Hapus Kemiskinan Ekstrim di Wilayah Pesisir*. Kominfo.Go.Id. https://kominfo.go.id/content/detail/38902/pemerintah-targetkan-hapus-kemiskinan-ekstrim-di-wilayah-pesisir/0/berita

kominfo.jatimprov.go.id. (2021). *Kadinsos Jatim : Ada 4 Program Bansos dari Pemprov Jatim*. Kominfo.Jatimprov.Go.Id. https://kominfo.jatimprov.go.id/read/umum/kadinsos-jatim-ada-4-program-bansos-dari-pemprov-jatim

Kraay, A. (2006). When is growth pro-poor? Evidence from a panel of countries. *Journal of Development Economics*, *80*(1), 198–227. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdeveco.2005.02.004

Kurniawan, A. (2020a). *Bantuan Langsung Tunai-Dana Desa Untuk Menangani Dampak Pandemi Covid-19: Cerita Dari Desa* (No. 4; Catatan Penelitian Smeru, Issue 4). https://smeru.or.id/sites/default/files/publication/cp04_covidblt_in.pdf

Kurniawan, A. (2020b). *BLT-Dana Desa Sebagai Upaya Mitigasi Dampak Ekonomi Pandemi Covid-19* (No. 4; Catatan Penelitian Smeru). https://smeru.or.id/sites/default/files/events/covidwebinar3_20200717_asep.pdf

Lakner, C., Mahler, D. G., Negre, M., & Prydz, E. B. (2020). How Much Does Reducing Inequality Matter for Global Poverty? In *Global Poverty Monitoring Technical Note 13* (Issue June). World Bank Group. https://doi.org/10.1596/33902

Leidig, M., & Teeuw, R. M. (2015). Quantifying and mapping global data poverty. *PLoS ONE*. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0142076

Lidyana, V. (2020). *Emil Dardak Ungkap Data Penerima Bansos Masih Tumpang Tindih*. Finance.Detik.Com. https://finance.detik.com/berita-ekonomi-bisnis/d-5129829/emil-dardak-ungkap-data-penerima-bansos-masih-tumpang-tindih

Ludwig, T. (2017). The Key to Engaging with the SDGs: Utilizing Rio Principle 10 to Successfully Implement the U.N. Sustainable Development Goals. *Sustainable Development Law & Policy*, *16*(2), 26–48. https://digitalcommons.wcl.american.edu/sdlp/vol16/iss2/7/

Mahembe, E., & Odhiambo, N. M. (2018). The Dynamics of Extreme Poverty in Developing Countries. *Studia Universitatis „Vasile Goldis" Arad – Economics Series*, *28*(2), 18–35. https://doi.org/10.2478/sues-2018-0007

McCall, M. K. (2003). Seeking good governance in participatory-GIS: A review of processes and governance dimensions in applying GIS to participatory spatial planning. *Habitat International*, *27*(4), 549–573. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0197-3975(03)00005-5

Mccall, M. K., & Dunn, C. E. (2012). Geo-information tools for participatory spatial planning: Fulfilling the criteria for "good" governance? *Geoforum*, *43*(1), 81–94. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2011.07.007

Merdeka. (2020). *Emil Dardak Akui Ada Data Penerima Bansos dengan NIK Tak Valid*. Merdeka.Com. https://www.merdeka.com/uang/emil-dardak-akui-ada-data-penerima-bansos-fiktif-di-daerah.html

Miranti, R. (2017). Understanding the Relationships between Development Factors and Regional Poverty : What Have We Learned from Indonesia ? Understanding the Relationships between Development Factors and Regional Poverty : What Have We Learned from Indonesia ? *Journal of Poverty*, *00*(00), 1–25. https://doi.org/10.1080/10875549.2017.1348420

Nain, U. (2019). *Pembangunan Desa Dalam Perspektif Sosiohistoris* (M. Faisal (ed.)). Garis Khatulistiwa.

Neuman, W. L. (1991). *Social Research Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*. Allyn and Bacon.

Nugroho, A. (2021). *Pengamat UGM: Penyaluran Bansos Jangan Tumpang Tindih*. Ugm.Ac.Id. https://ugm.ac.id/id/berita/21411-pengamat-ugm-penyaluran-bansos-jangan-tumpang-tindih

Oktavianti, H., Smail, M., & Yustika, A. E. (2010). Strategi Penanggulangan Kemiskinan: Pendekatan Tindakan Kolektif (Collective Action) Pada Petani Di Desa Tretes Kecamatan Pujon Kabupaten Malang. *MediaTrend*, *5*(1), 17–41. https://doi.org/DOI: 10.21107/mediatrend.v5i1.1789

Pantel, P., Philpot, A., & Hovy, E. (2005). Data alignment and integration [US government. *Computer*. https://doi.org/10.1109/mc.2005.406

Pebrianto, F. (2021). *Bappenas Akui Data Penerima Bantuan Pemerintah Kerap Tumpang Tindih*. Bisnis.Tempo.Co. https://bisnis.tempo.co/read/1437932/bappenas-akui-data-penerima-bantuan-pemerintah-kerap-tumpang-tindih/full&view=ok

Permana, M. Y., & Fadly, F. (2021). *Dua Alasan Mengapa Pemerintah Perlu Menambah Bantuan Sosial Tahun 2021 Bukan Malah Memotongnya*. Theconversation.Com. https://theconversation.com/dua-alasan-mengapa-pemerintah-perlu-menambah-bantuan-sosial-tahun-2021-bukan-malah-memotongnya-156313

Pienkhuntod, A., Amornbunchornvei, C., & Nantharath, P. (2020). Quantitative analysis of poverty indicators: The case of Khon Kaen Province, Thailand. *Journal of Asian Finance, Economics and Business*. https://doi.org/10.13106/jafeb.2020.vol7.no2.131

Pudjianto, B., & Syawie, M. (2015). Kemiskinan Dan Pembangunan Manusia. *Sosio Informa*, *1*(03), 231–246. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.33007/inf.v1i3.167

Saefuddin, A., Wigena, A. H., & Nuryartono, N. (2012). Pengembangan dan Aplikasi Geoinformatika Bayesian pada Data Kemiskinan di Indonesia (Studi Kasus Jawa Timur) (Bayesian Geoinformatics Development and Aplication on Poverty Data in Indonesia (Study Case East Java)). *Jurnal Ilmu Pertanian Indonesia*, *17*(2), 77–82.

Said, A. A. (2022). *Jumlah Penduduk Miskin Turun Jadi 26,5 Juta Orang pada September 2021*. Katadata.Co.Id. https://katadata.co.id/agustiyanti/finansial/61e5085f4546a/jumlah-penduduk-miskin-turun-jadi-26-5-juta-orang-pada-september-2021

Saputra, D. (2021). *Kemenkeu Soroti Tumpang Tindih Data Petani Penerima Bantuan Pemerintah*. Ekonomi.Bisnis.Com. https://ekonomi.bisnis.com/read/20210330/

9/1374599/kemenkeu-soroti-tumpang-tindih-data-petani-penerima-bantuan-pemerintah

sdgsdesa.kemendesa.go.id. (2021). *Pendataan SDGs Desa 2021*. Sdgsdesa.Kemendesa. Go.Id. https://sdgsdesa.kemendesa.go.id/pemutakhiran-data-sdgs-desa/

Seidman, A., & Seidman, R. B. (2011). Instrumentalism 2.0: Legislative Drafting for Democratic Social Change. *Legisprudence*, *5*(1), 95–142. https://doi.org/10.5235/175214611796404831

Sen, A. (1976). Pover ty: An Ordinal Approach to Measurement. *Econometrica*, *44*(2), 219–231. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.2307/1912718

Shofihara, I. J. (2021). *Demi Capai Tujuan SDGs Desa, Kemendesa PDTT Lakukan Pendataan Besar-besaran*. Nasional.Kompas.Com. https://nasional.kompas.com/read/2021/11/26/19130871/demi-capai-tujuan-sdgs-desa-kemendesa-pdtt-lakukan-pendataan-besar-besaran?page=all

Shrestha, R., Köckler, H., Flacke, J., Martinez, J., & van Maarseveen, M. (2017). Interactive knowledge co-production and integration for healthy urban development. *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, *9*(11). https://doi.org/10.3390/su9111945

Siksnelyte-Butkiene, I., Streimikiene, D., Lekavicius, V., & Balezentis, T. (2021). Energy poverty indicators: A systematic literature review and comprehensive analysis of integrity. *Sustainable Cities and Society*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scs.2021.102756

Sjaf, S. (2018). Pembangunan Pertanian Berkelanjutan dan Socio Culture. *Pembangunan Pertanian Berkelanjutan Berbasis Sumberdaya Lokal Pembangunan*, *9*(2), 15–27. http://www.ejurnal.unisri.ac.id/index.php/innofarm/article/viewFile/28/2

SMERU. (2004). *Understanding The Poor* (No. 11; Issue 11). www.smeru.or.id

Suharto, E. (2009). Menengok Kriteria Kemiskinan Di Indonesia: Menimbang Indikator Kemiskinan Berbasis Hak. *Jurnal Analisis Sosial*, *14*(2), 31–39.

Sukmana, O. (2018). Strategi Percepatan Pertumbuhan Lapangan Kerja Dan Pengentasan Kemiskinan Melalui Kebijakan Pengembangan Pariwisata. *Sosio Informa*, *4*(03), 488–500. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.33007/inf.v4i3.1570

Suryahadi, A., & Al Izzati, R. (2018). Cards for the poor and funds for Villages: Jokowi's initiatives to reduce poverty and inequality. *Journal of Southeast Asian Economies*, *35*(2), 200–222. https://doi.org/10.1355/ae35-2f

Suryahadi, A., Al Izzati, R., & Suryadarma, D. (2020). Estimating the Impact of Covid-19 on Poverty in Indonesia*. *Bulletin of Indonesian Economic Studies*, 175–192. https://doi.org/10.1080/00074918.2020.1779390

Suryono, A. (2010). *Dimensi-dimensi Prima Teori Pembangunan*. Universitas Brawijaya Press.

Susilowati, S. H. (2010). The Equivalent Scale Approach to Measure Poverty Level. *Forum Penelitian Agro Ekonomi*, *28*(2), 91–105. https://doi.org/DOI: 10.21082/fae.v28n2.2010.91-105

Swastika, D. K. S., & Supriyatna, Y. (2008). The Characteristics Of Poverty and Its Alleviation In Indonesia. *FORUM PENELITIAN AGRO EKONOMI*, *26*(2), 103–115. https://doi.org/DOI: 10.21082/fae.v26n2.2008.103-115

tnp2k.go.id. (2021). *Pengurangan Kemiskinan Ekstrem di 7 Provinsi dan 35 Kabupaten Prioritas Tahun 2021*. Http://Tnp2k.Go.Id/. http://tnp2k.go.id/acceleration-policies/pengurangan-kemiskinan-ekstrem-di-7-provinsi-dan-35-kabupaten-prioritas-tahun-2021

Toye, J. (2007). Poverty reduction. *Development in Practice*, *17*(4–5), 505–510. https://doi.org/10.1080/09614520701469427

Wade, R. H. (2004). Is globalization reducing poverty and inequality? *World Development*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2003.10.007

Wahyuni, D. (2021). Permasalahan Penyaluran Bantuan Sosial dalam Masa Pemberlakuan Pembatasan Kegiatan Masyarakat. *Bidang Kesejahteraan Sosial*, *XII*(15), 13–18. https://berkas.dpr.go.id/puslit/files/info_singkat/Info Singkat-XIII-15-I-P3DI-Agustus-2021-218.pdf

Wang, H., Zhao, Q., Bai, Y., Zhang, L., & Yu, X. (2020). Poverty and Subjective Poverty in Rural China. *Social Indicators Research*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-020-02303-0

Wilson, C. (2020). The socialization of civic participation norms in government?: Assessing the effect of the Open Government Partnership on countries' e-participation. *Government Information Quarterly*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2020.101476

Wong, S. Y. (2012). *Understanding Poverty: Comparing Basic Needs Approach and Capability Approach*. https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2066179