

## Conference

# Realizing a Village Without Poverty: The Challenges of Implementing the Village SDGs Policy in Indragiri Hilir Regency, Riau Province

**Muammar Alkadafi**

Department of State Administration, Faculty of Economics and Social Sciences, Sultan Syarif Kasim State Islamic University, Riau

**ORCID**

Muammar Alkadafi: 0000-0002-8004-4171

**Abstract.** Indragiri Hilir Regency is an autonomous region in Riau Province, which in 2020 had the second highest level of poverty in the region (13.10%). This level of poverty was not directly proportional to the wealth of natural resources in the village. The purpose of this study was to determine the contribution of development and village empowerment programs in alleviating poverty and the challenges of realizing SDG goal 1 in the Indragiri Regency. Qualitative research methods were used and data were collected through a literature review of related studies and reports on the achievements of the SDGs program. The results showed that the village government could not carry out the tasks and functions of empowering the poor in their village. Empowerment programs carried out by local governments did not focus on strengthening the capacity of the poor.

Corresponding Author:

Muammar Alkadafi; email:  
muamar@uin-suska.ac.id

Published 15 March 2022

Publishing services provided by  
Knowledge E**Keywords:** challenges, policy implementation, village SDGs, poor community

© Muammar Alkadafi. This article is distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution License](#), which permits unrestricted use and redistribution provided that the original author and source are credited.

Selection and Peer-review under the responsibility of the IAPA Conference Committee.

## 1. Introduction

The big problem faced by the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia since its independence on August 17, 1945, until now is the life of its people who are on the poverty line. Various central and regional government interventions in the form of public policies to address poverty problems, especially the poverty problem of the people left in rural areas. BPS data shows that from 1970 until now (45 years) poverty is still quite high. If we look at the changing conditions of poverty reduction since the reform era, we start from 1999 until now in 2021 (22 years). In 1999 the poor population in the village was 32.33 million (26.03%), in March 2021 the poor population in the village was 15.37 million (13.10%). Central Bureau of Statistics (BPS) 2021. Seen from the average reduction in the poverty rate in rural areas from 1999 to 2021 (22 years) it decreased by an average of 0.77% per year (26.03%-13.10%). This means that poverty is still eating away at the people in rural areas, the average number of poor people is reduced by less than 1% per year. The ideals of an independent Indonesian nation are to realize general welfare, thus the State/government must be responsible for alleviating poverty.

**OPEN ACCESS**

The poverty alleviation policy has been implemented by the government and absolutely must be done. The problem lies not in whether or not poverty alleviation is carried out, but how poverty alleviation policies are carried out in the right way to provide efficient and effective results (1).

Thus, what is the right format for poverty alleviation in Indonesia? The concept offered globally by the world organization, the United Nations, through a High-Level Conference (KTT) which was attended by 189 member countries agreed and declared the concept of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) revising the concept of international development goals (International Development Goals). The MDGs concept has 8 goals, 18 targets, and 48 indicators to be achieved by 2015. Indonesia is one of the countries that signed and committed to achieving the MDGs goals by 2015. The substance of the MDG's goals and targets is reflected in the National Development Program (Propenas), and accommodated in the RPJMN and RPJPN documents (2). The first goal and target of the MDGs is poverty alleviation. The results of the implementation of achieving the MDGs by many countries are not very encouraging, even though Indonesia is said to be one of the countries that have achieved the MDGs (2). In 2015, at the end of the implementation of the MDGs, the United Nations together with member countries declared a new concept called Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), a global development agenda that contains 17 goals and 169 targets. The first goal of the new concept of SDGs which includes social, economic, and environmental dimensions is "without poverty", meaning that people are free from poverty. Indonesia's commitment to implementing the new concept of SDGs is the issuance of Presidential Regulation of the Republic of Indonesia Number 5 of 2017 concerning the implementation of achieving sustainable development goals (SDGs). The contents of the Presidential Regulation contain, the first goal of the SDGs is "without poverty" which means that there is no poverty in any form throughout Indonesia (2).

National SDGs implementation is integrated into all government policies and programs across ministries, institutions, and local governments (Provincial and Regency/City). Specifically, the Ministry of Villages, Development of Disadvantaged Regions and Transmigration (Kemendes, PDTT) adopts the concept of SDGs globally, the implementation of SDGs nationally is the priority policy agenda of the Ministry of Villages, Development of Disadvantaged Regions and Transmigration to achieve sustainable development goals at the lowest locality level, the spearhead of Indonesia's development, namely villages and rural areas. Halim Iskandar as the Minister of Villages for Development of Disadvantaged Regions and Transmigration of the Indonesian People in 2020 declared and set priorities for the use of village funds (DD), as the

implementation of Law no. 6 of 2014 concerning villages, into the concept of Village SDGs. Iskandar, 2020 stated that the purpose of the Village SDGs is to accelerate the implementation of the national SDGs goals. The SDGs goals globally have 17 goals, all of which were adopted and added 1 goal, so that it becomes 18 goals of the Village SDGs concept. The following presents the goals of the global SDGs and the Village SDGs in Indonesia.

TABLE 1: Goals of SDGs and Village SDGs

Number	SDGs	Number	Village SDGs
1	No Poverty	1	Village Without Poverty
2	No Hunger	2	Village Without Hunger
3	Healthy and Prosperous Life	3	Healthy and Prosperous Village
4	Quality Education	4	Quality Village Education
5	Gender equality	5	Involvement of Village Women
6	Clean Water and Proper Sanitation	6	Villages with Clean Water and Sanitation
7	Clean and Affordable Energy	7	Clean and Renewable Energy Village
8	Decent Work and Economic Growth	8	Village Economic Growth Even
9	Industry, Innovation, and Infrastructure	9	Village Infrastructure and Innovation as Needed
10	Less Gap	10	Gap Village
11	Sustainable Cities and Settlements	11	Safe and Comfortable Village Residential Area
12	Sustainable Consumption and Production	12	Environmentally Conscious Village Consumption and Production
13	Handling Climate Change	13	Villages Responding to Climate Change
14	Ocean Ecosystem	14	Marine Environment Care Village
15	Mainland Ecosystem	15	Land Environment Care Village
16	Peace, Justice, and Strong Institutions	16	Village of Justice and Peace
17	Partnership to Achieve Goals	17	Partnership for Village Development
		18	Dynamic Village Institutions and Adaptive Village Culture

Source: Iskandar, 2020

The Ministry of National Development Planning/BAPPENAS, 2017 stated that the goal of SDG 1 is to end poverty in all its forms, the first target of achieving goal 1 of SDGs by 2030 is to eradicate extreme poverty for all people who currently earn less than US\$1.25 per day. According to BPS, the poor are the inability from an economic point of view to meet the basic needs of food and non-food which are measured from the expenditure

side. People who have expenses for food and not food worth Rp. 370,950.00 per month or Rp. 12,365.00 per day, it is called a poor person. So people whose expenses are above this figure are categorized as not poor. According to Nurcholis, 2018 said people whose expenses were Rp. 370,950.00 per month or Rp. 12,365.00 per day is no longer called poor, but destitute in the sense that his life is far from a decent standard of living. Furthermore, the BAPPENAS report, 2019 on achieving SDGs 1 mentions the decline in the extreme poverty rate in Indonesia in 2009 (18.43%) to (2.7%) in 2019 based on the results of the purchasing power parity (PPP) assessment of USD 1.9 per capita/ day (World Bank). According to Iskandar, 2021 from the results of the Village SDGs data collection, the characteristics of extreme poverty are elderly, living alone, not working, disabled, having chronic/chronic diseases, uninhabitable houses, not having clean water, and adequate sanitation facilities.

To achieve the goals of the SDGs, there are 4 (four) development pillars that are the focus of implementation, namely the pillars of social, economic, environmental, and legal development and governance (3). Related to the concept of social and economic development, (4) views economic development and social development as two things that are integrated. Social development is economic development, social development is a good economic condition of a society, the fundamental goal of economic development is not economic growth, but the advancement of human welfare, which is what is often called human development or social development. So the real development goal is only one, namely human welfare. Thus social development is human development itself. Thus, the implementation of the SDGs goals on a national macro scale, as well as on a village micro-scale (locality) is human development itself. The implementation of the SDGs in the world from the results of research studies by experts has been revealed. First, to realize the goal of SDGs 1 (without poverty) is through structural changes based on the new economic structural economy. To make a country's economy competitive in the market, infrastructure and institutions that reduce transaction costs must also be appropriate. The state is responsible for infrastructure and institutional improvements (5). Second, the study (6) mentions that achieving the SDGs in the social and economic fields in Sukamantri village, Bogor, West Java, is categorized as less. This means that sustainable development to free poverty in Sukamantri Village has not been achieved. The natural wealth in Sukamantri Village has not been managed to achieve the fulfillment of quality basic human rights in a fair and equal manner. Third, the study (7) concluded that achieving the goals of SDGs 1 and 2, namely ending poverty and hunger in developing countries, depends on the development of the agricultural sector, and that requires foreign assistance provided

to host countries. Fourth, according to data from the Ministry of Villages, Development of Disadvantaged Regions, and Transmigration of the Republic of Indonesia, that the status of villages in Indonesia at this time, has undergone many changes based on a survey conducted through the Developing Village Index (IDM). The following is the status of villages in Indonesia.

TABLE 2: Village Status in Indonesia

Number	Village Status	Amount
1	Independent	3.269
2	Proceed	15.321
3	Develop	38.083
4	Left behind	12.635
5	Very Lagging	5.649

Source: Kemendes PDTT, 2021.

Through the Village Building Index (IDM) with variables assessing social, economic, and environmental resilience. The Ministry of Villages, Development of Disadvantaged Regions, and Transmigration of the Republic of Indonesia stated that the allocation of Village Funds from 2015 to 2021 has succeeded in reducing poverty in rural Indonesia.

## 2. Research Methods

This study intends to explore the challenges of the Indragiri Hilir Regency Government in realizing the goals of the Global, National, and Local Village SDGs programmed by the Ministry of Villages, Development of Disadvantaged Regions, and Transmigration of the Republic of Indonesia. The study also explores China's progress in poverty alleviation in achieving the SDGs goals, which Indonesia can learn, especially Indragiri Hilir Regency in implementing village development programs through the Desa Maju Inhil Jaya program. This study uses secondary data obtained from the publications of the Central Statistics Agency of the Republic of Indonesia and Indragiri Hilir Regency, the Developing Village Index (IDM) of the Ministry of Villages, Development of Disadvantaged Regions and Transmigration of the Republic of Indonesia. According to Szaboand and Strang (1997), secondary data using existing data or published from various data sources can be collected from databases and internet sites, and publication of scientific articles from various national and international journals. This study follows a qualitative research approach, qualitative approach researchers have the option to select their data relevant to the chosen topic. In addition, qualitative data helps to ensure that the researcher uses coherent data and that the information collected does help to solve

problems (8). The data were analyzed by content analysis to understand the conditions for achieving SDGs goal I in Indragiri Hilir Regency, challenges in achieving the Village SDGs, and the steps taken to learn from other countries.

### 3. Results and Discussion

#### Village Poverty Alleviation Failed in Indragiri Hilir District

Various interventions in the form of policies and programs have been carried out by the Government, the Provincial Government, and especially the Indragiri Hilir Regency Government to reduce poverty in Indragiri Hilir Regency. Empowerment-based village development programs since 2005 implemented by the central government, the national program for empowering rural independent communities (PNPM), implemented by the Ministry of Home Affairs of the Republic of Indonesia during the reign of President SBY for 2 (two) periods from 2004 to 2014. The Riau Provincial Government at the same time implemented the Village Empowerment Program (PPD) to address the problem of poverty in Riau Province, from 2005 to 2013 with an allocation of Rp. 500,000,000, - per village.

Specifically, the Indragiri Hilir Regency Government, at the same time also issued the Independent Village Program (PDM) from 2005 to 2013, then with the change of regional leadership, it was changed to the Maju Inhil Jaya Village Program (DMIJ), with the same program substance, from 2013 to date. After the enactment of Law Number 6 of 2014 concerning Villages, during the government of President Joko Widodo 2 (two) periods from 2014 to the present. PNPM was changed to the village community empowerment development program (P3MD) as a program to channel village fund transfers (DD) from the State Revenue and Expenditure Budget (APBN) in every village in Indonesia, as mandated by law number 6 of 2014 concerning villages. The P3MD program is implemented by the Ministry of Villages, Development of Disadvantaged Regions, and Transmigration of the Republic of Indonesia. Then, the Central Government through the Ministry of Social Affairs, through the Family Hope Program (PKH), the Ministry of Agriculture, through various programs, ministries, and other institutions, have also issued many socio-economic empowerment programs for rural communities aimed at alleviating the problem of poverty in rural areas. . Programs aimed at rural areas to overcome the problem of poverty in the countryside, if you look back, actually there have been many previous programs that have been implemented, even since the era of the New Order government through the Presidential Instruction Program for

Underdeveloped Villages (IDT), business cooperatives. village (KUD) and several other programs.

Based on the description of the government’s policy interventions through its various programs across ministries, institutions, and local governments, empirically up to now, the poverty rate in rural areas is still quite high, although BPS data shows a downward trend from time to time. Many research studies from internal government and academics provide assessments. Some gave a positive rating in the sense that the programs were successful, and some gave a negative rating in the sense that the programs were categorized as failures. The Ministry of Villages, Development of Disadvantaged Regions, and Transmigration of the Republic of Indonesia provide an assessment of the status of villages in Indragiri Hilir Regency through the Developing Village Index (IDM). The results of the assessment show that there are still many villages in Indragiri Hilir Regency that are underdeveloped or developing. This means that the people of these villages live in conditions of severe poverty.

TABLE 3: Village Status in Indragiri Hilir District

Number	Village Status	Amount
1	Independent	2
2	Proceed	21
3	Develop	93
4	Left behind	81
5	Very Lagging	0

Source: Kemendes PDDT, 2021.

Indragiri Hilir Regency with an area of 11,605.97 km<sup>2</sup> is one of the regions in Riau Province, geographically located on the east coast of the island of Sumatra, directly adjacent to Jambi Province. Indragiri downstream is divided into 20 sub-districts, 33 sub-districts, and 197 villages. It has a population of 740,598 inhabitants. The number of poor people in 2015 (56.85), 2016 (56.82), 2017 (55.40), 2018 (51.42), 2019 (48.29) thousand people (6.54%). This figure decreased by 0.51% from 2018 which amounted to (7.05%). (BPS Indragiri Hilir). The data shows a decrease in the poverty rate in Indragiri Hilir Regency from time to time, although the rate of decline is slow and very low, with an average of not reaching (1%). This means that the poverty alleviation programs in rural areas that have been implemented, especially in Indragiri Hilir Regency so far, categorization researchers have not made a major contribution to changing the lives of rural communities, especially the poor so that researchers say they have failed or failed to provide implications in strengthening community capacity. poor to be able to live more socially and economically.



Indragiri Hilir Regency from being a low area in terms of the Human Development Index, Indragiri Hilir Regency has the second-lowest HDI after Meranti Regency. The HDI of Indragiri Hilir Regency is 66.84. Likewise, with life expectancy, Indragiri Hilir Regency ranks the second-lowest in Riau Province after Meranti Regency. The life expectancy in Indragiri Hilir Regency is 67.66 (3). This factual condition shows that the condition of the people in Indragiri Hilir Regency is experiencing poverty which is quite worrying. This condition should not have happened because Indragiri Hilir Regency is an area that has the potential of natural resources and human resources to accelerate the achievement of the SDGs goals, especially the first goal (without poverty). Potential resources, especially in the agricultural sector which is quite large, the average rice harvest area in Indragiri Hilir Regency reaches 19,159.29 ha with a production of 70,138.75 tons. Meanwhile, the potential that contributes the most to the economy of Indragiri Hilir Regency in the form of added value and employment in the production of local coconut (inner coconut and hybrid coconut) on average 265,875,731.19 kg and oil palm of 274,449,528. kg. Then, another local potential in agriculture is the very large production of areca nut, which has been alternative support for the people of Indragiri Hilir in meeting their daily needs. Thus, the potential of natural resources in agriculture is a potential capital to be managed properly by local governments to increase people's income, to get out of poverty, especially in people living in rural areas.

The challenge for the Indragiri Hilir Regency Government to create a village without poverty is first, the capacity of human resources at the village government level. Effective government performance is at the core of creating market-oriented economies, safe and productive populations, and democratic political systems in developing countries. Capacity building to improve public sector performance is thus an important focus of development initiatives. Capacity building is a process for carrying out a series of movements, multi-level changes within individuals, groups, organizations, and systems. In the context of strengthening the capacity of village government administrators, capacity building is intended to improve the human resources of village officials in carrying out their duties and functions in providing services to the community (9). The human resource capacity of village government administrators is the main factor in implementing the goals of the SDGs, and the Village SDGs. Village management activities cover the fields of government, development, institutional development, and community empowerment. The results showed that the level of understanding of village officials in understanding human resource management and technical capabilities of village officials was still lacking. The majority of village officials have not attended education and training / technical competency guidance, because they have a working



period of more than 10 years, village officials feel they have an adequate level of knowledge (10). Other research shows that there is a lack of competence of village government officials, so it is necessary to strengthen village organizations and staff, as well as optimize the role of local government agencies and stakeholders to take part in the village development process (11).

All aspects of management activities carried out by the village government must be planned according to the criteria of the SDGs objectives, especially goal I (no poverty). However, the aspect of development planning to achieve the SDGs has its challenges. Because the village development planning deliberations (Musrenbangdes) as a forum for translating the SDGs targets have so far not been achieved. This is because the process of practicing public participation in the village results in a mismatch between the implementation of the Musrenbang and the evaluation of the SDGs criteria (12).

The Integrated Desa Maju Inhil Jaya (DMIJ) Plus Program, as the main program of the Indragiri Hilir Regency Government, and the Village Community Empowerment Development Program (P3MD) implemented by the central government, have not yet led to efforts to achieve the goals of SDGs I (alleviating poverty). The establishment and institutional management of Village-Owned Enterprises as a step to empower the poor in the village, apparently also cannot empower the poor. The growth of the number of Village-Owned Enterprises Institutions in Indragiri Hilir Regency amounted to 197 as of 2019. One of the Village-Owned Enterprises categorized as Village-Owned Enterprises that has succeeded in increasing its income, namely the Village-Owned Enterprises of Lancang Kuning Village, Rumbai Jaya, has not succeeded in empowering the poor. So, the institutional instruments of Village Owned Enterprises that have been operating so far have not been able to prove their role in strengthening the capacity of the poor, both in Indragiri Hilir Regency and in other regions in Indonesia. This is reinforced by the results of research in the best national village, Ponggok Village, Central Java Province. The results of the study stated that the success of Village Community Empowerment Using Village Owned Enterprises, the Ponggok Village Government succeeded in transforming village community empowerment from community-based to BUM Desa in managing and utilizing shared resources (natural tourism villages), but the criticism of the research is that community empowerment carried out by BUM Desa Tirta Mandiri, Ponggok Village, both directly and indirectly, does not prioritize the poor, but instead to those who are financially and socially capable (13).

Learn from China in alleviating poverty in achieving SDGs I goals. China has made remarkable achievements in poverty reduction. One of the programs taken to accelerate poverty alleviation in China is the implementation of the Development-Oriented Poverty

Alleviation Program in Rural China. As a result, China has reduced the number of rural poverty by less than \$1.25 per day, from 690 million in 1990 to 84.17 million in 2011, so that China is one of the countries that can achieve poverty alleviation goals ahead of the schedule set by the MDGs. The Chinese government through the Rural Poverty Alleviation Development program as a pro-poor government strategy. So that Globally the Chinese Government was able to reduce the poor from 165.67 million in 2010 to 70.17 million in 2014, achieving remarkable results in poverty reduction.

The steps taken by the Chinese government to reduce poverty are, first, setting a measure of poverty as measured by currency, and a multidimensional poverty assessment standard that reflects the level of education, health, housing, and living standards. The two standards are combined, to truly identify, target, monitor, and assess poverty in all its forms. Second, the government must strive to create new partnerships in poverty alleviation. Domestic poverty reduction must fully mobilize enterprises, social groups, and individuals to participate in poverty alleviation and development and make full use of social resources. The government must cooperate between government and companies, social groups and individuals, find ways to effectively build and cover the shortage of government financial resources for poverty alleviation. Third, new ways of poverty alleviation must be explored. Poverty alleviation covers a wide range of areas such as health, women's protection, and the environment (14).

Other studies show that China mostly supports State-Owned Enterprises, which make the economy grow and help poverty alleviation. The Chinese government invests in research to motivate the technology industry sector, to improve the technology sector which will then lead to more job creation and poverty alleviation. Other research reveals a comparison of poverty reduction in rural areas between China and Indonesia. Indonesia tries to develop rural communities with Village-Owned Enterprises (BUMDes) and Village Funds. in China through Township and Village Enterprises (TVEs) since the 1970s. There are some differences between TVE in China and Village-Owned Enterprises in Indonesia in their implementation. Despite the different social structures and economic environment, Indonesia has learned lessons from improving its management policies for Business Entities Owned by the Village to provide transportation social life in rural areas. First, the Top-Down Policy in establishing Village-Owned Enterprises through village funds is only a "gateway" not the endpoint to end or minimize rural poverty in Indonesia. It will only be a potential conception if we apply it without good governance and good environment as the most important factors. Whereas China completely surrenders to its people (Bottom-Up Policy), because its people have the

value to work together and add value with accountability and discipline to get out of poverty.

The Chinese government has succeeded in building rural communities, by creating people who have the value of accountability and discipline. So that the government can standardize goods and promote them in a larger market. These are lessons that Indonesia can learn to build rural communities out of poverty. Second, China's development of Township and Village Enterprise is a total implementation approach of villagers, Township and Village Enterprise employs experts and experienced people to become Township and Village Enterprise managers, to ensure that Township and Village Enterprise will run according to plan. In addition, Township and Village Enterprises in China received assistance from SOEs to obtain low source prices, and Township and Village Enterprises received subcontracts from SOEs as a reciprocal relationship to improve efficiency and effectiveness. Then the central government in China only ensures a high internal control system in its implementation at the village level (15).

Several research findings indicate that the objectives stated in the SDGs document have been successful, but are still not optimal, especially in terms of sustainable economic development. Regarding village development, it was found that each village can formulate strategic solutions by planning to improve public information and communication, organizing to strengthen systems and internal control, mobilizing to optimize the role of Village-Owned Enterprises (BUMDes), and exercising control to strengthen spatial control (16). The researchers in their findings encourage local governments to be more extra and must be more intensive in implementing economic equity programs so that it will also have an impact on the lower classes of society (17,18). Thus, the Indragiri Hilir Regency Government can learn from best practices in implementing the implementation of the SDGs achievement by building collaborative partnerships. Through local governments try to foster a sense of ownership and shared responsibility for the SDGs by forming collaborations on four platforms, namely; government and parliament, academia and experts, civil society and the media, and philanthropy and business. These four platforms complement each other in their duties and functions, and their existence provides value for the implementation of the SDGs (19).

## 4. Conclusion

Poverty is a multidimensional phenomenon, which must be solved with appropriate approaches. The goal of sustainable development is to define poverty in all its forms. The results of this research conclude that the village development and empowerment

programs in Indragiri Hilir Regency that have been implemented so far have not been effective or failed to have an impact on reducing poverty rates significantly in rural areas in Indragiri Hilir. The transfer of village funds provided by the government to the government since 2015, based on the evaluation results of the Ministry of Development of Disadvantaged Regions and Transmigration of the Republic of Indonesia, shows that there is no significant change in the status of villages in Indragiri Hilir Regency. The results of the assessment show that there are still many villages in Indragiri Hilir Regency which have the status of underdeveloped villages. This means that the quality of the people living in the village experiences poverty in various forms, where the majority of the people still live in quite severe conditions.

The challenge of the Indragiri Hilir Regency Government to realize the sustainable development goals (SDGs), especially reaching villages without a mission, is a big job. The current village development and empowerment program need to be evaluated comprehensively. This study recommends the main government steps that must be taken by the local government of Indragiri Hilir Regency through each regional apparatus organization to increase the capacity of the village apparatus, as the spearhead in implementing the Village SDGs. Then, the Desa Maju Inhil Jaya Program as a strategic program for the Regional Government of Indragiri Hilir Regency must focus on empowering the poor in each village.

## References

- [1] Susiana S, Yulia. *Pembangunan Sosial Teori dan Implikasi Kebijakan*. Jakarta: Pusat Pengkajian dan Pelayanan Informasi Sekretariat Jenderal DPR RI; 2000.
- [2] Halim IA. *SDGs Desa Percepatan Pencapaian Tujuan Pembangunan Nasional Berkelanjutan*. Jakarta: Yayasan Pustaka Obor Indonesia; 2020.
- [3] Badan Perencanaan Pembangunan Nasional Republik Indonesia (Bappenas). *Pencapaian tujuan 1: Mengakhiri kemiskinan dalam segala bentuk dimanapun. ringkasan eksekutif pelaksanaan pencapaian TPB/SDGs Indonesia*. 2020. Sekretariat SDGs Indonesia. Menteng – Jakarta Pusat.
- [4] Birdsall N. *WPS IZ3 Social Development Is Economic Development*. Policy Research Department, World Bank; 1992 Washington, D.C.
- [5] Lin JY. Structural change and poverty elimination. *China Agricultural Economic Review*. 2019;11(3):452–459. <https://doi.org/10.1108/CAER-08-2018-0169>
- [6] Sukamantri D, Barat J, Sjaf S, et al. *Measuring achievement of Sustainable Development Goals in rural area: A case study of Sukamantri village in Bogor District*,

- West Java, Indonesia (Mengukur pencapaian tujuan pembangunan berkelanjutan di pedesaan: Studi kasus.) *Sodality: Jurnal Sosiologi Pedesaan*. Vol 09 (02) 2021. <https://doi.org/10.22500/9202133896>
- [7] Dhahri S, Omri A. Foreign capital towards SDGs 1 & 2—ending poverty and hunger: The role of agricultural production. *Structural Change and Economic Dynamics*. 2020;53:208–221. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.strueco.2020.02.004>
- [8] Szabo V, Strang VR. Secondary analysis of qualitative data. *Advances in Nursing Science*. 1997;20(2):6674.
- [9] Grindle MS, Hilderbrand ME. Building sustainable capacity in the public sector: What can be done? *Public Administration*. 1998;15:441–463.
- [10] Asrori A. Kapasitas Perangkat Desa Dalam Penyelenggaraan Pemerintahan Desa di Kabupaten Kudus. *Jurnal Bina Praja*. 2014;6(2):101–116. <https://doi.org/10.21787/jbp.06.2014.101-116>
- [11] Wahyudi A, Sartika D, Wismono HF, et al. Investigating organizational and human resource capacity of village government: A case study in Kutai Kartanegara regency. *Policy & Governance Review*. 2020;4(2):99. <https://doi.org/10.30589/pgr.v4i2.267>
- [12] Akbar A, Flacke J, Martinez J, van Maarseveen MFAM. Participatory planning practice in rural Indonesia: A sustainable development goals-based evaluation. *Community Development*. 2020;51(3):243–260. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15575330.2020.1765822>
- [13] Sidik F, Nasution FGA, Herawati H. Pemberdayaan Masyarakat Desa Menggunakan Badan Usaha Milik Desa: Desa Ponggok dan Kritik Terhadap Prestasi Terbaik Nasional. *Jurnal Pemikiran Sosiologi*, Vol 5 (2); 80-107 2018. <https://doi.org/10.22146/jps.v5i2.44636>
- [14] Liu QQ, Yu M, Wang XL. Poverty reduction within the framework of SDGs and post-2015 development agenda. *Advances in Climate Change Research*. 2015;6(1):67–73. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.accre.2015.09.004>
- [15] Mubecua MA. China's progress in poverty reduction: What can South Africa learn from China to attain the poverty eradication goal in the Sustainable Development Goals? *Journal of Economics and Behavioral Studies*. 2018;10(6):91-98.
- [16] Tarlani, Sirajuddin T. Rural development strategies in Indonesia: Managing villages to achieve sustainable development. *IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science*. 2019 6-7 November. Wednesday and Thursday; Surakarta-Indonesia. IOP Publishing, UK. Volume 447 (2020) 012066. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1755-1315/447/1/012066>
- [17] Triatmanto B, Natsir M, Rachyuningsih E. The achievement of Sustainability Development Goals (SDGs) in community empowerment with participatory rural

appraisal approach. Paper presented at: 3<sup>rd</sup> International Conference of Graduate School on Sustainability; 22-23 September 2018. Malang-Indonesia.

- [18] Triatmanto B, Natsir M, Wahyuni N. Measuring of Sustainability Development Goals (SDGs) for poverty alleviation in Batu City, East Java Province - Indonesia. 477 Proceedings of the International Conference on Community Development (ICCD) 20 October 2020. Wednesday. Jakarta-Indonesia. Atlantis Press. Volume 477 138-142. <https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.201017.032>
- [19] Rasanjani S. Ending poverty: Factors that might influence the achievement of Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) in Indonesia. *Journal of Public Administration and Governance*. 2018;8(3):114. <https://doi.org/10.5296/jpag.v8i3.13504>
- [20] Badan Perencanaan Pembangunan Nasional Republik Indonesia (Bappenas). Metadata for Indonesia's sustainable development goals indicators: Pillars of social development (Metadata indikator tujuan pembangunan berkelanjutan Indonesia: Pilar pembangunan sosial). 2017. Sekretariat SDGs Indonesia. Menteng – Jakarta Pusat.
- [21] Maddatuang B, Syukur A, Indar SH, Karim A. The rural economic growth in south Sulawesi drives the national Sustainable Development Goals. *International Journal of Management (IJJM)*. 2021;12(3):9–21. <https://doi.org/10.34218/IJM.12.3.2021.002>
- [22] Hanif N. Pemerintah desa, Nagari, Marga dan Sejenisnya: Pemerintahan Tidak Langsung Warisan Kolonial yang Inkonstitusional. Tangerang Selatan-Banten: Universitas Terbuka; 2020.
- [23] Wernecke B, Mathee A, Kunene Z, et al. Tracking progress towards the Sustainable Development Goals in four rural villages in Limpopo, South Africa. *Annals of Global Health*. 2021;87(1):1–11. <https://doi.org/10.5334/aogh.3139>