

Policy Brief

Adequacy and Coverage of Social Assistance Benefits During the Covid-19 Pandemic

Key Messages:

- Poor and vulnerable people pin their hopes on social assistance benefits—particularly during the Covid-19 pandemic.
- The government has expanded coverage of beneficiaries and value of the benefit channelled through social assistance programs, either regular or ad hoc, to anticipate the socioeconomic impacts of Covid-19.
- Economic stimulus and social assistance provided during the Covid-19 pandemic have not significantly eased the economic hardship on families and reached all groups of people in need.
- The government needs to consider expanding existing social assistance policies to increase the benefit value, coverage, and more accurate delivery perspectives.

1. BACKGROUND

Social assistance is one type of government intervention that poor and vulnerable people rely on, particularly during the Covid-19 pandemic. An annualised rate of economic growth of only 2.97 per cent in the first quarter of 2020 indicates a slowdown in economic activity, including company failure—those that provide employment opportunities. According to the Ministry of Manpower, at least 15.6 per cent of the workforce had lost their jobs. This also happened to daily and informal workers. Consequently, many households have experienced a fall in their income and the risk of becoming poor has risen.

The Government of Indonesia has a number of policies and programs to support Indonesian households to cope with the shocks caused by the Covid-19 pandemic.

These include: (i) provision of electricity bill discount for households in the 450 VA and 900 VA categories; (ii) expansion of coverage and increase in the value of social assistance under the Family Hope Program (*Program Keluarga Harapan: PKH*) and Non-Cash Food Assistance

(*Bantuan Pangan Non Tunai: BPNT*); and (iii) provision of Cash Social Assistance (*Bantuan Sosial Tunai: BST*) and Staple Food Social Assistance (*Bantuan Sosial Sembako: BSS*) for households that are not PKH and BPNT beneficiaries. In the second amendment to the State Budget (APBN) stipulated in Presidential Regulation No.72/2020, the government allotted a budget of up to Rp 203.9 trillion to support household social protection.

The types of social assistance provided by the government in the budget year of 2020 are focused on a strategy of mitigating risk. Expansion of coverage of beneficiaries and the value of benefits is limited to a six month period to December 2020.

The number of BPNT—now called *Program Sembako* (Staple Food Program)—beneficiaries has risen from 15.2 million to 20 million beneficiary households (*Kartu Penerima Manfaat: KPM*). Similarly, PKH beneficiaries increased from 9.2 million to 10 million KPM. Furthermore, BSS had been disbursed to 1.9 million families (1.3 million in Jakarta and 600,000 in Bogor, Depok, Tangerang, and Bekasi) and BST had been disbursed to 9 million families. Since March 2020, *Program Sembako* has disbursed up to Rp 200,000/month, while the amount of BSS and BST

was Rp 600,000/month for three months. In addition, family assistance was channelled through the Village Fund - Direct Cash Transfer (*Bantuan Langsung Tunai – Dana Desa: BLT-DD*) targeted at families who are not in receipt of PKH, *Program Sembako*, BSS, BST, and the *Kartu Prakerja* (Pre-employment Card) Program.

Policy options that focus on increasing in household income need to receive special attention starting from mid to the end of this year. These fairly substantial initial findings indicate that beneficiary coverage and the amount of assistance remains inadequate, as indicated by secondary data compiled by the National Socioeconomic Survey (*Susenas*) and media reports. As inaccurate program targeting is an issue that frequently arises, policy makers need to reformulate strategies to protect impacted households in a timely manner. These should include acceleration of program realisation for poor and vulnerable households through the *Padat Karya* program that has been implemented in a number of ministries and institutions (M/I), as well as numerous incentives for local government through transfer to the districts. Furthermore, labour absorption can also be increased with support from the government for projects initiated by state-owned enterprises and corporates that receive incentives to fund placement, state capital participation (*Penyertaan Modal Negara: PMN*), and bailouts as stipulated in the National Economic Recovery (*Pemulihan Ekonomi Nasional: PEN*) Program.

This analysis commences with a look at the coverage of beneficiaries as well as the amount of social assistance during the Covid-19 pandemic at the household level. The following section will outline the adequacy of the social assistance being disbursed. In the final part of the paper, recommendations are presented and can be used for further consideration.

2. SOCIAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM COVERAGE

Common problems with the prevailing social assistance programs include inaccuracy of target beneficiaries. The benefit incidence of social assistance programs in various income deciles (Table 1) demonstrates poor coverage of various assistance programs for people whose income is in the bottom 40 per cent.

In other words, despite being entitled to assistance, many households are inadequately covered by various programs launched by the government.

The social assistance provided during the pandemic has not reached the group of people who were not poor prior to the pandemic but then suffered from income and job losses due to the pandemic. According to a survey by the Abdul Latif Jameel Poverty Action Lab (J-PAL), 56 per cent of males and 57 per cent of females in

Indonesia lost their jobs within eight weeks of the onset of the pandemic. Job loss has hit workers in all sectors and regardless of their education levels, but it has hit those in agriculture and the service sector the hardest. The survey also found that most of the people who lost their jobs have not received any assistance from the government. Only 26 per cent and 23 per cent of males and females respectively have benefitted from *Program Sembako* and PKH. This has a direct impact on the food insecurity in Indonesia. In the eighth week, only 19 per cent of households reported eating as many times as they did in the past week while 35 per cent reported eating less than normal due to financial issues.

Table 1: Benefit Incidence for Beneficiaries of Social Assistance Programs (%)

Income Group	PIP	PKH	BPNT
1	29.6	26.6	42.5
2	25.9	21.6	34.2
3	24.7	18.2	30.1
4	21.6	14.8	25.5
5	19.1	12.4	22.1
6	15.8	9.7	19.2
7	13.6	7.5	16.0
8	9.9	4.7	11.5
9	5.7	2.2	6.3
10	2.0	0.6	2.2
Total	17.1	11.8	20.9

Source: *Susenas* March 2019, processed.

The World Bank¹ made a relatively similar finding from monitoring conducted during the Covid-19 pandemic. The results indicate a fall in income in almost all economic sectors, including the agriculture sector. The monitoring

suggested that 24 per cent of breadwinners had stopped working while the remaining 76 per cent were still working although one-half of these people had suffered a decrease in income. Falls in income occurred in all socioeconomic groups. In addition, part of the Indonesian population faced food insecurity. One-third of households reported reducing food portions and, based on field reports, 31 per cent of households reported not having enough food. In addition, 30 to 50 per cent of households experienced a change in income (termination of employment, decrease in income) as well as food vulnerability (food insufficiency or decrease in food).

¹ Indonesia High Frequency Monitoring of Covid-19 Impact.

Nevertheless, the monitoring showed that most of the population received government social assistance. This is valuable information for the government regarding the mechanism for implementation of the current program. The field results showed that 54 per cent of households in the poorest 40 per cent of the population received at least one form of social assistance from the government. Nevertheless, approximately one-third of households have seen a change in their income and are not receiving any government assistance. This is an important for the government to note to

improve the effectiveness of program implementation. Effective preparation is needed to determine the types and mechanism for assistance if the government plans to set alternative policies through expansion of beneficiary coverage. It is primarily related to preparation of program strategies that can cover a wider range of people during the pandemic while still maintaining health protocols. This

breakthrough can be done through market mechanisms such as market operations aiming at reducing the price of rice.

3. CONTRIBUTIONS OF SOCIAL ASSISTANCE

To develop the initial findings on social assistance contributions, this review adopted micro data from March 2019 *Susen* household surveys. The basic assumption was the “normal” economic conditions in early 2019. Despite the significant fall in consumption during the Covid-19 pandemic in 2020 due to economic slowdown, this paper aims to first investigate the consumption profile of existing social program beneficiary households. *Susen* data identifies social assistance program benefits received by respondents. Table 2 illustrates the amount of assistance disbursed through each program in 2019.

Table 2: Pre- and Post Covid-19 Program Benefits

Program	Target	Existing Benefit Value	Supplemental Benefits after Covid-19
PKH	The 2019 beneficiaries	Rp 2,400,000	Fixed
PIP	The 2019 beneficiaries	Based on Level	Fixed
BPNT/Groceries	The 2019 beneficiaries	Rp 110,000	Rp 90,000
PLN Discount	900VA and 450VA Households	Subsidised	Rp 40,000 Discount
BST	DTKS non-beneficiaries of PKH and BPNT	None	Rp 600,000

Source: *Susen* March 2019, processed.

Economic stimulus measures and social assistance for the community during the Covid-19 pandemic have not significantly eased the burden on households. The data in Table 3 presents the average household consumption expenditure during the normal economic period in early 2019 according to *Susen*.

The average household expenditure in the first decile is Rp 1,918,716. Food expenditure is the largest component of expenditure at Rp 1,254,394, while non-food expenditure is Rp 664,322.

Table 3: Distribution of People Based on Expenditure Decile and Average Household Expenditure

Group	Total		Expenditure			Expenditure per Capita (Rp)		
	Household	Individual	Food	Non- Food	Total	Food	Non- Food	Total
Decile 1	5,720,926	26,731,202	1,254,394	664,322	1,918,716	230,164	121,894	352,058
Decile 2	6,105,087	26,733,362	1,586,160	874,782	2,460,942	315,340	173,913	489,252
Decile 3	6,364,220	26,728,224	1,796,683	1,064,774	2,861,457	371,984	220,450	592,434
Decile 4	6,624,730	26,730,558	1,955,920	1,259,132	3,215,052	420,628	270,780	691,408

Source: *Susen* March 2019, processed.

Assuming no changes in benefit incidence of social assistance programs in each income group, the overall proportion of assistance received by the poorest group of people accounts for 11.35 per cent of total

household expenditure (Table 4). Proportionally speaking, contributions of assistance has fallen in line with average income of the group above.

Table 4: Distribution of Expenditure, Amount, and Proportion of Assistance per Household (Rp)

Expenditure Group	Food Expenditure (Rp)	Non-food Expenditure (Rp)	Total Expenditure (Rp)	Value of Assistance (Rp)*	Proportion of Assistance/ Expenditure (%)
1	1,099,761	579,889	1,679,650	190,659	11.35
2	1,420,208	793,953	2,214,161	179,775	8.12
3	1,598,414	968,036	2,566,450	177,449	6.91
4	1,759,972	1,155,858	2,915,830	179,756	6.16

Source: Susenas March 2019, processed.

Note: Estimation numbers based on assumption in Table 2.

In general, the program options exercised by the government have not been proportionally distributed. Beneficiaries of non-regular programs—beneficiaries of BST and electricity bill discount—on average received assistance totalling 21.3 per cent of their monthly

household expenditure (Table 5). Meanwhile, beneficiary of regular programs, such as PKH, PIP, and *Program Sembako*, as well as electricity bill discount, received benefits totalling approximately 16.95 per cent of their total monthly expenditure.

Table 5: The Amount of Social Assistance Benefits and Social Safety Nets During Covid-19

Code	PKH	PIP	BPNT	PLN Discount	BST	Existing Social Assistance	Covid-19 JPS	Total (Rp)	Total Expenditure (Rp)	Proportion of Assistance/ Household Expenditure
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11 = 9/10)
00000	No	No	No	No	No	0	0	0	5,326,128	0
00001	No	No	No	No	Yes	0	600,000	600,000	5,177,191	11.59%
00010	No	No	No	Yes	No	0	40,000	40,000	3,116,990	1.28%
00011	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	0	640,000	640,000	3,005,165	21.30%
00100	No	No	Yes	No	No	110,000	90,000	200,000	5,126,746	3.90%
00110	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	110,000	130,000	240,000	3,117,058	7.70%
01000	No	Yes	No	No	No	65,501	0	65,501	5,059,043	1.29%
01001	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	68,398	600,000	668,398	4,930,044	13.56%
01010	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	62,194	40,000	102,194	3,100,902	3.30%
01011	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	66,642	640,000	706,642	3,021,590	23.39%
01100	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	183,790	90,000	273,790	5,113,637	5.35%
01110	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	180,928	130,000	310,928	3,152,169	9.86%
10000	Yes	No	No	No	No	200,000	0	200,000	4,962,451	4.03%
10010	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	200,000	40,000	240,000	3,180,704	7.55%
10100	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	310,000	90,000	400,000	4,914,737	8.14%

Code	PKH	PIP	BPNT	PLN Discount	BST	Existing Social Assistance	Covid-19 JPS	Total (Rp)	Total Expenditure (Rp)	Proportion of Assistance/ Household Expenditure
10110	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	310,000	130,000	440,000	3,023,761	14.55%
11000	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	281,531	0	281,531	4,833,545	5.82%
11010	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	280,950	40,000	320,950	3,130,865	10.25%
11100	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	391,993	90,000	481,993	4,868,408	9.90%
11110	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	388,751	130,000	518,751	3,061,179	16.95%

Source: Susenas March 2019, processed.

Note: Assumption for calculation using Table 2.

4. ADEQUACY OF SOCIAL ASSISTANCE BENEFITS

4.1. CALCULATION OF VALUE OF ADDITIONAL BENEFITS BASED ON POVERTY GAP

Estimates for additional social assistance program benefits can use poverty-related indicators, particularly for cash assistance. It is important to stress, however, that benefits will be effective if they are correctly targeted—to those living below the poverty line.

Table 6: Expected Addition to Social Assistance Benefits Value

Indicator	March 2019	March 2020
Number of people (million)	267.16	270.14
Poverty line (Rp/month, per capita)	425,250	454,652
Number of poor people (million)	25.14	26.42
Percentage of poor people, P0 (%)	9.41	9.78
Poverty gap index, P1	1.55	1.61
Expected Addition to the Benefits		
Per capita (Rp)	70,046	74,846
Household (Rp)	350,230	374,230

Source: BPS, processed by TNP2K staff.

The size of the benefit is determined by the average of the gap between consumption expenditure per capita of the poor and the poverty line. The poverty gap index (P1) plays a role in the calculation, along with the total number of population and the number of people in poverty. In making this estimation, it is assumed that each poor household consists of five family members on average. Moreover, though respondents or households have been the recipients of assistance program, it

would still be ideal to give them the additional amount generated. In other words, if one poor household has been a beneficiary and received a total of Rp 150,000, there is still an amount of money to be added to reach the poverty line. The amount of benefits to consider using the average approach is presented in Table 6 below.

The expected value of the program assistance benefit in 2019 is Rp 350,230 per household (Table 6). Only Rp 110,000 worth of BPNT was distributed in 2019, however, and this amount is still far below expectation. Given that targets are still inaccurate, poor beneficiary households must receive an additional amount in line with the expected benefit, to ensure that assistance programs are able to reduce the poverty rate.

The government needs to re-consider its plan to lower the benefit value from Rp 600,000 from July to September 2020. For the 2020 estimation (according to data from Susenas March 2020), an expected extra benefit of Rp 374,230 per targeted household is required to reach the poverty line. It is important to note that numbers presented in Table 6 are based on data taken in the beginning of year, when the impacts of the Covid-19 pandemic on the economy were less severe. In the first quarter of 2020, all calculations showed that economic activities, particularly the growth of gross domestic product, slowed down.

4.2. ADEQUACY OF BENEFITS BASED ON EXISTING PROGRAMS

The main problems with social assistance during the Covid-19 pandemic include insufficient amount of assistance, limited coverage, and ineffective distribution.

During a non-conventional crisis like today, the government must review all available options rather than just focus on conventional distribution mechanisms.

Table 7: The Amount of Social Assistance Benefit Based on Regions

Code	Urban			Rural			
	Total Benefit (Rp)	Total Expenditure	Proportion of Assistance/Household Expenditure		Total Benefit	Total Expenditure	Proportion of Assistance/Household Expenditure
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4	=2/3)	(5)	(6)	(7 =5/6)
00000	0	5,591,791	0.00%		0	4,938,014	0.00%
00001	600,000	5,490,459	10.93%		600,000	4,863,651	12.34%
00010	40,000	3,142,076	1.27%		40,000	3,084,084	1.30%
00011	640,000	3,007,397	21.28%		640,000	3,003,224	21.31%
00100	200,000	5,354,539	3.74%		200,000	5,043,516	3.97%
00110	240,000	3,101,582	7.74%		240,000	3,122,788	7.69%
01000	67,730	5,264,087	1.29%		63,824	4,904,734	1.30%
01001	667,796	5,063,936	13.19%		668,833	4,832,949	13.84%
01010	102,048	3,171,138	3.22%		102,319	3,040,790	3.36%
01011	705,819	2,959,691	23.85%		707,233	3,065,962	23.07%
01100	271,625	4,941,261	5.50%		274,826	5,196,139	5.29%
01110	315,862	3,258,239	9.69%		308,745	3,105,243	9.94%
10000	200,000	5,092,921	3.93%		200,000	4,885,537	4.09%
10010	240,000	3,075,148	7.80%		240,000	3,236,253	7.42%
10100	400,000	5,588,410	7.16%		400,000	4,574,875	8.74%
10110	440,000	2,885,205	15.25%		440,000	3,087,839	14.25%
11000	280,005	5,186,831	5.40%		282,667	4,570,594	6.18%
11010	324,782	3,020,701	10.75%		318,157	3,211,177	9.91%
11100	481,988	5,170,774	9.32%		481,996	4,703,820	10.25%
11110	519,722	3,093,025	16.80%		518,176	3,042,300	17.03%
Total	142,447	4,575,584	3.11%		203,260	4,144,883	4.90%

Source: Analysis of Susenas March 2019

Note: Program combination codes refer to Table 5.

The amount of social assistance disbursed by the government, on average, covers between 1 and 23.85 per cent of the total household expenditure. This depends on the composition of assistance type they received. As to region, rural households received a higher proportion of assistance than urban counterparts. In urban areas, households received a proportion of 3.11 per cent while rural households received up to 4.90 per cent (Table 7). In rural areas, the assistance has not included the BLT from village fund. The table also indicates that, in general, the impacts of the Covid-19 pandemic have been more substantial in urban than in rural areas. It is, therefore, important to formulate policies specifically targeted for urban areas, such as through allocation of urban village (*kelurahan*) funds.

5. DISCUSSION

The programs currently running during this Covid-19 pandemic are constraining by beneficiary data. Distribution of BST program that, according to regulations, can only be received by families who are non-recipients of PKH and *Program Sembako*, for example, still requires potential beneficiaries to have been registered in DTKS. Distribution of assistance through conventional channels that use data on regular program beneficiaries such as PKH, PIP, and *Program Sembako* is inadequate due to ineffective targeting, particularly exclusion errors in the DTKS. As a result, there are still many people in poverty who have not received PIP, PKH, and *Program Sembako* assistance. To overcome this, another option that can be considered is to authorise village/urban village officials to prepared the list of target beneficiaries so that distribution can be more accurately targeted. This should be done by maintaining the system of data reporting to the relevant agencies to ensure that data can be documented as a source of data updates.

The government plans to distribute 15 kilograms of rice to 10 million households. By implementing a policy of adding benefit in the form of rice, the above findings can be considered when designing plans for the next stage of social assistance. Based on the experience of *Rastra* (Rice Assistance Program), rice distribution is highly vulnerable to the risk of inequitable distribution. At the same time, the absence of data and a channel for distributing assistance to people who are not registered in the DTKS hampers the government's efforts to assist people affected by the economic impacts of the Covid-19 pandemic.

Social assistance for poor and vulnerable people can be in the form of the *padat karya* (intensive work) program. This option can be taken into consideration and, in case of government budget constraints, the allotted fund from the PEN program can be used. For example, incentives for ministries, institutions, or

local government amounting to Rp 106.11 trillion can be used. In the short-term, a number of development projects can be designed in such a way that workers can be employed, such as through the urban cash-for-work initiative (*padat karya wilayah perkotaan*). As a result, government can provide not only social support, but also employment opportunities and sources of income for poor and vulnerable people.

6. RECOMMENDATIONS

- The government needs to consider expansion of current social assistance policies and programs due to insufficient amount of assistance, limited coverage, and ineffective distribution.
- The government needs to formulate strategies for urban areas, such as through urban village fund allocation or PEN program incentives for M/I and local government. Policy intervention can be in form of direct transfer such as BLT-DD or Cash-for-Work (*Padat Karya Tunai*: PKT) in urban areas.
- The government needs to expand coverage of beneficiaries and prepare for the type of assistance and mechanisms that can effectively cover a wider range of people during the pandemic while still maintaining health protocols. This breakthrough can be done using market mechanism such as conducting market operations to lower the price of rice.
- The government needs to delegate authority to officials at the lowest level of government administration (village/urban village head), allowing them to prepare the list of beneficiaries to make distribution more effective while still maintaining a system for data reporting to relevant agencies to ensure data can be documented as a source for data updates.

APPENDIX

Table A1: Distribution of People Based on Poverty Status and Average Household Expenditure

Group	Total		Average Household Expenditure (Rp)			Average Household Expenditure Per Capita (Rp)		
	Household	Individual	Food	Non-food	Expenditure	Food	Non-food	Expenditure Per Capita
Non-poor	66,059,865	242,161,810	2,658,817	2,804,421	5,463,238	608,425	641,744	1,250,169
Poor (Actual)	5,377,802	25,144,742	1,237,504	655,390	1,892,894	227,065	120,255	347,319
Very Poor	1,682,759	8,227,408	1,109,311	574,329	1,683,640	193,597	100,232	293,830
Poor	3,695,043	16,917,334	1,294,574	691,557	1,986,131	243,341	129,992	373,333
Below Food Poverty Line	1,067,685	5,317,392	1,081,733	547,670	1,629,403	184,596	93,459	278,056
Near Poor	4,495,588	19,912,760	1,545,232	836,521	2,381,753	303,582	164,346	467,928
Other Vulnerable-to-Poverty	11,177,287	46,842,406	1,802,863	1,079,555	2,882,418	363,389	213,497	576,886

Source: Susenas March 2019, processed.

Note:

- **Poor people (actual)** are people whose expenditure per capita is below Poverty Line (PL). As of March 2019, expenditure was recorded at Rp 425,250 per capita along with Food Poverty Line of Rp 313,232 (73.66 per cent) and Non-food Poverty Line of Rp 112,018 (26.34 per cent).
- **Poor people below Food PL** are those whose expenditure per capita is below Food Poverty Line that was Rp 313,232.
- **Very poor people** are people whose expenditure per capita is below 0.8 x PL.
- **Poor people** are people whose expenditure per capita is between 0.8-1 x PL.
- **Near-poor people** are people whose expenditure per capita is between PL-1.2 PL.
- **Other vulnerable-to-poverty people** are people whose expenditure per capita is between 1.2 PL-1.4 PL.

Table A2: Coverage of Beneficiary Target

Code	PKH	PIP	BPNT	PLN Discount	BST	Number of Households	Number of People	Total Monthly Expenditure
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
00000	No	No	No	No	No	26,036,870	96,795,062	5,326,128
00001	No	No	No	No	Yes	4,939,155	18,535,188	5,177,191
00010	No	No	No	Yes	No	17,006,888	63,789,985	3,116,990
00011	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	3,552,667	13,190,877	3,005,165
00100	No	No	Yes	No	No	4,787,562	18,144,728	5,126,746
00110	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	3,255,570	12,338,112	3,117,058
01000	No	Yes	No	No	No	665,653	2,456,103	5,059,043
01001	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	582,293	2,213,309	4,930,044
01010	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	485,176	1,813,093	3,100,902
01011	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	445,069	1,680,478	3,021,590
01100	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	718,112	2,669,033	5,113,637
01110	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	499,384	1,879,218	3,152,169
10000	Yes	No	No	No	No	524,225	2,028,219	4,962,451
10010	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	420,042	1,592,337	3,180,704
10100	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	1,911,828	7,139,944	4,914,737
10110	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	1,557,363	5,846,203	3,023,761
11000	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	374,770	1,399,065	4,833,545
11010	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	272,624	1,026,538	3,130,865
11100	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	1,876,511	7,018,540	4,868,408
11110	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	1,525,905	5,750,520	3,061,179
Total Program Beneficiaries and Average Household Expenditure						45,400,797	170,511,490	3,806,064
Total Population and Average Household Expenditure						71,437,667	267,306,552	4,360,081

Source: Analysis of Susenas March 2019.

Note: Estimation number is based on assumption in Table 2.

NOTES:

The policy brief "**Adequacy and Coverage of Social Assistance Benefits During the Covid-19 Pandemic**" was written by Priadi Asmanto, Taufik Hidayat, Ardi Adji, Gracia Hadiwidjaja, and Sutikno (Research Unit - TNP2K Secretariat) in August 2020.

Support for this publication has been provided by the Australian Government through the MAHKOTA Program. The findings, interpretations, and conclusions expressed in this work do not necessarily reflect the views of the Government of Indonesia or the Government of Australia. You are free to copy, distribute, and transmit this publication for non-commercial purposes.

SECRETARIAT OF THE NATIONAL TEAM FOR THE ACCELERATION OF POVERTY REDUCTION

Grand Kebon Sirih Lt.4, Jl.Kebon Sirih Raya No.35

Jakarta Pusat, 10110

T. 021 - 3912812

www.tnp2k.go.id