

CRC 1342 / No. 28

Covid-19

Social Policy Response Series

Mulyadi Sumarto
Fery Ferdiansyah

**Indonesia's Social Policy
Response to Covid-19:
Targeted Social
Protection under
Budget Constraints**



Mulyadi Sumarto, Fery Ferdiansyah

Indonesia's Social Policy Response to Covid-19: Targeted Social Protection under Budget Constraints
CRC 1342 Covid-19 Social Policy Response Series, 28
Bremen: CRC 1342, 2021



SFB 1342 Globale Entwicklungsdynamiken von Sozialpolitik /
CRC 1342 Global Dynamics of Social Policy

Postadresse / Postaddress:
Postfach 33 04 40, D - 28334 Bremen

Website:
<https://www.socialpolicydynamics.de>

[ISSN 2702-6744]

Funded by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft
(DFG, German Research Foundation)
Projektnummer 374666841 – SFB 1342

Mulyadi Sumarto
Fery Ferdiansyah

Indonesia's Social Policy
Response to Covid-19:
Targeted Social Protection
under Budget Constraints

CRC 1342
Covid-19 Social Policy Response Series
No. 28

CONTENT

ABSTRACT 3

INTRODUCTION 3

POLITICAL AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC CONTEXT 4

SOCIO-ECONOMIC CONSEQUENCES OF COVID-19 6

INDONESIA’S SOCIAL POLICY RESPONSE 7

THE POLITICS OF INDONESIA’S SOCIAL POLICY RESPONSE 10

 Policy Adoption 10

 Policy Implementation 10

CONCLUSION 11

REFERENCES 12

APPENDIX 1: SOCIAL POLICY DEVELOPMENTS IN RESPONSE TO COVID-19 BY POLICY AREA
(INDONESIA, JANUARY–SEPTEMBER 2020) 15

APPENDIX 2: SOCIAL POLICY LEGISLATION IN RESPONSE TO COVID-19
(INDONESIA, JANUARY–SEPTEMBER 2020) 16

INDONESIA'S SOCIAL POLICY RESPONSE TO COVID-19: TARGETED SOCIAL PROTECTION UNDER BUDGET CONSTRAINTS

Mulyadi Sumarto *

Fery Ferdiansyah **

ABSTRACT

This report discusses Indonesia's social policy response to Covid-19 as well as the public's response to this policy response. It finds that the Indonesian social policy response to the pandemic was mainly through reallocations within the government budget to finance targeted social safety net programs covering social assistance, family support, and labor market benefits. These budget reallocations, however, have been insufficient to cover all the poor, thus the government sought financial support from the World Bank, global bonds, and local governments. The government's social policies stimulated public responses, including both support and opposition from politicians and community members. The most salient support stemmed from the community in the form of collectively working to informally provide assistance to the poor. Community support for the poor and the participation of global agencies in welfare provision underline the limitations of state social policy during times of socio-economic adversity, particularly due to budget constraints. During the crisis, the state, which should be able to protect its citizens, was less capable of providing social protection, prompting it to seek support from both global and local welfare providers.

INTRODUCTION

Covid-19, which initially struck China in December 2019, caused catastrophic socio-economic adversity, stimulating governments in the Global South (Gerard et al. 2020), covering several countries in Africa (Noyoo 2021), Asia (Kuhner et al. 2021; Shim 2021; Woo 2021), and Latin America (Arza 2021; Massard da Fonseca et al. 2021; Velázquez Leyer 2021), to address this adversity through bundles of social protection policies. Covid-19 hit Indonesia a few years after the country had implemented a major social policy reform, which brought about a more inclusive welfare regime in which the government provides greater social protection (including for the poor who were previously excluded), but it still relies heavily on informal welfare provision (see Sumarto 2020a). Like other countries of the Global South, Indonesia sought to overcome the adversity by enacting a series of social policy responses, particularly welfare provision for the poor. The Indonesian social policy reform substantially equips the government with the capacity to manage the policy response, because the new welfare regime establishes institutional arrangements for targeted social protection policy and increases the government's competence in social protection provision for the poor. Without the reform, it is likely that the government would have to deal with sizable technical-administrative issues in providing targeted welfare. The new welfare regime, however, has not been able to aid the government in dealing with budget constraints, as the regime also has to cope with limited financial resources.

In general, the Indonesian policy responses to Covid-19 can be divided into three categories, i.e. health, economic, and social. In the health sector, as has been enacted globally by other countries (An and Tang 2020; Gerard et al. 2020; UN 2020), the Indonesian government restricted social gatherings and inter-city travelling

*Department of Social Development and Welfare & Center for Population and Policy Studies, Universitas Gadjah Mada, Yogyakarta, Indonesia, mulyadi.sm@ugm.ac.id

**National Social Security Council (DJSN), Jakarta, Indonesia, feryferdian@djsn.go.id

to contain the spread of the disease (Olivia et al. 2020; WHO 2000b). In this context, the restrictions were tighter for the elderly, as this age group is more vulnerable to being infected by Covid-19 (An and Tang 2020; Olivia et al. 2020). In the social sector, large-scale social restrictions were introduced (Olivia et al. 2020; WHO 2000b), allowing both central and local government to lock down their authorized-administrative areas. On the economic front, the government sought to sustain economic growth performance through providing several economic stimulus packages. On the social issues, the Indonesian government helped the poor and newly poor who had lost their jobs due to Covid-19, by providing targeted social safety nets covering food assistance, cash transfers, income maintenance benefit, family support, and unemployment benefit. To finance all these programs, the Indonesian government used the national budget. However, since the budget was insufficient to cover the programs, the government issued global bonds and secured a loan from the World Bank (UN 2020).

The Indonesian government's policy response outlined above has stimulated the political dynamics of social policy. Current literature on social policy (e.g. Dorlach 2020; Schmitt 2020; Stensota and Bendz 2019; Tillin and Duckett 2017) proposes that the political dynamics of social policy development are affected by democracy. While the facts show that many developing countries initiated social protection programs under non-democratic regimes, democratization triggers a higher need for social protection (Dorlach 2020; Schmitt 2020; Tillin and Duckett 2017), as an egalitarian-transparent government needs to satisfy citizens' social rights. To what extent a government can satisfy citizens' social rights, is partly fueled by social mobilization (Dorlach 2020; Tillin and Duckett 2017; Yoruk et al. 2019). Social mobilization in several developing countries such as Argentina, Brazil, South Africa, Thailand (Dorlach 2020), and Mexico (Yoruk et al. 2019) has stimulated welfare benefit provision. Many cases show that mobilization, which mostly takes the form of public protest, is rallied by middle-class citizens, particularly labor unions (Dorlach 2020; Tillin and Duckett 2017). Citizens' perceptions (e.g. satisfaction or dissatisfaction) of how the government takes care of their aspirations for welfare, may stimulate them to publically express their attitude to the government's policy (Stensota and Bendz 2019). Public attitudes on welfare policy are partly embedded in a value system of the ideal relations between citizen and state (Chung & Mileuman 2017) and the government's responsibility for welfare provision (Cheng and Ngok 2020; Taylor-Gooby et al. 2020).

This report discusses Indonesia's social policy response to Covid-19 and how political dynamics arose during the social policy response. Understanding the political dynamics that emerged as a reaction to the government's social policy response to a less secure and emergency situation like Covid-19 is important, because Indonesia is one of the world's largest democracies that has just experienced democratization and social policy reform. Another reason is the government's social policy response attracted political dynamics that took shape in welfare attitudes of politicians and the community toward the policies. The community attitude shows both support and opposition to the government's policy response. One important area of community support is the collective work on informal welfare provision for the poor. Understanding the interrelation between how the state provides welfare and community members' responses in the form of informal welfare provision may yield academic insights, particularly on the dynamics of the welfare mix in times of crisis. To discuss these issues, this article analyzes government documents, WHO archival records, national survey data from the Central Board of Statistics – *Badan Pusat Statistik* (BPS), national television news, and previous research.

POLITICAL AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC CONTEXT

Prior to Covid-19, Indonesia experienced a political and economic democratization, which brought about social policy reform. Both democratization and the social policy reform are important for understanding the socio-political context of Indonesia's social policy response to Covid-19. The initial step in the democratization of Indonesia was marked by the fall of the authoritarian regime (1966–1998) in 1998, which provided an important impetus in the democratization process. The regime's downfall was mainly due to political-economic turmoil caused by the Asian financial crisis, which hit Indonesia in 1997 (Robison and Hadiz 2004). Soon after the downfall of the authoritarian regime, the Indonesian government implemented a political reform of the electoral system, which introduced a new system, i.e. direct election of national and local leaders. The government introduced the first direct presidential election in 2004 and elections for local leaders in 2005 in a gradual manner (Kis-Katos and Sjahrir 2017; Lewis 2018).

The electoral system reform took place at the same time as a structural adjustment program, which restructured the Indonesian political-economic system into a democratic system. Between 1997 and 2004, the Indonesian government implemented the adjustment program, as a conditionality for borrowing loans from the World Bank in response to the economic adversity caused by the Asian financial crisis (Sumarto 2017). The adjustment was intended to reform the political-economic system from a centralized system to a decentralized one. The former represents a less democratic political-economic system, while the latter politically mirrors a more democratic system and economically reflects a more market-oriented economy. In general, the World Bank's adjustment prescription covered liberalization, privatization, stabilization, and deregulation (Forster et al. 2019). The adjustment program in Indonesian included price liberalization, privatization, banking reform, and political-economic decentralization (Sumarto 2017).


The structural adjustment program triggered an important reform of Indonesia's social policy, which changed the Indonesian welfare regime into an informal quasi-inclusive regime (Sumarto 2020a). Social policy reform started in 1998, when the government provided a social safety net specifically for the poor as a part of the World Bank's adjustment program (Sumarto 2017). The aim of the safety net program was to mitigate the socio-economic adversity caused by the Asian financial crisis for the poor (OECD 2019). The social safety net covered five types of social protection benefits, i.e. health insurance for the poor, payment of school fees for children from poor families, subsidized rice for the poor, grants for selected communities, and labor-intensive work. The safety net was the first social protection program targeted at Indonesia's poor citizens, most of whom work in the informal sector, as prior to the safety net program, the Indonesian government provided social protection only for public sector workers (Sumarto 2017).

Soon after the repayment of the World Bank loan for responding to the Asian financial crisis, in 2005 the Indonesian government considerably enlarged the safety net program into a national targeted social protection program under a broader umbrella called the poverty reduction program. Under this umbrella, the government developed not only the social protection program, but also micro-finance and programs for small and medium-sized enterprises. Within the social protection program, the government still provides the first three types of safety net benefits, namely health insurance for the poor, payment of school fees for children from poor families, and subsidized rice, but changed the last two schemes into an unconditional cash transfer and a conditional cash transfer. Although the government enlarged the program sizably, institutionally, all of these programs remain vulnerable to any policy changes, since the programs were set up under an ad hoc system as temporary administrative arrangements to address specific issues in society (Sumarto 2017).

In 2014, the Indonesian government initiated an essential institutional reform by merging health insurance for the poor with health insurance for formal sector workers into one national health insurance program, under the Law for the National Social Security System that was enacted in 2004 (Aspinall 2014; Dantarto et al. 2020; Jung 2016, Pisani et al. 2016; Sumarto 2017). This law institutionally stabilizes health insurance, thus safeguarding it from any potential change. This health insurance program is the declared means of the Indonesian government for achieving its aim of attaining universal health coverage by 2019. As of July 2019, however, the insurance program covered only 83.6% of the population (Dantarto et al. 2020), and by the end of 2019, the government had not been able to achieve universal coverage (OECD 2019).

This happened at the same time as two other complicated issues. The quality of health services provided under the health insurance program has been relatively poor, which stimulates people to express dissatisfaction (Pisani et al. 2016). The other issue is that the government has been dealing with a financial deficit in financing the health insurance program since 2014, mainly because the level of the insured members' premium contributions is not sufficient to cover healthcare expenditure. The government in fact expanded its social protection policy, including the national health insurance reform, but spending on social protection remains less than 2% of Gross Domestic Product (GDP). The International Labour Organization (ILO) suggests that governments in developing countries spend a minimum of 5.6% of GDP on social expenditure (Duran-Valverde et al. 2019). Figure 1 below shows the magnitude of Indonesia's social protection spending. Compared with government budgets in other Southeast Asian countries, Indonesian government spending is the lowest.

Figure 1. Government Spending on Social Protection in Southeast Asian Countries, in percent of GDP, 1995–2015



Source: ILO 2017

Another fundamental issue in the targeted social protection program is its distribution accuracy. This issue describes an important socio-political context of how people reacted to the government's policy response to Covid-19, elaborated below in the section 'The Politics of Indonesia's Social Policy Response'. All the targeted social protection programs have been experiencing mistargeted distribution since the introduction of the program in 1998 (Sumarto 2020b). Mistargeted distribution can be seen in the low targeting score of the programs. Overall, the targeting score of the subsidized rice program was only 13 out of 100 and that of the unconditional cash transfer program was 24 (World Bank 2012). When the targeted safety net program was initiated in 1998, the Indonesian government did not have any dataset on poor households, collected specifically for the social protection programs. The only data available were a dataset for the family planning program. Under these circumstances, the government unavoidably used the existing dataset, which led to mistargeted distribution. The government made several efforts to improve data accuracy by conducting periodic national surveys to collect data on poor households using proxy means testing. The dataset resulting from the survey, which is called the integrated social welfare database, is updated periodically. This helps to reduce mistargeted distribution even though there are inclusion and exclusion errors, mainly due to low capacity of the government officers in charge of data updating, and clientelism in data collection (McCarthy and Sumarto 2018). Mistargeted distribution results in social jealousy, social tension, and conflict in the community (Sumarto 2020b).

SOCIO-ECONOMIC CONSEQUENCES OF COVID-19

Covid-19 caused the most problematic socio-economic adversity in Indonesia since the 1997 Asian financial crisis (Olivia 2020). In the economic sector, Covid-19 caused catastrophic economic hardship, which mainly can be seen in the fall in the economic growth rate. Indonesia's GDP growth diminished considerably from 4.97% in the last quarter of 2019 to -5.32% in the second quarter of 2020. Prior to this problematic economic performance, from the first quarter of 2018 to the third quarter of 2019, the GDP trend fluctuated somewhat but was relatively stable, ranging from 5.02 to 5.27% (BPS 2020c). The GDP drop in 2020 was partly because most of the components of GDP slowed down considerably, i.e. agriculture, mining, transport, construction, trade, and accommodation and restaurants. The most problematic fall was in the trade, accommodation and restaurant sectors, mainly because tourism was hit severely. In spite of this problematic industrial performance, the service sector still expanded modestly, which helped the GDP continued to grow (Olivia et al. 2020).

The contraction in the industrial sector inevitably confronted businesses with serious economic difficulties. A national survey on the impact of Covid-19 on business in Indonesia was conducted by BPS, interviewing 34,559 business people on all of Indonesia's big islands from 10–26 July 2020. The results of the survey show that among all the corporations questioned, 59% did not change their operations and 1% expanded their operations. The remaining 40% experienced changes in production. Some of them, 24%, reduced their operating capacity, 9% stopped operating completely, 5% asked their workers to work from home, and the other 2% required all workers to work from home. In terms of revenue, most of the business people, 82.85%, perceived that their revenue had decreased, while 2.55% believed that their income had increased and 14.6% said it had remained stable. Due

to this significant fall in profits, 35.56% of corporations dismissed their workers, 62.29% kept their workers on, and 2.15% recruited additional workers (BPS 2020a).

The problem of unemployment caused complicated social issues leading to a more problematic poverty rate. BPS conducted a further survey on people's behavior during Covid-19 using online media. Between 7 and 14 September 2020, 65,561 respondents mainly aged 17–45 years and working in the private sector were interviewed. Of the respondents, 6% had been dismissed, 3% laid off and 31% were not employed. Under these circumstances, most of them, i.e. 52.84%, perceived that their daily living expenditure had increased, 14.91% felt that their expenditure had remained stable, and 32.25% believed that their expenditure had decreased (BPS 2020b). Given this problematic situation, the poverty rate in 2020 increased dramatically (Suryahadi et al. 2020).

INDONESIA'S SOCIAL POLICY RESPONSE

Given the socio-economic adversity caused by Covid-19, the government initiated an essential social policy response to Covid-19. The government's initial policy response took the form of a national regulation, called Government Regulation in Lieu of Law No. 1/2020 on Monetary Policy and Stability of the Financial System in Response to Covid-19. The main concern of the regulation is refocusing and reallocating the national budget to address Covid-19, particularly to finance all programs in public healthcare, economic recovery, and the social safety net. The safety net is offered to the poor to mitigate their socio-economic hardship caused by Covid-19.

To put the regulation into practice, the government needed to issue a more practical legal document, namely Presidential Regulation No. 54/2020 regarding the changes to the structure of the national budget. Under this regulation, the Indonesian government reallocated IDR 677.20 trillion (approx. USD 46.384 million)¹ of the national budget specifically for responding to Covid-19 in three sectors, i.e. health, economic recovery, and the social safety net. The regulation, however, only covers relatively broad social safety net programs but does not stipulate the technical-administrative details on how to implement the programs. To implement the safety net programs, the Indonesian president mandated some ministers to be responsible for specific social protection programs and to develop legal arrangement at ministerial level for regulating the programs. All the social protection programs are thus technically regulated by the regulations issued by the ministers responsible for those programs.

There are eleven social safety net programs, listed in the Table 1 (p. 8). Using the Indonesian government's terms, the programs can be divided into two types, i.e. "regular programs" and "non-regular programs". The first three programs listed in Table 1 are of the first type, while the following eight programs belong to the second category. The first type of program is basically a social protection program regularly carried out by the Indonesian government, but in response to Covid-19 the government changed some features of the program, such as the amount of benefit, regional coverage of the program, and measures for distribution. The non-regular programs are social protection programs that were first initiated during the Covid-19 pandemic. Therefore, the Indonesian government considers the non-regular programs to be newly-initiated programs, but some of them essentially resulted from a modification of existing social protection programs that had already been implemented prior to the Covid-19 pandemic. Of the eight non-regular programs, only three were newly initiated, i.e. Pre-employment card, Wage subsidy, and Cash assistance for micro-enterprises, while the others are pre-existing programs. This article follows the government's definition, with the consequence that the last eight programs are assumed, as inquired in Appendix 2 (question No. 15) of this report ('change in coverage of existing benefits?'), not to have changed the coverage of existing benefits.

The conditional cash transfer – *Program Keluarga Harapan* (PKH), aims at providing cash assistance to poor families to send their children to school and to make sure that the children receive sufficient nutrition and primary healthcare. The other objective is to help the elderly and the disabled who live in poor families gain access to health services and take part in some activities specifically prepared for them. The PKH is a social protection program that was introduced in Indonesia in 2007 (Kwon and Kim 2015). During Covid-19, the government slightly modified PKH through increasing the amount of the PKH benefit. The PKH is administered by the Ministry of Social Affairs. All poor families with children under seven years of age and/or attending primary/junior/senior school, and/or a disabled or elderly member are eligible for the PKH program. PKH is not a local initiative; this program is a result of global policy diffusion. It was originally implemented in Brazil and Mexico and dissemi-

1 USD 1 is equal to about IDR 14,600.

Table 1. Social Safety Net Programs in Response to Covid-19

Program Name	Recipients		Amount of benefit (IDR)	Period of provision (months)	Total budget (IDR trillion)
	Number (million)	Income decile*			
Conditional cash transfer	10	1–2	Varies, following program criteria	12	37.4
Basic food card	20	1–3	200,000	12	43.6
Electricity subsidy	31.2	1–5	450 VA is free; 900 VA is 50% discount	6	6.9
Cash transfer for Non-Greater Jakarta	9	4	600,000	9	16.2
Basic food assistance for the Greater Jakarta region	1.9	5	600,000	9	3.42
Village fund cash transfer	11	4–5	600,000	6	31.2
Pre-employment card	5.6	5–6	600,000**	8	20.0
Wage subsidy	15.7	1–6	600,000	4	37.78
Additional cash transfer for recipient of basic food card	9	3	500,000	1	4.6
Cash assistance for micro-enterprises	9.12	1–6	2,400,000	1	22.02
Rice assistance for PKH recipients	10	1–2	15***	3	4.6

Note, *: decile 1: poor, decile 2–6: near poor; **: with an additional IDR 1 million for training incentive; ***: in kg/month.

Source: Modified from Wardhana et al. 2021.

nated to the Global South across Africa and Asia (Beland et al. 2018), to propagate ideas of social investment (Mahon 2019; Papadopoulos and Leyer 2016; Von Gliszczynski and Leisering 2016).

The basic food card – *Kartu Sembilan Bahan Pokok (Kartu Sembako)* – is provided by the Indonesian government to help poor households access basic foodstuffs by providing cash assistance to purchase the food. During Covid-19, the Indonesian government increased the amount of the cash assistance from IDR 150,000 to IDR 200,000 per month. The *Kartu Sembako* program is also administered by the Ministry of Social Affairs. This program is not new because it was introduced in 1998 as part of the targeted social safety net program to address socio-economic adversity due to the Asian financial crisis (Sumarto 2017). At the onset of program implementation, *Kartu Sembako* provided subsidized rice for poor households but then the program underwent several changes, such as its name, the number of recipients, and distribution method.

Two other programs listed in Table 1, i.e. basic food assistance for the Greater Jakarta region (covering Jakarta and its nearby urban districts, i.e. Bogor, Depok, Tangerang, and Bekasi) and Rice assistance for PKH recipients, are similar to *Kartu Sembako* in providing social assistance to the poor, specifically aimed at distributing basic foodstuffs. The difference between basic food assistance for the Greater Jakarta region and *Kartu Sembako* is that the *Kartu Sembako* provides a cash benefit of IDR 200,000 throughout Indonesia, while basic food assistance provides a benefit of IDR 600,000 to the poor living in the Greater Jakarta region. The difference between *Kartu Sembako* and Rice assistance for PKH recipients is that *Kartu Sembako* provides cash for the poor in Indonesia, while Rice assistance for PKH recipients only distributes rice to PKH recipients.

The electricity subsidy provides substantial help for poor households to get wider access to electricity, particularly those with a low level of usage of between 450 volt ampere (VA) and 900 VA per month. Users of this low VA are the poor or near poor. During the Covid-19 pandemic, the government increased the level of the benefit by providing poor households with free access for the first 450 VA per month of electricity and a discount of 50% on electricity costs for usage between 450 VA and 900 VA. The electricity subsidy program is regulated by the Ministry of Energy and Mineral Resources. The subsidy program has been implemented by the Indonesian government since 2007.

The next social protection program, i.e. cash transfer for non-Greater Jakarta, is an unconditional cash transfer that provides cash assistance for poor households. The amount of the benefit is IDR 600,000 per month, specifically targeting poor households living outside the Greater Jakarta region. This unconditional cash transfer program, which is administered by the Ministry of Social Affairs, is to help the poor achieve wider access to basic necessities and social services.

The cash transfer for non-Greater Jakarta program was, in fact, only initiated in April 2020, but the essential content of the program, i.e. an unconditional cash transfer, was already introduced by the Indonesian government in 2005. The 2005 unconditional cash transfer, which is called *Bantuan Langsung Tunai* (BLT), was originally intended to compensate poor households for a reduction in their fuel subsidy (Sumarto 2020b). Its funding in the budget therefore came from the reduction in the fuel subsidy. The BLT program underwent changes, particularly to its name and the amount of benefit. The other two programs listed in the Table 1, i.e. village fund cash transfer – *Bantuan Langsung Tunai Dana Desa* (BLT DD) and additional cash transfer for recipients of basic food card are the same as the cash transfer for non-Greater Jakarta program, they are modified BLT programs. BLT DD is a BLT program which is financed not by the reduction of the fuel subsidy but from the village fund. The village fund is a part of the decentralized districts' revenues, arising from central government transfers aimed at helping the district governments finance village administration, capacity building, and community empowerment.

The Pre-employment benefit – *Kartu Pra-kerja*, the Wage subsidy – *Bantuan Subsidi Upah*, and Cash assistance for micro-enterprises – *Bantuan Produktif Usaha Mikro* are all newly-initiated programs, implemented specifically in response to Covid-19. The *Kartu Pra-kerja* benefit provides training and monthly benefit payments for unemployed and terminated workers. The training is intended to improve workers' skills so they can re-enter the labor market or to develop new businesses, and the benefit is to help the workers access basic necessities and services. The *Bantuan Subsidi Upah* provides a cash benefit of IDR 600,000 per month for four months to active workers who have a monthly salary of less than IDR 5,000,000. This is intended to help low-wage workers maintain their purchasing capacity, and to provide an economic stimulus to maintain economic activities in society (Wardhana et al. 2021). The last program, *Bantuan Produktif Usaha Mikro*, provides cash assistance of IDR 2,400,000 for small enterprises to help them run and expand their business during Covid-19. The assistance can be used to meet all technical needs of the enterprises. This program is administered by the Indonesian government to support the national economic recovery programs.

The social policy response detailed above requires central government to ensure that all district governments throughout Indonesia take part in the program systematically. This is important because Indonesia covers 514 districts and 83,344 villages spread over 17,504 islands, most of which are situated in remote areas and have to deal with less than sufficient capacity in governance. Given this situation, not all district governments may be able to participate in the policy response to meet the central government's policy goal. Considering this situation, central government issued a Presidential Instruction No. 4/2020 mandating the Minister of Home Affairs to instruct regents/mayors to reallocate the local government budget to address Covid-19. To increase administrative priority, the Minister of Home Affairs enacted a Regulation of the Minister of Home Affairs No. 20/2020 to ensure that local government spending is prioritized for the policy response to overcoming the socio-economic impacts of Covid-19.

These facts show the government's effort to ensure that all the social safety net programs can cover all the poor in all the hundreds of districts in Indonesia. Despite this effort however, the program has not been able to cover all the poor and provide a sufficient safety net for them, for several reasons. First, the program has to cope with budget constraints in financing the programs. To address this problem, the government requested a reallocation of local government spending, issued global bonds, and borrowed a loan from the World Bank. In April 2020, the global bonds provided USD 4.3 billion for the Indonesian government to support the 2020 national budget, particularly to address Covid-19. The tenure for the bonds is 50 years, thus the government needs to pay back the bonds in 2070 (Ministry of Finance 2020). In May 2020, the Indonesian government borrowed USD 700 million from the World Bank. This loan comprises USD 300 million for economic recovery and USD 400 million for supporting social protection policy, particularly the PKH program (World Bank 2020).

Second, the Indonesian government has to deal with less accurate data on poor households. When the social policy response to Covid-19 was initiated, many local governments did not update the integrated social welfare database. At the same time, newly poor people who lost their employment due to Covid-19 were not recorded systematically. This results in a less accurate distribution of social safety net benefits. Third, the government has to cope with technical difficulties in distributing the safety net benefits, particularly in thousands of remote villages. The last two factors for instance, caused the government to reach only 94.5% of the total recipients of the *Kartu Sembako* by the end of 2020.

The social policy response discussed above reveals targeted welfare benefits covering social assistance, family support, and labor market benefits. The main sources of financing for the policy response are central

government budget reallocations with sizable additional funding from global bonds, a World Bank loan, and local government support, as the policy response has to deal with budget constraints. The budget constraints led the government not to cover an old-age care program, although such a program is especially needed for those who are vulnerable to Covid-19. The government prefers to provide social assistance that can stimulate economic activity in the labor market rather than healthcare for the elderly. As much literature (e.g. Sumarto 2020a; Yang and Kuhner 2020) argue that social policies in some countries in East and Southeast Asia, including Indonesia, have been designed to support economic growth, in the time of adversity, in which citizens are vulnerable due to Covid-19, the Indonesian government retains the safety net programs to support economic productivity.

THE POLITICS OF INDONESIA'S SOCIAL POLICY RESPONSE

The policy process and the implementation of the social safety net programs discussed in the previous section stimulated the political dynamics of the safety net policy. The political dynamics in this context are shown by public responses, particularly the responses articulated by politicians in parliament and by community members. The former arose during the political process of the adoption of Government Regulation in Lieu of Law No. 1/2020 in parliament, while the latter occurred when the regulation was implemented in the community.

Policy Adoption

When the Indonesian president issued the government regulation and submitted it to parliament to gain parliamentary approval, there was very limited public debate criticizing the regulation. In the Indonesian political system, a government regulation in lieu of law does not have legal authority to regulate any policy unless this regulation gains legal approval from parliament. To gain approval, the Indonesian government brought the regulation into parliament on 1 April 2020, one day after the enactment of the regulation. Activists from trade unions, non-government organizations, and students did not express any observable response toward the regulation. This does not reflect any obvious support or opposition toward the regulation but reveals "reluctant support", as the public's attitudes remained and provided a frame for the political process in parliament. This is completely different to the public response to the Omnibus Law on Job Creation, which was a noticeable public rejection of the law. Activists from trade unions, non-government organizations, and students expressed their rejection through rallying public demonstrations in mid-October 2020, some of which were destructive, resulting in damage to public facilities.²

When the government regulation entered the political process in parliament, the political process proceeded without any serious barriers. Most politicians in parliament approved the regulation. Of the nine political factions in parliament, eight agreed with the government regulation and approved it in less than two months. This was relatively surprising as the government regulation contains a politically-sensitive issue on reallocating a sizable proportion of the budget, namely IDR 677.20 trillion. In many cases, a politically-sensitive legal proposal attracts high political interest among politicians, which may mean that the political process for the approval of the regulation faces political impediments. This smooth political process took place mainly because the objective of the reallocation was to respond to socio-economic adversity caused by Covid-19. This reflects a morally-constructive political attitude among political actors in a political process in a country where corruption is still a problematic issue, who joined together to overcome the socio-economic adversity which threatening their citizens' lives.

Policy Implementation

After the regulation came into force, the next step was to distribute the social safety net benefits, which attracted two kinds of public response, namely support and opposition to the distribution. Soon after the Indonesian presi-

2 The same public attitude was expressed in national demonstrations in 2011 when the Indonesian people opposed the government's lack of commitment in implementing the national health insurance program under the National Social Security System Law. The peak of this public protest was a citizens' lawsuit against the Indonesian government in which the government was defeated and forced to implement the health insurance program (Aspinall 2014; Jung 2016; Pisani et al. 2016; Sumarto 2017).

dent issued the government regulation, in the last week of April 2020, the government started distributing several forms of social protection benefits under the social safety net program for the poor. All the poor listed in the integrated social welfare database are eligible for the social protection benefits. In addition, the social protection program also covers all newly poor people with the condition that they had to register at the village head office. Distribution could not commence simultaneously, however, due to technical difficulties caused by the diverse and complicated physical and socio-economic situation of thousands of villages in Indonesia.

In this situation, some poor people received the social protection benefits but some of them, particularly those affected by exclusion errors, newly poor people, and the poor living in remote areas, had not yet received the protection benefits. Most Indonesian people were aware of this situation, as the distribution of social protection benefits was broadcast in prime-time national news by national private television stations. This situation aroused Indonesian people's sense of social responsibility to help those coping with socio-economic adversity and led them to provide informal social support for them. People's charitable attitude was particularly high at that time, as this situation occurred during Ramadan. The majority of the Indonesian population are Moslems and believe that Ramadan is a religiously appropriate time to provide benevolent social support to help the poor.

In order to help the poor, community members distributed informal social support in the form of in-kind and cash benefits. In-kind social support was provided through giving lunch packets to informal workers and basic food packets (e.g. rice, instant noodles, sugar, and cooking oil) to poor households. In many cases, community members provided the in-kind support collectively through cooking the food for lunch communally and distributing the food to the poor at specific distribution spots. In terms of cash benefits, people put money into envelopes and gave them to people they believed were poor. This informal provision of social support took place during the first three to four weeks of the government commencing distribution of social protection benefits, when distribution had not yet been well established.

This supportive public response by community members occurred at the same time as the appearance of opposition. Those who rejected the government's social protection benefits were poor people and village heads. Mainly they were afraid that the distribution of social protection benefits might cause social jealousy, social tension, and conflict in the community, as this had already happened in some targeted social protection programs (Sumarto 2020b). Both individuals and village heads did not want to get involved in conflict again. In fact, in the first month of distribution of social protection benefits, there were complaints and protests from those who perceived that they were eligible but had not received the benefits. This mainly happened to newly poor people who had not registered as a safety net recipient at the village head office. Soon after they registered and all administrative issues surrounding the newly poor people's eligibility were resolved, the complaints and protests from them disappeared. The diminishing complaints and protests were followed by the disappearance of the opposition expressed by the poor and village heads.

CONCLUSION

The discussion of Indonesia's social policy response to Covid-19 elaborated above shows how a targeted welfare policy deals with budget constraints and attracts a public response to such a policy. The government provided several types of targeted social safety net programs to mitigate the socio-economic adversity caused by Covid-19 for the poor. Despite the high need for an old-age care program, the government preferred to provide labor market benefits rather than old-age care in order to support economic productivity. To finance its policy response, the government reformed national budget allocations. This government budget has, however, been insufficient to cover all the poor, prompting the government to seek financial support from the World Bank, global bonds, and local government. The government's policy response engendered political dynamics in society, as shown by a complicated public response. During the political process of the policy response, politicians and people supported the political process. When the policy response was implemented, community members and village heads both opposed and supported it. The opposition was based on concerns about the policy response potentially causing social tension. The supportive attitude was expressed through community members collectively working to prepare food for the poor. This indicates how the socio-economic crisis attracted politician's and community members' solidarity to address adversity during the crisis.

The engagement of community members in providing complementary informal social protection to support the state reduced social risk, and the participation of the international agencies, in the form of the World Bank loan

and global bonds, to address the government's budget limitation, reveal budget constraints in welfare provision and show the important role of informality in welfare provision (see Roumpakis and Sumarto 2020). Both the problem of budget constraints and the essential role of the community in welfare provision are the major characteristics of the Indonesian welfare regime. At a time of crisis due to Covid-19, these characteristics remain as an accompaniment to governmental welfare provision. Community members, many of whom work in the informal sector, are relatively vulnerable to economic adversity but they supported the government in welfare distribution. This shows the limited capacity of the government to protect its citizens, both in normal circumstance and during the crisis.

REFERENCES

- An, Brian Y. and Shui-Yan Tang. 2020. 'Lessons from COVID-19 Responses in East Asia: Institutional Infrastructure and Enduring Policy Instruments'. *American Review of Public Administration*, 50 (6-7): 790–800.
- Arza, Camila. 2021. 'Argentina's Social Policy Response to Covid-19: Protecting Income and Employment', *CRC 1342 Covid-19 Social Policy Response Series/17/2021*, Bremen: CRC 1342.
- Aspinall, Edward. 2014. 'Health Care and Democratization in Indonesia.' *Democratization*, 21 (5): 803-23.
- Beland, Daniel, Rosina Foli, Michael Howlett, M. Ramesh and J. J. Woo. 2018. 'Instrument constituencies and transnational policy diffusion: the case of conditional cash transfers', *Review of International Political Economy*, DOI: 10.1080/09692290.2018.1470548, 1-20.
- BPS (Biro Pusat Statistik - Indonesian National Statistical Board) 2020a. Analisis Hasil Survei Dampak Covid-19 Terhadap Pelaku Usaha. Jakarta: BPS.
- BPS 2020b Perilaku Masyarakat di Masa Pandemi COVID-19, Jakarta: BPS.
- BPS 2020c 'Pertumbuhan Ekonomi Indonesia Triwulan II-2020'. *Berita Resmi Statistik*. No. 64/08/Th. XXIII, 5 Agustus 1-12.
- Cheng, Qiu and Kinglun Ngok. 2020. 'Welfare Attitudes towards Antipoverty Policies in China: Economical Individualism, Social Collectivism and Institutional Differences'. *Social Indicators Research*. 150: 679–94.
- Chung, Heejung and Bart Meuleman. 2017. 'European parents' attitudes towards public childcare provision: the role of current provisions, interests and ideologies', *European Societies*, 19 (1): 49-68.
- Dartanto, Teguh, Alin Halimatussadiah, Jahen Fachrul Rezki, Renny Nurhasana, Chairina Hanum Siregar, et al. 2020. 'Why Do Informal Sector Workers Not Pay the Premium Regularly? Evidence from the National Health Insurance System in Indonesia', *Applied Health Economics and Health Policy*, 18 (1): 81-96.
- Dorlach, Tim. 2020. 'The causes of welfare state expansion in democratic middle-income countries: A literature review', *Social Policy and Administration*. 1-17. DOI: 10.1111/spol.12658.
- Duran-Valverde, Fabio, José F. Pacheco-Jiménez, Taneem Muzaffar, and Hazel Elizondo-Barboza. 2019. 'Measuring financing gaps in social protection for achieving SDG target 1.3 Global estimates and strategies for developing countries'. *ESS – Working Paper*. No. 73: 1-44.
- Forster, Timon, Alexander E. Kentikelenis, Thomas H. Stubbs, and Lawrence P. King. 2019. 'Globalization and health equity: The impact of structural adjustment programs on developing countries' *Social Science and Medicine*, 1-9, DOI: 10.1016/j.socscimed.2019.112496.
- Gerard, Francois, Clement Imbert, and Kate Orkin. 2020. 'Social protection response to the COVID19 crisis: options for developing countries'. *Oxford Review of Economic Policy*, 1-16.
- International Labour Office 2017 'World Social Protection Report 2017–19', Geneva: ILO.
- Jung, Eunsook. 2016. 'Campaigning for All Indonesians: The Politics of Healthcare in Indonesia.' *Contemporary Southeast Asia*, 38 (3): 476-94.
- Kis-Katos, Krisztina and Bambang Suharnoko Sjahrir. 2017. 'The impact of fiscal and political decentralization on local public investment in Indonesia', *Journal of Comparative Economics* 45: 344–65.
- Kwon, Huck-ju and Woo-rim Kim. 2015. 'The evolution of cash transfers in Indonesia: policy transfer and national adaptation', *Asia and the Pacific Policy Studies*, 2 (2): 425–40.
- Kühner, Stefan; Keerty Nakray, and Daniel Neff. 2021. 'India's Social Policy Response to Covid-19: Temporary Relief in a Rigid Welfare Landscape', *CRC 1342 Covid-19 Social Policy Response Series/4/2021*, Bremen: CRC 1342.
- Lewis, Blane D. 2018. 'Local Government Form in Indonesia: Tax, Expenditure, and Efficiency Effects'. *Studies in Comparative International Development*. 53:25–46.

- Mahon, Rianne. 2019. 'Broadening the social investment agenda: The OECD, the World Bank and inclusive growth', *Global Social Policy*, DOI: 10.1177/1468018119826404, 1-18.
- Massard da Fonseca, Elize, Luisa B Arantes, and Beatriz C. Portella. 2020. 'Brazil's Social Policy Response to Covid-19: Healthcare and Poverty Alleviation', *CRC 1342 Covid-19 Social Policy Response Series/2/2020*, Bremen: CRC 1342.
- McCarthy, John and Mulyadi Sumarto. 2018. 'Distributional Politics and Social Protection in Indonesia: Dilemma of Layering, Nesting and Social Fit in Jokowi's Poverty Policy', *Journal of Southeast Asian Economies*, 35 (2): 223-36.
- Ministry of Finance. 2021. 'Dukung Pembiayaan COVID-19, Pemerintah Terbitkan Global Bond Senilai 4,3 Miliar USD', Jakarta: Ministry of Finance, available at: <https://www.kemenkeu.go.id/publikasi/berita/dukung-pembiayaan-covid-19-pemerintah-terbitkan-global-bond-senilai-4-3-miliar-usd>, accessed: 17 September 2020.
- Noyoo, Nandangwa. 2021. 'South Africa's Social Policy Response to Covid-19: Relief Measures in an Unequal Society', *CRC 1342 Covid-19 Social Policy Response Series/21/2021*, Bremen: CRC 1342.
- OECD (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development). 2019. 'Social Protection System Review of Indonesia'. Paris: OECD.
- Olivia, Susan, John Gibson, and Rus'an Nasrudin. 2020. 'Indonesia in the Time of Covid-19', *Bulletin of Indonesian Economic Studies*, 56 (2): 143-74.
- Papadopoulos, Theodoros and Ricardo V. Leyer. 2016. 'Two decades of social investment in Latin America: outcomes, shortcomings and achievements of conditional cash transfers', *Social Policy and Society*, 15(3): 435-49.
- Pisani, Elizabeth, Maarten Olivier Kok and Kharisma Nugroho. 2017. 'Indonesia's Road to Universal Health Coverage: A Political Journey', *Health Policy and Planning*, 32 (2): 267-76.
- Robison, Richard and Hadiz, Vedi R. 2004. *Reorganising power in Indonesia: The politics of oligarchy in an age of markets*, London: Routledge.
- Roumpakis, Antonios and Mulydi Sumarto. 2020. 'Introduction: Global Welfare Regimes Revisited', *Social Policy and Society*. 19 (4): 585-88.
- Schmitt, Carina. 2020. 'The coverage of social protection in the Global South', *International Journal of Social Welfare*: 29: 6-19.
- Shim, Jaemin. 2021. 'South Korea's Social Policy Response to Covid-19: Swift and Bipartisan Attempts', *CRC 1342 Covid-19 Social Policy Response Series/7/2021*, Bremen: CRC 1342.
- Stensöta, Helena O. and Anna Bendz. 2020. 'Public response to welfare policy retrenchment: The importance of trust in implementing agencies. The case of early retirement in Sweden 1999-2010', *Social Policy and Administration*. 54:102-18.
- Sumarto, Mulyadi. 2017. 'Welfare Regime Change in Developing Countries: Evidence from Indonesia.' *Social Policy and Administration*, 51(6): 940-59.
- Sumarto, Mulyadi. 2020a. 'Insecurity and Historical Legacies in Welfare Regime Change in Southeast Asia: Insights from Indonesia, Malaysia, and Thailand', *Social Policy and Society*, 19 (4): 629-643.
- Sumarto, Mulyadi. 2020b. 'Welfare and Conflict: Policy Failure in the Indonesian Cash Transfer.' *Journal of Social Policy* 1-19, doi: 10.1017/S0047279420000252.
- Suryahadi, Asep, Ridho Al Izzati, and Daniel Suryadarma. 2020. "Estimating the Impact of Covid-19 on Poverty in Indonesia", *Bulletin of Indonesian Economic Studies*, 56 (2): 175-92.
- Taylor-Gooby, Peter. 2020. 'Regimes, Social Risks and the Welfare Mix: Unpacking Attitudes to Pensions and Childcare in Germany and the UK through Deliberative Forums'. *Journal of Social Policy*. 49 (1): 61-79.
- Tillin, Louise and Jane Duckett. 2017. 'The politics of social policy: welfare expansion in Brazil, China, India and South Africa in comparative perspective', *Commonwealth & Comparative Politics*, 55 (3): 253-77.
- UN (United Nations). 2020. 'The Impact of COVID-19 on South-East Asia Policy'. Brief: July, United Nations.
- Velázquez-Leyer, Ricardo. 2021. 'Mexico's Social Policy Response to Covid-19: A Path of Minimal Action', *CRC 1342 Covid-19 Social Policy Response Series/5/2021*, Bremen: CRC 1342.
- Von Gliszczynski, Moritz and Lutz Leisering. 2016. 'Constructing new global models of social security: How international organizations defined the field of social cash transfers in the 2000s', *Journal of Social Policy*, 45(2): 325-43.
- Wardhana, Dharendra; Dinar D. Kharisma; Gayatri W. Nirwesti; Ekaning Wedarantia; Ratna Kusumaningrum, et.al. 2021. 'Sistem dan Mekanisme Perlindungan Sosial', in Badan Perencanaan Pembangunan Nasional. *Studi Pembelajaran Pembangunan COVID-19 di Indonesia*. Jakarta: Badan Perencanaan Pembangunan Nasional, 269-75.
- WHO (World Health Organization). 2020a. 'Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19): Situation Report – 1 (Indonesia)'. 27 March 2020, Jakarta: WHO Indonesia.
- WHO. 2020b. 'Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19): Situation Report – 1 (Indonesia)'. 02 April 2020, Jakarta: WHO Indonesia.

- Woo, Jun Jie. 2021. 'Singapore's Social Policy Response to Covid-19: Focusing on Jobs and Employment', *CRC 1342 Covid-19 Social Policy Response Series/16/2021*, Bremen: CRC 1342.
- World Bank. 2012. 'Targeting poor and vulnerable households in Indonesia', Jakarta: The World Bank, Jakarta Office.
- World Bank. 2021. 'Bank Dunia Setujui Pendanaan untuk Mendukung Sistem Bantuan Sosial dan Penanganan COVID-19 di Indonesia', Jakarta: World Bank, available at: <https://www.worldbank.org/in/news/press-release/2020/05/15/world-bank-approves-financing-to-support-indonesias-social-assistance-system-and-covid-19-coronavirus-response>, accessed: 17 September 2020.
- Yang, Nan and Stefan Kühner. 2020. 'Beyond the Limits of the Productivist Regime: Capturing Three Decades of East Asian Welfare Development with Fuzzy Sets', *Social Policy and Society* 19 (4): 613–27.
- Yörük, Erdem, Ibrahim Öker, and Lara Sarlak. 2019. 'Indigenous unrest and the contentious politics of social assistance in Mexico', *World Development* 123: 1-16.

**APPENDIX 1: SOCIAL POLICY DEVELOPMENTS IN RESPONSE TO COVID-19 BY POLICY AREA
(INDONESIA, JANUARY–SEPTEMBER 2020)**

	Policy Area	Pensions	Healthcare	Long-term care and disability	Labor market	Education
(1)	Have there been any significant legislative reforms in the indicated policy area during the indicated time period?	No	No	No	Yes	No
(2)	If (1) yes, have any of these reforms been explicit responses to the Covid-19 pandemic?	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes	N/A
(3)	If (2) yes, has there been significant regional variation in the implementation of these reforms?	N/A	N/A	N/A	No	N/A
(4)	Have subnational governments enacted any significant legislative reforms in the indicated policy area during the indicated time period?	N/A	N/A	N/A	No	N/A
	Policy Area	Family benefits	Housing	Social assistance	Other*	
(1)	Have there been any significant legislative reforms in the indicated policy area during the indicated time period?	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	
(2)	If (1) yes, have any of these reforms been explicit responses to the Covid-19 pandemic?	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes	
(3)	If (2) yes, has there been significant regional variation in the implementation of these reforms?	No	N/A	Yes	No	
(4)	Have subnational governments enacted any significant legislative reforms in the indicated policy area during the indicated time period?	No	N/A	No	No	

* Legislative reforms in other policy areas explicitly aimed at social protection, e.g. food subsidies or tax cuts aimed at social protection.

APPENDIX 2: SOCIAL POLICY LEGISLATION IN RESPONSE TO COVID-19 (INDONESIA, JANUARY–SEPTEMBER 2020)

Note: This appendix covers all major national social policy legislation published between 1 January 2020 and 30 September 2020.

Law 1: Reallocation of National Budget – Social Safety Net		
(1)	Number of law	No. 1 / 2020
(2)	Name of law (original language)	Peraturan Pemerintah Pengganti Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 1 Tahun 2020 tentang Kebijakan Keuangan Negara dan Stabilitas Sistem Keuangan untuk Penanganan Pandemi Corona Virus Disease 2019 (Covid- 19) dan/ atau dalam Rangka Menghadapi Ancaman yang Membahayakan Perekonomian Nasional dan/atau Stabilitas Sistem Keuangan.
(3)	Name of law (English)	Government Regulation in Lieu of Law No. 1/2020 on Monetary Policy and Stability of the Financial System in Response to Covid-19.
(4)	Date of first parliamentary motion	01 April 2020
(5)	Date of law's enactment	31 March 2020
(6)	Date of law's publication	31 March 2020
(7)	Is the Covid-19 pandemic explicitly mentioned as a motivation in the law or any accompanying text?	Yes
(8)	Was the Covid-19 pandemic a motivation for the initial parliamentary motion for this law?	Not Applicable
(9)	Was the Covid-19 pandemic a motivation for a significant revision of the legislative project after the initial parliamentary motion?	Not Applicable
(10)	Note on (7)-(9) (max. 300 words)	<p>The Indonesian government issued the Government Regulation in Lieu of Law No. 1/2020 specifically to respond to Covid-19 in an emergency situation. This happened on the same day as the government declared that Indonesia was in a public health emergency, i.e. 31 March 2020. The emergency provided legitimacy for the Indonesian president to issue a government regulation in lieu of law. The regulation administers a reallocation of the national government budget, specifically for addressing Covid-19. Through this regulation, the government wanted to make sure that they had sufficient financial resources to address the emergency and socio-economic adversity caused by Covid-19.</p> <p>In the Indonesian legal system, a government regulation in lieu of law does not have legal authority to regulate any policy unless this regulation gains legal approval from parliament. To gain approval, the Indonesian government brought the regulation into parliament on 1 April 2020, one day after the enactment of the regulation.</p> <p>The political process in parliament proceeded without any significant barriers. The law contains a politically sensitive issue, as this mandates the government to reallocate parts of the national budget for a policy response to Covid-19. Under this regulation, the government then reallocated IDR 677.20 trillion of the budget to finance its policy response. In many cases, a politically sensitive legal proposal attracts high political interests among politicians, which meant that the political process for approval of the regulation potentially faced impediments. However, a smooth political process ensued, mainly because the objective of the reallocation was to respond to socio-economic austerity caused by Covid-19. This reflects a morally-constructive political attitude among political actors in a political process in a country where corruption is still a problematic issue, who joined together to overcome the socio-economic austerity threatening its citizens.</p>
(11)	Was this law a legislative package that contained multiple social reform components?	No
(12)	If (11) yes, how many distinct social reform components did it contain?	Not Applicable

Law 1: Component 1		
(13)	Policy Area	Other (Legislative reforms in other policy areas explicitly aimed at social protection (e.g. food subsidies or tax cuts aimed at social protection))
(14)	Brief description of reform component (max. 300 words)	This regulation covers relatively broad issues. It is not concerned with administering technical aspects of social protection programs, but regulates monetary policy and the financial system in response to Covid-19. The regulation's main concern is refocusing and reallocating the national budget to address Covid-19, particularly to finance all programs in public healthcare, economic recovery, and the social safety net. The safety net provides benefits to the poor to mitigate the effects of the socio-economic austerity caused by Covid-19. The social safety net includes several social protection programs. All the social protection programs are regulated by specific regulations issued by a ministry or a ministerial functionary.
(15)	Change in coverage of existing benefits?	Not Applicable
(16)	Duration of coverage change?	Not Applicable
(17)	If fix-term, duration in months	Not Applicable
(18)	Note on (15)-(17) (max. 200 words)	Not Applicable
(19)	Change in generosity of existing benefits?	Not Applicable
(20)	Duration of generosity change?	Not Applicable
(21)	If fix-term, duration in months	Not Applicable
(22)	Note on (19)-(21) (max. 200 words)	Not Applicable
(23)	Introduction of new benefits?	Not Applicable
(24)	Duration of new benefits?	Not Applicable
(25)	If fix-term, duration in months	Not Applicable
(26)	Note on (23)-(25) (max. 200 words)	Not Applicable
(27)	Cuts of existing benefits?	Not Applicable
(28)	Note on (27) (max. 200 words)	Not Applicable
(29)	Estimated cost of reform in 2020 (national currency)	Not Applicable
(30)	Estimated cost of reform in 2021 (national currency)	Not Applicable
(31)	National Currency Code (ISO 4217)	Not Applicable
(32)	Source of cost estimation	Not Applicable
(33)	Note (29)-(31) (max. 200 words)	Not Applicable
(34)	If the implementation of the reform should already have started, has the reform been implemented?	Not Applicable

Law 2: Reallocation of National Budget – Social Safety Net		
(1)	Number of law	No. 54 / 2020
(2)	Name of law (original language)	Peraturan Presiden Republik Indonesia Nomor 54 Tahun 2020 tentang Perubahan Postur dan Rincian Anggaran Pendapatan dan Belanja Negara Tahun Anggaran 2020.
(3)	Name of law (English)	Presidential Regulation No. 54/2020 on the Changes to the Structure and Details of the National Budget, 2020.
(4)	Date of first parliamentary motion	Not Applicable
(5)	Date of law's enactment	03 April 2020
(6)	Date of law's publication	03 April 2020
(7)	Is the Covid-19 pandemic explicitly mentioned as a motivation in the law or any accompanying text?	Yes
(8)	Was the Covid-19 pandemic a motivation for the initial parliamentary motion for this law?	Not Applicable

Law 2: Reallocation of National Budget – Social Safety Net		
(9)	Was the Covid-19 pandemic a motivation for a significant revision of the legislative project after the initial parliamentary motion?	Not Applicable
(10)	Note on (7)-(9) (max. 300 words)	This regulation covers technical aspects of the budget reallocation for the social safety net program covered by Government Regulation in Lieu of Law No. 1/2020 elaborated above. The government regulation in lieu of law covers relatively broad issues of budget reallocation for the social safety net program. To implement the regulation, it needs a more detailed legal document which governs all technical matters of the implementation. One article of the government regulation therefore clearly states that to put the regulation into practice, the government needs to issue a more detailed legal document, i.e. a presidential regulation. This law did not need approval from parliament as this is part of the government regulation that had been approved by parliament.
(11)	Was this law a legislative package that contained multiple social reform components?	No
(12)	If (11) yes, how many distinct social reform components did it contain?	Not Applicable

Law 2: Component 1		
(13)	Policy Area	Other (legislative reforms in other policy areas explicitly aimed at social protection (e.g. food subsidies or tax cuts aimed at social protection))
(14)	Brief description of reform component (max. 300 words)	This regulation covers the details and technical aspects of the reallocation and refocusing of the national budget contained in Government Regulation in Lieu of Law No. 1/2020 elaborated above, as the government regulation is only a relatively general legal arrangement of the reallocation and requires a more detailed legal document. One article of the government regulation clearly states that to put the regulation into practice, the government needs to issue a more detailed legal document, i.e. a presidential regulation. The regulation, however, covers a relatively broad range of social protection, namely the social safety net program and the budget allocation for the program. The regulation does not stipulate the social protection programs covered by the safety net. To execute the social protection programs, the Indonesian president mandated several ministers to implement the programs and to develop legal arrangements at ministerial level to regulate the programs. All the social protection programs are therefore technically regulated by regulations issued by the ministers responsible for the programs.
(15)	Change in coverage of existing benefits?	Not Applicable
(16)	Duration of coverage change?	Not Applicable
(17)	If fix-term, duration in months	Not Applicable
(18)	Note on (15)-(17) (max. 200 words)	Not Applicable
(19)	Change in generosity of existing benefits?	Not Applicable
(20)	Duration of generosity change?	Not Applicable
(21)	If fix-term, duration in months	Not Applicable
(22)	Note on (19)-(21) (max. 200 words)	Not Applicable
(23)	Introduction of new benefits?	Not Applicable
(24)	Duration of new benefits?	Not Applicable
(25)	If fix-term, duration in months	Not Applicable
(26)	Note on (23)-(25) (max. 200 words)	Not Applicable
(27)	Cuts of existing benefits?	Not Applicable
(28)	Note on (27) (max. 200 words)	Not Applicable
(29)	Estimated cost of reform in 2020 (national currency)	Not Applicable
(30)	Estimated cost of reform in 2021 (national currency)	Not Applicable

Law 2: Component 1		
(31)	National Currency Code (ISO 4217)	Not Applicable
(32)	Source of cost estimation	Not Applicable
(33)	Note (29)-(31) (max. 200 words)	Not Applicable
(34)	If the implementation of the reform should already have started, has the reform been implemented?	Not Applicable

Law 3: Conditional Cash Transfer – Program Keluarga Harapan (PKH)		
(1)	Number of law	No. 02/3/BS.02.01/4/2020
(2)	Name of law (original language)	Keputusan Direktur Jenderal Perlindungan dan Jaminan Sosial tentang Indeks dan Faktor Penimbang Bantuan Sosial Program Keluarga Harapan dalam Penanganan Covid-19 Tahun 2020
(3)	Name of law (English)	Decree of the Director General of Social Protection and Security (Ministry of Social Affairs) on Index of Conditional Cash Transfer – Program Keluarga Harapan (PKH) – in Addressing Covid-19.
(4)	Date of first parliamentary motion	Not Applicable
(5)	Date of law's enactment	02 August 2020
(6)	Date of law's publication	02 August 2020
(7)	Is the Covid-19 pandemic explicitly mentioned as a motivation in the law or any accompanying text?	Yes
(8)	Was the Covid-19 pandemic a motivation for the initial parliamentary motion for this law?	Not Applicable
(9)	Was the Covid-19 pandemic a motivation for a significant revision of the legislative project after the initial parliamentary motion?	Not Applicable
(10)	Note on (7)-(9) (max. 300 words)	PKH has been implemented in Indonesia since 2007. The decree by the Director General of Social Protection and Security No. 02/3/BS.02.01/4/2020 was issued specifically to respond to Covid-19. This was enacted by a ministerial functionary who was mandated by the Presidential Regulation No. 54/2020 to issue the legal document regulating the social protection mentioned above. This regulation was enacted specifically to cover the increase in the level of the PKH benefit. Prior to the enactment of this regulation, on 3 April, the Director General of Social Protection and Security (Ministry of Social Affairs) issued a decree 03/3/BS.01.02/4/2020 which changed the distribution mechanism from quarterly (prior to Covid-19) to monthly provision.
(11)	Was this law a legislative package that contained multiple social reform components?	No
(12)	If (11) yes, how many distinct social reform components did it contain?	Not Applicable

Law 3: Component 1		
(13)	Policy Area	Family benefits
(14)	Brief description of reform component (max. 300 words)	The Indonesian conditional cash transfer, PKH, provides family support as a cash transfer aiming to help poor families send their children to school and ensuring that the children have access to sufficient nutrition and healthcare. The other objective is to help poor families ensure that elderly and disabled members can access health services and take part in some activities specifically prepared for the disabled and elderly. To be eligible for the PKH, a poor household must have children under the age of senior school, and/or a pregnant woman, and/or disabled or elderly members. The PKH is a social protection program which was introduced in Indonesia in 2007. In response to Covid-19, the government increased the amount of the PKH benefit.

Law 3: Component 1		
(15)	Change in coverage of existing benefits?	Expansion
(16)	Duration of coverage change?	Yes
(17)	<i>If fix-term, duration in months</i>	April to December 2020
(18)	Note on (15)-(17) (max. 200 words)	Not Applicable
(19)	Change in generosity of existing benefits?	Expansion
(20)	Duration of generosity change?	Fix-term
(21)	<i>If fix-term, duration in months</i>	April to December 2020
(22)	Note on (19)-(21) (max. 200 words)	Not Applicable
(23)	Introduction of new benefits?	No
(24)	Duration of new benefits?	Not Applicable
(25)	<i>If fix-term, duration in months</i>	Not Applicable
(26)	Note on (23)-(25) (max. 200 words)	Not Applicable
(27)	Cuts of existing benefits?	No
(28)	Note on (27) (max. 200 words)	Not Applicable
(29)	Estimated cost of reform in 2020 (national currency)	In 2020, there was an increase in the PKH budget allocation of IDR 8.27 trillion (from IDR 29.13 trillion to IDR 37.4 trillion)
(30)	Estimated cost of reform in 2021 (national currency)	In 2021, the PKH budget is IDR 28.7 trillion. This will be distributed to 10 million beneficiaries
(31)	National Currency Code (ISO 4217)	IDR 360
(32)	Source of cost estimation	Other
(33)	Note (29)-(31) (max. 200 words)	Not Applicable
(34)	If the implementation of the reform should already have started, has the reform been implemented?	completely

Law 4: Basic Food Card (<i>Kartu Sembako</i>)		
(1)	Number of law	No.45/HUK/2020
(2)	Name of law (original language)	Keputusan Menteri Sosial tentang Perubahan atas Keputusan Menteri Sosial Nomor 29/HUK/2020 tentang Jumlah Keluarga Penerima Manfaat, Lokasi, Besarannya, dan Bahan Pangan Lokal dalam Penyaluran Bantuan Program Sembako Tahun 2020
(3)	Name of law (English)	Decree of the Minister of Social Affairs on Amendments of Decree of the Minister of Social Affairs No. 29 / HUK / 2020 on Number of Beneficiaries, Location, Value, and Local Food Ingredients in Distribution of Basic Food Assistance (Sembako) in 2020
(4)	Date of first parliamentary motion	Not Applicable
(5)	Date of law's enactment	07 April 2020
(6)	Date of law's publication	07 April 2020
(7)	Is the Covid-19 pandemic explicitly mentioned as a motivation in the law or any accompanying text?	Yes
(8)	Was the Covid-19 pandemic a motivation for the initial parliamentary motion for this law?	Not Applicable
(9)	Was the Covid-19 pandemic a motivation for a significant revision of the legislative project after the initial parliamentary motion?	Not Applicable

Law 4: Basic Food Card (<i>Kartu Sembako</i>)		
(10)	Note on (7)-(9) (max. 300 words)	This decree was enacted by the Minister of Social Affairs to regulate the Basic Food Card – <i>Kartu Sembilan Bahan Pokok</i> (<i>Kartu Sembako</i>) to help poor households access basic foodstuff by giving cash assistance to purchase food. During Covid-19, the Indonesian government increased the number of program recipients and the amount of the cash assistance from IDR 150,000 to IDR 200,000 per month. The <i>Sembako</i> program is not new because it was introduced in 1998 as part of the social safety net program to address socio-economic shocks due to the Asian financial crisis. At the onset of the implementation of the program, <i>Kartu Sembako</i> provided subsidized rice for poor households but then the program underwent several changes in its name, distribution method, number of recipients, and some other features.
(11)	Was this law a legislative package that contained multiple social reform components?	No
(12)	If (11) yes, how many distinct social reform components did it contain?	Not Applicable

Law 4: Component 1		
(13)	Policy Area	Social assistance
(14)	Brief description of reform component (max. 300 words)	<i>Kartu Sembako</i> is a social assistance program, which was introduced in 1998 as part of social safety net to mitigate the effects of socio-economic shocks on the poor caused by the 1997 Asian economic crisis. From 1998–2016, <i>Kartu Sembako</i> provided 15 kg of subsidized rice for each poor household monthly. In 2017, the government changed the 15kg subsidized rice to 10 kg of rice assistance. In 2018, the government again changed the rice assistance with cash assistance specifically to purchase basic foodstuffs. From 2018–2019, <i>Kartu Sembako</i> provided IDR 150,000 for each poor household monthly. To respond to Covid-19, the Indonesian government continues to provide cash assistance to the poor. During Covid-19, the government increased the amount of the assistance from IDR 150,000 to IDR 200,000 per month.
(15)	Change in coverage of existing benefits?	Expansion
(16)	Duration of coverage change?	Yes
(17)	If fix-term, duration in months	April 2020 to December 2020
(18)	Note on (15)-(17) (max. 200 words)	Not Applicable
(19)	Change in generosity of existing benefits?	Expansion
(20)	Duration of generosity change?	Fix-term
(21)	If fix-term, duration in months	April 2020 to December 2020
(22)	Note on (19)-(21) (max. 200 words)	Not Applicable
(23)	Introduction of new benefits?	No
(24)	Duration of new benefits?	Fix-term
(25)	If fix-term, duration in months	April 2020 to December 2020
(26)	Note on (23)-(25) (max. 200 words)	Not Applicable
(27)	Cuts of existing benefits?	No
(28)	Note on (27) (max. 200 words)	Not Applicable
(29)	Estimated cost of reform in 2020 (national currency)	The cost of the reform is IDR 2.16 trillion (IDR 500,00 x 4,800,000 x 9 months). The total budget allocation for <i>Kartu Sembako</i> in 2020 is IDR 43.6 trillion.
(30)	Estimated cost of reform in 2021 (national currency)	The cost of the reform is IDR 2 trillion (IDR 50,000 x 3,300,000 x 12 months). The total budget allocation in 2021 for <i>Kartu Sembako</i> is IDR 45.12 trillion.
(31)	National Currency Code (ISO 4217)	IDR 360
(32)	Source of cost estimation	Other
(33)	Note (29)-(31) (max. 200 words)	Not Applicable
(34)	If the implementation of the reform should already have started, has the reform been implemented?	completely

Law 5: Electricity Subsidy (<i>Subsidi Listrik</i>)		
(1)	Number of law	No 707/26/DJL.3/2020
(2)	Name of law (original language)	Surat Direktur Jenderal Ketenagalistrikan tentang Pelaksanaan Diskon Tarif Tenaga Listrik PT PLN (Persero)
(3)	Name of law (English)	Letter of the Director General of Electricity on the PT PLN (Persero) Electricity Tariff Discount
(4)	Date of first parliamentary motion	Not Applicable
(5)	Date of law's enactment	31 March 2020
(6)	Date of law's publication	31 March 2020
(7)	Is the Covid-19 pandemic explicitly mentioned as a motivation in the law or any accompanying text?	Yes
(8)	Was the Covid-19 pandemic a motivation for the initial parliamentary motion for this law?	Not Applicable
(9)	Was the Covid-19 pandemic a motivation for a significant revision of the legislative project after the initial parliamentary motion?	Not Applicable
(10)	Note on (7)-(9) (max. 300 words)	The Letter of the Director General of Electricity was issued specifically to regulate government assistance for the electricity subsidy. The electricity subsidy program is for poor households who use up to 450 VA or 900 VA. During Covid-19, the electricity subsidy program increases the amount of the benefit by providing free electricity for poor households using up to 450 VA and a discount of 50% for poor households for their electricity usage between 450 VA and 900 VA. The electricity subsidy program is for six months from April to December 2020
(11)	Was this law a legislative package that contained multiple social reform components?	No
(12)	If (11) yes, how many distinct social reform components did it contain?	Not Applicable

Law 5: Component 1		
(13)	Policy Area	Other (Legislative reforms in other policy areas explicitly aimed at social protection (e.g. food subsidies or tax cuts aimed at social protection))
(14)	Brief description of reform component (max. 300 words)	The electricity subsidy program provided substantial help to poor households to maintain their access to electricity, particularly for those using up to 450 VA and 900 VA. During Covid-19 the government increased the amount of the benefit by providing free electricity for poor households using up to 450 VA and a discount of 50% for poor households for their electricity usage between 450 VA and 900 VA. The electricity subsidy program is for six months from April to December 2020. The subsidy program has been implemented since 2007.
(15)	Change in coverage of existing benefits?	Expansion
(16)	Duration of coverage change?	Yes
(17)	If fix-term, duration in months	April to December 2020
(18)	Note on (15)-(17) (max. 200 words)	Not Applicable
(19)	Change in generosity of existing benefits?	Expansion
(20)	Duration of generosity change?	Fix-term
(21)	If fix-term, duration in months	April to December 2020
(22)	Note on (19)-(21) (max. 200 words)	Not Applicable
(23)	Introduction of new benefits?	No
(24)	Duration of new benefits?	Fix-term
(25)	If fix-term, duration in months	April to December 2020
(26)	Note on (23)-(25) (max. 200 words)	Not Applicable
(27)	Cuts of existing benefits?	Not Applicable
(28)	Note on (27) (max. 200 words)	Not Applicable

Law 5: Component 1		
(29)	Estimated cost of reform in 2020 (national currency)	Total budget for this program in 2020 is IDR 6.9 trillion.
(30)	Estimated cost of reform in 2021 (national currency)	Not Applicable
(31)	National Currency Code (ISO 4217)	IDR 360
(32)	Source of cost estimation	Other
(33)	Note (29)-(31) (max. 200 words)	Not Applicable
(34)	If the implementation of the reform should already have started, has the reform been implemented?	to a large degree

Law 6: Cash transfer for beneficiaries outside the Greater Jakarta region		
(1)	Number of law	No.18/6/SK/HK.02.02/4/2020
(2)	Name of law (original language)	Keputusan Direktur Jenderal Penanganan Fakir Miskin tentang Petunjuk Teknis Penyaluran Bantuan Sosial Tunai Dalam Penanganan Dampak Covid-19
(3)	Name of law (English)	Decree of the Director General for Handling the Poor on Technical Instructions for Distribution of Social Cash Assistance in Handling the Impact of Covid-19
(4)	Date of first parliamentary motion	Not Applicable
(5)	Date of law's enactment	20 April 2020
(6)	Date of law's publication	20 April 2020
(7)	Is the Covid-19 pandemic explicitly mentioned as a motivation in the law or any accompanying text?	Yes
(8)	Was the Covid-19 pandemic a motivation for the initial parliamentary motion for this law?	Not Applicable
(9)	Was the Covid-19 pandemic a motivation for a significant revision of the legislative project after the initial parliamentary motion?	Not Applicable
(10)	Note on (7)-(9) (max. 300 words)	The Decree of the Director General for Handling the Poor, Ministry of Social Affairs is issued specifically to administer the Cash transfer for non-Greater Jakarta to address socio-economic adversity caused by Covid-19. The cash transfer for non-Grater Jakarta is an unconditional cash transfer which provides cash assistance to poor households. The amount of the benefit is IDR 600,000 per month for each poor household. Nine million poor household throughout Indonesia, except for the Greater Jakarta region, receive the cash transfer.
(11)	Was this law a legislative package that contained multiple social reform components?	No
(12)	If (11) yes, how many distinct social reform components did it contain?	Not Applicable

Law 6: Component 1		
(13)	Policy Area	Social assistance
(14)	Brief description of reform component (max. 300 words)	The Cash transfer for non-Greater Jakarta is categorized by the government as a non-regular social protection program. It is a new program initiated specifically to respond to Covid-19. The cash transfer for non-Greater Jakarta is an unconditional cash transfer, which provides cash assistance to poor households. The amount of the benefit is IDR 600,000 per month for each poor household. Nine million poor household throughout Indonesia, except for the Greater Jakarta region, receive the cash transfer. (to be continued)

Law 6: Component 1		
(14)	(Continued) Brief description of reform component (max. 300 words)	<p>The Cash transfer for non-Greater Jakarta is categorized by the government as a non-regular social protection program. It is a new program initiated specifically to respond to Covid-19.</p> <p>The cash transfer for non-Greater Jakarta is an unconditional cash transfer, which provides cash assistance to poor households. The amount of the benefit is IDR 600,000 per month for each poor household. Nine million poor household throughout Indonesia, except for the Greater Jakarta region, receive the cash transfer.</p> <p>The cash transfer for non-Greater Jakarta program was, in fact, only initiated in April 2020, but the essential content of the program, i.e. an unconditional cash transfer, was already initiated by the Indonesian government in 2005. The 2005 unconditional cash transfer, which is called <i>Bantuan Langsung Tunai</i> (BLT), was originally intended to provide compensation for the reduction of a fuel subsidy for poor households. Its funding in the budget thus came from the savings from reducing the fuel subsidy. The BLT program underwent changes, particularly to its name and the amount of benefit.</p>
(15)	Change in coverage of existing benefits?	Not Applicable
(16)	Duration of coverage change?	Not Applicable
(17)	If fix-term, duration in months	Not Applicable
(18)	Note on (15)-(17) (max. 200 words)	Not Applicable
(19)	Change in generosity of existing benefits?	Not Applicable
(20)	Duration of generosity change?	Not Applicable
(21)	If fix-term, duration in months	Not Applicable
(22)	Note on (19)-(21) (max. 200 words)	Not Applicable
(23)	Introduction of new benefits?	Yes
(24)	Duration of new benefits?	Fix-term
(25)	If fix-term, duration in months	April to December 2020
(26)	Note on (23)-(25) (max. 200 words)	Not Applicable
(27)	Cuts of existing benefits?	Not Applicable
(28)	Note on (27) (max. 200 words)	Not Applicable
(29)	Estimated cost of reform in 2020 (national currency)	Budget allocation for 2020 is IDR 16.2 trillion for about 9,000,000 beneficiaries.
(30)	Estimated cost of reform in 2021 (national currency)	Budget allocation for 2021 is IDR 12 trillion for about 10,000,000 beneficiaries.
(31)	National Currency Code (ISO 4217)	IDR 360
(32)	Source of cost estimation	News report
(33)	Note (29)-(31) (max. 200 words)	Not Applicable
(34)	If the implementation of the reform should already have started, has the reform been implemented?	completely

Law 7: Basic food assistance for the Greater Jakarta		
(1)	Number of law	No. 05/3/BS.01.02/7/2020
(2)	Name of law (original language)	Keputusan Direktur Jenderal Perlindungan dan Jaminan Sosial tentang Petunjuk Teknis Pelaksanaan Penyaluran Bantuan Sosial Sembako Dalam Rangka Penanganan Corona Virus Disease 2019 (Covid-19) Untuk Provinsi DKI Jakarta, Kabupaten Bogor, Kota Depok, Kota Tangerang, Kota Tangerang Selatan, dan Kota Bekasi
(3)	Name of law (English)	Decree of the Director General of Social Protection and Security on Technical Guidelines for the Distribution of Basic Food Social Assistance in the Context of Handling Corona Virus Disease 2019 (Covid-19) for the Greater Jakarta Region.
(4)	Date of first parliamentary motion	Not Applicable
(5)	Date of law's enactment	16 April 2020

Law 7: Basic food assistance for the Greater Jakarta		
(6)	Date of law's publication	08 July 2020
(7)	Is the Covid-19 pandemic explicitly mentioned as a motivation in the law or any accompanying text?	Yes
(8)	Was the Covid-19 pandemic a motivation for the initial parliamentary motion for this law?	Not Applicable
(9)	Was the Covid-19 pandemic a motivation for a significant revision of the legislative project after the initial parliamentary motion?	Not Applicable
(10)	Note on (7)-(9) (max. 300 words)	The Director General of Social Protection and Security issued the decree No. 05/3/BS.01.02/7/2020 specifically to help the poor living in the Greater Jakarta region by providing basic food assistance. The program provides social assistance of IDR 600,000 per month to the poor to purchase basic foodstuffs. The beneficiaries of basic food assistance are 1,900,000 poor households, covering 1,300,000 beneficiaries from Jakarta and 600,000 beneficiaries from other regions/cities mentioned above.
(11)	Was this law a legislative package that contained multiple social reform components?	No
(12)	If (11) yes, how many distinct social reform components did it contain?	Not Applicable

Law 7: Component 1		
(13)	Policy Area	Social assistance
(14)	Brief description of reform component (max. 300 words)	Basic food assistance for the Greater Jakarta region is classified by the Indonesian government as a non-regular social protection program. It is a new program initiated specifically to respond to Covid-19. The basic food assistance program provides social assistance of IDR 600,000 per month to the poor to purchase basic foodstuffs.
(15)	Change in coverage of existing benefits?	Not Applicable
(16)	Duration of coverage change?	Not Applicable
(17)	If fix-term, duration in months	Not Applicable
(18)	Note on (15)-(17) (max. 200 words)	Not Applicable
(19)	Change in generosity of existing benefits?	Not Applicable
(20)	Duration of generosity change?	Not Applicable
(21)	If fix-term, duration in months	Not Applicable
(22)	Note on (19)-(21) (max. 200 words)	Not Applicable
(23)	Introduction of new benefits?	Yes
(24)	Duration of new benefits?	Fix-term
(25)	If fix-term, duration in months	April to December 2020
(26)	Note on (23)-(25) (max. 200 words)	Not Applicable
(27)	Cuts of existing benefits?	Not Applicable
(28)	Note on (27) (max. 200 words)	Not Applicable
(29)	Estimated cost of reform in 2020 (national currency)	Budget allocation for 2020 is IDR 3.42 trillion.
(30)	Estimated cost of reform in 2021 (national currency)	The program will not be implemented in 2021.
(31)	National Currency Code (ISO 4217)	IDR 360
(32)	Source of cost estimation	News report
(33)	Note (29)-(31) (max. 200 words)	Not Applicable
(34)	If the implementation of the reform should already have started, has the reform been implemented?	completely

Law 8: Village fund cash transfer (BLT Dana Desa)		
(1)	Number of law	No.7/2020
(2)	Name of law (original language)	Peraturan Menteri Desa, Pembangunan Daerah Tertinggal, dan Transmigrasi tentang Perubahan Kedua atas Peraturan Menteri Desa, Pembangunan Daerah Tertinggal, dan Transmigrasi Nomor 11 Tahun 2019 tentang Prioritas Penggunaan Dana Desa Tahun 2020
(3)	Name of law (English)	Regulation of the Minister of Villages, Development of Disadvantaged Areas, and Transmigration on the Second Amendment to the Regulation of the Minister of Villages, Development of Disadvantaged Areas, and Transmigration Number 11 of 2019 on Priority of Village Funds in 2020
(4)	Date of first parliamentary motion	Not Applicable
(5)	Date of law's enactment	16 June 2020
(6)	Date of law's publication	16 June 2020
(7)	Is the Covid-19 pandemic explicitly mentioned as a motivation in the law or any accompanying text?	Yes
(8)	Was the Covid-19 pandemic a motivation for the initial parliamentary motion for this law?	Not Applicable
(9)	Was the Covid-19 pandemic a motivation for a significant revision of the legislative project after the initial parliamentary motion?	Not Applicable
(10)	Note on (7)-(9) (max. 300 words)	The Regulation of the Minister of Villages, Development of Disadvantaged Areas, and Transmigration is issued specifically to administer the Village fund cash transfer – <i>Bantuan Langsung Tunai Dana Desa</i> (BLT DD) program, to address socio-economic adversity caused by Covid-19. BLT DD is an unconditional cash transfer program providing cash transfers to the poor to help them access basic necessities and social services. During Covid-19, BLT DD gave the poor a cash benefit of IDR 600,000 per month for six months. Eleven million poor households received BLT DD.
(11)	Was this law a legislative package that contained multiple social reform components?	No
(12)	If (11) yes, how many distinct social reform components did it contain?	Not Applicable

Law 8: Component 1		
(13)	Policy Area	Social assistance
(14)	Brief description of reform component (max. 300 words)	Village fund cash transfer – <i>Bantuan Langsung Tunai Dana Desa</i> (BLT DD) is categorized by the government as a non-regular social protection program. It is a new program initiated specifically to respond to Covid-19. BLT DD is an unconditional cash transfer program providing cash to the poor to help them access basic necessities and social services. During Covid-19, BLT DD provided cash assistance of IDR 600,000 per month for each poor household, for 6 months. Eleven million poor households received BLT DD. The BLT DD program was, in fact, only initiated in April 2020, but the essential content of the program, i.e. an unconditional cash transfer, was already initiated in 2005. The 2005 unconditional cash transfer, which is called <i>Bantuan Langsung Tunai</i> (BLT), was originally intended to provide compensation for the reduction of the fuel subsidy for poor households. Its funding in the budget thus came from the savings from the reduction in the fuel subsidy. The BLT DD program is financed from the village fund. The village fund is a part of the decentralized districts' revenues, arising from central government transfers aimed at helping the district governments finance village administration, capacity building, and community empowerment.
(15)	Change in coverage of existing benefits?	Not Applicable
(16)	Duration of coverage change?	Not Applicable
(17)	If fix-term, duration in months	Not Applicable

Law 8: Component 1		
(18)	Note on (15)-(17) (max. 200 words)	Not Applicable
(19)	Change in generosity of existing benefits?	Not Applicable
(20)	Duration of generosity change?	Not Applicable
(21)	If fix-term, duration in months	Not Applicable
(22)	Note on (19)-(21) (max. 200 words)	Not Applicable
(23)	Introduction of new benefits?	Yes
(24)	Duration of new benefits?	Fix-term
(25)	If fix-term, duration in months	April to December 2020
(26)	Note on (23)-(25) (max. 200 words)	Not Applicable
(27)	Cuts of existing benefits?	No
(28)	Note on (27) (max. 200 words)	Not Applicable
(29)	Estimated cost of reform in 2020 (national currency)	Budget allocation for BLT DD in 2020 is IDR 31.2 trillion.
(30)	Estimated cost of reform in 2021 (national currency)	The government has not yet decided about the implementation of the BLT DD in 2021.
(31)	National Currency Code (ISO 4217)	IDR 360
(32)	Source of cost estimation	Other
(33)	Note (29)-(31) (max. 200 words)	Not Applicable
(34)	If the implementation of the reform should already have started, has the reform been implemented?	to a large degree

Law 9: Pre-employment Card (<i>Kartu Prakerja</i>)		
(1)	Number of law	76/2020
(2)	Name of law (original language)	Peraturan Presiden tentang Perubahan atas Peraturan Presiden Nomor 36 Tahun 2020 tentang Pengembangan Kompetensi Kerja melalui Program Kartu Prakerja
(3)	Name of law (English)	Presidential Regulation on Amendments of Presidential Regulation Number 36 / 2020 on Work Competency Development through the Pre-Employment Card Program
(4)	Date of first parliamentary motion	Not Applicable
(5)	Date of law's enactment	08 July 2020
(6)	Date of law's publication	07 July 2020
(7)	Is the Covid-19 pandemic explicitly mentioned as a motivation in the law or any accompanying text?	Yes
(8)	Was the Covid-19 pandemic a motivation for the initial parliamentary motion for this law?	Not Applicable
(9)	Was the Covid-19 pandemic a motivation for a significant revision of the legislative project after the initial parliamentary motion?	Not Applicable
(10)	Note on (7)-(9) (max. 300 words)	The Presidential Regulation No. 76/2020 was enacted specifically to respond to the socio-economic issues caused by Covid-19. This regulation covers the Pre-employment card – <i>Kartu Pra-kerja</i> program, which provides social support for the poor, particularly those who are unemployed or newly-terminated due to Covid-19, to help them re-enter the labor market. The <i>Kartu Pra-kerja</i> program provides training and a monthly benefit for unemployed and terminated workers.

Law 9: Pre-employment Card (<i>Kartu Prakerja</i>)		
(11)	Was this law a legislative package that contained multiple social reform components?	No
(12)	If (11) yes, how many distinct social reform components did it contain?	Not Applicable

Law 9: Component 1		
(13)	Policy Area	Labor market
(14)	Brief description of reform component (max. 300 words)	The pre-employment benefit – <i>Kartu Pra-kerja</i> is classified by the government as a non-regular social protection program. A non-regular program refers to a new program which was initiated specifically to respond to Covid-19. This program is the first targeted social protection program in the sphere of the labor market in Indonesia. The <i>Kartu Pra-kerja</i> program provides training and a monthly benefit of IDR 600,000 for unemployed and terminated workers for 8 months. The training is intended to improve workers' skills for re-entering the labor market or developing a new business, and the benefit is to help the workers access basic necessities and services.
(15)	Change in coverage of existing benefits?	Not Applicable
(16)	Duration of coverage change?	Not Applicable
(17)	If fix-term, duration in months	Not Applicable
(18)	Note on (15)-(17) (max. 200 words)	Not Applicable
(19)	Change in generosity of existing benefits?	Not Applicable
(20)	Duration of generosity change?	Not Applicable
(21)	If fix-term, duration in months	Not Applicable
(22)	Note on (19)-(21) (max. 200 words)	Not Applicable
(23)	Introduction of new benefits?	Yes
(24)	Duration of new benefits?	Fix-term
(25)	If fix-term, duration in months	April to November 2020
(26)	Note on (23)-(25) (max. 200 words)	Not Applicable
(27)	Cuts of existing benefits?	Not Applicable
(28)	Note on (27) (max. 200 words)	Not Applicable
(29)	Estimated cost of reform in 2020 (national currency)	The budget allocation for this program is IDR 20 trillion.
(30)	Estimated cost of reform in 2021 (national currency)	The program will not be implemented in 2021.
(31)	National Currency Code (ISO 4217)	IDR 360
(32)	Source of cost estimation	Other
(33)	Note (29)-(31) (max. 200 words)	Not Applicable
(34)	If the implementation of the reform should already have started, has the reform been implemented?	completely

Law 10: Wage Subsidy Assistance (<i>Bantuan Subsidi Upah bagi Pekerja/Buruh</i>)		
(1)	Number of law	No. 4/845/HK.00/VIII/2020
(2)	Name of law (original language)	Keputusan Direktur Jenderal Hubungan Industrial dan Jaminan Sosial Tenaga Kerja tentang Petunjuk Teknis Penyaluran Bantuan Pemerintah berupa Subsidi Gaji/Upah bagi Pekerja/Buruh dalam Penanganan Dampak Covid-19
(3)	Name of law (English)	Decree of the Director General of Industrial Relations and Labor Social Security on Technical Guidelines for the Distribution of Wage Subsidy for Workers during Covid-19
(4)	Date of first parliamentary motion	Not Applicable
(5)	Date of law's enactment	24 August 2020
(6)	Date of law's publication	24 August 2020

Law 10: Wage Subsidy Assistance (<i>Bantuan Subsidi Upah bagi Pekerja/Buruh</i>)		
(7)	Is the Covid-19 pandemic explicitly mentioned as a motivation in the law or any accompanying text?	Yes
(8)	Was the Covid-19 pandemic a motivation for the initial parliamentary motion for this law?	Not Applicable
(9)	Was the Covid-19 pandemic a motivation for a significant revision of the legislative project after the initial parliamentary motion?	Not Applicable
(10)	Note on (7)-(9) (max. 300 words)	The Decree of the Director General of Industrial Relations and Labor Social Security No. 4/845/HK.00/VIII/2020 was enacted specifically to address the socio-economic adversity caused by Covid-19. The decree governs the <i>Bantuan Subsidi Upah</i> program, which provides cash benefits to low-wage workers to help them dealing with socio-economic difficulty during Covid-19. The program gives a cash benefit of IDR 600,000 per month for four months to active workers that have a monthly salary under IDR 5,000,000.
(11)	Was this law a legislative package that contained multiple social reform components?	Yes
(12)	If (11) yes, how many distinct social reform components did it contain?	Not Applicable

Law 10: Component 1		
(13)	Policy Area	Labor market
(14)	Brief description of reform component (max. 300 words)	The wage subsidy – <i>Bantuan Subsidi Upah</i> is categorized by the Indonesian government as a non-regular social protection program. A non-regular program can be considered a new program initiated specifically to respond to Covid-19. This program is the second targeted social protection program in the area of the labor market in Indonesia, initiated soon after the first one, the <i>Kartu Pra-kerja</i> program. The wage subsidy – <i>Bantuan Subsidi Upah</i> gives a cash benefit of IDR 600,000 per month for four months to active workers with a monthly salary under IDR 5,000,000. This is intended to help low-wage workers to maintain their purchasing capacity, and to provide an economic stimulus to maintain economic activity in society.
(15)	Change in coverage of existing benefits?	Not Applicable
(16)	Duration of coverage change?	Not Applicable
(17)	If fix-term, duration in months	Not Applicable
(18)	Note on (15)-(17) (max. 200 words)	Not Applicable
(19)	Change in generosity of existing benefits?	Not Applicable
(20)	Duration of generosity change?	Not Applicable
(21)	If fix-term, duration in months	Not Applicable
(22)	Note on (19)-(21) (max. 200 words)	Not Applicable
(23)	Introduction of new benefits?	Yes
(24)	Duration of new benefits?	Fix-term
(25)	If fix-term, duration in months	September to December 2020
(26)	Note on (23)-(25) (max. 200 words)	Not Applicable
(27)	Cuts of existing benefits?	Not Applicable
(28)	Note on (27) (max. 200 words)	Not Applicable
(29)	Estimated cost of reform in 2020 (national currency)	The total budget for the <i>Bantuan Subsidi Upah</i> program is IDR 37.7 trillion.
(30)	Estimated cost of reform in 2021 (national currency)	Not Applicable
(31)	National Currency Code (ISO 4217)	IDR 360

Law 10: Component 1		
(32)	Source of cost estimation	Other
(33)	Note (29)-(31) (max. 200 words)	Not Applicable
(34)	If the implementation of the reform should already have started, has the reform been implemented?	partially

Law 11: Additional cash transfer for recipients basic food card		
(1)	Number of law	No.30/6/SK/HK.02.02/8/2020
(2)	Name of law (original language)	Keputusan Direktur Jenderal Penanganan Fakir Miskin tentang Petunjuk Teknis Penyaluran Bantuan Sosial Tunai Dalam Penanganan Dampak Covid-19
(3)	Name of law (English)	Decree of the Director General for Handling the Poor on Technical Instructions for Distribution of Social Cash Assistance in Handling the Impact of Covid-19
(4)	Date of first parliamentary motion	Not Applicable
(5)	Date of law's enactment	12 August 2020
(6)	Date of law's publication	12 August 2020
(7)	Is the Covid-19 pandemic explicitly mentioned as a motivation in the law or any accompanying text?	Yes
(8)	Was the Covid-19 pandemic a motivation for the initial parliamentary motion for this law?	Not Applicable
(9)	Was the Covid-19 pandemic a motivation for a significant revision of the legislative project after the initial parliamentary motion?	Not Applicable
(10)	Note on (7)-(9) (max. 300 words)	The decree of the Director General for Handling the Poor was enacted by the Indonesian government specifically to address the socio-economic difficulties caused by Covid-19 by providing an additional cash transfer to recipients of the basic food card. The additional cash transfer is an unconditional cash transfer, which provides an additional benefit of IDR 500,000 per month to 9 million poor households. The poor who are eligible for this program are specifically those who already receive the basic food subsidy and are registered as recipients of PKH.
(11)	Was this law a legislative package that contained multiple social reform components?	No
(12)	If (11) yes, how many distinct social reform components did it contain?	Not Applicable

Law 11: Component 1		
(13)	Policy Area	Social assistance
(14)	Brief description of reform component (max. 300 words)	An additional cash transfer for recipients of the basic food card is considered a non-regular social protection program by the Indonesian government. A non-regular program refers to a new program initiated specifically to respond to Covid-19. The additional cash transfer for recipients of the basic food card is an unconditional cash transfer, which provides cash assistance to poor households. The amount of the benefit is IDR 500,000 per family as a one-off disbursement. Nine million poor households receive the cash transfer. The recipients of this program are specifically those who already receive the basic food subsidy and are registered as recipients of PKH. In fact, the additional cash transfer program was only initiated in 2020, but the essential content of the program, i.e. an unconditional cash transfer, was already initiated in 2005. The 2005 unconditional cash transfer, which is called <i>Bantuan Langsung Tunai</i> (BLT), was originally intended to provide compensation for a reduction in the fuel subsidy for poor households.
(15)	Change in coverage of existing benefits?	Not Applicable

Law 11: Component 1		
(16)	Duration of coverage change?	Not Applicable
(17)	If fix-term, duration in months	Not Applicable
(18)	Note on (15)-(17) (max. 200 words)	Not Applicable
(19)	Change in generosity of existing benefits?	Not Applicable
(20)	Duration of generosity change?	Not Applicable
(21)	If fix-term, duration in months	Not Applicable
(22)	Note on (19)-(21) (max. 200 words)	Not Applicable
(23)	Introduction of new benefits?	Yes
(24)	Duration of new benefits?	Fix-term
(25)	If fix-term, duration in months	September 2020
(26)	Note on (23)-(25) (max. 200 words)	Not Applicable
(27)	Cuts of existing benefits?	Not Applicable
(28)	Note on (27) (max. 200 words)	Not Applicable
(29)	Estimated cost of reform in 2020 (national currency)	IDR 4.6 trillion
(30)	Estimated cost of reform in 2021 (national currency)	The program will not be implemented in 2021.
(31)	National Currency Code (ISO 4217)	IDR 360
(32)	Source of cost estimation	Other
(33)	Note (29)-(31) (max. 200 words)	Not Applicable
(34)	If the implementation of the reform should already have started, has the reform been implemented?	completely

Law 12: Cash Assistance for Micro-Enterprises (<i>Bantuan Produktif Usaha Mikro</i>)		
(1)	Number of law	No. 6/2020
(2)	Name of law (original language)	Peraturan Menteri Koperasi, Usaha Kecil dan Menengah tentang Pedoman Umum Penyaluran Bantuan Pemerintah Bagi Pelaku Usaha Mikro untuk Mendukung Pemulihan Ekonomi Nasional Dalam Rangka Menghadapi Ancaman yang Membahayakan Perekonomian Nasional serta Penyelamatan Ekonomi Nasional Pada Masa Pandemi Covid-19
(3)	Name of law (English)	Regulation of the Minister of Cooperatives, Small and Medium Enterprises on General Guidelines for Distribution of Government Assistance to Micro-Business to Support National Economic Recovery during Covid-19
(4)	Date of first parliamentary motion	Not Applicable
(5)	Date of law's enactment	12 August 2020
(6)	Date of law's publication	12 August 2020
(7)	Is the Covid-19 pandemic explicitly mentioned as a motivation in the law or any accompanying text?	Yes
(8)	Was the Covid-19 pandemic a motivation for the initial parliamentary motion for this law?	Not Applicable
(9)	Was the Covid-19 pandemic a motivation for a significant revision of the legislative project after the initial parliamentary motion?	Not Applicable
(10)	Note on (7)-(9) (max. 300 words)	Regulation of the Minister of Cooperatives, Small and Medium Enterprises No. 6/2020 was issued by the Indonesian government specifically to administrate cash assistance for micro-enterprises to help owners of small businesses run their business during Covid-19. The <i>Bantuan Produktif Usaha Mikro</i> provides cash assistance of IDR 2,400,000 for small enterprises to help them to expand their business during Covid-19. The cash assistance is distributed to 9.12 million business owners in Indonesia.

Law 12: Cash Assistance for Micro-Enterprises (<i>Bantuan Produktif Usaha Mikro</i>)		
(11)	Was this law a legislative package that contained multiple social reform components?	No
(12)	If (11) yes, how many distinct social reform components did it contain?	Not Applicable

Law 12: Component 1		
(13)	Policy Area	Social assistance
(14)	Brief description of reform component (max. 300 words)	Cash assistance for micro-enterprises – <i>Bantuan Produktif Usaha Mikro</i> is considered a non-regular social protection program by the Indonesian government. A non-regular program refers to a new program initiated specifically to respond to Covid-19. The cash assistance for micro-enterprises program provides cash assistance of IDR 2,400,000 to small enterprises to help them run and expand their business during Covid-19. The assistance can be used to meet all technical needs of the enterprises. This program is implemented by the Indonesian government to support the national economic recovery programs.
(15)	Change in coverage of existing benefits?	Not Applicable
(16)	Duration of coverage change?	Not Applicable
(17)	If fix-term, duration in months	Not Applicable
(18)	Note on (15)-(17) (max. 200 words)	Not Applicable
(19)	Change in generosity of existing benefits?	Not Applicable
(20)	Duration of generosity change?	Not Applicable
(21)	If fix-term, duration in months	Not Applicable
(22)	Note on (19)-(21) (max. 200 words)	Not Applicable
(23)	Introduction of new benefits?	Yes
(24)	Duration of new benefits?	Fix-term
(25)	If fix-term, duration in months	August to December 2020
(26)	Note on (23)-(25) (max. 200 words)	Not Applicable
(27)	Cuts of existing benefits?	Not Applicable
(28)	Note on (27) (max. 200 words)	Not Applicable
(29)	Estimated cost of reform in 2020 (national currency)	Budget allocation for this program in 2020 is IDR 22.02 trillion for 9.12 million micro-businesses.
(30)	Estimated cost of reform in 2021 (national currency)	Budget allocation for this program in 2021 is IDR 48 trillion for 20 million small and micro-businesses.
(31)	National Currency Code (ISO 4217)	IDR 360
(32)	Source of cost estimation	News report
(33)	Note (29)-(31) (max. 200 words)	Not Applicable
(34)	If the implementation of the reform should already have started, has the reform been implemented?	partially

Law 13: Rice Assistance for PKH Recipients (<i>Bantuan Beras untuk penerima PKH</i>)		
(1)	Number of law	322/2020
(2)	Name of law (original language)	Peraturan Direktur Jenderal Pemberdayaan Sosial tentang petunjuk teknis bantuan sosial beras
(3)	Name of law (English)	Regulation of the Director General of Social Empowerment on Technical Instructions for Rice Assistance
(4)	Date of first parliamentary motion	Not Applicable
(5)	Date of law's enactment	31 August 2020
(6)	Date of law's publication	31 August 2020
(7)	Is the Covid-19 pandemic explicitly mentioned as a motivation in the law or any accompanying text?	Yes

Law 13: Rice Assistance for PKH Recipients (<i>Bantuan Beras untuk penerima PKH</i>)		
(8)	Was the Covid-19 pandemic a motivation for the initial parliamentary motion for this law?	Not Applicable
(9)	Was the Covid-19 pandemic a motivation for a significant revision of the legislative project after the initial parliamentary motion?	Not Applicable
(10)	Note on (7)-(9) (max. 300 words)	The Regulation of the Director General of Social Empowerment was enacted specifically to administrate the Rice Assistance for PKH recipients program, which was introduced to help the poor deal with the socio-economic adversity caused by Covid-19. This program provides in-kind assistance for households. During Covid-19, the program provided rice assistance of 15 kg per month per household for 3 months. The program distributes the assistance to the 10 million poor households who receive the PKH benefit.
(11)	Was this law a legislative package that contained multiple social reform components?	No
(12)	If (11) yes, how many distinct social reform components did it contain?	Not Applicable

Law 13: Component 1		
(13)	Policy Area	Social assistance
(14)	Brief description of reform component (max. 300 words)	The Rice Assistance for PKH recipients program is categorized as a non-regular social protection program by the Indonesian government. A non-regular program refers to a new program initiated specifically to respond to Covid-19. During Covid-19, the program provided rice assistance of 15 kg per month to 10 million poor households for 3 months.
(15)	Change in coverage of existing benefits?	Not Applicable
(16)	Duration of coverage change?	Not Applicable
(17)	<i>If fix-term, duration in months</i>	Not Applicable
(18)	Note on (15)-(17) (max. 200 words)	Not Applicable
(19)	Change in generosity of existing benefits?	Not Applicable
(20)	Duration of generosity change?	Not Applicable
(21)	<i>If fix-term, duration in months</i>	Not Applicable
(22)	Note on (19)-(21) (max. 200 words)	Not Applicable
(23)	Introduction of new benefits?	Yes
(24)	Duration of new benefits?	Fix-term
(25)	<i>If fix-term, duration in months</i>	August to October 2020
(26)	Note on (23)-(25) (max. 200 words)	Not Applicable
(27)	Cuts of existing benefits?	Not Applicable
(28)	Note on (27) (max. 200 words)	Not Applicable
(29)	Estimated cost of reform in 2020 (national currency)	The estimated cost of the reform in 2020 is IDR 4.6 trillion.
(30)	Estimated cost of reform in 2021 (national currency)	The program will not be implemented in 2021.
(31)	National Currency Code (ISO 4217)	IDR 360
(32)	Source of cost estimation	Other
(33)	Note (29)-(31) (max. 200 words)	Not Applicable
(34)	If the implementation of the reform should already have started, has the reform been implemented?	completely