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Abstract. Poverty in Indonesia is still a major problem in national development. Therefore, poverty is still a top priority program that must be carried out by various regions in Indonesia. Various models of regional policies have been created to promote poverty alleviation. This study aims to evaluate and analyze the poverty alleviation policy model that has been carried out by the Sumedang Regency Government and the Magelang Regency Government and its impact on the socio-economic sector through a spatial approach. The research was carried out with a qualitative descriptive method using secondary data derived from official government documents covering poverty alleviation policies and their performance achievements. This study is able to show a scientific deepening of the form of poverty reduction supported by the sensitivity of regional policies to provide space in the process of spatial-based regional economic development. The results of this study present a partial spatial strategy that must be carried out, including agricultural intensification from the small farming sector, the development of a more dynamic commercial agriculture sector, providing growth stimulation in the non-agricultural rural sector, shifting the productive age population and providing a safety net for those trapped in poverty as an alternative in solving poverty alleviation. This strategy can be used as a recommendation for further improvement of poverty alleviation policies by presenting policy implications and a roadmap for the action plan.

Keywords: poverty, regional policies, regional economy, regional approach.

1. Introduction

Poverty in Indonesia is still a major problem in national development. Therefore, poverty is still a top priority program that must be carried out by various regions in Indonesia. Based on poverty data released by the Central Statistics Agency, the percentage of poor people in Indonesia in 2018, 2019 and 2020 experienced significant fluctuations. The percentage of poor people in March 2019 was 9.41 percent, down 0.25 points against the percentage of poor people in September 2018 and down 0.41 points against the percentage of poor people in March 2018. The number of poor people in March 2019 was 25.14 million people, decreased by 0.53 million compared to the number of poor people in September 2018 and decreased by 0.80 million in March 2018. However, the percentage of poor people in March 2020 was 9.78 percent, an increase of 0.56 points to the percentage of poor people in September 2018 and an increase of 0.37 points to the percentage of poor people in March 2019. The number of
poor people in March 2020 was 26.42 million people, an increase of 1.63 million people compared to September 2019 and an increase of 1.28 million people as of March 2019. Fluctuations are also seen in urban and rural areas. The percentage of poor people in urban areas in September 2018 was 6.89 percent, fell to 6.69 percent in March 2019 and fell back to 6.56 percent in September 2019. However, the percentage of poor people in urban areas in March 2020 again rose to 7.38 percent. The percentage of poor people in rural areas in September 2018 was 13.10 percent, decreased to 12.85 percent in March 2019 and fell back to 12.60 percent in September 2019. However, in March 2020 the percentage of poor people in rural areas rose again to 12.82 percent.

The provinces of West Java and Central Java are provinces that contribute to the poverty rate in Indonesia. This is because the population in the two provinces is quite large with a fairly large poverty rate as well. Various policies have been carried out to alleviate poverty in these two areas, as seen by the decrease in the percentage of poor people and the number of poor people in both areas. However, in 2020, the poverty rate in the two regions increased again along with the entry of Covid-19 into Indonesia, including West Java and Central Java Provinces. This research is interesting to discuss to find out whether the policies that have been implemented so far are able to overcome the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on the economy in the Sumedang Regency and Magelang Regency.

Sumedang Regency is one of the areas in West Java Province which has a fairly large number of poor people. To improve poverty alleviation efforts, the Sumedang Regency Government issued Sumedang Regent Regulation Number 110 of 2019 concerning Regional Action Plans for Poverty Reduction in Sumedang Regency for 2019-2023. In 2019, the percentage of poor people was 9.05 percent, an increase of 0.71 points from the percentage of poor people in 2018, but in 2020 it rose 1.21 percent to 10.26 percent. Magelang Regency, Central Java Province also has a large number of poor people. To increase poverty alleviation efforts, the Regency Government issued Regional Regulation Number 5 of 2008 concerning Poverty Reduction in Magelang Regency. In 2019, the percentage of poor people was 10.67 percent, an increase of 0.56 points from the percentage of poor people in 2018, but in 2020 it rose 0.6 percent to 11.27 percent.

Judging from the Gross Regional Domestic Product (GRDP) by Business Sector 2016-2020, Sumedang Regency and Magelang Regency have the same condition. In these two areas, there has been a shift in the business sectors that contribute to GRDP, from agriculture, forestry and fisheries to the manufacturing industry. This shift is believed to have occurred due to a decrease in the quality of the response to agricultural intensification from the small farming sector, a more dynamic commercial agriculture sector, the stimulation of growth in the non-agricultural rural sector, the movement of productive populations and the provision of safety nets for those trapped in poverty. This shift certainly affects the livelihoods of the people in the two regions and the response to global dynamics. At the beginning of 2020, the COVID-19 pandemic began to infect the people of Indonesia. The report submitted by Bappenas [1] stated that in the first quarter of 2020, the case of the COVID-19 pandemic did not cause much change in the agricultural sector. On the other hand, the manufacturing industry only grew 2.1 percent (YoY), slower than the previous period, mainly due to slower growth in the non-oil and gas processing industry. With the increasing number of COVID-19 cases in Indonesia and the policy of limiting community activities, it affects the activities of the processing industry. This condition certainly affects the workforce. Many processing industries that have been affected by COVID-19 have been forced to terminate their employment, as a result, unemployment has increased and the poverty rate has also increased.

Based on these data, this study aims to evaluate and analyze the poverty reduction policy model that has been carried out by the Sumedang Regency Government and the Magelang Regency Government and its impact on the socio-economic sector through a spatial approach. The spatial approach in accelerating poverty alleviation has become an interesting scientific topic such as [2–9] qualitatively and quantitatively.
2. Data and Methods

The research was carried out with a qualitative descriptive method using secondary data derived from official documents from the Central Government and the Regional Government of Sumedang Regency and Regional Government of Magelang Regency. The secondary data collection method uses a visualized secondary data tabulation to clarify the analysis (see Table 1). The analysis in this study uses scientific deepening in the form of poverty alleviation efforts that are supported by the sensitivity of regional policies to provide space in the process of improving the spatial-based regional economy. The focus of the discussion is directed at decreasing the quality of the response to agricultural intensification from the small agricultural sector, a more dynamic commercial agriculture sector, stimulating the growth of the non-agricultural rural sector, moving the productive population and providing a safety net for those trapped in poverty. The following are secondary data analyzed in this study.

Table 1. Data Source

| No | Data                                                                 | Years               | Data Source                                      |
|----|----------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|--------------------------------------------------|
| 1  | Percentage of poor people                                           | 2019-2020           | Statistics [10–13]                               |
| 2  | Number of poor people                                               | 2019-2020           | Statistics [10–13]                               |
| 3  | Welfare status                                                      | 2019-2020           | Ministry of Social Affairs Republic of Indonesia |
| 4  | Gross Regional Domestic Product (GRDP) by Business Sector            | 2016-2020           | Statistics [10,12]                               |
| 5  | Poverty Reduction Policies/ Programs/ Activities in Sumedang Regency  | 2019-2020           | Sumedang Regency                                 |
| 6  | Poverty Reduction Policies/ Programs/ Activities in Magelang Regency  | 2019-2020           | Magelang Regency                                 |

3. Results and Discussion

In this study discusses two districts, namely Sumedang Regency with 26 sub-districts and Magelang Regency with 21 sub-districts, detailed as in the Figure 1.

Figure 1. Spatial District in Sumedang and Magelang Regency
The population of Sumedang Regency based on the 2020 population census is 1,152,507 people, consisting of 581,991 male residents and 570,516 female residents. Compared to the population in 2019, the population of Sumedang grew by 0.51 percent. Meanwhile, the sex ratio in 2020 for the male population to the female population is 1.02. The school participation rate for the population of Sumedang Regency for ages 7-12 years reaches 106.25 percent. Meanwhile, for ages 13-15 years, school participation reached 119.27 percent. However, this percentage of school enrollment decreases at the next age level. The school participation rate of the population aged 16-18 years has only reached 53.7 percent [11].

During the last five years (2016-2020) the economic structure in Sumedang Regency was dominated by five industrial categories, namely 1) Processing Industry, 2) Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries, 3) Wholesale and Retail Trade, 4) Vehicle and Motorcycle Repair; and 5) Construction. In 2018, the Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries Business Sector contributed the highest to Sumedang Regency's GRDP, reaching 19.72 percent. However, in 2019 this contribution fell to 19.05 percent and in 2020 it increased again to 19.81 percent. While the contribution of the processing industry in 2018 was 19.04 percent, in 2019 it increased to 19.99 percent and in 2020 to 20.02 percent. The GRDP figure [14] based on the current prices of Sumedang in 2020 reached IDR 35,490,752.9 million. In nominal terms, this GRDP figure increased by IDR 51.12 billion compared to 2019 which reached IDR 35,439,626.6 million or an increase of 0.14 percent. However, this increase was much lower than the increase in the previous year which reached 8.93 percent. Based on 2010 constant market prices, GRDP decreased from Rp 23,932,729.7 million in 2019 to Rp 23,665,066 million in 2020. This shows that during 2020 Sumedang Regency experienced negative economic growth of around 1.12 percent [10].

To improve poverty alleviation efforts, the Sumedang Regency Government issued Sumedang Regent Regulation Number 110 of 2019 concerning Regional Action Plans for Poverty Reduction in Sumedang Regency for 2019-2023. Various policies and development programs have been carried out by local governments as an effort to alleviate poverty and improve people's welfare for example [3,9,14–16] with the general conclusion being the synergy of policy directions and a good program between the center and the regions is very helpful in alleviating poverty. This policy is reflected in the budget allocated for various multi-sectoral poverty reduction programs that also involve other parties and other sources of financing outside the APBN/APBD of Sumedang Regency. With the policy of program synergy and collaboration of various parties, the achievement of poverty reduction programs becomes more optimal. Furthermore, to monitor the accuracy of the implementation of programs and activities, the Regional Poverty Reduction Coordination Team of Sumedang Regency periodically and continuously conducts monitoring and evaluation starting from the Planning Phase (ex-ante), Evaluation at the Implementation Phase (on-going) and Evaluation at Post-implementation stage (ex-post). The following are poverty alleviation programs and activities in [17] Sumedang Regency:

a. **Rumah Besar Simpati** is an Integrated Referral Service System for the Poor. This program was established by Regent Regulation Number 63 of 2018 concerning the Integrated Referral Service System for the Sympathy Large House for Handling the Poor and the Poor. The development of the Simpati Big House at the village level is the Simpati Social Welfare Center/Simpati Health Center. In 2019, 54 Simpati Health Centers have been formed and in 2020 there have been Social Health Centers in all villages.

b. **Rantang Simpati** is a program of providing nutritious food to the poor, especially the neglected elderly who are no longer productive. This program is stated in the Regent's Regulation Number 13 of 2020 concerning the Implementation of the Sympathy Rantang Program for the Abandoned Poor Elderly.

c. **Jumat Berkah** is a program of friendship between the government and the community. Through this program, the Government in addition to capturing the aspirations of the community also disseminates the Simpati Sumedang Program and provides services to the community, including population services, provision of basic necessities, rehabilitation of uninhabitable houses, capital assistance for MSMEs, capital assistance for farmers, breeders, craftsmen and others. other.
d. **Serbu Desa** is a collaboration program between the National Charity and Zakat Agency (BAZNas) and several agencies in Sumedang Regency which includes physical and spiritual health programs, clean environmental education and business potential development programs in the community.

e. **Tawadhu** is a Dhuafa Student Savings Program. Tawadhu is a collaboration program between the National Charity and Zakat Agency (BAZNas) and the Sumedang Regency Education Office.

f. **Kusuma Credit** is a program of providing credit to the public with low credit interest. This program continues to be rolled out in order to improve the community's economy and eradicate moneylenders.

g. **One Village One Product** (OVOP) is a people's economic business development program. Through this program, each village must have a characteristic product that can be sold. The OVOPs that have been formed include the Socks Village, Baja Village, Shoe Village, and others.

h. **Koperasi Syariah** is a mosque entrepreneurship program. Through this program, the administrators of the grand mosque in each sub-district are given business capital so that the mosque management can be productive.

i. **Product Outlet for Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises**. The government requires every sub-district to have outlets for Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises. This outlet is used as a shelter and sales of Micro, Small and Medium Enterprise products produced by local residents.

j. **Internships in Japan** is a program to send workers from Sumedang Regency to work in Japan. Before sending workers to Japan, the government has provided training in advance.

k. **Calendar of Events** is a series of major events held in Sumedang Regency. Through this activity, it is hoped that the community's economy can grow because of the many visits to Sumedang Regency.

l. **Digital Marketing** is a program to improve the community's economic business through selling its products through e-commerce.

Various policies have been carried out to alleviate poverty as seen by the decrease in the percentage of poor people and the number of poor people in Sumedang Regency. In 2019, the percentage of the poor was 9.05 percent, an increase of 0.71 points from the percentage of the poor in 2018. However, in 2020 the percentage of the poor rose again by 1.21 percent to 10.26 percent. The number of poor people in Sumedang Regency in 2020 is 118,380 people or 10.26 percent of the total population of Sumedang Regency. This number increased compared to 2019 which was 104,180 people. The poverty line in Sumedang Regency in 2018 was IDR 334,743/capita/month. In 2019 it increased to IDR 342,073/capita/month and in 2020 it will be IDR 353,092/capita/month [11].

Figure 2 shows the welfare status in Sumedang Regency showing the accumulation of 95,709 people with details of welfare status in decile 1 as many as 10,167 people, welfare status in decile 2 as many as 23,265 people, welfare status in decile 3 as many as 34,600 people and welfare status in decile 4 as many as 27,677 people.
Figure 2. Number of Households and Individuals, by District and welfare status in Sumedang Regency, West Java Province

Based on the results of the September 2020 Population Census, the total population of Magelang Regency is 1,299,859 people, consisting of 654,989 men and 644,870 women. The annual population growth rate of Magelang Regency from 2010 to 2020 is 0.93 percent per year. The total population of Magelang who worked in August 2020 was 741,284 people. The service sector is still the sector that absorbs the most workers, as many as 305,138 people or around 41.16 percent. The manufacturing industry is the least labor absorber, which is only 203,251 workers or around 27.42 percent absorbed. The largest proportion of workers in August 2020 was still dominated by permanent employees at 29.65 percent or 219,773 workers. Meanwhile, the smallest proportion is that employers are assisted by permanent workers/laborers who are paid only 3.24 percent [13].

During the last five years (2016-2020), the economic structure in Magelang Regency was dominated by five industrial categories, namely: manufacturing industry; agriculture, forestry, and fisheries; wholesale and retail trade, repair of vehicles and motorcycles; construction; and educational services. This can be seen from the share of each industry in the formation of the GRDP of Magelang Regency. The largest share in 2020 is generated by the manufacturing industry. The share of this industry reached 22.38 percent, followed by the agriculture, forestry and fisheries industry by 21.31 percent (down from 22.92 percent in 2016) and then followed by wholesale and retail trade, repair of vehicles and motorcycles with a share of 13.27 percent (down from 13.43 percent in 2016). The next largest contribution was provided by construction with a share of 9.33 percent (up from 9.23 percent in 2016), and then education services which contributed 6.53 percent. GRDP of Magelang Regency [16] based on current prices in 2020 reached Rp 32.45 trillion. In nominal terms, the value of this GRDP has decreased by IDR 0.04 trillion compared to 2019 which reached IDR 32.49 trillion. The decline in the value of GRDP was influenced by the decline in production in most industries as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic. Based on 2010 constant prices, the GRDP figure also decreased from Rp 23.25 trillion in 2019 to Rp 22.86 trillion in 2020. This means that during 2020 Magelang Regency experienced a contraction or minus economic growth of 1.68 percent. The decline was purely due to the decline in production in most industries as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic, unaffected by inflation [13].

To improve poverty alleviation efforts, the Magelang Regency Government issued Regional Regulation Number 5 of 2008 concerning Poverty Reduction in Magelang Regency. The scope of poverty alleviation contained in the Regional Regulation includes increasing educational opportunities, improving health status, increasing business capabilities and increasing business capital capabilities. The regional regulation also contains poverty reduction strategies which include expanding opportunities for fulfilling basic rights and improving living standards, empowering the poor, social protection, and partnerships. Poverty reduction planning and budgeting is one of the priorities of regional
development programs. The implementation of poverty reduction programs and activities is financed from the Regional Revenue and Expenditure Budget and other legal and non-binding sources. The amount of the budget for the implementation of poverty alleviation programs and activities is set at a minimum of 2.5 percent of the total Magelang Regency Regional Revenue and Expenditure Budget, excluding the salaries of Regional Apparatus.

The implementation of evaluation and monitoring of poverty reduction is carried out through coordination meetings of each working group and program as well as coordination meetings that bring together all team members. Meanwhile, the performance evaluation was obtained from data mining for each poverty indicator in Magelang Regency. Physical evidence of the team's evaluation and performance is contained in a performance report that is prepared annually as well as a report on the implementation of regional poverty reduction that is aligned with the Regional Poverty Reduction Strategy (RPRS). Public Complaints Service about poverty in Magelang Regency is still done conventionally. Complaints are still being handled in various technical RPRS related to poverty programs, this has resulted in complaints about poverty problems not being collected and handled at one door. Complaint services that are carried out directly through the Technical RPRS are expected so that direct complaints can be handled directly by the manager of poverty reduction activities. Complaint services that are handled through an online mechanism can only be implemented on targeted electricity subsidy programs that are facilitated directly by the Central Government.

Various policies have been carried out to alleviate poverty as seen by the decrease in the percentage of poor people and the number of poor people in Magelang Regency. In 2019, the percentage of the poor was 10.67 percent, an increase of 0.56 points from the percentage of the poor in 2018. However, in 2020 the percentage of the poor rose again by 0.6 percent to 11.27 percent. The number of poor people in Magelang Regency in 2018 was 143.40 thousand people, this figure decreased in 2019 to 137.40 thousand people and but in 2020 it rose again to 146.30 thousand people. The poverty line in 2018 reached IDR 296,327/capita/month, in 2019 rose to IDR 325,921/capita/month and in 2020 it will reach IDR 342,430/capita/month.

Figure 3 shows the welfare status in Magelang Regency shows an accumulation of 153,337 people with details of welfare status in decile 1 as many as 65,178 people, welfare status in decile 2 as many as 52,956 people and welfare status in decile 3 as many as 29,149 people and welfare status in decile 4 as many as 6,054 people.
Figure 3. Number of Households and Individuals, by District and welfare status in Magelang Regency, Central Java Province

Based on the description of the data above, it can be concluded that in 2020 there will be an increase in the percentage of the poor, the number of poor people and the poverty line in both Sumedang Regency and Magelang Regency. One of the reasons for this increase was the COVID-19 pandemic. In the previous discussion, it has been explained that in Sumedang Regency as well as in Magelang Regency, there has been a shift in the business fields that contribute to GRDP, from the agricultural, forestry and fishery sectors to the processing industry. The COVID-19 pandemic that entered Indonesia in early 2020 had a significant impact on the manufacturing sector compared to the agriculture and forestry sectors [18] explained that the slowdown in the performance of the manufacturing industry was driven by a decline in export demand in line with the slowing economic conditions of trading partner countries.

This is also influenced by the slowdown in physical investment due to declining investor confidence due to the high uncertainty in the global economy during the COVID-19 period. The COVID-19 pandemic has disrupted the production activities of the business sector, so that many workers/laborers have been laid off or have contract terminations. The sectors most affected are the textile industry and textile products, accommodation/restaurants, the manufacturing industry, tourism and the trade industry. In West Java Province, in April 2020, 16.12 percent of manufacturing industry workers were laid off and 21.43 percent were laid off. With the increasing number of workers who are laid off and laid off, it will indirectly lead to an increase in the number of unemployed which if not handled immediately will increase the number of poor people.

On the other hand, the results of the research by [19] show that "The Covid-19 pandemic in addition to having an impact on economic growth, has also had an impact on changes in the economic structure. Prior to the pandemic, Indonesia's economic growth was dominated by the industrial and service sectors. However, during the pandemic the agricultural sector became the driver of economic growth in addition to the information and communication sector. The Covid-19 pandemic did not have a significant impact on the performance of the agriculture and forestry sectors. The food crops, horticulture and plantation
sub-sectors have an important role in achieving positive economic growth in the agricultural sector. Horticultural crops grow due to the high demand for vegetables, fruits, and medicinal plants. During the pandemic, these commodities are consumed a lot to increase the body's resistance. Muhyiddin [20] also stated that other agricultural commodities experienced price strengthening, including rice, wheat, soybeans, chocolate, Arabica coffee, and shrimp. The average shrimp price rose quite high by 18.7 (YoY) to USD14.0 per kilogram.

Based on this, to anticipate the impact of COVID-19, it is necessary to carry out strategies aimed at optimizing poverty alleviation efforts referring to the World Bank [2] also Peters and Pierre [21] in Sumedang Regency and Magelang Regency, namely:

a. Agricultural Intensification in the Small Agricultural Sector. The estimated total poverty in Sumedang and Magelang districts, which are generally found in agricultural households and low productivity. Efforts need to be made so that this group can effectively pursue the acceleration of poverty alleviation by involving them in the agricultural sector which has begun to decline due to sectoral GRDP shifts. Therefore, agricultural policy should be directed at small-scale agriculture with low productivity. Important policies that must be carried out are land market reform and rural finance, increasing R&D and technology transfer to rural areas, supplying public goods, and building social capital.

b. A More Dynamic Commercial Agriculture Sector. The revitalization of the commercial agricultural sector can increase employment and reduce poverty in rural areas directly by absorbing wage labor and indirectly through the growth of downstream processing industries. Revitalization can be done through the expansion of an efficient market and encouraged to create new opportunities. The important thing to encourage growth and increase employment in this sector is the improvement of market factors, labor, water, land and capital. In addition, based on the perspective of the poor, better education levels and reform of labor regulations will increase employment opportunities in the commercial agriculture sector.

c. Stimulating the Growth of the Rural Non-Agricultural Sector. The growth of the Rural Non-Agricultural Sector, especially in the food processing and service sectors, can increase employment, reduce unemployment and ultimately reduce poverty. However, this strategy may not work for the majority of the poor living in remote, low density, and poor infrastructure conditions. Some research results show that the growth of the Rural Non-Agricultural Sector is found to be greater in areas with better infrastructure services, such as roads, electricity, and communications.

In other words, the Rural Non-Agricultural Sector is more concentrated in areas where markets and products are performing better and transaction costs are lower. This implies that they thrive near urban areas. Furthermore, there is evidence to suggest that a larger number of schools and ease of access to such infrastructure can significantly increase the likelihood of high returns. Therefore, the most important thing that must be done to stimulate the development of the rural non-agricultural economy is to increase the level of better education, provide good basic infrastructure, develop social capital, labor market and well-functioning business capital credit.

d. Migration of the younger generation who are workers of productive age. Several studies have shown that income differences are the single biggest driving force for increased migration. Differences in wages and labor productivity ratios suffice to explain that most of the migration takes place among landless agricultural workers. On the other hand, most of the rural poor are small farmers/farmers/informal workers. To analyze the migration process this group must take into account other sources of income, apart from land assets which are not fully transferable during migration. Potential migrants, especially the poor, generally want to bring all their capital. In the case of farmers, incomplete land certificates and a poorly functioning land market will lower the selling price of land. The second factor that hinders migration is the competence of human resources specifically for agriculture. In general, they gain skills and experience in the field of agriculture from generation to generation and learning outcomes in the workplace. These skills are not rewarded with commensurate rewards outside the agricultural sector. This condition is made worse for prospective migrants who are older because there is not much that can be done to overcome this obstacle. This underscores the importance of investing in education, health, social assistance for young people in rural areas and seeking to provide them with sector-specific skills.
Opening up more training and education opportunities for the rural poor appears to be the most important policy variable to increase the absorption of this group into other economic sectors. Migration will not only benefit migrants but in many cases also benefit household members living in rural areas through remittances.

e. Provision of safety nets for those “trapped” in poverty. In rural areas, especially underdeveloped villages, there are generally poor community groups who do not have the ability to take advantage of opportunities in the commercial agriculture sector, small-scale intensification, or migration. Members of this group are generally older, widowed, and some are agricultural workers in poor areas. This group is “trapped” in extreme poverty with no viable future in agriculture other than subsistence. Members of this group face major barriers in finding work off-farm. For this group, a social safety net is needed to ensure a decent basic standard of living. However, there are challenges in implementing the social safety net program, namely the lack of access that must be taken by the rural poor who live in remote areas with low population density and high illiteracy rates. On the other hand, efforts need to be made to reach the younger generation (especially in the poorest households and those who rely heavily on the provision of safety nets) through education, health and social assistance so that in the future they have a better chance of escaping poverty.

In addition to the above efforts, to improve the performance of poverty reduction in the two regions, additional regulations are needed to strengthen the aspects of regional policies and technical guidelines. To strengthen the commitment between the legislature and the executive in poverty alleviation in Sumedang Regency, the Sumedang Regency Government needs to issue a Regional Regulation. On the other hand, the Magelang Regency Regional Regulation must be spelled out in the Regent's Regulation to further clarify the implementation of poverty reduction programs in Magelang Regency. Furthermore, to optimize the implementation of poverty alleviation programs, it is necessary to strengthen poverty reduction institutions as institutions that coordinate all regional apparatuses involved in poverty alleviation in their respective regions. Formulation of programs and activities that are integrated and synergistic between regional apparatuses involved in poverty alleviation, in order to avoid overlapping activities. Improvement of the facilities and infrastructure owned and needed must continue to be carried out and strengthening the competence of human resources through formal and informal education.

4. Conclusion

Poverty reduction policy models in Sumedang Regency and Magelang Regency are both covered by laws and regulations although the levels are different, in Sumedang Regency it is in the form of a Regent's Regulation while in Magelang Regency it is in the form of a Regional Regulation. The existence of different legal umbrellas and different regional conditions have an impact on the success of poverty reduction programs in the two regions. To optimize the program, it is necessary to issue other regulations that will strengthen the commitment between the legislature and the executive as well as the commitment between the regional apparatus in the preparation and implementation of the program. In addition, it is necessary to carry out a partial spatial strategy to accelerate the achievement of program performance, taking into account the factual conditions in the two regions, namely through intensification of agriculture in the small agricultural sector, encouraging a more dynamic commercial agriculture sector, providing stimulation for the growth of the rural non-agricultural sector, migration of the aged population, productive and providing safety nets for those “trapped” in poverty.
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