



<https://ejurnal.pps.ung.ac.id/index.php/PPJ/index>

Housing Rehabilitation and BLT Programs: Achieving SDG 1 No Poverty in Sawunggaling, Surabaya

Annida Qonita Syahida¹, Ratu Andini Anindiya Hanum², Firre An Suprpto³, Indah Prabawati⁴

¹ Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, State University of Surabaya, Indonesia. 25040674119@mhs.unesa.ac.id

² Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, State University of Surabaya, Indonesia. 25040674121@mhs.unesa.ac.id

³ Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, State University of Surabaya, Indonesia. firresuprpto@unesa.ac.id

⁴ Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, State University of Surabaya, Indonesia. indahprabawati@unesa.ac.id

Article Information	Abstract
Article history: Accepted 20-07-2026 Fixed 28-07-2026 Approved 05-08-2026 Keywords: <i>Poverty, Home Renovation Program, Direct Cash Assistance, SDGs No Poverty.</i>	Abstract: Poverty remains a complex socioeconomic problem in Indonesia, including in the city of Surabaya. The government implemented the Housing Rehabilitation Program and Direct Cash Assistance (BLT) as an effort to improve community welfare and support the achievement of the first Sustainable Development Goal (SDG), namely, No Poverty. This study aims to analyze the implementation of both programs in poverty alleviation efforts in the Sawunggaling area, Joyoboyo, Surabaya. The method used was descriptive qualitative research, with data collection techniques through observation, interviews, and literature review. Data analysis was conducted through the stages of data collection, data reduction, data presentation, and drawing conclusions. The results indicate that the Housing Rehabilitation Program contributes to improving the quality of community housing, while the Direct Cash Assistance (BLT) helps meet the basic needs of low-income communities. However, program implementation still faces obstacles such as suboptimal distribution of assistance, suboptimal development quality, limited program information, and community dependence on social assistance. This study indicates that both programs have supported reducing the vulnerability of the poor and achieving the SDG No Poverty, although their effectiveness in sustainable poverty alleviation still needs to be improved through strengthening community economic empowerment.

Introduction

Poverty is a challenge and essential issue in economic development that has existed since the beginning of humanity. Poverty appears to remain a serious problem, and may never be completely resolved. The problem of poverty is complex and multidimensional, intertwined with social, economic, cultural, and other aspects. Poverty continues to be a phenomenal problem worldwide, particularly in Indonesia, a developing country (Hastina Febriaty & Nurwani, 2017). Etymologically, poverty comes from the word "miskin," meaning lacking in material possessions and lacking in everything. The Ministry of Social Affairs and the Statistics Indonesia (BPS) define it as an individual's inability to meet the minimum basic needs for a decent life (BPS and Depsos, 2002). Poverty in society has varying degrees of severity, one of which is extreme poverty. In other words, extreme poverty is a condition where the inability to meet basic needs (food, clean water, sanitation, health, shelter, education, and information) is achieved with expenditures below US\$2.15 PPP per capita per day (BPS, 2025). Calculated at

a \$1 PPP exchange rate in 2024, this equates to approximately Rp 5,900, meaning the expenditure of the extremely poor is below Rp 12,885 per day. Therefore, systematic efforts are needed through targeted policies and multi-sectoral collaboration. Research also treats poverty as multidimensional, requiring attention to income, access to essential services, housing conditions, and social protection rather than income support alone (Hatta, 2011; Slater, 2011).

Poverty alleviation policies implemented by stakeholders are considered ineffective, particularly in reaching the poor in a sustainable manner. Existing programs are not yet sufficiently integrated with the long-term goals envisioned in the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), particularly the first goal, "No Poverty," which targets the eradication of extreme poverty. To achieve this target by 2030, every country must formulate an effective and sustainable strategy. In the Indonesian context, the current government is targeting ambitious commitments as part of the 2025-2029 National Medium-Term Development Plan (RPJMN) through various strategies, ranging from the National Socio-Economic Single Data (DTSEN), more targeted social assistance distribution, to empowerment programs and job training for the extreme poor. In this study, the focus of the programs analyzed is the Integrated Welfare Housing Assistance program and Direct Cash Assistance (BLT) for low-income communities. "In the last 10 months, I, along with the Red and White Cabinet, have strived to combat poverty with a holistic, comprehensive approach. We want the extreme poverty rate to drop to zero percent as quickly as possible," This zero percent poverty target was conveyed directly by President Prabowo Subianto in his state address at the annual session of the People's Consultative Assembly of the Republic of Indonesia, Friday (15/8/2025). Several indicators used to measure the achievement of the SDGs on poverty in Indonesia include: 1) Percentage of the poor population, 2) Access to basic services (education, health, clean water), 3) Social security coverage ratio, and 4) Income inequality (Gini ratio). Evidence on cash-transfer programmes indicates that their effects depend on targeting design and administrative capacity, while sustainable poverty reduction requires coordination between immediate social protection and longer-term livelihood opportunities (Slater, 2011; Nurhasanah et al., 2024).

According to data from the Surabaya City Statistics Agency (BPS), the number of poor people reached 105,090 in March 2025. This figure decreased by 11,530 people compared to 116,620 in March 2024. The percentage of the poor population also decreased from 3.96 percent to 3.56 percent. This decline demonstrates ongoing poverty alleviation efforts in Surabaya. However, the number of poor people, which remains at over 100,000, demonstrates that poverty remains an unresolved problem. This situation demands more effective poverty alleviation policies to ensure that vulnerable groups can sustainably escape poverty.

These poverty alleviation efforts are based on the hope and goal of realizing social welfare for all Indonesians as a form of implementing the values of Pancasila. This principle, in particular, emphasizes the fifth principle, namely social justice for all Indonesian people. This principle emphasizes the state's responsibility to create equitable social welfare and ensure that every citizen can live a decent life without exception. Social welfare is a fundamental right for all Indonesians, including those living in underprivileged circumstances. This is not merely an obligation, but a human right that must be enjoyed by all citizens. The state is tasked with providing this social welfare, as stipulated in Law Number 11 of 2009, Articles 4 and 5, paragraph 2, concerning the Implementation of Social Welfare.

Population growth is a factor influencing regional development conditions as an indicator of community welfare, such as access to a decent standard of living and the availability of basic needs. Population growth significantly impacts the social, economic, and geographical conditions of a region. According to Kartomo Wirosuhardjo in Thea (2022), population growth is the collection of people inhabiting a particular area, bound by social, cultural, and legal ties. Population growth is influenced by fertility (births) and mortality (deaths).

Population growth in the city of Surabaya has increased significantly in recent years. According to data from the Central Statistics Agency (BPS), the population is projected to reach 2,931,611 by 2025. This compares with 2,921,996 in the previous year. This means that nearly 10,000 people will be added to Surabaya in one year. This increasing population growth impacts population density, leading to an increased need for housing. However, the availability of housing is not matched by the availability of land or affordable housing, especially for low- and middle-income communities. The increasing need for housing amidst the economic constraints of low-income communities has given rise to densely populated settlements with substandard housing conditions. The program to repair uninhabitable houses and the provision of direct cash assistance (BLT) are among the ways to alleviate poverty in the area. However, in its implementation, there is still a gap between expectations and reality on the ground, such as the quality of housing construction results that do not meet standards, as well as the uneven sustainability of assistance and difficult access to information. Therefore, this study is expected to provide an overview of the conditions of vulnerable areas of urban poverty in the Sawunggaling area, Joyoboyo, Surabaya and serve as a reference for various parties in supporting poverty alleviation efforts and achieving the SDGs goal of no poverty.

Method

This study employed a descriptive qualitative research method. A qualitative approach was chosen because this study aimed to understand the implementation of social assistance programs in poverty alleviation efforts in depth, grounded in real-world conditions (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). Concurrently, a descriptive method was used to systematically depict the implementation of these social programs and the various structural obstacles encountered by recipient communities in the Sawunggaling area, Joyoboyo, Surabaya. To support the empirical data, a literature review was conducted through data collection from academic journals, books, regulatory documents, and statistical data relevant to the study.

Data collection techniques included observation, interviews, and literature review to achieve data triangulation. Observations were conducted by directly assessing the environmental conditions of low-income communities and the physical execution of social assistance in the study area. For the data analysis, this study employed the qualitative interactive model according to Miles, Huberman, and Saldaña (2014) as adapted by Sugiyono (2020), which consists of four concurrent stages: Data Collection, Data Reduction, Data Display, and Conclusion Drawing/Verifying.

Results and Discussion

1. Implementation of the Social Assistance Program in the Sawunggaling Area Socioeconomic Conditions in Sawunggaling

The Sawunggaling (Joyoboyo) area in Surabaya is a high density residential zone predominantly inhabited by low to middle income communities. Based on field observations

and interviews, a significant portion of the population consists of migrants from Madura who relocated to Surabaya to secure employment and elevate their families' socioeconomic standards.

This phenomenon of urbanization serves as a critical factor shaping the socioeconomic conditions of the community in the Sawunggaling area. Urbanization is fundamentally defined as the demographic growth within urban areas resulting from rural-to-urban migration. High rates of urbanization inevitably escalate population density and the demand for residential space; consequently, land availability becomes increasingly constrained, driving up property and land values. Such conditions pose a substantial barrier for low-income populations seeking to acquire habitable and decent housing (Aisyah Bintang, 2022, as cited in Sabitha, 2022). As one of the largest metropolitan hubs in Indonesia, Surabaya serves as a primary destination for regional migration. This heavy influx of inbound migration is fueled by the prospect of securing better employment, higher incomes, and superior access to diverse urban facilities a reality clearly reflected in Sawunggaling, where many migrants settle in pursuit of better economic opportunities. Comparative research on informal settlements likewise shows that housing affordability and the quality of informal housing are shaped by urban land markets, regulatory choices, and the limited availability of affordable alternatives (Tunas & Peresthu, 2010; Mottelson, 2023).

The population surge driven by urbanization directly intensifies the pressure on residential land allocation. Conversely, the dwindling availability of land in Surabaya triggers a localized spike in population density. These compounding variables encourage the expansion of densely populated pockets and urban slum settlements. Notably, the Surabaya City Government recorded that approximately 100 Rukun Warga (RW or community units) were still classified under the slum category in 2023 (Putri, 2023). This systemic issue highlights that population growth, when left unmitigated by adequate housing spatial planning, generates a multitude of complex social and environmental challenges.

Furthermore, land scarcity has driven a continuous appreciation in land prices across Surabaya. The soaring demand for space whether for housing, commercial activities, or long-term investments keeps pushing real estate values upward. Concurrently, rapid infrastructure developments across various urban nodes further appreciate localized land values. As a direct consequence, securing affordable and decent housing has become increasingly unattainable for low-income groups. This financial exclusion forces many residents to settle in overcrowded residential clusters characterized by relatively substandard environmental quality.

In terms of livelihoods, the majority of the Sawunggaling community is absorbed into the informal sector, working as small-scale traders, pedicab (becak) drivers, daily laborers, and home-based entrepreneurs with irregular incomes. This occupational structure leaves the community highly vulnerable to economic shocks, particularly during periods of income contraction or rising living costs.

Ultimately, this unstable economic baseline creates a persistent reliance on government social assistance to fulfill basic daily needs. The ongoing presence of substandard housing, dense residential configurations, and a lack of supporting public infrastructure underscores that the Sawunggaling area continues to grapple with multifaceted socioeconomic challenges deeply rooted in urban poverty. This critical condition is aligned with the official regional planning data, which formally categorizes certain sub-districts in Surabaya as urgent priorities for infrastructure and housing intervention, as outlined in Table 1.

Tabel 1: List of Priority Areas for Development and Quality Improvement and Settlement in Surabaya

District	Sub-District (Village)	Information (priority)
Wonokromo	Sawunggaling	Priority I
Bulak	Kenjeran	Priority I
Bulak	Kedung Cowek	Priority I
Bulak	Sukolilo Baru	Priority I
Kenjeran	Bulak Banteng	Priority I
Rungkut	Rungkut Kidul	Priority I
Rungkut	Kalirungkut	Priority I
Semampir	Wonokusumo	Priority I
Semampir	Sidotopo	Priority I
Gubeng	Airlangga	Priority II
Mulyorejo	Kalisari	Priority II
Pakal	Benowo	Priority II
Simokerto	Tambakrejo	Priority II
Sukomanunggal	Putat Gede	Priority II
Tenggilis	Mejoyo Kutisari	Priority II
Krembangan	Morokrembangan	Priority II
Asemrowo	Asemrowo	Priority II
Bubutan	Bubutan	Priority III
Bubutan	Gundih	Priority III
Bulak	Kenjeran	Priority III
Gunung Anyar	Gunung Anyar	Priority III
Gunung Anyar	Tambak	Priority III
Semampir	Sidotopo	Priority III
Tandes	Tandes	Priority III
Wonokromo	Darmo	Priority III
Krembangan	Dupak	Priority III
Tandes	Karangpoh	Priority III

Data source: Surabaya City Medium-Term Development Plan 2021-2026

The data in Table 1 explicitly indicates that addressing urban slums and housing vulnerability remains a top government priority for the 2021-2026 planning period. In an effort to mitigate these problems, the government has implemented several social assistance programs, including the Housing Rehabilitation Program and Direct Cash Assistance (BLT). These programs are expected to help improve community welfare and support the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), particularly the first goal, No Poverty.

2. Implementation of Social Assistance Programs in the Sawunggaling Area

2.1 Housing Rehabilitation Program

According to Law Number 1 of 2011 concerning Housing and Residential Areas, slums are defined as *"settlements that are uninhabitable due to building irregularities, high building density, and substandard building quality and facilities and infrastructure"* (BPK RI, 2011). Therefore, it can be concluded that this condition is in line with the Sawunggaling area which tends to have buildings that do not meet safety standards such as being close together so that

they are prone to fire, inadequate environmental conditions and infrastructure, and in some narrow alleys clean water connections and waste management (communal sanitation) are still limited.



Picture 1: Densely Built Housing Conditions in Sawunggaling Village, Surabaya
Source: Researcher Documentation, 2026

The housing rehabilitation program (Program Bedah Rumah), or the rehabilitation of uninhabitable houses, is a government initiative aimed at improving the housing quality for low-income communities. This program is implemented as part of the government's efforts to establish a healthier, safer, and more habitable living environment for the urban poor. Housing interventions should therefore be assessed not only by whether construction activities are completed, but also by housing safety, affordability, service access, and the durability of improvements for low-income households (Tunas & Peresthu, 2010; Simbolon et al., 2023).

According to Setyawan and Prathama (2024), the housing rehabilitation program has been executed in the Sawunggaling area and has been well-received by the community. No public resistance or rejection was found regarding the implementation of the program. The residents perceive that the home improvement assistance has significantly enhanced their living conditions compared to the previous state. The implementation process also involves the sub-district (kelurahan) office and relevant institutions in data collection, application submission, and the construction phase of the residents' houses. These conditions correspond with prior research indicating that the implementation of the uninhabitable housing rehabilitation program in the Sawunggaling Sub-district has operated quite effectively in terms of communication, resources, disposition, and bureaucratic structure.

Nevertheless, based on field observations, several bottlenecks in program implementation were still identified. Some of the rehabilitated structures were deemed to have suboptimal construction quality. In addition, the distribution of assistance has not been fully equitable, as there are still residents with uninhabitable houses who have not yet received the program's benefits. Similar implementation concerns have been identified in Indonesian housing subsidy policy, where recurring problems include inaccurate beneficiary targeting and low occupancy or use of subsidized housing (Simbolon et al., 2023).

While the study by Setyawan and Prathama (2024) focused predominantly on policy implementation analysis, the research gap of this study lies in the absence of a comprehensive analysis specifically assessing the contribution of the housing rehabilitation Program toward

poverty alleviation and the achievement of the SDGs 'No Poverty' targets in the Sawunggaling area. Therefore, this study goes beyond evaluating program execution by rigorously examining its broader impacts on the socioeconomic conditions of the beneficiaries.

The findings of this study can also be linked to research by Ulu and Sholichah (2020) in the Wonokromo District, which demonstrates that mitigating slum areas still requires an increase in the volume of housing rehabilitation assistance to achieve a wider coverage. This is consistent with the empirical evidence of this study, which reveals that some residents in Sawunggaling, despite living in sub-standard housing conditions, have not yet been reached by the housing rehabilitation Program. These realities indicate that although the program has progressed smoothly from an administrative standpoint, field implementation still encounters several barriers that affect the overall quality of the development outcomes.

2.2 Direct Cash Assistance Program (Program Bantuan Langsung Tunai)

Aside from the housing rehabilitation program, the government has also implemented the Direct Cash Transfer (BLT) program for low-income communities in the Sawunggaling area. The BLT program is provided as a form of social assistance aimed at helping the community meet their daily basic needs, particularly amidst unstable economic conditions. The institutional framework for this program refers to various government regulations regarding social assistance, one of which is the Mayor's Regulation (Peraturan Walikota) Number 130 of 2023 concerning the Implementation of Direct Cash Transfers to Poor Families in Surabaya.

Based on the interviews, the community perceives this assistance as highly beneficial in fulfilling basic household needs, especially for residents working in the informal sector with irregular incomes. The recipients utilize the funds to purchase food, pay for household utilities, and meet other urgent necessities. This finding is consistent with research on cash-transfer programmes in Indonesia, which identifies household consumption support as an important immediate benefit while emphasizing the need to assess effects on poverty beyond short-term relief (Nurhasanah et al., 2024; Mootalu et al., 2026).

Nevertheless, the community still faces limited access to information regarding the sustainability of the assistance. Some residents lack definitive information regarding the disbursement schedules or whether the program will continue in the subsequent periods. This situation indicates that the dissemination of program information to the public remains suboptimal.

Administratively, the BLT program in Surabaya is not cross-coordinated with the East Java Provincial Social Services, but is directly linked to the central government through the Ministry of Social Affairs. As stated by the Head of the Social Protection Technical Team of the Surabaya City Social Services, the specific program linked to the East Java Provincial Social Services is the assistance for persons with disabilities. This program is managed directly by the Social Rehabilitation Technical Team of the Surabaya City Social Services, which subsequently processes the regional data of disabled individuals.

In a broader regional context, the East Java Provincial Government initiated the BLT program as a strategic response to socioeconomic hardships, aiming to provide cash assistance to vulnerable and impoverished communities. One of the emergency conditions requiring BLT intervention was the impact of the El Niño phenomenon in 2023. This climate phenomenon triggered a decline in agricultural productivity, particularly affecting fruit and vegetable yields due to extreme weather that accelerated crop spoilage. This decline in productivity directly impacted public income, particularly among farmers and informal sector workers, thereby increasing their vulnerability to poverty (Ainia & Pradana, 2025).

Furthermore, the BLT assistance tends to be consumptive and only provides short-term relief for the community. The program has not been fully capable of fostering long-term economic independence because it is not accompanied by income-generating initiatives or community economic empowerment. Consequently, while the BLT program successfully mitigates immediate shocks by fulfilling basic needs, it has not yet fully resolved the deep-rooted issue of poverty in the long run. Studies of social protection caution that cash transfers should not be treated as a stand-alone solution to poverty; programme design must balance targeting with implementation capacity and connect assistance to broader measures that reduce vulnerability (Slater, 2011; Airmas et al., 2023).

3. Obstacles to Social Assistance Program Implementation

The implementation of social assistance programs in the Sawunggaling area still faces several obstacles that affect the program's effectiveness on the ground. One major obstacle is the uneven distribution of aid to those in need. Some residents from low economic backgrounds still do not receive optimal program assistance.

Furthermore, the quality of construction results in several housing rehabilitation programs is considered suboptimal. This situation indicates a gap between program objectives and implementation results in the field. Previous research also found that housing construction results still do not meet community expectations.

Within the Direct Cash Assistance (BLT) program, the community also experiences limited information regarding the sustainability of social assistance provided by the government. This lack of information certainty results in a lack of clarity regarding the mechanisms and sustainability of the assistance program, including through online sources. This finding aligns with research by Awalia and Sumayya (2024), which showed that some aid recipients are still not included in the most needy groups, while some poor communities have not received assistance due to weaknesses in the data collection and verification process for beneficiaries. This limited access to information has the potential to create a perception of inaccurate targeting among the community because the aid distribution process cannot be transparently monitored by residents. Research on the distribution of the Family Hope Programme in Indonesia also highlights the importance of accurate data, socialization, monitoring, and implementation improvements in ensuring that assistance reaches intended beneficiaries (Mootalu et al., 2026).

Another obstacle is the community's still unstable economic conditions. The majority of people work in the informal sector with unstable incomes, making social assistance a primary means of supporting their livelihoods. This situation indirectly creates a dependency on government social assistance.

Therefore, the implementation of social assistance programs in the Sawunggaling area still faces a gap between policy objectives and actual conditions on the ground, particularly regarding the equitable distribution of assistance, the quality of program implementation, and the sustainability of the community's economic impact.

4. Analysis of Social Assistance Programs for the SDGs: No Poverty

The social assistance programs implemented in the Sawunggaling area demonstrate the government's efforts to support the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), particularly the first goal, No Poverty. The housing rehabilitation program helps communities obtain more decent housing, while the Cash Assistance (BLT) program helps communities meet basic daily needs.

An analysis of the contribution of social assistance programs to supporting the SDGs: No Poverty requires consideration of previous research findings in the same area. Setyawan and Prathama (2024) found that the implementation of the Social Rehabilitation Program for Uninhabitable Houses (RS-RUTILAHU) in Sawunggaling Village had been quite successful in terms of communication, resources, disposition, and bureaucratic structure. However, the study also revealed persistent obstacles, including suboptimal development quality and inadequate distribution of assistance.

Unlike those studies, this study not only examines policy implementation but also analyzes the extent to which the housing rehabilitation Program and Direct Cash Assistance (BLT) contribute to poverty alleviation efforts in support of achieving the SDGs: No Poverty. The results show that although both programs have benefited the community by improving housing quality and meeting basic needs, their effectiveness in reducing poverty sustainably still faces various obstacles in the field. This interpretation is supported by Indonesian research on cash transfers, which finds that assistance can improve household welfare and consumption but that the accuracy of targeting remains an important policy concern (Nurhasanah et al., 2024; Mootalu et al., 2026).

The implementation of social assistance programs demonstrates the government's efforts to mitigate the impact of poverty by providing assistance to low-income communities. The housing rehabilitation program helps improve the quality of community housing, thus supporting a healthier and safer living environment. Meanwhile, the Direct Cash Assistance (BLT) helps communities survive in unstable economic conditions. However, program implementation has not been fully optimal in supporting sustainable poverty alleviation. Various obstacles remain, such as uneven distribution of assistance, suboptimal development quality, and community dependence on government social assistance.

Furthermore, the Direct Cash Assistance (BLT) program tends to have short-term impacts because it focuses more on meeting community consumption needs. The program has not been fully able to increase community economic independence in the long term. When viewed in light of the SDGs No Poverty, the Housing Rehabilitation Program and Direct Cash Assistance (BLT) have contributed to reducing the vulnerability of poor communities. However, these contributions remain limited to meeting basic needs and have not fully addressed the economic capacity of the community. The SDGs No Poverty emphasize the importance of sustainable poverty reduction through increased access to economic resources, employment opportunities, and inclusive social protection. Therefore, the success of the social assistance program in Sawunggaling can still be categorized as an effort to reduce the impact of poverty, not its complete elimination. International evidence similarly suggests that cash transfers can reduce immediate hardship, but their poverty-reduction effects depend on targeting and on whether social protection is linked to wider opportunities and services (Slater, 2011).

This study's findings also indicate that the success of the program's administrative implementation does not fully reflect its success in improving overall community welfare. Previous research has focused more on the implementation of the housing rehabilitation program policy, focusing on communication, resources, disposition, and bureaucratic structure. However, this study demonstrates that the program's effectiveness in poverty reduction still faces various obstacles in its implementation. In the context of the SDGs No Poverty, poverty alleviation focuses not only on providing temporary assistance but also on increasing community economic independence in a sustainable manner.

Therefore, more effective policy implementation, more optimal distribution of aid, improved quality of development monitoring, and community economic empowerment programs are needed so that the poverty alleviation goals in the SDGs can be achieved optimally and sustainably.

5. Policy Implementation Review Based on George Edward III's Theory

In evaluating settlement-area interventions in Sawunggaling, it is methodologically important to contextualize the findings within the policy implementation framework proposed by George Edward III. According to Edward III (as cited in Agustino, 2006), the successful implementation of public policy depends on the interaction of four key variables: communication, resources, disposition, and bureaucratic structure.

Prior administrative studies, most notably by Setyawan and Prathama (2024), argued that the Uninhabitable Houses Rehabilitation Program (RS-RUTILAHU) in Sawunggaling Sub-district has been effectively implemented from an institutional standpoint. In terms of communication, the transmission of data from the Surabaya Housing and Residential Area Department down to the sub-district officials, neighborhood leaders (RT/RW), and local communities has achieved clarity and consistency through direct socialization. Regarding disposition, there has been zero public resistance; implementers demonstrated high institutional commitment and shared a cohesive understanding of the program's objectives.

Structurally, the bureaucratic framework operated strictly under the Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) mandated by Surabaya Mayor's Regulations No. 9 and No. 35 of 2022. Lastly, the resources—including personnel from the Technical Committee for Social Rehabilitation (KTPR) and the allocation of physical and digital registration facilities—were deemed numerically and capability-wise sufficient.

While Edward III's framework confirms that the program has successfully achieved administrative and procedural compliance, this study identifies a profound conceptual and empirical gap in that assessment. The critical oversight of relying solely on structural-procedural theories like Edward III's is the assumption that a "smooth bureaucratic process" translates directly into "successful socio-economic outcomes." Evidence from housing and settlement policy reinforces this distinction: formal implementation does not by itself resolve affordability and livelihood constraints when low-income residents lack viable housing options and broader support (Arifin, 2021; Mottelson, 2023).

Empirical evidence from this field research reveals a stark divergence between administrative metrics and actual socioeconomic realities. Despite being deemed "well-implemented" procedurally, serious field discrepancies persist, such as substandard construction quality due to lax field oversight, and exclusionary errors where vulnerable residents are left unaided.

More importantly, this procedural achievement does not address the core mandate of the first Sustainable Development Goal (SDG 1: No Poverty). While the housing rehabilitation program successfully enhances immediate physical livability (mitigating housing vulnerability), it operates merely as a short-term social safety net. It does not elevate the community's economic capacity, income stability, or self-reliance, especially given that the majority of Sawunggaling residents remain trapped in volatile informal sectors.

Therefore, this study transcends the limitations of Edward III's administrative paradigm. It argues that a policy cannot be declared completely successful merely because its communication, resources, disposition, and bureaucracy are intact. Instead, its ultimate efficacy must be measured by its substantive impact on structural poverty alleviation and long-term socio-economic sustainability.

Conclusion

Based on the research results, this study concludes that while the Housing Rehabilitation (RS-RUTILAHU) and Direct Cash Transfer (BLT) programs in the Sawunggaling area, Surabaya, have successfully met procedural and administrative compliance, their substantive contribution to achieving SDG 1 (No Poverty) remains constrained. The interventions function effectively as immediate social safety nets temporarily enhancing physical shelter livability and buffering daily consumption shocks. However, they fail to drive long-term structural poverty alleviation due to three systemic vulnerabilities: suboptimal construction quality resulting from weak field oversight, exclusionary targeting errors driven

by rigid database rigidities, and a chronic community dependency stemming from the lack of income-generating empowerment models.

Based on these findings, this study proposes three strategic recommendations: (1) The Surabaya City Government needs to improve the accuracy of targeting and equal distribution of beneficiaries by regularly updating data on poor communities. This step is important considering that there are still people who need assistance but have not received optimal benefits from the program. (2) The implementation of the Housing Rehabilitation Program needs to be accompanied by stricter supervision and evaluation of the quality of construction so that the results of house rehabilitation are in accordance with housing feasibility standards. With better construction quality, the benefits of the program will not only be felt in the short term, but will also be able to improve the quality of life of the community in a sustainable manner. (3) The Direct Cash Assistance (BLT) Program needs to be integrated with community economic empowerment programs, such as skills training, productive business assistance, entrepreneurship assistance, and expanding access to employment. These efforts are needed so that the community does not depend on social assistance in the long term and is able to increase family economic independence. By improving the distribution of aid, the quality of program implementation, and strengthening community economic empowerment, the Home Renovation Program and Direct Cash Assistance are expected to not only function as instruments for fulfilling basic needs, but also be able to support sustainable poverty alleviation and strengthen the achievement of the first SDG goal, namely No Poverty.

Reference

- Agustino, L. (2016). *Dasar-dasar kebijakan publik (Edisi Revisi)*. Alfabeta.
- Ainia, N., & Pradana, G. W. (2025). Efektivitas Pelaksanaan Penyaluran Bantuan Langsung Tunai (BLT) oleh Dinas Kota Surabaya (Studi Kasus Kecamatan Pabean Cantian). *Global Research and Innovation Journal (GREAT)*.
<https://journaledutech.com/index.php/great/article/view/13>
- Airmas, P. F., Ilato, R., & Aneta, Y. (2023). Poverty reduction through the Family Hope Programme. *Public Policy Journal*, 4(2). <https://doi.org/10.37905/ppj.v4i2.2117>
- Antara News. (2026, 3 Februari). Program untuk mencapai nol kemiskinan ekstrem [Infographic]. *Antaranews.com*.
<https://www.antaranews.com/infografik/5390098/program-untuk-mencapai-nol-kemiskinan-ekstrem>
- Arifin, S. (2021). A fragmented approach to Indonesia's decentralized urban slum reduction policy: Central Java's case. *Unisia*, 39(2). <https://doi.org/10.20885/unisia.vol39.iss2.art8>
- Awalia, S., & Sumayya, S. A. (2024). Analisis efektivitas program bantuan langsung tunai dalam mengurangi kemiskinan di pedesaan. *JEKP (Jurnal Ekonomi dan Keuangan Publik)*.
<https://doi.org/10.33701/jekp.v11i2.4759>

- Badan Pemeriksa Keuangan Republik Indonesia (BPK RI) Perwakilan Provinsi Jawa Timur. (2023). PAD Jember termasuk tujuh besar tertinggi di Jatim, terbaik di Sekarkijang. <https://jatim.bpk.go.id/informasi-hukum/catatan-berita/>
- Badan Pemeriksa Keuangan Republik Indonesia (BPK RI). (2011). Undang-Undang (UU) Nomor 1 Tahun 2011 tentang Perumahan dan Kawasan Permukiman. <https://peraturan.bpk.go.id/Details/39128/uu-no-1-tahun-2011>
- Clarence, J., Anggraeni, D. R., Farouk, A., Qudsy, C., Amrullah, M., & Haryanto, I. (2024). Sustainable Development Goals dan pengentasan kemiskinan dalam rangka meningkatkan derajat rakyat di Desa Batuah. Prosiding NCOLS UPN Veteran Jakarta.
- Hatta, Z. A. (2011). The poverty situation in Indonesia: Challenges and progress of the marginalized group. *Asian Social Work and Policy Review*, 5(2), 92–106. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1753-1411.2011.00051.x>
- Kementerian Sekretariat Negara RI. (2009). Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 11 Tahun 2009 tentang Kesejahteraan Sosial.
- Mootalu, A. R., Isa, R., & Nani, Y. N. (2026). Distribution of PKH funds as a form of government service for poor families. *Public Policy Journal*, 7(1). <https://ejurnal.pps.ung.ac.id/index.php/PPJ/article/download/3226/1984>
- Mottelson, J. (2023). On informal housing supply restrictions and livelihood in informal settlements: Implications for sustainable development. *Sustainable Development*, 31(5), 3566–3578. <https://doi.org/10.1002/sd.2611>
- Nurhasanah, S., Juanda, B., & Sugema, I. (2024). The impact of the cash transfer program on poverty of households in Bogor Regency. *Jurnal Ekonomi dan Kebijakan Pembangunan*, 13(1), 30–43. <https://doi.org/10.29244/jekp.13.1.2024.30-43>
- Pemerintah Kota Surabaya. (2021). Rencana Pembangunan Jangka Menengah Daerah (RPJMD) Kota Surabaya Tahun 2021-2026. Dinas Pemerintahan Kota Surabaya.
- Pemerintah Kota Surabaya. (2023). Peraturan Walikota Nomor 130 Tahun 2023 tentang Pelaksanaan Pemberian Bantuan Langsung Tunai kepada Keluarga Miskin di Kota Surabaya. JDih Kota Surabaya. <https://jdih.surabaya.go.id/peraturan/4431>
- Pemerintah Kota Surabaya. (2025). Surabaya berhasil tekan kemiskinan, persentase turun jadi 3,56 persen di 2025. Berita Resmi Pemerintah Kota Surabaya. <https://www.surabaya.go.id/id/berita/24257/surabaya-berhasil-tekan-kemiskinan-persentase-turun-jadi-3-56-persen-di-2025>
- Putri, A. (2023). Perspektif Hukum dan Implementasi Perencanaan Tata Ruang Permukiman Kumuh Kota Surabaya (Undergraduate thesis, Universitas Muhammadiyah Surabaya). Repository Universitas Muhammadiyah Surabaya (UMSURA). <https://repository.um-surabaya.ac.id/id/eprint/8657>
- Rahayu, S., & Febriaty, H. (2025). Upaya pengentasan kemiskinan menuju pencapaian Tujuan Pembangunan Berkelanjutan (SDGs) di Indonesia. *Jurnal Sosial Humaniora Komunikasi (SOMASI)*. <https://doi.org/10.53695/js.v6i1.1268>

- Ramadhani, T. A. R., & Fauzi, A. M. (2023). Analisis perilaku masyarakat pada lingkungan kumuh di Kelurahan Sawunggaling Surabaya. Prosiding Seminar Nasional Ilmu Ilmu Sosial (SNIIS). <https://proceeding.unesa.ac.id/index.php/sniis/article/view/48>
- Sabitha, F. A. (2022). Analisis Pengaruh Tingkat Urbanisasi Terhadap Ketersediaan Lahan Lahan Permukiman Perumahan Di Kota Surabaya. Jurnal Lemhannas RI. <https://doi.org/10.55960/jlri.v10i1.268>
- Saputri, M. A., Millah, M. N., Falah, R. N., & Dewi, S. A. (2025). Poverty Alleviation Strategy: Challenges and Opportunities in Realizing SDGs in Indonesia. Entita: Jurnal Pendidikan Ilmu Pengetahuan Sosial dan Ilmu-Ilmu Sosial. <https://doi.org/10.19105/ejpis.v1i.19213>
- Setyawan, J. A. P., & Prathama, A. (2024). Implementasi kebijakan program rehabilitasi rumah tidak layak hadi di Kota Surabaya (Studi kasus Kelurahan Sawunggaling). Jurnal Dinamika Pemerintahan (JDP). <https://doi.org/10.36341/jdp.v7i1.3905>
- Simbolon, A. M., Rusli, B., & Candradewini. (2023). Pendekatan dan pemecahan masalah implementasi kebijakan subsidi perumahan bagi masyarakat berpenghasilan rendah. Jurnal Permukiman, 18(1), 25–35. <https://doi.org/10.31815/jp.2023.18.25-35>
- Slater, R. (2011). Cash transfers, social protection and poverty reduction. International Journal of Social Welfare, 20(3), 250–259. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2397.2011.00801.x>
- Surya TV. (2017, Maret 29). VIDEO - Melihat pemukiman kumuh di Surabaya, target penggusuran berikutnya [Video]. Surya.co.id; Tribunnews Surabaya. <https://surabaya.tribunnews.com/2017/03/29/video-melihat-pemukiman-kumuh-di-surabaya-target-penggusuran-berikutnya>
- Susilo, E. (2026, 12 Januari). Tiga tahun, penduduk Surabaya bertambah 30 ribu. Harian Disway. <https://harian.disway.id/read/922624/tiga-tahun-penduduk-surabaya-bertambah-30-ribu>
- Tunas, D., & Peresthu, A. (2010). The self-help housing in Indonesia: The only option for the poor? Habitat International, 34(3), 315–322. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.habitatint.2009.11.007>
- Ulu, M., & Sholichah, N. (2020). Penanganan kawasan kumuh perkotaan melalui program perbaikan rumah di Kecamatan Wonokromo. Jurnal Kesejahteraan Sosial.