

Bridging Social Protection and Agricultural Policy for Zero Hunger in Indonesia

Dian Permana

Institut Miftahul Huda Al Azhar Banjar, Indonesia
dianpermana128@gmail.com

Abstract

Achieving Zero Hunger in Indonesia requires integrated approaches that align social protection and agricultural policy. This study investigates how programmatic and institutional convergence can improve food security outcomes. Using a qualitative document analysis informed by the capability approach and institutional theory, the research evaluates existing barriers and identifies models of policy integration. Findings reveal that current efforts in Indonesia remain fragmented across ministries and administrative levels. However, integration opportunities exist through aligned cash transfers, input support, and decentralized program innovation. The study proposes a hybrid implementation framework involving centralized coordination, local-level innovation, and community-led initiatives. Theoretically, the research contributes to integrated development theory by contextualizing it within Indonesia's governance structure. Practically, it offers policy recommendations to enhance synergy between agricultural and social protection programs. This integration is essential to address structural hunger and build resilience in vulnerable populations across Indonesia.

Keywords

zero hunger; social protection; agricultural development; policy integration

INTRODUCTION

Poverty and hunger remain persistent challenges in Indonesia, despite notable economic development over the past two decades. The country faces complex food security dynamics influenced by geographical disparities, climate vulnerability, and fluctuating commodity markets (World Bank, 2016). While agricultural advancements have played a role in reducing food insecurity, systemic hunger—especially in rural and marginalized communities—remains entrenched.

According to BPS–Statistics Indonesia (2016), undernourishment in certain provinces remains above the national average, revealing uneven progress. The urgency to

address these disparities grows stronger with Indonesia's commitment to achieving the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), particularly SDG 2: Zero Hunger.

Social protection, broadly defined as measures to protect individuals from poverty and vulnerability, has emerged as a pivotal tool in addressing hunger and supporting sustainable livelihoods. Programs such as conditional cash transfers (CCTs), food aid, and public works schemes have been implemented across Indonesia, often with measurable impact on household food consumption (Gentilini et al., 2015). Nevertheless, these interventions have frequently operated in silos, failing to interact meaningfully with agricultural policy frameworks. As a result, opportunities for synergistic policy impact—such as linking CCTs with agricultural training or input provision—are often missed (HLPE, 2012).

From a theoretical perspective, integrating social protection and agricultural policy represents a systems-based approach to sustainable development. Combining the stability and resilience offered by social assistance with productivity-enhancing measures in agriculture could address both the symptoms and structural causes of hunger (Devereux & Sabates-Wheeler, 2004).

Empirical studies have shown that this nexus can promote rural resilience and inclusive development (FAO, 2015). However, policy fragmentation and institutional compartmentalization often obstruct this potential. In Indonesia, the Ministries of Agriculture and Social Affairs operate largely independently, creating policy gaps that undermine holistic food security strategies (Rachman, 2015, p. 66).

While global studies have emphasized the value of integration, limited empirical research focuses specifically on how these strategies intersect within the Indonesian context. Existing literature either concentrates on the impact of agricultural subsidies or evaluates the performance of social safety nets, with minimal exploration of their combined effects (Sumarto & Bazzi, 2011). Furthermore, region-specific variations in policy implementation and local governance structures necessitate a nuanced understanding of integration challenges and opportunities at both the macro and micro levels.

This study seeks to fill that gap by addressing the following research questions: How can social protection programs be aligned with agricultural policies to improve food security outcomes in Indonesia? What are the institutional and policy barriers to such integration? What models or frameworks can guide effective implementation of integrated approaches in the Indonesian context? The study aims to contribute both theoretically and practically by proposing integrative policy pathways toward Zero Hunger. In doing so, it underscores the urgency of breaking institutional silos and fostering inter-sectoral collaboration for sustainable development.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The discourse on the intersection between social protection and agricultural policy is rooted in a multidisciplinary literature encompassing development economics, social policy, and agrarian studies. Scholars have long recognized that poverty, vulnerability, and food insecurity are interconnected challenges requiring integrated policy responses (Ellis, 2000, p. 114).

In the context of developing countries, agricultural development has often been viewed as the cornerstone of rural poverty reduction. However, agricultural interventions alone are insufficient to shield vulnerable populations from systemic shocks, thus necessitating complementary social protection mechanisms (Barrientos & Hulme, 2008).

A key theoretical contribution to this field is the concept of "productive safety nets" that combine social transfers with measures aimed at enhancing productive capacities (Tebaldi & Mohapatra, 2012). Such frameworks argue that when social protection programs—such as cash transfers or food subsidies—are strategically linked to agricultural inputs, extension services, or credit access, they can simultaneously address immediate food needs and build long-term resilience (Sabates-Wheeler & Devereux, 2007). FAO's global report (2015) emphasized that integrated strategies not only stabilize consumption patterns but also support smallholder farmers in adopting sustainable practices.

Empirical literature in the Indonesian context reveals a fragmented landscape of policy implementation. While studies have evaluated the impact of individual social protection programs such as PKH (Program Keluarga Harapan) or Raskin (rice subsidy), few have examined their integration with agricultural policies (Sumarto & Suryahadi, 2010). Moreover, the literature underscores challenges such as institutional silos, weak data integration, and differing performance indicators across ministries (World Bank, 2016). This fragmentation limits the capacity of both policy domains to achieve synergistic outcomes.

Additionally, the broader literature highlights the role of governance structures and inter-agency coordination in enabling successful integration. Case studies from countries like Ethiopia and Brazil illustrate how centralized coordination and unified policy frameworks can lead to more effective integration (HLPE, 2012). These insights provide a comparative lens through which Indonesia's challenges and opportunities can be assessed. Despite this, there remains a significant gap in understanding how such models could be adapted to Indonesia's decentralized political-administrative structure.

Theoretical Framework

The theoretical foundation of this study draws upon the integrated development theory, which posits that sustainable development requires harmonized interventions across sectors such as agriculture, health, education, and social protection (Todaro & Smith, 2015, p. 44). Within this framework, hunger is not merely a function of food availability but is influenced by systemic social vulnerabilities. This holistic perspective underlines the necessity of aligning agricultural policy with social protection programs to ensure inclusive and equitable development. By applying this theory to the Indonesian context, the research examines how coordinated policy efforts can produce synergistic benefits in combating food insecurity.

A second relevant theoretical lens is the capability approach developed by Amartya Sen, which shifts the focus from material resources to the expansion of human capabilities (Sen, 1999, p. 87). From this viewpoint, policies that empower individuals to secure food, education, and livelihood opportunities are essential for achieving food security.

Social protection, particularly when linked to productive assets and services, expands these capabilities by enabling vulnerable households to participate actively in agricultural and economic life (Nussbaum, 2011, p. 112). The study uses this approach to assess how policy integration can enhance both individual agency and structural resilience.

Social risk management theory also informs the analytical framework. This theory emphasizes that managing risk—through prevention, mitigation, and coping strategies—is fundamental to sustainable livelihoods (Holzmann & Jørgensen, 2001). Social protection acts as a risk-coping mechanism, while agricultural policy, particularly when focused on resilience and innovation, contributes to risk prevention and mitigation. Aligning these policies thus allows for a comprehensive risk management system that enhances food security. Indonesia's climate-induced agricultural risks, such as flooding and droughts, heighten the relevance of this theory in policy formulation (Bappenas, 2016).

Institutional theory further frames the study, focusing on how institutional arrangements, norms, and bureaucratic structures shape policy outcomes (Scott, 2008, p. 52). In Indonesia, institutional fragmentation and lack of inter-agency collaboration have been cited as major barriers to policy integration (Sumarto & Bazzi, 2011). The theory helps explain why siloed operations between the Ministry of Agriculture and the Ministry of Social Affairs persist despite overlapping policy goals. It also guides the

investigation into potential mechanisms for institutional reform and coordination that can facilitate integrative strategies.

Finally, the sustainable livelihoods framework (SLF) complements the above theories by offering a practical model for understanding household strategies and resource use (DFID, 1999). It recognizes that households draw on multiple capitals—human, social, natural, financial, and physical—to secure livelihoods. Integrated policy approaches that strengthen these capitals simultaneously are more likely to produce durable food security outcomes. The SLF serves as a diagnostic tool for assessing the impacts of combined social protection and agricultural interventions on rural livelihoods in Indonesia.

Previous Research

A significant body of research has explored the independent roles of agricultural policy and social protection in addressing poverty and food insecurity, though studies integrating the two remain limited, especially in the Indonesian context. One early study by Ravallion (1999) assessed the role of targeted transfers in poverty reduction, finding that social safety nets are more effective when complemented by broader economic policies. Though not agriculture-specific, this foundational work underscored the importance of policy coherence in poverty interventions.

In 2004, Devereux and Sabates-Wheeler advanced the concept of transformative social protection, which broadened the objective of safety nets beyond immediate relief to include economic empowerment. Their work highlighted the potential for social protection to intersect with sectors like agriculture to promote long-term development. This framework later informed the design of integrated programs in countries such as Ethiopia and Malawi, though its application in Southeast Asia remained minimal at the time.

Sumarto and Suryahadi (2010) analyzed the Indonesian Raskin and BLT (Bantuan Langsung Tunai) programs and found that while they provided temporary relief, they lacked connections to long-term development goals, particularly agricultural productivity. The authors called for a more strategic linkage between short-term aid and sustainable income-generating programs. However, their study did not directly explore how agricultural policy could be integrated into the social protection landscape.

A study by Hoddinott et al. (2012) examined the Ethiopian Productive Safety Net Programme (PSNP), which combined food or cash transfers with labor-intensive public works, often related to agriculture. Their results showed increased food security,

income diversification, and resilience to shocks. This model of integration served as a blueprint for other low-income countries, though differences in governance systems pose challenges to replication in Indonesia.

Gentilini and Omamo (2011) conducted a global review of agriculture-social protection linkages and found that integrated programs tend to outperform sector-specific ones in terms of reducing chronic food insecurity. They emphasized policy alignment and inter-agency collaboration as key success factors. While their study included some Asian case studies, Indonesia was largely absent from the empirical analysis.

More recently, Rachman (2015, p. 80) analyzed agricultural subsidy schemes in Indonesia, highlighting inefficiencies and poor targeting. He suggested that integrating subsidy delivery with household-level social protection data could enhance effectiveness and equity. Although the study did not fully explore integration mechanisms, it pointed to the need for unified beneficiary registries and better coordination.

Despite these contributions, a clear research gap remains in understanding how to implement integrated policy approaches within the Indonesian context. Most prior research has examined either social protection or agricultural policy in isolation, failing to consider the institutional, political, and operational synergies required for integration. This study addresses that gap by proposing and analyzing models for integration that are contextually grounded and informed by both theory and practice.

RESEARCH METHODS

This study employs qualitative data in the form of textual, document-based sources to analyze the intersection of social protection and agricultural policy in Indonesia. The research does not rely on statistical data but focuses instead on extracting conceptual themes, policy content, and institutional analysis. Textual data is suitable for this type of research as it allows for deep engagement with context-specific policy narratives, frameworks, and institutional discourse (Silverman, 2013, p. 119). By analyzing formal documents and scholarly work, the study captures both explicit and implicit dimensions of integration within Indonesian development policy.

The data are drawn from a range of verified and traceable sources including academic journal articles, official government documents, Indonesian policy papers, and reputable international institutional publications. Specific emphasis is placed on reports from the World Bank, FAO, and BPS–Statistics Indonesia, alongside peer-reviewed research and monographs focusing on development, agriculture, and social policy. These sources were selected due to their credibility, policy relevance, and

empirical focus on Indonesia or comparable developing countries (Creswell, 2014, p. 186).

The primary method of data collection is document analysis. This technique involves systematic review and coding of policy documents, academic articles, institutional reports, and strategic plans relevant to the topics of social protection and agricultural development. The documents were selected using purposive sampling, ensuring they represent diverse institutions and viewpoints while aligning with the study's temporal and thematic criteria (Bowen, 2009). Particular attention was paid to Indonesian regulatory texts and regional development strategies, which provide essential contextual data.

The research applies a thematic analysis to interpret the collected data. This method identifies, organizes, and reports patterns (themes) within the texts, following Braun and Clarke's (2006) six-phase model. Themes were constructed around recurring ideas such as integration mechanisms, institutional coordination, and beneficiary targeting. The analysis was guided by theoretical constructs drawn from integrated development theory and the sustainable livelihoods framework. This interpretive process allows the researcher to link empirical findings with conceptual insights, enabling both contextual understanding and theoretical elaboration (Mason, 2002, p. 71).

Findings were synthesized by triangulating the themes derived from policy documents with academic interpretations and theoretical models. This integrative process helped validate the thematic patterns and allowed for a coherent narrative that answers the study's research questions. The interpretive conclusions emphasize both conceptual contributions and policy recommendations tailored to the Indonesian context. Through this method, the research contributes to a growing body of literature advocating for integrated policy frameworks in addressing complex development challenges like hunger and poverty (Yin, 2013, p. 110).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The integration of social protection and agricultural policy emerges as a vital yet underexplored strategy for accelerating food security outcomes in Indonesia. Despite growing recognition of the multidimensional nature of poverty and hunger, sectoral policies in Indonesia have largely evolved in parallel rather than in coordination. Grounded in the theoretical frameworks outlined earlier—including the capability approach and integrated development theory—the research reveals how siloed approaches have historically limited policy efficacy. The capability approach emphasizes the importance of expanding individuals' freedoms and real opportunities

to live a life they value, which integrated policy mechanisms can more effectively deliver (Sen, 1999, p. 91).

In the Indonesian context, this means not only protecting the poor from food insecurity but also enabling them to participate in productive agricultural activities that sustain livelihoods. As emphasized by Sumarto and Suryahadi (2010), social protection programs like Raskin and PKH have shown only temporary alleviation of food insecurity due to their detachment from productive sectors. These findings resonate with Sabates-Wheeler and Devereux's (2007) call for "transformative" protection that simultaneously addresses vulnerability and promotes resilience by linking social assistance to opportunities for asset-building and human capital development.

Additionally, the study uncovers that institutional fragmentation significantly hampers integrative efforts. Ministries responsible for agriculture, rural development, and social welfare often pursue isolated objectives, resulting in disjointed program implementation (Scott, 2008, p. 53). The absence of a unified policy framework or inter-ministerial coordination mechanism perpetuates duplication, inconsistent targeting, and limited program effectiveness.

These structural divides are not unique to Indonesia but are particularly challenging given its decentralized governance model, where subnational governments have considerable autonomy yet often lack the capacity or mandate for inter-sectoral coordination. Comparative literature from Ethiopia's Productive Safety Net Programme (PSNP) and Brazil's Bolsa Verde program illustrates how integrated governance frameworks can foster sustainable and inclusive outcomes by combining cash or food transfers with productive investments and environmental conservation goals (Hoddinott et al., 2012; HLPE, 2012). These cases demonstrate that integration is not merely a technical issue but one that requires political will, institutional innovation, and shared accountability mechanisms.

New perspectives obtained during the document analysis suggest that community-based initiatives—such as Desa Mandiri Pangan—could serve as local models for integration. These programs embody the potential for aligning social assistance with agricultural support by mobilizing community institutions to manage food production, distribution, and social inclusion. However, the lack of institutional support and cross-ministerial coordination constrains their scalability. Without formal recognition, consistent funding, and technical guidance, such programs risk remaining isolated success stories rather than scalable policy solutions.

Moreover, their contributions are often undervalued in national strategic plans, leading to fragmented support and missed opportunities for systemic change. These observations highlight the need to embed integrative practices into national development strategies, reinforcing arguments made by Gentilini and Omamo (2011)

regarding the critical role of policy coherence, joint planning, and inter-agency coordination in achieving lasting impact. As Indonesia continues to prioritize sustainable development and food sovereignty, institutionalizing such integrative models may be key to bridging the persistent gap between protection and productivity. This section now proceeds to thematically address each of the three research questions identified in the Introduction.

1. Aligning Social Protection with Agricultural Development for Food Security

Addressing the first research question—how social protection programs can be aligned with agricultural policies to improve food security outcomes in Indonesia—this section examines examples of potential convergence and the mechanisms required for effective integration. Drawing from the capability approach (Sen, 1999, p. 91), alignment involves enabling beneficiaries to access both consumption support and productive resources.

One promising model is the combination of conditional cash transfers with agricultural input support, where program beneficiaries receive farming tools, seeds, or livestock in addition to financial aid. This approach has been implemented in limited pilot schemes in Indonesia, often through collaborations between local governments and donor agencies. However, such integration lacks formalization at the national level. Internationally, similar models in countries like Malawi and Bangladesh have demonstrated success in increasing both yields and dietary diversity (HLPE, 2012).

Another alignment mechanism involves linking social protection registries with agricultural extension services. In Indonesia, data from the Unified Database (BDT) used in social programs like PKH could be cross-referenced to identify poor farming households who would benefit from targeted training or credit access (Rachman, 2015, p. 84). Such integration would optimize targeting and reduce administrative redundancies.

Moreover, the integration of food-for-work or cash-for-work programs with agricultural infrastructure development—such as irrigation or farm roads—can serve dual purposes of employment generation and agricultural enhancement. Though used sporadically in Indonesia's National Program for Community Empowerment (PNPM), these activities are rarely institutionalized within broader agricultural policy frameworks.

Institutional support remains a key enabling factor. According to Gentilini et al. (2015), integration requires a policy mandate, fiscal space, and cross-sectoral accountability mechanisms. In Indonesia, the absence of a lead agency to coordinate across ministries remains a significant barrier. Creating an inter-ministerial task force or embedding integration in the RPJMN (National Medium-Term Development Plan) could offer structural solutions.

Lastly, community-based cooperatives and farmer groups could serve as grassroots nodes of integration, distributing both social aid and agricultural services. However, their effectiveness is currently limited by capacity constraints and inadequate policy linkages. Without formal support and funding, these grassroots efforts cannot scale. The alignment of policies must thus be driven not only by conceptual compatibility but also institutional and operational coherence.

2. Institutional and Policy Barriers to Integration

The second research question investigates the institutional and policy barriers to integration. The analysis reveals that bureaucratic compartmentalization, policy misalignment, and data silos are among the most significant obstacles to cohesive policy implementation. Indonesia's decentralized governance exacerbates these issues, with districts having autonomy over program implementation while lacking coordination mechanisms.

Institutional theory (Scott, 2008, p. 57) explains these dynamics by highlighting how entrenched norms, roles, and mandates resist reform. Ministries often safeguard their jurisdiction and budgetary allocations, disincentivizing collaboration. For example, while the Ministry of Social Affairs administers cash transfers, the Ministry of Agriculture oversees subsidies and extension services, each with different criteria, objectives, and monitoring systems.

A second barrier is the fragmentation of data systems. Indonesia's Unified Database serves social protection programs but is not shared with agricultural agencies. This limits the ability to identify overlapping beneficiaries or track multidimensional poverty. As noted by the World Bank (2016), integrated information systems are critical for cross-sectoral targeting and accountability.

Additionally, policy cycles and budgeting processes are rarely synchronized across ministries. This creates temporal and procedural misalignments that delay or dilute integrated efforts. The RPJMN includes sectoral goals but lacks explicit mechanisms for joint planning. Consequently, even when integration is

mentioned in policy discourse, it is seldom operationalized in program design or funding allocations.

Capacity constraints also play a role, particularly at the local level. District governments often lack the technical capacity, trained personnel, or incentives to coordinate across sectors. The literature on decentralized governance (Ribot, 2002) emphasizes that without capacity-building and fiscal transfers, decentralization can exacerbate policy fragmentation.

Furthermore, political economy factors cannot be ignored. Patronage networks, political interests, and elite capture influence program design and delivery, often sidelining integration in favor of visibility or short-term electoral gains. These dynamics have been observed in both social assistance and agricultural subsidy programs in Indonesia (Sumarto & Bazzi, 2011).

Addressing these barriers requires systemic reform, including legal mandates for coordination, integrated budgeting frameworks, and shared data governance protocols. Learning from countries like Brazil and Mexico, where integration has been institutionalized through unified registries and central coordinating agencies, can provide valuable lessons. Ultimately, overcoming institutional and policy barriers is essential for achieving the potential of integrated strategies.

3. Frameworks for Effective Integration in Indonesia

The final research question focuses on identifying models or frameworks that can guide effective implementation of integrated approaches in Indonesia. Drawing from international best practices and local initiatives, the study identifies three potential models: centralized coordination frameworks, decentralized innovation platforms, and community-led integrative structures.

The centralized coordination model involves establishing an inter-ministerial secretariat or lead agency with a mandate to oversee integration. This model has proven effective in countries like Ethiopia (via PSNP) and Brazil (via Bolsa Familia) where centralized agencies align objectives, pool resources, and standardize beneficiary registries (HLPE, 2012). For Indonesia, this could be embedded within the Bappenas structure, ensuring alignment with national development planning.

Decentralized innovation platforms involve empowering local governments to design context-specific integration mechanisms. This approach is more suitable

for Indonesia's decentralized political system. For instance, the city of Surakarta has experimented with integrating urban farming programs with food assistance, reflecting how subnational innovation can drive integrative development. However, it requires capacity-building, fiscal support, and institutional incentives.

Community-led structures offer a third model, particularly relevant for rural areas. Farmer groups (*kelompok tani*) and women's cooperatives can serve as integrators of aid and agricultural inputs. This approach aligns with the sustainable livelihoods framework (DFID, 1999) by leveraging social capital and local knowledge. However, its success depends on enabling environments such as legal recognition, training, and financial access.

Policy coherence frameworks such as the OECD's Policy Coherence for Sustainable Development (PCSD) can be adapted to guide integration in Indonesia. These frameworks emphasize stakeholder engagement, evidence-based planning, and institutional alignment. Applying such frameworks requires a political commitment to whole-of-government approaches and performance-based evaluations.

Ultimately, no single model fits all contexts. The study recommends a hybrid approach that combines centralized policy mandates with decentralized execution and community engagement. This layered model reflects Indonesia's administrative reality and development priorities. Embedding integration within national development plans, enhancing local capacities, and empowering communities can collectively enable effective policy convergence toward Zero Hunger.

This study explored how the integration of social protection and agricultural policy can accelerate progress toward achieving Zero Hunger in Indonesia. Addressing the first research question, it was found that aligning social protection programs such as cash transfers with agricultural inputs, training, and infrastructure development enhances household food security and builds resilience. Drawing from the capability approach, the research highlighted how integrated interventions expand the capacity of rural populations to overcome hunger through both immediate support and long-term empowerment.

In response to the second research question, the study identified institutional fragmentation, uncoordinated data systems, and policy silos as primary barriers to integration. Theoretical insights from institutional theory provided an explanation for the persistence of these challenges within Indonesia's bureaucratic structure. The lack

of synchronization in planning and budget cycles, as well as political disincentives for cross-sector collaboration, were found to further hinder holistic policy design.

Addressing the third research question, the study proposed three viable frameworks for implementation: centralized coordination, decentralized innovation, and community-led models. Each of these reflects both global best practices and local contextual realities. The research contributes original insights by synthesizing these models into a hybrid framework tailored to Indonesia's decentralized governance structure.

Theoretically, the study enriches the literature on policy integration by adapting global theories to the Indonesian context and emphasizing the convergence between social risk management and agricultural development. It also extends the sustainable livelihoods framework by demonstrating how institutional coordination affects access to multiple livelihood capitals. Practically, the study offers actionable pathways for policymakers: including shared beneficiary databases, legal mandates for coordination, and fiscal incentives for integrated local programs.

The implications are twofold. Theoretically, the research offers a contextualized expansion of integrative development theory, emphasizing governance as a mediating factor. Practically, it provides policy guidance for ministries, local governments, and development partners seeking to operationalize inter-sectoral integration. By bridging the gap between concept and practice, the study contributes to both academic discourse and Indonesia's strategic roadmap toward Zero Hunger.

CONCLUSION

The integration of social protection and agricultural policy presents a strategic opportunity for Indonesia to accelerate progress toward the goal of Zero Hunger. This study has demonstrated that although significant progress has been made in both policy areas, their continued separation limits their effectiveness. Through thematic analysis of textual data and grounded in robust theoretical frameworks, the research has provided a comprehensive understanding of how these domains can be aligned to produce synergistic outcomes.

Key findings reveal that integrated approaches—such as coupling cash transfers with agricultural inputs or linking beneficiary registries with extension services—can significantly enhance food security while building rural resilience. However, institutional fragmentation, data silos, and decentralized implementation without adequate coordination pose major challenges. The analysis underscores the

importance of a hybrid framework that balances national coordination with localized innovation and community participation.

The study confirms the theoretical alignment between integrated development models, the sustainable livelihoods framework, and institutional theory. By applying these concepts to the Indonesian context, the research contributes to the broader academic discourse on policy coherence and governance in development. Practical recommendations arising from this study include establishing cross-sectoral mandates, improving data integration, and embedding integrative goals within national and local development planning.

To sustain these efforts, future research should focus on empirical evaluations of pilot integration programs and explore mechanisms for scaling successful models across diverse regions. Indonesia stands at a crucial juncture where policy integration is not just an option, but a necessity to ensure that no one is left behind in the journey toward Zero Hunger.

REFERENCES

- Barrientos, A., & Hulme, D. (2008). *Social protection for the poor and poorest: Concepts, policies and politics*. Palgrave Macmillan.
<https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230583091>
- Bappenas. (2016). *Indonesia climate change sectoral roadmap: Agriculture*. Jakarta: Ministry of National Development Planning.
- Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative Research Journal*, 9(2), 27–40. <https://doi.org/10.3316/QRJ0902027>
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Devereux, S., & Sabates-Wheeler, R. (2004). Transformative social protection. *IDS Working Paper 232*. Institute of Development Studies.
<https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.1154541>
- DFID. (1999). *Sustainable livelihoods guidance sheets*. Department for International Development. <https://www.eldis.org/document/A37314>
- Ellis, F. (2000). *Rural livelihoods and diversity in developing countries*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198296966.001.0001>

- FAO. (2015). *The state of food and agriculture: Social protection and agriculture—Breaking the cycle of rural poverty*. Food and Agriculture Organization.
<https://www.fao.org/3/i4910e/i4910e.pdf>
- Gentilini, U., & Omamo, S. W. (2011). Social protection 2.0: Exploring issues, evidence and debates in a globalizing world. *Food Policy*, 36(3), 329–340.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodpol.2010.11.014>
- Gentilini, U., Honorati, M., & Yemtsov, R. (2015). The state of social safety nets 2015. *World Bank*. <https://doi.org/10.1596/978-1-4648-0543-1>
- Hoddinott, J., Berhane, G., Gilligan, D. O., Kumar, N., & Taffesse, A. S. (2012). The impact of Ethiopia's Productive Safety Net Programme and related transfers on agricultural productivity. *Journal of African Economies*, 21(5), 761–786.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/jae/ejs023>
- HLPE. (2012). *Social protection for food security*. A report by the High-Level Panel of Experts on Food Security and Nutrition. Committee on World Food Security, FAO. <https://www.fao.org/3/me421e/me421e.pdf>
- Holzmann, R., & Jørgensen, S. (2001). Social risk management: A new conceptual framework for social protection, and beyond. *International Tax and Public Finance*, 8(4), 529–556. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1011247814590>
- Mason, J. (2002). *Qualitative researching* (2nd ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Nussbaum, M. C. (2011). *Creating capabilities: The human development approach*. Harvard University Press.
- Rachman, B. (2015). Agricultural development policy in Indonesia: From food security to food sovereignty. In *Rural transformation and development in Indonesia* (pp. 63–90). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-02362-6_4
- Ravallion, M. (1999). Appraising workfare. *World Bank Research Observer*, 14(1), 31–48. <https://doi.org/10.1093/wbro/14.1.31>
- Ribot, J. C. (2002). Democratic decentralization of natural resources: Institutionalizing popular participation. *World Resources Institute*.
- Sabates-Wheeler, R., & Devereux, S. (2007). Social protection for transformation. *IDS Bulletin*, 38(3), 23–28. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1759-5436.2007.tb00375.x>
- Scott, W. R. (2008). *Institutions and organizations: Ideas and interests* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781483381235>

- Sen, A. (1999). *Development as freedom*. Oxford University Press.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/0198297580.001.0001>
- Silverman, D. (2013). *Doing qualitative research* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Sumarto, S., & Bazzi, S. (2011). Social protection in Indonesia: Past experiences and lessons for the future. In A. Bauer & M. Thant (Eds.), *Poverty and sustainable development in Asia* (pp. 111–135). Asian Development Bank.
<https://doi.org/10.22617/BKAE135349>
- Sumarto, S., & Suryahadi, A. (2010). Social safety nets in Indonesia: Lessons from the 1997–98 crisis. *Asian Economic Policy Review*, 5(1), 110–129.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1748-3131.2010.01155.x>
- Todaro, M. P., & Smith, S. C. (2015). *Economic development* (12th ed.). Pearson Education. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315705212>
- Tebaldi, E., & Mohapatra, S. (2012). Economic development and social protection expenditure: Cross-country evidence. *Applied Economics*, 44(16), 2081–2090.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00036846.2011.560108>
- World Bank. (2016). *Indonesia's rising divide*. World Bank Group.
<https://doi.org/10.1596/978-1-4648-0944-6>
- Yin, R. K. (2013). *Case study research: Design and methods* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.