


## Evaluation of the Implementation of the Smoke-Free Zone Policy in DKI Jakarta Province

Arga Lintong<sup>1</sup>, Nurliah Nurdin<sup>2</sup>, Megandaru Widhi Kawuryan<sup>3</sup>

Sekolah Pascasarjana, Institut Pemerintahan Dalam Negeri, Jakarta

Article Info	ABSTRACT
<b>Keywords:</b> Evaluation, Policy Implementation, Smoke- Free Areas	This study aims to analyze and evaluate the implementation of the Smoke-Free Area (KTR) policy in DKI Jakarta Province. The objectives of this study are to assess the extent to which this policy is implemented effectively and efficiently, and to identify factors that influence compliance with the policy in the field. This study uses Dunn's (2003) policy evaluation theory, which includes six main criteria: effectiveness, efficiency, adequacy, equity, responsiveness, and accuracy. The approach used in this study is descriptive qualitative, with data collection techniques through interviews, observation, and documentation. The results show that although this policy has shown some progress, such as increased public awareness of the importance of a smoke-free environment, significant challenges remain, particularly in terms of inconsistent law enforcement and low levels of compliance in several sectors, such as public transportation and public places. This evaluation also highlights the need for increased oversight, community engagement, and the provision of smoking facilities that meet standards. Furthermore, although resource management is quite good, increased budget and human resources are essential to strengthen policy implementation. This study proposes that the DKI Jakarta Provincial Government improve inter-agency coordination, strengthen oversight through technology, and expand educational campaigns to ensure the overall success of the KTR policy. In this regard, stricter law enforcement and continuous evaluation are key to achieving optimal policy objectives. This research contributes to our understanding of the implementation of the KTR policy in Jakarta and strategies for improving it for a healthier future.
This is an open access article under theCC BY-NClicense 	<b>Corresponding Author:</b> Arga Lintong Sekolah Pascasarjana, Institut Pemerintahan Dalam Negeri, Jakarta <a href="mailto:argabaik46@gmail.com">argabaik46@gmail.com</a>

### INTRODUCTION

According to data from the World Health Organization, global cigarette production reaches approximately six trillion cigarettes annually. This vast production requires 5.3 million hectares of land and over 22 billion tons of water. Indonesia produces approximately 36.26 billion cigarettes annually. Unlike its neighbor, Singapore, which does not provide duty-free access to any tobacco products imported into the country due to its strict taxes and regulations on cigarettes.

Currently, at least 335 of Indonesia's 514 districts/cities have established Smoke-Free Area (KTR) regulations (Ministry of Health, 2022). Therefore, the government has emphasized

that all provinces, districts, and cities that have not yet established regulations on KTR must immediately do so.

Based on Jakarta.go.id data shows that the first province to enact regulations on Smoke-Free Areas (KTR) through a Gubernatorial Regulation (Pergub) was DKI Jakarta Province. Jakarta issued Pergub Number 88 of 2010. This was later replaced by Pergub Number 40 of 2020 concerning Smoke-Free Areas, which regulates the prohibition of smoking in public places such as healthcare facilities, educational institutions, and other places frequently visited by the public.

The DKI Jakarta Province itself can be seen from various aspects that make it unique and play a vital role in Indonesia. It is renowned for its diversity, including being the nation's capital, the center of government, and home to numerous state institutions and foreign embassies. Nearly all policy decisions are made from Jakarta.

Furthermore, the DKI Jakarta Province is known as an economic hub, the largest in Indonesia. Many large companies, business centers, and trade centers are headquartered in Jakarta, making it a hub for money and business circulation. Furthermore, Jakarta boasts a rich cultural and historical heritage, boasting diverse ethnicities and cultures.

Furthermore, Jakarta boasts modern transportation and infrastructure, boasting a continually expanding network, including Transjakarta, the Commuter Line (KRL), and the Jakarta Light Rail Transit (LRT), all of which facilitate public mobility. Furthermore, Jakarta is known as one of the most densely populated cities in the world.

Then from the 2023 Pro Tobacco Control data, it was revealed that there were 4,715 cigarettes found on the UIN JAKARTA campus. Of course, this can be seen that there is a weakness in law enforcement in Jakarta regarding the smoke-free area which has been regulated in the regulation of the governor of the capital city of Jakarta number 40 of 2020 concerning guidelines for implementing guidance, supervision and law enforcement of the no-smoking area in article 1 which states that the no-smoking area is a room or area declared as a place or area where smoking activities are prohibited, namely public places, workplaces, teaching and learning places, health service places, public transportation, children's activity areas and places of worship.

So according to data between 2021, it was recorded that in approximately 15 and 13 markets in Jakarta, 60% of malls were found to have people smoking inside the mall building, then as many as 92% of markets had people still smoking inside the market, this shows that malls and markets in Jakarta have not provided a place for smoking, but that is clear in Regulation of the Governor of the Capital City of Jakarta Number 40 of 2020 concerning Guidelines for the Implementation of Guidance, Supervision and Law Enforcement of No-Smoking Areas, one of which is public places.

As a result, the Governor's Regulation cannot be fully implemented due to the low level of awareness and interest of both public officials and the community regarding a clean environment and the dangers for non-smokers who inhale cigarette smoke.

The aim of this research is as follows: following:

1. To analyze the implementation of smoke-free areas in DKI Jakarta Province, violations still occur.

2. To formulate the Implementation of the Smoke-Free Area Policy Strategy in DKI Jakarta Province.

## METHOD

This study employed a qualitative research design with descriptive methods and an inductive approach. It is stated that this research is qualitative because the research findings were not obtained through statistical procedures or similar methods. Data collection techniques are closely related to the data that will help solve this research problem. The data collection techniques and methods used in this study are: observation, interviews, and documentation.

Research requires data sources to obtain information related to the research focus. Best divides data sources into two types: primary and secondary data. This qualitative research considers methods for obtaining appropriate field data. The field data referred to in this study are data the researcher experiences, remembers, and records in field notes.

The informants in this study were determined using purposive sampling techniques. Purposive sampling techniques determine the informants to be interviewed on research objects related to the problem or focus of the research. The Head of the Legal Bureau of the Regional Secretariat of the DKI Jakarta Provincial Government, the Legal Bureau is responsible for the legal aspects of the smoke-free area policy, starting from the creation of regional regulations and gubernatorial regulations, to the interpretation and implementation of applicable laws. The Head of the Health Office of the DKI Jakarta Provincial Government, the health office has a major role in developing programs and activities related to health promotion, such as anti-smoking campaigns and providing education about the dangers of smoking. The Head of the Public Order Agency (Satpol PP) of the DKI Jakarta Provincial Government, Satpol PP plays a role in direct supervision and action against violations that occur in the field, such as smoking in areas that should be smoke-free. Civil Servants, as directly involved in monitoring, supervision, and giving reprimands or warnings to violators who smoke in prohibited areas.

The data analysis technique in this study is data from interviews between one informant and another informant who provides information that will be compared with the results of observations made by the author and observations of related documents.

In this study, the researcher used triangulation techniques, which check the accuracy or validity of the data by asking a number of questions using interview techniques to different informants to produce consistent data. In this case, the researcher used semi-structured interviews with the informants, then using the same questions to confirm and analyze the accuracy of the answers.

## RESEARCH RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

According to William Dunn (2003), policy evaluation is a systematic process for assessing the success or failure of a public policy in achieving its stated objectives. This evaluation is conducted after the policy has been implemented and aims to provide useful feedback for the process of improving, refining, or even terminating the policy if it is deemed ineffective. In

other words, policy evaluation serves as an analytical tool that helps decision-makers determine the direction of future policy, based on empirical data and evidence.

### **Evaluation of the Implementation of the Smoke-Free Area Policy in DKI Jakarta Province**

Policy evaluation is an integral part of the public policy management process, aiming to ensure that implemented policies are effective, efficient, and on-target. Through proper evaluation, policies can be refined and adapted to field conditions, thereby maximizing their positive impact on society. Therefore, policy evaluation plays a crucial role in improving the quality of governance and public services.

The results of this study examine the Evaluation of the Implementation of the Smoke-Free Area Policy in DKI Jakarta Province according to William N. Dunn's theory (2003) into 6 (six) dimensions, namely: (1) Recruitment Effectiveness; (2) Efficiency; (3) Adequacy of Retain. (4) Equity (5) Responsiveness (6) Accuracy. The results of this study are described as follows:

#### **a. Effectiveness**

Effectiveness can be measured by the extent to which the policy succeeds in reducing exposure to cigarette smoke in public spaces, improving air quality, or preventing smoking-related diseases. It also raises awareness among various groups and levels of government and society.

Based on the evaluation of the previous policy—which still permitted smoking areas within buildings—it was found that particles or harmful substances from cigarette smoke were still detected in other rooms within the building. This indicates that the presence of smoking areas within buildings, even if physically separated, is not completely effective in preventing air pollution in other areas that should be free of cigarette smoke.

In response, the Jakarta Provincial Government then formulated policy changes with a stricter approach oriented toward protecting public health as a whole. One strategic step taken was the restructuring of smoking areas. Under this new policy, smoking areas are no longer permitted inside the main building, even if structurally separate. Smoking areas may only be provided outside the building, in open areas, and must be located far enough away from human traffic—especially entrances, corridors, or areas frequently used by employees and visitors.

This policy change aims to minimize the impact of air pollution from cigarette smoke in buildings while providing optimal protection for all individuals within them. This step aligns with the principle of prevention in promotional and preventive environmental health efforts. Furthermore, this policy also demonstrates the Jakarta Provincial Government's commitment to creating healthy, safe, and comfortable public spaces for all its citizens.

With these stricter regulations, it is hoped that public awareness of the importance of Smoke-Free Areas will increase, and the risk of exposure to cigarette smoke for passive smokers, especially children, the elderly, and other vulnerable groups, can be significantly minimized.

It can be explained that the results of monitoring of Smoke-Free Areas (KTR) in seven settings conducted in various locations showed varying levels of compliance. The recorded data indicates that some settings comply with KTR regulations, while others show significant non-compliance.

First, in the public transportation sector, the results were very disappointing, with 0% compliance, meaning that all public transportation locations inspected failed to comply with the KTR regulations. This indicates that many public transportation options still require greater attention when it comes to implementing smoke-free zones.

Unlike public transportation, healthcare facilities demonstrated a fairly good level of compliance, with 73% complying, although 27% remained non-compliant. This demonstrates that the healthcare sector has sufficiently understood the importance of smoke-free environments, but there are still areas where improvements are needed.

Meanwhile, educational institutions recorded an even higher level of compliance, with 80% complying with the KTR. Only 20% were non-compliant, indicating that the education sector is taking this regulation seriously. Meanwhile, in the children's play area sector, the results were balanced, with 50% of establishments complying and 50% not. This suggests that this sector still has much room to raise awareness about the importance of smoke-free spaces for children.

For places of worship, although only two places were inspected, the results showed 50% compliance and 50% non-compliance, indicating that this sector also needs more attention in maintaining smoke-free areas in holy places. In the workplace, 61% of places comply with the KTR, but 39% still violate it. This sector demonstrates that while the majority of workplaces comply with the regulations, many still do not implement the KTR optimally.

Finally, public places had the highest rate of non-compliance, with only 27% complying, while 73% did not comply with the KTR regulations. This indicates that awareness of creating a smoke-free environment remains very low in broader public spaces. Overall, while some settings have demonstrated good compliance, much remains to be done, particularly in the public transportation and public places sectors. Therefore, further monitoring and education are essential to ensure that all sectors fully comply with the KTR regulations, creating a healthier, smoke-free environment for all.

**Table 1** Achievements in the Implementation of the Smoke-Free Area (KTR) Policy in DKI Jakarta Province

Tatanan	Status Kepatuhan				Total
	Patuh		Tidak Patuh		
	Jumlah	%	umlah	%	
Fasilitas Pelayanan Kesehatan	121	82%	26	18%	147
Tempat Belajar Mengajar	164	77%	50	23%	214
Tempat Bermain Anak	20	87%	3	13%	23
Tempat Ibadah	14	70%	6	30%	20
Tempat Kerja	34	76%	11	24%	45
Tempat Umum	32	63%	19	37%	51
Fasilitas Olahraga	2	67%	1	33%	3

Based on the presented data, it is clear that the implementation of the Smoke-Free Area (KTR) policy in DKI Jakarta Province is still not fully effective. Despite progress, all areas designated as KTR have not achieved 100% compliance, the ideal target of this policy. This



means that some areas are still not completely smoke-free, potentially disrupting air quality and endangering public health, particularly vulnerable groups.

The Smoke-Free Area (KTR) policy in Jakarta Province has been implemented quite effectively and has shown positive results. While challenges remain, such as violations in some locations, the policy is considered quite effective in reducing the number of smokers in designated smoke-free areas. Places that were supposed to be smoke-free are now starting to become cleaner and healthier environments.

From this explanation, it can be concluded that the implementation of the Smoke-Free Zone (KTR) in DKI Jakarta has made significant progress. Public awareness of the importance of maintaining smoke-free areas is increasing, resulting in a more comfortable and healthy environment for all residents. However, challenges in enforcing the regulations remain, as several violations of smoking in prohibited areas are still being discovered.

The Public Order Agency (Satpol PP) has conducted regular and rigorous oversight to enforce this policy. However, the continued occurrence of violations demonstrates the need for stricter law enforcement and increased public education and outreach efforts. These steps are crucial for the optimal implementation of the KTR policy throughout Jakarta.

Overall, the Smoke-Free Area policy has been implemented quite effectively, but there is still room for improvement, especially in terms of supervision and law enforcement, as well as in increasing public awareness to increase compliance with this regulation.

#### **b. Efficiency**

Efficiency in the NWC policy is about how the government can achieve its goal of creating a smoke-free environment with minimal resources. Proper management of budget, human resources, and time, as well as the selection of appropriate methods, will contribute to achieving optimal results. An efficient NWC policy will help create a healthier environment without sacrificing excessive resources, making it more sustainable and more easily expandable to other areas.

Ms. Intan's statement explained that there is no specific budget allocated for the implementation of Smoke-Free Area (KTR) supervision in DKI Jakarta Province within the Health Office or community health centers. KTR supervision is considered part of the routine duties and responsibilities inherent in the daily functions and work of Health Office and community health center staff. Therefore, there are no additional payments or extra budgets for this supervision.

However, the Health Service budgets funds twice a year for increased supervision, which is usually used for supporting activities such as monitoring and evaluation (money) meetings to ensure that the achievement of supervision targets is running according to plan.

Meanwhile, for a more specific budget focused on monitoring non-smoking areas (KTR), this responsibility falls under the Public Order Agency (Satpol PP). Satpol PP has a specific role in monitoring and enforcing regulations on smoke-free areas and has been given monitoring targets to achieve, thus having a separate budget allocated for this function.

Currently, the available resources allocated to support the Smoke-Free Area (KTR) policy in DKI Jakarta are sufficient to implement it. However, as the policy evolves, there is a

need to increase the budget and human resources. This increase is crucial to strengthen oversight and law enforcement against KTR violations in the field.

With the increasing number of places and areas to be monitored, such as public spaces, sports venues, and entertainment venues, increasing the number of supervisors and improving their training would be crucial in strengthening the implementation of this policy. Furthermore, increased funding is also needed to support the provision of designated smoking areas and conduct broader public awareness campaigns to educate the public about the importance of this policy.

Increasing resources and infrastructure will increase the effectiveness of oversight of the KTR policy. This will ensure its implementation and reduce violations, such as smoking in prohibited areas. With stricter oversight and the provision of more adequate facilities, it is hoped that the public will be more compliant with the regulations, thereby better achieving the KTR policy's primary goal of creating a smoke-free and healthier environment.

Although the current resource allocation is adequate, improvements in budget and human resources are needed to ensure the smoke-free zone policy is implemented effectively and achieves its primary goal of creating a healthier, smoke-free environment. This strengthening of smoke-free zones will make monitoring and enforcement of regulations more effective, and the impact will be felt by more people, particularly in improving air quality and reducing the number of smokers in smoke-free zones.

The implementation of the Smoke-Free Area (KTR) policy in Jakarta Province has shown positive results, although challenges remain, particularly in resource management and budget efficiency. The Jakarta Provincial Government, through relevant agencies, such as the Health Office and Public Order Agency (Satpol PP), has implemented planned oversight using existing resources. However, budget and human resource increases are needed to optimize the policy's effectiveness.

Although there is no separate budget for supervision, supervision is still carried out effectively using existing funds, such as the Jakarta Provincial Budget (APBD). Supervision is conducted routinely, involving sufficient personnel, and efficient allocation of operational costs, such as food and beverages and supervision equipment. This demonstrates efficient budget management, although there is still room to improve the effectiveness of the KTR policy through increased human resources and more adequate equipment.

In terms of effectiveness, the KTR policy has been successful in reducing the number of violations and raising public awareness. However, challenges such as violations remain. To address these challenges, increased budget and human resources are essential to expand the scope of supervision and improve law enforcement against violators. Over time, with better management and more adequate resources, the KTR policy in DKI Jakarta is expected to become more effective, have a greater positive impact, and create a healthier, smoke-free environment.

### **c. Coverage**

Coverage measures the extent to which a policy reaches all parties who should be involved or benefit from it. In this regard, policy evaluation examines not only whether the policy is effective but also whether it reaches all target groups.

The 2023 Indonesian Health Survey revealed quite shocking facts about smoking habits in Indonesia. Nationally, approximately 85% of the population aged 10 and over smoked indoors. This figure demonstrates the prevalence of smoking in enclosed spaces, which undoubtedly increases health risks not only for active smokers but also for those exposed to secondhand smoke.

In Jakarta, although slightly lower, the proportion of indoor smoking still reaches 54%. This figure indicates that despite stricter regulations regarding smoking in Jakarta, indoor smoking remains quite high. This indicates that indoor smoking is not limited to certain areas but is a widespread issue throughout Indonesia.

Even more concerning, around 30.4% of Indonesians are still exposed to secondhand smoke every day indoors. This means that many people, even those who don't smoke, face health risks from the smoke around them. Exposure to secondhand smoke can lead to various dangerous diseases, such as lung cancer, heart disease, and respiratory disorders.

These figures serve as a reminder of the importance of strengthening policies regarding smoking bans in enclosed spaces and continuing public education on the dangers of smoking and secondhand smoke. This is a major public health challenge that requires serious attention from all parties.

Currently, even though regulations regarding smoke-free areas have been implemented, the deterrent effect on violators has not been fully felt. This is due to the fact that violators are only given warnings not to smoke, without any regional regulations (Perda) specifying administrative fines or criminal penalties. Without firm consequences, many violators feel there is no significant risk if they continue to violate the rules.

The positive impact of the smoke-free area (KTR) policy is clearly felt. In addition to increased comfort, employee health is also better protected by minimizing exposure to cigarette smoke. This, of course, creates a more productive and comfortable work environment for all parties. As this policy has been implemented, violations of smoking regulations have begun to decrease. One factor supporting this compliance is the presence of clearly defined and separate smoking areas, which makes it easier for employees to follow the rules without disturbing others around them.

It can be explained that the smoke-free area in the workplace has a very large positive impact, the impact is reflected in increased comfort, guaranteed employee health, reduced violations of smoking rules, with the existence of a separate and clear smoking area, this policy has succeeded in creating a more productive, healthy and comfortable work environment for all parties, both smokers and non-smokers. This policy shows effectiveness in reducing violations, as well as efficiency and accuracy in providing solutions to the problem of smoking in the workplace.

Overall, the smoke-free area policy has shown positive results in creating a healthier work environment, increasing employee comfort, and reducing violations of smoking regulations. However, there is a need for increased enforcement, clearer regulations, and ongoing education to change smoking behavior, especially in the long term.



#### **d. Alignment**

Equity in policy is crucial to ensuring that all target groups receive equal benefits and that no group is neglected or disadvantaged. By providing fair and equitable treatment at every stage of policy implementation, the policy will be more widely accepted and more effective in achieving its intended goals.

In efforts to enforce Smoke-Free Areas (KTR), there have been no complaints of discrimination. This demonstrates that oversight is in accordance with established regulations, namely Gubernatorial Regulation No. 40 of 2020 concerning Guidelines for the Implementation of Guidance, Supervision, and Law Enforcement of KTR. This regulation provides a clear basis for how supervision should be carried out and regulates how law enforcement in smoke-free areas can be carried out fairly and effectively.

To date, the Smoke-Free Area (SWA) policy in the workplace has not generated many complaints of discrimination. The majority of employees understand that this policy is in place to protect everyone's health, and they recognize that a smoke-free work environment is essential for everyone's health. This is reflected in the lack of significant reports of discrimination resulting from this policy.

This policy is applied fairly to all employees, regardless of whether they smoke or not. All employees, both smokers and non-smokers, are required to comply with the rules. This is intended to create a healthier and more comfortable workplace environment for everyone, without anyone feeling disadvantaged or excluded.

This awareness demonstrates that the policy is not a suppression of individual rights, but rather a collective effort to create a healthier and safer environment for all employees. With a clear understanding from all parties, this policy can be implemented effectively and bring significant benefits to the health of all employees.

#### **e. Responsiveness**

Responsiveness in policy is the ability of a policy to adapt quickly to changes or community needs. In the context of smoke-free zones, responsiveness means the policy is ready to respond to complaints, problems, and challenges that arise during implementation. With good responsiveness, smoke-free zones policies can be relevant, effective, and accepted by the community. Responsive policies not only address current community needs but also adapt to future developments, creating a healthier environment for everyone.

Various communication channels have been established to allow employees and the public to express their opinions and input. These channels include suggestion boxes, online surveys, and employee forums, which aim to increase transparency and employee involvement in the decision-making process. These channels enable both employees and the public to feel more valued and actively participate in providing constructive input on existing policies.

Furthermore, the socialization and implementation of the KTR policy also involves the general public. Through various forums and educational activities, such as seminars and health campaigns, the public is given a deeper understanding of the importance of this policy. These activities aim to educate the public about the dangers of smoking and the benefits of smoke-free areas, thereby fostering a broader and deeper collective awareness of health.

Through this approach, it is hoped that the KTR policy will be accepted not only by employees but also by the wider community, creating a healthier and more comfortable environment for all. With the active involvement of various stakeholders, this policy can be implemented more effectively, maintaining health quality and creating a better atmosphere in the workplace and the community at large.

**f. Accuracy**

Policy appropriateness is a crucial principle to ensure that Smoke-Free Area (SFA) policies effectively achieve their objectives. This includes determining appropriate targets, using relevant instruments, and implementing policies that are aligned with community needs. Policy appropriateness is a crucial principle to ensure that Smoke-Free Area (SFA) policies effectively achieve their objectives. This includes determining appropriate targets, using relevant instruments, and implementing policies that are aligned with community needs. Appropriate SFA policies can create a healthy environment, reduce exposure to secondhand smoke, and ensure that these policies are accepted and successfully implemented by the community.

It's important to understand that the term "area" used in this policy is distinct from "room." While "room" typically refers to an enclosed space with walls and a roof, "area" refers to an open space designated for smoking. This emphasis is intended to ensure the public understands where they can smoke without disturbing others.

Thus, this policy is expected to create healthier and more comfortable public spaces, where non-smokers can feel safer from exposure to secondhand smoke, while those who smoke are still provided with a clear and organized designated space. All of this is designed to improve the quality of life and public health in Jakarta.

Despite the implementation of the Smoke-Free Area (KTR) policy, the biggest challenge is the lack of compliance and optimal oversight. In the workplace, for example, smoking bans are still frequently violated. Long-standing smoking habits make it difficult for some people to change this behavior, even with clear regulations in place.

To address this issue, ongoing education is crucial. The public, both employees and the general public, needs to be continually reminded of the dangers of smoking and the importance of maintaining a smoke-free environment. Consistent education will help the public understand the rationale behind this policy and provide them with knowledge on how to support its successful implementation.

However, education alone is not enough. Supervision and guidance must be carried out more seriously and involve more parties. Not only the Public Order Agency (Satpol PP), but all regional agencies responsible for implementing Smoke-Free Areas, such as the Health Department, Education Department, and Transportation Department, must be actively involved. Comprehensive and ongoing supervision will be more effective in enforcing this policy across all sectors.

With collaboration between the government and the community, as well as more intensive supervision, it is hoped that the Smoke-Free Area policy can succeed in creating a healthier and more comfortable environment for everyone, reducing the negative impacts of smoking, and protecting future generations from the dangers of cigarette smoke.

Furthermore, from observations made by researchers, there are still people who smoke in inappropriate places, even in areas where there are no smoking signs, there are still people who smoke in these areas, as can be seen in the image below:



It can be seen in the picture above that, in the canteen area of the office, there is a sign prohibiting smoking, but in fact, there are still people smoking in the area that is prohibited for smoking.

The Smoke-Free Area (KTR) policy in Jakarta, as a whole, has been designed with flexibility and realism, considering the conditions and needs of the community. This policy can be adapted to various situations on the ground. For example, in crowded places or open spaces, the policy remains relevant without disrupting the comfort of others. This demonstrates that the KTR policy prioritizes not only regulations but also considers the practical needs of the community.

However, while this policy is sound, several challenges remain. Consistent oversight is a key challenge. Given the long-established smoking habit, ensuring that this policy is consistently implemented in all locations is a significant undertaking. Furthermore, providing adequate smoking areas is another challenge. These areas must be sufficiently separated from public areas and not disrupt the comfort of others, which requires careful planning and monitoring.

To address these challenges, more intensive and sustained outreach is needed. The public must be continuously educated on the benefits of the smoke-free policy and the importance of maintaining smoke-free public spaces. This outreach can be conducted through various channels, including social media campaigns, seminars, and other activities involving the wider community.

Furthermore, stricter oversight is also essential. By increasing the number of supervisors and utilizing technology to monitor smoking areas, it is hoped that this policy can be enforced more effectively. More intensive oversight, coupled with firm action against violations, will increase public compliance with this regulation.

Ultimately, with improvements in oversight and more extensive outreach, it is hoped that this KTR policy will run more smoothly and effectively, creating a healthier and more comfortable environment for everyone.

## Weakness Factors of Non-Smoking Areas

### a. What are the Supporting and Inhibiting Factors for the Implementation of Smoke-Free Areas in DKI Jakarta Province?

#### 1. Supporting Regulations

Clear regulations and bylaws: DKI Jakarta has a Regional Regulation (Perda) on Smoke-Free Zones, which provides a strong legal basis for policy enforcement. This regulation covers various aspects, such as a ban on smoking in public areas, workplaces, and public facilities frequently accessed by the public. The existence of a clear legal instrument provides a strong foundation for implementation. Furthermore, the existence of a new draft regional regulation will significantly support the successful implementation of these smoke-free zones.

#### 2. Increasing Health Awareness

Support from the health community: Many health organizations and medical professionals fully support the KTR policy, as it aims to protect public health, particularly from exposure to harmful secondhand smoke. This has given the KTR policy widespread support from the medical community, which is often a key player in health campaigns and also among organizations that support campaigns to ban smoking areas.

#### 3. Community Participation

a. Active community involvement in the socialization and monitoring of non-smoking areas (KTR), including anti-smoking awareness communities, social campaigns, and educational programs. Jakartans are quite aware of this policy, as evidenced by the high level of participation in various social activities and campaigns that educate the public about the dangers of smoking.

b. Easily accessible complaints through applications such as JAKI and Lapor1708 also allow the public to report violations, thereby strengthening participatory oversight mechanisms.

#### 4. Provision of Appropriate Smoking Facilities

Providing designated smoking areas that meet standards and are away from public areas in various public facilities, such as parks, government offices, and entertainment venues. Providing adequate space for smokers will support the success of this policy by reducing disruption to non-smokers.

#### 5. Ongoing Law Enforcement and Supervision

The active role of the Public Order Agency (Satpol PP) in enforcing KTR violations. Increasing the number of supervisory officers and collaborating with various regional agencies also supports the implementation of this policy. Furthermore, sanctions for violators strengthen the policy's effectiveness.

### b. Factors Inhibiting the Implementation of KTR in DKI Jakarta

#### 1. Lack of Consistent Oversight

Uneven or inconsistent supervision remains a major obstacle to implementing the KTR policy. Despite clear regulations, many people still violate the smoking ban in prohibited areas, such as public areas or offices, due to a lack of on-the-ground supervision.

#### 2. Strong Smoking Culture in Society

- a. The long-standing smoking habit, ingrained in the culture of most Jakartans, presents a significant challenge. Smokers often feel their rights are restricted by the KTR policy and tend to ignore the regulations due to their unfamiliarity with changing habits.
  - b. Long-standing smoking habits in the workplace or public places can be very difficult to change in a short period of time, especially if there is a lack of understanding about the dangers of smoking.
3. Lack of Adequate Facilities and Infrastructure  
Establishing smoking areas that meet standards is often hampered by budget constraints and limited space in public places or facilities. Many places lack adequate designated smoking areas, forcing smokers to smoke in prohibited areas.
  4. Protests from Entrepreneurs and Related Industries  
The tobacco industry and businesses involved in cigarette-related businesses often oppose KTR policies due to the economic losses that could result from a decline in cigarette consumption. This can prompt them to file lawsuits or lobby for a reduction in the policy's implementation.
  5. Negative Perception of Policy
    - a. Some may view the KTR policy as a restriction on personal freedom, especially for smokers who feel their rights are being violated. Public misunderstanding of the policy's objectives and a lack of effective outreach can lead to resistance.
    - b. Therefore, effective communication and more intensive awareness campaigns are needed so that the public better understands the objectives of the policy and the importance of smoke-free areas.

#### **Strategy for Implementing Smoke-Free Area Policy in DKI Jakarta**

The strategy for implementing the Smoke-Free Area (KTR) policy in DKI Jakarta using SWOT analysis involves identifying existing strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats, to formulate effective steps in implementing the KTR policy. The following is a SWOT analysis and strategies that can be taken to support this policy:

1. *Strengths*(Superiority)
  - a. Clear and Supportive Regulations: The existing KTR Regional Regulation provides a strong legal basis for enforcing this policy. Clear regulations facilitate law enforcement and ensure consistency in implementation.
  - b. Support from the Health Sector: This policy has received widespread support from the health sector, which sees it as an important step to reduce exposure to secondhand smoke, which is harmful to the public, especially vulnerable groups such as children and pregnant women.
  - c. Community Involvement in Socialization: There is active community involvement in the socialization of this policy through health campaigns, anti-smoking communities, and supervisory participation which can accelerate the acceptance of the policy by the wider community.



- d. Easily Accessible Public Complaints: Complaint channels through JAKI and Lapor1708 make it easy for the public to report violations of the KTR policy, which increases the effectiveness of supervision.
2. *Weaknesses*(Weakness)
  - a. Inconsistent Supervision: One of the main weaknesses in the implementation of this policy is the lack of consistent supervision in some areas. Some places may not be adequately supervised, leading to continued violations, such as smoking in prohibited areas.
  - b. Lack of Adequate Smoking Facilities: The provision of designated smoking areas that meet the criteria and standards of the KTR policy is still lacking in some areas. This leads to smokers tending to smoke indiscriminately, even despite signs prohibiting smoking.
  - c. Strong Smoking Culture: The long-standing smoking habit in society presents a challenge. Many people still consider smoking a personal right and believe this policy restricts their freedom.
  - d. Lack of Knowledge and Understanding: People who are less educated about the dangers of smoking and the objectives of the KTR policy may have a harder time accepting this policy, making them less compliant with the existing regulations.
3. *Opportunities*(Opportunity)
  - a. Increasing Public Awareness: Increased public health awareness about the dangers of smoking, particularly secondhand smoke, provides an opportunity for wider acceptance of KTR policies. More extensive campaigns can encourage changes in public behavior.
  - b. Technology Support: The use of technology, such as the JAKI app and other online platforms, provides opportunities to improve oversight and policy dissemination. Furthermore, technology can assist law enforcement through a more effective violation reporting system.
  - c. Collaboration with the Private Sector and Community: Collaborating with entertainment venues, restaurants, and cafes to provide designated smoking areas that meet standards can create a healthier environment without reducing business revenue.
  - d. Policies that Support a Healthy Economy: KTR policies can open up opportunities for the development of the health industry and healthy tourism sectors, which can be drivers of economic growth through the provision of health-friendly facilities.
4. *Threats*(Threat)
  - a. Resistance from Businessmen and Related Industries: Cigarette entrepreneurs and tobacco-related industries (e.g. restaurants, cafes, and entertainment venues that provide smoking areas) may be opponents of the policy because they are worried about the decrease in income and economic losses due to the decrease in the number of smokers.

- b. Persistent Violations: Despite regulations, established smoking habits in many places are difficult to change quickly. This leads to repeated violations that hinder the policy's success.
- c. The Influence of a Strong Smoking Culture: A long-standing smoking culture, particularly among men and in certain work cultures, can lead to resistance to these policies, especially if the policies are perceived as restricting personal freedoms.
- d. Economic Issues for Cigarette-Related Workers: KTR policies can lead to a decline in jobs in tobacco-related sectors, and unemployment in sectors affected by the reduction in cigarette consumers.

#### **StrategySWOT Analysis of Smoke-Free Area (KTR) Policy**

1. SO (Strengths – Opportunities) strategy
  - a. Leveraging internal strengths to seize external opportunities.
  - b. Optimizing regulations and health sector support to expand public education campaigns on the dangers of smoking and the importance of KTR, in line with increasing public awareness of health.
  - c. Strengthening community and technology collaboration (JAKI, Lapor1708) to expand the reporting and outreach system, so that it reaches more regions and age groups.
  - d. Integrating community oversight with the use of technology to create a real-time and responsive violation reporting and monitoring system.
  - e. Develop strategic partnerships with the private sector to provide designated smoking areas according to standards, while maintaining the quality of a smoke-free environment.
2. WO (Weaknesses – Opportunities) weakness-opportunities strategy
  - a. Minimize weaknesses by taking advantage of existing opportunities.
  - b. Increase technology-based and local community outreach to address the lack of public understanding of the dangers of smoking and the objectives of KTR.
  - c. Develop dedicated smoking facilities in strategic locations through partnerships with the private sector, to reduce indiscriminate smoking.
  - d. Optimizing reporting applications and social media to strengthen oversight in areas where enforcement has been inconsistent.
  - e. Gradually changing the smoking culture through inclusive, sustainable campaigns and tailoring the approach to social groups that are still resistant.
3. ST (Strengths – Threats) strategy
  - a. Using power to overcome or reduce external threats.
  - b. Affirming the legal basis and support of the health sector in facing resistance from the tobacco industry and entrepreneurs, by demonstrating the long-term positive impacts on society.
  - c. Encourage public participation and anti-smoking communities to suppress repeat violations through collective monitoring and rapid reporting.
  - d. Increase transparency and public involvement in policies to reduce resistance stemming from perceived restrictions on freedom.

- e. Promoting the economic benefits of a healthy environment as a counterbalance to the potential economic losses resulting from restrictions on smoking areas.
- 4. WT (Weaknesses – Threats) strategy
  - a. Reduce weaknesses and avoid possible threats.
  - b. Train supervisory officers intensively and evenly to correct inconsistencies in supervision in the field and prevent repeated violations.
  - c. Implement an economic transition program for workers in the tobacco sector to prevent unemployment due to a decrease in demand for cigarettes.
  - d. Massively increase public literacy through media and educational institutions to dismantle the smoking culture and increase compliance with policies.
  - e. Implementing a persuasive and participatory approach in enforcing KTR, so that the community feels involved and not oppressed by this policy.

## CONCLUSION

Based on the research that has been conducted, it can be concluded that the causes of the implementation of the Smoke-Free Area policy in DKI Jakarta Province are not optimal in its implementation are as follows: The Smoke-Free Area (KTR) Policy in DKI Jakarta Province can be concluded that the Smoke-Free Area (KTR) Policy in DKI Jakarta is not fully optimal. Although there has been positive progress, such as increased awareness and decreased violations in several sectors, there are still challenges that need to be addressed, especially in sectors such as public transportation and public places that show low compliance. In addition, more consistent supervision, increased human resources, and more intensive education are needed to ensure that this policy can be implemented effectively across all sectors and reach all target groups. Therefore, despite progress, this policy still requires improvement to achieve more optimal results. The Smoke-Free Area (KTR) Policy in DKI Jakarta has significant strengths, especially in terms of a clear legal basis through Regional Regulations (Perda), extensive health sector support, and community involvement in socialization and supervision. Easily accessible complaint channels, such as the JAKI and Lapor1708 applications, also strengthen supervision and accelerate the reporting of violations. However, this policy faces several weaknesses, such as inconsistent supervision in some areas, limited availability of smoking facilities that meet the criteria, and challenges related to the entrenched smoking culture within the community. There are significant opportunities to improve the implementation of this policy, such as increasing public awareness of the dangers of smoking, conducting more extensive health campaigns, and utilizing technology to improve real-time monitoring. Collaborating with the private sector to provide smoking rooms that meet standards also opens up opportunities to further support this policy without disrupting the business sector. However, this policy also faces threats, particularly resistance from businesses associated with tobacco and entertainment venues, as well as the persistence of smoking habits among the public, especially those who consider smoking a personal right. Challenges also arise from the potential economic impact on workers in the tobacco industry, who may be affected by a decline in cigarette demand.

## REFERENCES

- Arikunto, S. (2006). *Prosedur Penelitian: Suatu Pendekatan Praktik*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.
- Arikunto, S. (2011). *Prosedur Penelitian: Suatu Pendekatan Praktik*, Edisi Revisi VII. Jakarta: PT. Rineka Cipta.
- Badjuri, D., & Yuwono, A. (2002). *Indikator Evaluasi Kebijakan Publik*. Jakarta: Universitas Indonesia.
- Best, J. W. (1959). *Research in Education AB*. United States of America.
- Best, J. W. (2015). *Research in Education*, 10<sup>th</sup> Edition. Boston: Pearson Education.
- Centre for Science and Technology Studies. (2025). *VOSviewer: Visualizing Research Trends*. Retrieved from <https://www.vosviewer.com>.
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*, 4<sup>th</sup> Edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- (2003). *Evaluating Publik Policy*. Boston: Pearson.
- Dunn, William N. 2003. *Pengantar Analisis Kebijakan Publik*. Yogyakarta, Gadjah Mada University Press.
- Esterberg, K. G. (2002). *Qualitative Methods in Social Research*. Boston: McGraw-Hill.
- Hidayat, M. (2004). *Metode Penelitian Deskriptif: Konsep dan Aplikasi*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.
- Judge, T. A., & Robbins, S. P. (2017). *Essentials of Organizational Behavior*. Pearson Education (US).
- Labolo, M., Rowa, H., & Kawuryan, M. W. (2015). *Dialektika Ilmu Pemerintahan (Kompilasi Hasil Seminar, Makalah dan Jurnal Ilmu Pemerintahan)*. Ghalia Indonesia.
- Ndraha, T. (2005). *Kybernologi I dan II*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.
- Ndraha, T. (2011). *Kybernologi (Ilmu Pemerintahan Baru)*. Rineka Cipta, Jakarta.
- Nurcholis, M. (2005). *Metodologi Evaluasi Kebijakan*. Yogyakarta: Gadjah Mada University Press.
- Nurcholis, Hanif. (2005). *Teori dan Praktek Pemerintahan dan Otonomi Daerah*. PT. Gramedia, Jakarta.
- Supriyanto, B. (2009). *Manajemen Pemerintah*. Tangerang: CV. Media Berlian.
- Syafiie, I. K. (2013). *Pengantar Ilmu Pemerintahan*.
- Wahab, S. (2004). *Evaluasi Program dan Kebijakan*. Jakarta: Lembaga Penerbit Fakultas Ekonomi Universitas Indonesia.
- Wahab, Solihin Abdul. (2004). *Analisis Kebijaksanaan*. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.
- Widjaja, S. (2005). *Teori dan Praktik Pemerintahan*. Jakarta: LP3ES.
- Yin, R. K. (2003). *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*, 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Yuwono, A. & Badjuri, D. (2002). *Indikator Evaluasi Kebijakan Publik*. Jakarta: Universitas Indonesia.
- Undang – Undang Nomor 36 Tahun 2009 tentang Kesehatan.
- Peraturan Gubernur Nomor 88 Tahun 2010 tentang Kawasan Tanpa Rokok.
- Peraturan Gubernur Nomo 40 Tahun 2020 tentang Kawasan Tanpa Rokok.
- Organisasi Kesehatan Dunia (WHO). (2021). *Tobacco Facts and Figures*. World Health Organization. Retrieved from <https://www.who.int>

- Badan Lingkungan Nasional (NEA). (2021). *The Smoking Situation in Singapore*. National Environment Agency, Singapore. Retrieved from <https://www.nea.gov.sg>
- World Population Review. (2022). *Countries with the Highest Percentage of Smokers in 2022*. World Population Review. Retrieved from <https://worldpopulationreview.com>
- Kementerian Kesehatan Republik Indonesia. (2021). *Statistik Konsumsi Tembakau di Indonesia*. Ministry of Health, Republik of Indonesia. Retrieved from <https://www.kemkes.go.id>
- The World Bank. (2020). *The Economics of Tobacco and the Tobacco Industry*. The World Bank Group. Retrieved from <https://www.worldbank.org>
- Asia Pacific Foundation of Canada. (2020). *Global Tobacco Use and Public Health Policies*. Asia Pacific Foundation of Canada. Retrieved from <https://www.asiapacific.ca>